Chapter IV

EARLY BRITISH CONTACTS WITH THE TERRITORIES NORTH OF SUTLEJ AND THE BOUNDARY COMMISSION OF 1846 AND 1847
While Ranjit Singh and his feudatory Gulab Singh were active in the consolidation of Northern India beyond Sutlej, the British power in India was also expanding gradually from east to west. Jaswant Rao Holkar who was pursued by Lord Lake suddenly appeared in the Punjab and sought the help of Ranjit Singh. Disappointed in his efforts of procuring assistance from Ranjit Singh, Holkar concluded a treaty with the British Government and returned to his territories. Apprehensive of a powerful alliance between Holkar and Ranjit Singh, the British Government immediately concluded a treaty of friendship and alliance with Ranjit Singh and his ally Sardar Fateh Singh Ahluwalia. This treaty provided that Ranjit Singh would help Holkar in removing his army at a distance of 30 koss from Amritsar and "will never hereafter hold any further connection with him". The British Government agreed that

...as long as the said chieftains Runjeet Singh and Futteh Sing abstain from holding any friendly connection with the enemies of that Government, or from committing any act of hostility on their own parts against the said Government, the British Armies shall never enter the territories of the said Chieftains, nor will the British Government form any plans for the seizure or sequestration of their possessions or property. (1)

---

Notwithstanding with this solemn agreement with Ranjit Singh, the British Government soon began to meddle with Phulkian Misl on the left bank of the Sutlej. In the quest of securing scientific boundary of their possession, and in order to avoid enemy penetration between theirs and Ranjit Singh's territories, the British Government sought to hold the Jumna-Sutlej tract. Coupled with these reasons, the rise of Napoleon with his designs in the east, compelled the British Government to seek an alliance with Ranjit Singh and to bring it about, Charles Theophilis Metcalf was appointed the British Envoy to the Court of Ranjit Singh on 20 June 1808. Imam-ud-din, an adviser of Ranjit Singh met him at Patiala on 22 August 1808. (2) After a great deal of negotiations a four articles treaty was signed on 25 April 1809 at Amritsar. This treaty with the Raja of Lahore provided that "perpetual friendship" would continue between Ranjit Singh and the British Government. The British Government promised to consider Ranjit Singh and his heirs and successors with "respect" on the footing of the most favoured powers; and will not have any "concern with the territories and subjects of the Raja to the northward of the river Sutlej." Ranjit Singh promised not to interfere with the people below Sutlej. (3) Thus all the cis-Sutlej states went into the British protection, and the boundaries of the British Empire in India extended up to river Sutlej.

(2) Victor G. Kiernan, Metcalfe's Mission to Lahore 1808, Punjab Government Record Office Monograph No. 21 (Lahore, 1941).
(3) Aitchison, n. 1, p. 34.
Not content with the treaty of friendship, the British Government in India began to expand the bounds of their knowledge beyond Sutlej, and the activities of the Maharaja were closely watched. (4) Several British travellers went beyond Sutlej to the remotest parts of the northern India, under the pretext of adventure, geographical curiosity and commercial enterprise. The findings of these travellers supplied first hand knowledge to the administrators of the Company and paved the path for ultimate annexation of Punjab.

James Baillie Fraser

Soon after the Anglo-Nepal War in 1815, James Baillie Fraser went upto the Sutlej river in Bashahr state. He was a very keen observer. He reported about all the aspects of the state of Bashahr situated in the Sutlej river valley. He pointed out that the limit of Tibet on the Indus river extended only upto Toshigong. (5) In regard to Tibet's relations with China Fraser was of the view that Tibet was "... indeed very independent in all but name". (6)

(4) B.H. Hodgson, Resident in Nepal to Metcalfe, Secretary, Fort William, 11 September 1819. Foreign Political, 20 October 1819, Nos. 28-29.

(5) J.B. Fraser, Journal of a tour through part of the snowy Ranges of the Himala Mountains and to the sources of the rivers Jumna and Ganges (London, 1820), p. 309. On the route from Leh to Gonc "11th day - 7 Cos - Donzog, thus far in Ladak, 12th day - 8 cos - Tuzhzheegong (a Chinese fort)".

