



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

A Minority in Perennial Opposition: A Mixed-Methods Analysis of Political Discourse in the House of Commons in the Wake of the Indian Mutiny

Braake, Mark te

Citation

Braake, M. te. (2022). *A Minority in Perennial Opposition: A Mixed-Methods Analysis of Political Discourse in the House of Commons in the Wake of the Indian Mutiny*.

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [License to inclusion and publication of a Bachelor or Master thesis in the Leiden University Student Repository](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3454180>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

A Minority in Perennial Opposition:

A mixed-methods analysis of political discourse in the House of Commons in
the wake of the Indian Mutiny

Name: Mark te Braake
Student number: s2997436
Date : 29-06-2022
Master: Politics Culture and
National Identity: 1789 to the
present
Supervisor: Dr. L.P.F. Laborie

Faculty: Humanities

Leiden University

Wordcount: 19435

Table of contents.

Introduction - 3

Chapter 1: Literature review - 3

- Post-colonial framework - 6
- Mutiny literature - 8

Chapter 2: Database Analysis - 13

- General results - 15
- Party politics and stance on policy - 15
- Party politics and mention of atrocities - 19

Chapter 3: Individual Source Analysis – 23

Conclusion: - 32

Bibliography - 34

Appendix - 37

Introduction

The nineteenth century saw the transformation of Britain from one of the great European powers into arguably the premier global power. A multi-continent spanning empire that governed hundreds of millions of souls and upon which the proverbial sun never set. A key element of this transformation into a truly global empire was the transferral of power over its Indian dominions from a 'double-government', which included the East India Company, to the custodianship of the British Crown in 1858. This development made Queen Victoria the sovereign ruler of much of the Indian subcontinent. This momentous change in the government of 'the jewel in the British Crown' came after Britain narrowly avoided disaster in an unforeseen uprising of Indian soldiers in British employ, often referred to as the Indian Mutiny, a year earlier in May 1857.¹ The uprising started in the Northern city of Meerut, apocryphally after a dispute regarding animal grease used in gunpowder cartridges, from where mutinous sepoys marched on Delhi.² In Delhi, the rebellious sepoys forcibly crowned Bahadur Shah Zafar, last figurehead of the Mughal Empire, Emperor of India. The uprising spread, mostly in Northern and Central India, with Delhi, Cawnpore, Lucknow and Jhansi as the most important hotbeds of sedition. However, the rebellious Indian factions never managed to form a united front, and individually lacked the strength to truly challenge British power. A year later, in June 1858, the rebellion was crushed in Gwalior, modern day Madhya Pradesh in central India.³ However, the information delay between India and England meant that when hostilities broke out, English leadership was unsure about its severity or outcome for weeks. At that moment, it seemed wholly reasonable to assume India, the jewel in the English crown, was lost.

No less than the subsequent transferral of power from the double-government to the British Crown, the Mutiny itself was viewed as an epoch-defining event, both by contemporaries and later writers.⁴ This crisis on the colonial front played out after a decade of political turmoil in England. 1848 had marked the Springtime of the Peoples in Europe, and although England had avoided revolution, tensions had risen high. Mutual resentment regarding the infamous protectionist Corn Laws had run so deep on all sides of the political spectrum, that the spectre of civil war had haunted England. A series of unsuccessfully executed or entirely unwanted foreign wars (the Crimean War which started in October 1853 and was concluded in February 1856, the Second Opium War which started in October 1856 and would run on until October 1860 and the Anglo-Persian War which started in November 1856 and would conclude in April 1857) had made parliament wary of being coerced into further foreign adventurism. Although the ripples of the 1840's had largely dissipated, one new feature would not be shed so easily: the reawakening of fierce party politics. Although political parties had existed before, the general feeling had been that any cabinet minister, and to a lesser extent parliamentarian, was a King's man first, and a party man second. Recent political animosity and Royal failure had changed that. The Indian Mutiny and its fallout was to be dealt with by a deeply entrenched parliament and highly politicized body of government.⁵

Many contemporary accounts of the uprising focussed on the atrocities committed by the disgruntled Indian sepoys at the start of the conflict, with specific narrative focus on the killing of white women and children. The murder of innocent British nationals by racially stereotyped dark-skinned mutineers formed a powerful image, which culminated in the often evoked symbol of the 'well at Cawnpore', where the bodies of the victims were dumped only to be discovered by

¹ The name the Indian Mutiny is a highly debated one, with Indian nationalist historians insisting on its revolutionary, nationalist character whilst other historians point to the lack of internal cohesion of the rebellion. Due to its frequent use in both my primary and secondary sources, I have decided to use the term Indian Mutiny in order to keep the contents of this paper as simple and intelligible as possible, without taking a stance on the broader matter of the nomenclature.

² Sepoy was the term used to describe Indian soldiers in the employ of European powers. The term is still used as a rank similar to 'private' in Nepal, India and Pakistan.

³ Christopher Herbert, *War of No Pity*, (Princeton University Press, 2008), 15.

⁴ Herbert, *War of no pity*, 1.

⁵ George Kitson Clark, *The Making of Victorian England*, (London, 1962), 207.

reconquering East India Company soldiers.⁶ The succeeding years saw less sensationalist, albeit jingoist, scholarly works like John William Kaye's three volume *A History of the Sepoy War in India*, Charles Ball's two volume *A History of the Indian Mutiny* and G.B. Malleeson's *The Mutiny of the Bengal Army* published side-by-side with deeply sensationalist works such as John Cave-Browne's *The Punjab and Delhi in 1857* and John Edward Wharton Rotton's *The Chaplain's Narrative of the Siege of Delhi*.⁷ Cave-Browne and Rotton served grotesque tales of Sepoy cruelty towards defenceless white women and children and painted the ensuing British crackdown with the brush of divine retribution. British soldiers were cast as soldiers of Christ, white casualties as martyrs. These sensationalist narratives gained credence with the information-starved British public through their first-hand account status. The public image in England of the events in India became a conflation of fact and fiction with a strong focus on firstly British victimhood in losing control of the Bengal army to traitorous sepoys and secondly British heroism in regaining it.

Variations on this nationalist narrative remained more or less the norm in British mutiny literature until after the Second World War. Then, as the hegemonic power balance shifted from the colonially-minded British Empire to the staunchly anti-colonial United States, so too did academic discourse slowly shift into a new paradigm. Decolonisation called for new academic tools to interpret a quickly changing reality. The early 60's saw the publication of Frantz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth*, one of the earliest and most-influential post-colonial publications.⁸ Fanon's theories focussed on the psychological aspects of colonialism and contained sharp criticisms of nationalism and imperialism, offering an intellectual counterweight to centuries of European colonial history. The following decade saw the watershed publication of Edward Said's *Orientalism*.⁹ Influenced by the simultaneous rise to prominence of post-modernist theories, *Orientalism* is a Foucauldian-inflected analysis of the power-relation between the Occident and the Orient, as expressed through centuries of written (scholarly-) work. He discerns a trend in European writing of methodical reduction of the near-Orient to a system of self-referencing, static, stereotypical concepts (the sensual East, the wisdom of the East, the excitable Arab). The 90's saw the publication of Homi K. Bhabha's *The Location of Culture*, a continuation of Said's efforts in creating the intellectual framework of a post-colonial school of scholarship.¹⁰ He was essential in further providing the discipline with interpretative tools through the introduction of concepts like *hybridity*, *mimicry* and *liminality* to describe the cultural and psychological impact of colonisation. The increasing influence of post-colonial theories, especially Said's work, coupled with postmodern notions of disassembling historical metanarratives inspired new generations of scholars to reassess centuries of colonial European history.

The shifting of the paradigm in the humanities to a more mainstream acceptance of post-colonial theories has unequivocally led to the reassessment of the relationship between England and its former Indian colonies. The imperial relationship between coloniser and colonised is reinterpreted through the critical lens of colonialism and imperialism in publications like Catherine Hall and Sonya O. Rose's *At Home With the Empire*, C.A. Bayly's *Indian Society and the Making of the British*

⁶ Modern day Kanpur in upper-central India.

⁷ George Bruce Malleeson, *The Mutiny of the Bengal army: an historical narrative*, (Bosworth and Harrison, 1858), Charles Ball, *The History of the Indian Mutiny: Giving a Detailed Account of the Sepoy Insurrection in India: And a Concise History of the Great Military Events which Have Tended to Consolidate British Empire in Hindostan*, (London Printing and Publishing Company, 1858), John William Kaye, *A History of the Sepoy War in India, 1857-58*, (Longmans, Green and Company, 1866), George Otto Trevelyan, *Cawnpore*, (London, Macmillan, 1886), John Cave-Browne, *The Punjab and Delhi in 1857: Being a Narrative of the Measures by which the Punjab was Saved and Delhi Recovered during the Indian Mutiny*, (William Blackwood and Sons, 1861), John Edward Wharton Rotton, *The Chaplain's Narrative of the Siege of Delhi: From the Outbreak at Meerut to the Capture of Delhi*, (Smith, Elder, 1858).

⁸ Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, Trans. Richard Philcox, (New York: Grove Press, 2004).

⁹ Edward Said, *Orientalism*, (New York: Pantheon, 1978).

¹⁰ Homi K. Bhabha, *The location of culture*, (Routledge, 1994).

Empire and James Trafford's *The Empire At Home*.¹¹ These works represent a shift in emphasis in imperial studies from the coloniser to the colonised. Studies that still focus on the coloniser now often seek to turn traditional historical approaches on its head and instead portray how the colonial periphery influenced the centre. Imperial historians have decisively shifted away from the study of domestic politics, and towards a more culture-oriented version of Victorian studies. Although Victorian studies as a field has been admirably quick to adapt to the exciting new methods and ideas that post-colonialism presented, its wholehearted embrace of a culture and language-oriented approach has led to the relative neglect of other new and interesting methodologies. For example, the use of digital humanities and quantitative methods have been largely absent from the study of the Indian Mutiny. An integration of such methods, I believe, could still offer new and interesting perspectives on Victorian England's political reality.

Post-colonialism and postmodernism have been immensely important developments in the field of the humanities. The cross-disciplinary influence of post-colonial theory over the last half century is hard to overstate. The works of Frantz Fanon, Edward Said and Homi K. Bhabha have influenced the reconstruction of traditional historical practice, and the deconstruction of nationalist historical narratives. However, in this thesis I will formulate a cautious critique of the post-colonial emphasis on culture and language in the study of the Indian Mutiny and present an interesting new perspective on English domestic politics in this timeframe. I will do this through answering the question: do claims in regard to the monolithic nature of the British Empire and the narrative focus on Indian atrocities during the Indian mutiny crisis of 1857 hold up against a mixed methods analysis of discourse in the House of Commons from May 1857 to July 1858? For this purpose, I have created a database that includes all debates in the House of Commons on the broader topic of 'India' dating from 22 May 1857, roughly the start of the Mutiny, to 1 August 1858, marking the end of the legislative process that officially transferred power over the Indian dominions from the double-government including the East India Company to the sovereignty of the British Crown. The database consists of 490 individual speeches in the House of Commons on various topics related to India, ranging from short announcements to multi-hour orations. This database, which is included in a raw form in the appendix, introduces descriptive quantitative methods into the study of Victorian age politics and will serve to provide a new, innovative perspective. The database's relatively large size will enable me to both look at the importance of individual speeches and judge their relevance against the general political trends of the day.

In the first chapter I will delve deeper into the broader postcolonial intellectual framework and its common themes as found in recent scholarship pertaining to the Indian Mutiny in order to emphasise the existence of broader trend of post-colonial scholarship focussing on cultural discursive practices. To do this, I shall first present a short overview of the most influential postcolonial works, then highlight how they influenced current scholarship on the Indian Mutiny. In the second chapter, I will introduce quantitative methods to introduce a new way of analysing Victorian age domestic politics. I will use the collected data to test claims made in recent scholarship relating to England's cultural discourse in regard to the Mutiny against the political discourse in the House of Commons in the year following the start of the insurrection. By doing this, I will present possible explanations for English decision making in this crisis other than that of cultural discourse. For example, I will ascertain the extent to which party politics influenced political decision making in the House of Commons during the Indian Mutiny crisis. I will also look at the relationship between party politics and a recurrently mentioned theme in recent literature: the mention atrocities committed by sepoys and the ignoring of atrocities committed by the British. Finally, in the third chapter I will enter into

¹¹ Catherine Hall and Sonya O. Rose, eds. *At Home with the Empire: Metropolitan Culture and the Imperial World*, (Cambridge University Press, 2006), Christopher Alan Bayly, *Indian Society and the Making of the British Empire*, Vol. 1. (Cambridge University Press, 1987), James Trafford, *The Empire at Home: Internal Colonies and the End of Britain*, (Pluto, 2020).

dialogue with both the qualitative discursive analysis employed by recent scholars of the Mutiny and my own quantitative approach. I will ‘zoom in’ on some remarkable individual speeches made during this tumultuous year, and tentatively warn against focussing overly much on the larger trends and structural dominances of a timeframe. I will do this by introducing a number of individual politicians, most notably lifelong opposition politicians and Quakers John Arthur Roebuck and John Bright. I will argue that any method that searches for patterns, commonalities and trends runs the risk of overlooking the cultural significance of outliers and deviations from the norm.

Chapter 1

The broader post-colonial framework

The Indian mutiny is often described as an epoch defining occurrence and is well documented and researched, resulting in a rich historiography. Its study, however, similar to all studies pertaining to the Victorian era, has been deeply influenced by varying trends and new schools of thought. In the words of Alex Middleton: “*Victorian politics has thus responded even more readily to general trends in modern British political history: above all the shift away from cabinets, ministries, and parliaments, and towards languages, arguments, and cultures.*”¹² This proclivity to adopting new approaches has resulted in a layered and multi-faceted body of work. The increasing focus on cultural history and discourse analysis, has also resulted in the fact that there have been very few recent studies of note into the English political dimensions of the mutiny. Recent developments in the field have decisively skewed towards new approaches in cultural history, qualitative discourse analysis being the primary component, whilst largely ignoring the possibilities offered by quantitative methods. The increasing focus on cultural history in turn means that standard works on the mutiny, such as George Malleeson’s *The Mutiny of the Bengal Army*, Charles Ball’s *The History of the Indian Mutiny*, John William Kaye’s *History of the Sepoy War* and sir George Trevelyan’s *Cawnpore* are all well over a hundred years old.¹³ This is further aggravated by the fact that historians of the British Empire have turned away *en masse* from the study of domestic politics after the 1980’s.¹⁴ In its place came a post-colonial framework and an increasing focus on the importance of language and culture.

Post-colonialism can be defined as the critical study of both the overt and subtle historical and contemporary influences of centuries of European colonialism. Although its roots are arguably older, the field truly started developing in the decolonisation period after the Second World War. The period between 1960 and 2000 saw the rapid growth and development of post-colonialism as an academic doctrine, extending its influence in many subfields and disciplines. Within the field of English Imperial history, post-colonialism became paradigmatic. In this chapter, I shall take a closer look at the post-colonial historiography of the Indian Mutiny and highlight the ways in which works on the Indian Mutiny have been influenced by some of the most influential post-colonial writers: Frantz Fanon, Edward Said and Homi K. Bhabha. Each of these writers represents a developmental stage of the post-colonial theoretical framework, laying the indispensable groundwork for the next generation. In order to start an analysis, it is important to first address what these authors understood the concept of post-colonialism to encompass and what their contribution to its theoretical framework are. Its broad use and incorporation into a multitude of studies, subjects and disciplines has introduced a certain fluidity to the term, meaning various things to various people. Indeed, the most influential contributors to the field seem to have worked with overlapping yet distinctly differing definitions. All three authors understand colonialism to refer to both the system of government *and* that system’s ideological underpinnings. For Frantz Fanon, often seen as the godfather of postcolonial thought, post-colonialism was to be found in the lived reality of colonial subjects and theorizing about the way forward after national independence. Actively engaged in the dismantling of the colonial remnants of

¹² Alex Middleton, "Victorian Politics and Politics Overseas," *The Historical Journal* 64, no. 5 (2021): 1462.

¹³ Malleeson, *The Mutiny of the Bengal army: an historical narrative*, Ball, *The History of the Indian Mutiny*, Kaye, *A History of the Sepoy War in India, 1857-58*, Trevelyan, *Cawnpore*.

