CLEMENTS ROBERT MARKHAM AND THE GEOGRAPHICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE INDIA OFFICE 1867–77
DONOVAN WILLIAMS

I

THE NAME OF Clements Robert Markham—Honorary Secretary (1863–88) and President (1893–1905) of the Royal Geographical Society—is appropriately associated with considerable achievement in exploration and the dissemination of geographical knowledge. His interests were manifold, his curiosity insatiable and his capacity for writing and translation enormous. Basically of restless disposition, Markham never allowed an opportunity for the exercise of his talents to go unexploited. Some of his rollicking excursions have received publicity, such as the snatching of the cinchona tree from under the noses of the jealous but outwitted Peruvians and its establishment in British India (Markham, A. H., 1917, ch. xi, Williams, 1962). Yet there were other achievements for which paltry recognition has been accorded, partly because they were part and parcel of routine administration. That these should have languished between the office walls in no way detracts from their intrinsic merit and they deserve wider recognition. Such an achievement was the reconstitution of the Geographical Department of the India Office 1867–77. It is an aspect of Markham’s career which received no mention in his biography (Markham, A. H., 1917). Sir Malcolm Seton, in his book on the India Office, approved of Markham’s work, but recognition was necessarily tailored to suit the passing parade of departments (Seton, 1926, pp. 253). Dr. J. Scott Keltie, writing shortly after Markham’s death, gave more detail about this phase in his career, but merely mentioned that he was ‘entrusted with the geographical business’ of the India Office (Keltie, 1916, pp. 170). This hardly does credit to Markham’s achievement. But it is an episode in Markham’s life which should be recounted. It is a poignant story of achievement laced with frustrated ambition, impatience and lack of restraint, played against the background of change and tension in the newly created India Office. It provides the measure both of his ability as an organizer and idealist dedicated to the dissemination of geographical knowledge, and of his weakness in the form of undisciplined impulse which brought to a premature close a promising career in Whitehall.

II

The English East India Company had early shown an interest in geographical information. By February 1661 Richard Hakluyt had prepared a memorandum on the location of spices and the principal products to be obtained from the ports and
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islands of the Indies. By the beginning of the nineteenth century the Company ruled much of India, and as its grip tightened on the subcontinent so the feeling grew increasingly in favour of the substitution of Company Government by that of the Crown. The Mutiny of 1857 provided the opportunity which many had sought, and in 1858 the India Office was created, taking over the existing Home Government of the Company (which consisted of the 'dual government' of the Board of Control and the Court of Directors). A Secretary of State for India, assisted by a Council, was the ultimate authority. He was also assisted by two Under Secretaries of State and various Departments, each with a Secretary at its head. By this time Hakluyt's contribution had swelled into an unorganized mass of material which flowed into the India Office, there to accumulate and decay because of lack of interest. This neglect had started in the 1830's. During the early years of the India Office Mr. John Walker came once a week to supervise the records. He was called 'Geographer' and was responsible for starting the *Atlas of India*. But he could not cope with the amount of work. The basic difficulty was the lack of a separate department. The situation was summed up by Markham in 1877: 'All geographical and kindred work ceased to be performed. The records were lost or left to rot, and even the correspondence books were destroyed. Many precious documents were sold as waste paper, others were purloined or torn to pieces' (Markham, 1877, pp. 9–10). Such was the depressing state of the geographical records when Markham received his appointment to the Board of Control in July 1854.

During his first four years in the India House, Markham worked in the Secret Department which dealt with confidential political matters. In 1858 he was transferred to the Revenue Department. From July 1861 to August 1863 he was Private Secretary to Thomas Baring, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for India. During these years both interest and necessity drew Markham continuously closer to the geographical records. He found it difficult to acquire information necessary for his work. Data which should have been easily available had to be painstakingly hunted up; often they were never found. There was no coordination between the Secret Department and the geographical records, and this resulted in 'blunders and confusion of ideas'. Markham alleged that in the Revenue Department the situation was worse. Accurate geographical information necessary for agricultural and fiscal matters was unobtainable. Here Markham's allegations must be viewed with caution; from April 1859 until April 1861 he was away from the India Office (Williams, 1962). But his observations about the lack of information while he was Private Secretary to Baring carry more weight. During the early 'sixties an attempt was being made to solve the vexed problem of the land revenue in India. When Baring wanted to make certain comparisons in land revenue it was difficult to locate the exact areas of permanent settlement because the records were not available. These frustrations set the enterprising Markham to work to provide something which would help fill the painful gaps. *A General Sketch of the History of Persia* began to take shape. Memoirs were prepared on such subjects as Arab tribes and islands which required official attention at the time, and on several of the native states of India. Accompanying each memoir was a geographical notice, a list of maps and other sources of information. Yet the preparation of some of these works in themselves increased his frustration at the lack of facilities which made it difficult to identify areas (Markham, C. R., 1877, pp. 10–12).

