

29
3839

Turkish Expedition to Nejd.

No 211. Telegram dated the 8th May 1871.

From—COLONEL PELLY.

To—Political Secretary, Bombay.

YOUR telegram of to-day. Am requesting Bahrein messenger to postpone his return, hoping for early further telegram. Can Turks and Kowait make tracial Chief's harbour a basis of operations against Wahabees in friendly relations with Bahrein? *Clyde* awaits orders at Jask. Please submit I should be glad to have her or some vessel to watch proceedings, otherwise aggressors may fasten a quarrel on Bahrein despite her resolve to observe maritime peace. I presume British subjects employed on Turkish vessels could not be concerned in molestation of tracial Chiefs.

No 212. Telegram dated the 10th May 1871.

From—Political Secretary, Bombay.

To—COLONEL PELLY, Bushire.

YOUR telegram of 8th. Viceroy has telegraphed to Constantinople for precise intelligence, and can give no instructions till he receives reply.

No 213 No. 264, dated *Suffur* 1288 (corresponding with the 11th May 1871).

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

To—HIS HIGHNESS SAOOD BIN FAYSUL.

AFTER COMPLIMENTS,—I have had the honor of receiving your Highness's friendly letter. I am awaiting instructions from Government, and purpose afterwards proceeding to Bahrein, when I shall hope to have the honor of again communicating with your Highness.

No 214 No. 265, dated *Suffur* 1288 (corresponding with the 11th May 1871).

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

To—SHEIKH ESAW BIN ALI AL KHALEEFA, Chief of Bahrein.

AFTER COMPLIMENTS,—I have received your friendly letters and trust, at no distant date, to meet you at Bahrein. Meantime, I trust you will strictly refrain from any operation by sea. I have ordered some coal to be sent from Bassidore to Bahrein, and I would request the favor of your causing it to be taken care of until I arrive.

I am awaiting instructions from Government.

No 215. Telegram dated the 11th May 1871.

From—ROBERTSON, Bussorah.

To—Resident, Bushire.

COLONEL HERBERT directs me to report to you probable date of expedition's departure. Troops are now going on board transports and will leave here for Kowait in course of to-morrow. Entire force about 4,000 men, including 100 cavalry, will assemble there. According present arrangements, cavalry, with one-third of infantry, will proceed in land from Kowait.

D

3840

Turkish Expedition to Nejd.

No 252. Telegram dated the 1st June 1871.
From—COLONEL PELLY, Bushire.
To—Political Secretary, Mahableschwur.

COMMANDER of *Bullfinch* telegraphs from Bassidore that he would leave for Bahrein next morning, 31st May.

K.

No 253. Télégram dated the 2nd June 1871.
From—Foreign Secretary, Simla.
To—COLONEL PELLY, Bushire.

YOUR telegram of 31st. Can you communicate with *Bullfinch* ?

L.

No 254. Telegram dated the 2nd June 1871.
From—COLONEL PELLY, Bushire.
To—Foreign Secretary, Simla, and to Political Secretary, Mahableschwur.

FOREIGN Secretary's telegram of 2nd. I telegraphed to *Bullfinch* and *Maggie*, via Angaum, Gwador, and Muscat. *Bullfinch* replied from Bassidore was leaving for Bahrein,—vide my telegram of yesterday. Your notification for Chiefs and persons interested in pearl-fisheries sent direct to Bahrein, and through Angaum to Lingah and pirate coast. Landing of Turks contradicted from Kateef. Saood said to be in pursuit of Abdoollah.

APPENDIX II.

No 253.
Translated purport of a letter from ESAW BIN ALI AL KHALEEFAH, to COLONEL PELLY, Resident, Persian Gulf,—dated 20th "Suffur" 1288 (corresponding with the 19th May 1871)—received 22nd May 1871.

AFTER COMPLIMENTS,—I have had the pleasure of receiving your letter communicating the happy tidings of your approaching visit (to Bahrein). I am rejoiced at this news, and am awaiting your arrival.

Some letters containing intelligence of a disagreeable character have been received here, of which it seems necessary to inform you. The letters are forwarded, enclosed in Hajee Abdul Nubbee's letter, for your information. The intelligence is to the effect that a man from Kowait, one of the servants of Sebah, and who is the son of Binzubun, went to Biddah to Jassim bin Tani and spoke words which it will be lengthy to detail, but of which the abstract is, that the Resident has been removed (from office) from the Persian Gulf, and that the Ottoman Government are making warlike preparations against Bahrein and other places, and all the Gulf (regions). When Jassim learnt this news, he immediately turned out Ahmed bin Khaleefah Alghatem, and sent for Nauser bin Mobarek and the Beni Hanjir and brought them to Biddah, where they are at this moment in a declared state of hostility.

