

MISSIONS & MISSIONARIES TO INDIA.



REMARKS BY

A NATIVE CONVERT.

(AUTHOR OF THE ARTICLE ENTITLED "NATIVE CHURCH" IN THE
"FRIDAY REVIEW" OF THE 4TH OCTOBER 1867.)

Calcutta:

SOLD BY BARHAM, HILL & CO., CALCUTTA.
R. C. LEPAGE & CO., LONDON.

1868.

MISSIONS & MISSIONARIES TO INDIA.



REMARKS BY

A NATIVE CONVERT.

(AUTHOR OF THE ARTICLE ENTITLED "NATIVE CHURCH" IN THE
"FRIDAY REVIEW" OF THE 4TH OCTOBER 1867.)

Calcutta:

SOLD BY BARHAM, HILL & CO., CALCUTTA.
R. C. LEPAGE & CO., LONDON.

1868.

**PRINTED BY J. N. GHOSE & CO., AT THE ORIENTAL PRESS.
AND AT THE SCHOOL BOOK PRESS.**

PREFATORY NOTE.

In laying before the public the following few pages I have no other end in view than the promotion of that great cause which is so dear to my heart,—the cause of Missions in India. A false friend is ten thousand times worse than an open foe. And Christianity as well as the cause of Christian Missions does not suffer half so much in the hands of her open foes—atheists, infidels, sceptics and scorers of every shade and description—as she suffers in the hands of her false friends—nominal Christians, unfaithful Missionaries, untrue clergymen and “baptised infidels” of every class. In the following pages I have attempted, I do not say succeeded, to describe as faithfully as possible the daily lives and doings of only a single class of the false friends of Christianity, I mean the so called Missionaries to this “great and magnificent”, yet benighted and heathen land.

A Christian convert as I am, I should be the last person to take up my pen—feeble as it is—and expose to public view what may be well termed the dark side of the picture of the lives and doings of the Missionaries who even as educationists have deserved well of the sons of the soil. And most certainly I would not have at all taken up my pen to write a single line that might even seem to go against such men, had not the noblest, I might say the holiest of causes, the cause of the Evangelization of India, been dearest to my heart, and had I not been honestly convinced that the conduct and the doings of those very men were fraught with utter ruin to that cause.

The good and Christian men of England and Scotland actuated by the holiest of motives not only send forth Missionaries to preach to and convert the people of this country, but also pay them most liberally in order to enable them to carry on the more effectively that great work. And, surely, those good and Christian men can justly demand of those Missionaries, whom they both send and support, all honest and possible labour on their part for the due accomplishment of the work wherewith they are entrusted. That they at least expect this, is evident from their repeated and anxious inquiries to hear of conversions. How disappointed do they feel when for years together they hear of no conversions! And how much more than

disappointed do they feel when on the contrary they are told that the Hindus are a people "with whom there is no hope of ever succeeding"! With such a prospect before them, the hearts of the supporters of Indian Missions cannot but fail. Nor are Missionaries here quite unaware of this. The extraordinary earnestness and punctuality with which these Missionaries send to their supporters at Home detailed list of successful Entrance, First Arts, B. A. and M. A. candidates, fully show that they are quite aware of the disappointed feelings of their patrons.

But will the supporters of Missions and Missionaries at Home know the true cause of the absence of conversions here? If they will let them read these pages.

The Church of Christ in these days of unbelief is truly beset with enemies. A few of these are brave enough to fight openly against Her. But the vast majority of them are sneaking cowards, who, tho' at heart Her enemies, yet profess themselves to be Her friends. The day however is not far hence when She like the Eternal City will conquer and subdue all Her foes, open and secret, and vindicate Her honor as the unspotted Bride of the spotless Lamb!

In conclusion I must say that in publishing these pages I have fully availed myself of that LIBERTY OF THE PRESS which is the glory of this civilized age. I have however carefully avoided every expression which might be considered as only abusive and not at all true.

And now may the Lord of Missions cause his Missionary Servants to examine their hearts and see whether by their conduct and doings, they really deserve their name.

Manicktollah Street
Calcutta,
January 1868.

B. L. CHANDRA.



MISSIONS AND MISSIONARIES TO INDIA.

At the western extremity of the continent of Asia lies a strip of land which was once the loveliest and richest country in the world and which still affords every thing that can delight the eye and feed the imagination of genuine lovers of scenery. Towards the far north of this remarkable piece of land, rise in solemn grandeur the "snowy heights" of a long range of mountains, famed of old for their lofty cedars. From the high peaks of this majestic range, issues a stream of greater renown than

"Abana and Pharpar, lucid streams,"

or even than

"Siloa's brook that flow'd

"Fast by the Oracle of God."

