

NODE
29180

NODE
29180

THE FIRST AGHA KHAN AND THE EMPIRE,

1838 - 1863,

A STUDY IN BRITISH INDIAN

DIPLOMACY AND LEGAL HISTORY

by

Zawahir Moorally

Thesis presented for the degree of M. A.,

in the University of London

April 1964



ABSTRACT

Mohammed Russain Alias Hassan Ali Shah, the first Agha Khan, was the Imam or head of the Ismaili sect of Islam. In 1818 he was the governor of Mahallat and Qum in Persia. In the year 1837, he rebelled against Mohammed Shah Qajar and tried to establish his independent authority in the south of Persia. In 1841, he fled from Persia and took refuge at Qandahar. He helped the British in the first Afghan war. In 1845, he was employed by the British in Sind, to use his influence there. In that year the Agha Khan was refused permission to return to Persia and was given allowances by the Indian Government. The Persian Government complained to the Foreign Office about the protection given to the Agha Khan in India. Following an agreement between the Persian and the British Governments in 1844, he was sent to Calcutta in April 1847. During his stay in Calcutta the Agha Khan repeatedly asked to be allowed to return to Persia. In 1848, after the death of Mohammed Shah Qajar, the Government of India allowed him to leave Calcutta for Bombay en route to Persia. The situation in Persia was unstable and the Foreign Office recommended his detention in India but refused the request of the Governor General that they should share in the payment of the allowance. However, the India Board in 1851 decided to allow the Agha Khan to reside permanently in Bonbay with his numerous followers.

In 1866, a case was filed against the Agha Khan by some of his followers in the Bombay High Court, as a result of which the Agha Khan succeeded in establishing his authority over the Ismaili community in India.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
Abstract	1
Table of Contents	3
Introduction	4
Chapter I. The First Agha Khan and the British in Persia 1838-1841	11
Chapter II. The Agha Khan in Afghanistan 1841-1842	41
Chapter III. The Agha Khan in Sind 1843-1844.	67
Chapter IV. The question of Asylum 1843-1847	90
Chapter V. The Agha Khan in Calcutta 1847-1848	124
Chapter VI. The re-opening of the asylum issue and the settlement of the Agha Khan in Bombay 1849-1851	141
Chapter VII. The Agha Khan and his community in India. 1847-1868	166
Conclusion	183
Bibliography	187
Notes on references and Abbreviations	195
Appendix	195

INTRODUCTION

This thesis deals mainly with the career of the first Agha Khan from 1858-1868. His career can be divided into two parts. Firstly, as a religious head of the Ismaili sect of Islam and secondly, his role in British Indian diplomacy. As far as the first part is concerned, it needs some explanation.

After the death of the Prophet Muhammed, Islam was divided into sects, of which Shia and Sunni were the two main ones. The Sunnis, the traditionists, were the Orthodox Muslims, professing their faith, "there was no God but God, Muhammed his Prophet"; to this the Shias, the separatists, added, "Ali was the Vicar of God", and that Ali and his descendants were the rightful successors of the Prophet Muhammed to his religious and temporal authority. The Ithna Asharia and the Ismailia were the two main branches of Shiism. The Ismailis were those who held Ismail, the son of Imam Jafer-us-Sadiq, as their rightful Imam. Under the dominion of the Abbasid rulers of Islam, in the 10th century, the Ismailis succeeded in establishing their Fatimid Caliphate in Egypt and also developed a revolutionary religious, social and rational philosophy within the predominantly religious society of Islam. The movement manifested itself under various names and spread in Syria, Persia, Central Asia and India. In the 11th and 12th centuries the dreaded

Assassins of Persia and Syria were one of the facets of the movement.¹

Many Shia and Sunni historians of the time attempted to write the history of the movement. The characteristics of syncretism and esoterism rendered the investigation difficult. Also, the Orthodox Sunni historians were not unbiased in their approach. However the movement had challenged the Islamic thinkers. Writers like Chasali and Bagdadi asked themselves why the movement had spread so rapidly and adduced reasons of varying plausibility.²

In 1256, after the general massacre of the Ismailis in Persia, their fortresses and libraries were destroyed by the Mongols. Since that time it has remained a difficult task to trace the surviving links of the living Imam and his followers. It seems the movement had survived in Persia, Central Asia, Syria, Afghanistan and India and the Agha Khan and his ancestors have claimed to be the surviving Imams.³

¹ Donaldson, D. M., The Shi'ite Religion, London 1933.
 Hodgeson, M. G., The Order of Assassins, Gravenhage 1955.
 Lewis, B., The Origins of Ismailism, Cambridge 1940.
 Mansour, P. H., Polemics on the origin of the Fatimi Caliphs, London 1934.
 Raverty, E. G., A brief history of the rise of the Ismailian Sect, MSS. Eur. C. 37.

² Lewis, B. The origins of Ismailism, p.90.

³ Ivanov, V. has done research on this obscure period. His research has convinced him that the Imams have always been carrying on the propaganda of the faith - see "Tools of some Persian Ismaili Imams", J.B.R.A.S., XIV, 1938, pp. 49-62; also A guide to Ismaili literature, London 1933, Teheran 1963.

Medieval Europe knew little about Shia Islam, except in the form of the Assassins. It was really in the 17th century and after that European travellers and scholars began to enlarge their knowledge of Islamic sects. Various Sunni and Shia histories of Islam were edited and travellers' accounts of their contacts with eastern people were published.¹ To early European scholars, Ismailis, Fatimids, Assassins and Karmathians were all different names for one movement.² It was after the appearance of the Sunni, Shia and Ismaili source materials that, in the nineteenth century, scholars began to isolate the Ismaili movement and its surviving chief in Persia. British travellers like James Morier, Macdonald Kinair, John Malcolm, Robert Porter, and James Fraser gave accounts of the first Aga Khan's ancestors (although only up to his grandfather).³ Malcolm mistakenly describes the Ismaili followers of

¹ Chardin, J., Description de la Perse, Paris 1811.
 Daniel, N., Islam and the West, Edinburgh 1960, pp. 282, 318-19.
 Holt & Lewis, Historians of the Middle East, London 1962, p. 295.
 Herbert, T., Travels begun anno 1626, London 1634.
Marco Polo, ed. by Yule, H. London 1871.
 de Sacy, S., Exposé de la Religion de Druses, Paris 1838.
 Volney, M.C.F., Travels Egypt & Syria, New York 1798.

² Lewis, Ismailism, p.20.

³ Fraser, J.B., Narrative of journey into Khorassan, 1821-22, London 1829, pp. 376-77.
 Kinair, J.H., A geographical Memoir, London 1815, pp. 157-58.
 Malcolm, J., The History of Persia, London 1815, Vol. I, p. 407.
 Morier, J., A Journey through Persia, 1808-09, London 1812, Vol. II, p. 359.
 Porter, R., Travels in Persia, London 1821-22, Vol. I, pp. 285-88.

the Agha Khan in India as the Bohras. In 1818, von Hammer, in his book Die Assassinen, stated that the Ismaili Imam then resided in Kehk, a village in Qum, under the protection of Fath Ali Shah Qajar, the Shah of Persia, and that many Ismailis from India visited the Imam.¹ Henry Rawlinson of the Bombay army, while serving in Persia between 1834 and 1838, travelled in different parts of Persia and collected information regarding the Ali Lalahi or followers of the Ismaili Imams.² Robert Grant Watson using some Persian histories of the early 19th century, added some more information about the relations of the Agha Khan with Fath Ali and his activities in Persia.³ It was at the time when Muhammed Shah Qajar invaded Herat in 1837 that the Agha Khan's name first appeared in the official correspondence of the British agents in Persia.⁴ From that

¹ See von Hammer - trans. by C. B. Wood from German, London 1835. Hammer derived his accounts from the Sunni Histories, at Imperial Library, Vienna, and also used travellers' accounts.

² Rawlinson, H., "Notes on a march from Zohab in 1836", J.R.G.S., Vol. IX of 1839, pp. 36-37. Rawlinson, H., "The Journey in Kurdistan", J.R.G.S., Vol. X, 1841, p. 24.

³ Watson, R. G., The History of Persia, London 1866, pp. 192, 333.

⁴ In the British correspondence, the phrase 'Agha Khan' has been treated as a name and not as a title. Even Persian scholars like Rawlinson and W. Macnaghten considered it a name. Rawlinson in his report on the Agha Khan mentioned that "Syad Mahomed Russain but better known by his 'Amchalies' or 'nom de guerre' of Agha Khan." See Rawlinson to C.O. 20.12.42, E.S.L.I. Vol. 91, No. 22 of No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843. In the Bombay Government's correspondence and the newspapers, 'His Highness' was added to the Agha Khan's name. 'Agha' and 'Khan' were revenue titles under the Qajars. See Rawlinson, Journey in Kurdistan, pp. 35-36, Fraser, Travels in the Persian Provinces, p. 145. In the Persian Government's letters his territorial name is added, 'Aga Khan Mahallati'.

time onwards his activities were reported in some details. Further, a good deal of Indian Ismaili theological writing came to light in 1866, in the Bonbay High Court. The material in the official papers has not been hitherto used to give an account of the career of the Agha Khan and to examine on a systematic basis his role in British Indian diplomacy between 1838 and 1868.

In the course of the 18th and early 19th centuries, the East India Company had grown to be the paramount power in India. The general problem of British diplomacy in the Eastern Muslim world in these years was that of checking the progress of Russian influence towards India. By the early 19th century Britain and Russia had emerged as the two great European powers with substantial interests in the East. Their interests met in Central Asia. For a time both powers did endeavour to keep the peace in Central Asia and in 1834 they cooperated on the question of the succession in Persia, after the death of Fath Ali Shah.¹ But distrust of Russian policy grew and politicians in England like Palmerston, who returned to office in 1835, began to advocate a forward policy in Central Asia.² The interests of Britain and Russia clashed when Muhammed Shah invaded Herat and it seemed likely that Russian influence would be extended into Afghanistan. As a result, in 1839, Afghanistan was occupied and

¹ Rawlinson, England and Russia, pp. 10-50.

² Webster, Palmerston, Vol. II, p. 738.

diplomatic relations with Persia were terminated.¹

The control of British policy in the Eastern Muslim world presented problems of some difficulty. Since it was the interests of British India which were involved, it seemed logical that India should both control the policy and pay the bill. So Canning thought when he transferred control of the mission in Persia to India in 1826. But since the principal threat to India came from Russia and Britain had relations with Russia in Europe it became clear that the Government in England should have the final arbiter. The failure of Canning's policy became clear after 1830 and in 1835 control of the mission was resumed by the Crown.² Policy in Afghanistan and Northern India on the one hand was left in the hands of the East India Company. The result was that debates about policy, who should pay for it, tended to take place between the Foreign Office, the Board of Control and the Court of Directors in London, and between England and the Government of India. Problems also arose of achieving a co-ordinated policy in these areas. In practice policy was largely settled by discussion between the President of the Board of Control and the Foreign Secretary and orders transmitted accordingly to Persia

¹ See Mosely, "Russian Policy in Asia," Slavonic Review, 1936, p. 670. Crawley, "Anglo-Russian Relations 1815-40," Cambridge Historical Journal, 1929. Memoirs of Sir John MacNeill, p. 245.

² Yepp, "The Control of Persian Mission," Birmingham University Historical Journal, 1959, pp. 162-70.

and India. In those discussions it was clear that the views of Palmerston and Aberdeen as Foreign Secretaries tended to prevail over those of Hobhouse and Ripon. But even after agreement was reached it was plain, as this thesis shows, that it was not easy to persuade the Government of India to take the necessary action. Even within India it was difficult to co-ordinate the policy of the Government of India in Bengal and the Government of Bombay. As the case of the Agha Khan's asylum shows this could lead to delays which made nonsense of policy decisions.

Although H.M. Government could usually in the long run enforce its policy it still required the East India Company to pay for it. This in turn led to disagreements between the authorities concerned and financial problems were frequently a limiting factor in the operation of these policies.

The role of the Agha Khan in the British Indian diplomacy is a minor one, and the following pages will investigate the same in the light of the materials available.

Chapter I.The First Agha Khan and the British in
Persia 1838-1841 A. D.

During the reign of Fath Ali Shah Qajar, the Shah of Persia (1798-1834), the first Agha Khan was the Governor of Mahallat and Qumm. In the year 1837, the Agha Khan rebelled against Fath Ali's grandson and successor Muhammed Shah and tried to contact British agents, in order to obtain help against the Shah. The position of the Agha Khan and his possible contacts with the British agents are seen here in the light of conditions existing in Persia at that time.

Persia's frontiers in the South extended up to the Persian Gulf. In the North, after the Perso-Russian war, and the Treaty of Turkomanchay in 1823, Persia's boundaries were the Aras river and the Caspian. Both the Eastern and the Western frontiers were the subject of periodic disputes. During the last days of Fath Ali's reign however, it was the Eastern frontier that was becoming important. The most extensive claims were made on this side.¹

The inhabitants of Persia were of mixed stock. Apart from the Iranian population itself, there were a number of separate linguistic and racial groups.² In Adharbaijan, the population was

¹ Watson - Persia, pp. 258-260.

² Curzon - Persia, Vol. I, p. 464.

Turkish; in the North East and North West, Kurdish, and in the South mostly Arabic. The population also contained a very substantial proportion of nomads, particularly in the South West. The official religion of the country was the Shia Ithma-Ashari, but there were Sunnis, Ali Illehis (Ismailis),¹ Christians, Jews etc. Often there were religious clashes among the Southern tribes.

Persia was an agricultural country growing main crops such as wheat, barley, millet, maize, opium, vines and numerous other products. Raw silk was an important export and cotton and wool were also manufactured. The south was trading with India through the Gulf and the North with Russia. During the early part of Fath Ali's reign, trade with Russia and India was growing. After 1830, through the opening of the route via the Black Sea, Trebisond and Erzerum, British goods started flowing into Northern Persia.²

The Qajar dynasty came to power in the late 18th Century, after a long struggle, which was continued during the early part of Fath Ali's reign. Fath Ali was an absolute monarch, ruling Persia, with the help of his many sons, whom he appointed Governors of his provinces.³ The Governors, each in their province, had his own Nasir

¹Rawlinson, "Journey of 1836", J.R.G.S., 1839, IX, pp. 26-116.

²Curzon, Persia, Vol. II, pp. 554-556.

³For details see, Lambton, Landlord and Peasant, p. 135.

appointed to assist him in his administration. These Governors were independent in their administration, provided their own defence, and also collected their revenues. Fath Ali had redistributed some tribes in order to weaken or strengthen certain groups. For example in Falish, he had weakened the family of Mustafa Khan. From the Bakhtiari Chiefs, he had taken hostages.¹ In 1818, in Mahallat and Qum, he had appointed the Agha Khan as the Governor of the province, after a religious affray in which the Agha Khan's father Khalilullah was murdered.²

During Fath Ali's reign European interest in Persia was growing. As early as 1798, a British diplomatic mission was sent to Persia. In the beginning of the nineteenth century, the fear of a possible invasion of India by a European power was felt by both the Indian and the British Governments. In 1814, the Treaty of Teheran was concluded between Great Britain and Persia. It was declared to be a strictly defensive treaty, by which England was to defend Persia against any foreign invasion and in return Persia was not to allow any European army to enter Persian territory nor to proceed towards India and should any European powers invade India, Persia was to oppose them. Two more clauses of the treaty are of import-

¹ Morier, Second Journey, p. 126.

² Watson, Persia, p. 192.

ance to this study. According to the ninth clause, if war should be declared between the Afghans and the Persians, the English Government should not interfere, unless their mediation should be solicited by both parties. According to Clause 10 "Should any Persian subject of distinction, showing signs of hostility and rebellion take refuge in the British dominions, the English Government shall, on intimation from the Persian Government, turn him out of their country, or if he refuses to leave it, shall seize and send him to Persia."¹

However, in the years immediately following the conclusion of the treaty, very little interest was taken by the British Government in the affairs of Persia. In 1826, when the Franco-Persian war began, Britain remained neutral on the grounds that Persia was the aggressor in the war.² There had always been a conflict between the Indian and London administrations as to which should control relations with Persia.³ In 1835, when Palmerston became Foreign Minister, no change had already been made in the control of the British mission in Persia.⁴ Henry Ellis was sent to Persia as the British Ambassador.

¹Witchison, G., Legations XII, pp. 54-57.

²Mayo, Admiralty, I, p. 140.

³Tapp, "Persian Mission," B.U.H.J. VII, pp. 112-120.

⁴See Webster, Palmerston, II, p. 759.

charged to congratulate Muhammed Shah, the grandson of Fath Ali, who had succeeded to the throne in 1834. Ellis was authorized to open negotiations for the conclusion of a commercial treaty. Also he was instructed to co-operate with the representative of Russia, unless they attempted to induce the Shah to undertake foreign invasions. Ellis was further instructed to promote friendship between Persia and Turkey.¹

After his accession, Muhammed Shah projected a plan to invade Herat. He claimed that the ruler of Herat, Kamran Shah, had not fulfilled promises which he had made to release Persian captives and pay tribute to Persia. Besides other rulers of Afghanistan had sent agents to negotiate with the Shah of Persia an alliance for a joint attack.² The Shah made preparations to attack.

Ellis' advice on Persian domestic and foreign policy were received without enthusiasm and Persians objected to his remarks opposing their designs on Afghanistan. At the Persian Court, the Russian Envoy, Count Simonich did not discourage Muhammed Shah from his ambitions of extending his empire.³ Meanwhile Ellis adopted an alarmist attitude towards the question of Herat, attacked Russian designs

¹ Kaye, Afghanistan I, p. 154.

² Watson, Persia, p. 296.

³ Koseley, Russian Diplomacy, pp. 5-4.

and wrote anxious letters to Palmerston.¹ In June 1836, Palmerston decided to send John McNeill to replace Ellis. McNeill was instructed to strengthen and confirm the alliance subsisting between Great Britain and Persia and to suggest amendments of the political treaty. In addition to these orders, he was given a detailed draft of a commercial treaty of which he could negotiate only the substance if necessary. He was also instructed to offer advice on other domestic and foreign affairs. He was authorized to offer British mediation between Persia and Herat.²

After reaching Persia in September 1836, McNeill found that the Shah was very anxious to attack Herat. However McNeill became optimistic on learning that in the Summer of 1836, Turkoman tribes had revolted in the North East and the Shah was forced to postpone his expedition to Herat. At the end of the same year, the Shah reopened his negotiations with Herat. At the same time it appeared doubtful, whether the Shah possessed the means of immediately putting his plans for conquest into practice, for in his encounter with the Turkoman he was repulsed. By the summer of 1837, McNeill thought

¹ Ellis to Palmerston, 18.11.35 No. 15 of P.O. 60/37.
" " " 30.12.35 No. 22 of P.O. 60/37.

² See Memo of 2.6.36. No. 5 of P.O. 60/42.

that the Shah had postponed his projects indefinitely.¹ However in November 1837, Muhammad Shah attacked Herat. Till December, McNeill remained optimistic and thought of taking leave in England. However the siege at Herat went on and the extent of Russian activities gradually became known. In March 1838, McNeill went to Herat and, according to his instructions, he tried to negotiate with the Shah on the question of Herat. However, in the absence of any specific instructions from Palmerston on the question of Herat, he could not go far enough to stop the Shah.² McNeill's negotiations came to nothing and in June 1838, he announced his intentions of breaking off British diplomatic relations with Persia. He himself withdrew from Herat and stayed at Tabriz for some time. By the end of 1838, he left for England and British relations with Persia were finally broken off.³

In September 1837, the first Agha Khan declared his rebellion in the South of Persia. He was the head of certain tribes of the Ismaili sect in Nahallat, Qum, Kirman, Yazd and Khorasan. Not much is known about his strength and power. J. B. Fraser, who travelled in Persian Khorasan between 1821-22, mentioned that his followers were to be found in Yazd and in the area of Sabzavar.⁴ Major H. Rawlinson

¹ McNeill to Palmerston, 2.10.37 No. 84 and
" " " 30.10.37 No. 58 of P.O. 60/51.

² McNeill to Palmerston, 12.5.38. No. 25 of P.O. 60/57.

³ Webster, Palmerston, II, p. 742.

⁴ Fraser, Khorasan, p. 376. At Sehich which lies about half way between Qum and Birjand, a few Ismaili families lived - see Sykes, Ten Thousand Miles, p. 409. Ata Ullahi nomads of Kirman sent their flocks to the Agha Khan, see Sykes, p. 78.

who was a military officer, attached to the British mission in Persia in 1834-36, stationed at Kirmanshah, but who travelled elsewhere wrote in 1842, that "At the present day the title of Immaelees is alone retained by some two or three thousand families, who inhabit the province of Kerman".¹ Fraser on the authority of his Persian guide reported that the Imam, the Chief of the sect, was visited by his other followers from Persia and India.² In 1836-37, the Agha Khan was visited by about 500 followers from India.³ Fraser also mentioned that the father of the Agha Khan, Khalilullah, in 1818 was murdered by the people of Yazd, because Khalilullah, with the help of the Governor of the province, had extorted revenues from the people.⁴ R. G. Watson, writing about Qajar History in 1856, described the same event and added, "The news of this event was received with the greatest concern by the Shah who dreaded lest he should be held responsible by the dangerous sect of Ismailites for the death of their sacred Chief.... Fetteh Ali adopted his son Aga Khan, Mahalati, and added a considerable property to the estates which the boy had inherited from his father."⁵

¹ Rawlinson to G.O., 20.12.42. E.S.L.I. 91 of No. 22 of No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

² Fraser, Khorasan, p. 377.

³ Arnould, Judgment, p.12.

⁴ Fraser, Khorasan, p. 377. Khalilullah had 100 'Gholams' - standing troops - and at the time of the riot, many of his Indian followers who had come to visit him were killed.

⁵ Watson, Persia, p. 192. Watson mistakenly gives the name Khalilullah as Halilullah.

Apparently the young Agha Khan then lived quietly for some years in Mahallat and Qazvin as the Governor of the province. Rawlinson also reports that, after his accession, Muhammad Shah confirmed the Agha Khan in his post at Mahallat and Qazvin and also, in consideration of his local influence, appointed him the Governor of the 'rich province' of Kirman.¹ In 1835, the Agha Khan's administration of revenue proving unsatisfactory, he was removed from Kirman. Rawlinson mentioned, "in 1836, however, as it was found impossible to keep the province in order under any other Governor, unless supported by a large military force, he was reappointed."²

The Agha Khan after reaching his province, in September 1837, declared his dissatisfaction. McNeill reported that the Agha Khan had occupied the fortress of Bam and had declared his rebellion in September 1837.³ The Agha Khan continued in rebellion for some time. Watson reports that the Shah found his rights disputed by 'a rival of a different order' after his return to Tehran from his Afghan campaign.⁴ In describing the reasons for the Agha Khan's rebellion, Watson writes, "There is no reason for believing that he especially

¹ Rawlinson to C.G. 20.12.42. E.S.L.I. 91 No. 22, No. 12 of 19. Feb. 1843.

² Ibid.

³ McNeill to Palmerston, 28.9.37. No. 78. P.O. 60/50.
Also: enc. Col. Taylor's letter of 6.9.37. No. 46 of P.O. 60/52.

⁴ Watson, Persia, p. 331.

selected the moment of the Shah's return from an unsuccessful campaign for attempting to set up his own dominion in opposition to that of the King; for his pretensions were to spiritual authority more than to temporal, and in the East, religious enthusiasts have generally been guided in their appeals to men more by fancied promptings of some invisible power than by the suggestions of common sense".¹ Rawlinson reflecting on the Agha Khan's character wrote, "On reaching his government, the indignation which he felt at his recent ill-treatment, operating upon a character naturally restless and ambitious, induced him to take advantage of the distraction, which had begun to prevail in Persia, owing to the failure of the Turko-man campaign, to proclaim the independence of Kerman and to set the power of the Shah at defiance."² In 1856, the Chief Justice of Bombay, J. Arnould, whilst pronouncing the judgment in 'The Agha Khan case', pointed out what was, in his opinion, a more probable reason for the rebellion of the Agha Khan. He quoted the authority of a Persian historian (unnamed) who assigns the reason, "Hadji Mirza Ahasi (sic), who had been the tutor of Nahomed Ali Shah (the Shah of Persia), was during the whole reign of his royal pupil the Prime Minister of Persia. A Persian of very low origin, formerly in the service of Aga Khan, had

¹ Watson, Persia, pp. 331-32.

² Rawlinson to C.O. 20.12.42. H.S.L.I. 91.

become the chief favorite and minion of the all-powerful minister. This person, though his patron, had the impudence to demand in marriage for his son one of the daughters of Aga Khan - a grand daughter of the late Shah in Shah! This, says the Persian historian, 'was felt by Aga Khan to be a great insult' and the request though strongly pressed by the Prime Minister, was indignantly refused. Having thus made the most powerful man in Persia his deadly enemy, Aga Khan probably felt that his best chance of safety was to assert himself in arms - a course not uncommon with the great founders of disorganized Persia."¹

The Agha Khan, however, himself claimed different reasons for his rebellion at different times. In a letter to Sir William MacNaghten, the Envoy at Kabul (1839-41), which the Agha Khan wrote while seeking his help and British protection in August 1841, he claimed that, "Since the conduct of the Persian Government has been so oppressive that all the respectable people and nobles of Persia, particularly those of Iraq, Fars and Kerman have been reduced to vexatious misery, the whole body of the learned men, governors and chiefs induced me to throw off the yoke of the Persian allegiance and protect the wretched people."² In 1842, when the Agha Khan was dissatisfied

¹ Arnould, Judgment, p.12. The Persian history was apparently Nasikh-i-Tavarikh, Tarikh-i-Qajariyah, by N. Taqi Siphr Kashani. Story, C.A., Persian literature, Vol. I, pt. I & II, p. 122 and p. 343. See Naz. Isf. under Siphr, also Ravery, H.G., The Nahid, a brief history of the Rise of Ismailism, MSS. Eur. C.37, pp. 213-20.

² Trans: The Agha to MacNaghten, 25.8.41. H.S.L.I. 60 No. 79, No. 68 of 21 Oct. 1841.

with British treatment towards him in Qandahar, he explained to the Governor General his reasons for the rebellion, and he alleged, "I have had frequent correspondence with the Hon'able the Governor of Bombay (Sir James Carnac), who expressed himself highly pleased with me and also with Major Todd at Herat who promised and also wrote, 'that you are to oppose Mahomed Shah, I have received instructions from Government to re-inburse you any expenses that you may incur', and in the year that Mahomed Shah besieged Herat, I set him at defiance in the Fort of Bam - From MacNeil Sahib I received many promises through the Hindoo merchants and were I to relate one half of them they would give you a headache".¹

There is no other written evidence that Carnac and Todd wrote to the Agha Khan to rebel against his Government.² Rawlinson commenting on the Agha Khan's statement wrote "that Agha Khan ever really received, in reply to his communications to the Government of Bombay, Sir John McNeill or Major Todd, letters or messages, expressive of more than a general sympathy in his misfortune, I do not for a moment believe - Agha Khan threw the South of Persia into rebellion from a mixed motive of ambition and revenge - that this rebellion tallied or was supposed to tally with our interests was purely accidental".³

¹Trans. The Agha Khan to G.O. 25.10.42 E.S.L.I. 91, No. 17 No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

²I have consulted S.P. letters Rd & St to G.O. 1834-41, E.S.L.B., P.L.B., S.L.B. (1-2 series), E.S.L.I., F.R.P., P.O. 60/50-70.

³Rawlinson to G.O. 20.12.42. E.S.L.I. 91, No. 22 of No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

When the Agha Khan declared his rebellion, the news of his movements was reported from Teheran by McNeill, as long as he was there, and later on by J. Riach and E. Bonham (who were attached to the British Mission) to Lt. Col. Justin Sheil, the Chargé d'Affaires, who was stationed at Erzeyan. Also reports were sent from the Persian Gulf and from Bagdad to the Secret Committee.

In September 1837, when the Agha Khan occupied the fortress of Bam near Kirman, the fort was in the hands of the Shah's artillery men. As their leader was betrayed by his men, the Agha Khan was able to occupy this fort without much difficulty.¹ By January 1838, the Agha Khan had advanced further in the South and occupied another strong fort called Kaheen, half way between Bam and Kirman. McNeill wrote "Considerable apprehensions are entertained for the safety of Kerman the Capital of the province".² Prince Zemah Kuli, the grandson of Fath Ali Shah, who had taken refuge with the British at Bagdad, (after the death of his father), reported alleged details of news to Palmerston, through the British Resident Col. Taylor. He claimed that the Agha Khan had "formed an alliance and mutual league with the people of Sistan and the army of Beloochians".³ Meanwhile

¹ McNeill to Palmerston, 29.9.37. No. 78 P.O. 60/50.

² McNeill to Palmerston, 1.1.38. No. 3 P.O. 60/50.

³ 6.9.37. No. 46. P.O. 60/52.

Muhammed Shah ignored this rebellion in the South and continued his attack on Herat.

Watson says that the Agha Khan "crossed by bypaths the country lying between the plain of Hamadan and the remote cities of Yezd and Kerman" and reached the capital of Kirman and produced some forged letters by which he was appointed the Governor of Kirman, "a position which he was soon called upon to maintain by force of arms, for the real Governor (Firus Mirza) returned from Ispahan and hastened to meet the usurper in the field".¹ In the contest, the Agha Khan was obliged to surrender and the Governor pardoned him and sent him to Teheran. E. G. Browne, in his Literary history of Persia, quoting the 'Nasikh-i-Tavarikh' writes that in Teheran he was well received by Haji Mirza Aghasi and was allowed to return to his former government in Meshallat and Qum.² Watson reports differently. He thinks that the Agha Khan ran away to the mountains of Lar and spent his summer there.³ However, T. Mackenzie from Kharraq reported, somewhat vaguely, that the Agha Khan "was induced to surrender himself under solemn promises which were shamefully violated by the Persian Government, and instead of being restored

¹ Persia, p. 332. It seems Firus Mirza later on himself was dissatisfied with the Persian Government.

² p. 148. Vol. IV.

³ Persia, p. 332.

to his Government, he was kept a prisoner at Teheran and the King's camp.¹ It seems likely that the Agha Khan was sent to the Court of Teheran by the Governor of Kirman and at Teheran he must have been detained; for Bonham later on reported from Tabriz that the Agha Khan had escaped from Teheran,² perhaps at the beginning of 1840.

In summer of 1840, the Agha Khan rebelled against the Persian Government again. He reached Kirman from Teheran and sent away his family to Kerbella, to leave himself unencumbered. He gave out that he intended to make the pilgrimage to Mecca, and quietly made preparations for his rebellion.³ In September, Dr. Riesch who was at Teheran, wrote in his diary of events that were taking place in Persia, that the Agha Khan had rebelled the second time in Kirman and had placed himself at the head of the Kirmansies.⁴ Riesch added some further details that the Agha Khan "got together one thousand good horses and taking Peerooz Koorsa along with him, he went towards Kerman by the route of Kopaych (Kuhpayah), and plundered along the road wherever he could - he sent formans to all the dis-

¹ MacKenzie to S.C. 17.10.40 F.R.P.71 p.152.

² To Sheil, 20.10.40. No. 51 F.O. 60/74.

³ Riesch's Diary of events to Sheil 5-25.9.40, enc1: Sheil to Palmerston 14.11.40, No. 52 of F.O. 60/74.

⁴ Riesch's Diary. 21.9.40. No. 44 of F.O. 60/74.

triots informing the people that all Governors were displaced,
and directing the people to wait for further orders from him".¹
Col. Sheil, in enclosing the diary of Riach to Palmerston, added,
"The insurgent chief Agha Khan of Nehlat... is the same person
who three years ago raised an insurrection in the province of
Kerman, where he obtained possession of the fortress of Benn. He
is considered to be a descendant of the Chiefs of the Ismaeleses
or Assassins; and has many partisans in Persia and in India. His
adherents in the latter country who consider him their religious
Chief, are said to contribute large sums annually towards his support."²
Riach also reported that Bakhsh Ali Khan from Shiraz came to seize the
Agha Khan but he was defeated by the followers of the Agha Khan;
that Muhammad Shah, who was at that time in Isfahan, sent two mess-
engers to arrest the Agha Khan. The Agha Khan, "ordered both hands
of one of them to be cut off which was done - the other by entreaty
mercy was not injured".³ Riach reported that no other measures were
taken by the Shah to check the rebellion.

¹ Rimoh's Diary. 14.11.40 No. 52 of F.O. 60/74.

² No. 52 of 14.11.1840 F.O. 60/74 Sheil travelled in Alamut mountains
in May 1838. See J.R.G.S. VIII, pp. 430-34.

³ Riach Diary of Sep. encl. 52 of F.O. 60/74.

Watson claims that the Governor of Kirman, without the orders of the Shah, came to fight with the Agha Khan.¹ Riach reported that the Agha Khan was on the borders of Kirman and Yazd and that the Governor of Yazd, Behman Mirza, the brother of the Shah came to fight with the Agha Khan.² In this encounter Behman Mirza was defeated by the one thousand horse of the Agha Khan and the two thousand horse of his disciples.³ Mackenzie reported that "his followers amounted to six or eight thousand men, that a battle had been fought between him and the Governor of Yazd, Behman Mirza, in which the latter was defeated".⁴ It is likely the Agha Khan had about one thousand horsemen and that with their help he was able to defeat Behman Mirza. However, Behman Mirza had made a blunder, Watson writes that the Governor divided his force into three parts and thus gave an opportunity to the Agha Khan to defeat each detachment in detail. Among the first troops of Behman Mirza, "there were many who secretly held the tenets of Ismail, the result was, that in the action which ensued, they went over in a body to Agha Khan, and their leader Isfendiar, was killed".⁵ Then

¹ Persia, p. 333.