3841

Turkish Expedition to Nejd.

In a former letter you warned me to refrain from any movements by sea, and I have acted according to your orders. I am at present prepared for the defence and protection of my country, and await your arrival. I hope I will not be forgotten. I have full confidence in whatever you may deem proper, and I shall always act in accordance with your orders.

This is what I thought necessary to represent, and await your reply.

After writing this letter, I received some letters from the Noaim-Rashed bin Jubbur and Nausar bin Jubbur, which have been addressed to them by Mahomed bin Tani, his son, Jassim, and Nausar bin Mobarek. These letters will, D. V., reach you, and receive your attention; any view you may take in the matter will, Inshallah, be the most advisable.

I beg the favour of an early reply, and conclude with compliments, &c.

(True translated purport.)

(Signed) GEORGE LUCAS,
Residency Interpreter.

No 256.

Translated purport of a letter from ABDU RAHMAN BIN ABDOULLAH BIN JAAFAR, to SHAIKH ESAW, son of the late SHAIKH ALLI AL KHALEEFAN,—dated 20th Suffur 1288 (corresponding with the 11th May 1871).

AFTER COMPLIMENTS,—I have to inform you regarding the Al e Mahomed clan of the Beni Hanjir tribes, some of them waited on the Imaum, and he detained them, and gave permission to the Ojman and Ali e Marreh to attack their tribesmen, the Beni Hanjir. One of them, however, managed to escape, and went and warned the Beni Hanjir, and they fled by night to the neighbourhood of Guttur. The Imaum then released a few of that tribesmen whom he had detained, and told them to go and reach their people; afterwards a number of the Beni Hanjir went and demanded the release of the remainder of their tribesmen, but the Imaum did not let them go, saying that he required their services. Jassim corresponds with the Beni Hanjir. Be careful of these people, for you know thieves and robbers always look for an opportunity. May God destroy them, and their supporter. Amen.

At this date Abdoollah bin Tenayan, with Serrich, are encamped to the South of al Hassa in support of the Imaum's cause. The Imaum has been joined by some horsemen of Bin Sowait by the Zefair Chiefs, and by the Anezah Chiefs, Ben Hezal and his horsemen—these have brought 10 horses for presentation to him. The Imaum is at present in the village of Otman. He will move thence on Monday, the 24th Suffur 1288 (corresponding with the 15th May 1871). May God bless him with victory. Amen. The Dowais and the people of the Shemaul moved their encampment towards the Remah Saood bin Jelewie Ben Zeytan Janher al Maztaf, all the Dowassi tribes, Bedouins and townspeople, the Erjaun, Sesseloon, Bedouins of Nejran al Razek al e Shaumer and the Karinieh tribes are all at Orasileh. They had wished to move against Abdoollah, but Saood bin Jelewie objected for the time, and addressed the Imaum explaining that their men were short of money, and specified some other time for the move.

Abdoollah bin Fysul is in the Wadec Hamyeh and weak (in force or position). Thank God for the same. The people of Riadh objected to his entering the capital.

I hope God will give victory and success to the Imaum Saood, aid him with his own strength, and destroy his enemies. Amen.

3842

Turkish Expedition to Nejd.

I hasten to write to you this letter in order to warn you against the Beni Hanjir; and, Inshallah, the Imaum will soon bring them to account, as also those who are allied with them.

Salaams to Shaikhs Khanled and Ahmed, and all the al e Selmaun, &c., &c., &c.

(True translated purport.)

(Signed) GEORGE LUCAS,
Residency Interpreter.

10257.

Translated purport of a news-letter from HAJEE YUSHA KATEEF,—dated 28th May, received per buggarah on 1st June 1871.

AFTER COMPLIMENTS,—Saood Jelewie, a relative of Imaum Saood in Nejd, attacked Abdoollah bin Fysul and defeated him, killing a number of his men, and seizing 18 sowars with their horses. Imaum Saood, hearing this news while between Lahsa and Joodah, followed after Abdoollah bin Fysul with a large following.

The son of Bin Thenoyan has been placed at Lahsah for protection of that place and Kateef.

No engagement has as yet taken place between the Turkish Government troops and those of Imaum Saood. Up to date the Turkish Government troops have not landed.

