Chapter VII

THE FINAL RAPTURE BETWEEN BARODA AND POONA GOVERNMENT WITH BRITISH INTERPOSITION

The treaty of Bassein and the Definitive treaty of 1805 completely changed the nature of the Gaekwad-Peshwa relations. The relations after 1805 were not cordial so there was ground for vigorous assertion of the British authority in Gujarat. The policy of the British[1] also aggravated the dispute between the Gaekwad and the Peshwa.

The British interference in the internal affairs of the Baroda Government :

The Baroda Government introduced a number of reforms in the administration with the help of the English Resident. The Arab troops were relieved after paying their arrears. The Company gave the loans to the State to liquidate its debt. There were now no further risings by the members of the Gaekwad Family. On the contrary Fatehsingrao was in Baroda. For all important reforms in the State and on administrative matters the British Resident was consulted.

---

1 The British Policy as defined by Lord Hastings (1813-23) Governor General of India, was as follows : "That our object in India ought to be to render the British Government paramount in effect, if not declaredly so, to hold the other States as vassals though not in name, and to oblige them in return for our guarantee and protection to perform the two feudatory duties of supporting our rule with all their forces and submitting their mutual differences to our arbitration.

Marshman : History of India, Vol.II, pp. 214-216.

This influence of the British in the internal affairs of the State was against the interests of the Baroda Ministers. After the death of Raoji Appaji, his cousin Sitaram succeeded to the Diwanship. He was opposed to the reforms introduced by the Resident and so he contrived to delay their implementation. In order to curtain the influence of Diwan Sitaram Fatehsingrao was appointed as a regent in 1806. Later Sitaram was relieved from the State service with the result that he formed an anti-British party at Baroda. He was influential at Poona and Bombay. He tried to obstract in the settlement of the Peshwa's claims on the Gaekwad.

Another difficult problem was of the Mulukgiri tribute which also bittered the relations of the Peshwa and the Gaekwad.

Mulukgiri Settlement :

Mulukgiri has been defined as the periodical progress or intersion of the military force for the collection of tribute or revenue from feudatory princes, by violence and intimidation. This tribute was paid only when it was exacted and extorted at the point of the sword.

The Baroda Government and the Peshwa's officers collected the Mulukgiri from the chief of Kathiawad and the Mewasi Thakors of Mahi-Kantha, Reva Kantha and Palanpur.

Every year the Baroda Government was to dispatch an armed force to collect the Mulukgiri dues as the tributaries defrayed the dues only under compulsion.

This custom was not strictly followed in the early years of Anandrao's reign as there were many internal problems at Baroda. Moreover after getting the lease of Ahmedabad the Gaekwad Government thought of collecting the arrears of tribute, but it was difficult and expensive for Baroda Government.

The Semi-Independent tributaries were keen in creating troubles at Baroda so that the Baroda Government might not send the force. The Mewasis had joined Kanhojirao in his rebellation and the Kathiwad chieftains were supporting Malharraoof Kadi against Baroda.

The British Company wanted the possessionof Kathiawad, and the British Resident at Baroda sent the subsidiary force with the Mulukgiri Officers of the Baroda Government to collect the dues.

After waging war with some turbulent chiefs, agreements were made with as many as one hundred forty-seven native chiefs of Kathiawad, Mahikantha, Reva Kantha and Palanpur for permanent tributes. A permanent Mulukgiri force of the Baroda Government was stationed in the heart of Kathiawad.

In 1811 there were fresh troubles in Kathiawad, and the Kathis began fresh depredataions. Many Kathi Chiefs

wanted to be free from the control of the Gaekwad so fierce war was there and at the end considerable reinforcement was added to the Mulukgiri force in Mathiawad. The agreements were favourable to the princes of Kathiawad because they had to pay only the fixed sum, and they were free from external or internal disturbances. To Baroda Government the system was less costly as it secured a fixed tribute without having the necessity to use force. But this action of the English and the Baroda Government was not liked by Peshwa Bajirao.

Peshwa Bajirao considered this settlement not binding on him. He thought that the campaign against the chiefs of Kathiawad chiefly had been conducted without his consent and the penalties imposed had not been officially recognised. So he thought that the settlement was an infringment of his suzereinty.

Peshwa Bajirao's claims on the Baroda Government :

The ttadition of the Marathas entitled the Peshwa to exercise control over all the members of the Maratha confederacy. But when Peshwa Bajirao signed the treaty of Bassein, he had renowened his position of the head of the confederacy and all the dependent confederates were made subservient to the foreign power. The different members of the confederacy had signed the treaties separatey with the English.

The provisions of the treaty of Bassein compelled the Peshwa to regulate all his relations with his feudatories through the Company government. For years he continued to wangle with the British Government on this subject. He tried his best to assert his right of ascendency over his subordinate chiefs, but without success. Bajirao was compelled in the end to submit to British dictation.

The relations between the Peshwa and the Gaekwad had long been strained, as Anandrao had accepted the British protection. Anandrao had neither paid the succession fees, nor the yearly tribute to the Peshwa. Moreover the hereditary minister Sitaram was relieved and the Mulukgiri settlements were made without being referred to him.

Peshwa Bajirao therefore wanted to restore his control over the Gaekwad and to establish his ascendancy in Gujarat. To regain his authority in Gujarat he used several means, some of them were as follows :

1. To put an end of the lease of Ahmedabad.
2. To appoint his own officers at Ahmedabad.
3. To put an end to the Mulukgiri settlement introduced by the Baroda Government in his territory of ten Talukas of Kathiawad and to put a separate military force of the Peshwa.
4. To demand for the settlement of huge financial claims owed by the Gaekwads to the Peshwa.

