CONCLUSION

The Uprising of 1857 was an epoch making event in the annals of the history of the nineteenth century as it harnessed the people's urge for freedom through a powerful movement which encapsulated diverse approaches and ideologies for the attainment of an immense vision – freedom of the country from the British Colonial rule and establishment of an independent India of the Indians. This extraordinary goal resulted in it becoming the largest armed struggle waged against colonialism in the nineteenth century, with the ousting of the British from power in Delhi and Lucknow and the establishment of a rebel government in these two Centres which functioned, about temporarily, from May to September 1857. The establishment of a spacious and absorptive idea of Hindustan where the multi-religious and Multi-furious castes and sects were all integrated and assured of the safety of their life, religion, honour and property exemplified the extraordinary efforts of the revolutionaries and the participants to implement their immense vision promulgated in their writings the envisaging of the country as 'Hindus and Muslims of Hindustan'.

The Uprising of 1857 is a most momentous, if tragic, event in the history of Modern India. Historians have held divergent views about Outbreak of 1857. Firstly, it has been argued that it was a mutiny of a Company's sepoys, pure and simple. The sepoys were discontented on account of various reasons among which the alleged supply of greased cartridges was the principal one. Secondly, it has been said that the Uprising marked a struggle between the civilization of the West and that of India. It has been suggested that the fast approaching tide of the western civilization caused a great alarm in the minds of the conservative sections, and made them combat against the British rule.
Thirdly, some scholars are of the view that the Uprising reflected the
discontent of the expropriated feudal classes whose powers and
privileges had been lately assailed by the British. Fourthly, the Great
Uprising was viewed as a secret Muslim conspiracy to oust the British
from India and restore the old Muslim sway. It has been asserted that
the Mughal Court stirred up the Mutiny for selfish political reasons.
This movement is also said to have been encouraged by the
representatives of the dispossessed house of the Avadh Monarchy.
Lastly, the Indian Uprising has been regarded as the first Indian War of
Independence. These different view points amply indicate that the
Uprising of 1857 was not a simple movement but a complex one. It
would be a mistake to treat it as a disconnected and sudden explosion.

History of the Uprising of 1857 is largely understood through the
writings of British. Greater parts of the records out of which history
takes shape, come from British sources, and the large material of the
Indian side suffered destruction during the course of revolt, 1857-1858.
The most celebrated sources on the subject are the works of John
William Kaye, Martin Montgomery, T.R. Holemes, G.B. Malleson,
G.W. Forrest, Charles Ball, Colin Campbell, Macleod Innes M.R.
Gubbins. They show the views of contemporary British historians. The
work of Richared Hilton, C.T. Metcalfe, G.B. Palmer, Alexander
Lewellyn are the major works published in the 20th Century.

Sir John William Kaye, one of the most prolific writers on the
history of the British connection with India, was convinced that the
main cause of the rebellion in 1857 was fear on the part of the
Brahmans of the innovations introduced by the British. Unlike other
observers who had come to somewhat the same conclusion he did not
regard this fear as either unjustified or as a reflection on the character
of British rule. As the traditional guardians of Hindu culture, the
Brahman according to Kaye, understood the threat posed to their religion and to their own privileged position by the advance of western civilization. They had taken the lead, therefore, in instigating the soldiers and the general populance to Uprising. In this understanding, the war was seen as the last desperate efforts of the Brahmans to defend themselves against the forces of modernity.

Kaye writes that the grasping policy of Lord Dalhousie and above all the alienation of the higher class and elites and the land settlement policies and other economic factors also contributed as the causes of the Uprising of 1857. He also described that the rebellions chose this season for Uprising because of British could not do very well in the hot season. Mutineer know that British could not survive at that time. Kaye writes in his book that among the mutineers were some brave and desperate men, who were ready to court instant death for the sake of the national cause. Many act of heroism of this kind brighten up the history of the war and many more doubtless, performed of which history has no record. He says that the great summer was against the English because they did not survive at that time.

