

2

1893
FOREIGN DEPARTMENT.

SECRET F.

Pros. April 1893, Nos. 53-66.

New edition of the map of India—Frontier boundaries to be marked thereon.

राष्ट्रीय अभिलेखागार को वापस
Return to National Archives of India

राष्ट्रीय अभिलेखागार को वापस
Return to National Archives of India

Nothing need be said about the Chin-Lushai boundary.
Shall I draft?

J. S.—23rd June 1892.

Please and shew authority for the Bhutan boundary.

24th June 1892.

W. J. C.

DEPUTY SECRETARY.

Draft below. The authority for the Bhutan boundary is Part II of Aitchison's Volume I, "Assam," which is based upon the proclamation of 4th July 1866, page 165 of the same volume.

J. S.—27th June 1892.

The proclamation defines no boundary. Did the Commissioner who is alluded to in it fix any?

27th June 1892.

W. J. C.

DEPUTY SECRETARY.

Yes. Please see Proceedings Political A, June 1872, Nos. 633-664 (No. 664), Political A, November 1873, Nos. 60-65 (No. 62), and External A, March 1892, Nos. 170-173 (No. 170).

J. S.—29th June 1892.

Issue.

30th June 1892.

W. J. C.

[Pros. No.
58.]

[To the Surveyor-General of India, 1238-E., dated the 30th June 1892.]

MR. SCOTT.

A piece of the Nepal boundary—from the vicinity of Philibit northwards—comes into the sheet No. 1 of the map of India.

We have told* the Surveyor-General that the boundary in that part of sheet 1 is

* Proceedings No. 56.

second class, while we have told† him that the

† " " " 58.

Nepal boundary in sheet No. 4 is first class.

Please look into the question of the Nepal boundary and let me know if it ought not to be all first class, in which case I can send a letter in correction.

4th July 1892.

W. J. C.

DEPUTY SECRETARY.

The Nepal boundary ought to be all first class.

The part of the boundary from Philibit northwards which comes into sheet No. 1 is the boundary indicated by the Kali or Sardah river.

By Article V of the Treaty with Nepal of 1815, the Raja renounced all claim to the

No. 53, Aitchison's Volume II, page 166.

countries lying west of the river Kali. By

No. 60, page 183.

Article 3 of the Treaty of 1860 the boundary

line surveyed by the British Commissioners (in 1859-60, papers in Calcutta) extending eastward from the river Kali or Sardah was accepted as the boundary and is still the boundary.

I have somewhat delayed the case in order to try and get the actual report of the Boundary Commissioners, but I find the papers are in Calcutta, but there can be no doubt that the part of the boundary under disposal should be first class.

J. S.—9th July 1892.

Draft accordingly to the Surveyor-General.

11th July 1892.

W. J. C.

DEPUTY SECRETARY.

Draft below.

J. S.—14th July 1892.

Address Calcutta. The Surveyor-General's Office here closes to-day.

15th July 1892.

W. J. C.

[Pros.
No. 59.]

[To the Surveyor-General of India, No. 1326-E., dated the 16th July 1892.]

Frontier Branch to see.

J. S.—18th July 1892.

Seen. Thanks.

E. H. S. C.—19th July 1892.

[Pros. No.
60.]

FROM THE SURVEYOR-GENERAL OF INDIA, No. 284-S.—S., DATED THE 1ST JULY 1892.

With reference to paragraph 8 of our letter No. 1114-F., dated 10th June 1892, forwards a silver print of the sheet which he has had prepared with the frontier boundaries shown as suggested. Regrets that there are no proof copies of the sheet available at present.

The Surveyor-General explains "that no more proofs of the sheet are available at present as the stone is undergoing corrections." He has had a silver print prepared to save delay, and he has had the frontier boundaries drawn thereon in accordance with the instructions contained in the letter above quoted, which he trusts will answer the present purposes.

2. He draws attention to the boundary of the Pishin assigned districts, and enquires whether the portions thereof that do not fall under the terms of our instructions are (1) to remain as they stand in the map with a symbol representing a first class boundary and treated like other internal boundaries in the map, (2) or to be shown with a second class symbol and coloured red, (3) or to be removed altogether.

Submitted for orders.

W. HANRAHAN—11th July 1892.

W. S.—11th July 1892.

SECRETARY.

The Surveyor-General has told me that we can get another silver print if it is wanted from Colonel Holdich (Drawing Office, Simla).

