614TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,
WESTMINSTER, ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 2ND, 1920,
AT 4.30 P.M.

E. J. SEWELL, ESQ., TOOK THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The Hon. Secretary announced the Election of the following Associates:—Colonel Hope Biddulph, Miss Georgiana Biddulph, Colonel C. W. R. St. John, Mrs. Annie C. Bill, Miss Theodora Cazalet and Mrs. Howard Hooke.

The Chairman then called on Sir Andrew Wingate, K.C.I.E., to read his paper on "India."

INDIA. By Sir Andrew Wingate, K.C.I.E.

FIFTY years ago the young civilian had to collect his information about India with considerable difficulty. Now books in abundance are available, and among these a special debt of gratitude is due to Dr. Vincent Smith for his admirable Oxford History of India, which I have used as the most accurate authority for my facts.

India, as distinguished from the larger area known as our Indian Empire, has been described as a figure composed of two triangles on a common base drawn from Karachi to Calcutta. We shall think more correctly, both geographically and historically, if we draw the dividing line from Broach along the line of the Narbada River to the mouth of the Hugli. South of such a line the Peninsula, with its coast line of about 3500 miles, becomes the Deccan, meaning vaguely the South Country—while all to the north constitutes Hindustan, the location of the Hindus, the Indus country.

Some place the northern mountain ranges in a third division, but the Himalayas—the Abode of Snow—are bound as a turban, slantwise, upon the head of India by two mighty rivers, the Indus and the Brahmaputra, each 1800 miles long, while the people, though Mongolian in type, have mostly accepted Hinduism.

Awed by the majesty of Nature, the Hindus lift up their eyes to the hills in worship and crowd to the rivers to cleanse their hearts from sin. Possibly the Indus came to be thought unclean, because they knew not whence it came, whereas the Ganges
rose inside the sacred area. The waters fertilize their lands, and make life possible and pleasant. Viewing the things which are seen, they turned them into gods. They lost sight of the elemental fact proclaimed by Isaiah (xlv, 18), which they might have deduced from a study of the geography of India, God "formed the earth to be inhabited." The vast reservoirs of the Himalayas, the plains spread out from their feet, the tilt of the Deccan plateau, the accessibility of the ocean, the monsoon rain-laden winds, teach that India was prepared by loving hands under the direction of one master mind. We may expect to find the same provision for the spiritual welfare of its inhabitants. They have been disciplined by judgments, light has broken through from time to time, and finally they have been entrusted to the British people to be trained and guided into that true Liberty which is the bond slave of Righteousness.

The line of the Narbada demarcates the history of India into two parts. Very little is known about the Peninsula before A.D. 600, whereas in Hindustan some events become definite as far back as 600 B.C.—a difference of twelve centuries.

Cut off from Hindustan by the broad belt of hill country occupied by fearsome jungle tribes, the Peninsula dwelt in isolation. Especially was this true of the far south, where the Dravidian languages resisted the penetration of the Sanskrit of the Brahmans, so evident in the languages of the Deccan farther north. But the Dravidians exported much valuable produce by sea, and it was to develop this trade that King Solomon, with the assistance of the skilled navigators of Tyre, organized a fleet of larger vessels. Unfortunately, the seamen brought back no accounts of the lands they visited, unless such may some day be discovered in Arabia.

This paper may help us to understand why the Bombay and Madras Presidencies are so sharply differentiated from North India, and why the present policy of decentralization is so true to history and to existing facts.

The fuller knowledge of the condition of Hindustan is due mainly to the inclusion from time to time of part of North-Western India within the far eastern limits of the Persian and Grecian Empires. Thus, Darius Hystaspes (521–485 B.C.) sent an expedition to ascertain the feasibility of a sea passage between Persia and the Indus—that river being then the recognized eastern boundary of Persia. Darius then annexed a portion of the Panjab, constituting it his twentieth satrapy, one of the
richest. Evidently his information was good. A few years later, in 479 B.C., an Indian contingent of archers under Xerxes shared the defeat of the Persians at Platæa in Greece. We are familiar with Darius Hystaspes in the fifth and sixth chapters of Ezra, when he confirmed the decree of Cyrus authorizing the rebuilding of the Temple of Jehovah at Jerusalem.

About the time of Darius Hystaspes, two notable religious movements were in progress in Magadha, a kingdom situated in South Behar, due to the preaching of Gautama Buddha, who died about 544 B.C. (some say 488), and of Mahavira, who died in 527 (or may be 477), the one the founder of Buddhism, the other of Jainism.

Dr. Vincent Smith draws attention to the importance of this period. "The sixth century B.C. was a time when men's minds in several widely separated parts of the world were deeply stirred by the problems of religion and salvation." The century not only saw Mahavira and Buddha, but also Zoroaster and Confucius, the reformers of Persia and China. The period may be said to have begun from the taking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in 606 B.C. and the dispersion of the Jews. How widely they were distributed over Persia we learn from the Book of Esther, which also mentions India. The Assyrian and Egyptian Empires were subdued, and then, by a dramatic stroke, as the seventy years of the Hebrew prophets were expiring, this glorious Babylon, the conqueror of many gods, the defier of Jehovah, fell with a crash that resounded throughout the earth (538 B.C.). It was a time to compel thought. Who was God? Was there any God? Were the idols of the nations vain?