Kaye was the first among the British historians to write that there were fears and discontents which had no connection with the greased cartridges and Uprising was not motivated by the spoils of the military system, that in many places the first attack came from the disaffected communities and that every where the reign of annexation and innovations was threatening to crush the very hearts of the nation. Elsewhere he wrote that it was not due to the instigation of the sepoy but a great movement from within was beginning to make itself felt upon the surface of the rural society and all traces of British rule were rapidly disappearing.
One of the most debated aspects of the war of 1857 is the nature of the Indian leadership. In contrast to the opinion generally held by almost all modern historians that there was no really coordinated advance planning, however, the British scholars are of the view that a widespread and well organized conspiracy had been at work for some years plotting the overthrow of the British. The most persuasive exponent of this interpretation was George Bruce Malleson, author of many historical works on India. Malleson had come to India as a cadet in the military service of the East India Company in 1842, but later became the correspondent for the London Times.

G.B. Malleson referred that the Uprising of 1857 was widespread. There were revolts against the British throughout the entire belt from Delhi to Dacca. He also referred that Mutiny broke out in the East of British India, like Chithagong, Tiparah, Latu and Manipur also. Malleson paid serious attention to the affairs of the South during the Uprising. His account of South India is full descriptions of British Generals and administrators whose contributions in saving the Empire at a time of crisis were immense. He describes the serious Uprising in South India at Kolhapur, Hyderabad and Indur, and describe the heroic role played by British officers and their men. Malleson describes that 1857 was not only a sepoy mutiny, he accepts many times in his writings that it was a mass movement.

Another important work on 1857 was authored by J.C. Browne. Browne says that the Uprising of 1857 was a 'Poorbean Mutiny'. The word 'Poorbean' which he has used throughout exactly expresses his feeling of hatred for the Indians. He describes that it was a political and religious struggle. It was a 'Jahad', a war of extermination to the Christian. Browne writes that the greased cartridges and the annexation of Oudh were no more responsible for the events of 1857. He describes
the important role of spies. The British army according to him was able to capture Delhi on Sep. 20, 1857 because of the help of spies.

On the bases of making a detailed and analytical study of John William Kaye, G.B. Malleson and John Cave Browne writings it appears to the present research-scholars that these historical writings truly represent the British imperialistic character and British imperialist mind. To these scholars the events of 1857, by all accounts, was not only a victory of the British colonialism but also of the British is a people.

Charles Ball observes that the Uprising of 1857 eventually became the rebellion of the whole people and a mass movement. All Hindus and Mussalmans were united in this struggle. Ball also describes that Uprising did not stop even after the withdrawn order of cartridges. He says that defective military system was also responsible for the Uprising. He says that the disaffected state of a great portion of the native army of Bengal became a fact acknowledged, and was a subject of anxious consideration by the Indian government. The whole rational of the military system was freely analyzed and the conduct of the authorities was severely commented on by the press, for their neglect of ordinary prudence in the choice of individuals to fill the higher appointments of the army and for their obstinate perpetuation of a system by which the efficiency of the military strength of the Presidency was impaired. Many time Charles Ball was impressed by the sweep of the Uprising and considers that its sudden outbreak disorganized the whole scheme of a violent Uprising against the British rule. Ball also describes the suppression of the Uprising and he says that the civil officers in every district were encouraging all persons to return to their usual occupations, and punishing only such of the principle offenders as can be apprehended, and to postpone as far as
possible all minute inquiry into political offences untill such time as
the government may be in a position to deal with them in strength after
thorough investigation.

Other 19\textsuperscript{th} century historians like T.R. Holmes argues that traders
were forced to help rebels during the Uprising of 1857. The upper
classes during the rebellion, especially that of the talukdars, zamindars,
shahukars makes this clear to support the British during the first phase,
which lasted approximately till the first of July 1857. According to
Holmes the Uprising was a mass movement of people because the
mercantile and shop keeping classes who knew that their position and
prosperity were staked upon the continuance of orderly rule, and would
be liable to ruin amid the anarchy which would be sure to follow upon
its subversion, were steady, if not loyal supporters of the Government.
The mercantile class thus shut their ears against rumours about the fall
of British rule in India.

