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Abstract

The Indian Army underwent a process of reform and modernisation from 1861 onwards. The aim was to create a desirable working environment for the Indian troops, who were necessary for the defence of the subcontinent. This included providing Indian regiments with a professional officer corps, consisting of British men of sufficient quality. By creating a prosopography and combining this with thematic chapters, this thesis aims to chart this process of reform up to 1914. The First World War placed demands on the Indian Army which meant that progress was interrupted owing to an influx of new officers. This created numerous challenges which had to be overcome during the conflict. The effects of the First World War, the world’s first ‘total war’, on the Indian Army will be assessed. As will the performance of Indian Army units in numerous battles and campaigns between 1861 and 1921, analysing the role of the British officer on active service. Away from the battlefield, the officers of the Indian Army were a diverse group with many different backgrounds. The thesis aims to analyse these backgrounds and look for trends within the officers’ origins. Familial ties to India or the military would have helped officers assimilate to the subcontinent. Finally, the social lives enjoyed by officers will be evaluated; sport, marriage, and family all impacted on an officer’s career. Overall, this thesis aims to provide a thorough depiction of the Indian Army officer corps in the period under consideration.
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Note on Place Names

All places names and language references used in this thesis are the historical names used during the period under study and as they appear in the original documents.
Regimental Ranks of the Indian Army

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indian Cavalry</th>
<th>Indian Infantry</th>
<th>British Army (equivalent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Captain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Lieutenant</td>
<td>2nd Lieutenant</td>
<td>2nd Lieutenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risaldar-Major</td>
<td>Subadar-Major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risaldar</td>
<td>Subadar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemadar</td>
<td>Jemadar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daffadar</td>
<td>Havildar</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance-Daffadar</td>
<td>Naik</td>
<td>Corporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acting Lance-Daffadar</td>
<td>Lance-Naik</td>
<td>Lance-Corporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sowar</td>
<td>Sepoy</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1:

Introduction

Introduction

In light of the 1857 Rebellion it was decided that Indian Army units should be reorganised along the lines of irregular units. The irregular system had been created in the early nineteenth century by Europeans such as James Skinner, who had been in the employ of the Mughal armies before joining the East India Company (EIC). Its purpose was to placate the EIC’s Muslim troops and to attract further recruits by keeping the military organisation akin to that of the Mughal forces. Irregular units had fewer European officers and so gave greater responsibility to the Indian officers, perhaps as a result, these irregular units had proved themselves loyal to the British during the rebellion. Indian regiments of between five and six hundred sepoys had just six European officers, although some pre-mutiny irregular units had as few as three. The idea behind this was that one European officer with the correct approach could inspire the loyalty of a thousand native troops, whereas thirty Europeans would make the Indian officer, or Viceroy Commissioned Officer (VCO) as they became known, obsolete, giving private soldiers neither the incentive to further himself nor anything in common with his superiors.¹ The concept was known as cultivated loyalty. The irregular system had worked for men such as Sir John Jacob. Jacob had joined the EIC in 1828 and saw action in the First Anglo-Afghan War and on the North-West Frontier. In 1841, he was given command of the Scinde Irregular Horse, which became better known as Jacob’s Horse.² Jacob implemented the irregular system to good effect. His men were so devoted that when the rebellion began they remained loyal despite Jacob not being in India at the time. Jacob was a great advocate of this system and although he died in 1858 his ideas and opinions were heeded by the commission that was set up after the British quelled the rebellion.

² A biography of Jacob was published by Alexander Innes Shand, *General John Jacob: Commandant of the Sind Irregular Horse and Founder of Jacobabad* (London; Seeley and Co. Limited, 1900).
This was the Peel Commission – which took its name from Lord Jonathan Peel, Secretary of State for War.

As a result of the post-1858 changes Indian officers thrived, proving themselves more than capable of leading troops and commanding outposts miles away from their European superiors. These men were picked ‘on the principle of efficiency’. In contrast, prior to the 1857 Rebellion, promotion of sepoys was based largely on length of service. This resulted in a large number of officers and non-commissioned officers (NCOs) being upward of 60 years old. This had been one of the recommendations made by the Peel Commission. Most of witnesses who gave advice to the commission agreed that promotion by length of service was a significant problem for the EIC Army. Colonel John Welchman of the 1st Bengal European Fusiliers wrote ‘promotion by seniority the bane of the army’, whilst Major-General Low, a veteran of over 50 years’ service wrote ‘merit and fitness should be more consulted in the promotion of native commissioned and non-commissioned officers’.3 Equally, British officers were selected on the basis that they had the right qualities for the task, rather than simply length of service. Before the 1857 Rebellion, age had been a similar problem in European officers. As Philip Mason put it: ‘They had encouraged officers to stay on in command of troops until they were gout-ridden invalids of seventy.’4

This irregular system was never fully implemented. From 1863 onwards, a battalion had seven British officers. The job of these men was largely supervisory, native officers commanded companies (infantry) and troops (cavalry). By 1882 the number of European officers per regiment had again risen and was now ten. It then rose to fourteen in the year preceding the First World War. The number of Indian officers remained largely unaltered, but their responsibility was much diminished.5 Yet, despite the failed attempt to implement the irregular system across the three presidency armies and the rise in the number of British officers per battalion there was a traceable process of reform within the

Indian Army officer corps aimed at improving the calibre of the men commanding Indian soldiers, even if their numbers increased.

The purpose of this thesis is to account for the rise in professionalism and modernisation within the Indian Army’s officer corps, and the Indian Army more generally, from the aftermath of the 1857 Rebellion until the beginning of the First World War. Under the EIC the military had been based on patronage and seniority, any attempts at reform were little more than token gestures – there had been attempts to introduce language examinations in the 1840s, for example, but these were given little credence. This thesis aims to show that from 1861 onwards the military authorities in India began to set standards for its officers. These professional standards changed as the Indian Army moved further away from its Company origins. Standards were set regarding linguistic proficiency, command capabilities and regimental work. This professionalisation aimed to provide the Indian Army with a better quality of officer and add a level of uniformity to the calibre of the officer corps. It was not just a case of creating a more uniform officer corps, it was also the case that the authorities were looking to emulate the setup of the major European powers. The British Army was an obvious benchmark, the two worked closely together on the subcontinent, the Indian Army was subordinate to British needs, and the Commander-in-Chief India was drawn alternately from the British and Indian Armies. The British had their own benchmarks, however, when it came to reform. The Prussian Army surprised Europe when it defeated the Austrian, 1866, and then French, 1870-71, armies. Forces began to look to the Prussian military system for examples to follow – in Japan French military advisors were replaced by Germans. As such, much of the concepts of modernisation relate to the Indian Army taking examples from other military forces, particularly the British but also the Prussian.

The following is taken from a recent review of a recent book on the VCOs of the Indian Army. The book is by Michael Creese, the reviewer is Kaushik Roy, himself a prominent scholar on the history of the Indian Army.

We have had a substantial body of work on the Indian Army… We have solid studies of the social composition of the Indian Army (Seema Alavi and David Omissi), civil-military relations (D. Peers), tactical-operational analysis of the Indian Army deployed along North-West Frontier (T.R. Moreman and Alan Warren), Afghanistan

---

(Brian Robson and Robert Johnson), and during the two World Wars (George Morton-Jack and Daniel Marston). Conspicuous by its absence in Roy’s list of works on the Indian Army is any research into the British officers of the Indian Army. It is this gap in the literature that this thesis intends to fill.

This will be achieved through analysis of the changes to the entrance and promotion regulations, the officer-man relationship, the training of Indian troops, the Indian Army’s performance in the field, and, the Indian Army’s disciplinary system. The thesis also intends to assess the effect that the First World War, the world’s first ‘total war’, had on this long-term process of reform. The meteoric demand for soldiers induced by the First World War meant that the careful cultivation of a more professional officer corps was disrupted for the sake of the volume of men required. This opened officer recruitment to previously untapped resources of men, some of whom had experience of India, whilst others had military experience. The demands of the First World War tested the Indian Army officer corps and its reforms.

This thesis falls into the category of ‘new military history’. This is the study of the interaction of warfare and the military with society, economics, politics, and culture. To this end it also aims to assess the social aspects of life in India as a British officer of the Indian Army. Serving in the Indian Army was more attractive to those who belonged to the upper classes of British society but who lacked the financial means to serve in the British Army – where an officer required a private income to support his lifestyle. India offered higher wages and lower living costs for such men. The subcontinent also offered a variety of sporting pursuits, again at reasonable prices. India afforded a comfortable existence and active social life for these men, this will be a focus of the thesis. This period in Indian history saw considerable political change as the rise of Indian nationalism saw imperial concessions made. These concessions impacted on the military in India and though not the focus of this thesis, do have a bearing on the process of change in the Indian Army.

---

Military history is often criticised for being disconnected from broader historical debates. But the military is at the centre of South East Asian history, it was the tool by which the British were able to control the region. Yet, the military did not operate in total isolation from the wider Indian society from which it was drawn, and likewise, the British officer corps did not live in isolation nor concern itself solely with military work. By incorporating all these themes, this thesis therefore goes much further than military history or indeed ‘new military history’. By taking this approach and analysing the Indian Army officer corps in this way this thesis also contributes to South East Asian, Imperial, and Global History as it contributes to the knowledge and understanding of the coloniser, their motivation, lives on the subcontinent, and their understanding and interactions with their imperial subjects. The officers’ origins, motivations and social lives offers much to historians of culture, society and migration. Military service invariably meant that men were sent away from Britain on campaign or garrison duty, this was part of a soldier’s job. What marks the Indian Army officers out, is that they made a conscious choice to join the Indian Army, settling by choice in India. Why these men selected India, and what they did once they were there, outside of their profession, adds to previous work about migration. It is generally acknowledged that military personnel were responsible for much of the British settlement in India and subsequent continued presence there. This thesis offers analysis on the motivations behind this presence.

The study and analysis of discipline and dissent within the Indian Army will be of interest to historians looking into how India was controlled and indeed dominated by the British who were outnumbered so significantly by their Indian subjects. The Indian Army was the mainstay of British security in India and this thesis looks at how officers of the Indian Army controlled these troops and maintained discipline so that in turn, these troops could control the subcontinent on behalf of their British overlords. This adds further understanding regarding colonial governance on the subcontinent as officers kept their regiments in line through example with methods that changed little over this period, despite there being modernisation elsewhere within the Indian Army.

---


Given the subject under discussion this thesis does also offer much to the military historian. Themes such as morale, officer-man relations, discipline and punishment are all areas of interest for military historians. Much has been written on these themes for various armies throughout history, the British Army being one of the more popular subjects.\textsuperscript{11} This thesis offers a different perspective on these themes, that of the imperial officer and colonial subject. There is an element of campaign study to this thesis, but this is undertaken largely to analyse the impact Indian Army officers had on morale and performance on the battlefield, asking whether or not the reforms undertaken to professionalise the Indian Army had any impact on the training ground and battlefield.

There is no direct comparison to this thesis. The closest book to this study is \textit{Sahib} by Richard Holmes. There are however considerable differences between the two. Holmes has a much larger time frame and incorporates periods both of EIC control in India and the British Raj up until 1914. Secondly, Holmes’ book looks at both officers of the Indian and British Armies to assess the British officer’s experience of India at its most broad, he also gives consideration to the private British soldier in India. The purpose of this thesis is to home in solely on the British officer of the Indian Army. On face value Pradeep Barua’s \textit{Gentlemen of the Raj} would appear to be another study of great similarity. His timeframe however is misleading. Barua devotes only the opening chapter to the period up until the end of the First World War. Barua’s focus is the process of Indianization, by which Indian soldiers were commissioned into the Indian Army officer corps.\textsuperscript{12}

There are also a considerable number of works on the Indian Army that incorporate the officer corps into their study, often the officer corps forms one chapter of the book in question. These include works by T.A. Heathcote, Kaushik Roy, Douglas


Peers, Seema Alavi and Stephen Cohen. By and large these works offer an overview of the role of an Indian Army officer and remarks regarding their background but usually without example and rely predominately on similar assertions. Several more popular, or narrative, histories have been produced over the years. Amongst the more informative of these are works by Byron Farwell and Philip Mason. David Omissi’s *Sepoys and the Raj* is one of a number of books that have parallels with this study. Omissi’s work is concerned only with the private soldiers of the Indian Army. It has a chapter on officers but this is focused on the VCOs and the officers who were commissioned as part of the early Indianization process. Another that has parallels with this study is Michael Creese’s *Swords Trembling in their Scabbards*. This work looks solely at the VCOs of the India Army. This thesis aims to build on the scholarly studies of both the private soldier and the VCOs of the Indian Army by adding an additional layer to the historiography, that of the European officer corps which ran the Indian Army and commanded it in the field.

The thesis begins with a prosopographical chapter to ascertain the origins of the British officers who commanded the Indian Army. The information and conclusions drawn from this chapter then provide a base from which the thematic chapters that follow can progress. In terms of this thesis, particularly the thematic chapters, several case studies of British officers will help to assess how the process of modernisation and professionalisation worked at the lower levels of the Indian Army officer corps. Likewise, this approach will help to assess the effects of total war on the officer corps and the Indian Army more generally. J. Bell states that: ‘Case study researchers aim to identify such features, to identify or attempt to identify the various interactive processes at work, to show how they affect the implementation of systems and influence the way an

---


organization functions.\textsuperscript{16} This method allows for both the comparison of many lives and the analysis of many lives together.\textsuperscript{17}

This study makes use of a variety of primary sources to build up the collective biography and draw out the examples used as case studies. The majority are housed in the India Office Records of the British Library and include a large number of private papers in its European Manuscript Collection. These are predominately in the form of diaries, private correspondence, or unpublished memoirs. Similarly, there are also diaries housed at the Imperial War Museum that have been accessed as part of this study. The Imperial War Museum also has a large number of recorded interviews with soldiers, including a number of interviews with Indian Army officers who served in the First World War and after. These have also been used as part of the process of creating the prosopography. Two smaller archives have also been accessed, the Centre for South Asian Studies Archive, University of Cambridge, and the archives of the Gurkha Museum, Winchester. These repositories have a number of private papers which have been used in the prosopography of the thesis.

A potential limit to this thesis is the lack of Indian agency within. ‘European discourse, indeed, is all we can retrieve from colonial documents’ wrote Ricardo Roque and Kim Wagner.\textsuperscript{18} This statement is certainly true in relation to the Indian Army. European, namely British, officers not only commanded the sepoys, they also commanded the narrative of the Indian Army through their writing. Often this writing painted the indigenous troops as inferior. Yet, the writing stems from real life interactions between these officers and Indian soldiers. Some officers wrote of sepoys in generic terms, treating the troops \textit{en masse}. Others however, wrote in more personal terms, suggesting that such interaction left an impression on the officer’s just as their upbringing and Victorian values did. Given that the majority of Indian troops were illiterate, there is little written record left behind. Thus, the writings of the coloniser alone can be consulted. This thesis must use the letters and diaries of the Indian Army officers, alongside the official sources of the both the military and government. As such, the claims made by


\textsuperscript{17} Lois W. Banner, ‘Biography as History’, \textit{American Historical Review}, Vol. 114, No. 3 (2009), pp. 579-586.

officers and official records regarding the views of Indian soldiers cannot be taken without critical examination. With this in mind this thesis cannot, nor does it intend to, offer conclusions regarding the motivations of the Indian troops who served under the British officers.

David Omissi’s edited collection of First World War letters does offer the researcher an accessible Indian voice. For the latter period under examination, namely 1914-1918, the letters written by the Indian troops can be used to corroborate or contradict the claims of officers and officials. The British high command feared that Indian morale may suffer serving in such unfamiliar areas of the world, particularly Europe, and so monitored and recorded their letters. These have thus survived and have been used wherever possible.

**History of the Military in India**

According to Douglas M. Peers British India had ‘the pervasive presence of the military within the decision-making process, the priority given to the military in terms of resource allocation’. It was a garrison state. It was controlled and defended by two separate military elements. Firstly, there was the British Army. Units of the British Army served in India for a limited time – though this could be lengthy in some cases. Secondly, India was garrisoned by units raised specifically for permanent service in the country. The EIC first began to recruit battalions in Britain for permanent service on the subcontinent, from the mid-seventeenth century, to protect outposts, trading stations, and factories. The EIC, and later the Raj, had a hybrid character as European and Indian practices met and blended together. The army modernised largely along European lines but retained many of its Asian characteristics and practices. Likewise, as the British looked to modernise the economy along with the army, Indian society remained largely unchanged, as did its culture and politics. In the words of Christopher Bayly, the EIC ‘taxed and counted like

---

a western European state but allowed many social functions to be monopolized by groups of indigenous administrators and landlords’. 21

Founded in 1600, the EIC steadily grew in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. A number of coastal possessions developed into three presidencies, Bengal, Bombay and Madras. Each had a governor and until 1773 were independent of each other. After 1773 the governor of the Bengal presidency became Governor-General and his government became the government of India. The other two presidencies retained a certain amount of autonomy nonetheless, including their own armies. In 1748, in response to the capture of Madras by the French, the first Commander-in-Chief in the East Indies was appointed. The holder of this post directly commanded the Bengal Army and provided supervision for the armies of Bombay and Madras, though they again remained nominally autonomous. The three armies were not unified until 1895. 22

During the War of the Austrian Succession, 1740-1748 the Royal Navy made it difficult for the French to get reinforcements from Europe to India and so they began to experiment with recruiting local soldiers, organising and training them along European lines. The soldiers, named sepoys, a derivative of the Persian word sipahi meaning infantry soldier, quickly mastered European drill. Both the French and British realised that these troops were cheaper, already acclimatised, and much more numerous than European soldiers. 23

British officers of the EIC commanded these Indian troops. The native infantry battalions were organised along similar lines to the British battalions. A battalion consisted of around 1,000 men, commanded by a lieutenant-colonel. The colonel was supported by two majors, who commanded a wing, or half battalion, each. The battalion was then divided into companies, ten per battalion. Five of the companies were commanded by captains and the other five by lieutenants. These company commanders were supported by a British subaltern and two Indian Officers, a subadar and a jamadar.

22 For more on the early British military activity in India see Chapter 2 of Heathcote, The Military in British India, pp. 21-37; Rajendra Singh, History of the Indian Army (New Delhi; Attar Singh, 1963), pp. 61-5.
Ultimately, the French were defeated by Clive, leaving the EIC as the dominant European power in South East Asia.

By the turn of the nineteenth century the EIC’s armies had grown considerably. In 1805, the Bengal Army had 57,000 sepoys, Madras had 53,000, and Bombay 20,000. Between 1774 and 1822 these three armies defeated every local military power from Ceylon to Nepal. Occasionally the numerically superior local forces would win a battle but more often than not the technologically advanced, well-drilled EIC forces emerged from the war victorious. Each victory extended the EIC’s power and influence.

*The Military Mutiny of 1857*

The annexation of Lahore, a result of victory in the Anglo-Sikh Wars, was followed by that of other states that were not in a position to resist the EIC militarily. Nagpur, Jhansi, Sambalpur, and a number of other smaller states were absorbed into the EIC’s India. The annexation of Awadh was not as smooth as previous annexations had been. The British annexed Awadh in February 1856 under the pretence that the kingdom was corrupt. One of the first moves made by the British was to cut expenditure. As a result, many administrators, soldiers, and scholars became unemployed. The British also made changes to land distribution in Awadh, excluding the traditional landholder kings, through whom systems of patronage and honour flowed. The annexation of Awadh was an important step on the road to rebellion because as many as three quarters of the Bengal Army’s sepoys were recruited from Awadh.24

There were several other reasons for the outbreak of the military mutiny in 1857, including a tightening of discipline and changes to uniform. Uniform was a grievance in all three presidency armies. In place of baggy native dress, sepoys wore tight red coats and close-fitting trousers. The shako, with its brass rim, weighed between two and three pounds. Around their necks the sepoys wore black leather stocks, designed to keep them straight, which had been phased out of the British Army by 1855. The Bengal Army had borne the brunt of EIC expansion, used as ‘the cannon fodder of imperialism’ according

---

to Irfan Habib. They did the majority of the fighting in Afghanistan, the Punjab, and were despatched to China during the First Opium War.25

In the years preceding the outbreak of the rebellion officers and men of the EIC grew apart – the obvious exception being the aforementioned irregular units. Sepoys felt they could not trust or confide in their officers. The officers became bored and in some cases lazy. Often officers looked to leave their regiments at the first opportunity in favour of civilian employment that could be both more lucrative and enjoyable. In the eighteenth-century officers took Indian wives, which naturally helped them pick up vernacular languages, they would dress in Indian fashions, and partake in entertainment with their men. By 1857, however, the influx of European woman meant such practices had died out, the two parties grew apart. There were a number of cases in the 1840s and 50s of sepoys being court-martialled for insolence, simply because they had grown exacerbated trying to make their officers understand them. Despite the introduction of the first language examinations in 1844, it remained the case that patronage got an officer further than study or the affection of his men.26

The 1856 General Service Enlistment Act demanded that sepoys agree to serve abroad if required. This was intended to make the army more flexible but was only applicable to new recruits. Yet, it was feared that all sepoys would be sent abroad. Previously, volunteers had been sought for foreign campaigns, now it was expected. This was an extremely unpopular measure. On top of this, prior to its annexation Awadh had been treated as service ‘abroad’, sepoys serving there had been eligible for extra pay. Increases in land revenues put additional pressure on the families of soldiers. Soldiers of the Bengal Army struggled to make ends meet – the high caste sepoys of Bengal were particularly hard hit by this.27 In the regular line infantry regiments these men were expected to perform the roles of errand-boy and informant.28

The most often-cited cause of the 1857 Rebellion is the issue, or alleged issue, of ammunition greased with either cow or pig fat, offensive to Hindus and Muslims respectively. The EIC wished to see its own army be equipped to the same standard as

the British Army and ordered large quantities of the new Enfield rifle. Much like the smoothbore musket it replaced the Enfield was a muzzle-loading gun. The rifle’s ammunition came in the form of a paper cartridge, each containing a charge of gunpowder and a lead bullet. Soldiers used their teeth to bite the cartridges open. Enfield cartridges were greased with the pig or cow fat, a matter of great importance for the Muslim and Hindu soldiers who would be putting these in to their mouths and biting down. The rumour and subsequent alarm spread quickly. Even if the cartridges being used were not greased with the offensive material the rumour was powerful, troops sent to depots to train with this new weapon risked being stigmatised by the rumour alone.29

Initially, the solution seemed simple. Complaints were made in an orderly manner. The soldiers made it clear that they objected to the new cartridges on religious grounds but suggested that an alternative such as beeswax or coconut oil be used instead. These suggestions were authorised. In Madras the cartridges were distributed ungreased and the sepoys supplied their own lubricant. In Bengal, however, the rumours persisted. It was suggested that even the paper used for the cartridges was made using forbidden animals. Further rumours started that the British were grinding up pig and cow bones and mixing them into the flour sold at the bazaar.30

Acts of defiance ensued at Berhampur and Meerut amongst troops who opposed the issuing of the new cartridges. At Meerut, the dissenters were all sentenced to ten years’ hard labour. A court of enquiry was also set up, this found that the men refused to cartridges so as to not be seen as British sympathisers. The 85 men were arrested on 9 May in front of their entire regiment, many of the men were decorated veterans of the Sikh Wars. That evening as the European soldiers fell in for church, sowars (cavalrymen), who were also based at Meerut, sprung the sepoys from the jail, along with all other prisoners too. The sepoys, sowars and a civilian mob joined forces, attacking Europeans indiscriminately. From Meerut the mutineers marched to Delhi. They were joined by three other native regiments that had been based at Delhi.

In Awadh, annexed only a year prior, the EIC’s rule quickly collapsed. Garrisons of native troops joined the rebellion, Europeans were murdered, and, as at Meerut, civilian

rioters joined them. However, at Lucknow loyal Indian and British troops defeated the mutineers, who, once defeated, marched to Delhi. Later in the rebellion the residency building at Lucknow was besieged and subsequently relieved. At Delhi, the mutineers took the city but the Delhi Field Force (DFF) was able to take control of the ridge outside of the city. The DFF held the ridge against numerous rebel attacks and slowly increased its numbers in order to retake the city. The DFF massed their artillery to fire on the mutineer defenders before assaulting the city. The Siege of Delhi lasted between 8 June and 20 September 1857. At Cawnpore, soldiers and civilians were granted free passage to waiting river boats but were attacked before they could reach them.

All rebellion had been stamped out by July 1859. The 1857 Rebellion was the greatest challenge to British authority the Empire had or would face. It was a war in which the atrocities were committed by both sides and the harsh punishments exacted by the British after the conflict. Nonetheless, the British still needed Indian soldiers to serve in its army. The British crown, which took control of India from the EIC in 1858, began to implement concepts such as the irregular system discussed at the outset of this introduction. The Indian uniform was adapted to better assimilate it to the climate and customs of the subcontinent. The tight red coat worn by the sepoys was replaced by a looser-fitting tunic, the leather stocks and heavy shako were also replaced.

The Indian Army under the Crown, 1858-1914

In July 1858 a special parliamentary committee, the Peel Commission, was formed. The aim of the Commission was to review the state of the Indian Army and help to determine the size of the force moving forward. The Commission consulted 47 witnesses, all of whom had two things in common, they had military experience of India and were white – no Indians were consulted as part of the commission. Peel presented the recommendations of the commission to parliament in March 1859. The commission offered few firm recommendations however. The seven-page report offered a series of vague recommendations as to how the Indian Army could move forward from the Great Rebellion. The report was supported with over 600 pages of addenda – largely the answers

31 Clifford Mecham, the subject of analysis in Chapter 5, was one of the besieged in Lucknow. Mecham published a collection of his drawings of the siege in 1858 in Clifford Henry Mecham, Siege of Lucknow, Drawings Made During the Siege (London; Day & Son, 1858).
33 Heathcote, The Military in British India, pp. 103-5.
provided by the 47 correspondents. Much of this evidence was contradictory. For example, with regards to language Major-General Robert Alexander, former Adjutant-General of the Madras Army, wrote that he felt it better that officers learn the native languages of their sepoys. On the other hand, British Army officer Colonel Orlando Felix argued that ‘Native officers should be encouraged to learn English’. Major-General Sir Frederick Abbott suggested that officers only learned native languages in order to gain civil secondments and without the enticement few would attempt to learn the languages of their sepoys.\(^{35}\)

One of the few solid recommendations made by the Peel Commission was in relation to the numbers of troops that required to control India and the ratio of European to Indian troops necessary in each presidency. It was recommended that the British garrison in India be doubled to around 80,000 men. In the presidencies of Bombay and Madras, where rebellion did not spread, there was to be a ration of three Indian troops to one British soldier. In Bengal, epicentre of the rebellion, the ration was to be two sepoys to one British soldier.

There was a second group set up to consider much the same issues, the Punjab Committee. The Punjab Committee had its origins in India rather than Britain and at its head was Sir John Lawrence.\(^{36}\) The Punjab Committee came into conflict with the Peel Commission over the issue of mixing racial groups within a regiment. It was the consensus of those asked as part of the Peel Commission that regiments should contain different nationalities and as such that was recommended by the Peel Commission report. The Punjab Committee on the other hand, felt a ‘divide and rule’ approach would continue to be more appropriate. Keeping national groups apart would reduce the sharing of grievances. In much the same way, Lawrence and his Committee felt that the three presidency armies were essential to Indian security too – keeping them separate again reduced the chance of disaffection spreading. The recommendation of the Peel Commission was briefly heeded and some ‘general mixture’ regiments were created in the Bengal Army in the 1860s. Ultimately, it was Lawrence’s views that were taken up, largely in deference to Lawrence as the man who had secured the Punjab, recruited heavily there and then retaken Delhi during the 1857 Rebellion.\(^{37}\)

---

\(^{35}\) ‘Report of the Peel Commission’, pp. xxiv, xxv, xxxvi.

\(^{36}\) The Punjab Committee’s report was included as an appendix in the report of the Peel Commission.

In 1861 the Indian staff corps was created as a means to combat the problems of promotion by seniority within a regiment and subsequent stagnation. Officers joining the Indian Army from this year onwards served and were promoted within the broad umbrella of the staff corps and so were not forced to await the death or retirement of officers above them in a regiment. They belonged to the Indian Army and not their regiment. Officers would be moved to another regiment to be promoted and fill in gaps within other regiments. It is the creation of the staff corps and alteration to the promotion system that is the starting point for this thesis – the previous arrangements belonged to the defunct EIC and so not within the scope of this thesis. However, the proceedings and recommendations of the Peel Commission and Punjab Committee, both of which occurred before 1861, must be considered as they informed the creation of the staff corps.

The Indian Army fought a number of wars between the suppression of the 1857 Rebellion and the beginning of the First World War. These include the British expedition to Abyssinia, 1868; the Second Anglo-Afghan War, 1878-80; and, the Third Anglo-Burmese War, 1885-87. There were also a considerable number of wars or campaigns waged on the North-West Frontier against the tribes of the region. Some of the more famous of these expeditions were the Relief of Chitral, 1895; the Tirah Campaign, 1897-8; and the Abor Expedition, 1911-12. In truth, the fighting was almost constant. Regiments stationed at hill forts on the frontier had to be in a constant state of readiness in case of attack on the base or a raid nearby. Local tribesmen also regularly sniped at officers and men.38

In 1902, Sir Horatio Kitchener arrived in India as the new Commander-in-Chief, India. Kitchener took to the task with the same vigour and attention to detail that he had used to modernise and reorganise the Egyptian Army in the 1890s. Kitchener modernised many aspects of the Indian Army to meet the threat he perceived from Tsarist Russia. Finance for Kitchener’s reforms began to dry up as the threat from Russia subsided after their defeat at the hand of the Japanese in 1905 and he left India in 1909. He had, however, overseen much change during his tenure.

38 For the development of tactics on the North-West Frontier T.R. Moreman, The Army in India and the Development of Frontier Warfare, 1849-1947 (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1998) is the seminal work. More recently literature has begun to look at the nature of intelligence on the frontier and how this informed the British both in India and at home, generating colonial knowledge, see Hevia, The Imperial Security State; Martin J. Bayly, Taming the Imperial Imagination, Colonial Knowledge, International Relations, and the Anglo-Afghan Encounter, 1808-1878 (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2016).
The First World War

The Indian Army was still preparing itself predominately for small, frontier wars by the time Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife were assassinated in Sarajevo. It was soon realised by Kitchener, who was made Secretary of State for War on the outbreak of hostilities, that Indian troops would be required, if not to fight the Central Powers directly, then at least to garrison parts of the empire to free up British Army units for the war in Europe. The First World War is included in this thesis, and indeed acts as an endpoint for it, because the stresses and strains put on the Indian Army during this conflict are the ultimate test of a force which has gone through much reform in the preceding half a century. Of course, other campaigns are analysed within, but the First World War occurred at a time far enough removed from 1857 to be sure that the remaining personnel of the EIC were no longer part of the Indian Army and also long enough for the modernisation and professionalisation to have been embedded fully. As this thesis will show, some officers rose to the challenge of the First World War but others were found wanting – particularly those left behind in India, their want of action and adventure overrode their professionalism regardless of reform.

Indian Expeditionary Force A (IEFA) was initially sent to Egypt with the intention of freeing up the British garrison there. It was quickly decided that IEFA should go to France instead. This was more desirable for politicians and the military authorities in India. By sending the sepoys to France and Belgium the British believed that they were showing respect for Indian soldiers and it was hoped that it would encourage further support for the government and for the war.39 IEFA was introduced piecemeal into the fighting at the First Battle of Ypres in order to stem the German advance. France was alien to the Indian soldiers and it was initially a surprise to their officers too. Captain Roly Grimshaw noted in his diary in October 1914 that when he joined the Indian Army in 1902 that he never expected to serve outside of the North-West Frontier and Afghanistan, never mind be in Calais with a squadron of the Poona Horse.40

The Indian soldiers’ experience and the Indian Army’s contribution to victory in the First World War is a topic that has garnered much attention, particularly since 1914 and the commencement of the centennial commemorations. This has led to a number of

volumes being produced on the Indian Army in this conflict. Focus has fallen on the Indian Army on the Western Front in particular. This is unsurprising as this was the main theatre of the war and has gained the most scholarly attention in general. The sepoy experience of France and Belgium has been the focus of a number of works, with historians fascinated by the Indian soldiers’ adaptation to Northern Europe, or in some cases failure to adapt. The battlefield performance of these soldiers in France and Belgium has also been evaluated and of course this is inextricably linked to the sepoys’ experience of their new surroundings.

Generally, the performance of the Indian troops in France and Belgium has been viewed negatively. Of the works on this topic George Morton-Jack’s work has played a primary role in rehabilitating the Indian Army’s performance on the Western Front during the Great War. Morton-Jack does this by comparing Indian performance in France with that of the British Army in the same theatre and Indian performance in other theatres. By doing this he highlights that the traditional line that the Indian Corps performed below an acceptable level in France and Belgium is incorrect.

Further expeditionary forces were despatched from India. Indian Expeditionary Forces B and C (IEFB and IEFC) were sent to German East Africa. Indian Expeditionary Force D (IEFD) went to Mesopotamia to secure British interests in the Middle East and safeguard oil supplies. Indian Expeditionary Force E (IEFE) was given the task of defending the Suez Canal.

---


Peter Stanley has recently produced a tome on the Indian Army’s performance and experience on the Gallipoli Peninsular, 16,000 sepoys saw action during this aborted campaign against the Ottoman Empire.\footnote{Peter Stanley, \textit{Die in Battle Do Not Despair, The Indians on Gallipoli 1915} (Solihull; Helion & Company, 2015).} The East Africa Campaign, another ‘sideshow’ of the Great War, also saw Indian soldiers serve there. The Indian Army in East Africa has been covered by Ross Anderson as part of his study of the early campaign, particularly the Battle of Tanga. Anderson’s treatment of the Indian Army performance in this campaign is unsatisfactory. He makes the mistake of accepting the old colonial view that sepoys could not fight effectively if their officer was killed on the battlefield. Whilst there are of course cases of this, in relation to the Battle of Tanga, there are a number of other factors that Anderson fails to take into consideration. A more balanced view of the Indian Army’s performance in this theatre can be found in Hew Strachan’s work.\footnote{Ross Anderson, ‘The Battle of Tanga, 2-5 November 1914’ in \textit{War in History} Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 308-9; Hew Strachan, \textit{The First World War in Africa} (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2004).} A satisfactory account, which provides further understanding of both the Indian and African troops involved, has yet to be written.

As a collective, the works focused on the Indian Army in the First World War provide a great deal of narrative and analysis of the Indian Army’s experience and
performance during the First World War in the face of many difficulties. There are of course references to the officer corps of the Indian Army in these works, but this is often minimal. For instance, Peter Stanley’s work on Gallipoli looks only very briefly at the calibre of Indian Army officers, the Kitchener reforms, and the officer-man relationship. Stanley takes issue with the conventional wisdom that sepoys were incapable of operating without their British officers and the traditional argument of Indian troops being devoted to their officers in a paternal fashion. He points out that in letters home sepoys rarely mentioned their British officers. Stanley does concede that several regiments gave their British officers affectionate nicknames.47

British Officers had to be recruited from numerous sources to meet the demands of the First World War. In 1921, the authorities in India began to consider how to reduce the number of officers they had in their service, aiming to bring this down to levels necessary for the Indian Army to carry out its regular duties. As of 1 June 1921, it was suggested that the Indian Army had 2,646 surplus officers. Many who had fought in the war on temporary commissions were released from the service and enhanced pension terms were offered to men who voluntarily left the service.48

Another key theme of this thesis is ‘total war’ and social change. Definitions of total war vary greatly. Some historians claim it is a synonym for a large war, or a ‘modern war’. Others focus on the bloodiness and lack of moral constraints involved.49 ‘Total war’ is best seen as an ‘all out’ conflict in which all available national resources are concentrated towards defeating the enemy with extreme ruthlessness. ‘Total war’ was a predominately twentieth century phenomenon.50 It has also been seen as a refinement of military theorist Carl von Clausewitz’s concept of absolute war, claiming it was a product of the combination of administrative, technical, and ideological forces.51 ‘Total War’ comprised four principles: the destruction and disruption caused; the tests incurred, the stresses and strains on a states military, social, political, and economic institutions; participation, total war requires the involvement of all groups in society be it on the

47 Stanley, Die in Battle, Do Not Despair, pp. 30-3.
49 Gary Sheffield, ‘Introduction’ in Gary Sheffield (ed.) War Studies Reader, From the Seventeenth Century to the Present Day and Beyond (London; Continuum, 2010), pp. 11-2.
50 Ibid., pp. 11-2.
frontline or the home front; and the psychological dimension, attitudes change and the view that such slaughter must be for something prevails. The question of a war’s totality raises difficult and complex questions on several levels. The totality of a war stretches far from the battlefield and past the politics of a war. Economies, finances, societies, and cultures all need analysing. The historian has to look past the elites and assess all aspects of society, the aim of total war was to stimulate all forms of public towards victory on the battlefield. Important for this study is the disruptive and transformative nature of total war, including during the First World War to the Indian Army’s process of reform and modernisation and to officers and sepoys required to fight further away from the subcontinent than before. In India itself, whilst not on the scale of Britain, the social experience of the officer was altered owing to a change in the gender balance.

In 1917, it was decided to grant commissions to the officer corps to ‘suitable Indians’. This process became known as the Indianization process. It was one of a number of small military concessions in recognition of India’s contribution to the war effort. Ten vacancies were to be reserved for these ‘suitable Indians’, who were drawn from conservative, aristocratic families. It was expected that most of these men would not continue to pursue a military career after the end of hostilities with the Central powers. These carried the title King’s Commissioned Indian Officer (KCIO). A year later, in 1918, an Indian Cadet College was set up at Indore. Graduates from Indore received temporary commissions. The college was open for only one year.

In recognition of India’s contribution to the war effort Indianization continued. By 1930 77 KCIOs had been commissioned into the Army. In October 1932, the Royal Indian Military Academy was opened at Dehra Dun. For the remainder of the 1930s the process continued at a slow pace, but it was accelerated considerably by the manpower requirements of the Second World War, in 1939 there had been 396 KCIOs by September 1945 there was 8,340.

55 Ibid., pp. 162-3; Srinath Raghavan, India’s War, The Making of Modern South Asia, 1939-1945 (London; Allen Lane, 2016), pp. 82-5.
A number of works have focused on the Indianization of the Indian Army officer corps. For example, Barua’s *Gentlemen of the Raj* and also the chapter on officers in Omissi’s tome. This process has attracted much scholarship owing to the nationalist politics behind it and the effect it had on the Indian Army and its combat efficiency during the Second World War. Despite it falling into the timeframe, it is not the purpose of this study to revisit the Indianization process. The focus of this work is solely the European officers who commanded the Indian Army.56

**Culture, Society and Politics**

Writing regarding training in India, of both Indian and British soldiers, Captain W.B. James, 2nd Bengal Lancers, wrote: ‘Troops are trained by officers and officers are moulded by a system.’57 James’ words in fact cover all aspects of the Indian Army’s British officer corps. The British officers who made up the Indian Army’s officer corps, or staff corps as it was known between 1861 and 1903, belonged to a most complex system. The term system means an interconnecting network or a set of principles by which things are done. The Indian Army officer corps was indeed an interconnecting network of men and regiments. Not only were they linked together but very often they were interchangeable too. Officers could either by request or orders find themselves transferred to a different regiment. Likewise, regiments could move and swap stations. For instance, a regiment would spend a period of time on the North-West Frontier and then move elsewhere.

The idea of an interconnecting network reaches further. The social and familial ties the officers had was also important, they were part of the social system of British India. Men joined the Indian Army because their fathers and grandfather had served in India, or because in many instances they had been born there. There was a set of principles


by which an officer lived whilst in India. Not only was their day-to-day job as army officers regulated, but so also was their free time. It was regulated by a complicated, informal code of conduct that had many unwritten rules regarding marriage, sport, and intemperance amongst other things. All of this moulded the officers of the Indian Army. Marriage was a particularly complex system for officers of the Indian Army. It was not deemed appropriate to marry too young or whilst of junior rank. To do so was to risk being ostracised. Officers in all armies often refer to themselves as ‘brothers’, and their regiments as a ‘family’. This suggests a close-knit kinship and bond. To marry at the wrong time was to betray this family.

Militarily the Indian Army officers were also moulded by the system, this is of course in the manner Captain James was referring to. Officers of the Indian Army all had to pass through either the Royal Military College (RMC) Sandhurst or Woolwich as their counterparts in the British Army did. In fact, cadets only elected to join the Indian Army as they finished up their studies. Therefore, as part of the British Army’s education system all had the same level of military schooling prior to joining the Indian Army. Once in India an officer had to command his men’s loyalty and respect. An officer had to allow his sepoys to observe their religious customs. He also had to forego certain military requirements to do this. Yet, an officer could also make use of punishments such as dismissal, flogging, and in some cases execution to keep his men in line, usually the punishment of one or two offenders served as sufficient to bring the remainder under control. This process of commanding and controlling a native regiment had to be learned quickly and never forgotten. Failure to placate and control sepoys could result in large-scale insubordination.

How an officer or officers approached the running of a regiment was influenced by Victorian race science and what became known as martial race theory. This thesis aims to assess the effects of martial race theory on officers and their performance. Indians fell between the supposed taxonomies of ‘civilised’ and ‘savage’ and it was believed that only certain of them had the necessary qualities to fight. This had an adverse effect when officers were put in command of regiments made up of people deemed to be non-martial, as was the case during the First World War. In 1933, Sir George MacMunn, Lieutenant-General and Colonel Commandant of the Royal Artillery, produced a book entitled *The Martial Races of India* designed, as he put it, to:
…draw the picture so that it may be useful to the younger officers of the Indian Army, and to those of the British Service who have, as most must, to soldier in India, while making it a book that parents whose sons will soldier in the East may like to see in their hands. I do not attempt to emulate the detailed knowledge that an officer in a Sikh regiment should have of his Sikhs or in a Mahratta corps of his Mahrattas, but I have served in close touch with most of the races, and try to show a reel, a hasty reel perhaps, that all who care for India may wish to glance at. To me the whole story is so glorious, so stimulating and so rich in all that makes an active life worthwhile, that I should like to think that anything that I might write will encourage our sons still to seek their careers in this great Indian continent. It is their forebears, the British and the British alone who have rebuilt it, and are endeavouring to restore it in some part to those who are fit to inherit the estate.  

The 1857 Rebellion proved to be the crucial point in defining martial peoples. The high caste sepoys of the Bengal Army had rebelled, and the British later painted them as disloyal and cowardly for their killing of European women and children. Meanwhile, battalions of Sikh soldiers and Nepalese Gurkhas had helped to put down the rebellion. Subsequent views were documented for the first time in the 1879 Eden Commission, headed by Sir Ashley Eden Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal. The commission’s goal was to offer reform to the Indian Army that would reduce military spending. The commission recommended abolishing the three presidency armies in favour of four army corps. These corps were to come under one commander-in-chief, removing the separate presidency commanders-in-chief and their sizeable staffs. In the interest of military efficiency, it was recommended that the Madras contingent of the Indian Army be reduced significantly whilst more soldiers should be recruited in the northwest of India. The report stated that ‘the Punjab is the home of the most martial races in India and is the nursery of our best soldiers’.  

MacMunn’s *The Martial Races in India* was for a long time the primary source of information on martial race theory, but he was very much a product of his time and firmly believed in the theory. Similarly, journalist Edmund Chandler had aimed to lay down a guide to the peoples of India for the benefit of the officers who would command these men. Much like MacMunn, Chandler was clearly a believer in the imperial notions he was writing about. A more critical work that has been done on the Martial Race Theory

---

60 MacMunn, *The Martial Races*.
is Heather Streets’ *Martial Races*. Streets looks at the Punjabi Sikhs, Nepalese Gurkhas, and Scottish Highlanders, these three had particularly strong reputations in Britain as great warriors. She argues that the success on the battlefield of these three groups worked to prove the martial race theory correct in the mind of Victorian Britons. The concepts of obedience, loyalty, and masculinity assured Victorian society of British military might and countered the threats and fears caused by such movements as Irish nationalism. Streets does assess the soldiers of the martial races themselves but devotes only one chapter to this, concluding that these men joined because few other avenues were available to them rather than because they had a particular bloodlust. One of the main themes in *Martial Races* is the British press. The majority of reports from the battlefield were written and censored by British Officers and so served as a vehicle for propaganda and self-promotion. Praise for the martial races was a frequent feature of this.

The concept of what made a regional group ‘martial’ was contradictory. The popularity of particular races with recruiters waxed and waned. Indeed, recent works by David Omissi, Gavin Rand and Kim Wagner show that the martial race theory was not a clear and definite system. Some high-caste Brahmins were still recruited despite being classed as non-martial for example. The reverse is also true. During the Tirah Campaign of 1897 there was reports of Punjabis refusing to advance on the enemy. An enquiry discovered that the refusal to advance was due to a high number of Punjabi men having already lost their lives, leaving a shortage of men to undertake tasks such as tending crops in that area. The system was imperfect. Kaushik Roy has studied these same inconsistencies in the theory and the recruitment process during The First World War. Roy concludes that only a small percentage of India’s vast manpower pool was required during The First World War and so recruitment policy remained the same. However, he offers this counter-factual point: ‘If the war had lasted longer, British-India might have been forced to raise a multi-million mass-army. Then probably all the distinctions as
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regards martial and non-martial races would have been wiped out and the Indian Army might have been transformed into a popular conscript force.'

The Eden Commission had long-term consequences as the careers of the men who had served on the commission progressed. For instance, when Sir Donald Stewart was permitted to raise five new battalions, four of these were recruited from the martial races, three Sikh and one Gurkha. When he replaced Stewart in 1885, Sir Frederick Roberts continued along the path to reform. Roberts had been Commander-in-Chief of the Madras Army between 1881 and 1885 and this tenure had convinced him of the lack of a fighting spirit in the peoples of Madras.

The idea of martial races had a considerable impact on the way officers approached the men under their command. Regiments containing those peoples who were seen as the most bellicose, such as Sikh or Gurkha regiments, were sought-after appointments amongst the European officers. In comparison, posts with non-martial regiments, such as Bengalis or peoples of Southern India, were unpopular. This meant that the calibre of men taking these postings differed, which in turn meant the standard of leadership and training in regiments, and indeed whole armies, differed considerably. The martial regiments became even more efficient, whilst others stagnated. As already discussed the First World War created manpower requirements never before seen in India. This meant that the recruitment of non-martial peoples and the creation of new regiments drawn from those people who were deemed to have a low fighting pedigree was unavoidable. Officers were required for these new regiments, postings that proved to be unpopular. Unhappy officers in unpopular posts was not a recipe for the successful training and development of these soldiers.

A further aim of this study is to assess the importance of ideas about masculinity within the Indian Army and the development of officers’ careers. In keeping with new imperial histories of gender and sexuality, this study includes the role of women in the lives of the Indian Army officers. Women formed an important part of society in India for officers of the Indian Army. Most obviously, this was as wives. This study intends to assess how an officer came to choose a wife, if indeed he was the one making the choice at all, and at what time in an officer’s career it was acceptable or advantageous to get

65 Ibid., pp. 1343-7.
married. It will also explore men and women’s collective sociability, including through sport.

*Sport and the Military* by Tony Mason and Eliza Riedi looks at the close ties organised sport has had with the British military. Though its focus is the British Army, Mason and Riedi’s work looks at the sport played in India both by Indian and British Army units. Sport played an important role in building and maintaining morale and *esprit de corps*. Sport gave men of varying backgrounds a unified purpose and common ground. Sport also provided a link between the armed forces and civilian life. Through teamwork, discipline, bravery, commitment, aggression, fitness, and many other values sport readied men for warfare. Sport also played a role in the recruitment process, Mason and Riedi assert that this is particularly true of India where a wide variety of sport from cricket and hockey to game hunting and pigsticking made the subcontinent an attractive place to serve for many officers. In the late Victorian era cricket was popular with officers in India, as was hockey as the hard, dry ground made it a faster paced, more skilful game. The other ranks preferred football. As well as inter-army competitions, military teams also dominated civilian tournaments. Though not permitted to compete in these tournaments, native teams often played friendly matches against regimental teams, breaking down the usual barriers.