Isaiah closed his utterances about 700 B.C. He spoke to all races of men. It is difficult to decide that such messages of judgment on nations and visions of glory for mankind never winged their way to other lands. We know that merchandise was carried to and fro, that military expeditions penetrated far, that travellers performed astonishing journeys. Were the thoughts of men immobilized by the restraints of language? The nations were never left in total darkness by the Good Shepherd. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were sent to the Canaanites, Moses was sent to Egypt, Jonah to Nineveh, Daniel to Babylon and Persia, Paul to Greece and Rome—God's most powerful messengers met the rulers of idolatry before they perished. The Far East can hardly have been shut out from the Light which shone from Jerusalem.
In this sixth century B.C. a people of education, known as Aryans and later as Brahmans, closely akin to the Iranians or Persians, were established in Hindustan. They had come from the north-west, doubtless bringing with them their priestly ritual and some of their ancient odes. The general idea of the Rigveda (meaning Hymn-knowledge) was based on fireworship—still maintained by the Parsees—but behind the personified powers of Nature was the reasoning that compelled back to the primal knowledge of one God. The celebrated Creation Hymn expresses this conclusion: “Whence this manifold creation sprang? The gods themselves came later into being.” We are familiar with the same degeneration from the original knowledge of one God in the Old Testament.

This intellectual priestly community, keeping itself strictly apart from the population, had slowly penetrated along the courses of the Indus and Ganges. The gradual compilation of its worship and ritual into the four Vedas preserved cohesion between its members while the rhythm and perfect structure of its language captivated successive multitudes. Consequently, just as most of the chief languages of Northern India derive from the Sanskrit, so the marked features of Hinduism, social and religious, have been impressed on the private and public life of all Indians by the Brahmans. Against this enslavement, Buddhism and Jainism rose in revolt, as there have been attempts to get free both then and since.

The Brahmans worked not by conversion but by absorption. This led to an immense multiplication of deities, from the conception of one God to serpent worship. The cobra is the power represented in most Hindu idols. Both Moses and Paul testify that the sacrifices are literally made to devils and not to God (Deut. xxxii, 17; 1 Cor. x, 20). Originally, Brahmans neither worshipped the cow nor refused meat. Perhaps these early habits and their cruel sacrifices ran counter to local sentiment. They were also forging caste. The intensity with which they protected their blood against intermarriage no doubt helped the belief that they were of divine origin. This would incline other societies to adopt similar means of elevation in the social scale. There is perhaps a universal distaste for intermarriage, but nowhere else has this become a part of the religious, social and economic life as in India. The other factor in the production of caste was the teaching that food contaminates, and that the body must be protected as rigorously as the
offspring. In both respects Brahmans and Jews have developed along similar lines, but the low estimation accorded to Jews perhaps saved Europe.

Jainism rejected the Vedas and animal sacrifices, but continued to venerate the Hindu gods and main doctrines and to accept the services of Brahmans. Consequently, it has been tolerated by the Brahmans and survives in Rajputana and Western India. Jains are a well-to-do and influential body, believing in prayer and fasting, but carrying respect for animal and tree life to extreme limits.

Buddhism, on the other hand, cast out the false gods of Hinduism, but as it left no place for God at all, it failed to keep free from idol worship. Buddha accepted Karma and Transmigration and regard for animal life. The motive power of his reform lay, however, in its spiritual appeal. His call was to purity in deed, word and thought, the renunciation of the world and its lusts, and obedience to ten commandments, such as not to kill, steal, or commit adultery, not to lie, slander, or swear, not to covet or hate.

Karma means "action," and the doctrine is concisely defined by Dr. V. Smith to mean, "that the merits and demerits of a being in past existences determine his condition in the present life." Therefore, as Mr. Farquhar explains (A Primer of Hinduism), every act of a man works itself out in retribution in another birth. The doctrine of Transmigration of the Soul is the necessary companion of Karma. The idea is that after innumerable lives during myriads of years, the soul rises to perfection, an idea now being adapted by a shallow Christianity to the moral evolution of mankind, flesh developing into spirit. The facts of life in India have so little encouraged this hope, that pessimism has laid its paralysing hand on all religious thought. Not only so. These doctrines paralyse philanthropy. "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" (John ix, 2-3). Hinduism was unable to answer, "That the works of God should be made manifest in him," that Love would strive to cure or alleviate suffering. Karma and Transmigration have become the synonyms for perpetual retribution. The uplifting power of the Forgiveness of Sins and the Fatherhood of God are thus lost. The widow, specially the child-widow, has borne the age-long, relentless cruelty of these doctrines.

The earliest known date in the history of India is the invasion of Alexander the Great in 326 B.C. He marched from Kabul
and reached Taxila (now Hasan Abdul) some twenty miles north-west of Rawalpindi. Taxila was the capital of a kingdom between the Indus and the Jhelum, a wealthy, cultured city with a mixed population. Alexander was received with gifts and advanced against Porus, another king, ruling between the Jhelum and the Chenab. At this time, the Panjab was divided among a number of States, much as Rajputana is to-day. The army of King Porus was well-appointed, and represents the struggle for existence of the period. It comprised 30,000 infantry, 4000 cavalry, 300 chariots and 200 war elephants. Alexander prevailed after a stiff battle, and fought his way to the Beas River. His soldiers, impressed by the tall stature and military prowess of the men of the Panjab, refused to penetrate farther, and Alexander was compelled to retreat by way of the Jhelum and the Indus, across South Beluchistan, back to Persia. He died at Babylon in 323 B.C.

His invasion furnished opportunity for the overthrow of the Nanda dynasty, which had been for a long time reigning in Magadha, a city already mentioned in connection with the Jains and Buddhists. A young adventurer, Chandragupta Maurya, aided by a clever Brahman, Chanakya, seized Pataliputra (Patna), the capital of Magadha, in 322 B.C., drove out the Macedonian garrisons from the Panjab, and compelled Seleukos, Alexander's successor in Asia, to cede Afghanistan. Chandragupta reigned with "ruthless severity" from 322 to 298 B.C. over all North India from Herat to Patna, the Narbada being his southern boundary. Dr. V. Smith emphasizes the appalling wickedness of the statecraft taught by Chanakya and the espionage and corruption which tainted the administration.