5. To encourage the anti-British party at Baroda.

6. To asset his rights of deciding the rightful ruler of the Baroda State.

7. To claim to be a Suzerain authority for appointing important to officials in the State including the Diwan.

By the 14th article of the treaty of Bassein of 1802 and the by the 11th article of the Definitive treaty of 1805, all the disputes regarding unfinished transactions, unadjusted accounts etc. of the Peshwa and the Gaekwad were to be submitted to the British arbitration.

Peshwa Bajirao's efforts for settlement of the claims :

Peshwa Bajirao often wrote and pressed the Bombay Government for the early settlement of his financial claims on the Gaekwad. In 1806 the Peshwa showed his anxiety to Bombay Government through the Resident at Poona for his claims on the Baroda Government.

In reply to this correspondence[2] Major Walker, the Resident at Baroda categorically repudiated the financial claims but forward by the Peshwa. He explained that the claims of the Peshwa were Illegal as they had their origin in the unjust imprisonment of Damajirao by the Peshwa in 1752. The resident at Baroda also stated that the Gaekwads were not the vassals of the Peshwa. He further added that the Gaekwad's share in Broach had been ceded to Sindia by

---

2 H.S.B.S.R., Vol.IV, letter 108 of June 1807.

the Peshwa by the treaty of Salbai and that therefore it was for the Peshwa to make allowance for it in the accounts.[3]

In 1807 the Peshwa Government again renewed the demand. This time the Bombay Government directed the resident at Baroda to take necessary measures for an early settlement of the dispute. He had also pointed out that the points should be cleared up by deputing a special officer to Poona. But nothing was done for two years.

In 1810 due to repeated demands of the Peshwa, the Baroda Government expressed willingness for sending a deputy to Poona. Looking to the Peshwa's insistance the Bombay Government again asked the Baroda Government not to delay any longer the deputation of an agent, for the settlement of the accounts of both the States.

On account of the pressure on the Bombay Government, Baroda Government appointed Bapu Mairal, as the Gaekwad's Vakil (Agent) to Poona. Bapu Mairal left Baroda by the end of December 1810 and reached Poona via Bombay in April 1811. Bapu Mairal, inspite of ⅞ his stay for a year in Poona could not effect any settlement.

In September 1812 Fatehsingrao finding Bapu Mairal's mission a complete failure decided to send Gangadhar Shastri as his Vakil and sought permission of the Resident. The Resident requested the Bombay Government to agree to

---

3 Ibid. Letter No.114 of July 1807.

these proposals and consent was given on October 8, 1812 and Gangadhar Shastri was to represent the case Baroda Government at Poona.

Gangadhar Shastri :

Gangadhar Shastri had attained the post by hard toil. He was born in a small village named Manali[4] District in 1775. In his youth he served the Phadkes at Poona. He had accompanined Raoji Appaji and Govindrao Gaekwad to Baroda. In 1803 Major Walker appointed him as British Vakil i.e., a confedential intermediary between the Resident and the Durbar, on a salary of Rs. one hundred[5] per month. As he was found very useful he was granted the village of Dindoli in Chorasi Paragana in Inam (Prize) by the ruler of Baroda. The Bombay Government also granted him a palanguin[6] with one hundred rupees per month for his upkeep.

In the same year under the influence of the British Resident Baroda Government fixed an allowance on him.

After the death of Babji Appaji. Vithalrao Bhaw was appointed as the Diwan but soon he was found unfit with the result that Gangadhar Shastri was recommended for the post by the Resident. With the recommendation of the Resident and after getting the approval of the Governor of Bombay

---

4 G.B.Sardesai : Marathi Riyasat, p.466.

5. Grant Duff : Vol.II, p.368.

6 Gense and Banaji, Vol.VII, pp. 450-451.

in May 1813 Gangadharrao was appointed as a Mutalik[7] on a salary of sixty thousand rupees per year. Shastri's rise to power created a strong feeling of Jealousy among the Baroda Officers.

The Struggle of Ministers at Baroda :

Gangadhar Shastri was considered as an interlopwer and his ascendency was deplored by the former minister Sitaram. So two parties came into existance, one headed by the Shastri, which looked to British for support and the other which was headed by Sitaram. The latter party was helped by Rani Takhatanbai and some members of the Royal family. This party in fact was a party of the palace. The author of the 'Rulers of Baroda' described this party as the 'patriotic party'. Anandrao sometimes favoured this party as he disliked the control of the English resident. Even Fatehsing showed favour to this party under family pressure.

Sitaram's party had agents both at Poona and Bombay. Govindrao Vishwanath (Bandhuji) was at Poona favouring Sitaram. Another influential member was Bhagwantrao, the illegitimate son of Govindrao. Both of them supported this patriotic party in Peshwa's court, and they put opstacles in the way of Gangadhar Shastri. Sitaram got all the confidential details of the Company's plans and negotiations Bombay.

---

7 H.S.B.S.R., Vol.IV, letter of 165 of 10-5-1811.

As early as March 1807 the Bombay Government was in know of the secret dealings of Sitaram and it considered Sitaram as the source of all troubles between the Baroda government and the Company on one side and the Poona court on the other.

