

Confederation of Indian States – Continuous Crisis Committee

Agenda - Consolidating the struggle for independence in the wake of the sepoy mutiny

Freeze date: 13th May, 1857





Table of Contents

- Letter from the executive board – Page 3
- The Revolt– Page 4
- Situation in India in 1857– Page 4
- East India Company's Expansion in India – Page 8
- Causes of the Revolt – Page 10
- Outbreak in Meerut and situation in Delhi– Page 13
- Timeline – Page 14
- Situation Across India – Page 15
- Recent events important for Britain– Page 18
- Role of Peasantry and tribes – Page 21
- Aftermath in India – Page 23
- What we expect – Page 24
- Communiques and Treaty – Page 25
- Bibliography-Page 26

MUN

Letter from the Executive Board

Respected delegates,

We are pleased to welcome you to the Daly College Youth Parliament, 2019. It is our pleasure to serve as the executive board of the Confederation of Indian States (Continuous Crisis Committee). We hope that this study guide gives you an insight on the agenda and proves to be useful.

As Indian rulers and leaders, you have been called by the recently proclaimed emperor of India – Bahadur Shah Zafar and the mutinied sepoy of Meerut, to further the cause of Indian independence and help them in their fight against these foreign powers. The fate of the land that would in the future support more than a billion people, now lies upon your shoulders. You will change the course of history, but how you do it is upon you.

The English East India Company, (EEIC) has gained control either directly or indirectly of the entirety of India over the past century. The company has established itself to become the supreme power in India, and thus carrying a revolt against them would require strenuous diplomatic, political, social, economic and military action that is going to be planned by you.

Delegates we expect you to take part in all debates actively and contribute to the committee as much as you can. You must abide by your portfolio's stance at all times. Most importantly, you must be very well rehearsed with the topic and be prepared for anything. Delegates remember as this is a crisis committee, be prepared for any unanticipated scenario. You should note that the committee **begins on 13th May, 1857**. We will maintain the realism of this simulation to the extreme, however we have not limited the information in this guide up to this date. There are notes mentioned multiple times to help you take into account of the data which is beyond this date. However, please note that only information prior to the freeze date shall be held valid in the committee. Nevertheless, you are expected to research past this date as well. The committee will also experience time jumps, where we will advance the timeline of the committee. So come along with your thinking caps on and gain an insight into the precarious situation in India of 1857.

Hope to see you soon!

Rudra Saigal- Chairperson

Sahajveer Singh - Vice Chairperson

Pranayani Singh - Rapporteur

Contact us at: ccc.dryp@gmail.com

The Revolt

Revolt of 1857, which led to the removal of British Company Rule in India, is the display of anger in Indians towards the Foreign Rule. It was the most severe outburst of anger and discontentment accumulated in the hearts of the various sections of the Indian society ever since the inception of the British rule.

By the first half of the 19th century, the East India Company had brought major portions of India under its control. Anger against the unjust and oppressive British Government took the form of a revolt that shook the very foundations of British rule in India, while British historians called it the Sepoy Mutiny, Indian historians named it the Revolt of 1857 or the First War of Indian Independence. The Revolt preceded by a series of disturbances in different parts of the country from the late eighteenth century onwards. Some say that the Revolt of 1857 was just a mutiny initiated by the Indian Sepoys and hence the name Sepoy Mutiny. The soldiers were discriminated on the basis of racism and were paid low salary. But this kind of outbreak happened only when the soldiers were given cartridges which had a coating of grease that was made up of Cow and Pig fat. It was against the religious views of both Hindu and Muslim community. They were given false hopes by the company that all of this is rumour but when it came out to be all true, the soldiers lost their temper and resulted in an event where a soldier called Mangal Pandey (a soldier in the 34th Infantry stationed at Barrackpore), on March 29, 1857 fired at his commander for forcing the Indian troops to use the controversial rifles. Indians constituted a large part of the British army (almost 95%) and the violence against British quickly spread.

Discontent and Resentment against the British rule was growing among the Indians and only a spark was needed to set the country ablaze and that spark was provided by as small thing as a rifle cartridge.

Situation of India in 1857

The Political, Social, Religious, Economic Conditions prevailing at the time of 1857

The East India Company was established in 1600 in England for trade. In 1608 they reached the western coast of India at Surat and there they established an Industrial house. Other European countries as the French, the Portuguese had also come to India in this period for the propose of doing trade with India. The English East India Company had initially started as a trading power but gradually became a political power. The process of establishing itself into a political power is said to have begun with its victory under Robert Clive at the battle of Plassey in 1757 over Siraj-ud-Daula, the Nawab of Bengal. Thereafter the East India

Company started looking for various administrative ways to establish its control over India. The East India Company made many changes in the administrative policy towards India between 1757 to 1857, but simultaneously it also promoted its business and took its profits to Britain. Whatever changes occurred in the economic policies of England, East India Company introduced similar changes in India. Different methods were adopted by it to capture the economy, and in the process it rejected the self-reliant villages of this country, which were the backbone of the Indian economy for centuries. Some methods were the Doctrine of lapse.

Social life and discontent due to social causes

Indian society was divided on the basis of religion language, and castes. The Hindu society was divided into four varnas or classes, which in turn were further divided in myriads of other castes and sub castes. The practice of untouchability was prevalent against the lower castes to such an extent that the lower castes were forbidden to touch the Higher caste Hindus. The Muslims were also divided into different castes and tribes. Shias and Sunnis were often engaged in clashes against each other. The Iranians, Afghans and Indian muslimans were divided into various tribes. As regards the relations between the Hindus and Muslims, even before the establishment of British rule, there was a distinct cleavage between the Hindus and Muslims and Bengal. In a written memorandum on the 'Judicial system of India' which the Raja Ram Mohan Roy submitted before a committee of House of Commons, the contrasts the Hindus with the Muslims. The queries and the answers show that the Hindus and Muslims were regarded both by the British and the Indians as two separate communities with distinct cultures and different physical, mental and moral characteristics. Throughout the 19th century we find this sharp distinction between the Hindu and Muslim communities. Nevertheless in spite of occasional communal riots, there was generally speaking, no ill feeling between the two communities at the beginning of 19th century, and each tacitly recognised the position evolved in the course of centuries as normal and usual. There was of course no social intercourse between the two. In all vital matters affecting the cultures, the Hindus and Muslims lived in two watertight compartments as it were. Despite social evils and cultural stagnation, the Hindus and Muslims by and large sank their differences to get united and fight against the

Britishers in 1857.

There was a deep-rooted belief in number of Gods and Goddesses; image worship; the caste system, restrictions of food and marriage, strict prohibition of marriage of the widows in the 19th century at the time of the revolt of 1857. As regards the attitude of the English towards the Indians, the attitude of a conquering people to the conquered people is bound to be arrogant in most cases, and the Englishmen were no exceptions. From the very beginning of the British rule, the unsociable character of the English men offended the sensibilities of Indians. There were some reasons for the bitterness of the relations between the two communities. English in general regarded the Indians as barbaric and the Christian missionaries held in open contempt the idolatrous practices of the Hindus.