Alexander had broken the fighting strength of the Panjab kingdoms which rendered possible this rapid extension of the Magadha State under what is known as the Maurya Dynasty. Chandragupta was succeeded by his son, Bindusara (298–273 B.C.), and he by his son, the famous Asoka (273–242 B.C.). The army was large, composed of some 700,000 infantry, with 8000 chariots and 9000 elephants, clad in mail, representing the modern "Tank." The Maurya kings emulated the Persian monarchs and lived in much splendour. Gladiatorial combats and animal fights were the cruel amusements, as indeed they long continued. Dancing girls occupied as prominent a place then as now, though we recollect the noble answer given not long ago by the Mysore Government to the temple priests, that uncleanness could form
no part of acceptable worship. The administration was well organized, though the bulk of the expenditure was upon the army and the palace.

Much of the information of the Maurya period is derived from Megasthenes, the ambassador from Seleukos Nikator at the Court of Chandragupta and his successors. With Asoka began numerous inscriptions on rock and pillar composed by himself. Asoka’s empire by this time included the greater part of India, from the Hindu Kush to near Mysore. So far the precept enunciated by Chanakya for the guidance of a king, “In the happiness of his subjects lies his happiness,” had not been followed. Now came a sudden change. For some three centuries, Buddhism had been making its way, and the Maurya kings came under its influence. In Asoka it became a living force. Remorse entered his mind for having attacked the Kalingas, a small State on the Bay of Bengal, “because the conquest of a country previously unconquered involves the slaughter, death and carrying away captive of the people” (261 B.C.). Asoka felt similar sympathy for the despised Hill Tribes. He desired that all “animate beings should have security, self-control, peace of mind and joyousness.” His officers were enjoined to avoid harshness towards any and to show sympathy with all.

Asoka propagated his beliefs with energy. He had a vision of internationalism. He sent his messengers to the Far West, including Syria and Egypt. His brother and sister brought about the conversion of Ceylon. Buddhism spread to Burmah, Siam, Japan, Tibet, and during the first century after Christ became an active force in China. Mohammed compelled men to accept his creed by the sword. Asoka conquered by meekness. The strength of Mohammedanism lay in the truth that there is one God, its weakness is that it requires no change of heart and has no place for love. The power of Buddhism is that it approached the Kingdom of God. It insisted on speaking the truth, on reverence to parents and teachers, sympathetic treatment of inferiors, respect for the religious opinions of others, regard for animal life. Such were the stone-cut edicts of Asoka. We do not find the like again till we get to Akbar.

The Maurya Empire scarcely lasted fifty years after the death of Asoka, and a reaction against Buddhism followed. For some centuries Hindustan lapsed into conflicts between petty kings till once more a strong ruler arose in a second Chandragupta and his son, Samudragupta, who between A.D. 320 and 375
re-established Pataliputra as the capital of an empire, ranging north of the Narbada from the Satlej to the Hugli. Kabul and North-West India were lost. The Gupta period lasted some 350 years, but its golden age was confined to one and a-half centuries.

As India owes to Greek sources most of her knowledge of the Maurya dynasty (326-185 B.C.), so it is from Chinese travellers that she has interesting records of the Gupta dynasty (A.D. 320-480). These Chinese came to study Buddhism in the land of its birth, and found large towns and prosperous peoples, charitable institutions, including hospitals and rest houses for travellers. There was still a strong Buddhist influence, but caste was strict.

During the fifth century A.D. the Hindu reaction was in progress. Buddhism would make no terms with Brahmanism. The two were entirely opposed. Buddhism enjoined sharing the joys and sorrows of others, cultivating love, thoroughly democratic. Brahmanism cared for none of these things. Isolation, pride, supremacy, distinguished the Brahman, thoroughly aristocratic, and in return for deference any conduct was good enough for Hindus. The glory of Asoka's kingdom was due to Buddhism. The Brahmans hated its light and stifled its life. During the Gupta period, Buddhist ideals still moderated rulers and Buddhist monasteries popularized education. The Brahmans kept education to themselves. Finally, the Brahmans crushed Buddhism out of India. The little that remained was stamped out by the Mohammedans. With the triumph of Brahmanism, the opportunity to work towards a national India was lost, and in the seventh century A.D. India again broke into fragments, and disappeared in darkness and corruption till the Mohammedans took command.

It is well to recollect that during the centuries under review, within Brahmanism, certain conceptions of salvation took shape in the teaching of what is known as "Bhakti," which produced the Bhagavadgita, or Song of the Lord, and is exhibited in personal devotion to Rama and Krishna. Kalidasa, the Sanskrit poet, lived in the Gupta age. His celebrated play, Sakuntala, was lately produced in London.

The immediate cause of the disruption of the Gupta Empire was the inroad of the Huns into the Panjab about A.D. 500, as not long previously other bands under Attila had overrun Germany and France. General disorder followed. The seventh
century is interesting on account of the appearance of the Rajput clans, and their settlement in Rajputana, a people that have exercised immense influence, and to a considerable degree have been able to resist being Brahmanized. Tod describes the Rajputs as Scythians from Central Asia, whence came also the sturdy cultivators, Jats, Gujars, Ahirs and others, now embedded in the caste system.

We need not linger to investigate the ever-changing kingdoms which struggled with each other south of the Narbada. The strife was varied by occasional invasions from Hindustan and by perennial wars of the Deccan kings with the Dravidian kings further south. Buddhism declined, and the Brahmans steadily penetrated Southern India, and there secured their most unquestioned supremacy at the cost of the most cruel degradation of many millions of the depressed classes. The Lingayet sect, strong in the Kanarese country, broke away in the twelfth century. The Lingayets worship Siva, but reject the Vedas, Brahmans, Transmigration, child-marriage and perpetual widowhood. They have been compelled to revert to caste.

In the dust raised by falling dynasties and the conquests from which new ones emerged, we must not lose sight of occasionally prolonged intervals of settled and good government, such as produced the great irrigation anicuts across the Kaveri and other rivers during the Chola dynasty, which dated from A.D. 907 and lasted about four centuries. The huge temples of Tanjore date from the eleventh century. Imposing temples had been built long before that. The most wonderful is at Ellora, sculptured out of the solid rock, from which it stands clear, as though it had been erected stone by stone (about A.D. 760).

