

No 211.

No. 776, dated Gulmarg, the 1st July 1889.

From—COLONEL R. PARRY NISBET, C.I.E., Resident in Kashmir,

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

I HAVE the honour to submit with this a demi-official letter, and its enclosures, from Captain Ramsay, British Joint Commissioner, Leh, dated the 23rd of June, giving some interesting information regarding the Lapchak and other kindred missions which at stated intervals pass between Ladak and Thibet, and *vice versa*.

2. I obtained the papers on which Captain Ramsay has formulated this preliminary report, and promises others, from the Kashmir Durbar, at his request. I think the examination and translation of these papers, with the aid of such a competent assistant as the Reverend Mr. Redslob, of the Moravian Mission, are likely to prove very useful, and I would encourage Captain Ramsay to continue his research, but not with any idea necessarily of following it up by any active or forcible suppression of long standing communications between these northern peoples, unless there was the clearest evidence that such intercourse was politically embarrassing to the Government of India. The point that appears to me most deserving of early consideration in the preliminary report now submitted by Captain Ramsay is that mentioned in the concluding portion of clause (e) of paragraph 13, *viz.*, whether, in the event of the conclusion of a treaty with Thibet on the Sikkim border, a clause might be inserted under which the Thibetans would formally relinquish any claim to political influence over Ladakh, Spiti or any of those northern people subordinate to the British Government or their Feudatories.

3. In conclusion, I fully support Captain Ramsay's request to be allowed to pay the amounts sanctioned in his budget as rewards for intelligence, *viz.*, Rs. 100, in any way that may seem best to him to acknowledge the assistance given by the Reverend Mr. Redslob.

No 212.

[DEMI-OFFICIAL.]

Dated Leh, the 23rd June 1889.

From—CAPTAIN H. RAMSAY,

To—COLONEL R. PARRY NISBET, C.I.E.

I HAVE now got from the Wazir all the papers I want in regard to the Lapchak Mission, and other kindred missions of a semi-political, semi-commercial character, and have made them over to Mr. Redslob, of the Moravian Mission, for translation. There must be over 50 papers, I should think; and, though it will probably not be necessary to send up, with my report, copies of more than a few of these, yet it is essential that each of these papers should be carefully examined, on the chance of its containing information which would be of value to us.

2. The papers are mostly in the best high-flown Thibetan book language, and even Mr. Redslob finds much difficulty in translating them into intelligible English. The translating of the metaphors is the chief trouble. He hopes to have finished the work of examination in a fortnight or three weeks, and he will then give me careful translations of such of them as I may desire. This will probably take another fortnight, so that I shall not be in a position to commence my report till about the beginning of August, by which time I hope to have received through you the Lhasa-Jamu treaty of 1842, asked for in my demi-official of 5th instant.

3. There are, however, certain points in connection with this matter in regard to which it is desirable that I should receive orders before leaving Ladak for the winter, and I therefore now address you demi-officially in regard to them. But first let me dispose of Mr. Redslob. When I gave him the papers to translate, he said that his mission would not allow him personally to receive any remuneration for the work, but that he would, aided by his Lhasa

munshi, translate the papers, and in return accept from the Government of India any donation to the mission funds which it might be thought proper to give him. Under these circumstances, I would ask for sanction to pay him Rs. 100 and to charge the same as "rewards for intelligence," under which head Rs. 100 is available in my budget for the year.

4. So far as I know, the only reports on the Lapchak Mission which have been submitted to the Government of India are those made—

- (1) by Mr. Girdlestone about 1872-73, the gist of which is given in the Kashmir Précis;
- (2) by Captain Strachey in 1851;
- (3) by Mr. Elias, in his memorandum dated 20th September 1880.

None of these officers had seen the original papers connected with the Lapchak. Their opinions were therefore, of necessity, formed only on the strength of such information as the people of Ladak, &c., saw fit to give them. They are consequently of no great weight.

5. The following is a rough outline of the true facts as revealed by the papers.

Every third year, about September, a party, called by us the Lapchak Mission, is despatched from Leh to Lhassa; it halts at certain places *en route*, and reaches its destination about January or February; and again starts for Leh about September, and reaches Leh at the end of the year. The word "Lapchak" has no connection with the words "vakil" or "agent," nor is "Lapchak" the title of the leader for the time being of the party. Moreover, the word is not "Lapchak" but "Lochak," the former being an evident corruption of the latter word, which frequently occurs in the papers connected with the case.