James Campbell’s work consists of many of the same theses as Mason and Reidi. However, Campbell has a chapter devoted to the Indian Army. Campbell’s chapter focuses on the adoption of the British Army’s physical culture in the Indian Army. From the 1860’s British Army in India was encouraged to partake in sport as an alternative to alcohol and prostitution and to improve soldiers’ health in the hot climate. Campbell furthers this by looking at how the encouragement of sport was transferred from the British to Indian Armies. There is also a plethora of works relating to hunting on the
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subcontinent. This thesis aims to apply what has previously been written on both sport and hunting solely to the Indian Army and its unique professional and social system.

Elizabeth Buettner’s *Empire Families* looks at the lives not only of the high-ranking government officials or army officers but of the lower born British men and woman. Buettner gives good accounts of how families lived in India and how class and racial status affected them. The book also looks at children, some of whom were schooled in India, others returned to Britain to be educated. Possibly the most interesting aspect of Buettner’s study is her look at how these people fared when they returned to Britain. British society afforded these people only a slither of the status they had been used to in India and thus they were inclined to form their own communities, networks which had been formed in India tended remain on return to Britain. Social and sexual lives of the British in India is the focus of several other important works, in particular Kenneth Ballhatchet and Durba Ghosh. These assess the progression for early British settlement to the Victorian Raj. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries Europeans and Indians shared social and sexual spaces but grew apart as the nineteenth century progressed, as European women began to inhabit the subcontinent in greater numbers. This thesis intends to place the Indian Army officers in to this social and sexual context.

The political backdrop to this study is of considerable significance. Indian nationalism gained substantial pace in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Indian intellectuals had begun to seek democratic rights in the mid-nineteenth century, but the 1857 Rebellion caused the British to become more cautious and suspicious of such appeals. Opposition from the Indian intellectual elite faded away until the 1870’s. New
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nationalist societies sprung up, most members were young, for them 1857 was a childhood memory. Reforms in the face of rising nationalism saw responsibility for education, public health, medical services, agriculture and several other departments pass to Indian control. The military was able to resist change despite the rise in nationalism, even when the Indian Civil Service had to make concessions. Yet, the Indianization process did signal a shift to appeasement of nationalism with military compromises.74

Chapter Outlines

The focus of Chapter 2 will be the origins of the British men who joined the Indian Army. It has previously been suggested that the majority of the British Army’s senior officers were Anglo-Saxon, Protestants with a rural or middle-class professional background. The aim of this chapter is to attempt a similar generalisation for the officers of the Indian Staff Corps using a combination of statistical analysis and a small number of case studies. This is similar to the work done by David Gilmour in The Ruling Caste in relation to the Indian Civil Service.75 This chapter will make use of a database of 380 entries (Appendix A), which has been created from several, often fragmentary, sources specifically for this thesis. From this, certain conclusions regarding the Indian Army officer corps will be drawn. Any given year between forty and sixty officers were accepted into the Indian Army from the Royal Military College Sandhurst, and through transfers from the British Army – men under the age of 26 could transfer provided that there was a space available for them. By the time of the Kitchener reforms of 1903, there were 39 cavalry regiments and 135 infantry regiments. These 184 regiments had between ten and 12 European Officers each. That makes the sample of 380 around one fifth of the Indian Army officer corps at any one time. The purpose of this specially created database is to extrapolate information regarding Indian Army officers, including the most common birthplaces of the officers, and what their fathers did for a living. The conclusions drawn from the database can be evidenced by examples from the memoir and diary literature of the collective biography.


The majority of officers in the database have followed their father in one form or the other. Firstly, they directly followed their father into the armed forces. Secondly, they followed their father, or family, by living in India. In many cases the men in the sample followed in their father’s footsteps by joining the Indian Army, much like the dolphins in Kipling’s story *The Tomb of His Ancestors*. Kipling wrote: ‘certain families serve India generation after generation as dolphins follow in line across the open sea’. Unlike the British Army the Indian Army officer corps was made up of men from a lower social status. These men, and their families, could not afford to support a career in the British military. The present study points to a similar social make-up for the Indian Army officer corps as previous studies have proposed for the EIC Army before it.

This prosopographical and case study approach allows the reasonings for selecting Indian service to be extrapolated and studied in a way that the more traditional forms of military history, such as institutional histories or combat studies, do not. Similarly, the connections between these men, the patronage, their familial and geographical backgrounds can all be traced and analysed in more detail than by the usual ‘drum and trumpet’ military histories. Furthermore, the findings in this chapter inform the following thematic chapters. By establishing that most of the officers of the Indian Army arrived on the subcontinent from a background linked to India, the military or both, certain assumptions can be made relating to what knowledge and views officers arrived in India with, such as martial race theory, infantilisation and punishment. These would have influenced the approach officers took in relation to their Indian troops.

The information for this database has been collected from several sources. The officers included in the prosopography are included in Appendix A where possible. Most of the information is drawn from the Indian Army Lists, which were published quarterly by Government of India Military Department between 1889 and 1942, and the two volumes of *Bond of Sacrifice* produced as a record of fallen officers of the First World War. Any additional information has been taken from the records of *Find My Past*.
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76 Quoted in Gilmour, *The Ruling Caste*, p. 29.
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Often all of these sources have been used in order to gain as much information as possible on any one individual.

Having assessed the origins of these men, Chapter 3 will study the entry and promotion systems of the Indian Army officer corps, again making use of the specifically created database in Appendix A. Through assessing the entry methods and early training of officers of the Indian Army this chapter will show that there were significant attempts to reform the Indian Army’s officer corps in the second half of the nineteenth century and on into the twentieth century with the arrival of Kitchener in India in 1902. There was a slow weeding out of ineffectual officers through a tightening of examinations and promotion criteria. This prolonged campaign of reform and modernisation bore fruit. The demands of the First World War saw the Indian Army officer corps, and the Indian Army, have to postpone further reform. The steadily improved pool of officers created by decades of change and improvement was diluted by an influx of unskilled officers and the high casualty rate of the Great War. The professionalisation of the Indian Army officer corps from above was complemented by moves to professionalise from below. The United Services Institute of India was founded in 1870 and a journal was started two years later. This acted as a forum for discussion regarding tactics and training, as well as a home for the reporting on and replication of foreign military developments. The production of such suggests that there was a conscious move towards modernisation within the officer corps as well as from above.

Chapter 4 is a study of the officer-man relationship. The aim of this chapter is to assess how important the British officer was to the maintenance of morale and good performance in battle. This chapter is in effect a study of how the reforms presaged in Chapter 3 manifested themselves in reality, asking did they impact an officer’s behaviour and in turn have a positive effect on the Indian Army’s capabilities and performance? The traditional view is that the officer was all important to morale, he acted as a father figure to his Indian soldiers. More recently, a number of scholars have suggested that the officer had little to do with morale, Indian soldiers continued to fight largely for the regular pay and to avoid bringing shame upon their family by deserting. Such generalisations cannot be made, it is too much of an oversimplification. The results varied greatly from officer to officer. High morale and also a good standard of training depended on the officer in charge. The chapter also argues that the officer alone cannot be blamed for losses of morale. Alien climates, lack of supplies, inability to adhere to religious practices, superior
enemy, and other such complaints could all combined to lower morale. This was particularly the case during the First World War.

After assessing the officer-man relationship Chapter 5 analyses the punishment apparatus of the Indian Army and how officers implemented it. Officers did not use the punishments available to them on a regular basis. Instead the threat of punishment or the occasional use of punishment as an example was usually enough to quell any unrest amongst the sepoys. Of course, there were instances when unrest did spill over to open, if minor, mutiny. This chapter also looks at this by making case studies of four minor mutinies: 9th Bengal Cavalry, 1865; 3rd Gurkha Rifles, 1886; 130th King George’s Own Baluchis, 1914; and, 5th Native Light Infantry, 1915. In each of these cases officer mismanagement plays a part in the cause of the mutiny and highlights that despite reform within the Indian Army officer corps the calibre of officer varied, and the ineffectual officer could have a negative impact on his troops.

Chapter 6 looks at how officers spent their free time in India. Many played sports or went hunting, those who did not were seen as outcasts and viewed as lacking masculinity. The chapter also looks at the process of courtship and marriage. For officers of the Indian Army there was a strict unwritten code regarding marriage: ‘subalterns must not marry; captains may marry; majors should marry; and colonels must marry’. 80 Those who broke this code risked being ostracised or could damage their career prospects. Finally, this chapter looks at men who fell into bad habits such as drink or gambling. Often these men would fall into debt to native merchants, winding up as a ‘poor white’ or taking their own life.

Ultimately, this thesis will show that the Indian Army officer corps became more professional and modernised, assessing how such reforms affected the Indian Army’s day-to-day running and also its performance in battle. The First World War interrupted this process of change. The effects of the Great War will be evaluated also. Yet, despite the upheaval of the First World War, the Indian Army as a whole continued to be efficient and effective, something that has not always been acknowledged by historians – particularly in relation to the Indian Army on the Western Front and in Mesopotamia. As part of the change over time study that this study seeks to undertake, the social lives of

80 Farwell, Armies of the Raj, p. 102; Procida, Married to the Empire, pp. 30-1.
Indian Army officers will also be analysed in order to place the military into the broader understandings of British colonial society in India.
Chapter 2:  
‘Dolphins’? Officer Origins

Introduction

‘The British Empire was never static; neither were its people. They moved by choice, or were moved by compulsion’ wrote Robert Bickers. Previous studies have sought to analyse and understand the flows of people within the British Empire asking why and how they moved into, through and across the Empire. In many cases India and the Indian Ocean has been the main source of study. Usually such studies have treated soldiers as migrant labour, posted to the empire to garrison and defend it with little choice in the matter. The purpose of this chapter is, in part, to show that moving to, living and working in India was a conscious choice made by these men for reasons pertaining to family, familiarity and finance. Of course, the three are not mutually exclusive, an officer could opt for India for two, even three of these reasons.

This chapter also intends to examine the origins and familial ties of Indian Army officers, in order to establish if any generalisations can be reached regarding the background of the officers of the Indian Army. Generalisations of this kind have previously been made regarding the British Army officer corps. In order to look for similar patterns in the officers of the Indian Army a sample database of 380 entries has been specifically collated (Appendix A). There have been previous attempts to provide such an analysis, most notably by P.E. Razzell, but the period under discussion in this thesis, 1861-1921, has not come under examination before. Unlike Razzell’s work, this analysis includes men born outside of the United Kingdom. By including these, this thesis seeks to provide a fuller picture of where the Indian Officer corps drew its officers from.

1 Gilmour, The Ruling Caste, p. 29.
4 Razzell, ‘Social Origins of Officers in the Indian and British Home Army’.
whilst still looking for similar patterns as identified by Razzell regarding the origins of Indian Army officers born in Great Britain.

By extrapolating data from Appendix A, building a prosopography and combining this with several case studies this chapter will provide conclusions regarding the shared origins of the European men who joined the Indian Army. The information will then inform the other chapters as to the shared background and experience of these men.

**Officer Origins**

The British Army saw sweeping reforms in the 1870’s undertaken by Secretary of State for War Edward Cardwell, which have become known as the Cardwell Reforms. One of the greatest changes was the abolition of the purchase system, whereby officers secured commissions, promotions and retirements through a process of buying and selling them from each other. This abolition did not however change the composition of the British Army Officer Corps in any great form. The senior officers of the British Army had a relatively narrow social and political attitude and therefore had a small base of recruitment. The majority of the British Army’s senior officers were Anglo-Saxon, Protestants with a rural or middle-class professional background. These men shared political affiliations, social circles, and, often, family ties too. By 1914, around one third of the officers of the British Army at this time were from families where the father or grandfather had served, the church and law are occupations with significant representation also.

A prevalent image of the EIC’s European officers is of men with a not-too-dissimilar background to their British Army counter parts. As Saul David writes:

The popular image of an East India Company army officer is of a gentleman, the younger son of a small country squire or vicar who could not afford to set him up at home. Often as not he had Scots or Irish blood and was “well-educated, hardy and ambitious”. He tended to be a man of firm religious convictions, and went out to
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7 John Mason Sneddon ‘The Company Commander’ in Jones (ed.) *Stemming the Tide*, p. 316.
India not only to make his fame and fortune but because he believed it to be his Christian duty.\(^8\)

David concedes that there were men such as this in the EIC’s army but these were the exception not the rule. The Company’s directors had initially resolved to allow no sons of gentlemen to serve under them in India. In the 1750s and 1760s there was a concerted effort to improve the calibre of the EIC’s officer corps. This coincided with reductions in the British Army after the Seven Years War. Regular army officers took up roles with the EIC rather than go on half pay or unemployment lists in Britain. Despite these efforts officers of the EIC were still predominately drawn from a lower social strata than that of the British Army. By the mid-nineteenth century the majority of EIC officers were of modest social origin, poorly educated, and only interested in going out to India for the financial benefits. Most of the men came from the middle class and their families chose to send their sons into the EIC because they could not afford the cost of a purchased commission in the British Army. Likewise, these men were going to India with the promise of a high wage. A newly commissioned EIC ensign could expect to earn Rs 182, around £18, per month. This was almost double the wage of a British officer of the same rank. The latter were expected to have a private income to supplement their pay, usually from their family’s estate.\(^9\)

**The Family Business?**

A number of studies have previously been carried out to assess the occupations of officers’ fathers in both the British and EIC armies. As part of his study of the late Victorian British Army, for example, Edward Spiers’ collated information on the higher ranks of the British Army, colonels and generals, for the years 1868, 1899, and 1914. Spiers’ research suggests that the largest percentage of colonels and generals in the British Army in these three years were drawn from the landed gentry. In 1868 the social background of 28 percent of colonels and 33 percent of generals was the gentry. In 1899 and 1914 this number dropped to 26 percent for colonels. For generals the figure also dropped. In 1899 29 percent of British Army generals were drawn from the gentry. In 1914 this percentage was 32. In Spiers’ research the armed services were the second highest represented social background. For colonels the percentages for the armed
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\(^8\) David, *The Indian Mutiny*, p.34.

services were 18 percent in 1868, 23 percent in 1899, and 23 percent again in 1914. For generals of the same period Spiers’ percentages were slightly higher: 23 percent in 1868, 19 percent in 1899, and 25 percent in 1914. Tim Bowman and Mark Connelly undertook a similar analytic process to produce the occupation of the fathers of RMC Sandhurst cadets between 1910 and 1914. Of the 418 subjects in Bowman and Connelly’s study 155 are listed as having an Army officer father (there is no distinction made between British and Indian Army in this study). A further seven are listed as having a Royal Naval officer as a father. In total 162 out of a sample of 418 had a father from the armed services, this equates to 39 percent of Bowman and Connelly’s sample.

Both above-mentioned studies point to a British Army officer corps which, even at the higher echelons, had a significant proportion of men drawn from families with a military tradition. Family tradition saw many young men join the army, even when their family’s finances were stretched. These men were often willing to take service with less popular regiments and spend their careers in less climatically hospitable parts of the British Empire out of a sense of family duty and tradition. It was for many, as Lord Wavell referred to it, the ‘line of least resistance’ to follow the family tradition and join the British Armed forces. The work of T.A. Heathcote suggests a similar story for the EIC’s army prior to the Victorian era. Heathcote’s analysed the occupation of fathers of 1,945 officers of the Bengal Army between 1820 and 1834. Heathcote found that 331 officers’ fathers were army officers based outside of India, 86 were Royal Navy officers, 252 were Indian Army officers, 34 were surgeons, and 31 belonged to the EIC’s naval service. In total 734 Bengal Army officers out of 1,945 came from a military family. This equates to 38 percent of Heathcote’s study. This number is very close to that produced by Bowman and Connelly in their study of RMC Sandhurst cadets and suggests that the want or need to continue a family tradition, either for reasons of finance or prestige, was reasonably constant in both the British and EIC Armies.

For the period 1861 to 1921, the percentages appear to be much higher (see Table 1 below). 30 percent of the men in Appendix A had a father who served in the Indian

---

10 Spiers, The Late Victorian Army, p. 94.
12 Ibid. p. 9; Spiers, The Late Victorian Army, p. 95; J. Connell, Wavell: Scholar and Soldier (London; Collins, 1964), p. 34.
Army, or its predecessor the EIC. A further 19 percent of the total sample had a father who served in the British Army. There are also eight percent, who had military rank listed but it is unclear whether this service is with the Indian or British Army and a small number of Royal Navy officers are listed too. In total 59 percent of the officers sampled followed their fathers into the military.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father’s Occupation</th>
<th>Number in Study</th>
<th>Percentage of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian Army Officer</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Army Officer</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Officer (army unclear)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Navy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Military</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: Father’s with military backgrounds.** (Figures calculated from entries in Appendix A).

As part of his work on the Indian Civil Service, David Gilmour wrote about what he called ‘Dolphin Families’. This name derives from a Rudyard Kipling story, *The Tomb of His Ancestors*. The full quote used by Gilmour is ‘certain families serve India generation after generation as dolphins follow in line across the open sea’. Gilmour asserts that is was common for three generations of the same family to spend their careers in India. Some families could list four, five, or six generations who had worked in India. Many could boast that both sides of their family had a long-standing connection to the subcontinent. As this chapter shows Gilmour’s idea of ‘Dolphin Families’ is as applicable to the Indian Army officer corps as it is to the Indian Civil Service.

Vincent Ormsby belonged to a family who had a long history of association with the Indian military. In 1863 a Captain George F. Ormsby of 2nd Dragoon Guards was posted to Benares, the district commander there was Major-General Sir Stuart Corbett. Captain Ormsby was made Aide-de-Camp to Major-General Corbett and in 1864 married his daughter, a year later Vincent Alexander Ormsby was born. Vincent Ormsby went straight into RMC Sandhurst from school, passing out in 1885, he was commissioned into 2nd Battalion the East Surrey Regiment. The 2nd East Surreys were at this point in Egypt – a fact disliked by Ormsby as he felt he was unlikely to see action in Egypt. George
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Ormsby was able to call in a number of favours and got Vincent posted to the 1st battalion of the East Surreys instead, who were at this time in India.\footnote{Mss Eur C837 Vincent Alexander Ormsby papers, an account of his life, mainly up to 1902, compiled by Ruth Fell from a memoir left by him and other sources., pp. 1-27.} The young Lieutenant Ormsby enjoyed the subcontinent, he could hunt regularly and played a lot of cricket and polo. Similarly, the Harvey-Kelly and Minchin families both have fathers and two sons listed in Appendix A.\footnote{Harvey Hamilton Harvey-Kelly appears in Appendix A on page 194, his sons Harvey St. George and Charles Hamilton Grant Hume appear on pages 214 and 223. Hugh Dillion Massy Minchin can be found in Appendix A on page 198, his sons Herbert Charles Loder Minchin and High Charles Stephens Minchin appear on pages 228 and 231.}

It had always been the understanding within the Ormsby family that eventually Vincent would transfer into the Indian Staff Corps and it was hoped he would serve in the Bengal Cavalry, the regiment his Grandfather had served with during the 1857 Rebellion. Vincent was reluctant, however, because he enjoyed his life with the East Surreys, he had a good relationship with both the men and his brother officers. The application for a transfer was withdrawn as Ormsby had also put in for six months’ leave and his commanding officer informed him he could only have the furlough if he retracted his transfer application. The Indian Army offered a better rate of pay but Vincent calculated that he could afford to stay with the East Surreys because he was in receipt of a £120 annual stipend from his father.\footnote{Mss Eur C837 Vincent Alexander Ormsby papers, an account of his life, mainly up to 1902, compiled by Ruth Fell from a memoir left by him and other sources., pp. 27-36.} Vincent’s father wrote to him near the end of 1888 to inform him that he was in financial difficulty and had to cease sending the allowance. This put Ormsby in a difficult position. He had been planning to get married – like his father, Vincent was to marry his commanding officer’s daughter. To fund this marriage, he had to reapply for the Indian Staff Corps and take the higher pay that came with it. Despite having applied once and withdrawn his bid, he was accepted, something he attributed to his family connection to India, predominately his grandfather’s rank and stature within the Indian Army.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 41-2.}

In both Spiers’ and Bowman and Connelly’s studies of the British Army, a proportion of the father’s occupations are listed as a peerage or baronetcy. 12 fathers of the 418 Sandhurst cadets in Bowman and Connelly’s study have titled backgrounds. In his study of British Army colonels and generals of 1868 and 1899, Spiers shows that 12 of colonels and 14 percent of generals in his sample had their origins in the British
nobility.

In comparison both Heathcote’s study of the Bengal Army’s officer corps, 1820-1834, and the present study for the years 1861 and 1921 have no officers of noble birth listed, pointing again to the higher social classes of Britain being drawn to the British Army and not service on the subcontinent. The sons of peers were more than able to meet the financial demands of the British Army.

**Familiarity**

The conventional view is that officers of the Indian Army were drawn from lower social origins than their British Army counterparts. These men selected Indian service for a variety of reasons. The geographical origins of the men who chose Indian service is extremely broad (see Table 2). 41 percent of the men in Appendix A were born in India, 37 percent were born in England and Wales, with much smaller percentages born in Scotland, Ireland, and elsewhere within the British Empire. A small number were also born elsewhere outside of Great Britain or its empire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location Born</th>
<th>Percentage of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Empire</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Geographic Birthplaces of officers** (Figures calculated from entries in Appendix A).

Razzell attempted to place the social origins of the Indian and British Army officers between 1758 and 1962. Razzell’s time frame is misleading as he studied only the Indian Army from 1758 up to 1834 and then went onto look at the British Home Army from 1780 to 1962. Razzell reached the conclusion that Indian Army officers were largely drawn from the middle class with a quarter of them originating from London and the South East of England and another quarter from Scotland. In his study Razzell did not include men born outside of the United Kingdom. The database collated in Appendix A has been created to build on Razzell’s findings by carrying out similar analysis for the period 1861-1921, but also change the understanding of the Indian Army officer corps by including officers born outside of Great Britain and Ireland as this is an important feature.
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For the period 1861-1921, Razzell’s assertion that the London and the Southeast of England was a fertile production ground for future Indian Army officer holds true. Of the men in the Appendix A born in England the South East of the country accounts for 49 percent of the sample – this includes London, Middlesex, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Kent, Hertfordshire, Surrey, Sussex, Buckinghamshire, Bedfordshire, Hampshire, and Oxfordshire. The South West accounts for a further 20 percent and the Midlands for 13 percent. Counties with large ports by and large account for more officers in the sample than those without. For example, Gloucestershire, with its proximity to Bristol, is the birthplace for nine men of the sample. Similarly, Sussex with the seaport of Shoreham accounts for the birthplace of 12 men from the sample. Devon, with the port of Plymouth, has seven, and Kent, which houses several ports, has eight. The exception to this is Hampshire, despite the fact that Southampton and Portsea (now Portsmouth) are situated there.

Nineteen of the officers in the sample, or seven percent, were born within the British Empire: Australia, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Hong Kong, Malaya, Malta, New Zealand, South Africa, and the West Indies. Given that some of these men have fathers listed as Army officers it could be assumed that the reason for their being born in these locations was due to their fathers’ posting at the time. This is not the case for all however. For example, Guy La Bertouche’s father worked on the Melbourne railways and Frank Messervy’s father was a bank manager in the Caribbean. Similar observations can be made for those who were born outside of India, Britain, or the Empire. Again, some of these men had fathers in the Armed forces. Others had fathers who were traders and merchants. A number of these birthplaces were linked to Britain, India, and the Empire through trade, such as China. This suggests an affinity with the British Empire or at least the trade routes – Britain’s informal empire. Granville Pennefather Evans is one example of this theory (Evan’s entry in Appendix A can be found on page 203). Evans’ father, Matthew Pennefather Evans, was born in Ireland in 1836 and left the country to make his fortune. Matthew did indeed make his fortune in tea, firstly in China, where Granville was born, and then in Ceylon.\footnote{Mss Photo Eur 288, Other Days: copy of extract from memoir by Lt-Col Granville Pennefather Evans, pp. 1-4.} One possible explanation for the statistics and backed up by the case of Matthew Pennefather Evans, is a thesis put forward by David Lambert and Alan Lester in their edited volume \textit{Colonial Lives Across the British Empire}. Lambert
and Lester’s work looks at what they call ‘imperial careering’, whereby a person or family would reside and work in an area of the empire for a considerable period of time before moving on to a different region, again for a significant period of time. A possible extension to this theory could be a concept of imperial families, once a person had spent his time travelling around the empire as part of his parent’s career he might himself wish to travel and make a career from the empire. They may find that they have more in common with Britons across the empire, with who they share a bond of experience, than with those who had been brought up in Britain, unaccustomed to life away from the metropole. Indeed, Elizabeth Buettner has demonstrated how British people returning to Britain from India and elsewhere struggled to adapt to everyday life there having been accustomed to a very different lifestyle. Having been raised in imperial surroundings it would be reasonable to suggest that a young man looking for a career would look for employment in climes with which he was familiar or with people whom shared his experience. The Indian Army would afford such an opportunity for travel and in surroundings far removed from Britain but with regular pay and accommodation. The hypothesis of an ‘imperial family’ could explain the motivation for some of these men to join.

It is India itself that accounts for the largest number of listed birthplaces in the database, 145, or 45 percent. The majority of these had fathers listed as Indian Civil Servants or Army officers, British or Indian. This suggests that either these men were born whilst their father was working, or serving, on the subcontinent; or, their family took up residence permanently in India. The figures suggest that the parents taking up residence or serving in India encouraged the son to follow in their footsteps. Again, if these men were born into the empire then it is likely that they would feel a stronger affinity to it than to the metropole, which would more than likely be alien to them. Furthermore, they would have a pre-existing familiarity with the India or the British Empire more broadly which would aid them upon their arrival, or return, to the subcontinent. They may have had experience of the climate and be accustomed to some of the peoples of India. They could have arrived with existing connections to the country, that could aid their settling in, or as Chapter 3 will show, aid their progress.

\[26\] Lambert & Lester (eds.) Colonial Lives Across the British Empire.  
\[27\] Buettner, Empire Families, pp. 188-9, 198-9.
It is potentially the case with men of Scottish or Irish descent that they were the latest in a line of several generations to be born into the empire. They would have been familiar with the cultural and social norms of British India, and used to the luxuries and privileges of whiteness in India, to take a career in Britain would be to give up such privilege and have to become accustomed to a new way of life. This may thus explain why the percentages are so small for the Scotland and Ireland as places of birth; men had Scottish or Irish heritage but were born in India.

A mere 26, or eight percent, of the subjects in Appendix A were born in Scotland. The percentage of men born in Ireland from the sample is even smaller, just six percent, or 18. Yet these two Celtic nations have a long military history and tradition within the British Army and British Empire that dates back further than the Act of Union of 1707. Marlborough’s victorious army at the Battle of Blenheim in 1704 had five Scottish and four Irish colonels out of a total of sixteen. In 1709 at Malplaquet, during Marlborough’s same campaign, of 25 general officers present, ten were Scottish and three Irish. When the Act of Union was passed in 1707, a third of the final Scottish Parliament was in some way linked to the British military and thus voted in favour of the union treaty. The Scottish elite had always seen themselves as a ‘warrior class’. As well as military service with Britain there were opportunities to sell their services in the armies of Holland or France, thus in the early Eighteenth Century experienced officers migrated back and forth between continental Europe and the British Isles. By the 1750s almost a quarter of all British Army officers were Scottish, a fifth of all regimental colonelcies at this time were filled by Scots. Scots and Irish each made up a third of the officers who went on campaign in North America during the Seven Years War. In comparison the British percentage on this campaign was just 25.5, the remainder made up by Americans and other foreign nationals. Even during the mass expansion of the British Army during the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars Scots were still in possession of around a quarter of all commissions. India offered the opportunity of a livelihood, position, and wealth to the Scottish gentleman. This was through either service with the British Army on the subcontinent or with the EIC Army. Some of the first Scottish personnel to serve with the EIC in large numbers were surgeons. Men of impoverished genteel Scottish families could hope to gain a position of power within the EIC or to make their fortune through
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trade whilst in the country. Service in India offered these opportunities in a way that Britain could not, given the unpopularity of Scots in London and other centres of commerce. 29

By the turn of the nineteenth century the tendency was for the wealthiest Scots to take up residence in England, provide their sons with an English education and encourage inter-marriage with English families, diluting the Scottish proportion of the British Army’s officer corps. Patronage and advancement for the traditional Scottish officer became minimal. As great colleges were created and catered for the English gentlemen smaller establishments were created in Scotland. One example is the Scottish Naval and Military Academy, founded in Edinburgh in 1825. The principal aim of the academy was to prepare boys for cadetships in the EIC. To this end the subjects taught included Hindustani alongside military topics, such as fortifications and military drawing. The aims of men who attended these colleges would have been quite modest. 30 Razzell’s study of 1758 to 1834 places one quarter of the Indian Army officers as born in Scotland. 31 The small percentage of this study born in Scotland may be explained by the fact that by the time of the 1857 Rebellion many modest Scottish families had already taken domicile in India and were serving either with the army or civil service of the EIC.

George McGilvary argues that this large Scottish presence in the EIC was a result of early attempts to solidify the union between Scotland and England. By offering Scottish families the opportunity to enter the EIC, English politicians were encouraging a Scottish interest in the governmental and economic cohesion of the new union. In reward for favour, in the form of EIC patronage, the English hoped to receive political support for the fragile union. McGilvary’s study suggests that one quarter of all EIC patronage grants made between 1760 and 1830 went to Scots, population proportion suggest this figure should have been no more than one eighth or ninth. This need to solidify the 1707 union resulted in a disproportionate number of Scots taking up lucrative roles within the EIC. 32 Subsequent generations of Scottish migrants would therefore be born in their parents’ country of residence, India. A similar situation was present in the

30 Ibid., pp. 99-100.
Indian Civil Service. Scot William Wedderburn suggested that for certain Scottish families’ service in the Indian Civil Service was as hereditary as fighting for the Jacobite cause and being executed for treason had been a century previous. The EIC had been the best opportunity for Scottish families in decline to send their sons in the hope that they may be able to make a fortune in India. One Scot described the EIC as ‘the Corn Chest for Scotland where we poor gentry must send our youngest sons as we send our black cattle to the South’.  

The smaller percentage of officers in the database being born in Ireland is akin to the situation in the Indian Civil Service around the same period. Gilmour estimates that one in twenty Indian Civil Servants were born in Ireland during the first half of the nineteenth century. These were invariably Protestants from the North and seldom had any links to the aristocracy. Landed gentry in Ireland preferred to send their sons to join the British Army. The smallness of their estates encouraged them to seek a military career. One example is Abraham Roberts, father of one of the Victorian era’s most famous soldiers, Frederick Roberts. Abraham was born in Waterford, Ireland in 1784. He was commissioned into the British Army in 1801, aged 17. The Peace of Amiens, 1802, temporarily ended hostilities during the French Revolutionary Wars. This led to the British Army provisionally reducing its strength. Abraham Roberts was thus induced to apply for a commission into the army of the EIC. He was duly commissioned in 1803. This guaranteed Abraham Roberts greater pay and also a greater chance to see action. Thus, his son Frederick would be born at Cawnpore in 1832. Likewise, Frederick’s children would be born on the subcontinent too. Therefore, much like the case of officers with Scottish descent, it may be that by 1861 many Irish families had taken up domicile in India and had children there.

Conclusion

What this chapter has helped to highlight is the types of families and communities Indian Army officers were drawn from. The majority of Indian Army officers followed their father in one form or another. Firstly, they directly followed their father into the armed

---

forces. Secondly, they followed their father, or family, by living in India. In many cases, men followed in their father’s footsteps by joining the Indian Army, much like the dolphins in Kipling’s tale or, as Lord Wavell put it, took the ‘line of least resistance’. What this did though was provide the Indian Army with a corps of men who had shared experiences, had similar connections and belonged to similar communities. This would have greatly helped them assimilate to army life and to India. The purpose of Chapter 3 is to take a closer look at the assimilation to army life, whilst Chapter 6 does the same for the social lives of these officers.

Unlike the British Army the Indian Army officer corps was made up of men from a lower social status. These men, and their families, could not afford to support a career in the British military. Analysis of the database collated in Appendix A points to a similar social makeup of the Indian Army officer corps as has been previously proposed for the army of the EIC. This meant that the Indian Staff Corps belonged to the same system and maintained the same networks as the EIC officer corps had before it. The change in authority from company to crown appears to have affected the social makeup of the Indian Army officer corps little, as did the abolition of the purchase system despite the fact it opened the Indian Army up to a larger pool of potential recruits.

36 Bowman and Connelly, The Edwardian Army, p. 9.
Chapter 3: ‘By merit only’?37

Getting in and Getting on in the India Staff Corps

Introduction

In the years directly after the suppression of the 1857 rebellion one of the main objectives of reformers within the Indian Army was to make military service more palatable to Indian soldiers. As discussed in the introduction, efforts were made to meet the grievances of sepoys through enquiries such as the Peel Commission. The native uniform was adapted to make it more comfortable and better suited to the Indian climate. The promotion of Indian soldiers became based on merit, offering sepoys and sowars reward for efficiency. From the 1820s onwards, the mutual respect between sepoys and their officers began to die away, as did the general efficiency of the EIC’s officers. Post-rebellion reforms aimed to redress the relationship between the sepoys and their officers, and also provide the Indian Army with a higher calibre of officer. It is this process of professionalisation that this chapter will focus upon. This process began during Sir Hugh Rose’s tenure as Commander-in-Chief India, 1861-1865. This process was at times haphazard, and inconsistent, nor was it always intentional but steadily the Indian Army officer corps did professionalise and modernise with the introduction of stringent examinations for entry and promotion, along with language tests, and new means with which to remove ineffectual officers.

The First World War interrupted this process. The demand for both men and officers meant that training periods had to be lowered, if kept at all, and expectations regarding skill and language also had to be reduced. This chapter will highlight how the process of modernisation and professionalisation evolved but also showing that not all officers adhered to new systems and backdoors for entry did exist. This chapter will then underline how, during the First World War, concessions had to be made in order to meet the manpower demands of the war with the Central Powers and volunteers such as

William Sargisson and the Ceylon Planters Rifles had to be absorbed into the officer corps along with men who had the military knowledge and experience but not the linguistic skill, and vice versa.

**Entering the Staff Corps**

In 1861 the Indian Staff Corps was created. An officer was commissioned to the unattached list of the Staff Corps and all regimental, staff, and civilian positions were filled by men from this central pool. This was to counter the fact that officers in the EIC Army belonged to a regiment and their promotion was based upon seniority within this regiment, which resulted in a slow rate of promotion, it was a case of waiting for the officer in front to retire or die and then take his place. The Armies of Bengal, Bombay, and Madras each had their own Staff Corps. These were pools of manpower from which to draw officers. This provided officers with more scope for transfer between regiments and meant that their promotion was not hampered by seniority within a regiment.38

The transfer to the authority of the crown from the EIC through the Government of India Act, 1858, brought with it a lowering of wages and pensions for the officers of Indian units. Officers of the EIC had been guaranteed promotion based on seniority – only a court-martial could prevent an officer from being promoted if he was next in line. Both of these changes led to some disgruntlement amongst the officers being transferred from company to crown. In an open letter to the Adjutant-General of the British Army, Captain Osborn, formerly of the 45th Bengal Infantry, argued that officers of the Indian Army should accept their new terms of employment ‘most graciously’ as the rate of promotion had increased meaning an officer could hope to reach the higher ranks and subsequent higher pay more quickly than they could under the EIC.39 Osborn was referring to the fact that promotion in the Indian Army would now be based on length of service and ability. From 1861 the length of service required for promotion was set at 16 years for a lieutenant to be promoted to captain, after 26 years’ service a captain could be promoted to major, and a major could be promoted to lieutenant-colonel after 35 years’ service. In comparison prior to the 1857 Rebellion it had taken an average of 30 years for an officer to reach the rank of major in the Bengal Army. The EIC’s Board of Control estimated

---

that on average it took an officer 48 years to progress from an ensign to full colonelcy. Only during times of war or epidemic did the speed of promotion in the EIC pick up pace. To make this new system work a proportion of the older colonels of the EIC had to be pensioned off. The length of service was reduced further in 1865, to 12 years’ service before promotion to captain, 20 years for promotion to major, and 26 years’ service for a promotion to lieutenant-colonel. In 1912 this was further reduced to nine years for a captaincy, 18 years for a majority, but it remained 26 years for promotion to lieutenant-colonel.

To take one example, Clement Benthall was looking to join the military as the process of transferring the Indian Army from the EIC to the crown was underway. His father wrote to him in early 1860 encouraging Clement to take a cadetship in the Indian Army. Clement’s father, who was himself a judge in India, felt that in the near future the Indian Army might merge with that of Britain. Therefore, by joining the Indian Army in 1860, he wrote, Clement might gain valuable experience but not be permanently posted to India, as he would be easily able to transfer elsewhere within the British Army once the two armies merged. His father was mistaken however, Clement spent his first two years in India with a British regiment of the Indian Army but these British battalions were a hangover from the days of the EIC and were either disbanded or transferred to the British Army in the years following the 1857 Rebellion. Benthall remained in the Indian Army, serving in the Bengal cavalry until his death in 1873.

The more regular route into the Indian Army was to join the unattached list of the Bengal, Bombay, or Madras Staff Corps. A cadet would attend Royal Military College (RMC) Sandhurst, just as a potential British Army officer would, and upon graduating would elect to join the Indian Army. As the century progressed this option became more popular and by the turn of the century a cadet with an eye for the subcontinent had to ensure he finished in the top 30 of his cohort in order to guarantee one of the limited places available. The exact number of places each year varied, as discussed below in

---

40 Peers, Between Mars and Mammon, pp. 78-9; Heathcote, The Indian Army, pp. 131-3.
41 IOR/L/MIL/7/13488, Sir John Lawrence to Sir Charles Wood, 10/08/1861, Number of British Officers with native regiments to be reduced to six.
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43 Centre of South Asia Studies Archive, Benthall Papers, Box 26, Benthall family correspondence from 1827-1875. Letter from Father, undated.
relation to Claude Auchinleck’s experience of Sandhurst. At least 165 of the officers surveyed in Appendix A are listed as having attended Sandhurst. It is likely that a much larger number did attend and graduate from Sandhurst. An additional 11 officers are listed as having attended the Royal Military College Woolwich. This was the British Army’s training centre for officers of the artillery and engineers. After electing to join the Indian Army, a cadet would be placed on the unattached list. Once arrived in India an officer would spend their first year of service not with an Indian Unit but with a British regiment serving in India, as was recommended by the Peel Commission. The idea behind this was that an officer could acclimatise to India and make the basic mistakes of a junior officer under the watchful eye of British NCOs who could subsequently correct him. To make such mistakes in an Indian battalion would be to damage the prestige of the sahib in the eyes of the Indian soldier. After this year with a British unit the officer would then move onto a posting with an Indian regiment.

Under the EIC directors afforded would-be officers patronage. In 1862 new regulations were introduced giving the Secretary of State for India the ability to appoint 20 cadets to Sandhurst each year. Essentially this was transferring the military patronage from the EIC’s directors to the Secretary of State. The cadetships were known as Queen’s, later King’s, India Cadets. They were only open to the sons of former Indian servants, both civil and military. These cadets were not obligated to join the Indian Army upon leaving Sandhurst, but the majority did as it is unlikely that the son of an Indian Civil Servant or Army officer could afford to join the British Army instead, as in order to purchase everything required of an officer and also live comfortably a man would need a private income of between £100 and £600 per annum depending on which regiment they joined. Potential cadets had to pass the usual Sandhurst entrance examination in order to be eligible for the cadetship. But the awarding of cadetships came down to the ‘length and distinction’ of their father’s service. John Cyril Atkinson, Edward Egerton Barwell, William Arthur McCrae-Bruce, W.A.B. Dennys, and, Henry Ironside Money are known to have been in receipt of a Queen’s, or King’s, India Cadetship. Alternatively, a number of commissions were granted to graduates from ‘principal universities in the United

---
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Kingdom’. These men were appointed directly to the unattached list without passing through Sandhurst.47 A number of university graduates appear in the sample. Table 3 shows the names of these graduates and the institution from which they graduated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Charles Day</td>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Sinclair Thomson</td>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Angrave Cecil Topham</td>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Ajphn Fitzgibbon</td>
<td>University of Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustace Lockhart Maxwell</td>
<td>University of Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Hugh-Jones</td>
<td>University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hew Renwick</td>
<td>University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winspeare Toye Hungerford</td>
<td>University College Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Etlinger</td>
<td>Trinity College Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Stafford Northcote Wright</td>
<td>Heidelberg University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: University Graduates and their institutions (Taken from Appendix A48)

The fact that there is such a small number of men in the database who took this route into the Indian Army suggest that it was not a particularly common one. Hugh Stafford Northcote Wright graduated from Heidelberg University, but he was in the British Army for a number of years before he transferred to the Indian Army.

Upon being placed on the Indian Army’s unattached list and then being placed with a British regiment, a second lieutenant would be earning Rs. 425 per month. Once with their regiment this pay would also have a regimental allowance added to it, this was Rs. 150 for cavalry and Rs. 100 for infantry. A second lieutenant was earning the equivalent of £35 per month.49 This was significantly more than a second lieutenant in the British Army. The British Army’s rate of pay had been set in 1806 and remained in place until 1914. A British Army infantry second lieutenant could expect to receive around £7 10s per month. A British Army officer was not expected to live off his wage. To pay for their uniform, mess bills, sport, and social activities an officer was expected to have a private income. It is estimated that an infantry officer would need an additional £150 on top of their pay to meet all expenses. This could rise as high as £600 for a fashionable cavalry regiment. This led many men who lacked this personal wealth to opt

47 IOR/L/MIL/7/19350 Specimens of forms used in recruitment of Indian Army and Indian Army Reserve officers, Indian Army Cadetships at Sandhurst, pp. 1-3.
49 From the 1870’s onwards the rupee to pound exchange rate was Rs. 10 to £1. From 1899 this exchange rate became Rs. 15 to £1. Source: John F. Richard, ‘Fiscal Strains in British India 1860-1914’ given at XIV International Economic History Congress, Helsinki 2006, Session 57.
for the Indian Army in which an officer could live off of their wage alone given its higher value and the lower living costs of India.\footnote{IOR/L/MIL/7/19350 Specimens of forms used in recruitment of Indian Army and Indian Army Reserve officers, Pay on Being Commissioned, pp. 2-4; Spiers, \textit{The Late Victorian Army}, pp. 104-6; Bowman and Connelly, \textit{The Edwardian Army}, pp. 10-1.}

Future Field Marshal Claude Auchinleck had few options but to apply for the Indian Army and hope he passed out of Sandhurst high enough to achieve this. The Auchinleck family finances were tight. Another future famous Field Marshal Bernard Montgomery also opted for the Indian Army due to his lack of personal wealth, though unfortunately he failed to achieve a place from Sandhurst. Auchinleck had always intended to follow his father into the military but given his family’s poor financial status he had few options but to opt for the Indian Staff Corps upon leaving Sandhurst. Auchinleck’s father, John, was a Royal Artillery officer who had served in India during both the 1857 Rebellion and the Second Anglo-Afghan War, 1878-80. Claude was born in Aldershot, Hampshire, but travelled to India with his family when he was just one year old. It was hoped that Claude would follow in both his father’s and uncle’s footsteps and join the Royal Artillery. However, John Auchinleck died in 1892 leaving his wife to raise four children on a widow’s pension. Thus, money was tight for the Auchinlecks. Claude was able to get into Wellington School on a scholarship for sons of deceased officers and then went onto RMC Sandhurst at much expense to his mother. Auchinleck struggled with mathematics at both Wellington and Sandhurst so a career in the artillery or engineers was out of the question. Given his family’s poor financial situation it would be ill advised for him to join a British Army cavalry regiment – a cavalry officer’s pay often did not cover the expenses of uniform, horses and equipment and so a cavalry officer often had to use their own or their family’s personal wealth to fund their career. A fashionable infantry regiment in the British Army could also come with additional costs above the pay of an officer would receive so this was also out of the question for Auchinleck. Indeed, his best option was to opt for the Indian Army and the combination of greater pay and lower living costs that came with it. As stated previously, in this period the Indian Army was a popular option with Sandhurst cadets. To guarantee a place in India a cadet had to finish in the top thirty of his cohort. In Auchinleck’s year there were 45 places available in the India Army. Auchinleck finished 86th in his cohort and of those
who had opted for India he finished 45th out of 45 available places. So Auchinleck sailed for India in 1903 and went on to serve in the Second World War as a Field Marshal.  

Those who could not pass the entrance examinations into Sandhurst or Woolwich would often enter the army via a backdoor, the Militia. The Militia, and Yeomanry, were by the beginning of the twentieth century bodies of volunteers who would be engaged for six years and carried out 28 days exercise per annum. These volunteers would be called upon in times of emergency – though yeomanry could not be sent abroad. Militia officers could be commissioned into the regular army after passing a special examination. Initially this examination was a hybrid of military and literary subjects but from 1904 it became based solely around military topics. The examination included military history, strategy, tactics, military engineering, topography, military law, and administration and organisation. In comparison the examination for Sandhurst or Woolwich included the classics, mathematics, and modern languages. Thus, this alternative route into the regular British Army became even more attractive. Those who failed to pass the entrance examination for Sandhurst or Woolwich could now turn to the less rigorous Militia examination. Many men who would go on to play an important part in British military history had to use the Militia as their route into the regular army. These included father of the RAF Sir Hugh Trenchard and Chief of the Imperial General Staff Sir Henry Wilson, who failed his Sandhurst examination no less than three times.  

In times of war many would-be officers would shun Sandhurst or Woolwich and instead join the Militia as a fast track to participating in the conflict. This was particularly the case between 1899 and 1902 as young men saw it as the quickest way of becoming junior officers and thus seeing action in South Africa against the Boers. John Sneddon’s study of the 466 British Army captains and majors killed in action between August and December 1914 has revealed that 254 of them entered the regular army through the Militia. Only 161 of these men entered through the RMC Sandhurst. The Second Boer War created a demand for junior officers that could not be met by Sandhurst alone. From
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the database in Appendix A there are at least 21 men of the Indian Army who took this back door into the regular British Army before transferring to the Indian force. The dates for these commissions ranges from 1890 to 1910 but there is a cluster of 11, over half, of these between 1899 and 1903. All but one of the officers who were commissioned during the Second Boer War subsequently transferred into the Indian Army within three years, suggesting their aim had always been to serve in India. The only exception was Henry Etlinger who was commissioned into the North Staffordshire Regiment in 1902 but did not transfer into the Indian Army until 1912. Of those commissioned from the militia either side of the South African War the longest period between the commission and transfer to the Indian Army was Granville Pennefather Evans’ four years. Again, this suggests that for men using the Militia to gain a commission their end goal had always been to transfer into the Indian Army.

An officer could transfer from the British Army into the Indian Army whilst serving on the subcontinent. According to the recruitment pamphlet of 1912 ‘any officer of the British Army who may show exceptional qualifications for service in India may, with concurrence of the army council, be specially selected for the Indian Army.’

Service in India was for a long period of time unpopular with British Army officers. Until the Cardwell reforms of 1870s officers had been able to sell their commission if their battalion was earmarked for India. It was subsequently bought by a man who wanted the financial inducements offered for serving in India. This offered the less well-heeled promotion in place of a man who had neglected to ‘go east’. Alternatively, the less affluent officer might afford a transfer into the more expensive cavalry thanks to additional pay allowances gained through Indian service. It was in no way regarded as discreditable to transfer out of a regiment in order to avoid service in India. Once the purchase system was abolished attitudes to India changed. It became possible to transfer out of a regiment heading for India only on health grounds or owing to personal circumstance, but this was frowned upon. The advent of steamships and the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 made the journey to India much faster and a rise in hygiene standards meant a fall in the mortality rate. Military cantonments were some of the first places to implement public health programmes. It was deemed necessary to keep the army healthy in case of another outbreak of rebellion akin to that of 1857. Disease would

55 IOR/L/MIL/7/2593 Inter-departmental committee on recruitment and regulations re officers of Indian Army; correspondence with War Office, Indian Army Recruitment 1912, pp. 1-2.
always be a major problem for the military in India, but mortality rates began to fall significantly from the 1880s onwards.\textsuperscript{56} For the less well-off officer India afforded luxuries they could ill afford in Britain. Even Winston Churchill, the grandson of a Duke, enjoyed India despite his initial apprehensions, appreciating the comfort afforded to him by being able to hire 30 servants between himself and two brother officers. India proved to be popular with the less well-heeled British officer and many subsequently transferred to Indian service.\textsuperscript{57}

The First World War interrupted the process of reform. The Indian Army rapidly grew in the opening months of the war and officers had to be found to lead new battalions. In 1914 the Indian Army numbered around 140,000 native soldiers and 15,000 British officers. In addition to this there were a further 45,000 non-combatants. It was impossible for the Indian Army to meet the demands put on it during the Great War with its pre-war recruitment of 15,000 men per annum. Lord Robert’s martial race theory had to be abandoned and previously marginalised groups, such as Bengalis and Madrassis, were admitted into the army. In total 877,000 combatants and 563,000 non-combatants had been recruited by 31\textsuperscript{st} December 1918.\textsuperscript{58} Officers were also needed. The British Army, undergoing its own rapid growth through mass volunteerism, also needed officers, both to command newly raised battalions and to replace casualties.