We have told* Colonel Thuillier, or are about to do so, that the Nepal British boundary of this sheet No. 1 should be a *first class* boundary. For the rest the boundary markings are as they are wanted.

* Proceedings No. 59.
I can't quite follow the topography of the Mustagh Mountain line with reference to the War Office Map, but if the line follows the crests of the ridge it is right.

I think however that the words "boundary undefined" in the Yaghistan between British India and Chitral should not indicate so closely the supposed boundary. As printed they give the impression that Chilas is as little within control as Swat.

I would print these words once in a straight line beginning just under the 'C' of Chitral, and extending close to, but not up to, the word Chilas. Below and parallel, I would print 'Frontier' beginning on the mountain range just N. W. of Dir; and below that again and parallel 'Tribes' beginning just above the word Bajaur.

Approved.

L.

Yes.

L.

The boundaries of British Baluchistan, except where they come within the description of the external boundary as marked in this map, ought to be marked as internal district boundaries.

The boundary of Baluchistan with Afghanistan from Shorawak onwards to the west has been coloured blue in this proof, and we cannot include this territory "within the line which indicates the external frontier of British India until" we get the Secretary of State's permission. I think, however, that the time has come for asking for that permission and taking the red line to Koh-i-Malik-i-Siah.

If my suggestions are approved, the next step is to get a new proof and write a despatch to the Secretary of State with reference to the despatch from which I have just quoted, asking leave to publish a new edition of the map of India with the boundary markings on sheet No. 1 as indicated in such revised proof.

13th July 1892.

W. J. C.

HIS EXCELLENCY.

We may perhaps act as proposed by Mr. Cuningham. The simplest way would be to let our red line run round Baluchistan and Afghanistan, and so down the Mustagh and Himalaya. But we should excite comment, and there would be obvious difficulties in marking the northern boundaries of Afghanistan.

"Bajaur" should, I think, be extended across the range in the direction of Dir. The position of Dir in this map is very different from the position formerly assigned—the lie of the rivers and ranges being altered.

"Bajaur" should be in a large type and spread over more space. The type is now smaller than that of 'Swat' and 'Boner.'—L.

16th July 1892.

H. M. D.

I have spoken to Sir M. Durand, and will ask him to look at this again.

I am not altogether satisfied with the present mode of showing the different sorts of boundary.

Moreover I do not know whether the map will be washed over with colour or not for the purpose of distinguishing British and Native State territory.

I am very much against taking the public too much into our confidence as to these unsettled and embarrassing frontier questions. If we could have one line (instead of a red and blue one), a good deal of trouble would be saved. The different *classes* of boundary could be shown by different combination of dots and dashes. The use of red and blue lines leads to all kinds of difficulty. I see, *e.g.*, that in this map the Zhob district is included in a red line. But have we ever said that it is British territory?

The red line following the north frontier also seems to include an immense extent of territory which we should not allow any one else to take, but which we can scarcely call British.

The whole question requires to be very carefully considered.

18th July 1892.

L.

Certainly our action is not logical, but it is very difficult to know how to put in the colour boundaries. Could we issue the map uncoloured? Ask the Surveyor-General.

19th July 1892.

H. M. D.

Perhaps the best thing would be to let Colonel Thuillier see these notes unofficially.

W. S.—19th July 1892.

E. H. S. C.—19th July 1892.

Yes.

20th July 1892.

J. A. C.

To the Surveyor-General unofficially.

In previous editions of this map, British territory is coloured with a wash of pink and Feudatory States with a wash of yellow, while the limits of British India are indicated by a riband of red. To issue the map uncoloured would detract considerably from its utility and value.

I think the objections that have been raised to the colouring of the boundaries in the specimen under consideration could be met by omitting the colouring of the boundaries in such parts only where the frontier is not settled, and omitting the blue colour along the Afghanistan boundary.

I would suggest that the red riband be allowed to stand from the south-east corner of the sheet, up to the angle in the boundary about $\frac{1}{2}$ an inch south-west of the Shimshal Pass. Between that point and Michni, where the British limits are questionable, the riband might be omitted. From Michni southwards as far as the Gomal near Tank I believe there is no doubt about the boundary, and the riband of red might remain there. West of that point all the boundary colouring might be omitted, except the limits of the Pishin and Quetta districts which under the orders of the Secretary of State are included in a red line—this was ruled in the correspondence regarding the boundaries to be shown on the second edition of the map.

Secret E., August 1890, Nos. 25-33.

,, February 1891, Nos. 124-125.