In 1862 Markham was transferred to the Public Works Department of the India
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1 Some of Markham's memoirs were not printed and are in the appropriate departmental records in the India Office Records. A list of his printed works appears in Appendix B of Markham, A. H. 1917.
Office, where, once again, a constant supply of geographical information was called for. By now experience had convinced Markham that 'every department should be provided with copious memoirs on the subjects of which they treat, with copious references; and that, in the interests of all departments, there should be a special geographical branch to furnish that local information, without which accuracy is not possible'. At this time Markham went to India to inspect the progress of cinchonas and to report on the pearl fisheries. There he took the opportunity of studying irrigation works, forests and the agricultural statistics of south India, as well as the extent of exact geographical information. Predictably, he was disappointed. The geographical materials were 'very defective'. As a gesture of defiance he prepared an agricultural map of the Nilgiris and Wynaad, showing the coffee and cinchona plantations and teak reserves. He also corrected and published a new edition of Col. Franklin's old chart of the Tinnevelly pearl fisheries. He started a memoir on the irrigation of India which was to be preceded by a history of irrigation in other parts of the world. This interest took him to the irrigation works in the valleys of the east coast of Spain. In Spain he found that geographical information was far more copious and accessible than in the India Office. Because of the lack and confusion of records, by the time he left the Public Works Department in 1872, the work was still incomplete (Markham, C. R., 1877, pp. 12–13).

III

By 1866 Markham's ideals and frustrations, laced with a measure of self-interest, urged him to write to Herman Merivale, the Permanent Under Secretary of State for India, drawing his attention to 'a part of the work of this Office which is now almost entirely neglected, and which I should be glad to take charge of'. He pointed out that all matters relating to maps, charts, the trigonometrical and geological surveys, meteorology, tidal observations, harbours, light-houses and hydrographical matters already came to the Public Works Department (L/PO/Misc. (a)). By 1867 he had had time 'to examine the state of the geographical business of the office, and of the records, and to prepare a scheme for introducing an efficient system'. On 6 April 1867 he again asked to take charge of all geographical and similar work. He felt that the valuable collection of maps and other geographical documents should be properly arranged and cared for, and work done in India should be used to best advantage. Survey reports should be duly noticed in despatches to India. Here he was supported by General R. Strachey (Public Works Secretary to the Government of India), Sir Bartle Frere† (Member of the Governor General's Council), Col. H. E. L. Thuillier (Surveyor-General) and Col. J. T. Walker (Superintendent of the Great Trigonometrical Survey) (Markham, C. R., 1877, pp. 14–15).

Markham's suggestions were approved and in June 1867 the geographical work was placed in his charge (Markham, C. R., 1877, p. 15). His wide geographical knowledge and experience outside the India Office must have contributed towards this decision. The path was smoothed by the fact that the Secretary of State, Sir Stafford Northcote, was an active participant at meetings of the Royal Geographical Society, of which Markham had been the Honorary Secretary since 1863 (R.G.S. Proc. 12 (1867–8) 116; Dictionary of National Biography, 1912–21). At a meeting held on 24 February 1868, after Markham had read his papers on the geographical results of the Abyssinian expedition, Northcote, in complimentary vein, said that 'shortly before Mr. Markham was called away he had been promoted to a post of considerable importance and difficulty in the India Office, with a view to special

† President, R.G.S., 1873–4.
services' (R.G.S. Proceedings, 12, p. 116). Markham's success was probably also due to the excellent timing of the proposal. In 1867 the India Office moved from the Westminster Palace Hotel to King Charles Street, Whitehall. Such a move, anticipated for some time, would have created conditions conducive to change. The 'sixties generally were years of experiment in the organization of the India Office which was trying to adjust itself to the changed circumstances after the Act of 1858.