One day long ago on the solitary banks of this stream of "old renown," stood a singular person—singular in his dress, singular in his food, and singular in his work. Along with him stood two men, genuine sons of "father Abraham" anxiously listening to every word that was falling from his inspired lips. The man was talking perhaps of that "kingdom" of which he came to testify and especially perhaps of that peculiar preparation without which none could enter into it, when lo! "a mysterious stranger" passed by. He looked up and pointing to the stranger exclaimed, "Behold the Lamb of God!" These were words sufficient to excite the curiosity of any mortal. The two disciples were touched. They followed the Lamb and soon became His attached servants. The name of one of these two servants was Andrew. "He findeth his own brother and saith unto him, We have found the Messiah." And he brought him to the Master. Thus the convert became a *Missionary*, the first Missionary of the cross! And ever since that memorable day there have existed numberless men calling themselves by that glorious name. The work of Missions, thus, began with Andrew's calling his brother to the Messiah. But it was not till sometime after, that missionary operation on any considerably large scale, began to be carried on.

About three hundred miles from the metropolis of the strip of land of which we have been speaking, on the fertile banks of the classic

Orontes, stood a city—it still stands there though woefully changed—where “the Roman Senator, the Greek rhetorician, the Chaldean astrologer, the Hebrew juggler, the Pagan augur, the Jewish rabbi, merchants from Rome, Alexandria, Corinth, Arabia, Babylon, mingled together in the same society and jostled together in the same thoroughfares, and where classic culture, and oriental forms of thought met each other face to face and mutually acted and reacted on each other.” In this ancient city of classic refinement and oriental scenery, erewhile the receptacle of the far-famed grove of Daphne with its interminable shades of myrtle and cypress, embosoming the temple of the father of the gods of ancient Greece, was formed, within a few years of Andrew’s becoming the servant of the Messiah, a regular congregation of similar servants. On a certain day four or five years after the establishment of this congregation, there was heard a voice from heaven saying, “Separate unto me! Paul and Barnabas for the work whereunto I have called them.”

Paul and Barnabas became Missionaries. Thus was fairly launched the goodly vessel on the open sea of the world. Thus was set on foot a grand missionary movement. In this movement the great Apostle of the Gentiles leads the way. During twenty long years did he go forth from within the bosom of the “mother church” at Antioch, accompanied by his little band of missionary attendants, carrying far and wide the sound of the gospel trump. Rapidly traversing over Cilicia, Lycaonia, Galatia, and the furthest extremities of Asia, he soon crossed the Ægean waters and planted the cross on the adjacent European coast. He then casts his eagle glance towards Rome. Rome he did see. And though a prisoner in chains, there too he prosecuted his Master’s work!

Paul was a Missionary! In our own time we have Missionaries too. But how great is the difference between them and Paul! We are not speaking now of their respective moral qualifications. We are just now simply alluding to their respective work, the mode of accomplishing it; and their manner of general living. And what was Paul’s work? Why, it was that of a Missionary, of one sent to preach the cross. It was therefore *preaching the cross* in the ordinary sense of that phrase. The mode in which he accomplished that work, was by journeying from place to place, from

house to house. His manner of living also was just what was compatible with his name. A missionary is but a synonym of simplicity and unworldliness. Paul illustrated in his life what Missionaries of the present day illustrate only by their lips,—“a Christian, specially a missionary although he lives *in* the world, is nevertheless, not *of* the world.” It is true that Paul laboured with his hands for an independent livelihood. He made tents. But never did Paul for a moment fancy that tent making was part of his work *as a missionary*. Nor did he ever appropriate to himself that glorious name for the simple fact that he was carrying on his former business that of tent making, in a *foreign* land, or that he had translated himself to a foreign land to carry on *some* business, and not a *particular* one. The latter however is just *the* reason for which many a person calls himself a Missionary in our own land. A youngman, who has been a moment before working away as a master in some unknown village of Scotland at twenty or thirty rupees a month is invested by some presbytery, with the not very envious title of Rev, and is sent by some missionary society to this land. He arrives we will suppose at Calcutta. He engages an airy palace at Chowringhee, or on the Esplanade, and perfectly innocent of the least knowledge of both the language and the manners and customs of the people to whom he has come out as a Missionary, snugly fits himself up in the upper chambers of his spacious mansion without for once coming out amongst the people at large, to mix with them and to win them to the cross as well by public preaching as by private, and familiar conversation.

And how can he come out to mix with them? Are they not poor, barbarous, conquered heathen? And is he not a rich, civilized, conquering christian? Paul might have been a civilized man. But his civilization was at most of the first century, while the civilization of our Missionary is of the “NINETEENTH CENTURY”! Then again, has not our Missionary come to the “land of the Sun,” to a tropical climate? Ought he not, therefore, to be afraid of “sun-strokes, liver diseases, weakness of the nerves, asthma, and many other disorders” which perhaps, in other quarters of the globe missionary flesh is not heir to? Really how can he come out to mingle with the people and win

* *Vide*, the letter of “A Lieut. in the cave of Adallum” in the *Bombay Guardian* of September last.