Regarding the colour wash, Kashmir and Gilgit would be yellow as in the previous edition, and the portions on the west within the boundary symbols would be uncoloured. Baluchistan would also be coloured yellow, including the Zhob district. The pink wash would be restricted to the portions which are unquestionably British.

30th July 1892.

H. R. T.

To Foreign Department unofficially.

TO SECRETARY, FOREIGN DEPARTMENT.

Although it is generally understood that what is unquestionably British territory should be washed in with red,* it would be as well to insert this rule, as (e) paragraph 3.

* Pink.

H. R. T.

I would suggest that in paragraph 4 after the words "continuous riband of colour," the following should be inserted "Discontinuous ribands of colour being awkward in practice should never be used."

In No. 1114 F. of 10th June 1892, paragraph 3, the words "corresponding method of colour could be used" occur in connection with the symbolical delineation of boundaries. They seem somewhat ambiguous, and the addition suggested to paragraph 4 would prevent any future doubt upon this point.

14th October 1892.

G. S.

DEPUTY SECRETARY.

Colonel Strahan does not approve of my suggestion as to coloured lines of dashes. I have introduced the additions he proposes in the draft, but I fancy he must have written 'red' for 'pink.' I don't think red is used as a wash.

2. If Colonel Thuillier is returning next week, it would perhaps be well to let him see the draft before issue, as he has studied the question and noted on it.

19th October 1892.

H. D.

Yes, and let Mr. Cuningham see too.

20th October 1892.

J. A. C.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL UNOFFICIALLY.

I am very sorry that I could not deal with this file until to-day.

In your note of the 30th July I doubt if you meant only first class boundaries by the expression "settled," because from Nepal to the point near the Shimshal, where you would let the red riband (it is a broken one) stand, is a second class boundary.

The draft, understanding you to mean first class boundary by "settled" boundary, forbids colouring any but first class boundaries, and is inconsistent in permitting the boundary from Nepal to near the Shimshal to remain coloured. I think your point would be met by substituting in paragraph 4 for "only those of the first class," "those of the first and second class."

Then do you agree as to forbidding broken ribands of colour? They are used on this very proof.

The draft does not take in the alterations to be made (see page 4 of the notes containing His Excellency's marginal notes) in the printing of the words boundary undefined in the Yaghistan between British India and Chitral; nor the alteration in printing Bajaur (see page 5 of the notes). These matters can, however, be better noted by you unofficially than put into the letter?

18th November 1892.

W. J. C.

Surveyor-General, unofficially.

In my note of 30th July, I used the word "settled" inadvertently, and did not mean the colouring to be restricted to first class boundaries. I disagree with Colonel Strahan that discontinuous ribands of colour are awkward in practice, and recommend that boundaries of the first class be coloured by a continuous, and those of the second class by a broken riband, except in the places where special instructions are given to the contrary, e.g. (c) in paragraph 2 of draft. This procedure will accord with the instructions conveyed in paragraph 3 of Foreign Department letter No. 1114 F., dated 10th June 1892.

I observe that one of the enquiries in my letter under reply has not been answered in the draft, viz, what class of boundary is to be shown round British Baluchistan and the assigned districts of Quetta? I suppose it will be second class. Please add.

The alterations referred to in last paragraph of Deputy Secretary's note of 18th ultimo will be attended to and need not be inserted in the draft.

5th December 1892.

H. R. T.

Foreign Department unofficially.

Pros. in 56.

Pros. in 56.

21
APRIL 1893.

New edition of the map of India.

S F 58-60

No. 58.

No. 1238-E., dated Simla, the 30th June 1892.

From—W. J. CUNINGHAM, Esq., Deputy Secretary to the Government of India,
Foreign Department,

To—The Surveyor-General of India.

In compliance with the request contained in the second paragraph of your letter No. 147-S.—S., dated the 13th June, I am directed to return the proof of sheet No. 4 of the new edition of 32-mile map of India.

2. I am to request that the boundaries between British territory and Nepal, Sikim and Bhutan may be shown under class (1) as laid down in Foreign Department letter No. 1114-F., dated the 10th June 1892. The north-east boundary of Assam is still undefined, and may be shown under class (3), so also should the boundaries between Burma and China and Burma and Siam, except, of course, as to the latter, that part of the demarcated boundary south of Karenni which has hitherto been shown on published maps of India.

No. 59.

No. 1326-E., dated Simla, the 16th July 1892.

From—W. J. CUNINGHAM, Esq., Deputy Secretary to the Government of India,
Foreign Department,

To—The Surveyor-General of India.

