

- No. 177.—Tel. to Poltl. Secy. to Govt. of Bombay, No. 1525P. of 20th July 1871—In reply to his tel. of 18th, enquires whether Turkish steamer was man-of-war or merchant vessel, and who ordered *Lynx* to Bombay.
- No. 178.—Office Memo. to Marine Dept., No. 1525A.P. of 21st July 1871—Forwards extract from a tel. from the Resident at Bushire of 18th July 1871, and states that it is highly desirable that after as short a stay as possible at Bombay the *Lynx* should be ordered to Persian Gulf.
- No. 179.—Tel. from Poltl. Secy. to Govt. of Bombay of 19th July 1871—Col. Pelly telegraphs to-day:—"My telegrams of yesterday. Herbert replies as follows. Pasha states that being without news he cannot say if flags have been sent to Gwuttur. Firmans being orders emanating from Sultan have not been sent thither. More by post."
- No. 180.—Tel. to Poltl. Secy. to Govt. of Bombay, No. 1555P. of 24th July 1871—His telegram of 19th. Col. Pelly to get full information regarding character of Turkish steamer and hoisting of flag, but he is not to telegraph to Col. Herbert.
- No. 181.—Tel. from Poltl. Secy. to Govt. of Bombay of 19th July 1871—Col. Pelly telegraphs 18th July as follows:—"A Native craft from Kateef reports that Turkish troops occupied Lahsa District without opposition."
- No. 182.—Tel. to Col. Pelly, Bushire, No. 1528P. of 21st July 1871—Enquires whether Lahsa is a sea-coast town or the district of which Hoofoo is capital, or another name for Hoofoo. It seems used indiscriminately. How far inland are Turks believed to have reached.
- No. 183.—Tel. from Poltl. Secy. to Govt. of Bombay of 21st July 1871—Col. Pelly telegraphs on 20th:—"Turkish steamer from Kateef confirmed report of taking of Lahsa."
- No. 184.—Tel. from Poltl. Resident, Persian Gulf, of 22nd July 1871—Informs Lahsa is a fertile district inland. Hofoof, a principal fort there. Turks are said to be in occupation of the district. Oojair is the nearest sea-port.
- No. 185.—From Marine Dept., No. 22 of 24th July 1871—With reference to this Office No. 1525A.P. of 21st July 1871, forwards copy of letter to Bombay Govt. directing that after as short a stay as possible at Bombay the *Lynx* should return to the Persian Gulf.
- No. 186.—Tel. from Poltl. Secy. to Govt. of Bombay of 24th July 1871—Col. Pelly telegraphs to-day:—"Occupation of Lahsa by Turks officially confirmed from Kateef. Saood in Riadh. Abdoollah two days' march distant. Brothers not reconciled. Arabs said to contract rule of Turks with the severity and exactions of their own Imams, but recent importation of strumpets and publicans disapproved by Wahabees. Cholera prevailed in Turkish camp. Commander unable to advance owing to heat and sickness. His garrison in Kateef 800 strong."
- No. 187.—Tel. to Secy. of State, No. 1570P. of 25th July 1871—Pelly states Saood and Abdoollah not reconciled. Cholera in Turkish camp. Commander unable to advance owing to heat and sickness. His garrison in Kateef 800 men.
- No. 188.—Tel. from Poltl. Resident, Persian Gulf, of 25th July 1871—For notice of Lahsa refers to paragraphs 96 to 101 of his Report No. 57 of 15th May 1866, also to sketch map of his route to and from Riadh at page 78 of printed Report.
- Nos. 189 to 225.—From Acting Secy. to Govt. of Bombay, No. 2347 of 29th June 1871—Forwards, with reference to tels. from Govt. of India of 13th April 1871 and subsequent tels., copies of letters from Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, on the subject of Turkish expedition from Bagdad to Nejd.
- Enclos. to above.
- No. 226.—From Mily. Dept., No. 27 of 29th July 1871—In continuation of No. 22 of 24th July 1871, forwards, for intimation, copy of tel. from Bombay Govt., reporting the arrival of Her Majesty's Ship *Lynx* on 28th July 1871 from the Persian Gulf.
- No. 227.—Tel. from Poltl. Secy. to Govt. of Bombay of 28th July 1871—Acknowledges this Office tel. of 19th, and states that from enquiry it appears register of *Snipe* is in the name of Messrs. Sassoon, and was taken out in London. *Snipe* appears now to be property of British subject resident in Bombay, who has applied for transfer. If desired by Govt. of India, Messrs. Sassoon can be addressed stating that it appears that register of *Snipe* is in their name, but that it is intimated that they are not the owners, and asking for such information as they may be at liberty to give.