them to the cross? Is the preaching of the cross dearer than life? Fancy of a mid-day Indian sun burning bright over-head in sultry May or June. Is that the time to walk from house to house, or from village to village, "carrying the glad tidings of salvation to poor famished souls? Is not that rather the time to sit under the *punkah* with a glass of ice water, or perhaps a glass of iced simkin before you? If that is not the time, to enjoy such little and necessary comforts, of what use then is a "living"—not "fat" of course—of three or four hundred rupees a month? Exactly. But do you remember that you are a *missionary*—that you have been sent to *preach the cross* and that your three hundred rupees are given you on the condition that you will preach it? As a simple matter of fact we say that you do not mingle freely with the people for whose spiritual welfare you have come out from a distant country leaving behind you dear parents and affectionate brothers and sisters.* But more than this, you not only do not go out to meet the people at large, you don't allow the people to come to you. It is no exaggeration to say that not more inaccessible are the highest officials in government service, than most *Missionaries* of the cross. There they are lovers of comfort, yet boasters, more or less of the immense sacrifice they have made in coming out to India across the boundless expanse of immense seas, sitting in their upper chambers as so many little princes, pleasantly enjoying their meerschaum pipes, or manilla cigars.

Suppose a poor Hindu desires to see one of these little princes—of course he is very presumptuous, if not audacious in so desiring—but suppose he desires to see him. He presents himself at the gate in his simple *dhoote* and *chuder*, with or without shoes. The *durwan* comes out with his "konhaye?" The poor man asks whether the *padre Saheb* is at home. "He is, but what do you want him for?" demands the *durwan*. "I want to see him" replies the poor Hindu. "See him, where's your *ticket*." "Ticket, what ticket?" "Your card, your card." The poor man, ignorant of European fashion, cannot understand why in the world he should be asked for card. He knows that *card* is a thing to play with and surely the *padre Saheb* does not want to play at cards. Puzzled and confounded he goes away, convinced that the missionary is not to be seen so easily. Fortunately however the same evening he happens to meet with a rather

* There may be some who do this, but their number is very small.

anglicised friend of his. Him he applies to for the solution of the card problem. The problem is solved, and next morning he provides himself with a sort of a card and presents himself again at the gate of the royal missionary. The card is taken up to the *burra* Saheb on the third story. The bearer returns with the message that "the Baboo" might wait in the down-stair parlour. This is shown to him. But what is his feeling when he sees it? Why, he is afraid to enter the room, it is so fashionably fitted up, so finely matted all over, with oil cloth foot-path and perhaps a rich velvet pile in the centre to boot. The man looks at his feet. They are all covered over with dust. How shall he dare spoil the mat, the oil cloth, the carpet by treading them with such unclean feet? He stands therefore at the door for half an hour till the *burra* Saheb is pleased to come down. He comes down and after a word or two, sends him away to some one favorite convert to speak with, as he himself can not spare any time for that purpose. Thus ends the Hindu's visit to the Missionary Saheb! Let no one think that I am writing all this from mere fancy. I am writing *not* from *fancy* but from experience. I have actually seen missionaries behaving thus. Of course there is nothing wrong or condemnable whatsoever in an European's matting or otherwise furnishing his room. Nor is there anything wrong in his practice of asking for card. Such things are absolutely required by the civilization of which he is an exponent. But then the European Missionary ought always to bear in mind that he has translated himself into a foreign land where his new civilization must necessarily come into collision with an older civilization, and that according to a well known law of nature, the collision must cause an explosion violent in proportion to the force with which the two heterogeneous elements strike each other. Under such circumstances it is clear that the Missionary should take to heart the Pauline maxim of being all things to all men that thereby some may be won to Christ.

But asks a Missionary all trembling in anger, "Are Missionaries then mere idlers? Are they not active laborious men? Do they only snore away their time and do no work at all?" Certainly they are active, laborious *men*. They do *not* only snore away their time. They do *some* work. But people who know any thing of the matter will feel no hesitation to declare that they are neither active nor laborious *as missionaries*. Undoubtedly they do and do with industry some work but not *the* work after which they are

called. Most missionaries are attached to Educational establishments belonging to the Societies which have sent them out as missionaries. One is a Principal of an Institution, another a Professor of Literature another of History another of Logic and Philosophy, another of Mathematics. Supposing that each of these missionary—professors teaches on an average* four hours a day, three of these four hours are assuredly to be devoted to secular subjects, the remaining one *may* be devoted to the teaching of Scripture. I say, *may be*, because I know that some missionaries don't teach the Bible at all! The fact is that as educationalists they want to see their pupils pass well in the University examinations; and this is the sole end and aim for which they labour day and night. Let a missionary Institution send some forty boys to the University Entrance examination and let a good many of these be "plucked," what a scene will ensue! All the missionaries connected with that institution will be pricked in their hearts and measures will be taken to prevent a similar occurrence next year. Enquires will be made to find out the subject in which the boys have mostly failed. If that subject happen to be the one taught by a *native* professor, then woe to him! If it be the one taught by a missionary then, woe to the boys! But let the same institution send some ten boys to a competitive Bible examination and let one pass only, no notice is taken, nothing is done except perhaps that some ungenerous remarks are made upon sister institutions on account of their better success.