² Riach Diary of Sep. enc1. 52 of P.O. 50/74.

³ Ibid.

⁴ To S.C. 17.10.40. P.R.P.71, p. 152.

⁵ History, p. 333.

the Agha Khan defeated other detachments easily and advanced towards Shahri-babek in Khorasan. The Governor of Shahri-babek was Kohin Dil Khan of Qandhar, who had fled from his territory in 1839, and had taken refuge in Persia. Muhammed Shah had appointed him the Governor of Shahri-babek.¹ In 1840, in Babek, the Sunni Kohin had prohibited the people from making the Shiite declaration, "Ali was God's Deputy". The Agha Khan expelled Kohin Dil Khan and occupied Shahri-babek.² MacKenzie reported that "In the direction of Kerman, Agha Khan continues his depredations, and in all attempts of the local authorities to oppose him they are said to have been invariably defeated and that the province is now in a state so disturbed as not to be surpassed. The followers of the Khan, it would appear view him both as a temporal and spiritual guide, as a warrior and a saint."³ MacKenzie considering the discontent that prevailed in Persia, thought that the Agha Khan's rebellion, "will even endanger the stability of the present Government".⁴ Bonham thought that the Shah might be obliged to undertake a winter

¹ Keye, Afghanistan, III, pp. 187-88.

² Riach to Sheil 12.10.40 encl. 52 of P.O. 60/74.

³ To S.C. 18.11.40 encl. Taylor to S.C. No. 85 of P.R.P.71.

⁴ To S.C. 17.10.40 P.R.P.71. p. 152-3.

campaign in person to put down the rebellion. However, Sheil doubted whether the Shah would do so.¹

By December 1840, the South of Persia was becoming disturbed by a number of rebellions. It was rumoured that a Persian Prince Sulciman Mirza, residing at Bagdad, had arrived in Kirman to help the Agha Khan. Muhammed Shah's uncle Ali Shah was busy establishing his influence in the mountains of Fara.² He was in contact with the Agha Khan. Among the Khamseh and Bakhtiari tribes, Timur Mirza, a grandson of Fath Ali Shah, was endeavouring to raise an insurrection.³ The chief of the Bakhtiari tribe Muhammad Taqi Khan, from whom Muhammed Shah had taken his brother, Maqi Khan, as a hostage for his good conduct, was dissatisfied. Taqi contacted the Agha Khan to help him. Some of his tribesmen and some Baluchis had made common cause with the Agha Khan.⁴ Layard of Nineveh, who was then a casual traveller in the Bakhtiari mountains, reported to Sheil that Muhammed Shah had asked Taqi Khan to pay his revenue in advance, which he could not do. Therefore Muhammed Shah accused Taqi Khan of having supplied the Agha

¹ Bonham to Sheil, encl. Sheil to Palmerston 27.12.40 No. 59 of P.O. 60/74.

² Hennell to S.O. 18.1.41 No. 2 P.R.P.72.

³ Sheil to Palmerston. 25.2.41 No. 7 P.R.P. 72.

⁴ Risch to Sheil. 11.2.41. B. to 11 of P.O. 60/80.

Khan with his men to aid him in rebellion and displaced him.

In his place Muhammad Shah appointed Ali Naqi Khan as the Governor of Khusistan with orders to raise the revenue.¹ When the news of the new appointment reached Taqi Khan, he contacted Layard, who wrote to Sheil that, "In this juncture, Mohamed Taki Khan requested that I would immediately proceed to Karak and ascertain from the English Resident the views of his Government with regard to Persia....

In common with many of the Persians he (Taqi Khan) believes that much will depend upon the line of conduct pursued by the English Government and as he conceives that Agha Khan has been receiving pecuniary assistance from its (British) Agents, a report generally circulated through Persia, he concludes that it is at the same time supporting Ali Shah".² Layard wanted to know, "whether the English Government will enter into any communication with Mohamed Taki Khan?".³ Layard sent this report to Sheil through S. Hennell, who was at Kharak. However, Sheil did not attach much importance to Layard's report,⁴ though he sent it to Palmerston.

Layard in his book on his adventures wrote that, when he was in

¹ Layard to Sheil. 26.12.40. encl: Sheil to Palmerston, 15.4.41. No. 19, F.R.P. 72.

² Layard to Sheil. 26.12.40. encl: to 19. F.R.P. 72.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Sheil to Hennell 14.4.41. F.R.P. 72, p. 513.

the mountains he received news that the Agha Khan in his revolt was supported by the British Government.¹ It is likely that the Agha Khan himself tried to contact the British agents. There is no other evidence that the Agha Khan was ever contacted by any British agent or given any pecuniary aid to instigate or carry on his revolt. Nevertheless, it is clear from Layard and other sources that rumours to this effect were widely current in Persia during 1840-41. Similar rumours had reached the Russian Envoy, General Duhamel, who in August 1840 wrote from Isfahan to the Russian Government at St. Petersburg that "On vient d'apprendre qu'un certain Aqa Khan parcourt et rangeonne le pays à la tête de plusieurs centaines de cavaliers. C'est la 2^{nde} fois que cet individu lève— l'étandard de la révolte.... Si les autorités persanes ne parviennent pas à se saisir de cet individu avant qu'il n'ait gagné Kerman, il pourrait susciter d'assez graves difficultés au Gourt dans cette Province éloignée. On prétend que les émissaires Anglais qui, malgré l'absence de la mission ne cessent de parcourir la Perse ne sont pas étrangers à cette nouvelle levée de boudriers."²

In 1842, Rawlinson while pleading the Agha Khan's case to the Governor General confirmed the existence of these suspicions of British

¹ Adventures, p. 322.

² Extract d'une dépêche du Général Duhamel Isfahan 31 Août 1840. encl. MacNaughten to S.C. 11.8.41. F.R.P. vol. 73, p. 1059.

complicity. "The impression indeed, that we were actively supporting the Kerman rebel chief became so universal and threatened so much danger, that General Duhmel expostulated upon the subject to the Court of St. Petersburg, and the Persian Prime Minister in the discussions with Dr. Riach which preceded the return of our mission to Tehran, repeatedly brought forward our interference in Kerman, as one of his grounds of complaint against us."¹ Here it is necessary to examine those complaints of the Russian and the Persian Governments, in the light of the events that followed the attack on Herat.

During Muhammed Shah's attack on Herat, St. Petersburg and Kabul had for the first time entered into direct relations. The Russian officer Vickovich was sent to the Court of Dost Muhammed, the ruler of Kabul. In 1838 an attempt was made to form a Perso-Afghan alliance under Russian guidance.² In retaliation, the Indian Government had seized the Island of Kharak in the Persian Gulf and had organised an expedition to overthrow the Afghan rulers Dost Muhammed and his half brother Kohin Dil Khan and others of Qandahar, and to set up Shuja ul-Shulk as puppet ruler of Afghanistan. By this course it was hoped that Afghanistan would become a friendly state under British influence and thus a barrier to Persian penetration, behind which was

¹ Rawlinson to C.G. 20.12.42. E.S.L.I.91 No. 22. No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

² Mosely, "Russian Policy" - Slavonic Review, 1936, p. 670.

the more dangerous possibilities of a Russian advance into Central Asia and an attack on India. In October 1838, Anglo-Russian relations were approaching a crisis. If Russia gave her new Afghan allies military support, Russian and British armies might soon clash in Asia despite the vast distances which separated their possessions. Russia in turn attempted an attack on Khiva in 1839, and the Indian Government, after occupying Kabul and Qandahar, had retained their forces there as well as in Kharak. However, in 1840 the Russian expedition to Khiva proved a failure and the British position in Afghanistan started becoming insecure. Meanwhile Russia by the end of 1839, opened her policy of conciliation with Britain. She sent General Brunnov to London to arrange an agreement between the two powers.¹ She also disavowed her agents' policies in Persia and Afghanistan.

In London, Palmerston had received the news of the Russian attempt on Khiva, when he had begun his discussions with the Russian Envoy Brunnov. These talks continued for some time. In one of his meetings with Brunnov, Palmerston protested against the new threat of Russia in Central Asia. In his replies, Brunnov insisted that the expedition had no political object but was meant to free the slaves and to prevent attack on the Russian caravans. He also protested against the British action in Afghanistan and in Kharak and claimed that although the British mission had withdrawn from Persia, British

¹ Nosely, Massey's Question, p. 4. Slavonic Review, p. 674.

agents were assisting in Kerman the rebellion of the Agha Khan.¹

During these discussions, Palmerston in one of his letters to Brunnov clarified the British attitude towards the Agha Khan. He wrote that "Quant à l'affaire de Aga Khan la Province de Kerman est bien éloignée de nos Frontières et je ne vois pas pourquoi on doit imputer à nos agents la Révolte d'un chef qui paraît d'après la dépêche même de M. Duhamel, avoir fait le métier d'insurgé depuis le commencement du Règne du Shah; et certainement personne ne peut supposer que nous désirions alors exciter des Révoltes contre un Souverain que nous venions d'aider à monter au Trône".²

After the withdrawal of McNeill from Persia, Mohammad Shah sent his Envoy Hussein Ali Khan to London to bring about the resumption of Anglo-Persian relations. However, Palmerston drew up a memorandum of demands to be fulfilled by the Persian Government. In particular the question of the future of Herat and Choristan were emphasised. He called for the evacuation of the Persians from Choristan and the signature of the Commercial treaty etc.³ These demands were made in London in 1839, but it was long before the Persian Government complied with them. She protested during the negotiations.

¹Encl. Brunnov to Palmerston 25.11.40. S.D.S.L.13 No. 684 encl. 13.

²Extract d'une dépêche de Lord Palmerston à l'adresse du Baron Brunnov 24.11.40 S.D.S.L.13 No. 684 encl. 14.

³Watson, Persia, p. 329.

Dr. Risch was appointed to carry on the negotiations with the Shah in Persia. In February 1841, during his talks he was hopeful and wrote that "I am inclined to attribute this speedy and unconditional compliance on the part of Persia with Lord Palmerston's demands, to various causes - among which are doubtless to be reckoned the proofs recently given of the power and vigour of England on the affairs of Afghanistan, Syria, Khiva, Naples and China, by which the Shah and Hajee have been alarmed, but to these must, I consider be added the present state of Persia which with an active rebel, Agha Khan Nahlatese on the Kerman frontiers, a population disunited in feelings, but all generally much discontented with the existing government, the Zilla-Sooltan and other refugee Princes at Baghdad, and with the public finances in a most ruinous state of confusion, is at this moment in condition of extreme weakness".¹ Bonham reiterated this hope and wrote to Sheil adding that he considered that the Persian court was alarmed at the state of the South of Persia.² Captain S. Hennell stressed the importance of the revolt of the Agha Khan and wrote that, "It will most likely lower the tone of Hajee Mirza Agasy, the Muscoor and render him more favourably inclined to meet the views of the British government".³

¹ Risch to Sheil. 12.2.41. enc1. Sheil to Palmerston No. 10 of P.C. 80/80.

² Sheil to Palmerston. 25.2.41. No. 7 of F.R.P.72.

³ Hennell to S.C. 19.3.41. No. 19 of F.R.P.73.

However, whilst the British expressed their hopes that internal disturbances in Persia like the Agha Khan's revolt would inevitably weaken the Shah's opposition to the demands of their negotiations, the Persian Ministers held the British to be responsible for their country's weak position. In reply to Finch's arguments, Haji Mirza Aghasi remonstrated that the Agha Khan was instigated by the British to revolt in Kirman. The Persian Government also sought Russian assistance in this matter. Since 1840, friendship had prevailed between Britain and Russia. Russia had urged the Persian government to resume their diplomatic relations with Britain and to comply with the demands of Palmerston. However, the Persian government had remonstrated. Mirza Aghasi in April 1841, wrote to General Duhamel and to Count Nesselrode regarding British interference in Persian affairs. Mirza Abul Hassan, the Persian Foreign Minister, wrote to Duhamel that the British had encroached on their rights, had taken the Island of Kharak and had taken measures to create disturbances in Persia itself by instigating and giving secret assistance to the rebel Agha Khan.¹

By the middle of 1841, the Persian government finally agreed to the demands of the British government and in October 1841, McNeill resumed his office in Teheran.²

¹Abul Hassan to Duhamel trans: No date written in April 1841,
also Aghasi to Nesselrode " " " " "
encl: McNeill to Aberdeen. 31.12.41. No. 57. F.O. 60/79.

²Watson, Persia, p. 331.

In December, McNeill, in view of the Persian accusation of British interference in Kirman and also in view of other accusation, he felt it incumbent on himself to make a formal denial of the charges to his government. He wrote to Aberdeen, who had succeeded Palmerston, "It may be almost unnecessary for me to add that the charges brought in these letters against the British government or its agents, of having instigated the government of Herat to attack Persian Khorasan, of having facilitated or promoted the attempts of the Prince of Baghdad to disturb the tranquility of Persia, of having endeavoured to induce the Arab Sheikhs or Chiefs on the shores of the Persian Gulf to revolt, and of having secretly aided the rebel Aga Khan, are altogether without foundation and that the Persian government must either have been deceived by its informants or it must have desired by deceiving the Russian government into belief that Great Britain had acted with great injustice and with covert hostility towards Persia to induce the Emperor, to take a more decided course than he otherwise might have thought justifiable".¹

In June 1841, Muhammad Shah finally decided to crush the revolt of the Aga Khan in Kirman. He sent Abdullah Khan, the Commandant of his artillery, from Teheran with orders to burn and destroy every town and village that was suspected of aiding the Aga Khan.²

¹ McNeill to Aberdeen, 31.12.41. No. 57. P.O. 60/79.

² Hennell to S.C. 18.5.41. No. 83. P.R.P.73.

He also ordered Khan Ali Khan, the Governor of Lar to suppress the revolt. Hearing of these preparations, Habibullah Khan, the new Governor of Yazd, also came out to fight with the Agha Khan, with eight guns and a considerable body of troops.¹ The Agha Khan was thus surrounded on all sides by his enemies. In a battle with Khan Ali Khan, he was defeated and had to fly to the mountains of Baluchistan.² During the night, however, he returned from the mountains with reinforcements and surprised the troops of Khan Ali Khan and defeated them.³ When he learned the news of the Shah's orders and the arrival of artillerymen in Kirman, he decided to change his course. With a small body of horse, he travelled through the eastern deserts of Kirman and Yazd,⁴ and went to Khorasan to raise a party of followers. He also tried to contact the British envoy in Kabul, Macnaghten, through Yar Muhammad Khan the Wazir of Herat, for help.⁵ Rawlinson regarding the defeat of the Agha Khan, wrote, "His Persian Majesty determined to make a vigorous effort to crush him. A force of 8,000 with a due proportion of artillery was

¹ Hennell to S.C. 18.5.41. No. 85. F.R.P.73.

² Hennell to S.C. 18.6.41. No. 19 of F.R.P.73. Also see Watson, Persia, pp. 333-34.

³ Hennell to S.C. 18.6.41. No. 19 of F.R.P.73.

⁴ Riach to Sheil - Dairy. 16-16.7.41. R. to 9 P.O. 60/78.

⁵ Husur Khan to McNeill. 9.12.41, encl: Sheil to Aberdeen. No. 5 of F.R.P.73.

Also the Agha Khan to Macnaghten, 25.6.41. E.S.L.I.80, No. 44 of E.O.83 of 21 Oct. 1841.

sacked into Kerman and the Khan found it necessary to leave before the storm. Had his object merely been to save his life from his enemies, his most convenient point of flight would have been Bandar Abbas, from where he might have embarked for Baghdad or Bombay but Agha Khan had other views - he was not inclined easily to abandon his hopes of empire in Southern Persia - he conjectured that the determination evinced by the Shah to maintain his right of sovereignty over Herat might not only derange our plan of reconciliation with Persia but force us into actual hostility with her on the Afghan Frontier and he flattered himself that under such circumstances, we should be too glad to create a diversion by assisting him to reassert his own claims over Kerman - he accordingly adventured on a long perilous journey through Central Persia and with a party of 100 horsemen reached Candahar in the beginning of August 1841.¹

Rawlinson wrote the above statement whilst pleading the case of the Agha Khan in 1842. It seems he had discussed with the Agha Khan the reasons for his flight from Persia. The British reconciliation with Persia had taken place before the flight of the Agha Khan, but the British Minister McNeill had not yet arrived in Persia. However, it is doubtful whether the Agha Khan had much insight into British policy at Herat. He himself, before reaching Afghanistan, was roaming

¹ Rawlinson to G.O. 20.12.42. E.S.L.I.91 No. 22 of No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

40

in the mountains, having lost his own province and, with no hope
of recovering it and expecting no mercy from his ruler, he decided
to leave Persia and went over to the British.

Chapter IIThe Agha Khan in Afghanistan. 1841 - 42.

In August 1839, the British occupied Afghanistan and placed Shah Shuja on the throne of Kabul and Qandahar. William MacNaughten was appointed as the British Envoy and Minister at the Court of Shah Shuja. Qandahar was left under the governorship of one of the sons of Shuja with Robert Leech as the Political agent at Qandahar, responsible to MacNaughten. As we have seen in the previous chapter (p. 53) Russia had sent an expedition to Khiva in retaliation for the British movement. Therefore in view of the changing British position in Central Asia, British forces were retained in Afghanistan. It is necessary to say a little more about the British position in Afghanistan before discussing the arrival of the Agha Khan at Qandahar.

In November 1840, the Barakzai ruler of Kabul, Dost Muhammad Khan, who had fled to Turkistan in 1839, surrendered to the British. He was sent to India. With the help of British forces and money, the new government of Sadorsai Shah Shuja was maintained. However by the end of 1840, the signs of revolt among the Afghan tribes of Durrani and Ghilzais against the Sadorsais became apparent. At Qandahar, the Durranis who had welcomed Shuja's arrival were the foremost in showing their dissatisfaction of his rule.¹ But the

¹ Rawlinson's report on the Duranni tribes 19.4.41, p. 30. No. 21 of 74 of M.P.S.D.R. Memorandum of Political & Secret Deptt. Records. For an account of the risings in the Qandahar Province see N.E. Vassy, 'Disturbances in Western Afghanistan 1840-41' R.R.G.I.H., XXVII, Part 2, 1953, pp. 209-315.

British position in Afghanistan was far from secure. In Herat, Yar Mohammed, the Minister of Kasmran, the ruler of Herat, was found writing inflammatory letters to the Durrani chiefs at Qandahar.¹ It also became known that Yar Mohammed contemplated an attack on Qandahar. Besides he had sent a secret deputation to the Persian governor of Meshed, seeking assistance to expel the British from Afghanistan.² The position of the British officer Major Todd who was Envoy there since 1839 was not respected, in spite of the treasures that were paid to the Herat government. In January 1841, Yar Mohammed demanded more money which, Todd knowing his intrigues, refused to pay. In February Todd withdrew from Herat and the British mission to Herat ended in failure. Great alarm was shown by the British officers in Afghanistan among whom there was strong support for an invasion of Herat. This project however was rejected by the Governor General, Lord Auckland. Although the internal revolts at Qandahar were put down by the British Commandant, General Nott, in consultation with Major Rawlinson, the Political Agent, in place of Leech, the British position at Qandahar was not secure.

On 6th August, 1841 intelligence from Girishk reached Rawlinson reporting the arrival at that place of the Agha Khan and his hundred horsemen proceeding to Qandahar, "for the purpose of communi-

¹Kaye, Afghanistan II, p. 107.

²Ibid., p. 108, also Forrier, History of Afghanistan, p. 470.

oating on matters of importance with the British authorities in Afghanistan".¹ Rawlinson took the earliest opportunity of informing Macnaghten of the Agha Khan's influence and of his importance as a Persian refugee in Afghanistan.² He wrote, "Should the Persian government be still inclined to assert its rights of sovereignty over Herat, in opposition to our views for maintaining the independence of that principality, I cannot avoid seeing that the entertainment of Agha Khan at Candahar may operate greatly to our advantage as a means of intimidation over the Courts of Tchran. On the other hand, should the Herat connection have been repudiated by Persia, it may perhaps be inexpedient that countenance should be shown by the British government to a refugee rebel of consequence as tending to give rise to fresh suspicion at Tchran, and thus a third time to embarrass the adjustment of our differences with Persia... the honorable reception of Agha Khan at Candahar may possibly be productive of further inconvenience in tending to verify the suspicions which were formerly entertained by the Russian government of a friendly communication between the British and this chief during the progress of the Kerman rebellion."³ Rawlinson made it clear to which view he

¹Rawlinson to Macnaghten 6.6.41 and Macnaghten to S.O., P.R.P., Vol. 73, p.1039.

²Rawlinson in his report on the Agha Khan mentioned that "the Moghals and 'Charagh Kushan' of Afghanistan and the valley of the Oxus... consider Agha Khan as the present visible Imam... a hundred families of Hindoos in Cabool professing Ismailianism..." Rawlinson to S.O. 20.12.42, H.S.L.I. Vol. 91, No. 22, No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

³Rawlinson to Macnaghten, 6.6.41, and Macnaghten to S.O., P.R.P. Vol. 73, p. 1039.

himself inclined. He wrote, "As our last official letters from Tehran report a case of gross duplicity on the part of Persia with reference to Herat, we are bound, I presume to consider ourselves at present, in a state of great hostility with that government. Under these circumstances, I can hardly think that we should be warranted in declining to avail ourselves of an important political instrument that is accidentally placed at our disposal by a mere desire to avoid being subjected to the false imputation of insincerity which attends the state of our relations with Persia/ perhaps even pending a protest from that government sanctioned by Treaty against the shelter of Persian refugees in Afghanistan/ there would thus seem to be no legitimate plea for our refusing to admit a chief who seeks an asylum from his enemies in the territory of His Majesty Shah Shooja ool-Moolk".¹

When Macnaghten received the intelligence reporting the arrival of the Agha Khan and his wish to meet the Envoy, he refused to see him but wrote privately to Rawlinson that "I regard the advent of this chief as a great catch at the present moment".² In his official letter, however, he instructed Rawlinson, "It would be impossible to refuse an asylum to this refugee without a manifest breach of these laws of hospitality, which especially among Eastern nations are held

¹Rawlinson to Macnaghten, 6.8.41. and Macnaghten to S.C.P.R.P. Vol. 73, p.1039.

²11.8.41. Enccl: Rawlinson to G.O. 20.12.42. E.S.L.I.91 No. 22 or No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

in general reverence. Without any advertence, therefore, to the present state of our relations with Persia I approve of your recommending His Royal Highness Shahzadeh Tenour to receive Agha Khan as a guest who has sought the protection of the Afghan monarchy. The Persian Court could not consistently complain of such reception seeing that Kohin Dil Khan and his rebel brothers of Candahar have sought and obtained an honorable asylum within the Persian territories".¹ But he warned Rawlinson, "His Royal Highness should, however be advised to refrain for the present from encouraging, on the part of Agha Khan expectation of assistance from us, in any designs he may form to disturb the tranquillity of the Kingdom of Persia. On the contrary that chief should be distinctly apprized by His Royal Highness that as a condition necessary to his obtaining the protection he has sought - he must relinquish such designs while enjoying an asylum within His Majesty's territories. In your own communications with Agha Khan / which should be conducted with as little ostentation as possible / you should invariably hold the same language".²

He also wrote to the Government of India informing them of his proceedings and asked for their instructions. He added, "Should amicable relations with Persia be restored on a satisfactory basis,

¹ Macnaghten to Rawlinson. II.C.41 P.Z.P. Vol. 75, p. 1059.

² " " " " " " "

The Lordship in Council, would perhaps be induced to direct that Agha Khan beside the condition specified in my letter to Major Rawlinson, should be required to dismiss the followers which he is said to have brought with him to the number of hundred or at least such of them as may not be his relations or immediate dependants".¹

Kaenaghten's attitude towards the Agha Khan is further clarified by his private correspondence with Rawlinson from August to November 1841. He not only asked Rawlinson to prevent the Agha Khan from doing mischief whilst a guest at Qandahar, but also told him to see that the distinguished refugee did not go back to Persia. Kaenaghten could not tolerate the idea of giving up the Agha Khan "as a peace offering to Persia".² Indeed he instructed Rawlinson to use force to detain him, in case the Agha Khan attempted to run away.³ He also advised Rawlinson not to send the Agha Khan to Kabul, "I do not say this to avoid trouble to myself but embarrassment to our government. There is a difference between a grant of an asylum and the reception of a refugee - going out of his way for an interview with the ruler of the country".⁴ He suggested sending the Agha Khan to Bonbay and asked Rawlinson to supply the Agha Khan with some economical means to facilitate his journey there.⁵ He also suggested

¹ Kaenaghten to G.G. in C. 11.8.41, encl: Kaenaghten to S.C. F.R.P. Vol. 73, p. 1039.

² 17.8.41. encl: Rawlinson to G.G. 20.12.42. E.S.L.I. 91, No. 22 of No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

³ 9.10.41. encl: Rawlinson to G.G. 20.12.42.

⁴ 11.8.41. encl: Rawlinson to G.G. 20.12.42.

writing an introductory letter to John Willoughby, the Secretary to the Political and Secret department of the government of Bombay, although he himself was not sure what kind of reception the refugee might meet with there.¹ He also asked Rawlinson to provide for the Agha Khan and his horsemen and pay an allowance of Rs. 2,000 per mensem for his maintenance, which he raised to 3,000 after two months.² At the same time Rawlinson was frankly advised to exploit the situation: "You cannot do wrong in playing with Agha Khan as long as possible".³

Meanwhile, the Agha Khan remained at Qandahar and contemplated plans for the conquest of Persia. In one of his letters he wrote to Macnaghten asking, "It has always been my wish to attach myself to your government.... It is properly known that I have left my distant country merely in the hope of receiving assistance from your government and now I am anxious to know what your powerful arms can do for me".⁴ He then went on to explain what he could do for the British in Persia, "I will undertake the conquest of Iraq, Persia,

(cont.)

⁵ Macnaghten to Haddock. 26.8.41, E.S.L.I. 80, No. 44 of No. 63 of 1 Oct. 1841.

¹ 19.8.41. enccl: Rawlinson to G.O. 20.12.42. E.S.L.I. 91, 22 of No. 12 of 19. Feb. 1843.

² Rawlinson to G.O. 20.12.42. E.S.L.I. 91, No. 22 of No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

³ Macnaghten to Rawlinson. 17.8.41, enccl: Rawlinson to G.O. 20.12.42, E.S.L.I. 91, No. 22 of 12 of 19 Feb. 43.

⁴ Trans. 26.8.41. E.S.L.I. 80. enccl: to 44 of 53 of 1 Oct. 1841.

Kerman and Khorasan. I will seize the countries for you without the least trouble.... What are your orders? If it be your intention to take Persia, I pledge myself to gain it without loss for you, either from the direction of Khorasan or the lower parts of Kerman and Pars. No fighting will be necessary. The population will join and the disaffected persons will not delay to surrender themselves.... I have friends in Turkistan, Budukshan, Cabool and Hindooostan. Allow me to assemble a body of men and having been joined by these in Persia, take that Kingdom.... If you think that this plan of mine ^{is} unadvisable, you must lend assistance in some way or other, that I may prepare myself to take that country - and after this is done, all Persia will be attached to the British Government".¹

Macnaghten naturally rejected these extensive projects. He wrote to the Agha Khan that, "Be it known to you that neither the British Government nor Shah Shooja ool Moolk has any intention of conquering Herat or of experiencing any interference in the affairs of that country - still less has it any views on Persia. The two governments are quite content with the territories they possess. It is the universal practice of the British Government to abstain from meddling with others from whom it has experienced no injury or

¹Trans: 25.8.41, E.S.L.I. 80, encl: to 44 of No. 88 of 1 Oct. 1841.

unbecoming conduct. It is true that there was some misunderstanding between the British government and Mohamed Shah. It is most probable all that has been settled /but the distance of England and Tehran prevents me from being quite sure whether any difference of opinion still exists or not/. The real state of the case will speedily be known. As you are arrived at Candahar, I feel assured that His Royal Highness Shahzadeh Fomour and Major Rawlinson will receive you as a respected and honored guest. Moreover that, if you wish to proceed on by any other direction and are embarrassed for want of funds, pecuniary aid will be offered to you. I trust you will regard me as a sincere friend and one who is ever desirous to hear of your welfare and happiness".¹

The government of India approved the course that Maconaghten adopted in his treatment of the Agha Khan.² Lord Auckland in his private letter to Maconaghten commented, "The arrival at Candahar of Agha Khan, the Kerman rebel, is a curious circumstance and he must of course have an asylum. It will give food for discussion among the diplomats at Teheran".³

¹ Maconaghten to the Agha Khan, tran: 25.8.41. E.S.L.I. 80. No. 44 of No. 88 of 1.10.41. Maconaghten mentioned Herat, but I have failed to trace any reference to projects against Herat in the Agha Khan's letters. I have consulted Rawlinson's Private Papers at the Archives of Royal Geographical Society but found no further information on this question.

² Maddock to Maconaghten 27.9.41. E.S.L.I. 80, No. 45 of 88 of 1.10.41.

³ 3.9.41. Enclo: Rawlinson to G.G. 20.12.42, E.S.L.I. 91 of No. 22 of 12 of 19.2.43.

The Agha Khan stayed on as a guest of Muhammad Tímur at Qandahar. Rawlinson was disappointed at his first meeting with the Agha Khan, whom he calls in his Diary "The Khalifah of the Ismaeelites". He wrote that the Agha Khan "is a coarse made, hard featured man and hardly as intelligent as I had expected to find him".¹ At Qandahar, the Agha Khan lived very extravagantly in a large house with all his horsemen and servants.² He received his allowances monthly from the Afghan revenues, that is 500 Rupees, for himself and Rs. 25 per head for his horsemen. Originally the number of horsemen he had brought with him was 100 but later on the number was increased to 300. Although he received aid from the government as well as from his followers, he was in constant financial difficulties. In his two months stay at Qandahar, he contracted debts and applied to Rawlinson for relief, proposing that Rawlinson should advance him a sum of Rupees 20,000 to 30,000 for which he would give an order on his agents, who collected the Ismaili tribute in Bombay, payable to the government of that Presidency. Macnaghten disapproved of risking so large a sum. He wrote, "I certainly could not make the loan, unless with holding is sure to give the holy man a mortal offence".³ but authorized Rawlinson to make an advance

¹ MSS Diary. Rawlinson. 1.R.C.S. 14.8.41.

² Rawlinson to C.O. 20.12.42, E.S.L.I. 91 No. 22 of 12 of 19.2.43. Also Rev. I. Allen. Diary P. 200.

³ 26.9.41. excl: Rawlinson to C.O. 20.12.42. E.S.L.I. 91, No. 22 of 12 of 19.2.43.

of Rupees 5,000, which was later paid over in Bonbay to Willoughby.¹ However as a result of this affair, the news circulated that the Ismaili Imam had taken up his abode at Qandahar and a considerable amount of tribute was consequently remitted to him. He often gave lavish parties to the British officers, during the time when it was quiet at Qandahar.²

Although the internal revolts in the Qandahar Province were put down by October 1841, by Nott, and one of the Chiefs of the Durramis, Akram Khan was executed, the disaffection among other tribes continued and a very serious outbreak took place at Kabul in November, which gradually spread to Qandahar. As a result the British position became critical and in the ensuing struggle, the Agha Khan as the ally of the British, was necessarily involved. Rawlinson also made use of the Agha Khan's influence among the Shia party, to bring about the success. Here I propose to discuss the military and political services of the Agha Khan at Qandahar, separately.

In November 1841, the Eastern Ghilzais broke into revolt near the Kabul area, in protest against the reduction of their allowances, which had been carried out in the interest of economy by Macnaghten.³

¹ Rawlinson to G.G. 20.12.42. D.S.L.I. 91, No. 22 of 12 of 19.2.43.

² Allen BARRY. pp. 200-203.

³ For further account see KAYE, Afghanistan II, pp. 164-65.

These Ghilzais occupied the passes on the road to Jellalabad, plundered and cut off the communications of Kabul. On 2nd November, the insurrection broke out in Kabul and Sir Alexander Burnes, Macnaghten's deputy and intended successor was murdered. The British lost control of Kabul. Macnaghten tried to negotiate with the Chiefs of the dissatisfied tribes, but on 23rd December, he was murdered by the rebels and the condition of the British at Kabul became critical.¹

The insurrection spread slowly towards Candahar, Mohammed Atta Khan had been dispatched by the Kabul party to win the Durranis and thereby raise an insurrection in Qandahar. To counter this move, Rawlinson tried to win the favour of the Durranis against the rebel Barakzais. But on December 27, a force of Janbas, that is disciplined Afghan cavalry, murdered their British officer Licut. Golding at Qandahar and deserted to the rebels. Saifur Jang, a brother of Timur also joined the Durranis. To put down this rising, Nott on January 12, 1842, fought with the rebels and defeated them.²

The Agha Khan had joined Nott and Rawlinson in the skirmish of Killashuk during the action of 12th January,³ with his 100 Pushtun

¹For a further account see Mayo Afghanistan II, pp. 235-300.