Discontent due to administrative system

The masses in Bengal did not show disaffection to the English at first when they first obtained political power in Bengal. But gradually there was a feeling of aversion against them, not so much on account of their being foreigners, as on account of the evils of their administration.

Long list of grievances against the British Administration, the most important of these maybe summed up as follows:

- II. The English Officials were not accessible and so people could not place their grievances before them.
- III. There was difference in customs and language between them.
- IV. Their administration was impersonal in character and therefore responsible for many evils such as slowness of proceedings, delay in taking action, frequent changes in policy etc.
- I. The English had deprived the inhabitants of India of the various branches of commerce and benefit which they were enjoying before.
- II. Partiality of the English to their own country men and their dependents.

Sir Syed Ahmed Khan regarded the non-admission of Indians into the legislative and demonstrative branches of the Government of India as the primary cause of the Mutiny of 1857. He rightly points out that the permanence and prosperity of the Government depends on an accurate knowledge of the manners, customs, usages, habits, hopes and aspirations, temper, and ability of the people. But the foreign government cannot possess such knowledge until the people are allowed to participate in the administration of the county.

Thus we find that all classes of Indians were greatly dissatisfied with the strange laws and procedures and the system of administration introduced by the English in India.

Political condition of India in the 19th century

In those days there was no conception of India as country. There were Bengalis, Hindustanis, Sikhs, Rajput, Marathas but no Indian.

The hostile reactions to the British rule during the second half of the 18th century was inspired mainly by considerations of self-interest. Hyder Ali of Mysore almost all the Maratha chiefs and the Nizam had organised a grand confederacy for making simultaneous raids against the British from their respective headquarters, but superior statesmanship of the British ensured their failure.

The revolt of Chait Singh, raja of Benares in 1778 was occasioned by the tyrannical measures taken by the Governor General Warren Hastings against him. A large number of Zamindars and common people of the region extending up to Avadh and Bihar rose against the British with the intention to expel the English

Arising of such large proportions cannot be explained as due only to the grievances of an individual against the British. Chait Singh, was helped in his insurrection by MahadjiSindhia,

the most powerful Maratha ruler of those day. Chait Singh was given asylum with his family members at Gwalior, where he lived for the rest of his life.

Similarly the rebellion of Wazir Ali, the dethroned Nawab of Avadh, from 1799-1800 AD was a part of all India confederacy against the English towards the close of the 18th century, as admitted by the British themselves. This rising was widespread and was also supported by the Hindus. It was one of the first spontaneous outbreaks of a large section for the Indian people against the newly established and gradually expanding British rule in India. The insurrection of Wazir Ali was a precursor to a number of uprising and revolts against the British in large areas of North and Central India which reached a climax in the great uprising of 1857.

The discontent and disaffection of Indians manifested themselves in open acts of defiance, often leading to active rebellions which sometimes assumed serious proportions. The most important of these are clearly traceable to political grievance. Many outbreaks were however of mixed character; originating in agrarian discontent or other economic causes.

The series of outbreaks due to political, economics, religious frenzy, and primitive tribal instincts may be regarded as the real precursors of the great revolt of 1857.

Discontent due to economic causes

It can be said that the thought for swadeshi was behind the revolt, interlay of the civil population in 1857, which was manifested in their desire to drive out the British from their territories to secure freedom from foreign rule, for they were responsible for destruction of the self-contained 'swadeshi' village economy of this country of its swadeshi handicrafts, agriculture, and for driving the public at large to poverty and deprivation.

The feelings of swadeshi grew with the east India company rule and its visible and invisible effect. A situation of confrontation between the Indian and British interests had arisen. The British had conquered India for the fulfilment of their interest and accordingly they safeguarded their interests as against those of the Indians.

The economic decline of the peasantry was reflected in the twelve major and numerous minor famines witnessed by this country from 1770 to 1857. Annie Besant had made the following observation about the state of Indian Economic - 'Comparing relative income and taxation we find that England paid 8 1/2% of her annual income as taxation, whereas India nearly 22% it must be remembered that England pays out of wealth, India out of poverty in England taxes are spent in the country in India, half goes out.' Annie Besant further said that some of the taxes are particularly cruel such as the tax on salt, which is an absolute necessity of life

Discontent and disaffection of the Sepoys

The discontent and disaffection against the British Raj was also extended to the Indian section of the army of the East India company. The sepoy always nursed a strong sense of resentment at their low scale of salary and poor prospects of promotion, neither of which in their opinion had any real correspondence to their worth, particularly when contrasted with those of their British colleagues.

Moreover, the European corps took nothing of the rough ordinary duties, of the service. Their lodging, feeding and salaries contrasted with those of their English counterparts and this adversely affected the moral of the sepoy. We learn from a Bengali clerk attached to the cavalry regiment at Bareilly in 1857 that the sepoy had to pay for their uniform and he

bought his daily ration on credit from a salesman in the regimental bazaar. On the pay day his account was settled and after deduction for his ration etc. the balance was paid to him

Some Sepoys got at the end of the month no more than a rupee and in other case the monthly savings did not exceed a few annas. What was more galling was the sense of depreciation at every step and the racial discrimination in matters of promotion and privileges. The sepoy was in fact a peasant in uniform, whose conscious was not divorced from that of the rural population. Almost every agricultural family in Oudh had a representative in the army. He was naturally concerned with the well-being of the rural population. A proclamation issue by the rebels after capture of Delhi in the mutiny of 1857 clearly reflected the Sepoy's awareness of the misery brought about by the British rule.

‘We have ungrudgingly shed our blood in the service of our foreign masters.’

‘We have conquered for them kingdom after kingdom until nothing remained to be annexed within the four corners of the country, but what has been the return spoliation of our people, degradation of our princes, and worst of all, inconceivable insults to our religion.’

One of the most serious revolts, which bears a very close resemblance to the mutiny of 1857 so far as the genesis is concerned, was the mutiny at Vellore in 1806. When the new regulations were introduced in the Madras army forbidding the men to wear the masks of caste upon their forehead's ordering them to change their old turbans for new ones with leather cockades, the Indian soldiers broke into mutiny at Vellore with the backing of the members of the exiled family of Tipu Sultan who lived there, threatened to assume serious proportions.

In 1839, symptoms of disaffection could be clearly seen among the sepoy who were taken to Afghanistan during the first Afghan war. The Hindu sepoy fancied that they had lost their caste for they had to cross the Sindhu and go outside India, which was forbidden by religion. They had to forego their daily bath, take their bread from Muslims, and wear jackets made of sheep skin. The Muslim sepoy were dissatisfied as they had to fight against the men of their own faith. A Hindu and a Muslim subedar were shot dead for expressing these sentiments, which further excited the sepoy.

Mutinous spirit was also displayed in 1849 by the sepoy of Punjab. The discontent and disaffection among all classes of people and sporadic disturbances in all parts of India grew in intensity, till a suitable opportunity in 1857. The series of outbreaks due to political, economic, religious causes, and primitive tribal instincts may be regarded as the real precursors of the great revolt of 1857.