(6) Ibid., p. 286.
William Moorcroft

William Moorcroft, a native of Lancashire, and a Superintendent of Military Stud in the East India Company in Bengal, visited Gartok in western Tibet in 1812. He went without permission and succeeded in obtaining some of the shawl wool. He could not discover much about the lands beyond Gartok. (7) In October 1819 Moorcroft set out on the great journey which took him first to Ladakh and then later through Afghanistan into Bukhara. He was accompanied by young companion George Trebeek. The journey was "... undertaken not without the encouragement of the Government of India but without their expressed approbations". (8) His twofold objective of the journey was to procure a good type of horses for cavalry and to explore the "... possibility of establishing a commercial intercourse with the trans-Himalayan districts". (9) Moorcroft and Trebeek reached Leh, the capital of Ladakh on 24 September 1820. They had a formal meeting with the King of Ladakh. Moorcroft proposed for a commercial treaty. He submitted a draft of the treaty containing a provision for the liberty of trade with Ladakh and through Ladakh to other countries, with a permanent factory at Leh. (10) It took

---


(9) Ibid., p. xxiii.

(10) Ibid., vol. 1, p. 255.
him several months to finalize the provisions. Ultimately in the
month of May 1821, the engagements were exchanged between the King
and the chief officers of Ladakh and William Moorcroft on behalf of
Calcutta merchants. (11) At the same time the King of Ladakh, out
of the fear of the Sikhs, offered allegiance to the British Gover-
ment. Moorcroft was not empowered to deal in political matters.
He, therefore, forwarded the King's request to the Government at
Calcutta. (12) The British Government was not in a position to
take extra burden of protection of a state, far away from their
possessions. Prior to the annexation of Punjab this proposition
was hard to be accepted. Hence the request of the King of Ladakh
was rejected. While at Leh, Moorcroft tried to establish contacts
with Ahmed Shah, the ruler of Baltistan. (13)

Moorcroft was the first British traveller who went into
Ladakh. He supplied more valuable information about the country to
the administrators of the East India Company in India. According to
him the country of Ladakh was bounded by Yarkand province in the
north. In the south it was bounded by Bashahr, Kulu and Chamba. In
the west it was surrounded by the independent principalities of Hunza,
Nagar and Baltistan. (14) In the north east Ladakh was bounded by

(11) Ibid., p. 257.
(12) Ibid., p. 420; J.D. Cunningham, A History of the Sikhs from
the origin of the nation to the battles of the Sutlej (London,
1918); H.L.D. Garnett, ed., p. 331; Alastair Lamb, Britain
and Chinese Central Asia; The Road to Lhasa 1767 to 1905
(14) Ibid., vol. 1, pp. 258-61.
a mountain, "... which divides it from the Chinese province of Khotan, and on the east and south east by Radokh and Chan-than, dependencies of Lhasa". (15)

It appears, therefore, that the Government of China and the Government of Lhasa were two separate Governments then, and they had nothing in common with each other. Moorcroft had a great deal of travelling in the eastern region of Ladakh. He was of the view that the boundaries of Ladakh in the east were in a semi-circular line. Beyond the boundaries of Ladakh, the Tibetan province of Chan-than (16) was located. The most northern part of Chan-than was known by a separate province of Radok. This was located along the northern border of the lake of Pangong. Along the course of river Indus (Sink-Kha-bab) the province of Gardokh (Garo) was situated, which was "said to be distant six days journey from the frontier, the Sink-Kha-bab is crossed". (17) Moorcroft with his companion went little beyond the village of Chusul in the vicinity of Pangong lake, via Chushut, Marshilla, Sakti, Chumri, Changla and hot springs. From the village Chushul while Trebeek went up to Chibra via Tsakala Ralmang, Kang-jung and Moorcroft went to Leh. (18) Moorcroft's

(15) Ibid., p. 238.

(16) Chan-than or snow country was known to the Bhotias as Him-des, and to Tibetans 'Nari', Asiatic Researches, vol. 17, p. 45; Alexander Csoms de Koros, "Geographical Notes of Tibet", Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. I, 1832, p.124.