Sitaram and his party assured to the Peshwa that he would satisfy all his claims if he was restored to the office of the Diwan. With this representation of Sitaram, Peshwa Bajirao desired the removal of Gangadhar Shastri from the Baroda Government.

Under these unfavourable circumstances the Baroda Government decided to send Gangadhar Shastri to Poona.

The task before Gangadhar Shastri :

Gangadhar Shastri knew very well that this task was a difficult one and was apprehensive of the risks in his mission. So he left a will[8] properly attested by Fatehsingrao which became known only after his death.

Gangadhar Shastri left Baroda on October 19th 1813 and arrived at Poona in February 1814. He had travelled under British guarantee. Bajirao at first refused to receive him on the plea that the appointment of Diwan was the Peshwa's right. In the past, the post of Diwan was given to Raoji Appaji and so sitaram was the proper person to represent the Baroda Government. On this plea he considered

---

8 Gupta : Bajirao II and East India Company, p.117.

Shastri's appointment as illegal and invalid.[9] Even though Anandrao Gaekwad[10] had informed the Peshwa of his deputing Gangadhar Shastri to Poona.

Peshwa Bajirao's second objection against Shastri was that Shastri in his early a career was attached to the family of Phadke whom he considered as his enemeies. To receive such a person of low origin as a minister would be the dishonour to the Peshwa so he refused to receive him.

As regards his first objection the Bombay Government denised that Shastri had been appointed as the Diwan of Baroda. According to British Government Shastri had been nominated to a confidential position under Fatehsingrao Gaekwad and he did not hold the office of the Diwan. Really speaking he was acting as a principal minister in all but name.[11] Elphinston therefore persueded the Peshwa not pay much attention to this point but to look to the real object of the mission.[12]

As regards his second objection it was clarified that Shastri wasin a subordinate position in the services of the Phadkes so he was in no way an ally[13] of the Phadkes. On these grounds the Peshwa was prevailed upon by Elphinston, the British resident at Poona to receive Gangadhar Shastri as a deputy of the Baroda Government.

---

9 The Family History of Shastri.
10 Selection from Baroda State Records, Vol.VI, letter 15.
11 Grant Duff.: Vol.III, p.368.
12 Poona Residency correspondence Vol.XI, Part I, pp. 309-10.
13 Ibid, pp. 309-10.

Shastri in Poona :

Gangadhar Shastri was well aware of his task and the members of the opposit party like Sitaram and Govindrao Bandhuji. Govindrao Bandhuji was in Poona before Shastri's arrival there. His principal work was to counter act and defeat the objects[14] of the mission of Gangadhar Shastri. Due to his endeavours, the Company's Government was also suspected of having a direct interest in the discussions at Poona. Bajirao Peshwa was instigated by these two people and Gangadhar Shastri wrote to Fatehsingrao on March 5,1814 that he had no hopes about getting the important question of the lease of Ahmedabad solved properly.[15]

Gangadharrao Shastri on March 14, 1814 presented his credentials at the Poona Court and 15th March was fixed for opening discussion of the Baroda question. At the same time Fatehsingrao[16] informed Peshwa Bajirao, Mr. Elphinston and others that Sitaram Raoji was removed from the Services of the Baroda State on account of his bad financial policy. In this letter Fatehsingrao had requested the Peshwa that representation made by Govindrao Vishwanath alias Bandhuji should be discrenited and that the Shastri should be enabled to complete his work and return soon to Baroda.

---

14 The Gense and Banaji : Vol.IX, p.278.

15 H.S.B.S.R., Vol.V, letter 38.

16 H.S.B.S.R., Vol.V, letter No.40.

Fatehsingrao addressed a letter to Sadashiv Pant, minister of Peshwa on June 22, 1814. In this letter he stated that Govindrao Vishwanath who was at Poona was notorious for misrepresenting things and he was a partisan of Sitaram, the dismissed minister. Moreover Govindrao had no connection with or had any authority from the Baroda Government and that Gangadharrao Shastri was the sole Baroda agent deputed for negotiations with the Poona Government.[17]

In August 1814 Fatehsingrao complained to Captain Carnc, the resident at Baroda that Sitaram Raoji was unfairly obtaining unauthorised letters from Maharaja Anandrao to the Poona court and the Bombay authorities. Fatehsingrao had also drawn the attention of the resident by enclosing a report which he had been secured by him after opening not less than four intercepted letters. He had also explained how Sitaram was receiving reports from his Bombay agents and he requested the Resident to take immediate steps to check the activities of Sitaram. Under these circumstances the discussions were started and the question of the lease of Ahmedabad was soon taken up as it was to end in October 1814.

The lease of Ahmedabad :

The lease of Ahmedabad had been given for the first

---

17 Ibid, letter No.57 of 22-6-1814.

time in 1800 to Bhagwantrao Gaekwad for five years and for five lakhs of rupees. It was renewed in 1804 for four and half lakhs for ten years and it was to expire in 1814.

The Baroda Government wanted that the lease should be renewed, and be extended even for higher payments, with a view to avoid the evils of divided authority. The British government also felt that it was necessary as the Baroda Government would have its own districts becoming more valuable. The Bombay Government emphasised this point on the grounds as follows :

1- The affairs of the Gaekwad State are conducted under the immediate direction and the control of the British Government.

2. The Mulukgiri settlement concluded by the Baroda Government in 1807 with the princes of Kathiwad had been guaranteed by the Company.