East India Company's Expansion In India

East India Company, also called English East India Company, (1600–1708) was a company formed for the exploitation of trade with East and Southeast Asia and India, incorporated by royal charter on December 31, 1600. Starting as a monopolistic trading body, the company became involved in politics and acted as an agent of British imperialism in India from the early 18th century to the mid-19th century. The company was formed so that England could participate in the East Indian spice trade. In addition, the activities of the company in China in the 19th century served as a catalyst for the expansion of British influence there. It also traded cotton, silk,



indigo, salt, pepper, and tea and transported slaves. From the late 18th century it gradually lost both commercial and political control. In 1873 it ceased to exist as a legal entity.

Most of the forces of the company were based at the three main 'stations' in India, at Madras, Bombay and Bengal. The expansion is variously taken to have commenced in 1757, after the Battle of Plassey, when Mir Jafar, the new Nawab of Bengal enthroned by Robert Clive, became a puppet in the Company's hands; in 1765, when the Company was granted the diwani, or the right to collect revenue, in Bengal and Bihar; or in 1773, when the Company established a capital in Calcutta, appointed its first Governor-General, Warren Hastings, and became directly involved in governance. By 1818, with the defeat of the Marathas, followed by the pensioning of the Peshwa and the annexation of his territories, British supremacy in India was complete.

The East India Company made many changes in the administrative policy towards India between 1757 to 1857, but simultaneously it also promoted its business and took its profits to Britain.

Whatever changes occurred in the economic policies of England, East India Company introduced similar changes in India. Different methods were adopted by it to capture the economy, and in the process it rejected the self-reliant villages of this country, which were the backbone of the Indian economy for centuries.

At the same time as the Opium Wars, the Company started witnessing an increasing amount of rebellion and insurgence from its Indian territories. There were many reasons for this insurgency, and the Company's rapid expansion through the sub-continent during the 18th and early 19th century had not helped matters.

The rebels, many of whom were the Indian troops within the Company's army (which at this time was over 200,000 men strong, with around 80% of the force made up of Indian recruits) caught their employers off guard and succeeded in killing many British soldiers, civilians and Indians loyal to the Company.

Annexation of States

The British ruled India with two administrative systems. One was 'Provinces' and the other 'Princely States'. About 60% of the Indian sub-continent's territory were Provinces and 40% were Princely States. Provinces were British territories completely under British control. Princely States were states in British India with local ruler or king with honorary titles like Maharaja, Raja, Maharana, Rana, Nizam, Badshah and other such titles meaning king or ruler in different Indian languages. These rulers were subjected to the British Empire. These two types of administrative systems were the result of the British East India Company's attempt to annex the whole of Indian sub-continent and make it into a British territory.

Shifting its role from a trading corporation, the English East India Company gradually became supreme political power in India. There were other regional kingdoms

which were conquered by the British. Haidar Ali and his son Tipu Sultan the legendary rulers of Mysore (in Carnatic, modern day Indian state of Karnataka), gave a tough time to the British forces in the second half of the eighteenth century. Haidar Ali was in command of the army in Mysore from 1749; he became the ruler of the state in 1761. Until his defeat by Sir Eyre Coote in 1781 Haidar Ali continued his struggle against the Company. Mysore finally fell to the Company forces in 1799, with the slaying of Tipu Sultan in 1799. With the gradual weakening of the Maratha Empire in the aftermath of the three Anglo-Maratha wars fought during 1772-1818, the British also secured the Maratha territories.

The second method was the use of **subsidiary agreements (sanad)** between the British and the local rulers. This development created what came to be called the Native States, or Princely States. The Subsidiary Alliances system was also introduced by Lord Wellesley in and after 1798. The British, under the subsidiary alliance system, agreed to protect the Indian rulers against external threats and internal disorder but, in return, the Indian rulers who accepted the Subsidiary Alliance system were to agree to the stationing of British contingent for whose maintenance they would pay a subsidy to the British. The ruler under the system of alliance could neither enter into alliance with any other power nor fight a war without prior permission from the British. A British resident was stationed at these ruling states that had the authority to interfere in state politics.

The Nizam of Hyderabad was first to enter into a subsidiary alliance with the English in 1798. He was forced to replace the French officers from his court and put English officers in their place. He also granted the territories of Bellari and Cudappah to British for the maintenance of the army. The subsidiary alliances created the Princely States (or Native States) of the Maharajas and the Nawabs, prominent among which were: Cochin (1791), Jaipur (1794), Travancore (1795), Hyderabad (1798) and Mysore (1799). The annexed regions included the North Western Provinces (comprising Rohilkhand, Gorakhpur, and the Doab) (1801), Delhi (1803), and Sindh (1843). Punjab, Northwest Frontier Province, and Kashmir, were annexed after the Anglo-Sikh Wars in 1849. Kashmir was sold under the Treaty of Amritsar (1850) to the Dogra Dynasty of Jammu, and thereby became a princely state. In 1854 Berar was annexed, and the state of Oudh two years later in 1856. The Main purpose of the subsidiary alliance system was to expand the British Empire in India by bringing new territories under its control and to decrease the French influence so that The British could become the paramount power in India. Punjab remained the last Indian state to be conquered by the British in 1849. It was under the rule of Maharaja Ranjit Singh who had united the various Sikh chiefs into one state. He had established a modern administrative system. The East India Company maintained friendly relations with Ranjit Singh .But just within one decade of his death in 1839, two Anglo-Sikh wars were fought and in 1849 Punjab also became part of the British India.

The Doctrine of Lapse was an annexation policy devised by Lord Dalhousie, who was the Governor General of India between 1848 and 1856. With the introduction of this policy of lapse, the Company could establish absolute, imperial administrative control over many regions spread over the subcontinent. The Company took over the princely states of Surat (1842), Satara (1848), Jaitpur (1849) , Sambalpur (1849), Punjab (1849), Tanjore (1855), Nagpur (1854) and Jhansi (1854) using this Doctrine. Often the annexation, such as that of Awadh (Oudh) in 1856, was justified on the grounds that the native prince was of evil disposition, indifferent to the welfare of his subjects.

Causes of the Revolt of 1857

Economic Causes

The newly introduced British Economic policy in India worked against the interest of Indian trade and commerce. Small industrial houses were closed. Company employees used force to destroy Indian handicrafts. They worked as an intruder who broke out the Indian handloom industry and destroyed the spinning wheel. The Company Government imported machine-made finished cloth to the Indian markets.

Millions of weavers who used to supply cloth to crores of people lost their hereditary jobs and turned dependents on agriculture when agricultural sector was not prepared to accommodate these surplus unemployed weavers. Lord Bentinck himself admitted in the words that “The misery hardly finds a parallel in the history of commerce. The bones of cotton weavers are bleaching the plains of India.” Impoverished by heavy taxation, the peasants resorted to loans from money lenders/ traders at usurious rates, the latter often evicting the former on non-payment of debt dues. These moneylenders and traders emerged as the new landlords, while the scourge of indebtedness has continued to plague Indian society to this day. The introduction of the British policy “drain of wealth from India to Britain” hammered the backbone of the Indian economy. They carried raw materials in huge quantities, produced machine-made goods in these raw materials and flooded the Indian markets with them.