3826

- No. 228.—To Acting Secy. to Govt. of Bombay, No. 1614P. of 31st July 1871—With reference to correspondence ending with the above, agrees to communication being made by Bombay Govt. to Messrs. Sassoon about ownership of vessel, &c. It might at the same time be hinted to them that it would be desirable that the vessel (*Snipe*) should not engage in the Turkish expedition to Nejd.
- No. 229.—Tel. from Poltl. Secy. to Govt. of Bombay of 30th July 1871—Communicates following message from Col. Pelly to-day:—"Herbert having addressed Bagdad Pasha concerning Turkish flag at Gwuttur, latter replied his assurance had related to Bahrein, which would not be interfered with until settlement of question between British and Ottoman Governments, but that Gwuttur was not excepted like Bahrein."
- No. 230.—Tel. to Poltl. Secy. to Govt. of Bombay, No. 1612P. of 31st July 1871—Asks him to instruct Col. Pelly to make no direct communications to Col. Herbert in matters political or international principles, or Treaty rights and duties, which matters should be referred to the Govt. of India.
- No. 231.—Tel. to Col. Herbert, Bagdad, No. 1613P. of 31st July 1871—With reference to his communications to Pasha about Gwuttur flag, desires him to remember instructions in telegram of 5th June to confine himself to assurances of Pasha about maritime operations except under positive instructions. To report constantly by telegraph and ask for orders.
- ~~Nos. 232 to 272.—From Acting Secy. to Govt. of Bombay, No. 3214 of 18th July 1871—In continuation of No. 2347 of 29th ultimo, forwards copy of further letter from Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, No. 559-141, dated 5th idem, regarding Turkish expedition to Nejd, together with the opinion of Bombay Government as to the assurances of Turkish Government, as regarded by the Govt. of India, &c.~~
- Enclos. to above.
- No. 273.—Tel. from Acting Secy. to Govt. of Bombay of 30th July 1871—Communicates following message from Col. Pelly received to-day:—"Magpie arrived. Major Smith found Turkish flag in Jassim's house. Arab flag in Bin Thanni's at Biddah. Gwuttur Chief explained by letter. Turkish flag was hoisted by desire of Turkish Commander, who sent it through Kowait Chief. Does not appear Turkish steamer entered port. Chief verbally referred English to Turkish Sultan regarding hoisting flag."
- No. 274.—Tel. to Acting Secy. to Govt. of Bombay, No. 1650P. of 5th Aug. 1871—Enquires whether the Turkish steamer concerned in affair at Biddah was a Turkish man-of-war, the Commander, a Turkish official, and whose did the party land, who took the flag, and on whose authority did they act.
- No. 275.—Tel. from Acting Secy. to Govt. of Bombay of 7th Aug. 1871—In reply to above, states Resident instructed on 28th to ascertain whether Turkish steamer private vessel or man-of-war. In his telegram of 31st sent on the same day he reported Turkish flag hoisted by desire of Turkish Commander, who sent it through Kowait Chief, but that Turkish steamer did not appear to have entered port. In despatches just received Major Smith reported to Resident that he was informed that a Turkish Govt. steamer and Chief of Kowait in his own boat proceeded to Gwuttur bearing communication from the Pasha commanding Ottoman Forces in Nejd.
- No. 276.—Tel. from Poltl. Agent, Turkish Arabia, of 1st Aug. 1871—States that his letter No. 25 of 19th July will show that the instructions contained in this Office tel. of 5th June has been followed. The subject of Nejd is avoided between Pasha and himself by tacit consent. If any question arise, he will immediately telegraph for orders.
- No. 277.—Tel. to Col. Herbert, Bagdad, No. 1654P. of 7th Aug. 1871—His reply quite satisfactory.
- No. 278.—Tel. from Poltl. Secy. to Govt. of Bombay of 31st July 1871—Col. Pelly telegraphs, July, 30th:—"I learn secretly from Turkish source that Lahsa affairs are settled. All forts taken without fighting. Saood asked for, and will receive, terms. Abdoollah expected in Turkish camp. Turks purpose building forts at Ojair."
- No. 279.—Tel. to Col. Herbert, Bagdad, No. 1641P. of 4th Aug. 1871—Enquires whether he considers to be true Col. Pelly's news about Lahsa affairs being settled. All forts taken. Saood to receive terms. Abdoollah expected in Turkish camp.

