

Draft:  
The Multiple Meanings of 1857 for Indians in Britain  
by Michael H. Fisher, Danforth Professor of History, Oberlin College, USA

Prominent historians and other commentators have discussed many of the multiple meanings of 1857, particularly studying the disparate roles and responses of various Britons and Indians in India and also the public opinions and policies of Britons in Britain. This paper complements that distinguished work by highlighting how the thousands of Indian men and women of all classes living in British society during and after 1857 related themselves to those events. As a focus, this paper uses the especially significant Awadh diplomatic delegation to London, which included Indian men and women of all classes, from royalty to slaves. The paper closes by pointing to some of the longer-term effects of these events on the actual lives of Indians in Britain. All these Indians, whatever their actual feelings toward the fighting in India, collectively and individually experienced increasingly hostile attitudes from the various Britons surrounding them, catalysed by the 1857 conflict.

The transitions in Britain of Indian experiences and British attitudes toward them over the period surrounding 1857 appear particularly clearly through analysis of this largest and arguably most significant Indian embassy to London up to that point, one sent by Wajid Ali Shah (r. 1847-56, d. 1887), the deposed King of Awadh. Over the years, his dynasty more than any other had dispatched more delegations to London—including more Indian royalty, diplomats, servants, and slaves, in 1822-23, 1824-25, 1835-37, 1837-38, and 1856-63. Awadh had been one of the largest and wealthiest Indian "princely states"; the British annexation of Awadh in 1856 proved to be the last major British aggression ever in India and one of the most controversial, hotly debated at the time on legal and moral grounds by Indians and Britons in both India and Britain.<sup>1</sup> Further, many scholars and commentators have continued until today to regard the annexation of Awadh as one of the prime causes of the insurrection. During 1857-58, Awadh and particularly its capital, Lucknow, became and remained crucial centres of anti-British feeling and action. Virtually all schools of historiography—including British imperialist, bourgeois Indian and Pakistani nationalist, Marxist, and neo-Marxist Subaltern Studies—have found in the conflict in Awadh a class to highlight, condemn, or celebrate. For many Britons, the British defence of the besieged Lucknow Residency ranks a prime and enduring symbol of their heroic pluck against almost overwhelming assaults by Indians. Many of the sepoys (as "mutineers," "freedom fighters," or "peasants in uniform") who fought the British across north India were born in Awadh. The landholding taluqdars of Awadh were seen by the British as among their fiercest opponents during the conflict and staunchest supporters subsequently. Famous among elite Indians fighting against the British were Wajid Ali Shah's wife, Hazrat Mahal, and young son, Birjis Qadr, whose resistance lasted among the longest of any prominent anti-British leaders. The rise of Awadh peasants as a class, for and of themselves, formed a major part of the resistance against both feudal elite landholders and royalty as well as the British. Gramscian-inspired scholars have identified various rebels among the peasants, bandits, and other lumpenproletariat of Awadh.<sup>2</sup>

In 1856, more than one hundred members of this final diplomatic delegation from Awadh, headed by the Queen Mother, went to London to try to reverse this annexation.

They remained there during and after the insurrection of 1857. Indians of each socio-economic class already in London bonded in solidarity with their counterparts in this mission. Many Britons viewed it, and particularly its female leader, variously sympathetically, sceptically, or voyeuristically. Thus, the dynamics and history of this particularly prominent embassy reveals many of the experiences and attitudes faced by virtually all classes of Indians in Britain during the transitions around 1857.

### Historical Context of Indians in Britain

While people from India had been travelling to Britain since the early seventeenth century, the burgeoning British Empire and its expanded transportation networks in Asia from the early nineteenth century onward meant that ever more Indians of all classes decided each year to make the journey to Britain.<sup>3</sup> Over the century from 1757 to 1857, the East India Company conquered and annexed hundreds of kingdoms covering 1.6 million square kilometres (about a million square miles); India's other 800,000 square kilometres (half a million square miles) remained under approximately 550 nominally sovereign Indian "princes" who kept their thrones but struggled under British controls and feared annexation.<sup>4</sup> Over that period, tens of thousands of Indian sepoys, seamen, officials, scholars, students, landholders, businessmen, diplomats, royalty, and others went to London to protest injustices perpetrated against them by British colonialism or to advance their interests serving the British. Once there, they presented petitions and applications directly to the British monarch, Government, law courts, or the East India Company's Court of Directors. Many were convinced by British assertions that justice would ultimately be obtained and wrongs righted if only superior authorities in Britain learned what their British subordinates in India had been perpetrating. Enough of these appellants did indeed obtain redress and/or advancement (or at least promises of these) that further Indians were encouraged to make this journey. Some stayed on as settlers, continuing their campaigns, savouring Britain, establishing careers working for Britons, and/or occasionally finding employment as advisors, local guides, and/or hosts to later Indian arrivals. Some Indians in Britain also developed class solidarities to support them in this alien environment.

During the early nineteenth century, the position and reception of an Indian in British society depended greatly on his or her background: collective (socio-economic class, religious community, gender, and regional origin) and individual (degree of Anglicization, physical features, and particular personal relationships and circumstances). Many Indians had chosen to merge into British society, appreciating the relative acceptance of them by Britons of their economic class, compared to the more racially-divided situation in colonial India. Many Indians, including virtually all Indian settlers, Anglicized their dress, deportment, and names, converted (at least nominally to Christianity), and married a Briton. Thus, these early Indians could shape to some degree how they were received by the Britons around them.

Over this period, however, British attitudes toward the diverse Indians living in British society varied and also changed considerably. Many Britons had interacted easily with Indians who appeared to be of their own socio-economic class and regarded Indian royalty as comparable with European peers. Symptomatic of British acceptance of Indians were the high levels of intermarriage between Indians and native Britons. Others, particularly Britons with personal experience in the colonies, imported the more racially-

based distinctions present there. To some extent, many Britons identified all of Indians as non-British, using a wide and imprecise range of terms and categories including "Asiatic," "Oriental," "Orientalist," "East Indian," "Indian," and "Black," occasionally classing them together with Africans, Afro-Caribbeans, and foreigners generally. European fantasies about the exotic "Oriental woman," particularly the members of the regal harem, as sensually desirable but enticingly inaccessible, added a gendered aura to these images. Yet, the very vagueness of British understanding of who these "others" were gave scope to early Indians to shape to some extent their public personae. Nonetheless, British stereotypes about Indians were hardening by the mid-nineteenth century, and especially did so after 1857.

Collectively the largest number of Indians in Britain at this time were working-class seamen (lascars) and male and female servants. Since the early nineteenth century, a substantial Indian-centred, working-class community, albeit a transient one, had developed in east London. Between 1802 and 1834, off the Ratcliffe Highway near east London's docks, an exclusive contractor with the East India Company had managed a depot or barracks where the 500 to 1,000 Indian seamen who arrived each year, along with various other indigent Indians including servants and diplomats, lived until they could ship home. In 1834, Parliament's suspension for twenty years of the East India Company's Charter to trade in India ended the contract for this depot. This community of lascars and other Indians then moved slightly east to London's Poplar and Limehouse area, nearer the East India Docks. There arose an array of private lodging houses, often under the managements of Indians, anchoring a service-based and Indian-centred community widely known as the Oriental Quarter, attracted many lascars and other unemployed and indigent Indians. Other Indians, even if they lived elsewhere, including servants of diplomatic delegations, also visited this neighbourhood for the distinctively Indian companionship, cuisine, entertainment, and other pleasures available there.

During the decades leading up to 1857, many Britons began to regard the Oriental Quarter as an alien presence in the imperial capital. Social reformers and religious evangelicals found its mixing of Indian and British cultures, peoples, and bodies to be a threat to British morality. Britons made efforts to control and manage the seamen and other working-class Indians there. Yet, the necessities of imperial commerce meant that thousands of Indian maritime labourers continued to arrive and live in London, estimated at 3,000-3,600 annually in the early 1850s.<sup>5</sup>

Particularly prominent in Britain were the various Indian diplomatic delegations that trooped to the British imperial capital. Given that hundreds of Indian dynasties were deposed by the British, the thirty Indian missions that reached London by 1857—often evading the Governor-General's explicit direction or advice that they not go—was a relatively modest number. Once in Britain, the most effective among these embassies learned about and manoeuvred through the world of British politics, often aligning with British opposition politicians in critiquing and/or embarrassing the British Government or East India Company administration in India. Some successfully obtained enhanced pensions and influence in high British society including with the British monarch. While no official British policies in India were reversed by the lobbying and bribing done by these Indian delegations, colonial officials apparently restrained themselves somewhat from particularly egregious annexations or other imperial assertions by the knowledge that their deeds would face hostile scrutiny in London. Further, as we will see, the rented

residences of the various Indian missions, including that from Awadh, the largest of them all, also provided centres for socializing among the various other Indian visitors and settlers in London, as well as sympathetic British supporters and hangers-on.

British public opinion toward these often colourful Indian delegations proved mixed and shifted adversely against them by the mid-nineteenth century. On one hand, these exotic-looking ambassadors and their entourages brought colour and panoply to London as an imperial capital. On the other hand, growing imperial confidence degraded the significance of these Indian missions while contempt for oriental despotism made them appear as archaic demonstrations of Indian backwardness, contrasting with British modernity and progress.

Thus, leading up to 1857, most Indians in Britain lived in (and often moved among) British society generally, the community of the Oriental Quarter of east London, or the smaller social centres provided by Indian diplomatic delegations. Yet, various Indians increasingly felt alienated by the spreading phenomenon and injustice of British imperialism, both in India and globally. Living in Britain provided them with the distance to perceive the larger patterns, something more difficult to do from the perspective of India. They also observed, either from news reports or first-hand, anti-British fighting, as in the Crimean War; the relative success of the Russians there questioned British invincibility. Overall, a sense of themselves as collectively Indian and an early patriotism developed among these groups, even as they bonded to their fellows from different regions and/or religious communities.