Now, let the candid reader honestly say whether he can call such men, *Missionaries of the cross* in the truest sense of that phrase. For my part I can say that to call them *missionaries* in the true sense of that term would be the grossest abuse of human language. You may and must call them *Christian teachers or educationalists* but never, *missionaries of the cross*. Native christians who labour in connection with missionary institutions, who generally teach the Scriptures two or three hours every day, and who moreover go about preaching from place to place, are better, infinitely better missionaries than these educationalists who falsely and boastingly call themselves missionaries.

* I say on an average, because some don't teach even so much, tho' some teach more.

The question has been often asked why have the Missionaries in this country failed to do anything worth mentioning in the way of conversion? People are at a loss to account for this failure. They wonder at the fact, but don't know what adequate reason to give for it. For my part I confess that I don't in the least wonder at this failure. I believe the true reason of it lies in this :—

That the missionaries here do not put forth adequate efforts to make conversions, either by directly preaching or teaching the Gospel or by indirectly inculcating its precepts by leading a sufficiently self denying life amongst the heathen around them.

From what has been written already it must be evident to all that the so-called Missionaries here do *not* put forth adequate efforts to secure conversions from the ranks of heathenism around them. I have already said that the missionaries in this country, at least the vast majority of them, do not like Paul of old, go about preaching the Gospel from place to place. This of course is the heaviest charge that can be brought against them. Justin Martyr has some where said, "every one who can preach the truth and does not preach it, incurs the judgment of God." If every one who *can* preach, but *does not* preach the truth, incurs the judgment of God, how much more does he incur that judgment who not only can, but *avowedly comes out* to preach the truth and yet *does not* preach it?*

Nor do missionaries devote all their time to *teaching* the Gospel. On an average it may be safely said that every missionary attached to educational establishments,—and as a matter of fact, most missionaries are attached to such establishments,—devotes at the most, an hour every day to teaching Christianity. I say, *at the most*, for I know of missionaries who do not devote even that much of their time to the teaching of the Bible. If you ask them, why this is the case, they will immediately tell you with an air of intolerable boasting, "O! but don't you know that though we do not devote all our time to the teaching or preaching of the Bible, yet we devote much of it to imparting a highly Christianized education to multitudes of heathen

* On this point a friend suggested that some Missionaries would perhaps say that they *cannot* preach the truth as they don't know the language of the Natives. So much the better then. Fancy a man calling himself a Missionary to those natives whose language he does not even profess to know!

youth?" Yes truly. And that is just the reason why you should not call yourselves *missionaries*, but merely *Christian educationalists*. This would be consistent as well as honest. Lord Byron with all his imperfections, could freely say,

"The tree of knowledge* is not that of life."

But the false missionaries of the present day would fain reverse the maxim and say,

"The tree of knowledge is truly that of life!"

And thus mistaking the tree of knowledge for the tree of life, they toil in vain to climb its slippery stem and pluck the much desired fruit. Their unfaithfulness is very sadly rewarded here, namely with utter failure, and who can say what may be its reward hereafter?

But one may ask, what, after all may be the true reason for which Missionaries do not devote all their time, energy and talent to the *one work* to which they have been purposely called and to perform which they one and all admit, they have journeyed across oceans and seas, the work, *viz*, the conversion of the heathen to the religion of the Son of God?

The answer to this can be given in a word. The work of conversion is very tedious and pre-eminently self-sacrificing. It has no glory or honour in the eye of the world. It requires one to bid farewell to every idea of earthly comfort. Bass's Indian Ale, Cutler's gold necked Simkin and Exshaw's No. 1 must be put aside. Harmoniums, and pianos that give out sweet breathing airs must not be thought of. The Bible is to be taken up and often half-fed and scantily-clothed, mocked and laughed at, in heat and in cold, the preacher must toil from place to place. Such things are not easy to do. They sadly clash against every idea of comfort, pleasure and enjoyment. Not so however is a professor's chair. To occupy such a chair full of glory and honour, for a few hours during the day and then to drive home in a buggy some two or three hours before other men can close their daily work, there to prepare for an evening party, is at once easy and comfortable. And if one can do all this and at the same time can appropriate to himself the glorious name of a Missionary, a name which is synonymous with self-sacrifice and disinterestedness,

* By knowledge here is not meant that knowledge of which the Apostle speaks in Phil. III. 8 nor even does it mean the gnosis of the Gnostics.

why then the very nature of the human mind—the nature that always, hates pain and loves comfort,—demands that the second course be at once availed of. It is because of this that the missionary does not devote all his time, energy and talent, solely and wholly to the work of conversion.