19\textsuperscript{th} century historian, C.T. Metcalf discussed that the rebellions
had chosen a particular time and place for Uprising. The hot season was
most deadly and trying to the European. The place selected for the
outbreak was Meerut, some forty miles only from the residence of the
titular king of Delhi. The place was selected in North India since the
rebellions thought that a considerable European force should be sailing
through the Indian Ocean within hailing distance of Calcutta. W.H.
Russell describes all the measures adopted for suppression by the
British officials. Russell had shown the racial differences and he found
the Company's rule not very favourable to the Indians. Russell had also
shown racial differences. He did not forget to appreciate Lieutenant
Hodson on his action for the shooting down of Bahadur Shah's sons.

British imperialist historians of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century have also taken
up some other aspects related to the Uprising of 1857. Such as, Henry
Mead describes the role of Press during the Uprising of 1857. He says that the Indian Press was in isolation because of the Gagging Act passed by the Indian Government. It is said that the liberty of the Press was in incompatible with a state of insurrection. Freedom of publication was dangerous to the well being of the state. Another reference made by Hendy Mead was the moral support by other Europeans to the cause of Indian freedom fighters. Another 19th British historians Sir D. Cavenagh and Ascott R. Hope describes about the Uprising of 1857 that it was a totally Religious war. Ascott R. Hope criticized the religious policy of East India Company. Alexander Duff concluded that it was Indian hostility to British rule.

Charles Ball and other 19th century historian described that the Uprising of 1857 was totally a sepoy mutiny and if it was mass a movement then the people of India were involved in this Uprising only because of their selfishness. According to him the British had racial attitude against rebellions. But 20th century writings of British historian are little liberal towards the Uprising of 1857 because they were affected with liberalism.

G.W. Forrest like J.W. Kaye, G.B. Malleson, C. Ball, C.V. Browne and other British historian writes only in the praise of the British army and he never told heroic act of Indian soldiers. He uses world 'sepoy' for Indian soldier. He never describes even one Indian name, where he praised heroism of the soldiers. Forrest accepted that it was not only a religious rebellion but it was a great intellectual and emotional event. Forrest praised those Indians who helped British during the Uprising and according to him this was the major cause of British victory, like Diwan of Gwalior helped British.

19th century British historians described that it was only the Indians who committed the atrocities during the Uprising of 1857. But
20th century historians on 1857 had emphasis on the atrocities committed by Indians and as well as by Europeans. Edward J. Thompson described that the actions like the massacre of Cawnpore by the Indians followed only because of the British brutality which occurred earlier.

20th century historians described that peasant also participated in this Uprising of 1857. Lester Hutchinson an Englishman, was deeply involved in trade union and working class movement. Hutchinson sees the war as the last protest of a feudal order that felt itself in undated by the forces of modernity. He says that it was not a Mutiny because it was not confined to the troops, but was supported by the vast majority of the peasants and people of Northern India. He says that it was a revolt precipitated by the revolutionary changes introduced by British.

Huge Tinker examines the results of the Uprising on both Indian and British after 1857. Tinker sees in the celebration of 1857 as the beginning of the nationalist movement which stands in contradiction to the version of that history that sees India's independence was won through non-violence.

William Forbes Mitchell described that during the Uprising Europeans played important role to help rebel or some Europeans took part or fought with the rebels. Another 20th century historian T. R. Metcalf also argued that the Uprising of 1857 was a result of the agrarian grievances arising from the British over assessment and the passage of landed property to the money-lenders. But after these liberal attitude, they praised British soldier and write that Indian Uprising failed because of their lack of leadership. T.R. Metcalf writes that on the other hand, British were extraordinarily well provided with first class leaders.
On the basis of the present research-work it may be said that the some of the 20th century British historians have asserted that the British won the Uprising because of their huge amount of spies and these spies worked very well against mutineers. Reginold Rey estimated that about six thousand Indian were summarily hanged during a period of three month in the Uprising of 1857 on the bases of the work of the spies. 20th century British historians views on Uprising is slightly liberal because these historians were influenced by the liberalism background. But they also accepted that it was only a sepoy mutiny because of their British racial attitudes.