Three days before war against Germany was declared, Secretary of State for India, Earl Crewe, informed Viceroy Hardinge that should war come the War Office was likely to commandeer officers of the Indian Army on furlough in Britain for use with the British Army.\textsuperscript{59} Most of the officers who were on leave in Britain when war broke out initially looked to return to India and re-join their regiments. This was the usual practice in a time of war. When the government of India had previously declared war against Afghanistan or against tribes of the North-West Frontier officers had abandoned their leave and taken the first available ship back to the subcontinent in the hope of seeing action. Roly Grimshaw recalled heading to the docks of Southampton, arriving on 11 August 1914. An India Office clerk read out a long list of names to the waiting crowd of officers. These
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men had had their sailing cancelled and were to return to London. Grimshaw was not amongst these names and confided his disappointment to his diary. He also noted in it that most of the names he recognised were cavalrymen. The men on the India Office list had been seconded to the British Army.\textsuperscript{60} The creation of the ‘New Armies’, largely from volunteers, meant the British Army officer corps had to be multiplied several times over. 560 officers on furlough from India were commandeered in the opening weeks of the First World War. Several British battalions went to war with Indian Army officers in command. For example, the 8\textsuperscript{th} Royal Berkshire Regiment went to war commanded by an Indian Army officer, this man was one of only two officers of the regiment with any previous regular army experience.\textsuperscript{61}

Whilst Crewe and Hardinge conversed, a similar discussion regarding officers was struck up between senior military figures in both Britain and India. As early as 6 August 1914 Lord Kitchener sent a telegram to his former Adjutant-General, now Commander-in-Chief India, Sir Beauchamp Duff, informing him: ‘we are in a tight place … officers are badly needed’.\textsuperscript{62} Duff’s response was to offer to remove two officers from each of the British regiments still stationed in India and send them to Britain to be relocated. Duff was quick to remind Kitchener that officers had been in short supply during his tenure as Commander-in-Chief India, 1903-1909. He also expressed his concern for the internal security of India if too many British soldiers were removed from the subcontinent.\textsuperscript{63}

Duff was able to free up a number of senior officers to be used in the training of new recruits, but he insisted again in early September that junior officers could not be spared. He also noted that should casualties be high in the Indian Corps, which was by this point on its way to France, it would be difficult to replenish its officers. On the 16 September Kitchener telegrammed Duff requesting a further 3 officers from each British battalion in India. Kitchener informed Duff that he had already had to despatch 600 additional officers to the front from Britain and that the BEF’s commander, Sir John French, was requesting more still. Kitchener claimed ‘men cannot fight properly without
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good officers’.\textsuperscript{64} One way to meet the supply problem was to promote five NCOs from British battalions in India, something that was already being done in Britain. These could then replace trained officers, who could then be sent to Europe. Duff also suggested Kitchener send out untrained officers to India, they could be trained in India and then sent back to Europe.\textsuperscript{65}

On 22 September Duff informed Kitchener that an appeal had been issued to gentlemen residents of India to join the Indian Army Reserve of Officers (IARO). These would be commissioned, attached for training with a battalion in India, then once trained be sent with drafts to Europe.\textsuperscript{66} At the outbreak of war with Germany and Austria-Hungary the IARO numbered just 40 men. These were soon eaten up by the losses incurred by the British Army’s secondment of officers on leave. Hardinge set an initial IARO enlargement target of 800 to 900. In May 1915 Hardinge’s target was increased to 1,300 additional IARO personnel.\textsuperscript{67}

The IARO had several sources of potential recruits. One such source was the 30,000 men of the European volunteers. The volunteers were part time units made up of Europeans who worked on the subcontinent and intended to be called upon in times of internal unrest. For the demands of the Great War however, the volunteers offered the Indian Army a source of men with some military experience or training and, through their working in India, some command of Indian languages. William Sargisson,\textsuperscript{68} and his fellow engineers Glenville and Spring, were volunteer soldiers who joined the IARO. Sargisson was working for the South India Railway when war broke out. At the time he was sharing a bungalow in Trichinopoly with Glenville and Spring. The three men were also members of their local volunteer unit, recorded in Sargisson’s notes simply as the Mounted Rifles. To these three men it was quite obvious, as news reached Trichinopoly of the BEF’s retreat from Mons, that they as experienced volunteer troopers would be needed. Sargisson had been a volunteer for 11 years, nine of which he had spent as a cavalry trooper. The Indian authorities asked the Mounted Rifles if they would join a locally raised contingent if needed. All agreed. For Sargisson, Glenville, Spring, and other employees of the South India Railway the news was not met with great joy. According to
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Sargisson when informed of the engineers’ wish to serve in the war, their employers began a dialogue with the men which ‘at a glance one would think we had been asking for some leave of absence to which we were not entitled for the purpose of going on a beano’. The South India Railway did not wish to lose its engineers, as was the company’s prerogative. When the concept of a locally raised contingent fell through Sargisson and his companions considered returning to Britain and joining a cavalry regiment before instead opting to apply to the IARO. Meanwhile the South India Railway continued to meet any requests to go to war with rejection. the company had ordered all men on leave to return to their posts. There was now an abundance of engineers in places like Trichinopoly with little or nothing to do as the Government of India informed the company that all expenditure was to be kept at a minimum and work only to be undertaken if it was absolutely necessary.69

With nothing to do, Sargisson, and others in his position, spent their time making their dissatisfaction known. He wrote to his employers asking to have his contract suspended so that he could fight and return to a vacant position after the war. The letter never received a reply. Eventually, the London office wrote in November 1914 to say a certain number of men could join up and fight. The Acting Chief Engineer responded to the London office claiming he could not spare anyone. This almost caused the discontented engineers to mutiny. The London office, however, ordered the release of a number of men to the war. Sargisson, Glenville, and Spring were informed that their IARO applications had been forwarded at last. Spring was attached to the Somersets at Murree, Glenville attached to the South Lancashires in Quetta, and Sargisson to the 27th Cavalry at Secunderabad.70

Sargisson was confident in his own ability as a soldier when he travelled to Secunderabad. He was joining a cavalry regiment, had nine years’ experience in the ranks of a volunteer cavalry unit and had passed the examinations for a volunteer captain. He had also undertaken a musketry course and studied the Maxim Gun. There were rumours going around that IARO men were being treated as inferior in the units they were being
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posted to. Sargisson felt this was probably a question of personality and went with an
open mind. His only concern was his lack of Hindustani.  

Sargisson’s troubles with his employer may not have been common place but the
move from civil employment and part time volunteering to full time IARO commission
was. This process filled many vacancies within the Indian Army. 61 of the sample were
commissioned between 1914 and 1919. Not all of these would have been emergency
commissions into the IARO. Basil Amies, for example, was already studying at Sandhurst
when war with broke out. Amies completed his course and elected to join the Indian Army
in 1915. Others certainly were emergency commissions. For instance, Christopher
Masterman was in the Indian Civil Service prior to being commissioned in 1917. After
the Great War ended and he was decommissioned Masterman re-joined the ICS. Other
examples include Arthur Peckham, who was an architect until his 1915 commission, and
Henry King, who had been a school master before being commissioned in 1918.

George Western Hornsby, Sidney Van Dyke Hasluck, and, Eric Godfrey Hodgson
belonged to the Ceylon Planters Rifles. The Planters’ Rifles was a volunteer infantry
unit made up of Europeans for the defence of Ceylon and was based at Kandy. Most of
the 150 men of the Planters’ Rifles had been in commercial pursuits, tea or rubber, and
were well educated. Most, like Sargisson, were proficient in Tamil or Singhalese. Ceylon
was a Crown colony and therefore not part of the Raj but it was felt that these men would
make suitable officers for Indian regiments. These men were first brought to the
attention of Duff in January 1915 when William Birdwood, commander of the ANZAC
Corps suggested the men of the Ceylon contingent were ‘too good to let slip’. Birdwood,
like Duff, had been on Kitchener’s staff in India as his Military Secretary and would go
on to become Commander-in-Chief India himself. Though they could not speak
Hindustani, Birdwood felt these men would be make suitable Indian Army officers as

71 Ibid., pp. 29-30.
72 Basil Amies joined the Indian Army from Sandhurst in 1915, retiring as a lieutenant-colonel, Appendix A, p. 232.
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they were ‘accustomed to dealing with Indians’. Similarly, Ian MacDonald, of the IARO, noted during an interview that his training mostly revolved around learning about the various groups that made up his regiment. Edmund Chandler’s tome *The Sepoy* highlights this approach of ‘dealing with Indians’. Chandler’s book, written in 1919 after he had seen Indian troops in Europe and Mesopotamia as a journalist during the First World War, aimed to give new officers a guide to the peoples of India. For example he stated that Jharwa people are ‘lazy, hard to train, and not very clean’ but that Meena tribesmen were ‘steadfast and loyal’. One example given by Sargisson is that he had learnt as a civilian engineer to not lose his temper with Indians, to get angry only exacerbated the language barrier – he found this approach particularly useful when acting as regimental quartermaster. Birdwood and Major-General Alexander Wilson, General Officer Commanding (GOC) Canal Defence in Egypt, selected 70 of the Planters’ Rifles to be sent to India for training. Hornsby, Hodgson and Hasluck were three of the 70 selected and sent to India by Birdwood and Wilson. All three were commissioned in 1915. IARO men were quickly trained at depots in India and despatched to other units both in India and on campaign. These depots would cycle through considerable numbers of green officers. For example, 1st Skinner’s Horse, which spent the First World War in India, had over 70 reserve officers pass through the regiment during the course of the conflict.

The commissioning of men from the volunteers was a way of getting men with some military experience, some understanding of the people of India, their cultures, customs and religions, and, at least some grasp of the necessary languages into the IARO. Another avenue to get men with similar attributes but with much greater military experience was to commission NCOs of British units based in India into the IARO. In the British Army, whence these potential officers came, the commissioning of NCOs to be officers in the regular army was not particularly common. NCOs were given commissions during the Victorian and Edwardian era, but the practice tended to be rather limited except
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in the case of a major conflict, for instance, 252 NCOs were commissioned during the Crimean War, 1853-1856. Commissioned NCOs never made up more than five percent of the British Army’s officer corps. The most notable example of promotion from the ranks is Sir William Robertson. Robertson was commissioned in 1888, 11 years after enlisting in the ranks of the 16th Lancers. Robertson rose to be Chief of the Imperial General Staff between 1915 and 1918. Commissioned NCOs usually failed to progress past captain and most had ‘dead-end’ roles such as quartermaster. An officer raised from the ranks had to overcome a lack of education and social status enjoyed by most officers. There were also financial burdens such as uniforms, mess bills, and mounts. Many commissioned rankers had to take unfashionable posts in colonial units, such as West Indian regiments, in order to gain additional pay and stay away from more costly, modish regiments. Robertson himself spent most of his regimental career in India where living costs were lower and wages higher.\(^8^3\)

Public school educated men had volunteered in their thousands for the British Army in 1914. By 1916 this pool was beginning to dry up. The British Army had to begin to look elsewhere. The demands of total war broke down the social barriers of NCO promotion from 1916 onwards.\(^8^4\) The same was true in the Indian Army. Yet, these men faced the same issues as they had done in the nineteenth and first decade of the twentieth centuries, most notably the problem of financing the career of an officer and also of being from a lower class. Harry Ross, as commander of the 103rd Mahratta Light Infantry, received three lieutenants in 1918 all of whom had been commissioned into the IARO from the ranks of the British Army. The three were in place of a pre-war officer who had been transferred elsewhere. The replacement of one regular officer with three is suggestive of low expectations attached to these three men. Ross notes that all three were very hard working and assumes all three were very good sergeants but not suited to be officers. One man, Goulden, particularly struggled. Goulden had a wife and three children. As a sergeant in the British Army the government paid for the upkeep of Goulden’s family as well as pay him a sergeant’s wage. He never sought the commission that was granted him because as an officer he was expected to use his wages to pay for


the upkeep of his family himself. Others who obtained commissions had less military experience. For example, the *Derby Daily Telegraph* reported in July 1915 that Cecil Ryder of Wednesbury had been commissioned into the Indian Army and would take up his position in a Gurkha regiment stationed near Delhi. The short article states that Ryder had only joined the Hampshire Territorials the previous September and sailed with them to India in the October of 1914 – as was arranged by Duff and Kitchener so that regular army units could be freed up to face Germany. Prior to signing up at the outbreak of the Great War, Ryder had been the secretary of Worcestershire County Cricket Club.

The demands of the First World War saw the Indian Army require an influx of British officers. These had to be sought from usually untapped resources. The demands had to be met for the defence of India, the Indian expeditionary forces fighting on various continents against the Germans and Austrians, and also in 1914 to meet the British Army’s own shortfall in officer numbers. This interrupted the process of reform around the Indian Army officer corps that had taken place over the previous 50 years. The effects of the First World War on the British Army make up has been given scholarly attention but it is clear that the Indian Army also suffered upheaval that until now has not been given the same consideration.

**Education and Training**

Under the EIC, officer training and education had been poor if not non-existent. A military seminary was established in 1809 at Addiscombe, near Croydon, to address this. Yet, even at Addiscombe the curriculum was severely lacking. The syllabus revolved largely around mathematics. Other topics such as military fortifications, chemistry, and technical drawing were all outdated, irrelevant, or too narrow for use in India, even for the artillery and engineer officers it was initially designed for. The teaching of Hindustani was equally poor despite The Company directors enlisting the top academics of their day to lecture there. A similar college had been established at Barasat, Bengal, in 1804 but this was scraped in 1811. The cadets were taught Hindustani, drill, and small unit tactics. According to Heathcote, the cadets shone only in ‘drinking, swearing, and duelling’.

Any who shone at these two institutions did so in spite of them and not because of them.

---
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Two of the men listed in Appendix A holding commissions from early in this period of study, attended Addiscombe: John Edward Sandeman and Arthur George Hammond.88

Two thirds of the EIC’s officer cadets entered the Army directly. Not until 1851 did the directors introduce an examination for non-Addiscombe cadets. Most of these direct entry cadets had attended schools that would have had curricula devoted largely to the study of the classics and, similar to Addiscombe, been irrelevant for military service on the subcontinent. Attempts were made to improve the language proficiency of officers of Indian regiments. From 1837 it was decreed that officer who joined from that year could not be appointed adjutant or interpreter unless they were in possession of a basic qualification in written and conversational Hindustani. In 1844 further attempts were made to improve the language competence of the officer corps. The Indian government introduced an order whereby no subaltern could take the role of troop or company commander unless they passed an examination in Hindustani. Yet problems persisted. Young officers soon learned that patronage would get them further than the possession of a second or third language. Sir Charles Napier, Commander-in-Chief of India between 1849 and 1851, recalled dealing with a number of court-martial cases whereby the problem arose not through a native soldier’s insolence but simply because they could not make their officer sufficiently understand them.89 In February 1862, Clement Benthall wrote home of his studying for a language examination with a view to transferring to a native regiment. Benthall worked with a Munshi (language teacher) in order to pass these examinations. In a letter one month later, he expressed a degree of fear over his coming language examination. He states that the government of India had ordered the examination to be made more difficult for would be Indian Army officers so as to reduce the numbers entering the service. According to Benthall just one in ten in the last batch of applicants had passed the test. He did indeed fail at his first attempt in July 1862, but he put this down to his Munshi being ill for the five days prior to it. He passed at the second attempt in September 1862.90 This suggests that the Indian military authorities under Sir Hugh Rose were making early attempts to filter out the lesser cadets by creating a more difficult examination.
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Promotion

Between 1861 and 1865 an officer had to be passed fit for command alongside completing the prescribed length of service before he could be promoted. This process relied on the word of a commanding officer, an officer simply needed his superior’s nod of approval for promotion. This led to problems, most notably in 1865 when men of the 9th Bengal Cavalry revolted against their commandant, Captain Clifford Mecham. Mecham had been charging his men an additional tax and using this pool of money to buy them new equipment. His aim was to catch the eye of his commanding officer and gain his approval for promotion.91

Sir Hugh Rose, Commander-in-Chief India, 1861-1865, skilfully oversaw the transfer of the military from EIC to the crown and the handover of the European battalions to the British Army. Rose, a hero of the 1857 Rebellion for the British, also oversaw a number of reforms. One important change implemented by Rose was the attempted removal of favouritism in the Indian Army. Rose announced, ‘patronage should go by … merit only’. Favouritism and ‘petticoat patronage’ had dogged the military of the EIC.92 In 1865, as part of Rose’s process of reform and modernisation the process of being passed fit for command was changed. A process of examination was introduced to replace the commanding officer’s approval. A process of examination was introduced which by 1912 was a complex series of written and spoken tests. An officer was commissioned a second lieutenant, ensign or cornet until 1871. After two years and three months of service he was promoted to lieutenant.93 Within three years of service an officer was required to pass an examination known as ‘higher standard Hindustani’ and a professional examination also. For the higher standard Hindustani, the officer had to pass: a written translation from English, a viva voce translation from a text book into English, reading and viva voce translation from a manuscript, and, a conversation. Additionally, an officer might also be required to pass further examinations if a different language was chiefly spoken by the men of their regiment, for example a Gurkha officer would be required to learn Gurkhal. The professional examination was similar to that carried out in the British Army and featured: the drilling of a regiment of cavalry or infantry, regimental duties
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were also examined including pay, pensions, accounting, arms, equipment and supply, and Indian military law. An officer was also required to hold a musketry certificate. Cavalry officers were further examined on veterinary treatment, shoeing, and the fitting of saddlery.94

William Sargisson, a reserve officer, claimed he had a stroke of luck with his language examination in 1915. His lack of Hindustani had been his only worry prior joining his regiment – as an engineer for the South Indian Railway based in Trichinopoly, Madras, Sargisson had been used to using Tamil when interacting with labourers and locals. Sargisson had been acting as squadron commander, due to a shortage of officers, when he came to take his language assessment. Shortly before this took place he received a request for two of his men to be provided for it too, their purpose was to converse with the officers being assessed. Sargisson chose two he knew spoke clearly and understood an Englishman’s Urdu. The examiner, a cavalry captain, asked questions of a military nature in which Sargisson noted that he was inclined to overlook mistakes in the Hindustani just so long as the military answer was correct.95 He recalled his examined conversation with his own sowar:

The soldier was told to talk to me about some happening in the line. He knew quite well that I’d been kicking up a row about bad shoeing in the squadron, so he started on a long rambling yarn about the shoeing being done so badly that the horses’ feet were pinched and got dirty in the clefts and the horses got thrush, and so on. I then had to tell the examiner in English what he had said, I managed that, and then Walker (the examiner) said “go on.” The man grinning turned to me and asked me what I proposed as a remedy. I didn’t fancy my Urdu would stand a longwinded description of the treatment for thrush especially as Walker was a cunning horse master himself so I simply said “sack the farrier” which delighted him beyond everything.96

Not all officers were as lucky as Sargisson to be tested whilst conversing with their own sowars but his example shows the type of examinations that were carried out and also the somewhat amateur or haphazard nature the Indian Army operated, particularly during the First World War. Yet, the fact that such examinations were still carried out during the First World War shows that the newly found professionalism within the Indian Army was not abandoned.
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The process of a commanding officer providing the nod of approval for promotion to captain, major, and lieutenant-colonel remained until 1883. From that year for subsequent promotions to major and lieutenant-colonel an officer had to pass a further examination to assess their ‘tactical fitness for command’. Failure to do so would result in an extended stay in their current role. For example, a captain who failed to be pronounced fit and be recommended for promotion to major had to spend a further 9 years as a captain. Likewise, a major who failed to pass for a colonelcy had to spend a further 8 years as a major.97

Between 1875 and 1883 a different system had been implemented. In 1873 it was proposed that an officer should be examined for an appointment such as wing commander but not for promotion, therefore an officer who could not pass any examination and could fulfil no specific role could still be promoted and gain higher pay simply through length of service. These men were ‘of almost useless service to the state’.98 This was rejected by the Earl of Kimberley, the Secretary of State for the Colonies. He claimed that men of the Indian Staff Corps had not signed up to such terms of promotion when they joined the staff corps. It was therefore decided to apply these new regulations regarding fitness for promotion only to officers who joined the Indian Army from 1883 onwards.99

These reforms were all designed to improve the calibre of the Indian Army officer corps, and for the most part these were successful. The eradication of patronage, started by Sir Hugh Rose, was never wholly achieved. Appointments to staff positions and commands above the regimental level were still open to accusations of jobbery. Sir Hugh Rose’s aim was to encourage appointment by merit alone. His appointment of Donald Stewart to the position Deputy Adjutant-General in 1862 seems to have been based on his high opinion of Stewart. In his letter to Stewart he makes clear the value he believes Stewart will be too him in the position:

In reply to your letter thanking me for recommending your promotion to the Deputy Adjutant-Generalship, I am glad to tell you that I have great pleasure in being able to do so. Firstly, because you deserved it; and secondly, I was enabled to fulfil the promise I made to you, when you, for the sake of the army, gave up the appointment
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of Postmaster-General of the Punjab. I am sure that you will be of great assistance to me. In fairness you ought to have had your share of Simla; but, although, for the sake of business, you remain now at Calcutta, I hope that you will accompany me in my inspections in the cold weather, as an officer of your valuable departmental experience will be required.  

Others who took higher office were less scrupulous or, at least, were thought to be. Frederick Roberts and Sir William Beresford were either guilty of jobbery or seen to have been. Roberts enjoyed the benefit of patronage in advancing his own career. Initially, this had been through his father and his father’s comrades. Roberts then made several important friendships during the 1857 Rebellion, including Robert Napier, who would help his advancement significantly. Napier took Roberts with him to Abyssinia with him for the punitive expedition against Tewodros II of Ethiopia. As Commander-in-Chief himself, Roberts was accused of jobbery by the Duke of Cambridge, Commander-in-Chief of the Forces. Roberts was keen for his friend, George White, to be promoted to the rank of major-general. At the time White was in command of the forces engaged in a guerrilla war in Burma. The Duke of Cambridge opposed this, writing: ‘I greatly objected, not because Colonel White was not a good officer, but because his selection passes him over the head of 250 officers, many of whom are of great service, and some of whom are even serving at the present moment in India’. Cambridge was keen to see men promoted due to both seniority and merit. He disliked both Roberts and his rival Garnet Wolseley advancing their protégés. Hugh Bixby Luard, an Indian Army medical officer, wrote: ‘Bobs never forgot his old friends and comrades, and took care to advance their sons in the services. My own belief is that he was a good judge of character, devoted solely to the public interest, and rarely made a bad appointment: but naturally out of a host of equally competent officers chose those whom he knew most about.’ For example, in 1884, during the same conflict in Burma Roberts procured a staff position for Henry Rawlinson, whose father, also called Henry, was a friend of his and a fellow advocate of action against Russia. It was also suggested that Roberts’ wife, Nora, played a role in the advancement of young officers, in a case of ‘petticoat patronage’. Again, Luard commented on this: ‘When I was in India, it was said that any ambitious officer who
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wished to get on found it advisable to get favour from Lady Roberts at Simla, who was supposed to have unbounded influence with [her husband], and was a person of very strong character.  

The Viceroy’s Military Secretary between 1881 and 1894, Sir William Beresford, unexpectedly helped the career of J.M. Stewart. Stewart was transferred to the 1st Sikhs, Punjab Frontier Force, in 1883 after a distant relative had written to Beresford on his behalf. Beresford proved a useful acquaintance for Stewart. He would subsequently approve Stewart’s transfer to the 5th Gurkhas two years later. In 1888, Stewart was told to remain in Simla commanding the Viceroy’s guard, when the Black Mountain Expedition began. Beresford saw to it that Stewart was relieved of the guard duty and so could return to the frontier. Beresford had only a distant connection to Stewart but that seems to have been enough to encourage him to assist Stewart.

These cases suggest that patronage was far from removed from the Indian Army in 1861 as Rose hoped. Indeed, Rose himself was guilty of providing Donald Stewart with assistance. The continued importance given to social connections and patronage within the Indian Army was a contradiction of the process of professionalization that was occurring between 1861 and 1921. Despite the need to modernise and set professional standards commanders saw fit to help the careers of those they had a connection to. This was an old habit that was difficult to remove from the Indian Army.

Nonetheless, in other areas progress and reform continued. Kitchener continued the process of improvement in the officer corps as part of his modernising reform of the Indian Army. Kitchener introduced a system whereby an officer could have their promotion retarded due to their ineptitude as commanders. The final decision rested with Kitchener, as Commander-in-Chief, and his military council as to whether or not an officer’s promotion should be retarded or not. For instance, in May 1906, Captain Hay of the 107th Pioneers had his promotion to major checked because he had not passed the necessary examination and because, although he possessed good general ability and self-reliance, he showed no ‘zeal or willingness for hard work’ according to his commanding officer. Hay’s case is straightforward as he had served the appropriate amount of time
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but had not successfully undertaken the necessary examination. Other cases were not so clear-cut.

A Major Charles Davidson received praise from his commanding officer and inspecting officer in the annual confidential reports on him between 1901 and 1903. By 1905 however Davidson was being reported as not fit for command. This was largely due to his ongoing ill-health. His commanding officer praised Davidson as ‘a steady, good, hard worker’, a good shot, and as having the power to impart knowledge to his men. But subsequent reports from the inspecting officer and the District Commander recommended Davidson’s promotion be retarded due to his physical inability. This was confirmed by Kitchener and his council.108

Kitchener also made changes to the regulation regarding regimental commanding officers. Kitchener suggested that the period of regimental command be kept at seven years. The Commander-in-Chief introduced a new regulation that commanding officers deemed unfit for the role be removed by himself and his council after five years in the position. Alongside this change Kitchener reduced the age at which an officer had to vacate a regimental command. In 1903 this age was 52, but Kitchener reduced it to 50.109 His reasoning behind these two changes were relayed by his Adjutant-General, Beauchamp Duff, to the Viceroy’s military secretary:

The efficiency of fighting units depends in a large measure on the regimental officers, particularly on the Commanding Officers, who, besides possessing the necessary personal qualifications, must be young and energetic and capable of undergoing the hardships of active service. It is admitted that the present system fails to produce good results. What we want to provide for is, that the able and hardworking officer shall in future earn more rapid promotion by exercise of his abilities and by a strict attention to his duties, while those who neglect the study of their profession, or for other reasons fall short of the standard, will be prevented from rising beyond such rank as their qualification may justify.110

Kitchener also took issue with officers spending too long on civil employ and not on military duty being able to gain promotion and a larger pension. Again, Duff relayed Kitchener’s concerns:
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As regards officers in civil employ the commander-in-chief is of the opinion that they should not receive military promotion at all after date of their permanent transfer to such employ, for it is absolutely indefensible to allow men who are civilians in every sense of the word to receive military rank because they happen to have entered upon a military career which they relinquished on the first opportunity. 111

Kitchener wished to see periods on civil employ discounted when considering promotions and pensions. The temporary transfer of men from regimental duties to civil employ had always been a problem for the Indian Army. Officer absenteeism is often given as a reason for the military mutiny in 1857. In the first half of the nineteenth century as the territory controlled by the EIC expanded rapidly the need for civil administrators, political officers, surveyors, and engineers amongst others also grew. The majority of these civilian or staff roles came with much better wages than that of a regimental posting which encouraged many officers to abandon their regiment at the first opportunity. This was a particular problem in the Bengal Army as the EIC pushed northward. By 1852 the Bengal Army was providing on average six officers per regiment for employment elsewhere. In the Bombay Army this figure was five per regiment and in Madras it was an average of three per regiment. Though offering no additional figures for men on sick leave or furlough, David suggests that these in addition to the men on civil or staff employ counted for over half of a Bengal regiment’s 24 officers by May 1857. Most of those missing held the rank of captain or above. Regimental service in the EIC was merely a stepping stone for most men onto the more lucrative civil employ. 112

Professional Discussions

The various reforms to the entrance and promotion regulations of the Indian Army were intended to provide it with a higher level of professionalism. The formation of the United Services Institute of India (USI India) in 1870 and the subsequent publication of the journal from 1872 suggests that the officer corps itself had begun to recognise the greater need for change. The journal was used to share ideas, discuss best practice and report on foreign armies. The British equivalent, Journal of the Royal United Service Institution, had been first published in 1857 – the Royal United Services Institution (RUSI) having been founded in 1831 by the Duke of Wellington.
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Officers of both British and Indian service wrote for the USI India. Some of the early articles published were concerned with the uniform and equipment of the Indian Army. But amongst these early articles, there was one that pointed the way to things to come; ‘Non-Commissioned Officer’s School in Prussia’ by Captain E.F. Chapman.\(^\text{113}\) The discussion of European methods and the translation of articles from foreign periodicals became a common feature of the USI India. Some articles were focused on the application of European weapons and techniques to India, whilst others were simply reports of manoeuvres or operations that had taken place on the continent. As the nineteenth century progressed Prussia, and later Germany, began to be viewed as the leading military power in Europe and as such the USI India saw a considerable number of articles written or translated on the subject.\(^\text{114}\) This was at a time when a similar debate was being had in Britain. There was a campaign in the late nineteenth century for the British Army to adopt a General Staff system like that of Germany. When the 29\(^{th}\) Brigade sailed to Egypt as part of 10\(^{th}\) Indian Division in 1914 they initially believed they were to sail to France and face the Germans. In preparation to face the Germans in Europe the commander of the 29\(^{th}\) Brigade, Brigadier-General Cox, had his officers lecture their men on German methods of fighting and how they were to be faced. The USI India articles may well have provided a base for the knowledge used to give these lectures on board the troops ships.\(^\text{115}\) Cox himself wrote a number of articles on the impact of the magazine rifle on tactics, training for jungle warfare, and the use of communications in the field amongst others.\(^\text{116}\)

The USI India also served as a forum for discussion regarding recent conflicts and how the experience of them might prompt changes in training, tactics or weaponry. There were articles published on the Lushai Expedition, the Tirah Campaign, the three wars with Burma and the two wars in Afghanistan. The Second South African War, 1899-1902,  
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generated particular interest amongst the USI India writers. The difficulty in overcoming
the Boers in South Africa provided stimulus for debate. Acknowledging that the military
record of any major nation was blotted by defeat and disaster, one officer wrote:

It is the duty, none the less sacred because unpleasant, of the rising generation of
British officers carefully to study the cause of our recent ill-successes, in order to
prepare for a possible struggle with sterner, more powerful, and better informed
enemies than the peasant soldiers of the two South African Republics. The materials
or such a study are now within our reach; nor need we fear the accusation of dictating
from the safety of an Indian cantonment how battles should have been fought in
South Africa… a bird's-eye view is in such cases not unfrequently more correct than
the vivider recollection of those who, having taken part in the strife, carry before
their eyes with undue prominence the thrilling incident of the operations which they
themselves happen to have witnessed.\(^{117}\)

The same writer, credited as simply ‘CB’, went on to make a number of accurate
assertions about the changing nature of warfare and the lessons of the Second South
African War. Amongst them was the observation that the battalion was too large a unit to
be controlled in battle. Tactically it would be more beneficial to give more responsibility
to company commanders and use the company as the main tactical unit in battle. This was
a view shared with many who sought to analyse the conflict.\(^{118}\) The same article and a
second which was published in the following issue, written by Lieutenant-Colonel
Ranken of the 46th Punjab Infantry, also asserted that more individuality had been shown
by the Boers and needed to be shown by British and Imperial troops also. They argued
that disciplined volley fire by well drilled troops had its merits in conflicts against
unorganised, poorly equipped enemies but had been proved wholly insufficient against
the astute Boers. As such new drill and training was required, Ranken wrote:

The drill of by-gone days had, as its object, the training of automata, not the
development of individuality; our object must be to combine the mechanical
obedience of disciplined troops with the development to the highest extent possible,
of individuality.\(^{119}\)

Some thought had been given over to the need for more initiative within the
British and Indian armies prior to the Second South African War but it was not a widely
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held belief. The initial setbacks against the Boers highlighted the need to improve both
the initiative and intelligence of the ordinary British soldier. This move away from rigid
formations created a further problem, junior officers had more responsibility but not the
necessary training. Evidence presented to the Elgin Commission, set up in the wake of
the conflict, called for men and officers to be trained for and to accept greater
responsibility and display more initiative.\textsuperscript{120} It is against this backdrop that men such as
C.B. and Ranken were discussing similar matters and attempting to apply the lessons they
were drawing to the Indian Army. Captain W.B. James tried to draw on some of these
lessons in his writing by looking to apply them to practical training. In relation to the
infantry James concluded that they required ‘increased practice in taking cover and
advancing intelligently under cover’ and offered up suggested training routines to foster
this.\textsuperscript{121}

The very fact that these debates and discussions were taking place in India whilst
the Second South African War was ongoing and that the correct lessons were drawn from
the conflict – and other conflicts were also analysed – is indicative of a body of men
looking to share ideas and improve the Indian Army’s capabilities. The studying of
European armies and the translation of foreign writings is also suggestive of a body of
men looking to learn from a variety of sources as well as research potential enemies. This
points to two things: firstly, professionalisation and modernisation did not come solely
from above, the process also came from below and officers in regimental positions shared
and discussed ideas for improvement. Secondly, the professionalisation from below is a
result of the professionalisation from above. Had there not been a concerted effort to
improve the quality of officers within the Indian Staff Corps, the possibility of \textit{The
Journal of the United Services Institution of India} being used for professional debates
about training, tactics and other military matters would have been greatly diminished.

\textbf{Conclusion}
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During the period 1861 to 1909 there was an overall awareness of the shortcomings in the system by which Indian Army officers were selected, trained, and promoted. This process of reform was begun by Sir Hugh Rose. The period is characterised by attempts to correct the inefficiencies within the officer corps. When Kitchener arrived in India in 1902 there was still several deficiencies in the system by which British officers were commissioned and promoted. Some of these deficiencies had been present in the EIC Army and had gone unchanged since the 1857 Rebellion. There was certainly some success in providing the Indian Army with a higher calibre of officer, but the officer corps was still dogged with several problems by the time of the Great War. The fact officers now had to pass through Sandhurst or university before being accepted into the Indian Army was a marked change from the EIC and the commissioning of officers with prior training or education. Further changes to the promotion system also show a great professionalisation of the officer corps.

The process of modernisation and improvement was helped by the abolition of the purchase system and the opening up of India to a wider range of potential transferees. Nigel Woodyatt’s interview with the Deputy Adjutant-General points to a continued problem with amateurism but Woodyatt himself is an example of the broadening pool of prospective officers brought about by the changes made to the British Army. Woodyatt enjoyed his life in India and decided to stay. Patronage, or jobbery, remained in the Indian Army despite Rose’s attempts to eradicate it. This, however, shows no signs of affecting the efficiency of the Indian Army. Roberts, Wolsely and Beresford may have helped the sons and relations of their friends advance but these were still capable officers. There were of course men who slipped through this system. In Chapter 5, this study will show what happened when men of the wrong calibre mistreated their men and caused mutiny amongst them.

The First World War interrupted this prolonged campaign of reform and modernisation. The demands of total war dealt the Indian Army officer corps, and the Indian Army as a whole, a series of setbacks in its attempts at reform. The steadily improved pool of officers created by decades of change and improvement was diluted by an influx of unskilled officers and the high casualty rate of the Great War. The case of Sargisson highlights the amateurism that crept into the Indian Army due to the burden of the 1914-1918 War. Also, the case of Goulden, promoted from British Army sergeant, shows that men unsuitable for the officer corps had to be promoted to meet demand.
Having now established the process by which officers were recruited, trained and promoted and also assessed the origins of these men, this thesis will now analyse how the process of professionalisation and modernisation impacted on the day-to-day running of the Indian Army, effectively putting this process to the test. To this end how officers of the Indian Army led their sepoys both on cantonment and also in the field will be assessed. An important aspect of the following chapter is how officers fostered a good relationship with their men – something that had been severely diminished in 1857 and is cited as a cause of the military mutiny. Finally, Chapter 4 will measure how the First World War affected the officer-man relationship given the influx of both Indian soldiers and British officers brought about by the demands of total war.
Chapter 4:

'For Heaven's sake, my children, form square and steadily!'¹

The officer-man relationship

Introduction

Having established how the military authorities reformed and modernised the Indian Army officer corps, particularly how there was a concerted effort to raise the efficiency of officers by standardising entry and promotion requirements, this chapter looks to put the theory of these reform to the test by looking at how officers interacted with their men, their approach to training them, and leading them in battle. The key aspect to all of this was the maintaining of a good working relationship with the sepoys and preserving good morale. The maintenance of morale has become a key principle of war. J. G. Shillington, a British officer who saw combat during the First World War, asserted that morale could be described as having three main ingredients: confidence and pride in the self; confidence and pride in leaders, and confidence and pride in the team. For Shillington team could be anything from a section or platoon up to an entire nation or assemblage of nations. No matter what the size of the group, or team, mutual trust was essential.² Clausewitz divided morale into two components. Firstly, the ‘mood’. The mood of a group is a transient thing, which can change quickly. Secondly, there is the ‘spirit’. The military spirit is much more resistant. It is what keeps cohesion in the heat of battle and in the face of defeat. This military spirit is created in two ways, argued Clausewitz: by waging successful campaigns and by testing an army to its very limit. So according to Clausewitz the morale of a group can remain intact throughout a war but that does not necessarily mean that soldiers, either individual or units, have to be entirely happy all of the time.³ Shillington was clearly writing about what Clausewitz would call the military spirit. An ethos of fighting for each other, fighting for leaders, and fighting for the self has to be fostered over time and cannot be eroded through one downturn in results on the

¹ Major Ashe, Personal Records of the Kandahar Campaign by Officers Engaged Therein (London; David Bogue, 1881), p. 84.
battlefield. A single defeat would affect the mood according to Clausewitz. Likewise, a change in circumstance is, for Clausewitz, not enough to diminish the spirit on its own. It takes a combination of factors to soften the military spirit of a group.

The aim of this chapter is to establish just how important British officers were in the maintenance of morale in the Indian Army. To do this, the Clauswitzian concept of mood and spirit will be applied to the sepoys of the Indian Army. The end goal is to ascertain what combined to create the military spirit of Indian sepoys and subsequently how significant a contributor the British officer was to this spirit. Was the British officer the only contributor to their sepoys’ spirit? Or were there several factors affecting the mood and spirit of the Indian troops? Firstly, this chapter will analyse how officers trained their men. Previously studies have analysed the ways in which the British and Indian military adjusted to the unique circumstances of the North-West Frontier, but this is not applied to lower level learning. This chapter will assess how officers imparted their knowledge to the sepoys beneath them. Secondly, the officers’ contribution to Indian regiments’ performance in battle will be analysed. Conventional wisdom during the period in question was that childlike Indian troops could not stand the strain of battle without their British officers present. The blame was often placed on the early loss of British officers in instances where an Indian unit or units had fallen back, or worse. According to Gary Sheffield, the officer-man relationship in both the Indian and British armies followed the pattern of a ‘country house’. The officer, as if a landlord, would expect loyalty and deference from his soldiers, or tenants, in exchange for paternalism and leadership. This idea of paternalism was a widely held Victorian principle that continued into the Edwardian period. First World War. Regular officers held the idea that discipline could be maintained because the regiment was a community, officers and men were bound together through a common interest and shared values. The paternalist creed was noblesse oblige, the privileged were required to discharge their responsibility. Part of this responsibility was to provide help and guidance to those less fortunate. Often, this resulted in men being treated as if like children, a belief that was applied to the peoples of India almost wholesale.4 Previous works on morale, discipline and the officer-man relationship in the period under study here have focused on homogeneous forces, whose

The bond between men and their officers helped to maintain both discipline and morale. More recently, through scrutiny of Indian soldiers’ letters David Omissi has argued that British officers were not as important to sepoys as they believed. Omissi asserts that British officers were only mentioned in letters when they resolved a dispute, presented a medal, or when a well-regarded man was killed. Omissi takes this to mean that the Indian soldiers were indifferent to their British commanders. Ultimately, this chapter aims to show that the British officer was an important part of the process of both training and fighting for the Indian Army. An efficient, conscientious officer could both prepare his men for war and inspire them to fight effectively and gallantly in it. The rate of success for this was variable, dependent on the officer in question. In effect this chapter puts much of the changes, particularly the weeding out of ineffectual officers discussed in Chapter 3, to the test, questioning just how effective the process of reform was, from the 1860s through to the First World War by which time all remnants of the defunct EIC Army had been removed or retired.

Particular analysis will be applied to the campaign against King Téwodros of Abyssinia in 1867-68 and Mesopotamia 1914-16. Whilst, it should be acknowledged that the Indian Army was under considerably more stress during the First World War, this analysis can still show how an officer in the higher echelons of the Army could affect Indian morale through his actions. The reason for selecting these two case studies is that there are a number of similarities between the two campaigns. These include the difficulties of climate, resupply and medical care, amongst others. In Abyssinia, however, Indian morale held, and the campaign was a success. In Mesopotamia the morale of the sepoys was eroded to the point at which they could not perform effectively.

The Regimental System

---

One of the chief causes of the military mutiny in 1857 was the failure of native officers to report the well-springs of discontent to their British commanders. They were not aware of the disgruntlement, they were too weak to act, or they themselves were dissatisfied. After the Rebellion, it was decided that the standing of the native officer should be heightened. Indian Army units were to be reorganised along the lines of irregular units. A number of older officers were pensioned off and others posted to staff positions in order to cover the reduction in the number of officers required. The irregular system, and the process of cultivated loyalty, had worked for men such as Sir John Jacob. His two battalions, 1st and 2nd Scinde Irregular Horse, were so devoted to him that when the rebellion began they remained loyal despite the fact he was not in India at the time. Jacob’s two battalions were made up predominantly of Hindustani Muslims from Delhi and the United Provinces. They were the same class of most of the regular sepoys who mutinied. Only ten of the Bengal Army’s 18 irregular cavalry regiments joined the rebellion – almost all of the regular regiments in Bengal mutinied.

As a result of these changes Indian officers thrived and proved more than capable of leading troops and commanding outposts miles away from their European superiors. From 1863 onwards, a battalion would have seven British officers. The job of these men was largely as supervisors, native officers commanded companies (infantry) and troops (cavalry). As the historian of the Royal Deccan Horse put it: ‘The paucity of British Officers has this advantage – that it throws more work, responsibility and independence upon the Indian officers, thus increasing their efficiency, which is liable to deteriorate when everything is done by the British officers.’ Financially, the irregular system was attractive to the government and military authorities of India. Fewer British officers meant lower costs.

In August 1876, it was decided that the number of British officers with a native battalion should remain at seven with 16 native officers. It was felt that this was ample for the duties carried out during peace-time. It was also financially desirable for the government of India to retain the same number of British officers and not make any

---

increases. It was agreed that in wartime, if necessary, the government could temporarily attach additional British officers to battalions on campaign from men seconded to civilian posts, on furlough or simply from regiments on garrison duty. These seven British and 16 Indian officers commanded a battalion that numbered 712 men. The Second Anglo-Afghan War highlighted to the authorities the fragility of the system. It was felt that several of the reverses suffered during that campaign were due to the lack of officers in Indian battalions. A battalion only needed to lose three officers and its British officers were halved. The authorities also decided to increase the number of sepoys in a battalion, as ‘under the stress of service’ they suffered heavy losses. In 1882 the number of sepoys per battalion was raised from 712 to 832, bringing it closer in line to the number of men in a British Army battalion. In the same year the number of British officers was also increased from seven to ten.

By the time of the First World War the number of British officers was up to 14 on average, with the same 16 native officers, and around 900 sepoys or sowars. Michael Creese has charted the increase in the 1/14th Punjab Regiment, formerly 5th Bengal Native Infantry. Prior to 1786 the 1/14th had just 3 British officers and 20 native officers, plus three British sergeants. By 1824 the regiment’s British contingent had increased to 23 officers but still had 17 native officers. In 1861, as part of the post-mutiny reductions the battalion had five British officers, plus one medical officer, and still had 17 native officers. Five years later this number was six British officers, but there remained just one medical officer and 17 native officers. By 1878 and the onset of the Second Afghan War, battalions consisted of nine British officers and one medical officer. There had also been a reduction in native officers to 15. Finally, when the First World War broke out in 1914 the number of British officers had increased to 12, there remained one medical officer, and the native officer contingent had returned to 17.

The irregular system was never fully taken up in the 1860s in the Bengal Army, only a small number of regiments were remodelled in Bombay, and the planned introduction of it in Madras was cancelled entirely after the idea was met with ill will.

---
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The hostility towards the change was captured in the *Times of India*. In an anonymous letter to the editor in 1865 someone claiming to be a regular cavalry man of the Madras Army laid down his objections to the change of system. Firstly, the writer argued that a number of older officers, formerly of the EIC, were good line officers but would be ill suited to the irregular system: ‘men of about thirty years’ service, who although good steady officers for regular regiments are not the style of men to infuse that spirit and dash which is considered essential qualities in an irregular one.’\(^{16}\) Thus men with the required gallantry and knowledge would have to be selected to command the new irregular battalions. This would put younger men of lower rank above majors or lieutenant-colonels with twenty or thirty years’ experience as was the traditional way within irregular cavalry units of the EIC. Men were to be specially selected based on ability not seniority. This aggrieved several officers and in 1865 the matter was brought to parliament in the form of a petition, signed by 750 officers of all ranks in Indian service. Secretary of State for India, Sir Charles Wood, had to defend the India Army’s proposed new selection process. Wood used historical precedent referring to the Army List of 1856, he claimed that the 3rd Irregular Cavalry had been commanded by a lieutenant, whilst the second in command was a captain. Similarly, the 14th Irregular Regiment was at that time commanded by a captain, and a major was second in command. He argued that the Indian Army was ‘acting in accordance with old practice in the time of the East India Company.’\(^{17}\)

Wood went on to point out that in the Indian Army an officer could only be superseded by a junior officer if he gave his consent.\(^{18}\) This suggests an officer had to recognise of his own accord that he was ill suited to commanding an irregular unit and submit to being subordinate to a junior officer. Wood was able to account for a number of the signatories of the petition as having no grounds for grievance, but he could certainly not account for all 750. Clearly, a sizeable number of the Indian Army officer corps had taken exception to the irregular system and its process of advancement.

Another argument made in the same letter to the *Times of India* was that the sepoys of Madras would be ill-suited to the change of system. The writer claimed that Madras sepoys required ‘constant and strict’ European supervision, without this they would be

---

\(^{16}\) Regular, ‘To the Editor of the “Times of India”’, *The Times of India* (2 August 1865), p. 2.
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‘about as useless an animal as there is on the face of the earth’. By comparison, the author noted, Northern tribesmen were accustomed to handling arms from youth and grew up to be soldiers. ‘Put them behind good officers and they will go ahead as well as Europeans’, stated the writer. He then claimed that a Madras regiment needed a full complement of officers in order to guarantee that a Madras cavalry regiment parades well. An irregular cavalry unit from Madras would make for a far less impressive sight on parade according to the complainant.19 This bias against Madras sepoys’ ability was widely held and fostered in the following decades, bolstering the Martial Race theory.20 The final argument put forward by this particular writer was that part of the reason that the Madras Army did not mutiny in 1857 was that they had their families with them in the cantonment. This was not the case in irregular units, which moved around with much more frequency. The writer claimed that removing the families from cantonments would dampen the loyalty of the Madras sepoys and also make the service less popular in Southern India.21

The letter and others like it and the petition to parliament highlight the objections within the Indian Army to the blanket adoption of the irregular system. Previous histories of the Indian Army have noted the increase in British officers over time without offering explanations for why the irregular system was phased out. Often the sole explanation for any increase is T.A. Heathcote’s assertion that the Second Anglo-Afghan War showed the system to be flawed in combat. Yet, there was clearly considerable objection from within the officer corps of the Indian Army itself to the continuation and further implementation of the irregular system prior to the outbreak of hostilities with Afghanistan in 1878. The opposition to the Irregular System was so strong that it had to be debated in parliament. It was quickly recognised that not all officers and not all regiments were suited to the irregular system. The process of halting and reducing the irregular system was underway before the Second Anglo-Afghan War.