In 1857, reports and rumours from India alleging the disloyalty of Indian servants and sepoys of the Britons they served, including discriminate murder and rape, made all Indian males suddenly appear dangerous to most Britons. Even particularly sympathetic Britons regarded all Indian men with suspicion and a sense of betrayal. Many expected Indians to "prove" their trustworthiness by speaking or acting against the "mutineers." Others verbally assaulted passing Indian men with unfounded epithets like "Johnny Sepoy." British official and also collective antipathy increased dramatically against the Awadh mission in particular since some of the suddenly infamous leaders of the fighting against the British were members of that dynasty.

When word of the 1857 conflict reached Indians in Britain, virtually all recognized that they had to make visible choice, whatever their private sentiments. Most of those supportive of the insurrection dared not express that sentiment in the face of an almost uniformly hostile host society. Some publicly professed their loyalty to Britain and opposition to the "mutineers," hoping to use this crisis to their own political or personal advantage, or at least to mitigate its disadvantages. Of those who returned to India, some faced accusations of treason, arrest, and interrogation by British authorities. Indeed, some of the most prominent who fought against the British in India had been embittered by prejudice and injustice that they personally experienced during their time in Britain.

After the immediate crisis of 1857-58 ended, British attitudes toward Indians in Britain softened somewhat but did not completely revert to earlier modes. Subsequent British stereotypes largely rendered all "Indians" as unalterably alien, reinforced as these stereotypes were by popular understandings of Darwinian biological inheritance, pseudo-scientific social Darwinism, and the "race"-based conflicts in 1865 in Jamaica and lasting until 1872 in New Zealand. Yet, British Raj policies favouring Indian princes as the

"natural leaders" of India actually gained them more access to the British Queen and more favourable policies from the British Government. Hence, the later lives of Indians remaining or newly arrived in Britain continued to be affected by the reverberations of 1857.

### Indian and British Men and Womenfolk

One particularly salient theme in the changes caused by the events of 1857 was that of gender relations between Britons and Indians. In Britain, there were relatively fewer Indian women than men present. Most Indian women were the wives of Britons or their servants and they appeared infrequently as objects of public debate there. The rare elite Indian women in Britain, however, drew particular attention from the British public because of the aura of the harem and their veiled visages forbidden to British men, and therefore particularly enticing. Crowds of British male gapers went to great lengths to catch a glimpse of such Indian women, including the aging Queen Mother of Awadh. While the British press poked fun at these British "peeping toms," it also simultaneously directed the attention of British readers to the secluded presence of these Indian royal women. Further, elite British women made special efforts to call upon these Indian aristocratic ladies and then to report on the degree of alleged attractiveness or disappointment of those women's personal features.

British public attention also concentrated on the relatively more numerous male Indians in Britain and their relations, or supposed relations, with British women. Earlier in the nineteenth century, many elite British men and women had regarded Indian men as innocent victims, easily gulled by predatory British women, especially sex-workers but ranging up to aristocrats. Over the decade prior to 1857, however, many Britons were coming to regard such inter-racial relations (as later Britons would term them) to be socially dangerous to British morality.

On their part, many Indian men had long regarded their own relatively easy familiarity with British women in Britain as empowering; numerous Indian male authors suggested or explicitly discussed this phenomenon—what Tavakoli-Targhi calls "Euroeroticism."<sup>6</sup> The situation in the metropole powerfully contrasted to that in India where British colonialists strongly asserted their racial separation and superiority, and especially stressed the prevention of social or sexual relations between British women and Indian men. Thus, once in Britain, many Indian men considered their relationships with British women as valuable by enhancing their own self-esteem as well as providing their entrée into British society.

The sudden and shocking news of the events in 1857 focused and hardened British attitudes against all Indians. Lurid rumours and reports flooded London about sepyo atrocities in India against British women, including mass rapes, highlighted gendered differences of racial identity and led to a degree of British national hysteria. Only a few Britons dared express toleration, saying Indians, especially men they had known, could not be as bad as news and rumours portrayed. Indian men's hitherto relatively easy relationships in Britain with British women of their own economic class now became seen by many Britons as charged with racial and sexual transgression. Indian women in India—despite the prominence of the Begum Hazrat Mahal of Awadh and the Rani of Jhansi as well as the sexual violation of many Indian women (that must have occurred)—did not apparently draw as much hostile attention, these women either

appearing as romantic heroines or masculinized warriors. Most of the alleged atrocities involved male protagonists and British women as subjects, either of molestation by Indian men or revenge by British men.

British popular authors represented these changed gender attitudes. Prior to 1857, for example, Sir Walter Scott's The Surgeon's Daughter (Edinburgh: R. Cadell, 1830), was perhaps the only popular book suggesting Indian male desire for British womanhood (and that novel highlighted a Scottish procurer of a Scottish virgin for the notorious Tipu Sultan). During and subsequent to 1857, however, such British fictional accounts of Indian men pursuing or assaulting British women, as well as "Mutiny" literature generally, became a virtual genre, continuing to today. Thus, the events of 1857 made White British womanhood into the symbol of British purity that needed protection and created British public and official hostility against Indian men in Britain as well as India. By considering closely one example, that of the large diplomatic delegation from Awadh in London, we can see various of these changes, gendered and otherwise, around the events of 1857.

### Awadh's Last Royal Diplomatic Delegation

The unrealistic goal of the final diplomatic mission from Awadh was to convince the British in London to reverse the recent annexation of their kingdom carried out by the Governor-General in India. In 1856, after being dethroned, Wajid Ali Shah refused the proffered £150,000 annual pension (although this meant severe financial hardship for his many dependents, both those who went with him into exile in Calcutta and those who stayed behind in Lucknow). Instead, he determined to go to London personally to petition Queen Victoria, Parliament, and the Directors, protesting this immoral and illegal act. When the British blocked him from travelling to London, he diplomatically reported illness and instead dispatched a delegation officially headed by his mother, Queen Dowager Janab-i Aulia Taj Ara Begum (1795/1803-1858), supported by his son and proclaimed heir, Mirza Muhammad Hamid Ali Mirza Bahadur (1836/38-1874), and one of Wajid Ali Shah's younger brothers, General Mirza Sikandar Hushmat Bahadur (1822-58). As British newspapers frequently reported, the Queen Mother was personally attended by: nine of her "daughters" (probably including younger relatives and ladies in waiting); twenty-one other female servants and slaves; seven eunuchs (including a nearly seven foot tall "Nubian" slave); her personal interpreter, Englishman Captain John Rose Brandon; her personal hakim (doctor); and numerous other aides and courtiers. Similarly, the Heir Apparent and the General each had their own entourages, for a total of 113 people in the mission. Most prominent among the diplomats assisting the Queen Mother was Maulvi Muhammad Mussehood-Deen Khan Bahadur (b.1804), whom Wajid Ali Shah appointed to carry out the actual negotiations with the British on behalf of the royal principals.

Mussehood-Deen's family had long served the Awadh rulers but for the last three generations had worked for the British as intermediary officials and judges.<sup>7</sup> Mussehood-Deen himself had been twelve years employed by the British, receiving from them the title "Khan Bahadur" and rising to the high office of Mir Munshi ("chief secretary") in the Persian Department in Calcutta, the peak in his profession. After someone leaked a confidential British document to the Awadh ruler, the British accused and fired him in 1844, with none of the charges against him ever proven, or even made

explicit. After this dismissal, he found employment with the Awadh ruler, despite British insistence that he be dismissed by that ruler.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, other Indian experts in British ways but resentful of their mistreatment by British hands, supported this mission (as we will see).

Even before the Awadh envoys disembarked in Britain, Wajid Ali Shah's hired British agent there—Major Robert Wilberforce Bird, the former Assistant Resident to Awadh who had been transferred for allegedly supporting the Awadh dynasty against the policies of his superiors—made sure that news of this distinguished embassy circulated in Britain. This news excited both Indians and Britons because of the nature of the mission, its size and opulence, and its composition. For example, the thirteen person delegation headed by the claimant as Nawab of Surat, Mir Jafur Ali Khan Bahadur (which had already been in London since 1854 on his second visit), reportedly enthused at the prospect of their arrival; its diplomats later conveyed to the Awadh mission their hard-earned experience dealing with British authorities and the British public. An English missionary, Joseph Salter, who had attached himself to the Surat embassy, echoed their anticipation by hyperbolically declaring: "The visit of a Mohammedan Queen to London was the most extraordinary event our Indian empire had ever witnessed."<sup>9</sup> An Indian scholar, author, and official, Syed Abdullah of Pushkar (who had married and settled in London), reported himself delighted that there were "upwards of 12 learned Moulvees, Moonshees, Poets, Authors, etc. in the suite of H.M. the Queen Dowager of Oude."<sup>10</sup> He had already presented to the East India Company's Directors for their Museum his translation of an Urdu poem by Wajid Ali Shah, called "Ocean of Love."<sup>11</sup> Later Syed Abdullah met with and advised this mission (as he did others), serving as a translator for it; his appeal to Wajid Ali Shah for a regular salaried position with it, however, failed.<sup>12</sup> Thus, when the Awadh delegation reached Southampton via Alexandria on 20 August 1856 with a grand display, it attracted fascination from other Indians already in Britain and also the British public.