(17) Moorcroft, n. 8, vol. 1, p. 363. Details of these locations are dealt at pp. 360-63 and 423-40; a day's journey was about 15 miles. Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. 4, p. 595.

projected journey to Yarkand was frustrated and hence he went towards Dras - en route to Afghanistan and Bukhara.

G.T. Vigne

Baltistan's relations with the British Government began in 1829. Ahmad Shah the King of Baltistan sent Chirag Ali with a letter to Captain G.M. Wade, the British Political Agent at Ludhiana. He requested Wade for the deputation of some intelligent person of the British Government to his capital Iskardo, for the purpose of the investigation of a fort which was supposed to be constructed by Alexander the Great. This desire of Ahmed Shah was not fulfilled. Wade replied to him "I cannot properly depute a person on my own part, for answer your questions without the permission of my Government". (19) But when Vigne was leaving Ludhiana on 1 June 1835 for his journey of Iskardo, Wade requested him to visit the capital. (20) Vigne visited Iskardo and had an interview with Ahmad Shah. (21) This traveller had supplied most valuable information about northern India to the British Government. According to him northern frontier of India was; "... divided into several Tibetas and that Ladak, Iskardo, Khopalu, Purik, Nagar, Gilghit and Astor etc.

---


(21) Ibid., pp. 236-7.
are distinct Tibets." (22) This whole region was, "...divided into, upper, middle and little Tibet, and it extended east and west from Lhasa to Gilgit for a distance of about twelve hundred english miles." (23) This general application of the word Tibet to all the hilly tract of northern India was common in the first half of the nineteenth century - in the English knowing world. Vigne went eastward from Iskardo. When he reached Ladakh, he met with a hostile reception by the soldiers of Maharaja Gulab Singh. (24)

Political Asylum to the King of Ladakh

Ladakh was practically conquered by Zorawar Singh in 1834 and its capital, Leh, was occupied in the spring of 1835. (25) The King of Ladakh, Juspal Namgyal petitioned several times to the commander-in-chief of British Government for aid, but he could secure none. His appeals were turned down by the commander-in-chief on the plea that "the country of Ladakh is beyond the limits of the Company's dominions". (26) The King of Ladakh was, however, allowed

(22) Ibid., p. 250.
(23) Ibid., p. 248.
(24) Wade to Macnaughten, 30 August 1837. Foreign Political, 20 October 1837, No. 62.
(26) Foreign Political, 20 December 1837, Nos. 6-9; Foreign Political, 17 July 1837, Nos. 81-83; Foreign Political, 14 August 1837, Nos. 7-9; Political letter to the Court of Directors, 24 January 1838, No. 5, 4 April 1838, No. 10.
to stay in the British territory in Bashahr on the condition
that, "he must refrain from acts of hostility beyond the frontier,
and remain quiet and peaceable". (27) A pension of Rupees 200/-
per month was granted to the son of the King of Ladakh in 1838. (28)
The British Government in India remained a silent spectator, of
the activities of Zorawar Singh, so long, they were confined to
Indian territory.

First Anglo-Sikh War 1845-46

At a time when Ranjit Singh and his subordinates - Chieftains
were busy in capturing Kashmir, Ladakh and Baltistan, the British
were concentrating on the expulsion of Gorkhas from Tarai, breaking
of the Maratha confederacy, the chasing up of Burmese in Assam,
and the reduction of Bharatpur. Thus, after consolidating their
position in India, with a debacle from Kabul and a triumph at
Nanking in China, the British Government in India looked towards
Punjab. The kingdom of Lahore after the death of Ranjit Singh on
27 June 1839 was in the state of utter confusion. Mutual friendship
and trust between the Sikhs and the British were subjected to a
severe test. The military anarchy of the Sikhs led to the British