Nor do Missionaries, generally speaking, lead such self sacrificing, such righteous lives amongst the heathen around them, as thus to impress on the minds of those heathen, the saving precepts of the religion of Christ. Precept and practice are inseparably connected. The precept that is not borne out by the practice of the preceptor, can not but fail to make any beneficial impression upon those to whom the precept is addressed. Hence the Great Preceptor was also a Model Man. Indeed on this subject the opinion of all moralists is that practice or example is always an infinitely more powerful teacher than any mere precept or instruction.

But of most Missionaries it may be safely said that their teachings and their doings are sadly at variance with each other. They teach in accordance with the precepts of the Bible, but they live in accordance with the precepts of the world! They teach that "to be carnally minded is death," but in their every day life and conversation they are as carnally minded as any body else in the world! They teach that without holiness or down right honesty of thought, motive and action, none can see the kingdom of God, but woefully does their daily practice fail to illustrate what they teach! They teach that "charity beareth all things and never thinketh evil," but unfortunately how soon do they actually think of evil when no evil is really meant and how often do they, instead of bearing all things, revenge the least imaginable wrong!

That Missionaries are as worldly-minded as any mere layman, can be proved beyond the possibility of there being the shade of a shadow of doubt about it. Missionaries, as it has been already remarked are Principals of *Literary Institutions*. They are Professors of Literature, of Logic and Philosophy, of History and of Mathematics! They are examiners to the University, authors of "Problems in Dynamics" and "Questions on Indian History" intended for students going up to the University Examinations! They are lecturers on "the source of the Nile" and on "Abyssinia," are keepers of "jails" and prosecutors before Magistrates and Judges! Missionaries are all this but seldom or never preachers of the cross to the people at large

in their bazars or thorough-fares, street-corners or dwelling houses. Has any body ever heard an Ogilvie, a Fyfe, a Don or a Macdonald preach the glad tidings of salvation to the poor uneducated inhabitants of Calcutta and its suburbs? And yet these are Missionaries! True there was a Lacroix in the midst of us and there are still a Vaughan and a Lesle all zealous preachers. But these are noble exceptions. All honour to such worthy servants of Him who went about doing good and whose meat and drink was to do the will of His Father! The words of that eminent Christian layman Mr. H. C. Tucker, on the point in question, deserves the most serious consideration of every honest Missionary. Mr. Tucker says, "European evangelists ought not in general, to settle down in any one locality, but after the example of our Lord and His Apostles, should *itinerate* over a longer or smaller extent of country, mixing intimately with the people, disseminating the Word of God and Christian literature, and endeavouring by their whole life and conversation to spread a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus." I beg not to be misunderstood. I do not mean to say that preaching is the *only* legitimate means of securing conversions. Teaching may be a means also, though only a subordinate means. But that teaching can not be a hebrid elementary teaching of all sorts of subjects, literary and scientific. It must be only the teaching of the Word of God in some form or other. That word as the Spirit's sword can alone cut asunder the thick, strong chord which binds the soul so securely to the world and the love of it. Thus a missionary whose sole vocation it is to convert sinners and not to train up men for the business of the world, ought if

* In the statement relative to the objects and operations of the Free Church Mission in Bengal, presented by the Rev. W. C. Fyfe at the last annual distribution of prizes to the pupils attending the F. C. Institution, occurs the following sentence,—“In our Schools we address ourselves to the young, we also go out and seek to influence the old.” I do not quite understand what Mr. Fyfe meant by his “we.” If he meant by it as one would naturally think he did, himself and his missionary colleagues, the statement then is simply false. But if he meant by it—of course by first murdering both Grammar and Logic—his “almost all Christian Teachers,” the statement then is doubtless true. But the question occurs what credit then to the Missionaries? What do they do? The reply is “sweet is the dance at another's cost.”

he teach, to teach the Bible only or if he preach, to preach the same. Let him make any compromise in this and he will not only be an unfaithful servant of his heavenly Master but also a laughing stock to men who will not fail to notice how ill he deserves the name he so vainly appropriates to himself.

But this is not all. There are other remarkable traits in the missionary character which go far not indeed to recommend to the favourable reception by the people of this country, of those "pure moralities" which are the glories of the Gospel, but rather to depreciate them in their eyes. Whatever moral truth a teacher may inculcate, the taught always, as it were instinctively, seek for its illustration in the character of the teacher. Should they fail to find the illustration, they not only consider the teacher to be a hypocrite, but also begin to think that the truth after all is not so very important for leading a moral life. Of course, a missionary is not a saint, however much he may wish to be one. We should not therefore expect anything like perfection from him. The Poet has said that, "Perfection was not meant for man below." And so it was not. But certainly it is not unreasonable to expect a professed teacher of morality to be strictly a moral man. He who invites others "to cast in his lot with the people of God," ought reasonably himself to be a "man of God." He who quotes and evidently delights in the words of Him like whom never man spake "Cast out first the beam from thy own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brothers's eye," ought himself to be a clear-eyed man. The questions therefore are by no means unwarrantable,—Are the missionaries of the cross as strictly truthful and honest, kind and charitable as one would naturally expect them to be? Are their words and writings as true and correct as they should be? Are they as prideless unrevengeful, kind and charitable as they ought to be? Leaving a sufficient space for noble and honorable exceptions, will it not be safe to answer these questions in the negative?