Northcote's instructions were not immediately acted upon. Markham's absence as geographer to the Abyssinian Field Force from October 1867 to June 1868 (Markham, C. R., 1869, passim) probably contributed towards this. Official inertia must also be considered as a cause, and there were those who did not want to see him progress in the India Office (see p. 349). There seems to have been some difficulty regarding a reduction of salary during 1868 (L/PO/Misc. (c)). The circumstances are obscure and may have been connected with the Abyssinian expedition. However, between July and September 1868 Thuillier was in the India Office on official business and Markham gratefully welcomed his advice, based on long experience, for the reconstitution of the Geographical Department. It was Thuillier who gave Merivale a prod on 8 September 1868. He resurrected some of his previous arguments in favour of a separate and coherent Geographical Department under a responsible official. Apart from recognizing the labours of painstaking but unappreciated surveyors in India, such a department would coordinate correspondence, disseminate maps and receive, analyse and arrange for reference all geographical documents. He urged that an order from the Council of India should define the business of the new department (Markham, C. R., 1877, p. 16; L/PO/Misc. (d)). Thuillier's letter suggested a status for the person in charge of the Geographical Department which was apparently not envisaged by others in the India Office. Coupled with the demand for definition of duties from the Council, the letter suggests the influence of Markham. Less than a week later the Public Works Committee of the Council of India placed Markham in charge of the geographical business for a trial period of six months. On October 4 Merivale issued a circular requesting that Secretaries of Departments transfer to Markham all correspondence on geographical subjects, exploration, the geological surveys, and all annual reports, maps, plans and charts received from India (Markham, C. R., 1877, p. 17; L/PO/Misc. (d). The latter source gives the date as November 4). On 24 November 1868 the Supreme Government of India was ordered to mark all despatches on the above subjects 'geographical'. (By a further order, dated 6 May 1871, all reports and correspondence on marine surveys, meteorology and the observatories were also to be sent to Markham (Markham, C. R., 1877, p. 17)). Merivale's instructions indicated that the new Geographical Department was hardly experimental. It was also a novel department, a sort of portmanteau which Markham carried about with him. In 1872, when he was transferred to the Revenue Department, the Geographical Department accompanied him (L/PO/Misc. (d)). He nurtured and nourished it, and built up a relationship with it which was too personal, too intense, and which was to contribute substantially towards his premature retirement from the India Office in 1877.

IV

Markham found that the condition of the geographical records was far worse than he had anticipated. "The old correspondence books were destroyed; the Survey Reports were unnoticed; there was no arrangement of any kind for utilizing the work of the Surveys; and the valuable collection of maps and geographical documents was carted in a heap into a corner of a passage. Many of the maps were like much-used
coffee-house table-clothes; they were folded in unequal sections, the margins frayed, and the edges broken and worn away. Many were lost, while whole editions had never been distributed or even unpacked. The map mounter, Mr. Jones, afterwards said that in an experience of fourteen years he had never come across anything so bad as the condition of the geographical records of the India Office’ (Markham, C. R., 1877, pp. 15–16; Markham, C. R., 1878, p. 409). On this, as on other occasions, Markham may have exaggerated, for he was partly trying to justify his work in the Geographical Department; but even when due allowance is made for overstatement, the picture was a melancholy one.

The tangle of the geographical records was a challenge in which Markham revelled. He obtained the appointment of Mr. Trelawney Saunders to sort the maps. It took 165 days, working six hours a day, to put an end to the ‘indescribable confusion’ (Markham, C. R., 1878, p. 410). By May 1886 the records and maps were organized. Two years later, although sadly understaffed, the department was ‘in full working order’. Catalogues were produced. The first edition of the Memoir on the Indian Surveys was published (1871). Copies of maps in other repositories were obtained. The maps were now being ‘gradually and steadily cleaned and backed’. Complete sets of maps were presented to the Royal Geographical Society, the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew, the Privy Council Office for the use of the Judicial Committee, the War Office, the British Museum, the Radcliffe Camera at Oxford and numerous other organizations and bodies. For Kew alone 175 maps were mounted covering an area of 1000 sq. ft. This labour was high-lighted by heart-warming finds. The original manuscript of a journal kept by Captain Knight during the voyage to the North Pole in 1606 was discovered ‘amongst a heap of rubbish’ and edited for the Hakluyt Society (Markham, C. R., 1878, pp. 410 ff). Maps and other official publications from Calcutta were now easier to obtain through the agents appointed by the India Office. By 1877 the work of the Department was organized into four branches: correspondence, the supply of information including map-making, accounts and map mounting (Markham, C. R., 1877, pp. 45–6). From July 1872 Markham edited the Geographical Magazine, a source of departmental information. In the same year he was made responsible for producing the Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress of India, the annual statement which was presented to Parliament, and into which he introduced a new arrangement of material (Moral and Material Progress in India 1871–2, pp. iii–iv). Even then the eternal complaint about overcrowding was heard. The map mounter worked in ‘a narrow corridor screened from the main passage by a pair of dwarf cupboards, with an area of 24 by 9 feet’. In this retreat where draughts caused attacks of ‘neuralgia and violent colds’, he was expected to perform miracles of preservation, storage and distribution (Markham, C. R., 1877, pp. 21–2).