3827

Turkish Expedition to Nejd.

*No 189.* No. 2847, dated Bombay Castle, the 29th June 1871.

From—W. WEDDERBURN, Esq., Acting Secy. to the Govt. of Bombay in the Political Dept.

To—The Secretary to the Government of India in the Foreign Department.

WITH reference to your telegram of the 13th April last, and subsequent telegrams, I am

- 1. Letter from Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, No. 416—104, dated the 22nd April 1871, with accompaniments.
  - 2. Further letter from ditto ditto No. 481—118, dated the 6th May 1871, with accompaniments.
  - 3. Further letter from ditto ditto No. 505—130, dated the 20th May 1871, with accompaniments.
- directed to forward, for submission to the Government of India, copies of letters as per margin, from the Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, on the subject of the Turkish expedition from Baghdad towards the Nejd territories.

2. Transcript of Colonel Pelly's letter No. 381—92 of the 8th April last, referred to in his letter of the 22nd idem, is also forwarded herewith.

*No 190.* No 416—104, dated camp near Bushire, the 22nd April 1871.

From—LIEUT.-COL. LEWIS PELLY, C. S. I., Her Britannic Majesty's Political Resident in the Persian Gulf.

To—The Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Political Dept.

I HAVE the honor to continue the subject of my letter as per margin, concerning the intended expedition from Baghdad towards the Nejd territories.

2. Appended are copies of two telegrams which I had the honor of forwarding to your Office on the 10th instant, also copy of a third telegram which I forwarded on the 13th instant.

3. I beg also to enclose a translated purport of a private letter received by a Native merchant in Bushire from an Arab Sheik who had just returned from a visit to the camp of His Highness Saood bin Fysul, also a translated purport of a letter which I have received from the Guttur Chief, Mahomed bin Tanee.

4. The letter from the Sheik is confirmatory of the intelligence summarized in paragraph 6 of my letter marginally noted. But the Sheik's letter further alleges that His Highness Abdullah was proceeding to Mecca. The letter also pretends to explain the manner in which the articles sent by Abdullah for the Pasha of Baghdad were plundered *en route*.

5. The letter from the Guttur Chief is declaratory of his friendly relations with His Highness Saood and with the Chief of Bahrein.