Zamindars, the traditional landed aristocracy, often saw their land rights forfeited with frequent use of a quo warrant by the administration. This resulted in a loss of status for them in the villages. In Awadh, the storm centre of the revolt, 21000 taluqdars had their estates confiscated and suddenly found themselves without a source of income, “unable to work, ashamed to beg, condemned to penury”. These dispossessed taluqdars seized the opportunity presented by the sepoy revolt to oppose the British and regain what they had lost. Abysmal poverty became the fate of India for all these factors. Thus the pre-British rich India turned an economically backward in every respect. That accelerated the incoming of this historic event. The ruination of Indian industry increased the pressure on agriculture and land, the lopsided development in which resulted in pauperisation of the country in general.

Political Causes

The British policy of territorial annexations led to the displacement of a large number of rulers and chiefs. The vigorous application of the policies of Subsidiary Alliance and Doctrine of Lapse angered the ruling sections of the society. Rani Lakshmi Bai and Nana Sahib became bitter enemies of the British and led to the revolt in their respective territories. Policy of ‘Doctrine of Lapse’ was aggressively followed under Lord Dalhousie and came to be widely resented. By following the Doctrine of Lapse, the adopted sons of the deceased kings were derecognised as heirs to the throne, which subsequently led to the annexation to a large number of Kingdoms. Satara (1848), Nagpur, Sambalpur and Baghat (1850), Udaipur (1852) and Jhansi (1853) to name a few, were annexed by the British.

The annexation of Awadh, on grounds of misgovernment, was greatly resented. The Nawabs of Awadh had always been loyal to the British. The annexation was widely seen as a blatant act of back-stabbing by the British. It deeply hurt the sentiments of the Company’s sepoys because most of them came from Awadh. Moreover, even under the new regime, the people of Awadh got no relief from oppression. Peasants had to pay even higher revenue and additional taxes were imposed. The British provided no alternative source of employment to the people who lost their jobs due to the dissolution of the Nawab’s administration.

Titles of the Nawabs of the Carnatic and Tanjore were abolished. The annual pension of Peshwa Baji Rao II’s adopted son was stopped. These activities of the Company Government caused widespread suspicion among the people in general and the members of the royal families in particular. Report of the Government officials to England created a bad atmosphere and Indians started believing that the “British were playing the wolf in the garb of the lamb.”

Social and Religious Causes

The social reforms introduced by the British were looked upon with suspicion by the conservative sections of the Indian society. Reforms such as abolition of 'sati', legalisation of widow remarriage and extension of western education to women were looked upon as examples of interference in the social customs of the country. The social discrimination faced by the Indians due to the British attitude of racial superiority also led to much resentment. These fears were further compounded by the Government's decision to tax mosque and temple lands and legislative measures, such as the Religious Disabilities Act, 1856, which modified Hindu Customs, for instance declaring that a change of religion did not debar a son from inheriting the property of his heathen father.

A rumour was spread that the British mixed the powder of animal bones with salt only to destroy the religion of the Hindus. It was also said that the flesh of pigs and cows was thrown into wells. By the religious sentiments of Muslims and Hindus were greatly hurt by such stories. Indians became fearful of their religion being destroyed. The Western education began to spread. It influenced educated Indians. They began to criticise the orthodox. There began a silent mental hostility between the conservative and the progressive Indians. Many started believing the Britishers as enemies. Educated Indians were denied promotions and appointments to high office. Gradually a social discontent began to grow. John William Kaye, the English historian, regarded Dalhousie's encouragement of female education as one of the causes of the mutiny.

The introduction of railways, telegraph system and other reforms of Dalhousie alarmed the Indian mass to a great extent. On the whole, the Western ways and modes of life disturbed the orthodox minds of India which helped the great event to come quickly.

Administrative Causes

The annexation of Indian states resulted in depriving Indian aristocracy of the power and high positions. They found little chance to gain the same old position in the new administrative set up under the British rule. In the military services, the highest posts attainable by the Indians were that of a Subedar on a salary of Rs. 60 or Rs. 70 to the maximum. Under the British rule, all high posts Civil and Military were reserved for the Europeans. British officers were in regular practice of treating the natives with violence and often with cruelty. The Character Act of 1833 could not change the policy of the British officers towards their subordinates in any manner.

The administrative set up of the East India Company was inefficient. The land revenue policy introduced by Cornwallis was most unpopular. The Company administration even used force to collect land revenue. In the newly annexed states, the Company Government had ignored the rights of the middlemen and established direct contract using force. Many holders of the rent-free tenures were dispossessed and large number of estates was confiscated.

As a result, the aristocracy turned pauper. The peasant was pushed to the mercy of the money lenders.

Military Causes

Indian soldiers formed seven-eighth of the total British troops in India. As they were an integral part of the Indian society, they too suffered the consequences of the oppressive British rule. Besides, they had other grievances. The Indian sepoys were looked upon as inferior beings and treated with contempt by their British officers. Then Indian Sepoy was equally unhappy with their emoluments compared to their British counterpart. All avenues of the promotion were closed to them as all the higher army posts were reserved for the British. The annexation of Awadh, home of many of the sepoys, further inflamed their feelings.

They were also influenced by the general fear that their religion was in danger. The order that forbade the sepoys from wearing caste and sectarian marks hurt their sentiments deeply. So also the Act of 1816 which required the new recruits to travel overseas, if needed. The Hindu sepoys resented this as according to the popular Hindu belief, travel across the sea led to a loss of caste. A more immediate cause of the sepoys' dissatisfaction was the order that they would not be given the Foreign Service allowance (bhatta) when serving in Sind or in Punjab.

The outbreak in Meerut and the situation in Delhi

On the evening of 9 May, a native officer of the 2nd Troop of the 3rd L.C. came to Lieutenant Gough, the troop commander, under pretence of making up the accounts. After a time he informed Gough that a mutiny of the native troops at Meerut would take place on the following day; the native infantry was going to rise, the cavalry would do the same and release their comrades from the jail. Gough went at once to his Colonel and reported this, but Carmichael-Smyth treated the report with contempt and reproved Gough for listening to such idle words. That same evening, Gough met the Brigadier and told him the story, but Archdale Wilson also was incredulous. Two of the deponents before Major Williams, the court registrar and one of the sub-divisional revenue official at Meerut, stated that it was rumoured on the 9th that the sepoys would mutiny. On the evening of the 9th the Commissioner (Mr Greathed) and his wife were dining with Colonel Custance of the Carabiniers: she told him of a report, which she had probably heard through her servants, that placards had been seen in the city calling on all true Mussulmans to rise and slaughter the English.

May 10, 1857 was a Sunday. The British officers at the Meerut cantonment in north India were

preparing to attend church, while many other British soldiers were off duty. The Indian troops in the cantonment, already waiting for an opportunity to revolt against their foreign masters, seized the day. Almost 50 British soldiers, and other men, women and children were killed by the sepoys and the crowds who soon joined the Indian soldiers.