Four ships and seven Ghonchahs have arrived. Hamad bin Towayan of Kowait and four Kowaitees landed at Dahrein, and were seized and taken by Imaum Saood's troops to the Governor of Kateef, Ameer Abdul Azeez bin Ahmed, Sudeyree, who put them in confinement, where they still are.

(True translated purport.)

(Signed) J. C. EDWARDS,
Assistant Resident, Persian Gulf.

10258.

No. 288, dated 6th Rubbee-ool-Awal 1288 (corresponding with the 26th May 1871).

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

To—SHAIKH ESAW BIN ALLY, Chief of Bahrein.

AFTER COMPLIMENTS,—I have the pleasure to acknowledge your letter of 28th Suffur 1288 (corresponding with the 19th May 1871). As regards your questions and anxiety concerning the movements of the Turks, I am commanded by His Excellency the Viceroy of India to inform you that the Government of His Highness the Sultan of Turkey deny all intention of obtaining supremacy over either Bahrein or any of the independent Arab Chieftains, and no attack against any of you is contemplated. The sole object of the Turkish expedition is declared to be the restoration of tranquillity in Nejd. The Government of the Ottoman Porte have given assurances that no maritime operations are contemplated in the Persian Gulf, and that the vessels employed are only intended as transports to convey troops to a point from which they can reach Nejd.

3843

Turkish Expedition to Nejd.

His Excellency the Viceroy of India further commands me to inform you that the Turkish expedition in no way affects the treaty rights and obligations of British Government or of the trucial Chiefs, and I am ordered to maintain the terms of the truce.

An English ship-of-war is under orders to proceed to Bahrein, and cruize in your neighbourhood. You will, I am sure, give her commander every proper aid, and keep him accurately informed of all that goes on by land and by sea.

As to the supposed intentions of the Guttur Chiefs, I hope and think that Mahomed bin Tani is too wise and experienced a man. But rest assured that if any trucial Chief attempt to infract the peace at sea, Her Majesty's ships will maintain the peace by all legitimate means.

If necessary, I shall myself proceed to Bahrein in a second steamer or depute a person to such a point as may seem best adapted for watching the peace at sea.

No 289

No. 289, dated 6th *Rubbee-zol-Awal* 1288 (corresponding with the 26th May 1871).

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

To—SHAIKH MAHOMED BIN TANI, Chief of Guttur.

AFTER COMPLIMENTS,—Reports have reached me from more than one source that a certain emissary from Kowait has visited Biddah, and given out that the Government of His Highness the Sultan of Turkey intend attacking Bahrein, &c., and that certain of your subordinates are preparing to put to sea, &c.

I hope and believe your own wisdom and experience are sufficient to prevent your crediting false reports, or breaking the peace at sea, and I am commanded by His Excellency the Viceroy of India to inform you that the Government of His Highness the Sultan of Turkey deny all intention of obtaining supremacy over either Bahrein or any of the independent Arab Chieftains, and no attack against any of you is contemplated. The sole object of the Turkish expedition is declared to be the restoration of tranquillity in Nejd. The Government of the Ottoman Porte have given assurances that no maritime operations are contemplated in the Persian Gulf, and that the vessels employed are only intended as transports to convey troops to a point from which they can reach Nejd.

His Excellency the Viceroy of India further commands me to inform you that the Turkish expedition in no way affects the treaty rights and obligations of the British Government on the trucial Chiefs, and I am ordered to maintain the terms of the truce.

An English ship-of-war is under orders to proceed to Bahrein and cruize between Ras Rekkan and Ras Tunora. A second steamer will occupy a convenient point for maintaining the peace at sea; and I beg you to explain to any or all of the tribes in your region whom you may suspect of intention to put to sea, that if they attempt to infract the maritime peace, Her Majesty's ships will maintain the peace by all legitimate means.

No 290

No. 291, dated 7th *Rubbee-zol-Awal* 1288 (corresponding with the 27th May 1871).

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

To—SHAIKH ESAW BIN ALLY, Chief of Bahrein.

AFTER COMPLIMENTS,—Since writing to you my letter of yesterday, I have received from India a telegram in which His Excellency the Viceroy com-

Handwritten text in Devanagari script, likely a signature or official stamp.

Handwritten text in Devanagari script, likely a signature or official stamp.

3844

Turkish Expedition to Nejd.

mands me to inform you that the statement of the emissary from Kowait is untrue. I am to renew to you the assurances given by the Turkish Government, and which were contained in my letter of yesterday.

His Excellency the Viceroy desires that you observe strict neutrality.

A gun-boat will be immediately sent to Bahrein for the maintenance of the maritime truce, and the protection of the pearl-fisheries.

