

itive instruments, and few attempts, if any, have been attended with such a measure of success as that of Warren Hastings.

The position of Hastings was, to say the least, unique. He knew that the favor of his employers depended chiefly upon their dividends. It would have been, indeed, difficult for him not to know this. "Govern leniently and extort as much money as possible," was the general nature of their instructions to him. He was ambitious, both personally and for the state. He wished to reinstate his family in the ancestral seat of Daylesford. This scheme originated, the essayist tells us, "when, as a boy, he lay on the banks of the rivulet which flows through the old domain of his house to join the Isis." We are safe in saying that it spurred him on in after life. His moral calibre was not such as to enable him to resist this double gad, the company's demands and his personal ambition. Again, we are safe in saying that when the base Sujah Dowlan wished to enslave a brave and comparatively enlightened people, whom he, with his immense number of troops, feared to attack, it was this ambition which stifled the sense of right, and prompted Hastings to make of British soldiers, mercenary butchers. The same reason was responsible for his acquiescence in the hanging of the Nuncomar, and for his finding a pretext by which he could give the semblance of justification to the disgraceful intrigue which accompanied the expropriation of the treasure of Cheyte Sing by him in the name of the company; for, forcing Asaph-ul-Doulah to disregard, not only the ordinary laws of humanity and justice, but even the laws of filial respect, by robbing his mother and grandmother of possessions and treasure, theirs by every right. These examples are but a few of many.

Macaulay's essay is an endeavor to justify Hastings, but of itself, it defeats its purpose. The conviction forced upon the reader by his subtle attempts to minimize the most disgraceful events of Hastings' long administration by hustling the chief actor behind the scenes, while the minor ones are placed in the limelight of his abusive pen, is that he was, perhaps, unconsciously imbued with admiration for the great work which the empire-builder accomplished, neglectful of the means used for its accomplishment. Naturally, the reader will refuse to accept the essayist's judgement, but will look behind the scenes and form for himself an estimate of the character of Hastings.

C. J. JONES, '07.