Meerut is almost 60 kilometres from Delhi. They reached that city on the morning of the 11th. The native troops composing the garrison, and the inhabitants of the city, made common cause with the mutineers. The English residents were either murdered or forced to fly; the old king of Delhi, Bahadur Shah Zafar was proclaimed Emperor of Hindustan on 13th May, and the first act of the great mutiny of 1857 duly completed. Why all this was



permitted, in the face of the large European force at that time quartered in Meerut, is a question which has often been asked, and to which no satisfactory reply ever has been or ever can be given.

Timeline of important events



Jan

- Problems in Dum Dum over greased cartridges

Feb

- Mutinies at Barrackpore and Berhampore

Mar

- Pandey Executed

Apr

- Unrest at Amabala, 48th Native Infantry minor mutiny in Lucknow

May 10

- Mutiny and Murder at Meerut initiated by the 3rd light cavalry. Mutinied native regiments march towards Delhi

May 11

- Europeans attacked in Delhi as sepoy take control of the walled city

May 12

- Bahadur Shah Zafar hold his first formal audience with the sepoys and is proclaimed 'Emperor of India'

Situation across India

Oudh State

The strategic geographical position of their capital at Lucknow and their province of Oudh, prompted the EEIC to using them as a buffer state between their own territories in the east, and the unruly competitors for power in the west. The Nawabs of Oudh, on their part,

contained a powerful military ally who could assist them in securing their independence from Delhi. By the last quarter of the eighteenth century, this had been achieved in all but name.



The treaties of alliance, between the Oudh rulers and the EEIC, were increasingly used by the latter to exert influence over the former. At first, this influence was used to secure loans of money and grants of various kinds, on generous or advantageous terms. In time, the usual court intrigue prevalent in most Indian courts and the perpetual jockeying for position amongst influential nobles, led to greater and greater interference. By the turn of the nineteenth century, the succession had become a matter over which the Governor-General of Bengal exercised a near veto.

The former Mughal province was encouraged to establish its independence from Delhi by formally assuming the title of King in 1819. However, this independence was largely symbolic, since the British authorities exercised influence in most important matters of state. Ministers were usually appointed with the approval of the resident, and the army was very largely officered by Europeans. The Kings devoted much of their time trying to project the outward signs of their sovereignty and royalty, rather than establishing their power. As a consequence, a great flowering of art, literature, music, and architecture, occurred under their rule. Lucknow became the virtual centre of artistic excellence in Northern India.

By the middle of the nineteenth century, the main reason for the Anglo-Oudh alliance, the military buffer state, had ceased to serve that purpose. Indeed, the army had deteriorated into near uselessness. The succession of Muhammad Wajid 'Ali Shah in 1847 did not help the deteriorating situation due to his incompetence. The army deteriorated further, revenue collection slumped, debts increased and outlawry became commonplace. All of which prompted increasing complaints to the British accompanied by appeals for help and interference. The British in turn had lost interest in supporting their ally, preferring to take outright control of the kingdom and impose direct rule. When the final decision was taken and annexation implemented in 1856, no opposition arose from the King's former subjects.

Wajid 'Ali Shah was exiled to Calcutta with most of his family. When the Sepoy Mutiny broke out in 1857, he at once declared himself for the government and against the mutineers.

Meanwhile, at Lucknow, the mutineers found support from one of Wajid 'Ali's former wives, Hazrat Mahal. They proclaimed the young prince (her son) Birjis Qadras King and appealed for recognition to the King of Delhi, with the latter felicitating the Prince.

Delhi

It was during the last three decades of the eighteenth century that the Mughal emperor eventually ceased to have any real power. The defeat of the combined forces of emperor Shah Alam (1759-1806) and the nawab of Awadh by the Company at Baksar in 1764, and the blinding of the emperor in 1788 by the Rohilla chieftain Ghulam Qadir, were two events that did much to shatter the prestige of the Mughals. From 1785 onwards Shah Alam was under the protection of Mahadji Sindia, who was entrusted with the administration of the Delhi region.

In 1803 the East India Company's forces led by Lord Lake captured Delhi after defeating the Daulat Rao Sindia's troops (Daulat Rao was the successor of Mahadji) at the battle of Patparganj. Percival Spear points out that Shah Alam 'was the nominal suzerain of both the contending parties, for the British held Bengal by the grant of the Diwani in 1765, and Sindia was his Vakil-i-Mutlaq or imperial Regent. One of the declared objectives of Lord Wellesley [the governor-general] was to seize Delhi and the Jumna Doab, and "the possession of the nominal authority of the Mughul".... Officially, of course he [Shah Alam] sided with his Regent and treated the Company as a rebellious vassal.

Following Lake's victory, the administration of Delhi and its adjoining areas was taken over and Shah Alam was placed under the protection and control of the Company. He was assured of an income, amounting to about twelve lakh rupees per year at this stage (technically this was a portion of the tribute promised to the emperor in return for the grant of diwani; this tribute had been withheld for a long time).

The emperor's authority was now confined to the Red Fort and to members of the royal family (several hundred members of the royal family resided in the Fort). Actual administrative control over Delhi and the surrounding areas was in the hands of the British resident. The resident also exercised some indirect control over what went on inside the Fort.

Thus since 1803, He was an instrument of indirect rule present in the Mughal Darbar by the British.

Central India and Maratha States

British hegemony over the states of Central India began in 1802, when several states in the Bundelkhand and Bagelkhand regions came under British control at the conclusion of the Treaty of Bassein between the British and the Maratha - Peshwa Bajirao II. British control of Bundelkhand expanded at the conclusion of the Second Anglo-Maratha War in 1805. The remaining states, including Gwalior, Indore, Bhopal and a number of smaller states in the regions of Malwa, Nimar, and Bundelkhand, came under British control with the end of the Third Anglo-Maratha War in 1818. The estate of Chanderi was ceded to the Sindhia ruler of Gwalior in 1844 by the British, and Jhansi State was seized by the British in 1853 under the doctrine of lapse was added to the United Provinces. All were princely states part of the Central India Agency with two residencies at Indore and Gwalior.

Rajputana Proper

By the end of the 18th century nearly the whole of Rajputana had been virtually subdued by the Marathas following the . The Second Anglo-Maratha War distracted the Marathas from 1807 to 1809, but afterwards Maratha domination of Rajputana resumed. In 1817 the British went to war with the Pindaris, raiders who were based in Maratha territory, which quickly became the Third Anglo-Maratha War, and the British government offered its protection to the Rajput rulers from the Pindaris and the Marathas. The Pindari were defeated, and the Afghan adventurer Amir Khan submitted and signed a treaty with the British, making him the ruler of Tonk. By the end of 1818 similar treaties had been executed between the other Rajput states and Britain. The Maratha Sindhia ruler of Gwalior gave up the district of Ajmer-Merwara to the British, and Maratha influence in Rajasthan came to an end. Most of the Jat and Rajput princes remained loyal to Britain in the Revolt of 1857, and few political changes were made in Rajputana until Indian independence in 1947.