6. Referring to my cypher telegram of the 10th instant, copy now enclosed, and to your telegram of the 13th, intimating to me the instructions of the Government of India in regard to the Turkish expedition, and the maintenance of the maritime truce, I would respectfully submit, 1st, that it was not my intention to request special vessels for the Gulf, but respectfully to remind Government that *Kwanglung* having been re-called to Bombay for refitment, and the gun-boat *Hugh Rose* having been placed at the disposal of General Goldsmid, no vessel remains in the Persian Gulf, whether for the purpose of carrying on current, police, and other duties on the Arab coast, or for watching the intended expedition in its relation to the trucial Chiefs; 2nd, if, as is

3828

Turkish Expedition to Nejd.

apparently intended, the Turkish expedition proceed to Kateef, reasonable alarm will undoubtedly be caused among all the Arab Chiefs of the Littoral, especially among those who, like the Chiefs of Guttur and Bahrein, are located in the immediate neighbourhood of Kateef. The Chiefs will possibly be called on by His Highness Saood to aid in protecting Kateef and the inland Districts. But even should they not be so requested, these Chiefs will almost certainly address me requesting advice as to the attitude they should observe towards the invaders, and as to whether the British Government would permit the Turkish authorities to infract the peace at sea to the prejudice of the Chiefs who are subscribers to the maritime truce. I would respectfully solicit instructions by telegraph on these points.

7. I would beg to enclose an extract from a previous letter showing the line of policy which has on former occasions been proscribed by British authority in respect to Turkish designs on the Arab coast.

*10191*

Telegram dated the 10th April 1871.

From—PELLEY.  
To—Political Secretary, Bombay.

*Depêche recommandée.*—Native merchant returned from Saood's camp at Lahsa, informs correspondent all tribes of Nejd and Guttur had accepted Saood's rule. Quiet prevailed. Abdullah a fugitive to Shummur tribe, who had refused assistance. Saood sending his son to capital, moving northward himself with camp. Guttur Chief writes to me he had visited Saood and was in amity with him and Bahrein. No copy sent to Foreign Secretary.

*10192*

Telegram dated the 10th April 1871.

From—PELLEY.  
To—Political Secretary, Bombay.

*Depêche recommandée.*—In continuation of reply to Foreign Secretary's telegram of 28th ultimo. Expedition from Busreh to Kateef by sea believed in here. Remonstrances might be made,—*vide* Bombay Government selections, Persian Gulf, pages 446, 448, 450. Am authentically informed that Dutch Consul shipped 300 tons coal to Fao for Turkish steamers *Asshur*, *Nineveh*, and *Brusseh*. I am indirectly asked whether Arabs would be forbidden aiding Wahabees against Turks. I respectfully request instructions, and unless especially instructed should not interfere as maritime truce does not relate to Turks. If Government wish me to watch proceedings, an efficient steamer would be necessary. There is at present no Government vessel in Persian Gulf. I suggest that Government of India request Political Agent, Baghdad, and Vice-Consul Busreh to keep me informed of expedition movements. This telegram not sent direct to Foreign Secretary.

*10193*

Telegram dated the 13th April 1871.

From—Political Secretary.  
To—COLONEL PELLEY, Bushire.

FOREIGN Secretary intimates that, according to latest intelligence from Baghdad, expedition, is temporarily postponed. Political Agent, Baghdad, will be instructed to keep you informed in event of expedition sailing, and that you

3829

Turkish Expedition to Nejd.

should not interfere with the proceedings of Turkish authorities without specific order from Government of India, to whom you should immediately report if Arabs take part in quarrel. You should limit your action strenuously to maintaining maritime truce. No vessel need be sent specially to Persian Gulf. *Forte* sailed on the 11th instant.

No 194.

Telegram dated the 18th April 1871.

From—COLONEL PELLY, Bushire.

To—Political Secretary, Bombay.

POLITICAL Agent, Baghdad, telegrams: Preparations Nejd expedition recommencing leaving Baghdad in few days. Three steam vessels ordered to convey troops, six regiments, and twelve guns. One thousand Arab horse going by land.

No 195.

Translated purport of a letter from AHMED BIN ABDUL KADER BIN HADEED,—dated the 13th "Mohurrum" 1288 (corresponding with the 4th April 1871).