With reference to paragraph 4 of my letter No. 1114-F., dated the 10th June 1892, regarding the new map of India, I am directed to request that the portion of the Nepal boundary shown on sheet No. 1 may be indicated with a symbol of the first class instead of with a symbol of the second class.

No. 60.

No. 284-S.—S., dated Simla, the 1st July 1892.

From—COLONEL H. R. THUILLIER, R.E., Surveyor-General of India,

To—The Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department.

With reference to paragraph 8 of your letter No. 1114-F., dated 10th June, I regret that no more proofs of the sheet are at present available as the stone is undergoing corrections, and the hills are being drawn thereon, so that proofs cannot be taken therefrom for another two months without causing great damage.

To save delay I have had a silver print prepared, and I have had the frontier boundaries drawn thereon in accordance with the instructions contained in your letter above quoted, and I trust this will answer the present purpose.

I have to draw attention however to the boundary of the Pishin assigned districts, and to enquire whether the portions thereof that do not fall under the terms of your instructions are (1) to remain as they stand in the map, with a symbol representing a 1st class boundary and treated like other internal boundaries in the map; (2) or to be shown with a second class symbol and coloured red; (3) or to be removed altogether.

A61
FROM

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,

To

THE SURVEYOR-GENERAL OF INDIA.

FOREIGN DEPT.

FORT WILLIAM, the 24th December 1892.

SIR,

I am directed to reply to your letter No. 284 S. S., dated the 1st July 1892, regarding the boundaries to be shown on sheet No. 1 of the proposed third edition of the map of India.

2. I am to inform you that the system of boundary colouring adopted in the proof referred to in your letter under reply should be introduced in the third edition with the following alterations:—

- (a) The blue colour along the north-western, western and southern boundaries of Afghanistan, from the Oxus to the neighbourhood of Nushki, should be entirely omitted.
 - (b) The red riband running from the south-east corner of the sheet to the angle in the boundary about half an inch south-west of the Shimshal pass may be retained.
 - (c) To the west of the point last mentioned, and between it and Michni, the boundary should not be coloured.
 - (d) From Michni southwards the red riband may stand as far as the Gomal river near Tank, but beyond this point it should be omitted until the boundary of the British district of Pishin is reached.
 - (e) The limits of the districts comprised in British Baluchistan should be defined by a second class symbol and coloured red.
3. As regards colour wash, I am to convey the following instructions:—
- (a) Kashmir, including the dependencies of Gilgit, Nagar, Hunza, Chilas, and Chitral, should be shown in yellow.
 - (b) The whole of the country within the Baluchistan Agency, except the districts comprised in British Baluchistan, should also be coloured yellow.
 - (c) The districts of British Baluchistan should be washed in pink.
 - (d) The assigned districts of Quetta and the Bolan should be coloured yellow, but the external boundary line, which should be defined by a second class symbol, should be coloured red.
 - (e) All unquestionably British territory should be washed in pink.

4. I am to add that the decision now given is intended to apply *mutatis mutandis* to all the other sheets of the new map of India. The principle to be observed in respect to the colouring of boundaries is that only those of the first class—that is to say, boundaries which have been formally defined either by demarcation or by treaty stipulations—are to be indicated by a continuous riband of colour. Discontinuous ribands of colour will indicate second class boundaries. This principle should also be adhered to in the preparation of the new map of Turkistan and of the maps required for the new edition of Aitchison's Treaties in so far as they mark external boundaries. No map which shows a change in the external boundaries of India can, however, be published by authority, without the previous sanction of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India, and I am accordingly to request you to forward, as early as possible, for submission to His Lordship, proofs of a complete set of the sheets of the new map of India.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,

Your most obedient servant,

(Sd.) H. M. DURAND,

Secretary to the Government of India.

M/6

Nos. 3048-3049 F.

A copy of the foregoing, and of the correspondence* marginally noted,
is forwarded to the* ^{Military Department} Intelligence Branch for in-
formation.

* Copy of office notes accompanies.

By Order, &c.,

FOREIGN DEPARTMENT; }
FORT WILLIAM, }
The 24th December 1892. }

(Sd.) H. DALY,
Asstt. Secretary to the Government of India.

* From the Surveyor-General of India, No. 2303 S., dated the 9th October 1890.
To " " " " 1659 F., " 13th December "
From " " " " 790 S., " 23rd March 1892.
To " " " " 1114 F., " 10th June "
From " " " " 147 S.S., " 13th " "
From " " " " 284 S.S., " 1st July "

APR-1893

Sec-F

5366

NATIONAL ARCHIVES OF INDIA

21
APRIL 1893.

New edition of the map of India.