As previously stated, the irregular system was financially attractive to the authorities of the Raj. But to be financially viable the system required total devotion from the British officers. Men like Skinner and Jacob spent all of their time with their regiments without taking lengthy furlough or leave of any kind. In the post-mutiny irregular units

---
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the officers were not willing to go without the annual leave to which they were entitled. In order to cater for this many regiments had to have two lieutenant-colonels, one to cover whilst the other was on leave, and also double up further down the chain of command. In another anonymous piece in the *Times of India* the case of the 14th Bombay Native Infantry was highlighted. It noted in 1872 the 14th BNI had ten officers but only five or six were ever with the battalion at any one time. There was supposed to be seven. Theoretically there should have been one lieutenant-colonel in command, one major as second in command and senior wing commander, one captain as junior wing commander, and four lieutenants, two to act as wing subalterns, and one each as adjutant and quartermaster. In the 14th to cover for furlough and because men had been promoted after length of service without them having a more senior position to fill there were: one full colonel on furlough; four lieutenant-colonels, two on furlough, one temporarily in command, and, one as second in command; one major as a junior wing commander; three captains as adjutant, quartermaster, and, wing subaltern; and, one lieutenant as a wing subaltern. This was costly. Instead of costing Rs 4,395 per month the 14th’s officer’s wages were Rs 6,071, even with those on furlough being on half pay.\(^{22}\) The lack of positions available also caused a large number of officers’ careers to stagnate. For example, the lieutenant-colonels in the 14th BNI should each have had command of their own battalion. This highlights that while in theory the irregular system was desirable, in reality it was costly to implement and undesirable on the part of many officers.

**Infantilisation and Martiality**

The Victorians believed Indians to be incapable of adult behaviour of their own accord. Naïve, childlike sepoys needed British officers to lead them and stiffen their resolve. As shown in Chapter 2, officers of the Indian Army had fathers who were connected to either India, the military or both. In many cases officers were born on the subcontinent. As such, these men would have been familiar with the Victorian concepts regarding sepoys. Officers would have arrived in India with preconceived notions of martial races and of infantilisation.

The problems pertaining to the loss of officers was highlighted during the Second Anglo-Afghan conflict. Historians of the Indian Army often cite its failings in this conflict to highlight the inadequacies of the irregular system. This is linked to the Victorian
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discourse of infantilising Indian soldiers. At the Battle of Maiwand, July 1880, the 30th Bombay Infantry, or Jacob’s Rifles, lost their officers and fell into disarray. When a group of Afghan cavalry attempted to rush the British, two companies of Jacob’s Rifles were detached to stop them. They were successful but at a price. They lost their two Subahdars and their British officer. Though the disciplined fire of the Indian regiments was able to prevent the Afghans getting too close, their artillery was taking its toll, eating away at morale with every fresh casualty.23 Jacob’s Rifles, consisting mainly of raw Pashtun recruits, began to move backwards. They retreated into the 66th Berkshire Regiment. This upheaval allowed the Afghans to get in amongst the 66th who had provided the backbone of the British line. The fighting devolved into small stands of British troops and sepoys against the marauding Afghans; each of these pockets of resistance eventually gave way. One eyewitness wrote of the ensuing chaos: ‘My spirit of discipline was indeed shocked to see that our men were becoming more like wild beasts than human beings.’24

Ashe, a former serving soldier turned author, wrote after the battle: ‘Had Jacob’s Rifles been officered up to their full complement, there is every reason to believe they would have made a better stand in front of the foe. As it was, they, having lost their leaders, gave way to panic… being completely demoralised.’25 In truth the lack of experience amongst the Pashtun troops of Jacob’s Rifles would have contributed to the chaotic withdrawal as much, if not more so, than the loss of the officers. However, this was not discussed as a factor in the defeat at the time.

This idea endured well into the First World War and beyond. During the battle of First Ypres, (19 October-22 November 1914), the Indian Corps was required to haphazardly fill gaps in the British line. The 2/8th Gurkhas had only been in position at the front for a matter of hours on 29th October when the German artillery began to bombard them. The Germans soon got the exact range of the Gurkhas trench, which was little more than a drainage ditch. The parapet was so high the Gurkhas had to stand on ammunition boxes or ration crates to fire over it. Over the next 18 hours the Germans made a number of attacks against the Gurkha trench whilst mortar, high explosive, and shrapnel shells rained down on them. The attacks were never pushed home by the Germans, suggesting they were probing for a weak spot. Nonetheless the assaults and the
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artillery barrage took its toll on the 2/8th. Small groups of the regiment’s reserves had to be constantly fed into the trench to replace killed or wounded comrades. By 4pm of the 30th the trench had been virtually flattened and the Gurkhas were exhausted. In all the 2/8th lost 208 men. 10 British officers were killed, wounded or missing, as were five Gurkha VCOs. The few remaining VCOs decided to lead a retreat. This enabled the Germans to take the trench and press on and take the reserve trench also. A counter attack retook the reserve trench.26 The decision to retreat once there was no remaining British officer to command the 2/8th represented an inherent flaw in the abilities of the Indian soldier for the Indian Corps’ official historians:

So ended a terrible night and day, an experience which, as an eye-witness testified, would have shaken the moral[e] of any troops, however seasoned. Much more trying was it, then, to the Gurkhas, newly arrived, fresh to the work, handicapped by imperfect and unsuitable trenches, by the failure of ammunition, and, above all, by the heavy losses suffered by their British officers, on whom the Indian soldier, be he Sikh or Gurkha, Pathan or Dogra, is dependent… for leading and control.27

Similarly, the 1914 Battle of Tanga is an example of officer loss being blamed for failure without the proper examination of other factors. According to Ross Anderson, ‘the first setback occurred when accurate machine-gun fire swept the Rajput Line, wounding their commanding officer and killing several officers. This shook morale and the brigade commander was forced to deploy his only reserves.’28 Much like the arguments surrounding Maiwand, Anderson’s discussion about Tanga fails to make clear that the Indian Army units attacking were raw recruits, most of whom had never faced machine gun fire before, even in training. Furthermore, the troops belonging to Indian Expeditionary Force B (IEFB), which attacked at Tanga, had been afloat for over a month by the time of the attack and therefore not fit for an attack immediately upon landing.29 Therefore, the mood of the troops in IEFB was affected by a series of problems, not simply the loss of their officers as suggested by Anderson.

This belief that the Indian sepoys were childlike and unable to perform their duties without the leadership of their British officer was an established concept by the time of

27 Merewether & Smith, *The Indian Corps in France*, p. 74.
the Second Anglo-Afghan conflict. The British press began regularly covering the wars of the EIC in India from the 1820s onwards. This was sparked by public fascination with the First Anglo-Burmese War, (1824-26). Tales of war had always sold papers but prior to this the pages of British newspapers had been filled with stories related to the wars with France. A notable exception to this was the campaign against Tipu Sultan led by Lord Cornwallis in the 1790s. But this too was part of the wider struggle against Revolutionary France.

This interest gained momentum through the First Afghan War (1839-42), the two Sikh Wars (1845-6 and 1848-9), and the 1857 Rebellion. Often, articles would be written by serving officers either of their experience of campaigns or battles or critiques of the military system – frequently these were anonymous. In these pieces the Indian leaders were painted as cruel, unreasonable despots. The bravery and fanaticism of the troops in service of these despotic rulers was often emphasised. This courage and zeal, however, could not overcome the stoic British soldier, with his disciplined fire and modern arms. In cases when the native armies had modern weapons, particularly artillery, they were unable to make full use of it. If a native army did successfully deploy artillery it was credited to them being trained by Europeans or that the guns were in fact manned by Europeans. Fanaticism over discipline and a lack of technological capabilities reassured the British reader that an Indian Army was incapable of defeating an organised European adversary.  

The sepoys in British employ were stereotyped in a similar manner. By the third decade of the nineteenth century the Indian communities who served the EIC were each characterised and ranked. The Gurkhas were seen as martial tribes, the Sikhs as being naturally brave, and the Hindu as patient.  

Contrasts were drawn between east and west and feminine and masculine. The historian J.W. Kaye wrote in 1857: ‘The sepoy is very credulous. There is indeed a childlike simplicity in the readiness with which he believes and ponders over the most absurd story’. Another, anonymous, contemporary wrote ‘Jack Sepoy is, in many respects, quite a child.’ It became the accepted idea that Indians were incapable of
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individual thought or objectiveness. They needed their officer to lead them on the battlefield and instil courage within them. This childlike, feminised image of the Indian soldier became the stereotypical image in Britain and the West. At the disastrous Battle of Maiwand, the colonel of the Bombay Grenadiers is said to have attempted to halt the scrappy retreat by calling out: 'For Heaven's sake, my children, form square and steadily!' Whether this statement is true or not, it highlights both the Victorian view of the sepoy and the paternal officer-man relationship that officers believed existed within their regiments. Between publications produced in Britain and previous knowledge gained from family connections to India, officers joining the Indian Army in the late Victorian period and beyond would join with preconceived notions of sepoys race and nature.

The development of the martial race theory encouraged officers to seek opportunities in North India with regiments containing Sikhs, Gurkhas, Jats or Pathans. Many of the people regarded as non-martial were excluded from the Indian Army altogether. Such scientific selection had to be abandoned to meet the manpower requirements of the First World War. For the most part, the previously ostracised people who were introduced into the army during the Great War performed admirably, but afterwards the Indian Army returned to its preferred few.

The prejudice of officers could affect the training and development of newly raised battalions from non-martial societies. For instance, in 1917 Basil Amies was posted to a newly formed Bengali Battalion, much to the amusement of his fellow officers in the mess. The 49th Bengalis, as the battalion was officially designated, had been created for political reasons so that, as Amies put it, ‘the unwarlike people of Bengal might be stimulated into the war effort’. Bengalis had been known as a martial race up until the Tirah Campaign of 1897. Their poor performance in that campaign led to an official investigation. The conclusion was reached that Bengal’s Muslim soldiers had deteriorated as soldiers. Amies noted that all of the British officers posted to the battalion had a low opinion of their men. This affected training as the officers had little faith in the Bengali
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troops being able to adopt the ways of a soldier. Lieutenant-Colonel ‘Boomer’ Barrett, commanding officer of the 49th, reported that they were ‘congenital maniacs’ and paralytic idiots’. According to Amies, this condemnation would be repeated in Indian Army circles for many years afterwards. In comparison, Ian MacDonald, an IARO man from the Ceylon Civil Service, noted that he was glad to have ‘northern soldiers’ in his regiment. He stated in an interview that he could not explain why this was, but it was likely that he had some understanding of the martial race theory and had accepted the idea by virtue of the fact the officers who was working alongside believed in it. To return to the ideas of Shillington, the approach of Barrett and his subordinates could not have fostered faith in either one’s self or in the team, both of which are required to generate high morale.

Pay, Rations, and Rewards – a Contract?

In the era of the Mughals Indian troops would often mutiny over a lack of pay or rations. In both the EIC and Indian armies pay was certain, this was a considerable draw for potential soldiers. However, this did not mean that there were not limits on sepoys’ willingness to carry out orders. Nikolas Gardner has asserted that sepoys performed ‘a defined set of tasks over a specified duration’. In return for this service they received a range of ‘tangible and intangible rewards and benefits’. Some of these rewards were the traditional ones of regular pay and rations, sufficient medical care, and pensions for sepoys and their families should they be killed or wounded. Gardner also suggests that Indian soldiers expected their British officers to respect their religious ceremonies and dietary requirements. This was, according to Gardner, to all intents and purposes a contractual agreement. Morale could drop if sepoys felt their officers or the high command were not meeting their contractual obligations.

Gardner based his argument on the experiences of 6th Indian Division in Mesopotamia in 1915 and 1916. Indian Expeditionary Force D (IEFD) was despatched as soon as the Ottoman Empire declared war on Britain in November 1914. The aim was to expel Ottoman forces from Mesopotamia and secure local oilfields. After initial

40 IWM, Sound Archive, 9149, Ian Pendlebury MacDonald, Reel 1.
42 Ibid., pp. 3-4.
victories against a disorganised enemy the Indian government began to eye Baghdad. Taking the Mesopotamian capital had no strategic value but would impress the Arabs in the region.43 The 6th Indian Division under Major-General Charles Townshend was given the task of taking the Mesopotamian capital. The division advanced towards Baghdad with a lack of logistical support. The port facilities at Basra were extremely poor and the IEFD lacked sufficient river transport to supply the 6th Division as it advanced along the Tigris River. These deficiencies lead to shortages of warm clothes, blankets, boots, tents, and, most importantly, rations. The Indian government were only able to send out onions and potatoes to Mesopotamia in 1915. These would often be spoilt due to a lack of cold storage once they arrived in the country. Sepoys received less rations than British troops but a greater allowance so that they could purchase food in accordance to their religious custom and caste. In Mesopotamia the necessary food could not be regularly procured. As early as March 1915 scurvy began to be noticed in the Indian ranks. It became more prevalent as the campaign progressed.44

A lack of clean drinking water led soldiers to contract dysentery and during the summer of 1915 cases of malaria increased also. There was a shortage of medical supplies to deal with all these diseases and the casualties of battle. The IEFD was short of ambulance beds, stretcher-bearers, and importantly medical officers. The suffering of sick men was prolonged and wounded soldiers had to be left on the battlefield. The problem was compounded by the fact there was only one transport ship available to take sick and wounded men from both East Africa and Mesopotamia to Bombay.45 Townshend’s force was able to defeat the Ottoman Sixth Army at the Battle of Es Sinn, which allowed him to capture the town of Kut. The Ottoman forces reformed and dug in north of Kut at the ancient city of Ctesiphon. Being less than 22 miles from Baghdad meant that the Turks could reinforce and resupply much more easily than 6th Indian Division. Townshend was defeated at Ctesiphon in November 1915 and forced back to Kut, where he was besieged.46

43 Townshend, When God Made Hell, pp. 38-41.
45 Garnder, Siege of Kut-al-Amara, pp. 6-7.
The siege would last from 7 December 1915 to 29 April 1916. Several relief attempts were made to no avail. Inside the besieged town the conditions worsened. Pack horses had to be slaughtered to provide meat for the troops. British soldiers received eight ounces of bread and one and a quarter pounds of horsemeat. Indian troops were given 12 ounces of horse meat, ten ounces of flour, and four ounces of parched barley. Most Indian troops, however, refused the meat meaning they needed additional grain rations. This abstention caused ill feeling between the British and Indian soldiers and between the sepoys and their British officers. The flour and barley was enough to keep the sepoys alive but was not sufficient to support any strenuous activity, either work or battle. The malnourishment also rendered the sepoys more susceptible to disease. There was a feeling amongst the British that the Indian soldier could not stand up to the requirements of modern war due to their caste and religious prejudices. For example, Henry Gallup, of the 1/5th Hampshire Howitzer Battery, Royal Field Artillery, wrote: ‘People were getting weaker [and] there was a deal of sickness, especially among the Indian troops who had of course brought a great deal of it on themselves by refusing to eat horseflesh until the last few days.’

Townshend himself was reluctant to issue a direct order that all should eat horseflesh as he feared that the meat of 1916 might inspire mutiny in the same way greased cartridges had in 1857. Part of the problem was that no one caste wanted to be the first to give in in the face of other castes. Even after permission was sent for and received from Rajahs and Brahmin in India for the sepoys to eat horse flesh many still refused. The sepoys could neither fight to defend Kut nor work to shore up its defences. Townshend attempted erroneously to buoy Indian morale in March by telling them that the siege would be over within a month. This simply encouraged the abstaining Indians to continue their refusal to eat horseflesh as they expected to be relieved and back on regular rations in the not-too-distant future. When Townshend’s claim never materialised the soldiers’ faith in him deteriorated along with their health. Ultimately, the garrison capitulated.

The despatching of 6th Indian Division to capture Baghdad was undertaken without the appropriate chains of supply in place. Robert Cornelis Napier, later Lord Napier of Magdala, was given a similar task in 1867-8 but chose instead to take his time

preparing for the operation. This decision risked the scorn of his superiors but ultimately proved vindicated. By patiently building up his supplies and equipment he made sure that the troops under his command were not unduly deprived. In return the Indian soldiers under Napier’s command – of the 13,500 troops despatched from Bombay in 1868, 9,800 were Indian troops – were willing to waive some of their religious dietary needs as all their other needs were met. 49 The target of Napier’s expedition was Emperor Téwodros II (‘Mad Theodore’) of Abyssinia. Téwodros, had taken the British Consul, Captain Charles Cameron, prisoner. Cameron was tortured and flogged. 50 In July and August 1867 the British government decided it should be able to protect its subjects and made enquiries to the Governor of Bombay as to how soon a force could be mustered to mount an expedition against Téwodros. Napier, then Commander-in-Chief of the Bombay Army, had joined the EIC Army as an engineer in 1826. He had seen action in the First and Second Sikh Wars, the 1857 Rebellion, and the Second Opium War, amongst others. Napier wisely decided not to make a quick dash into the heart of Abyssinia, rescue the prisoners and extract himself as had been expected by his superiors in London. 51

Napier knew that the rugged, trackless terrain of the country was not suited for such a plan. Napier planned a slower advance, making sure his 13,000 troops were well-supplied using 36,000 camels, horses, elephants, and donkeys, and 291 ships of varying size. Napier’s force highlights the transitioning military science of the 1860s and 1870s. Troops were transported from India in sail ships, others in steam-powered vessels. Alongside the 36,000 animals used to transport supplies were a small number of locomotives. To provide fresh water, modern condensers and water pumps were ordered from the United States. To reproduce maps, a photographic unit was attached to the expedition for the first time in British military history. Some regiments disembarked on the shore wearing the new khaki uniforms, others still in the traditional red coats. 52 Napier divided his force into two unequal divisions, a 5,000-man striking force and an 8,000

49 Figure given in Field Marshal Lord Roberts of Kandahar, Forty-One Years in India, From Subaltern to Commander-in-Chief (London; Macmillan and Co., 1901), p. 299.
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52 Ibid., pp. 169-70; For a full breakdown of the engineering works and supply system see Lieutenant-Colonel Wilkins, RE, ‘Abyssinian Expedition’ Papers on Subjects Connected with the Duties of the Corps of Royal Engineers, Contributed by Officers of the Royal Engineers, New Series Vol. XVII (Woolwich; Jackson & Son, 1869), pp. 140-9.
strong division to defend Napier’s lines of communication. Defending the supplies was vital for putting the striking force within range of Magdala, Tewodros’ mountain capital.

The expedition set off on 25th January 1868 and was within 12 miles of Magdala by 8th April. Augustus Currie, second in command of the 23rd Punjab Pioneers, spent much of the march out in front of the main body of the army, clearing a path ahead and marking it out for those following.53 A large part of this success was down to Frederick Roberts, then a major, who as Assistant Quartermaster-General oversaw the successful supply of food and water to Napier’s force during the 400-mile trek. As the British and Indian troops approached Magdala Tewodros had 200 of his prisoners thrown over a cliff, chained in twos. The finale, the Battle of Magdala, 9th April 1868, was an anti-climax. Tewodros’ showpiece weapon, a large mortar, blew up with its first charge. The Abyssinian soldiers proved no match for the disciplined firing of the British and Indian troops. Tewodros’ force of 9,000 was easily defeated. 700 dead and 1,200 wounded Abyssinians lay on the battlefield at the cost of 20 wounded and 2 dead British casualties.54

Tewodros attempted to open negotiations with Napier. He released his British prisoners. Once these were safely back behind the lines Napier continued his advance on Magdala. The only possible assault was a frontal attack up a narrow track to the main gate as Magdala was built on a cliff with only one accessible side. It would be a difficult advance, but it was helped by the fact Tewodros had lost his grip on things and only a few hundred of his men remained in position to resist the British assault. The cost of the attack was two officers and thirteen other ranks. Tewodros took his own life and Napier ordered the Abyssinian artillery to be destroyed and Magdala torched.55

The march from the coast to Magdala was difficult for the men under Napier owing to the lack of roads. Additionally, the terrain provided few large clearings in which units could make camp. Currie says that in most clearings there was room for no more than 400 men, their equipment, and pack animals. Much like Mesopotamia in the opening years of the Great War, very little, if anything, was procurable during the march through Abyssinia. Currie noted that men were issued 1½ pounds of ‘very bad’ meat but makes
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no mention of religious custom or preparation method, suggesting possibly that there were no special arrangements made to slaughter and prepare meat in line with the various religious requirements of the Indian Army. It would be difficult to do this when sepoys were camped in groups of more than 400. Currie also makes no note of disgruntlement amongst his pioneers for any reason. In an address after the campaign Napier acknowledged the sacrifices his Indian troops had made in order to maintain the speed of the advance:

Soldiers of the Army of Abyssinia, the Queen and the people of England intrusted[sic] to you a very arduous and difficult expedition… Our complete and rapid success is due—first, to the mercy of God, whose hand I feel assured has been over us in a just cause. Secondly, to the high spirit with which you have been inspired. Indian soldiers have forgotten their prejudices of race and creed to keep pace with their European comrades. Never has an army entered on a war with more honourable feelings than yours; this has carried you through many fatigues and difficulties. You have been only eager for the moment when you could close with your enemy. The remembrance of your privations will pass away quickly, but your gallant exploit will live in history. The Queen and the people of England will appreciate your services. On my part, as your commander, I thank you for your devotion to your duty, and the good discipline you have maintained; not a single complaint has been made against a soldier of fields injured or villages wilfully molested, in property or person.

The fact that Currie makes no mention of any special religious arrangements regarding food, coupled with Napier’s praise in the above address, suggests that Indian troops accepted the meat they were given. This enabled them to continue the fast-paced march and ultimately defeat Twedoros’ forces. Unlike in Mesopotamia, the troops under Napier travelled to East Africa with everything else they required due to Napier’s own instance on a slower methodical preparation, rather than the quick campaign envisioned by the politicians who sent Napier. The proceedings of the Military Department of Bombay attest to this. Napier oversaw the organisation of the campaign and had a leading role in its planning. For instance, at Napier’s insistence proper preparations were put in place at Zoola, the British base of operations, including sanitary requirements, such as a soil cart and two British Sergeants to monitor the Bazaar created there by merchants and camp followers in case of ‘dirty habits’. It appears that Indian soldiers were thus willing
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to forego their religious dietary requirements as everything else was in place to make the campaign as comfortable and as successful as possible.

Whilst not strictly a contractual agreement it certainly paid dividends for any officers of Indian troops, regardless of rank, to understand his men and their needs and cater for them in order to get the best out of them. By doing this, officers could foster strong morale. Dietary requirements appear to have been just one contributor towards the mood of a force. Again, the officers of the Indian Army would have arrived on the subcontinent with preconceived ideas regarding the needs of Indian soldiers. It is conceivable that officers whose fathers had served in the Indian Army, or in the military in India, would have informed their sons about their interactions with sepoys and how they managed their troops.

In Abyssinia, the foregoing of certain foods did not detract from the overall mood of Napier’s force as everything else was provided for. By contrast, the food and supply problems in Mesopotamia were one of several issues which Townshend was unable to overcome. These came together to create a negative mood, which when coupled with the defeat at Ctesiphon, resulted in a loss of spirit amongst the troop of 6th Indian Division. Whilst it is important to acknowledge that the constraints during the First World War were far greater than during the 1860s but what this comparison helps to highlight the required approach to managing Indian troops of differing caste and religious requirements.

Caste and Religion

When serving in India, on campaign aside, castes would be kept separate and officers would try to ensure all of their men’s religious sensibilities were not offended. After the 1857 Rebellion the understanding of the religious needs of sepoys became paramount. Officers were encouraged to tour the recruiting ground of their battalion to learn of their ‘habits, customs and peculiarities’. Recruitment handbooks had information on Indian religions in them. Religious ceremonies were observed and if an officer was aware or unsure of any customs he would often err on the side of caution rather than cause any offence.\(^{59}\) However, when on active service during the Great War the Indian soldiers had
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to make a number of concessions regarding their religious needs. On the transport ship a
Dogra subadar came to Evans, who was OC on the ship, with a complaint. He said that the
Dogras could not use the galley after the ‘Mohammedons’. Evans countered by saying
that the ‘Mohammedons’ would likely say that they could not use the galley after the
Dogras. The subadar had no reply to this and so Evans told him that the roster would not
be changing and the Dogras could either put up or do without. No more complaints were
made on the matter.60 Similarly, in Egypt in 1914 Indian soldiers had to abandon many
of their religious and social values. One soldier, M.L. Tilhet, noted:

There is no doubt that I had not practiced abstinence because I could not continue to
remain hungry…In Egypt not only I but numbers of other Hindus – some of whom
would, formerly, have rejected their food if only the shadow of a pass-by had fallen
on it – have eaten from the hands of sweepers. Had we not done so there would have
been no alternative but starvation, which could not be tolerated.61

Religious sensibility may have been forsaken during the Indian Army’s time in
Egypt, but the British and Indian authorities did ensure a good supply of traditional Indian
ingredients for the sepoys’ food. For instance, in late January 1915 Alexander Wilson,
commanding the defences of the Suez Canal, asked Commander-in-Chief of India,
General Sir Beauchamp Duff, for an increase in the volume of dal, chillies, and ginger
being sent from India. Wilson informed Duff that the monthly requirements of the forces
in Egypt were 200,000 pounds of dal, 8,500 pounds of chillies, and 17,000 pounds of
ginger.62 The Indian troops of 10th and 11th Indian Divisions had been sent to Egypt to
defend the Suez Canal in 1914. By December and January, the sepoys found themselves
short of warm clothes such as mufflers, cardigans, shorts, and flannel pyjamas. The Indian
units in France had sailed without these same items and a charity, the Indian Soldiers’
Fund, had been set up in Britain to raise money in order to send these items across the
Channel to France and Belgium. Whilst the Egyptian winter was mild in comparison to
that of Northern Europe the temperature dropped significantly at night. H.V. Gell
recorded in his diary the weather being ‘beastly cold’ and having to wear a scarf and
mittens.63 The Secretary of State for India, the Earl of Crewe, and the Viceroy, Lord
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Hardinge, had to request that some of the supplies being sent by the Indian Soldiers’ Fund be diverted to Egypt.\textsuperscript{64} The Indian Soldiers Fund also provided religious books for the Indian troops. Sepoys became especially concerned about the availability of these. As other aspects of their religious life were eroded by the conditions of war they may have wanted to keep these of means of clinging to their religious beliefs.\textsuperscript{65}

Arrangements were also made to have Surgeon-General William Babtie and an assistant spend six weeks in Egypt to assess the medical needs of the forces there. Medical supplies came from both Britain and India. Three motorised ambulances were also supplied from Britain.\textsuperscript{66} On the whole the Indian Army did not suffer from ill health whilst in Egypt. The history of the 1/5th Gurkhas notes that the health of the battalion was generally good during their stay. Dysentery or fever was rare. The only regular complaint the men had was lice – though the battalion received steam disinfectors to remedy this shortly after the Ottoman attack.\textsuperscript{67}

**Sport**

Officers of the Indian Army often partook in sport with their men. Harry Ross, of the 13\textsuperscript{th} Bombay Infantry, and his men played hockey two or three times each week. Ross states that hockey was the most popular sport amongst his regiment composed mainly of Punjabi Muslims. Ross and his sepoys played against teams from other regiments including the Royal Artillery and The Norfolk Regiment. In his diary, Ross recorded a tournament being held at Gujarat towards the end of 1900. This was a great show of martial ability and skill. Ross’ battalion won eight of the events including hockey and the tug of war. Ross states he went to great lengths to train his men for the tug of war, he may have been keen for his men to win in order to show their strength. The 13\textsuperscript{th} were also able to win the hockey tournament.\textsuperscript{68}

\textsuperscript{65} Omissi, *Indian Voices of the Great War*, pp. 13-4.
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Konrad Lorenz suggested sport taught a man ‘a conscious and responsible control of [their] own fighting spirit’. For Lorenz sport readied a man to sacrifice himself for the common cause, remain disciplined, retain formation, and, created a strong bond between men. Team sports involving officers also created *esprit de corps* between the ranks. It would be reassuring for a sepoy to see their sahib risk injury to tackle an opponent for instance. Of course, it also promoted physical fitness. British officers in India also had a belief that Indian soldiers did not have the same physical prowess as European troops and that this had to be built up through sport to give the sepoys a greater fighting capacity. Historian James Campbell states that the performance of Indian soldiers in both World Wars proves that this was a success. The Gurkha regiments seem to have taken particularly well to sports, especially football, playing ‘a great deal’ though they did not always allow rules to get into the way of a good match. Nigel Woodyatt noted: ‘The Gurkha takes readily to games. Football, undoubtedly, appeals to him most... After football, quoits, putting the shot, tug-of-war, and then hockey come next in their estimation.’

2/5th Gurkhas lengthened their exercise arena by levelling out a slope so that they could have a large football pitch with which to hold a Gurkha battalion football tournament. The encouragement of sport amongst the rank and file stemmed from the British Army and Royal Navy. Sporting pursuits, alongside other introductions such as libraries, were an effort to provide ‘rational recreation’ for soldiers and sailors as part of a process of making service in the British Armed Forces more appealing.

Whilst seconded to the Military Police in Burma Granville Pennefather Evans took part in a sporting gathering at Fallam, the headquarters of the Chin Hills military police. Evans noted that the ground was too steep for polo or racing but the parade ground was used for tent pegging competitions for both officers and other ranks. A handicap race for children of the battalion was also arranged:

Almost invariably won by some long-limbed Sikh of nine or ten, looking with his fine features extraordinarily like a girl; while the short-legged little Gurkhas of the same age were infallibly overtaken despite a liberal starting allowance. Any heart
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burning over defeat was promptly wiped out by the following race for Gurkha children only, which was for them the chief event of the day.\textsuperscript{74}

Such competitions would instil a love of sport and competition and the will to win into these children from an early age, possibly with benefits to the regiment. Most sons of sepoys would follow their fathers into the same regiment and so the regiment would be recruiting young men who already possessed an understanding and love of sports.\textsuperscript{75} It could also have helped the officers of a regiment identify the most able from an early age.

Sport was also an opportunity to impart British values and masculinity onto the Indian troops, according to Campbell. The aim was to create soldiers who were closer to the British Tommy in culture, and physical and sporting prowess. Campbell posits that it is difficult to assess the outcome of this. Indian troops certainly took to sport and helped disseminate it to Indian society more broadly but prejudices regarding the martial nature of sepoys remained until Partition.\textsuperscript{76}

In his PhD thesis, Oliver Walton has shown that the late Victorian Royal Navy used sport as a means of making even the most alien of landscapes familiar.\textsuperscript{77} Sailors of the Royal Navy would regularly find themselves in distant lands, and though the Indian Army did not serve outside of the subcontinent as frequently Walton’s concept holds equally true for the times when Indian units were required far away from India. For example, when based at Kandahar in 1879, during the Second Anglo-Afghan War, Sir Donald Stewart was faced with an outbreak of cholera that claimed the lives of 65 officers and sepoys. Stewart was able to maintain morale in a number of ways. Firstly, he would visit the cholera hospital in person and converse with the ill soldiers. To distract the rest of his command from the sickness, Stewart organised weekly gymkhanas. These provided both amusement and exercise for the sepoys and their officers as well as taking their minds of the threat of cholera.\textsuperscript{78}
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During the Tirah Campaign, 1897-98, Vincent Ormsby and his fellow officers took to organising sporting events and competitions to entertain themselves and their men during intervals between the fighting. Ormsby wrote:

Meanwhile as things were comparatively slack, we followed the universal custom of the British Army when it finds a little unoccupied time on its hands, and held a gymkhana, which ran through two afternoons. The Afridis [local tribesmen], respecting the sacredness of sport, refrained from putting any bullets into the midst of the festive gathering, so the programme was got through with undisturbed harmony. 79

On this occasion, the competition was won by a plainsman. According to Ormsby the course was not long enough for his Gurkhas to showcase their superior stamina. The 4th Brigade, to which Ormsby’s 3rd Gurkhas belonged during the campaign, seem to have organised a number of sporting competitions or matches between both Indian and British regiments: ‘We adopted all the possible expedients to break the monotony of camp life: football was played nearly every afternoon, hockey too; the KOB’s [King’s Own Scottish Borderers] instituted broomstick cricket, and there were to be seen at least two sets of badminton.’ 80

The First World War saw Indian soldiers serve outside of the subcontinent on a scale never before seen. Sport was used by officers to provide a sense of continuity despite changes in circumstance that the sepoys were not accustomed to. For example, in Egypt in January 1915 as the Ottoman Army began to approach the Suez Canal the amusement of the troops was not neglected. A football tournament for the four Gurkha battalions in Egypt was organised in January 1915. The 1/5th Royal Gurkha Rifles defeated the 1/7th Gurkha Rifles in the final. Their reward was a trophy in the form of a bronze sphinx. This trophy would find its way to the 5th Gurkhas’ mess at Abbottabad. 81 Similarly, on the Western Front sporting competitions were held for the Indian troops. In a letter to a Lancer stationed in Delhi, Sikh soldier Hazura Singh, wrote of divisional tournaments in amongst his discourse on the cold weather and his attendance at the machine gun school. Singh wrote: ‘We are better off than in cantonment. Matches are fixed to take place between regiments, at tug-of-war, wrestling, football and running. We are the winners at football in our division. In the second division the 9th [Hodson’s Horse] have won. We
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are to play them.

130 footballs were sent to France as part of the supplies sent by the Indian Soldiers’ Fund, alongside the warm clothes, blankets, socks, and religious books. Also included were 40 gramophones and 125,000 pounds of sweets. Sir James Willcocks, commander of the Indian forces on the Western Front recalled attending the regimental sports of the 4th Cavalry, the Divisional Cavalry Regiment of the Meerut Division. A large crowd of French spectators formed to watch the sowars compete – the size of the crowd reminded him of similar events back in India. Willocks recalled that ‘the tent pegging was quite good, and the jumping showed that the horses were in good fettle and well trained’.

Training

Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the India Army’s main defensive concern was the North-West Frontier of India. The annexation of the Punjab in 1849 first brought the Indian Army into contact with the tribes of the North-West Frontier. Thus, principles for hill warfare were established and passed on both formally and informally by Indian Army personnel. The training and preparation for war, however, was certainly not a new phenomenon in India. It significantly predated the cessation of the Second Anglo-Sikh War, and even the arrival of the EIC, though it was somewhat lost during the Mughal period. The ancient Sanskrit text Mahabharata, which details the mythological Kurukshetra War for the throne of Hastinapur, thought to be from around 400 BC, recounts how holy men would lecture on the art of war on a daily basis. The text referred to untrained raw troops as equal to bales of cotton. Competitions were encouraged to promote physical development. It also covers formations, logistics and static defences.

Yet, from the Middle Ages onwards, the armies of Indian states began to suffer defeat. Their tactics and strategies became outdated and they put an emphasis on the size of their army rather than its quality, training suffered as a result. The Mughal forces began to incorporate gunpowder and fire arms into their armies, but cavalry and archers still took
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prescience. By the time of the Mughal Empire, there was an over-reliance on foreign mercenaries. Afghans, Asians, Persians, and Turks filled the ranks of the Mughal armies. In attempts to out-do their rivals Mughal nobles would attempt to outbid each other for the service of mercenaries. Thus, a mercenary would continually change allegiance, mercenary captains taking on an entrepreneur like quality. These mercenaries paid much attention to their own physical prowess but at the expense of cohesive unit training. Swordplay was an important part of both this physical training and shows of personal skill. The Mughal forces continued to pay close attention to horsemanship, musketeers were the ‘least valued and least paid’ Mughal soldiers into the mid-eighteenth century.

As the EIC’s reach expanded, it began to absorb many facets of Indian society into its army, training became more commonplace and far more standardised. Manuals were produced regarding the training of soldiers and discussions of best practice filled the pages of military journals both in Britain and India. This is in stark contrast to the Mughal period, during which it was only military animals that were given any special consideration. Horses and elephants were both well looked after by expert grooms. Grooms were painstakingly trained to understand the animal’s dietary needs as well as the best grooming and saddling techniques. Each horse was named by the Emperor himself and thorough records of each creature was kept. Both horses and elephants were trained to stand musket and artillery fire.

With the Sikhs defeated and the Punjab annexed the Indian Army was now in direct contact with the tribes of the North-West Frontier. The Sikhs had had no definite borders but limited their territories to a chain of villages at the foot of the hills, they would perform annual military parades through these villages, exacting tributes from local chiefs. 1849 saw the authorities of British India inherit this 800 mile long irregular and ill-defined borderland.

Pathan tribes inhabited the hills and mountains beyond the borderland. Tribes on the western slope of the hills came under the authority of Afghanistan. The tribes on the eastern side of the mountains were independent and posed a threat to British-held
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territories. The general title of Pathan covered many peoples: Afridis, Mahmands, Mahsuds, Orakzais, Swatis, Waziris, and Yusufzais amongst others. Each of these people could put between 2,000 and 20,000 into the field in the form of a *lashkar* (war party). A *lashkar* was not organised or disciplined in the same way that a Western army was and, according to contemporary British beliefs, could not maintain itself in the field for more than a week, ten days at most.⁹⁰

Henry Bellew described these tribes in an 1886 pamphlet: ‘In general terms, the whole of these tribes may be described as utter barbarians steeped in the grossest ignorance. By birth they are savages, and by profession robbers.’⁹¹ Bellew continued, ‘they are nevertheless extremely bigoted, are entirely controlled by their priests, and are at all times ready for a jihad, be the infidels black or white.’⁹² These frontier tribes were largely self-sufficient and often squabbled amongst themselves but would often join forces and leave the safety of their mountain bases to raid the villages of the plains bellow in the name of Islam. They would plunder and burn villages, attack the inhabitants, and carry off valuable cattle.⁹³

The authorities in India guarded against tribal incursions and made reprisals when deemed appropriate. The Punjab Irregular Force (Punjab Frontier Force from 1865), consisting of five infantry and five cavalry regiments, was subsequently created to keep them at bay. Initially this force relied very much on improvisation to combat the native *lashkars*. It soon became clear that a more organised set of principles and tactics was needed for frontier warfare.⁹⁴ The Punjab Irregular Force proved itself to be as capable in more conventional surroundings when, during the 1857 Rebellion, it moved from the North-West Frontier and fought in central India. It would return to the frontier after the rebellion.
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The Punjab Irregular Force had two aims when it mounted an expedition against the frontier tribes. Firstly, it aimed to inflict punishment and revenge upon the tribes for their actions against imperial territories and people. Secondly, through military force it aimed to impose an armistice or treaty upon the warring tribes, such accords would usually be to the commercial benefit of the authorities but not so harsh as to encourage continued resistance. General Sir Charles Keyes, who served with the Punjab Irregular Force between 1849 and 1878, described the manner in which the negotiations were carried out: ‘In fanatical warfare what is understood by unconditional surrender is not that the wild tribe come in and lay down their arms… but that the jirga (tribal assembly) come in and displays his willingness to submit to any terms you choose to inflict. But if these terms were not to be unsatisfactorily lean, the jirga has really no power to make his tribe accept them. You might do what you please with the jirga but the men of the tribe living still amid and in the hills could renew the fight.’

Contemporaries like Bellew may have criticised the tribesmen of the North-West Frontier for their lack of western training and organisation but centuries of inter-tribal feuding and warfare had enabled the Pathan tribes to hone their martial skills. The tribesmen fought from a young age, they were physically fit, skilled with a range of weapons, immune to local diseases, and knew the terrain and pathways. All of which meant that a lashkar could move quickly over the broken ground to skirt around British columns. Pathan expertise lay in hit and run attacks on isolated groups of troops, convoys, lines of communication, or column rear guards. Sniping was also a popular form of harassment with Pathan tribesmen. Crudely-made rifled muskets enabled the Pathans to fire upon targets from a safe range.

In his seminal work *Small Wars*, first published in 1896, Charles Callwell observed: ‘hill warfare may fairly be said to constitute a special branch of military art’. As such there was no formal learning process for men who joined the Punjab Irregular
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Force in the early stages of its existence. Knowledge of how to fight on the frontier was simply ‘passed on’. Firstly, the ways and means of hill warfare were passed on and learnt ‘on the job’ during periods of fighting against the tribesmen. Alternatively, when there was a lull in the fighting, mock battles would be arranged, one regiment would attack as if a native lashkar and another would defend using their usual tactics.99

This method of learning through mock battles helped the Indian Army to adjust to new theatres of war during the First World War. For instance, during January 1915 as Turkish troops approached the Suez Canal the Indian defenders practised defending it. The 10th and 11th Indian Divisions had only arrived in Egypt in November 1914 and had to spend considerable time strengthening the earthwork defences on both sides of the canal. On 17th January 1915 a field day was held by the 11th Division. Two infantry battalions of 31st brigade and two squadrons of Imperial Service Cavalry made up White Force. Three battalions of 32nd Brigade and seven squadrons of Imperial Service Cavalry made up Khaki Force. White Force were to defend the canal from an attack by Khaki Force. White Force were successful. The mock battle was followed by a debrief.100 Similarly, Brigadier-General Cox, commander of 29th Indian Brigade tested the defensive scheme for Kantara by having the 14th Sikhs attack it whilst the remainder of his brigade defended the post. The brigade war diary states that the defenders made a decisive counter attack.101

Being stationed at small frontier forts gave officers of the Punjab Irregular force time to train their men to a high standard and also bond with them without interruption. John Luther Vaughan wrote that the ‘remoteness of the frontier stations, and the absence of the enervating influences of long peace service, all tended to improve the quality both of officers and men.’ Vaughan also claimed the ‘absence of society threw the officers back upon their professional duties.’ Field sports, tent pegging, and polo could all be enjoyed by the officers and their men, again without interruption and without the crowds such competitions could draw in more populated stations. Vaughan added that the lack of women in frontier stations in the early days of the Punjab Frontier Force further

100 The National Archives (TNA), WO 95/4422, War Diary 31 Infantry Brigade Headquarters, 1914 December - 1916 February.
101 TNA, WO 95/4422, War Diary 31 Indian Infantry Brigade, 93 Battalion Burma Infantry, 1914 October - 1915 September.
encouraged both men and officers to concentrate on their profession. By the time Kitchener arrived in India in 1902, however, the regiments stationed on frontier forts had ‘taken root’. Kitchener noted that some of the regiments lacked efficiency because they were out of contact with their brigadiers and so had no regular supervision or inspection. He also felt that there was no rivalry or competition for regiments stationed on their own in frontier forts. Kitchener conceded that some did spend their time on the frontier honing their profession in an attempt to maintain their regiment’s reputation, but these were a minority.

Despite the regulation for promotion requiring an officer to learn and be assessed on the language(s) of his battalion, not all officers were as proficient as might be expected. William Villiers-Stuart paints himself as a conscientious officer who viewed learning the languages of India as a hobby. Villiers-Stuart made particular efforts to learn Parbatya, which was obligatory for him as the officer of a Gurkha regiment. He had trouble with learning this through the reading of texts. He discovered that a fellow officer named Evatt spoke very little Parbatya but what he did he spoke very well. Evatt had picked up the language from the men of his company, this meant that the Parbatya which Evatt knew was exactly what he needed to converse with his men and give them orders. Villiers-Stuart took to doing the same. He would converse daily with a number of riflemen until he had built up a pocket book of several hundred relevant phrases. He was soon able to pass his language examination. Free of examinations Villiers-Stuart claims to have been ‘really’ able to learn Parbatya. In doing this he was acquainting himself not only with the language but also with the culture of his men, narrowing the social and professional gap between them, strengthening their relationship.

Villiers-Stuart noted that it was far more fruitful conversing with new, younger recruits than older experienced NCOs and VCOs. The reason for this is that the native officers, used to dealing with their British commanders, regularly ‘mutilated’ their own language in order to be understood by officers who had only the faintest grasp on
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Parbatya. They spoke a blend of Parbatya, Urdu, Hindi, and English. These officers belonged to what Villiers-Stuart called the ‘old regime’.

The exact period in which Villiers-Stuart is writing is unclear, but it is most likely the 1890s, it is possible that the ‘old regime’ is the EIC. In which case these older officers would not have been subject to the same stringent examinations as Villiers-Stuart and his contemporaries. This, according to Villiers-Stuart, lead to a lack of efficiency in the regiment. NCO and VCO promotions were made based less on ability and experience as a soldier and more because they could make themselves understood. Villiers-Stuart suggests in reality these men were qualified to be signallers at best, not of sufficient quality to hold a VCO rank.106

Basil Amies was another officer who was aware of the advantages of learning the languages of his men and their backgrounds too. Amies had joined the Indian Army in 1915 straight from Sandhurst, passed his Lower Standard Hindustani in January 1917 and his Higher Standard Hindustani in 1920. He then began to examine fellow officers at both higher and lower standard levels and began to learn Persian. Amies had spent the years 1918 to 1920 as a junior instructor at the Musketry School, Satara.107 Through learning more than one language and by coming into contact with a variety of regiments as they passed through the musketry school Amies was able to find out a lot about the men that made up the Indian Army and to differentiate between them: ‘I learnt to recognise one language, speech or dialect from another: to see differences of manner, gait and native dress: to judge from these dissimilarities the ethnic class: and to appreciate the better and poorer qualities of the Indian fighting man.’108

Here Amies could be talking of one of two concepts. Firstly, he could he refereeing to the martial race theory and the development of his ability to make distinctions between martial and non-martial sepoys. Alternatively, he could be referring to the notion that Indian troops of differing backgrounds had different qualities that had to be recognised if they were to be properly commanded. The most famous laying down of the qualities, both good and bad, of Indian soldiers was Edmund Chandler’s *The Sepoy*.109

106 Ibid., pp. 247-8.
108 Ibid., p. 23.
109 Chandler, *The Sepoy*. 
Amies went on to pass as a Persian interpreter whilst on leave in Britain and then moved on to study French. The First World War had seen unprecedented wastage of junior officers and the Indian Army officer corps had had to expand rapidly to meet demand. As discussed previously, men recruited from within India had the necessary languages but lacked the military knowledge or experience. Men recruited from Britain often had the military experience and knowledge but had no command of the languages of India. The inability of junior officers to speak the necessary languages during and immediately after the First World War created problems similar to those bemoaned by Villiers-Stuart. Amies noted that in the years immediately after the Great War a number of havildars had been specially chosen because of their language capabilities, bilingual NCOs were a particularly valued commodity in this period.\(^{110}\)

Again, though this time through necessity rather than inefficiency, native officers were selected only on their abilities as interpreters and not for their military experience and leadership qualities. The language barrier created by the influx of British officers who lacked the necessary linguistic skill meant that officers and sepoys could not bond and build up mutual respect. Amies noted this whilst with the 4/9\(^{th}\) Bhophal Regiment in 1917.\(^{111}\)

Moore-Brick has suggested that British Army junior officers developed strong feelings for their men and grew attached to them.\(^{112}\) It would be difficult to bond in such a way with a language barrier in place for the junior officers of the Indian Army and their sepoys. J.S. Lord was one such young officer. During an interview regarding his military career in India Lord recounted his struggles learning Urdu. Lord had joined the Indian Army in late 1915, straight from Sandhurst as Basil Amies had. Joining during the war meant that Lord missed out on what he called his apprenticeship, spending a year with a British regiment based in India. He was posted immediately to the 124\(^{th}\) Duchess of Connaught’s Own Baluchis. He engaged a munshi and worked with him in the afternoons.

Unfortunately, Lord admits that he failed to fully grasp the language in either its written or spoken form. When asked if he managed to ‘get along all right’ without a full grasp of Urdu during the Great War, Lord responded:

\(^{111}\) Ibid., pp. 16-7.
Well, you see, you had a magnificent class of men in the Indian Army who were the Viceroy-Commissioned Officers and they started in the ranks, worked their way up and when they’d gone through the lance naik, naik, havildar, business which was equivalent to lance corporal, corporal and sergeant, if they had the necessary educational qualifications which after all the regimental school had to sort of supply for them, then they got a Viceroy commission, so all our subalterns really in the Indian Army were the Indian Officers and the highest rank that they could get to, and only one of them could get to it, was subadar major, and he had no executive command and he was the confidential advisor to the colonel.\textsuperscript{113}

Lord obviously held the VCOs of his regiment in high esteem. This also suggests that Lord’s regiment may have a similar policy towards the promotion of VCOs as Villiers-Stuart’s did. Those who could make themselves understood and in return understand their officers instructions would be promoted regardless of military knowledge or experience.