It is probable that I shall myself visit you shortly.

Please send detailed and reliable information concerning everything that goes on.

No. 261.

No. 295, dated 9th *Rubbee-ool-Awul* 1288 (corresponding with the 29th May 1871).

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

To—The British Agent at Lingah.

AFTER COMPLIMENTS,—I enclose, for your information, copies of two letters which I have written to the Chief of Bahrein, having reference to the Turkish expedition to Nejd.

Should any of the Chiefs on the coast allude to or question you on the subject, you will reply to them in the tenor of the enclosed letter.

No. 262.

No. 294, dated 9th *Rubbee-ool-Awul* 1288 (corresponding with the 29th May 1871).

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

To—The British Agent at Shargah.

AFTER COMPLIMENTS,—I enclose, for your information, copies of two letters which I have written to the Chief of Bahrein, having reference to the Turkish expedition to Nejd.

Should any of the Chiefs on the coast allude to or question you on the subject, you will reply to them in the tenor of the enclosed letter.

No. 263.

No. 297, dated the 31st May 1871.

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

To—SHAIKH MAHOMED BIN TANI, Chief of Guttur.

AFTER COMPLIMENTS,—I am commanded by His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor General of India to inform you that the Turkish Government, in their present expedition towards Nejd, have no intention of obtaining supremacy over any independent tribe or State, and do not contemplate any attack whether against Bahrein, yourselves, or any of the independent Arab tribes. I am to state that the terms of the treaty for the maintenance of the maritime peace will be enforced by the British Indian Government, who, on the other hand, will fulfil their obligations by preventing an attack by sea on any trucial Chief who observes the terms of the treaty, and abstains from any operations by sea. Be so good as to inform all persons interested in the pearl-fisheries and residing at Guttur, that the British Indian Government will protect those interests.

3845

Turkish Expedition to Nejd.

A gun-boat has already left for Bahrein, and two of Her Majesty's ships-of-war are following. I beg you explicitly to warn all parties of the resolve and notification now made through me by His Excellency the Viceroy of India; the consequences of infracting the maritime treaty will be on the heads of those who infract.

No 264.

No. 298, dated the 31st May 1871.

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

To—The Hindoo community of British Indian subjects residing at Guttur.

AFTER COMPLIMENTS,—Herewith is forwarded, for your information, a copy of a letter which I have addressed to Shaikh Mahomed bin Tani, Chief of Guttur.

I request that you will be so good as to keep me accurately informed of all that goes on.

No 265.

No. 299, dated the 31st May 1871.

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

To—SHAIKH ESAW BIN ALLY, Chief of Bahrein.

AFTER COMPLIMENTS,—I am commanded by His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor General of India to inform you that so long as you observe Articles II. and III. of the Treaty entered into between your State and the British Government, that Government will fulfil its obligation in regard thereto. An Arabic copy of the treaty under notice is enclosed.

Pray inform all those residing on your islands, and who may be interested in the pearl-fisheries, that their interests will be protected.

The gun-boat *Hugh Rose* has already gone over to Bahrein with the Assistant Resident on board, and two men-of-war are under orders to proceed to Bahrein likewise.

P. S.—I have already communicated to you, under date 26th of May, the assurances given by the Ottoman Porte, and which cannot but be satisfactory you.

APPENDIX III.

No 266.

Telegram dated the 31st May 1871.

From—Resident, Bushire.

To—Sub-Assistant Surgeon, Bassidore, *via* Angaum by messenger.

PLEASE address Native agent, Lingah, by my order, and instruct him to notify by command of the Viceroy of India, that Turkish Government contemplates no attack and has no intention of claiming supremacy over any independent Arab tribe; that Government will protect interests in pearl-fishery, and enforce the terms of the treaty for the maintenance of the maritime peace. Three vessels-of-war ordered to Arab coast. Linga agent to communicate above to Shargah agent for information of crucial Chiefs and all others concerned.

दवाधिकार सुरक्षित राष्ट्रीय अभिलेखागार
भारत सरकार के कार्यालय

Copy Right vests in the National Archives
of India. Government of India

REFERENCES TO FORMER CASES. Rf. R. Nos.

S. I. of 1870, Nos. 97-101A.
 " " 23-59 & 61-73.

GOVT. OF
 INDIA. }

1870

{ FOREIGN
 DEPT.

S. I.

3846

Nos. 133-154.

Muscat Affairs.

LIST OF PAPERS.

Nos. 133 & 134.—From the Acting Secy. to the Govt. of Bombay, No. 6 of 7th Jan. 1870—Transmits copy of despatch addressed by the Poltl. Resident in the Persian Gulf relative to the affairs at Muscat.