The word "Lo" means "year," and "Chak", which stands for "Chak-bbul", means "salaam" or "nazar" or "adoration" or "votive offering."

The leader of the party at Lhassa is called the "Lochakpa" (Lochak-wallah) or Lochak mu sna (Lochak messenger).

6. Before starting from Leh, the leader of the party (who must be a Thibetan apparently, though the papers afford no information on the point) is given, by the Wazir of Ladak, certain *murasilaks*, or complimentary letters, addressed to the chief men of Lhassa and the intervening country, each letter being accompanied by certain customary gifts of small value. There is a regular stereotyped form for these letters. The replies to them call for no remark, except as regards two replies from the Chinese Ambans at Lhassa. These are most insolent, and copies are herewith forwarded for information.

7. The Wazir of Ladak also gives the Lapchak leader the following articles unaccompanied by any letter, for delivery to the Deva Jung's treasurer (*i.e.*, to the State Treasurer) at Lhassa, *viz.*, one *khatak* or complimentary scarf, worth from one to three rupees; ten bags of gold dust, each bag containing a *chilki* rupees weight of gold dust, value Rs. 80 to 100; 1½ lbs. of saffron, value Rs. 60; four pieces of coloured *pattu*, value Rs. 24; one or two pieces of coloured cotton cloth, value Rs. 4. For these articles the Lhassa Treasurer gives a formal receipt. This receipt is *the* important document. A translation of it, with full explanatory notes, is herewith forwarded.*

* Marked A.

The translation and notes, which have been worked out most carefully, deserve attentive consideration. I shall refer to this later on.

8. Having got all the above-mentioned letters, &c., from the Wazir of Ladak, the Lapchak leader gets from the Wazir's office a "lamik" or "rahdari" or "pass," and then starts on his journey. Some two years ago I heard that the Lhassa authorities ignored the Wazir of Ladak and would never recognise his "lamik" as sufficient authority for any person to enter Lhassa territory,

but that they admitted the right of the ex-Raja of Ladak to grant such "passes," and required every person coming from Ladak to Lhasa territory to obtain a "lamik" from the ex-Raja issued under his seal, without reference to, and without the cognisance of, the Wazir of Ladak. I then made enquiries from different people, and of the persons I asked no one (except Pandit Radha Kishen, the then Wazir) denied that the ex-Raja granted passes; some said they did not know; most of them said that they had heard that he did so, and one man of this country, whom I will call B, said most distinctly that he knew for a fact that the Lhasa people did not recognise the "lamiks" issued by the Wizarat, but did recognise those issued by the ex-Raja, and that consequently the Lapchak, in common with other persons, was allowed to enter Lhasa territory only on the strength of a pass obtained from the ex-Raja of Ladak. Last year B told me the same story, but this year, after a certain amount of stir and excitement had been caused by the call for, and collection of, all papers connected with the Lapchak Mission, both from the Wizarat and the ex-Raja of Ladak, B came up and spontaneously told me that the ex-Raja gave no passes, and was not recognised in any way at Lhasa. Whether B remembered what he had told me before I cannot say; I did not ask him. The result of his communication was only to convince me of the truth of his former statement, and that he had been "put up" to come and tell the fresh tale.

9. But to return to the narrative. After obtaining his Wizarat "rahdari" the head of the Lapchak Mission leaves Leh and goes to Stok, a village about eight miles from Leh and just off the road to Lhasa. This village was given to the ex-Raja of Ladak by Maharaja Golab Singh, and here it is that the present ex-Raja lives. The ex-Raja then gives him certain letters and small presents for some of the leading personages in the Lhasa country. These, like the Wizarat letters, are matters of routine, and so are the replies brought back from Lhasa. Whether any secret correspondence passes I do not know, but I have no reason to think that it does. I feel pretty sure that before leaving Stok a "lamik" is obtained from the ex-Raja.