With the subsidence of threat from Russia new financial constraints were implemented which put an end to a series of modernising reforms overseen by Kitchener. When he arrived in India, regiments were unevenly equipped and trained. The lingering spectre of 1857 meant that the Indian authorities had maintained a policy whereby potentially mutinous Indian troops were armed with inferior weaponry to their British counterparts. Upon Kitchener’s arrival, soldiers in the Indian Army were still issued with outdated Martini-Henry Rifles. These breech-loading weapons, used black, smoke-giving powder, were accurate up to 1,500 yards and fired approximately 12 rounds per minute. By comparison British Army units were equipped with state-of-the-art .303 Lee-Metford Rifles, the precursor to the famous Lee-Enfield Rifles that dominated the twentieth century. The Lee-Metford used smokeless powder, which did not give away the shooter’s position, and took an eight round magazine, meaning it could fire around twenty rounds per minute. The Lee-Metford was accurate up to 2,000 yards. Kitchener saw to it that Indian soldiers were also issued with the Lee-Metford, a process that would take time to complete given the dispersed nature of the Indian Army across the subcontinent but would make the Indian Army a more efficient fighting force.\textsuperscript{114}

There was in peace-time a great tradition of competitiveness between regiments of the Indian Army. Divisional tournaments were popular for sports such as hockey and

\textsuperscript{113} Centre for South Asian Research, University of Cambridge, Interview: Col. J.S. Lord.
\textsuperscript{114} Morton-Jack, \textit{The Indian Army on the Western Front}, pp. 53-4; Cassar, \textit{Kitchener’s War}, p. 16; Martin Pegler, \textit{The Lee-Enfield Rifle} (Oxford; Osprey, 2012), pp. 14-7.
football, as were racing and gymkhanas. The rifle-range too became a source of competition for sepoys and officers alike. Kitchener aimed to utilise this for the improvement of the army. Kitchener had concluded that the standard of the Indian Army was extremely varied. Kitchener determined that the reason for this discrepancy was the instruction troops were receiving from their officers.

During the cold weather season of 1904-5 regiments were informed that they were to be subjected to very thorough and competitive testing. By way of a competition the best British and Indian infantry until would each receive a trophy. Each battalion had to take exactly the same test. The curriculum for the test was as follows: a fifteen-mile march in field service order, carrying a hundred rounds of ball ammunition. This was followed immediately by an attack on a position prepared by another unit, and was to include reconnaissance, writing of orders, etc. A bivouac camp with outposts was to be constructed, this would then be attacked. A night operation was to be carried out, as was the preparation of a defensive position, which was to be assailed by other troops. Finally, a retirement of at least ten miles followed up by another unit. These tests were carried out one after the other over of a period of around fifty hours, all under active service conditions. The battalion which gained the highest mark in its brigade went on to be retested to ascertain the best battalion in the division. Ultimately, those with the highest marks were tested by Kitchener’s own board and the winner was thus decided. The 130th Baluchis took the award for the Indian Army with the 1/3rd Gurkhas coming in second, and 55th Coke’s Rifles finishing third. Some officers and men, such as the commander of 1/3rd Gurkhas, Nigel Woodyatt, enjoyed the competitive tests whilst other units were said to have struggled to complete them. Kitchener took such complaints to mean that the commanders had not liked them. He decided the tests should be kept though without the prizegiving.¹¹⁵

Nigel Woodyatt, himself a keen trainer and disciplinarian, as shown by his battalion’s performance during Kitchener’s tests, wrote that not all commanders in the Indian Army had a leaning towards training and would often leave it to lesser experienced junior officers. Woodyatt observed that a commander needed to supervise, guide and control the training of sepoys, particularly raw recruits. Less-inclined commanders would often focus on administrative works instead. For Woodyatt the best example of a good

trainer was General Poore, commander of the Jhansi Brigade. According to Woodyatt: ‘Every morning he [Poore] was round somewhere infusing life and spirit into his many units. He had evolved an excellent system of progressive instruction, and being an expert himself with sword, lance, bayonet or rifle (as well as – with bat and ball!), the "guidance" was of the greatest value.’

Poore attempted to make sure training never stagnated and became dull. He pioneered a system whereby recruits trained their fellow recruits. Both Woodyatt and Basil Amies recalled using this method, christened the ‘Jhansi System’ during the First World War when there was an influx of new recruits and a lack of trained officers. The concept was a simple one. Qualified officers, VCOs or NCOs would instruct and demonstrate to the unqualified sepoys, who would then turn and pass on the same instructions and demonstration to the recruits behind them. In 1915, when he took over command of the Dehra Dun Brigade, Nigel Woodyatt found he had over 2,000 men with ‘good physique and possessing a knowledge of ceremonial combined with a fine soldierly spirit’. These men, however, had no experience of camp or barrack life, and had no field training. Similarly, their officers lacked professional instruction or schooling. Woodyatt’s solution was to teach by example. He had with him at Dehra Dun 2nd Gurkha, a regular army unit, and a British Territorial battalion. These two battalions were used to demonstrate and instruct the officers, VCOs, and NCOs of the raw battalions. These officers, VCOs, and NCOs, would then relay what they had learnt to their men, in a similar manner as the ‘Jhansi System’.

Not all senior officers were as conscientious as Poore however. Alexander Fenton wrote home that he and his fellow officers would leave their colonel in his tent drinking so that they could carry on with their work without his interference. In another letter to his mother, Fenton stated that the regiment’s new recruits were poor shots. He attributed this to the fact that an officer named Warner was leaving the musketry training to a havildar. Similarly, Basil Amies noted in his memoir that the commander of the
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4/9th Bhophal Regiment ‘drank gin before breakfast’ and that this affected the efficiency of the battalion.\textsuperscript{122} These less efficient officers were supposed to have been weeded out by the introduction of examination for promotion. Clearly, officers slipped through the net. Even after Kitchener had introduced more stringent rules for colonel it seems some remained in position.

During the First World War, new recruits had to be trained in depots and then sent overseas. Demand for these men meant that the training process had to be expedited in order for the Indian Army to meet the demands of total war. The training in most cases was hampered by the fact that the officer and staff left in charge of recruitment, training, and drafts at the depot were those who battalion commanders did not want at the front with them. It should have been the case that a regiment left one of its best officers behind to supervise recruitment and training.\textsuperscript{123} Regular officers, be they proficient or not, would often take offence at being left behind whilst their regiment went off to war. Viewing themselves as undervalued, these men would take to doing as little as possible, leaving IARO men to carry out most of the work despite little or no experience. Sargisson noted that the only conscientious regular officer at his depot helped the IARO men as much as he could but was of ill health.\textsuperscript{124} In this instance, there is clearly a lack of professionalism coming from the regular officers left in India during the First World War. The want of action and adventure overrode the professionalism of these officers.

Drafts regularly numbered 100 or 200 men, it was a ‘herculean task’ to keep up with this demand and ensure that the men being sent to replenish units at the front were of sufficient standard. Harry Ross, for example, was tasked with overseeing fifteen such depots. He observed that the largest problems lay with the clerks and Military Accounts Departments. He reported back that clerks were pigeonholing problems so that officials higher up the chain of command never became aware of issues.\textsuperscript{125} In February 1917 when Ross had moved on to the 2/103\textsuperscript{rd} Mahratta Light Infantry, he found it difficult to keep his unit up to scratch as his men were required to replenish front line units. After losing 50 men to 105\textsuperscript{th} Mahratta Light Infantry he bemoaned: ‘I was fleeced of my trained men and had to start all over again’. The task was made more difficult by the fact that at this
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point Ross’ battalion was spread across the Bombay shoreline on coastal defence duties.\(^{126}\) The attitude of regular officers impacted on the training of new recruits. As did the removal of trained men to the front, it meant approaches such as the ‘Jhansi system’ used by Woodyatt was not always possible. The issue was exacerbated by the fact officers higher up the chain of command were not informed of the problems that arose.

Even the more experienced troops and their officers faced the difficulty of fighting in new theatres, against an organised enemy and in unfamiliar terrain during the First World War. As H.V. Gell and his men sailed from Karachi they were under the impression that they would be heading for Europe to face the German Army. As such the commander of 29th Indian Brigade, to which Gell’s 69th Punjabis belonged, ordered regimental officers to lecture their men in preparation for the coming battle against the Germans. The 29th Brigade were rerouted and would fight the Ottoman Army in Egypt and Gallipoli. Gell wrote of the topics on which he lectured in his diary. He talked to his men about protecting themselves from aircraft. Still a new form of warfare in 1914, the Indian Army would not have faced enemy aircraft before. Attacking enemy positions at night was another topic covered by Gell. Fire discipline was another subject he lectured on, disciplined fire had been important when facing tribal enemies, but it would be equally as important against a more organised enemy. Finally, Gell addressed the topic of German fighting methods and how to meet them, an important topic but as the war progressed became less relevant as new tactics were developed to break the stalemate of trench warfare.\(^{127}\) This points to the fact that efficient and resourceful officers would find ways and means of educating and training their men when their typical methods were not possible – although once the 29th Brigade arrived in Egypt they were able to employ some of their more usual training techniques.

**Conclusion**

Gardner wrote of a contractual agreement between sepoys and their officers regarding their duties and the conditions under which they are prepared to operate. Morton-Jack also alluded to the conditions under which Indian soldiers were willing to serve by arguing that Sikh soldiers were not prepared to remain under heavy bombardment and so

\(^{126}\) Ibid., p. 55.
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self-mutilated in order to get to hospital and then be sent home. Others, such as Greenhut and Moreman, suggest that the Indian Army on the Western Front completely lacked morale and that is why it had a high casualty rate, limited success, and ultimately had to be removed from Europe to Mesopotamia in December 1915. Contemporary commentators of the Indian Corps in France and Belgium place the emphasis on the loss of officers for a lack of resolve on the part of sepoys. This was the conventional wisdom of the time.

The part played by the officer, however, is just one aspect that could affect the mood of the Indian troops, as put forward by Clausewitz. On the Western Front, when troops did retire or intentionally wounded themselves, it was the result of a combination of problems. These combined to bring down the military spirit of the sepoys. The loss of their leaders, in a foreign country with an alien climate, in substandard trenches, and being outgunned by the technologically more advanced German Army all served to erode the military spirit of a battalion. These factors would affect the belief in the self and the group put forward by Shillington. Given that in the early months of the Great War in Northern Europe the majority of Indian Army officers were killed or wounded the belief in the leaders immediately above them would be none existent. The belief in the leadership of the higher echelons of the BEF would also have been eroded by the state of the defences manned by the Indians and by their lack of modern weapons.

The same problems ensued at Kut-al-Amara. The Indian soldiers did not refuse to eat horse meat or carry out their duties because they felt their officers had broken any sort of unwritten contract, but because disease, starvation, and a lack of supplies all combined to again erode the sepoys’ military spirit. In campaigns where circumstances allowed a good supply of necessary food and other items and where the authorities were able to meet the majority of the sepoys’ religious requirements they were in reply willing to make a number of sacrifices, such as eating food which had been prepared by lower caste sweepers. These would of course affect the mood of a group but as long as other factors remained constant, such as the battalion’s officer remaining largely the same, regular sport and exercise, or the bulk of a battalion remaining intact. The evidence of the First World War suggests that the military spirit of the sepoys was particularly strong. For

example, the issue of self-mutilation was confined to a small number of battalions, or 2.5 percent of the Indian Corps. In other theatres, such as Egypt, morale was maintained despite some privations being necessary. Prior to the Great War a similar process is evident, as shown by Napier’s praise of the Indian Soldiers during the Abyssinian Campaign.

British officers were important to the process of maintaining morale as their actions, or lack of their presence, could affect the mood of a sepoy group. An officer’s role was to create a bond between himself and his men that would be conducive to a good working relationship. This was important because an officer’s main priority was to ready his men for war through training. A strong bond could be conducive to efficient training and a strong display in battle. Where examples are given of Indian soldiers withdrawing after their officers had been killed, there are often additional reasons for the loss of morale and fighting spirit than solely the loss of officers. As Chapter 5 will show, the threat of corporal punishment was not removed from the Indian Army, providing either a backup or alternative to the nurturing of the sepoy-sahib relationship, suggesting this relationship alone was never fully believed in by the higher echelons of the Indian Army. Chapter 5 will also show that when the relationship broke down entirely, an officer’s actions could lead to insubordination and mutiny.

The development of training methods, much like the cultivation of the officer-man relationship, depended on the officer in question. An innovative and forward-thinking officer trained men well. Some however, had no inclination towards training. Training was often left to the lesser-qualified or newer officers. The more rigorous testing of officers introduced by Kitchener, as discussed in Chapter 3, may have begun weeding out those officers who lacked the ability to bond with their men or the wherewithal to effectively train them, but would seem that by the time of the First World War there remained deficient officers. Also, Kitchener’s encouragement of competition may have reinvigorated officers and their men. As both Kitchener and Vaughan observed, regiments that spent too long at one station could take root and lose their edge as fighters.

The First World War affected a unit’s ability to train and pushed officers to produce combat-ready men more quickly. Often the most able officers were lost to the frontline or even to the British Army, leaving behind the less competent or less experienced men to train raw recruits. When experienced officers were left behind, they
took this as an affront to their abilities and often did not carry out their duties with the 
vigour required. In this situation these officers failed the test of the First World War, they 
allowed their own want of action to trump their professional standards to the detriment of 
their regiment. Additionally, the influx of green officers who lacked the language skills 
required of an Indian Army officer affected both the proficiency and mood of an Indian 
regiment. Again, total war took its toll on the Indian Army.

Officers, regardless of experience had to, on occasion, take action against their 
soldiers and punish them. As Chapter 5 will show, this was not done excessively, even if 
the means of punishment retained by the Indian Army had been abolished elsewhere. The 
following chapter will also show that despite the process of professionalisation that is 
apparent in the Indian Army officer corps after the 1857 Rebellion there remained officers 
who mismanaged their troops and this resulted in mutiny.
Chapter 5:
‘Over Drilled, Over Dressed, and Over Bothered’

Discipline and Dissent in the Indian Army

Introduction

After the 1857 Rebellion the authorities in India took a great number of precautions to prevent a similar outbreak in the future. To this end the government and army were successful, there was no second great revolt and Indian soldiers continued to serve the Raj with distinction. There was however, a series of small, or minor, mutinies after 1857. The majority of these were passive affairs, concerning the refusal of orders. The mutiny of the 5th Native Light Infantry at the Singapore Naval Base in 1915 was the only instance of Indian soldiers becoming violent during an act of mutiny. In 1865, after one such peaceful mutiny, the Viceroy of India Sir John Lawrence wrote: ‘My own impression is that the native army generally, and the native cavalry, in particular, is over drilled, over dressed, and over bothered, and hence that in spite of its solid advantages the service is by no means so popular as it might be’.

The purpose of this chapter is to assess how accurate Sir John Lawrence’s summation was. To this end the chapter will first survey how discipline was maintained in Indian Army regiments. Varying forms of punishment were permitted in Indian Army regulations, some were used more than others. For the most part these were deterrents, designed to discourage insubordination. Given the unique composition of the Indian Army different punishments and deterrents were implemented dependent on caste or race. This chapter will also look how the regulations regarding punishment changed during this period, particularly as the moral compass of Victorian and Edwardian society in Britain moved towards compassion towards native soldiers. Regardless of the punishment used, what was important from the point of the British officer was that the punishment served as an example to his men. Despite the fact reformers had sought to develop a more meritocratic, professional officer corps, aimed at fostering good relations between officers and sepoys, the retention of a range of disciplinary devices was continually
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encouraged. This suggests that despite reform there remained a belief that punishment was necessary for good discipline.

Finally, this chapter will examine the causes and consequences of Indian soldiers’ disaffection. As previously stated, the majority of mutinous outbreaks were passive affairs. Some of these were born of local circumstances, whilst others were related to wider issues such as religion. European officers played a key role in many acts of revolt in this period, often through mismanagement. A number of the insurrections assessed have their origins in an officer’s failings, whilst others spread through officers’ inability to maintain control of their troops. This shows that despite the process of professionalisation that this thesis has previously detailed there remained a small body of officers who were not up to the task and disaffection could spill over into mutiny through their mismanagement. These mutinies also highlight another, broader, issue: the way in which sepoys, and people of India more generally, made their grievances felt. In three of the four cases the sepoys protested peacefully in the manner of workers taking industrial action. Only at Singapore in 1915 did violence break out. The Indian Army mirrors the society it is drawn from as both forms of resistance to colonial rule can be found in Indian history.

**Discipline**

Previously, historians such as Elizabeth Kolsky, have looked at the legal system of British India and Singha has looked at the peculiar arguments regarding the retention of flogging. This chapter delves further into this by looking at how officers viewed and used punishment to control their sepoys, analysing the way in which colonial control was maintained on a practical level. British officers maintained discipline within the Indian Army through several measures. In many cases the threat of punishment was enough to keep sepoys in line. When necessary, officers were required to take action against their men in order to stamp out indiscipline and prevent it from spreading. Usually, an officer would look to punish a small number of his sepoys, even a solitary soldier, for that to serve as an example to the rest. The punishment meted out depended on the crime and
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also on the caste of the offender. Acts of treachery came with a capital sentence. Many other wrongdoings could be met with imprisonment, transportation, flogging, or discharge.

This section will show how the range of punishments available to Europeans changed throughout the period 1861 to 1921 and assesses how the officers of the Indian Army would alter their approach depending on the caste and experience of a soldier. The usual system for deciding guilt and handing out punishment was through a court-martial, usually presided over by European officers, though for some lesser crimes VCOs were given the responsibility of presiding. On active service, however, disciplinary proceedings took a much less formal, more prompt approach. The reason for this attitude was that indiscipline could prove costly in a time of war and therefore swift justice was needed to stamp out any disruptive behaviour. Yet even on campaign, officers usually opted to set an example rather than punish a large body of men. These two concepts are at odds with each other. On the one hand it is being suggested that a better class of officer, speaking the necessary languages and with the skills for command, should inspire loyalty in his men as Skinner and Jacob had in the early nineteenth century, whilst also saying punishment should inspire discipline and quell unrest. These are two competing views of governance. It is indicative of a wider change in approach to governance and control, a move from treating subjects as familiars to a more general, abstract means of ruling.  

Kaushik Roy has argued that prior to British domination of the subcontinent Indian soldiers had been known to mutiny or desert predominately over issues concerning pay and arrears. In the EIC and Indian armies, however, pay was regular and certain. Barring some obvious exceptions, Indian soldiers were generally better behaved than British troops during the periods of EIC and crown rule in India. Douglas Peers cites the number of convictions following military courts-martial in the Bengal Army for the period 1834-5 as an example of the disparity between the indiscipline of European soldiers and sepoys. In total, 162 European troops of the Bengal Army were convicted by courts-martial. Of these the highest number of convictions was for desertion, mutinous
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conduct or for striking an NCO. In comparison the number of sepoys convicted in the Bengal Army for the same period was just 32.

Murder was the most common crime amongst sepoys of the Bengal Army, for which nine sepoys were convicted. This difference is largely down to the fact that Indian soldiers joined the army because the profession offered respectability within their own communities, and in many regions, had become customary. The previously mentioned regular and certain pay was something that was not obtainable in many other professions in India, many sepoys used this money to supplement their family’s agricultural activities. Such willingness to join the army meant that native soldiers were more amenable to the discipline that came with their chosen career. The European ranks, both of the British Army and of the EIC’s European units prior to 1857, were formed of men who had joined the army to escape poverty, evade the law, or at the invitation of a magistrate in the place of a jail sentence – the ‘scum of the earth’ as the Duke of Wellington famously called them. Financial incentives were also available to Indian soldiers, designed to reward or induce loyalty. For example, a number of regiments who had proved their loyalty in 1857 were rewarded with higher pay, as were soldiers who performed heroically in battle. Such higher pay however, depended on a soldier’s past record also. A soldier who performed an act of bravery could not receive a pay rise if his record showed past misdemeanours, further encouraging good behaviour and loyalty.7

Roy points out that punishment was severe in the period before the British conquest. In the Sikh Army of Ranjit Singh, for instance, punishment was generally the amputation of a limb. In the Mughal armies a punishment frequently used was the firing of men from canon. This form of execution seems to have been used predominately for men who were caught deserting to the enemy and also for those deemed to have surrendered without putting up a sufficient fight.

When Nadir Shah invaded India in 1739 he brought with him the concept of a military enforcer, the Nasaqchl. A Nasaqchl was an armed man employed to impose orders, there were several thousand of them in Nadir Shah's camp, and military punishment was inflicted through them. For instance, one of their duties was to stand in

---

the rear of the army during battle and to use a battle-axe to cut down everyone who dared to flee the fray. The British attempted and arguably succeeded in modernising the punishment structure of the Indian Army. The obvious exception was in the aftermath of the 1857 Rebellion when leading rebel sepoys were strapped to cannon and fired as they had been in the Mughal period.\(^8\) Governor-General, Charles Canning attempted to oversee a policy of restraint over revenge for the revolt, recognising the fact that the native soldiers would still have a role to play in the newly formed Raj. This was something he was ridiculed for at the time.

The process of modernisation can be seen in 1754, when the first statutory provision was laid down for ‘punishing mutiny and desertion of officers and soldiers in service of the United Company of Merchants of England trading to the East Indies, and for the punishment of offences committed in the East Indies, or at the Island of Saint Helena’. This gave the government the power to create articles of war for the armies in India. Though these were initially designed for Europeans they were applied to Indian troops too. The British authorities realised that they needed to adjust their methods and assimilate them more closely to Indian military traditions. Amendments were subsequently made to the rules regarding punishment to better make them appropriate to native troops. In 1823 it was decided that these should be applicable regardless of where troops were serving. In the same year it was decreed that native officers could be punished by death, dismissal, suspension, and reprimand, whilst native soldiers could only be punished through corporal or capital punishment. Transportation or imprisonment was, at this stage, not available.\(^9\)

After the 1857 Rebellion, the military authorities in India adopted a lenient disciplinary process as it was felt that excessive violence forced private soldiers towards seditious activities, often leading them to meet violence with violence. The disciplinary apparatus of the Indian Army consisted of three forms of courts-martial. Firstly, a general court-martial which dealt with serious crimes such as treachery and could punish a soldier with death or transportation for life if such punishments were deemed appropriate. The district court-martial generally dealt with VCOs or medical personnel. The district court-martial could demote or suspend a native officer, dealing a setback to both their pay and


privileges. Finally, there was the summary court-martial. A summary court-martial could be convened by as few as one European officer and would hand out extra drill or confinement to barracks as punishment. Summary courts-martial could quickly quell any unrest, however, they tended to act with caution, appearing too harsh could fan the flames of discontent.10

After 1857 the authorities reduced a regimental commandant’s powers of punishment, a sanction had to be obtained from the Commander-in-Chief before extra guard duty or cancellation of paid leave could be implemented. After 1859 the general court-martial came to be the more frequently used method of discipline. A general court-martial was presided over by a number of British officers from differing regiments, taking the pressure off the man on the spot a summary court-martial could create. Unless an offender directly challenged British authority, officers presiding were inclined to be lenient. Offences such as sepoys fighting amongst themselves, drunkenness, and even desertion were met with lesser punishments as the nineteenth century progressed. Roy highlights the case of drunkenness. In 1866, for instance, a subadar was dismissed from service by general court-martial for failing to attend parade through intoxication. In 1899 another subadar was punished with demotion by a general court-martial for the same crime and in 1901 a jemadar was given only a one month suspension.11

Where Roy’s argument falls down is in the exclusion of flogging from his analysis, a punishment not fully removed from the Indian Army until 1920. Flogging was initially prohibited in the India in 1835 by William Bentinck, Governor-General of India 1828-35. Bentinck arrived in India with a reformist agenda and emphasised rehabilitation over retribution, painting the British as benevolent in comparison to the Mughals. Many within the EIC army believed Bentinck’s move would strip away one of the most effective means of discipline within the army. As the figures produced by Peers show, the Bengal Army’s disciplinary record was not compromised by the lack of the lash. Several Governors-General kept Bentinck’s decision in place, but it was rescinded in 1845 by Governor-General Lord Hardinge (1844-8). Hardinge reintroduced flogging, but it was to be used only on a limited scale.12

11 Ibid., pp. 942-56.
Prior to Bentinck’s decision there had been a general trend within the Bengal Army towards limiting flogging as a punishment, given that soldiers of the Bengal Army were of higher castes. Discharge from the army, and the symbolic dishonour that came with it, was the preferred method of punishment, as per Roy’s argument. The armies of Bombay and Madras however, were not made up of men from the higher strata of Indian society. These two presidency armies recruited their soldiers from a much broader span of the Indian population. This diversity meant that high caste was not as evident as in the Bengal Army. The result was that European officers in Bombay and Madras used flogging as a punishment more than their counterparts in Bengal during the 1820s and 30s.13

Corporal punishment was reintroduced for certain crimes in 1845 and as G.L. Pepys, a military secretary with the India Office in the 1930s, had it, the ‘necessity was reaffirmed after the mutiny’.14 The British Army was slower than its Indian counterpart to address the issue of flogging. Until 1860 there was no restriction on the awarding of corporal punishment other than a restriction on the number of lashes. The article of war dealing with this was amended in that year, so no flogging could be carried out without the approval of general or commanding officers of a district or station unless in the case of mutiny or gross insubordination. This was modified again in 1867, so that in peace time no award of corporal punishment could be made by court martial unless it was in a case of mutiny, gross insubordination accompanied by personal violence or for disgraceful conduct. In wartime or the line of march, however, the lash could be given freely. The lash was used infrequently during the 1870s until the Anglo-Zulu War in 1879. The Zululand Campaign saw excessive use of the lash, which provoked parliamentary protestations. In light of protests by many leading liberals, including Gladstone and Lord Hartington, flogging was limited within the British Army to wartime and then only for acts of mutiny or insubordination. The Army Act of 1881 abolished flogging entirely in the British Army.15

The removal of flogging was not universally supported. Many officers in both British and Indian service wished to see it retained. Sir Donald Stewart, Commander-in-Chief India between 1881-5, wrote at this time of how important he felt flogging was to
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13 Ibid., p 218.
15 Ibid.; Spiers, The Late Victorian Army, pp. 73-4.
the maintenance of discipline, citing an example from his service during the Second Anglo-Afghan War:

Corporal punishment was, in point of fact, a substitute for death, and I don't believe that order and discipline can maintained in an army exposed to the temptations of war, if the Commander has no other effective means of enforcing his authority in serious cases, than by resorting to the penalty of death. At the commencement of the Afghan War I had to try three soldiers for insubordination in refusing to perform certain fatigue duties at a time when the whole force was exposed to great privations from cold and hard work. The three men were promptly flogged, and the example was so efficacious that I had not to punish another soldier in the same way during the remainder of the war. How such cases are to be dealt with under the present law I cannot imagine, but I fancy that most Commanders would rather flog an insubordinate soldier illegally than shoot him in accordance with the law.\textsuperscript{16}

Stewart went on to note how ‘painful’ the experience was, given his close relationship with his sepoys, but accepted that it was justified as it ensured the discipline of the regiment. Stewart felt that insubordination was a serious threat to the discipline and cohesion of the whole unit and that flogging was the only means of stamping it out. Alternatives, for Stewart, were non-existent: ‘I do not think it is possible to devise a punishment that will act as an adequate deterrent.’\textsuperscript{17}

Encouraged by his success in removing the lash in the British Army, Lord Hartington went onto push for its removal within the Indian Army also. Ultimately Hartington acquiesced, in 1882, to the retention of flogging but ‘only as a necessity’.\textsuperscript{18} The drafting of the Indian Articles of War 1886 saw the issue raised once more in parliament. Again, the arguments for and against flogging were discussed. This time Lord Roberts became involved. Roberts objected to the abolition of the lash stating:

Although native soldiers are, as a body, quiet and orderly in cantonment, many of them are drawn from turbulent races, upon whom the yoke of discipline bears heavily, while all are liable to be touched by outbursts of temper or fanaticism, when reason is thrown to the winds, and only exemplary punishment inflicted on the spot can be of any avail. One act of insubordination in a native regiment is a thousandfold more dangerous than in a British corps, and might lead to the most disastrous results, unless promptly and effectively checked.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid. p. 405. 
\textsuperscript{18} IOR/L/PJ/6/752 File 896, Use of the Punishment of Flogging in India, 1906. 
\textsuperscript{19} IOR/L/MIL/7/13714 Indian Articles of War Amendment Act, 1894: Retention of Flogging as a Punishment.
Roberts’ view of the native soldiers was not the only argument in favour of the retention of the lash. Flogging remained part of Indian criminal law. The colonial administration believed that the Indian people looked on flogging differently than the people of Britain. It was argued that for many of the peoples of India a whipping was preferred to imprisonment. Imprisonment and hard labour, it was believed, had a stigma attached to them that flogging did not. After a flogging a sepoy could go on to become a good soldier and progress through the native ranks. Lord Elgin claimed that ‘fathers had been known to beg that it [the lash] might be inflicted on their sons, rather than that they should be sent to jail’. As with dismissal from the service, a jail term would result in a loss of income, which may also account for a sepoy and his family preferring to be flogged. Financially, the retention of the lash was also desirable for the government of India. Stewart and Roberts were at the forefront of Army reform, it is telling that they were against the removal of flogging from the Indian Army. It suggests that they felt the reforms were not making the progress they should or that the officers of the Indian Army were not capable of generating the kind of officer-man relationship required to be rid of the need for flogging.

If flogging was to be removed it would have to be replaced for a number of criminal offences with prison sentences. Greater numbers in prison would mean greater costs for the government. It was ultimately decided that the number of lashes that could be meted out as punishment should be reduced from 50 to 25 and that the range of crimes for which a sepoy could be flogged be reduced also. In 1904 it was reported that a sepoy died after his wounds, which were the result of a flogging, had not been tended to. Again, this brought the abolition of flogging in India to the notice of the House of Commons. By this time the lash had been abolished not just in the British Army and Royal Navy but also in the locally recruited regiments of West Indies, giving those in favour of abolition a greater platform from which to argue.
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21 This is at odds with the punishment process in another British colony, Natal. In the eyes of the black community of Natal no disgrace was attached to imprisonment but flogging carried a significant stigma. See Stephen Peté and Annie Devenish, ‘Flogging, Fear and Food: Punishment and Race in Colonial Natal’, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 1 (2005), pp. 3-21.
22 IOR/L/MIL/7/13714 Indian Articles of War Amendment Act, 1894: Retention of Flogging as a Punishment.
23 IOR/L/PJ/6/752 File 896, Use of the Punishment of Flogging in India, 1906.
Flogging was not at this point totally abolished either in India or the Indian Army. Further reductions in its use in the army were made, however, in 1907. The lash was now prohibited in peace-time other than for crimes which would be punished with the whip in civilian life. In civilian life Indians could still be flogged for theft; trespass or house breaking; rape, attempted, abetted, or committed; causing hurt during an attempted robbery; and dacoity (banditry).

On active service it was continued but the punishment could not be administered without referral to and the approval of Army Headquarters. The reason for this was that on active service crimes such as sleeping on sentry or malingering were extremely serious. If flogging was not available to a court martial the only alternative was to meet the guilty verdict with capital punishment. It was felt that imprisonment would not match the severity of the crime. This is at odds with the argument previously put forward in the 1890s by Lord Elgin, regarding the Indian view of imprisonment as the more damaging punishment. British Secretary of State for War, Richard Haldane, wrote to the Viceroy, the Earl of Minto, in August 1907 warning him that flogging was defensible for certain crimes but stated that ‘with the progress of civilisation and public opinion, the retention of this penalty for a large number of offences cannot be defended’. This statement came eighteen months after the Liberal Party had won a landslide election victory. Liberal MPs began to ask Secretary of State for India John Morley if the abolition of corporal punishment could be extended to include the Indian Army.

Between the period 1895 and 1906 it was estimated that one in every 2,000 sepoys had been flogged per year, or one in every other battalion. During the First World War the number of Indian Army floggings increased, owing to the fact that on active service commanding officers could administer punishments through summary courts-martial. In turn this encouraged officers of other colonial contingents to resort to the whip to punish their men. After the First World War the issue of flogging again come to the fore. A
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25 Ibid, Secretary of State for War, Lord Haldane to Viceroy, Earl of Minto, 16 August 1907.
26 Singh, ‘The “Rare Infliction”’, pp. 804-5.
telegram from the Viceroy’s Army Department to Lord Montagu put forth the argument for the continuation of flogging in the Indian Army:

There is no doubt that flogging is a great deterrent. Cases of theft in the barracks frequently become epidemic amongst certain classes of Indians and a flogging not only stops this but the offender has frequently become a good soldier afterwards and it has not been found necessary to dismiss him from the service. But the classes of soldier differ very much and while this punishment is a deterrent and very appropriate amongst soldiers of the lower castes and amongst followers, it is not so appropriate to soldiers of higher castes. Desertion pre-war in peace time was almost unknown in the Indian Army, and was generally confined to young recruits. It is possible, however, that it may become more prevalent in the future owing to the activity of agitators, in which case it might be necessary to find some strong deterrent such as flogging, and the fact that it is still a legal punishment would enable us to exact its application.29

There is nothing new in the argument put to Montagu. The Indian Army’s need for a punishment and deterrent had not diminished, but British public opinion was now firmly against the lash and the Liberal government looked to facilitate reform. Montagu’s reference to differing ‘classes of soldier’ and Roberts’ to ‘turbulent races’ more than likely refer to soldiers drawn from the frontier tribes, such as Baluchis or Pathans, often labelled as ‘fanatics’. It was felt that corporal punishment was needed to coerce and fashion recruits from this region into effective soldiers.30 The Commander-in-Chief, Sir Charles Munro, was in favour of the abolition of flogging in the Indian Army but only if a suitable alternative could be found.

The available alternative was Field Punishment No. 1. This had been regularly used on the Western Front during the First World War and was standardised in 1917. The instructions for carrying out this punishment were as follows:

The soldier must be attached so as to be standing firmly on his feet, which if tied, must not be more than twelve inches apart, and it must be possible for him to move each foot at least three inches. If he is tied round the body there must be no restriction of his breathing. If his arms or wrists are tied, there must be six inches of play between them and the fixed object. His arms must hang either by the side of his body or behind his back… irons should be used when available but straps or ropes may be used in lieu of them when necessary. Any straps or ropes used for this purpose must

29 IOR/L/MIL/7/13738 Abolition of Flogging in the Native Army. Field Punishment in lieu of Flogging as Punishment in the Field, 1906-1936, Summary of replies received by War Office regarding field punishment, 18 April 1919.
be of sufficient width that they inflict no bodily harm, and leave no permanent mark on the offender.\textsuperscript{31}

The issue for Munro and others in the Indian military was the Indian climate. He was concerned that leaving a man tied up in the heat and sun of India would render him incapacitated for a time or leave him with long-term health concerns. The aim of Field Punishment No. 1 was largely to humiliate the offender without any permanent signs of punishment. Munro sought suggestions from the War Office as to what punishments had been used in warmer climates such as Egypt, Mesopotamia, Palestine, and Salonika during the Great War. Major-General Sir Edmund Allenby, who had commanded in the Egyptian Expeditionary Force from 1917 until the culmination of the war, was thus consulted. Allenby gave no allusion to the effects of heat or strong sunlight but did suggest Field Punishment No. 1 was a ‘valuable aid to discipline’ despite it being degrading to the soldier involved.\textsuperscript{32} Field Punishment No. 1 was indeed taken up by the Indian Army. Even though the punishment was abolished in the British Army in 1928, it remained part of the Indian Army’s punishment system until the end of the Raj. Gajendra Singh claimed that in the eyes of the British the Tommy may have evolved past needing such barbarous punishments but the sepoy and their ‘oriental predilection for crime’ had not.\textsuperscript{33} This statement does not give the whole picture. The officers of the Indian Army wanted to keep as many differing forms of punishment available as possible given how diverse the army was – particularly as the Indian Army recruited considerably from the frontier regions, whose inhabitants were still treated differently in civil law.\textsuperscript{34} Radhika Singha’s recent essay on the retention of flogging, and the curious legal arguments surrounding it, also misses a key aspect of the argument. While she is correct that the key argument was that the punishment should be retained as it was rarely used, the key reason for this limited use is that officers used it sparingly as an example, choosing this over inflicting punishment \textit{en masse}. Flogging was effective as it created a spectacle to watch

\textsuperscript{31} IOR/L/MIL/7/13738 Abolition of Flogging in the Native Army. Field Punishment in lieu of Flogging as Punishment in the Field, 1906-1936, Summary of replies received by War Office regarding field punishment, 18 April 1919.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.


and left permanent marks on the recipient, but it was also something that a sepoy could recover from and, after recovery, continue as before.

The use of discipline through example was not, however, confined to corporal punishment. Treason was one crime that was still met with the most severe of punishments – death. In the opening phase of the Second Anglo-Afghan War, two sepoys – Huzrat Shah and Meer Abaz – were charged with ‘having unlawfully loaded and discharged their rifles with the intent to convey intelligence to the enemy’. Both men belonged to the 29th Punjab Infantry. The events took place during the Battle of Peiwar Kotal, 28-9 November 1878. By firing their rifles the two sepoys successfully alerted Afghan forces in the area of their unit’s position. The court of enquiry found Huzrat Shah guilty but decided that Meer Abaz, a much younger soldier, had fired out of confusion upon hearing Shah’s initial shot. Abaz was given two years imprisonment with hard labour for his mistake. Huzrat Shah was hanged for his crime.35

At the same court-martial Jemadar Razan Shah was tried and found guilty of ‘having become aware of Huzrat Shah’s treachery and failing to report it’. Razan Shah received seven years transportation for his wrongdoing. Eighteen other sepoys of the 29th Punjab Infantry were found guilty of desertion during the same battle. The two youngest offenders got prison sentences of one and two years. The other sixteen deserters were condemned to transportation ranging from seven to fourteen years in length. All twenty-one men tried were Pathan and the British authorities felt that this indicated unwillingness amongst Pathan troops to fight against their co-religionists.36 There remained a suspicion among the British in India that Muslim loyalty could not be relied upon, a hangover from the 1857 Rebellion which would emerge again when the Ottoman Empire entered the First World War on the side of the Central Powers. The religious aspect to these crimes may account for the severity with which they were punished. The lighter punishments meted out to younger soldiers is suggestive of an acknowledgement that young, inexperienced troops could be easily led and that short terms of imprisonment would offer them a chance to return to the ranks and be re-assimilated more quickly.

For acts of a more individual nature, such as desertion, a process of discouraging the behaviour by example was again implemented by several British commanders. For
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the sepoys based in Egypt in 1914 being in close proximity to the Ottoman Empire encouraged a small number of Muslim soldiers to desert and attempt to cross the Sinai. In late December four Khattak, Pashtun, men deserted. The first instance reported on the night of 23 December saw four Khattak men desert and that search parties failed to locate them. Eight days later another four Khattak men attempted to desert. This time a cavalry search party had more success. All four men were picked up. A summary court martial found all four men guilty of desertion and sentenced them to death. The sentence was confirmed on three of the Khattak men, whilst the sentence of the fourth was commuted to penal servitude for life.37 There were no further reports of desertion for at least the next two months. This suggests that the capture, trial, and execution of the second band of deserts served as an example to the Muslim soldiers in Egypt, discouraging further attempts to abscond.

On the Western Front Sir James Willcocks also administered punishment as an example. At The First Battle of Ypres the Indian Corps’ medical staff estimated that 1,848 Indian troops were wounded between 23 October and 3 November 1914. 1,049 of these had injuries to their hand, most commonly the left hand. As Morton-Jack points out, it is likely that a large number of these wounds were not self-inflicted. But a significant proportion were. These wounds were mostly amongst the first battalions to see action. The 15th and 47th Sikhs had been bombarded by German shells almost immediately as they took up positions in the front line. These two battalions had the highest number of self-inflicted wounds. Pre-war Indian Army custom dictated that injured sepoys could return home. The self-inflicting of wounds was most likely an impulsive decision by troops that they did not wish to work under such intense shellfire and instead wanted to return home.38 Willcocks initially panicked and requested reinforcements from Sir John French, as he feared the Indian line would give way under a serious German attack. French was keen to see the Indian Corps hold its own without assistance and so refused to reinforce Willcocks. This steeled Willcocks’ resolve and he decided to deter further self-infliction. Convening a field court-martial Willcocks sentenced two sepoys who had self-mutilated to death by firing squad and awarded prison sentences to a number of other men. Willcocks introduced a new rule that lightly wounded soldiers had to return to duty once passed fit, rather than be sent home. These measures helped to stamp out the self-

mutilation by March 1915.\textsuperscript{39} The issue did resurface again in April and May 1915 as new drafts from India arrived. These newly arrived sepoys had not witnessed the example made of the two sepoys in November 1914. Around 200 men injured their hands, feet, or calves as rumours spread that injured sepoys could again choose to return home. Willcocks convened court-martials once more, several troops were handed lengthy prison sentences and the rules regarding lightly wounded men were reiterated. This was enough to see self-mutilation cease for a second time.\textsuperscript{40}

The system for the punishment of native soldiers was a not progressive one despite the fact there was modernising reforms taking place within the Indian Army. The enforcer armed with a battle axe cutting down fleeing troops may have been replaced with the court-martial system, but punishments remained as severe under the British as they had been under the Mughal rulers. In instances warranting it, the death penalty and corporal punishment could be and were both still used. The key to maintaining discipline however was believed to be through example and deterrent. Officers held that to stamp out the ember of insubordination was key to the preservation of discipline and order. For sepoys of a higher caste the greatest deterrent was believed to be discharge. Dismissal acted as an effective deterrent not only because the family of a sepoy relied on his wage but also because removal from the army had the stigma of dishonour attached to it, this was particularly effective when used against VCOs who were in receipt of a higher wage and great honour as the example of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Gurkhas at Almorah below demonstrates. For sepoys of lower caste or rank, the most effective preventative was the lash. It was up to the European officers to use these measures to ensure a native unit’s compliance.

There appears to be no manual suggesting these punishments should be meted out in small numbers by example. Interestingly, Major-General Henry Hancock of the EIC told the Peel Commission that in the irregular system he would have flogged the ‘first man who refused obedience’.\textsuperscript{41} This suggests that the same process of punishment through example existed in some units prior to the 1857 Rebellion. Much like the training and tactics on the North-West Frontier, the approach to discipline in the Indian Army appears to have been passed on rather than laid down officially. Again, there is also the familial link to be considered. As with preconceived notions of race and infantilisation,

\textsuperscript{40} Morton-Jack, \textit{The Indian Army on the Western Front}, p. 174.
\textsuperscript{41} ‘Report of the Peel Commission’, pp. 91.
an officer who had familial ties to the military, and Indian Army in particular, may have arrived in the country with ideas of how to maintain order and discipline in an Indian regiment. Those questioned in relation to the retention of flogging as well as those involved in disciplinary matters all seem to have the same ideas and same approach to the matter, namely that example was the key to the maintenance of order.

**Dissent and Mutiny**

The most severe form of indiscipline is mutiny, and as long as there have been armies and warfare there have been mutinies. Mutiny is one of the most terrifying forms of rebellion as it originates in the armed services, the very institution that is supposed to ensure order and security of the state. It is this terror that has encouraged novelists and filmmakers to focus upon it, from *Battleship Potemkin* (1926), *The Caine Mutiny* (1954) to *Crimson Tide* (1995) and a great many cinematic attempts to convey the events of the mutiny on the *Bounty* in between.\(^{42}\) The word itself derives from the Latin *modus* (meaning motion or movement), in turn this spawned the French word *émeute* (riot) and the German word *meute* (mob). From these etymological beginnings came *meuterei* in German, *muiterij* in Dutch, *mutinerie* in French and the English mutiny. Initially this was a term for a general state of tumult or social disturbance. Only in the sixteenth and seventeenth century did the word mutiny come to be associated with the collective rebellion from within an army. This was against the backdrop of a revolution in the military organisation. Soldiers were becoming part of a standardized, highly organised, war machine. Though slower the same process of standardization took place at sea too as collective decision making gave way to a hierarchical system.\(^{43}\)

The fact the majority of the cinematic and literary works listed above focus on seaborne mutinies may encourage the non-specialist reader to associate the term mutiny with maritime and naval personnel, this is inaccurate.\(^{44}\) The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines a mutiny ‘as a rebellion of a substantial number of soldiers, sailors, prisoners, etc.,
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\(^{44}\) Hathaway, ‘Introduction’, p.xii.
against those in authority’.\(^{45}\) Between 1689 and 1879, the British government passed a series of mutiny acts, including ‘Articles of War’ which dealt with discipline and punishment, applicable to both the British and Indian Armies. The final Mutiny Act of 1879 defined mutiny as collective insubordination, or a combination of two or more persons to resist or to induce others to resist lawful military authority.\(^{46}\)

These definitions suggest that a mutiny cannot be carried out by a single soldier. Neither description uses the term violent, suggesting that a mutiny can be non-violent or bloodless. They also imply that the authorities expected soldiers to take their problems to their superiors separately, and in turn.\(^{47}\) Jane Hathaway suggests that the majority of mutinies follow a similar pattern. According to Hathaway there is usually a ‘rising action’, consisting of underlying social, economic, or political grievances. An ‘inciting incident’ then occurs, often a lack of food or pay. Next comes the ‘climax’, the rejection of authority by military men. Finally comes the ‘denouement’, the resolution and conclusion of proceedings, successful or otherwise.\(^{48}\) This pattern put forward by Hathaway covers the majority of mutinies featured in her volume and is equally apt for this study of the Indian Army.

In several cases it is the European officer’s behaviour and actions that prove to be either the ‘rising action’, ‘inciting incident’ or both. The most famous revolt carried out by the Indian Army is of course the 1857 Rebellion, followed by the 1806 Vellore mutiny. These may have received the majority of scholarly attention, but they were not the only Indian mutinies during the period of British rule in India. According to David Omissi, there were fourteen so-called mutinies in the Indian Army between the years 1886 and 1930, thirteen of which occurred up to and including 1918. Six of these mutinies took place in India and three in neighbouring Burma. Of the other five, two occurred in both China and Mesopotamia, with the other taking place in Singapore. Omissi therefore concludes that Indian soldiers were more likely to rebel outside of India. This is significant given that much of a unit’s service would be in India.\(^{49}\) Omissi only concerns himself with insubordinations that are traceable through official military reports available
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at the India Office Records. There are of course instances prior to 1886 worth studying which have not been previously examined by historians. There was a small but important mutiny which took place in 1865, which has not previously been studied. Equally, by using sources besides the official reports different conclusions can be formed on a number of the mutinies between 1886 and 1930 analysed by Omissi. This chapter intends to study the 1865 mutiny and a number of other insubordinations to assess the role of officer mismanagement as a cause of such actions.

The relationship between the British officers, Indian VCOs, and sepoys or sowars was key to a regiment upholding discipline, maintaining morale, and conducive to a good performance in battle. On this subject Sir John Lawrence, Viceroy of India 1864-69, wrote:

There are many things in our military system which the natives like. Such as the good and certain pay, the pensions, the furloughs which they enjoy; but, after all in their minds everything depends on the commanding officer. The native officers do not look to rule or law, nor even to the government, but they do look to him. And if he has not the qualities either to command their love nor their reverence, a corps may look well on parade and be drilled to any extent but it will never stand the strain of a real difficulty.  

Lawrence’s assessment was written in 1865 and in response to insubordination by the 9th Bengal Cavalry under a Captain Mecham. Clifford Henry Mecham was born on 24 September 1831 to George Mecham, 3rd Dragoon Guards, and his wife Harriett. Mecham’s baptism is recorded in Melcombe Regis, Dorset, in February 1832. Soon after his baptism however, the family moved to St. Helier, Jersey. After being educated at Cheltenham College and through a private tutor Mecham joined the the EIC Army. Quite why Mecham decided to join the EIC is unclear given that his father served in a famous cavalry regiment of the British Army. The 3rd Dragoon Guards could boast Blenheim, Ramillies, Malpaquet, and Talavera amongst its battle honours by the time of Clifford Mecham’s birth. In 1857 Mecham joined the newly raised Hodson’s Horse, an irregular cavalry unit raised in the early stages of the Indian Mutiny by Brevet Major William Stephen Raikes Hodson. Hodson’s Horse played a key role in the retaking of Delhi whilst Mecham himself took part in the defence of the Residency at Lucknow, his sketches of the residency during the revolt were published in book form in 1858. Mecham served with Hodson himself for only a brief time before his death in March 1858.