So far as the opinions of the British Generals and other Military Officers are concerned regarding the nature of Uprising of 1857, they are generally of the view that the Uprising was only a sepoy mutiny. The sepoy were in employ in the English East India Company and they defend the Company every time it was under the crises. The Company would have collapsed if these Generals and Military Officials have not fought for it. Company ruled from Kashmir down to Cochin. Macleod Innes described that upper classes helped British during the Uprising of 1857. Like Talukdars and Bannias supplied the British armies with necessaries and also gave shelter to British fugitives. He described the causes of Uprising and said that it was because of the centralised administration. The power of the Commanding Officers were weekend. Indian people did no believe in alien power. However, some of the military historians say that the Uprising was more than a mutiny. Such as, MacMunn says that in central India the position was more of a rebellion than a mutiny. He also observed that the mutiny coincided with the march of Science and many progressive forces and all these climaxed by the Independence of India.
MacMunn further pointed out that while the Governor-General and all officers of his government were in Calcutta and the whole of the Military machine was in Simla. This paralysed the government and accounted for the ineffectiveness of the civil side of the military machine to cope with the situation. Lt. Colonel George argues that no military revolt in the world's history had so many chronicles as the Indian mutiny. He discussed that some Indians helped to the British and that was the main important cause of defeat of the rebellions. MacMunn argues that British won the Uprising because of their doctoring was unusually good. Wounded British soldiers were quietly well after the treatment of doctors and they went again to the battlefield against rebellions.

Military historians described that they had night attacks on the rebellions, so they won the mutiny. They accepted that the British suppressed mutiny very soon but Indian monsoon was a big hurdle for them. They are of the view that the British won the Uprising because of friendly help from the Afghan. 19th and 20th century historians don't described that the British were trying about friendly help from the Afghans. Military historians are rational than other historian and they used niggers word for Indians in their works. Like R.G. Wilberforce. described during the Uprising cooks of British mess were also involved in the Uprising. But Military historians accepted it was an organized conspiracy against the British Government.

John Adyl another military historian argues that the cartridge question was the immediate cause of the revolt but the army had for a long time been in an unsatisfactory state. Military historians accepted that the great mutiny was a simple military mutiny and a mutiny only of the Bengal army. They have also pointed out that why the Indian army failed in the Uprising. They argued that the sepoys had no orgainsed
skill. There was no individual action among them, they attempted no
guerilla system and started no move to cut off British supplies or to
intercept their line of communications. Every military historian
describes that the 1857 Uprising was primarily because of the
dissatisfaction in Bengal army's soldiers. But very soon it was spread in
while army's soldiers. Military historians were generally of the opinion
that it was fundamentally an army mutiny.

The present research-scholar now wish to make a humble attempt
to examine the views of the British administrator historians on the
Uprising of 1857. British administrator historian J.W. Sherer argued
that there was no special cause for Uprising of 1857. British
administrator historians views were different to other historians. They
described that British good administrative policy played an important
role for British victory like regular post, Thanmans, Police, Russud,
and Daks etc. William Muir argued that the origin of Uprising was only
and mainly caused of cartridge. He raised one point also that during the
Uprising British did not face any financial problem in India. They were
financial strong than Indian. It was also a main cause of victory of
British. He argues that the Britain provided a big relief fund during the
Uprising for India.

Martin Richard Gubbins writes that during the Uprising Indian
helped the British but British did not help Indians. Gubbins writes that,
British's intelligence department was very strong and it helped British
for their victory. British administrator historians condemned
contemporary historian like Edward Lecky because he described that
administrative policy of British was a causes for sepoy mutiny.