²Mayo, Afghanistan III, pp. 135-40.

³The Agha Khan to Dalhousie. 22.3.43, B.O. III No. 3 of 77 of 27.9.43. (See appendix).

Rawlinson had written reports to the Government of India on Herat and requested further instructions. But replies had not come. After November, communications between India and Qandahar were interrupted. The Agha Khan, after arriving at Qandahar, had told Rawlinson about his alleged previous communications with Yar Muhammed.¹ In one of his letters, the Agha Khan claimed that in consultation with Rawlinson he had sent his agent Abdur Rahman Razzaq to Yar Muhammed to draw him over to the British and to discourage him in his plans to attack Qandahar.² Rawlinson in December mentioned in his Diary that he had consulted the Agha Khan and Sultan Muhammed Khan regarding their reports from Herat.³ The Agha Khan's horsemen had served Rawlinson in bringing reports from the area. On January 6th, the Agha Khan's messenger reported that Shah Nemat and Yar Muhammed were in open conflict and that the Shah was holding out against Yar Muhammed with as much force as he had, and that the Shah had asked Fuzund Khan to assist him in the war. Rawlinson in his political Diary wrote, "This is so far fortunate as it prevents Yar Md from turning his attention to affairs on our frontier".⁴ Re-

¹ Husur Khan to McNeill, 9.12.41. encl: McNeill to Aberdeen, 29.1.42 No. 3 of P.R.P.75.

² Trans: Agha Khan to G.O. 3.9.43. E.S.L.I.94, No. 74 or 56 of R.10.43. Also see Appendix I.

³ 31.12.41. MSS Journal Rawlinson A.R.G.S.

⁴ 6.1.42. MSS Journal Rawlinson, A.R.G.S.

horse and fought against the rebels.¹ One of the Agha Khan's men was killed and others were wounded in the action. In his own account of his services, the Agha Khan does not describe clearly his services at Qandahar. However, Rawlinson in his report on the Agha Khan mentioned, regarding the event of January 12, "on this occasion Agha Khan, having volunteered the services of his hundred men, was present and was engaged in skirmishing with the enemy, but no opportunity occurred of turning his detachment to much account".²

In the winter months, the rebel party near Qandahar was quiet but preparing for a grand attack on Qandahar under the direction of Mirza Ahmed, formerly in the confidence of Rawlinson in the revenue department, who had deserted to the Durrani rebel with some of the other Durrani Chiefs on January 12. The British were in a difficult state. Money was scarce and so was fodder for the cattle. There were no medicines for the wounded in the camp. Fear of an insurrection among the Afghan population of Qandahar was prevalent. On March 3, Rawlinson decided to clear the city of its Afghan inhabitants who were suspected of joining the rebel party. Many families were turned out. On 7th Mott decided to give a severe blow to the rebel party. He led his forces out to look for the enemy. On this occasion, Raw-

¹ Rawlinson MSS Political Diary 11 - 12.1.42. A.R.C.S.

² Rawlinson to C.G. 20.12.42, E.S.L.Y. SI, No. 22 of 12 of 19.2.43.

Minson in consultation with Nott formed a Parsewan troop, with the horsemen of the Agha Khan and the other Shia Chiefs, Nabi Khan and Mirza Ibrahim and placed altogether 300 cavalry under the command of the Agha Khan.¹ Nott had expressed his wish that the Agha Khan and his horsemen should accompany him and Nott had made other preparations to attack the Durranis. Rawlinson in a report for the government of India regarding the projected attack, mentioned, "The Persian refugee, Agha Khan, is still a guest at Qandahar, and Gen. Nott, in consideration of our deficiency of cavalry, has expressed a wish that this Chief, who is possessed of much military experience, and whose attachment to our interests is certain, should be entrusted with the temporary direction of such Parsewan horse as have remained true to us, since the disorganisation of the Janibaz. Agha Khan has at present about 300 of these horse under his orders and will accompany Gen. Nott in his projected attack upon the enemy. Were we not threatened with a deficiency of funds for our necessary expenses I should venture to recommend that the Parsewan horse were considerably increased, as well with a view to relieving our own cavalry of the harassing duty of patrolling..."²

Nott with his forces marched out of Qandahar towards the Arghandab in pursuit of the enemy. As he advanced, the rebels retired be-

¹ Rawlinson MSS Journal, 7.3.42. A.R.G.S.

² Rawlinson to Maddock, 6.3.42. E.S.L.I. 83, No. 32 of 3 of PL.4.42.

fore him. These rebels had a plan to draw Nott with his forces away from Qandahar. However some small skirmishes took place on the 9th. On the 10th Nott still continued marching towards the river Tumuk; Captain Neill, an eye-witness, in his book Recollections mentioned, "a small body of cavalry, commanded I believe, by Mirza Ahmed, who was kept out to employ and deceive us, molested our rear for a short time; they were, however, driven back by Agha Khan, a Persian refugee Prince, who, with about two hundred (the number was 300) followers, had accompanied our force from Candahar, and rendered our rearguard some very valuable assistance".¹ Rawlinson in his report on the Agha Khan also mentioned that the services at that time, of the Agha Khan, were of such consequence, "that the general thought him deserving of special notice in the report that was forwarded to the government on the occasion".²

Meanwhile from the Argandab and the Tumuk, Mirza Ahmed and Safer Jang had quietly moved towards the city of Qandahar and in the evening of the 10th, when Nott with his forces was away, the rebels attacked the city and fired the Herat gate. There were very few British troops in Qandahar, who guarded the city. However the rebels were repulsed. Nott with his troops returned afterwards.³

¹p. 179.

²Rawlinson to G.O. 20.12.42, E.S.L.I. 91, No. 22 of 12 of 19.2.43. I have not found the report of which Rawlinson speaks.

³Kaya, Afghanistan III, p. 154.

During most of the months of April and May, Qandahar was quiet. The enemies had suffered loss previously and were repairing it for further attack. During this time, the Agha Khan was given the charge of patrolling the city. On the 3rd of May, he and his horsemen had a skirmish with some of the rebels near the Arghandab and the Agha Khan succeeded in capturing two of the enemies' horses.¹

By the end of May, the rebel party had managed to collect together to make a final attack on 29th May near the Arghandab. Nott took the field himself with all his troops. Some reinforcements from India under General England had arrived. Nott organized the position of all his troops and gave a final blow to the rebel party at Qandahar. In this encounter, the Agha Khan and his horsemen were sent by Nott, with Rawlinson, in charge to clear the main body of the enemy.² Nott in his report to Maddock, mentioned the charge that was made by the Agha Khan during the engagement.³ J. H. Stocqueler, in his Memorials of Afghanistan mentioned a letter of Nott, "Our Infantry and guns, with the energy of their attack, seem to have astonished the Dervishes. The Parseeian horse under

¹ 3.5.42. Rawlinson's MSS Journal A.R.G.S.

² Rawlinson to C.C. 20.12.42, E.S.L.I.91, 22 of 12 of 19.2.43.

³ 29.5.42. No. 376. Parliamentary Papers on Afghanistan Vol. XXVII, p.312.

their brave leader Agha Mohamed, also did great execution and were very instrumental in destroying the position of and following up, the enemy".¹ The Reverend I. Allen, who was also present at the encounter, mentioned the service rendered by the Agha Khan.² Rawlinson in his report, gave further details, "Agha Khan was at the head of the party of Parasewan horses who charged the enemies' cavalry and drove them from the field, as reported in General Nott's despatch. I can speak positively to the Khan's gallantry in this instance, as we rode together throughout the action; and his nephew was shot through the head in the charge by my side".³

The Agha Khan as a Persian refugee was found useful for political purposes at Qandahar. In October 1841, news had reached Qandahar, regarding the growing power of Yar Muhammad at Herat.⁴ In November, Sultan Muhammad Khan, a cousin of Yar Muhammad but in the confidence of Kanran Shah, the ruler of Herat, had come to Qandahar to ask for British help against Yar Muhammad. Sultan Muhammad had brought letters from Kanran, Shah Fuzund of Lash, and Shah Fuzund's brother Deen Muhammad, who all pressed Rawlinson for help against Yar Muhammad.⁵

¹ Nott's account. 29.5.42. Stockqueler p. 235.

² Diary of March, p. 193.

³ Rawlinson to C.G. 20.12.42, E.S.L.I. 91 No. 22 of 12 of 19.2.43.

⁴ Rawlinson to Maddock. 27.11.41, E.S.L.I. 82, No. 34 of 2 of 19.1.42.

⁵ Ibid.

Rawlinson had written reports to the Government of India on Herat and requested further instructions. But replies had not come. After November, communications between India and Qandahar were interrupted. The Agha Khan, after arriving at Qandahar, had told Rawlinson about his alleged previous communications with Yar Muhammed.¹ In one of his letters, the Agha Khan claimed that in consultation with Rawlinson he had sent his agent Abdur Rahman Roushak to Yar Muhammed to draw him over to the British and to discourage him in his plans to attack Qandahar.² Rawlinson in December mentioned in his Diary that he had consulted the Agha Khan and Sultan Muhammed Khan regarding their reports from Herat.³ The Agha Khan's horsemen had served Rawlinson in bringing reports from the area. On January 6th, the Agha Khan's messenger reported that Shah Nemat and Yar Muhammed were in open conflict and that the Shah was holding out against Yar Muhammed with as much force as he had, and that the Shah had asked Pusand Khan to assist him in the war. Rawlinson in his political Diary wrote, "This is so far fortunate as it prevents Yar Md from turning his attention to affairs on our frontier".⁴ Re-

¹ Husur Khan to McNeill, 9.12.41. enc1: McNeill to Aberdeen, 25.1.42 No. 3 of P.R.P.75.

² Trans: Agha Khan to C.G. 3.9.43. H.S.L.I.94, No. 71 or 53 of 2.10.43. Also see Appendix I.

³ 31.12.41. MSS Journal Rawlinson A.A.G.S.

⁴ 6.1.42. MSS Journal Rawlinson, A.A.G.S.

garding Pusund Khan, Rawlinson thought of taking advantage of the situation. Through the messengers of the Agha Khan, Rawlinson tried to negotiate with Shah Pusund to bring about Kanran's success over Yar Muhammed.¹ He agreed to advance Rs. 10,000 to Shah Pusund, which Rawlinson again writes, "I was authorised by the Envoy to advance on a former occasion".² The object was, he says, to involve Pusund Khan with Yar Muhammed so as to prevent the possibility of attack by the latter on Qandahar. But he was nevertheless cautious with his promises. He again wrote, "Kanran and Deen Md. press me hardly for aid and I fully recognise the benefit to us of the Shah's success, but it seems to me again very probable that our pecuniary aid would arrive too late to be of use and under such circumstances we should be irrevocably committed with Yar ~~Md.~~".³ However by 20th January he made up his mind to remain neutral. He wrote in his Diary again, "As the Shah and the Minister are now at open war, I could not supply funds without committing the government to accomplish the expulsion of Yar Md. in the event of Kanran's failure to attain this object - I do not believe moreover that were the Shah to succeed it would be possible to organise a working government in Herat with

¹ 7, 9, 10.1.42. MSS Journal Rawlinson, A.R.G.S. also Appendix I.

² 10.1.42. MSS Journal Rawlinson, A.R.G.S.

³ 13.1.42. MSS Journal Rawlinson, A.R.G.S.

two rival chiefs like Deen Md and Shah Fuzund aiming at ministerial authority and again under the Muzeership of either of these two aspirants to the office I doubt if our position at Kairan's court would be in any way more secure or profitable than under the old regime of Yar Md - the only plan which I can hit upon securing to ourselves direct and solid political advantages at Herat would be to make Agha Khan the minister of Shah Karan but how to accomplish such an object under existing circumstances, I do not clearly perceive".¹ However as conditions at Qandahar became serious and British policy towards Afghanistan took a different turn, these projects were abandoned.

Before the insurrection spread at Qandahar in December 1841, the Agha Khan assisted Rawlinson in his projects to win over the Durranis against the rebel tribes.² When Dauder Jang and Mirza Ahmed joined the rebel party, Rawlinson with the help of the Agha Khan tried to break the confederacy. The Agha Khan in one of his letters to the Governor General described his intrigues, "Major Rawlinson sent for me and said, the Afghans evidently imagine that Shah Shooja is well inclined towards the rebels - You must therefore cause some letters to be forged bearing the Shah's signature and seal and addressed to me, these can be despatched to Surfer Jung and Mirza Ahmed Khan, by which their hopes may be blighted. I accordingly directed the requisite papers."³

¹20.1.42. MSS Journal Rawlinson A.R.G.S.

²11.1.42. MSS Journal Rawlinson A.R.G.S.

³From: The Agha Khan to Dalhousie 32.3.46, see Appendix I.

Rawlinson also tried to break the confederacy of the Durrani's with other tribes, by creating Shia-Sunni religious animosity among the Afghans.¹ Most Afghans at Qandahar were Sunnis. However Rawlinson with the help of the Agha Khan organized a party of 300 Shia horsemen under the leadership of the Agha Khan. On at least one occasion the Durrani's tried to win over this Shia party against the British. The Agha Khan with his men remained loyal² and in fact captured some of the letters which were written by the Durrani's in their attempts to win over the Shias.³ Writing a report on the services of the Agha Khan Rawlinson related, "when the intelligence reached Cabool of the total destruction of our army on the retreat from Cabool, the whole body of the Durrani's chiefs broke into rebellion and it became necessary, if we wished to retain our position in the province, as allies of the Native Government rather than as conqueror or military occupants, to make some very decided change in the Civil administration - Following the example of their brethren at Cabool - the Barakzies had coalesced with the other Durrani's against us - we had no resource therefore but to consolidate a Sheik party in opposition to the Soonees and to bring the former into power, and in effecting this

¹ 23.2.42. MSS Journal Rawlinson A.R.G.S.

² On that occasion the Agha Khan was considered as Khalif by the Durrani's. See the Agha Khan to G.O. trans. 5.12.44, E.S.L.I.59, No. 43 of Ms. 14 of 14 Feb. 1945.

³ 23.2.42. MSS Journal Rawlinson A.R.G.S.

object the services of Agha Khan were of the utmost value... the entire Sheah division of Islam is infected to certain extent with that belief in the divinity of Ali and his descendants, which forms the ground word of the Ismaelean heresy. The Sheahs did not admit the divine succession in the line of Iesrael, but they would not dispute the descent of Agha Khan... and I thus found that when the Soonee and Sheah prejudices were brought into antagonism at Candahar, the latter party immediately showed a disposition to rally round the Ismaeleen Imam - Agha Khan had no personal interest to subserve in the local politics".¹

When Rawlinson in March decided to clear the city of all Afghans who were suspected of sympathy with the rebel party, the services of the Agha Khan and his Pariwan were employed but they did not prove to be very useful. Rawlinson had to clear the city again afterwards, with Company troops.²

But Rawlinson, in 1842, when pleading the case of the Agha Khan, paid tribute to the Agha Khan's services, especially his local influence. The Agha Khan had accompanied Rawlinson in his visits to various villages where he had talked with chiefs, endeavouring to re-

¹ Rawlinson to G.O. 20.12.42. E.S.L.I. 91. No. 22 of No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

² See 22.2.42. MSS Political Journal Rawlinson A.R.G.S. 7.3.42. Ibid.

store their confidence in the British troops.¹ In his report to the Governor General, Rawlinson mentioned, "To his unceasing efforts and his powerful influence with this party it is I think to be mainly attributed that we were able to hold Candahar so long and so creditably and to leave it in such a state of comfort and efficiency - not that I mean in any way to detract from the gallantry and endurance of the troops - but it was certainly owing to the good will of the Parseewans, conciliated by Agha Khan, that our cattle were supplied with forages, our men and officers with all requisite articles of consumption, that we obtained constant information of all the designs and movements of Afghans and finally that carriage was afforded for the transport of our magazines and a large proportion of our provision."²

Meanwhile, Lord Ellenborough had arrived in India in succession to Auckland and he decided that the British troops should evacuate Afghanistan. These orders were received at Qandahar but were kept secret. In July 1842, the Agha Khan learned that the British were to evacuate. Rawlinson in June, made a list of the names of certain chiefs having claims upon the British Government, in the event of their withdrawal, and he proposed the formation of a Parseewan Colony on the right bank of the Indus, which he thought might, in five years' time,

¹ 7.2.42, 20.2.42, 19.3.42, 26.3.42, MSS Political Journal Rawlinson, A.R.O.S.

² Rawlinson to G.G. 20.12.42, H.S.L.I. 91, No. 22 No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

amount to 20,000 families and afford a sort of political counter poise to the Durrani power at Qandahar.¹ There were altogether 21 chiefs in the list and the Agha Khan and Sultan Muhammad Khan of Herat were among them. Rawlinson put forward the case of the Agha Khan in the following words: "he would be obliged either to accompany us to the Southward or to make a rapid retreat to the Persian Frontier. Taking into consideration, the danger of hostility from Persia which must accrue from our abandonment of Afghanistan, the political value of Agha Khan's attachment to our interests will necessarily be greatly increased, and it would I think therefore be desirable to invite the Khan to accompany us to India".²

Hillenborough rejected Rawlinson's suggestion of a Persian colony and regretted the necessity of bringing into India any of the persons mentioned by Rawlinson. He considered them as likely to be of much more use at Qandahar than in India, "if they really be friendly to us".³ Nevertheless he told Nott that if there should be in his opinion some persons, whose lives, in consequence of their services, would be endangered, on account of the retirement of the British troops, he was authorised to extend his protection to such

¹Rawlinson to Nott 1.6.42. E.S.L.I.97, No. 76 No. 22 of 8 July 1842.

²Ibid.

³Haddock to Nott 25.5.42, Hillenborough pte PRO. 30/12/35. pt 1/6 No. 305.

persons as far as the Indus.¹

However Nott did not consider the case of the Agha Khan serious enough. Nott himself with his troops retreated via Chusni, Kabil and Jellalabad and the remaining troops were to return to India via Quetta and Sildur with General England. The charge of Qandahar was left in the hands of Saifur Jang. Prince Timur decided to go to India. The Agha Khan proposed to accompany the forces retiring to India with General England. At that time the Agha Khan was in pecuniary distress. His allowance had not been paid by Nott, during the past four months. He pressed Nott for a loan to enable him to purchase carriage in order to accompany the army. Owing to the difficulties of communication he had been long without receiving any tribute from his followers in India and in the shock which the commercial credit of Qandahar had sustained due to the constant war and the retirement, the Agha Khan could not negotiate a loan from any merchants.² Rawlinson thought, "owing to the constant fighting in which he had been engaged with the Afghans, as well as to the religious rancour with which he must have been viewed by the Soonees, as the leader of the now depressed Sheah party, his continuance in Qandahar after our retirement would have been attended

¹ Reddock to Nott 1.6.42. Ellenborough pte. PRO /30/12/33. pt 1/6 no. 305.

² Rawlinson to C.G. 20.12.42, E.S.L.I. 91, No. 22 No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

with extreme personal danger".¹ Rowlinson in his Diary of 8 August prior to his departure for Channi noted, "I regret this, for I feel assured he remains at Oondshar only to be murdered. The General however, positively refused to advance him a single Rupee and he had thus no alternative".²

¹Rowlinson to G.O., 20.12.42. B.S.L.I. 91, No. 22 No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1943.

²S.C.42. MSS Journal Rowlinson A.M.G.S.

Chapter III.

The Agha Khan in Sind. 1843-44.

After the departure of England's troops from Qandahar on August 9, 1842, for Quetta, the Agha Khan stayed on in Qandahar for about six weeks. Rawlinson who sympathised with him, advised him to retreat to India and encouraged him with the hope that General England would be able to do something for him.¹ The Agha Khan, however, eventually managed to borrow Rs 20,000 from two merchants of Qandahar and, leaving his brother Mirza Abul Hassan Khan as a security, he himself with his horsemen followed England's route. He reached Quetta on 5th October 1842, and found that England's forces had left for Sind.² He then went to stay with the Khan of Kelat for more than a month. By the end of November, he reached Sukkur and made his salaam to Charles Napier, who was the Commander of the British forces there.³

In October, the Agha Khan had made an approach to the Governor General through General England.⁴ The Agha Khan related to the Governor General, in his application, some details of the services

¹ Trans. The Agha Khan to England, 26.10.42, E.S.L.I.91, E.17, No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

² Trans. The Agha Khan to G.G. 26.10.42, E.S.L.I.91, No.17, No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

³ Napier to Maddock. 21.11.42, E.S.L.I.91, No.21, No.12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

⁴ England to Napier. 26.10.42, E.S.L.I.91, No. 17, No. 12 of 19 Feb 1843.

he had rendered at Qandahar and asserted that he had not been paid since June 1842. He also applied for the repayment of the Rupees 20,000 which he had borrowed to enable him to leave Qandahar and also for British protection professing that, "If the Governor General thinks that such services should go unrewarded without compromising the British character, I am content - otherwise I am in hopes of a favourable answer and an order on the merchants of Kurrah to such an amount as may enable me to pay off my debts and to proceed to whatever place you may be pleased to allow me."¹ On receipt of these letters, the Governor General directed his Secretary Maddock to request Nott and Rawlinson to provide any particulars relating to 'Mahomed Hussain, the Persian Nobleman' and his claim on the Government.² Nott, not knowing the original name of the Agha Khan, replied that the only Persian refugee he had ever heard of at Qandahar was the Agha Khan and that if any person named Muhammed Hussain was at Qandahar, Major Rawlinson would be able to provide relevant data.³

Rawlinson, of course, made a long report to the Governor General.

¹ Trans. The Agha Khan to G.O. 26.10.42, E.S.L.I.91, E.17, No. 12 of 19 Feb 1843.

² 11.11.42, E.S.L.I.91, No. 18, No. 12 of 19. Feb 1843.

³ Nott to Maddock, 24.11.42, E.S.L.I.91, No. 19, No. 12 of 19 Feb 1843.

For the material to write the report, he relied partly on the private letters of Macnaghten regarding the Agha Khan and partly on his own memory. (The records of the Qandahar affairs had been accidentally burnt during the withdrawal from Afghanistan.) In this report Rawlinson explained the origins of Ismailism in Islam and the position of the Agha Khan as the chief of the Sect. He also wrote a report on the Agha Khan's Military and political services at Qandahar. Regarding the indemnification he wrote that, "We are not liable for the amount, in strict law or even in honor, nor indeed, do I think that the Khan stands in any need of our assistance to defray the debt."¹ As for the Agha Khan's reasons for borrowing money and leaving Qandahar, Rawlinson analysed them thus: "he came to Qandahar, in the first instance to seek our support in re-establishing his power in Persia, not to claim an asylum among the Afghans, as he fought on our side, with a view of conciliating our good will and not from any affection to the Shesahs or hatred to the Soonees, so, at the present time, he has quitted Qandahar and proceeded to Suldkur, rather in the hope of retaining his hold upon us until circumstances may bring us to furnish him with the means of agitating in his lost province of Kerman, than with any object of pressing for an indemnification of expenses, or from any

¹Rawlinson to G.O. 20.12.42, E.S.L.I.91, No. 22, No.12 of 19 Feb 1843.

real apprehension of personal danger among the Afghans."¹ He added, "Acquiescence with the request, would of course mark in a most gratifying way his Lordship's sense of the Khan's services at Candahar and would further have the advantage of absolving the Government from any appearance of obligation, on account of those services, to promote the intrigues in which the Khan is anxious to involve us, but to show that he is in reality altogether independent of any such pecuniary assistance, as that which he now demands."²

Rawlinson also predicted that, after his arrival in Sardar, the Agha Khan would press both for asylum and a pension. He considered that these demands would raise political issues. He argued, "Is it desirable, by a moderate outlay of money, to hold at our command an instrument by which we may at any time throw the South of Persia into rebellion and thus paralyse any attempt at an advance from Tehran to the Eastward or is the latter contingency so remote or so un consequential as not to be worth the expense and trouble of keeping Agha Khan in our hands with a view to its possible counteraction? Agha Khan's residence in the Indian territories will certainly be viewed with extreme jealousy by Persia and will in all probability be productive of much embarrassment to us, for the Khan will, as I think, assuredly continue to prosecute his intrigues in Kerman,

¹Rawlinson to G.O. 20.12.42, E.S.L.I.91, No. 22, No. 12 of 19 Feb 1843.

²Rawlinson to G.O. 20.12.42, E.S.L.I.91, No. 22, No. 12 of 19 Feb 1843.

and will hardly be withheld from the unauthorized employment of our name - on the other hand, should the Khan be obliged to quit India, dissatisfied with the British Government, he will in all likelihood take up his abode in Baghdad, to which place he has sent his family when he himself fled to Candahar, and he will there be quite ready to place his influence and resources at the disposal of Turkey or Russia for the injury of Persia and possibly to the serious prejudice of our interests.¹

The Governor General, before receiving the above report of Rawlinson, had asked Napier to discover the whereabouts of the Agha Khan.² Napier informed Ellenborough that the Agha Khan was expected to reach Sukkur in November 1842. Meanwhile Ellenborough after receiving the report by Rawlinson, passed on copies to Napier and stated, "You are at liberty to employ that individual".³ In January the Agha Khan asked for financial indemnification for his debts from Napier. However Napier was not sure about what he should do and therefore referred the matter to Ellenborough for instructions. "I do not clearly understand how I can employ this Persian Nobleman

¹ Rawlinson to G.O. 20.12.42, E.S.L.I.91, No. 22, No. 12 of 19 Feb 1843.

² Maddock to Napier. 11.11.42, E.S.L.I.91, No. 20, No. 12 of 19 Feb 1843.

³ Maddock to Napier. 3.1.43, E.S.L.I.91, No. 23, No. 12 of 19 Feb 1843.

Mahomed Hussain? This gentleman does not ask for employment, he wants a sum of money amounting to 20,000 Rupees, which he declares to be due to him by the company. Am I to pay this sum or any portion thereof?"¹

The Governor General replied, "You were at liberty to employ Mahomed Hussain, it was not meant that you should give to him an employment under the Government, that is, an office but that with reference to the papers transmitted, showing the influence of Mahomed Hussain over the Ismaelites Sect, you were at liberty to make use of that influence, if you should think fit and see occasion to do so, for the purpose of forwarding the views of the Government in Scinde".² At the same time he sent him another copy of Rawlinson's report on the Agha Khan, for he informed from Napier's letter that he had not received one and advised him that, "my remuneration Mahomed Hussain would receive, would depend upon his conduct and the value of his services". Regarding the question of the 20,000 Rupees Napier was informed, "The Governor General does not, as at present informed, consider him to be entitled to any such sum". Ellenborough argued following Rawlinson, that the Agha Khan went to Qandahar on his own account, being expelled from Persia and being at Qandahar he had fought on the British side for which he was paid,

¹ Napier to Maddock, 30.1.43, E.S.L.I.91, No. 24, No. 12 of 19 Feb 1843.

² 11.2.43, E.S.L.I.91, No. 25, No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

"His losses in Persia in no degree arise out of any connection with the British Government".¹

In January 1843, the Agha Khan went with Napier to the British camp at Khiria and then to Hyderabad, with 60 of his horsemen. In Hyderabad he was employed in the British service during the battles of Miani and Dubba. In September 1843, by the orders of Ellenborough he was detained in Sind. After giving a brief account of the British conquest of Sind, I propose to discuss the role of the Agha Khan in Sind.

The British connections with Sind had been re-opened during the time of the Napoleonic Wars. The contacts were limited to trading establishments and then to treaties which had as their sole purpose the protection of India from a possible invasion by Russia and later on incursions by predatory tribes. In the 1850s, Sind was a buffer against any attack and the Indus served, or was intended to serve, as a major line of transit for British commerce into Central Asia.² In consequence various treaties were concluded with the Mirs of upper and lower Sind. During the first Afghan war, the Mirs had allowed the British forces to pass through their territories. In 1840, James Outram was appointed as the British Political agent to the Mirs of Lower Sind in place of Henry Pottinger. Outram was also made Politi-

¹ 11.2.43, E.S.L.I.91, No. 25, No. 12 of 19. Feb 1843.

² Battenback - Sind, p.113.

cal agent of Upper Sind in place of Ross Bell in 1841. Ellenborough after coming to India, appointed Napier as the Commander of the British forces stationed in Sind. Napier after taking up his post in September 1842, opened negotiations for a new treaty with the Mirs of Upper and Lower Sind. He appointed Outram as the commissioner for the negotiations. Various meetings were held in December 1842 and January 1843 with the Mirs.¹ However on January 11, Napier stormed the deserted fortress of Imangarh. The Baluchi tribes of one of the Mirs were embittered and on 14th February 1843, attacked Outram and other officers at the British Residency in Hyderabad, where earlier Outram had had a Durbar with the Mirs regarding the negotiations of the terms of the new treaty. On 17th February Napier marched with his forces on Hyderabad and defeated the Mirs of Hyderabad, Khaipur and Mirpur in the battle of Miani and took Hyderabad. All the Mirs of Upper and Lower Sind surrendered except Mir Sher Muhammed of Mirpur. On 26th March, at the battle of Dubba, Napier defeated Sher Muhammed, who escaped to the North. However on 13th June, John Jacob, the Commander of the Sind irregular horse, defeated him finally and by August 1843, the annexation of Sind to the British territories was formally announced.²

¹ Lambrecht, Napier and Sind, pp. 69-100.

² Ibid., pp. 100-133, also Huttonback, Sind, pp. 68-90.

In January 1843, the Agha Khan offered the services of himself and his horsemen to Napier.¹ Napier reported vaguely to Ellenborough in February that, "When the Amirs resolved upon hostilities, he (the Agha Khan) told them they could not stand against the English troops".² It seems that the exact occasion of the Agha Khan's intervention is not certain. When the Agha Khan was in Hyderabad he must have visited, or as a Shiite Imam, somehow seen the Mirs (most of them were Shias) and tried to explain to them the weakness of their position. It is also probable that the Agha Khan was present in the Burbar when all the Mirs except Mir Nasir Khan of Khairpur, signed the treaty in the presence of Outram on 12th February. At any rate, after the Burbar, the news of the Baluch hostility was given to Outram who refused to take it seriously and on 14th, the British Residency was attacked by the Baluchis. However, Napier's attack on Hyderabad had followed and in giving his report to Ellenborough, Napier wrote, "Major Outram and his companions were in great peril, a plot had been laid to murder them all".³ Napier also tried to prove that the Mirs had

¹ Napier to Ellenborough, 25.2.43, E.S.L.I.92, No. 35, No. 17 of 13 Mar 1843.

² Napier to Ellenborough, 25.2.43, Ellenborough pte P.R.O. 30/12/35, pt. I, No. 5 ..

³ See Lambbrick - Napier and Sind, p. 149.

long planned hostile action against the British [in order to justify his attack].⁷ In arriving at this conclusion, Major found supporting evidence in the testimony of the Agent whom he claimed had renegociated to Major O'Brien (who was present in the Durbar) against his statement of attacking O'Brien in the Residency.⁸ Major asked the Agent whom for a written report on his protest, which Major subsequently sent to Elphinstone, adding: "It confirms every other statement, viz. that the assault on Major O'Brien was a premeditated assault and not made from a sudden impulse of British anger. Of the fact I never had any doubt - I believe Major O'Brien was the only Englishman that believed this trumped up story of the assault."⁹ (That the Agent did not plan the attack, as they told O'Brien, he believed it, and the had concluded an attack unlikely, before being attacked in the Residency.) WILLIAM HAYES, the brother of Charles Hayes also wrote, who (the Agent whom) had come to Delhi with a crowd of Europeans before the arrival of the Amritsar Agents to assist the Residency, had remonstrated against it, ... Europeans gave him information on that subject as to render O'Brien's information.

⁷ See, however, to H. L. M. 27.11.03, 1.1.04, 1.1.05, 2.5, 2.11.05 or 2.12.05 1904.

⁸ Major to Elphinstone: 17.12.03, 26.12.03, 26.1.04, 26.2.04 or 26.3.04 1904.

on that occasion most painfully prominent.¹ Sometimes after 1851, Outram himself was presented with a copy of this book, in which he made marginal notes and other additions. He underlined the words 'inbecile vanity' and commented, "This inbecile vanity was so lauded at the time that a dispatch to itself was talked of for itself".²

Soon after the battle of Miani the Agha Khan was given a post at Jherruk to secure the communications between Karachi and Hyderabad, on which route some British officers and others had been killed. Napier wrote to Ellenborough, "As it is a matter of considerable importance to prevent marauding, and as he is not only a brave man, but, as head of a religious sect, has much influence and numerous followers, I have desired him to do so till I have your Lordship's decision".³ Napier informed Col. Boileau, the officer commanding at Karachi, about the employment of the Agha Khan and his responsibility for guarding the post between Hyderabad and Karachi. He also warned Boileau to prevent the Agha Khan from interfering with the Jam of Jokia.⁴

The Agha Khan and his horsemen whose number had risen to 200, took up their post near Jherruk in February 1843 and helped to safeguard

¹. Napier - Administration, p.75.

² India Office Library contains MSS notations by Outram, E.O.MSS., B.114.

³ 22.2.43, E.S.L.I.92, No. 35, No. 17 of 13 Mar 1843, see Napier, Mita II, p. 342.