10. After leaving Stok the Lapchak leader marches on some five miles further to Matho, the residence of the uncle of the ex-Raja. The Matho Raja gives him a few letters for Lhasa, but he does not write to any of the headmen there. After this the Lapchak leader makes his final start, and does not halt again in Ladak.

11. I have made no mention of the commercial part of the Lapchak leader's duties, as that part of the question does not affect the points which I now wish to bring to your notice; but I may mention that the Tartars have to supply him, free of charge, not only with some 300 yaks, but with grain, grass, food, tents and servants all the way to Lhasa. This arrangement, of course, leaves a large margin for profit; but it is most unfair on the unfortunate Tartars and is vicious in principle. At Lhasa he receives "rasad" for himself and party, and on return to Ladak he also gets "rasad," I think. When he goes to Kashmir to settle accounts he gets "rasad" for himself and 25 men during his whole stay away from Ladak.

12. The above description will enable you to understand the general position. The questions I wish to present for consideration are—

- (a) What is the origin of this triennial Lapchak Mission?
- (b) Is it based on political considerations?
- (c) In what light is it regarded by the Lhasa authorities?
- (d) Do the Lhasa authorities recognise the true relative positions in Ladak of the Wazir as representing the Kashmir Darbar, and the ex-Raja as representing the old Kings of the country?
- (e) Is it advisable to interfere in the matter of the Lapchak Mission; and, if so, in what manner?
- (f) Can the correspondence which passes between the ex-Raja and the Lhasa authorities be regarded as non-political; if not, should it be put a stop to; if so, how?

- (g) Having regard to the provisions of Article V of the treaty of 16th March 1846 and to the position of the Kashmir State as a feudatory of the British Government, is it fitting that communications of a political nature should be allowed to pass between Leh and Lhasa ?

13. The opinion I have arrived at in regard to these several questions is as follows :—

- (a) The Lapchak Mission is admitted by all to be an institution of long standing, but the papers at my disposal do not show how or when it was originated. It doubtless dates from a time prior to the Dogra conquest of Ladak, and I think it highly probable that in the treaty concluded in 1842, between the Lhasa and the Jamu representatives, or in some supplementary agreements connected therewith, provision was made for its continuance. Probably no particular mention was made of the Lapchak ; but it was agreed that the Lhasa authorities would not interfere on behalf of the newly conquered Ladakis, on condition that the Dogras did not interfere with the existing arrangements of Ladak, in so far as they concerned Lhasa. On page 264 of the Gulabnamah a Persian version of the treaty of 1842 is given, and I herewith forward a translation thereof.* This Gulabnamah version of the treaty is suspiciously vague, and has probably been “cooked” to suit the Jamu taste.
- * Marked B.
- (b) It is certainly based on non-commercial considerations, and was probably instituted as a means of making the payment to the Deva Jung’s treasurer of the articles for which a formal receipt is granted as above stated ; but whether this payment is made to Lhasa in acknowledgment of political subjection, or to the Deva Jung as the head of the Buddhist Faith, is not clear. I never heard the latter view suggested by any person, and I therefore think that the *raison d’être* of the Lapchak is to convey “tribute” to Lhasa. Similar “Lapchaks” are sent from Nipal and certain monasteries in Lhasa territory. All meet at Lhasa, and are all received at once by the Deva Jung in darbar on a certain day—the Thibetan New Years’ Day I think it is, but I am not at all sure. The commercial part of the business was probably merely tacked on as affording a convenient method of replenishing the coffers of the Ladak and Lhasa authorities at the cost of the people, who have to supply the carriage, &c., for the Lapchak and his goods, and of maintaining a friendly and unofficial intercourse between the two countries.
- (c) The payment for which the Deva Jung’s treasurer gives a receipt (*vide* enclosure A) is for “stipulated tribute,” paid in accordance with some treaty or other deed, under which such payment is compulsory. The wording of the receipt proves that the Lhasa authorities regard the Ladakh authorities as their inferior, if not as their subjects ; and it may be presumed that they regard the Lapchak Mission as being officially sent from Ladak with the express object of formally paying the “stipulated tribute.” The letters and presents to the Lhasa authorities and the two Chinese Ambans, though probably despatched in accordance with treaty or rule, may be regarded as complimentary official communications, though in one of the letters from the Ambans (*vide* enclosure C) a word is used which signifies that the presents made are “compulsory” or “treaty presents.” The commercial part of the business is probably regarded as unofficial and unconnected with politics.
- (d) The Lhasa letters have no formal heading—“From so and so—To so and so,” neither have they the writers’ names signed at the bottom ; while the seal which is affixed is, in the case of the Thibetan seals at any rate, only a mark, not a name. The large red seals, which we