S F 58-60

No. 58.

No. 1238-E., dated Simla, the 30th June 1892.

From—W. J. CUNINGHAM, Esq., Deputy Secretary to the Government of India,
Foreign Department,

To—The Surveyor-General of India.

In compliance with the request contained in the second paragraph of your letter No. 147-S.—S., dated the 13th June, I am directed to return the proof of sheet No. 4 of the new edition of 32-mile map of India.

2. I am to request that the boundaries between British territory and Nepal, Sikim and Bhutan may be shown under class (1) as laid down in Foreign Department letter No. 1114-F., dated the 10th June 1892. The north-east boundary of Assam is still undefined, and may be shown under class (3), so also should the boundaries between Burma and China and Burma and Siam, except, of course, as to the latter, that part of the demarcated boundary south of Karenni which has hitherto been shown on published maps of India.

No. 59.

No. 1326-E., dated Simla, the 16th July 1892.

From—W. J. CUNINGHAM, Esq., Deputy Secretary to the Government of India,
Foreign Department,

To—The Surveyor-General of India.

With reference to paragraph 4 of my letter No. 1114-F., dated the 10th June 1892, regarding the new map of India, I am directed to request that the portion of the Nepal boundary shown on sheet No. 1 may be indicated with a symbol of the first class instead of with a symbol of the second class.

No. 60.

No. 284-S.—S., dated Simla, the 1st July 1892.

From—COLONEL H. R. THUILLIER, R.E., Surveyor-General of India,

To—The Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department.

With reference to paragraph 8 of your letter No. 1114-F., dated 10th June, I regret that no more proofs of the sheet are at present available as the stone is undergoing corrections, and the hills are being drawn thereon, so that proofs cannot be taken therefrom for another two months without causing great damage.

To save delay I have had a silver print prepared, and I have had the frontier boundaries drawn thereon in accordance with the instructions contained in your letter above quoted, and I trust this will answer the present purpose.

I have to draw attention however to the boundary of the Pishin assigned districts, and to enquire whether the portions thereof that do not fall under the terms of your instructions are (1) to remain as they stand in the map, with a symbol representing a 1st class boundary and treated like other internal boundaries in the map; (2) or to be shown with a second class symbol and coloured red; (3) or to be removed altogether.

REFERENCES TO FORMER CASES.

GOVT. OF }
INDIA. }

1893

{ FOREIGN
DEPT.

SECRET F.

APRIL.

Nos. 53-66.

BRIEF SUBJECT.

New edition of the map of India—Frontier boundaries to be marked thereon.

LIST OF PAPERS.

- No. 53.—From the Surveyor-Genl. of India, No. 789-S., dated the 22nd March 1892—With reference to this office letter No. 1659-F., dated the 13th Dec. 1890, submits an uncorrected proof of sheet No. 4 of the new map of India, and requests instructions regarding the boundaries to be shown thereon.
- No. 54.—To the Surveyor-Genl. of India, No. 836-E, dated the 7th May 1892—In reply to above, conveys instructions regarding the boundaries between Burma and Siam and Chin and Lushai country.
- No. 55.—From the Surveyor-Genl. of India, No. 790 S, dated the 23rd March 1892—With reference to this Office letter No. 1659-F., dated the 13th Dec. 1890, forwards, with remarks, a proof copy of sheet No. 1 of a new edition of the map of India, and requests orders regarding certain boundaries to be marked thereon.
- No. 56.—To the Surveyor-Genl. of India, No. 1114-F., dated the 10th June 1892—In reply to above, conveys instructions regarding the frontier boundaries to be marked on the map, asks for a fresh proof of the sheet drawn in accordance with present directions, and states that the sanction of the Secy. of State will be required before the map can be published.

Branch, date, and Nos.	Brief title of file.
Secret F., Feb. 1891, Nos. 124-125.	Same subject. Map of India. Burma-Siam boundary. States of Karenni. Bhutan-Jalpaiguri boundary. Legal position in the Chin-Lushai Hills. } Kashmir-China boundary. } Status of the Kyaington State. } Jurisdictional arrangements for British Baluchistan. } Assam-Bhutan boundary.
Secret E., Aug. 1890 " 25-33.	
" March 1893 " 37-155.	
Extl. A, Nov. 1892 " 12-16.	
" March " 170-173.	
" Dec. 1891 " 69-74.	
Secret F., Oct. 1890 " 141-170.	
" July " " 225-245.	
Secret E., Feb. " " 100-103.	
Extl. A, March 1888 " 124-156.	
Secret E., Aug. 1887 " 535-548.	
Poltl. A, Nov. 1873 " 60-65.	
" June 1872 " 633-664.	