Baroda

In 1802, the British under Major Walker defeated the Arab mercenaries in Baroda, who agreed to leave the state under British control. As a result, the Gaekwads accepted the subsidiary system of the British. Consequently, a British resident was stationed in Baroda, and henceforth, the British arbitrated in all transactions of the Gaekwads with outsiders, including the Peshwas. Subsequent treaties, were signed in 1817-18 with the Gaekwad, and with the Peshwas in 1819. The connection between Baroda and Poona was finally cut.

Punjab

Punjab was annexed by EEIC in 1849. The situation here was much more different from Oudh. The country had been annexed following two wars in both of which the EEIC had convincingly and decisively defeated the Sikhs. The majority of the population was Muslim and these viewed the EEIC as liberators who had liberated them from the Sikh tyranny. The country was systematically disarmed after annexation unlike Oudh where this was not done¹⁹¹. The British administrators in the person of John and Henry Lawrence were highly capable men who were just courteous and efficient and followed a policy of conciliation. The first canal i.e. Upper Bari Doab Canal was started in 1851 and was in final stages of completion by 1857. Many Sikh ex-service men were re-employed in the army; the regiments bearing the title 'Sikh Infantry and Sikh Cavalry' being entirely composed of Sikh, Dogra and Muslim soldiers of the Old Khalsa Sikh Army. The Muslims were won over by restoration of various mosques which were previously used by the Sikhs as powder magazines and stables.

Mysore

The political scenario of Mysore changed rapidly after the death of Tipu Sultan. That period witnessed rebellions, revolts, corruption and inefficiency in the administration of the State. In 1831, the insurrection which started in the Nagar Division engulfed very rapidly in every nook and corner of the State which attracted the attention of the then Governor - General of India, Lord William Bentinck. It was he who by applying the fourth Article of the Treaty of 1799 assumed the administration of Mysore affairs on October 31, 1831. This paved the way for the direct rule of the State by the British.. Thus, for about fifty years the administration of Hindu Royal Dynasty of Mysore was carried out by the Commissioners appointed by the East India Company.

NOTE: The soft policy of the then Commissioner of Mysore, Sir Mark Cubbon, can be assessed when comparing the effects of the 1857's Indian Revolt at Mysore with other parts of India where the modernization policy of Dalhousie had already made its impact. In Mysore State the effects of mutiny were unnoticeable.

Travancore

The Mysorean invasion and the treaty of 1762 put a real check on the independence of Travancore. Subsequently with a view to containing the Mysore storm, the Raja Bala Rama Varma proposed the perpetual Treaty of Subsidiary Alliance in 1793. Based on his proposal a treaty was signed in 1795 which entertained British interference in the political, commercial and administrative affairs of Travancore. The dissatisfied elements in the administrative echelon rallied under VeluThampi, who soon rose in esteem and power became the Diwan. He maintained friendly relationship with the English and in 1805 entered into a treaty with the British Resident, whereby the British were to render military aid to Travancore and to quell even internal disturbances. However, The British Resident started interfering with the internal administration of the State which infuriated VeluThampi eventually turning him to make a historic proclamation at Kundara in 1809 ultimately resulted in the launching of a struggle for freedom from the Company's domination. In a fierce battle that happened between the Company's troops and the halati forces, the latter was defeated. UnniThampi, who succeeded Velu, made peace with the British Resident. With this, the influence of British was finally established.

Recent important events

The revolt of 1857 coincided with certain outside events in which the British suffered serious losses- the first Anglo-Afghan War (1838-42), Anglo-Sikh War (1845-49), Crimean Wars (1854-56), Santhal rebellion (1855-57). These had obvious psychological repercussions.

First Anglo-Afghan War (1838-42)

In the years leading up to this conflict, both the British and Russians approached Afghanistan's Emir Dost Mohammad Khan, hoping to form an alliance with him. Britain's Governor-General of India, George Eden (Lord Auckland), grew extremely concerned with he heard that a Russian envoy had arrived in Kabul in 1838; his agitation increased when talks broke down between the Afghan ruler and the Russians, signaling the possibility of a Russian invasion. Lord Auckland decided to strike first in order to forestall a Russian attack. He justified this approach in a document known as the Simla Manifesto of October 1839. The manifesto states that in order to secure a "trustworthy ally" to the west of British India, British troops would enter Afghanistan to support Shah Shuja in his attempts to retake the throne



from Dost Mohammad. The British weren't *invading* Afghanistan, according to Auckland - just helping out a deposed friend and preventing "foreign interference" (from Russia).

In December of 1838, a British East India Company force of 21,000 mainly Indian troops began to march northwest from the Punjab. They crossed the mountains in the dead of winter, arriving at Quetta, Afghanistan in March of 1839. The British easily captured Quetta and Qandahar and then routed Dost Mohammad's army in July. The emir fled to Bukhara via Bamyan, and the British reinstalled Shah Shuja on the throne thirty years after he had lost it to Dost Mohammad. Well satisfied with this easy victory, the British withdrew, leaving 6,000 troops to prop up Shuja's regime. Dost Mohammad, however, was not ready to give up so easily, and in 1840 he mounted a counter-attack from Bukhara, in what is now Uzbekistan. The British had to rush reinforcements back into Afghanistan; they managed to capture Dost Mohammad and brought him to India as a prisoner.

Dost Mohammad's son, Mohammad Akbar, began to rally Afghan fighters to his side in the summer and autumn of 1841 from his base in Bamyan. Afghan discontent with the continued presence of foreign troops mounted, leading to the assassination of Captain Alexander Burnes and his aides in Kabul on November 2, 1841; the British did not retaliate against the mob that killed Captain Burnes, encouraging further anti-British action. Meanwhile, in an effort to soothe his angry subjects, Shah Shuja made the fateful decision that he no longer needed British support. General William Elphinstone and the 16,500 British and Indian troops on Afghan soil agreed to begin their withdrawal from Kabul on January 1, 1842. As they made their way through the winter-bound mountains toward Jalalabad, on January 5th a contingent of Ghilzai (Pashtun) warriors attacked the ill-prepared British lines. The British East India troops were strung out along the mountain path, struggling through two feet of snow.

In the melee that followed, the Afghans killed almost all of the British and Indian soldiers and camp followers. A small handful was taken, prisoner. The British doctor William Brydon famously managed to ride his injured horse through the mountains and report the disaster to British authorities in Jalalabad. He and eight captured prisoners were the only ethnic British survivors out of about 700 who set out from Kabul. Just a few months after the massacre of Elphinstone's army by Mohammad Akbar's forces, the new leader's agents assassinated the unpopular and now defenseless Shah Shuja. Furious about the massacre of their Kabul garrison, the British East India Company troops in Peshawar and Qandahar marched on Kabul, rescuing several British prisoners and burning down the Great Bazaar in retaliation. This further enraged the Afghans, who set aside ethnolinguistic differences and united to drive the British out of their capital city. Lord Auckland had a stroke in 1842 and was replaced as Governor-General of India by Edward Law, Lord Ellenborough, who had a mandate to "restore peace to Asia." Lord Ellenborough released Dost Mohammad from prison in Calcutta without fanfare, and the Afghan emir retook his throne in Kabul.