¹⁴ Alex Middleton, "Victorian Politics and Politics Overseas," 1462.

the 19th century, colonialism, and by extension post-colonialism, were not abstract intellectual concepts. In his work the *Wretched of the Earth*, Fanon describes colonialism as the psychological yoke under which the colonial subject lives and suffers. It is being forced to adopt the role of the supplicant, always bowing and scraping and having to hide any outward sign of being a threat to the colonial overlord. For him, post-colonialism was to be found in the everyday praxis involved in breaking out of the real and psychological shackles of colonial oppression. This, infamously, also included the perpetration of violence.¹⁵

Said expands upon the traditional concept of colonialism and introduces a more subtle cultural, largely literary component: a thousand year old tradition of observing and writing about the Orient (and by extent the larger 'colonial world') as an antithesis to the West. He recognises a complex system of words, symbols and stereotypes that calls to mind 'the East' for Europeans, an image which seemingly has little to do with any experienced reality of the people who live there. For him, post-colonialism is to be found in recognising and breaking down this one-dimensional, reductive system.¹⁶

Homi K. Bhabha builds further on the intellectual foundations laid by Said, but with an emphasis on overcoming the system of cultural stereotypes Said has identified. Bhabha introduces new concepts, most notably *hybridity*, which he defines as a new space opened up between the coloniser and the colonised through interaction, that weakens the colonisers authority which is based on a clear-cut 'otherness'.¹⁷ Where Fanon sees the concept of 'whiteness' as insurmountable by 'mimicking', attempts by colonised peoples to imitate cultural aspects of the coloniser in order to become accepted, Bhabha sees this act as the opening up of a new space that cracks the colonialist façade. Where Said sees colonial discourse as wholly possessed by the coloniser, Bhabha poses that any fantastical, static projection of the 'other' is bound to fail.¹⁸ Although often criticised for his opaque language and overreliance on jargon, Bhabha sees the concept of *hybridity*, and the implications it has for an essentialist understanding of culture, as a passageway to a new interpretation of cross-cultural relations. For Bhabha, post-colonialism means a way of moving past the differences, past the systems of stereotypes that have defined colonial relations.¹⁹

Fanon, Said and Bhabha have, all in their own way, shaped the field of post-colonial studies and its conceptual framework. Although the three authors distinctly differ from each other, there are large overlapping foundational assumptions and understandings that have, I will argue in this chapter, persisted throughout the post-colonial field up to this day. Fanon deviates slightly from the other two authors in some aspects: he published some decennia earlier, but is included in this summary because of his clear and ongoing influence on the field. The first important common denominator is the understanding of colonialism as a form of government, as well as the ideological underpinnings that drive a colonialist society forward and serve as justifications for the subjugation and exploitation of other peoples. These ideological justifications rest on a system of beliefs that include pseudo-scientific racism, relatively complex civil and political institutions, religious convictions and superior technological advancement relative to the subjugated peoples. The combination of these factors results in an ideology based on a supposed inherent superiority. Understanding colonialism as both a form of government and an ideology, has led to the conflation of the concepts of European-style colonialism and imperialism, which are often used interchangeably. The broadening of the definition of colonialism to also include its ideological underpinnings, means that when an author speaks of European-style colonialism, imperialism is implied.²⁰ Underlying this conflation of colonialism and imperialism, is a reductive tendency towards a structural and monolithic understanding of imperialist West-European colonial societies. Although Said professes that he does believe in the importance of the individual writer, both Fanon and Bhabha tend towards a more unforgiving and abstract understanding, respectively, of colonial societies. Fanon sees decolonisation as nothing less than the

¹⁵ Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*.

¹⁶ Said, *Orientalism*.

¹⁷ Bhabha, *The location of Culture*.

¹⁸ Antony Easthope, "Homi Bhabha, Hybridity and Identity, or Derrida Versus Lacan," *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies (HJEAS)* 4, no. 1/2 (1998): 145-151.

¹⁹ Bhabha, *the Location of Culture*.

²⁰ Michael Adas. "Imperialism and colonialism in comparative perspective," *The International History Review* 20, no. 2 (1998): 371-388.

unmasking and destruction of the Western values system based on enlightenment and the renouncing of individualism. He holds accountable every Westerner for the crimes of colonialism.²¹ Bhabha tends towards a more abstract, theoretical approach to discourse, recognising a unified 'colonial discourse', with most of his attention focussed on the meaning of the relationship for the colonised, rather than the coloniser.²²

This reductive image of colonialist societies is prompted by the second shared intellectual underpinning of post-colonial theory: (Foucauldian inspired-) discourse analysis. Both Said and Bhabha embrace Michel Foucault's conception of the relationship between power and knowledge and the role institutions play in including and excluding groups through discourse. Although neither Said nor Bhabha would identify their works as postmodern, both have cited Foucault's work as foundational for their own theories.²³ Although Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth* predates Foucault's *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and *Discipline and Punishment*, there are parallels to be drawn between Foucault's famous panoptical understanding of internalised discipline and the relationship between institutionalised control of discourse and power relations and Fanon's concept of 'double consciousness'. This concept describes the mental anguish a colonised individual experiences in having to view himself both as himself, as well as himself in the eyes of the oppressive coloniser.²⁴ Although, admittedly, such retrospective interpretation is inherently speculative and tricky, especially since Fanon himself defined his work and worldview as a variety of Marxist. Inherent to the overlapping approaches of these post-colonial authors is a psychological approach to the mechanisms of colonialism. Fanon's *the Wretched of the Earth* is essentially an examination of the psychological effects of colonisation on colonial subjects. Said and Bhabha, although not psychiatric professionals like Fanon, make use of Foucault's notion of discourse, which per definition draws a relationship between language and psyche and makes use of psychological terminology.²⁵

The third and final core element is a narrative and theoretical focus on the written, cultural production of Western colonialist powers. Although Fanon's work is not a direct consideration of Western cultural production, he theorises that cultural production plays a key role in the creation of a national culture in the wake of independence for African colonies.²⁶ Said's *Orientalism*, however, is an analysis of several centuries of mostly British and French cultural production in regards to the Orient. His source material consists of a broad collection of cultural written works, ranging from the literary works of Flaubert, von Goethe, Dickens and Kipling to the scholarly efforts of Renan, H.A.R. Gibb and de Sacy.²⁷ Bhabha does not deal as directly with Western literary output as Said, but focusses on the deconstruction of culture in the colonial setting, investigating the cultural consequences of colonial relations. Bhabha is in direct dialogue with Jacques Derrida, Foucault and Said, indirectly referencing their extensive corpus of Western literature.²⁸

Mutiny literature

The works of Fanon, Said and Bhabha are not only directly related and in dialogue with each other, they represent the developmental stages post-colonialism has passed through. The recent decades have seen multiple influential publications on the subject of the Indian Mutiny of 1857, viewed through a post-colonial, deconstructive lens. Having established the common themes in the foundational works, I will now examine how and if these themes are present in recent works on the Indian Mutiny with an expressly post-colonial approach.

The first work is *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination* by Gautam Chakravarty.²⁹

²¹ Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, 11.

²² Ibid., 94.

²³ Said, *Orientalism*, 23., Bhabha, *the Location of Culture*, 348-350.

²⁴ Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Mask*, Trans. Max Silverman, (Manchester University Press, 2005).

²⁵ Megan Vaughan, "Madness and colonialism, colonialism as madness re-reading Fanon. Colonial discourse and the psychopathology of colonialism," *Paideuma* (1993): 45-55.

²⁶ Fanon, *the Wretched of the Earth*, 145.

²⁷ Said, *Orientalism*, 359-363.

²⁸ Bhabha, *the Location of Culture*, 368.

²⁹ Gautam Chakravarty, *The Indian mutiny and the British imagination*, Vol. 43. (Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Chakravarty's book is essentially a study of English literary works dealing with the Indian Mutiny. He deals with a great many written sources on the Mutiny, ranging from historical chronicles to adventure novels. The earlier established concept of the post-colonial tendency to conflate colonialism and imperialism and interpret them as an ideology is present in Chakravarty's analysis of the British nineteenth century as a series of armed conflicts across the world that might very well be termed 'the Long War'. He postulates that a century of war could not have been sustained if there was not a general understanding of long-term benefit among the British population. This understanding, Chakravarty believes, was fuelled by an expansionist, imperialist ideology, thinly veiled as civilising, Christianising reciprocity. Britain received riches and prestige, the natives received Christ and civilisation. In Chakravarty's words: "...nineteenth-century globalisation justified multiform violence through self-serving, self-congratulatory high talk about civilising and racial missions while expropriating subject peoples and denying them agency...".³⁰ Chakravarty describes what he sees as the civilising mission as 'humbug', a fine veneer for the need for new markets to penetrate, new areas of cheap labour to exploit, new areas to bleed dry. Chakravarty does not appear to subscribe to a monolithic understanding of English society and actively engages with the concept of 'dissent' in the introduction of his book, allowing for the existence of deviations from the imperialist norm. He does, however, immediately minimize the influence of these dissenters by stating: "the history of dissent that dogged at nearly every step the Long War was, like the career of Edmund Burke, the Rockingham oligarch and early dissenter, that of a minority in perennial opposition."³¹

The second common theme, (Foucauldian inspired-) discourse analysis, is very much present in Chakravarty's analysis. He approaches literary works on the topic of the Indian Mutiny with the express intention of dissecting them for the common themes and stereotypes that constitute the Victorian discourse on colonial relations. An example of such a theme is the 'resurgent heroism' of British protagonists in mutiny literature.³² First being wrong-footed by the cowardly betrayal of previously loyal subjects, the English protagonist bounces back and is even able to retain his sense of adventure through his ordeals. The colonial overlord remains unperturbed, even in the face of mass revolt. Chakravarty stresses the importance that is placed on the psychological superiority of the British race, which allows them to overcome even the most challenging of situations. Chakravarty announces: "*Among the novels that will be examined in detail in this study, their most obvious difference from earlier writing is that the rebellion now turns into a site of heroic imperial adventure, and an occasion for conspicuous demonstrations of racial superiority.*"³³

The third common theme, a focus on the cultural production of the colonizer, is perhaps so obviously present in a literary study such as *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination* that it warrants little further elaboration. It is interesting to note a new theme emerging in Chakravarty's writing that will resurface in most post-colonial accounts of the Mutiny: the presence of an overarching imperial narrative centred on the perpetration of unspeakable atrocities by the rebelling sepoys. This narrative, centred on white victimhood, Indian duplicity and the beastly slaughter of innocent women and children, is assumed to have dominated the discourse for about a hundred years, with attention for British atrocities only re-emerging hand-in-hand with Indian nationalism during the twentieth century and the post-colonial scholarship that followed.³⁴

The second post-colonial work is noted Victorian scholar Patrick Brantlinger's *Rule of Darkness*.³⁵ Brantlinger's book is a Victorian literary study in the same vein as Chakravarty's *The Indian Mutiny*, only dealing with the broader topic of imperial discourse in literature, rather than exclusively focussed on the Indian Mutiny. In his introduction, Brantlinger questions where to start a narrative on British literature in a colonial context. He treats on the common misconception that mid-Victorian people were blithely unaware, even disinterested of anything larger than the British Isles. It was in the second half of the century, the traditional narrative goes, that public sentiment changed

³⁰ Chakravarty, *the Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination*, 2.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 2.

³² *Ibid.*, 127

³³ *Ibid.*, 6.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 16, 114.

³⁵ Patrick Brantlinger, "Rule of Darkness: Imperialism and British Literature, 1830-1914," *Ithaca: Cornell UP* (1988).

from blithely unaware to a “...self-conscious, jingoist drum-beating...”.³⁶ Brantlinger, however, sees a much earlier literary trend of the larger Empire as subject. Trollope, Carlyle and Thackeray all wrote extensively on subjects in a colonial setting. It is Brantlinger’s classification of writers treating on the subject of the British colonies as ‘imperialist writers’, that points to the conflation of colonialism and imperialism, and an understanding of imperialism as ideology. Thackeray, Trollope and Carlyle’s writing in this framework is perceived as a vehicle for the ideology of imperialism.³⁷ Brantlinger works with a broad definition of imperialism. An interesting example of this is his labelling of Trollope’s expressed opposition to further expansion of the empire as imperialist, because Trollope’s reason to do so is a fear that further expansion would be detrimental to previous British acquisitions.³⁸ In Brantlinger’s words: “Nowhere does he argue that India, the key to British power and glory, should be returned to the Indians, or that white settlers should relinquish the Cape to black Africans.”³⁹ This broad definition implies an increasingly monolithic, structural understanding of Victorian England. Trapped within the cultural framework of empire, even opposition to further imperial expansion is necessarily imperialist because the reasoning behind such a stance takes place within an already existing imperial context. The status quo is imperialism.

Brantlinger’s broad definition of imperialism as an ideology simultaneously points towards his use of discourse analysis. In his own words: “Imperialism, understood as an evolving but pervasive set of attitudes and ideas toward the rest of the world, influenced all aspects of Victorian and Edwardian culture.”⁴⁰ Throughout his book, Brantlinger seeks an overarching imperialist discourse spanning the entirety of Victorian literature with a colonial theme. As an example of such discourse, he highlights a Victorian literary trope that other literary scholars, including Chakravarty, have also touched upon: that of the ‘empire hero’.⁴¹ The empire hero is the quintessential British adventurer: eloquent, boisterous, sportsmanlike and fearless. Brantlinger highlights the power relation that always underlies the actions and adventures of the empire hero. He blends in with the ‘natives’ without a problem, but always retains the ‘Englishness’ at the core of his being: it makes him incorruptible. The reverse route, however, cannot be travelled by the native: no colonial subject could pass for an Englishman.⁴² This empire hero is presented as a clear example of the underlying power dynamics of imperialist discourse as found in Victorian literature.

Explicitly present in *Rule of Darkness* is the theme of Indian atrocities in the English imagination. Brantlinger uses his entire seventh chapter to discuss literary representations of the Indian Mutiny, with a specific focus on ‘the well at Cawnpore’ as a symbol. He contends that the slaughter of British women and children at Cawnpore by rebel leader Nana Sahib and his men still forms the image most associated with the Mutiny, whilst the events are rarely placed in the context of retaliation to General Neil’s bloody campaign, which by then had already commenced.⁴³ In England, the image of hewn off body parts stuffed in a well became such a potent symbol of Indian savagery, that any revenge seemed justified. Due to the emotions it evoked, Brantlinger identifies the Mutiny of 1857 as a turning point for British colonial attitudes. He sees a sharp divide between the racist, yet predominantly hopeful pre-Mutiny discourse and the more negative discourse that followed its outbreak and violent quelling. The feelings of hate the Mutiny stirred in the breasts of the English reached a fever pitch and Brantlinger poses that, for a while, advocating for the wholesale extermination of the Indian race became an integrated part of acceptable discourse.⁴⁴

Another interesting example of the post-colonial approach to the Mutiny is found in the collection of essays *Neo-Victorian Tropes of Trauma: The Politics of Bearing After-Witness to*

³⁶ Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness*, 4.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 4.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 6.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁴¹ Michael Paris, *Warrior Nation: Images of War in British Popular Culture, 1850-2000*, (London: Reaktion Books, 2000).

⁴² Chakravarty, *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination*, 6.

⁴³ Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness*, 201.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 201.

Nineteenth-Century Suffering.⁴⁵ The aim of the collection as a whole is to “...analyse the complex revival, re-vision and recycling of the long nineteenth century in the cultural imaginary.”⁴⁶ Its approach is self-described as ‘post-modern, post-colonial inspired trauma study’, which focusses on the nineteenth as the cradle of cultural trauma’s that still resound today.⁴⁷ It aims to do this by analysing Victorian literature, which it describes as both a reflection of the traumatic moment itself as well as the post-traumatic reflection upon said moment. One of prominent traumatic experiences that is featured in the book is the Indian Mutiny. The chapter is written by Marie-Luise Kolhke.⁴⁸ The unifying post-colonial concept of colonialism as ideology is unmistakably present in her writings. For Kolhke, imperialist ideology is inseparably amalgamated with any writings on British colonial history. The very culturally determined discourse used to write about India, is laced with symbolically laden imagery. Implicitly, there is no significant deviation from a sort of structural cultural norm termed ‘the British imagination’, which expresses itself through this shared discourse. There is no clear demarcation in Kolhke’s narrative between various subsections of society (the political, the cultural etc.). She examines a shared imperial discourse as is to be found in Victorian literature on the Indian Mutiny, and extrapolates this to be indicative of a nationwide ‘popular imagination’. In many ways, Kolhke represents the extreme position of a monolithic understanding of colonial societies. Victorian Britain is reduced, in some ways, to a hive mind, bound together in colonialist purpose through a shared imperialist discourse.