Imagination may be left to weave out of a few shadowy indications a decorative tapestry to hang behind the period when some sort of history begins. We have seen that in India historical data commence in the sixth century B.C., with the appearance of Buddhism as the antagonist against cruel idolatry and human strife. We have seen that twice, some 300 years B.C. and again some 300 years A.D., under Hindu kings, more or less swayed by Buddhistic teaching, Hindustan seemed to be within sight of becoming a beneficent government over a united people, and that gradually Brahmanic idolatry reasserted its popular power, itself torn between the opposing tendencies of philosophic and licentious thought. During the sixteen
centuries, ending about A.D. 1000, of what is known as the Hindu period of Indian history, the Brahmans moulded public opinion and conduct, and became the dominating class throughout India, with the net result that Hindustan, the Deccan and the Far South, all alike, were left in a welter of bloodshed and a tangle of morals. Brahmans had a free hand to regenerate India or even bring it decent government, for they were the only universal influence. They utterly failed. Why? Because, in my judgment, they used their intellectual strength to despise other men to a degree unknown even in slavery, and to justify the worship of debasing idols.

Mohammedans.

Such a population, retrograde in civilization, degenerate in character, devouring one another, with wealth stored in centres by kings and priests, asked for trouble. Judgment came in terrible form. Raiding began from Afghanistan. Round about A.D. 1000, Mahmud of Ghazni plundered one rich temple after another, including Somnath, and annexed the Panjab. The warning was unheeded, and in A.D. 1175 Sultan Mohammed Ghori, advancing from Eastern Afghanistan, had no difficulty in overthrowing the huge Hindu host of confederate kings under the Chauhan Rajput Prithiraj, ruler of Ajmer and Delhi. This victory (A.D. 1192) sealed the doom of Hindustan. Armies reared on the caste system, which divides, were no match for the unified enthusiasm of the Moslems. Bengal fell an easy victim about A.D. 1200, and remained under the Mohammedan heel till the British brought deliverance after five and a-half centuries. The ferocity of the early invaders was merciless, slaughtering idolaters and destroying temples, in place of which mosques were everywhere substituted.

From this time till the middle of the fourteenth century the Sultans of Delhi reigned supreme. Only two need mention. Ala-ud-din in 1303 stormed the hill-fort of Chitor in Meywar, when the Rajput ladies and their female attendants saved themselves from the horrors of capture by entering a subterranean gallery, where they perished by fire, including the lovely Padmani. Tod says he went to the entrance only of the sacred cavern. He was probably informed, as I was by a later Maharana, that the place had already been ransacked by the victors.

This Ala-ud-din understood the taxation of profits. In his instructions for the treatment of Hindus, he recorded that he
had given orders "that they shall not be allowed to accumulate hoards and property." This was the working principle of revenue officials during many generations, so that the rapacity of Mohammedans and Hindus alike reduced both production and population.

The power of the Delhi sultans reached its height under Mohammed bin Tughlak, who began by causing the evacuation of Delhi and replacing it by what was constructed to be an impregnable fortress, Dowlatabad (A.D. 1326). His atrocities led to Bengal and Kashmir asserting independence, and to the founding of the Mohammedan Bahmani and the Hindu Vijayanagur kingdoms in the Deccan. Among the acts of this despot, it is interesting to note that he sought spiritual sanction for his authority from the Kaliph, whom he decided to be the Circassian Mameluke Sultan of Egypt. This indicates that even in these early days India did not look to Arabia. Nor is it altogether strange that Indian Moslems now look to Constantinople, when it is remembered that every Friday in the mosque they listen to the official prayer. From the first step of the Khutba God is praised; from the second, Mohammed; from the third, the Koran and religion; and from the fourth, the reigning Sultan of Turkey. Thus Mohammedans grow up from boyhood in the persuasion that Constantinople is their political centre, and that their allegiance to the Kaliphate is intact.

It was under these uncompromising sultans that large numbers of Hindus, who now form the bulk of the existing Mohammedan population in North India, and many of whom still retain evident traces of their origin, were converted to escape the tax and the massacre. The treatment of the Armenians recently by the Turks is merely a fair sample of Mohammedan intolerance. These Delhi sultans were almost without exception not only fiendishly cruel, but obscene and bestial beyond description. Yet they encouraged learning, and built impressive mosques and tombs—a combination of kultur, frightfulness and disgusting vice. Judgment came as a bolt from the blue.

In 1398 Timur (Tamerlane) made his terrible raid from Samarkhand into India, smashed the power of Delhi, and left chaos behind him. From this date, besides Bengal, Malwa and Gujarat became independent Mohammedan kingdoms. For the capital of Gujarat, Ahmed Shah built Ahmedabad, renowned for its carved woodwork. It was this kingdom which came in contact with the Portuguese, who had rounded the
Cape in 1497 and soon after established themselves at points on the west coast. To the Portuguese was given the first chance to regenerate India. They forfeited it by their misdeeds.

The Bahmani kings ruled from Kulburga and in their wars with the rising Hindu kingdom of Vijayanagar carried into the Deccan all the fanatical ferocity of Delhi, butchering idolaters, men, women and children, in immense numbers. In 1518 this dynasty came to its natural end in scenes of drunkenness, debauchery and murder. It broke up into five fragments, of which the more important were Ahmednagar, Bijapur and Golkonda, the last named becoming Hyderabad, now the chief Mohammedan State in India.

As we survey India under Hindu rulers till the twelfth century was closing and under Mohammedan sultans and kings till the early years of the sixteenth century, the first idolatrous and the latter fiercely trying to stamp out idolatry, we are struck by the fact that both left India in chaotic misery. Huge armies, constant fighting, depraved luxury, hunted peasantry. It is not that a bright spot or a decent governor cannot be discovered here and there. Good is never left without witness. It is that the records as a whole unfold what horrors more or less civilized human nature can inflict when men do not know the character of God. Where there is no love, there is no God.