Encl. in above.

Nos. 135 to 137.—From the Acting Secy. to the Govt. of Bombay, No. 8 of 7th Jan. 1870—Transmits copies of despatches addressed by the Poltl. Resident in the Persian Gulf forwarding copy of letters received from the Poltl. Agent at Muscat, reporting that all is quiet at Muscat, and that Syud Azan has returned to that place.

Encl. to above.

Nos. 138 & 138A.—From the Acting Secy. to the Govt. of Bombay, No. 22 of 20th Jan. 1870—Forwards copy of a letter from the Poltl. Resident in the Persian Gulf relative to affairs in Oman.

Encl. to above.

No. 139.—Tel. from Govt. of Bombay, Malabar Point, of 29th Jan. 1870—The Gulf Mail just in leaves little room for doubting that the Wahabees are actually on the march for Beraymee. It seems also that they have prepared boats, loosely stated at one hundred, to co-operate with our land force. We have only *Clyde* in the Gulf and *Dalhousie* at Muscat. I shall send Col. Pelly back in the *Dryad* if possible as soon as she can be got ready.

No. 140.—Tel. to the Poltl. Secy. to the Govt. of Bombay, No. 230P. of 7th Feb. 1870—Govr.'s tel. of 29th ultimo. Has he any information to show where Wahabee boats are likely to start from and where likely to land? Are tribes in country between Khateef and Aboo Debay feudatory to Wahabee Aneer, or independent? Any precedent for British interference between two powers not parties to maritime truce?

No. 141.—Tel. from Govr. of Bombay, Malabar Point, of 7th Feb. 1870—Communicates copy of a tel. received, reporting the advance on Muscat of the Wahabee Force; that the tribes in Jaalum southward are generally holding back, and that it is doubtful if Azan can raise a sufficient opposing force. Intimates also the orders issued thereon directing the preservation of the maritime peace and protection of British subjects, but abstinence in all land operations.

No. 142.—Tel. to Govr. of Bombay, Malabar Point (from Viceroy), No. 238P. of 8th Feb. 1870—States that reply to his tel. of 7th will be sent to-morrow. *Bullfinch* may be ready to start on Thursday morning.

Nos. 143 & 144.—From the Acting Secy. to the Govt. of Bombay, No. 38 of 4th Feb. 1870—Forwards copy of a letter addressed to Captain Douglas, R.N., requesting him to detach to Muscat a vessel of the squadron now temporarily under his command for the protection of British interests during the impending struggle between the Aneer of the Wahabees and the present Govt. of Muscat.

Enclos. to above.

REFERENCES TO LATER CASES. Rf. R. Nos.

TAKEEDS.

KEEP-WITHS PRINTED.

- (1.) Orders on face of Nos. 133. Note, No. 139.
- " " 141.
- (2.) " Nos. 146-146A.
- " " 148-149.
- " " 151-152.

KEEP-WITHS NOT PRINTED.

- (2.) Printed copy of Nos. 133-134.
- " " 138-138A.
- (1.) " " 146-146A.
- (1.) Rough Draft of letter to H. M.'s S. of S. for India, No. 17 of 22nd Feb. 1870, Nos. 153.
- (2.) Printed copy of No. 153.

वर्षाधिकार, सुरक्षित राष्ट्रीय अभिलेखागार
 भारत सरकार के-साथ
 Copy Right vests in the National Archives
 Government of India.