With reference to the correctness of missionary writings, I have only to inform those of my readers who are not already aware of it, that in certain quarters, the expression,—"*As unfaithful as a missionary report,*" has passed into a proverb. And truly missionary reports generally speaking are little to be relied upon. Nor is this to be wondered at. If Missionaries ~~can~~ make ~~also~~ statements in open courts after solemn oath and in public journals in the teeth of well

could be
a wrong

known facts,* what wonder that they should make their reports intended as these are for persons living in distant countries and therefore liable to be easily imposed upon, what wonder that they should make their reports rose-coloured, exaggerated and a little too "glorious"? Dr. Ogilvie, himself a missionary evidently alludes to the unfaithful nature of reports written by other missionaries, in the following paragraph contained in his letter, entitled "Explanations relative to the training of native ministers in connection with the General Assembly's Mission." The paragraph runs thus:—"Indeed, in a Report that was presented some years ago to the General Assembly "our pictures of Native Converts to our creed," were pronounced to fall very far short of those that had been drawn by others. But, if they did fall thus short, they certainly had one advantage:—they

* In connection with the above I beg to quote here the letter of a correspondent published in the *Daily News* of Tuesday the 5th November 1867.

"MISSIONARY HONESTY."

To the Editor of the *Daily News*.

SIR,—In the case *W. C. Fyfe* versus *Heera Lal Seal* and another, a report of which appeared in your issue of the 2nd instant, Mr. Fyfe made the following statement:—"Permission is required by parties who wish to visit the house." Again, "It is usual for strangers to ask permission if they wish to see a convert." Justice to the defendants, the Magistrate and the public, demands that this statement be publicly contradicted as altogether false. As an inmate of the "house" for more than twenty-four months I am in a position to say that there is not the slightest truth in the statement. I have also been told by each and all of the youngmen, now living in the "house" that such a thing never was required. And yet Mr. Fyfe who is a senior Missionary, declared on solemn oath that such a thing *was* required. Is this missionary honesty? And after this, will any body dare deny that the conscience of Missionaries is "a botch &c." yours obediently AN INMATE &c." I need not say that what "An Inmate" has said is ~~the truth~~. Even if it be admitted that "a convert" means "a candidate for baptism," still I believe "An Inmate" ~~is~~. I myself have resided in the house for a length of time sufficient to enable me to witness the baptism of no less than *nine* individuals. And I can say that in not one instance did I see any stranger asking *permission* of any body to see a candidate, though doubtless in every instance the stranger asked some body to point out the room in which the candidate was lodged. ~~the only person who~~

were no fancy pictures; they were no pictures of the imagination, they were natural pictures; in short they were sketched from life. It is plain then that if they were not pictures of the BEAUTIFUL, at all events they must have been pictures of the TRUE." In these words Dr. Ogilvie has very correctly described the character of missionary reports in general. These reports are truly "fancy-pictures," very *beautiful*, as beautiful as moonshine. No doubt, just like a missionary Dr. Ogilvie has quite taken to himself the credit of truthfulness. But our readers know how to account for this. Whatever therefore the Doctor may say for himself, people would still believe that just like the reports drawn by other missionaries, if the Doctor's reports are true, they are true only in the sense in which Dean Swift's famous "Travels," may be said to be true.

The next remarkable trait in the character of Missionaries, to which I shall here allude is their pride of race and colour. European Missionaries or rather I should say, British Missionaries naturally consider themselves as belonging to a conquering race. The Natives are their conquered subjects. And as belonging to a conquering race, British Missionaries almost necessarily entertain a high "sense of superiority and arrogance" towards the conquered natives. People would seem to believe that it is the Planters of America only that make a distinction between the Black and the White. But this is not the case. Such a distinction is made wherever the two are found together. But no where is it made so widely, so prominently, as amongst the Missionaries to this country. There can not be the least doubt that the true reason for which Missionaries do not freely mingle with the Hindus, is their pride of colour. Missionaries sometimes say that "the peculiar customs of the Hindus, preclude all familiar intercourse with them." No doubt this is partially true. Some of the peculiar customs of the Hindus, do preclude a certain sort of familiar intercourse, such as eating and drinking together. But it is simply false to say that those customs preclude all sorts of familiar intercourse. There is no such custom, for example, which prevents a missionary from visiting a Hindu, however orthodox, in his house which may be but a hut and to sit on his mat and hold familiar converse together. There have been missionaries who did this and there may be some who do this even now. But the generality of Missionaries think such a practice to be derogatory to their dignity as white men and especially as conquerors. Hence, as

a rule, these Missionaries lead a lordly life, the life of the "upper thousand."