3. The turbulent tribes in north Gujarat have been kept in check by the active interference of the Company.

4. If the lease was not to be renewed all those arrangements affected with so much trouble and expenses would be reduced to nothing and the country would revert to its former condition of anarchy.[18]

---

18 Poona Residency correspondence, Vol.XII, part I, p.304.

The Resident at Baroda also felt that divided authority in Ahmedabad would seriously affect the general condition and tranquility of Gujarat.[19] He also wrote to the Resident at Poona to use the utmost endeavours for the accomplishment of this object.

The Views of Peshwa Bajirao on the lease of Ahmedabad :

Peshwa Bajirao was looking at the opposite side of the picture. He was now apprehensive that further renewal might result in the alienation,[20] of Ahmedabad for ever even though on regular and increased payment may be made. He considered the question of Ahmedabad as a prestige issue and he felt that it was a discredit to his Government to 1st Ahmedabad remain out of his own hands.

By discontinuing the lease the Peshwa would have a chance to favour the persons whom he wished and thus he would secure the recongisition of his authority over Gujarat. He also expected greater revenues from his possessions in Gujarat than what the Gaekwad had been paying.

In spite of hard efforts of Shastri and Elphinston, the Peshwa did not agree to the reneweal of the lease. He appointed Trimbakji Dengle as his officer at Ahmedabad.

---

19 Ibid, p.306.

20 Ibid, p.328.

Gangadharrao Shastri had hoped that the English would prevail upon the Peshwa for granting the lease. Ephninston did not like this idea of using a language for intrmidating the Peshwa. He also did not bring sufficient pressure on Bajirao.

Gangadhar Shastri therefore professed to consider the question of Ahmedabad as lost and planned to correct it with the other question of payments[21] to the Peshwa.

The action of the Baroda Government on the expiry of the lease :

The Baroda Government on September 30, 1814 informed to all the officers in charge of six divisions : (1) Ahmedabad and Daskroi (2) Petlad and Borsad (3) The Panchmanals (4) Prantij and Modasa (5) Viramgam and (6) Kathiawad that the lease of Ahmedabad had expired and that year it was given by the Peshwa to Trimbakji Dengle. All the officers in charge of these six divisions were asked to relinquish their charge to Naroji Takte sent by Dengle as his representative to administer the portion leased.

Kathiawad Mulukgiri disputes :

The refusal of renewing the lease of Ahmedabad also gave rise to difficulties in administration of ten Talukas

---

21 Poona Residency correspondence, Vol.XII, Part I, pp. 317-18.

of the Peshwa in Kathiawad. Upto this time the Gaekwad in the capacity of the farmer of Ahmedabad has been empowered to collect the revenue of the Peshwas' share. Now with reversion of Ahmedabad to the Peshwa the collection of the revenue from Kathiawad ceased to be the Gaekwad's concern. To collect the revenues the Peshwa should send Poona contigent into Kathiawad. This contigent was dreaded by both Baroda and the British authorities as there would be an entry of a third military power in Kathiawad.

The Mulukgiri settlements whech had been concluded in 1807 with the princes of Kathiawad were not approved by the Peshwa and the Peshwa was not consulated in the agreement. By the good offices of the English Company the Peshwa was reconciled to this matter and he claimed only the regular payments of his dues and he did not send a Poona contigent to collect his revenues of Mulukgiri in Kathiawad as he thought that it would be an expensive affair.

Though a compromise was thus arrived between the Poona Durbar and the Bombay Government as regards Kathiawad the peace of that province was often disturbed. This was largely due to the policy followed by the Peshwa, by this agent at Ahmedabad and other subordinate officers. The result was accusations and denials and remonstrances

from both sides[22] for a pretty long period. The question of Kathiawad was permanently solved after 1818 when the Peshwa's authority was ended.

Financial claims of Peshwa Bajirao :

The sum that the Peshwa Bajirao claimed was enromous and of an obscure and doubtful origin. The Peshwa's claims on the Gaekwad infact comprised the total span of the Gaekwad family. When Damajirao was imprisoned in 1752, the Gujarat was divided between the Peshwa and Gaekwad and Damaji had agreed to pay rupees five lakhs twenty-five thousands as annual tribute. He was required to main a contigent of three thousand troops at the service of the Peshwa in Poona.

In 1768 after the battle of Dhodap, Govindrao Gaekwad was required to pay a penalty and the tribute was increased to seven lakhs and seventy-nine thousand rupees a year and five thousand military service. During the first Anglo Maratha War Nana Fadnis waived aside the condition of military service on the understanding that the Gaekwad would pay rupees six lakhs and seventy-five thousand in lieu thereof.

During the disputes of succession the Debts mounted rapidly due to the promises made by the sons of Damajirao.

---

22 His Selections from Baroda State Records, Vol.V.letters No.70 and 71 of 21-11-1814 and 24-11-1814.

Govindrao was served with a memorandum in 1797 in which there was an up-to-date account of all the claims of the Peshwa and Govindrao was reminded that he should pay a sum of Rs. 39,82,789 which was the arrears of all the dues of the Peshwa on the Baroda rulers.

The debt generally consisted of (1) Annual tribute (2) Sum in lieu of the military service (3) Nazarana on the succession of a king (4) Tribute or revenue collected from feudatory princes (5) The sum borrowed by the Gaekwads from the bankers of Poon on the Peshwa's guarantee.