Although Kolhke deals with the traumatic experience of the Mutiny for Victorian society, there are Foucauldian power dynamics to be found in this discourse of trauma. English (or white) suffering is usually portrayed as heroic, sad and tragic. Conversely, Indian suffering is hardly dealt with at all. Indigenous casualties are almost always portrayed as either faceless numbers or as part of a fitting punishment for rebelling in the first place.⁴⁹ Not all suffering is equal, in the discourse surrounding the Indian Mutiny. Similar to Brantlinger, Kolhke identifies the Mutiny as a turning point in Britain’s imperial self-image. She sees the large-scale uprising as stabbing at the heart of the self-declared British civilising mission. The violent insurrection clashed with the image of simple yet appreciative Indians being lifted out of the civilisational muck.⁵⁰

Similar to Chakravarty and Brantlinger, Kolhke deals with the uneven focus in historical literature on the atrocities committed by the Indians in general and Nana Sahib specifically. Where Brantlinger highlights how calling for the extermination of the Indian race became acceptable discourse in the period after the Mutiny, Kolhke cites instances of soldiers referring to the re-conquest of India as the “...extermination of vermin.”⁵¹ Part of the British cultural coping with the traumatic experience of what they perceived to be horrendous Indian atrocities, is the theme of the ‘unspeakable’ or ‘indescribable’ event. The indescribable event is a recurring theme in contemporary British accounts of the Mutiny. Kolhke refers to the infamous ‘well at Cawnpore’, also touched upon by Brantlinger as one of the sites of ‘indescribable trauma’.⁵² The savageries committed there are often left to the imagination of the reader, rather than described in gruesome detail. The events left undescribed, supposedly because they defy either description or the authors willingness to go into detail, invoke the readers imagination to fill-in the horrific blanks.⁵³

Another important work that approaches representations of the Indian Mutiny from a distinctly post-colonial perspective is Robert J. Crane’s *Inventing India: A History of India in Fiction*.⁵⁴ Crane sets out to establish the manifold ways in which India has been invented and represented by English authors and how these inventions have been passed on through history in the form of symbols and imagery. Perhaps more so than any of the other authors, Crane positions himself in a tradition of not

⁴⁵ Marie-Luise Kohlke and Christian Guteben, *Neo-Victorian Tropes of Trauma: The Politics of Bearing After-Witness to Nineteenth-Century Suffering*, Neo-Victorian Series, vol. 1. (Rodopi, 2010).

⁴⁶ Kohlke and Guteben, *Neo-Victorian Tropes of Trauma*, abstract.

⁴⁷ Kohlke, *Neo-Victorian Tropes of Trauma*, 2.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 367.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 374.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 370.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 368.

⁵² Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness*, 200.

⁵³ Kohlke, *Neo-Victorian Tropes of Trauma*, 373.

⁵⁴ Ralph Crane, *Inventing India: a history of India in English-language fiction*, (Springer, 1992).

only post-colonial, but postmodern writers.⁵⁵ Crane divides literature on the topic of the Mutiny between those authors that are critical of English imperialism and those that perpetuate the myth that British rule was beneficial to India. Although he sets out to portray the role novels played in shaping India in the English imagination, his approach tends to focus on the specific rather than the structural. Contrary to his initial aims, he seems often more occupied with testing occurrences in the books for historical accuracy rather than analyse their role in a larger imperial discourse. An example of Crane's small scope approach is the role of a former 'thuggee', in *Night Runners of Bengal* by John Masters.⁵⁶ The 'thuggee' were a semi-mythical group of professional robbers supposedly broken up by the English, although the extent of their existence is debated to this day.⁵⁷ Rather than questioning the larger discursive meaning of such an Indian trope in the way Said has done in *Orientalism*, Crane simply chooses to question the realism of someone openly wearing the symbols of his association with a broken up crime syndicate.⁵⁸ Crane's narrative focus on mostly practical symbols prevents him from discussing on a meta-level the meaning of these symbols for Great Britain as an ideologically driven coloniser.

Crane intends to analyse the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised through the use of over a century of literary output. His methodology to establish the common discursive imagery used in English novels on India is superficially similar to Chakravarty, Brantlinger and Kohlke's. What sets him apart from the authors discussed previously is his use of both English and Indian novels as source material. Crane brings forward the writer on the colonial subject as a 'myth-maker', indispensable in creating, recreating and affirming mental images associated with India.⁵⁹ A clear example of this mythmaking is the 'hero myth', a variation on the earlier discussed 'empire hero'. This trope serves as an affirmation of the sportsmanlike, adventurous nature of the Englishman.⁶⁰ An interesting aspect of Crane's analysis is the use of the Empire Hero as the voice of reason. In multiple instances, the English protagonist takes up the initial grievances of the Sepoys, only to be thwarted by less understanding military types. This juxtaposition of the 'good English' and the 'bad English' allows for acknowledgement of the Indian complaints without having to draw any unwanted conclusions about English rule as a whole.⁶¹

Although Crane acknowledges that in most Mutiny novels: "...*indignant voices had only bemoaned the treachery and savagery of the Indians.*", he is the first to introduce and discuss the perspective of English authors dealing with British savagery as well. About *Night Runners of Bengal* Crane writes: "*The death, rape, and mutilation caused by the sepoys in the early hours of 10th May (the date of the mutiny in Meerut) is both vividly described and carefully balanced with later, equally gory accounts of British brutality.*"⁶² Crane represents a slowly changing approach in the post-colonial paradigm. Although he does not say it with so many words, his willingness to allow for source material to be anything other than unquestioningly jingoist signals a more critical, more reticent approach to post-colonial literary criticism. Whilst post-colonial methodology in the form of discourse analysis became the norm in the eighties and nineties, the turn of the century saw an increasing counter-movement, that allowed more room for voices of dissent. Examples of this increasingly critical attitude towards the post-colonial paradigm are Christopher Herbert's *War of No Pity* and Margery Sabin's *Dissenters and Mavericks*.⁶³ Both Herbert and Sabin actively engage with the paradigmatic structuralism by shifting the attention to the importance of dissent, deviance and actively questioning post-colonial assumptions. Although both fascinating works in their own right, the criticisms formulated by Herbert and Sabin are focussed on the methodological approach within the field of literary studies, rather than the transcendent issue of post-colonial literary studies forming a

⁵⁵ Crane, *Inventing India*, 4.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁵⁷ Daniel J.R. Grey, "Creating the 'Problem Hindu': Sati, Thuggee and Female Infanticide in India, 1800–60," *Sex, Gender and the Sacred: Reconfiguring Religion in Gender History* (2014): 104-116.

⁵⁸ Crane, *Inventing India*, 24

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 21.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 22.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 21.

⁶³ Christopher Herbert, *War of no pity*, (Princeton University Press, 2008), Margery Sabin, *Dissenters and mavericks: Writings about India in English, 1765-2000*, (Oxford University Press, 2002).

disproportionate amount of recent studies into the Indian mutiny specifically and imperial history as a whole. As such, I will leave them out of further consideration.

In this chapter I have established the development of the post-colonial field, its influence on Indian mutiny scholarship and a set of common views and claims this field has produced in regard to the Indian mutiny. In chapter two, I will test some of these common claims against the political discourse in the House of Commons in 1857-1858.

Chapter 2

Database analysis

In the first chapter I have established the link between foundational post-colonial texts and recent scholarship on the Indian Mutiny. I have also highlighted some common themes in recent post-colonial scholarship on the Mutiny that seem to be intrinsically linked to the post-colonial approach to history. One of these common themes is a focus on the cultural production, most specifically literature, in order to establish patterns of discourse. Chakravarty, Brantlinger, Kohlke and Crane all discuss ‘Mutiny novels’ in order to make observations about imperialist discourse in relation to the cultural trauma of the Indian Mutiny. In this chapter I will expand upon the scope of these authors and test their claims against the discourse pertaining to the Indian Mutiny in the political sphere, rather than the literary cultural one. Specifically, in this chapter offers an inventory in regard to the discourse in the House of Commons on the topic of the politically important events of the Mutiny and the atrocities committed during its course. As shown in the first chapter, a commonly held idea by post-colonial historians of the Indian Mutiny is that atrocities committed by the British were omitted from the imperialist narrative, whilst there was an excessive focus on atrocities committed by the Indians.⁶⁴ Prime example of this is the aforementioned ‘well at Cawnpore’, which became a potent symbol for perceived Indian ‘savagery’. Whilst these authors have made an interesting case by analysing the discourse on atrocities in a selection of British novels, I wish to test this supposed pre-occupation with Indian atrocities and omitting of British atrocities against the discursive political reality of 1857 and 1858, as well as detail the political context that informed various stances by looking at the influence of party politics on various subtopics of the Indian Mutiny.

In order to do this, I have created a database of all political speeches made in the British House of Commons from 22 May 1857 up until 30 July 1858 on the topic of the Indian Mutiny, spanning a little over a year. The starting date of the database corresponds with the first reports of the Mutiny reaching Britain and invoking worried discussion in the House of Commons, whilst July 30 signals the end of the legislative process that transferred power over India from the double-government of the East India Company and the British government to the sovereignty of the British Crown. The passing of this legislation termed the Government of India Act, which was officially to commence on 2 August 1858, meant the start of a new phase in Anglo-Indian relations.⁶⁵ Although there were still pockets of rebels at large in the Indian countryside, all meaningful resistance has been quashed and the fears of losing control of India had subsided. The focus shifted towards the future, as the British Raj was born. The database consists of 490 individual speeches made by 127 individual Members of Parliament.

I have compiled the database within the database and statistical analysis programme IBM SPSS (Statistical Product and Service Solutions). The source for the database has been Hansard, the official name of the transcripts of Parliamentary discussions and votes named after Thomas Curson Hansard,

⁶⁴ Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness*, 201.

⁶⁵ “Government of India Act 1858,” Indian Legislation, Accessed on 15 February 2022, <http://www.indianlegislation.in/BA/BaActToc.aspx?actid=2222>

publicly available since 1771.⁶⁶ Hansard reports are not verbatim transcripts, but are meant to stay as close to the original speech as possible, whilst allowing for the correction of grammatical and linguistic mistakes. Any inconsequential comments made by the Speaker of the House are also omitted. Rules and etiquette surrounding the publication of Hansard have strongly varied over time. In the 1850s, it was customary to let the speaker in question read the transcript and allow them room for correction if necessary.⁶⁷ Although not a word-for-word transcript and subject to some censorship by the speakers, Hansard can be an extremely valuable source for analysing the political discourse of any given era.

Before building the database, I have established the parameters within which I would conduct my search in Hansard. To cast as wide a net as possible, I have refrained from using overly specific search terms and settled on the general search term 'India'. The search covered all political debates on this topic from 1 May 1857, until 1 August 1858, and only included discussions in the House of Commons, meaning discussions in the House of Lords were left out of the scope of this research. The House of Commons discusses and passes legislature, whilst the House of Lords discusses and approves this legislature. This makes the House of Commons more suitable for measuring immediate political reactions to contemporary events. Every speech has been categorised and divided into 9 variables:

1. Date
2. Subject
3. Speaker
4. Nature of the speech (critical, neutral or positive towards government policy)
5. Party affiliation (Liberal or Conservative)⁶⁸
6. Military involvement (military or civilian)
7. Mention of atrocities (no mention, mention of Indian atrocities, mention of British atrocities, mention of both British and Indian atrocities, mention of British heroics)
8. Stance on the EIC⁶⁹
9. Which government was in power (First Palmerston Ministry or Second Derby Ministry)

These variables have been co-determined by the literature discussed in chapter one, as well as the most pressing political points of contention in 1857-1858, such as the de facto abolition of the EIC.⁷⁰ The relatively recent introduction of telegraph technology and the use of the Suez route meant that England received news of Indian occurrences relatively quickly. Only a few decades earlier, news took about six months to travel from India to England. The use of telegraph lines, steamships and the route from Bombay to Suez meant that the delay had been cut drastically. Summaries of the mail were received telegraphically within 20 to 30 days, whilst the actual mail arrived some 10 to 15 days later.⁷¹

Every speech, no matter the length, has been included. Left out of consideration are members

⁶⁶ "Thomas Curson Hansard," About Hansard, Accessed on 12 May 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/about>

⁶⁷ John Vice and Stephen Farrell, *The history of Hansard*, (House of Lords Library and House of Lords Hansard, 2017), 20.

⁶⁸ I have refrained from categorising the two broader liberal and conservative coalitions into the specific schools of thought (Peelite conservative, Protectionist conservative, Radical liberal, Irish independent nationalist etc.) as the smaller divisions have little bearing on the specific topic of this research and would only serve to overcomplicate things.

⁶⁹ The introduction of the Government of India Act of 1858 by the Palmerston administration is taken as the date the EIC government is no longer in effect. In reality it took until August 1858 to officially transfer power to the Crown, but after the introduction of the bill, the fate of the Company was sealed and the discussion shifted from whether to transfer rule to how to best transfer rule.

⁷⁰ For the sake of clarity I have omitted the variables not used for this research in the appendix version of database, such as 'military involvement', and 'stance on the EIC'.

⁷¹ Daniel Headrick, "A double-edged sword: communications and imperial control in British India," *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung* (2010): 54.

of the sitting cabinet, who are assumed to adhere to and defend government policy. For example: Prime Minister Palmerston, although a prominent speaker, is left out of consideration until the fall of his government on 19 February 1858, after which he once again takes his seat in the house as an MP and is eligible for consideration. In turn, Benjamin Disraeli is a prominent speaker until 19 February 1858, after which he takes his seat in the Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry as Chancellor of the Exchequer and is thus no longer considered. Members of the EIC Board of Directors have been left out of consideration, as well as members of the Board of Control, as both had a direct stake in the perpetuation of the EIC and the defence of her conduct in the governance of India.

General results

In the year that the database spans, there were 127 individual speakers, divided over two large political coalitions: the Liberals spearheaded by Viscount Palmerston and Lord John Russell, and the Conservatives led by Lord Derby, Benjamin Disraeli and, on the topic of India, Lord Stanley.⁷² The 127 MPs together gave 490 speeches on the topic of the Indian Mutiny. 299 of these speeches were made by Liberal coalition politicians, whilst the Conservative coalition was responsible for the remaining 191 speeches. This discrepancy can partly be explained by the fact that there were simply more Liberal Members of Parliament in 1857 than Conservative. The most recent British general election, running from the 27 March until the 24 April 1857, had been framed as a plebiscite on the policy of Liberal Prime Minister Viscount Palmerston and had resulted in a resounding defeat for the Conservatives.⁷³ Thus, the Liberals had the upper hand in the House of Commons. Mostly, however, it has to do with the relative amount of debates that took place during each of the two governments that were in power during this period. The first period running from the 22 May 1857 until the 18 February 1858, with the liberal First Palmerston ministry in charge, saw a total of 114 speeches, 48 made by Liberals and 68 made by Conservatives. The second period running from the 22 February 1858 until the 30 July 1858, with the Second Derby-Disraeli ministry in charge, saw a total of 376 speeches, with 253 made by the Liberals and only 123 made by Conservative MPs. Due to my decision to exclude speeches made by government ministers, who I have assumed to generally defend government actions, the relative portion of speeches made by the opposition has increased. In terms of the most prolific speakers there are no surprises. During the First Palmerston ministry Conservative leader Benjamin Disraeli gave 12 speeches, the most of all politicians. Disraeli had been a long-time advocate for the abolition of the role of the EIC in the government of India and immediately took interest in the Mutiny.⁷⁴ During the Second Derby-Disraeli ministry, Liberal leaders Viscount Palmerston and Lord John Russell were the most prolific speakers, both making a total of 21 speeches. Over both periods combined, Lord John Russell is the most prolific speaker with a grand total of 24 speeches. John Bright, who will feature prominently in chapter 3, made a total of 6 speeches, whilst John Arthur Roebuck spoke 11 times.

Party politics and stance on government policy

The mid-Victorian age was an era in many ways defined by the spirit of party politics. The loss of the crown's direct political influence originating from George III's reign had taken on serious forms due to the extravagance of his successor, George IV and been passed on to Queen Victoria. Traditionally, the government ruled in both name and spirit of the monarch. However, in the early decades of the nineteenth century, party politics had increasingly made their way into the heart of English politics. By the 1850s, any aspiring politician had to align himself with the broad ideas of either the Liberal or the

⁷² Edward Smith-Stanley, 14th Earl of Derby, will succeed Viscount Palmerston in the Prime Ministership in 1858 and will be referred to as the Lord Derby, whilst his son Edward Stanley shall be referred to as the Lord Stanley, as he only became the 15th Lord Derby on his father's death in 1869.

⁷³ A.J.P. Taylor, "Lord Palmerston," *History Today* 41, no. 1 (1991): 38.

⁷⁴ Matthew Stubbings, "British Conservatism and the Indian Revolt: The Annexation of Awadh and the Consequences of Liberal Empire, 1856–1858," *Journal of British Studies* 55, no. 4 (2016): 730.

Conservative party.⁷⁵ The 1840s had been a hotbed of party struggle with the repeal of the infamous protectionist Corn Laws as a focal point. In August 1846, Prime Minister Sir Robert Peel had gone against his own Conservative Party and allied with the Whigs to repeal the Corn Laws. This caused a deep rift within the Conservatives with many declaring themselves either Peelite or Protectionist. The political tensions, aggravated by the outbreak of the Great Famine in 1845 in Ireland due to potato blight and the great Springtime of the Peoples igniting across Europe in 1848, rose so high that there was serious fear of revolution or civil war.⁷⁶ Although the political pressure had greatly decreased by the 1850s, the spectre of party politics and factionalism still loomed large and instances of politicians deviating from the party line were rare.