The Moguls.

These conditions, coupled with the increasing influence of Western ideals, prepared the way for the brilliant era of the Mogul emperors. Its sun rose in splendour, with some promise that love might overcome hate, and sank after the brief period of 180 years into the same gory mire from which it emerged.

As before, fresh vitality came from Central Asia. Babur of Kabul, a fine soldier, claiming both Ghingiz Khan and Timur in his ancestry, invaded India (A.D. 1525), overcame first the resistance of the Mohammedan sultans and then of the Hindu host commanded by the Rajput Rana of Meywar. Babur's son, Humayun, had a bad time, but his grandson, Akbar (1555–1605), practically contemporary with our Queen Elizabeth, was a great king and extended the empire from Kabul to Calcutta and as far south as Ahmednagar.

Akbar revolted from ceaseless slaughter of idolaters. He saw India divided by hatred and set himself to win the Hindus, specially by abolishing the tax on non-Moslems, the badge of
Mohammedan contempt. He was curious as to Christianity and encouraged Jesuit fathers from Goa. To the Sikhs he gave the site of the Golden Temple at Amritsar. Akbar went beyond British neutrality and proposed to unite all sects in one eclectic faith, of which he would be the infallible head, but he permitted no persecution and sought to be the impartial king of all his subjects.

The renown of the Moguls is due primarily to the character of Akbar for tolerance and sympathy, and secondly to the magnificence and exquisite taste of their buildings. From Akbar to Aurangzeb they were remarkable men. They lost their power owing to the relapse of Aurangzeb to the fierceness of Mohammedan bigotry. So far was this carried, that Aurangzeb, who was a Sunni, destroyed the Shia kings of the Deccan, including Bijapur, and thus opened the way for the rise of the Marathas. Naturally, Aurangzeb had lost the support of the Hindus.

Aurangzeb died near Dowlatabad in 1707, broken hearted. The huge empire quickly fell to pieces. In 1724 the Nizams of Hyderabad founded their house. Oudh and Bengal both became independent Mohammedan kingdoms. The Rohillas established themselves in Rohilkhand. The Brahman Peshwas ruled the Deccan, while Gwalior, Indore and Baroda rose into States.

The canker of the later Moguls came from their domestic life—drink and sensuality—so that sons rebelled against their fathers and then fought savagely for the succession, the victor usually destroying the seed royal. Even in such courts there are instances of wives who, like Esther, commanded respect. The most familiar is that of Shahjahan. He married Mumtaz Mahal, niece of the celebrated Nurjahan, who had exercised so much power over his father, Jahangir. Between 1613 and 1631 Mumtaz Mahal bore him fourteen children. She died, aged 39, and her body was taken to Agra, which was the capital till the Court moved to Delhi in 1648. The Taj, begun in 1632 and finished in 1653, was raised by her husband to her memory. After her death, bigotry and lust debased Shahjahan, till his son Aurangzeb in 1658 imprisoned him in Agra Fort, where he died eight years later.

The Taj, its pure loveliness pointing upwards, broadbased on family affection, is India's testimony to the value of her women. India's wives and mothers have protected the sanctity of the home and the purity of family life. They have risen superior
to degrading conditions. Not even the Zenana has crushed them. Mumtaz Mahal is but the type of a womanhood which, rich in tales of the bravery, endurance, obedience unto death, of ladies of rank, has produced under the British peace the village life of the masses and is beginning in some towns to overcome caste and creed by co-operation for the common benefit. In this connection mention must be made of the varied and valuable service rendered by the women of India throughout the war both to the Government and to the fighting men without regard to race or religion. This latent power was a revelation. It has already been utilized to undertake the care of Zenanas in famine, to look after children’s welfare, and is rapidly taking a share in communal and philanthropic work. If leading men wish to give the franchise to women, it is because their pioneer vision discerns that the rescue of India from licentious temples, debasing misrepresentations of God, self-destroying contempt for other people, will come only by the help of the women of India. Therefore the most high-souled daughters from the English-speaking nations are needed that education may be conveyed through channels which, as some of the safeguards now existing weaken, will fortify Indian girls by the manifestation of the power of the indwelling Christ to preserve the majesty of womanhood.

As the invasion of Timur in A.D. 1398 put an end to the Delhi sultanate and that of Babur in 1526 brought in the Mogul emperors, so that of Nadir Shah, the Persian warrior, in 1739 shattered the power of the Moguls, chiefly perhaps by carrying off the accumulated treasure, and left the people bleeding. This defenceless state of Hindustan invited attack from both sides. Since A.D. 1737 the Marathas had been threatening from the south. In 1760, under their Peshwa, they moved north in force to assert their supremacy. The Afghans, under Ahmed Shah Durrani, had like ambitions. The armies in 1761 met at Panipat, the oft-fought battlefield north of Delhi, and there the Marathas received their knock-out blow so far as succession to imperial power was concerned. The Afghans returned to Kabul.

The year 1761 marks also the passing of India from Mohammedan and Maratha domination to British management. The Mohammedans had destroyed themselves. The Marathas were splitting into separate States. The Rajput resistance was exhausted. Haider Ali and Tippoo in Mysore, the Nizam
in Hyderabad, the Maratha chiefs in the West, the Sikhs in the Panjab, fresh invaders from Afghanistan, would doubtless have supplied a few more pages of sanguinary history, but deliverance was at hand. In 1761 the British had finally driven the French from India, and by their victory at Plassey in 1757 were bringing about the emancipation of Bengal from its effete Nawabs.

The decadence of Mohammedan and the rise of British power in India were parts of wider, irresistible movements. British command of the sea was enabling her to found our present Commonwealth of free nations, while since the repulse of the Turks from Vienna in 1683, of which Aurangzeb was aware, Mohammedan vitality has ebbed with accelerating rapidity in both east and west. Islamic rule has desolated, never benefited, any country it reached. Even Asia Minor, the family home, shows no success. Under British guidance, Mohammedan communities are transformed.