According to the Peshwa, the sum[23] was Rs.3,40,76,790. Besides this there were miscellaneous demands which included the Gaekwads' promises to give to the Peshwa three elephants and five horses and a debt of one lakh taken in 1794 by Govindrao Gaekwad.

The counter claims of Fatehsingrao Gaekwad :

The claims of Fatehsingrao on the Peshwa were also of the same magnitude. According to him the claims of the Peshwa upto 1798 were of Rs.2,43,38,789 while his claims were of Rs.3,36,50,000. Fatehsingrao's first and the most important claim was about the transfer of Broach to the English by the treaty of Purandhar. He clculated the share of the Gaekwad in the income of Broach as six lakhs a year. This claim counted from 1776 to 1811 amounted to Rs. 2,16,00,000.

---

23 Poona Residency correspondence, Vol.XII, Part I, p.277.

His second demand was of Rs. eighty thousand against the expenses incurred by Baroda Government for suppressing Aba Shelukar in 1800.

His third demand was that there was political unrest in the State due to the incursions of Holkar and Sindia and there were rebellians of Malharrao, Kanhojirao and Arabs for six years. During this period the State was put to a loss of forty lakhs fifty thousand rupees. This claim was advanced on the ground that it was the responsibility of the Peshwa to help the Gaekwad for suppressing these insurrections, which the Peshwa did not do and the Gaekwads had to spend a large sum. The Peshwa's Government therefore should share the expenses.

As regards the tribute from Babi Mahals, Fatehsingrao contented that these Mahals were conquerred by Damajirao and they were given as a free gift, so he was not bound to pay anything.

Fatehsingrao claimed that there should be some suitable deduction in the payment of the succession fees of Govindrao for Rs.50,38,001 due to the financial difficulties of the State however he agreed to pay a smaller sum.

The Peshwa mostly rejected the claims of expenses. Moreover he did not agree to share in the expenses for the suppression of insurrections. According to the Peshwa he considered that the disturbances in the Gaekwad's territory were due to Gaekwad's ownmistakes.[24] Only in the case of Broach the Peshwa could not meet the claim with any sound aggument.[25]

The British attitude towards the claims :

The claims and the counter claims of both the parties needed a serious decision, as both the parties hoped to gain by British arbitration. The Peshwa expressed his willingness to act accordingly to the arbitration of the British. On the other hand Gaekwad State which was just emerging from its difficulties was likely to be ruined[26] by these excessive demands of the Peshwa and Fatehsingrao wanted to obtain a decision in his favour. The British Government did not want its ally the Gaekwad to suffer. Elphinston was also of the opinion of favouring the Baroda State. He therefore did not think it proper "to make any offer of arbitration as the Peshwa was the only party to profit by the decision."[27] On the side of the Gaekwad he wrote that the Gaekwad Government expected

---

24 Poona. Ass.Corrs.Vol.VII, Part I, pp. 285-93.
25 Rulers of Baroda, p.149.
26 Poona Ass.Corrs.Vol.VII, p.305.
27 Ibid, p.276.

to be free from any further loss. In these circumstances the British Government must run the risk of offending both the parties.

The British Resident did not want to put the Gaekwad to loss as the British abritration would be beneficial to the Peshwa. The Governor General therefore did not interfere and allowed the two states to settle their affairs by direct negotiations.[28]

Gangadharrao Shastri's attempts towards settlement :

Gangadharrao Shastri after being disappointed in securing the British influence adopted his own plan. He entered into confidential negotiations with Sadashiv Mankeshwar, the Peshwa's minister. Shastri made two proposals one of a payment of fifty lakhs of rupees in three years in lieu of all the claims of the Peshwa for the arrears. His second proposal was for the payment of eight lakhs[29] of rupees per annum for five years for the lease of Ahmedabad.

The Peshwa was willing to settle the question of his financial arrears but he was not prepared to lease Ahmedabad. All these negotiations were progressing very slowly and the Gaekwad Government had to undergo huge expenditure due to the retinue of Gangadhar Shastri at

---

28 Poona Residency Correspondence, Vol.VII, Part I,p.385.

29 Ibid, p.389.

Poona. Fatehsingrao Gaekwad was tired of this delay and he desired that Shastri should return. The Bombay Government also desired that Shastri's mission be speedily dismissed.[30] The failure of the negotiations was due to the Peshwa, the Poona ministers and the British authorities.

The Peshwa's obduracy for claims :

From the beginning of the negotiations Peshwa Bajirao Frequently absented himself from Poona and more than a year had lapsed since the coming of Gangadhar Shastri to Poona. He further delayed the negotiations by claiming sovereingty over the Gaekwad territories. He demanded that the Baroda ruler Anandrao should pay a visit to Poona at his own cost as other rulers did to receive their investitures and he also asserted that he had the right to mominate the Gaekwads Diwan or the Highest officer in Baroda.

He further claimed that he had the right of enquiring into the Gaekwads domestic concerns, and declared that the British were keeping Anandrao and Sitaram in confinement while Fatehsingrao[31] was not really a free agent.

The British Company strongly disapproved this policy of the Peshwa because by the treaty of Bassein the Peshwa

30 Gupta : "Bajirao II".

31 G.H.Desai : The Gazetteer of the Baroda State, Chap.VII, p.506.

had renounced all his power on the Baroda State. The British Resident Elphinston urged the Peshwa either to send Shastri home or to dismiss from his court Bhagwantrao, Govindrao and others who were misrepresenting the facts. Gangadharrao Shastri also shortly declared his resolution to quite Poona and to leave the settlement of the claims to the British arbitration.