- No. 145.—Tel. to the Govr. of Bembay, No. 259P. of 10th Feb. 1870—
His tel. of 7th. In absence of Col. Pelly instruct
Poltl. Officer in Persian Gulf (considered best
fitted for the duty) to maintain the maritime peace.
Instructions to Col. Douglas approved.
- Nos. 146 & 146A.—From the Acting Secy. to the Govt. of Bombay,
No. 35 of 3rd Feb. 1870—Forwards copy of a
letter from the Poltl. Resident in the Persian Gulf
relating to the affairs at Muscat.
- Encl. to above.
- No. 147.—From the Secy. to the Govt. of Bombay, No. 41 of 5th Feb.
1870—Forwards copy of a letter from the Poltl.
Resident in the Persian Gulf regarding the affairs
in Oman.
- Nos. 148 & 149.—From the Secy. to the Govt. of Bombay, No. 43 of
5th Feb. 1870—Forwards copy of a letter from the
Poltl. Resident in the Persian Gulf regarding the
struggle between the Wahabees and the *de facto*
Govt. of Muscat.
- Encl. to above.
- No. 150.—Tel. from the Acting Secy. to the Govt. of Bombay of 10th
Feb. 1870—Proposed plan of Wahabee movement
against Muscat territory. Disposition and poltl.
relations of adjacent littoral tribes.
- Nos. 51 & 52.—From the Secy. to the Govt. of Bombay, No. 55 of 14th
Feb. 1870—Transmits copies of despatches addressed
by the Poltl. Agent at Muscat relative to the affairs
in that quarter.
- Encl. to above.
- No. 153.—To H. M.'s S. of S. for India, No. 17 of 22nd Feb. 1870—
In continuation of previous despatches on the
question of the formal recognition of the Govt. of
Azan bin Ghias in Muscat, refers to recent events
in Muscat and to the advance of the Wahabee
Ameer, and intimates the opinion of the Govt. of
India that, if Azan bin Ghias succeeds in adjusting
his differences with the Wahabees and still retains
his power in Muscat, he should be formally
recognised. Asks for the final decision of H. M.'s
Govt. in regard to the Zanzibar subsidy.
- No. 154.—Abstract of Contents.

3847

Exd.—J. T. F.

3848

From Bombay Government,
No. 6, dated 7th January 1870.

Muscat Affairs.

HIS EXCELLENCY.

THE previous papers are in the press, but I do not delay the printing and send this up by itself.

It may be read and circulated. No orders are needed till we got Colonel Pelly's report in answer to the full written instructions he would get on arrival at Bombay.

(Sd.) C. U. A.

12-1-70.

(Sd.) M.

14-1-70.

Telegram from Bombay,
dated 29th January 1870.

Wahabee advance on Beraymee.

FROM the Bombay Selections regarding the Persian Gulf it appears (page 117) that the fort of Beraymee was built by the Wahabee General Syud bin Mootluk, and was held by the Wahabees till the decline of their power when it was taken possession of by the Naeem tribe who inhabit the surrounding country. It is really the key to Oman.

In 1845, when the Wahabee forces were marching to demand tribute from Muscat, the fort of Beraymee again fell into the hands of Syud bin Mootluk, and the Chiefs of the Naeem and other neighbouring tribes tendered their allegiance. Beniyas Chief reduced the fort of Beraymee and defeated the Wahabee troops in 1848, but the Wahabees recovered it in the following year and appear to have held it ever since till it was taken by Azan bin Ghes in June last. It was always considered as the Wahabee outpost towards Oman and held by a Wahabee Governor, and in 1853 Syud Thoweynee, then Chief of Muscat, agreed to the permanent occupation of Beraymee by the Wahabees.

During the recent contest for power in Muscat, Sideynee, the Wahabee Lieutenant of Beraymee, was pledged to the side of Syud Salim. He was murdered, however, by the Chief of Shargah on 7th April last year. On his death, the Naeem tribe, according to Colonel Disbrowe, * who—

* Proceedings, August 1869, No. 170.

“complained bitterly of oppression suffered at the hands of Sideynee, the late Wahabee Lieutenant, resolved in their minds how they could free themselves from the Wahabee yoke and resorted to the expedient of inviting Azan to take possession of Beraymee. Azan and Khuleelee not being the men to allow the grass to grow under their feet, the offer of the Naeem was accepted.”

The proceedings of Azan were most probably hastened by peremptory demand made on him by the Wahabees for payment of tribute. At any rate, the result was that Azan marched on Beraymee with about 1,500 men, and took it on the 18th of June after a very slight resistance.

On 2nd August Colonel Disbrowe wrote:—

“So far as I can see and judge, Beraymee was gratuitously and unjustly invaded by Syud Azan, and Azan must look for Wahabee retaliation.”

From the telegram received from Bombay it appears that the Wahabees are now really marching to recover Beraymee, and that they have prepared boats, loosely stated at 100, to co-operate with their land forces. The question is whether this is or is not a breach of the maritime peace, which will justify our interfering to prohibit the co-operation by sea.

वर्षाधिकार, सुरक्षित राष्ट्रीय अभिलेखागार
भारत सरकार के माध्यम
Copyright vests in the National Archives
of India

Now, in the first place it is to be remarked that, although in 1866 the Wahabee Ameer gave us a written declaration that we would not—

“injure or attack the territories of the Arab tribes in alliance with the British Government, especially the kingdom of Muscat, further than in receiving the Zukat (tribute) that has been customary of old,”

yet this agreement can of course give us no ground for remonstrating against any attack provoked by hostilities on the part of Muscat. The engagement is, therefore, wholly inapplicable to the present case.