I ARRIVED at Lahsah and visited the Imaum Saood and have now returned safe. His messenger to you, Othman bin Hazeem, returned on the day I quitted, but there was no time for the Imaum to write, as he was very busy: he has much work and does it well. He wishes ten days after *Mohurrum* to move with his force from Lahsah and proceed northwards in Nejd, after which he would go to Armah and Rumeykah. His brother Abdullah, after receiving no assistance from the Arabs in the north, went to Mecca. When he arrived at a place, named Shayirah, distant ten days' journey from Mecca, he met the Kehtan there, and stayed with them.

Saood wrote to them not to give Abdullah countenance, and ordered that in Nejd no person should give Abdullah anything.

Saood's arrangements are excellent. Armah and Rumeykah are within a day's march from Riadh.

Abdullah bin Fysul sent presents to the Pasha of Baghdad, viz., nine mares and a horse that belonged to the Al Khulifa that Mahomed bin Abdullah sent formerly as a present to Abdullah bin Fysul when looking to becoming Chief of Bahrein.

A tribe from Mutayer, named Al Ghuffur, seized the presents and horses above-named, together with the arms, such as daggers, swords ornamented with gold.

The plunder they brought to the Imaum Saood. Saood sent the horse of the Al Khulifa to Sheikh Eysan bin Ali, in charge of Eysan's brother Ahmed.

(True translated purport.)

(Signed)

S. SMITH, Major,

Asst. Political Resident in the Persian Gulf.

No 196.

Translated purport of a letter from MAHOMED BIN TANEE, to COLONEL PELLY, Resident, Persian Gulf,—dated 1st "Mohurrum" 1288 (corresponding with the 23rd March 1871).

AFTER COMPLIMENTS,—I wrote to you before this by hand of a man of mine, named Ali bin Najum, and informed you of what had been plundered from my craft at sea by the tribe of Amayir.

Turkish Expedition to Nejd.

My man returned but brought no reply from you, but I do not know how this occurred ; what occurred was done at sea, and I hope you will not neglect it.

I went to see Saood at Lahsah, where I met Sheikh Ahmed bin Ali, Al Khulifa, and Saood was mediator and arranged a friendly settlement between us. Sheikh Eysan also has written to me. Praise be to God, I am well with him now.

You know that I only want to live quietly at home and have no desire to seize others' countries. You will not, I feel sure, forget me.

(True translated purport.)

(Signed) S. SMITH, Major,  
Asst. Political Resident in the Persian Gulf.

*No. 197.*

Extract paragraph 3 from a letter No. 127 of 18th December 1866, addressed by LIEUTENANT-COLONEL LEWIS PELLY, Her Britannic Majesty's Political Resident in the Persian Gulf, to C. GONNE, Esq., Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Political Department.

PARA. 3. The Islands of Bahrein are held by English authorities to be independent, and this view of the case has, for at least the past 20 years been maintained by us. In exemplification of this view I would refer to correspondence now noted, where, with reference "to the designs of Turkey to establish a supremacy over Bahrein, Government laid down that it is obviously desirable to exclude, as much as possible, all interference by foreign powers in the affairs of the Persian Gulf, since it is only by retaining the supreme authority in its own hands that the British Government can hope to secure the permanence of the objects it has gained in that quarter at such a large expense;" and where the "Hon'ble the Board of Directors ruled that any attempts upon Bahrein ought to be resisted by the naval force in the Gulf," and, "authorized Government to instruct the Resident accordingly. On a subsequent occasion it was laid down by the Government of India that Her Majesty's Government would not admit of the occupation of Bahrein by the Turkish Government, or by any one acting for it, or in its interest," and, "consequently, that the Government of India should offer every obstacle to an attack upon that island by the Wahabee Chief." Again, Sir Charles Wood, in his letter now noted, and copy of which has already been submitted, decided "that Bharein should be regarded independent, and as subject neither to Turkey nor Persia."