Peshwa Bajirao foresaw the futility of the negotiations, so he endeavoured to engage Shastri in the separate negotiations. Bajirao changed his attitude towards Gangadhar Shastri and Began to treat him with great honour. Gangadhar shastri conducted separate negotiations without the knowledge of the Resident at Poona. The gist of this negotiation was that the Gaekwad should surrender a territory worth seven lakhs rupees a year for all the claims of the Peshwa. Gangadhar Shastri was not sure whether Fatehsingrao would ever part with so large a portion of his territory. Gangadharrao Shastri sought the help of the Resident at Poona to assist him in influencing Fatehsingrao, to agree to this his proposal of ceding the territory.

Fatehsingrao resented this proposal of ceding the territory worth seven lakhs to the Peshwa and he drew the attention of the Resident that Gangadharrao Shastri was not to touch on this problem. Since it concerned the

Baroda sovereignty. Shastri was ordered to keep to accounts and the claims of the Peshwa only. During all these negotiations a good deal of time was wasted and Peshwa Bajirao played upon the vanity of Gangadharrao Shastri.

Peshwa Bajirao duplicity against Gangadharrao Shastri :

Peshwa Bajirao played a trick on Gangadharrao Ahstri. All the ministers of the Peshwa did nothing to further the negotiation because they did not receive the bribes from Gangadhar Shastri as they had exepcted. The peshwa was afraid of antogonizing the British if the negotiations failed. so the Peshwa brought out a sudden change in this treatment to Gangadharrao Shastri. Bajirao gave up his formal aversion to Shastri and began to treat Gangadharrao Shastri cordially. On this show of affability of the Peshwa, Shastri made proposal to Elphinston to continue negotiation for some time. Shastri's talent was praised by the Peshwa and his men, and he was tempted to quit Baroda and to accept the ministership of Bajirao Peshwa.[32] Moreover Bajirao offered his wife's sister in marriage to Shastri's son. Thus Gangadharrao Shastri was duped by the Peshwa.

The Government of Bombay disapproved Shastri's conduct and they warned Shastri that he was going beyond

---

32 Sardesai, Part III, p.459.

his terms and he should not negotiate on what he was not suprosed to discuss. An order of May 8, 1814 for terminating Shastri's mission was sent to Poona Resident. But the party of Bajirao along with Gangadharrao Shastri was on tour so no action was taken on this order. Gangadharrao Shastri had accompanied the Peshwa to Nasik, Trimbakeshvar and Pandharpur. Grand preparations were made for the celebration of the marrigge of the Shastri's son at Nasik.[33]

Fatehsingrao learned about the activities and negotiations of Gangadharrao Shastri and he did not accept the proposal of ceding the territory to the Peshwa. He further requested the British Government to end the mission of Gangadharrao Shastri soon. This decision confused Shastri and he feared the anger of his master on his knowing of his entering into the matrimonial relations with the family of the Peshwa. So he declined to celebrate the marriageof his son.

This action of Gangadharrao Shastri wasinterpreted by Peshwa Bajirao as an insult. In addition, Shastri refused to allow his wife to visit the Peshwa's palace on an invitation from the Peshwa's wife. This increased Peshwa's anger. The Peshwa and his friend Trimabakji assumed a perfectly claim exterior and a soon after this the whole Poona court party started for a visit to Pandharpur.

---

33 Ibid, p.459.

Gangadharrao Shastri also followed the court party to Pandharpur. He had left all his retinue including Bapu Mairai at Nasik with an order to go to Poona. A religious celebration of Ashadi Ekadeshi was to be furnished on July 20. On that night Shastri was invited to offer the last prayer. Shastri tried to avoid it on an execuse of sickness but Trimbakji repeated his request and pressed Shastri to come out. While returning from the temple at about 8.30 p.m. Shastri was backed to pieces by a band of armed men in the darkness. Trimbakji Dengle nor the Peshwa made any attempt to discover the guilty party. The family of Shastri and Bapu Mairal found it very difficult to except from further atrocities and under the protection of the British the party reached Bombay.

The consequences of Shastri's murder :

The British officer at Poona informed the Bombay Government and to Governor General and Elphinston of the crime. Elphinston considered Trimbakji Dengle at the root cause of all troubles. He demanded an immediate inquiry and punishment to the "author and instigators of atrocity."[34] After careful inquiry Elphinstone declared Trimbakji responsible for the murder and demanded from the

---

34 Poona Residency Corres., Vol.XII, part I, p.377.

Peshwa his arrest. Elphinston also demanded the arrest of Govindrao Bandhuji and that of Bhagwantrao Gaekwad.

Peshwa Bajirao was reluctant either to conduct an inquiry or to arrest trimbakji. The governor directed stern action against Trimbakji and even ordered a military action. The Peshwa after much hesitation confined Trimbakji in the fort of Vasantgarh.[35]

Elphinstone was not satisfied by this action of the Peshwa and he demanded the surrender of Trimbakji to the British Government. Elphinstone made military preparations and the Peshwa ultimatey surrended Trimbakji. The British resident imprisoned Trimbakji at Thana. Bhagwantrao Gaekwad and Govindrao Bandhuji were arrested and sent to Baroda for punishment by the Gaekwad Government. Sitaram was already under restraint from August 1815.