In the next place it is to be noted that neither the Ameer of Riadh nor the Sultan of Muscat is a party to the maritime peace. We have, however, of our own authority declared our determination to prevent by force of arms if necessary any party at Muscat or elsewhere from undertaking warlike operations by sea; but we have also declared that these orders will not prevent the Muscat Government from sending munitions of war from one port in Muscat territory along the unbroken Muscat coast line to another Muscat port, provided the vessels remain constructively within Muscat territory by never going beyond gun-shot distance from the beach.

Now the case of Wahabee boats co-operating for the reduction of Beraymee seems very different from that of Muscat above referred to. It is not stated in the telegram where the boats are to sail from, where they will probably land, and by whom they are manned. I have been unable to ascertain precisely how far the Wahabee coast line extends. In the map attached to his memorandum on the Wahabees, Wheeler only brings it to the west of the promontory of Katar, quite 350 miles to the west of Beraymee. At any rate, whether this intervening coast line is actual Wahabee territory or only subject to Wahabee influence, it is inhabited by the Beni-yas, Joasmi, and other tribes, upon whom the terms of the maritime peace are binding. Beraymee is good 50 miles from the sea coast and cannot be reached from the sea, except by landing on a part of the coast occupied by tribes subject to the perpetual agreement of peace. We should be justified in calling upon these tribes to prevent their coast line from being made such use of, and therefore we should equally be justified in remonstrating with the Ameer of Riadh from making such use of it, and in preventing him from doing so, even though he is no direct party to the maritime peace.

There is also, I think, a great difference between the transport of munitions of war along the coast for the purpose of storing and garrisoning a fort, and the transport of such munitions with the avowed purpose of attaching or recovering a fort. The one is a precautionary measure which may really be in the interests of peace and the prevention of hostilities; the other is directly aggressive and provocative of hostilities.

I think, therefore, we should be quite justified in calling on the Ameer to abstain from sending a force against Beraymee by sea even if it never go beyond gun-shot from the shore. If our ships of war were in the Gulf, probably the mere expression of our wish would be sufficient. It is un-
 nate that they have all left the Gulf except the *Clyde*.
 e *Dalhousie* is at Muscat. The *Dryad*, the *Nymphe* and *Daphne* are all in Bombay harbour. On the 23rd December instructions were sent to Colonel Pelly to return to Muscat. He does not seem yet to have left Bombay. He might now be directed to return to the gulf with the *Nymphe*, or the *Daphne*, or both, taking Muscat on the way.

6-2-70.

(Sd.) C. U. A.

3850 7

THE following copy of a telegram is circulated by order of His Excellency the Viceroy :—

Dated 7th February 1870.

From—Governor of Bombay,
To—Viceroy.

“ Clear the line. Following telegram received :— ‘ Wahabee force approaching Muscat. Tribes in Jaalan southward are generally holding back. Appears at present doubtful if Azan can raise any sufficient opposing force.’ *Telegram ends.* My instructions of February 3rd were to observe strict neutrality between contending parties and to interfere with no operations by land, as force only sent to protect British subjects and property, and to maintain maritime truce by force, if necessary. If thought necessary to alter these instructions it will be best to do so at once, as three days will be lost in going to Jask, which is one hundred and fifty miles beyond Muscat. *Bullfinch* reported to be ready on Wednesday.”

8-2-70. (Sd.) C. G.
8-2-70. (Sd.) W. R. M.
9-2-70. (Sd.) G. N. T.

THIS looks as if the Wahabee leader was acting promptly.

10-2-70. (Sd.) H. M. D.
10-2-70. (Sd.) J. S.

From Bombay Government,
No. 35, dated 3rd February 1870.

Muscat's claim to Gwador, Charbar, &c.

In a letter from Azan bin Ghes to Colonel Pelly, dated 16th December 1869, occurs the following passage :—

“ We have territories (abroad) belonging to ourselves and the Arabs, but we cannot put our hands on them; and we do not understand what is your object in regard thereto. If the rules laid for the Arabs, the same on which our predecessors acted, are still in force, then we can go (by sea) to any of our territories we may wish. If the prohibition (to move by sea) is to be with our consent, we will neither consent nor act up to it. But if it is to be compulsory, and not according to rules and justice, then of course we cannot help it, and will leave it to God. But we do not think that a great and powerful Government as the English will enforce such prohibition without just cause.”

Colonel Pelly assumes that the complaint relates to “Gwador, Charbar,* &c.,” on the Mekran coast, which “have hitherto been acknowledged by us as being included in the dominions subject to the Sultan of Muscat.”