50 Mss Eur F90/28, no.26, Sir John Lawrence to Sir Charles Wood 15/04/1865.
After the mutiny Mecham continued his career as a regimental officer in the newly created Indian Army. He served as second-in-command and later commandant of the 2nd and 3rd battalions of Hodson’s Horse respectively, before being promoted captain and moving to become commandant of 9th Bengal Cavalry in 1863. In this period Mecham’s career came under the spotlight and his name can be found in the correspondence of Sir Charles Wood, Secretary of State for India 1859-66, as well as Viceroy Sir John Lawrence. On 15 April 1865 Lawrence wrote to Wood to inform him of a small mutiny by men of the 9th Cavalry. He attributed the revolt to Mecham, who he claimed had provided his men with meagre rations and charged them an additional tax. This extra taxation was used to see the men well equipped and mounted. According to Lawrence: ‘This man cared for nothing than the good will of his commanding officer and so the ill will and discontent of his men passed unchecked’. 51

Such disgruntlement could only have gone unnoticed by Mecham for two reasons. Firstly, if he ignored the warning bade him by his native officers. Secondly, if Mecham’s native officers were dissatisfied they may not have informed him of the unsettled state of the regiment. Whatever the case, it is at odds with the Mecham of 1857. During the early stages of the mutiny Mecham had been able to keep his own men in check by using his VCOs to calm them and to report on any unrest. Indeed, when his men’s frustration did finally boil over, Mecham and his second-in-command were saved by the fact they were warned by one of their native officers that an attack on their bungalow was imminent. 52

An example of this relationship bearing fruit can be seen in the war diary of the 27th Punjabis. The War Diary describes the difficulties officers faced in convincing sepoys to accept inoculations against cholera in Mesopotamia in 1916. A rumour spread through the regiment that troops in Egypt had been given the same inoculation to protect them from cholera, but it had rendered them impotent. The sepoys of the 27th refused even after being informed that the vaccination was compulsory. The following day Subadar Major Mir Akbar found out who was behind these rumours and persuaded them to be
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immunised, the rest of the regiment then followed suit.\textsuperscript{53} A trivial issue, perhaps, but one that nonetheless highlights the role of a good VCO.

A second officer who allegedly incited mutiny in his men was Lieutenant-General, then Colonel, Harry Lyster VC. Lyster, like Mecham, had joined the Indian Army prior to the 1857 Indian Rebellion. Lyster won his Victoria Cross as a lieutenant in the 72\textsuperscript{nd} Bengal Native Infantry when serving in the Central India Campaign under Sir Hugh Rose in 1858. He went on to command 1\textsuperscript{st} Battalion the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Gurkha Regiment – including during the Second Anglo-Afghan War, 1878-80. As Colonel of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Gurkhas Lyster caused unrest in 1886 at their permanent barracks, Almorah. There was in place at this time a system known as ‘compensation for dearness of provisions’, whereby part of a soldier’s income was deducted to pay for supplies but then refunded at a later date. The amount of compensation a soldier would receive depended on the quality of the provisions he received. In the case of rice, for example, a higher quality rice would fetch one rupee for eight seers but for a lower quality of rice ten seers could be purchased for the same one rupee.\textsuperscript{54} The official report into insubordination would later assert that Lyster had been claiming for rice of ‘the most expensive kind of table rice and only used by the wealthiest natives, and at marriage feasts, and other occasions of ostentatious hospitality.’\textsuperscript{55} Each man had been receiving a small addition to his regular pay from the compensation since 1883. Lyster was replaced by a Colonel Money who had been aware of this issue but did not think to raise it until he himself took over and became responsible for the compensation claim. Money had attempted to reduce the compensation the men of 3\textsuperscript{rd} Gurkha received in January 1885 when he was acting commander in Lyster’s absence. A Company 3\textsuperscript{rd} Gurkha refused to accept the reduction and the problem was only resolved when Lyster returned and doled out the usual amount of compensation.\textsuperscript{56} Having failed in his first attempt to stem the excess allowance, Money attempted to obtain official decree on the matter before tackling it for a second time. Armed with an order from HQ Money announced that the rice batta would be reduced.\textsuperscript{57} Naturally, the men of 1st
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Battalion the 3rd Gurkha Regiment did not appreciate this sudden change in income. The mens’ allowance went from Rs 2-8-0 to around 12 annas per man per month. As a consequence of this loss of income a number of Gurkha met in secret and planned to make their feelings known during their annual inspection, in what Vincent Ormsby called ‘a most mutinous manner’. As the inspecting General Gordon and Colonel Money visited the hospital at Almorah the Gurkha ranks, including those on guard duty, assembled on the parade ground to protest.

In his account of the 1886 Almorah insurrection, Ormsby claims that Lyster received only a light reprimand for his part in this misdemeanour. The insubordinate Gurkhas received similarly light chastisement, even the ring leaders of the defiant act went without particularly severe punishment. Soon after this event Lyster was promoted to major-general. According to Ormsby it was Colonel Money who was scapegoated for the incident. Money, unlike Lyster, had no connection in the higher echelons of the Indian Army. The unfortunate colonel found himself with the command of Chunar Fort. Chunar was well known as a ‘dumping ground for old and invalided soldiers’. Vincent Ormsby served at Chunar under Colonel Money but his account of the events at Almorah may be biased towards Money as he eventually became Ormsby’s father-in-law. The official report into the mutinous actions of the 3rd Gurkhas in 1886 largely blames Lyster for the unsavoury incident. The Gurkhas saw Money as the villain of the piece for reducing their income and they misunderstood the orders from HQ with regards to what they were allowed according to army regulations. When the men did protest to General Gordon more peacefully they also brought up a series of other complaints such as the cost of fuel, nine months without furlough, the fact that had had to contribute to the building and repair of the fort, and the lack of a sheltered area to cook in during bad weather. All of these additional complaints had, similarly to Mecham’s case, either not been picked up on or ignored by the native officers.

The official report of the revolt at Almorah labels Money a weak commander who failed to gain the confidence of his Indian officers, NCOs, and men. It was the fact he was
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seen as unfit for command that resulted in his removal to Chunar Fort. The sepoy-sahib relationship is emphasised by most scholars as being the key factor in explaining why Indian soldiers fought for their British masters. The above examples show how the native soldier behaved when this relationship was damaged. Mecham, Lyster, and Money were all veterans of the 1857 Rebellion having joined the army of the EIC. Given that a major cause of the rebellion was the souring of the relationship between the Indian soldier and the European officer this suggests that some officers who formerly served the EIC did not learned from past mistakes.

The higher echelons of military authority in India recognised that in many cases of insubordination the British officer was the one at fault and could cause disturbances within his regiment. In these cases, Roy states that the British officer was removed at once from his position. Yet, these officers could simply be removed from their present position and placed in another role with a different regiment, as was the case with Clifford Mecham, who was discussed earlier. Mecham died of syphilis in September 1865, aged just 33, but he did not die in disgrace as may have been expected. Instead of being punished or removed from the Indian Army Mecham was transferred from the 9th Bengal Cavalry and instead posted to the 10th Cavalry. The insubordinate soldiers of the 9th, however, were imprisoned. Lawrence lamented the fact that as viceroy he could not interfere with the court martial process and punishment process in the case of the 9th Cavalry. According to Lawrence British officers tended to act with undue severity when court martalling native soldiers despite the fact in many instances the officers were as culpable if not more so. Eventually the mutinous men of the 9th Bengal Cavalry were released from prison by Commander-in-Chief of India, the recently appointed General Sir William Mansfield, with the exception of the ring-leader of the revolt who had his sentence reduced from seven years imprisonment to three.

Another case traceable through the letters of Sir John Lawrence and Sir Charles Wood is that of a Colonel Stanley, again from 1865. Lieutenant-Colonel Stanley allowed a man under his command to wound a sepoy on the parade ground. Stanley was removed from his position but allegedly received only a light reprimand from the Commander-in-
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Chief. Much to Lawrence’s disappointment Stanley was not dismissed from the Bombay Army and so was still able to draw pay. It was felt by Lawrence and other politicians in India that Stanley should be punished as a warning to other European officers against the maltreatment of native soldiers. A tribunal or courts-martial made up of British Officers would never however, have found one of their own guilty in a case involving a native sepoy.  

When acts of insubordination involved the VCOs and NCOs of the Indian Army the most common course of action was the punish them through discharge or to deny them promotion. This set an example, cooling discontent amongst the remaining native officers and sepoys of a regiment. Such dismissals were an important event as the pace of promotion for Indian officers was slower than for British officers. If a VCO, for example, was dismissed it prompted the remainder of the regiment to reign in their protest as to continue would affect their chances of receiving a promotion to the newly vacant position or to subsequent vacated positions. This was taken further at Almorah in 1886. Subadar-Major Bhim Sing Gharti and Subadar Jit Sing Allia of the 3rd Gurkhas were both pensioned off as a result of this mutiny as they had failed to pick up on or discourage the unrest within the regiment. The replacement subadar-major and subadar were chosen from outside of the battalion as to deny the other Indian officers and NCOs of 3rd Gurkha promotion as punishment for the debacle.

A similar punishment was carried out in early 1915. The Mahsud contingent of the 130th King George's Own Baluchis (Jacob's Rifles) had mutinied during August 1914 over the overlooking of a fellow Mahsud subadar for promotion, 79 men were tried and sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. Early experience of the First World War suggested to the British that regiments drawn largely from Muslims of the North-West Frontier, as the 130th were, were prone to heavy desertion if sent to the Persian Gulf and Mesopotamia to fight the Ottoman Empire. It was thus decided that the 130th should be sent instead to East Africa to face the German Army. During embarkation at Bombay, Major Anderson of the 130th was attacked and killed by a Mahsud sepoy wielding a bayonet. The Mahsud bore a personal grudge against the Adjutant and had intended to murder him – he mistook Anderson. Embarkation was suspended. The murderer was
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sentenced to death and hanged at the docks two days later. The authorities in Bombay could not prove it but felt more Mahsud sepoys were complicit in the murder. The 130th was sent to Rangoon whilst further investigations were carried out. At Rangoon the Mahsuds were detained and the rest of the regiment were to embark for Mombasa. Three Pathan companies of the 130th mutinied in November 1914 they refused to travel abroad for active service. The ring leaders were severely punished, two were executed and five others given lengthy terms of transportation. 197 insubordinate men were sentenced to varying terms of transportation or imprisonment. As at Almorah, several Indian Officers were punished for failing to detect or deter the mutinous fervour within the 130th Baluchis. According to the Parliamentary enquiry into the conduct of the 130th a sudabar-major and two other VCOs were dismissed.

It was felt necessary by Sir John Nixon, Commander-in-Chief of Southern Army, India, to remove the 130th Baluchis commander, Lieutenant-Colonel Mennie. According to the official report the ‘whole sequence of event seemed to prove his command unsatisfactory’. Mennie’s position seems to parallel that of the above-mentioned Colonel Money in that he was removed as his leadership had failed to prevent insubordinate acts. There is no suggestion in the reports that Mennie had in any way behaved out of line but he, like Money, lacked either competent Indian officers or the confidence of them to prevent a revolt.

The most well-known revolt by Indian soldiers is the mutiny of 5th Native Light Infantry (NLI), ironically known as the ‘Loyal 5th’, at the Singapore Naval Base on 15 February 1915. The Singapore mutiny is the only case of sepoy violence against their European officers and serves as a good benchmark against which to compare the more passive insubordinations seen in India during this period. On the Chinese New Year holiday of 15 February 1915 the troops of 5th NLI mutinied at Alexandra Barracks, Singapore. The date was chosen because the predominately Chinese city would be in a relaxed and celebratory mood. Around half of the garrison’s 850 men rebelled. The 5th NLI’s British officers were off duty when the mutiny began and news was slow to reach them of the commencing insurrection. The mutineers divided into three groups. The first cluster headed to a POW camp and released captured German sailors. The second group
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headed into central Singapore. The third gang headed to the Malay States Guides’ barrack and attempted to persuade them to join the revolt. Clashes saw at least thirty people lose their lives. Most of the dead were European soldiers and civilians but a number of Indian troops were killed too. The mutineers had been deliberately shooting at any Europeans they came across regardless of gender or age. Western women and children were hastily evacuated to boats in the harbour and at the Singapore Gaol the families of European prison warders were locked in cells for their own protection.\textsuperscript{71}

The mutineers failed to gain any local support, but the authorities were slow to react. The 5\textsuperscript{th} were the only regular army unit defending Singapore and they were in open revolt. The Malay police were poorly trained and rarely carried firearms. There were volunteer units in Singapore made up of locals but as it was Chinese New Year most of these were off duty celebrating. Much like the Malay police, the Chinese units were also poorly trained. Martial Law was declared in Singapore and eventually an assortment of army reinforcements and sailors from nearby naval vessels suppressed the rising. By the time British reinforcements had reached Singapore from Burma the revolt was all but extinguished. In all the mutiny had lasted ten days.\textsuperscript{72} Repercussions were severe. 202 men of the 5\textsuperscript{th} Native Light Infantry were tried and all but one found guilty. 11 men of the Malay States Guides were also put on trial accused of joining the mutineers but these were adjudged to be innocent. Sentences included forty-one hangings, transportation for life, and prison sentences ranging from six weeks to twenty years. These were not just sepoys of the rank and file, the guilty included two Indian VCOs, nine havildars, and 11 naiks. Both VCOs were sentenced to death, as were six havildars and all 11 naiks.\textsuperscript{73}

Many historians now agree that the predominant cause of the mutiny at Singapore was pan-Islamic sentiment and propaganda distributed by the Indian nationalist \textit{Ghadar} movement (\textit{Ghadar} is literally translated from Urdu as ‘revolutionary’). The \textit{Ghadar} Party had been a long-time challenge to British rule in India, but the authorities were more
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than able to contain it within India, just as they were Ottoman attempts at to subvert the Muslim population of India. Singapore had no intelligence network in 1914 and so no way of surveilling Ottoman or Ghadar agitators. The 5th NLI had come into contact with several Ghadar supporters whilst based at Singapore all of whom had gone unnoticed by the authorities owing to the lack of apparatus. A local shop owner was a Ghadar and a Muslim holy man at the local Mosque had given several anti-British diatribes. A number of the 5th’s own NCOs were also believed to have given nationalist or pro-German lectures. Jamadar Chisti Khan was purported to have encouraged sepoys to reject a move to Egypt to fight against the Ottomans and to have drawn maps in the dirt for the sepoys of the main theatres of the First World War and alleged that both Belgium and France were finished and that Germany would soon invade England.

At the time, however, the official court of enquiry for the Singapore Mutiny presented a number of primary and secondary factors as to why the sepoys rebelled. Nationalist sympathies were only noted as a secondary cause of the uprising. Chief amongst the reasons presented was the considerable tension amongst the 5th NLI’s British officers, which had a detrimental effect on discipline within the regiment. The commanding officer, Lieutenant-Colonel Martin, had taken charge of the regiment two years prior to the mutiny and observed that there was a ‘solid clique of British officers who were in opposition to him’. Rather than break up this group, Martin adopted a ‘live and let live’ approach. As long as regimental business was not affected Martin was happy to let the officers dislike of him go unchecked. The report stated that this division amongst the 5th NLI’s British officers was clear for the sepoys to see and dampened the prestige they held for their officers. This consequently led to a drop in discipline. Similar disagreements were prevalent between the Indian officers and factions of the 5th’s sepoys. There was a vacancy in the regiment for a VCO. It was expected that the position would be filled by a regimental havildar who was not Pathan, a source of disgruntlement because the 5th NLI was made up predominately of Pathans. The non-Pathan portion of the 5th were then offended when Lieutenant-Colonel Martin decided to examine other NCOs for the position.
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Clearly, both the British and Indian contingents of the 5th were deeply divided. The official report into the mutiny concluded that the poor state of the regiment as a whole left it open to outside influences.\textsuperscript{76} It has also been alleged that word of Chisti Khan’s anti-British lectures had reached the ears of Major Cotton, of the 5th but it is unclear from the sources who informed him and why he failed to act on the information and investigate Khan further.\textsuperscript{77} Had the 5th NLI had a more unified command any disgruntlement on the part of the native officers, NCOs, sepoys may have been more easily noticed and quashed, leaving the regiment less open to sedition from groups such as the Ghadar activists.

During the 1857 Rebellion prisons were a focal point for the mutineers. As a symbol of British power and punishment over the native population they had been an early target for rebels. In most cases the rebels took the opportunity to release comrades and other imprisoned natives.\textsuperscript{78} This was also true of the mutiny at Singapore in February 1915. As discussed above, one group of rebellious sepoys headed for the POW camp and released the German naval crew of the SMS Emden.\textsuperscript{79} This is intriguing given the Emden that was responsible for the only shelling of the Indian mainland of the First World War when it fired on Madras in September 1914. Focus on prisons is not simply contained however, to violent mutinies. At Almora in 1886 when the 3rd Gurkha’s ringleaders were imprisoned after the initial revolt their comrades marched on the barracks jail and demanded their colleagues be released or themselves interned also.\textsuperscript{80} Bloodless mutinies could also turn their attention to the nearest prison. Omissi suggests that at Almora the Gurkhas were simply attempting to show solidarity in the face of British attempts to separate the men from the influence of the rabble-rousers. The attraction to the nearest prison is however, a deeper-rooted focus on the mainstay of British penal methods.

The Indian Army was not alone in the act of insubordination owing to local circumstances. The most comparable action occurred during the First World War, on the Western Front in 1917, at Étaples, Northern France. These events were similar in cause, consequence and scale to those of the Indian Army between 1861 and 1921. Étaples was
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a coastal base used for training in gas warfare. The training regime was rigorous and conditions were oppressive.\textsuperscript{81} In September 1917 a gunner from the New Zealand Expeditionary Force was arrested. A group of troops gathered to demand his release, after an altercation took place between the group and a military policeman, rioting broke out.

Many were given punishments in the wake of the Étaples mutiny but only one soldier, Corporal Jesse Short of the Northumberland Fusiliers, was sentenced to death and executed. Short was charged with inciting his men to lay down their arms and attack an officer, he was alleged to have said to his men: ‘you ought to get a rope and tie it round his neck with a stone and throw him into the river’.\textsuperscript{82} Just like the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Gurkhas at Almora, the insubordination at Étaples saw underlying tensions boil over when a member of the group was imprisoned and the prison and the release of the interned man thus provided a focal point for the mutineers. Unlike the events at Almora, the mutiny at Étaples became violent very quickly.

With the exception of the Singapore Mutiny in 1915, the mutinies listed here, caused at least in part by their officers’ failings, saw the sepoys take a non-violent stance. Indian history is littered with examples of both passive and violent peasant revolts against the British. For example, in 1810, in response to a new EIC house tax the residents of Benares left their homes and sat in protest outside of the city limits. Yet, during the Fakir Uprising in Bengal, 1776, peasants raided British factories, stole goods, weapons and ammunition and skirmishes broke out with EIC forces.

Whether passive or violent, peasant resistance usually had three general consequences. Firstly, some sort of advantage is secured by the peasants. Secondly, the resistance can erode away an unpopular law or policy. Finally, the practice of resistance can lay the foundations for more overt political activity.\textsuperscript{83} In relation to the above military acts of resistance it is only the first two consequences that can be seen in action. For example, the men of the 9\textsuperscript{th} Bengal Cavalry secured the removal of Captain Mecham and with it his additional taxation for equipment and uniform. Thus, there is an advantage gained in pay and Mecham’s unpopular policy is removed when he himself is transferred.


The nature of military service may account for the failure of these acts of insubordination spreading further. Guha states that insurgency was spread by both verbal and nonverbal means. In an isolated area such as a hill station, Almorah for example, the men of 3rd Gurkha would have been cut off from larger population. Therefore, these men would have been unable to spread their discontent, should they have wished to do so. Even in Singapore in 1915 the fact that the 5th NLI were the only Indian Army unit on a predominately Chinese island meant that the revolt did not spread to any of the local volunteer units or the general populace.

Coupled with Indian use passive resistance is the tradition of soldiers colluding in the barracks. As Peter Stanley has noted, barrack rooms acted as the parliament of the British working man. This accounts for the coherence in the soldiers’ protest. Soldiers and workers alike, formed enclaves, communities bound by shared experiences of background, work and hardships. These enclaves emerged wherever industrial workers congregated. Binding characteristics included race, ethnicity, skill, and economic status. In many cases the skills and points of view of the parents would be passed on to the children and they would remain in the same enclave. Parallels can be drawn here with the Indian Army. The sons of soldiers would often follow their fathers and join the army, usually the same regiment. The majority of sepoys or sowars in a regiment would be from the same region, and share the same race and religion, in all likelihood, they would also have the same background, often one of agriculture. Indian soldiers therefore created their own enclaves in much the same way as industrial workers in the western world.

Just like workers in Victorian England, soldiers pursued grievances through ‘autonomous working groups’, electing and supporting improvised committees, often comprising of older and more experienced men. Normally such negotiations or protestation were over wages or working conditions. In this instance, soldiers in
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cantonment are little different than men in the cotton mill or workshop. Likewise, Indian soldiers were equally organised in demonstrating their grievances. Unlike European industrial workers or British soldiers, however, sepoys would not have acted in a democratic manner. It is more likely that authority in Indian protest groups would have remained with any VCOs or NCOs who were part of the disgruntled faction.

Conclusion

The punishment system available to and used by British officers of the Indian Army became more humanised not because of any great moral reformations in India but because of those implemented in Britain. Indeed, when William Bentinck did abolish the lash in 1835 it was reinstated ten years later. Had the authorities in India gone unchallenged by British politicians there may well have been no reductions in the regulations regarding flogging. Roy is correct in his assertions that discharge was an effective deterrent, but this was not the case throughout the entire Indian Army, its ranks were too diverse. Flogging remained an important example and deterrent in the eyes of the Indian Army officer, and when it was used it was not done so in haste or without great heaviness of heart as described by Sir Donald Stewart. Yet, the continued existence of corporal punishment and the need to set examples suggests that despite all of the efforts at modernisation and the attempted strengthening of bonds between sepoys and their officers, there remained an element of mistrust on the part of the officers. They still sought to retain corporal punishment as an insurance policy against insubordination, which Indian troops were willing to turn to if they found their situation disagreeable.

It is generally thought that after the Great Revolt of 1857 all unrest within the Indian Army dissolved, this chapter suggests otherwise. A considerable number of mutinies erupted after 1858. During this period of history, the Indian Army on the whole served the British Empire faithfully and without significant disturbance on the scale of 1857. A number of minor insurrections occurred which blight the record of the Indian Army between 1861 and 1921. As this chapter shows even when the primary course of the insubordination was religion, the European officers of the Indian Army were still culpable through mismanagement of their unit. For instance, Mennie of the 130th allowed

ill-feeling to go unnoticed, whilst Cotton of the 5th NLI failed to bring his fellow officers into line and as a result discipline dropped, opening the regiment up to Ghadar subversion. These two men, and Money at Almorah, did not have the necessary skills to command their mens’ respect and were removed from their respective posts because of it. When an officer was guilty of mistreating or mismanaging his troops he too was removed from his position. There seems to be little difference in the severity of the punishments meted out to Mecham and Lyster in comparison to that of Mennie or Money. Even the violent Colonel Stanley was not wholly removed from the Indian Army for his actions. This suggests that in the eyes of the military authorities in India no matter how wrong their actions against a native soldier it was not worthy of dismissal. On the other hand, if a native officer was found to have let down his officer the most common punishment was dismissal.

In many of these cases the Indian soldiers, drawn from the native peasantry, followed the same pattern of resistance as their civilian brethren when local circumstances are not in their favour. Such instances were contained to single regiments or stations largely due to the dispersed nature of military service, even the religiously motivated revolt at the Singapore Naval Base failed to spread further than the disaffected, ill-disciplined 5th. With the exception of the 1915 mutiny, these examples show sepoys effectively taking industrial action against their officer in response to his methods, their working conditions, service demands, a combination of these, or all of them.

Having now established how the Indian Army officer corps professionalised, modernised and weeded out the majority of ineffectual leaders in this period; evaluated the punishment system available the Indian Army officers; and, assessed what happened when officers mismanaged their troops, this thesis will now move onto look at officers’ social lives in India. The subcontinent offered many opportunities to enjoy sports, hunting, and social occasions, these could be used to foster new relationships, gain favour with officials, senior officers, and to seek fame also. However, failure to join in with certain activities, or the wrong move in courtship, could see an officer ostracised.
Chapter 6:

‘The jungle is no place for a woman’¹

Officers’ Social and Sporting Lives in India

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to analyse the officers’ lives outside of their organised military existence, exploring how they spent their leisure hours. The chapter will look at how gender and masculinity informed an officer’s choice of hobbies, the maintenance of British values and white superiority in India, how connections were made and maintained through clubs, sports, and marriage, and what happened when officers made poor choices during their free time and found themselves in trouble. The social life of an officer in the Indian Army could be an enjoyable but complex affair. There was ample opportunity to partake in sports as well as much socialising to be done. Former Indian civil servant, Dennis Kincaid wrote that for the European in India living in close proximity to a military cantonment made life enjoyable. Women enjoyed the attention of young officers at dinner-parties. The men would be honoured to be asked to dine at the mess.² Such meetings provided entertainment for the officers and helped create connections. How these connections were forged on the playing field and in the club will be assessed in this chapter. Marriage, the ultimate connection between two people, carried with it a considerable number of unwritten rules for officers of the Indian Staff Corps. The process of moving to being married to the regiment to marrying a suitable partner will also be assessed. As Chapter 2 has shown most officers arrived in India already connected to either the military, India or the British Empire more broadly. This chapter shows how these connections were maintained and new ones made during an officers time on the subcontinent.

As has been discussed previously, the promoting and playing of sport in the regiment was a means of promoting masculinity and Britishness, as well physical fitness and esprit de corps. Sport also encouraged men such as Nigel Woodyatt to transfer into

¹ Mss Photo Eur 288, Other Days: copy of extract from memoir by Lt-Col Granville Pennefather Evans, p. 143.
the Indian Staff Corps so that he could prolong his time in India, where he enjoyed polo and horse racing. Sport in India was more than just a pastime however. It came to symbolise masculinity and Britishness. Those who did not take up sport whilst in India gained themselves a negative mantle. It also represented British dominion over the native Indian populace. The hunting of tigers, for instance, harked back to the British victory over Tipu Sultan, the ‘Tiger of Mysore’. Using previously unstudied memoir literature written by officers, this chapter will look at how an officer looked to show his own manly prowess through sports and hunting. This chapter will also argue that many officers looked to continue to promote their own masculinity after their military career through the writing of memoirs or guide books. For many officers sport was an alternative to war. They could not be on active service all of the time so a hunting excursion or battling with another team on the polo field was the next best thing.

Finally, this chapter will look at how men were ostracised by their peers. Those who landed in debt through gambling, alcoholism, or a combination of the two were initially afforded support by their brother officers. Over time, however, this would be eroded, especially if the men in question showed poor character when in drink, as was the case will George Pirrie. A man in debt was seen as letting down his regiment and the service as a whole. The effects of this will be assessed in this chapter.

Ultimately, the social and sporting side of life in the Indian Army was important to the men who served there. Such pursuits could have a bearing on their career choices, or open avenues of progression for them, it coloured the memories of their Indian career, and it could affect their love lives too.

**Sporting Pursuits**

During the second half of the nineteenth century, sports were a predominately male affair. It became the accepted wisdom that these sporting pastimes made men out of boys. Women who wished to join in found themselves blocked by an ‘athletic apartheid’. Women were mostly restricted to golf and tennis, neither of which was seen to pose any serious risk to their reproductive capabilities. Organised games came to be considered masculine or manly. Those who did not partake in organised sports therefore did not fit

---

the system. They were just deemed non-masculine. Manliness was not a birthright but something that was earned by a boy. The characteristics of manliness shifted numerous times but by the late Victorian, early Edwardian period masculinity within the British Empire came to mean sportsmanship, strength and endurance. Other peoples and cultures whose men did not partake in organised sport were deemed to be lacking this same manliness, the ability to play games with standardised rules highlighted that the British were ‘civilized’.4

Amongst the officers of the Indian Army, according to George Younghusband, no man wanted to acquire the mantle of ‘mug’. A ‘mug’ was an officer who did not enjoy going out shooting or partake in sports, who drank only water in the mess, went to bed early, and swotted for examinations. When at first the Staff College was opened it was seen as only for ‘mugs’. But as time went on attendance of Staff College began to open doors for these so-called ‘mugs’. Younghusband wrote that opposition to Staff College started to melt away as men realised: ‘Darn my skin! If old Smuggins is good enough to be a Staff Officer, dashed if I’m not too.’ Staff College ‘caught on’. Yet even at Staff College it was important to not be seen as a ‘mug’. An officer had to do well and avoid being labelled a ‘slacker’ but by the same token they must not appear overzealous and too hard working. The fact that staff college had ‘caught on’, as Younghusband put it, meant that some of the more sporting officers attended. Whilst there they could partake in polo and horse racing amongst other pursuits.5

Nigel Woodyatt was able to play polo in India and was able to purchase a polo pony for an extremely good price. He watched and gambled on much horse racing, he called Ambala the ‘Aintree of India’ as the racetrack had a grandstand. He also attended many balls in the summer capital at Simla, where he was able to meet the great and good of British India.6 This encouraged Woodyatt to apply for a transfer into the Indian Army. During his interview with the Deputy Adjutant-General of the Bengal Army Woodyatt was asked ‘Fond of Shooting?’ and answered ‘yes, sir, very’.7 He was subsequently admitted into the Bengal Staff Corps. The Deputy Adjutant-General was assessing Woodyatt’s suitability for the Indian Army. He did not want to admit a ‘mug’ to the Indian

---

6 Woodyatt, Under ten viceroys, pp. 13-17, 29-31.
7 Ibid., p. 57.
Army officer corps. By asking if Woodyatt liked to hunt he is checking that he would be compatible with other men of the officer corps

It was widely recognised in the Victorian period that exercise was a good way to remain healthy. This was something Alexander Fenton clearly believed in. Fenton wrote to his mother that once his debts were cleared he would have Rs 150 per month spare. He intended to use this money to play ‘racket’ and to fund his hunting expeditions also. Fenton told his mother these important, recreational pursuits helped maintain good health. According to Fenton it was the ‘stay at homes’ who often became ill. Those who did not join in on the sports field or join the hunt would have been seen as lacking masculinity and being devoid of British values. This is comparable to the British Army, many of whose officers held similar beliefs as their Indian Army counterparts. One of the Victorian era’s most celebrated soldiers Garnet Wolseley wrote in 1869:

Being a good sportsman, a good cricketer, good at rackets or any other manly game, is no mean recommendation for staff employment. Such a man, without book lore, is preferable to the most deeply-read one of lethargic habits.

Whilst Wolseley’s claims do not match up with those of Younghusband, the statement from Wolseley suggests that ‘mugs’ were unpopular figures in both armies. As discussed previously, the British Army officer corps had its origins firmly rooted in the upper classes. Thus, the pastimes of the upper echelons of British society became the pastimes of the British officer class. One of the foremost passions of the British upper class was sport, predominately hunting, shooting, fishing, and horse racing. Service in both Africa and India gave officers ample opportunity to continue these pursuits. This passion was further fostered through an officer’s public school education. This would encourage competitive and team sports. Most went from public school, to Sandhurst or Woolwich, then into the mess. Thus, meant that the public school atmosphere remained in the all-male environment of the officer corps. Sports, particularly team sports, were heavily encouraged in schools with the aim of bringing ‘out muscle, pluck, self-reliance, independence – the animal man’. This was the result of a Social Darwinist approach by

8 Mss Eur C404, Alexander Bulstrode Fenton Papers.
10 Campbell, ‘The Army Isn’t All Work’, pp. 9-10, 18-9;
many headmasters aiming to produce strong men ready for a life of conflict. It was also believed that sport would instil Christian and chivalrous values into pupils.\textsuperscript{11} 

Harry Ross is an example of an officer who continued his sporting pursuits in the Indian Army. Ross played cricket at school. He then captained the cricket team at Sandhurst and topped the batting averages whilst at the Royal Military Academy. Ross attributed his lowly passing out rank to his concentration on sport at Sandhurst rather than his studies. Almost from the moment Ross stepped off the troop ship he was playing cricket and tennis on the subcontinent.\textsuperscript{12} 

Cricket is first recorded as being played in India in 1721 by British sailors. The early records of Indian cricket all belonged to military men. In 1792 the Calcutta Cricket Club was established, it was the first cricket club to be founded outside of Britain. Guha claims that cricket was a source of comfort for the expatriate Briton in India. Through cricket, and other entertainments, the British could imagine that they had ‘brought their country with them’.\textsuperscript{13} Whilst Harry Ross was stationed at Mhow, with the 9th Bhophals, there was a concerted effort to increase local interest in cricket. A match was arranged whereby 22 women each drew a player out of a hat to select the sides. The aim being that these dies would be even and thus create a spectacle for the locals to enjoy. There was also a prize for the woman who drew the highest run scorer and leading wicket taker. Ross himself top-scored with 127 runs, and therefore the young woman who had pulled his name out of the hat received a gold bracelet.\textsuperscript{14} 

Ross was able to use his leave to partake in cricket tours to various parts of India. But it was costly to join these tours and Ross had to turn down one such invitation in 1893 as he could not afford the travel. This led Ross to seek alternative employment. He admits in his memoir that he cared little for office work but wanted the money that came with it. In 1894 he was duly accepted into the commissariat at Umbala as a probationer. This was a fortunate move for Ross. He was able to enjoy the cricket season in Umbala which included playing against the Patiala XI, the Maharaja of Patiala’s team. Ross wrote that
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the Maharaja used to bring together the best players from across India for his team. The team against which Ross played included J.T. Hearne, an England test match bowler.\textsuperscript{15}

Ross ran afoul of the regulations regarding leave when he was invited to play in a match at Simla:

During the Simla week which took place at the height of the hot season there was always a cricket match – Outstations v. Simla, & I was invited to play for the former, but my chief would only allow me 2 days leave. This of course was no use at all, as it took a day to get there, an-other to come back, while the match itself was a two day one. I took the 2 days leave, and I’m afraid in a very insubordinate manner stayed away 4 [nights].\textsuperscript{16}

To avoid a ‘row’ upon his return to Umbala over the addition two days leave Ross resigned from the commissariat department. Ross was posted instead to the 1\textsuperscript{st} Bombay Grenadiers. Ultimately, Ross had given up the job he needed in order to fund his hobby because of his desire to participate in it. As it turned out Ross and his team had an unsuccessful time on the pitch at Simla.\textsuperscript{17} This case highlights a certain lack of professionalism within Ross, preferring to abandon his duty and take up the invitation to play cricket.

Polo rose to prominence in India in the 1870s and 1880s. The British took an ancient Indo-Persian game and developed it into a more constrained game instead of the more fast paced native game. Its popularity became such that it became the focus of the social life of many officers of both the Indian and British armies.\textsuperscript{18} One of polo’s most famous players in this period was a young Winston Churchill. Churchill noted that during his time in India with the 4\textsuperscript{th} Hussars, aside from military duties polo received his full concentration.\textsuperscript{19} McDevitt has noted that polo, like other games and activities around the British Empire, was ‘on occasion an empty vessel into which a variety of meanings could be poured according to one’s outlook and cultural assumptions’. At times such assumptions could be contradictory but essentially manliness lay at the heart of an

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid. pp. 49-50, 64. Maharajas supported numerous sports and provided patronage for individuals and teams not just for cricket but also polo, wrestling, horse racing, and golf. The reasons for this patronage included the potential for social mobility, an opportunity to take on and defeat the British overlords, and a way to play out rivalries between princes. See Borja Majumdar, \textit{Cricket in Colonial India, 1780-1947} (Abingdon; Routledge, 2008), pp. 2-5.
\textsuperscript{16} Mss Eur B235/1 Colonel Harry Ross, pp. 68-9.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., p. 68.
\textsuperscript{18} McDevitt, \textit{May the best man win}, p. 37.
officer’s devotion to polo.\textsuperscript{20} Polo was popular with officers of the Indian Army. For instance, Walter Long,\textsuperscript{21} an officer in the Indian Army’s Ordnance Department, was told by his wife ‘no polo, no promotion’. Long was able to join the 32\textsuperscript{nd} Lancers on the polo field to learn the sport, starting with riding. Yet, there is no clear evidence that taking up polo contributed to his future promotions. In fact, promotion to the rank of lieutenant-colonel was based on length of service and ability under examination. There were, however, two less direct benefits of playing polo. Firstly, Long became a dab hand at training polo ponies – even those thought to be undesirable for the sport. Long bought horses known to rear or stumble for a low price, trained them and ‘cured’ them. He then sold them on at a profit.\textsuperscript{22} The ability to break in, school and cure a horse for polo was very desirable in the military. It was thought that these skills were transferrable to the training of enlisted men. Riders and polo players also had a tendency to ensure their horses’ comfort before their own, again this was a desirable quality in an officer.\textsuperscript{23}

When hunting, wrote John MacKenzie, there was a fine line to be walked by officers. It was an opportunity to showcase their talent and catch the eye of their superiors as well as get to know them in a more informal environment. On the other hand, the senior man could be offended by a lack of etiquette or the greater success of the younger officer.\textsuperscript{24} But this is true of all sport in India and cannot be attributed to hunting alone. Through sport a young officer could be noticed by their superiors, both those participating and spectating. This is the second benefit, that Long could join a local club without paying its high membership fee. Long was approached by a man unknown to him who asked why he was not playing polo at the recently opened Willingdon Sports Club, Bombay. Long explained that he and his wife felt the membership fee was too high and so trained their polo ponies on the beach instead. The enquirer turned out to be the polo secretary at Willingdon and made arrangements for Long and his wife to join but waived the monthly subscription and entrance fee for them both, Long was only required to pay to play polo matches. Long’s ability as both a polo player and pony trainer paid off. The club would
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have brought Long into contact with men of other regiments, both British and Indian Army, men of the Indian Civil Service, and also people in civilian employ.25

Where the British and Indian Army officer corps differed over polo was the use of a ‘polo fund’. British cavalry units based in India had a fund into which every officer paid in order to fund the regimental polo team. Officers who lacked interest in polo were often pressurised into contributing to the fund, effectively subsidising their fellow officers’ hobby. This came to a head in 1899 when a petition was brought to the commander of Naini Tal station demanding an end to the fund, referring to it as a ‘tyranny’. The idea was defended as necessary for regimental honour. The money was needed to ensure the regiment could compete in high profile tournaments.26 There is nothing to suggest a similar arrangement was put in place in the Indian Army. If there were it would appear that the officers whose papers have been consulted for this study were all happy to accept the ‘polo fund’ regardless of their own sporting preferences.

Tennis was another popular sport in India. Enjoyed predominately by Europeans, it was a sport often resorted too when an officer could not afford hunting excursions or polo ponies as it required little money. As Aflalo notes in The Sportsman’s Book for India: ‘labour is cheap, courts can easily be constructed, and the requisite players are usually ready to hand… the cost of racquets and balls is comparatively low.’ 27 This is corroborated by Granville Pennefather Evans, who noted in his memoir that he took up tennis when he ceased to be able to afford pig-sticking or polo.28 Tennis could be played on private courts or at clubs. Tennis differed from the majority of other sports in that it was usually enjoyed by both sexes. Clubs would hold tournaments in singles, doubles and mixed doubles. Harry Ross records winning a mixed doubles tournament at Bannu, his partner was the wife of his superior, General Bruce.29 This reflects the changing attitudes in Britain and subsequently in Britain towards gender relations. Lawn tennis emerged in Britain in the 1870’s – the same time polo became popular in India. Mixed doubles tennis matches were some of the first sporting encounters in which men and women competed together and on an equal footing. Tennis never took off in public schools, it was mostly

25 Mss Eur B306, Walter Edward Lionel Long papers, p.120.
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29 Mss Eur B235/1 Memoirs of Colonel Harry Ross p, 83.
played on the lawns of country houses, and therefore it never took on the same masculine associations as cricket or rugby. Rather than display aggression and masculinity on the tennis court, men showed chivalry and gentlemanliness. Over time mixed doubles moved from a social event at a garden party to serious competition. Men began to encourage their partners to improve with the intention of winning matches, enhancing their enjoyment.\(^{30}\) The popularity of tennis appears to have moved to the subcontinent from Britain at the same time that the number of British women living in India was increasing. By the time Ross recorded playing with Mrs Bruce in the 1890’s the competitive element would appear present in British Indian club competitions. Donald Rule recorded playing tennis even as his regiment mobilised for the First World War.\(^{31}\)

**Hunting**

Hunting had always been a male dominated pursuit in Europe. The second half of the nineteenth century saw more women take up fox hunting but at the same time other forms of hunting, such as stag hunting in Scotland and big game hunting abroad, became more exclusively male. Hunting was encouraged in British upper-class boys from a young age. When setting up the Boy Scouts in 1908, Robert Baden Powell wrote that a boy should learn to shoot and obey orders or come wartime they would be no more use ‘than an old woman’ .\(^{32}\) Hunting taught a boy courage, endurance, independence, resourcefulness, and environmental skill. All these qualities were required of the army officer, particularly in the British Empire. The capacity to hunt was thought to mark out the strong powers from the weaker, declining powers. The Germans and Americans, along with the British, were perceived as good hunters. No one encapsulated this more than Theodore Roosevelt – rancher, pioneer, soldier, hunter, cowboy, and president. On the other hand, the decline of the Portuguese and Spanish empires was attributed to a lack of hunting as its absence had stunted the development of effective soldiers and pioneers. Similarly, the Victorians saw the French and Belgians as effeminate owing to their lack of first rate hunters.\(^{33}\)


\(^{31}\) Centre for South Asian Studies, University of Cambridge, Rule Papers.


For men, hunting created a link to their primordial past. The physicality of hunting was as close a Victorian male could come to recreating the primitive world of his hunter-gatherer forebears. In mythology, it was of course Saint George, a man, who slayed the dragon. It was usually the male of the species that was pursued too. In most species it is the male who grows horns, creating a further link between man and hunting. Horns and tusks were collected as trophies, the bigger the better. The larger the trophy, the more successful the hunt.

According to John MacKenzie, this symbolised the male battle for sexual conquests. It was the tales of these hunts, reproduced in Victorian periodicals and books back in the metropole, which helped establish the stereotype of the masculine hunter and soldier on the frontiers of the British Empire. The earliest of these dates from the 1820s. By the second half of the nineteenth century there was a plethora of stories to inspire young boys. In 1879, Boy’s Own Paper was founded, in which hunting featured heavily. Nearly all of these stories had a youthful, self-reliant, and noble hero, illustrated to appear the peak of physical fitness.\(^\text{34}\)

When analysing of the plot of Rudyard Kipling’s *Kim*, Edward Said wrote ‘we are in a masculine world dominated by travel, trade, adventure, and intrigue’.\(^\text{35}\) This could easily be a statement regarding the real-life officers of the Indian Army not a novel. Much like the British Raj, the main characters in *Kim* are all male, women play only a minor role in the novel. Kim himself claimed that to be ‘eternally pestered by women’ was to be distracted and hindered in his work as British agent. Women had no place in Kim’s world, they were a nuisance.\(^\text{36}\) Granville Pennefather Evans took a similar view to Kim regarding women. In Evans’ case it was hunting not intelligence gathering, but the sentiment is very similar for a man from a male-dominated world such as the Victorian Army. Evans noted in his memoir that he would not allow his wife to accompany him on his hunting expeditions as ‘the jungle is no place for a woman’.\(^\text{37}\)

Hunting had many uses for the British in India. It gave officials the opportunity to appear in remote areas, check on subordinates or outposts, and gather intelligence. It

\(^{34}\) Ibid., pp. 178-81, 190-2.
\(^{37}\) Mss Photo Eur 288, Other Days: copy of extract from memoir by Lt-Col Granville Pennefather Evans, p. 143.
could be either public or stealthy depending on the need or the hunter in question. The
more public hunting could be a display of British wealth and dominance. The hunting of
tigers had particular symbolic significance in India for the British. As ‘royal’ beasts, tigers
had been closely associated with rulers of India. Tiger hunting on elephant-back was
referred to as the ‘sport of princes’. Native rulers had initially taught it to the British. Tipu
Sultan of Mysore was perhaps the Indian ruler most closely associated with the tiger.
When the Tipu’s fortress of Seringapatam was stormed in 1799, the British discovered an
organ in the shape of a tiger pouncing on a prostrate European victim. The piece was
designed to symbolise Tipu’s victory over the British. To hunt tigers in British India thus
took on two meanings. Firstly, it was a means of emulating the Mughal emperors and
other Indian rulers. Secondly, the killing of these animals represented the British victory
over Tipu and other Indian rulers who opposed them. 38

Royal visits to the subcontinent always saw a good deal of hunting. The future
Edward VII in 1875, George V in 1911, and, the future Edward VIII in 1921-2, devoted
much time to hunting during their visits. Hunts were a display of the monarchy’s prowess
for both the British and Indian subjects. In the absence of royalty, local governors and
viceroys were expected to continue the display. For example, the Indian Viceroy from
1880 to 1884, the Marquis of Ripon, was one of the most distinguished
hunters of his
time. 39

From the 1860s onwards, a new kind of literature began to be published in
increasing numbers, the hunting memoir. Often these were produced by men of high rank
within either the administrative or military ranks of British India. These were a hybrid of
personal narratives of hunting experiences, a guide for future hunters regarding the types
of animals and the means of hunting them, and as etiquette guidelines for colonial
hunters. 40 This was a means of both highlighting an officer’s own virility and also passing
on advice in order for the next generation of hunters and sportsmen to continue to show
and promote British values and manliness. F.G. Aflalo’s The Sportsman’s Book for India
is a prime example of this. The volume is edited by Aflalo and contained contributions

38 Joseph Sramek, “‘Face Him Like a Briton”: Tiger Hunting, Imperialism, and British Masculinity in
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40 Shresth, ‘Sahibs and Shikar’, p. 68
from ten men holding military rank. At least three of these are listed as being with Indian Army regiments.\textsuperscript{41} Granville Pennefather Evans, whose hunting exploits are retold below, published hunting memoirs in 1911 and 1951.\textsuperscript{42}

Sport, particularly hunting, came to imply mastery over the native Indians just as it did in the Indian Army. In the military an officer relied on his VCOs and NCOs to help command his unit both in training and on the battlefield. So, it was that when hunting a European relied on and harnessed native knowledge of local jungles, and on their woodcraft skills. A successful hunter had to manage his native guides as he would his subordinates in the army.\textsuperscript{43} Forestry officer, E.P. Stebbing, wrote that native beaters could not be trusted as they were interested primarily in lining their own pockets. In another guidebook-cum-memoir, it was suggested that Indian servants should be treated with contempt. It suggested that they could not be trusted to pack for a hunting trip for example.\textsuperscript{44} Men of both the Indian Army and Civil Service would have been used to working with Indian people and this may well have been an advantage when it came to the hunt and the management of beaters and servants. On the other hand, many officers made use of the readily available local knowledge of their own men when going out hunting.