It has been said further, that the Hindus being of a different religious persuasion, it would be neither good, nor wise, to mingle freely and frequently with them. Whether it would not be really good and wise to mingle freely and frequently with the Hindu on the ground that he belongs to a different religious persuasion, I shall not here discuss. Suffice it to say that this is not the true reason for which Missionaries do not mingle freely with the Hindus. That reason, as I have before said, is the Missionary's pride of colour, or as Lord Stanley once expressed it, it is that sense of superiority and arrogance which is almost inevitable to a conquering race.

That this is the true reason of the Missionary's not mingling with the Hindus, will be evident from the fact that Hindu converts to Christianity, do not fare any better in this respect than the Hindus themselves. If it be because of the difference of creed that the Missionary does not mingle freely with the Hindu, surely, there cannot be the same reason for his not mingling freely with the Native Convert. Why then, is he not as familiar, as one could desire, with the latter? The Author of the "Searchings of Heart," suggested the following questions to assist the Missionary's self-examination on this point:—"Do I look upon my converts, or converts in general of the Mission to which I belong as my sons in the faith—as brethren in Christ, and not as subordinates and servants? Am I sure that I am not aristocratic in my demeanour towards them, bearing myself loftily in their presence as a man of high spiritual attainments and of a superior civilization—issuing mandates to them with an air of authority and not condescending to sit with them and hold 'familiar converse delighted?'" Am I sure in short, we may add, that I am not a little too much puffed up with the pride of race and colour? The honest Missionary, I believe, must answer these questions in the affirmative.

But the pride of colour exhibited by the Missionary towards Native converts, does not manifest itself only in the fact that the former does not hold "familiar converse delighted" with the latter. That pride is more distinctly and essentially exhibited in the difference which he makes between his own and the converts' power and pay. The converts especially those who prepare themselves for the ministry receive the same education and training as the Missionary does, and yet

they are not allowed to enjoy the same power and control over Mission affairs and Mission funds, as the Missionary is allowed to do. The esteemed writer whom I have just quoted, writes thus on the subject in question. After pointing to the necessity of there being a body of highly educated Native Ministers in connection with Indian Missions, the writer goes on to say:—"The question then, naturally comes to be asked,—How is it that this scheme of raising a body of highly educated Native Ministers, though attempted by some Missionary Societies, has met with little success? Dr. Ogilvie, of the Church of Scotland's Mission lately wrote a pamphlet on this very subject, so far as his own Mission was concerned and after going through the pamphlet, we hardly know to what conclusion he has come—if, indeed he has come to any conclusion at all. And yet one would suppose that the whole thing lay in a nut shell. Mr. Tucker, who to great manliness of character and a wide knowledge of the world joins sincere piety and Missionary zeal, lays bare the secret in one sentence. He says;—" *But when we give education, we must expect it to excite ideas of independence and self advancement. Knowledge all over the world means power and pay.*" Would that these words of sterling common sense were inscribed in letters of gold on the walls of Mission offices and Society houses in England! In those words is contained the whole philosophy of the failure of the scheme of raising a body of Educated Native Ministers. You educate a man for the Ministry,—you give him a high literary, theological, mathematical and scientific education; you place him, so far as education is concerned, on a footing of equality with yourself,—and then you tell him that he cannot enjoy the same power and control over Mission affairs and Mission funds as you do! You give him an education as good as you yourself have received and then you turn round and tell him that he must be content with a fourth or third part of your pay! Knowledge means power and pay, all over the world, except in our Indian Missions; no wonder therefore that in our Indian Missions, Educated Native Ministers are at a discount.

"But it is alleged that a Native does not require so large a salary as a European. Very likely not. Is it because a Native has a less capacious stomach than his European brother? Is it because all creature comforts are meant by Providence for the European alone, and none for the Native? Is it because a black skin suffers

the opposite, since black colour is a worse conductor of heat than white.

“ The preposterous policy pursued by the Directors of Missionary Societies with respect to educated Native Ministers, is fraught with danger and ruin to the Indian Church and to the cause of Christianity itself in India. That policy is more illiberal than the policy pursued by the Indian Government with respect to its Native Officers. In the State, a Native Judge receives the same pay, and is invested with the same privileges as a European Judge, in the Church a Native Missionary neither receives the same pay, nor is invested with the same privileges as a European Missionary. Thus it appears that the Church, whose vocation it is to preach justice and truth, is less just than the state.” The author of these lines, once a Missionary himself and at the time of writing them a Native Minister and therefore fully in a position to speak with authority on the subject, has thus very clearly exposed the preposterous policy pursued by Missionary Societies with respect to Native Missionaries and Ministers. One thing, however, he has not done. He has not told us why this distinction is made between European and Native Ministers and Missionaries;—why the Native receiving the same amount of education with the European must be content with a fourth or a third part of the latter’s pay. This deficiency, however has been supplied by others,—and they, European Missionaries. Three such missionaries have published replies to the remarks of the Native Minister quoted above. And what is remarkable in those replies is, that they tell us in plain language that a distinction ought to be made between Native and European Ministers and Missionaries, simply because *a Native is a Native and a European, a European*. But on this subject I believe I had better insert here in full length the article which I published in the now defunct “*Friday Review*” when in charge of it. The article is headed “*Native Church*”; and it runs thus:—