REFERENCES TO LATER CASES.

Branch, date, and Nos.	Brief title of file.
<i>S. Feb 1893 - 344/45</i>	<i>Same Subject</i>
<i>Dept. F. Feb 1897; 15/118</i>	<i>N.W.T.F Series sheet no. 14 N.E. (4th edn)</i>
<i>F.B. April 1897 167/189</i>	
<i>E.A. April 1901 30/31</i>	<i>Symbols for boundaries of Assam and those between Native States and British districts.</i>
<i>F.B. Aug 1896 - 212/14</i>	

(To be continued on back, if necessary.)

Branch, date, and Nos.

Brief title of file.

E. B. Jan 9 '93 - 100
109.

- No. 59.—To the Surveyor-Genl. of India, No. 1326-E., dated the 16th July 1892—With reference to para. 4 of this office letter No. 1114-F., dated the 10th June 1892, requests that the portion of the Nepal boundary shown on sheet No. 1 may be indicated with a symbol of the first class instead of with a symbol of the second class.
- No. 60.—From the Surveyor-Genl. of India, No. 284-S.—S., dated the 1st July 1892—With reference to para. 8 of this Office letter No. 1114-F., dated the 10th June, states that no more proofs of the sheet are available at present, but forwards a silver print and makes certain enquiries regarding the boundary of the Pishin assigned tracts.
- No. 61.—To the Surveyor-Genl. of India, No. 3047-F., dated the 24th Dec. 1892—In reply to above, conveys instruction, regarding the boundary colouring to be shown on sheet No. 1 of the proposed third edition of the map of India, and asks for proofs of a complete set of the sheets for submission to the Secy. of State.
- No. 62.—Endorsements to the Mily. Dept. and Intelligence Branch, Nos 3048—3049-F., dated the 24th Dec. 1892—Forwards copy of above and of certain correspondence.
- No. 63.—From the Surveyor-Genl. of India, No. 315-S., dated the 23rd Jan. 1893—With reference to this Office letter No. 3047-F., dated the 24th Dec. 1892, forwards a complete set of the sheets of the new map of India. States that he is not sure of the colouring of the Chin and Lushai country, and asks for early orders on the map.
- No. 64.—To the Surveyor-Genl. of India, No. 389-F., dated the 20th Feb. 1893—In reply to above, conveys instructions with reference to sheet No. IV and the colouring of the Chilas country in sheet No. 1. Returns all the proof sheets, and states that they should be returned for transmission to the Secy. of State after the alterations indicated have been made.
- No. 65.—From the Surveyor-Genl. of India, No. 770-S., dated the 11th March 1893—With reference to above, returns a complete corrected set of the proof sheets of the map.
- No. 66.—To the Secy. of State for India, No. 70 (Secret-Frontier), dated the 29th March 1893—With reference to despatch No. 44 (Secret), dated the 28th April 1890, forwards, with remarks, proof sheets of a third edition of the map of India, and enquires whether there is any objection, to its publication.

No. 64A One to Intelligence branch - Forward copy of above letter.

K. W.

SECRET F., APRIL 1893.

Nos. 53-66.

New edition of the map of India—Frontier boundaries to be marked thereon.

[Pros. No. 53.] FROM THE SURVEYOR-GENERAL OF INDIA, CALCUTTA, No. 789-S., DATED THE 22ND MARCH 1892.

With reference to Foreign Department No. 1659-F. of the 13th December 1890, submits an uncorrected proof of sheet No 4 of the new edition of the 32-mile map of India, and requests instructions regarding the boundaries to be shown thereon. Makes certain remarks with respect to the boundaries.

DEPUTY SECRETARY.

We cannot show any defined boundaries between Burma and China and Burma and Siam at present, and it would be unwise to make any attempt at showing what we think ought to be the boundaries—the Surveyor-General may be told to leave these boundaries undefined.

As regards Chin-Lushai alterations will have to be made, for Lushai land is now, or soon will be, under Assam, while Chin land continues under Burma; but at present we are not in a position to show any boundaries between Chin and Lushai territory.