V

In 1872 Markham was transferred from the Public Works to the Revenue Department, taking his Geographical Department with him. This move brought to a head dissatisfaction with his anomalous situation. As early as 3 August 1868 Markham had suggested that there should be a responsible head of the Geographical Department who should receive a special personal allowance for the additional duty (L/PO/Misc. (d)). But he was never officially appointed as head of the department and his position was never officially recognized (Markham, C. R., 1877, p. 28). On 8 August 1869 the subject of Markham’s remuneration was deferred for further consideration. Yet in 1873 he was given an increase of staff, Mr. C. E. D. Black
being appointed 'Clerk in the Geographical Department', with Mr. Jones, the map mouter, receiving a permanent appointment (L/PO/Misc. (d)); Markham, C. R., 1877, pp. 34–5). Altogether there were six members of staff in a properly organized Geographical Department by 1873, including Markham, who had never officially been recognized as its head (Markham, C. R., 1877, p. 36). Thus, throughout the years 1867–75, although he had been provided with paid assistants, he himself had never received additional remuneration. His authority rested only on Merivale’s circular of 4 October 1868 (L/AG/7/31).

Markham’s position in the Geographical Department must be viewed against the background of an impending reorganization of the Revenue Department which had been in the air as early as 1867 (L/PO/Misc. (b)). The intention was to mould the structure of the India Office more closely to the pattern in India where there was a new Revenue, Agricultural and Commerce Department. By March 1874 there was strong feeling in the India Office in favour a new Department of Agriculture and Commerce which would embrace Markham’s work as well as that of the Statistical Reporter. These developments coincided with the arrival in the India Office of Lord Salisbury as Secretary of State and Sir Louis Mallet as Permanent Under Secretary. Markham might have been enthusiastic about the proposed new department had it not been for the fact that Henry Waterfield, his senior in service in the Revenue Department, and his junior in years, was to be appointed as Departmental Secretary with Markham as his Assistant (L/PO/Misc. (f)). Markham was dismayed. He had hoped that in time he would be appointed Secretary of a separate Geographical Department. Now he was to be superseded and, as he saw it, some of his work in the Geographical Department was to be done by others. Both his prospects and his pride suffered severely. Resentful to a point of desperation, he tried to convince Mallet that his special experience, ability and reputation deserved better than this. He found the proposals ‘unjust’ and ‘disheartening to the last degree’ and hinted at his resignation rather than continuing in ‘a tarnished and irksome position’. He felt his humiliation keenly, sincerely believing that he was uniquely qualified for the work of the Geographical Department. His travels in India had underpinned his revenue and forest work in the India Office, and as the authority on cinchona cultivation he was afraid of letting it loose in inexperienced hands. His personal interest in the Department was intense, as much of it was his own creation (L/PO/Misc. (f)). The full depth of Markham’s mortification was revealed in a private letter to Sir Bartle Frere, Chairman of the Council committee which had the oversight of his work: ‘... here and here alone would it be necessary for me even to represent my claims to charge of such a work. Her Majesty—by conferring upon me a Companionship of the Bath, for services connected with work which will be comprised in the new Department, showed a gracious appreciation of it ... [Markham then lists other high honours] ... If what is known to all the world is not recognized here, my official position is hopeless and no representation of special qualifications can help me’ (L/PO/Misc. (h)). He also appealed to Salisbury against the creation of a new department (L/PO/Misc. (g)). Alternative suggestions for a continuing and improved Geographical Department, under his care (L/PO/Misc. (h) (i)) bore no fruit. By July 1874 a new Department of Statistics and Commerce had been established with Waterfield in charge (India Army List, July 1874). In November 1874 he pressed Mallet for a personal allowance, drawing his attention to the fact that Lord Salisbury had described him as ‘a very valuable public servant’. What he wanted was fair wages for fair work, as he put it (L/PO/Misc. (j)). Markham was trying to force Mallet’s hand, but in February 1875 he heard that the Agricultural Statistics were to be removed from his care (L/PO/Misc.
This depressed him, blunted his initiative and interest in his work, and generally unsettled him altogether. He saw it as further evidence of deliberate meddling with his department (L/PO/Misc. (k)); Markham, C. R., 1877, pp. 38–9). As for Markham’s request for extra remuneration, Mallet doubted whether there was enough work for this (Markham, C. R., 1877, p. 1). However, he recommended that Markham should receive a small personal allowance of £100 p.a. from the middle of 1875. This was confirmed by the Secretary of State in Council (L/AG/7/31; Minutes of the Council of India, 34, pp. 289–90). As for Markham’s status in the Geographical Department, nothing was forthcoming (see p. 350). His representations were nevertheless seriously considered by the Secretary of State in Council, and on 15 April 1875 a special committee was constituted to discuss ‘the question of his designation’ (Minutes of the Council of India, 34, pp. 289–90). Markham was passing through what was probably the greatest crisis of his professional career. On the face of it, he was a prophet without honour in his own country.