It was thus, with this recent tradition of violent factionalism in mind, that the House of Commons confronted the news of the outbreak of apparent Mutiny in India. India was the treasured jewel in the British imperial crown. Yet, her governance was the domain of a select group of 'old Indians', men who had some experience on the subcontinent and were almost always currently or formerly in the employ of the EIC.⁷⁷ Before the Indian Mutiny brought the situation in India to the forefront, there was only a limited amount of policymakers with knowledge of or interest in Indian affairs. Despite abundant rumours of corruption, ineptitude, bankruptcy and mismanagement, the governance of India remained the domain of a select group of self-declared experts.⁷⁸ The outbreak of the Mutiny and the subsequent uncertainty and lack of information in the early days brought the attention of the whole of England to the state of Indian affairs. The time delay in carrying news from India to England still measured more than a month, as mail first had to be shipped to Suez, from whence it went to Malta, from whence summaries were telegraphed across Europe to England.⁷⁹ This delay created a space in time where England was confronted with the possible loss of its largest colony, without any means of ascertaining the outcome of events. The government of Prime Minister Palmerston had to start making policy in a news vacuum, with the spectre of the violent factionalism of the last decade still in mind, and fresh of an election that was framed by his political enemies as a plebiscite on his person.⁸⁰ In this context, it is interesting to see whether politicians from either party predominantly shared the same opinion, in other words if there was a clear party line, or if politicians addressed the issue of the Mutiny as individually elected representatives. Considering almost immediate calls from both sides of the political aisle to consider a matter this grave outside of petty party rivalries, the results becomes especially interesting when dividing the dataset in two subsets, taking first the Palmerston ministry and then the Derby-Disraeli ministry into account. During the Derby-Disraeli ministry, both government ministers and influential opposition politicians stress the importance of transcending party politics when debating on and legislating for India. On 12 April 1858, MP for Guildford Ross Donnelly Mangles appeals to the house:

"I hope the House will allow me to make one observation on a remark which has fallen from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He expressed a hope that party feeling might, as far as possible, be banished from our debates. I must entreat the House with all the earnestness of which I am capable, not to allow party feeling to mingle with this important question. All the great authorities on Indian questions—I would particularly refer to the late Lord Mctcalfe,— declared their opinion that India would be in the greatest jeopardy the moment matters affecting her interests were discussed in this

⁷⁵ Kitson Clark, *The Making Of Victorian England*, 207.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 208.

⁷⁷ Kate Teltscher, "Hobson-Jobson: The East India Company lexicon," *World Englishes* 36, no. 4 (2017): 517.

⁷⁸ William A. Pettigrew and Mahesh Gopalan, eds. *The East India Company, 1600-1857: Essays on Anglo-Indian Connection*, (Routledge, 2016): 178.

⁷⁹ Daniel Headrick, "A double-edged sword: communications and imperial control in British India," *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung* (2010): 58.

⁸⁰ Taylor, "Lord Palmerston," 38.

*House with reference to party interests. In that opinion I believe every man whose opinion is worth having heartily concurs.*⁸¹

In order to illustrate the relationship between MPs attitudes towards policy and their party affiliation, I have used a cross tabulation. A cross tabulation can be useful for investigating the differences in frequencies of outcomes between groups. In this case I will use it to see whether there is a relation between the variable Party Affiliation and the variable Attitude Towards Policy. Table 1 shows the frequency table for the entirety of the database.

TABLE 1. *Party affiliation and attitude towards policy (entire dataset)*

			Supporting policy	Opposing policy	Neutral stance	Total
Party Affiliation	Conservative	Count	60	74	57	191
		% within party affiliation	31.4%	38.7%	29.8%	100%
		% of total	12.2%	15.1%	11.6%	39.4%
	Liberal	Count	64	142	93	299
		% within party affiliation	21.4%	47.5%	31.1%	100%
		% of total	13.1%	29.0%	19.0%	60.6%
Total	Count	124	216	150	490	
	% of total	25.3%	44.1%	30.6%	100%	

Note: Difference in attitude towards policy between the Liberal and Conservative party shown proportionally from 22 March 1857 to 30 July 1858.

The outcome shows that over the entirety of the 16-month period, of all 191 Conservative speeches that were classified as either positive or negative towards policy, 31.4% were supportive of government policy and 38.7% opposed policy. In contrast, out of 299 total Liberal speeches, 21.4% were supportive of government policy, whilst 47.5% were opposed to government policy. Multiple preliminary conclusions can be drawn from this table. Firstly, the majority of speeches that were given were of a critical character regardless of party affiliation. Secondly, both parties had a relatively similar percentage of neutral speeches (29.8% versus 31.1%), indicating both parties might have had a similar ideological make-up of hardliners and moderates. Thirdly, when compared to their Conservative counterparts, the Liberal Party had a markedly more negative stance towards government policy during the Indian Mutiny crisis across all dates included in this dataset.

This result gives an indication of the overall influence of party affiliation on Members of Parliament's attitude towards government policy. It becomes even more interesting when the dataset is divided into two separate subsets: one covering the First Palmerston ministry and the other covering the Second Derby-Disraeli ministry. Especially considering the many calls to abandon respective party lines when legislating for the government of India during the Derby-Disraeli ministry.⁸² The results of table 1 suggest that across the entire dataset, there is a noticeable relation between party affiliation and stance, indicating the existence of a party line. In table 2.1, the same cross tabulation is applied to data subset 1, which only includes speeches made during the First Palmerston Ministry.

⁸¹ "Party spirit," Government of India debates, last accessed 03 February 2020, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-04-12/debates/ce242575-e540-4365-98a5-dfa1e2c7c05e/Supply%E2%80%9494GovernmentOfIndia>

⁸² "sir Harry Verney," Government of India Debate Resumed, Last Accessed 3 February 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/Debates?startDate=1858-05-03&endDate=1858-05-03&searchTerm=India&house=Commons&partial=False>

TABLE 2.1 *Party affiliation and attitude towards policy (First Palmerston Ministry, 22 May 1857-18 February 1858)*

			Supporting policy	Opposing policy	Neutral stance	Total
Party Affiliation	Conservative	Count	5	47	15	67
		% within party affiliation	7.5%	70.1%	22.4%	100%
		% of total	4.4%	41.6%	13.3%	59.3%
	Liberal	Count	20	15	11	46
		% within party affiliation	43.5%	32.6%	23.9%	100%
		% of total	17.7%	13.3%	9.7%	40.7%
Total	Count	25	62	26	113	
	% of total	21.1%	54.9%	23.0%	100%	

Note: The First Palmerston Ministry lasted until 18 of February 1858 and saw far fewer speeches than the Second Derby-Disraeli ministry. This is explained by both its shorter duration and the fact that the Second Derby-Disraeli ministry presided over the legislation for the government of India, which sparked increased interest in the topic.

Table 2.1 indicates that during the First Palmerston ministry, only 7.5% of Conservative speeches were positive about government policy concerning the Indian Mutiny. In other words, this means that on a total of 67 Conservative speeches, only 5 were supportive of policy measures. An overwhelming 70.1% of Conservative speeches between May 1857 and February 1858 were negative towards government policy. In contrast, 43.5% of speeches made by liberal MPs were of a positive nature, against the smaller percentage of 32.6% critical speeches. This seems to indicate that Conservative politicians were extremely hesitant to voice a positive opinion on government policy during the First Palmerston ministry and the opening stages of the Mutiny. This indicates the mutiny immediately became a stick for the Conservatives to beat the sitting ministry with. At the same time, Liberals were predominantly positive, although the difference between positive and negative speeches is not as overwhelming as with the Conservative party. Interestingly, once again the percentage of neutral speeches is somewhat similar (22.4% versus 23.0%). Overall, the first subset shows a clear inverse relation between party and stance towards policy.

TABLE 2.2 *Party affiliation and attitude towards policy (Second Derby-Disraeli ministry, 19 February 1858-30 July 1858)*

			Supporting policy	Opposing policy	Neutral stance	Total
Party Affiliation	Conservative	Count	55	27	42	124
		% within party affiliation	44.4%	21.8%	33.9%	100%
		% of total	14.6%	7.2%	11.1%	32.9%
	Liberal	Count	44	127	82	253
		% within party affiliation	17.4%	50.2%	32.4%	100%
		% of total	11.7%	33.7%	21.8%	67.1%
Total	Count	99	154	124	377	
	% of total	26.3%	40.8%	32.9%	100%	

The results of subset 2, as depicted in table 2.2, show a marked difference from subset 1. Now, 44.4% of Conservative speeches were positive about government policy, whilst only 21.8% were negative. At the same time, the amount of Liberal speeches voicing support for government has plummeted to 17.4%, while an overwhelming 50.2% of speeches are negative. The proportion of neutral speeches is once again similar for both parties (33.9 versus 32.9), although the number of neutral speeches did increase relative to the amount of positive and negative speeches. The most logical conclusion to draw from the results is that the expressed desire to not let party affiliation dictate opinion has not been met. The proportion of positive speeches made by Conservatives has skyrocketed when compared to subset 1 as depicted in table 2.1. Similarly, there was a great increase in negative speeches on the side of the Liberals. The majority of the debates that took place during the Derby-Disraeli ministry were on the topic of legislating on a new government for India, from 12 April until 30 July 1858. For this legislation, the Derby-Disraeli ministry adopted large parts of a bill previously worked on by Viscount Palmerston during the Palmerston ministry.⁸³ The fact that Liberal party members expressed such overwhelming negativity towards the Government of India Bill, which was originally drafted for a large part by Liberal party leader Viscount Palmerston, puts the influence of party rivalry in an even starker light. The data suggests that politicians of neither political party were able to rise above the dynamics of party conflict, even when legislating on such an important topic as the government for India.

Party politics and atrocities

As discussed earlier, the atrocities committed by both sides became an important theme in contemporary discourse and the Mutiny's subsequent historiography. In England the 'well at Cawnpore' became a haunting image of Sepoy savagery against innocent whites, whilst the British retaliation left deep scars in Indian society. The vengeful practice of blowing mutineers from a gun was imagery that was still evoked in the period leading up to Indian independence in the twentieth century.⁸⁴ One of the often repeated claims by post-colonial historians is that until relatively recently there has only been attention for the atrocities committed by the Sepoys in England, whilst British atrocities have gone relatively unmentioned. The cultural importance of atrocities has been well established by the writers treated on in the first chapter. For this thesis, I have included the mention of atrocities as a variable to ascertain whether there was contemporary attention for atrocities committed by either side and subsequently analyse whether there was a party-political dimension to this.

Over the complete dataset, there are a total of 42 speeches that somehow relate to atrocities committed on the Indian subcontinent against 448 that make no mention of them at all, roughly 10 percent. 16 of those speeches mentioned atrocities committed by Sepoy mutineers, whilst four mentioned only British atrocities. Five speeches mentioned atrocities committed by both the Sepoy and British troops, whilst 17 speeches praised the retaliatory actions of the British forces. These initial numbers suggest multiple things. Firstly, that atrocities, perhaps unsurprisingly, were not a big talking point in the first 16 months after the outbreak of the Mutiny. Only a little under one out of every 10 speeches mentions atrocities regardless of the perpetrator. Secondly, this dataset seems to confirm that the majority of attention went to atrocities committed by the mutineers, rather than British troops. Tellingly, positive remarks about the retaliatory nature of the British Royal forces in India were even more frequent. Thirdly, although less often mentioned than the Sepoy atrocities, there are 9 mentions of British cruelty, with 4 of them dealing exclusively with British misconduct and 5 mentioning both British and Sepoy brutality. This indicates that, contrary to some claims, there was a certain awareness of the fact that British soldiers were exacting gruesome revenge on the Indian populace. Table 3

⁸³ "Resolutions," Debate on the Government of India, last accessed 3 February 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-05-03/debates/d31b34d7-44e1-4199-afd0-84d8d7a1bd6e/GovernmentOfIndia>

⁸⁴ Being blown from a gun was a practice that entailed binding a person to the barrel of a canon before firing it, resulting in a horrific and gory scattering of limbs. This particularly offended Hindu religious sentiments, as it precluded funeral rites for the deceased.

showcases the relative proportions of the mentions of atrocities by both the Conservative and the liberal party over the entirety of the dataset.

TABLE 3. *Party affiliation and the mention of atrocities committed in India (whole dataset).*

			Sepoy/Indian atrocities	British atrocities	Praise British Conduct	Both British and Indian Atrocities	Total
Party Affiliation	Conservative	Count	11	1	10	1	23
		% within party affiliation	47.8%	4.3%	43.5%	4.3%	100%
		% of total	26.2%	2.4%	23.8%	2.4%	54.8%
	Liberal	Count	5	3	7	4	19
		% within party affiliation	26.3%	15.8%	36.8%	21.1%	100%
		% of total	11.7%	33.7%	21.8%	67.1%	45.2%
Total		Count	16	4	17	5	42
		% of total	38.1%	9.5%	40.5%	11.9%	100%

Although the total number of mentions does not diverge much, the make-up tells an interesting story. Almost half of all conservative mentions (47.8%) consists of the mention of Sepoy/Indian atrocities. Only one Conservative politician ever mentioned British atrocities, and one other mentioned British atrocities in combination with Indian atrocities. In the same time period, a total of 10 Conservative politicians praised British conduct in retaliating against the Indian mutineers. Conversely, five Liberal politicians mentioned Sepoy/Indian atrocities, whilst three mentioned British atrocities. Another four highlighted both British and Sepoy atrocities in the same speech. Finally, seven Liberals praised British conduct towards the enemy. This means that the proportion of mentions of Indian atrocities by Conservatives far outweighs the mentions of atrocities by Liberal politicians. This discrepancy becomes even more pronounced when taking into account the fact that over the same time period, Liberals accounted for 299 speeches, whilst the Conservatives made 191 speeches. This means that 5.7% of all Conservative speeches mentioned Indian atrocities, whilst 11% mentioned either Indian atrocities or were positive about British military conduct in India. This contrasts starkly with the 1.7% of Liberal speeches mentioning Indian atrocities, and the 4% that mentioned either Indian atrocities or were positive about British military exploits. This finding, in the context of the earlier established fact that Conservative politicians were very negative of government policy from the start as established in table 2.1, seems to indicate that atrocities were used as another stick to beat the sitting Liberal government. Once the Liberal government fell, the use of atrocities as a political weapon for the new Liberal opposition was limited, because they occurred during under a Liberal cabinet.

Table 3 at first glance confirms claims by the post-colonial authors discussed in chapter 1 that there was a narrative focus on Sepoy atrocities, whilst British atrocities were largely ignored, or even praised. British atrocities alone were only mentioned 4 times, whilst they were mentioned in the context of Sepoy atrocities 5 times. This contrasts starkly with the 16 mentions of Sepoy atrocities alone, and 17 instances of praise for British military conduct. The only nuance that is applicable here can be found in the individual mentions. Influential and popular contemporary politicians such as Liberal party leader Lord John Russell, revered war-hero sir George de Lacy Evans and General Thomas Perronet Thompson were among those that mentioned British atrocities, meaning knowledge of British atrocities was not as obscure as one might suppose based on table 3. I will elaborate on the

importance of individual sources for context in chapter 3.

The most interesting and pronounced development can be seen with the Conservatives. The Conservative party had in the years preceding the Indian Mutiny been outmanoeuvred by Viscount Palmerston and his Liberal party, and lost the elections that had been framed as a plebiscite on Palmerston's policies in 1857. Conservative political strategy in this time period has been described as 'support the war, criticise its conduct.'⁸⁵ It was this strategy they had used during the Crimean War (October 1853-September 1856), the Second Opium War (October 1856-October 1860) and the Anglo-Persian War (November 1856-April 1857), and they seemed to hold fast to this strategy with the outbreak of the Indian Mutiny.⁸⁶ Table 4.1 shows the mentions of atrocities when only taking into account a subset of the Palmerston ministry.

TABLE 4.1 *Party affiliation and the mention of atrocities committed in India (First Palmerston ministry 22 May 1857-18 February 1858)*

			Sepoy/Indian atrocities	British atrocities	Praise British Conduct	Both British and Indian Atrocities	Total
Party Affiliation	Conservative	Count	10	0	10	0	20
		% within party affiliation	50%	0%	50%	0%	100%
		% of total	34.5%	0%	34.5%	0%	69%
	Liberal	Count	4	2	3	0	9
		% within party affiliation	44.4%	22.2%	33.3%	0%	100%
		% of total	13.8%	6.9%	10.3%	0%	31%
Total	Count	14	2	13	0	29	
	% of total	48.3%	6.9%	44.8%	0%	100%	

Dividing the data into subsets again seems to confirm this strategy. 20 out of 23 total Conservative speeches mentioning atrocities occurred during the First Palmerston ministry. These mentions consist of 10 out of a grand total of 11 mentions of Sepoy atrocities and 10 out of a grand total of 10 times praise for British conduct. The mentioning of Sepoy atrocities can be construed as a criticism of government policy; a failure to protect British citizens in its Indian colonies. Simultaneously, the Conservative party praised British heroism in the armed services in equal measure. A good example of this tactic is present in a speech given by Conservative party leader Benjamin Disraeli on 8 February 1858. The debate is on the topic of giving an official Vote of Thanks to the British army in India for services rendered in putting down the insurrection. Disraeli uses the topic to deftly create a paradoxical rift between the colonial armed services and the Governor-General of India, Lord Canning. Lord Canning was a Conservative Peelite turned Liberal, and a personal rival of Disraeli. On top of this, Canning was an appointment personally made by Viscount Palmerston only the previous year.⁸⁷ Disraeli starts his speech with praising the heroics of British officers, specifically naming popular heroes such as generals Outram, Campbell and Inglis, while also making mention of the sometimes underappreciated role of non-commissioned officers in Britain's victories. However, after

⁸⁵ Geoffrey Hicks, *Peace, War and Party Politics: The Conservatives and Europe 1846–59*, (Manchester University Press, 2013): 158.