take to be Chinese seals, may be anything ; no one here understands them. It is therefore difficult to say who the writers are, or for whom the letters are intended ; but, accepting as correct the information on this point obtained by the Wazir from his Tibetan officials, it is clear that the Kashmir representative is not properly recognised at Lhasa. I have before me two letters received by the Wazir from the Deva Jung ; there is nothing inside them to show to whom they are addressed, but outside is written the address “ Ngāris Māng yool gyee sā skiong wā,” *i. e.*, the Earth Protector (or Ruler or King) of Māng yool (Ladak) in Ngāris (the Lhasa name for Western Tibet and including Ladak, Rudok, Gugey, Chomorti, &c.).

In a letter, also before me, from the Deva Jung to the ex-Raja of Ladak, the very same words of address are used. All three letters are complimentary, and are couched in almost identical terms, but are evidently addressed by a superior to an inferior. Again, in the letter (stereotyped form) which the Wazir sends to the Deva Jung, there is no heading and no ending to show that the writer is the Kashmir representative. The Wazir's letter is really a “ petition,” written in most humble language, in exactly the terms which any Tibetan would use when addressing the Deva Jung. Whether the Wazir signs or seals it I do not know. In it no mention is made of “ the Wazir” or “ the Kashmir Darbar” or “ the Maharaja,” but it is mentioned that the writer is busy with the affairs of the “ Sri Sirkar.” In Lhasa this is no doubt interpreted to mean “ the Deva Jung.” The two letters from the Chinese

* Marked C. D.

Ambans, of which translations* are attached, were certainly intended for the Wazir, for he is the only person who writes to the Ambans. In both of these the Ambans style him the “ Sāchōdpā ” of Ladakh, *i. e.*, the man in usufructuary possession of (or using) Ladakh.

The tone of both letters is arrogant and overbearing, while one of them is grossly insulting ; but, as I have made marginal notes on the translations, I need not say more about them here, except that their insolence and the rejection of the Wazir's gifts are very likely attributable to the fact that the Wazir had no business to address the Ambans at all. In 1886 or 1887, I remember perfectly distinctly Pandit Radha Kishen, who was then Wazir of Ladakh, told me that the Chinese authorities at Lhasa did not recognise him, and that they had refused gifts which he had sent them by the hands of the Lapchak.

On the whole I think that we may safely say that the position is this. The Lhasa authorities refuse to officially recognise that Ladak now belongs to the Kashmir State, and the Kashmir authorities, in return for the assent given by the Lhasa authorities to their “ using ” Ladak, consent to be ignored.

Very probably the true facts of the case have never been made known to any of the Jamu rulers, but the above is the existing position as accepted and brought about, by the Maharaja's representatives in Ladak. In confirmation of the above view I may add that there are two letters from the “ Pāuchen Rinpōchey,” the “ Incarnation ” at the head of the famous Tāshi Lunpo Monastery, to the address of the Wazir ; but this writer, not being a member of the Lhasa Government, addresses in the one case “ To the Thanadar Johnson Sahib, the Noble ;” and in the other “ To the Maharaja Bir Singh's Clever Minister, the Holy Johnson Sahib, the Noble.”