By this point, British popular opinion had well-established but not consistent expectations about "oriental" royalty, especially royal women, and how they should be regarded. In this environment, the British press reflected competing efforts by supporters and opponents of this mission to put their own "spin" on its particular significance. Initially, in the tone of a British royal court calendar, for example, the Times listed by name and title the mission's leading dignitaries.<sup>13</sup> This early article assured the British public that these dignitaries would receive "every accommodation" and noted that its ladies observed seclusion and therefore the embassy would hire entire hotels so as not to have to share it with other guests. A subsequent Times article announced:

The disembarkation of these illustrious individuals has excited the greatest curiosity, and a vast number of people congregated in the docks to witness it. The *suite* and attendants are most gorgeously attired in the Oriental costume. The Queen-mother was brought on shore in a sedan-chair, closely veiled, and the same seclusion was observed in reference to the landing of her daughters.<sup>14</sup>

This article also indicated their vast and easy wealth by recounting that jewels worth £50,000 had fallen overboard in the Red Sea. A few days later, the Times publicized some of the many British personages who paid their respects to the delegation: "the Earl and Countess of Hardwicke, Lady St. John, the Ladies Yorke, Sir George Pollock, Sir

George Wombwell, Admiral Ayscough, Viscount Royston..."<sup>15</sup> While not even these aristocrats could approach the Queen Mother, the Mayor of Southampton, Mr Andres, was permitted by the delegation to shake a female hand extended from behind the purdah; British newspapers debated whether this hand was truly that of the Queen Mother or else merely that of a servant who sacrificed her modesty as a concession to British manners.<sup>16</sup>

The Queen Mother was, however, not the first royal woman from Awadh who had fascinated Britain. Twenty years earlier had come the daughter of a previous Awadh ruler (and an aunt of Wajid Ali Shah) named Mariam Begum but famous in Britain as "Princess Mulvi" (from the name of her husband, Mumtaraz al-Ulama, Maulvi Muhammad Ismael Khan, the Awadh court scientist).<sup>17</sup> Her treatment of her female slaves, including locking one "naked" over a cold March night in the outer garden of their Marylebone mansion, had scandalized her neighbours and titillated British newspaper readers.<sup>18</sup> Nonetheless, Princess Mulvi also found a sympathetic reception from many in British society. One seventeen-year old Englishwoman, Caroline Fox, provided an extended account of meeting her on several occasions:

She was seated in great state in the midst of the family circle, talking English with great self possession, inspite of her charming blunders. Her dress was an immense pair of trousers of striped Indian silk, a Cashmere shawl laid over her head, over a close covering of blue and yellow silk, two pairs of remarkable slippers, numbers of anklets and leglets, a great deal of jewelry, and a large blue cloak over all. She was very conversable, showed us her ornaments, wrote her name and title in English and Arabic in my book, and offered to make an egg curry... She told us of going to "the Court of the King of London—He very good man, but he no power.—Parliament all power.—King no give half-penny but call Parliament, make council, council give leave, King give half penny.—For public charity King give one sovereign, poor little shopman, baker-man, fish-man, barter-man also give one sovereign. Poor King!—King Oude [Awadh] he give one thousand rupees, palanquin mans with gold stick, elephants, camels; no ask Parliament." She and papa talked a little theology: she of course began it. "I believe but one God, very bad not to think so; you believe Jesus Christ was prophet?" Papa said, "Not a prophet, but the Son of God." "How you think so, God Almighty never marry!"... She showed us some magnificent jewelry, immense pearls, diamonds, and emeralds, tied up so carelessly in a dirty handkerchief. Her armlets were very curious, and she had a silver ring on her great toe, which lay in no obscurity before her. Then a number of her superb dresses were displayed, gold and silver tissues, satins, cashmeres, muslins of an almost impossible thinness, which she is going to give away at Mecca.<sup>19</sup>

This description, while condescending, nevertheless portrays Mariam Begum as lively, witty, and intriguingly exotic, and further a person generally aware of the contrasting constitutional roles of the Awadh and British kings. For years, London society pondered Mariam Begum's behaviour and sought to decipher the limits and connotations of her purda practices.<sup>20</sup> Similar fascinated if uninformed British attitudes likewise greeted Awadh's Queen Mother in 1856.



Some British sentiment soon shifted against this final Awadh delegation, however, despite the lobbying of its hired publicists. The Times marked the Awadh nobles for their exotic display, but depicted their attendants as dirty drugged loafers who alienated the space in Britain that they occupied:

Although the appearance of the Princesses and principal attendants is most superb by reason of the elaborate and costly dresses with which they are attired, the mass of the inferior servants present an unusually filthy and unsightly group. Ranging on the basement floors of the hotel are large numbers continually to be seen lounging in the most careless manner, or squatting before a charcoal fire either cooking some article of food or indulging in the fumes derived from a dirty opium pipe. The entire floor of this portion of the hotel is strewn with the clothing of the inhabitants, and in appearance much resembles the back premises of an extensive rag merchant, the whole being rendered more unpleasant by the quantity of dirt which each article of dress apparently contains.

We can contrast these mid-nineteenth century images with those of earlier periods, when even Indian servants considered exotic rarities by most Britons.

At the same time, the Times described British commoners as mesmerized by this insubstantial oriental luxury and veiled sexuality:

...at present the interest excited is one of mere vulgar curiosity on the part of the multitude, who desire only to see the dresses and appointments of the servants and followers, and greedily drink in the absurd tales of the fabulous wealth and jewels belonging to the Royal party, which have been industriously circulated. Besides the usual rabble of boys consequent on such occasions, numbers of respectably dressed persons, with now and then a carriage filled with occupants, are to be seen intently gazing at the exterior of the Royal York Hotel, where the illustrious party is located, and great pains are frequently taken to secure a sight of the ladies of the Royal party, who sometimes take a sly peep from the upper apartments upon the congregated numbers assembled in the streets below.

Thus, some British newspapers recorded the British masses and Indian visitors observing each other.

The Globe newspaper depicted vulgar British delight in the Awadh delegation as a "raree-show."<sup>21</sup> This newspaper also ridiculed the obsession with seclusion by the Awadh women and their servants. It compared the members of the mission to the Shakespearian monster Caliban, and called them "charlatan"; the mission's goal was "ill-advised and preposterous." It debunked Bird's rhetorical efforts to sway the British mob. The Times, which had initially published more favorable representations of the delegation, echoed this scathing article. The Times thus shifted against the mission within ten days of their arrival, now portraying it as a nuisance to the British rather than a source of pride, profit, or even entertainment:

The strangely dressed natives stroll and lounge about the street without apparently the slightest notice being taken of them... Altogether the natives appear a very good-tempered race, and amuse themselves principally by troubling shopkeepers to explain the quality and use of the

articles exposed for sale, but in few instances making purchases at the prices which they are called upon to tender for the transfer of the goods.<sup>22</sup> In addition to their reluctance to spend money, the Times attributed unpleasant odours to them as a "race" apart. Indeed, the hotel that they rented would allegedly be unfit for respectable people (i.e., Europeans) for some time: "Mr. White, the proprietor, received 100£ for the use of his premises during the 10 days they have been occupied; and we do not doubt that it will be at least as many more days before the establishment will be again rendered fit to be used as the residence of a European."<sup>23</sup>

By the time of their departure by train from Southampton for London, the delegation retained mainly its curiosity factor. The Times stressed the childish disorganization and impracticality of these "natives" and "Orientalists." (Such language meant Indians were "natives" everywhere but Britons were not "natives" even in their homeland.) Again the press highlighted as comical and ineffectual the efforts of the eunuchs and other servants to follow "the customs of their race" and protect the modesty of their Queen, "this curious specimen of Eastern royalty," as she moved from covered carriage to the train.<sup>24</sup> Yet, the eunuchs were defeated by plucky Britons who climbed onto the roof of the railroad carriage to peer over the inadequate screening:

one or two [British male] persons, availing themselves of the opportunity afforded owing to the attention of the officials being directed to the importance of the proceeding, climbed to the roof of the Royal carriage, and by that means witnessed the Queen's progress between the two lines of drapery placed to secure privacy. However, the gratification could not have been very great, as Her Majesty was closely veiled.

Nonetheless, after the mission established itself in London, the Times later described the physical features of the Awadh Dowager Queen for the edification of the British public: "The Queen-Mother is between 50 and 60, and of a somewhat corpulent figure, of a light copper colored complexion."<sup>25</sup>

Some in British society admired her devotion but presupposed her incapable of effective action or even of understanding of British politics: "this journey of the widowed Queen to Europe, to solicit the restoration of her son to the throne of Oude [Awadh], displayed such an unusual energy of maternal affection as could only excite admiration. But, alas! what influence could she expect to exert in England; confined as she had been to her harem in Lucknow, ignorant of the usages of civilized life, with no one to plead her cause, or interested in her son's welfare?"<sup>26</sup>

In London, the embassy rented the Duke of Brunswick's Harley House on New Road [now Euston Road] for a year at £550 rent. It was not very secluded nor was it large enough for the entire entourage; they also hired nearby houses for the rest. Newspapers pictured their moving in as a great bustle of effeminate activity and expense:

The [British] mob...gaze and laugh at the barbaric crowd in feminine garb, who, with their semi-virile chiefs, throng the ante-rooms of the New-road harem, or cluster on the tops of the neighbouring cabs... The wrongs of the Oudean [Awadh] dynasty have produced a less intense effect than the number, the costume, and the dirt of the Oudean domestics.<sup>27</sup>

This delegation thus had become not a great honor to Britain but a comic Oriental farce.