(27) H.J. Tapp, Political Agent Sabathu to J.J. Metcalfe,
10 November 1836. Foreign Political, 9 January 1837, No. 24.
(28) Clerk to Maddock, 29 June 1841, Foreign Secret, 26 July 1841,
No. 63.
suspicion, distrust and territorial ambition. (29) Lord Ellenborough (28 February 1842 - 15 June 1844) took necessary precautions, and kept home government informed of the events in Lahore kingdom. He cautioned Baron Fitzgerald, the President of the Board of Control in London, that "such a position could not be endeavoured and the necessity would be imposed upon us of occupying the hills and taking the summit of the Himalaya as the boundary of our dominions." (30)

The British and the Sikh forces began to collect on the respective banks of the river Sutlej. Sir Henry Hardinge (23 July 1844 - 12 January 1848) the succeeding Governor General made due preparation for war. On 5 December 1845, Sir Hugh Gough, the Commander-in-Chief was told that, "In point of fact all diplomatic relations have ceased. I have been obliged ... to dispense with the presence of the Lahore Vakeel in my Camp. ..." (31) On 11 December 1845, the Sikh army had crossed the river Sutlej. Therefore, war was declared against the Sikhs. (32) Several battles were fought between the Sikhs and the British at Mudkee, Ferozshah, Budhowal and Aliwal. On 10 February 1846, the battle of Sobraon resulted in a decisive triumph for the British forces. The action


(31) Hardinge to Gough, 5 December 1845. Foreign Secret, 26 December 1846, No. 183 and K.W.

(32) Gough and Innes, n. 29, p. 61.
was over by noon and the Sikh army was scattered beyond any possibility of an effective rally. The way to Lahore was open for the victors. On 13 February the British troops were at Kasoor, and on the 20 February, the capital of the Sikhs, Lahore, was in the British occupation. (33) In the meantime Hardinge issued a proclamation to the effect: "The Sikh army has been expelled from the left bank of the river Sutlej having been defeated in every action with the loss of more than 220 pieces of field artillery". (34)

The Treaty of Lahore 1846

Soon after the hostilities, the peace negotiation began between Bhai Ram Singh, Raja Lal Singh, Sardar Teja Singh, Dewan Deena Nath, and Fakeer Nooruddin on behalf of Maharaja Duleep Singh with Fedric Currie and Brevet Henry Montgomery Lawrence on behalf of the East India Company and ended in a sixteen articles treaty of Lahore on 9 March 1846. It imposed upon Lahore Durbar a war indemnity of one and half crores of Rupees; reduced the strength of Sikh army to twenty battalions of infantry, consisting of 800 bayonets each with 12,000 cavalry; and placed the check on the expansion of territory. It snatched from Duleep Singh thirty guns and the territory between Sutlej and Beas. Finally: "The Maharaja ceded to the Honorable Company in perpetual sovereignty as equivalent for one crore of Rupees, all his forts, territories,

(33) Ibid., p. 141.

rights, and interests in the hill countries which are situated between the rivers Beas and Indus including the province of Kashmir and Huzarah." (35)

Thus the kingdom of Lahore was reduced to a principality of Lahore. Surprisingly, the will of the British Government was thrust under the high sounding slogan of "perpetual peace and friendship" with heirs and successors, as in the case of the treaty of 1809.

**Treaty of Amritsar, 16 March 1846**

Out of the dismemberment of the kingdom of Lahore, the modern state of Jammu and Kashmir emerged. In pursuance of articles four and twelve of the treaty of Lahore, a week later the treaty of Amritsar between Gulab Singh and the British Government was signed. Gulab Singh and his heirs were guaranteed "all the hilly or mountainous country with its dependencies situated to the eastward of the River Indus and the westward of the River Ravi including Chamba and excluding Lahul," on the payment of Rupees one crore, the part of war indemnity imposed upon Lahore Darbar. The British Government promised aid in the event of external aggression, but did not guarantee the internal security of the state. (36) Thus the position of Jammu and Kashmir with respect to the British Government was more favourable than that of the other princely states of India. Besides the ascertainment of the limits of the territories of the British and that of Gulab Singh, the treaty of Amritsar had placed restriction on the extension of the territories of Jammu and Kashmir.