⁴ Intelligence of 4-5.3.43, E.S.L.I. 92, E.26, No. 23 of 24 Mar 1843.

the post from Karachi and also to make speedy delivery of letters and goods required for the army.¹ The Agha Khan also reported intelligence matters to Napier, especially the movements of Sher Muhammed and his Baluchis. He also proposed writing a letter to Sher Muhammed to point out the folly of his contending with the British and to offer his services as mediator.²

However, Boileau reported that the posts between Karachi and Hyderabad were about as irregular as they were before the Agha Khan took over his responsibility.³ It seems the Agha Khan and his 200 followers, who were spread around Jhorruk and Tatta, did not take their duty seriously.⁴ The neighbouring Jokria and Kar-mati Baluchis, who had joined Sher Muhammed, threatened the Agha Khan and his followers with death, on account of their having joined the British.⁵ On 23rd March, the Agha Khan and his horsemen were attacked by the Baluchis who plundered and killed many of his followers.⁶

¹ Memorandum of intelligence, 12.3.43, E.S.L.I.92, No. 26, No. 23 of 24 Mar 1843.

² Memorandum of intelligence, Lt. Boileau to S.C.B. 19.3.43, Ellensborough pte. P.R.O. 30/12/33 pt I no. 5.

³ Boileau to S.C.B. 12.3.43, E.S.L.I.92, N.No. 26, No. 23 of 24 Mar 1843.

⁴ R. Burton, Sind - or the unhappy valley, Vol. I, p.190-5 gives a very dramatic account of the encounter.

⁵ Memorandum of 19-20.3.43, Ellensborough pte. P.R.O. 30/12/33, Pt I, No.5.

⁶ Memorandum of 28.3.43, Ellensborough pte. P.R.O. 30/12/33, Pt.I, No. 5.

Regarding this episode, William Napier wrote that the Baluchis attacked the Agha Khan's men and killed 170 of them and the Agha Khan himself fled with thirty of his horsemen to Hyderabad.¹ The Agha Khan himself claimed different numbers at different times.² Sher Ali Alidina, in his book Tarikh-i-Ismat writes on the authority of his parents, who related to him that their parents took part in the action and that the number of killed was 72.³ Roileau had received intelligence that all the villages between Tatta and Jarruk were plundered by the Baluchis and that all but five or six of the Agha Khan's men were killed.⁴ Captain A. Thomas reported that 25 of Agha Khan's men had survived whom Napier employed at the fort of Hyderabad, together with other soldiers to guard the fort, during the time when he was fighting with Sher Muhammed on 26th March in the battle of Dibba.⁵ Outram in his manuscript notes described the episode, "They with their master were the greatest cowards when at Jerruk, after the battle of Meanco. Agha and his warriors were

¹Comment, p. 369.

²The Agha Khan to Napier, trans. 27.11.43, E.S.L.I.95, No. 10, No. 5 of 20.1.44, in this letter number killed 150, 50 survived. See Appendix. The Agha Khan to Dalhousie, number killed 57, 150 wounded.

³See Tarikh-i-Ismat, pp. 150, 331-332.

⁴Intelligence, 28.3.43, Ellenborough pte. P.R.O. 30/12/33 Pt I, No. 5.

⁵Report 8.4.43, Ellenborough pte. P.R.O. 30/12/33, Pt. I, No. 5, see also S.H.C. Vol. II, p. 786.

alarmed by an attack by Beloochies - the assailants were fewer in number than the assailed but the Agha and horsemen instantly fled into the jungle."¹ However on 20th April 1843, Napier wrote to Ellenborough, "I have occupied Jerruk with a company of the 15th Native Infantry, supported by the influence and to control the over-vigor of the Persian Agha Khan".² He did not mention the Jherruk incident in his correspondence. In September 1843, when Ellenborough inquired of Napier concerning the employment of the Agha Khan, Napier summed up in his letter, "With regard to his employment, he has been useless. I began by charging him with clearing the communication between Jerruk where he lives and Kurrachoo, but I was at once obliged to take this from him - He is as great a marauder as the Belooches and put the whole country in a ferment, he would quickly produce an insurrection - He is daring, violent...."³ However it seems likely that the Agha Khan with his 30 followers had joined Napier again, before the battle of Dibba. After the battle, Napier had again posted the Agha Khan for a short time near Garra to secure the communication with Karachi.⁴ Napier, in April and May 1843, sent warnings to the

¹ E.R.O. B. 114, p.76.

² Napier to Ellenborough, 20.4.43, Ellenborough pte. P.R.O. 30/12/33 Pt I, No. 5.

³ 20.11.43, E.S.L.I.95, No. 6, No. 5 of 20 Jan. 1844.

⁴ Napier to Ellenborough, 20.4.43, Ellenborough pte. P.R.O. 30/12/33 Pt I, No. 277 of 5.

Jan of Jokia, asking him to return the plunder of the Agha Khan and surrender.¹ In May, he ordered his Commander at Karachi to attack and recover the property of the Agha Khan, which was done.²

After the conquest of Sind, the Agha Khan had returned to Jherruk and built his houses for himself and his followers. He and his followers were disliked by the people of Sind.³ Personally Napier was friendly to him and hoped to get a Persian cat from the Agha Khan for a relative. In one of his letters to his family he wrote, "He is a God - his income immense. He lets none of his sect kiss his hand under twenty Rupees, and is the greatest rascal possible, that is, a clever brave man, but being a God makes a virtue of any sin he likes to commit. I speak truly when saying that his followers do not and dare not refuse him any favour he asks, wives, daughters, slaves, money, houses, furniture, all are his, and he doesn't let the privilege grow rusty. However, I have put an end peremptorily, to his rights thencever any of his people choose to resist him, which is awkward for the divinity of the 'Old man of the Mountain'. He could kill me if he pleased, he has only to say the word and one of his people would do the job in a twinkling and go

¹ 7.4.43, 21.5.43, Ellenborough pto. P.R.O. 50/12/53, pt. I, No. 5.

² Lambbrick - Napier - Sind., p. 168.

³ W. Napier - Life, III, p. 127. Napier to Ellenborough, 20.11.43, E.S.L.I.95, No. 6, No. 5 of 20 Jan 1844.

straight to heaven for the same. He is too shrewd for that however, and they all have a great fear of me since the battles. The Padishaw they think has some secret art that nothing can fight against. Such is the advantage of victory, it gives a man credit for every thing."¹

In November 1843, the Agha Khan received a letter from his brother at Qandahar, informing him of secret movements among the Afghans of Qandahar, who had made common cause with the Baluchis of Sind and that they were endeavouring to raise a religious war against the British in Sind.² The Agha Khan sent a copy of this letter to Napier, who had also received some similar reports regarding the Baluch confederacy from other quarters.³ The Agha Khan also learned from his brother that Kohin Dil Khan had been able to return to his territory at Qandahar and that conditions in Persia were becoming unsettled owing to the Perse-Turkish border dispute of 1843. He sent the copy of this letter to Napier for the information of the Governor General.⁴

¹ Napier, Life III, p. 127.

² The Agha Khan to Napier. No date. E. Napier to Ellenborough 15.12.43, E.S.L.I.95, No. 14, No. 5 of 20 Jan 1844. See also W. Napier - Administration, p. 76.

³ Napier to Ellenborough, 15.2.43, E.S.L.I.95, No. 14, No. 5 of 20 Jan 1844.

⁴ The Agha Khan to Napier. No date. E. Napier to Ellenborough, 15.12.43, E.S.L.I.95, No. 14, No. 5 of 20 Jan 1844.

Napier, however, did not think much of the Agha Khan's intelligence on Persia and Qandahar. He wrote to Ellenborough, enclosing the letter of the Agha Khan, and added, "Its value I have no means of judging but I believe it cannot be much".¹ All the same Ellenborough advised Napier, "to transmit by the first opportunity to Major Rawlinson at Bagdad any information you may already obtain from the Persian Prince which may seem to be of any interest or importance."²

The Agha Khan had been in Sind since November 1842. As we have seen, in February 1843, Ellenborough had advised Napier that the Agha Khan would be paid for his services in Sind. Again in March, before the conquest, Ellenborough had suggested, "As we shall have lands enough at our disposal we may hereafter give him a Jaghire. It will be the best way of remunerating him for any service he may perform."³ It seems nothing was done until after the conquest, regarding the salary of the Agha Khan.

However in 1843, the Agha Khan decided to return to Persia. He wrote a long letter to the Governor General with the reports of

¹ 29.1.44, E.S.L.I.95, No. 5, No. 5 of 20 Jan. 1844.

² 25.3.44, Ellenborough pte. P.R.O. 30/12/14/4 No. 15.

³ 12.3.43, E.S.L.I.92, No. 35, No. 17 of 13 Mar 1843.

his services to the British Government and requested to be given permission to leave Sind. He also sent his agent Mirza Muhammad Ali to lay his case personally before the Governor General, who was then at Amballa. He explained that he needed British assistance to return to Persia and asked if the Governor General would give him letters of recommendation either to Nasir Khan of Kelat or to the Pasha of Bagdad or would at least pay his expenses to return to Persia to recover his lost province of Kirman. The Agha Khan requested a loan which he promised to pay "through merchants to the Company".¹ At the same time, the Agha Khan claimed to have received invitations to return to Afghanistan, from Yar Muhammad and Kohin Dil Khan. These invitations appear to have reawakened his ambitions. Yar Muhammad wrote to the Agha Khan, "If, however, you place no confidence in the British Government and if you find that the opportunity of realising your hope is not lost, pray come over to this place, even if you have only a few attendants, that the hope entertained by you, myself and all the people of this place may be fulfilled."² The Agha Khan sent copies of the invitations to the Governor General and asked his agent to wait upon the Governor General to get a personal reply. When the Agha Khan's agent

¹ Trans. The Agha Khan to G.O. 9.B.43, B.S.L.I.94, E. No. 8, No. 56 of 21 Oct. 1843.

² See Appendix. Enclo. to the Agha Khan to G.O. 9.B.43, B.S.L.I.94, E. No. 8, No. 56 of 21 Oct 1843.

reached Amballa, the Governor General had left for Fort William. Therefore he forwarded the applications of his master to Lt. Col. A. Richmond, agent on the North West Frontier, who in September sent them to the Governor General.¹

The Governor General, through his secretary in the Foreign Department, acknowledged their receipt and informed Richmond that the Governor General was in correspondence with Napier on the subject of the services and claims of the Agha Khan. He asked Richmond to send the Agha Khan's agent back to Sind and warned him "You will be careful in any further conversation with the agent to disavow any hostile intentions towards Persia and to let it be known that the British Government is in friendly alliance with that country and cannot lend its countenance to any projects which are likely to disturb those relations."² Ellenborough wrote to Napier informing him that, "The Persian Prince Agha Khan is desirous of going to Bagdad and of being recommended to the Sultan, as he wishes to be supported or at least assisted here. Our object is to prevent war between the Sultan and the Shah, and we cannot place at the Sultan's disposal an instrument which he could use with so much effect against the Shah."³ He therefore ordered that the Agha Khan "must

¹ Napier to Maddock, 11.9.43, E.S.L.I.94, No. 8, No. 55 of 21 Oct 1843.

² Thomason to Richmond, 14.10.43, E.S.L.I.94, No. 9, No. 55 of 21 Oct 1843.

³ 13.9.43. Ellenborough pte. P.R.O. 30/12/14/3. No. 95.

remain where he is". He suggested giving some allowances to the Agha Khan but was not sure how much to give. "It is difficult to decide what allowance it would be proper to make to him. It has been understood that he has not or did not receive less than 20,000 Rupees a year from his religious adherents. It would be convenient if your Excellency would communicate some opinions on the subject of the allowance it may be fit to give him and at the same time inform us how he has been of late employed."¹

Meanwhile the Agha Khan had requested Napier to be allowed to leave Sind and to go to Persia. He wrote, "Although you never agree to what I suggest, still this is the time for you to assist me that I may also get off by the Bumpora road, you of course act as you like - my duty is to keep you acquainted with everything I hear and I offer what services may be in my power."² Napier, however, replied, "You say I never agree to what you suggest! How can you, who are so good and brave a soldier, be ignorant, that I am not master but a servant. What you suggest I tell to my master, the Governor General, what he orders I tell to you. Why do you tell me I do not mind your suggestions? You are a wise Persian politician, and I am a plain English soldier. I tell you truth like a simple man and you,

¹ 25.9.43, Millenborough Pte. P.R.O. 30/12/14/3 No. 95.

² Trans. The Agha Khan to Napier, 25.1.44, H.S.L.I.95, No. 5, No. 5 of 29.Jan 1844.

being a politician, will not believe me! This is very unwise in you, because you want to know the truth and yet when you hear it, will not believe and tell me I never agree to what you suggest! Well have your own way and I will have mine."¹

However, Napier after receiving Ellenborough's orders regarding the allowances to be paid to the Agha Khan, he, after referring to Rawlinson's report on the Agha Khan of 1842, replied that Rupees one thousand a month ought to suffice the Agha Khan for himself and his personal servants. He did not think that the Agha Khan required his horses any more. But he informed Ellenborough that the Agha Khan himself expected Rupees 11,000 a month.² He also told Ellenborough "Unless he is satisfied with whatever your Lordship may think proper to allow him, he will go away."³

However Ellenborough in December 1843 sanctioned Rupees 1,000 per month for the Agha Khan as an allowance and considered that this was a sufficient sum.⁴ Napier took care to keep the Agha Khan under close surveillance. He asked the Agha Khan to live in Hyderabad instead of Jherruk and promised to find him a house there.⁵ He also

¹ Napier, Life III, p. 45.

² 20.11.43, E.S.L.I.95, No. 6, No. 5 of 20 Jan 1844.

³ 27.11.43, E.S.L.I.95, No. 10, No. 5 of 20 Jan 1844.

⁴ Currie to Napier, 25.12.43, E.S.L.I.95, No. 7, No. 5 of 20 Jan 1844.

⁵ Napier to Ellenborough 27.11.43, E.S.L.I.95, No. 10, No. 5 of 20 Jan 1844.

asked the Agha Khan to disperse his armed men. Writing to Ellenborough he inquired whether he should make the Agha Khan a prisoner if he attempted to escape.¹

Ellenborough rejected such measures and replied, "It is to be hoped that Agha Khan will not commit any act which would render his detention by compulsion necessary; as such a measure, with respect to a person who whatever may have been his motives and whatever may be his character, has apparently acted faithfully by us, is one to which we must be very unwilling to resort, but which would not but be subject to much misrepresentation." He added, somewhat optimistically, that the Agha Khan "will probably be very ready to remain quiet in the enjoyment of the proposed pension which together with what he receives from the persons of his religion must make his position one of affluence."²

Earlier the India Board acting through the Secret Committee wrote to Ellenborough concerning his decision of keeping the Agha Khan in India, "We approve of the course which you took with respect to the Persian Prince Agha Khan, in preferring to give to him, for his services, an allowance in money, rather than a recommendation for employment by the Porte, our object being, as you very properly

¹4.1.44, B.S.L.I.95, No. 11, No. 5 of 20 Jan 1844.

²Ibid.

state, to prevent war between the Sultan and the Shah of Persia, and not to place in the hands of either party the means of annoying the other."¹

Thus Ellenborough, in order to keep the Agha Khan in India, sanctioned the allowance of Re 1,000 per month, without making any conditions. The political conditions of 1843, especially of Persia and Bagdad determined the decision, although the services of the Agha Khan to the Indian Government were not neglected.

¹22.12.43. B.D.S.L.I, Vol. 17, No. 965.

Chapter IV.

The question of asylum, 1847-1847.

The Agha Khan, after accepting the allowance sanctioned by the Indian Government, did not live peacefully in India. He tried to create disturbances in Persia by various means. The Persian Government, on the basis of the Treaty of Tehrān demanded his expulsion from the British territories. In 1844, it was agreed between the British and the Persian Governments to remove the Agha Khan to Calcutta. The Agha Khan, however, continued to live in western India and did not leave for Calcutta until April 1847. This led to misunderstandings among the Governments involved. The whole issue is discussed in the light of events that followed.

The Agha Khan was anxious to return to his lost province of Kirman. He wrote inflammatory letters to certain chiefs residing on the borders of Kirman and Baluchistan. He also used the British name and authority to achieve his aims. In his letter to a certain Abbas Khan Baluch of Bamfahli, the Agha Khan asked him and some of his other supporters to make preparations for his return to Kirman.¹ In June 1843, the Agha Khan sent a letter to the Governor of Bamfahli, Muhammad Ali Khan Baluch, purporting to be from Sir Charles Mayier to Muhammad Ali Khan. The letter declared, "The letter full of amicable de-

¹The Agha Khan to Abbas Khan. June 1843, enc1: Shall to Aberdeen 12.4.44. No. 40 F.O. 60/104.

declaration, of that person of high rank to the address of Major Outram has been received through my exalted friend Agha Khan, and the statements contained in it have been understood, and we are much pleased with the friendly sentiments expressed by you".¹ There is no other evidence that the letter was written by Napier.²

Again in January 1844, the Agha Khan wrote a long letter to various chiefs residing on the borders of Kirman-Baluchistan, informing them that, "We resolved on marching in that direction and we had advanced (the phrase used in Persian implies royalty) as far as Kurachee, but His Excellency the Governor General (probably meaning the Governor of Sind) and the other officers requested that we should remain for some time till the arrival of an answer, to our communications from His Excellency the Governor General of England, Indis and Sind. Accordingly we have been pleased to remain for two or three months, so that, upon the whole, our various preparations may be completed, when we may march - but we have written to our fortunate brother Abul Hassan Khan Sirdar, to leave Seistan speedily for Bamfahles and it is incumbent on you, the light of our eyes, before the arrival of our fortunate and auspicious forces (the phrase in the original is confined in its use to royalty) in that country, to send

¹ Napier to Md. Ali Khan Baluch, 12.5.43, enccl: Sheil to Aberdeen No. 40 of 12.4.1844. F.O. 60/104. The letter was in Persian and bore the seal of the Governor of Sind. A copy of the letter was seen by Sheil in Tehran.

² I have consulted E.S.L.I., Milnerborough Papers and Napier's Journals.

"a special messenger to announce to Amor Rustam Khan, Mast Ali Khan, Rais Hajes Mohamed Khan (said to be subjects of Persia, residing in Kirman and on the frontiers of Beloochistan) and to others of our devoted servants in whom reliance can be placed, that please God, they should regard our advance as fixed, that they may all make preparation and firmly bind on the girdle of resolution, so that by the assistance of the Most High our affairs may be speedily settled.... We entertain the hope, by the Grace and assistance of God, to revenge in a double degree whatever was done to them and to stay in retaliation great and small and (we trust) that without any great difficulty we may be favoured by God with the conquest and victory".¹ The Agha Khan also informed the Governor General that since he was asked by Napier to disband his horsemen, he had sent them to Baluchistan.² He also asked Napier in 1844, for permission to visit his followers in Karachi, Bombay, Kutch and Kathiawar.

Napier, in September 1844, agreed to permit the Agha Khan to leave Hyderabad. Napier took care to write an introductory letter to Sir George Arthur, the Governor of Bombay, regarding the intention of the Agha Khan to visit his followers. He wrote, "I have orders to leave him at full liberty except that he is not to go to Persia. He had one tussle with the Shah for the Throne and wants to go back from

¹Trans: The Agha Khan to various chiefs on the borders of Kirman and Baluchistan. Jan. 1844, encl: Sheil to Aberdeen 24.3.44. No. 33 of Y.O. 50/103.

²Trans: The Agha Khan to G.O. 5.12.44, H.S.L.I. 99. No. 45, No. 14 of 20 Mar. 1845.

our frontiers to have another I suspect, giving out that we assist him. If you will just look after him when with you, and not let him go off in a steamer you will do all that is necessary, when he leaves Bombay he ought to come here but if he chooses to go to any other part of our territories, perhaps you will be so good as to send on this advice - I believe - there is not the least chance of his going away just now. He leaves his woman here, and has built a house".¹ The Agha Khan left Sind on 7 October for Bombay and did not reach Bombay till the first week of December.²

Meanwhile the attitude of the Indian Government towards the Agha Khan was criticised by the Persian Government. The border authorities of Persian Baluchistan had captured one of the letters of the Agha Khan to the chiefs of Kirman and Baluchistan, and had sent it to Teheran. The Persian Government complained that the countenance and protection which had been afforded to the Agha Khan by the Indian Government was contrary to the Treaty of Teheran of 1814. Justin Sheil, who was then British Minister in Persia, received a complaint in March 1844, from the Persian Foreign minister Mirza Abul Hassan, which stated, "My friend, how much the ministers of the exalted Government of Persia watch over the relations of friendship and unanimity subsisting, between

¹ Napier to Arthur, 30.9.44, E.S.L.Y. 99, No. 43 of No. 14 of 20 Feb. 1845.

² S.C.S. to S.G.T. 5.12.44, E.S.L.Y. 99, No. 45 of No. 14 of 20 Feb. 1845.

93

the two Governments, and to what a degree they are anxious and earnest in the protection of the Stipulation of the Auspicious Treaty, so that they have never in the slightest degree acted at variance with the requirements of friendship and to say the truth, the Ministers of the exalted Government (England) have like wise kept these praise worthy objects in view and have not been wanting in regard for friendly stipulations and agreements. But I do not know why and for what reason it is that at the present time the authorities of Sind, keep at the port of Kurachee, Agha Khan Nehal-lates, a traitorous servant of the Persian Government, who having carried off a large portion of the revenues of Kerman, fled to Sind, and why in opposition to the Auspicious Treaty, they afforded him protection, while he daily endeavours by means of inflammatory letters to throw the frontiers of the Persian Government into confusion".¹

Mirza Abul Hassan sent a copy of the captured letter to Sheil and requested that the Agha Khan should be expelled from the 'English territories'. In his answer to Mirza Abul Hassan, Sheil confined himself to a declaration that, "The British Government will be guided in its conduct by justice and friendship".² In March, Sheil sent all the correspondence to Aberdeen with a statement of what the Persian Government had requested.

¹ Trans: Mirza Abul Hassan to Sheil 16.3.44, with enclosure of the Agha Khan to the chiefs of Jan. 1844, enc1; to Sheil to Aberdeen 24.3.44. No. 33 of P.O. 60/103.

² Sheil to Aberdeen. 24.3.44. No. 33 of P.O. 60/103.

75

Aberdeen received Sheil's letter with enclosures in June 1844. Aberdeen consulted the Advocate General J. Dodson on the question of the treaty of Teheran and asked for an opinion on the legal position of the British Government.¹ Dodson considered that the Persian demand, "appears under the circumstances stated, to be warranted by the tenth article of the Treaty of Teheran, and that it will therefore be right, that directions should be given through the proper channel for the removal of Agha Khan Mahlates, from the British territory in India. The Statute 55 Geo. 3 ch. 84. 5. 6 and 7 gives the necessary power of removal".² Aberdeen accordingly wrote to Ripon, that the Persian Government's demand was well founded and asked to send instructions accordingly on the matters of the Agha Khan to India, so that he could inform the Persian Government.³

Ripon opposed Aberdeen. He argued that the Agha Khan had served the British Government in Afghanistan and Sind, and that subsequently in 1843, the Agha Khan had applied to the Governor General for permission to go to Bagdad and that the Governor General considering the conditions of Persia and Bagdad, had decided that the Agha Khan should remain in India and had given him an allowance of Rs 1,000. Ripon

¹ Canning to Dodson. 11.6.44, encl: Aberdeen to Ripon. S.H.C. Vol. 12, p. 195.

² Dodson to Aberdeen. 12.6.44. encl: Aberdeen to Ripon. S.H.C. Vol. 12; p. 195.

³ Aberdeen to Ripon. 19.6.44. S.H.C. Vol. 12, p. 195.

argued that Sir Charles Napier, believing that in case the Agha Khan attempted to escape, inquired whether he was to make him a prisoner. Rion said that Ellenborough ordered Napier to refrain from using force. Rion continued, "It may be presumed that, under the circumstances represented by the Governor General, he would be as unwilling to resort to compulsory expulsion as to compulsory detention, but Your Lordship will observe that the disposition to befriend Agha Khan, shown by Lord Ellenborough does not arise from a feeling of hostility towards Persia and it may be doubted whether the tranquillity of that country would be promoted by the removal of Agha Khan from British India".¹ Therefore Rion refrained from giving any instructions to the Indian Government and the problem of the Agha Khan's removal was left in abeyance.

Meanwhile in April 1844, the Persian frontier authorities had captured a letter of the Agha Khan to Abbas Khan Baluch, together with the alleged letter of Napier to the Governor of Bamfahlî, which the Agha Khan had sent in June 1843. These letters did not reach the person to whom they were addressed but were seized by the frontier authorities and sent to Teheran. Therefore the Persian Government requested Shorâl that the British Government should prohibit the Governor of Sind from entering into any communications with the Persian frontier authorities without their permission and consent,

¹Rion to Aberdeen. 24.6.44. S.H.C. Vol. 12, p. 201-7.

and repeated their request that the British should either expel the Agha Khan from India or deliver him over to the Persian Government.¹ Sheil reported this new approach to Aberdeen.²

In July 1844, Sheil's despatch with its further proofs of the Agha Khan's correspondence with the frontier authorities of Persia and his use of the British name (in order to achieve his purpose) was received in London. Aberdeen, therefore, again approached Ripon, "Your Lordship will have seen further proof in Colonel Sheil's despatch... is a legitimate cause of disquietude to the Persian Government and as the obligation to expel him or deliver him up is imposed by Treaty on the British Government, I fear that there is no means of escaping from the effect of that obligation if the Persian Government persist in their demand".³ However, Aberdeen suggested that the removal of the Agha Khan from the neighbourhood of Persia might satisfy the Persian Government, and that he was willing to direct Sheil to state to the Persian Government that the Agha Khan would be required to reside in Bengal if he chose to remain in the British territories. But if the Persian Government insisted on strict

¹ Trans: Mirza Abul Hassan to Sheil 9.4.44, encl: Sheil to Aberdeen. No. 40 of P.O. 60/104.

² Sheil to Aberdeen. 12.4.44, No. 40 of P.O. 60/104.

³ Aberdeen to Ripon 2.7.44, S.H.C. Vol. 13, pp. 1-7.

adherence to the terms of the treaty of 1814, Aberdeen wanted to be able to assure the Persian Government that the Agha Khan would be removed from India.¹

Ripon now agreed to send orders to the Governor General to that effect.² Aberdeen wrote to Sheil asking him to ascertain the feelings of the Persian Government with regard to his suggestions and to communicate the answer of the Persian Government direct to the Governor General, "in order that he may dispose of Agha Khan Wahleetee in conformity with their decision".³

The Persian Government agreed when in August 1844, Sheil represented the case of the Agha Khan. Mirza Atul Hassan told Sheil that the Shah had commanded, "although according to the stipulation of the Auspicious Treaty, refugees should not be protected, but delivered up, still as an obedience to the complete amity subsisting between the two governments we have no choice in fulfilling the wishes of that government - accordingly we give him permission to go from Scinde to Bengal, on condition that the Ministers of the English Government guaranty (sic) that the above mentioned person shall live

¹ Aberdeen to Ripon 2.7.44. S.H.C. Vol. 13, pp. 1-7.

² Ripon to Aberdeen 3.7.44. S.H.C. Vol. 13, pp. 1-7.

³ Aberdeen to Sheil 6.7.44, No. 37 of P.O. 50/102.

there quietly and that he will not engage in plots and intrigues, or maintain a secret correspondence with the subjects of our King-
dom".¹ Sheil despatched a special messenger to the Government of India to inform them of the decision of the Persian Government.²

In early October 1844, the Indian Government received both the instructions from the Secret Committee and the news of the Persian Government's approval. The Indian Government endeavoured to inform the Agha Khan of his circumstances. Apparently the Government did not want to appear harsh to a man who had rendered useful services in Qandahar and in Sind. Lord Ellenborough sent all the correspondence on the subject of the removal of the Agha Khan to Napier and instructed him to take measures for sending the Agha Khan to Bengal. He asked Napier to explain to the Agha Khan, "the nature of the correspondence that has taken place with the Persian Govern-
ment and the obligation of the Treaty by which the British Govern-
ment is bound and giving him to understand that the pension assigned
for his support will for the present, be continued to him at Calcutta
or such other place in Bengal as he may prefer for his residence".³

¹ Trans: Mirza Abul Hasam to Sheil. 20.8.44, enc1 to No. 91 of P.O. 60/105.

² Sheil to Aberdeen. 20.8.44, No. 91 of P.O. 60/105.

³ S.C.I. to S.C.S. 12.10.44, D.S.L.I. 59, No. 3 No. 75 of 22 Oct. 1844.

Ellenborough asked Napier to warn the Agha Khan that, "the condition of the continuance of the stipend being that he abstains from all intrigues and correspondence detrimental to the interests of the Persian Government".¹ The Indian Government at the same time sent only a copy of the above instructions without the enclosures to the Government of Bombay.²

However, the Agha Khan had left Hyderabad prior to the arrival of the Governor General's instructions to the Sind Government. The Agha Khan, with the permission of Napier, was travelling between Karachi and Bombay. In October, the Bombay Government received Napier's letter of 30 September to George Arthur announcing the intention of the Agha Khan to visit Bombay, and also the copy of the Governor General's instructions to Napier, regarding the removal of the Agha Khan to Bengal. On November 12, the Bombay Government considered the question and resolved to wait till further instructions were received in the matter of the Agha Khan.³ On November 4, the Sind Government forwarded copies of the instructions of the Governor General and its enclosures to the Government of Bombay.⁴ However,

¹S.G.I. to S.G.S. 12.10.44, E.S.L.I. 98, No. 3 No. 75 of 22 Oct. 1844.

²26.10.44, E.S.L.B. B5, No. 7 of No. 145 of 11 Dec. 1845.

³Minutes G.B. 12.11.44, Board collection 2588/127193 No. 4 of No. 145 of 11 Dec. 1845. The Board's collections of 1849-50, Nos. 127505-127595 of Vol. 2588 has the last 4 numbers i.e. 127592-127595 dealing with the question of the Agha Khan. I have abbreviated their numbers 127592-127595 to B.C. I, II, III & IV.

⁴S.G.S. to S.G.B. 4.11.44, E.O.II No. 5 of No. 145 of 11 Dec. 1845.

the Agha Khan had not reached Bombay, therefore, the Bombay Government resolved in its minutes of 27 November to wait for the arrival of the Agha Khan.¹ In the first week of December, the Agha Khan reached Bombay, and the Bombay Government took measures to inform the Agha Khan of the instructions of the Governor General.²

The Agha Khan did not take heed of the Governor General's conditions regarding his stipend. He asked the Governor General and Napier to allow him to live in Sind and receive his stipend there. He also tried to explain his circumstances to the Governor General, "My monthly expenses amount to 20,000 Rupees and being near my Koorda (spiritual disciples) I manage some how or other to procure the means to defray them. In Scinde also I have a large estate and if I leave it, I shall not be able to procure the means of livelihood. Under such circumstances Government ought not to cast a stain on its character and to leave without bread, one who is descended from a family of 900 years standing - If I am permitted to remain in Sind, I shall be able to earn my livelihood, otherwise I beg that the allowance which was settled upon me, may until government affords me assistance and I return to my country be ordered to be paid to me, and that a letter of recommendation be at the same time written to enable me to

¹ Minutes G.B. 27.11.44, B.C. II No. 6 of No. 146 of 11 Dec. 1845.

² C.S.C.S. to S.C.I. 18.1.45, B.C. II No. 9 of No. 146 of 11 Dec. 1845.

live either in Nagar Cutch or the country of Nasser Khan Beloochee,
which places are near my noorids".¹

The Governor General did not want to withdraw the stipend granted to the Agha Khan. He, through his Secretary replied in January 1845, to the Sind government to state that, "the local Governments are in this matter only carrying out the positive orders that have been sent them from England by the secret Committee in communication with the Queen's Government".² The Sind Government again inquired from the Governor General whether, since the Agha Khan no longer lived in Sind, the payment of the stipend should be suspended.³ In reply the Governor General explained, "It is not the intention of the Government to withdraw the stipend granted to His Highness - in the event of his conforming to the instructions regarding his residence already communicated and such facilities as may be necessary to enable him to come to Bengal will be afforded him, but he must not receive his stipend any longer in Sinde, where his remaining is contrary to the orders of the Home Government".⁴ The Governor

¹ Trans: The Agha Khan to G.O.I. 5.12.44, E.S.L.I. 99, No. 45 of No. 14 of 20 Feb. 1845.

² S.C.I. to S.G.B. 11.1.45, E.S.L.I. 99, No. 27 of No. 5 of 23 Jan. 1845.

³ S.G.B. to S.C.I. 29.3.45, E.S.L.I. 100, No. 18 of No. 39 of 13 May 1845.

⁴ S.C.I. to S.G.B. 29.4.45, E.S.L.I. 100, No. 19 of No. 3 of 13 May 1845.