For some Indians in Britain, however, this lavish delegation appeared both as a source of pride and also of employment and social support. Among them was Mirza Ali

Ackbar Khan Bahadur (b.1817). Until his sudden dismissal in 1848, he had achieved the highest levels of his profession as munshi under British officials. He had started working for Britons from age fourteen and by his thirties he had risen to the post of Chief Munshi, confidential secretary, and Persian translator to Sir Charles Napier.<sup>28</sup> This post made him one of the most influential Indians in newly annexed Sindh. Over the years, his British employers had honoured him with the title Khan Bahadur, a set of elegant pistols, and many glowing testimonials.<sup>29</sup> His monthly salary had risen to Rupees 520 (£625 annually). Yet, his career was also controversial (as was that of Napier). When charged with accepting bribes in 1842, Ali Ackbar had satisfied his British supervisor that his enemies were trying "frame" him. Yet, in 1845, when he had sued an Indian merchant for a Rupees 100,000 debt in a Bombay court, that merchant reported him to the Government as corrupt.<sup>30</sup> The Bombay Government began a long investigation which found his income disproportionate to his assets, allegedly including a palatial house in Karachi, private gardens, and a string of race-horses. Both he and Napier rejected these charges as malicious and inaccurate. Ali Ackbar denied his house was very valuable or that he had any race-horses, and that his property was legitimately acquired. Specifically, he explained the Rupees 100,000 as one-third inherited, one-third borrowed, and one-third earned by private trading. Unconvinced, the Bombay Government suspended him without pay in 1848 on suspicion, and then added more accusations including that he had stolen British secret documents and sold them to one of the many competing Sindh rulers, Ameer Ali Morad.<sup>31</sup> Although Ali Ackbar largely won his case in the Bombay Supreme Court and the investigation could find no firm proof of his guilt, the Bombay Government dismissed him anyway in 1849 without a pension. He fought this in Bombay and then, when unsuccessful there, went to Britain to continue his cause, officially as Persian Secretary in the suite of Mir Jafur of Surat, but allegedly also secretly in the pay of Ameer Ali Morad.<sup>32</sup>

Once in London, Ali Ackbar supported himself by working as advisor to the Awadh mission as well as that of Meer Jafur, as he explained, "writing pamphlets and taking opinions."<sup>33</sup> In addition, he also assisted the deposed ruler of Coorg, Veer Rajunder Wadiar (r. 1820-34, d. 1859), who had retired in London along with his Christian-convert daughter, Gauramma (goddaughter to Queen Victoria).<sup>34</sup> Among other services, Ali Ackbar witnessed the late Coorg ruler's will, which bequeathed him £100 and three carriages, plus horses to pull them. British critics remarked snidely how Ali Ackbar prospered in London through such work on behalf of other Indians.

Further, in London, Ali Ackbar submitted to the East India Company's Directors his own case for reinstatement or pension. They adopted their usual position that all such matters must be handled only in India. He nevertheless continued for years to appeal and lobby to defend his honour and obtain his pension.<sup>35</sup> The Napier faction in London backed him during bitter partisan disputes that raged in Parliament, the Company, and the public throughout this period. Ali Ackbar and his British supporters got Parliament on three separate occasions to demand all the papers relevant to his dismissal.<sup>36</sup> Using these hitherto confidential British documents, Ali Ackbar published a rebuttal: Reply to Attacks upon his Character Made by H. M. Frere, Esq., of the Bombay Civil Service, Without Proof or Inquiry (London: I.R. Taylor, 1858). After the Company lost its authority over India, Ali Ackbar petitioned the India Office which replaced it, but never received satisfaction.<sup>37</sup>

The Awadh mission's many nobility, scribes, and servants also interacted socially with the growing number of other Indians in London, according to their respective classes, and also with curious or interested Britons.<sup>38</sup> As a British missionary (who often visited the Surat mission seeking converts) described the interactions of those servants with their fellows from the Awadh mission and other working-class Indians in London:

The inmates of Harley House, however, were not long in discovering that a colony of Orientals was already established in London, and their number was soon increased by deserters from ships, and the Asiatic vagrants of the metropolis, and all soon made acquaintance with the suite of the Nawab of Surat. Some of them came into the kitchen of the Nawab... winter was then approaching and the cold autumnal winds blew with terrible effect on the naked legs of the visitors. English boots and stockings were produced by the servants of the Nawab; the boots were examined and approved of, but the stockings excited deep curiosity, and were the subject of much discussion as they were handed about for inspection.<sup>39</sup>

This observer also depicted their evening's socializing:

after dinner, which generally took place about seven o'clock, cards and tea were always placed on the table, visitors from other families would drop in... the dhol or native drum would be brought forward, a series of native songs sung... a long table, capable of seating about fifteen persons... was occupied by the card-players, the interval being usually filled up by tea and coffee drinkers and smokers."<sup>40</sup>

Thus, the shared experiences in London bonded these working-class Indians, and the accumulated knowledge of earlier visitors passed to later ones. Further, many of these Indian servants joined other working-class Indians in east London's Oriental Quarter, finding there fellowship and pleasure. For example, during the fast of Ramzan, which the Awadh and Surat delegations officially respected, unobservant attendants went there to eat and drink.<sup>41</sup>

Similar gatherings took place among middle-class Indians attached to the Awadh and other missions, settlers in London, and British hangers-on. The conversations took place in Urdu, although they sometimes led to political disputes. For example, the evening of Sunday, 7 September 1856, such a get-together took place at the 15 Warwick-road, Paddington, mansion where the Surat mission lived. A British Urdu-speaking participant, Major John Rose Troup (who had resigned from the East India Company's army in order to marry the foster daughter of the Begum Sombre, princess of Sardhana), described it and the scuffle it produced:

He found several persons sitting round a table in conversation with each other. They were all sober. There was only a decanter of water on the table. Some remarks were made by several of the company about the Rajah of Coorg, during which [Syed Abdoollah, a settler from Awadh] observed he was sorry to say that his countrymen [in London] were a treacherous and corrupt set of villains, and that the Rajah had not pearls or shawls to smooth public opinion. There was a dead silence after that remark, and [Syed Abdoollah] was very excited. After a short pause, [Ali Ackbar (discussed above)] said in a very kind way, "What do you mean?" [Syed Abdoollah] replied that he would not answer him. [Ali Ackbar]

observed, "That he was a donkey," and ordered him to go out. [Syed Abdoollah] refused to go, and remarked that [Ali Ackbar] was not the master. [Ali Ackbar] took hold of complainant by the coat, and said, "Come out." When in the passage [Syed Abdoollah] wanted to fight.<sup>42</sup> They scuffled and Ali Ackbar ripped Syed Abdoollah's British-style dress coat "nearly from the collar to the skirt," dislodging Syed Abdoollah's purse. The London Police then intervened. While in court Syed Abdoollah claimed to be a member of the Awadh delegation, they denied he had any official position with them. He then clarified that he had earlier been a secretary attached to Wajid Ali Shah in Lucknow who had later settled in London. He was known for his hot temper; indeed, in 1855 he had written a heated letter to the Times defending the honor of the Awadh dynasty and its government.<sup>43</sup> The Awadh embassy's lawyer represented Syed Abdoollah but his complaint was dismissed by the British magistrate.

While the members of this embassy met socially with their fellows across London, the Awadh emissaries officially mobilized their campaigns to win over the Directors, Parliament, Queen Victoria, and the British public. But, in these mid-nineteenth century years of British burgeoning imperialism, they met largely unsympathetic official responses. The Awadh Queen Mother wrote formally announcing her arrival and submitting the Awadh ex-ruler's appeal to reverse the annexation; the Directors and Board of Control rejected these.<sup>44</sup> She hired a firm of British lawyers (Gregory, Skirrow and Company) to formally request all the relevant papers in the Company's files, all unavailable in India. At first, the Directors refused to provide them. The delegation, however, induced Parliament to demand them, which made these accessible for the Awadh mission to refute.<sup>45</sup> Not until early 1857, six months after their arrival, were they received at the Company's headquarters, and then only as a courtesy not as ambassadors.<sup>46</sup> Indian members of the delegation also wrote letters to prominent British authorities and many newspapers.<sup>47</sup> Their British lobbyist Bird published a pamphlet outlining the wrongs perpetrated against them, The Spoliation of Oudh (London: W.S. Johnson, 1857), which he then expanded under the pseudonym, Samuel Lucas, into Dacoitee in Excelsis (London: Nassau Steam Press, 1857). Further, Mussehood-Deen published his own book: Oude: Its Princes and Its Government Vindicated (London: J. Davy and Sons, 1857).

By this time, however, some in the British press regarded the mission as a contest between British purity and Oriental debauchery. The Times now proclaimed the delegates: "parasites...lapped and nurtured in an atmosphere of venality, and hardened in the routine of those vile arts by which Eastern courtiers rise and fall..."<sup>48</sup> Yet, in fact, unconnected British and Indian swindlers bilked gullible Britons across Britain, using the scam that they represented the Awadh delegation.<sup>49</sup>

Frustrations led to further internal dissention. As described by a British observer: One day, on entering Harley House, all was astir and in a state of commotion; eight of the inmates had been poisoned, and narrowly escaped with their lives.

Such was the state of anarchy, jealousy, and deadly enmity towards each other in which they lived, ever plotting one against another! so that whilst the royal household was conflicting with Parliament, they were at war amongst themselves, till law-suits and counter claims disorganized the

whole establishment. But a shock was about to come, that would paralyze their secret counsels and blight their sanguine hopes; the astounding news of the Indian Mutiny blasted all their prospects and rendered their further residence in England useless.<sup>50</sup>

Indeed, the sporadically arriving news of the outbreak of the 1857 fighting destroyed most remaining public or official sympathy for the Awadh cause.

Nonetheless, it took a few months for a new British position to harden. For example, in mid-July, the Illustrated London News painted an unsympathetic history of Awadh. It concluded by arguing that the main virtue of the Queen of Awadh's visit is that it would draw attention of British public to the horrific events in India. Yet, in its 1 August Supplement, this journal published an etching of the delegation's leading men portrayed as dignitaries, albeit oriental ones.<sup>51</sup> [see Image OUDEVIS.BMP caption: left to right: interpreter, King's brother, heir, King's aide-de-camp; King's Agent.].

Official British policies also hardened. British authorities in Britain and India seized all the copies they could of Mussehood-Deen's recent book: Oude: Its Princes and Its Government Vindicated.<sup>52</sup> In India, to distribute or even possess a copy of this work became evidence for treason.

Nevertheless, the Awadh mission in London persisted. Yet, they, like other Indian delegations in London, now had additionally to protest their loyalty to the British, including through a petition to the House of Lords.<sup>53</sup> In this they expressed their "...sincere regret [at] the tidings which have reached the British kingdom of disaffection prevailing among native troops in India." They assured that they themselves were 'a Royal race, ever faithful and true to their friendship with the British nation'. Nevertheless, the Lords rejected their petition on a technicality, since it omitted the required term "Humble" in places where protocol repeatedly demanded it. Even the petition's sponsor, Lord Campbell, excused himself for having submitted it, which he said he did out of duty alone.