It was claimed that hunting could also be about winning hearts and minds by way of pest control. By hunting a man-eating animal, such as a tiger, the colonial hunter could claim to be protecting his fellow Europeans, the local Indians, and their livestock also.\textsuperscript{45} Granville Pennefather Evans undertook just such a hunt when both for his own enjoyment and also in the interest of the local Burmese villagers he hunted a rogue elephant. The bull had been raiding village stores and damaging paddy fields. Evans’ intentions were as much about using his newly purchased 10 bore Paradox Gun as they were about taking down the wild elephant. Most officers invested in a hunting piece, the 10 bore Paradox Gun manufactured by Holland & Holland was a particularly powerful example. Evans applied for 10 days leave from his post with the Military Police in Burma in order to track

\textsuperscript{41} F.G Aflalo (ed.), \textit{The Sportsman’s Book for India}.
\textsuperscript{42} Granville Pennefather Evans, \textit{Big-Game Shooting in Upper Burma} (London; Longmans, Green & Co, 1911); Granville Pennefather Evans, \textit{Small-game shooting: Experiences of an ordinary shoot} (London; Ward, Lock, 1951).
\textsuperscript{44} Storey, ‘Big Cats and Imperialism’, pp. 160-4; E.P. Stebbing, \textit{Jungle By-Ways in India: Leaves from the Notebook of a Sportsman and Naturalist} (London; Lane, 1911), pp. 211-2; Charles H. Stockley, \textit{Big Game Shooting in the Indian Empire} (London; Constable, 1928), p. 38.
\textsuperscript{45} MacKenzie, \textit{The Empire of nature}, pp. 170-6.
and hunt the beast. His first effort was fruitless. He had tracked the animal, but a local Burman startled the elephant by shouting to Evans he had spotted it. Evans lost track of the beast.\textsuperscript{46}

To aid a second attempt on the elephant, Evans engaged the help of an orderly and soldier from his battalion. He sent the two men off to pick up the elephant’s trail. He had purposely chosen two men who spoke Burmese so that they could make enquiries in local villages. Once they had located the animal the soldier was to continue to stalk it whilst the orderly was to return to HQ and inform Evans. This was duly done 10 days after they had set off. When Evans caught up with his soldier turned tracker he found a large gathering of locals too. They wished to follow Evans on the hunt so that they could harvest the meat of the elephant. These locals tried Evans’ patience until he eventually sat down and refused to continue the hunt unless he was left alone. The headman of the village agreed and ushered away the locals – Evans had promised to send for them as soon as he had felled the bull. After the bull was brought down the villagers were sent for as promised. They disembowelled the animals and carved it up from the inside out. Evans himself took the bull’s one tusk, its forefeet, and the tail, from which his cook made a stew. For taking down the rogue elephant Evans received a government reward which more than covered his expenses.\textsuperscript{47}

From then on, Evans was notified every time a nearby village put in a request for weapons and ammunition to chase off a wild elephant or herd. He would then go and hunt these animals before the villagers chased them off.\textsuperscript{48} Evans covers these hunting excursions in his unpublished memoir also. In total 22 pages of Granville Pennefather Evans’ memoir, almost three chapters, are dedicated to the hunting of elephants in Burma. This highlights where Evans’ interests lay and also, possibly, a lack of alternative for Evans in regards to hobbies or entertainment.\textsuperscript{49} This is also a good example of an officer making use of the readily available pool of men to aid his hunt. Evans was able to call upon men of his battalion with local knowledge and the appropriate linguistic skills to make his hunt a success.

\textsuperscript{46} Mss Photo Eur 288, Other Days: copy of extract from memoir by Lt-Col Granville Pennefather Evans, pp. 134-5.
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\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., p. 144.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., p. 143.
Evans’ dedicates as much of his unpublished memoir to fishing just as he does hunting. Much like Evans’ memoir in which hardly a page is turned without a reference to shooting or fishing, Alexander Fenton’s letters home frequently refer to both pastimes. In fact, shooting and angling take up more of Fenton’s letters than military matters. Many of Fenton’s letters are written as he and his battalion are on the march but his letters give the impression that the march is only of secondary concern to him. Whenever the horses were watered Fenton took the opportunity to hunt duck or snipe. In a letter of January 1882, which was addressed to his mother, he relates the story of how, whilst marching, a panther appeared from the undergrowth and scared a fellow officer’s horse. Fenton and this fellow officer, Hooper, went straight into the jungle after the panther ‘as soon as they could’. This suggests that for the officers hunting the panther was more important than the march, their men, or the evening’s camp – none of which are mentioned in the letter. Indeed, Fenton admitted to his mother that he and his fellow officers went hunting almost daily.⁵⁰ Fenton’s case on the march is similar to Ross absconding to play cricket, sporting pursuits took precedence for these men over the mundane work of an army officer.

The importance and regularity with which hunting was undertaken can be seen not only in the letters or memoirs of officers but in the volume of trophies officers achieved. A small photograph album belonging to G.D. Blackwood, an Indian Army officer, contains precise lists of the animals he shot. In India and Africa between 8 December 1889 and 4 April 1890 Blackwood shot a total of 518 animals. All are individually listed, and include common fare such as snipe or fowl but also five tigers and two cheetahs. Solely in India in 1892 and 1893 Blackwood shot a total of 973 animals. These included 320 snipe, 230 duck, 11 tigers, 9 cheetahs.⁵¹ Such a bounteous hunting record as Blackwood’s could not have been achieved without a substantial amount of time being spent on excursions, considerable stalking was required particularly for large animals and man eaters. Donald Rule notes in his diary that he spent the end of April and the entirety of May and June 1914 on leave hunting. His reward for his investment of time was a tally of: one red bear, four black bears, two black bear (wounded), two zhar, and two ghooral.⁵² Whilst their hunting proficiency may have impacted on their final tallies,
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⁵¹ Centre for South Asian Studies, University of Cambridge, Blackwood (G.D.) Papers, note book relating to hunting in India and Africa between December 1889 and April 1890.
⁵² Centre for South Asian Studies, University of Cambridge, Rule Papers, diary entry 16 April 1914. It is unclear what is meant by ‘zhar’.
the time spent by Rule to shoot 11 animals suggests Blackwood would have to have invested a significant amount of time to achieve his yearly totals.

Officers based at Wano kept a ‘Game Book’ to record every animal that was hunted and shot by men of the station. The annual tally was usually over 1,000. According to Jules Stewart the 1918-19 shooting season was particularly ‘marvellous’. The officers’ mess would often be adorned with hunting trophies just as the billiard room, the male preserve of a British stately home, would be. Keeping such trophies and tallies, in particular publishing these tallies, was a means of highlighting the collective manliness and success of the regiment.

Leave

This chapter has already discussed the use of leave by officers to play cricket or go hunting. Leave or furlough was regulated by the authorities. The Army Regulations India, 1912, made reference to leave warrants of 1796, 1854, and 1865. An officer was entitled to two years’ leave in Europe after nine years’ service with the Indian Army. Whilst on furlough an officer drew pay of his rank and half pay for any extra appointments they held. On top of this officers were entitled to sixty days of privilege leave each year – and if they needed it they could apply for further leave for a variety of reasons. If it was a commanding officer that went on furlough his second in command would take over and they would receive half of the commanding officer’s command allowance.

In the eighteenth and early nineteenth century leave would not have been used to return to Britain. Mason wrote that an officer joining the EIC in 1796 could have little expectation of seeing Britain again. As maritime technology improved, and the Suez Canal opened, however, the use of furlough to return to Britain became much more common. Men of the subcontinent would often travel from India, through the Suez Canal, stopping at Port Said. From there they went on to Malta, Gibraltar, Marseilles, or

---

53 Mss Photo Eur 437 Jules Stewart Papers.
54 Holmes, Sahib, pp. 488-9.
55 Woodyatt, Under ten viceroyos, p. 144.
a combination of the three. Upon reaching Europe, it has been claimed, a man fresh from India may have caused confusion by speaking to a French porter in Hindustani.\(^{57}\)

Leave in Europe was often spent with families, both near and extended. According to his biographer, when Claude Auchinleck returned home for the first time in 1908 he yearned for India. He felt totally removed from home life and the conversation that went with it. Even when Auchinleck found someone who understood the nature of India and his work there, they often only wanted to share their own tales from several decades earlier.\(^{58}\) Auchinleck’s experience was common amongst Britons returning to the metropole either on leave or retirement. Many felt connected to Britain, the homeland, but the reality did not live up to the expectation. In India, and other parts of the British Empire, whiteness marked these people out and afforded them elevated status. In Britain they blended into the crowd. Whiteness was not empowering in Britain as it was in India. Men and women who had been afforded considerable privilege in India, traveling in private train carriages or on the backs of elephants, now were merged with the rest of the populace fighting through throngs of people on buses and the underground and without the aid of numerous servants which were easily afforded in India but not Britain.\(^{59}\)

Boredom was equally a problem for those on either furlough or retirement. The cost in Britain of activities that had been enjoyed in India, such as hunting, riding, and fishing, meant few could undertake them. ‘Old Indians’, as they were known, often ‘fixed their tents in close proximity to each other’. This meant that they were surrounded by people of the same social standing, with shared experiences, and of similar financial means.\(^{60}\) For those on furlough temporary accommodation was often required, particularly in London. For officers of the Indian Army there was the Army and Navy Club, Pall Mall; the East India United Services Club, St. James’; or, the Oriental Club, Hannover Square. These provided opportunities for social interaction between both current and former Indian Army men. Bachelors could also find lodgings there. The Army and Navy Stores near Victoria Station would usually be visited to re-equip with goods and clothing for the return journey east.\(^{61}\) It could have been in clubs such as these that Auchinleck found the tedious conversation of India in days gone by.

\(^{60}\) Ibid., pp. 206-7.
\(^{61}\) Ibid., pp. 212-3.
Some officers like Auchinleck might have felt homesick for the subcontinent, but even those who enjoyed their furlough were happy to forgo it should there be a chance of action back in India. For example, Vincent Ormsby returned to India early when the Tirah uprising began in 1897. Ormsby travelled to London from Yorkshire after reading of the uprising in the newspapers. He applied to the India Office for a passage back to India, and when this was refused he paid his own fare. Ormsby was not the only officer to abandon their leave to return to India in search of war, one officer on the steamship back to India with Ormsby had been back in Britain for only a day when he heard of the revolt and applied to return to the subcontinent, another had abandoned six months’ leave.62

Leave would more regularly be used to travel to various parts of the subcontinent for familial relaxation or to pursue sporting glory – something that would see Harry Ross fall foul of regulations. Aside from sports and hunting, officers often took tours of regions to which they were near during their leave. For example, Alexander Fenton toured the Shan States whilst he was posted to Burma in 1890. He subsequently planned to join a fellow officer on a tour of China but the Commander-in-Chief of Madras at the time recalled him before he could set off on the journey. Fenton often spent time in the local Burmese villages taking in local customs and sampling their food.63

Sick leave was often used to return to Britain to recover from illness. Granville Pennefather Evans requested a year’s leave after he and his wife both contracted dysentery. They spent their time on the Welsh coast, at Saundersfoot, Denby. Nigel Woodyatt had to use similar leave in 1900. Woodyatt spent two years back in Britain on sick leave as he sought diagnosis of and then recovered from a liver complaint. Woodyatt sought the opinion of no less than 23 doctors during his time in Britain, including several on London’s Harley Street.64

Marriage

At the turn of the nineteenth century marriage was the exception amongst officers of the EIC. Senior officers often took Indian women as long-term concubines, cohabiting with
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them, taking them ‘under their protection’. In Bengal, an early tradition had been for Indian servants to be ordered to their master’s bed in the evening. Domestic labour and sexual labour were closely linked in this period. The importance of these Indian women can be seen in the wills left by officers of the Bengal Army in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century. For example, ICS collector and judge Matthew Leslie’s 1804 will left money and property, of differing proportions, to three wives, a mistress and six children. Infantry Major Thomas Naylor left Rs 4,000 to his pregnant ‘female friend’ and also bestowed upon her the bungalow they had shared together, a sum of Rs 3,000 was also left for the provision of the unborn child. In 1810 a travelogue by a former officer of the Bengal Army wrote in detail about the cost of keeping an Indian wife or mistress. The expense of Rs 40 per month, or £60 per year, was value for money in comparison to the cost of a ‘British damsels.’

As colonial rule expanded and the British presence in India increased so did the number of British women in the subcontinent. The stronger the British hold got, the more it required a settled presence. It was not feasible to ask ever-larger numbers of men to forgo family life and wed themselves to the British Empire. Instead entire families moved outwards to the Empire. This growing female presence saw British communities continue to develop more fully, which in turn made racial exclusivity more visible. Many saw the increased female presence as a softening and domesticating influence on the male dominated imperial settlements.

The influx of women from Britain began what James Lunt called ‘the rule of the memsahib’. Male habits of excessive drinking and over eating were replaced by much more moderate and moral behaviour. Liaisons with Indian women, either casual or permanent, outside of marriage began to be looked upon as morally shocking by sexually jealous British women according to Ghosh. Into the 1830s and 40s racial lines hardened against native women. Thus, relations with native woman became unacceptable. Naturally, there is no reference to such liaisons in the diaries or memoirs of officers of
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the Raj but it would be naïve to imagine such did not occur. Officers openly cohabiting became less and less respectable. Affairs became ‘less frequent, more casual and less affectionate’ according to Mason.71

More recent research by Erica Wald suggests that a financial worry played a part in the decline of these relationships. The EIC had no issue with British men and Indian women forming relationships but their children were a concern. The Company was concerned that it might be expected to support the widows and mixed-race children of thousands of former employees. It needed to manage their expectations. In doing this the EIC subtly encouraged the decline of long term relationships between British men and native women.72

Lord Cornwallis’ reforms of 1791 excluded people of mixed race from holding political or military office within the EIC. This meant that respectable roles once filled by the sons of officers or officials and their Indian partners were now closed to them. The shifted the perception of such relationships and their offspring and ultimately contributing to their decline.73 Ghosh suggests, however, that the Cornwallis reforms, and those of Wellesely that followed, were not the decisive break that has often been assumed. The effects of the reforms were initially limited, especially at the frontiers of British control. What they did do was to put legislation in place to discourage interracial social and sexual intimacy. It took time, and the arrival of more British women for this to work in practice.74

The death knell for Anglo-Indian intimacy came with the 1857 rebellion. There was a rise in anxiety about sexual attacks against Englishwomen, particularly in the light of events such as Cawnpore. To the British, the Indian massacre there highlighted Indian treachery whilst stressing the sanctity of British womanhood too.75 At the same time, British women in India took on two new personas, the stoic heroine and the helpless damsel to be saved. In much of the post-mutiny literature, both fact and fiction, besieged women were portrayed as patiently and virtuously facing the hardship, and in some instances accepting their fate with Christian strength. Alternatively, they were portrayed

72 Wald, Vice in the Barracks, pp. 28-30.
73 Ibid., pp. 29-30; Kenneth Ballhatchet, Race, Sex and Class, pp. 96-8, 144.
74 Ghosh, Sex and the Family, pp. 8-9, 97-8.
75 Jenny Sharpe, Allegories of Empire The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text (Minneapolis; University of Minnesota Press, 1993), pp. 85-6; Clare Anderson, Subaltern lives: biographies of colonialism in the Indian Ocean world, 1790-1920 (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 145-6.
as stranded damsels who were besieged and waited passively until rescued by valiant British soldiers.\textsuperscript{76} It was these women that needed the attention of British men in India, either because they had earned the respect or because they needed protecting.

However, it is conceivable that such liaisons continued given that European women were so outnumbered by European men. The 1901 Census of India shows that there were 384 European females to every 1,000 European men.\textsuperscript{77} In the case of the ICS, Gilmour suggests that such relationships did continue, and a blind eye was turned. Adulterous relationships in remote stations and the keeping of native mistresses could continue without a scandal so long as the standing of the government and service remained intact and the efficiency the civil servant in question was not affected.\textsuperscript{78} Sir Henry Ramsey, Bengal Army officer and Commissioner of Kumaon between 1856 and 1884, was alleged to have co-habited with a woman from Kumaon. It was said that whenever Ramsay travelled anywhere his Indian mistress was transported with him in a large packing case. His porters were instructed to inform anyone who asked that it was his piano.\textsuperscript{79}

Venereal disease was a particular issue for British private soldiers in India. To combat its spread brothels and prostitutes in close proximity to cantonments were regulated and inspected – the soldiers themselves not being inspected of course meant that diseases were still spread unchecked. The Contagious Diseases Act of 1864 brought tighter control by the authorities over prostitutes. Much has been written about the prostitute and the military in India, but most of this literature is concerned with the British private soldier. Officers, of both the British and Indian Army, are not assessed.\textsuperscript{80}

It would be naïve, however, to assume that officers did not visit brothels too. Though it is unclear if the subject is an Indian or British Army officer, a man known as ‘G.R.’ became something of a connoisseur of non-European prostitutes in a case study by
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Havelock Ellis, later studied by Ronald Hyam. ‘G.R.’ ranked them based on his erotic delight. He also took a very casual approach to contracting gonorrhoea whilst in Tokyo on leave. It was almost viewed as an occupational hazard.\textsuperscript{81}

Similarly, during the First World War considerable numbers of British Army officers contracted venereal disease (VD) from the brothels of France and Belgium. For many during the Great War the fight against VD was a moral fight as well as medical. Those who campaigned for moral policing, however, were forced to accept that, according to Harrison, ‘officers and chaplains – the supposed bastions of military virtue – were as prone to temptation as the humblest ranker’.\textsuperscript{82}

It was generally perceived that a man in India, whether he belonged to the Army, ICS, or other civilian employ, should not marry before the appropriate time. In terms of the Indian Army it was said, ‘subalterns must not marry; captains may marry; majors should marry; and colonels must marry’.\textsuperscript{83} The Victorian ideal was that sexual fulfilment was something that was linked to marriage. Young subalterns lived the lives of bachelors, hard drinking, gambling, and sports. The officers’ mess demanded loyalty to the regiment through camaraderie and esprit de corps. Subalterns were seen to be married to the regiment and the mess was no safe place for a woman. Ladies of the regiment were invited to the mess only on special occasions. Young men who did marry found their family and their brother officers competed for their time. These men were seen as the army equivalent of boarding school ‘day boys’. Marriage before the age of 30 was seen as adultery against the regiment.\textsuperscript{84} Granville Pennefather Evans married whilst a lieutenant, soon after transferring to the Indian Staff Corps. Later in life he advised that should a young officer wish to progress in the Indian Army, he should postpone marriage until he reached captain, if not major.\textsuperscript{85} Similarly, Vincent Ormsby’s father, himself a former officer in India, viewed his son’s fiancée, Agnes, as an ‘undesirable addition to the family’. He feared for the prospects of a married young officer.\textsuperscript{86} The process of selecting a partner,
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marrying her, and fitting in, seems to have been an extremely complicated system and one that officers were certainly moulded by as per Captain James’ phrase.

Such attitudes amongst the subalterns of the Indian Staff Corps may explain the views of Alexander Fenton. Fenton makes his negative view of marriage clear in a number of letters to his family. When a fellow officer became engaged to a young woman whom Fenton and others perceived as unattractive, arrangements were made for the officer to be transferred to a regiment in another part of India, away from the girl and her family. The officers thought they were doing their colleague a favour, moving him away and giving him a reason to break off the engagement. Much to Fenton’s amazement the young officer went through with the marriage anyway. 87 Fenton also wrote home regarding a visit he made to the mess of the 3rd Light Cavalry. All but two officers of the regiment were married and the mess had become ‘petticoat ridden’ as Fenton put it. Instead of the usual billiards table the 3rd’s mess had a piano and was frequented more regularly by the officers’ wives than the officers themselves. As for the two subaltern bachelors, the ‘unlucky young men cannot call the mess house their own.’ 88

Basil Amies found British society in India to be altered during the First World War. He wrote: ‘I had been in male society mostly until I met the reverse during my leave, for husbands and bachelors being overseas or down in the plains, women predominated in hill resorts during the summer.’ 89 This is corroborated by Mrs. P. Cartwright, the daughter of an Indian Army officer. Mrs. Cartwright was only three years old when war broke out but she recalls living in Simla with her mother whilst her father served in Mesopotamia. She recalls Simla being ‘crowded with wives and children’. 90 This was much the same as in Britain. In Britain, the traditional narrative is that as the men went off to war the women had to replace them in the factories and offices. 1.25 million women joined the British workforce during the First World War. For the most part these were rejoining the work force, having worked prior to marriage, or were going into work at a younger age than had been the pre-war norm. Despite the popular assumption of all classes going to work in the factories, few middle and upper class worked in factories, if at all. Those who did took up white collar jobs or nursing. Middle and upper-class women
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made up just nine per cent of munitions workers. Most of these were in skilled and supervisory roles, meaning the hierarchical structures of British society remained intact inside the munitions factories. In India prior to the Great War it was frowned upon for white women to earn a living. Charity work, acting or painting, were seen as more appropriate pastimes. This is borne out by Mrs Hutcheson, mother of Mrs P. Cartwright. She volunteered as a nurse during the First World War, she served in Mesopotamia where her husband was also serving as a staff officer.

Amies did not see this abundance of female company as a negative experience in the same way that Fenton had. Amies, 21 at the time, found that being in so much female company forced him to drop his shyness around women. He also found that being one of only a few males in the vicinity bought him many invitations. Amies claimed that: ‘all doors were open to officers if they kept a stock of visiting cards and made full use of them.’ On the other hand, officers such as Fenton and Harry Ross found the process of ‘calling’ a complicated process and the regular parties could be a bore: ‘these evening parties are a periodical infliction, the same as shaking hands all round on Christmas or New Year’s Day.’ It is not clear from the memoirs what the process of ‘calling’ consisted of, but the consensus is that it was complex and a ‘griffin’, freshly arrived from Britain, required tutelage in the procedure. Walter Long, for instance, was taught about calling and the writing in calling books, by officers of the Royal Artillery stationed with him at Kirkee.

When men did eventually marry it was often to the daughter of a fellow officer. Titles and noble lineage were few and far between in India. These were replaced instead by a family history of imperial service. It was deemed desirable for men and women with imperial heritage to marry in the hope that their offspring would in turn carry on the imperial traditions of both families. This meant that two people who were familiar with the demands of the British Empire were coupled together. They shared the same mentality and understanding.
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and marry the daughter, or sister, of a fellow officer. These women would have experience of India, its climate, and its people. For example, Vincent Ormsby married the daughter of Colonel Money, the man who commanded at Almorah when discontent spilled over into open insubordination. Ormsby served under Money at Chunah Fort and there met his daughter. Vincent Ormsby was following the example left by his father, George, a British cavalryman, who came under the command of Major-General Sir Stuart Corbett KCB at Benares in 1863. George Ormsby became ADC to Major-General Corbett whilst at Benares and in August 1864 married his daughter. Vincent was born at Benares a year later. Ormsby’s daughter, who was also born in India, herself married an ICS man. Similarly, Walter Long married Mary, the sister of a Royal Artillery officer who was stationed in India. Mary had joined her brother in India to keep his house. Lord Roberts married Nora Bews, daughter of an officer of the 73rd Foot. Nora had no background in India but would have been familiar with the life of a soldier. Roberts’ biographer suggests that the Roberts family guided him towards marrying someone of a similar background: from an Irish military family. As Chapter 2 has previously shown, the officers of the Indian Army often had a family background in India, the military or both. They looked for a similar background in a wife.

It was advantageous to have relatives, and their friends, in India. To marry a woman with similar imperial lineage would double the connections an officer had on the subcontinent. As shown in Chapter 3, despite efforts to eradicate it, there was scope for a man with the right patronage to get advantageous positions.

**Intemperate Habits**

The cheap and readily available drink of India proved to be the undoing of a number of officers of the Indian Army. Villiers-Stuart related in his memoir the tale of a brother officer called Davis, whose drinking had got him into money troubles. ‘His story was a sad one’ wrote Villiers-Stuart. As a ‘wild youth’ freshly arrived in India from Britain Davis discovered that he could easily procure money ‘merely signing for it with a pencil
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on any scrap of paper’. He borrowed money to purchase polo ponies and soon developed a drinking habit that was fuelled by debt. According to Villiers-Stuart ‘there is no quicker way of getting into debt than that of drinking too much’. The moneylender was Chukar Tal, an Indian banker from the Abbottabad bazaar and the battalion’s head clerk. This brought Tal into close proximity to young officers such as Davis and another named Kitchin. In his memoir, Villiers-Stuart offered an educated guess at the interaction between Tal and the two officers:

Probably it began by their holding a small regimental bill in their hand and saying “damn this thing. We got nothing to pay it with.” Chukar Tal would then say “May I please settle?” and they would thankfully give it to him. The next step was a small “loan”, then more, and so on.

There would be no mention of terms or interest rates until these loans reached into the hundreds. At which point Tal would have informed the officers that interest had been charged at the ‘usual rate’, this would have been 24 per cent, per annum, compound. In this social and racial inversion, the moneylender also insisted on a life insurance policy being taken out, of course this would be added to the debt. The Indian lender, of lower social ranking than the young officers, now held power over them in a reverse of the usual relationship between a European officer and battalion clerk.

Villiers-Stuart suggests that it would be impossible to pay this debt off unless a man could reach the rank, and accompanying wage, of a lieutenant-colonel. Even then it would only be managed by living most frugally. Depending on the debt a man may have to commute his pension to a moneylender. The ultimate result being: ‘he is then driven to the most miserable ending of all, remaining in India till he dies, living more than likely as a poor white, if not actually as cheaply as a poor native.’ Often times the moneylender got his hoped-for solution. His borrower would take their own life rather than drown in debt for the rest of their life, in which case they would cash in the life insurance policy. Both Davis and Kitchin committed suicide. In the case of Davis foul play was suspected but could not be proved. It was thought that Tal, keen to see a return on his investment, had paid Davis’ bearer to shoot him and make it look like suicide. These suspicions seem to be confirmed by the fact the bearer did not take another job after Davis’ death, he had been well paid by Tal.104
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Villiers-Stuart’s memoir provides a second example of an officer running up debt but in this instance the officer did not take his own life. Instead the man attempted to pay off the debts as best he could. Brigadier-General Harvey, originally of the 1st Punjab Cavalry, had borrowed from a number of sources. The most considerable part was borrowed from one of his sowars, the son of an Indian nobleman with considerable wealth. The sowar tried to use his position over Harvey to gain promotion through the native ranks without success. Harvey continued his career with his debts hanging over him. He reached the rank of lieutenant-colonel and then brigadier-general. Such were his debts however that he could pay only a portion of them off. Harvey did not achieve further promotion. The sowar was by this stage a senior VCO in the 1st Punjab Cavalry. He wrote to Harvey’s superiors stating that he had once lent Harvey money in return ‘for his favour and help’, and that he had waited a long time for it to be repaid. Harvey was sent for and asked for his version of events. In consideration for Harvey’s 32 years’ service he was put on pension and not court-martialled. His pension, however, went straight to paying off his debt. Many were as kind as their own finances allowed to Harvey and his wife but he was still pestered by moneylenders. This caused him to take a job with a road gang for Rs 40 per month. Soon after Harvey passed away. Villiers-Stuart described the fate of Harvey and other like him in bleak terms:

The lot of a “poor white” in India is sad and hopeless. He cannot compete with Indians at any humble work in such a climate. There are few if any other poor whites for him to consort with. There are no amenities for him of any kind. He has lost his own strata or status, and cannot obtain admission to a native status. If he goes to law he has no chance as he has no money. He has no hope of medical care. He has nothing, not even any church to go to.105

By the late nineteenth century nearly a quarter of all white people living in India were ‘poor whites’. The majority of ‘poor whites’ were made up of private soldiers who had served their time and elected to remain in India. Others had been low paid sailors on both naval and merchant ships and railway workers, whose income could vary dependant on demand. These people lived on the fringes of British colonial society and shared living spaces and occupations with the Eurasian population. These people offered a challenge to the imperial ideals of white dominance. It was an affront to the British and Indian understandings of the Raj to have white paupers.106 Villiers-Stuart’s dismay at the plight
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of Harvey is understandable, an officer in his fifties would indeed find it tough in this
environment amongst men he would be more accustomed to commanding than working
and living alongside. ‘Poor Whites’ were often discharged sailors or private soldiers,
orphans, widowed women, unemployed workers or lunatics.\textsuperscript{107} It was felt that these ‘poor
whites’ damaged the prestige of the British in the eyes of the Indians, who were regularly
told that the British were morally superior.\textsuperscript{108} For a retired brigadier, who had already
found himself in debt to a soldier under his command, to be working as a labourer would
have further blurred the lines between imperial overlord and the colonised.

In both these instances there is no mention of an officer’s drinking habits affecting
their work as a soldier, only that the debt they accrued ultimately had an effect on how
they ended their days. Harvey was seen as damaging the reputation of the service and so
paid for it by losing his pension. Captain George Pirrie’s alcoholism was so bad fellow
officers had to at times step in to protect his wife. Initial concerns were raised over Pirrie’s
health in 1868, 11 years after he joined the Madras Staff Corps, whilst he was serving
with his regiment in Hong Kong. Lieutenant Prendergast, a brother officer of Pirrie’s,
wrote to Mrs. Pirrie to inform her that George ‘suffers a great deal in his head’ and that
the medical board had decided to send him home in the hope that the cooler climate may
help him recover. His illness was recorded as dementia.\textsuperscript{109}

In a later letter, 1873, Prendergast told a fuller story. He had first met in Pirrie in
Madras in 1864, on which occasion Pirrie was drunk and tearful. He had to be put on
board his train to Secunderabad, otherwise he would have lost his place with the 38\textsuperscript{th}
Dogras, whose unit he was due to join for the first time. Prendergast writes that Pirrie was
frequently very drunk during the few months he was with the 38\textsuperscript{th} and on occasion
threatened the life of a brother officer, ‘swearing that he would cut his throat’. At the end
of 1864 Pirrie returned to England and married. The two officers next met, as mentioned
above, in Hong Kong. The steamer captain informed Prendergast that Pirrie had regularly


\textsuperscript{107} Kennedy, \textit{Magic Mountains}, pp. 135-6.
\textsuperscript{108} Ballhatchet, \textit{Race, Sex and Class}, pp. 124-5.
\textsuperscript{109} Mss Eur F282/9, Copy of a letter to Mrs George Pirrie from Lt J H Prendergast concerning her husband’s health, Letter dated 27 October 1873 – From Prendergast.
been drunk on the voyage across and on occasion turned violent, requiring restraint and being confined to his cabin. Prendergast claims to have tried to keep Pirrie in line whilst he was in Hong Kong but gave up after he appeared ‘in liquor’ in front of Mrs Prendergast and other ladies on several occasions. Pirrie was subsequently sent home from Hong Kong with dementia but was allowed to return to duty in 1872, owing largely to the pleading of his wife. Upon returning to duty Pirrie had his drink stopped in the mess and in ‘respectable shops’ but he was able to get a supply of it from traders at the bazaar.\footnote{Mss Eur F282/14, Letters from acquaintances and colleagues of Capt George Pirrie in Secunderabad, Bengal and Madras, commenting on his intemperance and bad behaviour. Letter dated 27 October 1873 – From Prendergast.}

Prendergast states that he knew Pirrie to have struck his wife on at least two occasions. In another letter concerning Pirrie’s intemperance, Moorhouse, a surgeon of the 20\textsuperscript{th} Madras Native Infantry, claims that during one of Pirrie’s violent drunken episodes he felt compelled to leave his servant at the Pirrie’s house to protect Mrs. Pirrie. The surgeon’s fears were proved correct as the servant was required to restrain Pirrie when he found him choking his wife on the veranda.\footnote{Ibid.} Pirrie was retired from the Indian Army on medical grounds in 1874. He is listed in the censuses of both 1891 and 1901 as being a hospital patient in his native Scotland.\footnote{1891 England, Wales & Scotland Census, Montrose, Forfarshire (Angus), Scotland; 1901 England, Wales & Scotland Census, Montrose, Forfarshire (Angus), Scotland. [http://www.findmypast.co.uk/; accessed 20 February 2016].}

The British soldier was seen essential for the maintenance of control in India in the nineteenth century, but the private soldier was prone to drunkenness and immorality. This was something of an embarrassment for the British authorities. As the century progressed many Indians began to acquire a good understanding of Western ideals and moral values, largely through the teaching of Christian missionaries. As such the behaviour of inebriated British troops was damaging to the British who portrayed themselves as morally superior.\footnote{Ballhatchet, \textit{Race, Sex and Class}, pp. 123-5.} Pirrie, an officer of the Indian Army behaving in a similar manner to private soldiers would have been a further embarrassment and more damaging. In an institution that infantilised its native labour, the officer was as a father figure and example to follow, drunken behaviour would certainly not conform to this idea.

The case of Pirrie has no reference to debt. He was, in fact, pensioned off as insane. What it does highlight is the concern for the welfare of an officer’s family. There
was concern regarding Pirrie’s wife and children, particularly from the surgeon who posted his servant to guard them. Prendergast wrote of Margaret Pirrie thus: ‘her conduct to him throughout was the admiration of everyone and she certainly deserved a better fate than to be tied to such a brute for life’.\(^{114}\) There is a sense in the letters regarding Pirrie that many involved with the couple wished to protect his wife and children but part of that protection was maintaining Pirrie’s reputation as an officer. Sympathy for Mrs Pirrie and her children and the need to protect the Pirrie name may account for George being treated for dementia and receiving a pension. The case of Brigadier-General Harvey suggests that such sympathies did not stretch to men who had accrued debt. Villiers-Stuart wrote that he believed that friends and former colleagues of the Harvey funded a passage back to Britain for the Brigadier’s widow.\(^ {115}\)

**Conclusion**

In most of the memoirs and personal papers analysed in this chapter, the sporting pursuits of the authors take up as much, if not more, pages than the day-to-day military work of an officer. Only during periods of active service does the narration of sporting activities fall away. Active service was the goal of most, if not all, officers in the Indian Army. This was highlighted by Vincent Ormsby and others like him who cut their furlough short and returned to India from Britain as soon as they read of hostilities in the newspapers in 1897.

But they could not be on active service all of the time and sport was the next best thing. These men were not interested in the mundane. To paraphrase Clive Dewey’s writing on the Indian Civil Service, these men knew intrinsically that getting to 07:45am to Tunbridge Wells everyday was not for them.\(^ {116}\) Nothing highlights this more than the title of Walter Long’s memoir – ‘In Search of Fun’.\(^ {117}\) If they could not showcase their talents for warfare in their memoirs these men would show their sporting prowess instead. Many recorded the variety of animals they had hunted, the number in which they had brought them down, and, for the largest animals, their measurements also. Others, like
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Ross, recorded their cricket scores, or polo results. It was a means of highlighting their manliness that they sought to express since their days at public school.

When these memoirs also became guide books for the sports of India they served both as advertisements for Indian service and as a means of passing on wisdom – wisdom that would equip an officer to continue to show his own virility and British dominance over India in the future. This advice was not solely about the animals that were to be hunted or the games to be played, they were also about handling the hired native guides, trackers, and porters, something an officer of the Indian Army should also be capable of, giving him an advantage.

Social historian E.M. Collingham has argued that the club provided a space for Europeans to ‘relax together… cement social ties, play sports together, swap gossip or talk “shop”’. For officers of the Indian Army this statement is certainly true. They gave the European officer the opportunity to enjoy the company of fellow white men after spending considerable time with their sepoys. ICS man W.O. Horne wrote that after a day’s work the opportunity to spend time with ‘men of his own race’ was important to the Briton in India as their ‘habits and customs were the same as his own’. This may have been the case but men were willing to put the need for European company only aside in order to partake in successful hunts where they needed local knowledge and skills. They were willing to neglect racial divides in the pursuit of hunting trophies.

Marriage, as well as other social processes such as calling, was a complex affair. An officer had to tread a fine line with his fellow officers. To marry too early could have a negative impact on relations with the other officers in the mess, as it was seen as adultery against the regiment. To not marry, however, could potentially see an officer left as the only, or one of the only, bachelors in the regiment. Leaving a mess dominated by married men and their wives as recalled by Fenton.

On the whole little changed socially for the British officer of the Indian Army in the period 1861-1914. Racial attitudes toward socialising with Indians and intimacy with local women had hardened in the first half of the nineteenth century, culminating with the massacre of women and children at Cawnpore during the 1857 Rebellion. Socialising was a strictly white affair in the clubs. The Great War again provided a clear break. The gender

---
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balance was disrupted as many men went abroad to fight, including many who would have been in civil employ prior to 1914.
Chapter 7:

Conclusion

The Indian Army emerged from the 1857 Rebellion with a great many issues to resolve. Not least, a great many changes to the officer corps were required. In the decades preceding the rebellion, officers and their men had grown distant, the service and loyalty of the Indian sepoys taken for granted. The armies of Bombay and Madras had remained loyal to the EIC during the insurrection but it was the Bengal Army that had borne the brunt of the EIC’s battles against the Afghanistan, the Sikhs, and on the North-West Frontier, and they would be required to do so again given their proximity to the turbulent border region. It was not feasible for British troops to defend and police the subcontinent. Locally raised forces were essential. As such, it was important to provide these forces with efficient officers as part of the process of making service in the Indian Army more palatable. To do this, changes had to be made to the way in which the EIC had taken selected, trained, and promoted its European officers. This process was not something that could be implemented quickly. Nor does it seem that the process was without problems. Over the course of almost fifty years, a series of changes were implemented that professionalised the Indian Army officer corps. There had been an almost token effort in 1844 to introduce language exams into the EIC officer corps but these counted for little and patronage continued to be the key factor in advancement.

The process was haphazard. Change and reform were often at the whim of particular commanders-in-chief who sought to improve the army they commanded. Sir Hugh Rose, the commander-in-chief who oversaw the transfer from the EIC to the Raj, began this process of change. He first attempted to limit the favouritism and patronage that had so affected the forces of the EIC. During his tenure language examinations became not only more stringent but also began to carry more weight with regard to progression. One significant bar to progress was the corps of officers who had joined the army, if not before the 1857 Rebellion, then at least prior to the transfer of power to the crown. These men had been commissioned under a different set of regulations, particularly regarding promotion, and so even when new directives did come into effect, such as those regarding examination for promotion past captain in 1883, officers who had joined the EIC were not affected. This helps to explain why officers such as the ineffectual and unpopular Colonel Money and Harry Lyster who, though a VC hero of 1857, seems
to have placated his troops by manipulating the system and providing them with extra pay, reached the ranks that they did despite the attempts to stifle the progression of inefficient officers. Only in the first decade of the twentieth century, by which time most of the EIC officers would have retired, was Kitchener able to make further changes to the command system, putting in place the regulation that officers could have their promotion stopped, regardless of their examination results, should they be perceived unfit for command in some way. He also sought to discourage the habit of officers taking civil employment – something that had dogged the EIC and still remained – by preventing this from counting towards time served for an officer’s pension.

This uneven but gradual process of reform clearly bore fruit. As Chapter 4 shows, officers who studied the languages of their troops, took time to develop their understanding of them, and learned the craft of command, made for effective leaders. These men built up a strong bond with their soldiers, which proved conducive to a good working relationship. This bond was important for good morale, advantageous in the training process, and also on the battlefield. On top of this, Chapter 3 shows that there was also an effort to develop professionally from within the officer corps. Men wrote on training and tactics in the USI India and looked to learn from European forces by translating and reproducing articles from Germany, Russia and France, as well as looking to learn from their British counterparts.

Though, as this thesis has shown, the success of Indian soldiers did not rest solely with their officers they were nonetheless important. To be ineffectual as an officer ran the risk of troops losing cohesion in battle, or a lowering of morale, which could again affect battlefield performance or court mutiny – as was the case of Colonels Money, Mennie, and Martin. Even though the latter two men presided over mutinies caused by religious anxieties, their ineffectual leadership was held up in both cases to be a contributing factor to the insubordinate outbreaks. The First World War proved to be a considerable test for this professionalised officer corps. Some met this test well enough, but others did not. Those who had to stay in India to train new troops took this as an affront and did not carry out their duties to the best of their ability.

As stated above, officers who lacked the correct approach and were ineffectual could prove to be the ‘rising action’ or ‘inciting incident’ in mutinies. Sepoys were, after all, professionals, paid to undertake certain work, and they expected a certain standard of
working conditions. The case of the 9th Bengal Cavalry and 3rd Gurkhas show that Indian soldier were willing to take industrial action if their officer failed to meet their needs. On campaign, however, there appears to have been two approaches to leadership implemented by officers of the Indian Army, some may have even used both. Firstly, through the fostering of a strong bond and through careful preparation, sepoys seem to have been willing to forego some of their requirements in order to carry out their job, fighting the enemy. The case of Napier’s painstaking preparations for the expedition against Twedoros is a good example of this. Examples can also be seen during the First World War in France and Flanders and also in Egypt when troops abandoned their dietary requirements in order to still be able to operate effectively in the field. Only during times of serious privation, such as during the siege of Kut-al-Amara, do sepoys seem to have refused to abandon their religious requirements whilst they suffered various additional privations in Mesopotamia.

The alternative form of control on campaign, and indeed on cantonment, appears to have been the use of or threat of punishment, in varying forms. The fact that these remained throughout the period suggests that even the more advanced officers were not comfortable operating without punishment apparatus available. Forms of punishment available were corporal punishment, in the form of flogging and later Field Punishment No. 1; dismissal, which had an obvious loss of pay and for Indian troops came with a significant stigma; demotion, which dented a soldier’s income and again had dishonour attached; imprisonment or transportation, which could range from a matter of months to life; and, the death penalty. For the most part these seem to have been used sparingly and as to serve as an example to the troops. Kaushik Roy has argued that as the nineteenth century progressed the Indian Army became more lenient but the potential to use heavier means of punishment remained and appear to have been used when seen fit. The fact that corporal punishment was not removed until partition reveals that there always remained a modicum of distrust between the authorities, the officers, and the sepoys, most probably a hangover from 1857.

The theme of manliness or masculinity runs throughout this thesis and impacted on everyday life in the Indian Army in a number of ways. The men from different regions were viewed as masculine or effeminate as part of the Victorian theory of martial race. This view affected how an officer approached the command of a regiment. It also discouraged officers from taking up posts with effeminate or non-martial regiments. Part
of the reasoning behind encouraging Indian troops to partake in sports was not only to build up *esprit de corps* but also to impart manly British values to the sepoys, such as an understanding of rules, fair play and gentlemanly conduct. Away from their troops, officers continued to be ruled by masculinity, a continuation in many ways of their experience at public school. Those who did not join in with certain sports, those who preferred to read books for instance, were judged to be lacking in manliness and became known as ‘mugs’. The question ‘fond of shooting?’ put to Nigel Woodyatt was an attempt by the Deputy Adjutant-General to ascertain whether or not Woodyatt was a masculine, active person who would fit in with his colleagues in the Indian Army – there was no point in accepting a ‘mug’ who may disrupt the harmony of a regiment.

Displays on the polo or cricket field were intended to catch the eye of suitors and also senior military figures. Hunting was, likewise, an opportunity not only for enjoyment but part of the ritual of displaying masculinity in the subcontinent. Prestige was garnered from trophies and tally books, both person and collective. Stories of successful hunts and large hauls were retold in letters home, diaries and memoirs in particular, intended to highlight an individual’s success and virility. The ultimate display of masculinity was success and heroics on the battlefield but as an officer could not be continually at war the alternative was to display his virility through sport. This was converse to the initial investiture into sports at school, which was designed to encourage masculinity in boys and prepare them for war.

The First World War, deemed the world’s first ‘total war’, is inescapable in this thesis. The effects of total war on Britain and the British Army have been well documented but less consideration has been given to its effects on the Indian Army, and more specifically the officer corps. Demand for officers to fight against the Central Powers lead the Indian Army to have to abandon almost fifty years of professionalisation and modernisation. Recruits had to be brought in from previous untapped pool, most of whom either lacked the linguistic skills required to command sepoys, the military experience and knowledge, or both. This significantly diluted the Indian Army officer corps. The First World War offered opportunities for officers to test themselves and their men on a scale never seen before, many proved their heroics on the battlefield, others were found wanting, for those who were forced to stay in India however, stagnation often set in. Professional, experienced officers did not wish to be left in India to train raw
officers and sepoys, they took this as a slight despite the fact that theirs was a particularly important job given the manpower requirements of the First World War.

The martial race theory, deeply engrained in the Indian Army by 1914, also had a detrimental effect during the course of the First World War. As new battalions were raised from regions deemed non-martial to meet the demand, officers did not wish to fill such roles, professional pride meant that these men wished to command troops with well-known fighting pedigree and be attached to regiments with lengthy battle honours. Much the same problem had existed prior to the outbreak of war with Germany, however. The Madras Army stagnated in the second half of the nineteenth century as many able officers transferred to regiments in Bengal as these offered more chance of seeing action given the proximity of that presidency to the frontier region and because many of the Bengal army regiments were seen as the most martial. The Madras Army was left with the less effectual or less ambitious officer to lead and train its regiments. This was a significant cause of the difficulties faced in Burma in 1885.

To return to the quotation from Captain James: ‘Troops are trained by officers and officers are moulded by a system’, the system which officers joined certainly did mould, or condition, them. An officer joining the Indian Army in the second half of the nineteenth century was quickly made aware of the martial and non-martial soldiers, if he had not already read of the bravery of soldiers such as Gurkhas or Sikhs in Victorian periodicals. He was joining a system whereby officers needed to fit in by partaking in certain activities and sports, to not join in was to risk being ostracised. The military system did modernise during the course of the nineteenth century and into the early twentieth century so that the new officer would be joining a more professional body of men and they themselves through selection would be of the right calibre to fit into the existing system.

The analogy of the system goes further still, stretching into officers’ personal lives and their relationships not only with fellow officers, but also with civilians and particularly with women. The system whereby officers were expected to hunt, play polo, drink, and dine brought these men into contact with civilians of various occupations in sports and social clubs. These meetings and the social lives of officers in general had their own system that had to be adhered to. The process of calling cards detailed by Basil Amies highlights this. Courting was not different. Engagement and marriage were not to be undertaken too early by an officer of the Indian Army, else they were perceived to have
committed adultery against the regiment and their brother officers. Similarly, officers had to select a bride carefully, ideally they needed someone who would fit into Indian society and also be used to or take to military life. Often fellow officers, friends, and family would help make a match, or in the example made by Alexander Fenton, intervene if the match was deemed unsuitable for some reason.

It was also a system that was followed whereby a young man having finished school would select a career path. In most cases he would select a career path similar to his father or at least influenced by his father’s career. The most regular route being to follow the father into the military. For men whose fathers had lived and worked in the British Empire, either formal or informal, joining the Indian Army would have been a means of working within the empire rather than the less familiar metropole.