J. S.—18th April 1892.

The Chin-Lushai part of the question is not important, and, though the boundaries as shown are inaccurate, we cannot say what is accurate.

The boundary between Burma and China and Burma and Siam is important and equally impossible to show. The only thing that can be done is to leave it out stopping on the Salween at the south of Karenni.

22nd April 1892.

W. J. C.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY.

Draft for approval.

J. S.—25th April 1892.

26th April 1892.

J. L. K.

Deputy Secretary.

Secretary should see.

2nd May 1892.

W. J. C.

Secretary.

5th May 1892.

H. M. D.

[Pros. No 54.]

[To the Surveyor-General of India, No. 836-E., dated the 7th May 1892.]

FROM THE SURVEYOR-GENERAL OF INDIA, No. 790-S., DATED THE 23RD MARCH 1892.

Submits a proof of Sheet No. 1 of the new map of India, and requests orders regarding certain boundaries to be marked thereon. (Pres. No. 53.)

Only two points are raised by the Surveyor-General:—

(1) Whether recent events on the frontiers of Kashmir involve any alteration in the British boundary in that direction.

(2) Whether, instead of indicating the Perso-Afghan boundary by the same symbols* as are employed for the officially determined Russo-Afghan boundary, he may substitute the marks† usually adopted for un-

defined boundaries when represented without colour.

2. As regards (1). Although recent events in the Gilgit command may be said to have brought the petty States thereabout more into political subordination to the Government of India, they have not culminated in any annexation of territory to the British dominions; and it is questionable whether any expansion of the boundary line could be sanctioned in a public map without the authority of the Secretary of State.

I put up the papers‡ containing the discussions which took place before regarding the boundaries to be shown on the new map of India.

‡ Secret E., August 1890, Nos. 25-33.
Secret F., February 1891, Nos. 124-125.

3. As to (2). We may perhaps agree to the Perso-Afghan boundary being marked in the manner proposed.

It is not quite understood what the Surveyor-General means by the statement that the 24-mile map of Afghanistan "showed the hypothetical portion of the Persian boundary with a broken riband of colour." This is not the case either in the old or the new map of Afghanistan. The former shows an unbroken boundary in colour and the latter, an uncoloured map, shows it thus:—

An uncoloured copy can't show colour of course.—W.J.C.

W. S.—14th April 1892.

E. H. S. C.—14th April 1892.

After what was written in the despatch to the Secretary of State, No. 44 S.-E.

Secret E., August 1890, No. 31.

of 28th April 1890, we cannot sanction the publication of a map of India with any extended boundary markings without first referring to the Secretary of State and getting His Lordship's consent.

The map as sent to us is defective in showing no topography in or about Gilgit, and in carrying the British India line which bounds Kashmir and its dependencies between Gilgit and Hunza. I am not sure that it is not defective in carrying the same line too far in the direction

§ A.

of the Yarkand river and Suget. In this connection, we must see what was written to (I think) the Resident in Kashmir about the boundary on the Leh-Yarkand road, and whether it was written subsequently to the 28th April 1890.

It is doubtless I think a good plan to show in the symbols indicating boundaries, the different weight to be attached to the marking a line of dot dash dot for demarcated boundaries; and one of dash dash dash for hitherto published undemarcated, but fairly accepted, boundaries

• B.

Persia. He has four different ways of showing 'value,' and possibly we might adopt them. What should I venture to think be abandoned at once and for ever, is any system, if one exists, of indicating the value of a boundary *by the colour* when the uncoloured map contains no indication of such value. To do that is to give in the coloured copy of a map more information (of an important kind too) than in the uncoloured copy, and to double the labour of those who have to examine the boundary question before issuing a map.

If we determine the different symbols of boundary marking by which to indicate the different values to be attached to various lines of boundary, the Surveyor-General can easily determine how in future to indicate by colour those different symbols.

I think I have already in a case† about a map required for the new edition of Aitchison's Treatise asked the Surveyor-General to fill in the topography up about Gilgit. No map should be published of that country that does not show the Baikra Pass.

† C.

25th April 1892.

W. J. C.

"A"—Please see K.-W. No. 2 of Secret F, October 1890, Nos. 141-170. The letter referred to was written on the 21st August 1890.

"B"—Contained in the proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society for February 1892.

"C"—

† To Assistant Surveyor-General in Charge Drawing Office Survey of India Department, No. 906 L., dated the 27th February 1892.