In November 1857, the delegation unrealistically offered to reconquer and rule India for Victoria: "We propose that the Prince Mirza Md. Hamid Allie Bahadur Heir Apparent to the King of Oude now resident in England should immediately proceed to India supported by a British Force and in the name of the King of Oude should assume the Government of the Country and call upon the People to rally round the Standard of the Sovereign against the revolted Sepoys."<sup>54</sup> They cited the precedent of Dost Muhammad, ruler of Afghanistan, whom the British had once imprisoned in Calcutta but who was supporting them in 1857. This proposal met no encouragement from the British.

Other Indian diplomats in London had to adopt the same position of protesting loyalty to a disbelieving British public. For example, Mir Jafar of Surat accepted a compromise of only : a pension of £10,000 annually, plus a cash payment of £20,000. Meer Jafur accepted this compromise after two visits and five years of negotiations in London, as he lamented: "worn out...in the unequal and protracted struggle to obtain justice at the hands of the British Government."<sup>55</sup> Further, news of the bloody fighting of 1857 in India began reaching London, making the environment more hostile to Indians there. In August 1857, Meer Jafur returned home.<sup>56</sup> Although one of his Indian assistants, an elderly "English Secretary," an Indian stayed on in Britain for years and wrote defending Islam against Christianity.<sup>57</sup>

Similarly, Mehdi Ali Khan Bahadur (d.1863), who had gone to London in 1856 in order to gain the title and estate of his late father-in-law, the Nawab of Rampoor, initially proved able to obtain the support of Members of Parliament. News of the events of 1857, however, put paid to his chances, and left him in a dilemma. To return to India might appear disloyal to the British, so, whatever his true personal feelings, he wrote the Directors assuring them of his loyalty and begging them not to misinterpret his departure for home which was solely on the basis of his "health."<sup>58</sup>

Indeed, the British Government and Directors increasingly pressured other delegations to leave. They instructed Ali Morad of Sindh to abandon his campaign for restored sovereignty and go 'manifest your zeal and fidelity in the service of the British Government' there.<sup>59</sup> Likewise, Syed Uckbur Ally and Khirat Ali Khan Bangash had been in London since 1851 representing Raja Tuckt Singh of Jodhpur. In September 1857, they submitted petitions to the Company's Directors and to the House of Commons which proclaimed: "the devoted friendship and zeal displayed by the Prince my master upon the breaking out of the deplorable occurrences that now convulse the portions of India contingent to his possessions and the promptitude with which (as I learn from the Public Press) he came to the assistance of the British Government... [showing] his unwavering loyalty" by sending 5,000 troops to support the British.<sup>60</sup> These diplomats, however, left London for Bombay at end of 1857, where they and their English attorney was arrested on charges of treason. The British ship captain testified against them:

the Mahommedan secretary [Khirat Ali Khan Bangash], in my presence and in the presence of the passengers, said that he could murder [Governor-General] Lord Dalhousie without remorse, and throw his body to the vultures, or something to that effect.... He frequently expressed his sympathy with the rebels and mutineers, and expressed his wishes for their success. He frequently stated that the country would be much better governed under native princes and rulers than by the English. The Syed vakeel [Syed Uckbur Ally] never expressed himself. He spoke English indifferently, and had little to say.... I now produce a book, entitled, "Oude, its Princes and its Government Vindicated." It was given to me by one of the passengers, Mrs. Fellows, who told me that Mr. Hudson [their British lawyer] had sent it to her, and that he had assisted in its compilation. I understand that a case of these books is on board intended for circulation here...<sup>61</sup>

The ship captain added for good measure that one of their servants, Mirjan, had abandoned his English wife back in London.

Even working-class Indians encountered the sudden opprobrium of appearing to be a "hostile." For example, a Bengali named Joaleeka, had come to London with Gholam Mohamed, youngest son Tipu Sultan, in 1854. While staying in the Oriental Hotel, Joaleeka fraternized with British women of his class, although he was in his forties. He reported:

I formed a connection with a white woman. She was a servant in the hotel. I broke my caste and from that moment I knew that it would not do for me to go back to India. The girl fell in the family-way...<sup>62</sup>

Rather than return to India, Joaleeka stayed on in London (although he abandoned his first English lover and their child), living with a series of other English and

Irish women, fathering at least four more children with them, and nominally converting to Christianity (although, he said, "so I turned Christian. I do not know what it means, but I am a Christian, and have been for many years"). Despite having thus settled in London for years, earning by interpreting for other Indians, begging from Britons, and doing odd jobs, British attitudes toward him radically changed during the fighting of 1857: "After the mutiny...I did very badly. No one would look at a poor Indian then—much less give to him... All that knew me used to chaff me about it, and call me Johnny Sepoy." Thus, Indians of all classes faced new difficulties during that period.

To add to the problems of the Awadh delegation in particular, its funds dwindled as Wajid Ali Shah remained in close confinement in Calcutta throughout the 1857 conflict.<sup>63</sup> They wrote: "The expenses in London [were] so much greater than what Her Majesty and the Princes could possibly have expected"; with much difficulty, the Awadh ex-King sent them £4,783 in October 1857.<sup>64</sup> He, however, also further confused the situation by sending Colonel Richard Ousely (who had just been suspended from the Bengal Army) to take over as "chief agent for the conduct of His Majesty's affairs in this country" at a lavish salary. After Ousely reached London at the end of 1857, the Awadh mission recognized his status but refused to give him any money.<sup>65</sup> After six months unpaid, unrecognized by the Directors, and becoming unwell, Ousely withdrew from further involvement with this cause. The Awadh delegation's appeals to the Directors for financial assistance received a cold shoulder.<sup>66</sup> They, gave up Harley House as inauspicious (after two women servants had died there) and rented four attached houses on Warwick Road (one leased by Jafur Ali of Surat), plus a country home in Richmond for the Queen Mother.<sup>67</sup> Finally, they received another £7,156 from Wajid Ali Shah in January 1858.<sup>68</sup>

In the face of the intensified British hostility to the Awadh ruler and his embassy, financial pressured and internal conflicts within the delegation broke it apart. In September 1857, Musseehood-Deen wrote the Directors requesting that they ignore any communications that came directly from the Queen Mother, since she had come under the influence of people opposed to him.<sup>69</sup> Some of the Awadh mission, finding no support in London, decided to go to Paris and from there to Mecca and back to Calcutta.<sup>70</sup> Although the British Government rejected their request for passports, the French government issued them.<sup>71</sup> In Paris, the Queen Mother died (24 January 1858), as supporters in Parliament said, 'of a broken heart'.<sup>72</sup> Next month, her son died in Paddington, London (25 February 1858). Then the young Awadh Heir tried to take leadership of the mission away from Musseehood-Deen, who had control over whatever funds remained. The Heir (who was below the age of majority in British law) therefore, acting in the name of his father, used the mission's British lawyers to sue Musseehood-Deen, who countersued using his own lawyer, Mr. T. J. Angell. Musseehood-Deen had one of the Prince's supporters jailed for forgery, which charge the courts dismissed. Musseehood-Deen was eventually compelled by British courts to turn over the remaining £4,000 of the mission's funds.<sup>73</sup> Various of the servants of the Awadh mission then sued to get their unpaid wages.<sup>74</sup> Several stayed on or went home separately, often in dire financial straits.<sup>75</sup> Several were arrested on their arrival back in India.

Musseehood-Deen blamed the youth of the Heir and the "unworthy and self-interested intriguers [in margin] Mehdi Koolie and Allie Ackbar."<sup>76</sup> The former was a



Persian who claimed to be the great grandson of Nadir Shah. The latter, Ali Ackbar, (discussed above) had also advised three other delegations in London.<sup>77</sup> In response, the Heir asserted that Mussehood-Deen "was ready to betray us." This internecine conflict divided many other Indians in London.<sup>78</sup> After a further vain petition to Parliament, the Heir then went via Marsailles and Alexandria back to India in 1861, taking the remaining valuables.<sup>79</sup> Although the Awadh ruler dismissed and replaced Mussehood-Deen in 1859, he remained in Britain, marrying an Englishwoman, the ironically named Miss Bilk.<sup>80</sup> During the 1857 fighting, his two houses in Agra had been looted, then confiscated by the British Government. His request for employment or a pension from the British was rejected.<sup>81</sup> He finally retired to India in November 1863, leaving his young but estranged British wife behind with no means of support.<sup>82</sup>

### Aftermaths of 1857

The events of 1857 marked a transition in the experiences of Indians in Britain as British attitudes shifted further against them collectively. Yet, 1857 was not an absolutely abrupt transformation. There had been precursors of these changes in both Indian and British attitudes. Many Indians there had developed a sense of class solidarity and transregional shared experience. Neither were British prejudicial stereotypes shared universally, nor did they apply equally to all classes of Indians. Gender relations between Indians and Britons particularly reflected these complex underlying patterns. Further, many of the changes catalysed by the 1857 conflict continued to affect the lives of Indians in Britain thereafter.