Letter from Major S. Hennell, Resident, Persian Gulf, to Secretary to Government, Bombay, dated 10th May 1847, No. 3, Secret Department. Government reply No. 834, Secret Department, dated 31st July 1847; and Government letter No. 512, Secret Department, dated 25th November 1847, enclosing extract paragraph 1 from the Home Secret Committee, dated 6th October 1847.

Fide Mr. Secretary Goldsmid's letter No. 166, Secret Department, dated 31st May 1853, to Captain A. B. Kemball, Resident Persian Gulf, and enclosure from Government of India, No. 177 of the 10th May 1853.

No. 2, Secret Department, dated India Office, 18th February 1861.

Government laid down that it is obviously desirable to exclude, as much as possible, all interference by foreign powers in the affairs of the Persian Gulf, since it is only by retaining the supreme authority in its own hands that the British Government can hope to secure the permanence of the objects it has gained in that quarter at such a large expense;" and where the "Hon'ble the Board of Directors ruled that any attempts upon Bahrein ought to be resisted by the naval force in the Gulf," and, "authorized Government to instruct the Resident accordingly. On a subsequent occasion it was laid down by the Government of India that Her Majesty's Government would not admit of the occupation of Bahrein by the Turkish Government, or by any one acting for it, or in its interest," and, "consequently, that the Government of India should offer every obstacle to an attack upon that island by the Wahabee Chief." Again, Sir Charles Wood, in his letter now noted, and copy of which has already been submitted, decided "that Bharein should be regarded independent, and as subject neither to Turkey nor Persia."

(True Extract.)

(Signed) S. SMITH, Major,  
Asst. Political Resident in the Persian Gulf.

3831

Turkish Expedition to Nejd.

No. 481—118, dated camp near Bushire, the 6th May 1871.

From—LIEUT-COLONEL LEWIS PELLY, C. S. I., Her Britannic Majesty's Political Resident in the Persian Gulf.

To—The Secretary to the Government of Bombay, Political Dept.

IN continuation of my letter as per margin\* and previous correspondence concerning the intended expedition from Baghdad to Nejd, I have now the honor to enclose copies of telegrams submitted to the Right Hon'ble the Governor in Council on the several dates marginally noted.†

\* No. 416A—104 of 22nd April 1871.  
† Dated 24th, 25th and 28th April, and 2nd May 1871.

2. I beg also to enclose translated purport of letters which I have received from His Highness Saood and the Chief of Bahrein.
3. Also copy of an extract from a note written to me by the head of the firm of Messrs. Gray Paul, indicating the effects which the mercantile community in the Gulf anticipate on their own interests and our influence should the contemplated attack be carried out.
4. Also copy of a deposition made by the master of a Native craft arrived from Fao.
5. Since submitting the telegrams above referred to, I have again been asked on behalf of the Imaum Saood and the Chief of Bahrein what the views and instructions of Government may be.
6. I have caused the messenger to be informed that I had telegraphed to Government and awaited instructions, and that, in the meantime, I would earnestly recommend a strict observance of the maritime truce on the part of the subscribers thereto. I understand, however, that the messenger and craft despatched from the Arab coast still delay return, in the hope of receiving replies to the questions alluded to in my telegrams of 22nd April and 2nd May.
7. From a letter addressed by the Imaum Saood to a private correspondent, it would seem that His Highness feels confident concerning the issue of the struggle by land; but that he desires to ascertain whether we should permit a naval attack on his Gulf coast line, as also whether we should object to his acting by sea.
8. The Chief of Bahrein relies on trucial engagement, and seems to consider that we should not permit him to be attacked by sea. I understand that one question that he puts is as to whether, in the event of his being so attacked, he is to defend himself, or to rely upon our arbitration and protection.
9. Independently of the question of a direct attack on Bahrein, it is obvious that, if a Turkish fleet, accompanied by Kowait Native craft, anchor in the harbour of Bahrein on pretence of thence attacking Kateef, there would be great risk of some misunderstanding arising, and, unless some English vessel were on the spot to observe the facts, a quarrel might be fastened on Bahrein in spite of any endeavours on the part of the Bahrein Chief to remain neutral.
10. Again, it is, I think, worthy of consideration whether, without affecting our trucial engagements, a Turkish fleet could make the harbour of trucial Chief a basis of operations against the Wahabee power which is in friendly relations with that trucial Chief.
11. It is to be borne in mind that at great cost and trouble the British Government have maintained the maritime police of the Persian Gulf for the term of a generation or longer, and that this police originated in the necessity of the case, in that it was found impracticable to preserve the Indian Ocean from the raids of the Persian Gulf pirates, unless by putting down piracy in the Gulf itself.
12. In furtherance of this maritime security, written trucial engagements were entered into with the Arab chieftains, who had been most addicted to piracy.