I think this shows that, as a matter of fact, the actual position of the Wazir of Ladak is perfectly well understood at Lhasa, but that for political reasons it is deemed best to utterly ignore him, except to the limited extent of receiving from, and sending to, him certain *murasilahs* and complimentary gifts, but always addressed to him in vague terms as “ the protector ” or “ usufructuary possessor ” of Ladak.

e) The decision of the question as to the expediency of interfering with the Lapchak institution rests upon considerations which are better known at Simla than here. From a purely local point of view it should be stopped, and could be stopped. The headmen of the country and the Lamas would grumble and disapprove highly of any such interference, but no internal disturbances of any kind need be anticipated. The zamindars would, of course, though silently, rejoice at being relieved from much "beygar". The next mission is due to leave Leh in September 1890; but, as large purchases of goods have to be made in anticipation, any decision which may be arrived at, if prohibiting its continuance, should be made known at least six months before that time. If the Lapchak Mission is abolished, it follows that the Darbar will refuse to supply "beygar" for the Lhasa "Chaba Mission," described by Mr. Girdlestone (*vide* Kashmir Précis) as "yearly kafilah from Lhasa," &c., &c. The Lapchak is the kafilah sent by the Ladak authorities, while the Chaba is its counterpart (as regards commerce only) sent by the Lhasa authorities.

The people here think that, if Ladak refused to continue to observe the existing arrangements, the Chinese and Lhasa people would take steps to enforce their observance.

From the Lhasa point of view, and supposing that the arrangements for the payment of the "stipulated tribute" are all in accordance with agreements entered into by the Dogras, or more probably by the old Ladak Rajas, the Lhasa people would *prima facie* be justified in enforcing payment, if they could!! From our point of view, however, the case bears a very different aspect; for, in the first place, it is incompatible with our dignity as a leading Power that the petty State of Lhasa should treat Ladak, which by right of conquest belongs to one of our Indian feudatory chiefs, as being politically subordinate to Lhasa; and, in the second place, if we are to be guided by book, we are entitled to disregard any of the old treaties between Ladak and Lhasa. For the international law on this point, please see Wheaton, Chapter 2, page 52 (edition of 1864). It is there laid down that treaties, whether real or personal, remain in force "so long as the nation exists as an independent State." In the case in point, neither Ladak or Jamu now exist as independent States; therefore the Lhasa treaties are not binding on us as the Paramount Power in Ladak. There is an exception to the above rule, but it is unlikely that the treaties between Leh and Lhasa would come within its scope. For my own part, I think it exceedingly probable that the Lhasa people would take steps to compel the payment of the "stipulated tribute," unless they were clearly given to understand that the Government of India would assist Ladak and would punish the Lhasa people, either by the inexpensive method of annexing the country between Ladak and the Mansarwar Lake or in such other way as might be deemed expedient.

Just now we have the Lhasa people treating with us about Sikkim. Surely it might be arranged to insert a clause in the treaty, which we shall sooner or later conclude, that Lhasa relinquishes all claim to, or rights in connection with, any country which is politically subordinate to the British Government.

(f) The reason for the interchange of presents and complimentary letters between the representative of the old Ladak Kings and the Lhasa authorities is certainly "political." It cannot be "personal," as the Stok Raja (the title now borne by the head of the old ruling family) has never been to Lhasa and does not know the Lhasa officials.

Nor can it be "commercial," for no merchandise is sent by him to Lhasa with his presents and complimentary letters. I feel sure that the Lhasa authorities, though aware of the Dogra conquest of Ladak,

decline to officially recognize that fact, and persist in considering that, so far as they are concerned, the old Ladak Giälpös are still ruling the country. In support of this view I would refer to facts above stated, *viz.*, that the letters sent from Lhasa to the ex-Raja are addressed "to the Protector of Mäug yool" (which is exactly the form of address used by them for the Wazir), and that there is a very strong suspicion that the passports enabling persons to enter Lhasa territory are issued by the Stok Raja, while those issued by the Kashmir representative are of no avail. The necessity for putting a stop to this playing at kings depends chiefly upon the position we hold at Lhasa.

If we are to have a Resident there and dominate the country, it matters little what the Stok Raja does; but if Lhasa is to maintain its habitual independent, semi-hostile attitude, then I think it is very desirable to remove the Stok Raja from this country.

The present Stok Raja is a youth of 25 or so; he has been married some years, but has never had any children, so probably he never will have any. In himself, he is a weak, timid, harmless creature, but he is regarded by all the people with the greatest reverence, and can undoubtedly be made use of, for political purposes, by the more able among the leading men of the country.