⁸⁶ Hicks, *Peace War and Party Politics*, 159-161

⁸⁷ Deep Kanta Lahiri Choudhury, "The telegraph, censorship, and 'clemency': Canning during 1857," *Contemporary Perspectives* 3, no. 1 (2009): 38.

extensively praising the armed forces, Disraeli singles out a problem with the vote: he objects to the inclusion of Governor-General Lord Canning in the Vote of Thanks. On this he proclaims:

*“Now I am desirous upon this occasion to enter into any controversy with respect to the conduct of Lord Canning. Her Majesty's Ministers were perfectly justified in proposing, if they think his Excellency deserves them, the thanks of this House to Lord Canning; but then I think that upon a subject like that due notice should have been given. It should not have been considered a mere form; it should not have been a surprise. After all we have heard, I think that the friends of Lord Canning, not to speak of his Excellency himself, could not desire that a vote of such a kind should be surreptitiously obtained.”*⁸⁸

Disraeli, very deftly, seeks to attain party political benefits by excluding a long-time political rival from the official Vote of Thanks issued by the government. The failure of leaving party politics out of the question of India becomes even more apparent when looking at the subset data in table 4.2.

TABLE 4.2 Party affiliation and the mention of atrocities committed in India (Second Disraeli-Derby ministry 19 February 1858-30 July 1858)

			Sepoy/Indian atrocities	British atrocities	Praise British Conduct	Both British and Indian Atrocities	Total
Party Affiliation	Conservative	Count	1	1	0	1	3
		% within party affiliation	33.3%	33.3%	0%	33.3%	100%
		% of total	7.7%	7.7%	0%	7.7%	23.1%
	Liberal	Count	1	1	4	4	10
		% within party affiliation	10%	10%	40%	40%	100%
		% of total	7.7%	7.7%	30.8%	30.8%	76.9%
Total	Count	2	2	4	5	13	
	% of total	15.4%	15.4%	30.8%	38.5%	100%	

The Disraeli-Derby subset shows that by the time a Conservative government came into power, almost all mention of Indian atrocities by Conservative politicians subsided. On the side of the Liberals, Lord John Russell is the most vocal on atrocities, mentioning both Indian and British atrocities twice. Interestingly, John Arthur Roebuck, never directly mentions (military) atrocities, whilst John Bright only British atrocities once. I will elaborate on the meaning of this in chapter 3.

On the basis of this data, it can be concluded that the calls to not act in a party spirit when dealing with the subject of India were largely ignored, most noticeably by the Conservative party. Almost all of their mentions of atrocities coincided with the Liberal Palmerston ministry, whilst the mentions abated when a Conservative ministry came into power. Overall one can conclude that the atrocities were a talking point, being mentioned in 11% of conservative speeches and 4% of Liberal speeches. One can also conclude, however, that the mention of atrocities served mostly the political purpose of damaging the sitting government.

In this chapter I have introduced the concept of party politics as an important influence in the process of legislating for India and reacting to the Indian mutiny, and shown that despite repeated claims to ignore petty factionalism, party lines were largely maintained. This serves to nuance the image

⁸⁸ “Disraeli,” Vote of Thanks Debate, accessed on 03-03-2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-08/debates/a088ba15-1705-41ca-93bd-01af0787010b/VoteOfThanksToTheCivilServiceArmyAndNavyInIndia>

conjured by recent post-colonial authors of the British Empire as a monolithic entity. Internal squabbling played a major role in shaping colonial policy. Claims by post-colonial authors Brantlinger, Chakravarty, Kohlke, and Crane in regard to the lack of mention of British atrocities and a narrative focus on Sepoy atrocities have been largely confirmed, with the important caveat that when they were mentioned, they were voiced by some of the most well-known and influential politicians of the 1850's. In the third chapter, I shall go deeper into individual speeches, and highlight the importance of individual sources that can get lost in the anonymity of descriptive statistics.

Chapter 3

The importance of individual sources

In the first chapter I have dealt with a post-colonial trend in recent studies on the Indian mutiny. These studies focus on the importance of cultural production. I have shown the development of post-colonial thought that ultimately has led to the plethora of culturally oriented literature studies published on the Indian mutiny in the eighties and nineties. In the second chapter I have looked at the discourse used in the political sphere of the House of Commons in the year after the start of the Indian mutiny crisis. This third, and final, chapter confronts some of the claims made by the authors I have discussed in the first chapter as well as the method I have employed in chapter two. The post-colonial approach used by the writers highlighted in chapter one is centred around the recognition and exposition of overarching themes and patterns in written discourse in order to expose a narrative. Similarly, the method I have employed in the second chapter is suitable for discerning trends and relations between variables through the presence or absence of repeating occurrences. Both methods, although valuable tools, leave little room for the importance of the individual source. In looking for similarity and pattern, one negates the possible influence of the dissenter and the nonconformist. In the introduction to *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination*, Gautam Chakravarty writes: "*The history of dissent that dogged at nearly every step the Long War was, like the career of Edmund Burke, the Rockingham oligarch and early dissenter, that of a minority in perennial opposition.*"⁸⁹ Although factually true, the revival of party political strife made dissent an almost exclusive trait of the opposition, it does not tell the whole story. The flippant dismissal of the influence of people in perennial opposition becomes even less convincing when taking into consideration that the middle of the nineteenth century featured perhaps the most famous dissenters in perennial opposition: Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. In the context of English politics it also featured famous and independent dissenters such as John Bright and John Arthur Roebuck. Both Bright and Roebuck were prominent Quakers, a small religious faction known for its pacifism that played a significant role in opposing slavery and expanding suffrage.⁹⁰

John Bright holds a singular status in British parliamentary history. A radical at heart, he came to be known as the 'tribune of the people' for his tireless insistence on electoral reform and the importance of free trade doctrines. Bright was generally considered one of the premier orators of his time and garnered respect from both sides of the political aisle. By the time of the Indian mutiny, he had joined the larger coalition of free-trade advocates termed the Liberal party, but still operated very much independently.⁹¹ His success in expanding suffrage through the Second Reform Bill earned him the scorn of the aforementioned Karl Marx, who believed Bright's efforts to help the working class only served to drain them of their revolutionary potential.⁹² John Arthur Roebuck was a similarly singular figure in the House of Commons. A former Radical, Roebuck had joined with the Liberal party in the

⁸⁹ Chakravarty, *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination*, 2.

⁹⁰ Sandra Holton, "John Bright, radical politics, and the ethos of Quakerism," *Albion* 34, no. 4 (2002): 590.

⁹¹ Holton, "John Bright, radical politics, and the ethos of Quakerism," 584-585.

⁹² Asa Briggs, *Victorian people: a reassessment of persons and themes, 1851-67*, (University of Chicago Press, 1955): 200.

aftermath of the Corn Law controversies of the 1840's. Although perhaps not as famed an orator, Roebuck was no less an independent politician in a time that was, as we have seen, increasingly dominated by party politics. Roebuck was born in Madras, India, and maintained a lifelong interest in the subcontinent. It also explains Roebuck's heavy involvement in discussions regarding the government of India.

Bright and Roebuck had been among the very select group of English Radicals who had opposed the Crimean War in the years prior. Their opposition to what had been framed as a patriotic war initially made them very unpopular, with crowds in Manchester burning effigies of Radicals opposing the war.⁹³ However, as the war dragged on and its mismanagement became apparent, early oppositionist politicians like Roebuck and Bright were vindicated. Their early opposition to the war now retroactively took on the form of prescience. Especially Roebuck made himself popular with the working class and unpopular in Parliament by insisting on a select committee to investigate the state of the army before and during the Crimean War.⁹⁴ His accusatory style and tireless denunciation of what he saw as the incompetence of the privileged aristocracy, mockingly termed 'Whiggery', now earned him the acclaim of dissatisfied groups throughout England.⁹⁵

Roebuck and Bright are good examples of some of the shortcomings of database analysis. Because of the way I defined my variables, John Arthur Roebuck does not appear in table 3, that deals with the mention of atrocities. Similarly, John Bright only appears in that table by mentioning British atrocities once. Although this result corresponds directly and correctly with the question asked of the database, Roebuck never directly mentioned military atrocities and Bright only mentioned them once, this result does no justice to the more complex contextual truth. It makes no mention of either politician's indefatigable campaign for better living conditions both at home and abroad. Roebuck may not have mentioned military atrocities specifically, but 8 of his 12 total speeches between May 1857 and July 1858 were denunciations of British policy with a strong focus on Indian hardship. Similarly, each of John Bright's 6 speaking moments were widely circulated, multi-hour orations on the evils of British colonial policy and the possibility of change.

Both Bright and Roebuck were relatively solitary politicians in Parliament, usually taking a stance on political matters on personal title rather than in name of a larger political movement. However, both enjoyed long political careers and lasting relevance. Both championed the cause of reform and achieved significant results. By remaining a constant voice for change, they helped shift political ideas from the radical to the mainstream. When debating on the legislation for India on 7 June 1858, John Arthur Roebuck says of his own position in politics:

*Were I to consult only the probabilities of success in the proposition I have to make I should certainly be daunted, for I am tolerably sure there will be an immense majority against it. But that to me is no new thing. I have brought forward many propositions, which were at first rejected, but which afterwards became the creed of this House. Some years ago I contended for a particular course being followed in our colonial policy, and was always outvoted; but a time came when that which had been so often rejected, almost with scorn, became the creed of the Colonial Minister. I am not daunted, therefore, at the prospect of a large majority against me.*⁹⁶

It is here that Roebuck touches on another important methodological shortcoming of both literary oriented discourse analysis as discussed in the first chapter and the quantitative method I have myself employed in the second chapter. Pattern and trend recognition do not account for the influence of sustained opposition over a long period of time, nor for the influence of dissenting opinions being

⁹³ Briggs, *Victorian people*, 52.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 64.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 64.

⁹⁶ "John Arthur Roebuck," Committee Legislation for India, accessed 10 January 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-07/debates/f607f554-5deb-415b-873a-8dea484848af/GovernmentOfIndia%E2%80%9494Committee>

brought forth by influential people. The influence of their opposition is hard to capture in a statistical analysis that intensively covers a shorter timeframe. Some of the mentions of British atrocities committed in India were voiced by influential politicians and military figures such as sir Henry Rawlinson (appointed member of the first Council of India in 1858), General Thomas Perronet Thompson and Colonel William Henry Sykes. Their voices carried weight, and their opposition meant something, regardless of whether it had an immediate effect on policy. Such political context is important while interpreting historical data.

In the first chapter I highlighted claims made in recent post-colonial works on the Indian mutiny. One often repeated claim is that there was no awareness or mention of British atrocities committed against the Indian mutineers, whilst the atrocities committed by the Sepoy mutineers became potent symbols for Indian savagery. Brantlinger writes on this: “*Victorian accounts of the Mutiny display extreme forms of extropunitive projection, the racist pattern of blaming the victim expressed in terms of an absolute polarization of good and evil, innocence and guilt, justice and injustice, moral restraint and sexual depravity, civilization and barbarism.*”⁹⁷ Similarly, Kohlke suggests that, when mentioned, Victorians liked to frame Indian suffering as fitting punishment for rebelling in the first place.⁹⁸ Robert Crane, too, explicitly mentions the tradition of leaving out accounts of British savagery.⁹⁹ Chakravarty condemns talk of the civilising mission in India as a ‘fine veneer’, which disguises unbridled imperialism and capitalist greed.¹⁰⁰ Brantlinger declares the mutiny to be a turning point, when a sort of parental warmth quickly turned into feelings of anger and betrayal.¹⁰¹ In the second chapter, I have myself argued that the mention or omission of British atrocities in the House of Commons during the first year after the outbreak of the mutiny was largely motivated by party political interests. Especially the Conservative party stopped mentioning atrocities once the Conservative led Derby-Israeli ministry took office. Because most of the atrocities occurred during a Liberal cabinet, mentioning them does not hold the same strategical value for the Liberal party going forward, which means the number of mentions declines.

However, neither the literary analyses of these post-modern writers, nor the quantitative focus on party politics of the second chapter accounts for the influence of voices of dissent in the House of Commons. Similarly, the conclusion that party politics influenced attitude towards policy and the mentioning of atrocities, does not mean that individual speeches that did not toe the party line, were inconsequential. Nor does it mean that speeches that did not specifically mention British atrocities committed during the quelling of the mutiny, did not mention other forms of British misconduct. In the year represented by my database, John Arthur Roebuck spoke a total of 11 times on the topic of the Indian mutiny. Two of these contributions were positive towards government policy, one was neutral and eight were critical. None of them directly mentioned atrocities committed by British soldiers during the mutiny, thus his contributions are not represented in table 4, that deals with mentions of atrocities. All 8 speeches that are marked as critical of government policy do, however, mention general British misrule and critiques of current legislation. His final speech on the subject of Indian legislation, on 30 July 1858, includes the rather controversial statement that he hopes India shall be ruled in a spirit of justice, rather than a spirit of Christianity.¹⁰² Similarly, John Bright spoke six times on the topic of the British mutiny. In those six speeches, he only mentioned atrocities once, on 24 June 1858, when he mentions atrocities committed on both sides.¹⁰³ Although specific atrocities are

⁹⁷ Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness*, 200.

⁹⁸ Kohlke, *Neo-Victorian Tropes of Trauma*, 374.

⁹⁹ Robert Crane, *Inventing India*, 21.

¹⁰⁰ Chakravarty, *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination*, 2.

¹⁰¹ Brantlinger, *Rule of Darkness*, 201.

¹⁰² “John Arthur Roebuck,” Government of India debate, accessed 20 June 2022, [https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-07-30/debates/129a2166-253f-43d0-930b-05b8072a93b7/GovernmentOfIndia\(No3\)Bill](https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-07-30/debates/129a2166-253f-43d0-930b-05b8072a93b7/GovernmentOfIndia(No3)Bill)

¹⁰³ “John Bright,” Government of India debate, accessed 13 May 2022, [https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-24/debates/08bc0a25-c97e-45bc-9aba-4d962762e936/TheGovernmentOfIndia\(No3\)Bill](https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-24/debates/08bc0a25-c97e-45bc-9aba-4d962762e936/TheGovernmentOfIndia(No3)Bill)

mentioned only once, most of his speeches contain scathing criticism of British rule in India.

For example, on 24 June 1858, during a debate on legislation for India and its potential future, John Bright gives a lengthy oration, detailing the state of India under English rule. Important themes addressed by Bright are the overwhelming poverty of the ryots who cultivate the land, the size of India in comparison with England, the enormous power vested in the office of the governor-general and the possible road to good administration for the people of India.¹⁰⁴ On the possibility for good government he says:

*We start from a platform of conquest by force of arms extending over a hundred years. There is nothing in the world worse than the sort of foundation from which we start. The greatest genius who has shed lustre on the literature of this country has said, "There is no sure foundation set on blood;" and it may be our unhappy fate, in regard to India, to demonstrate the truth of that saying. We are always subjugators, and we must be viewed with hatred and suspicion. I say we must look at the thing as it is, if we are to see our exact position, what our duty is, and what chance there is of our retaining India and of governing it for the advantage of its people. Our difficulties have been enormously increased by the revolt. The people of India have only seen England in its worst form in that country. They have seen it in its military power, its exclusive Civil Service, and in the supremacy of a handful of foreigners.*¹⁰⁵

In this segment of his speech, John Bright exhibits what one anachronistically could term a ‘modern’ view of England’s role in India. There is no sign of the ‘jingoist drum-beating’ or even the sugar-coating of self-aggrandisement. Bright shows an awareness of the power relations at play between the subjugator and the subjugated, without instinctively reaching for contemporary soothing discourse on white guidance, superiority and mentoring. These criticisms were voiced by a democratically elected, well respected, although admittedly radical, politician in the heart of English government. The response of Conservative politician James Whiteside is illustrative of the respect John Bright garnered from his fellow Members of Parliament:

*He had listened to the speech of the hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright) with much interest and no little instruction. The hon. Gentleman had ably and eloquently delivered to the House his sentiments on what, he agreed with him, was one of the greatest and grandest subjects which could occupy the human mind, and that was how they were to decide to govern great nations.*¹⁰⁶

The sentiments expressed by John Bright in his speech, including a general amnesty, denunciation of the EIC and great legislative reform for India, may not have been widely shared at that moment, but gained credence for being uttered by a well-respected MP.