Gwador, I may remark, was granted towards the close of the last century to Syud Sultan, who usurped the throne of Muscat in 1797. He had fled, after an unsuccessful attempt to overthrow his† brother's power, to Khelat, the Khan of which made over Gwador, then a fishing village of no importance, for his support. He and his successors have, despite various efforts of the Beloochees to regain it, never lost their hold on the place, and from time to time fortifications have been added, which have increased its strength. In the time of the same Syud Sultan Charbar was taken by surprise from the Beloochees, and has ever since been retained by the Arabs. In virtue of the extension of the Persian dominions under Nadir Shah, which included the whole of the Mekran Coast,

* I am not clear what Colonel Pelly means by “&c.” No territory beyond the limits of the two ports, so far as I know, has ever been held or claimed by Muscat.

(Sd.) C. G.

Colonel Goldsmid's *Précis* on Beloochistan, page 61.

† Saeed bin Ahmed.

the Shah's Government has never ceased to lay claim to these two towns. But Colonel Goldsmid, who probably knows more of the details of the case than any one else, has, after a careful investigation of previous history and correspondence, declared his conviction that the Shah has no sort of claim to either one or the other. The Imam's tenure of Charbar is acknowledged by the local Chiefs, who receive from him a portion of the revenues in order to protect the port from the interior. The Beloochees deny the free gift of Gwadur to* Muscat, but Colonel Goldsmid, who occupies himself mostly with the pretensions of Persia in these regions, has not stopped to consider whether there is any justice in the objection. In distributing the various places in Mekran, Colonel Goldsmid puts down Charbar and Gwadur as Arab. In 1865-66 the Governor of Kerman admitted to that officer that he had nothing to say to Gwadur, and that he had little power on the sea coast. In the Telegraphic Convention of April 1868 the territorial rights of Persia in Mekran were purposely not defined. Article II. merely grants a subsidy for leave to lay down a line of telegraph—

"on those parts of coasts and places which are under the sovereignty of Persia."

To judge by his remarks at pages 21 and 22 of his *précis* Colonel Goldsmid, whilst excluding Gwadur, would include Charbar, as a matter of expediency, within Persian limits if the boundary question ever really came under settlement.

Mr. Wheeler, who wrote a long note in 1863 on the frontiers of Persia, came to the conclusion that the suzerainty of the Imam extended from Jask eastwards to some point (not specified), where it meets the territory of the Khan of Khelat, and that from that point, wherever it might be, the latter's territory extended to the border of Sind. The Imam was, he considered, only *de facto* possessor of Gwadur and Charbar, the Khan of Khelat having the prior claim, and being barred from resuming possession only by the prescriptive right acquired by the uninterrupted tenure of Muscat. But this uninterrupted tenure is surely the strongest argument that can influence us. If Persia were allowed to suppose that she might, if she could, recover what she possessed in Nadir Shah's time, and Khelat what she held in Nusseer Khan's, there would be no end to encroachment and consequent wars and insecurity.

I have put all these details together in order that His Excellency may know exactly how the case stood, and how it was viewed until Gwadur and Charbar were seized in the course of last year by Syud Nusseer, the son of Syud Thoweynee by a Belooch concubine. His hold over their dependencies of Muscat is naturally irritating to Azan bin Ghes, who, as Colonel Pelly says, wishes to complete his "authority by the reduction of his transmarine provinces." Colonel Pelly, not having any control over our relations with Mekran, writes without knowledge of what may be our policy in regard to the status of the ports under notice, and remarks that if it is the intention of Government that this outlying territory should be permanently separated from the Muscat State, the same must be explicitly intimated to the Imam, and the declaration must, in his opinion, be supported by the presence of a gun-boat on the coast. If it is to remain an integral portion of Muscat, Colonel Pelly thinks that it would be expedient for us to mediate, as soon as convenient, for the attainment of this object. His Excellency may wish to confer personally with Colonel Pelly on this subject whilst he is in Calcutta. But for the moment, whatever decision may be come to, the question can

Précis, page 37.

* They say that half only of the revenues were assigned (Wheeler's memorandum on the Persian frontiers, page 63). But at all events the Imam monopolized the whole and has retained them.

(Sd.) C. G.

Précis, page 30.

Précis, page 44.

Précis, page 57.

Pages 63 and 64.

† For capture of Gwadur please see paragraph 8 of my note on Muscat affairs. We have only learnt incidentally of the fall of Charbar (Please see Proceedings, July 1869, No. 47).

(Sd.) C. G.