He is in possession of a jagir (the Stok village), nominally worth Rs. 1,212 a year, and he also gets a cash allowance of 500 chilke rupees per annum. It is considered that the jagir and cash allowance bring him in about Rs. 1,200 a year; his expenses must be more than 100 per mensem, but I do not know where the rest of the money comes from.

So long as he remains in this country, he may, for all we know, continue to grant passports for Lhasa, and otherwise play at being king, so far as Lhasa is concerned, for none of the people of the country, whether Mahomedans or Buddhists, would tell tales against him, and without their aid the Darbar cannot hope to find out what is going on in such matters.

A stronger reason for his removal from Ladak is to be found in the fact that if he, together with the three or four now surviving members of the old Royal Family (*viz.*, the half uncle of the Stok Raja, his wife, son, son's wife, and grandchild), were deported, the Lhasa people would have no one, except the Wazir of Ladak, whom they could regard as ruler of this country.

If the Stok Raja is to be moved, the Darbar should treat him liberally, give him (say) Rs. 300 per mensem, and let him live in Kashmir; or, if that is too hot for him, he might retire to the high lying portions of Gurhwal, and draw his allowance through our Assistant Commissioner of Gurhwal.

If the Stok Raja is to be moved, I would also move the other members of his family, and let them all go and live together, if they please. They are quite harmless, but their connection with Ladak should be severed till such time as the Lhasa people fully recognize the existing state of affairs in Ladak.

In connection with this, I may mention that during the winter there are two festivals here, known as Losir and Dosmoche, during which the Stok Raja is treated as King of Ladak. He is dressed in royal robes; all the Lamas and people come to salaam and be fed, and he makes a sort of royal progress in the vicinity of Leh. I attach no importance to this, as it is a purely local affair, though tidings thereof may perhaps reach Lhasa. But the present Wazir thinks it a most unfitting display, and he is asking the Kashmir Council to obviate the necessity for giving direct orders for its discontinuance by ordering the Stok Raja to come down, for the next year or two, during the winter, to make his salaam to the Maharaja.

(g) The last point is as to the propriety of allowing the Kashmir representative in Ladak to correspond with the Lhasa authorities and, I might add, with the Yarkhand authorities.

It seems to me, as Kashmir territory is in State matters, so far as all Foreign States are concerned, British territory, and as the Kashmir Darbar is not permitted to have dealings with Foreign States, that the Wazir of Ladak is placed in a false position. He ought not to correspond with trans-frontier officials, and yet circumstances may arise, and have arisen (*e.g.*, the Dalglish murder case, when the Wazir wrote to the Amban of Yarkhand), when, in the absence of any British officer, it is necessary for him to do so.

There are two remedies for this: one is, to keep a British Political Officer at Leh all the year round, and at the same time prohibit the Darbar representative from having any quasi-political dealings with persons not subjects of the Kashmir Darbar. The other is to arrange with the Darbar for a British Administration of Ladak. The latter is the better measure, and might with advantage be extended to the entire frontier, from Spiti to the Gilgit frontier.

P. S.—If you send these papers on to the Government of India, may I ask you to send them in original, as the numerous Thibetan words are likely to get mutilated in the copying.

21.

A.

Receipt given by the Treasurer of the Deva Jung, at Lhasa, to the Leader of the triennial Ladak Lapchak Mission.

“From the Ladak Lochakpa⁽¹⁾, the Kalon Tses Pal—of the water-monkey year, the stipulated⁽²⁾ tribute⁽³⁾ 1 khatak⁽⁴⁾ gold, 10 zho and 12 sewa full weight⁽⁵⁾ saffron, 10 thoorszang⁽⁶⁾ full weight, Ladak coloured pattu 4 pieces, red kharoo⁽⁷⁾ 1 piece, karas⁽⁸⁾ large (or good) 1 piece. These presents⁽⁹⁾ have arrived. In the revenue register⁽¹⁰⁾ (or office) a memorandum has been entered that payment in full⁽¹¹⁾ has been made. Water-monkey year, 2nd month 15th day⁽¹²⁾.”

(Sd.) THIBETAN SEAL,

Said to be that of Deva Gung's Treasurer.