General also advised Napier, "In making this communication to His Highness you will inform him of the necessity of his removal from Sind in the most courteous terms and explain that the present measure is not to be considered as indicative of any alterations in the friendly sentiments of the Governor General in Council towards His Highness".¹ He also asked that the tenor of the Government's previous orders should be distinctly explained to the Agha Khan and that he must not be allowed to remain in Sind. However, the Sind Government, could not inform the Agha Khan of the instructions of the Governor General but passed on the copies to the Bombay Government, where the Agha Khan was travelling. The Sind Government after April 1845 stopped paying the allowance of Rs 1,000 per month to the Agha Khan.²

The Bombay Government had taken no action beyond informing the Agha Khan of the Government's desire. They had no instructions from the Indian Government to order his removal to Bengal and they had never been responsible for the payment of his allowance. The Agha Khan, after staying for a short time in Bombay, left Bombay in January 1845, to visit his followers in Kutch, Kathiawar and Surat. The Bombay Government took care to forward the letters addressed to the

¹S.C.I. to S.G.S. 25.4.45, E.S.L.I. 100, No. 19 of No. 59 of 13 May 1845.

²S.G.S. to S.C.I. 7.7.45, E.S.L.I. 100, No. 40 of No. 59 of 7 Aug. 1845.

Agha Khan that were received from Turkish Arabia, and also from other parts of India, and sent them to the Agha Khan wherever he was in the Bombay Presidency, from January 1845 to April 1846.¹

The Agha Khan tried to evade the question of his departure to Bengal. In June 1845, he sent his uncle Iatuf Ali Khan to Bombay, to proceed to Calcutta instead of himself. Iatuf Ali Khan could not continue his journey due to storms at sea.² Therefore, in July 1845, the Agha Khan again applied to the Governor General to be allowed to live in Sind. He also informed the Governor General that he had sent another of his brothers, Muhammad Baqir Khan with his followers to Baluchistan, to purchase some land, for their maintenance. This is in addition to the group who was sent in 1843 [see p. 51].³ He wrote, "Should your Excellency's honor be dissatisfied with this proceeding, I trust you will direct them to be taken into the service of the British Government, as the only means of enabling them to retire from Baloochistan".⁴ The Agha Khan also argued that

¹B.P. Persian letters. Range 418 Vol. 67 Letters from Jan.-April 1846. B.C. II, letters No. 26-29, of 146 of 11.12.45. (Letters from Turkish Arabia were forwarded by Major Rawlinson, whom the Agha Khan's son Ali Shah and relatives had approached and requested to do so, for they did not know the address of the Agha Khan.)

²5.6.45, B.C. III, No. 11 of No. 146 of 11 Dec. 1846.
5.7.45, B.C. III, No. 14 of No. 146 of 11 Dec. 1845.

³Trans: The Agha Khan to G.O. 12.7.45, enccl: Shail to Aberdian 27.5.46, No. 55 of P.O. 60/122.
Trans: The Agha Khan to G.O. 5.12.44, E.S.L.I. 99, No. 45 No. 14 of 20 March 1845.

⁴The Agha Khan to G.O. 12.7.45, enccl: Shail to Aberdian, 27.5.46, No. 55 of P.O. 60/122.

his religious duties required him to be near his followers, to collect their dues. Therefore it was incumbent upon him to reside either in Bombay, Kutch Kathiawar or in Kolat and that he had properties up to eight lacs of Rupees. He begged, "Should it be Your Excellency's determination that I should proceed to Calcutta to reside there, so the entire destruction of all my future prospects which would entail on me a loss that could not be estimated at less than 20,000 Rupees per month - I am prepared to act in submission to your Excellency's command but I trust I may be able to look to the British Government for an indemnity for that sacrifice".¹ The Bombay Government passed on the application of the Agha Khan to the Governor General.² The Agha Khan received no reply from the Governor General and in December 1845, he wrote again and solicited an early reply and also requested to be allowed to visit Sind temporarily prior to his leaving Bombay.³

The Governor General could not make any change in the orders of the Home Government. On 7 February 1846, the Indian Government wrote directly to the Government of Bombay to remind the Governor that

¹The Agha Khan to C.O. 12.7.45, enccl: Sheil to Aberdeen 27.5.45, No. 56 of P.O. 60/122.

²S.G.B. to S.G.I. 4.8.45, E.S.L.B. 85, No. 17 of 146 of 11 Dec. 1845.

³12.7.45, B.C.II, No. 16 of No. 146 of 11 Dec. 1845.
27.12.45, B.C.II, No. 30 of No. 146 of 11 Dec. 1845.

the orders relative to the disposal of the Agha Khan were issued in accordance with instructions conveyed from England and that no change in respect to the future residence of the Agha Khan could be allowed. The Governor General wrote that "Agha Khan Noohiatoe may of course if he pleases, return to Persia but not under any guarantee of protection from the British Government".¹ He also stated that, "This Government is desirous to treat with all consideration, consistent with the maintenance of good faith with the King of Persia and obedience to the orders of the Home Government". Regarding the Agha Khan's temporary return to Sind, the Governor General suggested consulting Col. Sheil. He wrote "It is probable, that the Persian Government will not object, to the temporary return".² In the same month Sheil was asked to ascertain the same, from the Persian Government and to inform the Bombay Government of the reply of the Persian Government.³

The Agha Khan was not in Bombay city. However the Bombay Government endeavoured to inform the Agha Khan of the instructions of the Governor General.⁴ In March the Agha Khan received the instructions

¹S.G.I. to S.O.B. 7.2.46, B.C.II, No. 40 or No. 146 of 11 Dec. 1846.

²S.G.I. to S.G.B. 7.2.46, B.C.II, No. 40 or No. 146 of 11 Dec. 1846.

³Sheil to Aberdeen. 27.5.46, No. 56 P.C. 60/122.

⁴Minutes G.B. 18.2.46, B.C.II, No. 42 or No. 146 of 11 Dec. 1846.

in Bandra. Probably in May 1846, the Agha Khan arrived in Bombay and asked for the payment to him in Bombay of the allowance assigned by the Government. He reported that the Sind Government had refused to pay him and that he had earned that allowance because he had served the British and when the allowance was fixed there were no conditions mentioned.¹ In August the Bombay Government urged the Agha Khan to act in conformity with the instructions of the Governor General and informed him that his stipend would be paid only in Bengal.²

Meanwhile the Secret Committee was informed by the Governor of Bombay and the Governor General of their proceedings in the matter of the Agha Khan. The Secret Committee transmitted the information to Aberdeen.³

Meanwhile in Persia, in January 1845, the Persian authorities found that the Agha Khan's brother Mohammed Baqir Khan had arrived in Baluchistan in 1844 with 70 of the Agha Khan's followers and had distributed money among the local people to raise an army. Mohammed Baqir Khan succeeded in making an incursion across the Persian borders and allied with the Governor of Bamfahli. This intelligence reached Tehran, where the Persian Foreign Minister, Mirza Abul Hassan, argued that

¹The Agha Khan to G.E. No. date R& 7.8.46, B.P., Persian letters Range 418, Vol. 67, p. 159.

²S.C.B. to the Agha Khan. 18.8.45, B.P. Persian letters. Range 418 Vol. 69, p. 19.

³See Tennets to Canning. 25.7.45, S.H.C. Vol. 15, pp. 51-2.

107

Muhammad Baqir Khan had some English guns and, as he did not know how to use them, British assistance was given to him. Mirza Abul Hassan tried to attribute responsibility to the British Government for creating disturbances on the Persian borders. Abul Hassan requested Sheil that according to the conditions of the Treaty of Tehran and also the agreement, the Agha Khan should be sent to Bengal. He went on, "if your Excellency should be of opinion that the authorities of India would as on a former occasion not listen to what your Excellency says in this matter, be good as to inform me, so that, I myself may make his Excellency Lord Aberdeen, the British minister for Foreign Affairs acquainted with the circumstances".¹ Sheil explained to Haji Mirza Aghasi, the Chief Minister of the Shah that the British Government had no concern or connection with Muhammad Baqir Khan, "If the guns captured are really of such construction as to warrant the opinion of their being of English manufacture, it appears not unlikely that they are a portion of the ordnance which may have fallen into the hands of the Boloches during the insurrection at Kalat".² To Aberdeen Sheil wrote, "the Persian ministers consider or affect to do, that Mohamed Baiker Khan has received assistance for conducting his enterprise from the British authorities in Sind. This

¹ Enclosure: Mirza Abul Hassan to Sheil 23.1.45, incl. Sheil to Aberdeen 8.2.45, no. 12 of P.O. 60/112.

² Sheil to Aberdeen, 8.2.45, No. 12 of P.O. 60/112 (The insurrection at Kalat, which is referred to, is presumably that in 1840, which brought about the eventual deposition of Shah Nasar Khan).

suspicion was very plainly insinuated in a letter I received from the Minister for Foreign Affairs regarding this insurrection, but at my recommendation it has been modified".¹ However, the Persian Government believed that since the Agha Khan lived in the close vicinity of Persia, he had succeeded in assisting his brother to carry on the insurrection. In May 1845, Sheil had an audience with the Shah, to whom he reported that orders were sent to the Sind Government by the Indian Government regarding the removal of the Agha Khan but that he had not received any intimation of the Agha Khan's arrival in Calcutta. Sheil wrote to Aberdeen, "The Shah though still dissatisfied, did not revert to the demand for his expulsion from India".²

Sheil himself believed the Persian case was well founded. In September 1845, Sheil received a letter from Henry Rawlinson, the British Resident at Bagdad, who sent him a copy of the Agha Khan's letter to Rawlinson of May 1845. The Agha Khan had written to Rawlinson an account of his own affairs, from Bombay and had mentioned about his brother Muhammed Baqir Khan.³ Sheil sent a copy of the Agha Khan's letter to Aberdeen and requested, "Is by Agha Khan's own

¹Sheil to Aberdeen, 8.2.45, No. 12 of F.O. 60/112.

²Sheil to Aberdeen, 26.5.45, No. 54 of F.O. 60/113.

³See Agha Khan to Rawlinson, 17.5.45, incl: Sheil to Aberdeen, No. 110 of F.O. 60/115.

admision, his brother is carrying on intrigues against this country on the frontier towards Balochistan, Your Lordship will probably consider that the suspicions of the Persian Ministers of his connection with the British Government are not altogether without justification, and that it would be highly desirable for our own credit to redeem the promise given either by causing his removal without delay to Bengal,... or by obliging him to quit British India immediately, so that in the latter event no time may be lost in relieving the suspicition of the Persian Ministers by acquainting them with the cessation of his connection with the British Government";¹ Sheil continued, "the readiness with which the Shah consented in deference to the British Government though such against his own feelings, to forgo the right given him by Treaty, would appear to entitle the Persian Government to this mark of consideration".²

In 1846, the Persian Government on the question of the Agha Khan's removal, adopted an adamant attitude. The Persian Prime Minister expressed himself in a strong tone of exhortation to Sheil. Hot words were exchanged. In April 1846, the Persian intelligence from Baluchistan reported the rumours of the Agha Khan's sudden appearance in Baluchistan. Haji Mirza Aghasi complained that the British authorities, instead of handing over the Agha Khan to the Persian

¹Sheil to Aberdeen, 30.9.45. No. 110, P.O. 60/115.

²Sheil to Aberdeen 30.9.45. No. 110, P.O. 60/115.

Government, left him free in Baluchistan, from where he could create troubles for the Persian Government.¹ Sheil in his reply to Haji Kirza Aghassi explained that the Agha Khan had long left Sind and had gone to Kutch and Bombay, on his way to Calcutta and that if he had appeared in Baluchistan, that country did not belong to the British. The Haji was angry and wrote back to Sheil, "In the first place it is quite evident that Beloochistan is not British ground, such was not my intention nor did I write that I wished the British Government to protect us from the excesses of Agha Khan on our own frontiers and I ask, in case Agha Khan afraid of the chastisement of our own frontier authorities, should take to flight and proceed to those parts (Sind), whether the authorities of India will again give him refuge and afford him their protection or not? I request your Excellency will attentively peruse and consider my letter and give me a reply conformable to the enquiry, that it may be full and complete, and that there should be no reason for writing again on the subject".² Sheil tried to clarify his earlier statement, "If Agha Khan had really come to Beloochistan... my meaning was that in that case the original desire of the Persian Government's Ministers for his departure from the British territories had been attained".³

¹ Trans: Haji Kirza Aghassi to Sheil 12.4.46, encl: Sheil to Aberdeen, No. 41 of P.O. 60/121.

² Trans: Haji Kirza Aghassi to Sheil 1.5.46, encl: Sheil to Aberdeen, 27.5.46, No. 55 of P.O. 60/122.

³ Sheil to Zaji 27.5.46, encl: No. 55 of P.O. 60/122.

Sheil assured the Haji that if the Agha Khan had broken any agreement he might have made with the British authorities for his renunciation in India, "the Governor General of India will cease to extend his protection to that person". Sheil also recommended the Haji to invite the Agha Khan to return to Persia but the Haji refused to adopt that course.¹ At the same time Sheil had received the request of the Indian Government regarding the permission for the temporary return of the Agha Khan to Sind. He approached the Shah, who naturally refused to consider the request and instead insisted that the Agha Khan should be sent to Calcutta immediately. Sheil in his letter of 10 June 1846, informed the Governor General of India and, also reported to Aberdeen expressing his own opinion, "Agha Khan has no intention to proceed to Calcutta where he would be separated from his numerous adherents, as chief of a religious sect, in the West of India, Sind, Balochistan and Persia, and that he would forfeit his pension from the Indian Government in preference".²

In June 1846, the Foreign Office had received Sheil's correspondence of April 1846, regarding the supposed appearance of the Agha Khan in Baluchistan. The Foreign Office drew the attention of the Board of Control to the matter.³ On the 26th of June, 1846, the

¹Sheil to Aberdeen 27.5.46, Sheil to Haji 27.5.46, enclo: No. 56 of F.O. 60/122.

²Sheil to Aberdeen 27.5.46, No. 56 of F.O. 60/122.

³Addington to Jesselton, 25.6.46, S.H.C. Vol. 17, p. 251.

Governor General was instructed through the Secret Committee to act in strict conformity to the sentiments which Lord Abordeen had expressed previously with regard to the removal of the Agha Khan.¹

In October 1846, the orders of the Secret Committee and also the reply of Col. Sheil regarding the temporary visit of the Agha Khan to Sind reached the Government of India and the Bombay Government was informed of the position. The Indian Government also sent its orders to the Bombay Government that the arrears of the Agha Khan's allowances would be paid to him in Bombay "if care is taken to send him to Bengal".² The Bombay Government in its minutes of 21 October resolved to persuade the Agha Khan to go to Calcutta.³

The Agha Khan still tried to delay his departure. On November 3 he wrote another application to the Governor General, asking to be allowed to stay with his followers to defray his expenses and also wrote that, "I received a letter from Fuzul Aliy Khan, the Governor of Kerman forwarding several letters from the Muzeers and the other officers of the court of Persia, a copy of a Fersam from His Majesty the Shah and two letters from Hajee Neersa Aghasse, one to my address

¹ Jocelyn to Addington. 26.5.46, S.H.C. Vol. 17, p. 234.

² 19.10.46, B.C.II, No. 77 or No. 146 of 11 Dec. 1846.

³ 21.10.46, B.C.II, No. 74 or No. 146 of 11 Dec. 1846.

and other to that of Fuzuliy Khan. The purport of these communications is that if I should return to Persia, kindness beyond limits will be shown to me, and my state and other property will be restored to me".¹ The Agha Khan sent copies of the Firman of Shahzad Shah and the two letters of Haji Mirza to the Governor General requesting to be allowed to go to Persia.

In November 1846, the Governor General in Council wrote to Sheil to ascertain the attitude of the Persian Government towards the Agha Khan, "By your last reports, the Persian Government seemed averse to Agha Khan's return, nor is the Governor General informed, except by the Agha himself of any change having taken place in the feelings of His Majesty the King of Persia in the Agha's favour - His Lordship, - however, will be well pleased if without hazarding any compromise of your Government in respect to Agha Khan's future conduct, you could exert your good offices in his behalf especially in effecting a reconciliation between him and his sovereign".² Meanwhile the Bombay Government requested the Agha Khan to wait in Bombay till a reply was received from Col. Sheil.³

In January 1847, Sheil received the instruction of the Governor

¹The Agha Khan to G.G., & enclosures, 3.11.46, S.P. Range 418, Vol. 67, p.245.

²S.O.I. to Sheil 19.11.46. B.S.L. 1st series, 22, No. 145 of 11 Dec. 1846, see India Secret proceedings Vol. 142, N. No. 222 of 31 Dec. 1847.

³Minutes G.B. 3.2.47, B.C.II, No. 11 of No. 52 of 3 June 1847.

General of November 1846. He approached the Shah, who expressed his readiness to receive the Agha Khan and permit him to reside in his native district of Mahallat, without molestation, provided the Agha Khan returned to Persia by Bushire and Shiraz or Bagdad and Kirmanshah. Sheil wrote to Palmerston, "The meaning of the Persian ministers is, that he shall not approach Baloochistan and the Southern parts of Kerman, where he is able to exert some influence, and where his adherents and relations have so often excited disturbances".¹ Sheil wrote to the Indian Government expressing his own opinions, "Agha Khan has no intention of availing himself of this permission to revisit Persia - His object is probably merely to procrastinate his departure from Bombay to Calcutta, and his next demand in all likelihood will be that I should become guarantee for his favourable treatment, but this would of course be out of my power, though I have no doubt he will not suffer any molestation".² He pointed out in the same letter, "It is scarcely necessary for me to attract the observation of His Lordship the Governor General to the disadvantageous influence entailed by my being subjected frequently to taunts from the Persian Ministers of the English Government not having fulfilled its promise with regard to the removal of this person, and by his intrigues or the intrigues of his followers and adherents

¹Sheil to Palmerston, 25.3.47. No. 15 of F.O.60/129.

²Sheil to S.O.I. 16.2.47. enccl: Sheil to Palmerston No. 14 of F.O.60/129.

in Baloochistan, being so often a subject of discussion between us and the Persian ministers".¹ This letter of Shoil was received in Bombay on 27 April 1847 and the Agha Khan was informed of the route prescribed by the Persian Government. The Agha Khan refused to accept his conditional return.²

In Tehran, however, reports had arrived in November 1846 regarding the successful seizure of Bamur by another brother of the Agha Khan, Abul Hassan Khan Sirdar. Similar reports were received by Shoil from the British agent in Shiraz.³ The Persian Government was apprehensive about their border territories in the south. Previously after the disturbances of Mohammed Bagir Khan at the end of 1844 (see p. 107) the independent Baluchi chief of Bamur had made a hostile incursion into the province of Kirman and the Shah's artillery had been directed to punish the chief who yielded to the Persians. But a sanguinary conflict had ensued in which many had been killed and the chief had been restored to his territory.⁴ In 1846, Abul Hassan Khan Sirdar had arrived with 200 of the Agha Khan's fol-

¹ Shoil to S.O.I. 16.2.47. enccl: Shoil to Palmerston No. 16 of F.O. 60/129.

² G.O. in C. to E.O. 3.5.47, B.S.L. 1st series 23, No. 52 of 5 June 1847.

³ Shoil to Palmerston, 24.11.46, No. 119 of F.O.M. 69. (The name of Mohammed Bagir Khan was also mentioned but it was Abul Hassan Sirdar who carried on the Seizure.)

⁴ See Watson, *Persia*, p. 334-35.

lowers in Chahbar and collected another 1,500 Ismailis, who lived in Chahbar.¹ Sirdar Khan entered into correspondence with the inhabitants of Bamyan and in November succeeded in conquering Bamyan. He also carried on some marauding expeditions in Yassd and Kirman.² In April 1847, it was stated by the Persian authorities that the Sirdar Khan had been captured by the Persian frontier authorities and that all his possessions had been confiscated. Among his papers, there were found many letters of the Agha Khan from Bombay, in one of which he enjoined his brother to prosecute the insurrection with vigour, while he would assure the Shah with presents of elephant and other Indian animals, which were actually sent.³ In April the Shah, in his audience to Sheil, said that, "such things had a bad appearance and created a very injurious impression".⁴ Haji Mirza Aghasi attributed the affair to the British Government and wrote, "The Persian Ministers have the very strongest and most solid right to demand agreeably to former treaty, as well as the latter agree-

¹ Lorimer, Gazetteer of the Persian Gulf, Part I, Vol. I, p. 1966, p. 2156.

² Trans: Haji to Sheil. 24.11.46, No. 119 of F.R.P. Vol. 86.

³ Trans: Haji to Sheil. 19.4.47, enclo: Sheil to Palmerston No. 47 of P.O. 60/130.

⁴ Sheil to Palmerston. 23.4.47, No. 47 of P.O. 60/130.

ment, Agha Khan from Your Excellency, and henceforward to object to demand that he should be delivered up to the ministers of Persia".¹

In reply to the remonstrations of the Persian Government Sheil tried to explain, "The fact is, the authorities at Bombay are ignorant of the deceit and fraud which compose the character of the border inhabitants of this country. Thus Agha Khan daily invented excuses for delaying his departure. At one time he feigned to have important business in Sind, and begged the English authorities to obtain leave from the King of Persia for his return there for three months. When His Majesty refused to agree to his wish to proceed to Sind, he requested leave to bring his family or property from thence. Then his departure was then urged, he declared that the Shah of Persia now graciously regarded him with an eye of favour, and he requested that leave might be obtained for his return to Persia and so forth".² Sheil also repeated that military stores of every description were procurable from English merchants, over whom the British Government had no control. Also he promised to send Haji Mirza Aghasi's letter to the Indian Government.

In April 1847, Sheil wrote a long letter to Palmerston, who had succeeded Aberdeen, pleading, "I have more than once been under

¹Haji to Sheil. 19.4.47, enc1: Sheil to Palmerston No. 47 of F.O.60/130.

²Sheil to Haji Mirza. 21.4.47, enc1: Sheil to Palmerston. No. 47 of F.O.60/130.

the necessity of attracting your Lordship's observation to the inconveniences which the residence of Agha Khan Nekhtas at Bombay in opposition to the agreement entered into with the Persian Government, has entailed, as well as the imputations to which it has given rise against the British Government".¹ He went on, "that ever may be the services he has rendered to the British Government, the tenacity with which this person, who to his own sovereign has been a traitor, evaded the performance of the agreement for establishing his residence at Calcutta, affords some justifications of the suspicions of the Persian Government". "That is still more inconvenient, his insurrectionary movements are believed to originate in the schemes of the British Government, whose indulgence to Agha Khan in allowing him to remain in Bombay is intelligible on no other grounds at this court".²

Palmerston supported the position which had been taken up by Aberdeen. In June 1847, the Foreign Office again approached the Board of Control to state that "Lord Palmerston considers it desirable that Agha Khan Nekhtas should be removed from Bombay either to Calcutta or to some other part of India, from whence he would be unable to carry on communications with Persia for the purpose

¹ Sheil to Palmerston, 25.4.47, No. 47 of P.O. 60/130.

² Sheil to Palmerston, 1.5.47, No. 37 of P.O. 60/130, also Sheil to Palmerston 23.4.47, No. 47 of P.O. 60/130.

of disturbing the internal tranquillity of that country".¹

Before these orders were received in India, the Bombay Government succeeded in persuading the Agha Khan to comply with the previous instruction. In April 1847, arrangements were made to send the Agha Khan to Calcutta. The Bombay Government in its minute of 15 April, agreed to pay Rs 12,000 out of the Rupees 27,000, arrears of the Agha Khan's stipend and also advanced Rupees 2,000 extra for his expenses on the road.² They also agreed to pay Rs 45 per month as rent of the Agha Khan's house in Bombay and Rs 10 per month for the maintenance of sons of the members of the Agha Khan's family who were left behind.³ They also issued a permit for the Agha Khan to pass unmolested with 52 of his followers and personal luggage via a fixed route, that is Ahmednagar, Khandesh, Indore, Bhopal, Saugar and Mirzapur.⁴ The Agha Khan left Bombay on 19 April 1847 for Poona.⁵ The Bombay Government, on 27 April received Col. Snell's letter regarding the conditional return of the Agha Khan to Persia. They sent a special messenger to inform the Agha Khan of the permission. The Agha Khan declined to avail himself of the

¹ Addington to Syng. 30.6.47. S.H.C. Vol. 19, p. 279.

² Minutes G.B. 6.3.47, also 19.4.47, S.S.L.I. III, No. 166 of No. 44 of 7 July 1847.

³ S.O.B. to S.G.I., 26.5.47, S.S.L.I. III, No. 166 of No. 44 of 7 July 1847.

⁴ 10.4.47. B.P. Persian letters Range 418, Vol. 70, p. 13.

⁵ Minutes O.B., without date, S.S.L.I. III, No. 166 of No. 44 of 7 July 1847, also S.O.B. to S.G.I. 26.5.47.

conditional permission and preferred to continue his journey.¹

After the departure of the Agha Khan for Calcutta, the Bombay Government in its Minutes of 23 May, resolved to inform the Governor General of the reason for its delay in removing the Agha Khan to Calcutta. The Governor of Bombay, Sir George Clerk wrote, "The Agha had up to this time evaded quitting this Presidency on one pretext or another, notwithstanding the directions which he received from this government in consequence of the injunctions of the Governor General...."² The Agha Khan's reasons for clinging to the Bombay Presidency included "his proximity here to the scene of his brother's rebellion in Bampore and the facility of raising large sums in willing donations from his disciples who are most numerous on this side of India". Besides he had a large family in Bombay and nearly 200 retainers depended on him. Regarding their own attitude towards the Agha Khan and his circumstances, the Bombay Government commented, "Though his conduct has been always respectful and his arguments against removal hence to Calcutta in some measure plausible still his disregard of our advice urged upon him in conformity with the instructions of the Governor General has been so protracted, that we should have been prompted to more decisive

¹C.B. in G. to S.G. 3.6.47, B.S.L. 1st series 23, No. 52 of 3 June 1847.

²Minutes C.B. 23.5.47, B.C.II, No. 52 of No. 52 of 3 June 1847.

measures to enforce compliance with his Lordship's orders, had it not been for our reluctance to appear harsh towards one, who has evinced signal zeal and bravery in the cause of the British Government in the field, and who from his hereditary position is held in so much reverence by a considerable portion of the Native Community throughout India.¹ On 26 May the Governor General Lord Hardinge was informed of the same.²

Lord Hardinge, in July 1847, addressed a long letter to the Secret Committee informing them of the departure of the Agha Khan to Calcutta. With respect to the reiterated complaints of the Persian Government, he explained that the Bombay Government had every desire to meet the wishes of the Persian Government, but the Bombay Government was unable to effect the removal of the Agha Khan until recently. He went on, "As the residence of the Agha at Bombay seems to have given umbrage to the Govt. of Persia and to have occasioned a slight misunderstanding I deem it advisable to take this opportunity of laying before your Hon'ble Committee a brief review of the orders which the Supreme Government have from time to time issued with respect to this nobleman".³ The Governor General gave a memorandum of

¹ Minutes G.B. 23.5.47, B.G.II, No. 39 of No. 52 of 3 June 1847.

² G.O.C. to S.O.I. 26.5.47, B.S.L.I. III, No. 156 of No. 44 of 7 July 1847.

³ G.O. to S.O. 7.7.47, B.G.I. No. 44 of 7 July 1847.

the orders which he sent to the Sind and the Bombay Government since October 1844. He also enclosed a copy of the minutes of the Bombay Government of 23rd May 1847, and concluded, "I have thus adverted briefly to the endeavours made by this Government with a view to carry out your injunctions".¹ The Secret Committee in September transmitted the same to Lord Palmerston for his information.²

Apart from the slowness of the communications between all the Governments involved, it was partly the reluctance of the Bombay Government to appear harsh towards the Agha Khan and partly the Agha Khan's own evasion, that delayed the departure of the Agha Khan to Calcutta. It can be added also, that since the decision to send the Agha Khan to Calcutta was taken in London, the Indian Government though it could not disagree, did not show any particular interest in the problem. However, the suspicions and the insistent complaints of the Persian Government to the British Government were to some extent justifiable. It is difficult to assess the strength of the Agha Khan in Persia during this period, but it is obvious that, with the help of his brothers, the Agha Khan succeeded in creating troubles in Persia if not achieving his aim.

¹C.O. in C. to S.C. 7.7.47, S.C.I. No. 44 of 7 July 1847.

²Stark to Paddington, 4.9.47, S.H.C. 20, p. 309.

Chapter V.

The Agha Khan in Calcutta, 1847-48.

The Agha Khan left Bombay on 19 April 1847, for Calcutta, but did not reach there until August. After reaching Calcutta, he repeatedly requested to be allowed to leave. In September 1848 the Shah of Persia died. It was then considered that all the objections regarding the Agha Khan's return to Persia had disappeared. The Indian Government in December allowed him to leave Calcutta for Bombay.

The Indian government was informed by the Bombay government in their letter of 26 May 1847, of the departure of the Agha Khan with his 52 followers from Bombay.¹ His route was then stated to be via Poona, Ahmednagar, Khandaib, Indore, Bhopal, Sevner and Mirzapur.² At that time the Governor General was at the summer resort of Simla. On June 19, the Indian government advised R.H.C. Hamilton, the Resident at Indore, to report to them the Agha Khan's arrival within his district and instructed him to take the necessary measures "for his proceeding direct to Calcutta".³ It is not

¹S.G.B. to S.G.I. 26.5.47, E.S.L.I. vol. III, No. 165 No. 44 of 7 July 1847; also India Secret Proceeding Vol. 142, No. 245-253 of 31 Dec. 1847.

²S.C.C.B. to the Agha Khan 14.4.47, B.P.Rango 412, vol. 70, p.13.

³S.G.I. to Hamilton 19.6.47, E.S.L.I., No. 4, No. 27 of 23 Mar. 1848 (the words direct and Calcutta were underlined in the official record).

stated in the letter whether the "direct" route differed from that laid down by the Government of Bombay. The Governor General also directed the President in Council in Calcutta to make the necessary arrangements to receive the Agha Khan in Calcutta and to place him under the charge of Lieut. G. Cavenagh, the superintendent of the Mysore Princes and the Ex-Ansars of Sind.¹

However the Agha Khan had already reached Indore on the 1st June, and, having changed his route, left Indore on 18 June for Agra, before the arrival of the Governor General's instructions to Hamilton.² Both the Agha Khan and his followers had suffered much from the heat during their journey from Bombay to Indore, therefore the Agha Khan rested for a short time at Indore.³ It was Hamilton who persuaded the Agha Khan to change his route. "I had intended," he wrote to the Governor General, "that Agha Khan should have proceeded via Khopal and Seugar to Mirzapoor, and this route he wished; but as the rainy season was at hand, and it seemed he rather calculated upon the probability of being detained at Khopal for some time, where his presence, I had reason to believe, would

¹S.C.I. to G.O.M.S.C.I. 19.6.47, B.O.III, No. 5, No. 27 of 23 Mar. 1848.

²Hamilton to S.C.I., 23.6.47, B.O.III, No. 8, No. 27 of 23 Mar. 1848.

³Hamilton to S.C.I. 23.6.47, B.O.III, No. 8, No. 27 of 23 Mar. 1848, (three of the Agha Khan's followers died on the road and two more died after reaching Indore. The Agha Khan himself had an eye operation at Indore).

be the occasion of much embarrassment to Her Highness the Scindia
 Begum, I thought it best to send him by the new road direct to
 Agra, by which, I informed him, he would have the accommodation
 of the staging Bungalows and escape the jungles by the Sutler route,
 which are not altogether healthy at this season".¹ The Agha Khan
 left Indore for Agra on 18 June, and reached there in July and on
 18 July, he left Agra by water for Calcutta.²

Hamilton after receiving the Governor General's instructions,
 on 28 June, asked the 'Agent Lieutenant Governor at Agra' to assist the
 Agha Khan in procuring boats on which to proceed directly to Cal-
 cutta, so that he should be subjected to no detention at Agra, and
 recommended that he should not be allowed to stay more than a day
 or two at that place.³ He also explained that if the Agha Khan pre-
 ferred proceeding by land, "There need be no objection to his so do-
 ing provided that he proceeded by the direct route, being told that
 such is the wish of Government, and you will have the goodness to
 give him a route by Shekhupur, Etawah, Kurrah Jolander and Pathpore
 to Allichabad, so that he go not to Cannopore or into Oude".⁴ Hamilton

¹ Hamilton to S.O.I. 23.6.47, B.G.III, No. 8, No. 27 of 28 Mar. 1848.

² Hamilton to S.O.I. 4.8.47, B.G.III, No. 10, No. 27 of 28 Mar. 1848.

³ Hamilton to 'Agent Lieutenant Governor at Agra' 23.6.47, B.G.III, N. No. 8,
 No. 27 of 28 Mar. 1848. Agra was within the presidency of N.W.P. James
 Thomson was the Lieutenant Governor of N.W.P. Hamilton does not mention
 the name of the 'Agent Lieutenant Governor at Agra'.

⁴ Hamilton to 'Agent Lieutenant Governor Agra' 23.6.47, B.G.III, N.No. 8,
 No. 27 of 28 Mar 1848.

on the same day informed the Governor General of his proceedings.¹

Having relied only on the official government orders, it is difficult to say whether Hamilton had any private instructions concerning the direct route for the Agha Khan. The Bombay government had fixed the route which passed through the independent Muslim state of Khopoli, which perhaps the Indian government did not approve. Hamilton had planned carefully the land route from Agra to Allahabad, avoiding Lucknow, the stronghold of Shias in India. It seems likely that the Indian government did not desire that the Agha Khan should pass through the Muslim states.