Following this great victory over the British, Afghanistan maintained its independence and continued to play the two European powers off of each other for the coming years.

Anglo-Sikh Wars and Annexation of Punjab

The First Anglo-Sikh War (1845-1846) was a real test of the British East India Company's mastery of India. During the Napoleonic wars (1793-1815) the British finally defeated their French rivals on the sub-continent and dominated most of its native princes.

An exception was the powerful Sikh kingdom of Punjab, ruled until his death in 1839 by Maharaja Ranjit Singh. During his reign he built up one of the most formidable armies in the world, the Khalsa. These Sikh soldiers were subject to strict discipline, trained by European and American mercenaries and armed with the latest European weaponry. Their morale was high, crucially underpinned by a strong religious faith that demanded complete loyalty, courage and devotion to their religion and ruler. (Sikhs only formed about a sixth of the population of Punjab so Hindu and Muslim soldiers also served under Ranjit Singh).

Ranjit Singh (who had lost his left eye to smallpox when a child) built up this force partly to defend the Punjab from attack by Muslim Afghan raiders to the northwest and as a deterrent to the ambitions of the East India Company on his southern border. As long as Ranjit Singh lived, it suited the British to treat him as an ally. It meant they had a stable, powerful state on their northern frontier which blocked potential Muslim invaders from beyond and saved the expense of maintaining a large military presence in that part of India.



However, a dangerous period of instability in the Sikh kingdom followed Ranjit Singh's death in 1839. A five-year-old son, Duleep Singh, eventually succeeded to the throne with his mother Maharani Jind Kaur acting as regent. However, the Sikh court in Lahore (riven by scandal, rival factions, intrigue, corruption and approaching bankruptcy) proved incapable of controlling its all-powerful Khalsa Army. Its unpredictable will was expressed through influential committees (*panchayats*) to which all ranks had a right of free expression. (There is a comparison to be made with the radicalism in the ranks of the New Model Army in England in the late 1640s.)

Elsewhere the East India Company suffered a defeat during the disastrous occupation of Afghanistan (1839-1842) which damaged its military reputation. The British viewed the continuing instability of Punjab with alarm, speculating whether the restless and ever expanding Khalsa (numbering some 80,000 by 1845) might not invade British territory at some point. While British policy in India itself was generally expansionist in this period it is unlikely that the East India Company sought to annex Punjab at this stage as it had neither the manpower nor resources to do so. It has been suggested that figures in the Lahore court wanted to start a war with the East India Company deliberately, hoping that a defeated Khalsa would make it easier to control.

Following a period of rising tension, the Khalsa crossed the weakly defended British frontiers in December 1845. On the first day of the pivotal Battle of Ferozeshah (sometimes named as Ferozepore in contemporary British sources) the exhausted East India Company forces came close to defeat. The claim that senior British commanders also contemplated an unconditional surrender to the Khalsa is derived from one British source, the diary of Robert Cust, a political agent or intelligence officer. If the British had been defeated at Ferozeshah then the consequences would have been far reaching. British control of India itself might have

collapsed with a victorious Khalsa free to occupy and exploit as much territory as it could conquer, to the possible consternation of the Lahore court. As it was, the Khalsa were probably deliberately betrayed by two of their leading commanders who deployed their forces at Ferozeshah to ensure a Sikh defeat. One of the generals, Tej Singh, was certainly in secret correspondence with a British political agent and asked his advice about how he could lose the battle.

In 1846, after the Khalsa had been defeated at Ferozeshah and in later battles, Maharani Jind Kaur concluded a treaty which kept her son on the Punjab throne but that lost territory and turned his kingdom into a client state of the East India Company. Following a rebellion which led to the Second Anglo-Sikh War (1848-1849) the Sikh kingdom was finally annexed to British India. Its boy-king, Maharaja Duleep Singh, was forced to leave Punjab, converted to Christianity and sent to Britain for education as an English gentleman.

Role of the Peasantry and Tribes

Tribes

Tribal people are located on the fringes of the mainstream society and constitute the lower stratum. Adivasis or aboriginals were usually the original inhabitants of vast tracts in western, central, southern, eastern, and north eastern parts of the country. With the exception of the north east, they had been reduced to a minority with the influx of outsiders and exposed to rapid changes. Barring a few, especially the frontier tribes, most tribes had some form of contact with the mainstream society. The socio economic differentiation amongst them in comparison to the mainstream society was significantly less. The tribes were politically autonomous and had their own system of justice.

Tribal movements can be further subdivided into two categories along two main divisions of tribes based on the geographical region occupied.

Non- Frontier Tribes:

These constitute 89 percent of the total tribal population. The non-frontier tribes were mainly confined to central India, West-Central India and Andhra. Among the tribes that participated in the movements were Khonds, Savara, Santhal, Munda, Oraon, Koya, Kol, Gond and Bhil. The uprising of these tribes were quite volatile and constitute some of major uprising.

Frontier Tribes

Tribes of the seven North-eastern frontier states of Nagaland, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Assam, Manipur, Mizoram and Tripura.

Tribals deeply resented British penetration in their areas, The British penetrated the area during the First Anglo-Burmese War (1824-26), Annexed the Jaintia hills in 1832, including the earlier 25 khasi states. Each of these events was followed by revolts. these movements under the traditional chiefs continued much later than in the plains.

Causes of Tribal Movements

- Imposition of Land revenue Settlement: Expansion of agriculture by the non- tribals to tribal area or over forest cover led to the erosion of tribal

traditions of joint ownership and increased the socio-economic differentiation in the egalitarian structure of the tribal society.

- Work of Christian Missionaries brought about further changes in the socio economic and cultural equation of the tribals and the mainstream society plus in turbulent times, the tendency of the missionaries to refuse to take up arms or in discouraging people from rising against the government made the missionaries to be viewed as extension of colonialism and were often attacked by the rebels.
- Increasing demand for good from early nineteenth century- first for the royal navy and then railways, led to increasing control of company over forest land.
- Extension of settled agriculture led to influx of non tribals in the tribal areas. These outsiders exploited them and extension of settled agriculture led to the loss of land by the tribals which reduced them to agricultural labourers.
- Some of the tribal uprising took place in reaction to the effect of the landlords to impose taxes on the customary use of timber and grazing facilities, police exaction, new excise regulations, exploitation by low country traders and money lenders, and restrictions on shifting cultivation in forest.
- The rebellions by the non-frontier tribals were usually reactions against outsiders (dikus), local landlords and rulers, the support provided to the later by the British administration and intervention by them in the life of the tribals. The indigenous names for these tribal movements were Meli, Hool and Ul-Gulan.
- Introduction of the notion of private property- Land could be bought, sold, mortgaged which led to loss of land by the tribals.