The Brahmans had a further opportunity to rescue India when they took leadership of the Marathas. Instead, they instituted a complicated system of robbery by violence, and offered no prospect that their rule would bring anything but spoliation and treachery. Sivaji, the founder of Maratha nationality, who died in 1680, had been out for "Gods and cows, Brahmans and the Faith." The Brahmans requited his zeal for Hinduism by supplanting his Raj. In the sequel, they failed even to weld the newly-formed Maratha States. Yet under British control, the Brahmans have become adepts in honest administration and in devotion to public duties.

Brahmans and Mohammedans have become the right and left hands of the British Government in bringing about the present material prosperity of India. The Indian princes have loyally maintained good relations with each other, and have begun to interest themselves in the welfare of India as a whole. When the British began to assume responsibilities, they found India torn, divided, corrupt, without ability to recover. At first these conditions became a temptation to some, but steadily the light from the homeland dissipated the contaminating influences, and eventually the Government Services in India for rectitude, impartiality and devotion stand unrivalled by the public service of any country in the world. They have been rewarded by seeing increasing populations with rising standards of comfort and self-respect, lands and harvests growing in value, important
industries and mines developing, and latterly the bolder investment of Indian capital, such as the action of the Mysore State in transmitting power generated by the Kaveri River to the Kolar gold mines, or of the Tata family in using water collected on the Western Ghats to run the cotton mills and trams of Bombay.

Not only has the face of material India been changed, but there are evidences of a remarkable revolution in moral character and even in spiritual conceptions. The Indian subordinate service is establishing a reputation for truth and incorruptibility. The freedom of communications, the public press, education, the common English language, the uniform ideals of the public services, the solicitude in seasons of widespread calamity, a universal penal code: these, among other factors, have been teaching the many races of India that they live on one continent under one Government. That Brahmans should first catch the sentiment of nationality is natural. Spread over India and separated by vernaculars, they feel now united as they have not been for a thousand years, though still fissured by quasi-castes. It is natural, too, that ambitions should stir their imagination. The Great War suddenly evoked fellowship between other races, and seems to be bringing to the surface a fuller recognition that there is one God and Father of us all. These undercurrents of thought unexpectedly find expression. For instance, at the last National Congress the Chairman requested the assembly—consisting of Indians of all castes and creeds—to stand in silent prayer for the soul of a lad killed at Amritsar.

The war has done more. The services rendered to the Empire have entitled India to be admitted a welcome unit of the British Commonwealth, with an important place in international affairs, and as a corollary India subjects herself to win the good opinion of the world. Commenting on Aurangzeb's long reign, Dr. V. Smith remarks, “his sons, benumbed by the crushing weight of parental control, lost all capacity for government.” This concisely gives the reason why it was essential to seize this unique moment to give a substantial share in their own government to a selected electorate. No one can forget how recently order has been imposed on untamed passions, or that Brahmans and Mohammedans have failed to make anything of unfettered opportunities in the past. What has been the secret of British success with the same materials? Behind force there has been love, instead of covetousness there has been striving for righteousness,
devotion to the interests of the trusting masses has combated self-indulgence. These qualities, and the Bible which has produced them, are within reach of the new administrators, and it is because Indian members of the Government Services and Indian gentlemen of position have been exhibiting these qualities that courage has been found boldly to place confidence in them.

There are lines along which Indians may make faster progress, such as giving the Bible to the schools and colleges, a knowledge of which our neutrality has withheld from the boys and girls. More courage in taxation to provide the wider education without which an extended franchise is impossible, while it is at least likely that temples, idols, caste, social abuses and domestic wrongs would continue longer owing to our timidity before religious questions. Prohibition is sure of strong support. It is possible that the Indian Church and Missions will find more appreciation of their value and Indian reformers a stronger backing. There is hope, too, that, as Indian wishes prevail, Indian Christians will free themselves quickly from the patchwork of sects, which we have been struggling to impose on them, and that they will determine to have one Communion Table for all India. Similarly, India may be saved from the introduction of an ignoble Party spirit.

There are those who view the future with grave apprehension. We all rejoice that the bitter feelings between Mohammedans and Hindus, the cause of constant anxiety to our District Officers, are being bridged, but we could wish the use of a more permanent material than a common animosity towards ourselves. This disquieting feature is the outcome of agitation, and is temporary. It is the British who have guided distracted India into the semblance of a hitherto unknown national sentiment. It is the British who have made access to Mecca easy and safe, but if Indian Mohammedans confront Arab aspirations, pilgrims may be the sufferers. Early responsibility has forged the makers of our Empire. Let us trust that it will steady the youth of India. A son may share the world-wide impatience of any control, but when in difficulty he seeks out his father. We shall need each other. There are unknown forces generating in Asia. To meet them a united India is essential. However antipathetic these forces appear to be, they combine in the lust to loot, and Northern India is wealthy.

The king, out of the affection and devotion of the Royal House for his subjects in India, and from his heart concerned
for their prosperity and happiness, has sent forth a noble call to co-operation and goodwill between all classes. To such a message India has always generously responded. The new relationships will be judged not only by their attitude towards the conditions, which brought former failures, but by their removal of disabilities, which burden the members of other religions and of the depressed classes, by their sympathetic concern for hill people and criminal tribes, and by their furtherance of every legislative measure which has for its object the common weal of the masses, the multitudinous agricultural population. It is these interests which have made service in India a delight to our District Officers.

The Indian Civil Service has a grander mission in the future than even the pioneer work of the past, which has built the new India. If the new Ministers preserve efficiency and yet run it on rubber tyres, we shall thankfully learn the lesson. Those who have served in Native States will recall the ability with which important questions are handled, and the patience which instructs the people to understand them. A chief rules more by persuasion than perhaps we have done. The Indian Civil Service will soon find scope for this method, and its results are abiding. It will not be the personal work of the British officer, which is needed, so much as the standard and influence of his life. Therefore, the Indian Civil Service of the future must be once more staffed by the best men our Empire can produce.