During the early nineteenth century, various Indians in Britain had articulated their growing resentment about British prejudices against them, both in India and in Britain. Most Indians recognized that British racism was worse in India. One scholar-diplomat who had come on Mir Jafar's first mission to London in 1844, Lutfullah (1802-74), contrasted relatively welcoming British society with the condescending or contemptuous attitudes of Britons in India: "The fact is, that the more you proceed on towards England, the more you find the English people endowed with politeness and civility..."<sup>83</sup> Yet, Britons in Britain could also be racist, as various Indians experienced personally there.<sup>84</sup>

Their common treatment by the British as "other" made some conscious of their shared condition. Mixing with Indians from many other regions often overcame traditional cultural and political distinctions. Particularly articulate both about such British discrimination and also the need for a collective response to British aggression was Maratha diplomat, Rango Bapojee, who spent over a dozen years in London (1839-53). In 1842, Bapojee complained there about slights he had personally received from Britons, and the "oppression set upon our race and colour."<sup>85</sup> Bapojee also delivered public speeches in London and published his insightful analysis of British global imperialism and racial prejudice. He claimed to speak for 'the hundred and fifty millions of my fellow-countrymen'.<sup>86</sup> He also wrote a rallying letter to all the Indian rulers back in India, warning them against the insidious British practice of piecemeal annexation that was evident only from the perspective of Britain, the very annexationist policies that would depose Wajid Ali Shah.<sup>87</sup> Before he left London, Bapojee also passed on his understanding of these injustices to newly arriving diplomats, including Mohammed Ali Khan of Rohilkhand and Azimullah Khan (c.1830-58) who represented in London (1853-

5) the exiled Maratha prince Dhundu Pant "Nana Sahib".<sup>88</sup> After their alienating experiences in Britain, all three of these men evidently fought the British in 1857. Mohammed Ali Khan, Azimullah Khan, and Bapojee's son were all summarily executed without trial; despite the £50 reward that the British put on Bapojee's head, he evaded capture and disappeared.<sup>89</sup>

Indeed, to some of the avenging British officers in India, Azimullah's personal relationships with British women during his stay in Britain were particularly offensive. He had become protégé of Lady Lucie Duff-Gordon (1821-69), an author and traveller who had married the prime minister's cousin, Sir Alexander Duff-Gordon.<sup>90</sup> She educated Azimullah in British culture and politics, falsely believing she had convinced him to relinquish his anti-British sentiments. Although only about ten years older, she signed her letters to him 'your affect. Mother', and he addressed her as 'European Mother' in reply.<sup>91</sup> Additionally, a young British woman in Brighton, "Miss A.", wrote letters, partly in French, expressing her desire to marry him. Despite these women's affections for him, not all Britons accepted Azimullah, however. John Lang (1817-69, a British journalist and lawyer), when introduced to Azimullah as "the Prince" responded "Prince indeed! He has changed my plate fifty times in India [i.e., as a table-servant]."<sup>92</sup> This had become a repeating pattern: Britons with experience in India denigrating Indians who were received as royalty in London's salons. Frustrated, Azimullah Khan and Mohammed Ali Khan left Britain in June 1855, travelled via Crimea, where they observed the British army ineffectively fighting the Russians.<sup>93</sup> After rumours of Azimullah's participation in the Cawnpur "massacre" reached her, Lady Duff-Gordon hoped he could not have committed such "atrocious conduct" and bemoaned "Who will pity the poor, helpless mass of people guilty of the offence of a dark skin and a religion of their own? What a vista of disaster & hatred is before us and them!"<sup>94</sup>

Conversely, later Indian and Pakistani nationalist historians have highlighted these men as freedom fighting heroes. For example, one Pakistani nationalist historian called Azimullah "the Master Brain who created consciousness among the Muslims and lead them to the battle field to restore their last grandure [sic] from the jaws of the great colonial power. This was the master brain of Azimullah Khan, a great personality behind the war of independence of 1857 which has left everlasting imprints on the history—in the Shape of PAKISTAN."<sup>95</sup> Simultaneously, Indian nationalist commentators have also claimed him.<sup>96</sup> Similarly, Basu argues Bapojee "should be considered the first and pioneer Indian agitator in England, and his failure shows the futility of so-called "constitutional agitation" on the part of Indians for their rights and privileges."<sup>97</sup> In contrast, Christopher Bayly of Cambridge identifies their ideas as "old patriotism" rather than modern nationalism.<sup>98</sup>

Not all who came to Britain turned against them in 1857. General Jung Bahadur Rana (1817-77) of Nepal came to Britain in 1850.<sup>99</sup> There he was impressed by British military and industrial power. In 1857, he proved among the staunchest political and military supporters of the British.

Even during the crisis of 1857-58, some Indians in Britain managed to avoid being targeted by the Government or public. Indian royalty, including Dalip Singh (1838-93, r. 1843-49), and two descendants of the Nawab of the Carnatic, Hafiz Lodroo Islam Khan and Hyder Jung remained in Britain and eventually regained British favour as did others.<sup>100</sup> Gholam Mahomed spent 1857 in India but, once the fighting was over, he

returned to London with his son and grandson, receiving increased pensions and benefits and savouring London's high society. Overall, the Indian princes who did not egregiously oppose the British emerged thereafter as princely pillars of Raj and were often welcome in London.<sup>101</sup>

Increasingly appearing more of a social problem to many elite Britons were the growing number of working-class Indians in Britain, especially the community of the Oriental Quarter. The City Mission Magazine (August 1857) articulated British fears about promiscuous intercourse between Asian men and British women there:

Men of all colours, and half a score of nations, are accompanied by a host of [White] women. Many are drunk, and all are riotous; the women have sailors' hats on their heads, and sailors' belts round their waists; they are quarrelling and pulling each other about; some have been robbed, and the police are amongst them; the language uttered is such as Satan only could suggest, and the whole scene calls up in the mind of the spectator an idea of the orgies of hell.<sup>102</sup>

Similarly, missionary Salter described with dismay the shift of an English public house, the Royal Sovereign (12 Blue Gate Fields), into a haven for lascars and British lower-class women:

The skittles have long vanished, and the rough walls and roof have long ceased to echo with boisterous European voices—for Asiatics have taken possession of it, and twenty beds are spread out for the repose of the Lascars who seek shelter [in the skittle-ground]. The jagree dust, crazy hookas, and dirty lotas give evidence of the free use made of it. But, hark! what is that uproarious shout of discordant Asiatic and European voices mingled?—the sound of excited men and women together...only a jollification and a spree these Lascars have with the [British] ladies of the neighbourhood...<sup>103</sup>

This house was still owed by a British man, but a Goan Indian, Francis Kaudery, operated it, to Salter's dismay.

Also in Britain during the crisis but often less directly targeted were middle-class Indians including Syed Abdullah (discussed above) and Parsi scholar and merchant from Bombay, Dadabhai Naoroji (1825-1917). Both taught Indian languages at University College London until 1866.<sup>104</sup> The latter also became the second Indian elected to the British Parliament, and the "Grand Old Man" of the Indian National Congress. Indeed, many later Indian nationalists also studied in Britain during subsequent decades, learning there about the larger patterns of British colonialism. Many later Indian students in Britain became political leaders—including B.R. Ambedkar, S.C. Bose, Mohandas Gandhi, Aurobindo Ghose, M.A. Jinnah, Jawaharlal Nehru, and V.D. Savarkar. As has been extensively studied, all these men found their experiences in high colonial Britain helped them formulate their own political and cultural nationalisms. Additionally, Indian male and female social leaders—including Behramji Malabari, Saraswati Ramabhai, and Cornelia Sorabji—also engaged critically with British society, opposing British efforts to control their lives and impressions.<sup>105</sup> Nor did all Indians respond the same way. Some, including Sir Mancherjee Merwanjee Bhownagree, M.P., remained staunch Tories.<sup>106</sup>

Thus, the events of 1857 marked a major shift in the lives of Indians in Britain, and in British attitudes toward them. The experiences of the members of the Awadh

embassy and the other Indians who associated with them particularly reflected many of these changes. Subsequent generations of Indians in Britain also lived under its shadow, although their personal experiences there varied by their class and background.

<sup>1</sup> E.g., Syed Abdoolah, A Native of Oude, Letter to the Editor, Times, 12/9/1855.

<sup>2</sup> Gautam Bhadra, "Four Rebels of 1857," Subaltern Studies IV, ed. Ranajit Guha (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 229-275.

<sup>3</sup> See Rozina Visram, Asians in Britain: 400 Years of History (London: Pluto, 2002), Michael H. Fisher, Counterflows to Colonialism (Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004), and Michael H. Fisher, Shompa Lahiri, and Shinder Thandi, A South Asian History of Britain (Oxford: Greenwood, 2007).

<sup>4</sup> See Fisher, Indirect Rule in the British Empire (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998) and Barbara N. Ramusack, The Indian Princes and Their States (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

<sup>5</sup> In 1855, Colonel Hughes estimated 10-12,000 lascars served the British merchant fleet, with 5-6,000 reaching Britain annually, of whom 3-3,600 were Indian. Cited in Visram, Ayahs, Lascars and Princes (London: Pluto, 1986), p. 52.

<sup>6</sup> Mohamad Tavakoli-Targhi, "Imagining Western Women: Occidentalism and Euro-

eroticism," Radical America 24:3 (1993), 73-87. See also Michael H. Fisher,

Representing 'His' Women: Mirza Abu Talib Khan's 1801 'Vindication of the Liberties of Asiatic Women'," in Indian Economic and Social History Review 37, 2 (2000), pp. 215-

37.

<sup>7</sup> Throughout, we use his own spelling of his title. Foreign Political Consultations [hereinafter FPC] 31/10/1838 nos. 119-21, 10/4/1839 nos. 189-90, 24/4/1839 nos. 147-48, 6/12/1841 no. 81, National Archives of India [hereinafter NAI].

<sup>8</sup> FPC 11/12/1847 no. 194, 7/10/1848 nos. 224-26, 28/3/1856 no. 165, NAI.

<sup>9</sup> Joseph Salter, Asiatic in England: Sketches of Sixteen Years' Work among Orientals (London: Seely, Jackson, and Halliday, 1873), p. 52.

<sup>10</sup> Syud Abdoollah to Elphinstone, 27 August 1856 Elphinstone Correspondence May to August 1856, F 88/175, British Library [hereinafter BL].

<sup>11</sup> Syed Abdoollah letter 5/9/1855, Miscellaneous Letters Received, E/1/192, f. 296, BL.

<sup>12</sup> FPC 11/3/1859 nos. 862-67, NAI; Times 12/9/1857, 24/4/1858, 20/11/1865. Samuel Lucas, Dacoitee in Excelsis (London: Nassau Steam Press, 1857), pp. 153-60.

