

VII 11

Nagpur

Calcutta
December 2, 1829

My Dear Lord

I have the pleasure of sending enclosed a copy of a minute, which will give you a complete view of the proposed modification of our relation with the state of Nagpore, the general outline of which I communicated to you per Vectian (?). I trust the arrangement will meet your approbation.

J-I/①

Yours sincerely

William Bentinck

To

Lord Ellenborough

Public Record Office: PRO/30/9/4/11/2:
Ellenborough Papers: Letters from Lord
William Bentinck to Ellenborough:
Letter dated December 2, 1829 enclosing
a Minute dated November 15, 1829.

I had the pleasure of receiving your letter dated the 22nd March, and the accompanying Minute, which gives a most interesting account of the chiefs of the Southern Marhatta country. I have sent it to the Duke of Windsor, who will, I know, ^{in Wellington} peruse it with great pleasure. He looks back to India with the warm feelings of youth.

I have am much disposed to concur in all the observations you have made, and in all the opinions you have intimated in your minute. When I was appointed to my present office, I had no preconceived opinions, and I have kept out of the way of prejudiced men. I have allowed opinions to grow up gradually in my own mind, as I acquired more knowledge from more sources, and the result of my consideration has been that the fiscal and judicial functions must be entrusted, as much as possible, to the natives of India, and that the Village system must be the foundation of any good government.

I do not see my way to that which should be the first object of all governments,

Public Record Office: PRO/30/9/4/Parā V/2:
Letter from Ellenborough to Sir John Malcolm
Governor of Bombay: Dated 7th August, 1829 |
on Malcolm's Minute on the Southern Marhatta
country.

VII

Manatnas

Munro to Elphinstone

Camp near Belgaum
8th April 1818

My dear Sir,

The questions proposed in your letter of the 2nd cannot exactly be answered in writing as they embrace subjects too extensive to (b) discussed in an occasional correspondence.

I shall, however, endeavour in a few words (to) state generally my opinions respecting ().

I think that the Jaghirdars ought (not to) be in a worse situation than under (the pesh) wahs government and, therefore, () your first class should not be required () up more horse than formerly though the () number which they then maintained might not have been a third or fifth of their () zabitahs. This number, whatever it was, () might be obliged to muster and in the event of any deficiency, a proportionate part of the Jaghir might be resumed.

In the case of your second class () I would not attempt to exchange () that part of their Jaghirs which is assigned for their personal expences unless (by) their own consent. Without it the measure would give offence and the land resumed in most cases probably not yield the sum for which it was taken.

I see no objection to the sequestration of the land of the third class of Jaghirdars, who may be very refractory and giving some pecuniary allowance in the (event) of contention (?)

India Office Records: Elphinstone Papers: MSS: Eur: F.88/9/F/26: Letter from Thomas Munro to Elphinstone dated Camp near Belgaum 8th April 1818. The edges of the first page of this manuscript are gone, so the words at the end of each line are either illegible or have completely gone. Some missing possible words have been filled in within brackets.

(p.2) I am not sure that I understand your remark on the numerous divisions of revenue of which Jageers are usually composed being oppressive in their collection to the Rayets. In the smaller Jageers there will I imagined be no difficulty in consolidating the different heads. But in the greater Jageers where the internal administration must be left to the Jageerdars themselves it will not be so easy. Even among the greater Jageerdars however all such revenues as they may derive from Sirkar Villages under various denominations may be redeemed either by paying them the amount in money or by giving them one or more whole villages yielding a revenue equal to the aggregate of what they collect from money.

Though the people of India have not what we call gentry they have what they respect as such ~~tehn~~ themselves. It will not therefore I think merely with a view to the establishment of this class of society be necessary to restore the Desmooks, and Dessays who have been removed to make way for the Mahrattah Revenue Servants. Many of these Desmooks etc. had usurped lands and revenues during times of confusion and though they have been deprived of them they still enjoy in many instances all they had any right to originally. Many of them will still be found holding the office of Patail or Gurnum of one or a number of villages or even of a whole district and where this is the case they should be continued. But it would not be advisable to restore them where they have long been removed because their offices and emoluments, have been subdivided among a set of men to whom long possession or purchase has rendered them a property.

India Office Records: Elphinstone Papers:
F88/9/P/26: Letter from Thomas Munro to
Elphinstone, April 1818 (Extract).