13. In consequence of the security thus attained, trade developed, and has fallen largely into the hands of British Indian subjects who have settled in small colonies along the littoral.

14. While incurring the cost of the maritime police, we have not, like Russia in the Caspian, excluded other flags from these waters. On the contrary, we have rendered possible and aided the development of the sea-borne traffic of all nations concerned. Steam and telegraph communications and establishments have been introduced, and the line promises to become a high road between Europe and British India.

15. It appears, therefore, that our position in the Gulf rests, *1st*, on the reason of the thing; *2nd*, on the claims and obligations derived from long usage and practice; *3rd*, on the necessity for protecting our own interests, whether as respects those created by the present peace or those lawlessly and violently invaded by the previous condition of piracy; and *4th*, and in part on voluntary written engagements. I am deferentially of opinion that we could not relinquish the crucial contracts which we have entered into unless with the consent of the contracting Chiefs, and unless assured that the lives and property of our subjects, settled in these chiefdoms, would not be thereby jeopardised, and unless, further, we felt sure that trade interests, including the very considerable matter of the pearl fisheries, would not suffer; *secondly*, that neither the general good nor the interests and rights of our own subjects would permit of our abandoning the maritime police of the Persian Gulf, unless under unquestionable guarantee that that police would be hereafter maintained with a vigilance, justice, and success equalling that which now prevails; and *thirdly*, that questions of Indian policy would have, in the first instance, to be carefully considered. At present we are a real and felt influence and power for good in the Gulf; and in a crisis the Chiefs make action or the reverse depend on our advice. Results might be different if a Chief looked to a power of a different temper for advice, as to whether he should or should not harrass our craft and traders. But these questions of policy would be for the consideration of higher authority.

16. Naval aggression on the part of Turkey, on the Arab littoral, would, I think, shake general confidence as well in commercial affairs as in our own will or power to uphold our crucial engagements, or to maintain the maritime peace generally.

17. *It is said* that the views of Turkey are not confined to the Wahabee territory, but will, if practicable, be carried out as towards Bahrein, the Chieftains of the pirate coast, and the Sultanate of Muscat; and if, as is alleged, Turkey bases her pretensions to Nejd upon question of tribute, why Bahrein and Muscat pay tribute or black mail to the Wahabees, and Zanzibar a subsidy to Muscat.

18. It is beyond my province to enter upon the question of what might be the ultimate results to Turkey herself of an attempt to hold permanent possession of the peninsula of Arabia.

19. There is no doubt that, with her fleet, she might destroy, or, perhaps, for a period garrison towns or forts within range of her ships' guns. But could any one acquainted with the physical features of Central Arabia, and the character and temper of its tribes, predicate that disaster would not eventually befall Turkish detachments there stationed?

20. But it is not within the scope of this report to consider the question of the expedition in all its bearings, or to give an exhaustive analysis of our position in this region, and of possible modifications in our method of procedure. It is sufficient if in the foregoing paragraphs I have glanced at a few broad and weighty considerations that will not escape the judgment of Government.