Similarly, on 26 March 1858, Bright speaks on the role of the EIC in India. Now that the fall of the EIC is at hand, Bright exclaims that he is glad that he has opposed the company for over 15 years. Although he admits that some of the members of the court of directors would wish to do what is right for India, he objects to the governance of the EIC because there is: “...a total want of responsibility, and they could never lay hold of the great criminals who committed the great crimes

¹⁰⁴ A ryot or raiyat was a person that held the lease to a parcel of land for a certain duration and cultivated it in return. The impoverished state of the ryots is a point of much discussion, and is often attributed to overzealous taxation by English officials.

¹⁰⁵ “John Bright,” Government of India debate, accessed 5 March 2022, [https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-24/debates/08bc0a25-c97e-45bc-9aba-4d962762e936/TheGovernmentOfIndia\(No3\)Bill](https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-24/debates/08bc0a25-c97e-45bc-9aba-4d962762e936/TheGovernmentOfIndia(No3)Bill)

¹⁰⁶ “John Bright,” Government of India debate, accessed 27 June 2022, [https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-24/debates/08bc0a25-c97e-45bc-9aba-4d962762e936/TheGovernmentOfIndia\(No3\)Bill](https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-24/debates/08bc0a25-c97e-45bc-9aba-4d962762e936/TheGovernmentOfIndia(No3)Bill)

which all England now admitted had been committed against the people of India.”¹⁰⁷ This excerpt exemplifies the fact that opinions that start out radical, in time can become accepted. During the 1840s, Bright was ridiculed for his insistence that the EIC was misgoverning India. Bright’s insistence on the untenable nature of Company rule occurred in the margins of acceptable political discourse. Now, in 1858, Bright’s fringe ideas had taken on the form of inescapable truth. Dissenting discourse had found its way into the accepted mainstream.

On 15 February 1858, John Arthur Roebuck addresses the House on the topic of legislation for the government of India. Although he says he wishes not to enter into a discussion on the topic of how England acquired dominion of India, he does however wish to say, that in its acquisition, England has “...broken every rule of morality.”¹⁰⁸ Although Roebuck is not free of his share of delusions in regard to the racial superiority of the English over other races, he fiercely denounces the treatment of the people of India by the EIC. He indignantly exclaims in regard to Company rule:

*...that the whole object of their Government was money!—money to the directors in the shape of dividend—money to their servants in the shape of large fortunes; and that they had crushed and trampled upon the unhappy people of Hindostan as if they had been dirt beneath their feet, except that they were dirt out of which they could dig gold.*¹⁰⁹

Although a staunch believer in the possibility of a civilising mission, it is hard to believe that, at least for John Arthur Roebuck, it was just veneer to cover baser motivations. At the end of his speech, Roebuck implores his fellow members of parliament to not shrink away from their duty, to not allow England to further fill the role of the despot, when it is within parliament’s power to legislate for the good of India.¹¹⁰ Roebuck was not well-liked or universally respected like John Bright, but this mostly stemmed from a reputation for blunt honesty and his accusatory style. This is exemplified by the reaction of Liberal politician M.E. Grant Duff to Roebuck’s speech. Although he agrees with Roebuck on most points and would eventually help end Company rule by voting in favour of its abolition, he states:

*The hon. and learned Member for Sheffield (Mr. Roebuck) had spoken not very respectfully of the "Old Indians," when contrasting them with Mr. John Stuart Mill. Now, he (Mr. Grant Duff) entertained the greatest respect for the "Old Indians" who sat at the Board. If they had not extraordinary talent they had at least great experience. The hon. Member for Sheffield had blamed them for not possessing the abilities of Mr. John Stuart Mill; but if so high a standard was to be applied, how many of the best known public men in Europe would be found wanting!*¹¹¹

Although John Bright and John Arthur Roebuck fit the description ‘in perennial opposition’ the best, they were not the only ones to express contrary sentiments in the heart of British politics on the topic of India, and not all who expressed such sentiments were Radicals. On 22 February 1858, prominent Conservative politician and banker Thomas Baring opposes legislation presented by the

¹⁰⁷ “John Bright,” Government of India debate, accessed 5 March 2022, [https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-03-26/debates/48f2c1f0-ee22-46af-98a1-fd3e50bad212/GovernmentOfIndia\(No2\)Bill](https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-03-26/debates/48f2c1f0-ee22-46af-98a1-fd3e50bad212/GovernmentOfIndia(No2)Bill)

¹⁰⁸ “John Arthur Roebuck,” Government of India debate, accessed 5 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-15/debates/c39fd3b0-1eb4-43da-b05f-1c699d2a702c/GovernmentOfIndia%E2%80%94Leave>

¹⁰⁹ “John Arthur Roebuck,” Government of India debate, accessed 5 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-15/debates/c39fd3b0-1eb4-43da-b05f-1c699d2a702c/GovernmentOfIndia%E2%80%94Leave>

¹¹⁰ “John Arthur Roebuck,” Government of India debate, accessed 5 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-15/debates/c39fd3b0-1eb4-43da-b05f-1c699d2a702c/GovernmentOfIndia%E2%80%94Leave>

¹¹¹ “M.E. Grant Duff,” Government of India debate, accessed 5 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-15/debates/c39fd3b0-1eb4-43da-b05f-1c699d2a702c/GovernmentOfIndia%E2%80%94Leave>

Conservative party's own Lord Stanley because he believes the goal should be to achieve the best possible government for the people of India, and he does not believe the current bill achieves that.¹¹² This debate takes place after the fall of Palmerston's ministry, and is included in table 2.2. The number-driven conclusion based on this table is that most Conservative party members have stopped voicing criticism after the Conservative Second Derby-Disraeli cabinet was installed on 20 February 1858. However, Baring risks falling out of favour with Conservative party leader Lord Derby and his son Lord Stanley rather than vote in favour of what he believes to be legislation that is detrimental to the wellbeing of India. Although in table 2.2 Baring's speech only shows up as one of only 27 conservative speeches to be critical of government policy during the Second Derby-Disraeli ministry, this does no justice to the importance of a prominent Conservative politician like Thomas Baring voicing dissent, especially so early on in the cabinet's term, when power is still being consolidated.

On 15 February 1858, Liberal politician Robert Aglionby Slaney publicly accuses the EIC of years of mismanagement and presents a long list of public works the company has neglected to provide for India, which has resulted in the suffering of the local population. He places special emphasis on the fact that the company has neglected to install irrigating systems, of which he says:

*What had the Company done in return for these exactions? For want of works of irrigation whole populations were periodically decimated by famine. Canals, railways, and other improvements had indeed, within the last few years, been tardily set on foot; but by a wise and humane Government these enterprises, so essential to the welfare of the millions under their sway, and at the same time so reproductive to the public revenue, would have been commenced long ago.*¹¹³

On 25 June 1858, the same Robert Aglionby Slaney proclaims that the people of India have suffered enough, and begs his fellow members of parliament to legislate for their benefit.¹¹⁴

Two weeks earlier, on 7 June 1858, independent Conservative Henry Drummond states that if parliament does not currently succeed in drastically bettering the circumstances of the Indian populace, he wishes they had lost possession of the subcontinent. In the same speech he shames his fellow Englishmen in India, who professed indignation and surprise at the mutiny, yet have treated their Empire's Indian subjects with utter contempt for ages. He claims:

*...the insolent behaviour which English people resident in India thought it necessary to pursue towards the Natives by way of keeping up their own dignity, was carried to such a pitch as to lead the latter to avoid as much as possible all intercourse with them, inasmuch as they were far more likely to meet with slights and neglect than with sympathy.*¹¹⁵

He accuses many of the so-called 'old Indians' of having little to no knowledge of Indian customs or language, whilst acting in a cruel and tyrannical way towards their colonial subjects.¹¹⁶ Drummond asks: *"The people of India having been subjected to such treatment, was it surprising that they should*

¹¹² "Thomas Baring," Government of India debate, accessed 7 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-12/debates/f507c998-e250-48a4-8e01-9fbe7d8aa3d1/GovernmentOfIndia>

¹¹³ "Robert Aglionby Slaney," Government of India debate, accessed 7 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-15/debates/c39fd3b0-1eb4-43da-b05f-1c699d2a702c/GovernmentOfIndia%E2%80%9494Leave>

¹¹⁴ "Robert Aglionby Slaney," Government of India debate, accessed 7 March 2022, [https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-25/debates/27ac5087-4540-4481-a273-859407b57c77/GovernmentOfIndia\(No3\)Bill](https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-25/debates/27ac5087-4540-4481-a273-859407b57c77/GovernmentOfIndia(No3)Bill)

¹¹⁵ "Henry Drummond," Committee on the government for India, accessed 2 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-07/debates/f607f554-5deb-415b-873a-8dea484848af/GovernmentOfIndia%E2%80%9494Committee>

¹¹⁶ "Henry Drummond," Committee on the government for India, accessed 2 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-07/debates/f607f554-5deb-415b-873a-8dea484848af/GovernmentOfIndia%E2%80%9494Committee>

hate us?"¹¹⁷ In the same speech, Drummond daringly suggests that any legislation for India should always have the ultimate goal of Indian self-government. Illustrating a more stereotypical view of matters, fellow conservative Charles Cumming-Bruce responds:

*Now, he could conceive nothing more likely to retard the object which his hon. Friend had in view than that our legislation should cripple the power of Englishmen in India, because such was the absence of truth among the Natives, and their want of reliance upon each other, that he believed the only way to raise them to a capacity for self-government was to keep them attached for many years to come, as a dependency to this country.*¹¹⁸

Finally, on 26 March 1858, independent Liberal politician (and Quaker) Charles Gilpin, a politician involved in the international anti-slavery movement and the Peace Society, professes that he believes the new legislation would be an improvement for the Indian people. His only regret is that the Indian people will not have voice in the new government. He states:

*The only point on which he wished to ask the consideration of the right hon. Gentleman and of the House at that moment was this . . . while the Native Princes were to have, in one sense, a representative at the new Council Board, it was to be regretted that there was to be no representative of the people of India, whose happiness was deeply involved in this measure. He trusted that in all the stages of that Bill, it would be borne in mind on both sides of the House, that if they had any business in India, it was to govern for the benefit of India, rather than for the benefit of England.*¹¹⁹

Gilpin was a politician with a long and well-established reputation for humanitarianism. Gilpin undoubtedly saw flaws in the new legislation, but also seems to have genuinely believed it be an improvement for the people of India. For independent politicians such as Bright, Roebuck, Slaney and Gilpin, it seems too crude to define their contributions and convictions, like Chakravarty has done, as 'humbug'.¹²⁰

In the second chapter I have confirmed that atrocities committed by Indian Sepoys against white Brits were far more often mentioned in the House of Commons than atrocities committed by the British soldiery against the Indian populace. As can be seen in table 3, Sepoy atrocities are mentioned 16 times, whilst British atrocities are only mentioned 4 times. Indian and British atrocities are mentioned in the same speech 5 times, while the conduct of the British army is praised on 17 different occasions. This does not mean, however, that atrocities committed by British soldiers were not known at the time. In fact, atrocities committed by the British soldiers were discussed in attendance of the entirety of the House of Commons on several occasions.

On 16 February 1858, General Thomas Perronet Thompson sharply criticises any who claims surprise at the outbreak of the mutiny. He draws attention to a slew of insensitivities on the British part prior to the mutiny: trying to forcefully introduce the bible, manufacturing the infamous animal-greased cartridges, savagely punishing any soldier who respectfully addressed the problem. When the Sepoy finally had enough and rebelled, they were hunted down by cavalry and blown from guns. Thompson handily summarises the wisdom of British rule as follows: "*He declared that if he were on full pay and allowances, to do all he could to make difficult the British rule in India, he could think of*

¹¹⁷ "Henry Drummond," Committee on the government for India, accessed 2 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-07/debates/f607f554-5deb-415b-873a-8dea484848af/GovernmentOfIndia%E2%80%9494Committee>

¹¹⁸ "Charles Cumming-Bruce," Committee on the government for India, accessed 2 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-07/debates/f607f554-5deb-415b-873a-8dea484848af/GovernmentOfIndia%E2%80%9494Committee>

¹¹⁹ "Charles Gilpin," Government of India debate, accessed 2 March 2022, [https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-03-26/debates/48f2c1f0-ee22-46af-98a1-fd3e50bad212/GovernmentOfIndia\(No2\)Bill](https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-03-26/debates/48f2c1f0-ee22-46af-98a1-fd3e50bad212/GovernmentOfIndia(No2)Bill)

¹²⁰ Chakravarty, *the Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination*, 2.

nothing that had been left undone."¹²¹ General Thompson draws special attention to the murder of the princes of Delhi in the aftermath of the siege of Delhi, which he says cannot be seen as "...*anything but the foulest murder under trust recorded in history.*"¹²² The British lust for vengeance in India, Thompson claims, has turned soldiers into executioners.

Finally, General Thompson refers to letters in a newspaper of an officer who professes great joy at the execution of Indian mutineers. Of this he says: "*We hang them like fun*" wrote one of the colonist executioners. He begged pardon for making such a quotation in their presence, but it showed the manner of man who had got the upper hand in India."¹²³ General Thompson's speech is greeted with great hostility from other (mostly Conservative) members of Parliament. Conservative politician Lawrence Palk goes as far as to say: "...*he had certainly never expected to have his feelings so outraged as by the speech to which they had just listened.*"¹²⁴ It does, however, show that knowledge of British atrocities was relatively commonplace, if not palatable to the majority, and being discussed in the seat of representative government.

On 8 February 1858, Liberal party leader Lord John Russell addresses the House and praises the calm reaction to the mutiny displayed by governor-general Lord Canning. Lord Russell says that in the heat of the moment, the British clamouring for retaliation went too far. Although he admits that regrettable events have taken place, he is glad such conduct was not made policy by Lord Canning.¹²⁵ Similarly, on 18 March 1858, Henry Rich gives a speech on atrocities and tales of atrocities. He professes the greatest sadness at the atrocities committed on both sides, although he warns the house against falsehoods that have spread and inflame retaliatory passions. He says:

*He could make small allowance for those gentlemen who won their popularity at the cost of Indian blood, giving currency, on the platform and in the press, to extravagant tales of horror, for which they had no honest authority. They told of ladies and children, violated and mutilated, arriving almost by shoals in Calcutta and in England; so that their tales ran through the country like wildfire, making the blood run cold with horror and hot with vengeance. For much of the results of this vengeance they are answerable, for their facts were false.*¹²⁶

Thus, Rich notifies the House of the untrustworthiness of many of the stories doing the rounds. Furthermore, Rich makes mention of the indiscriminate hanging of Indians, Sepoy or not, and burning of villages in retaliation. Just as was the case with General Thompson's remarks, Conservative reactions were outraged, with MP William Vansittart rising in order: "... *express a hope that the House would not be carried away by the feeling of morbid sensibility evinced by the hon. Member for*

¹²¹ "General Thompson," The Annexation of Oude Debate, accessed on 15 February 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-16/debates/9ab7eb05-f8f9-420c-99d1-2d35c2b76b21/India%E2%80%94AnnexationOfOude>

¹²² "General Thompson," The Annexation of Oude Debate, accessed on 15 February 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-16/debates/9ab7eb05-f8f9-420c-99d1-2d35c2b76b21/India%E2%80%94AnnexationOfOude>

¹²³ "General Thompson," The Annexation of Oude Debate, accessed on 15 February 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-16/debates/9ab7eb05-f8f9-420c-99d1-2d35c2b76b21/India%E2%80%94AnnexationOfOude>

¹²⁴ "General Thompson," The Annexation of Oude Debate, accessed on 15 February 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-16/debates/9ab7eb05-f8f9-420c-99d1-2d35c2b76b21/India%E2%80%94AnnexationOfOude>

¹²⁵ "Lord John Russell," Vote of Thanks debate, accessed on 12 February 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-08/debates/a088ba15-1705-41ca-93bd-01af0787010b/VoteOfThanksToTheCivilServiceArmyAndNavyInIndia>

¹²⁶ "Henry Rich," Indian Mutinies debate, accessed on 29 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-03-18/debates/efff027-f07f-4cc2-9765-15d959f45bb1/EastIndiaMutinies>

*Richmond (Mr. Rich) on behalf of our mutinous Sepoys.*¹²⁷ As well as exclaiming: “...if any thought of the number of criminals, if any feeling of compassion, interfered with the executioner, there was an end of our character in Indian eyes.”¹²⁸

Finally, on 18 March 1858, liberal MP Charles Buxton warns parliament to use its influence to stem the retaliatory impulses of their soldiers in India. Although couching his language in understanding for the anger that ran hot among the British troops, Buxton clearly states that parliament needs to stop the British soldiers from committing further atrocities against the Indian population. Of the British soldiers he says warningly: “*There seemed to be no slackening in the tempest of rage against the Sepoys, and even against the whole Native population.*” Similar to Henry Rich, he also warns of exaggerated or baseless stories of Indian atrocities that further inflame British soldiers: “*But we ought now to bear in mind that after thorough investigation the highest Indian authorities had satisfied themselves that those tales, if not wholly groundless, were much exaggerated, while some were without any foundation.*”¹²⁹ Charles Buxton urges parliament to be on the side of reticence and of humanity, after so much blood has already been spilled by British soldiers.

