My dear Sir,

With many many thanks I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of the 30th ultimo; as the same time to ask of favour for the delay which has taken place in answering it. — I am sorry to learn you are unwell, but hope that under God's blessing your recovery will be speedily restored to your wanted health.

In your letters you made reply your answer, as by asking my opinion as to the extent to which the mutiny of 1857 grew into a popular rebellion in the N.W. Provinces; I express your opinion that it was not a mere military mutiny. As far as my personal knowledge goes, respecting the sepoys, Tumult of 1857, from all that I have learnt from investigation, I find that even the mere mere of the imposition of military duty conveys an idea of something more than the real fact. It is denied that the use of a greased cartridge did violence to the susceptions of the sepoys, who consequently determined not to bite the same. Almost all the sepoys had unanimously said, never to bite the cartridge, which determination was the only thing that could be brought against them, till a very severe punishment was inflicted upon them of severe, a punishment which produced a strong impression on the minds of those sepoys, that they would suffer to the greased cartridges or suffer the punishment of their disobedience. And it was then, first before, that the discontent of the sepoys grew into military mutiny. I am strongly of opinion that, if before the infliction of punishment the alternative offer of letting the cartridges, or resigning the service, had been offered them, the sepoys would undoubtedly have peaceably withdrawn themselves from the Company's service. If the real facts connected with the event on the N.W. the calmly enquired into, I do not thin...
that the events which happened here can properly be designated as a 'popular rebellion.' Undoubtedly the people of the N.W. I was dissatisfied with the Company's rule, & this in a great measure was owing to the following causes:— the decay of respectable families without the land left being filled up by others— the non-existence of any means by which the native community could procure humaneable situations — more especially — the forfeiture of the Iroquois (right of holding lands with out paying any rent to Court) which act of the authorities was considered a great injustice to the natives, & likely to cause other causes of less importance. — It may also be safely said that the Iroquois exercise of the right of pre-emption thereof, a power subject to no regulations or unlimited, and the interregnum in which all these matters existed, in the case of Adofet & Lepos, had created a distinct in the mind of the native chiefs who perhaps did so, urge themselves to revolt as it does however by no means appear that even this stimulated them to revolt or to take any part in the rebellion, for no native chief whatever, who were in possession of their principalities, notwithstanding the distinct pact which they looked upon the Company's rule committed themselves by any act of rebellion against the Government. — Putting the subject of the Iroquois Mutiny I shall now briefly describe the character of the rebellion in N.W. America. — The rebellion in the N.W.P. assumed three forms:—

1st Robbers and Bandits, who were kept down by the force & strength of the Iroquois, now assembling in numbers not only attacked wayfaring but also plundered villages & even towns, — 2nd Some of the minor chiefs whose lands had been taken into decay, endeavoured the recollection of their ancestors power. — 3rd The mutiny occurred in four places only: Canafare, Basiell,
Bijnor, and Farukhabad. Some of these parties tried to have themselves restored while others were compelled by the mutineers to make an effort.

50 Some of the lower classes, variously employed, entered the service of such rebellious chiefs. The first kind of rebellion cannot strictly be deemed one against the East. The second sort of rebellion also, although named by us, cannot be called a regular rebellion, if we take into consideration the state of India when serving a rebellious chief was not considered equivalent to an act of rebellion. This notion has taken root in the native mind, in times previous to the Company's rule, when chiefs fought with each other and when engaged in the military service of either party was not considered as a crime. The second sort of revolt was indeed of a serious nature, but this had hitherto been exclusively confined to the above-mentioned rebellious

chiefs and was never general. As far as I know the population of two parts of the N.W.P. tried to inveigle of rendering any assistance to the native rebellious chiefs, much less them of subverting the British rule. A great proof of the justice of the assertion lies in the fact that as soon as the persistent troops, the rebellious chiefs were expelled.

from a district, peace was immediately restored. I therefore think that the mutiny of 1857 was not a popular rebellion. To a European mind acquainted with the state of India, the very name of rebellion at once carries with it an idea that the people of the country must have taken part in it, and the real facts on them ignored.

With feelings of sincere regard, and hoping the above will suffice to give you some idea of my humble opinion,

Believe me,
Very truly yours,

J. W. Kay

Syed Ahmed

March 1857.

Very truly yours,

Syed Ahmed

J. W. Kay

India Office