In returning a sample map of Kashmir, we asked‡ the Survey Department if another copy could be prepared with the following modifications:—

"2. It is desirable that the map should include, up to the line of the Hindu Kush on the north-west and the Raskim Valley on the north, the topographical details and the names which are shown in the recently published map of Afghanistan (24-mile = 1 inch), and in Captain Younghusband's (confidential) map for the country on the northern slopes of the Mustagh. But the Karambar and Ishkuman Lakes should be shown as two separate lakes, not as one.

* * * * *

"4. If a map can be sent with the details referred to in the second paragraph inserted, the northern boundary of Kashmir will be marked on it by hand. The map will include the Hunza and Nagar Chiefships, and as much of Chitral westwards as can be shown upon the map enclosed."

No reply received yet.

W. HANRAHAN—3rd May 1892.

W. S.—5th May 1892.

A. We must see Secret F., July 1890, Nos. 225-245, in order to see what was written to the Secretary of State in despatch No. 87 of the 14th July 1890 about the Kashmir-China boundary.

A. Please see paragraph 7 of the despatch, Secret F, July 1890, Nos. 225-245; it says:

"We propose to instruct our Political Officers in the dominions of the Maharaja of Kashmir that they should regard the limits of the watershed as the boundaries of His Highness's territories towards the north, i.e., that the line of natural waterparting from a point near the Irshad Pass on the west to the recognised Tibet frontier on the east should be also the limit of our political jurisdiction."

His intermediate class of 'nominally defined, but not uniformly demarcated boundary' would apply to Sikkim-Tibet. It is a question though whether this sub-division is wanted in Indian maps.

His fourth class, a blank, for uncertain boundaries is what we show by a wavy line of print "boundary undefined."

C. We want the same details on the map of India.

8th May 1892.

W. J. C.

We must now ask for a new proof, showing the boundaries by the three classes of symbols according as they are—

- (1) delimited for which dot dash dot ;
- (2) already published and fairly accepted, but not delimited to be shown by dash dash dash ;
- (3) undefined to be not shown at all.

We must tell him how the north Kashmir boundary is understood to run, and ask for the same details in the Gilgit-Chitral direction as we asked for in the Aitchison Treaty map.

But we must tell him that a reference to the Secretary of State will be necessary before we publish a map, showing boundaries different to that on the 2nd edition of the map of India.

12th May 1892.

W. J. C.

SECRETARY.

I submit a draft letter for consideration. It is a puzzling question to deal with. If we mark by territory within the administration of British India or of Native States in British India, we exclude Chitral, Chilas, Hunza and Nagar, which are more or less self-governing dependencies. But I think this is very undesirable at present. If we show country under our political control throughout, we ought to take the line round the Afridis—or at least the Khyber Afridis, Kurram, the Mahsud Waziris (if not some of the Darwesh Khel too), and we would have a very irregular line and one difficult to define.

In one sense indeed political control would take in Afghanistan, and it must always be difficult to know where to stop, on whatever principle we try to mark the boundary.

7th June 1892.

W. J. C.

Very difficult. We may issue the draft letter.

8th June 1892.

H. M. D.

[Pros.
No. 56.]

[To the Surveyor-General of India, No. 1114-F., dated the 10th June 1892.]

[Pros.
No. 57.]

FROM THE SURVEYOR-GENERAL OF INDIA, NO. 147-S.—S., DATED THE 13TH JUNE 1892.
Acknowledges the receipt of Foreign Department letter No. 1114-F., dated the 10th June, and states that a fresh proof of sheet No. 1 of the 3rd edition of the map of India, prepared as directed in the above letter, will be submitted as early as possible.

For information. No orders.

W. S.—14th June 1892.

15th June 1892.

W. J. C.

EXTERNAL (B) BRANCH.

You require this file with reference to sheet No. 4 of the map of India.

W. S.—17th June 1892.

MR. SCOTT.

When orders* issued lately to the Surveyor-General about boundary markings on the sheet of the third edition of the map of India (1"=32 miles) shewing Burma, we did not return the proof copy. That should be done, and see if we have now to supplement what has been said by telling the Surveyor-General what classes of boundaries are to be shewn upon the eastern sheet.

* Proceedings No. 54.

14th June 1892.

W. J. C.

DEPUTY SECRETARY.

As regards the eastern sheet, we may tell the Surveyor General that the Nepal, Sikkim, and Bhutan boundaries should come under class (1).

North-East Assam is still undefined and may be shown in class (3).

The Burma-China and Burma-Siam (the whole) boundaries may be shown in class (2).

S F—53-65—April