Although these voices were no doubt exceptions during the first year of the crisis, they were nonetheless heard in Westminster Palace. In a world that moved relatively slowly due to imperfect communication methods, much of what happened in India eventually made its way to England, including the less admirable actions of its own armies. There were members of parliament who went against the grain and publicly denounced the conduct of British soldiers, and the spreading of falsehoods that further aggravated the situation. These opinions were voiced in the margins, but to paraphrase John Arthur Roebuck: what is one day scorned can become creed the next. Dissidents and oppositionists play a vital part and exercise influence that can be hard to measure. Ignoring their role in history would be to deny an essential part of historical reality. John Bright, John Arthur Roebuck, Charles Gilpin, Thomas Baring, Robert Aglionby Slaney, General Thompson and Henry Rich all voiced divergent views, defying the accepted contemporary narrative. The only historical constant is change, and change can only be affected through opposition. The monolithic picture of the British Empire painted by the post-colonial authors in chapter 1 certainly has its uses in a macro-historical perspective, but does no justice to the complex inner workings of societies and does not leave enough room for contingency and the steady attrition of persistent opposition.

¹²⁷ “Henry Rich,” Indian Mutinies debate, accessed on 29 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-03-18/debates/ffff027-f07f-4cc2-9765-15d959f45bb1/EastIndiaMutinies>

¹²⁸ “Henry Rich,” Indian Mutinies debate, accessed on 29 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-03-18/debates/ffff027-f07f-4cc2-9765-15d959f45bb1/EastIndiaMutinies>

¹²⁹ “Charles Buxton,” East India Mutinies debate, accessed 11 February 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-03-18/debates/ffff027-f07f-4cc2-9765-15d959f45bb1/EastIndiaMutinies>

Conclusion

My aim in this thesis was to substantiate the existence of a post-colonial paradigm within the subfield of Indian mutiny research. This paradigm is defined by an overreliance on cultural production and literature as source material. The field has skewed very far in favour of discourse analysis, to the detriment of other innovative research methods. I have discerned common themes and claims present within the recent historiography in order to answer the research question: do claims in regard to the monolithic nature of the British Empire and the narrative focus on Indian atrocities during the Indian mutiny crisis of 1857 hold up against a mixed methods analysis of discourse in the House of Commons from May 1857 to July 1858?

Thus, in the first chapter of this thesis, I have highlighted the increasing dominance of post-colonial thought in recent scholarship on the topic of the Indian mutiny from the 1960s up to the turn of the century and drawn attention to the increasing focus on cultural history in the form of literary analysis. I have introduced the theoretical framework of three influential 'founding fathers' of postcolonial theory: Frantz Fanon, Edward Said and Homi K. Bhabha. By doing this, I have tried to give insight into the source of these overarching themes and assumptions. Subsequently, I introduced Chakravarty's *The Indian Mutiny and the British Imagination*, Patrick Brantlinger's *Rule of Darkness*, Marie-Luise Kohlke's *Neo-Victorian Tropes of Trauma*, and Ralph Crane's *Inventing India* in order to highlight the presence of these common themes. The first theme I identified in these foundational post-colonial works is the understanding of colonialism as both a form of government and as ideology which leads to a structural and reductively monolithic understanding of West-European colonial powers. Colonial societies are reduced to hive-mind like juggernauts propelled by a collective, class-transcendent understanding of the societal gains of imperialism. The second common theme is the use of (Foucauldian inspired-) discourse analysis and the subsequent focus on the psychological components of colonialism. This translates into an overreliance on the cultural production of West-European colonial powers as source material. The third theme is the recognition in this literary source material of a narrative focus on Indian atrocities committed against British subjects, whilst ignoring British atrocities committed against Indian subjects.

In the second chapter, I have contributed to the Indian mutiny historiography by creating a database of all speeches on the topic of the Indian mutiny made in the House of Commons between May 1857 and July 1858. Through this database I have introduced party politics as a variable with considerable explanatory power in relation to the shaping of colonial legislation. Table 1 has shown that the relative percentage of positive/negative/neutral responses was (relatively) similar for the Conservatives and Liberals when taken for the entire duration of the dataset. However, table 2.1 and 2.2 have demonstrated that the distribution of positive/negative responses is directly related to which party was in the opposition. This indicates that calls to leave party politics out of the equation had fallen on deaf ears. This is most convincingly evidenced by Liberal party members expressing overwhelmingly negative responses to the Government of India legislation, which was supported by them when it was introduced (in a slightly different form) by Liberal party leader Lord Palmerston before his first cabinet fell in February 1858. Thus this study concluded that the Government of India Act, one of the most important documents in the government of England's largest colony and the foundation for much of the next century of colonial rule, was extensively influenced by domestic strife and factionalism in England.

When looking at the claims surrounding the mention of atrocities in table 3, the results of this study have shown that atrocities committed by Indian troops were indeed mentioned most often. When British atrocities were mentioned in the House of Commons, they were often placed in the context of Indian 'savagery'. Overall, most mentions of atrocities occurred in the first months after the outbreak of the mutiny. After Palmerston's Liberal cabinet fell, almost all Conservative mentions of atrocities, Indian or British, stopped. This shows there was an undeniable party political dimension to the mentioning of atrocities. In this regard, it appears that the claims identified in the first chapter in regard to the focus on Indian atrocities were largely correct. I would however, stress the fact that

mentions of British military misconduct were present, even when often coupled to Indian atrocities.

In the third chapter I have singled out examples of dissenters on the topic of the Indian mutiny and by extent the Government of India legislation. By focussing on dissenting opinions I have introduced a narrative counterweight against the image of Victorian England as a monolithic entity in chapter 1, as well as the lack of contextual nuance present in the tables of chapter 2. I have argued that ‘perennial oppositionists’ such as John Bright and John Arthur Roebuck, as well as regular politicians expressing moral concerns have an important part to play in effecting change over longer period of time. Simply focusing on majority opinions does no credit to the complicated historical reality of Victorian politics.

By moving beyond cultural analysis and introducing a quantitative analysis of parliamentary debates and a qualitative analysis of individual politicians going against the grain, I have provided important historical context and a completer image of the political reality surrounding the Indian mutiny in England. By marrying quantitative and qualitative methods, I have been able to present a nuanced image of political discourse, showing both popular and dissenting opinion. I believe any attempt to identify the structural should always be counterbalanced by a close inspection of the specific. In the end, this thesis has been a plea for employing mixed methods research and not falling for the reductive tendency to skew to one side of scholarly spectrum overly much, as has recently been the case in Victorian Empire studies.

Bibliography

Archival

- “Charles Buxton,” East India Mutinies debate, accessed 11 February 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-03-18/debates/effff027-f07f-4cc2-9765-15d959f45bb1/EastIndiaMutinies>
- “Charles Gilpin,” Government of India debate, accessed 2 March 2022, [https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-03-26/debates/48f2c1f0-ee22-46af-98a1-fd3e50bad212/GovernmentOfIndia\(No2\)Bill](https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-03-26/debates/48f2c1f0-ee22-46af-98a1-fd3e50bad212/GovernmentOfIndia(No2)Bill)
- “Disraeli,” Vote of Thanks Debate, last accessed 3 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-08/debates/a088ba15-1705-41ca-93bd-01af0787010b/VoteOfThanksToTheCivilServiceArmyAndNavyInIndia>
- “General Thompson,” The Annexation of Oude Debate, accessed on 15 February 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-16/debates/9ab7eb05-f8f9-420c-99d1-2d35c2b76b21/India%E2%80%94AnnexationOfOude>
- “Government of India Act 1858,” Indian Legislation, last accessed on 15 February 2022, <http://www.indianlegislation.in/BA/BaActToc.aspx?actid=2222>
- “Henry Drummond,” Committee on the government for India, accessed 2 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-07/debates/f607f554-5deb-415b-873a-8dea484848af/GovernmentOfIndia%E2%80%94Committee>
- “Henry Rich,” Indian Mutinies debate, accessed on 29 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-03-18/debates/effff027-f07f-4cc2-9765-15d959f45bb1/EastIndiaMutinies>
- “John Arthur Roebuck,” Committee Legislation for India, last accessed 10 January 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-07/debates/f607f554-5deb-415b-873a-8dea484848af/GovernmentOfIndia%E2%80%94Committee>
- “John Arthur Roebuck,” Government of India debate, accessed 5 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-15/debates/c39fd3b0-1eb4-43da-b05f-1c699d2a702c/GovernmentOfIndia%E2%80%94Leave>
- “John Bright,” Government of India debate, accessed 13 May 2022, [https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-24/debates/08bc0a25-c97e-45bc-9aba-4d962762e936/TheGovernmentOfIndia\(No3\)Bill](https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-24/debates/08bc0a25-c97e-45bc-9aba-4d962762e936/TheGovernmentOfIndia(No3)Bill)
- “John Bright,” Government of India debate, accessed 5 March 2022, [https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-24/debates/08bc0a25-c97e-45bc-9aba-4d962762e936/TheGovernmentOfIndia\(No3\)Bill](https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-06-24/debates/08bc0a25-c97e-45bc-9aba-4d962762e936/TheGovernmentOfIndia(No3)Bill)
- “Lord John Russell,” Vote of Thanks debate, accessed on 12 February 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-08/debates/a088ba15-1705-41ca-93bd-01af0787010b/VoteOfThanksToTheCivilServiceArmyAndNavyInIndia>
- “Thomas Curson Hansard,” About Hansard, last accessed on 12 May 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/about>
- “Party spirit,” Government of India debates, last accessed 03 February 2020, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-04-12/debates/ce242575-e540-4365-98a5-dfa1e2c7c05e/Supply%E2%80%94GovernmentOfIndia>
- “Resolutions,” Debate on the Government of India, last accessed 3 February 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-05-03/debates/d31b34d7-44e1-4199-afd0-84d8d7a1bd6e/GovernmentOfIndia>
- “Robert Aglionby Slaney,” Government of India debate, accessed 7 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-15/debates/c39fd3b0-1eb4-43da-b05f-1c699d2a702c/GovernmentOfIndia%E2%80%94Leave>

“sir Harry Verney,” Government of India Debate Resumed, last accessed 3 February 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/Debates?startDate=1858-05-03&endDate=1858-05-03&searchTerm=India&house=Commons&partial=False>

“Thomas Baring,” Government of India debate, accessed 7 March 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/Commons/1858-02-12/debates/f507c998-e250-48a4-8e01-9fbe7d8aa3d1/GovernmentOfIndia>

“Thomas Curson Hansard,” About Hansard, last accessed on 12 May 2022, <https://hansard.parliament.uk/about>

Secondary literature

Adas, Michael. "Imperialism and colonialism in comparative perspective." *The International History Review* 20, no. 2 (1998): 371-388.

Ball, Charles. *The History of the Indian Mutiny: Giving a Detailed Account of the Sepoy Insurrection in India: And a Concise History of the Great Military Events which Have Tended to Consolidate the British Empire in Hindostan*. Vol. 2. London Printing and Publishing Company, 1858.

Bayly, Christopher Alan. *Indian society and the making of the British Empire*. Vol. 1. Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The location of culture*. Routledge, 1994.

Brantlinger, Patrick. "Rule of Darkness: Imperialism and British Literature, 1830-1914." *Ithaca: Cornell UP* 1988.

Briggs, Asa. *Victorian people: a reassessment of persons and themes. 1851-67*. University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Cave-Browne, John. *The Punjab and Delhi in 1857: Being a Narrative of the Measures by which the Punjab was Saved and Delhi Recovered during the Indian Mutiny*. Vol. 1. William Blackwood and Sons, 1861.

Chakravarty, Gautam. *The Indian mutiny and the British imagination*. Vol. 43. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Choudhury, Deep Kanta Lahiri. "The telegraph, censorship, and 'clemency': Canning during 1857." *Contemporary Perspectives* 3, no. 1 (2009): 35-53.

Crane, Ralph. *Inventing India: a history of India in English-language fiction*. Springer, 1992.

Easthope, Anthony. "Homi Bhabha, Hybridity and Identity, or Derrida Versus Lacan," *Hungarian Journal of English and American Studies (HJEAS)* 4, no. 1/2 (1998): 145-161.

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Trans. Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press 6, 2004.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Mask*. Trans. Max Silverman. Manchester University Press, 2005.

Grey, Daniel J.R. "Creating the 'Problem Hindu': Sati, Thuggee and Female Infanticide in India, 1800–60." *Sex, Gender and the Sacred: Reconfiguring Religion in Gender History* (2014): 104-116.

Hall, Catherine, and Sonya O. Rose. eds. *At Home with the Empire: metropolitan culture and the imperial world*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Headrick, Daniel. "A double-edged sword: communications and imperial control in British India," *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung* (2010): 54-63.

Herbert, Christopher. *War of no pity*. Princeton University Press, 2008.

Hicks, Geoffrey. *Peace, War and Party Politics: The Conservatives and Europe 1846–59*, Manchester University Press, 2013.

Holton, Sandra. "John Bright, radical politics, and the ethos of Quakerism." *Albion* 34, no. 4 (2002): 580-605.

Kaye, John William. *A History of the Sepoy War in India, 1857-58*. Vol. 2. Longmans, Green and Company, 1866.

Kitson Clark, George. *The Making of Victorian England*. London, 1962.

Kohlke, Marie-Luise, and Christian Guteben. *Neo-Victorian Tropes of Trauma: The Politics of Bearing After-Witness to Nineteenth-Century Suffering*. Neo-Victorian Series, Vol. 1. Rodopi, 2010.

Malleson, George Bruce. *The Mutiny of the Bengal army: an historical narrative*. Vol. 1. Bosworth and Harrison, 1858.

Middleton, Alex. "Victorian Politics and politics overseas." *The Historical Journal* 64, no. 5 (2021), 1462-1474.

Paris, Michael. *Warrior Nation: Images of War in British Popular Culture, 1850-2000*, (London: Reaktion Books, 2000).

Pettigrew, William A., and Mahesh Gopalan. eds. *The East India Company, 1600-1857: Essays on Anglo-Indian Connection*, (Routledge, 2016): 169-175.

Rotton, John Edward Wharton. *The Chaplain's Narrative of the Siege of Delhi: From the Outbreak at Meerut to the Capture of Delhi*. Smith, Elder, 1858.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon 80, 1978.

Sabin, Margery. *Dissenters and mavericks: Writings about India in English, 1765-2000*. Oxford University Press, 2002.

Stubbings, Matthew. "British Conservatism and the Indian Revolt: The Annexation of Awadh and the Consequences of Liberal Empire, 1856–1858." *Journal of British Studies* 55, no. 4 (2016): 730-755

Taylor, A.J.P. "Lord Palmerston." *History Today* 41, no. 1 (1991): 38-46.

Teltscher, Kate. "Hobson-Jobson: The East India Company lexicon," *World Englishes* 36, no. 4 (2017): 510-522.

Trafford, James. *The empire at home: Internal colonies and the end of Britain*. Pluto, 2020.

Trevelyan, George Otto. *Cawnpore*. London: Macmillan, 1886.

Vaughan, Megan. "Madness and colonialism, colonialism as madness re-reading Fanon. Colonial discourse and the psychopathology of colonialism." *Paideuma* (1993): 45-55.

Vice, John, and Stephen Farrell, *The history of Hansard*, House of Lords Library and House of Lords Hansard, 2017.