The palace party considered Shastri's murder as their great triumph. Even Anandrao wrote to Bandhuji that he had been faithful to the Sarkar and he had done what was very right.[36] They were hopeful that Sitaram would be restored to his original post of Diwan,[37] by the help of the Peshwa. Fatehsingrao also insisted that Sitaram who was already in custody to be confined to any fort within the Baroda State.[38]

---

35 Ibid, p.380.
36 Illiot : Rulers of Baroda, p.152.
37 Ibid, p.152.
38 Ibid, p.154.

The proposal of Fatehsingrao was rejected by Resident Carnac and he tried to take security measures. Sitaram tried to raise an insurrection on September 16, 1815 though his party at Dhar but he was unsuccessful. Sitaram was not in a position to do anything and he was taken into the British custody and was confined in the fort of Navsari.

Search of murderers :

It is very difficult to decide who commited this crime. The suspects, involved in this crime, were the Peshwa, Trimbakji Dengle and Sitaram's party i.e.,Govindrao Bandhuji and Bhagwantrao Gaekwad. Whether the idea of murder of Shastri was originated with Bajirao or not, but obviously he became liable to the charge of not having taken any step to prevent it. The Peshwa remained unconcerned under the belief that he had no hand in it. All the available evidences prove that the background of the murder was prepared at Baroda. Shastri's attainment of highest post and his seeking the British help had set the anti-British elements at work at Baroda and they thought of retaliation. This plan reached Poona and was executed by Trimbaki and the two Baroda agents, as Bajirao considered Shastri as the main obstacle in his establishing over-lordship on the Baroda State.

Fatehsing suspected Anandrao and he thought that Shastri had been murdered treacherously for the raising Sitaram to power. Therefore, there is every likelihood that the Baroda party directed the assisation. The responsibility of the British Government was no less, because even though the company was empowered to arbitrate by the treaties, the company was reluctant to arbitrate and two parties were allowed negotiate themselves. Even the order of terminating Shastri's mission was not served on flimsy reasons. There is every possibility that the British Government was not averse to such a development, which would allow them to deel firmly with the increasing power of the Peshwa.

The action of the Baroda Government after the murder of Shastri :

Fatehsingrao on receipt of the news of the murder forwarded a letter of condolence to the sons of Shastri, and appointed Shastri's eldest son Bheem Shanker as a Mutalik on the post of his father with a pension of Rs. 10,000 a year. The British Government also extended to Bheemshankar Gangadhar the same protection which was afforded to Gangadhar Shastri when he was alive.[39]

Fatehsingrao stated demanding reparations, and renunciations of all pecuniary claims as he had strong

---

39 History of the Shastri's family.

doubts of the share of the Peshwa.[40] His demands were mainly as follows :

1. The Peshwa should renounce all pecuniary claims on the Gaekwads including the past and the future.
2. He claimed the Taluka of Ahmedabad in lieu of Broach.

The Steps of the Company after the murder of Shastri :

Elphinstone did not believe that Peshwa Bajirao had directly implicated[41] in the murder and Trimbakrao was imprisoned. Elphinstone had already informed the Governor General Lord Hastings about his views, also he did not think that Peshwa Bajirao was responsible for the murder of Shastri. Therefore the Calcutta Government i.e., the Governor General in Council decided that this development should not be allowed to have a bearing on the Peshwas claims on the Gaekwad.[42]

The Bombay Governor-in-Council did not think it expedient to authorise the renewal of negotiations regarding the question or Ahmedabad or the Mulukgiri settlement of Kathiawad on a footing to compensation to the Gaekwad for the murder of Shastri. Thus the question of awarding Punishment for the murder became a matter of secondary importance. With the surrender of Trimbakji to the English

---

40 Gense & Banaji : History of the Shastri's family, Vol.IX, pp. 240-41.

41 Gense & Banaji : The Gaikwads of Baroda, Vol.IX, p.214.

42 Ibid, p.246.

it was supposed that it had been duly punished. Trimbakji was confined at Thana Fort. Fatehsingrao's pleading for reprimending the Peshwa was ignored and Fatehsingrao was told that 'Satisfaction for the murder had been accepted on the principle of the Peshwa's innocence."[43] Moreover the Bombay Governor[44] advised Fatehsingrao to abstain from inisting on an enquiry against the Peshwa.

Elphinstone examined the Peshwa's claims and the Gaekwad's counter claims. After examining all the claims he was of opinion that the Peshwa's claims were well founded as they had arisen from regular treaties. Thus the opinions of the English the circumstances proved disastrous to the Baroda State.

The flight of Trimbakji however changed the situation of the Baroda State and proved detrimental not only to the Peshwa Bajirao alone but to the whole Maratha nation.

Bajirao's secret preparations :

Bajirao felt nervous for sometime due to the confinement of Trimbakji, who was detained at Thana. On September 12, 1816. Trimbakji escaped from detaintion with the help of Trimbakji Bajirao also was secretly making extensive preparation for war. These facts were soon discovered and

---

43 Ibid. Letter of 20-10-1815 p.244.

44 Poona Residency Correspondence Vol.XII.Part I.p.450.

Bajirao was informed that he had grossly violated his engagements. Elphinstone demanded the surrender of Trimbakji. Bairao tried to evade the demand. The British pressure compelled Peshwa Bajirao to issue a circular ordering for capturing Trimbakji Dengle. A reward of Two lakhs[45] of rupees and a village in Inam (prize) for the capture of Trimbakji dead or alive was also offered.