In Calcutta the Governor General's instructions of 19 June 1847, regarding the arrangements for the Agha Khan's stay there, were received before the arrival of the Agha Khan in the Presidency. On 24 July, the Officiating Secretary G.L. Bushby, informed Government of the expected arrival of the Agha Khan in Calcutta and wrote, "It having been determined upon political considerations that the Persian Nobleman Agha Khan Nehlata who has lately been intriguing against the government of Persia shall be required to reside for the present in Bengal.... The position in which he stands at present as regards the Persian government, makes it inexpedient to show him any marked distinction - but it is the wish of the government that he should be

¹Hamilton to S.O.I. 23.6.47. E.O.ZII, No. 8, No. 17 of 28 Nov 1848.

treated with the utmost courtesy and consideration and his comfort consulted as much as possible.¹ Bushby also informed Cavenagh that the Agha Khan was allied to the Royal family of Persia, that he received an allowance, and that the Treaty of Torkom required him, in the existing circumstances to reside in Bengal. Cavenagh was instructed to make necessary arrangements for the residence of the Agha Khan.² The Agha Khan arrived in Calcutta some time in August. Cavenagh had arranged for a house at Dum Dum in Calcutta. He was paid the remaining arrears of his allowances amounting to Rs 19,000 and the government took care to make him feel settled.³

The Agha Khan was unhappy in Calcutta. He continued to agitate for his return to Western India, where his numerous followers resided. Regarding his deportation to Calcutta, the Agha Khan had different ideas. He, during one of the visits of Cavenagh, asked him the reasons for his removal. Cavenagh avoided replying not knowing whether he should disclose his knowledge of the government's instructions.⁴ However the Agha Khan wrote a letter to Cavenagh in August 1847, re-

¹Bushby to Cavenagh. 24.7.47. B.C.III, No. 6, No. 27, of 28 Mar. 1848.

²Ibid.

³Cavenagh to Bushby 2.8.47, B.C.III, No. 12, No. 27, of 28 Mar. 1848. See also B.C. Nos. 18, 19, 21, 41-42, No. 27, of 28 Mar. 1848; some furniture at the state expense was bought, rent of his house was paid by the government until January and he was provided with free horse carriages etc.

⁴Cavenagh to B.C.I. 25.8.47, B.C.III, No. 13, No. 27, of 28 Mar. 1848.

questing, "I have every reason to hope that with the blessing of God and through the aid of this government I may eventually regain my country.... From the conversation which I had with Sir Herbert Maddock [Deputy Governor of Bengal and the President of the Council] it would however appear that I was directed to travel hither at the request of His Highness Mohamed Shah, I therefore beg the favor of your inquiring from His Honor the Deputy Governor whether I have been ordered to Bengal in obedience to the wishes of the King of Persia or in consequence of my services being required by the British government."¹ Cavenagh forwarded it to Maddock.

The Government of India acknowledged the letter of the Agha Khan and advised Cavenagh to disclose the conditions stated in the government's correspondence regarding the removal of the Agha Khan and ordered, "Aga Khan Nehlatee as long as he pleases to reside in the territories subject to the government of the East India Company, is required to reside in Bengal".²

After learning the reply of the Indian government the Agha Khan wrote a long application to Maddock in September, giving details of his high rank among his followers all over India and his importance as a Persian refugee. He requested that the British government should

¹ The Agha Khan to Cavenagh. No date. D. to Cavenagh to S.C.I. 25.8.47 E.O.III, No. 14, No. 27 of 23 Mar 1843.

² S.C.I. to Cavenagh. 4.9.47, E.O.III, 15 Nov. 27 of 23 Mar 1843.

obtain for him the government of Kirman from the Persian government and he promised to transmit the revenue of that province to the Persian government, through the British Plenipotentiary. He suggested, "should the British government consider it advisable I will subdue the country of Beloochistan (which is not in any way attached to the kingdom of His Highness Mohamed Shah) by which means the province of Seindo would be exempted from the danger on the part of the Afghans or Belooch tribes".¹ Cavenagh forwarded the letter of the Agha Khan to Haddock and added, I have not scrupled to make the Agha Khan fully acquainted with the circumstances under which he has been directed to reside in Bengal, he still appears unwilling to abandon the impression that the British government have ulterior views regarding him and intended eventually making use of his services on the Western frontier in fact he invariably endeavours to point out to me the advantages to be derived from such a course".²

In October 1847, Haddock tried to remove this impression held by the Agha Khan. He explained, "My friend, the British government has acknowledged the services which you performed at Candahar but it has no present occasion to trouble you with its affairs being free from ambitions or warlike views, and with respect to your removal from Bombay to this place it seems necessary that I should state ex-

¹The Agha Khan to Haddock. No date, E. Cavenagh to S.C.I. 18.9.47, S.C.III, No. 27, No. 27, of 23 Mar 1848.

²Cavenagh to S.C.I. 18.9.47, S.C.III, No. 27, No. 27 of 23 Mar 1848.

placitly that this removal was insisted on according to a requisition from the Persian government which took offence at your being permitted to reside so near the Persian confines as in Sind or Bombay".¹ He informed the Agha Khan that the British government desired to look upon him as their honoured visitor in its dominions, but was precluded from extending its hospitality to him in any of its Western provinces. Maddock was prepared to be the medium of transmitting any application which the Agha Khan might desire to make to the British representative at Teheran, for his objects, but he had no opinion to offer about them.²

However the Agha Khan, before receiving the above reply, collected some newspaper clippings, that had announced his arrival in Calcutta. The Agha Khan wrote to Covenagh that the "Mujam ul Akhbar",³ had suggested that the British government were about to avail themselves of his influence for political purposes in Persia, to counteract the movements made by the forces of that country in the direction of Herat and during that period, the paper suggested, that the Agha Khan should be so employed, his stipend would be again raised.

¹ Maddock to the Agha Khan 7.10.47, B.C.III, No. 28, No. 27 of 28 Mar 1848.

² Ibid.

³ I have failed to find this newspaper in London. It is likely that it was in Persian and was perhaps published in Calcutta monthly. See I. Schri, Journal of Persian Studies (Oxon) Delhi 1952.

to 3,000 per annum.¹ Similar suggestions had appeared in various Indian newspapers adding that the Agha Khan's brother Atul Hassan was in Baryur and that the British government were informed of the rumoured attack of Muhammad Shah on Herat and that the British government were to send steamers with the detachments of troops to the Persian Gulf to bring about the Shah to his senses, that the Agha Khan had been called to Calcutta to receive orders etc.²

After the murder of the ruler of Herat, Kamran Shah in 1842, the Minister Yar Mohammed Khan had become all powerful in the state. He tried to extend his authority among the neighbouring countries. By 1846, his growing power was a constant threat to the ruler of Candahar, Kohin Dil Khan, who tried to seek Persian assistance against Yar Mohammed. In Persian Khorasan, there had been religious revolts in 1847, and Muhammad Shah's troops were engaged in putting down the revolts. A few Khorassai chiefs had fled to Herat and taken refuge there. Yar Mohammed had directed his attention towards Khorasan apparently to extend his territory.³ Therefore the fear of renewed hostilities between Persia and Herat was growing. The Indian Press was alive to the

¹The Agha Khan to Cavenagh 25.9.47. B.C.III. B. No. 50, No. 27 of 26 Mar 1848.

²See The Delhi Gazette of 24.6.47, The Bombay Telegraph and Courier of 5.6.47, 22.11.47, Columns on Persia and Candahar.

³Perrier, The history of Afghanistan, pp. 470-90.

danger of a Persian attack on Herat.

Moved by these reports the Agha Khan offered his services as a tried soldier and requested that his allowances should be increased. However, Cavenagh tried to dissuade the Agha Khan from believing in the newspaper reports¹ and he forwarded the letter of the Agha Khan to Maddock. The Indian government acknowledged the letter without any comments.²

In December 1847, the Agha Khan again wrote to Maddock. He declared once more his desire to return to Kirmanshah, but he was apprehensive, "I had placed my self under the shelter of the Honourable Company's Government, I should be disgraced among my equals and taunted by them with having been obliged to retrace my steps to their doors".³ He requested as an alternative that he should be allowed to leave Calcutta and settle in Kerbala in Iraq where his mother and his son Ali Shah (the future Agha Khan) resided.

On 31 December the Indian government informed the Agha Khan that there was no objection to his going to Kerbala, as the government placed no restrictions upon his movements, but they could not

¹ Cavenagh to S.C.I. 25.9.47, B.C.XII, No. 50, No. 27 of 28 Mar 1848.

² S.C.I. to Cavenagh, 9.10.47, B.C.XII, No. 31, No. 27 of 28 Mar 1848.

³ The Agha Khan to Maddock No date, D. Cavenagh to S.C.I. 21.2.47, B.C.XII, No. 42, No. 27 of 28 Mar 1848.

facilitate his journey and that he would forfeit his allowances whenever he quitted the limits of the Bengal Presidency.¹

The Aga Khan continued to agitate. He had many reasons; he was away from his followers therefore he could not collect their willing donations; his allowances did not satisfy him. In January 1848, he was refused the increment in the allowance, for which he had applied. In February he stopped paying the rent of his house.² In March he wrote a long *Masajid*, a memorial of his services to Lord Dalhousie, who had then succeeded Hardinge, informing him of the services he had rendered at Qandahar and in Sind and the loss that he had suffered for upholding the cause of the British. He also sent copy of a testimonial signed by Sir Charles Napier. He tried to explain once again his circumstances to the Governor General and requested that arrangements should be made for him to go to Kartala or to Bagdad.³

The Government of India refused to comply with his requests.⁴ Lord Dalhousie, in his letter to the Secret Committee forwarded a copy of the memorials of the Aga Khan and commented, "The Aga complains much of the circumstances in which he is now placed. He demands

¹S.C.I. to Cavanagh 31.12.47, S.C.III, No. 43, No. 27 of 23 Mar 1848.

²Cavanagh to S.C.I. 11.1.48; S.C.III, 44, No. 27 of 23 Mar 1848.
S.C.I. to Cavanagh, 6.5.48, S.C.III, No. 8, No. 77 of 27 Sep 1848.

³The Aga Khan to Dalhousie 22.3.48, S.C.III, No. 3, No. 77 of 27 Sep 1848. (see appendix).

⁴S.C.I. to Cavanagh 7.4.48, S.C.III, No. 4, No. 77, of 27 Sep 1848.

to have expected that the British government would treat him as a distinguished guest rather than a person whose residence in Calcutta was required for political reasons - Some trouble has been experienced in making him understand what his real position is."¹

In April 1848, the Agha Khan suggested another plan. He now requested to be allowed to go to Egypt. He also wrote, "should the government at present wish to avail itself of my services, with the divine aid I shall conquer Balikh, Bokhara, the whole of Turkistan as far as Candahar and Seistan....among my converts there are natives of Samarkand, Bokhara and Khotassan.... I am anxious to be employed and in return for my services, hope to obtain honor and wealth."²

Covenagh wanted to bring an end to the repeated applications of the Agha Khan. He suggested to the Governor General that advantage might be taken of the Agha Khan's proposal to proceed to Egypt. He wrote that the Agha Khan's stipend, together with the sum granted to his family amounted to Rs 1,345 monthly and that by sending him away, "not only would an eventual saving accrue to the state, but by his departure the government would cease to be annoyed by the continued importunities of a discontented and ungrateful

¹ Dilkushie to S.C. 25.3.48, B.G.I, No. 27 of 28 Mar 1848.

² The Agha Khan to Covenagh 23.4.48, B.G.III, No. 5, No. 77 of 27 Sep 1848.

guest.¹ He also added, "The Agha is a person of a most restless and intriguing temperament and I am convinced he will never be satisfied with the position he occupies in this country which he considers far inferior to his deserts and instead of evincing gratitude for the kindness he has experienced from the British, evidently imagines that with especial reference to his rank and services he has been unjustly treated by not being permitted to reside in the vicinity of his disciples on the Western coast of India."²

Dalhousie agreed to pay the travelling expenses for the Agha Khan and his retainers to go to Egypt. He also warned the Agha Khan that on leaving Bengal his stipend would cease and would not be renewed. Regarding the projects of the Agha Khan in Central Asia, the Governor General ignored the proposal.³

In May, the Agha Khan requested to be allowed to go to Dacca, for his affairs were in disorder there. The Agha Khan's brother Shah-muhammad Baqir, who represented him there, was confronted with a difficult situation. The Ismaili community was divided into two groups and the name and credit of the Agha Khan had suffered much.⁴

¹O'Conoragh to S.G.I. 25.4.43, B.O.III, No. 5, No. 77 of 27 Aug 1848.

²Ibid.

³S.G.I. to O'Conoragh, 6.5.43. B.O.III, No. 5, No. 77 of 27 Aug 1848.

⁴The Agha Khan to O'Conoragh, 9.5.43. B.O.III, No. 5, No. 77 of 27 Aug 1848. See also B.O.III, Nos. 11-12, No. 77 of 27 Aug 1848. D.B. Report 410, vol. 71 p. 22. In the Dacca Supreme Court, there was a case of succession concerning some members of the Agha Khan's community. See Parry, B. Oriental Comm., p. 110.

The Governor General asked Cavanagh to inform the Agha Khan of the orders of government, "he can on no account be allowed to proceed to Bombay, he should therefore come to a decision at once either to proceed to Egypt or to stay in this country".¹

In June the Agha Khan fell ill, and was sent to a hill station for convalescence and, in July, the residence of the Agha Khan was shifted to Chinsurah in Calcutta. At that time the Governor General was moving to go to Panjab with the retinue, the Agha Khan requested to be allowed to go with them and that he would arrange the affairs of his people from there.²

In September the Shah of Persia died. The Agha Khan learned of this news at the end of October and immediately approached Haddock, that he should be allowed to return to Persia.³

The Indian Government was reluctant to agree. The Agha Khan however visited Haddock a number of times and repeatedly pleaded his case. He also sent applications to the Bombay government.⁴ In December Cavanagh estimated the expenses that would be required for

¹S.O.I. to Cavanagh, 13.5.48, 3.6.48, B.O.III, Nos. 10, 12 of No. 77 of 27 Sep 1848.

²The Agha to S.O.I. 3.7.48, B.O.III, No. 15 No. 77 of 27 Sep 1848.

³The Agha Khan to Haddock, No date, B. 9.11.48, B.O.III, No. 5, No. 5 of 20 Jan 1849.

⁴Mr. Baker to S.O.B., 21.11.48, B.P. Range 41G vol. 72 pp. 16 & 161.

136

The journey of the Agha Khan and his party to Bombay.¹

On 6 December the Indian Government agreed to send the Agha Khan to Bombay. Maddock stated, "the death of the King of Persia has apparently removed all objections that may have prevented his return to his native country at an earlier period when he seemed to look with distrust on the offers that were made to him if he would return, and he visited me yesterday to state his desire to leave Bengal by the first opportunity in order to revisit his native country."² Maddock suggested that the Indian government should bear the expenses of the journey and be prepared to pay any debts which the Agha Khan had contracted. "If this government allows him," commented Maddock "to go away without settling his debts for which there will not be time if he is allowed, as he proposes, to take his passage in the *Bentinck* which vessel is to leave Calcutta the day after tomorrow, we may become liable for between Rupees 4,000 and 5,000 more. But I think this expense should be incurred".³ He continued, "The Agha now costs the government of India Rupees 1,000 per month of which we shall be relieved when he is gone and

¹ Cavenagh to S.O.I. 6.12.48. B.O.III, No. 5, No. 5 of 20 Jan 1849.

² Minutes of P.M.C. 6.12.48, B.O.III, No. 6, No. 5 of 20 Jan 1849.

³ Ibid.

it is on many accounts very desirable that we should be relieved of the residence here of a person of a high rank in his own country holding so doubtful embarrassing a position as he does here". He proposed there fore to send the Agha Khan to Bombay.¹

This was agreed in the Council. On the same day the Bombay government was informed of the proceedings of the Indian government and was also instructed to arrange for a passage to Bushire or to any other port of Persia for the Agha Khan. The Bombay government was also asked to make suitable preparations to receive the Agha Khan and his party at the expense of the state and was informed that his former allowance was to cease. However until the further arrangements to remove him to Persia were completed, he was to receive a new allowance from the government. Regarding his route to Persia, the Indian government asked the Bombay government to refer to Col. Sheil's letter regarding the then anticipated return of the Agha Khan in February 1847, through Bushire and Shiraz or Bagdad and Kermanchah and not through Baluchistan.²

The Agha Khan left Calcutta on 5 December for Bombay. His debts were paid.³ Mistakenly the letter of the Indian government to the

¹ Minutes of P.A.C. 6.12.46, B.O.III, No. 6, No. 5 of 20 Jan 1849.

² OFF.S.G.I. to O.S.G.B. 6.12.46, B.O.III, No. 8, No. 5 of 20 Jan 1849.
See also Sheil to O.S. 16.2.47, B.No.16 of P.O.50/1849. Chap IV, p.

³ His debts amounted to Rs.10,000.

Bombay government regarding his departure from Calcutta was sent in an ordinary mail.¹ However the Agha Khan's own messenger to his brother in Bombay arrived before the Government boat. On 20 December, Muhammad Baqir informed the Bombay government of the expected arrival of the Agha Khan in the presidency.² However the Bombay government in the absence of any instructions then, resolved on 22 December to arrest the Agha Khan when he reached Bombay.³ The Agha Khan's boat reached Bombay on 26 December, but the instructions from the Indian government had fortunately arrived one day earlier and the Bombay government had withdrawn their orders for the arrest and instead made arrangements to receive him in Bombay.⁴

It seems, because of his repeated complaints and the death of the Shah of Persia, the Agha Khan was allowed to leave Calcutta.

¹Off.S.O.I. to S.O.B. 4.1.49, B.C.III, No. 14, No. 5 of 20 Jan 1949.

²Muhammad Baqir to S.O.B. 20.12.48, B.C.III, No. 6, No. 4 of 3 Jan 1949.

³Minutes. O.B. 22.12.48, B.C.III, No. 7, No. 4 of 3 Jan 1949.

⁴Minutes. 'O.B. 26.12.48, B.C.III, No. 13, No. 4 of 3 Jan 1949. The Agha Khan was provided with a Lorry and given an extra sum of Rs. 50 p.m. for his expenses.

Chapter VI

The beginning of the asylum issue and the
settlement of the Agha Khan in Bombay, 1848-1851.

The details of the question of sending the Agha Khan to Persia brought disagreement among the members of the Bombay Council and also between the Bombay Government and the Indian Government. However, in 1848, the Bombay Government tried to send the Agha Khan to Persia but the Agha Khan declined to go. After the accession of the new Shah of Persia, conditions in Persia continued to be unstable and the Persian Ministers refused to accept the return of the Agha Khan to Persia. The question of asylum then brought in the Foreign office and by 1851 the Agha Khan was finally allowed to settle in Bombay. In this chapter we shall discuss the process by which the decision was reached.

According to the instructions of the Indian Government, the Bombay Government asked the Agha Khan, after his arrival in the presidency (26 December 1848), to make preparations for his return to Persia. The Agha Khan requested to be allowed to return via Baluchistan and Kerman and declined to accept the proposed route that is by Bushire and Shires or Sind and Kirman Shah.¹ The Bombay Government of course could not consent to this. Subsequently on 20 Decem-

¹ C.R.I.S.O.I. to S.C.B. 6.12.4. 1.0.373, No. 2 of No. 3 of 20 January 1849. C.R.I.S.O.I. to Off. M.G.M. 3.1.49, I.C.IV No. 14 of No. 3 of 20 January 1849.

111

umber, the Bombay Government received a copy of Major Bowlinson's letter addressed to Sir Stratford Canning, which stated that Morwan and the surrounding districts of Persia were in a disturbed state, occasioned by events connected with the death of the late Shah of Persia.¹ The Bombay Government therefore resolved to postpone the departure of the Agha Khan temporarily. Lord Falkland, the Governor of Bombay minuted, "I think that delay should be imposed to prevent the departure of Aga Mohamed Khan until we receive a reply to a reference to be made to the Government of India, as to the expediency of his being permitted to return to Persia at this crisis".² Falkland argued, "Major Bowlinson's despatch to Sir Stratford Canning will in my opinion be a sufficient justification for our so acting - The duration of Aga Mohamed Khan's detention over and above the time he must necessarily have remained in Bombay, will be but a very few days, and I apprehend that no evil can result from our exercising a discretionary power in this matter".³

The Indian Government deferred to the opinion of the Bombay Government but advised them to carry out their instructions of sending the Agha Khan to Persia, as soon as the reasons for their restraint

¹ Bowlinson to Manning 3.11.43, P.O. 70, S.S.L.1st Series, Vol. 25, sub: No. 1 of No. 4 of 5 Jan. 1849.

² Minutes of C.B. in O. No.12.43, S.S.L. 1st Series, 25, sub: No. 1 of No. 4 of 3 Feb. 1849.

³ This.

17

upon the Agha Khan were removed.¹ On 18th January 1846, Maddock wrote to the Bombay Government explaining that the Agha Khan had always since his arrival in India, been given to understand that, "it was entirely optional with himself to remain in India or to return to Persia, the only control which the British Government in India professed to exercise over him being a refusal to permit him to reside in or to frequent those parts of the Indian Empire contiguous to Persia".² With respect to the Agha Khan's refusal to proceed by the prescribed route Maddock insisted that the Agha Khan should be 'distinctly and peremptorily apprised' that he could not go by way of Baluchistan and if he should persevere in his opposition, Maddock stated, "he can no longer be considered entitled to any consideration from the British Government and that no further expenses will be incurred by the British Government in providing for his entertainment, but that at the same time a sufficient surveillance over him will be kept up to prevent his leaving Bombay with any designs of proceeding to Persia through Baluchistan".³

However, after receiving the instructions from Maddock, the Bombay Government agreed to inform the Agha Khan and ask him to leave

¹Off.S.C.Y. to S.C.C.B. 18.1.46, B.G.IV, No. 17 of No. 5 of 20 Jan. 1846.

²ibid.

³ibid.

for Persia. The Agha Khan gave in, and on 2 February 1849 he agreed to return to Persia by the prescribed route. At the same time he requested to be allowed to stop for fifteen or twenty days at Muscat where he wanted to visit many of his followers and to 'settle their pecuniary affairs'.¹

This new request by the Agha Khan brought considerable doubts among the members of the Bombay Council. On 9 February the Bombay Governor's Council discussed the question. It was noted that the orders of the Indian Government were that the British Government exercised control on the Agha Khan only when he was in those parts of the Indian Empire contiguous to Persia. Therefore, 'after mature consideration', Falkland proposed to send the Agha Khan in a Government vessel and not to allow the Agha Khan to touch Muscat. He said that, "if we do not send him in a Government vessel we shall have no control over his actions".²

The Hon'ble L. Reid, a member of the Council disagreed with Falkland. He had doubts of expediency of sending the Agha Khan in a Government vessel. He said that, "I am not aware that we need, or indeed can do more than take care that he embarks in a vessel bound to Persia. Muscat is on the way to Bushire, and I scarcely see why we should take any notice of his intention to stop at that port. We

¹Minutes B.O. 29.1.49, Memorandum B.O. 2.2.49, B.O. 17, No. 24, 17.2., 26 of 16 Feb. 1849.

²Minutes 9.2.49, B.O. IV, No. 25 of No. 25 of 16 Feb. 1849.

103

if his doing so be deemed objectionable, we may inform him that we do not approve of that course and that he must proceed to Persia direct. Should he accede to this, I would at once allow him to depart".¹

J. P. Willoughby, another member of the Council was against, even sending the Agha Khan to Persia. He argued, "We know sufficiently of Agha Khan's history, to imagine that his appearance in Persia at the present moment may create great embarrassment. He engaged in hostilities against the late King of Persia, and the probability therefore is, that if he returns he will unite with the party who are now opposing the late King's son, the present King of Persia. We also know that Agha Khan's influence and authority in certain parts of Persia is great and thrown into the scale against the government which has been recently established in Persia by the combined influence of England and Russia, great embarrassment might ensue".² He went on, "From the despatches we have received from the Envoy in Persia, since the present King's accession, there can be no doubt that it is the desire of the Home authorities to support and strengthen his government to the utmost. I do not therefore think we should be justified in countenancing the return of Agha, who (as I conceive highly probable) if so disposed, may become a dangerous and formidable enemy of that Government". He was also

¹ Minutes 9.2.49, 21.6.17, No. 26 of No. 25 of 15 Feb. 1849.

² Minutes 10.2.49, 21.6.17, No. 27 of No. 21 of 15 Feb. 1849.

against sending the Aga Khan in a Government vessel for he considered that would entitle them with the Government of Persia who might blame the British Government for any evil consequences that might result from the Aga Khan's return to Persia. He suggested a further reference to the Indian Government.¹ Finally on 10 February, Falkland agreed to refer the question for precise orders from the Government of India. He added, "a portion of the territory under Muscat which is held by a Governor on account of His Highness, the Imam, was only last year attacked by a neighbouring Persian Governor and although the invader was frustrated in his attempt to capture the fortress of Minic, the sum of two thousand Tomanis (10,000 Rs) was extorted as a ransom for it and much other damage was done, for which we are not informed that any reparation has ever been made by the Government of Persia; it would therefore be highly undesirable that Aga Khan should be permitted to repair thither, I would also suggest to the Government of India that as Aga Khan has been so long an honored guest in India, his return whether in Government vessel or otherwise will be looked on by the Shah as our act and that the late King's relaxation at our instance, of his demands for Aga Khan's dismissal from our territories, entitles his son to expect that we should care for his interests.

¹ Minutes 10.2.49, S.O.27, No. 27 or No. 21 of 15 Feb. 1941.

by ensuring that this Nobleman should return by the route which was prescribed for him".¹ The Bombay Government on 12 February asked the Government of India for further guidance in the matter and on 16 February wrote to the Secret Committee that pending a reply from the Indian Government, they had resolved to postpone the departure of the Aga Khan from Bombay.²

Haddock disagreed with the Bombay Government. He recorded in the minutes that it was never contemplated to send the Aga Khan to Persia in a Government vessel. He argued, "When Aga Khan has landed in Persia or even arrived in the Persian Gulf the British Government should not hold itself responsible for his further conduct and we can not be called upon to prohibit him from visiting Muscat. When the late King of Persia assented to the Aga's return to Persia, that person was informed that he was at liberty to leave India by sea, if he intended to conform to His Majesty's orders as to the port of Persia to which he was to proceed - He has ever since, so long as he remained here, been told the same thing, and it did not appear to this Government that the late King's death was any reason why further restraint should be put on the Aga's action. It appears

¹ Minutes 10.2.45. B.O.IV, No. 23 of No. 25 of 16 Feb. 1845.
See Saldanha, Journal of Political Affairs, Nos. 435-447, and Minutes of the Foreign Dept., p. 459 of Part I, Vol. 2.

² B.S.G.B. to O.C. B.O.I. 12.2.45, B.O.IV, No. 23 of ... 25 of 13 Feb. 1845. In O. to B.O. 16.2.45, B.O.I. 1st Series, Vol. 25, No. 25 - 16. Feb. 1845.

16

rather that under the new reign, opportunity would arise for a thorough reconciliation between Agha Khan and the Persian Government and that we should be relieved of the embarrassment of detaining him in India without any offence to the Government of Persia".¹ He however, considered that the final decision ought to rest with the Governor General. He therefore asked the Governor General for further instructions and told the Bombay Government to await the reply.²

The Governor General agreed with Waddock's attitude towards the Agha Khan. On 17 March, he directed that the Bombay Government be informed, "His Lordship considers it inexpedient that he should be permitted to delay his departure, and requests that he may be speedily desired to proceed to Persia by the route prescribed for him by the Government of India. He is in no respect however entitled to the distinction of being sent in a Government vessel".³ Moreover, the Governor General added that if the Agha Khan did not avail himself of the opportunity to quit the country, "the Governor General desires that his pension may be stopped".⁴

¹Minutes 24.2.49, B.O.IV, No. 8 of No. 7 of 7 March 1849.

²Off. S.O.I. to U.S.O.I. 24.2.49, B.O.IV, No. 9 of No. 7 of 7 Mar. 1849.
S.O.I. to C.S.O.B. 5.3.49, B.O.IV, No. 10 of No. 7 of 7 Mar. 1849.

³S.O.I. to C.S.O.B. 17.3.49, B.O.IV, No. 15 of No. 42 of 20 April 1849.

⁴S.O.I. to C.S.O.B. 17.3.49, B.O.IV, No. 15 of No. 42 of 20 April 1849.

The Bombay Government then tried to send off the Agha Khan. On April 4, 1849, the Bombay Government told the Agha Khan of the strict instructions of the Governor General. They also informed him that the Government would pay passage only for those of his dependants, who came from Calcutta with him.¹ The Dr. Bay Government proposed to arrange his passage to Bushire in the Olive, which vessel was due to leave on 10 May.² But by 10 May, the arrangements were not completed. The Shipping Company offered to delay for a few days. But the Agha Khan evaded going, by bringing in the question of his pecuniary affairs. He asked the Government to pay his debts, which the Bombay Government refused to do.³ The Olive left and the Bombay Government ordered the shipand of the Agha Khan to be discontinued and they informed the Indian Government of their proceedings.⁴

The Agha Khan applied to the Bombay Government many times and asked to be allowed to stay in Bombay and receive his pension. He produced letters showing the disturbed state of Illesat and also letters of the new Shah of Persia that he should be arrested when he entered

¹ The Agha Khan had altogether 243 retainers, whom he wanted to take back to Persia, obviously with the purpose of creating rebellion. He also requested to be allowed to send some followers in advance, about which the Indian Government was unconcerned, see Resolution of O.G. 4.4.49, S.O. 27, No. 17 of No. 49 of 30 April 1849, pp. 1-2. Range 41B, Vol. 74, Nos. 1-2.

² G.O. in C. to O.G. 30.4.49, B.S.L. last series, Vol. 26, No. 1 of 30 April 1849; also letter, O.G. 2.3.49, 1.5.49, B.G.I.V., No. 15 or No. 49 of 30 April 1849, and No. 5 of No. 72 of 31 Aug. 1849.

³ The Olive was the last unoccupied boat of the service, having been months no sailing. The Agha Khan to O.G.C. 14.5.49, B.P., Range 41B, Vol. 72, p. 57.

⁴ Minutes of O.G. 16.7.49, B.S.L.V., No. 13 of No. 72 of 31 Aug. 1849.

Persia. The Bombay Government passed on his letter to the Indian Government.¹

In July 1849, the Indian Government asked the Bombay Government to send the Agha Khan to Persia. The Bombay Government informed the Agha Khan of this.²

The news of the arrival of the Agha Khan in Bombay from Calcutta and the subsequent proceedings had arrived in London in February and March 1849. Hobhouse transmitted them to Palmerston for his information.³ In March Palmerston sent them to Lt. Colonel Francois Farrant, the chargé d'affaires at Teheran in the absence of the Envoy Justin Sheil.⁴

In April Farrant informed Palmerston that he comprehended serious consequences from the return of the Agha Khan to Persia. In his letter of 25 April 1849, he reported that, "the return of that Nobleman to Persia at this moment would be fraught with the most dangerous consequences to this Government. His arrival even at Bushire would in all probability cause an outbreak in the Province of Fars, and that of Kerman would hail with delight the announce-

¹The Agha Khan to S.C.B. 14.5.49, B.T. Range G.S., Vol. 75, p. 50. Minutes G.S. 21.5.49, B.C.IV, No. 29 of No. 72 of 31 Aug. 1849. The Agha Khan to Dalhousie, No date, B.C.IV, No. 29 of No. 72 of 31 Aug. 1849.

²S.C.B. to S.C.B. 9.7.49, B.C.IV, No. 42 of No. 72 of 31 Aug. 1849. S.C.B. to the Agha Khan, 18.7.49, B.T. Range 415, Vol. 76, p. 25.

³Hobhouse to Palmerston, 2.8.49, and 5.8.49, J.H.C. Vol. 32, p. 21 and p. 37.

⁴Palmerston to Farrant, 8.5.49, No. 7 of P.O. 22/149. India Office - S.C. in C. 7.5.49. B.C.S.L.I. 44, p. 20.

sent of his return, exaggerated rumours would spread widely in every direction, supported as he is known to have been by the Indian Government. But should he be permitted to quit Bombay I trust he may be sent to Bagdad, there to be under the surveillance of Major Rawlinson".¹ He also informed Palmerston that it was reported to him that a correspondence had been carried on between Asif-ud-Dowlah, a fugitive Governor of Khorasan and the Agha Khan, in which the former urged his speedy return to Persia that they might act in concert. Farquhar commented, "I infer on the receipt of these letters the Khan expressed to the Indian Government his desire to return and to enter Persia by the route of Baluchistan".² He went on, "I should greatly regret his appearance even at Bushire at this moment, his connection with us would give rise to all sorts of malicious and exaggerated reports against Her Majesty's Government and place Her Majesty's Mission in a very embarrassing position towards this Government".³

In June Palmerston approached Hobhouse, and requested him to, "inform me whether you have received any further intelligence from India respecting the Khan Nehistans movements, and whether it

¹ Farquhar to Palmerston, 25.4.43, No. 31 of P.O. 60/144.

² Enc.