Appendix 1 – Database of debates on the topic of the Indian Mutiny in the House of Commons from 22 May 1857 to 30 July 1858

Date	Name speaker	Nature of contribution	Political party	Mention of atrocities	Cabinet in office
22-May-1857	Lord Claud Hamilton	Critical of government policy	Conservative	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
28-May-1857	Lord Claud Hamilton	Critical of government policy	Conservative	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
23-Jun-1857	John Benjamin Smith	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
26-Jun-1857	sir Erskine Perry	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
29-Jun-1857	Benjamin Disraeli	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
10-Jul-1857	Admiral Charles Napier	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
13-Jul-1857	Benjamin Disraeli	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
13-Jul-1857	sir John Pakington	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
14-Jul-1857	Benjamin Disraeli	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
16-Jul-1857	Admiral Charles Napier	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
16-Jul-1857	William Vansittart	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
17-Jul-1857	Admiral Arthur Duncombe	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
17-Jul-1857	Benjamin Disraeli	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
17-Jul-1857	Colonel John North	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
20-Jul-1857	John Arthur Roebuck	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
23-Jul-1857	Gerard Noel	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
24-Jul-1857	Admiral Charles Napier	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
24-Jul-1857	Benjamin Disraeli	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
29-Jul-1857	Thomas Thoroton-Hildyard	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
31-Jul-1857	Richard Spooner	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	Praise of British heroism	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
03-Aug-1857	Colonel John Wilson-Patten	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
05-Aug-1857	Colonel John North	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
05-Aug-1857	General William Codrington	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
05-Aug-1857	Lord Adolphus Vane-Tempest	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
06-Aug-1857	John Willoughby	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
06-Aug-1857	Viscount Ebrington	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
07-Aug-1857	William Vansittart	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)

11-Aug-1857	Benjamin Disraeli	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
11-Aug-1857	Charles Newdigate Newdegate	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
11-Aug-1857	Colonel John North	Critical of government policy	Conservative	Praise of British heroism	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
11-Aug-1857	Colonel William Henry Sykes	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
11-Aug-1857	George Bentinck	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
11-Aug-1857	Harry Verney	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
11-Aug-1857	James Whiteside	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
11-Aug-1857	sir George de Lacy Evans	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
11-Aug-1857	William Williams	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
14-Aug-1857	Acton Smee Ayrton	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
18-Aug-1857	Augustus Stafford	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
18-Aug-1857	Benjamin Disraeli	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
28-Aug-1857	Benjamin Disraeli	Critical of government policy	Conservative	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
28-Aug-1857	sir George de Lacy Evans	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Dec-1857	sir John Pakington	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Dec-1857	William Vansittart	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
09-Dec-1857	sir John Pakington	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
10-Dec-1857	Charles Adderley	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
10-Dec-1857	Henry Labouchere	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
10-Dec-1857	Henry Lygon	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
10-Dec-1857	sir John Pakington	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
12-Dec-1857	James Wyld	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
04-Feb-1858	Admiral Charles Napier	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
04-Feb-1858	Benjamin Disraeli	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
04-Feb-1858	Lord Adolphus Vane-Tempest	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
04-Feb-1858	sir George de Lacy Evans	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
04-Feb-1858	sir James Elphinstone	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
05-Feb-1858	Francis Baring	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
05-Feb-1858	Harry Verney	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
05-Feb-1858	Henry Willoughby	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)

05-Feb-1858	Joseph Henley	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	Admiral Charles Napier	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Praise of British heroism	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	Admiral John Edward Walcott	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	Arthur Kinnaird	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	Benjamin Disraeli	Critical of government policy	Conservative	Praise of British heroism	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	Benjamin Disraeli	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	Colonel William Henry Sykes	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	British atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	George Bentinck	Critical of government policy	Conservative	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	George Thompson	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	Henry Drummond	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	Henry Labouchere	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Praise of British heroism	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	Henry Willoughby	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	Praise of British heroism	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	J.W. Henley	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	Lord Claud Hamilton	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	Lord John Russel	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	Major-General Frederick Smith	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	Praise of British heroism	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	sir George de Lacy Evans	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Praise of British heroism	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	sir John Pakington	Critical of government policy	Conservative	Praise of British heroism	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	sir John Pakington	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	Spencer Horatio Walpole	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	Praise of British heroism	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	Sydney Herbert	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	Praise of British heroism	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
08-Feb-1858	William Vansittart	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
12-Feb-1858	Acton Smee Ayrton	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
12-Feb-1858	Monckton Milnes	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
12-Feb-1858	sir Erskine Perry	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
12-Feb-1858	sir James Elphinstone	Critical of government policy	Conservative	Praise of British heroism	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
12-Feb-1858	William Vansittart	Critical of government policy	Conservative	Praise of British heroism	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
15-Feb-1858	Arthur Mills	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
15-Feb-1858	Henry Danby Seymour	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
15-Feb-1858	Henry Liddell	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
15-Feb-1858	James Whiteside	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)

15-Feb-1858	James Wyld	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
15-Feb-1858	John Arthur Roebuck	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
15-Feb-1858	John Elliot	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
15-Feb-1858	M.E. Grant Duff	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
15-Feb-1858	Robert Aglionby Slaney	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
15-Feb-1858	Robert Lowe	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
15-Feb-1858	Robert Wigram Crawford	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
15-Feb-1858	sir Henry Rawlinson	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
15-Feb-1858	sir John Walsh	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
15-Feb-1858	William Henry Adams	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
16-Feb-1858	Arthur Kinnaird	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
16-Feb-1858	Colonel Henry Baillie	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
16-Feb-1858	Colonel William Henry Sykes	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
16-Feb-1858	General Thomas Perronet Thompson	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	British atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
16-Feb-1858	Lawrence Palk	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
16-Feb-1858	Lord John Manners	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
16-Feb-1858	Lord John Russell	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
16-Feb-1858	Patrick O'Brien	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
16-Feb-1858	sir John Pakington	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
18-Feb-1858	Benjamin Disraeli	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
18-Feb-1858	Colonel William Henry Sykes	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
18-Feb-1858	Lord John Russell	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
18-Feb-1858	Robert Campbell	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
18-Feb-1858	sir Charles Wood	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
18-Feb-1858	sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
18-Feb-1858	sir Henry Willoughby	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	First Palmerston Ministry (Liberal)
22-Feb-1858	Acton Smee Ayrton	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
22-Feb-1858	sir Henry Willoughby	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
22-Feb-1858	Spencer Horatio Walpole	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
22-Feb-1858	Thomas Baring	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)

22-Feb-1858	Thomas Baring	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
12-Mar-1858	Edward Cardwell	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
12-Mar-1858	James White	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
12-Mar-1858	sir Erskine Perry	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
12-Mar-1858	sir George Lewis	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
12-Mar-1858	sir Henry Willoughby	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	Arthur Kinnaird	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	Colonel William Henry Sykes	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Praise of British heroism	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	Colonel William Henry Sykes	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	Edward Cardwell	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	General William Codrington	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Praise of British heroism	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	George Alexander Hamilton	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	Henry Baillie	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	Henry Danby Seymour	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	Henry Drummond	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	Henry Drummond	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	James Aspinall Turner	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	John Cheetham	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	John Edmund Elliot	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Praise of British heroism	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	Lord Palmerston	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	Robert Parry Nisbet	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	Robert Parry Nisbet	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	sir Francis Baring	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	sir George de Lacy Evans	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	sir George Lewis	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	sir George Lewis	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	sir Henry Willoughby	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	sir James Elphinstone	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	William Ewart	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
16-Mar-1858	William Ewart	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)

18-Mar-1858	Charles Buxton	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Both British and Indian atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
18-Mar-1858	Colonel William Henry Sykes	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
18-Mar-1858	Henry Rich	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Both British and Indian atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
18-Mar-1858	Henry Rich	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Praise of British heroism	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
18-Mar-1858	Patrick O'Brien	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
18-Mar-1858	sir Henry Rawlinson	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Both British and Indian atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
18-Mar-1858	William Henry Adams	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	Both British and Indian atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
18-Mar-1858	William Vansittart	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
22-Mar-1858	John Brady	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
22-Mar-1858	John Esmonde	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
22-Mar-1858	Patrick O'Brien	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Mar-1858	Adam Black	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Mar-1858	Charles Gilpin	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Mar-1858	Colonel William Henry Sykes	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Mar-1858	James White	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Mar-1858	John Arthur Roebuck	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Mar-1858	John Bright	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Mar-1858	John Vance	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Mar-1858	Robert Aglionby Slaney	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Mar-1858	sir Erskine Perry	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Mar-1858	sir Harry Verney	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Mar-1858	sir Thomas Edward Colebrooke	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
12-Apr-1858	Acton Smee Ayrton	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
12-Apr-1858	Edward Ellice	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
12-Apr-1858	Edward Horsman	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
12-Apr-1858	Lord John Russell	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
12-Apr-1858	Philip Pleydell-Bouverie	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
12-Apr-1858	sir Benjamin Hall	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
12-Apr-1858	sir Charles Wood	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
12-Apr-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)

19-Apr-1858	Acton Smee Ayrton	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
19-Apr-1858	Edward Horsman	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
19-Apr-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
20-Apr-1858	Acton Smee Ayrton	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
20-Apr-1858	Henry George Liddell	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
20-Apr-1858	Henry George Liddell	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
20-Apr-1858	Robert Wigram Crawford	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
23-Apr-1858	Lord John Russell	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
23-Apr-1858	Viscount Goderich	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	Colonel William Henry Sykes	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	Edward Horsman	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	Francis Crossley	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	George Macartney	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	James Whiteside	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	Lord John Russell	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	Patrick O'Brien	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	sir Edward Colebrooke	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	sir Francis Baring	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	sir George Grey	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	sir Harry Verney	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	Viscount Goderich	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	William Ewart	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	William Ewart Gladstone	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	William Henry Gregory	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
26-Apr-1858	William Henry Gregory	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Apr-1858	Arthur Mills	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Apr-1858	Colonel William Henry Sykes	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Apr-1858	Edward Horsman	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Sepoy/Indian atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Apr-1858	George Bowyer	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Apr-1858	Henry Labouchere	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)

30-Apr-1858	James Wyld	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Apr-1858	Lord Harry Vane	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Apr-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Apr-1858	sir Francis Baring	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Apr-1858	sir George Lewis	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Apr-1858	Thomas Milner Gibson	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Apr-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Apr-1858	William Ewart Gladstone	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Apr-1858	William Henry Gregory	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Apr-1858	William Schaw Lindsay	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
03-May-1858	Acton Smee Ayrton	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
03-May-1858	Acton Smee Ayrton	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
03-May-1858	James White	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
03-May-1858	John Arthur Roebuck	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
03-May-1858	Lord John Russell	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
03-May-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
03-May-1858	sir Charles Wood	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
03-May-1858	sir Harry Verney	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
03-May-1858	sir Henry Willoughby	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
03-May-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
03-May-1858	William Ewart Gladstone	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-May-1858	Chichester Fortescue	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-May-1858	Edward Ellice	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-May-1858	Edward Ellice	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-May-1858	Henry Rich	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-May-1858	Henry Rich	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-May-1858	Lord John Russell	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-May-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-May-1858	Richard Monckton Milnes	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-May-1858	sir George Cornwall Lewis	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)

07-May-1858	sir Harry Verney	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-May-1858	Thomas Baring	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-May-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	Arthur Mills	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	Charles Cumming-Bruce	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	Charles Cumming-Bruce	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	Colonel William Henry Sykes	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	Henry Danby Seymour	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	Henry Drummond	Critical of government policy	Conservative	British atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	Henry George Liddell	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	John Arthur Roebuck	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	Lord John Russell	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	Lord Stanley	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	Richard Monckton Milnes	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	Robert Lowe	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	sir George Lewis	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	William Bovill	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	William Ewart Gladstone	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
07-Jun-1858	William Schaw Lindsay	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
11-Jun-1858	Charles Cumming-Bruce	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
11-Jun-1858	Edward Ellice	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
11-Jun-1858	Edward Ellice	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
11-Jun-1858	John Bright	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
11-Jun-1858	Lord John Russell	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
11-Jun-1858	Lord John Russell	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
11-Jun-1858	Lord Stanley	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
11-Jun-1858	sir Charles Wood	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
11-Jun-1858	sir Henry Willoughby	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)

11-Jun-1858	sir James Graham	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
11-Jun-1858	sir Thomas Edward Colebrooke	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
11-Jun-1858	Thomas Baring	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
11-Jun-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	Charles Cumming-Bruce	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	Colonel William Henry Sykes	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	Henry George Liddell	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	John Arthur Roebuck	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	John Willoughby	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	Lord John Russell	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	Lord John Russell	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	Lord Stanley	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	Sidney Herbert	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	sir Erskine Perry	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	sir Francis Baring	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	sir George Lewis	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	sir James Graham	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	sir James Graham	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	Viscount Goderich	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
14-Jun-1858	William Ewart Gladstone	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
17-Jun-1858	Acton Smee Ayrton	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
17-Jun-1858	Chichester Fortescue	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
17-Jun-1858	Colonel William Henry Sykes	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
17-Jun-1858	Henry Rich	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
17-Jun-1858	John Bright	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
17-Jun-1858	Lord John Russell	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
17-Jun-1858	Lord Stanley	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
17-Jun-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)

17-Jun-1858	sir George Lewis	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
17-Jun-1858	sir Harry Verney	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
17-Jun-1858	sir James Graham	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
17-Jun-1858	Spencer Horatio Walpole	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
17-Jun-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
17-Jun-1858	William Ewart Gladstone	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
24-Jun-1858	Colonel William Henry Sykes	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
24-Jun-1858	James Whiteside	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
24-Jun-1858	John Arthur Roebuck	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
24-Jun-1858	John Bright	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	Both British and Indian atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
24-Jun-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
24-Jun-1858	Patrick O'Brien	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
24-Jun-1858	Thomas Baring	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	Acton Smee Ayrton	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	Chichester Fortescue	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	Chichester Fortescue	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	Christopher William Puller	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	Colonel William Henry Sykes	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	Henry Danby Seymour	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	James Stuart-Wortley	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	John Arthur Roebuck	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	Lord Dunkellin	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	Robert Aglionby Slaney	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	British atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	Robert Lowe	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	sir Charles Wood	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	sir Erskine Perry	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	sir Francis Baring	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	sir Francis Baring	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)

25-Jun-1858	sir Henry Willoughby	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	sir Henry Willoughby	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	sir James Graham	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	sir James Graham	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
25-Jun-1858	William Ewart Gladstone	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	Acton Smee Ayrton	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	Acton Smee Ayrton	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	Chichester Fortescue	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	Henry Rich	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	James Ewart Gladstone	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	Lord Adolphus Vane-Tempest	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	Lord John Russell	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	Lord John Russell	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	sir Erskine Perry	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	sir George Lewis	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	sir James Graham	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	Thomas Baring	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	William Ewart Gladstone	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
01-Jul-1858	William Vansittart	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Acton Smee Ayrton	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Chichester Fortescue	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Henry Rich	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Henry White	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)

02-Jul-1858	John Arthur Roebuck	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	John Willoughby	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Lord John Russell	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Lord John Russell	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Robert Campbell	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Robert Lowe	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Robert Monckton Milnes	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	sir de Lacy Evans	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	sir Erskine Perry	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	sir Francis Baring	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	sir George Lewis	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	sir James Graham	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	sir Thomas Edward Colebrooke	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Thomas Baring	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Thomas Collins	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	William Ewart Gladstone	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
02-Jul-1858	William Williams	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	John Bright	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	John Elliot	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)

05-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	Peter Blackburn	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	Peter Blackburn	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	Robert Campbell	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	Robert Lowe	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	sir Francis Baring	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	sir Frederick Smith	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	William Ewart Gladstone	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	William Monsell	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
05-Jul-1858	William Trant Fagan	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Acton Smee Ayrton	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Alexander Murray Dunlop	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Arthur Kinnaid	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Chichester Fortescue	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Christopher Darby Griffith	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Henry Danby Seymour	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	James Whiteside	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	James Wilson	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	James Wilson	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	John Bright	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Lord John Russell	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Lord John Russell	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	sir Erskine Perry	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	sir George Lewis	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	sir George Lewis	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)

06-Jul-1858	sir James Graham	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	sir James Graham	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Sir Thomas Edward Colebrooke	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	William Ewart Gladstone	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	William Ewart Gladstone	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	William Henry Adams	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	William Vansittart	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
06-Jul-1858	William Vansittart	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
08-Jul-1858	John Arthur Roebuck	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
08-Jul-1858	Lord John Russell	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
08-Jul-1858	Samuel Gregson	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
08-Jul-1858	sir Erskine Perry	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
08-Jul-1858	Thomson Hankey	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
08-Jul-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
09-Jul-1858	General Jonathan Peel	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
09-Jul-1858	Lord Elcho	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
09-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
21-Jul-1858	sir de Lacy Evans	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
21-Jul-1858	Viscount Goderich	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
21-Jul-1858	Viscount Goderich	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	General Thomas Perronet Thompson	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	General William John Codrington	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	George Bowyer	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	Henry Rich	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	Henry Rich	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	James Wilson	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)

27-Jul-1858	James Wilson	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	Lord John Russell	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	Lord John Russell	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	Lord John Russell	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	Samuel Warren	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	sir Charles Denham Norreys	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	sir de Lacy Evans	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	sir Frederick Smith	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	sir James Graham	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	sir James Graham	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	sir James Graham	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	sir James Graham	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	sir Thomas Edward Colebrooke	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	sir Thomas Edward Colebrooke	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	Spencer Horatio Walpole	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
27-Jul-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	Arthur Kinnaird	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	Charles Gilpin	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	Christopher Darby Griffith	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	George Bowyer	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	Henry Rich	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	Henry White	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	John Arthur Roebuck	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	John Arthur Roebuck	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	John Stapleton	Neutral of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)

30-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Neutral of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	Lord Stanley	Supporting of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	Richard Spooner	Critical of government policy	Conservative	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	sir de Lacy Evans	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	sir James Graham	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	Viscount Palmerston	Supporting of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)
30-Jul-1858	William Coningham	Critical of government policy	Whig/Liberal	No mention of atrocities	Second Derby-Disraeli Ministry (Conservative)