Note.—The receipt has no formal heading, but I see no reason for doubting that it is issued by the Deva Jung's treasurer; but whether it is granted to the Lapchak leader as representing the Kashmir Darbar, or as representing the ex-Raja of Ladak, is doubtful at Lhasa. It is probably considered sufficient that he should come, with the usual Ladak presents, without regard to the question as to the authority by whom he is sent. The Lapchak, or to be more accurate the Lochak, Mission goes to Lhasa only every third year; the “stipulated tribute” must therefore be payable not yearly, but every third year; otherwise this receipt could not have been given in its present form.

Explanation of Thibetan words used in the Receipt.

- (1) The word “Lo” means “year” and “chak” apparently stands for “chakphul,” which means “low” or “nazar,” and “pa” is equivalent to the Hindustani “wallah.” The words “Ladak Lochakpa” means therefore “the Ladak yearly-nazar-man.”
- (2) The word “Driks” mean “arranged.”
- (3) The word “Bap” means “tax.” In Ladak it is used to mean only one kind of tax, *viz.*, the *land tax* or “Muamla.”
- (4) A Thibetan gentleman when calling on another presents a “khatak” or scarf of salutation; it is made of fine muslin or silk, and measures from 5 to 10 feet, and is worth about 3 rupees.
- (5) The Lapchak leader presents 10 bags, each containing a chilki rupee weight of gold dust. The total value would be from Rs. 80 to Rs. 100.
- (6) The weight of saffron sent is 12 chitaks, value Rs. 60.
- (7) The coarse red cotton fabric known in India as “kharwa.”
- (8) The coarse white cotton cloth called in India “garha.”
- (9) The word used is “chakbhul:” “chak” means “hand” and “bhul ches” means to “bow.” “Chakbhul” means either the low “bow of salutation” made by an inferior to a superior, or the “nazar” or “complimentary gift” of an inferior to a superior, or “adoration” such as that performed by Thibetans before their idols, or “votive offering” as presented at a shrine, &c. It might also possibly mean “complimentary gift” as between persons of equal rank. The gift of superior to an inferior is called “staks.”
- (10) The words used are “bap, dep.” The word “bap,” as above explained means “tax,” while “dep” means “register” or “office.” In Jaschke's Dictionary it is stated that “dep” is a Thibetanized form of the Persian word “daftar.”
- (11) The words used are “Tshang dzin:” “Tshang” or “Tshangma” means “all”, and “dzin” means “bond” or “written agreement.” The technical term for “receipt in full” on account of a payment due under the terms of some written bond, agreement, &c., is “tahang dzin.”
- (12) Corresponding to the 30th of May 1871, but I think 1870 is the year intended, for the Lochak went in 1869 and returned in 1870.

Leh,

The 18th June 1889.

H. RAMSAY, Captain,

British Joint Commissioner.

No 214.

B.

Translation of the Treaty of 1842 between the Darbar and Lhasa people—*vide* Ghulabnamah, page 264.

WHEREAS we, the officers of the Lhasa country, *viz.*, firstly, Kalon Sukanwala, and, secondly, Bakhshi Sapju, Commander of the Forces of the Emperor of China, on one hand, and Diwan Hari Chand and Wazir Ratnu, on the side of Raja Ghulab Singh, on the other, agree together and swear before God that the friendship, &c., between Raja Ghulab Singh and the Emperor of China and the Lama Guru Sahib Lhasa-wallah will be kept and observed till eternity; no disregard will be shown to anything agreed upon in the presence of God; and we will have nothing to do with the countries bordering on the frontier of Ladak. We will carry on the trade in Shawl, Pasham and Tea as before, by way of Ladak; and if any one of the Sri Raja's enemies comes to our territories and says anything against the Raja, we will not listen to him, and will not allow him to remain in our country; and whatever traders come from Ladak shall experience no difficulty from our side. We will not act otherwise but in the same manner as it has been prescribed in this meeting regarding the fixing of the Ladak frontier and the keeping open of the road for the traffic in Shawl, Pasham and Tea. We will observe our pledge to God, Gaitri and Pasi. Wazir Mian Khushal Chu is witness.

Written on the 2nd day of Asuh 1899 (about) July 1842.

No 215.

C.

Translation of a letter from the two Chinese Ambans at Lhasa, to the Wazir of Ladak.