---


The Boundary Commission of 1846

Under articles four and nine of the treaty of Amritsar, the limits of the territories of Maharaja Gulab Singh were to be ascertained and the boundary between the British Government and Jammu and Kashmir was to be laid down. A two man boundary commission of Vans Agnew and Alexander Cunningham was appointed to ascertain the territories of Gulab Singh and Captain James Abbott was to lay the boundaries between the British and Kashmir. (37) The Commission of Agnew and Cunningham was instructed to ascertain the point where the territories of Gulab Singh, the British Government and Tibet were meeting. It had to stop all payments by Spiti to Tibet, Ladakh, Kulu and Bashahr, except that "if there are religious presentations they need not to be interfered with". (38) The proper facilities to the traders were to be guaranteed. As the departure of the Commission was late, it was proposed to ascertain the entire boundary in the next season. (39) Unfortunately this Commission could never reach the frontiers. From the native information Vans Agnew had compiled a memorandum. (40) This memorandum provided all the necessary information in regard to trade and trade routes,

(37) Agent N.W.F. to Secretary, Government of India, 31 July 1846. Foreign Secret, 26 December 1846, No. 1334.

(38) Lawrence to Agnew, 31 July 1846. Foreign Secret, 26 December 1846, No. 1335.

(39) Ibid.

between Yarkand, Tibet and the territories of Maharaja Gulab Singh. In regard to boundary Agnew stated that the border of Tibet and Kashmir was "... the ancient boundary of Ladakh and Chantham and Yarkand and by the Chinese is well known and undisputed". (41) According to him it touched the British Spiti frontier on the river Pare and went upward by the south of Tso Morari lake and Hanle monastery and met the river Indus, "near a village called Demchok". (42) From the Indus river it went along the ridge and crossed Pangong Tso (lake) approximately in the middle, and continued on the top of the ridge to Bakala (Lanka La). From Lanka La it went along the ridge beyond the Shyok river. Later it turned westward and passed between Yarkand and Nubra of Ladakh along the mountain range till it passed over Nagar and Hunza principalities. (43) Agnew was however of the opinion that

It is of course highly advisable that all boundaries be defined; but on the reference to the map and after comprehending the ground natural characteristics of the boundary above detailed, the absence of all grounds for variance, the indisputed right of Ladak to the roads up the Shoyak and the Indus to certain fixed points and that of the Chinese beyond them. While there is absolutely nothing else to acquire nearer than Yarkand, Rodekh and Garo I conceive that as safe and unmistakable a boundary could be traced by the commissioners on paper at their first meeting, as if they were to travel along its whole length. (44)

(42) Ibid., para 7.
(43) Ibid., paras 8-14.
(44) Ibid., para 15.
When the Boundary Commission was appointed, a communication was sent to Wazir of Lhasa, informing him the change of sovereignty brought by the treaties of Lahore and Amritsar. Henry Hardinge desired the deputation of the similar commission on the part of Tibet for the determination of the boundaries. Not willing to forego the trade and commerce with Tibet, the Governor General suggested a change in the treaty of 1842 to the effect that "such person as may in future proceed from China to Ladak or to the British territory or its dependencies or from the Ladakh or the British territory and its dependencies to China are not to be obstructed on the road." (45) This letter was carried by Anant Ram, a native of Bashahr state, to Gartok (Garo). The Gurpon (officer) at first refused the letter by saying that "... it was against their rules to receive any such communication from strangers". Later he accepted it but refused to send it to Lhasa. (46) A copy of the letter to the Wazir of Lhasa was sent to Sir John Davis, the Governor of Hongkong, for its transmission to the Imperial Government at Peking through Keying, High Imperial Commissioner at Canton. Hardinge wrote to Davis:

---


I am led to understand that Tibet is immediately under the authority of the Imperial Court at Peking, I have to request that your excellency ... will take such measures as to you may appear best calculated for securing the co-operation of the Chinese authorities and for facilitating the objects of the Commission so far as they are connected with the boundaries subject to the Empire of China. (47)

This was perhaps the first time when the British Government effectively entertained China's suzerainty over Tibet. A good deal of correspondence between Davis, Keying, Hardinge and Lord Palmerston, the British Foreign Secretary went on for over a year. (48)

Ultimately Keying informed Davis:

Respecting the frontiers I beg to remark that the borders of those territories have been sufficiently and distinctly fixed, so that it will be best to adhere to this ancient arrangement and it will prove far more convenient to abstain from any additional measures for fixing them. (49)

On further pressing by Davis, Keying informed him that the Peking Government had sent instructions to her Amban in Inasa for arranging the matters satisfactorily by deputing boundary commissioners. (50)


(48) *Foreign Secret, 28 August 1847, Nos. 139-162.* For text of letter to Keying see Appendix V.