³ Enc.

is the intention of the Secret Committee to take any steps respecting him in consequence of Lieut. Col. Farrant's statement".¹

Hobhouse then had received the proceedings of the Bombay Government of 30 April, regarding the arrangements made for the Agha Khan to travel to Persia on the Clive. Hobhouse wrote to Palmerston and said that he had noticed Farrant's statement and in view of the Bombay Government's letter did not propose making any communications to the Government of India, for he presumed that any such communication would not reach Bombay in time to affect the proceeding of the Bombay Government, and secondly, because the Governor of Bombay would have received from Col. Farrant himself a copy of the dispatch in question and would therefore, have been apprised of the view taken by the British minister at Tehran.² However, Hobhouse wrote to Palmerston that if, "Her Majesty's Government deem it advisable to undertake the responsibility of detaining Agha Khan Nehlata in India, I am quite ready to forward by the next mail, any instructions which your Lordship may desire to send, on the chance of their finding that Nehlata still a sojourner in our territories".³

¹ Palmerston to Hobhouse, 15.5.49. S.H.C. Vol. 25, p. 181-2.

² Hobhouse to Palmerston, 15.5.49. S.H.C. Vol. 25, p. 183-7.

³ 1849.

175

Palmerston wanted the Agha Khan to be detained in India. He wrote, "in consideration of Capt. Col. Farrant's observations respecting Agha Khan Nohlatee, I am of opinion that it would not be expedient to allow that person to return to Persia just at present if he can be kept on in India".¹ He suggested informing Farrant that the Agha Khan would not be kept indefinitely in India, and that he should explain this to the Persian Government and prepare them for the eventual return of the Agha Khan to Persia.²

Hobhouse agreed and on 21 June, instructions were sent to the Indian Government through the Secret Committee recommending the detention of the Agha Khan in India, in consequence of Farrant's letter.³ Farrant was informed of this.⁴

The observations of Farrant had not arrived in India as Hobhouse had presumed. But the communications of the Secret Committee reached the Governor General in August and on 14 August the Governor General instructed the Bombay Government that, "It being desirable that the Agha Khan should remain at Bombay for the present.... and that the lights be detained in case he shows any disposition to leave.

¹ Palmerston to Hobhouse, 20.6.49. D.N.C. Vol. 23, p. 195.

² Palmerston to Hobhouse, 20.6.49. D.N.C. Vol. 23, p. 195.

³ S.O. to C.B.I.C. 21.6.49. D.D.L.I. Vol. 10, No. 1376.

⁴ Palmerston to Farrant, 23.6.49. M. 25. F.O. 8/145.

Bombay".¹ The Governor General also instructed that the allowance of one thousand Rupees per mensem, formerly paid to the Agha Khan, which had lately been withheld, should be restored without arrears until the orders of the Home Authorities could be received.²

The Bombay Government received the above instructions on 30 August and gave the necessary instructions for the renewal of the Agha Khan's allowances from the date of the receipt of the instruction.³ The Agha Khan on learning the news declared that, "I know it well that this allowance which had been granted in consideration of the trouble I took and the services I rendered in Candahar and Scinde would never be discontinued by Government".⁴ He also requested that his arrears should be paid, which were sanctioned by the Indian Government in January 1850.⁵

The Persian Government on learning the news of the detention of the Agha Khan in India, expressed their sincere gratitude to the British Government. The Amir-i-Nizam, the Persian Prime Minister told Varrant that he had himself addressed two or three letters to

¹S.C.I. to S.C.B. 14.8.49, S.C.IV, No. 3 of No. 49 of 18 Aug. 1849.

²S.C.I. to S.C.B. 14.8.49, S.C.IV, No. 3 of No. 49 of 18 Aug. 1849.

³Minutes G.S. 20.8.49. S.S.L. 1st Series, Vol. 26, smol. No. 42 of No. 72 of 31 Aug. 1849.

⁴The Agha Khan to S.C.B. 11.9.49. S.P. Persian Letters Range 415, Vol. 73, pp. 72-73.

⁵S.C.I. to S.C.B. 10.1.50, S.C.IV, p. 255; also S.C.B. to the Agha Khan 16.10.49, S.P. Persian Letters Range 415, Vol. 74, p. 16.

the Agha Khan, "recommending him for the present to remain quiet in India, but so soon as the tranquillity of this country was firmly established he would authorise him to return to Persia".¹

On 18 August, the Governor General in his letter to the Secret Committee brought up the question of the Agha Khan's asylum in India. He wrote that having been 'actuated by the desire of avoiding any act which might be productive of embarrassment to Her Majesty's Government in the conduct of the foreign relations of Great Britain' he had decided to keep the Agha Khan in India. But he went on, in the final paragraph, "as the Agha's pension would lapse on his return to his own country, I beg to represent for consideration whether it is just that the whole weight of the stipend should be borne by the East India Company, when but for circumstances connected with foreign relations of England it would be freed from the burden".²

On 8 October, Holhouse passed on the Governor General's communication to Palmerston, pointing out, "I have to lay your Lordship's particular attention to the last paragraph of the letter from Marquis of Dalhousie".³ Palmerston promptly wrote on 16 November to

¹ Telegram to Palmerston, 24.8.49. No. 62 of P.M.P., 52.

² O. d. in C. to S.C. 10.8.49. S.C.Y. No. 49 of 16 Aug. 1849.

³ Holhouse to Palmerston, 8.10.49. S.C.G. Vol. 23, p. 771.

Sheil who was in Teheran, to ascertain whether there was any longer any sufficiently valid reason for keeping the Agha Khan out of Persia and if there was not, to inform the Governor of Bushire directly.¹

The Persian Government still opposed the return of the Agha Khan to Persia. Sheil in January 1850, approached the Persian Minister to ascertain their attitude towards the Agha Khan. The Amir-i-Mizan gave his written reply, "I acquaint your Excellency that if the ministers of the British Government are desirous that he should return to Persia, they should give him over to the frontier authorities of this state as a fugitive, otherwise, in consequence of his rebellious character and offences, the Persian Ministers can never consent to Agha Khan's return to Persia in any other manner".² The Prime Minister also said that the Agha Khan 'had levied war against the Shah' and had excited insurrections after his flight and that it would be embarrassing if 'this traitor should return'.³ Sheil told the Prime Minister that there was no stipulation in the treaty between England and Persia for the surrender of refugees and that the British Government had not the power to detain the Agha Khan in India for an indefinite period.⁴

¹ Palmerston to Sheil, 10.11.49, No. 28, P.O. 6/140.

Palmerston to Hobhouse, 10.11.49. C.H.C. Vol. 23, p. 403.

² Trans: The Amir-i-Mizan to Sheil, 22.1.50. L. No. 18 of P.C. 60/122.

³ Sheil to Palmerston, 7.2.50. No. 52 of P.O. 60/150.

⁴ Ibid.

Palmerston explained the policy of the British Government in the light of Sherrill's despatch. In May he wrote to Metcalfe regarding Dalhousie's argument that His Majesty's Government should pay the Agha Khan's allowance. Palmerston wrote, "It appears from the Governor General of India's Despatch... that Agha Khan Nuhlazar is desirous of quitting the British territory and of returning to Persia, and that if he does so, the pension which he now receives from the Government of India would lapse, and that the Indian Government conceive that if permission to quit British India is withheld from the Khan, and he is therefore, against his will compelled to remain a British pensioner, Her Majesty's Government, who may require on political grounds that the prohibition in question should be maintained, ought to bear the expense consequent on that arrangement and to pay the pension themselves".¹ Palmerston further stated, "I am disposed, with your concurrence, to instruct Lieut. Col. Scott to state to the Persian Government that while the British Government will not give up Agha Khan Nuhlazar as a fugitive, they will no longer prohibit his departure from the British territory, and that if he has committed in Persia crimes against the state, the Persian Government has only to arrest him, and bring him duly to trial when he re-enters Persia".² He also suggested that the British authorities in India

¹ Palmerston to Metcalfe, 2.5.50, S.O.S.L.I. Vol. 9, No. 142; see S.O. in C. to S.C. 15.5.50. L.S.I. No. 49 of 15 Aug. 1850, see text, p. 158.

152

should apprise the Agha Khan that he was free to leave British territory, but to warn him of the risk which he would incur if he attempted to re-enter Persia and also to point out to him that he must not look to British protection to save him in Persia from the consequences of any proceedings that the Persian Government might adopt. Palmerston added, "If with such a prospect before him, Agha Khan Nehlatae decides on remaining in British India, it appears to me that he should not be permitted to reside in any place from which he can conveniently keep up communication with any partisans whom he may still have in Persia, and in that manner encourage disturbance in the dominions of the Shah".¹

However, Hobhouse wanted to obtain an explicit assurance by Palmerston, on the point of payment of the allowances to the Agha Khan.² Hobhouse agreed to send the instructions of Palmerston to the Indian Government. He again wrote to Palmerston, "It would, however, be convenient that I should at the same time apprise them what amount of pension Her Majesty's Government are willing to allow to Agha Khan Nehlatae in case he should prefer to remain in British India".³

¹ Palmerston to Hobhouse, 2.5.50, B.D.S.L.I. Vol. 19, No. 1612.

² Pencil note by J. Waterfield on the back of Palmerston's letter of 2.5.50 to Hobhouse. Also see Drafts of Previous Communications, No. 2.

³ Hobhouse to Palmerston, 4.5.50. B.R.C. Vol. 25, pp. 61-62.

Palmerston observed that he understood that the Indian Government had granted a pension to the Agha Khan as a reward for some services performed by him, and that pension was to be enjoyed by the Agha Khan as long as he remained in India, that was to cease on his departure from India, to return to Persia, but that he was not allowed to do so in consequence of its being supposed that his presence in Persia might lead to disorder in that country.¹ He argued that the British Government did not think it necessary to oppose the Agha Khan's departure from India.² He also wrote, "Although they think it fair that he should be warned of the danger to which he may be exposed, if he returns to Persia; and it appears to me that if Agha Khan Kehlatoe should from apprehension of this danger, prefer to remain in India, he would, in regard to his pension be in the same position in which he should have been if he had never expressed a wish to return to Persia, and it would certainly not be fair to allow him to go back to Persia in ignorance of that information which the British and Indian Governments are now able to give him - But the British Government was not, as I apprehend, any party to the grant of Agha Khan's pension, and can not in any case give any pension or allowance to him".

¹ Palmerston to Hobhouse, 6.5.50. B.O.S.C.C., Vol. 19, No. 1419.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

Palmerston transmitted copies of his lengthy correspondence with Holthouse to Shail and asked him to inform the Persian Government of his attitude.¹

The Secret Committee on 7 May, transmitted the copies of above communications to the Governor General of India for information and guidance and asked, "If, after the communication which is to be made to him, he should decline to return to Persia, you will take into your immediate consideration the question whether it be just that any, and if any, what amount of pension should be paid to him from the revenues of India".² The Governor of Bombay was also informed of the same.³

The instructions of the Secret Committee reached India in July. On 17th July, Dalhousie wrote to the Bombay Government to ascertain whether the Agha Khan wanted to return to Persia or not. Before he received a reply, Dalhousie informed the Secret Committee of his decision in the matter. He wrote that the Agha Khan's pension of Rupees one thousand was granted to him by Lord Ellenborough in 1843, without any conditions and not for any fixed period. He therefore, conceived that the Agha Khan was fairly entitled to that pension so long as he stayed in India. He also mentioned that, "I directed

¹ Palmerston to Shail, 6.6.50. No. 22, P.C. 50/100. also D.D.S.L.I. Vol. 19, No. 1419.

² P.C. to S.G. in C. 7.5.50. D.D.S.L.I. Vol. 19, No. 1418.

³ P.C. to S.G. in C. 7.5.50. D.D.S.L.I. Vol. 19, No. 1417.

121

his pension to be stopped last year, because Agha Khan having expressed his wish to return to Persia and there being no obstacle to his return, suddenly refused to go. In thus acting he appeared to me to be playing with the Government of India, and to have been scheming, in order merely to get his debts paid and his residence retransferred to Bombay, whence he was sent".¹ He went on, "who ever is different as it now stands, His return to Persia is objected to, except on terms which Agha Khan will hardly consider it safe to accept. His residence in India must, therefore be considered as in a great measure compulsory, and I apprehend that the Government must in fairness continue to pay the pension which was originally granted to him. If his pension had been larger in extent, I should have suggested that stoppages should be made from it until the Government had been reimbursed the sum of Rupees 10,000 and 5,000 which they expended on his debts at Calcutta and his passage to Bombay in expectation of getting rid of his pension altogether. The sum of Rupees 1,000 a month would not bear such reduction".²

The Bombay Government approached the Agha Khan to get a definite answer regarding his stay. On 2 September, the Deputy Secretary in the Persian Department of Bombay personally asked the Agha Khan, who stated that he was willing to stay in Bombay. The Agha Khan

¹O.O. in C. to S.O. 27.7.50. S.O.I. No. 15 of 27 July 1950.

²Ibid.

162

also promised that he had no intention of carrying on any secret correspondence with any one in Persia but he desired to remain and receive his allowance of stipend in Bombay.¹

The Secret Committee in October 1850, informed the Governor General that all the correspondence relating to the Agha Khan would be put before the Court of Directors for their final decision in the matter.² On 22 January 1851 all the members of the India Board finally decided that, "Agha Khan can not be given up to the Persian Government, and unless he voluntarily quits India, the pension of one thousand Rupees a month which was granted to him for his services to our Government should be continued. We are not desirous that he should be required to return to Bengal unless the Persian Government, on being further consulted, should renew its objection to his residing in Bombay, or unless he should engage in intrigues or conspiracies. But he should be distinctly apprised that his being permitted to remain at Bombay depends on these two conditions".³ The India Board also agreed with the decision of Dalhousie regarding the disbursement for his passage and the debts.

¹C.O. to C.O. 17.10.50. No. 57 of D.S.L. 1st Series, Vol. 27.

²S.C. to C.O. in C. 5.10.50. D.D.S.L.I. Vol. 19, No. 1430.

³I.B. to C.O. in C. 22.1.50. No. 4 of P.L.I. Vol. 16.

In April 1851, the Bombay Government apprised the Agha Khan of the decision of the Court of Directors.¹ The Agha Khan on April 18, wrote a letter to the Bombay Government expressing his gratitude and informed them that, "By the blessing of God all the people of Persia are happy during the reign of the Present King and the administration of the present Minister, and that with the exception of praying for the perpetual existence of the Persian estate, I would not do any other thing which might lead to intrigues or conspiracies".²

In June 1851, the Government of India informed Col. Shoril of their decision.³ It appears that there were no further complaints of intrigues by the Agha Khan in Persia and Shoril did not consult the Persian Government.⁴ The Agha Khan continued to live in Bombay with his numerous followers and to receive his allowances from the Indian Government.⁵ In Bombay some of his followers opposed his personal control of the affairs of the community and as a consequence

¹O.S. in C. to S.O. 17.4.50. No. 35 of S.S.L. Vol. 23.

²The Agha Khan to S.G.B. 18.4.51. No. 23 of S.P. Persian letters, Range 419, Vol. 3.

³See India Secret Proceedings, Vol. 169, No. 1, of 12.3.51 of 27 June 1851. Political letters from India, Vol. 20, No. 23 of 19 Aug. 1851.

⁴I have consulted P.O. 60 on Persia and P.R.P. for the relevant years but have found no further references.

⁵The Agha Khan died in 1851 in Bombay. His descendants were given some allowance by the Indian Government, see Tawakkil, N., *Agha Khan and his descendants*, p.62.

164

the Agha Khan was involved in disputes with his community, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

This prolonged and lengthy correspondence between the Governments involved, on the question of the Agha Khan's asylum in India, sheds light on the differences between the Bombay and the Indian Government and between the Indian and the British Governments in England, in their policies towards Persia. There appears to be some substance behind the belief that the Bombay Government had continued to support the policy of the Indian Government, which was advocated from the time of John Malcolm's second mission to Persia in 1808 onwards, of holding a dominant strategic position in the Persian Gulf from which it would be possible to throw the south of Persia into confusion in case of any dispute with the Persian Government about the defence of India.¹ In 1842, with this policy in mind, Henry Rawlinson, of the Bombay army, whilst writing a report on the Agha Khan, had suggested to the Governor General the political importance of keeping the Agha Khan in India.² Despite the orders of the Indian Government regarding the removal of the Agha Khan to Calcutta from 1844 to 1847, the Bombay Government had evaded any action.³ There is

¹ Mayo, Life of Sir John Malcolm, Vol. I, pp. 369-450.
Watson, History of Persia, p. 159-163.

² See Chapter III, p. 70.
Rawlinson to O.C. 20.12.42, S.S.L.I. 91, No. 22 of No. 12 of 19 Feb. 1843.

³ See Chapter IV.
O.C. to C. 7.7.47, S.S.L.I. IV. 44 of 7 July 1847.

no direct evidence to suggest, in fact, that the continued delays in sending the Agha Khan to Calcutta were due to more than the slow processes of government and the evasiveness of the Agha Khan but it is difficult to believe that if the Bombay Government had been sincerely in support of the policy of H.M. Government towards Persia, they could not have arranged matters more quickly. In 1869, on the question of allowing the Agha Khan to stop at Nascent, the Bombay Government had disagreed with the Indian Government and had tended to show interest in what one might call the Malcolm policy towards Persia, which, it seems the Indian Government had then abandoned.

Further it is clear, from the discussions between Palmerston and Hobhouse, that the Foreign Office, in view of the disturbed state of Persia, recommended the detention of the Agha Khan in India but refused the request of the Governor General for H.M. Government to share in the payment of the allowances to the Agha Khan. The Government of India then seems to have taken the view that since they were to be left with the bill they would decide on the place of residence. Bombay was therefore fixed despite the previously expressed wishes of the Government of Persia. It would appear then that the disagreement about finance led to a slight change in policy toward the Agha Khan and to his eventual settlement in Bombay. This would tend to indicate again that there were limits to the extent to which India could be made to serve the purposes of Britain's Indian policies.

Chapter VII

The Agha Khan and His Community in India 1847-1958.

This chapter deals with the Agha Khan's position as the religious head of the Ismaili community in India. The community was divided into two groups. After his arrival in India, one group filed a case against him in the Bombay High Court. Justice J. Arnould in 1856, gave a historical judgment in favour of the Agha Khan which gave legal recognition to his position as the sole head of the sect. The significance of the Arnould Judgment is discussed here.¹

Long before the arrival of the Agha Khan in India, there flourished a community of Ismailis, known as Khojahs.² According to the traditions of the community, Khojahs were originally Hindus, and were converted by a certain Dai (a propagandist) Pir Asdrubbin, who was sent to India by one of the Ismaili Imams in the 15th Century.³ The Ismailis of Sind claim that they migrated from Persia

¹ Most of the Judicial records of this period are in Bombay. I have consulted published reports, newspapers, gazettes etc. I have been able to trace very few original sources in London.

² The beginning of the Ismaili propaganda in India goes back to 8th Century. See, Muslims... in Northern India, 1956. 'Khojah' meaning 'the honourable or worshipped converts', see Iqbal Ali, The Origins of Shalihi, p.2.

³ Gazetteer of the Ashtar District, p. 36, Vol. II, Part VI, 1899. See, The Survey Collected and Classified, 5 Aug. 1899, Map Directorate, p.112 - 13 Jan. 1899.

15

after the general massacre of the Ismailis by the Mongols in 1256.¹ In 1565, there were about 2,000 families of Ismailis in Sind, and 5,000 in Kathiawar. There were considerable numbers in Cutch and in Gujarat, about 2,000 families in Bombay, 400 in Nascent, some in Kekra, Guader and about 400 in Zanzibar. (The Khojahs of Zanzibar had migrated from India probably in the early 19th Century²). Probably as a result of their being settled principally among Hindu communities, they practised like many other religious groups some Hindu customs. "Although they call themselves Mussalmans, they evidently know but little of their Prophet and of the Koran; they call themselves Shias to a Shia and Sunnaya to a Sunnay, and they probably neither know nor care anything as to the distinctive doctrines of either of these great civilisations of the Musselman world".³ The Ismailis of India were not only in the habit of transmitting contributions to their Imam from 'time immemorial', but they also made pilgrimages into Persia for the same

¹ Burton, R. Report on "Sindh and the Races" 29 Dec. 1847, Selection from Records of Bombay Government No. 17, Part II, p. 647, Bombay 1889.

² Froude, J. British Mission to East Coast of Africa. 1872-73, Parliamentary Papers 1873, Vol. 61 pp. 30-103. Froude, J., "The Vicar of the Disciples of the Old Man of the Mountain", Macmillan's Magazine, London 1875, p. 431.

See: Stanley, W.W. The Lost Tribes of Israel, pp. 6-7, London, 1878. Larimer, J.B., The Jews of the Persian Gulf, Vol. II, p. 102.

³ Parry, E., The Oriental Slave, p. 114.

115

of beholding (*vidar*) and doing homage to them.¹ The oldest surviving account books of the community, those of Sind from 1772, and of Kathiswar from 1782, were put in evidence before Arnould. These proved that the Khojas had been sending collections of voluntary contributions periodically to the fathers of the Agha Khan in Persia, "in the earliest and ruder times in the form of coin or treasure sent by special messengers (called Raics) in leatheren bags called 'Jowlies', afterwards, as commercial facilities increased, by means of boudies (bills of exchange), principally drawn upon and cashed at Russet".² Regarding pilgrimages, the earliest known contacts go back to the 18th century. Some graves of Indian Ismailis have been found near Meshk in Persia. They had apparently come for Dian and died there.³ The traveller, James Baillie Fraser, reported that in 1818, some Indian Ismailis were killed in an affray that took place in Yazd.⁴ In the oral

¹ The Ismailis paid 1/10th of their earnings to the Imam. See Zumbi-
linson's Report on the Agha Khan, 20.12.42, E.S.L.I. 91, No. 22
of No. 12 of 19th Feb. 1843.

² Arnould Judgment in the Agha Khan Case, p. 15.

³ Tammam to Bharatpur, pp. 376-77, London 1825; also see Von Hammer's
History of the Ismailis, trans. Wood, C.B., p. 211, London, 1893.

⁴ Arnould Judgment in the Agha Khan Case, p. 15. See also Tammam
to Bharatpur, 20.3.42, 20.4.42, 20.5.42, 20.6.42, 20.7.42,
October 1844.

⁵ e.g. Gazette of India, Aug. No. 1, 1722 and others. See Tammam "Tomb of 1400
Sufiyan Tasseer", E.S.L.I. 91, p. 49-52, vol. XIV, p. 127.

testimony which was given before Arnould, one witness gave a narrative of a pilgrimage that he made in 1895-97 to Kirman, with other Ismailis of India number 500. They made offerings to the Agha Khan, amounting to £2,000. These offerings were delivered personally to the Agha Khan, but collections were also made in India by the agents of the Imam of the time and sent back to him in Persia.¹

The Ismailis lived in a close community life. Their Prayer Houses, called Jamat Khana, were social centres and were administered by their elders appointed by the Imam of the time. In marriage and funeral rites, they followed some Sunni practices out of Takfir, that is adopting alien religious ceremony out of dread of persecution for religion's sake.²

The Agha Khan's first recorded exchange with the Indian Ismailis had in it elements of controversy. In 1887, a group of Ismailis in Bombay refused to make the customary payment to the Agha Khan. The Agha Khan, who was then in Persia, in order to overcome this opposition, sent to Bombay as his special agent one Mirza Hashim Qasim, who was accompanied by the Agha Khan's grandfather, Karim Rumi, "who herself appears to have harmonized the Bombay Khojas" in support

¹ Arnould, Document in the Agha Khan Case, p. 15. See, The Agha Khan to Maunughton, 25.6.41, H.S.L.L. 80, No. 44 or No. 51 of 31st Oct. 1841.

² Committee of the Bombay Presidency, p. 35, Vol. IX, Part II.

of the claims of the Agha Khan.¹ It was in the course of these proceedings that Mirza Abdul Qasim filed a Bill, on behalf of the Agha Khan, for the purpose of enforcing the payment by a decree of the then Supreme Court.² The Bill, however, was not proceeded with and on 22nd July, 1850, was dismissed from the Court. Arnould commented on the reasons for this. He suggested that because the Agha Khan himself was in Foreign he "was in all probability very imperfectly informed as to the inferences that would be drawn in an English Court from the attempt to enforce by legal process such payments as these. As he did not prosecute the suit, the fair and reasonable inference is that, on being more correctly informed, he found he had adopted a mistaken course and consequently abandoned the proceedings".³

The Agha Khan then directed the recusants to be excommunicated in the Jamat Khana and on their continued refusal to pay the dues, according to the community's practice, twelve Ismailis were turned out. These twelve Ismailis were then called Barmah, that is, "twelve brothers". They were not allowed to enter the Jamat Khana or to parti-

¹ Arnould Judgment in the Agha Khan Case, p. 17.

² Ibid. I have failed to trace this Bill now. Under the Bombay Presidency had a Mayor's Court from 1725-1793. This was then changed to a Recorder's Court, 1793-1824, then to Supreme Courts 1824-1861, then High Court. See Jain, H.P., The Caliphate of Sayyid Ali Muhammad, p. 200 Delhi, 1963. Cowell, H., The Muslim and Hindu Communities of Bengal and Bihar, 1905, p. 26, 3rd edition Calcutta, 1905.

³ Arnould Judgment in the Agha Khan Case, p. 17.

cipate in any other social activities of the Community of Bombay.¹ However, in 1855, they applied for re-admission and on their agreeing to pay their dues (with arrears) they were re-admitted into the community.²

After the arrival of the Agha Khan in India, the community was again divided. In 1847, when the Agha Khan was sent to Calcutta by the British Government, litigation was carried on in Bombay in which the question of the rights of female inheritance among the Ismailis was brought before the Supreme Court of Bombay. Sir Brokman Perry, the Chief Justice of the Bombay Supreme Court, presided over a succession case of a certain "Mirbae and Others v. Sonabao" where plaintiff Mirbae wanted to obtain a declaration from the court that, according to the custom, she, as a Muhammadan female, was entitled to a share of her father's property. The defendant set the demand by a plea that all the parties to the suit belonged to a certain exclusive sect (the Ismailis) and that in India, according to their custom, females were not entitled to any share of their father's property.³ In this case, the Agha Khan was represented by his brother Mohammed Baqir Khan, who endeavoured to uphold the rule of inheritance

¹"An Appeal to the British Legislature by Khojas of Bombay". London 1854. See Goolam Ali, Z., A Voice from India, Karachi 1952.

²Arnold Jijina in the Agha Khan Case, p.17.

³Perry, E. The Indian判例集, p. 719 Old Series, Vol. XV, Madras, 1912. See also Mangji v. Thaver Malia (1869) Vol. I, M.R.S.A., 371. Disinheritance of daughter was a Hindu custom.

as laid down in the Quran.¹ The Bar-Masis were active in this case of inheritance and supported the argument of the defendant and had refused to conform to the opinions of the Agha Khan.²

Perry made a detailed study of the oral evidence that was taken during the course of the hearing and referred to Henry Rawlinson's Report on the Agha Khan and the doctrines of the Ismaili faith. The inquiry revealed that there was little or no conflicting testimony as to the existence of a custom such as was stated in the plea. The principal question arose whether such custom was valid or not. Perry referred to the existing considerable difference of opinion amongst Jurists as to what the foundations of customary law were.³ He, therefore, according to the precedent of the British courts in India concluded that, "If a custom otherwise valid is found to prevail among a race of Eastern origin and non Christian faith, a British court of justice will give effect to it, if it does not conflict with any express act of the legislature".⁴ He also pointed out that

¹On the subject of the differences between the Shia and Sunni law of inheritance see Vyasa, L.L.B., Ismaili Law of Inheritance and Outlines of Muhammadan Law.

²Arnould Judgment in the Agha Khan Case, p.17.

³See cited Professor Austin and Sir William Blackstone for his argument. See also, Lickey, S., "Law" in O'Malley's Modern India and the West, p. 107. London: 1941.

⁴Perry, B., The Oriental Cases, p.110.

the succession to an inheritance was one of those subjects on which the English Legislature had not thought fit to introduce any general enactment. He supported the custom of the Khojahs and the judgment was in favour of the defendants.

This judgment led to fresh feuds among the community. The Bar-Shai, having supported the defendants in this case, organised themselves in a separate group after the judgment. In 1845, they were excommunicated again, from the general body of the Ismailis, for their refusal to conform to the opinions of the Aga Khan. This time the seceders established themselves in a separate Jamat Khana in Bombay, although following in other respects the same doctrine and practices as the rest of the Ismailis of India.¹

In November 1850, a tragic event arising out of these feuds occurred in one of the Jamat Khanas in Bombay. On the last day of the Isharren mourning, four Ismailis of the Bar-Shai party were murdered by several Agha Khan Ismailis, 19 of whom were tried in the criminal court and four were hanged in December 1850.² In the same year information and a Bill were filed by the Bar-Shai party, in the Bombay Supreme Court for the declaration of their rights in

¹See Aga Khan to Perry 4.4.49, Perry to the Aga Khan, 28.4.49, B.P. Persian Letters, Hongs 418, vol. 73 p. 62-63, p. 8-9, also B.C. IV, 1.1.69, No. 17 of No. 26 of 16 Feb. 1945, see also Judicial letters from Bombay vol. 14, No. 52 of 16 Dec. 1850.

²The Bombay Gazette and News, 12.12.1850. Law intelligence of Supreme Court, 19.12.1850. See also: Voice from India, an appeal to the British Legislature 1854/ p. 19 of the Green Letter of 1857 by Ismail Ali.

17

the community. The Bombay Ismailis had their own burial ground and a few other communal properties for the benefit of the Ismailis. From the time of his arrival in Bombay in 1843, the Aga Khan himself used to take part in the management of the affairs of his followers. Moreover the Bar-Sahi succeeded in getting a declaration in their favour by Justice Perry in 1851. He declared that every Khojeh be he a Sunni or a Shi'a, had a right to go to the Jamat Khana for worship and to use the communal property. He also declared that the Aga Khan had no right to exclude any person from the privileges of the use of the communal property, "the claim of such right", said Perry, "is not supported by the Koran, nor does it find any sanction in English Law."¹ Perry also expressed a hope, whilst declaring the rights, that the community would manage their affair among themselves without further application to the court. This had the effect of producing a state of peace. The new Jamat Khana was abandoned and the secedors were readmitted to the old community.²

In 1861 the disaffected party began again to criticise the Aga Khan and his management of the affairs of the Ismailis. They published under pseudonyms articles and letters to the editors of

¹An Appeal to the British Legislature of 1854? The Times of India, 24.4.1852.

²Judicial letter - Vol. 10 no. 55 of 2 April 1851. Account contained in the Calcutta Times, p.17.

various Bombay daily newspapers, denouncing the authority of the Aga Khan over his followers. They claimed that the Khojias were from an exclusive Sunni sect of Islam and that the Shah Aga Khan was a stranger and a tyrant.¹

In October 1861, the Aga Khan published a circular in which he expressed his desire to bring the Khojias to conform to the practices of the Shia Ismaili creed of his 'holy ancestors', regarding marriage ceremonies, ablutions, funeral rites etc.² The reason, the Aga Khan gave, was that under the English Government the exercise of all religion was free and that the Khojias who had followed some of the Sunni and Hindu practices out of prudence, should now not openly according to their Shia Ismaili faith. The circular ended thus, "He who may be willing to obey my orders shall write his name in this book that I may know him".³ Copies of the document were kept at the house of the Aga Khan's son in Bombay for signatures and were circulated in other places, such as Sind, Kathiawar, Cutch and Zanzibar. Except for a small minority in Bombay and Kathiawar an almost unanimous acceptance was received from the Khojias.

¹The Bombay Times and Standard 30.4.1861, 4.5.1861, 8.5.1861, 11.5.1861.

²Arnould Judgment in the Aga Khan case, p.16-17.

³Ibid., p.17.

The issue of the circular was regarded by the members as a fresh declaration of disagreement. They considered it a move on the part of the Aga Khan to change their ancestral religion. They formed a group called 'the Reformers' Society'¹, and stopped paying their dues and in June 1852, filed another information and Bill in, what was now, the Bombay High Court. The great object of this new litigation was to obtain an authoritative declaration, that the Khojahs in their origin were Sunnis and that no Shiah was entitled to any share or interest or voice in the management of the trust or the public property belonging to the Khojah community of Bombay or elsewhere in India.² The proceedings of the Reformers led to retaliatory movements among the majority Khojahs. In August 1852, a meeting of the whole community was announced, which the Reformers were invited to attend. The Reformers did not attend the meeting and subsequently they were excommunicated.³

In 1864, an appeal to the British Legislature was brought in London by a Reformer who was then settled in England, on behalf of the Reformers' Society.⁴ In the appeal, the writer of which is un-

¹ In the 20th century they adopted the name of 'WIDIES'.

² *Unshould Judgment in the Aga Khan case*, p.18.

³ *The Pioneer of India*, 19.8.1853, 2.9.1853, 4.9.1853.

