

poise; why  
 herein have  
 tude or of  
 difficult to  
 al sins, in  
 to be no-  
 ment less  
 tion; im-  
 on of the  
 ve of con-  
 ortion, op-  
 numerous  
 ance, and  
 ack cata-  
 or aston-  
 makes his  
 ; and in  
 to arrest  
 ot I visit  
 n such a

British  
 h it has  
 ment of  
 ulation.  
 there is,  
 derable  
 from the  
 ally on  
 nection  
 t they  
 alized,  
 again,  
 e been  
 t evils

that they have perpetrated there, and the encouragement that they have given to the idolatry that is there practised; while they refer only indirectly to the benefits reaped by India from its British connection, and represent them as by no means a counter-poise to the others. We do not presume exactly to apportion the two. We admit both the evil and the good, and are willing to assign their due place and prominence to each. But balancing the one against the other, which predominates? Making all allowance for the good done, what an amount of evil perpetrated, and of good that might have been done but was not, remains to be accounted for? Without discussing the question as to whether Britain came righteously by her Indian possessions, it will be admitted even by those who take the most favorable view of this question, that "*right*" was not always regarded, when "*might*" could achieve or acquire the object on which the representatives of British power had set their hearts, and that the interests of the natives were frequently, and recklessly, and shamefully sacrificed to personal cupidity, and national aggrandisement. Cowper, the faithful Mentor to his country, and fearless denouncer of her sins, placed the spoliation of India and the oppression of its inhabitants, foremost in the list of those national crimes for which God was punishing England in his time. Far be it from us to detract from the brilliant exploits of Robert Clive, or Warren Hastings;—but only the blindest of admirers or the most prejudiced of partizans will venture to deny the duplicity practised by the former, or to palliate the atrocities perpetrated by the latter. The glories of Clive's military career are sadly tarnished by the falsehood and treachery that, in many parts of it, characterized his diplomacy;—as, for instance, in the matter of supplanting Surajah Dowlah, the Nabob of Bengal, by a creature of his own. The glories, again, of Hastings' administrative career are still more stained by the exactions, alike unjust and exorbitant, of which he was guilty, in the case for example, of the Rajah of Benares; and by the cruelties, which, to secure compliance with his demands,