(50) Keying to Davis, 8 August 1847. *Foreign Secret, 30 October 1847, Nos. 26-29.*
The Boundary Commission of 1847

The Government of India appointed a new boundary commission on 10 July 1847. It was comprised of Captain Alexander Cunningham of the Engineers, Lieutenant Henry Strachy, 66 Regiment N.I. and Assistant Surgeon Thomas Thomson, M.D. (51) The primary function of the commission was to ascertain the boundaries of Maharaja Gulab Singh in consultation with the commissioners of Tibet and Kashmir. Besides the boundaries, the commission was asked to investigate the line of trade, the population of the countries nearby and the means of barter system prevalent. It was observed that:

As the greater part of the boundary between Ladak and Chinese Tartary is laid down by nature, and as it is believed that scarcely any portion except the two termini can admit of dispute, the business with the Chinese commissioners will most probably be soon adjusted, and when everything has been accomplished on the border of (if nothing can be accomplished on the border from the absence of Chinese mission)... the commissioners should individually use their best endeavours to increase the bonds of our geographical knowledge in those remote regions. (52)

This commission reached at the village Khyuri on the river Pare, at the junction of the British India, Tibet and Kashmir, on 29 August 1847. Neither the commissioners from Tibet, nor from Gulab Singh were available there. They attempted to enter Tibet but due to the opposition from the people of the village Shaktal they could not do so. (53) Cunningham sent a fresh note to the

(51) Elliot to Lawrence, 10 July 1847. Foreign Secret, 28 August 1847, No. 156.
(52) Elliot to Cunningham, 27 July 1847. Foreign Secret, 28 August 1847, No. 162.
(53) Lawrence to Elliot, 14 September 1847. Foreign Secret, 27 November 1847, No. 22.
Tibetan authorities, asking them to send the commissioners to Hanle. (54) Thereafter the commission moved to Hanle via Tso Morari lake and reached there on 14 September 1847. At Hanle two persons from the Gurpun of Gartok met Cunningham and told him that Khalun Ghakchoo from Lhasa had been to Gartok for the settlement of some revenue dispute. Ghakchoo was not deputed for ascertaining the boundaries of Ladakh and Tibet. The agents of Maharaja Gulab Singh, Mean Jawahar Singh and Mehta Basti Ram could not reach Hanle. (55) Therefore in absence of the Tibetan and Kashmiri commissioners, the primary object of the British commission remained unfulfilled. It was left with the task of trade assessment and geographical enquiry.

Dr. Thomas Thomson and Alexander Cunningham left for Leh via the Indus route. Lt. Strachey went along the boundary line and reached Demchok on 10 October 1847, and reported that a small rivulet "... constitutes the boundary in this quarter, between Gnari and Ladak". (56) From Demchok Strachey went to Leh to pass the winter there. Next year on 20 April he left Leh and entered into Nubra. He reached Akham (Agram) on the river Shyok. Following the course of the Shyok river Strachey reached Shyok village. From Shyok he went towards the north following the course of another river, which

(54) Cunningham to Lawrence, 29 August 1847. Foreign Secret, 27 November 1847, No. 23.