Administrative historians accounts are very authentic. Because
they used original sources like Blue Books. They have discussed about
the Intelligence Department of British. Dunlop discussed in his book
that during the Uprising Nepalese Government helped the British to suppress the mutiny. He argues that the help of the Ghoorkhas regiments to British was the main cause of British victory on Indians rebellions. Ghoorkas class usually were superior to the Indians in strength, activity and courage. These historians also write about the causes of disaffection in the native army and rural classes.

R. Montgomery Martin says that the British advance in technology played a key role in their battle against the rebels like telescopes which helped British forces to move, attack and defend accordingly. Whole administrative's thought was based on imperialism and they have condemned the feelings of India nationalism.

It may be argued on the basis of the present research-work that the British historians called Uprising of 1857 in India as 'Mutiny' because it was sparked throughout the sepoys of Meerut on 10th May 1857. But majority of the Indians described it as the 'first war of independence' because of the unity of Hindus-Muslims and its widespread nature. In spite of the Company's rule, Indians had declared Bahadur Shah II as the Mughal Emperor. Other non-British Europeans called it a 'national Uprising' as the Indians for the first time unitedly tried to overthrow the foreign rule of English East India Company. With the passage of time the views of the historians also moved with different approaches.

It appears that the British historians at the time of revolt wanted to maintain the supremacy of the British Empire and to glorify it. With the beginning of the 19th century the views of the historians like E. Thompson. W.H. Russels did not forget to highlight the atrocities made by British as well as by the Indians during the revolt and emphasised that welfare activities for the Indians in a civilised way should be given importance. There were some British historians, e.g., Philip Mason and
Charles Allen who highlighted the chivalry and bravery of their military officials side by side the grievances of the sepoy and their contribution in the extension of Company's imperial expansion of territories.

Non British historians called the event as 'national uprising', like Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, N.A. Dobrolyubove and Jan Myrdal. They found that Company's rule had exploited India for their economic benefit, which was unavoidable for the Indians for a long time. Through the Uprising of 1857, Indians tried to break the shackle of Company's rule, with one objective to overthrow the Company's rule.

The Indian nationals also got the opportunity to glorify the Uprising of 1857 during the National Movement, e.g. V.D. Savarkar's work, The Indian War of Independence 1857. Jawaharlal Nehru found the event as an opportunity for the revival of feudal system which ended in the defeat of the feudal system. The centenary year of 1957 has brought a large number of historical works by Indian historian on the Uprising of 1857. S.N. Sen, P.C. Joshi called the event of 1857, War of Independence except R.C. Majumdar who called the event as 'sepoy mutiny', S.B. Chaudhuri found the Uprising as the civil rebellion with a participation of the masses. In the 1980s Ranjit Singh Guha brought out his historical work with emphasis on the participation of the peasants as the main constituents of the Uprising.

The discussion of the different aspects will remain incomplete if we neglect the expectations of the Indians as well as the British historian from the Uprising of 1857. Indian participated whole heartedly in the Uprising with the sole objective to overthrow the East India Company's rule. The Company's officials also involved themselves in the revolt to suppress it for the security of their rule. The question arises who emerged successful in the Uprising? The Indians or
the British! Indians were not successful in their objective to remove the shackles of alien rule of course. British Crown emerged as the successor of Company's rule.

The East India Company's officials had taken inhuman and uncivilized methods like hanging the innocent, burnt a number of villages and killed not only the sepoys but also the innocent civilians. All these measures of suppression had indirectly created racial differences between Britishers and Indians. The method of suppression not only extinguished the fire of Uprising but it removed the mask of the British rule.

It may be concluded on the basis of the present research-work that the 1857 Uprising was the first anti colonial mass movement directed against the aggression of imperialist policies demonstrated in course of the first half of the 19th century. It was the first major armed movement faced by the British in India. It was a political struggle and not based only what can be narrowly defined as "economic" factors. Besides shaking the foundations of colonial rule in large parts of northern India, its political fallout was felt elsewhere, in the sense that it stirred up anticolonial imagination. But British historians views are based only on imperialism. Every British historian till 20th century described that it was only a sepoy mutiny.