<sup>13</sup> Times 19/8/1856.

<sup>14</sup> Times 22/8/1856.

<sup>15</sup> Times 27/8/1856.

<sup>16</sup> Times 28/8/1856 citing The Globe.

<sup>17</sup> Resident Lucknow to Political Secretary 15/11/1837, FPC 13/12/1837 no. 71, NAI.

<sup>18</sup> Times 14, 22/3/1836.

<sup>19</sup> Caroline Fox, Memories of Old Friends. ed. Horace N. Pym. 2d ed. (Philadelphia; Lippincott, 1882), pp. 11-13.

- 
- <sup>20</sup> Britons questioned Karim Khan about her around 1841. Karim Khan, Siyahatnama, ed. 'Ibadat Bareilvi (Lahore: Majlis-i Isha'at-i Makhtutat, Idarah-yi Adab o Tanqid, 1982 reprint), pp. 277-78.
- <sup>21</sup> Times 28/8/1856 citing The Globe.
- <sup>22</sup> Times 30/8/1856.
- <sup>23</sup> Times 1/9/1856, 8/5/1852; Salter Asiatic, p. 54.
- <sup>24</sup> Times 1/9/1856.
- <sup>25</sup> Times 2/9/1856.
- <sup>26</sup> Salter, Asiatic, p. 53.
- <sup>27</sup> Times 2/9/1856, 17/11/1856.
- <sup>28</sup> See H.T. Lambrick, Sir Charles Napier and Sind (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952) and , E.B. Eastwick, Glance at Sind...Dry Leaves from Young Egypt (London: J. Madden, 1849, 1851).
- <sup>29</sup> Foreign Secret Consultations 25/1/1843 nos. 79-81, 7/10/1843 nos. 113-14, 25/5/1844 nos. 44-46, 27/4/1844 nos. 103-06, NAI.
- <sup>30</sup> Court of Directors Minutes 28/3/1855; Broughton Correspondence ADD 36,478, vol. 23, ff. 233-47, BL; FSC 30/5/1844 nos. 70-74, 26/6/1847 nos. 37-49, 25/9/1847 nos. 75-80, 18/8/1849 nos. 50-53; FPC 21/7/1849 nos. 1-16, NAI.
- <sup>31</sup> Political Department Home Correspondence [hereinafter PDHC], L/PS/3/108, ff. 190-97, BL.
- <sup>32</sup> Court Minutes 28/3/1855, 2/5/1855; Political and Military Committee Minutes 2/5/1855, BL.
- <sup>33</sup> Parliamentary Papers, Returns (Commons) 1857-58, vol. 12, paper 115, pp. 369ff.
- <sup>34</sup> Court Minutes 21/12/1852 to 16/12/1857; Political and Military Committee Minutes 12-26/1/1853, 18/5/1853, 6/7/1853, 24/8/1853; Political and Military Committee Memoranda March 1856 no. 729 to March 1857 no. 2614; Wilson Correspondence EUR MSS E.301/13; PDHC, L/PS/3/108, ff. 113, 241ff, BL; FPC 1/9/1849 nos. 109-13, NAI;; Lords debate 21/7/1856, Hansard, series 3, vol. 143, pp. 1065-67; Parliamentary Papers, Returns (Commons), 1857(I) vol. 8, paper 39, pp. 301ff; Parliamentary Papers, Returns (Commons) 1863 vol. 45, paper 480, pp. 475ff; FPC 13/6/1856 nos. 355-56, NAI; Ali Ackbar letters 13/4/1858, 28/5/1858, 1-9/6/1858 and replies 27/4/1858, 30/6/1858, PDHC, L/PS/3/108; Salter, Asiatic, p. 255; Times 8/5/1852 5d, 17/6/1858 11b. Wadeer, Memorial
- <sup>35</sup> E.g., Court Minutes 14/4/1858, 28/5/1858, 30/6/1858.
- <sup>36</sup> PP, Returns (Commons) 1857-58, vol. 43, paper 159, pp. 207ff; 1860, vol. 52, paper 352, pp. 439ff; 1861 vol. 46, paper 242, pp. 89ff; Court Minutes 23/3/1858, 14/4/1858.
- <sup>37</sup> E.g., Ali Ackbar Petition to Secretary of State for India and reply 14/10/1858, PDHC, L/PS/3/108.
- <sup>38</sup> Stapleton Cotton, Memoirs and Correspondence 2 vols, ed. Mary Woolley Gibbings Cotton (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1866), vol. 2, pp. 331-33.
- <sup>39</sup> Salter, Asiatic, pp. 55-56.
- <sup>40</sup> Salter describing the Surat delegation which he associated with, Asiatic, pp. 47-49.
- <sup>41</sup> Salter, Asiatic, pp. 203-04.
- <sup>42</sup> Times 12/9/1856.
- <sup>43</sup> Syed Abdoolah, A Native of Oude, Letter to the Editor, Times, 12/11/1855.

- 
- <sup>44</sup> Political and Military Committee Memoranda September 1856 no. 3521, BL.
- <sup>45</sup> Musseehood-Deen letters 22/12/1856, 5/2/1857, 11-30/3/1857, 7/4/1857, 3/6/1857 and replies 3/1/1857, 19/2/1857, 7/5/1857, PDHC, L/PS/3/108; Court Minutes 24/12/1856, 7/1/1857, 11/2/1857, 8/4/1857, 22/7/1857; PP, Returns (Commons) 1856, vol. 45, Command Paper 2086, pp. 341ff.
- <sup>46</sup> Times 17/1/1857.
- <sup>47</sup> Musseehood-Deen letter 23/1/1857 and reply 5/2/1857, PDHC, L/PS/3/108; Court Minutes 28/1/1857; Petition from Queen Mother of Oude 26/5/1857, Miscellaneous Letters Received E/1/194, BL; Bird and Mohd. Musseh Ooddeen Letter to Editor Times 2/2/1857. See the extensive correspondence between the Directors and Musseehood-Deen, the Awadh principals, and their lawyers, in Political and Military Committee Memoranda, December 1856 to April 1857, BL.
- <sup>48</sup> Times 17/11/1856.
- <sup>49</sup> Article reprinted from Manchester Guardian in Times 12/9/1856; article reprinted from Birmingham Journal in Times 20/9/1856; Times 13/9/1856, 12/9/1857, 21/5/1858.
- <sup>50</sup> Salter, Asiatic, pp. 62-3.
- <sup>51</sup> Illustrated London News 18/7/1857, p. 71.
- <sup>52</sup> See Introduction by Ahmad in Musseehood-Deen Khan Bahadur, Moulvee Mohummud, Oude: Its Princes and Its Government Vindicated (London: John Davy and Sons, 1857); reprinted as British Aggression in Awadh, ed. Safi Ahmed (Meerut: Meenakshi Prakashan, 1969).
- <sup>53</sup> Times 8/8/1857; Court Minutes 17-29/4/1857, 13/5/1857, 24/6/1857, 1-22/7/1857, 2/9/1857; Lords debate 6/8/1858, Hansard, series 3, vol. 147, pp. 1119-22. .
- <sup>54</sup> Musseehood-Deen letter 28/10/1857, PDHC, L/PS/3/108; Court Minutes 25/11/1857, 2/12/1857; Political and Military Committee Memoranda November 1857 no. 4876, BL.
- <sup>55</sup> Commons debate 6-16/3/1857, Hansard, series 3, vol. 144, pp. 1943, 2375-81; PP, Returns (Commons) 1857(II), vol. 29, papers 31, 71, pp. 215ff; 1857-58, vol. 43, paper 167, pp. 277ff; Times 26/5/1857; Court Minutes 8/4/1857; PDHC 7/7/1857, L/PS/3/108, ff. 204-13, 236-39.
- <sup>56</sup> Court Minutes 5/3/1856 to 26/8/1857. Before going, he reportedly advised other Indian royalty, including the Awadh heir. Morning Advertiser cited in Bombay Times 9/2/1857. Lords debate 7/7/1856 Hansard, series 3, vol. 143, pp. 383-97; Commons debate 24/6/1856 Hansard, series 3, vol. 142, pp. 1898-1905.. Times 8/7/1856 5d-f. Political and Military Committee Memoranda July 1856 no. 2712, October 1856 nos. 216, 4155, December 1856 no. 783, January 1857 no. 1599, April 1857 nos. 2839, 2941, July 1857 no. 652, August 1857 no. 1069, BL. Commons debate 19/2/1856, 1-8/4/1856, Hansard, series 3, vol. 140, pp. 277, 639, 979-80; PP, Returns (Commons) 1856, vol. 10, papers 265, 265(I), 265(II), pp. 441ff; vol. 45, paper 63, 305, pp. 159ff; 1857(I), vol. 11, paper 82, pp. 107; (Lords) 1856, vol. 27, papers 199, 199(I), 199(II), pp. 441ff. Political and Military Committee Memoranda March 1856 no. 425-7, April 1856 no. 804, June 1856 no. 2089, BL
- <sup>57</sup> Salter does not name him, Asiatic, pp. 44-48. Times 8/12/1853.
- <sup>58</sup> L/PS/3/108 Home Political Committee letters 98) Mehdee Alee Khan Bahadur, 7 Grove Terrace, ST. John's Wood, 25/11/1857 to CoD; B/235 Minutes of Court of Directors covering 16/10/1857 to 14/4/1858 511) 2/12/1857, 596) 16/12/1857

---

<sup>59</sup> Ali Morad to Court 6/7/1857 and reply 19/8/1857 PDHC, L/PS/3/108.