From this very imperfect survey of the past and present conditions of India we conclude that the history of India, like its geography, is not a fortuitous arrangement, but under the guiding hand of a wise and loving God, has been over-ruled to produce gold from the roughest ore, pure incense from the wildest jungle. However dark the clouds, however probable the deterioration, we shall continue to believe that there is a noble future for India, and that her people will bring the riches of their patient, affectionate and religious nature to the feet of Christ.

We know that there are thousands of secret believers scattered over India; tens of thousands whose lives are more or less governed by Christian ideals; hundreds of thousands who have learned something about God as the loving Father of us all.

We know that the Scriptures, in all languages, are circulating in India at the rate of over a million copies a year, each copy consisting of at least one Gospel, and that there is much prayer behind these Books.
We know that the Indian Church is realizing its calling and that there are important movements towards Christianity. The influence of this body will become increasingly energetic, specially if the education of the children of Indian Christians, to enable them to occupy leading positions, is recognized by the Missionary Societies as the primary consideration.

**DISCUSSION.**

Mr. E. J. Sewell said:—The paper to which we have all listened with so much interest suggests a great number of questions which come crowding upon us and calling for answers. In the course of his masterly sketch of the long panorama of Indian history which enables us to understand the present state of affairs in India by showing us how it came into existence, the writer of the paper gives us outlines and hints of his answer to one of these questions. It is the question which perhaps most interests this audience, i.e., whether we can (apart from faith) reasonably expect India to become Christian. The chief obstacles to this are—on the philosophic side of religion, a pantheism which effectively divorces belief from conduct; and on the practical side—idolatry.

The writer of the paper tells us on pp. 63 and 64 of a remarkable revolution in moral character and even in spiritual conceptions, and of the influence of the Great War in bringing to the surface a fuller recognition that there is one God and Father of us all. That belief sounds the knell of pantheism.

As regards idolatry, we may, I think, trust for its eradication to the spread of education and to that instrument of unbounded power, the printing press. If men would only awake to its enormous potentialities and use it for Christ as it should be used, we should, I am persuaded, see a revolution in the moral and spiritual world of India greater than anything that has ever been known there hitherto.

We come then to the second pair of obstacles to the adoption by India of Christianity, viz., the doctrine of Karma and the institution of caste. The doctrine of Karma, it has been pointed out, gives a rational sanction to the caste system. That one man should be born a Brahman and another a pariah is quite reasonable
if the difference is the just recompense of the actions done in a former life. Thus the doctrine and the Institution hang together: nor is there any doubt that caste must go if Christianity is to triumph. But the doctrine of Karma is admittedly a purely metaphysical one resting on no evidential basis whatever and its offspring caste is undoubtedly crumbling away.

The spread of education and the democratic ideals which underlie the new Indian constitution strike at the root of caste, while the habit of demanding evidence as the basis of belief is fatal to the doctrine of Karma.

We have therefore reasonable ground for saying that the trend of thought and the current of events in India are both in favour of Christianity.

There is one criticism that I think should be made upon the statement on p. 53 of the doctrine of Karma. The doctrine is no doubt correctly stated as far as the definition goes. But a following sentence, "The idea is that after innumerable lives during myriads of years, the soul rises to perfection . . ." tends, I think, to give an incorrect view of the teaching of Karma. It seems to imply a kind of evolution, the final perfection being arrived at as the outcome of a series of lives increasing in moral value and ending in a life free from moral defect.

This is not, I think, the doctrine of Karma. This is stated by Prof. Deussen in his *System des Vedanta* as follows (pp. 381–2): " . . . the clockwork of requital in running down always winds itself up again; and so on in perpetuity—unless there comes upon the scene the universal knowledge which does not rest upon merit, but breaks its way into existence without connection therewith, to dissolve it utterly, to burn up the seed of deeds and thus to render a continuance of the transmigration impossible for ever after." The release from Karma is thus to be obtained not by the attainment of a morally perfect life, but by what is described as knowledge which cuts away all motives for action and ends in a state very hard to distinguish from annihilation.

It is very encouraging to find a writer of Sir Andrew Wingate's great knowledge and experience of India so hopeful, as the passage in the middle of p. 64 and on p. 65 shows him to be, of the outcome of the new powers given to native ministers: the ground of his
confidence is shown in his final noble paragraph with which I will bring these remarks to an end.

Mr. C. E. Buckland, C.I.E., said: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I venture to offer my contribution to the discussion, as I know something of India, for I spent thirty-four years in the Covenanted Indian Civil Service, and therefore had ample opportunity of gaining information on the subject before us. I have listened to Sir A. Wingate’s paper with the greatest interest, but I cannot say that I agree with all that he has read to us. People in England have, it is well known, great difficulty in understanding the subject of India for two reasons at least. The whole country, its circumstances, the people, the history, everything, are so entirely different to the corresponding matters in England, and again Anglo-Indians differ so greatly in their views that people cannot tell who is right or what they are to believe. Sir A. Wingate’s views seem to me too optimistic, and he does not, in his numerous suggestions, write with any certainty. I observe a number of such words as “may” this, “may” that, “if,” “hope,” “trust in,” “likely,” etc., all uncertain, and, indeed, indicating only possibilities. His views seem to be based on a trust in the recent Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, which are being, and are to be, carried out under the new Statute for the Government of India. Also, he seems to look, for the amelioration, for the advance, of India to the spread of religion, i.e., Christianity. I should like to say something on both these points, but really within five minutes it is quite impossible to do justice to such an enormous subject as India. In my time in that country we were expected and taught to aim at efficiency in the administration. We are now told that we must not mind inefficiency, if it results in the Indians being entrusted with more power and authority. In fact, the main object of the reforms is to take away power from the British officers in the Government, and to make it over to Indians, who have no experience of administration and have never shown the sense of the justice and impartiality which characterizes British rule in India. Many of us old Anglo-Indians view the future, as Sir A. Wingate has said, with grave apprehension. We foresee the friction there will be, the scramble for public money, the endless talk, the advocacy of selfish interests and of class legislation and aims. Party spirit is rife in India: we read lately in the papers of the
quarrels between the Extremists and the Moderates in the National Congress: it was notorious, in my time in Bengal, that there was what used to be called faction-fighting in every village in the Province: it is impossible to suppose that party spirit will cease.