VI

If Markham had such a strong case, why was he passed over for promotion to the Secretaryship of the new department? Seniority and efficiency were the criteria which dictated Waterfield’s promotion (L/PO/Misc. (e)), even though Markham believed that his own experience should have carried greater weight. But why was his position as head of the Geographical Department never officially recognized? Impending departmental rearrangement contributed towards his dilemma. More cogent explanation, however, has its roots in the early ’sixties when a feeling of resentment was brewing against Markham in the India Office. His achievements abroad were undoubtedly considerable but, as in the case of the acquisition of the cinchona tree, the opportunities were sometimes created by Markham himself. There were those on the Council of India who regarded him as a government official manufacturing jobs for himself outside the India Office (Williams, 1962, p. 438). His periodic absences made him vulnerable to criticism. Markham himself realized this. When he presented his case to Mallet and Lord Salisbury, he observed: ‘I have been told that I am too much engaged at work that is not connected with the office, that I have “too many irons in the fire” . . .’. And again: ‘My hands have been full it is true . . .’ (L/PO/Misc. (f)). In the India Office of the ’seventies, especially after the appointment of Sir Louis Mallet as Permanent Under Secretary of State in 1874, routine, efficiency and dedication to duty were regarded as essential virtues of the ideal civil servant. Markham was not inefficient, but his activities in the outside world were to his disadvantage. There is little evidence that he neglected his official duties, but absences from the India Office encouraged such thoughts. And for Markham to remind his superiors constantly of his reputation and unique qualifications for work in the Geographical Department tended to irk them (see Mallet’s pencilled underlining of certain words and phrases in L/PO/Misc. (f)),

Given this adverse situation, the appointment of a special committee to investigate Markham’s status in the Geographical Department was at least encouraging. But at this vital juncture, when prudence and restraint were necessary to strengthen his case, Markham committed an act of professional folly. On 29 May 1875 he sailed from Portsmouth with the Naval Antarctic Expedition, returning on August 29, having exceeded his leave by a month. The débâcle occurred when Markham could ill afford the loss of goodwill it occasioned, or the opportunities which it gave his critics of denying him promotion because of his transgression. Ever since 1865 Markham had advocated an Antarctic expedition which was first mooted by the
Royal Geographical Society with which he was intimately associated (R.G.S. Proceedings 21 (1876–7) 536–43). While the expedition was being fitted out in Portsmouth, he was ‘constantly’ there (Markham, A. H., 1917, p. 232)—a fact which was probably not lost on his critics in Whitehall. Markham had informed Sir Henry Anderson, his head of department, that he intended taking his annual leave during June and July. Anderson had asked him to discuss the matter with Mallet; this was the customary proceeding, at which arrangements were made for the distribution of work during absence on leave. According to Mallet, Markham did not see him, but informed him of his intention to sail with the expedition two days before it set out, leaving the Under Secretary no time to discuss matters. The Moral and Material Progress of India, which had to be delivered to Parliament before the end of the sitting, was farmed out to Mr. Black, Markham’s subordinate. On his return Markham still did not inform Mallet of the reasons for his absence. Mallet deplored this lack of protocol and the employment of subordinates for important work, something which he regarded as detrimental to the Civil Service (L/PO/Misc. (q)). Markham’s defence of his actions (L/PO/Misc. (m) (n) (o) (p)) are less convincing than Mallet’s indictments, and his impatience and occasional offhandedness (L/PO/Misc. (m)) must have further antagonized the Under Secretary of State. In retrospect, what weakens his defence was the fact that, two years later, he explained away his resignation from the India Office without mentioning the Antarctic expedition which had precipitated the crisis (Markham, C. R., 1877, pp. 1–4).