<sup>60</sup> L/PS/3/108 Home Political Committee letters

53-4) Syed Uckber Ally 31 Sussex Place, Kensington 11/8/1857 to CoD

B/234 Minutes of the Court of Directors covering 9 April 1857 to 14 October 1857 (1310) 12 August 1857 (1461) 19 August 1857 (1972) 16 September 1857; Parliamentary Papers (Sessionals) Commons 1859 session I vol. 18 p.73- , no. 125

Return 4 March 1859 wrt Mr. Hudson, Syed Uckber Ally, and Kirat Allie Khan (Mr. Ayrton); Syed Uckber to Board 28 September 1857;

<sup>61</sup> Parliamentary Papers (Sessionals) Commons 1859 session I vol. 18 p.73- , no. 125  
Return 4 March 1859

<sup>62</sup> Joaleeka's oral autobiography recorded in 'Hindoo Beggars' written by Andrew Halliday in Mayhew, London, vol. 4, pp. 423-25.

<sup>63</sup> Court Minutes 16-21/10/1857.

<sup>64</sup> Court to Musseehood-Deen 22/10/1857, 28/12/1857 and reply 23/11/1857, PDHC, L/PS/3/108.

<sup>65</sup> Desborough letter 22/12/1857 and reply 8/1/1858, PDHC, L/PS/3/108, ff. 117ff; Court Minutes 23-30/12/1857.

<sup>66</sup> Court Minutes 2/12/1857.

<sup>67</sup> FSC 29/1/1858 no. 609, NAI; Times 18/11/1857 6d.

<sup>68</sup> Times 21/4/1858 10b; Musseehood-Deen letter 9/1/1858 and reply 22/1/1858, PDHC, L/PS/3/108, ff. 89-91; Court Minutes 12-26/1/1858, 10/3/1858.

<sup>69</sup> Musseehood-Deen letter 22/9/1857, PDHC, L/PS/3/108; Political and Military Committee Memoranda September 1857 no. 3379, BL.

<sup>70</sup> Sikunder Hushmut to Court 9/12/1857, PDHC, L/PS/3/108, f. 88; Commons debate 16/2/1858, Hansard, series 3, vol. 147, pp. 1477-1543.

<sup>71</sup> Musseehood-Deen letter 9/9/1857 and reply 14/10/1857, PDHC, L/PS/3/108; Court Minutes 16-30/9/1857, 14/10/1857, 16/12/1857; Political and Military Committee Memoranda September 1857 nos. 3639, 3665, October 1857 no. 3873, December 1857 no. 5300, BL.

<sup>72</sup> Commons debate 16/2/1858, Hansard, series 3, vol. 147, p. 513.

<sup>73</sup> He retained his £948 annual salary, however. Skirrow letter 28/4/1858, 1/6/1858 and replies 31/5/1858, 9/6/1858, Court to Hamid Ali 2/10/1858 and reply 19/8/1858, Angell to Musseehood-Deen 6/8/1858, Skirrow to Hamid Ali 24/8/1858, PDHC, L/PS/3/108 ff. 121ff, 260, 266-69; Times 21/4/1858 10b, 23/4/1858 11c, 27/4/1858 11d, 10/5/1858 11c, 29/5/1858 11a-b.

<sup>74</sup> Times 10/5/1858 11b-c; FSC 29/1/1858 no. 609, NAI.

<sup>75</sup> E.g. Musseehood-Deen fired his long-time personal servant, Kadir Bukhsh, who had also married an British woman. With the help of Syed Abdoolah, Kadir Bukhsh took work in a Turkish Bath in Finsbury, and later sued Musseehood-Deen. Times 19/12/1861 10f, 20/12/1861 8a-b. See also Jaleesood Dowlah to Court 7/1/1859, PDHC, L/PS/3/108, f. 259.

<sup>76</sup> Musseehood-Deen letter 1/7/1858, PDHC, L/PS/3/108, f. 123.

<sup>77</sup> Court to Foreign Secretary 2/7/1858, PDHC, L/PS/3/108, ff. 124-25.

<sup>78</sup> Meer Jafur of Surat allegedly advised the Awadh Heir, in exchange for a share of any gains. Morning Advertiser republished in Bombay Times 9/2/1857 238c-d.

- 
- <sup>79</sup> Musseehood-Deen letter 26/8/1858, PDHC, L/PS/3/108, f. 125; Hameed Ali Petitions to Parliament presented to Lords by Lord Mounteagle 29/6/1858, 29/7/1858. For a critical epitaph on this mission see Kaye, History of the Sepoy War, vol. 1, pp. 402-04.
- <sup>80</sup> Musseehood-Deen, Oudh, pp. 170-2; Times 17/12/1861 8d-9a, 6/8/1862 11a-b. The Awadh ex-King later sent eunuchs Ahsanuddaula and Mean Mahboob to England as his representatives. FPC 18/11/1859, NAI; Calcutta Englishman 2/11/1859 cited in Times 20/11/1865 6a.
- <sup>81</sup> Political Dispatch from Secretary of State 24/7/1860 no. 58, BL; Musseehood-Deen to Secretary of State October 1859, PDHC, L/PS/3/108, ff. 364-66.
- <sup>82</sup> Times 16/1/1860 10f-11a, 2/10/1861 9f, 17/11/1865 11f, 20/11/1865 6a.
- <sup>83</sup> Lutfullah, Autobiography, pp. 387, 398, 413, 421.
- <sup>84</sup> Ali Ackbar to Court 9/9/1857, PDHC, L/PS/3/108.
- <sup>85</sup> Bapojee letters 24/1/1842, 12/3/1842, Sattara Papers, vol. 2, pp. 1301-2; vol. 3, pp. 28-30.
- <sup>86</sup> Bapojee, Statement, p. 2.
- <sup>87</sup> 'Circular to Princes and Chiefs in India', written 17/9/1849, enclosed in Rango Bapojee letter 8/11/1849, Broughton Papers, MSS EUR F.213/112, BL. The copy sent to the Maharaja of Mysore fell into British hands. FPC 29/12/1849 nos. 165-67, NAI.
- <sup>88</sup> Forbes-Mitchell, Reminiscences, pp. 174-93. Ward, Our Bones, pp. 22-26, 40-49, 535, 680-1, n.485. Shepherd, Personal Narrative, pp. 14, 101; ; Surendra Nath Sen, Eighteen Fifty-Seven, pp. 126-29, 368; Misra, Nana Saheb, pp. 145, 200-01, 557-60, 574-78.
- <sup>89</sup> Basu, Story, pp. 341-44. Basu doubts that Bapojee was 'foolish enough' to attack the British, however.
- <sup>90</sup> Frank, Lucie Duff Gordon, pp. 177-181; P. Taylor, Companion, pp. 29-31; Ward, Our Bones, pp. 40-49, 581, n.193.
- <sup>91</sup> Ward, Our Bones, pp. 45, 585; Roberts, Forty One Years, vol. 1, p. 377; Fred. Roberts, Letters written during the Indian Mutiny (London: Macmillan, 1924) Frederick Roberts to Harriet, Camp near Fatehgarh, Dec. 31<sup>st</sup>, 1857, pp. 120-21; Frank, Lucy Duff Gordon, pp. 190-91. LDG/Lord Lansdowne: 4 Jan. 1854 cited in Ward, Andrew, Our Bones are Scattered: the Cawnpore Massacres and the Indian Mutiny of 1857 (New York: Henry Holt, 1996) 43-45 Mowbray Thomson, Story of Cawnpore, pp. 53-9; Roberts, Forty One Years, vol. 1, pp. 293n, 427-29. These letters produced a range of reactions from hostile to sympathetic. E.g., Toon, Love Letters.
- <sup>92</sup> Lang, Wanderings, pp. 103-19; Keene, Servant, pp. 162-63.
- <sup>93</sup> William Russell, My Diary, vol. 1, pp. 165-67.
- <sup>94</sup> Ward, 513) LGD/Lansdowne c. September 1858; Frank, Katherine, A Passage to Egypt: The Life of Lucie Duff Gordon (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1994) OBIS 191)
- <sup>95</sup> Syed Lutfullah, Azimullah Khan Yusufzai: The Man Behind the War of Independence: 1857 (Karachi: Mohamedali Educational Society, 1970), pp. 6, 31.
- <sup>96</sup> E.g., [www.vandemataram.com/biographies/patriots/akhan.htm](http://www.vandemataram.com/biographies/patriots/akhan.htm).
- <sup>97</sup> Basu, Story, p. 142..
- <sup>98</sup> Bayly, Origins.
- <sup>99</sup> Whelpton, Jang Bahadur PDHC 17/8/1857, 9/9/1857, L/PS/3/108. FPC 24/6/1853 nos. 146-48, 26/6/1853 no. 147, NAI; Gordon, Our India Mission, pp. 40-49.



---

<sup>100</sup> Court Minutes 4-25/9/1850, 2/10/1850-27/6/1855, 4/7/1855, 1/8/1855, 6-14/4/1858; Military and Political Committee Minutes 11/7/1855; Political and Military References June 1855 no. 543, July 1855 no. 1155, August 1855 no. 1443, BL. Bell, Annexation of the Punjab; Login, Lady Logan's Recollections and Sir John Login; Singh, Correspondence; Victoria, Letters, vol. 3, pp. 49, 59-61, 69, 278-79, 315, 320; Court Minutes 7/6/1854 to 3/3/1858; EUR MSS F. 78/48, BL; Maharajah Duleep Singh to Editor, Times 13/11/1877 8a. E.g., Hafiz Ludroo Islam Khan. Court Minutes 18/8/1852, 26/1/1853, 9/2/1853; Political and Military Committee Minutes 25/8/1852, 29/9/1852, 26/1/1853, 5/4/1854, 16/5/1855; Braid, Statement. Stapleton Cotton, Memoirs, vol. 2, pp. 327-28.

<sup>101</sup> See Satadru Sen, Loyal Insurgent.

<sup>102</sup> Cited in Salter, Joseph, Asiatic in England: Sketches of Sixteen Years' Work among Orientals (London: Seely, Jackson, and Halliday, 1873), p. 34.

<sup>103</sup> Salter, Asiatic, pp. 31-32, 69.

<sup>104</sup> Bellot, University College, Chart 2.

<sup>105</sup> Burton, At the Heart, Viswanathan, Outside.

<sup>106</sup> See McLeod, 'Indian Tory'.