To the Man in Usufructuary Possession⁽¹⁾ of Ladak.

Just as Poorootherang la nin tin nga pa too gloo⁽²⁾, the Deputy of the Emperor of China, and Ruling Minister and Resident at Lhasa, had attained the rank of Amban, so (now) we, the two Ambans, send orders.

Let the Man in Usufructuary Possession of Ladak know this, that by this channel⁽³⁾ the supplication⁽⁴⁾ from you, the Man in Usufructuary Possession, has reached (us), and the presents which you⁽⁵⁾ have to make⁽⁶⁾ yearly to both of us, both great Ministers, have arrived, (and are) as stated in your letter.

But (the bearer thereof) earnestly represents that the distance (to Lhasa) is very great, and that you presented (the gifts) with great reverence and with a simple heart, and for this reason only we do not wish to make any further ado about the matter⁽⁷⁾.

One load of dried apricots you may consider as accepted by us, but we return to you the bale of cotton cloth⁽⁸⁾.

By the same channel we send in return to you, the Man in Possession, a gift⁽⁹⁾, and have sent two pieces of cloth and two scarfs of salutation, flinging them away⁽¹⁰⁾ from our side to you, and you must receive them immediately into your account⁽¹¹⁾.

Keep it always in your mind that you, as well as you can, must guide the zemindars under your power, and that you must keep peace with the surrounding petty kings, and live on friendly terms; this is most important.

Referring to this, you must bear in mind that you, the Man in Usufructuary Possession, have to write a letter (to us).

(We) the above-mentioned, to whom you were supplicating, the 11th on the throne (or in the 11th year of the present reign) in the wood-bird year, 2nd month, 4th day⁽¹²⁾.

(Sd.) RED CHINESE SEAL.

Explanatory Notes.

(1) Sa chod pa is the word used.
Sa = earth or land.
Chod = enjoy or use.
Pa = the Hindustani "walla."
Hence "the man in possession."

- (*) The name of the Chinese officer who subdued the Lhasa people and brought them under Chinese rule.
 (*) *i.e.*, by the Lapchak man.
 (*) Nianzho is the word. Nian is the big word for "ear" and zho is "petition." The meaning is "the humble petition made to the ear of the big man."
 (*) Kiotrang is the word used; it is like the Hindustani "tum" and very impolite. Ngirang, corresponding to "ap," is the word he should have used.
 (*) Charchan is the word; it means a gift made not voluntarily, but under compulsion or under treaty, &c.
 (*) Apparently the Ambans were angry either because the presents had been offered contrary to precedent or because they did not reach in proper time.
 (*) "Chir lok" means "returned;" it of course means "we refuse to accept it."
 (*) "Solras" is the word used. The present of a God or King might be spoken of, by the humble recipient, as "Solras." But for the giver to term his present "Solras" is an insult to the recipient.
 (*) Zar solingwa. The meaning is—we do not give to you politely, but we throw it away from us, on one side, for you to take.
 (*) I suppose this means "you must not venture to refuse to accept them."
 (*) Corresponding with about 1st March 1884.

No 216.

D.

Translation of a letter from the two Chinese Ambans at Lhasa, to the Wazir of Ladak.

To the Man in Usufructuary Possession of Ladak, from the Emperor's Representatives, Resident at Lhasa, the Officiating Great Minister Sung, the Amban, and the Representative Lhasa Resident, the Assistant Great Minister Gin, the Amban. They both order as follows:—

All the things which you, the man in Usufructuary Possession, have sent to us, both Great Ministers, by the hand of the messenger sent for that purpose have arrived, and may be considered as accepted, but we take them not in our account (1).

In the same way we make a return present (2) to you, the Man in Usufructuary Possession of Ladak, *viz.*, two pieces of cloth, and two complimentary scarfs, flinging them away, from our side to you.

You must take these into your account instantly.(3)

* * * * * (4)

No date.

Explanatory Notes.

- (1) This probably means "We won't insult you by returning them, but we decline to receive them into our keeping."
 (2) Solras; see note to Enclosure C.
 (3) See note to Enclosure C.
 (4) The letter ends just as in Enclosure C.