The British Company were not slow to understand the Peshwa's game. Elphinstone knew very well what was happening in the Peshwa's court. He was informed that Bajirao was preparing military operations on a large scale and he anticipated the struggle. Elphinstone moved the subsidiary force upon Poona and Bajirao was required to surrender three of his strongest forts. On May 10th, 1817 Elphinstone received the Governor Generals' directions to impose a new treaty on the Peshwa by which he might be rendered in capable of creating troubles in the future. (See Appnedix X)

The implications of the Treaty of 1817 :

This treaty forced the Peshwa to surrender all his rights and claims on the Gaekwad, past, present and future on condition that the Gaekwad should pay an annual payment of four lakhs rupees. As regards the Peshwa's other claims of the lease of Ahmedabad, the Peshwa agreed to renew the lease of Ahmedabad for four and half lakhs of rupees.

---

45. His.Sele.from Baroda State Records.Vol.V.letter No.164 of 25-5-1817.

By article fifteenth the Peshwa renounced all his rights of maintaining Vakeels or agents at the court of any power and he also renounced the right of receiving Vakeels from any power at his court. He was bound to hold no communications with any power except through the Resident. Thus he recognised the dissolution in form and substance of the Maratha confederacy. Peshwa Bajirao lost all his claims on the Gaekwad family.

The Peshwa also ceded the Talukas of Jambusar, Amod, Desharra, Dabhoi, Bahadarpur and Salvi to the British. The Gaekwad was recognised as an independent prince who was now to pay any tribute or reader troops' service or Nazarana to the Peshwa. With singing this treaty the Peshwa lost all his hopes of regaining the Gaekwad family in his fold. Thus as a result of the murder of Gangadhra Shastri and the importune act of Trimbakji Dengle the Gaekwads were saved from a huge financial liability and they secured independence from the control of the Peshwas.

<u>The Gaekwad and the British after the treaty of Poona-1817</u> :

The Gaekwads family was freed from the control of the Peshwa but at the same time the British desired the expansion of their own power.

A treaty[46] was signed on November ., 1817, known as the supplement to the Definitive treaty of 1805. By this treaty the lease of Ahmedabad was handed over th the British Company and the Company undertook to pay four and half lakhs of rupees directly to the Peshwa. The British also insisted that the subsidiary force at Baroda should be increased and the additional expenditure should be met from Ahmedabad and the tribute from Kathiawad. The cessasion of this rich city of Ahmedabad was covered by the company and it got it from the Gaekwad.

In order to consolidate the British possessions in Gujarat, there were exchanges of territories which were recently acquired from the Peshwa with those of the Gaekwad. There were exchanges for three times. These exchanges were made on the principle of the location of the places. These exchanges consolidated British possessions in Gujarat.

The circumstances leading to the final severance of all relations :

The treaty of June 13, 1817 was signed by Bajirao under severe pressure and the never wanted to observe it. He went to Pandharpur and requested secretly to all Maratha chiefs to rise against the British.

---

46. Aitchison : Treaties. Sanads etc. vol.VI.p.354.

The Central part of the country was infested by the Pindharihordes and the British Government wanted to make India free from the depredations of these hordes. So the British Government appealed to all native powers for help against the Pindharis. This call of the British was a handy excuse for raising a large army for Bajirao, but Elphinstone was aware of this preparation of the Peshwa and the British Resident Elphinstone made preparations to meet this situation. He also called for the Bombay European Regiment but the Peshwa did not like it and on November 5, 1817 the Peshwa attacked the English Residency at Kirki three miles from Poona. Unfortunately Bajirao had to retreat and the left his capital Poona. For about seven months he moved as refugee from place to place in search of help. In his flight he had persuded his younger brother Chmaji Appa and Raja of Satara by false promises to join him. On June 3rd, 1815 Peshwa Bajirao surrendered himself as a prisoner to Sir John Malcolm.

The Raja of Nagpur the best supporter of Bajirao was defeated on the battle of Sitabaldi in 1817. Pindhari hordes were crushed down by the English army. Malharrao Holkar was defeated on the battlefield of Mahidpur. Yashwantrao Sindia also suffered reverses at the hands of the English.

The Gaekwad Government was all the time on the side of the English and Fatehsingrao placed a contigent at the disposal of the British. He had sent his army in Malwa, Knkan and in Palanpur and Dhar. The Malwa war was a costly one and the Gaekwad was involved in a debt of forty-one lakhs of rupees.

The aftermath of the Third Maratha War of 1818 :

Peshwa Bajirao II surrendered to Sir John Malcolm on June 3, 1818 and he signed a proposations. By his act he resigned the sovereignty of the Peshwa and he wanted to proceed to some holy place in North India. Bajirao was to get a pension of eight lakhs of rupees a year and proceeded to Bithur near cawnpur, on the banks of the Ganges where he lived a pretty long life upto 1851.

The family of the Gaekwad was freed from the Peshwa's authority for ever. Due to the fall of the Peshwa all the territories of the Peshwa were annexed by the British. No additional territory was granted to the Gaekwad for their aid by the British. All the Gaekwad got was the end of the tribute of four[47] lakhs which the Gaekwad had to pay, had not the Peshwa's power been destroyed. Thus the relation of the Gaekwad and the Peshwa ceased to exist with the fall of the family of the Peshwa in 1818.

---

47 G.H.Desai. The Baroda Gazetter. Chapter VII,p.528.