Towards the end of September 1875 Markham and Mallet had a confrontation in which considerable heat was generated. The next day Markham demanded an apology from the Under Secretary for using the word ‘dishonourable’ to describe certain of his actions (L/PO/Misc. (r)). Early in 1877 there was an incident involving a bill for maps in which the matter of Markham’s status was raised again. Markham submitted a memorandum once more explaining the difficulty of his anomalous position and requesting that there might be an order from Council placing him in responsible charge of the Geographical Department. Mallet thought that a resolution of Council was unnecessary to make an officer responsible for the work entrusted to him by the Secretary of State. ‘Mr. Markham has always, in my time, been recognized and treated as the responsible Head of the Geographical Section of the India Office Establishment, and I cannot see what more is needed.’ Markham considered this view contrary to the minute of 18 March 1875, or the view of Lord Salisbury appointing a committee to review his position (Markham, C. R., 1877, pp. 3–4) (see p. 349).

In December 1877, having heard no more about his application, Markham decided to resign and take a pension. ‘... I very reluctantly came to the conclusion that neither the good of the service nor my own self-respect would be duly considered, if I continued any longer in a thoroughly anomalous position’ (Markham, C. R., 1877, p. 42). His resignation was accepted in March 1877. According to Markham, his request of November 1874, to be recognized as head of the Geographical Department, was granted, and by an order of the Secretary of State in Council of 13 April 1875, he was to receive a special designation as the responsible head of the Department. As his resignation had been occasioned by the failure to get the headship, he implied that the information had been withheld from him and released after his resignation (Markham, C. R., 1877, p. 43). There is, however, no record of such a decision in the Minutes of the Council of India; the only reference to Markham’s status is that of 15 April 1875, previously referred to (see p. 349). Office rumour might account for Markham’s misapprehension. He privately accused Mallet of victimization because of the Antarctic expedition and its consequences. ‘I see very
plainly' he observed 'that the intention is to render my position here unbearable' (L/PO/Misc. (a)). It is certainly true that Mallet did nothing to dissuade Markham from resigning.

It was not so much a clash of personalities which forced Markham's resignation as the difficulty which his volatile character found in fitting itself into the changed India Office of the late 'sixties and 'seventies. It was a time when the framework of the new institution was being adjusted in the bedding-down process after the Act of 1858. The coming of Sir Louis Mallet put an end to the comparatively easy-going days of the Company which had spilled over into the early years of the India Office. Shortly after his appointment as Permanent Under Secretary of State in 1874, Mallet was complaining to Salisbury about the 'laxity' which had been 'allowed to grow up in this office' (Salisbury Papers (b)). In his opinion the public service was more important than its servants. 'The personality of an official should be vigorously and systematically suppressed' (Salisbury Papers (a)). Small wonder then that he advocated to the Secretary of State that in Markham's case 'some very decisive measure will be necessary, if anything like discipline or decency is to be maintained in the office'. Markham's resignation comes as no surprise in the face of such a formidable personality who continued: 'I am conscious of one error in my dealings with him—viz. that I have been far too indulgent and considerate towards him—and the time has come when he must be told very distinctly that he must obey orders—comply with official rules, or go' (Salisbury Papers (c)).

Markham's passing from the India Office must be viewed with some regret, not because his work could not be done by others, for it was, but because it is symbolic of the end of an era in the Home administration of India. For the history of the India Office it is a significant event. The Geographical Department had been given form and substance by the last of a passing generation of administrators who were too large for the pale grey of routine administration. Already in 1867 Sir John Kaye, Secretary of the Political and Secret Department, and a great admirer of the old regime, regretfully noted that 'Mr. Company's successors were minded rather to open their doors to fashionable nonentities, immortalized by Mr. Debrett, than to men who will live in the history of India' (Kaye, 1867, p. 360). An exaggeration, perhaps, but by 1877 there was no room in the new India Office for the colourful characters of Company days.
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