⁴ In London it was published by Watkinson in 1864. It is a collection of various editorials in the Bombay newspapers, especially written by An Englishman and also of some of the letters and articles written by the Reformers in Bombay. It was republished along with other works of the Reformers to the Aga Khan III in 1959 by Farhan Ali, in Marathi.

known, the preface stated, "Firstly that it may direct the attention of the British Legislature to the facts which ought to come under the cognizance and consideration of Government. Secondly, that the result of such considerations may lead to the expulsion of Aga Khan from Bombay, which would not only be a simple act of justice, but a great boon to the community over which he now tyrannises with such baneful effect".¹ The number of the Reformers had now risen to about 400 families. In April 1866, the Reformers' Society, in continuation of their bill of 1852, filed another bill in the Bombay High Court, headed by their leader Days Mohammed and others, against the whole Khojeh community and the Aga Khan, praying among other things, "that an account may be taken of all property belonging to, or held in trust for the Khojeh community of Bombay... Aga Khan may be restrained from interfering in the management of the trust property and affairs of the Khojeh community etc."²

This case is described as 'the great Khojeh case' or 'the Aga Khan case' of 1866. The case was heard by Sir Joseph Arnould, the Chief Justice of the Bombay High Court.³ A great deal of information

¹ An Appeal to the British Legislature, p.1.

² S.C.R. No. 12, p. 323, Advocate-General ex. rel. Days Mohammed & Mohammed Hussain Deenay 1875. The text of the judgment was not published in the Bombay High Court Reports till 1879. The Times of India published the full text - 13-23 November 1866.

³ Sir Joseph son of the owner of White Cross in Borivali, went to Bedford and was the Bedford prize for English Literature. He called to the Bar in 1842, and wrote a number of books on law. He accepted a seat on the bench of the Supreme Court Bombay in 1853, see LMS Vol. XXX p. 78.

concerning the suit was elicited. The Aga Khan and his numerous supporters presented and defended their claim by bringing in all the records of their community in oral and written evidence. The Bombay High Court paid particular attention to the following questions:

"First - What are the Sunnis as distinct from the Shias?

Secondly - Who and what are the Shia Imams Ismailis?

Thirdly - Who and what is the first defendant Aga Khan?

Fourthly - Who and what (independently of their distinctive religious belief) are the Khojas, and what are and have been their relations with the first defendant and his ancestors?

Fifthly - What have been the relations of the first defendant, Aga Khan, with the particular community to which the relator and plaintiff belong, viz.: the Khoja community of Bombay.¹

The argument in the case and the examination of the witnesses and the evidence lasted twenty five days. Almost the whole of the Bombay Bar was employed in the case. The Advocates T.C. Anstey, A.R. Scobie, and the Judge A.G. Macpherson appeared for the Relators and the Advocates J.P. Green, L.H. Bayley, S.J. Howard and S. McCulloch for the defendants.²

¹ Arnould Judgment in the Aga Khan case, p.5.

² Amd., p.1.

174

Arnould considered the previous judgments of Perry of 1847 and 1851 regarding the Rights of the community (see pp. 172-4), and consented that he was called upon to decide and pronounce judgment upon almost the same questions. But the question of whether the Khojahs were by origin Shia or Sunni had not been decided before, nor had the position of the Agha Khan as the religious head of the community been in question then. Therefore the principal question in the suit was whether the Khojahs in their origin as a separate religious community were Sunnis or non-Sunnis - Sunni or Shia Ismaili Ismailis, bound or not bound by ties of spiritual allegiance to the Imams of the Ismaili Ismaili the Agha Khan.¹

During the proceedings, the history of the Sunnis, Shias and the Shia Ismaili Ismailis and their historical differences were examined in detail through various historical works.² The Agha Khan's pedigree and his relations with the Ismailis of India were also examined. Regarding the activities of the Agha Khan in Persia and his subsequent flight not much was brought to light; even his career in Afghanistan

¹ Arnould Sub-memb in the Agha Khan case, p.5.

² Those include: Cobley, S., History of the Saracens, Cambridge 1797. Gibbon, E., Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, London 1776-88. Chardin, J., Voyage du Chevalier Chardin au Perse, Paris 1611, 10 vols. Herodotus, J., Historiae, trans. by G. C. Macaulay, 1800-1809, London 1812. Herodotus, R., Historiae in Persian, London 1811-22. von Hammer, J., Iranianische Geschichte, Stuttgart 1816, French trans. 1827, English trans. from French by Wood, C. H., London 1799. de Saixy, S., Essai sur la Religion des Turcs, Paris 1802. Kinnaird, J. M., History of Persia, London 1808. Watson, R. C., Muslim Caliphate, London 1868. One copy without name mentioned in the Judgment, was exhibited as evidence.

and Sind was misrepresented.¹ But as far as the Judgment in the case was concerned his religious claims were more important. A good deal of theological material concerning Ismailism was discussed by Anstey and Howard, especially the book Bawatir attributed to the Pir Sadruddin, who converted the Khojhas. The court established that Pir Sadruddin was a Shia Ismaili and he converted the Hindus to a Shia Isma'ili faith. It was also proved on oral evidence that the Pir had not discouraged the practice of some Hindu rites and the observance of Sunni forms in matters of marriage, funerals etc. Arnould observed that the Khojhas had carried on these practices by way of Takia and had concealed their own religious views and had adopted alien religious ceremonies out of dread of persecution for religion's sake.²

It was also proved that the Khojhas were in the habit of making voluntary contributions to the Agha Khan alone and that the Agha Khan was willing to receive them. Arnould pointed out that the Court could not issue any order against that. Arnould also declined to grant an injunction on the question of the Agha Khan's interference in the affairs of the community, on the ground that the Agha Khan was the spiritual

¹ Arnould thought that the Agha Khan first came to Sind after leaving Russia, and from Sind came to Afghanistan.

² Arnould cited a chapter from Edinburgh's History of India, 5th edition, 1856, on Akbar's divine Mausoleum, regarding the punishment of a certain Jullu for not observing Takia.

111

descendant of the Ismaili Imam and as such he was within his religious pretensions to exercise his authority over his followers. On 12th of November 1856, Arnould delivered a judgment in the favour of the Aga Khan and his supporters.¹

Thus the Aga Khan was legally recognised as the Spiritual head of the Ismailis in India. During his life time his authority was not challenged by any of his followers in India or in Persia, Syria, Muscat, Central Asia, Afghanistan or in Cambay.² However the judgment of British Courts of law may not be acceptable in countries where there is an independent law.³

As far as the Reformers' Society was concerned, they remained separate from the rest of the Ismailis. In 1857, they filed an appeal to the Privy Council in Bombay against the decree of 13th November, 1856. On March 14, 1868 the petition was dismissed by the Bombay High Court.⁴ The Reformers' Society was basically against the fundamental

¹ *B.M.G.R.*, Vol. 12, p. 320, Bombay 1879.

See also Editorial, *The Times of India*, Bombay 15-16, November 1856.

² In 1856, a complaint was received by the Government of Bombay that some Khojehs who at Matvah were being ill-treated by their masters in order to make them join in the succession from the Aga Khan, and that these proceedings were countenanced by the Sultan of Oman. Bombay however showed that the complaint referred to the case of one Khojeh woman only who was a subject of the Sultan, and the master was stripped.⁵ See Lorimer, *The Peacock Throne*, p. 1979 f., Part II of Vol. I, Calcutta, 1915. In 1901, a case was filed by a certain Yaqi Sidi, a relative of the Aga Khan in Bombay, against the third Aga Khan, in which he demanded a share in the offerings. According to the Islamic law the offerings made to the Aga Khan by his followers were held to be inv-

15

principle of Ismailism, that is to follow the guidance of the living Imam. The Society had some programme of modernizing the community without the interference of the Aga Khan, which was rejected by the Orthodox Aga Khanis.¹ However the weddah Ismailis, under the guidance of the Aga Khan and his descendants continue to follow the principle of the presence of a living Imam in all ages. Under the Shariat Act of 1937, the Ismailis of India are now governed by the Muhammadan Law in their personal matters.²

(cont.) tended for his own personal use and benefit and his absolute property, made from feeling of veneration and to reap benefit of temporal or spiritual character. See Balak, Vol. II, p. 406, also Tyabji, F., Muhammadan Law, section 369-A; p. 397 of 3rd Edn., Bombay 1940.

³ Today Courts in India and Pakistan follow the precedence of the British Courts of Law in India.

⁴ Z.M.C.H.Wpp. 205-S, Bombay 1868.

¹ An Appeal to Lord Hardinge the Governor of Bombay, 1901, see Socio-
A.M., An open letter, Karachi, 1927 and 1935. In this appeal, the non-
orthodox have explained their difference with the Orthodox Aga
Khanis, also their aims and objects. They have given an account of
various heretics that had followed in the community since 1866. Some
new Reformers have joined Sunni Islam and Shia Ithna'isnis.

² Dyeas, A.A. Principles of Muhammadan Law, p. 37.

CONTINUATION

Since 1900, a number of popular books have been published about the life of the third Agha Khan, Sir Sultan Muhammad Shah which have a chapter on the ancestors of the third Agha Khan.¹ But very little has been written about the first Agha Khan, and his career. The first Agha Khan, after settling in Bombay, devoted his time to horse breeding and racing and his name was often found on the Bombay trophies. In 1870 and 1875 when the Duke of Edinburgh (A. E. Albert) and the Prince of Wales (Edward VII) visited India, the Agha Khan invited them to his Palace in Bombay and showed them his horses. In Bombay, the Agha Khan often entertained the Rajas and Maharajas and some British officers. The income which he received from the wealthy Ismaili community was the foundation of his glamorous career. The writings of Dummer, Greenwall and Jackson carry mostly sporting and popular themes of his life.² In 1954, the third Agha Khan published his memoirs in which he devoted a few pages to the life of his grandfather, but he made no new contribution to historical knowledge. The first Agha Khan in 1851, wrote his memoirs in Persian, in which he described his

¹Dumain, H., A Brief History of the Agha Khan, Bombay 1903.
 Dumain, H., The Life and Times of His Holiness, Bombay 1935.
 Greenwall, H. J., The Memoirs of the Agha Khan, London 1952.
 Jackson, S., The Agha Khan: His Life and Workings, London 1952.
The Memoirs of the Agha Khan, London 1955.

activities of the years 1837-1850, in only two pages of no interest.¹

During the proceedings of the Agha Khan case in 1856, in the Bombay High Court a good deal of material was exhibited. Unfortunately I have not been able to see the evidence presented in the case, only the text of the Judgment delivered by Joseph Arnould. The Judgment itself throws much light on the relations of the Agha Khan with his community and his religious position, but so far as the career of the Agha Khan in Persia and Afghanistan and his relations with the British government are concerned the Judgment has very little to offer.

European travellers of the early 19th century contributed some factual details on the origin of the Agha Khan and some of his activities in Persia.² Watson utilized Persian histories and added some knowledge on the rebellions of the Agha Khan in Persia. The role of the Agha Khan in British policy in Persian and Indian diplomacy, was minor and its details remained shrouded. Duncraig used the India office records in 1939, and threw some light on the Agha Khan's re-

¹The work was lithographed in Bombay.

See Ivanow, A., *A Guide to Persian Literature*, p. 11; London and Teheran 1905. See Sati, H., *and Khajeh Shahrestani*, Teheran 1923.

²Pennier, J.B., *A Narrative of Journey into Khorasan*, pp. 376-77; Kincaid, J.M., *An Anthropological Article*, p. 197-8.
Malcolm, J., *The History of Persia*, p. 407-8, Vol. I.
Morier, J., *A Journey Through Persia*, p. 359, Vol. II.
Porter, R., *Travels in Persia*, pp. 286-88, Vol. I.
Watson, E.O., *A History of Persia*, p. 333.

lations with the British during the First Afghan war. However his emphasis was directed towards showing that the Agha Khan was a faithful ally of the British government. He quoted some of the letters of the Agha Khan but did not assess them in the proper perspective. The book has no source references.

The rebellion of the Agha Khan in Persia gave rise to some misunderstandings. It was rumoured that he was assisted by the British in this revolt. I have consulted the Foreign Office records on Persia and the India Office Factory records to assess the possible contacts of the Agha Khan in the proper perspective of the policies pursued by the governments involved. I have however discovered more details concerning the services of the Agha Khan at Qandahar as a British ally. Rawlinson's Political Diaries and Journals at the Archives of the Royal Geographical Society helped me to supplement the meagre accounts in the official proceedings.

The problem of the control of the Mission in Persia was referred to in the introduction. The career of the Agha Khan sheds some light on the way in which policy towards Persia was shaped. The question of his asylum in India shows the financial disagreement between the Foreign Office and the Board of Control and the policy disagreement between the Government of India in Bengal and the Government in Bombay.

Apart from certain details derived from Elliot-Brough's private papers, my contribution is based upon the official government

records. I have not been able to use the Hardinge private papers for my exposition.

Lastly, in examining the relations of the Agha Khan with his community in India, I have avoided discussions of theological differences but have tried to assess their historical significance through the published sources, especially the Judgment. The Agha Khan's encounter with the Baluchis at Jerrak has given rise to some miraculous versions among his followers. I have been able to give the details of the encounter through the writings of Kayser and other official records.

BIBLIOGRAPHYI. MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

a) In the India Office Records at Commonwealth Relations Office.

Boards Drafts of Secret letters to India 2 series:

(1) 1838-1856

(2) 1856-1855

Bombay Secret letters 2 series:

(1) 1838-1854

(2) 1859-1857

Bombay Political letters 1841-1854.

Bombay Proceedings - Persian letters 1846-1855.

Enclosures to Secret letters from Bombay 1838-1854.

Enclosures to Secret letters from India 1837-1854.

Factory Records, Persia 1837-1854.

India Political letters 1850-1854.

Judicial letters from Bombay 1847-1856.

Political letters to India 1830-1854.

Drafts of Previous Communications. 1851.

Secret and Political Memorandum on Afghanistan A.W.C.2.

Secret Home Correspondence. 1839-1854.

Board's Collection 1838/1851/2-90

- b) In the Public Record Office.
 P.O. 60 (Persia) 1837-1854.
 Private MSS. Milnerborough Papers. P.R.O. 50/12.
- c) In the Archives of the Royal Geographical Society.
 MSS. Journals and Political Diaries of Henry Rawlinson.
- d) In the India Office Library.
 Roerty, H.C., The Nizam. A brief history of the rise
 of the Nizam's State, MSS. Eur. C.37.
 Outram, J., MSS. notes on G. Napier's Administration
 of Scinde, MSS. Eur. B. 114.
- e) London University theses (unpublished)
 Adeniyat, F., Diplomatic Relations of Persia with Britain,
 Turkey and Russia, 1815-30, Ph.D. 1949.
 Yapp, R. E., British policy in Central Asia, 1870-1917,
 Ph.D. 1959.

IV PRINTED SOURCES

- a) Papers and Reports.
1. Parliamentary Papers:
 - Afghanistan - H.C. 1843, Vol. XXIV, Nos. 425, 495.
 - Afghanistan - H.C. 1843, Vol. XXVII, No. 574
 - Persia, 1839, 1841, H.C. XXXIX, Nos. 450, 539.
 - Fraser Mission to West Africa 1873. Vol. II, No. 51.

2. Newspapers:

Bombay Advertiser and Courier. 1847-1851.

Bombay Times and Standard. 1850-1862.

Bombay Times of India. 1862-1863.

3. Reports:

Bombay High Court Reports 1861-1879.

Bombay Law Reporter 1909.

b) Printed Books and Articles:

Abbot, A., Afghan War 1878-79, London 1879.

Alidina, S., Sarif-i-Jahan (in Sindhi), Karachi 1952.

Allen, I. W., Diary of a March through India and Afghanistan, London 1843.

Aitchison, C.U., A collection of treatises, Vol. XII, Calcutta, 1909.

Arnould, J., Judgments in the Amritsar case, Bombay 1857.

Ballhatchet, K., Social Policy and Social Change in Western India, London 1957.

Bell, H.F.C., Palmerston (2 vols), London 1936.

Bellot, H.W., Afghanistan, London 1879.
History of Afghanistan, 1880.

Bombay Legislative Committee, Vol. IX, Part II, Bombay 1869.

Browne, E.O., A Literary History of Persia, Vol. IV, London 1824.

Bruce, H., Life of Verdi, London 1885.

- Brydges, H.J., Dynasty of the Nizam, London 1853.
- Biddulph, J., Traces of the Hindoo Koosh, Calcutta 1860.
- Buist, G., Operations in Sindia and Afghanistan, Bombay 1843.
- Burton, R., Sindia and the tribes that inhabit the Valley of Indus, London 1851.
- Spirits on the unhappy Yellow (2 vols.), London 1851.
- Cambridge History of India, Vols. 5 & 6 (ed. H. Dodwell) Cambridge 1889.
- Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy, Vol. II (ed. A. W. Ward) Cambridge 1895.
- Campbell, G.B., The Indian Mutiny 1857-79, London 1879.
- Cowell, H., The History of Constitution of the Courts and Legislative authority in India, 5th ed. Calcutta 1905.
- Cramley, C.W., "Anglo-Russian Relations 1815-40" Cambridge Historical Journal, 1929.
- Correspondence relating to Persia and Afghanistan, London 1859.
- Curzon, G.N., Persia and the Persian question (2 vols.), London 1892.
- Daniel, V., India and the East, Edinburgh 1860.
- Donaldson, D.M., The British Relation, London 1853.
- Duncraig, F., A Brief History of the Afghans, Bombay 1853.
The Afghans and their invasions, Bombay 1859.

- Durand, H.M., The First Afghan War, London 1879.
- Farghan, J.W., Modern Religious movements in India, New York 1915.
- Farrier, J.P., Cravat Journals, London 1856.
- History of the Afghans, London 1858.
- Fraser, J.B., Journey to Khosrovan, London 1826.
- Travels in Kurdistan, (2 vols) London 1840.
- Travels in Persia, London 1826.
- Froer, B., "The Khojehs, the Disciples of the Old Men of the Mountains", Macmillan's Magazine, XXIV, London 1876.
- Fyson, A.A., The Yomili Day of Mills, Bombay 1933.
- Gleason, J.H., The Gompa of Dapchochin in Great Britain, Cambridge (Mass.) 1930.
- Goolamali, K., An Open letter to H.E. the Am Khan, Karachi 1927.
An Appeal to Mr. Ali Salamat Khan, Karachi 1932.
- Gray, C., Various Adventures in Northern India 1735-1810,
(ed. Garrett) Lahore 1923.
- Hawkins, A.H., The Performance of the Yomili Days in Northern India, Cairo 1936.
- Hodgson, M.G., The Order of Assassins, Groningen 1855.
- Hollister, J.L., The Pirs of India, London 1953.
- Holmes, T.R., The Shikar Hunt, London 1926.

- Holt, P.M., "The treatment of Arab History by Prideaux,
Ogilby and Sale" in Historians of the Middle East
(ed. Lewis and Holt) London 1962.
- Hunter, W.W., Geography of Indian nations, Calcutta, 1871.
- Huttonback, R.A., British Relations with Sind 1799-1843,
California 1962.
- Inabah, A.H., Lord Ellenborough, Cambridge (Mass.) 1939.
- Ivanov, N., A Guide to Persian Literature, London 1935.
A Guide to Persian literature, Teheran 1955.
- "Notes of some Foreign Persian Inns" L.R.B. 1861-
XIV, 1913.
- Alamut and Lamur, Teheran 1900.
- Jain, K.P., Outlines of Indian Local History, Delhi 1952.
- Kaye, J.W., Rawalpindi (1st Edition) (2 Vols) London 1851.
Rawalpindi (3rd Edition) (3 Vols) London 1874.
Life of Sir John Malcolm (2 Vols) London 1836.
- Khadduri, M., Law in Middle East, Vol. 1, Washington 1955.
- Kinnair, J.H., Geographical Memoir, London 1813.
- Lambbrick, H.T., Six Months Doctor and Slave, Oxford 1952.
- Lashtan, A.M., Peasant and Peasant in Russia, London 1953.
- Layard, A.H., Early Monarchs (2 Vols) London 1837.
- Lewis, B., The Origins of Zionism, Cambridge 1940.
- Louis, J.C., Geography of the Persian Gulf (2 Vols) Calcutta 1925.

- Malcolm, J., History of Persia (2 Vols.) London 1825.
- McNeill, J., Progress of Russia, London 1856.
- Memoir of Sir John McNeill by his Granddaughter,
London 1910.
- Memoirs of Agh Khan, London 1954.
- Morier, J.J., Journey through Persia, London 1812.
Second Journey through Persia, London 1818.
- Mosely, P.B., Russian Diplomacy and the Origins of the Eastern
Question 1853-9, Cambridge (Mass.) 1934.
"Russian Policy in Asia 1858-9", Eastern Review
1936, April, Vol. 14, No. 42.
- Muhammed, T., Nasikh-i-Jamiat, vol. Tarikh-i-Safawiyah,
lithograph copy at the Library S.O.A.S.
- Mujtahid Ali, S., The Origins of the Khans and their Political
Life Today, Bonn, 1936.
- Napier, W., Conquest of Scinde, London 1845.
History of Sir G. Napier's Administration of Scinde,
London 1847.
Life of Sir G. Napier (4 Vols.) London 1857.
- Nehru, J., "His Highness the Aga Khan", Modern Review, Calcutta,
November 1935.
- O'Malley, L.S.S. (ed.) Modern India and the West, London 1941.
- Outram, J., Empress of India. A Biography (2 Vols) London 1946.
- Porter, R. Mar., Events in Persia (2 Vols) London 1921-2.

- Perry, E., The Indian Decisions, Old Series, IV, Madras 1912.
- Sketches Illustrative of Oriental Life and the Application of English Law to India, London 1855.
- Rawlinson, G., Life of Sir Henry Rawlinson, London 1898.
- Rawlinson, H., Zedan and Russia in the East, London 1873.
- "Notes on a March from Zobab... in 1836," J.R.G.S., Vol. IX, London 1839.
- "Narrative of Journey through Kurdistan", J.R.G.S., Vol. II, London 1841.
- Sabri, I., Tasrik-i-Sabri, Delhi 1852.
- Sai, N., Aza Khan Nishat-i-Sai - Persian, Tehran 1329 A.H.
- Saldanha, J.A., Extracts of Correspondence regarding the Affairs of the Marathas 1801-1853, London 1905.
- Stanley, E.M., How I Found Mysore, London 1872.
- Storey, C.A., Persian Literature, Vol. I, London 1935-36.
- Selection from the Records of the Bombay Government No. 17,
Part II, New Series, Bombay 1855.
- Sheil, Lady. Life and Works in Persia, London 1896.
- Stacy, L.R., Reportive 1840-42, London 1848.
- Stoeckeler, J.E., Memories of Afghanistan, Calcutta 1843.
- Narrative of Sir H. Nott (2 Vols.) London 1854.
- Sykes, P.H., History of Transoxiana (2 Vols.) London 1840.
The Persian Empire in Persia, London 1902.
- Tyabji and Peis, Maritime Law, 3rd edition Bombay 1940.
- Tyabji, H., Principles of Trade, Bombay 1952.
- Watson, R.O., History of Persia 1800-1850, London 1856.

- Webster, C.M., The Foreign Policy of Palmerston 1830-1861
(2 vols) London 1951.
- Wood, C., A History of Afghanistan by V. Minorsky, London 1955.
- Yapp, K.E., "The Control of the Persian Mission 1822-1856",
Birmingham University Historical Journal No. VII,
1959.
- "Disturbances in W. Afghanistan, 1840-41,"
B.G.A.S., XXVI, 1963.
- Yule, H., Son Marco Polo (3rd Edition) London 1903.

NOTES ON REFERENCES.

In references to printed sources the name of the author and sufficient of the title to identify the book are given, together with the date of publication where necessary. In references to other sources the following abbreviations are used.

A.R.G.S.	Archives of the Royal Geographical Society.
B.C.	Board's Collections.
B.D.S.L.	Board's Drafts of Secret Letters to India.
B.M.C.R.	Bombay High Court Reports.
B.P.	Bombay Proceedings.
B.S.L.	Bombay Secret Letters.
E.M.S.	European Manuscripts (at India Office Library).
E.S.D.B.	Enclosures to Secret Letters from Bombay.
E.S.L.I.	Enclosures to Secret Letters from India.
F.O.	Foreign Office.
F.R.P.	Factory Records. Persia and the Persian Gulf.
G.G. in C.	Governor General in Council.
G. in C.	Governor in Council.
P. in C.	President in Council.
J.R.G.S.	Journal of Royal Geographical Society.
J.B.B.R.A.S.	Journal of Bombay Branch of Royal Asiatic Society.
P.R.O.	Public Record Office.

S.C.	Secret Committee.
S.H.C.	Secret Hand Correspondence.
S.G.I.	Secretary to Government of India.
S.G.B.	Secretary to Government of Bombay.
S.G.S.	Secretary to Government of Sind.
C.S.G.B.	Chief Secretary to Government of Bombay.
Off.S.G.I.	Officiating Secretary to Government of India.

APPENDIX

Statement of Services rendered to the British Government by Agha Khan Nohiatae. (encl: to the Agha Khan's letter to Lord Dalhousie. D. 14th Russel vol Sansc 1264 Higras or 22nd March 1848, D.C.III & No. 3 of 77 of 27.9.48.)

1st The day previous to the action of Khillish [12th January 1848] I received a message from Major Rawlinson to the purport, that although General Mott had declared that as a guest of the British I could not be called upon to serve, yet if not causing me inconvenience it was requested that I should proceed with the General on his March, accompanied by my detachment of Sowars, to this I replied that it would afford no much pleasure to avail myself of the opportunity offered, as I considered all persons hostile to Government as my enemies and would therefore gladly oppose them, I was afterwards directed to state what articles I should require for the use of my servants then in answer to which I mentioned that I was fully prepared to move, [at that time every company wanted for service, obtained a large advance of money] upon hearing my reply the General exclaimed that it was evident I was a person of rank and would eventually be liberally rewarded by Government, on the day of the battle, the army through the grace of God

was defeated, and many Afghans were taken prisoners by my dependents and brought to Major Rawlinson, one of my followers was slain during the night on our march back - .

2nd On the occasion of Capt^R Goldings / 27th December 1841 / being killed and Capt^R Patterson severely wounded by the men under their command, not a single trooper had the courage to leave the city for the purpose of patrolling during the nights, at which time it was customary for the enemy to collect and plunder the suburbs, at last Major Rawlinson enquired whether I would undertake this duty, I willingly promised to do so, three nights afterwards 17th March 1842/ when I was stationed near the garden of Mehr Dil Khan a commd despatch by Akram from a distance of two miles, arrived for the purpose of informing me that the city would be attacked by the Afghan forces either on that night or the next, I communicated this intelligence to Major Rawlinson without delay and the necessary precautionary measures were accordingly adopted, the following morning the General moved out with his army and we advanced towards the rebels, on that day rarely any skirmishing occurred, but during the next the troops were warmly engaged from day break till past noon, when the Infantry became fatigued from heat and thirst and consequently unable to act, although the insurgents still surrounded the Camp, Colonel Macleod was then deputed by the General to ascertain whether my Souars could drive them off, I answered that with the blessing of God, I could not fail to exert myself to the utmost of my

power, I and my followers immediately mounted and with the Divine assistance, and the Company's auspicious fortune, we fought in such a manner that the whole of the Officers and men in Camp were struck with astonishment, and upon our return in the evening welcomed us with shouts of applause, on the succeeding night, information reached Tellookan of the movement made by the Afghans on Kundahar under the impression that it had been left destitute of troops, the next morning therefore the Force countermarched whilst en route, during the whole day we were closely followed by the Afghan horsemen, who made several attacks upon my detachment, about midday my Brother Sirdar Mohamed Bahar Khan shot one of the Afghan leader dead, his men collected round the body of their chief and in the meantime the main body of the British continued their march at the distance of about half a Purwah, but the skirmishing did not cease until evening. After our return to Kundahar as a reward for this service the General presented me with a double barrelled gun and a watch, to one of my brothers he also gave a horse with its trappings and to the other a Jubb or Robe of Khan and for the support of my followers he assigned the Jaghire of Moollah Bushroo yielding an income of 40,000 Rupees per annum.

All the officers who were present at the engagement near cantonments [26-29 May 1842] are well aware that when the Afghan troops were broken by the fire of the Artillery and Infantry

I and my Sowars pursued them for about four Cocoos beyond Baba Nulloo, securing many Captives and heads which were sent to the General, that night one of my dependents named Murree a very brave man was killed in the presence of Major Rawlinson. On the following day I marched out with two Regiments which proceeded to Baba nulloo under the command of Colonel Stacy, the troops encamped at that place, but I accompanied Major Rawlinson to Marunjan a distance of about four cocoos, when the Afghans perceived that we were not supported by the Infantry they advanced in pursuit, the whole of the Afghans and Persian Cavalry in British employ under the orders of Bahadur Khan dispersed and fled, I alone with about thirty or forty followers remained and charged front to the Enemy, although they numbered about a thousand Sabres, they had completely intercepted our retreat, we therefore cut our way through them to a hill called Motili Koorcha, in this affair the Afghans behaved with great intrepidity and our horses were completely knocked up, in fact we were all on the point of being either killed or taken prisoners, when I together with my Brother Sirdar Mohamed Bahadur Khan and one of my Sowars named Behar who is now at Barrackpore dismounted about half way up the mountain and within view of Major Rawlinson I shot the foremost of our pursuers dead, whilst his comrades crowded around the body, my troopers descended the hill and upon being informed of their having reached the fort in safety

I and my two companions followed and rejoined the Major. - This is a brief sketch of my services in the field but I have also secretly been of use to the Government as detailed below. -

When Mohamed Shah besieged Herat one of his writers, named Ahmad forged some bills bearing the signature and seals of the King and his ministers, with the aid of which he obtained money from the Treasury, upon this being discovered His Majesty determined to deprive him of life, but he was not executed in consequence of his representing that he could forge letters apparently written by all the Sirdars in Yar Mohamed Khan's service, to the effect that upon the approach of the Persian Army certain bastions on the ramparts of the city should be surrendered, these documents, being allowed to fall into the hands of the Khan, he would suspect the fidelity of his chiefs and place them under arrest, in which case the troops would mutiny and the fortress be easily captured, however Yar Mohamed Khan and Shah Pasund Khan having become acquainted with the intended strategem it was not carried into effect. - When I arrived at Kundahar I was accompanied by the writer above alluded to, and upon Sufdar Jung and Majorzai Khan (the son of Shah Pasund Khan) escorting Major Rendell and forming a league with the Afghans, I mentioned to that Officer that a person of this description was with me and should he wish it, I would direct him to prepare letters purporting to be from the above mentioned Princes to the Major's address.

stating that they had left the city in obedience to his instructions and with the blessing of God, would despatch Mehtar Ahmad Khan and the head Afghan Sirdars, these papers being forwarded to Mehtar Ahmad Khan, he and the other chiefs would certainly seize Shujah Khan. Two months after the departure of Suder Jung, Major Rawlinson sent for me and said, the Afghans evidently imagine that Shah Shooja is well inclined towards the rebels - You must therefore cause some letters to be forged bearing the Shah's signature and seal and addressed to me, these can be despatched to Suder Jung and Mehtar Ahmad Khan, by which their hopes may be blighted. I accordingly directed the requisite papers to be prepared and forwarded to the insurgents, God knows that immediately after receipt of these documents Mehtar Ahmad Khan and the other Afghans deserted Suder Jung who consequently was obliged to return to Kundhar and tender his submission to the British. Had those been of no importance the Campaign and siege of Kundhar would have undoubtedly been protracted. -

During the period of my stay at Kundhar [about one year] many letters were despatched through the means of my disciples to the officers imprisoned at Nowkara, and the last intelligence received is affirmed that they had expired in Captivity, my veracity in making this statement may be established by referring to Major Rawlinson.

In Scinde I guarded the road between Hyderabad and Narwarra and recovered the Government property which had been plundered from the camp

of Duggur Tatta by the Beloochees. - When the Amoor Shore Mohamed Khan advanced with his army on Hyderabad in accordance with the orders of General Napier. I circulated letters to all the Beloochees inviting them to become subjects of the British Government, I also addressed the Amoor advising him not to risk an action, this paper I despatched by my Hindoo Markee named Kundchance, but he and the servants who accompanied him were killed by the Amoor who instigated the other Beloochees to resist the British - When I had only 30 Sepoys with me at Jerruk and the rest of my followers were detached in parties of about 15 or 20 men at each stage between Hurrachee and Hyderabad, I was suddenly attacked by the Beloochees, six Persians and thirty seven of my disciples were killed and nearly one hundred and fifty wounded, Four of the troopers stationed at Duggur Tatta were killed and the rest dispersed, no loss was sustained by the other detachments some of whom were at Hurrachee under Osey^h. Preddy and the remainder /who were attached to the General at Hyderabad/ employed on duty at Hosypur,

The documents proving my services at Hurrachee were plundered together with the rest of my property at Jerruk by Shore Mohamed Khan Junior, and the Noormilas Tribe, but some of the papers relative to my exertions in Sindoo are still in my possession either here or at Bombay - Previous to the action of Hyderabad I used my utmost endeavours to prevent the engagement taking place and to cause such

arrangements to be entered into so might prove advantageous both to the Mar'ble Company's Gov^t and to the Amirs, the truth of this assertion can be ascertained either by a reference to the letters I forwarded through Sir Charles Napier to Lord Millesborough which can be found amongst the Government records or by instituting enquiries on the subjects from His Highness Moor Moor Mohamed Khan who is still in existence.

True translation

Sr. O. Covenagh Lieut^t.

Sup^r. of the En. Amirs
of Sindde