The officer of the Indian Army was indeed ‘moulded by a system’ from the moment they opted for Indian service at Sandhurst and were placed on the unattached list of the Indian Staff Corps. Complex professional and social systems continued to be at work as an officer progressed through the ranks. By showing that the Indian Army officer corps belonged to various social systems within British India this thesis has laid the groundwork for these men and their lives to be incorporated into the broader historiography of the British Raj as well as that of more traditional military history, which has thus far failed to provide an account of the officer class to dovetail with the work that has been done on other areas of the Indian Army such as the private soldiers and the VCOs.
Appendix A:

Officer Origins
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Forename(s)</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Father's Occupation</th>
<th>Commission</th>
<th>Rank Reached</th>
<th>Other Service (Date of Transfer)</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begg</td>
<td>Patrick Hunter</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Printer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td>David Lockhart</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Guildford, Surrey</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Surgeon-Major, Indian Army</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brigadier-General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowis</td>
<td>Frank Currie</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Chittagong</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Indian Civil Service</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badcock</td>
<td>Alexander Robert</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Taunton, Somerset</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>38th Foot (1862)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>William Walter Hopton</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Major-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandeman</td>
<td>John Edward</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Addiscombe Military Seminary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>Arthur George</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Dalwish, Devon</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Addiscombe Military Seminary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father Name</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Rank and Position</td>
<td>Commission Year</td>
<td>Service Branch</td>
<td>Military College</td>
<td>Mother's Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warburton</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>Royal Artillery (1866)</td>
<td>RMC Woolwich</td>
<td>Mother was Afghan National</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanrenen</td>
<td>Jacob Peter Deneys</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Captain, Indian Army</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>3rd Hussars (1869)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Lorn Robert Henry Dick</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>Officer, Indian Army</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson</td>
<td>James Bird</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>82nd Foot (1866)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandilands</td>
<td>Alfred Nimmo</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Midlothian</td>
<td>Captain, West Indian Regiment</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90th Foot (1867)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaselee</td>
<td>Alfred</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>93rd Foot (1866)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard</td>
<td>Montagu Gilbert</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Major, British Yeomanry</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Lieutenant-General</td>
<td>Royal Garrison Artillery (1870)</td>
<td>RMC Woolwich</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Stannus Verner</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>36th Foot (1868)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey-Kelly</td>
<td>Harvey Hamilton</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>56th Foot (1878)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rind</td>
<td>Alexander Thomas</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>102nd Foot (1870)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Branch/Army</td>
<td>Date of Promotion</td>
<td>Additional Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealy</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Bombay, India</td>
<td>Major-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Meerut, Bengal</td>
<td>Captain, Indian Army</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>106 Foot (1878)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vousden</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Perth, Scotland</td>
<td>Captain, Indian Army</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gompertz</td>
<td>Bowes</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Madras, India</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>108th Foot (1870)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Madras, India</td>
<td>Officer, British Army</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>John Forsyth</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Aberdeen, Scotland</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>Adelbert</td>
<td>Cecil</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Worcestershire, England</td>
<td>Vicar</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Royal Artillery (1869)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrott</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Alexander Napier</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Surrey, England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>76th Foot (1870)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pryce</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Sussex, England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>24th Foot (1871)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Father Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Military Rank</th>
<th>Service Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>Charles Arthur Ross</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Major-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1868 Colonel 104th Foot (1871)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaisford</td>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Major, Indian Army</td>
<td>1868 Lieutenant-Colonel Unsure (1871)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeway</td>
<td>Richard Kirby</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>County Meath</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1868 Colonel 96th Regiment (1872) RMC Sandhurst -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Moore Creagh</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>County Clare</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Captain, Royal Navy</td>
<td>1869 General 95th Regiment of Foot (1870) RMC Sandhurst -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobbs</td>
<td>George Cadell</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Major-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1869 Colonel 10 Foot (1871) -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schalch</td>
<td>Vernon Ansdell</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Barrister, Calcutta, India</td>
<td>1869 Colonel 85th Foot (1876) Rugby -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More-Molyneux</td>
<td>George Hand</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1869 Major-General 37th Foot (1874) -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garstin</td>
<td>George Lindsay</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>Cherrapunji</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Reverend, EIC Chaplian</td>
<td>1870 Lieutenant-Colonel 33rd Foot &amp; 63rd Foot (1877) -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Leonard William</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Officer, Indian Army</td>
<td>1870 Major-General -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rank (Year)</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Willoughby</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Major-General,</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>44th Foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pitcairn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1872)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwatkin</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stapleton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1875)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molesworth</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Major, British</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Brigadier-General</td>
<td>14th Foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hogarth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenton</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Officer,</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Brigadier-General</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulstrode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wauhope</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>Royal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>British Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1875)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>40th Foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1879)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cortlandt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duff</td>
<td>Beauchamp</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Turriff</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Royal Artillery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1881)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RMC Woolwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deane</td>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Brighton, Sussex</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Rector</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alban</td>
<td>Clifton</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Karachi</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Officer,</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Bryen</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Colonel,</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loughman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father Name</td>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Previous Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Commission Date</td>
<td>Commissioning Location</td>
<td>Commissioning of Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennys</td>
<td>Charles John</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Officer, Indian Army</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>Edward Spence</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Brigadier-General</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>109th Foot (1876)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasken</td>
<td>Charles Grant Mansell</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>General, Indian Army</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>16th Foot (1878)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>William St. Lucien</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>St. Lucia</td>
<td>West Indies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>15th Foot (1877)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barclay</td>
<td>Frank Miles</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Quilion</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Surgeon-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>19th PWO Regiment (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Arthur Arnold</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Carshalton, Surrey</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Clergyman</td>
<td>Field Marshal</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>44th Regiment of Foot (1879)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon</td>
<td>John Eccles</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Brentford, Middlesex</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lieutenant-General</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>75th Regiment of Foot (1879)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davison</td>
<td>Kenneth Stewart</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Poona, Bombay</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Royal Artillery (1882)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbrother</td>
<td>William Tomes</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>Devonshire Regiment</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Devonshire Regiment (1878)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minchin</td>
<td>Hugh Dillion Massy</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>7th Foot (1877)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Regiment/Army</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>William St. John</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummond</td>
<td>Francis Henry Ruther</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittuck</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Brath</td>
<td>Ernest</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo</td>
<td>Frederick William</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Simla</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Major, Indian Army</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobbs</td>
<td>Alexander Hugh</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younghusband</td>
<td>George John</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Dharmasala</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Major-General, British Army</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerrich</td>
<td>George Stuart</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>General, British Army</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Somerset Light Infantry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alban</td>
<td>William Gore</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Ahmedabad, Bombay</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Officer, Indian Army</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Date of Death</td>
<td>Other Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Royal Warwickshires (-)</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerrich</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Baden</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Somerset Light Infantry (1880)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennys</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Central Provinces</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Wiltshire Regiment (1880)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennys</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Wiltshire Regiment (1880)</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst Queen's Indian Cadet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadeson</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>King's Own Borderers (1881)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couper</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Meerut, Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Warwackshirere Regiment (1881)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Lahore, Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Brigadier-General</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Welsh Regiment (1883)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shakespear</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Liverpool Regiment (1881)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Regiment/Unit</td>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savage</td>
<td>William Henry</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Fort William, Bengal</td>
<td>Major, British Army</td>
<td>1882 Colonel</td>
<td>North Lancashire Regiment (1883)</td>
<td>Wellington College &amp; RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Charles James William</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Aberdeenshire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1882 Colonel</td>
<td>Suffolk Regiment (1884)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gale</td>
<td>Marmaduke</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>Indigo Planter</td>
<td>1883 Major</td>
<td>Royal Welsh Fusiliers (1897)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sillery</td>
<td>Cecil Charles Archibald</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>Major-General, British Army</td>
<td>1883 Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>5th Dragoon Guards (1884)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodyatt</td>
<td>Nigel Gresley</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1883 Colonel</td>
<td>Dorset Regiment (1887)</td>
<td>Served in Militia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegy</td>
<td>Charles Gilbert</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Karachi</td>
<td>General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1884 Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Unsure (1887)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennys</td>
<td>Alexander Harry</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Nagpur</td>
<td>Chaplain, Indian Army</td>
<td>1884 Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Unsure (1886)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erskine</td>
<td>David Keith</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Gonda, Bengal</td>
<td>Captain, Indian Army</td>
<td>1884 Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanston</td>
<td>Charles Oliver</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>Cuddalore</td>
<td>Major-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1885 Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Royal Irish Fusiliers (1887)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>Distant Relative of Lord Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Given Name</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Regiment/Service</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venour</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>West Indian</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regiment (1889)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td></td>
<td>General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Royal Irish</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balmain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rifles (1888)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laing</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Major, Indian Army</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Unsure (1888)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spence</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>Indian Civil Service</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trevor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>Reginald</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Murree, Punjab</td>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>Queen's Royal</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regiment (1888)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townshend</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Railway Clerk</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>Royal Marine</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regiment Light Infantry (1886)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferrers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormsby</td>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Benares, Bengal</td>
<td>Captain, British Army</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Brigadier-General</td>
<td>East Surrey</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regiment (1888)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symonds</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Hynutal</td>
<td>Chaplain</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regiment (1888)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Brigadier-General</td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regiment (1889)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Birth Place</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Other Info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britten</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Major-General,</td>
<td>Gloucestershire Regiment (1888)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Xavier</td>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indian Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Loyal North Lancashire Regiment (1890)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Augustus</td>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliott-</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>West Indian Regiment (1890)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockhart</td>
<td>Madras</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy Clare</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliott-</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockhart</td>
<td>Lucknow,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Yorkshire Light Infantry (1890)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Lucknow,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sykes</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brigadier-General</td>
<td>2nd Dragoons (1902)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy</td>
<td>Brompton,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molesworth</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenner</td>
<td>Murree,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Works Dept.,</td>
<td>Dorset Regiment (1890)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climo</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surgeon, Indian Army</td>
<td>Border Regiment (1889)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipton Hill</td>
<td>Longford</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant-General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shea</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Royal Irish Regiment (1891)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stuart</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shea</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Place/Region</td>
<td>Occupation/Title</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Military/Other Unit/College</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunning</td>
<td>Orlando</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Middlesex, England</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Brigadier-General</td>
<td>Manchester Regiment (1892)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Rawal Pindi, India</td>
<td>Major-General, British Army</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Manchester Regiment (1891) Wellington College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeland</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>- France, Clergy</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Royal West Kents (1890)</td>
<td>Served in Militia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacTier</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Perthshire, Scotland</td>
<td>Surgeon, Indian Army</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Royal Sussex Regiment (1891)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McKinnon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>David Coley</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Bombay, India</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Durham Light Infantry (1892) Wellington College &amp; RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobbe</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>- India, Lieutenant-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>SW Borders (1892)</td>
<td>Wellington College &amp; RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Fleetwood George Campbell</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Meerut, Bengal, India</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Wiltshire Regiment (1892)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Granville</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>- China, Tea Merchant</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>SW Borders (1894)</td>
<td>Served in Militia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennefather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Birthplace</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Regiment</td>
<td>Commission Year</td>
<td>Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>George Henry Fitzmaurice</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1890 Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Leinster Regiment (1892)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson</td>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Inverness, Scotland</td>
<td>General, British Army</td>
<td>1890 Major</td>
<td>East Kent Regiment (1891)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Frederick Manners</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Worcestershire, England</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>1891 Major</td>
<td>Gloucestershire Regiment (1893)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake</td>
<td>Hugh St. Aubyn</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>Admiral, Royal Navy</td>
<td>1891 Major</td>
<td>Northumberland Fusiliers (1895)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Madras, India</td>
<td>Indian Civil Service</td>
<td>1891 Major</td>
<td>North Stafford Regiment &amp; Derbyshire Regiment (1896)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeen</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Meerut, India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1891 Major-General</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td>Francis Aylmer</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Guildford, Surrey, England</td>
<td>Surgeon-Major, Indian Army</td>
<td>1891 Brigadier-General</td>
<td>Sussex Regiment (1893)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loring</td>
<td>Charles Buxton</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Gillingham, Kent, England</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1891 Major</td>
<td>Durham Light Infantry (1893)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Given Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Branch</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>Asirgarh, India</td>
<td>Major, Indian Army</td>
<td>1891 Colonel</td>
<td>Somerset Light Infantry (1892)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barwell</td>
<td>Edward Egerton</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Harrow, England</td>
<td>General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1892 Major</td>
<td>East Lancashire Regiment (1893)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>Queen's India Cadet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducat</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Ahmednagar, India</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>1892 Major</td>
<td>Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry (1896)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowercroft</td>
<td>Claude Harold</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Delhi, India</td>
<td>Captain, British Army</td>
<td>1892 Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Royal Artillery (1896)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobbs</td>
<td>Charles Farlie</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Madras, India</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1892 Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphreys</td>
<td>George Predergast</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>County Down, Ireland</td>
<td>Justice of the Peace</td>
<td>1892 Major</td>
<td>Welsh Regiment (1893)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>Reginald Edwin</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Meerut, India</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1892 Major</td>
<td>Yorkshire Regiment (1894)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodhurst</td>
<td>Bernard Lucas</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Benares, India</td>
<td>Indian Civil Service</td>
<td>1892 Major</td>
<td>Border Regiment (1893)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>DOB</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Regiment</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Bertouche</td>
<td>Guy Neal Landale</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Secretary of Railways, Melbourne</td>
<td>1892 Major</td>
<td>Suffolk Regiment (1896)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>Aenas Charles</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Naini Tal</td>
<td>General, British Army</td>
<td>1892 Major</td>
<td>East Kent Regiment (1895)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot</td>
<td>Reginald William</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Officer, British Army</td>
<td>1893 Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot</td>
<td>Sidney</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carlow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandfather = Captain, Royal Navy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Chakrata</td>
<td>Major-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1893 Major</td>
<td>Wiltshire Regiment (1897)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>Gedfrey Massy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Guy Hastings</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>Surgeon-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1893 Major</td>
<td>Northamptonshire Regiment (1895)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian</td>
<td>Charles Augustus</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1893 Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Gordon Highlands (1895)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Lionel Stuart</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Mercara</td>
<td>Major-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1894 Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villiers-Stuart</td>
<td>William Desmond</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Salford</td>
<td>Captain, British Army</td>
<td>1894 Brigadier-General</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Office Type</td>
<td>Commission Year</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Regiment/Unit</td>
<td>Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duhan Francis Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Calcutta, India</td>
<td>Officer, British Army</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Hampshire Regiment (1896)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith John Gwynne</td>
<td></td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Ajmere, India</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>South Wales Borders (1896)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Norman Ruthven</td>
<td></td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Otley, Yorkshire</td>
<td>Vicar</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Reginald Seymour</td>
<td></td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Sussex, England</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Cheshire Regiment (1897)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan-Sawyer George Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Alexander Clair Monte</td>
<td></td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>North-West Province, India</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Royal Sussex Regiment (1907)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Jonathan Maxwell</td>
<td></td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Punjab, India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummond Eric Grey</td>
<td></td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Simla, Bengal, India</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Somerset Light Infantry (1898)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatley Guy Rutherford Prescott</td>
<td></td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Telegraphs Divisional Superintendent</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Norfolk Regiment (1897)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father/Family Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Year of Appointment</td>
<td>Rank/Position</td>
<td>Other Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakenham</td>
<td>George de le Poer Beresford</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ireland Officer, Indian &amp; British Army</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Arthur Francis</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>China GP in Shanghai</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Esme Cosmo William Conway</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colonel, French Army</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stooks</td>
<td>Charles Sumner</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>England Vicar</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>(1899)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villiers-Stuart</td>
<td>Charles Herbert</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Scotland Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Edward Currie</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Curie, Bengal</td>
<td>India Justice of the Peace Sussex</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>Dorset Regiment (1898)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becher</td>
<td>Henry Sullivan</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>India Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>India Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamieson</td>
<td>Gerald Alister</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Peshawar</td>
<td>India Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Royal Artillery (1901)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Rank after 1896</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilchrist</td>
<td>Robert Crooks</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Aurungabad, India</td>
<td>Brigadier-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>William Henry</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Hove, Sussex, England</td>
<td>Officer, Indian Army</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatum</td>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>General, British Army</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>K.O. Yorkshire Light Infantry (1899)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adair</td>
<td>William Finlay</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Ayrshire, Scotland</td>
<td>Major, British Army</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke</td>
<td>Thomas Campbell</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Stratford-upon-Avon, England</td>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Royal Irish Rifles (1898)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsby</td>
<td>Henry Fyshe-Palmer</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Brentford, Middlesex, England</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>East Surrey (1910)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowan</td>
<td>Andrew Galbraith</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Paisley, Scotland</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beddy</td>
<td>Percy Langdon</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Rawal Pindi, India</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Brigadier</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgson</td>
<td>George Cecil</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Indian Army</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>John Steuart</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Elgin, Scotland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham</td>
<td>Alan Moir</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Lucknow, Bengal</td>
<td>Major-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Devonshire Regiment (1898)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McEuen</td>
<td>James Stewart</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Captain, Royal Navy</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Cameronians &amp; Sherwood Foresters (1901)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst &amp; Woolwich</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller</td>
<td>Richard Hope</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Indian Civil Service</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers (1900)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birdwood</td>
<td>Richard Lockington</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>High Court Judge &amp; Member of Council Bombay</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan</td>
<td>Claude Gray</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Hampshire Regiment (1899)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfield</td>
<td>Frederick Charles</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Major-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rundall</td>
<td>Arthur Montagu</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Rajputana</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Bedfordshire Regiment (1901)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Served in Militia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadler</td>
<td>Ernest Reginald</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel + Governor of Winward Islands</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitchurch</td>
<td>Leslie Sedgwick</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin</td>
<td>Hugh Laurents</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Major, British Army</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Middlesex Regiment (1900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robertson-Glasgow</td>
<td>Archibald</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Ayrshire</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Officer, British Army</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Royal Scots (1900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arundell</td>
<td>Reinfred Tatton</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Leicestershire Regiment (1903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliot</td>
<td>Charles Howard</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry (1900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimshaw</td>
<td>Roland</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Royal Irish Regiment (1901)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Christian Names</td>
<td>Year of Birth</td>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Regiment or Service</td>
<td>University or Training</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>Malcolm Arthur Russell</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Edinburgh, Scotland</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Scottish Borders (1902)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail</td>
<td>Robert George Anthony</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Anarkullee, Bengal</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gell</td>
<td>Philip Francis</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Thantet, Kent</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Manchester Regiment</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td>Eustace Lockhart</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Guildford, Surrey</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>New College, Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>George Campbell</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Yokohama, Japan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duff</td>
<td>Beauchamp Oswald</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Dehra Dun, India</td>
<td>C-in-C Indian Army</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>Alban John</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Tasmania, Australia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>South Staffordshire Regiment (1918)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Walter Edward Lionel</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>Royal Artillery (1911)</td>
<td>RMC Woolwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>Laurence George</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Sialkot, India</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>East Yorkshire Regiment (1901)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartwell</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Lucknow, Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Welsh Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td>Frederick William</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Leicester Regiment (1903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey-Kelly</td>
<td>Harvey St. George</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell</td>
<td>Hay Stewart</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Middlesex Regiment (1903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnis</td>
<td>Frank Alexander</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Murree, Punjab</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>Royal Garrison Artillery (1906)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran</td>
<td>Lionel Francis Abingdon</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Leinster Regiment &amp; Worcestershire Regiment (1905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>James Robert</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Scottish Borderers (1901)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father/Spouse</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Rank/Role</td>
<td>Commission Year</td>
<td>Military Unit</td>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny</td>
<td>William George Stanhope</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Madras</td>
<td>Lieutenant- Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Captain Hampshire Regiment (1902)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McRae</td>
<td>Archibald William</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Scinde</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Captain West Yorkshire Regiment (1902)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>3 uncles also served in Indian Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Robert Dundas</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Justice of the Peace Sussex</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Walter Falconer</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Denbigh</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Captain Border Regiment (1903)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Served in ranks before commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>Gerald Alexander Gaselee</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Kashauli</td>
<td>India Major, Indian Army</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Captain Suffolk Regiment (1902)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampe-Vincent</td>
<td>Percival Campbell</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>Commissioner of Police, Bombay</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>Hugh Stafford Northcote</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>Berar</td>
<td>India Superintendent of Police, Berar</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Captain Army Service Corps (1912)</td>
<td>Heidelberg University</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>Francis Hewson</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Captain Royal Irish Rifles (1903)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Served in Militia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Regiment</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradshaw</td>
<td>Arthur Edwin</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Plymouth, Devon</td>
<td>Surgeon-General</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Bedfordshire Regiment</td>
<td>Sandhurst</td>
<td>Both sides of family have long history in India, dating back to Plassey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Frederick George</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Justice of the Peace</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall</td>
<td>Burton Howard</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Yorkshire Regiment</td>
<td>Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCleverty</td>
<td>Robert Jim</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Nottinghams hire</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>West riding Regiment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandfathers = General &amp; Surgeon General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padday</td>
<td>William Hamilton</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>West Surrey Regiment</td>
<td>Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beattie-Crozier</td>
<td>Percy</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>South Staffs Regiment</td>
<td>Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Degree/Profession</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Branch</td>
<td>Military Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalmahoy</td>
<td>John Francis</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Allahabad</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Major-General, British Army</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>King's Royal Rifles (1902)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cecil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hore</td>
<td>Percy Standish</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>St. Asaph</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>South Wales Borderers (1904)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Served in Militia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparrow</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Royal Berkshire Regiment (1904)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whytehead</td>
<td>Hugh Richard</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Chapter Clerk, York Minster</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Northumberland Fusiliers (1903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Augustin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Served in Yeomanry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ussher</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>East Kent Regiment (1904)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>William McMillan</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Kirkcudbright</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Royal Scots Fusiliers (1903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Served in Militia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>Leonard Grey</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Poona</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Brigade-Surgeon</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>Grandfather = General Bombay Artillery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td>Percy Alexander</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Darjeeling</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>South Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Regiment (Year)</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>William Charles</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Ayrshire, Scotland</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>George Chichester Smyth</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Devon, England</td>
<td>Independently Wealthy</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Leinster Regiment (1909) -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beadle</td>
<td>Robert Denis</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Bombay, India</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auret</td>
<td>Alan Sauer</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Cape Colony, South Africa</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>West Yorkshire Regiment (1904) -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatacre</td>
<td>John Kirwin</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Dublin, Ireland</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Black Watch Sandhurst -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh</td>
<td>Gilbert Howe Maxwell</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Dorset Regiment (1904) - Served in Militia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortimer</td>
<td>Gerald Henry Walter</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Shrewsbury, England</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Scottish Borders (1904) RMC Sandhurst - Seconded to British Army whilst on leave in Britain 1914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Regiment/Unit</td>
<td>Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etlinger</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>North Staffordshire Regiment (1912)</td>
<td>Trinity College Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grigg</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Oudh</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Duke of Cornwall's Light Infantry (1905)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathew</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Darjeeling</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Brigade Surgeon</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Northamptons hire Regiment (1903)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Wynyard</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Lucknow</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Templer</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>South Staffordshire Regiment (1904)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparling</td>
<td>Sidney</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Norfolk Regiment (1904)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Hubert</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Justice of the Peace</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jotham</td>
<td>Eustace</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Kidderminster</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Wine Merchant</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>North Staffordshire</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father Name</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Birth Place</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Regiment</td>
<td>Place of Study</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auchinleck</td>
<td>Claude John Eyre</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Aldershot, Hampshire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Field Marshal</td>
<td>Wellington College &amp; RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maclaren</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Brighton, Sussex</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Indian Public Works Dept</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwatkin</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Murree, Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogg</td>
<td>Ivan Dayrell Meredith</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Oxford Light Infantry &amp; Agyll and Sutherland Highlanders (1904)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglis</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Ayrshire, Scotland</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Estate Factor</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Northamptons hire Regiment (1904)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Harry Norman</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Behar, India</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Indian Civil Service</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Royal Field Artillery (1906)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Regiment, Corps</td>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Burdwan</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Inspector General Police, Bengal</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Lincolnshire Regiment (1905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Henry Ironside</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Somerset Light Infantry (1903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td>Marmaduke JohnNorman</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Canon</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Dorset Regiment (1907)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson</td>
<td>William Noel</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Durham Light Infantry (1904)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>Percy D'Aguilar</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Wiltshire Regiment (1905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwick</td>
<td>Frederick James</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>East Lancashire Regiment (1904)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creagh</td>
<td>Aubrey Osborne</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>East Sussex</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Major-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Name         | Father's Name          | Year | Location       | Nationality      | Rank         | Branch/Unit                                      | Academy | Grandfather
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cruickshank</td>
<td>Henry Prinsep</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>Guernsey, England</td>
<td>Indian Civil Service</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Royal Garrison Artillery</td>
<td>RMC Woolwich</td>
<td>also ICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>Francis Lloyd</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Mussoorie, India</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Border Regiment (1904)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Served in Militia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Gilbert Stuart</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Penang, Malaya</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>West Yorkshire Regiment (1907)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>Grandfather = General, British Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothier</td>
<td>Robert Frank</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Madras, India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>Frank Berkeley</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Bombay, India</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Unsure (1905)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgson</td>
<td>Ernest Charles</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>India, Malaya</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackain</td>
<td>James Fergus</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Sussex, England</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Gordon Highlanders (1905)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>Family had long history with Royal Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Leonard de Lone</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>Major-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>North Staffs Regiment (1905)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>James Eric</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Shropshire, England</td>
<td>Major, British Army</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>North Staffs Regiment (1905)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Birthplace</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Hubert Winthrop</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Wrexham, Wales</td>
<td>Indian Civil Service</td>
<td>1904 Major</td>
<td>Royal Artillery (1908)</td>
<td>Eton -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blane</td>
<td>Hugh Seymour</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Norfolk, England</td>
<td>Captain, Royal Navy</td>
<td>1905 Captain</td>
<td>Wiltshire Regiment (1906)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookes</td>
<td>Henry Richard</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Port Blair, India</td>
<td>Indian Civil Service</td>
<td>1905 Captain</td>
<td>Bedfordshire Regiment (1907)</td>
<td>- Served in Militia. Grandfather = Colonel, British Army</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainsford-Hannay</td>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1905 Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey-Kelly</td>
<td>Charles Hamilton</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Secunderabad, India</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1905 Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst Son of Harvey Hamilton Harvey-Kelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Charles de Lona</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Major-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1905 Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Wellington College -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heath</td>
<td>Lewis Macclesfield</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1905 Lieutenant-General</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Archibald Kenneth</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Stratford-on-Avon, England</td>
<td>Vicar</td>
<td>1905 Captain</td>
<td>Gloucestershire Regiment (1906)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Regiment</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Royal Military College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Talbot</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Dorset Regiment (1906)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcox</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Bedfordshire, England</td>
<td>Major-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>West Surrey Regiment (1906)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Cuttack, India</td>
<td>Engineer, Public Works Dept.</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Bedfordshire Regiment (1908)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stack</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Bengal, India</td>
<td>Bengal Civil Service</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Huntingdon, England</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Seaforth Highlanders (1909)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Bombay, India</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>Grandfather = Commissioner of Oudh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Pass</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Kensington, England</td>
<td>Attorney, Nova Scotia</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Royal Horse Artillery (1909)</td>
<td>RMC Woolwich</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allardice</td>
<td>Colin</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Mysore, India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>East Lancashire Regiment (1911)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Regiment</td>
<td>Other Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowle</td>
<td>Louis</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Co. Cork</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>Royal Irish Regiment (1909)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gore</td>
<td>Annesley, Charles Edward St. George</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Murree</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>Royal Irish Regiment (1907)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartwell</td>
<td>John Redmond</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Irish Fusiliers (1907)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett</td>
<td>Alexander Dumaresq</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaisford</td>
<td>Lionel</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Quetta</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Royal Irish Regiment (1908)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Harold Clement Montagu</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>East Surrey Regiment (1910)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid</td>
<td>James Lestock Ironside</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Eastbourne, East Sussex</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>Scottish Rifles (1909)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>Richard Crawhall</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Insurance Secretary</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Rank/Position</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davison</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Major-General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GP</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peyton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railston</td>
<td>Spencer</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Cameronians (1908)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilfred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mankelow</td>
<td>Archibald</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Royal Berkshire Regiment (1911)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Columbo</td>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Royal Scots Fusiliers (1908)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staniforth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wemyss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinde</td>
<td>Reginald</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reilly</td>
<td>Ralph</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Jubbulpore</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Sherwood Foresters (1909)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>North-West Frontier</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>General, Indian Army</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyril</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barstow</td>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Commission Year</td>
<td>Commission Source</td>
<td>Additional Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beddy</td>
<td>Rafe Langdon</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Cheltenham, Gloucestershire</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Gordon Highlanders (1909)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Wickham Leathes</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Twickenham, Middlesex</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>South Wales Borderers (1909)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>Charles Offley</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rundall</td>
<td>Lionel Bickersteth</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>N. Staffordshire Regiment (1910)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baillie</td>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Indian Civil Service</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metcalfe</td>
<td>Edward Dudley</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacRae-Bruce</td>
<td>William Arthur</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacPherson</td>
<td>Duncan Stuart Ross</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Surgeon-General</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Black Watch (1910)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell</td>
<td>Charles William</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Essex Regiment (1910)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Overseas Service</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happell</td>
<td>William Horatio</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Edmonton, Canada</td>
<td>Indian Civil Service</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Brigadier</td>
<td>Sherwood Foresters (1914)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spankie</td>
<td>Montague Douglas</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Inverness, Scotland</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Essex Regiment (1911)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd</td>
<td>Owen Tudor</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>Officer, British Army</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCrae-Bruce</td>
<td>William Arthur</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Edinburgh, Scotland</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burridge</td>
<td>Henry Gardiner</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>North-West Frontier, India</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>North Staffs Regiment (1911)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innes</td>
<td>Ian Charles</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Inverness, Scotland</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>East Kent Regiment (1912)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minchin</td>
<td>Herbert Charles Loder</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Bath, Gloucestershire, England</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gell</td>
<td>Humphrey Vickers</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Yorkshire, England</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson</td>
<td>Kenneth Sinclair</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>St Johns, Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinton</td>
<td>John Alexander</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Victoria, Canada</td>
<td>Linen Manufacturer</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule</td>
<td>Fitzgibbon</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donald Gordon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>Royal West Kent Regiment (1912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Apjohn</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Captain, British Army</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Royal Fusiliers (1913)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule</td>
<td>Meade</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Deccan</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Essex Regiment (1912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arthur Verney</td>
<td></td>
<td>London</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>Royal West Kent Regiment (1912)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule</td>
<td>Smyth</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Indian Civil Service</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Brigadier</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule</td>
<td>Gallwey</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip Francis Payne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woolwich, Kent</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Captain, British Army</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>Royal Flying Corps (1915-1921)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule</td>
<td>Dickinson</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Woolwich, Kent</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Malcolm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule</td>
<td>Scoones</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Major, British Army</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geoffrey Allen Percival</td>
<td></td>
<td>Simla, Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Simla, Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Additional Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walcott</td>
<td>John Henry Lyons</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Maurice Charles</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>University nomination for Indian Army</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashmore</td>
<td>Edwin James Caldwell</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topham</td>
<td>Henry Angrave Cecil</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>2nd Lieutenant</td>
<td>Welsh Regiment (-)</td>
<td>Clare College, Cambridge</td>
<td>Died whilst still with Welsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messervy</td>
<td>Frank Walter</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh-Jones</td>
<td>Noel</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Brigadier</td>
<td>Royal Welsh Fusiliers TF (1917)</td>
<td>University of London</td>
<td>Training as solicitor when War broke out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slim</td>
<td>William Joseph</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Field Marshal</td>
<td>Warwickshire Regiment (1919)</td>
<td>Staff College, Quetta</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sykes</td>
<td>John Henry</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Brigadier</td>
<td>3rd Dragoon Guards (1917)</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teversham</td>
<td>Mark Symonds</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Brigadier</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thwaytes</td>
<td>Lancelot Lawrence</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Brigadier</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minchin</td>
<td>Hugh Charles Stephens</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Brigadier</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Cyril Percy</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Major, Indian Army</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Daniel George Mark</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Dharmsala</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Colonel, Indian Army</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>2nd Lieutenant</td>
<td>South Staffs Regiment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Ronald Christian Sundius</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>2nd Lieutenant</td>
<td>West Yorkshire Regiment (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavaghan</td>
<td>Edward Lawrence</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Arkonam, Madras</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anstey</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>Bristol, Gloucestershire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Commercial Drapery</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Brigadier</td>
<td>Worcecestershire Regiment (1915)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavender</td>
<td>Sydney Salter</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Walsall</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>South Staffordshire Regiment (1918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armitage</td>
<td>Hugo Evans</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Croydon, Surrey</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Tank Corps (1919)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Birth Place</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Rank and Regulations</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amies</td>
<td>Basil</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Faversham, Kent</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merk</td>
<td>John William</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Pashawar, Bengal</td>
<td>Indian Civil Service</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggs</td>
<td>Harold Rawdon</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant- General</td>
<td>King's Liverpool Regiment (1916)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham</td>
<td>Arthur Nyton</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Biddenden, Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargisson</td>
<td>William Frederick</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>Sign-Writer</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamble</td>
<td>Richard Sumner</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Grantham, Lincolnshire</td>
<td>Fire Service</td>
<td>2nd Lieutenant</td>
<td>East Lancashire Regiment (1915)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasluck</td>
<td>Sidney Van Dyke</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>2nd Lieutenant</td>
<td>Various jobs and travels prior to 1914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgson</td>
<td>Eric Godfrey</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Hazaribagh</td>
<td>Colonel, Survey of India</td>
<td>2nd Lieutenant</td>
<td>Served in Ceylon Planters Rifles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Forename</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rank/Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hornsby</td>
<td>George Western</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Calcutta, India</td>
<td>Colonel, British Army</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>2nd Lieutenant</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>John Riddell Musgrave</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Belfast, Ireland</td>
<td>Justice of the Peace</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Royal Inniskilling Fusiliers TF (1917)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine-Coffin</td>
<td>Edward Claude</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Militia &amp; GWR Shareholder</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rees</td>
<td>Thomas Wynford</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Glamorgan, Wales</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Dudley</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Dartford, Kent</td>
<td>Articled Clerk</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Lieutenant-General</td>
<td>Royal West Kent Regiment (1917)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waite</td>
<td>John Johnston</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Co. Armagh, Ireland</td>
<td>Insurance Superintendent</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Royal Irish Rifles (1918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Surname</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Year of Commission</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>College/Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayler</td>
<td>Skipwith</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Viper Island, Andamans</td>
<td>Deputy Commissioner Port Blair</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomkins</td>
<td>Gerard</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>India Accountant</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Brigadier</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst (1916)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aird-Smith</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Brigadier</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Aberdeen, Scotland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>Hubert</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Tong, Shropshire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst (1918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percy-Smith</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Royston Hertfordshire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Royal Irish Fusiliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forde</td>
<td>John Stuart</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Wolstanton, Staffordshire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews</td>
<td>David Ernest</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Royston Hertfordshire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Branch of Service</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>Harold Starmer</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Brighton, Sussex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Brigadier</td>
<td>Royal Field Artillery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Druett</td>
<td>Horace Charles</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Croyden, Surrey</td>
<td>House Decorator</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>East Surrey Regiment (1920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masterman</td>
<td>Christopher Hughes</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>Captain, Royal Navy</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutton</td>
<td>Reginald Anthony</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Insurance Clerk</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Brigadier</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Leigh Arbuthnot</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Natal</td>
<td>Major, British Army</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Cadet College, Quetta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sainter</td>
<td>James Dow</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>Army Surgeon</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>Territorial Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stables</td>
<td>Francis Hugh Anthony</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Nottinghams hire</td>
<td>Major, British Army</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>Canadian Army during FWW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson</td>
<td>William Robert</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfieri</td>
<td>Frederick John</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Farenham, Hampshire</td>
<td>Assistant Headmaster</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Major-General</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Birth Year</td>
<td>Birth Place</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Service Year</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Other Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berg</td>
<td>Clement Leonard</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>West Ham, Essex</td>
<td>Furniture Maker</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny</td>
<td>William David</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>County Down</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Francis Gordon</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Formby, Lancashire</td>
<td>Insurance Manager</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bates</td>
<td>Guy Ernest Lockington</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Playden, East Sussex</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Cadet College, Quetta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Henry Alfred</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Bristol, Gloucestershire</td>
<td>Locomotive Engineer</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>Pre-War Schoolmaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbs</td>
<td>Albert Edward Thomas</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Collar Cutter in Linen Factory</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungerford</td>
<td>Winspeare Toye</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>Cecil John</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Warehouseman</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard</td>
<td>Ronald Garvie</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Bristol, Gloucestershire</td>
<td>Solicitor</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Rank 1</th>
<th>Rank 2</th>
<th>Rank 3</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blaber</td>
<td>Hugh</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Medical Professional</td>
<td>1918 Colonol</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tozer</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Plymouth, Devon</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Building Contractor</td>
<td>1919 Colonol</td>
<td>Royal Field Artillery (1919)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Served in ranks of RFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barlow</td>
<td>Lance Mount</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Cuttack, Bengal</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1919 Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cadet College, Quetta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howitt</td>
<td>John Francis</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>1919 Lieutenant-Colonel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grahamsley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson-Haffenden</td>
<td>Donald James</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Stroud, Gloucestershire</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
<td>1920 Major-General</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambert</td>
<td>Denis de Gruchy</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Manmar</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Assistant Commissioner, Indian Railways</td>
<td>1920 -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedley</td>
<td>Robert Cecil</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1920 Major-General</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>RMC Sandhurst</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bibliography

Primary Sources
India Office Records, British Library

IOR/L/MIL/7/13738 Abolition of Flogging in the Native Army. Field Punishment in lieu of Flogging as Punishment in the Field, 1906-1934.

IOR/L/MIL/17/5/1618 Correspondence between General Sir Beauchamp Duff and Earl Kitchener.


IOR/L/MIL/7/4157 Indian Army Commands and Regimental Appointments. Promotion in the Indian Army – Tenure of commands.

IOR/L/MIL/17/5/1-219 Indian Army List.

IOR/L/MIL/7/9767 Indian Army Promotion & Recruitment. Retardation of promotion on account of inefficiency.

IOR/L/MIL/7/9749 Indian Army Rates of promotion, Proposed examination for promotion to Captain and Major in the staff corps.

IOR/L/MIL/7/13714 Indian Articles of War Amendment Act, 1894: Retention of Flogging as a Punishment.

IOR/L/MIL/7/7267 Insubordination of certain men of the 3rd Goorkha Regiment at Almorah in April 1886.

IOR/L/MIL/7/2593 Inter-departmental committee on recruitment and regulations re officers of Indian Army; correspondence with War Office.


IOR/L/MIL/7/18846 Parliamentary Question regarding mutinous conduct of 130th Baluchis (Afridis, Mohmands, Pathans).
IOR L/MIL/7/13491 Reorganisation of the Native Army – Establishment of 7 British officers not increased.

IOR/L/MIL/17/19/48 Report in Connection with Mutiny of 5th Light Infantry at Singapore 1915.

Mss Eur F90/25-33 Sir John Lawrence, Viceroy of India 1864-69: correspondence with Secretary of State.

IOR/L/MIL/7/19350 Specimens of forms used in recruitment of Indian Army and Indian Army Reserve officers.

IOR/MIL/7/7266 Treachery of a Native Officer and Misconduct of 20 Men of 29th Punjab Infantry at Peiwar Kotal, December 1878.

IOR/L/PJ/6/752 File 896, Use of the Punishment of Flogging in India, 1906.


European Manuscripts, British Library


Mss Eur C296 Charles Dennis Balding Papers.

Mss Photo Eur 288, Other Days: copy of extract from memoir by Lt-Col Granville Pennefather Evans.


Mss Eur B235/1 Memoirs of Colonel Harry Ross, Indian Army 1869-1901.


Mss Photo Eur 437 Jules Stewart Papers.

Mss Eur 1048/4, General Sir Charles Patton Keyes, Madras Army: Letters from various correspondents including Lord Roberts, Col John Davidson and Sir John Withers McQueen.
Mss Eur C837, Vincent Alexander Ormsby papers, an account of his life, mainly up to 1902, compiled by Ruth Fell from a memoir left by him and other sources.

Mss Eur C837, Vincent Ormsby, Battalion on the Tirah,


Mss Eur F282/9, Copy of a letter to Mrs George Pirrie from Lt J H Prendergast concerning her husband's health.

Mss Eur F282/14, Letters from acquaintances and colleagues of Capt George Pirrie in Secunderabad, Bengal and Madras, commenting on his intemperance and bad behaviour.

Imperial War Museum

IWM16777, Private Papers of W F Sargisson, Some Experiences of a Subaltern IARO.

IWM 10048, Private Papers of Lieutenant-Colonel H V Gell.

IWM, Sound Archive, 9149, Ian Pendlebury MacDonald, Reel 1.

The National Archives


The Gurkha Museum

From the Collection of Brig General W D Villiers-Stuart CBE DSO, 5th Royal Gurkha Rifles (FF) 1984 Volume 2.

The Memoirs of Major General J.M. Stewart, KCB, KCMG, 5th Royal Gurkha Rifles (Frontier Force).

Centre for South Asian Studies, University of Cambridge

Benthal Papers, Box 26, Benthal family correspondence from 1827-1875.

Blackwood (G.D.) Papers.
Cartwright Papers.

Papers of Lieutenant-Colonel Donald G. Rule, 27th Punjab Infantry.

Audio Archive, Col. J.S. Lord.

Audio Archive, Mrs M. Ravenscroft.

National Army Museum

Transcript of Lieutenant Henry Curtis Gallup's diary, 3 December 1915-10 March 1917.

Parliamentary Papers

Royal Commission to inquire into Organization of Indian Army, ‘Report of the commissioners appointed to inquire into the organization of the Indian army; together with the minutes of evidence and appendix’. 2515 (London; Her Majesty’s Stationary Office, 1859).

Newspapers and Periodicals

*Bentley's Miscellany* 32 (1852)


*North British Review* 27 (1857).

*The Times of India* (2 August 1865).

Contemporary Sources


Ashe, Major, *Personal Records of the Kandahar Campaign by Officers Engaged Therein* (London; David Bogue, 1881).

Bellew, H.W., *Our Punjab Frontier: Being a Concise Account of the Various Tribes by which the North-West Frontier of British India is Inhabited; Shewing its Present Unprotected and Unsatisfactory State, and the Urgent Necessity that Exists for its Immediate Reconstruction, also, Brief Remarks on Afghanistan and our Policy in Reference to that Country* (Calcutta, Wyman Bros, 1886).


CB, ‘Some Tactical Consideration Arising from Recent Events in South Africa’, *Journal of the United Service Institution of India,* Vol. XXX, No. 142 (1901).


Jacobsen, Mark, (ed.), *Rawlinson in India* (Stroud; Sutton Publishing for the Army Records Society, 2002).

James, Captain W.B., ‘The Practical Training of British and Native Troops in India with reference to the Lessons of the War in South Africa’, *Journal of the United Service Institution of India* Vol. XXX No. 144 (1901).

MacMunn, Sir George, *The Martial Races of India* (London; Sampson Low, 1934).

Mecham, Clifford Henry, *Siege of Lucknow, Drawings Made During the Siege* (London; Day & Son, 1858).


Roberts of Kandahar, Field Marshal Lord, *Forty-One Years in India, From Subaltern to Commander-in-Chief* (London; Macmillan and Co., 1901).


Stebbing, E.P., *Jungle By-Ways in India: Leaves from the Notebook of a Sportsman and Naturalist* (London; Lane, 1911).

Stockley, Charles., *Big Game Shooting in the Indian Empire* (London; Constable, 1928).


Woodyatt, Nigel, *Under ten viceroy’s; the reminiscences of a Gurkha* (London; Butler & Tanner, 1922).


**Secondary Sources**


- - - *The Indian Uprising of 1857-8, Prisons, Prisoners and Rebellion* (London; Anthem Press, 2007).


- - - (ed.), *Settlers and Expatriates: Britons over the Seas* (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2010).


- - - Empire Families: Britons and Late Imperial India (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2004).

Campbell, James, D., The Army Isn't All Work Physical Culture and the Evolution of the British Army, 1860-1920 (Farnham; Ashgate, 2012).

Caplan, Lionel, Warrior Gentlemen: "Gurkhas" in the Western Imagination (Oxford; Berghahn, 1995).

Carver, Field Marshal Lord, Britain’s Army in the 20th Century (London; Macmillan, 1998).


Corrigan, Gordon, Sepoys in the Trenches, The Indian Corps on the Western Front 1914-1915 (Staplehurst; Spellmount, 1999).


Deshpande, Anirudh, ‘Contested Identities and Military Indianization in Colonial India (1900-39)’ in Roy (ed.) *War and Society in Colonial India* (New Delhi; Oxford University Press, 2006).


- - - Queen Victoria’s Little Wars (London; Allen Lane, 1973).


Förster, Stig, and Chickering, Roger, (eds.), Great War, Total War, Combat and Motivation on the Western Front, 1914-1918 (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2001).


- - - The Siege of Kut-al-Amara: At War in Mesopotamia, 1915-1916 (Bloomington and Indianapolis; Indiana University Press, 2014).


Ghosh, Durba, Sex and the Family in Colonial India, the Making of Empire (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2006).


Gommans, Jos, Mughal Warfare: Indian Frontiers and Highroads to Empire 1500–1700, (London; Routledge, 2002).


Guha, Ramachandra, A Corner of a Foreign Field, The Indian History of a British Sport (Basingstoke; Picador, 2002).

Guha, Ranjit, Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India (Delhi; Oxford University Press, 1997).


- - - and Deshpande, Anirudh, (eds.), The British Raj and its Indian Armed Forces 1857-1939 (New Delhi; Oxford University Press, 2002).


Public Health in British India, Anglo-Indian Preventive Medicine 1859-1914 (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Harms, Robert W., Freeman, Bernard K., & Blight, David W., (eds.) Indian Ocean Slavery in the Age of Abolition (New Haven; Yale University Press, 2013).


- - - The Afghan Wars, 1839-1919 New Edition (Stroud; Spellmount, 2007).

- - - The Military in British India: The Development of British Land Forces in South Asia, 1600-1947 (Manchester; Manchester University Press, 1995).


Hevia, James, The Imperial Security State, British Colonial Knowledge and Empire-Building in Asia (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2012).


- - - Tommy: The British Soldier on the Western Front (London; Harper Perennial, 2005).


Jaffer, Aaron, Lascars and Indian Ocean Seafaring, 1780-1860: Shipboard Life, Unrest and Mutiny (Woodbridge; Boydell and Brewer, 2015).

James, Lawrence, Mutiny in the British and Commonwealth Forces, 1797-1956 (London; Buchan & Enright, 1987).

Jeffreys, Alan, (ed.), The Indian Army and the First World War, New Perspectives (Solihull; Helion Press, 2018).


- - - The Afghan War of War, How and Why They Fight (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2012).


- - - From Boer War to World War, Tactical Reform of the British Army, 1902-1914 (Norman; University of Oklahoma Press, 2013).


Khan, Yasmin, India At War, The Subcontinent and the Second World War (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2015).


*The British Empire, Sunrise to Sunset* (Harlow; Pearson Longman, 2007).

MacKenzie, John M., ‘The Imperial Pioneer and Hunter and the British Masculine Stereotype in late Victorian and Edwardian Times’ in Mangan, J.A., and Walvin,
James, (eds.), *Manliness and Morality, Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940* (New York; St. Martin’s Press, 1987).

---

The *Empire of nature: Hunting, Conservation and British Imperialism* (Manchester; Manchester University Press, 1997).


Majumdar, Borja, *Cricket in Colonial India, 1780-1947* (Abingdon; Routledge, 2008).


---

and Walvin, James, (eds.), *Manliness and Morality, Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940* (New York; St. Martin’s Press, 1987).


- - - Land, Landlords, and the British Raj: Northern India in the Nineteenth Century
(Berkeley; University of California Press, 1979).

Mizutani, Satoshi, ‘Degenerate whites’ and their spaces of disorder: Disciplining racial
and class ambiguities in colonial Calcutta (c. 1880-1930)’ in Tambe, Ashwini, and
Fischer-Tiné, Harald, (eds.) The Limits of British Colonial Control in South Asia,
Spaces of disorder in the Indian Ocean region (London; Routledge, 2009).

Rebellion, Repression, Reinvention: Mutiny in Comparative Perspective (Westport,

Moore-Brick, Christopher, Playing the Game, The British Junior Infantry Officer on
the Western Front 1914-18 (Solihull; Helion & Company, 2011).

- - - The Army in India and the Development of Frontier Warfare, 1849-1947

Morton-Jack, George, ‘The Indian Army on the Western Front, 1914-1915: A Portrait
- - - The Indian Army on the Western Front: India’s Expeditionary Force to France and
Belgium in the First World War (Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, 2014).

Omissi, David, ‘‘Martial Races’: Ethnicity and Security in Colonial India 1858–1939’,
- - - Europe through Indian Eyes: Indian Soldiers Encounter England and France, 1914-
- - - Indian Voices of the Great War: Soldiers' Letters, 1914-18 (Basingstoke:
Macmillan, 1999).
- - - The Sepoy and the Raj: The Indian Army, 1860-1940 (Basingstoke: Macmillan,
1994).

Oram, Gerard, ‘Pious Perjury: Discipline and Morale in the British Force in Italy, 1917-


Pegler, Martin, The Lee-Enfield Rifle (Oxford; Osprey, 2012).


review of The Indian Army on the Western Front: India's Expeditionary Force to France and Belgium in the First World War, (review no. 1714)DOI: 10.14296/RiH/2014/1714 [Date accessed: 2 November, 2016].
Procida, Mary A., *Married to the Empire, Gender, Politics, and Imperialism in India, 1883-1947* (Manchester; Manchester University Press, 2002).


- - - and Roy, Kaushik, (eds.) *Culture, Conflict and the Military in Colonial South Asia* (London; Routledge, 2018).


(ed.) *The Indian Army in the two World Wars* (Boston; Brill, 2012).

(ed.), *War and Society in Colonial India* (New Delhi; Oxford University Press, 2006).

*The Army in British India, From Colonial Warfare to Total War 1857-1947* (London; Bloomsbury Academic, 2013).

*War and Society in Afghanistan, From the Mughals to the Americans 1500-2013* (Oxford; Oxford University Press, 2015).

*Warfare in Pre-British India – 1500 BCE to 1740 CE* (London; Routledge, 2015).


Sharpe, Jenny, *Allegories of Empire The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text* (Minneapolis; University of Minnesota Press, 1993).


Simkins, Peter, *Kitchener's Army the Raising of the New Armies, 1914-16* (Barnsley; Pen & sword, 2007).


- - - *The Scottish Soldier and Empire, 1854-1902* (Edinburgh; Edinburgh University Press, 2006).

- - - *The Victorian Soldier in Africa* (Manchester; Manchester University Press, 2004).


- - - When God Made Hell, The British Invasion of Mesopotamia and the Creation of Iraq, 1914-1921 (London; Faber and Faber, 2010).


von Clausewitz, Carl, On War (London; Wordsworth Classics, 1997).


Wald, Erica, Vice in the Barracks: Medicine, the Military and the Making of Colonial India, 1780-1868 (Basinstoke; Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

Warner, Philip, Auchinleck, The Lonely Soldier (Barnsley; Pen & Sword, 2006).


Wilson, Jon, The Domination of Strangers Modern Governance in Eastern India, 1780-1835 (Basingstoke; Palgrave MacMillan, 2008).


**Unpublished Sources**