Passing on to religion, I wish to say that I yield to no one in my desire for the spread of Christianity. I should, of course, like to see it prevail throughout India. But this must be considered as a practical question. There must be caution, or more harm than good will be done. The Government has to be neutral in religious matters. If, for instance, they were to interfere by introducing religion into the curriculum of education, there would soon be some dispute in the spending of public money, the Press would take it up, and there would be the cry of religion in danger, which might easily lead to disturbances, mutinies, rebellion, throughout India. So also as to the Bible: much as one would like to see it introduced into the schools and colleges, it is impossible that this should be done with the authority of Government. Nor is it likely to be done by Indians in positions of authority. I have often been told by natives of India that, though they have to be tolerant in public, they really dislike our religion, and that they hate the missionaries, who are regarded as enemies to the Hindu and Mohammedan religions: the people go to the missionary schools because they are cheap and the teaching is good, but they object to the missionaries themselves. We must not shut our eyes to the whole facts, and there is no use in believing merely what we like and wish to see in the facts presented. I am afraid, therefore, that it will be a long time before Christianity makes any great way in India, although each census shows that the numbers of converts increase, especially among the lower classes and primitive races. Is there, then, no hope for India? I am no pessimist, and think there is still hope. But it will be so in spite of the reforms, not in consequence of them. Is it likely that as the Indians acquire more and more power, they will do anything to support Christianity, or the adoption of the Bible in schools and colleges? Hope lies, I think, in the reserve of final power in the hands of the Viceroy and the Government of India, who, in the last resort, are responsible that India does not altogether come to grief. But, by these reforms, Government in India has been made more difficult: there will be more talk, less done, and less progress will be effected. This is not
the time for experiment or for increased taxation. Christianity may come some day, but it will assuredly take a long time, and we must not expect too much.

The Rev. Dr. Kilgour remarked that Civil Servants often appeared on missionary platforms, but missionaries had fewer opportunities of bearing their testimony to the labours of civilians. As a missionary who had come into very close touch with Government officials high and low, he thanked God for the succession of noble unselfish men of the type of the present lecturer who had given themselves to the welfare of the Indian Empire.

One could not help admiring Sir Andrew Wingate's daring in attempting to describe in such a short paper the geography, history, philosophy, and religions of India. Yet, by concisely packing his information he has left upon his hearers the impressions he most wished to convey. A note of optimism had sounded all through the lecture, which must be very cheering to any who face the future with anxiety. In spite of political troubles and possible dangers he looks forward with hope that the India which has yet to be will learn from the lessons of the past. The generous tribute he paid, not only to the higher officials, but also to those in subordinate offices, is well deserved. Dr. Kilgour was very strongly of opinion that what India always expected from those who came to its shores was a clear and candid profession of religious faith. His own experience had taught him that one could have many friends even amongst those of different religions, and that the sympathy and affection of the Indian peoples was best won by a fearless acknowledgment of one's own faith.

Major-General Sir George K. Scott-Moncrieff said that he agreed generally with the remarks of the previous speaker, the Rev. Dr. Kilgour, and expressed admiration for the way in which the subject had been handled by the author.

Mrs. A. C. Bill said: May I add a few words to the discussion following the very interesting paper read by Sir Andrew Wingate this afternoon?

In relation to the somewhat pessimistic views expressed as to a possible early spread of Christianity in India, it is my deep conviction that when the Christian religion is presented to the people
of India as it was presented by Christ Jesus in Palestine, its effects being shown in the individual healing of physical disease according to the faith of the patient; and when the prophecy of the "greater works" that shall be done by His advancing followers begins to be fulfilled in life practice—India will support no serious rival to this Christianity which fulfils its world mission of healing both moral and physical discord.

Mr. S. N. Thakore, an Indian gentleman, added a few remarks.

**Reply by the Lecturer.**

In thanking Mr. Sewell for his very helpful remarks, I would point out that "perfection" on page 53 stands for perfection as understood by Hindus, usually absorption in the divine essence. How far Christian ethics enter into the Hindu conception of perfection is doubtful, because the sense of moral sinfulness is so often absent. My recollection is that Mr. Farquhar in "The Crown of Hinduism" endorses the statement to which objection is taken.

While receiving Mr. Buckland's criticisms with the utmost respect, I venture to claim that he makes my point when he admits that the Bible can never be introduced into schools by a neutral British Government. The Bible is therefore permanently excluded. Its introduction at least becomes possible when Indians are dealing with their own community. They must ask themselves why they should deny to their children the finest writing in the English language and the reservoir whence English-speaking people draw their ideals. The suggestion that the people object to missionaries can only be true of a limited number of Indians. My experience in Native States and British India is that were missionaries not welcome they could not make their way.

My paper is intended respectfully and sympathetically to submit to Indians undertaking new responsibilities, the very thin crust on which modern law and order rest. The antagonism of Mohammedans to Hindus has only been modified by the British axiom that public peace is the first duty of rulers. Attacks on women in the Panjab and other occurrences indicate how easily the worst aspects of the past can be repeated. Therefore the one hope for the future lies in co-operation of Hindus and Mohammedans.
with each other and with the British to maintain and strengthen stable conditions of goodwill between all classes. Some Europeans regard the new reforms as likely to make India impossible—Indian extremists continue to shout for they know not what. Between these two now not very considerable sections may be reckoned the vast majority of British and of educated Indians, who will put aside their views of what might have been and will do their level best to make the new conditions a success.