(56) Strachey to Lawrence, 15 November 1847. Foreign Secret, 28 May 1848, No. 68.
was flowing through an isolated valley, and reached Durguk. At
Durguk he met a Dogra officer whose function was to collect taxes
on salt and wool. From Durguk to Pongong lake he followed the route
of Moorcroft and Trebeck. At Pangong lake he was intending to go
round the lake but due to the fear of being obstructed by the people
of Rudok in the "half way", he could not do so. From the south
side of the Pangong lake, he crossed a high road between Ladakh and
Rudok and reached Chushul on 8 May 1848. At Chushul, once again he
tried to contact Rudok authorities. He went up to a lake situated
at a distance of 12 or 13 miles from Rudok in the area. He was of
the opinion that, "The Rudok boundary as at present received lies
across the mouth of a narrow valley running parallel to the south
side of the Pangong lake, directed therefrom by a narrow line of
mountains and opening into the east side of the Chushul valley
opposite the village". (57) From Chushul he went back to Leh and
tried to communicate with the Lhasa authorities through the head of
the Lapchuk mission, who went in the month of July 1848. (58) But
he could not succeed. His entire efforts to induce the Tibetan
authorities failed. Dr. Thomson who was busy with his researches,
observed only about the boundary point at River Pare. (59) Though
a positive attempt was made to ascertain the boundaries of the

(57) Strachey to Sir Fedric Currie, Resident at Lahore, 10 June

(58) Ibid.

(59) Thomas Thomson, Report on Western Tibet. Foreign Political,
29 December 1849, No. 332.
Maharaja Gulab Singh, but due to non-cooperation of Kashmir and Tibet nothing came out of it. The boundary commission could unilaterally ascertain the boundaries between Shipki La to approximately up to Lanka La.

The British power in India expanded from east to west. It captured Jamuna-Sutlej tract of land in 1809. After the first Anglo-Sikh war of 1845-46, the Sutlej-Beas tract was taken over by the British Government. The state of Jammu and Kashmir was created out of the Sikh kingdom as a powerful friendly buffer. The British Government in a triumphant hour after the treaty of Lahore and Amritsar was not in a mood to sacrifice the rich shawl wool trade of Tibet. Therefore Hardinge tried to cancel some of the provisions of the treaty of 1842 and sought the cooperation of the Tibetan and Chinese authorities. Tibet was a forbidden land for the British Government and their invitation of China could yield no results. China, then a weak power, lost all her influence at Lhasa after 1792, and therefore their writ regarding the deputation of boundary commissioners remained unimplemented. (60)

(60) Dr. Alastair Lamb, in his Chatham House Essays tried to advocate the Chinese case on the Sino-Indian boundary. He has advocated that Ladakh was a dependency of Lhasa and therefore was Chinese protectorate, because the rulers of Lhasa and Ladakh were from the Sakya clan. Certainly Sakya clan was not a Chinese clan, it was an Indian clan to which Great Gautam Buddha belonged. The ancient ruler of Tibet was an Indian not Chinese. If Ladakh was a protectorate of China, why not China did not come for the protection of it at the time of Dogra invasion in 1834. Similarly his doubt about the treaty of 1842 on the basis of a dispatch of Lt. Strachey (Foreign Secret, 27 May 1843, No. 73) is untenable. He, I believe, has not taken into account the existence of treaty

(contd. on next page)
in Gulabnama, in Antiquities of Indian Tibet, vol. II, in Aitchison treaties etc. Surprisingly he contradicts himself just within four years. In his book Britain and Chinese Central Asia: The Road to Lhasa 1767 to 1904 (London, 1960), p. 70, he has utilized all manuscript material in regard to the treaty of 1842 and has admitted its existence. His doubts about the Demchok village, again on the basis of the dispatch of Lt. Strachey is not at all justified. Because he had failed to consult the memorandum of Vans Agnew of 1846 (Foreign Secret, 28 August 1847, No. 154). In this memorandum Agnew had clearly stated that the boundary runs below the village of Demchok. Lt. Strachey's relevant paragraph which Lamb refers runs as follows: "On the 10th October I reached Dunjijokh (Demchok) the frontier point upon the Indus it is a hamlet of half a dozen huts and tents not permanently inhabited, divided by a rivelet (entering the left bank of the Indus) which constitutes the boundary in this quarter, between Gnari and Ladak". (Foreign Secret, 28 May 1848, No. 68, Strachey to Lawrence, 15 November 1847). The difficulty with Dr. Lamb is that he starts with a fixed notion that Tibet has always been a part of Chinese Empire which is far from correct.