Tribal Uprisings

The main non-frontier tribal uprisings include the Santhal rebellion; Khond Uprisings; Early Munda Uprisings

The main frontier tribal uprisings include the Khasi Uprising, Ahom Revolt and the Singhphos rebellion

Delegates are expected to be aware of and informed about such uprisings, as well as know how they impacted the living, ideology of peasants and farmers

Peasantry

When the elites of the Indian society were busy in initiating and social reforms to change their society from within to answer the moralistic critiques of the West, the rural society was responding to the imposition of colonial rule in an entirely different way. In contrast to the urban intelligentsia, who were also the chief beneficiaries of colonial rule, the response of the traditional elite and the peasantry, who were losing out as a result of colonial impositions, were that of resistance and defiance, resulting in a series of unsuccessful attempts at restoring the old order. Not that peasant revolts were unknown in Mughal India; indeed, they became endemic in the first half of the eighteenth century as the rising revenue demands breached the Mughal compromise and affected the subsistence provision of the peasants, and the Mughal provincial bureaucracy became ever more oppressive and rigorous in collecting it. The tendency became even more pervasive as the colonial regime established itself, enhanced its power and introduced a series of revenue experiments, the sole purpose of which was to maximize its revenue income. Ruin of handicraft added to the situation. Thus it can be said that resistance to colonial rule was there as old as the rule itself. Some of the peasant rebellions in pre-1857 India were participated exclusively by the tribal population whose political autonomy and control over local resources were threatened by the establishment of British Rule and the advent of its non-tribal agents.

Thus it is evident that the colonial rule even, during the days of the east India Company witnessed numerous uprising and disturbances. The nature of these disturbances varied from elitist grievances as manifested in the rebellions headed by deposed rulers to the popular grassroots or people's movement, as exemplified by various tribal movements. These varied grievances reached their climax in the revolt of 1857, which in spite of targeting certain groups of Indians remains the prominent uprising against the British before the beginning of the Indian Freedom movement.

Aftermath in India

NOTE: The following information contains data after the freeze date and is only mentioned for to provide a better understanding of the agenda. It is thus not going to be held valid in the committee

Direct Consequences :

- The Revolt of 1857 exposed the danger involved in allowing a commercial organisation to rule over a country. Thus British government passed Government of India Act 1858 on August 2, 1858, according to which the power that the company enjoyed was snatched and a direct rule was established. The British government was now established. The British was now directly responsible for ruling India
- The supreme executive and legislative authority in India henceforth came to be known as the Governor-General and the Viceroy Lord Canning so far known as the Governor General of India also became the first Viceroy of India.
- The British assured the people of India that there will be no more territorial expansion. They also assured the people of India that religious and social practices would be respected and not be interfered.
- The proportion of Indian soldiers in the army was reduced and the number of European soldiers in the army was increased.
- The ruling chiefs of the country were assured that their territories would never be annexed by the British. The Doctrine of Lapse was also abolished hereby allowing rulers to pass on their kingdoms to adopted sons.
- Policies were made to protect landlords and zamindars and give them security of rights over their lands.
- Muslims were considered to be responsible for the rebellion in a big way. Hence their land and property was confiscated on large scale.
- A new agrarian policy was introduced to guarantee security of tenure and to fix rent for lands. This policy freed the cultivators from tedious settlements and excessive demands of the state. The financial system was also decentralised by entrusting some items of taxation to local governments.

Indirect Consequences :

- The Revolt of 1857 further widened the difference between the ruler and the ruled.
- In the post-Revolt period, to maintain supremacy in India, British followed the policy of communal disharmony. The seed of communal discord planted by the English in India sprouted like a poison and bore the fruits of communalism.
- After the revolt, although British did not followed the policy of territorial expansion in India, the period was yet marked by a new era of economic exploitation of India by British
- From now on, the British adopted a policy of opposing the educated middle class and supporting the landlords and the native princes.

What We Expect

First and foremost, we expect you to be very well researched on the topic. There must be high levels of debating to make the committee interesting. Our priority would be to have quality discussions and pass communiques unanimously. The task of this committee is to successfully wage a war against European colonisers who have plagued this soil for a century now. Thus, it is required for a delegate to be extremely thorough with their research and mindful of the era the committee is situated in. You have to be innovative in your ideas in the fight against the British. Considering the many lives and potentially your own at stake, all suggestions must be practical, sensible and viable. You should also remember that you should make full use of communiques to facilitate your interests and those of the committee. We encourage highly elaborate communiques for a higher chance of implementation. We suggest avoiding giving vague orders or remarks. Understanding of yours and your enemy's economic, political and military might (including troop and regiment details) is key to successfully implementing your decisions. Research should be done beyond the stated freeze date to better understand the situation. Please be prepared for anything can happen in this committee and ensure that you are researched enough to tackle with the many crises that will develop along the course.

Finally, I'd like to encourage you all to participate as much as you can and make the most of this opportunity. Research well about your portfolio, what are your interests, what power do you possess and how significant can you be in the committee.

COMMUNIQUES AND TREATIES

Communiqu é

A communiqu é is a form of paperwork, enabled only in specialised committees. Basically, a communiqu é is an order or request, written by you, addressed to your government, or any other organisation as per required. Communiqu é s can enable you to unilaterally make important decisions, and simply, take action. Establishing alliances, asking for military aid, repositioning troops, etc are some of the things you can achieve, using communiqu é s. Communiqu é s must be as detailed and practical as possible. The four types of communiqu é s are as follows:

- Open communiqué: This type of communiqué is used to take action that is completely disclosed to the rest of the committee.
- Closed communiqué: This type of communiqué is used, when the action taken is to be kept secret from the rest of committee, that is, the only two parties privy to the information within the communiqué are the organisation to which the communiqué is addressed, and the delegate himself. This information can however be given to the rest of committee as well, in the form of updates, by the discretion of the chair.
- Joint communiqué these communiqué s may be open or closed, but are written by 2 or more delegates together, by sharing of resources, intelligence, etc.

Treaty

This is a special form of paperwork that allows delegates to take an official stance regarding any matter. Through this, delegates may declare war, sign a public declaration of friendship, trade resources, negotiate piece, form alliances, etc. Peace treaties will include exchange of some sort, such as territory or resources (such as food, ships, weaponry, etc). Treaties, due to

their official nature will be taken more seriously than statements made in speeches, as after signing a peace treaty, delegates will be expected to avoid war. Attacking without declaration of war, attacking someone you have signed a declaration of friendship with, are all considered dishonourable. Keep in mind that treaties also act as press releases, as they are completely public, hence, not sticking to your word can ruin the public's perception of you as well. A treaty merely requires the mutual consent of the two or more parties signing it. Forgery of treaties is a valid problem, that delegates may either try and prevent, or use to their advantage.



BIBLIOGRAPHY:

<http://defencejournal.com/dec99/1857.htm>

<https://www.britishempire.co.uk/forces/armycampaigns/indiancampaigns/mutiny/mutiny.htm>

http://www.visionias.in/beta/sites/all/themes/momentum/files/Advance%20Course%20for%20GS%20Prelims%202016/Early_Uprising_Against_the_British_and_Revolt_of_1857.pdf

<https://www.mapsofindia.com/maps/india/rebellion-of-1857.html>

https://www.jstor.org/stable/25109412?seq=4#metadata_info_tab_contents

https://www.academia.edu/32440914/THE_REVOLT_OF_1857_IN_BRITISH_INDIA_CASE_OF_SOME_LOYAL_ROYALS