“ Our readers will not be surprised to learn that our recent article on Missionary Agency has brought upon us a whole nest of hornets. Evidently the poor creatures have been too much annoyed. Ere while these creatures—the professional Missionaries—have been glibly passing away their days in fancied security. Easy with fat livings, and possessed of supreme power over their “*brethren*” of the sombre class, they have been pleasantly snoring away in the upper chambers of airy palaces, when our cruel article warned them of danger at

hand. Disturbed in their sweet sleep by the treachery of the most treacherous we of the *Friday Review*, they are now, not unlike Gray's "owl," bitterly complaining—

"Of such as wandering near their secret bowers
Molest their solitary reign."

We are, however, not in the least sorry for the flood of abuse that has been so plentifully poured down upon our devoted head by these gentlemen who have made such extraordinary sacrifice by coming out as Missionaries, by having crossed oceans and exposed themselves to the inconceivable discomforts of a tropical residence, out of pure love to the souls of the people of India. Truth, we know, is always unpleasant to those against whom it seems to go. And he must be condemned as very wicked, who dares speak out truth without respect of person and feeling. We confess we are guilty of this high crime and misdemeanor. We have spoken truth which unfortunately is not favorable to the reputation of this self-sacrificing body of mortals—the Missionaries of the cross. Our remarks in that article on Missionary Agency have evidently touched the tender conscience of these saintly people, and torrents of matter, not of a very pleasant nature, are ever and anon issuing from the wounds. For the conscience of these men—

"Is a botch

"That will not bear the gentlest touch";

"But breaking out despatches more,

"Than th' epidemical'st plague-sore."

Our Christianity has been doubted, our sincerity questioned, our honesty suspected. And all this has been done for no other reason than the one that we have advocated equality of power and pay between European and Native Ministers and Missionaries, when their qualifications and talents are every whit equal! Imbued with the true spirit of our most holy faith, we have already most emphatically declared against that invidious distinction which is so wickedly maintained by Missionary Societies, between their European and Native labourers, whether as Missionaries, or as ministers or teachers. And although our declaration has brought down upon us a good deal of abuse and ill-feeling yet we shall not, for our very life, stop short in the faithful discharge of our duty, viz. to protest and declare against that invidious distinction, so long as breath remains in us. But it may

be asked, have there not been given sensible replies to our remarks in that article? We shall presently see to this.

The *Bombay Guardian*, a Christian journal, edited, we believe, by Dr. Wilson of the Free Church of Scotland, in an article which we quoted at length in our columns a few weeks ago, has the following:—

“The claim advanced by the *Friday Review* that ‘the native minister should enjoy the same power and control over Mission affairs and Mission Funds that the European missionary does,’ is not one that we now hear for the first time. The Native minister is entitled to the support from the Church to which he ministers, such as it is able to give him. The Christians of Europe or America who have sent forth the missionary are not willing to burden the Native church with his support, and therefore, undertake it themselves. When Native churches send forth evangelists, they should in like manner become responsible for their support. Anything less than this, will not meet our idea of an independent Native Church.”

The same journal, in a later issue, publishes a pretty lengthy letter from a “Lieutenant in the Cave of Adullam,” in which the writer argues as follows:—

“It will scarcely be necessary now expressly to refer to the arguments of the F. R. about the capaciousness of different stomachs, the conducting qualities of black and white skins (science, however teaches *white* to be a worse conductor of heat). Such language is scarcely in keeping with the dignity of an educated Christian, and we will guard against falling into the same strain in answering the objections. It appears that sun-strokes, liver diseases, weakness of the nerves, asthma and many other disorders point out pretty clearly that we were not made for this climate and the climate not for us. Natives who love us, do not fail to observe that; and they warn us lovingly to take care of ourselves. To be short: if it be acknowledged that each Missionary labourer has to live on as little as possible (and in this principle lies the difference between the State and the Mission), there can be no doubt that man in his own country and native climate has not as many wants as he has in a foreign country and climate. And we can bear witness to the fact that we have seen Hindoo and Negro youths at school in Europe treated with more care and enjoying more comforts than their white brethren.

“But waiving the question of how much salary is proper for a Native Minister, granting that he is entitled to draw as much pay

as the European Missionary (and some of them have more than the Missionaries of our Society,) WHO IS TO PAY IT?—It is certainly very surprising to find that the F. R. thinks it quite a matter of course, that people in Europe and America should be responsible for the pay due to Natives of India. As you have written much on this point, I do not think it necessary to comment on 'these words of sterling common sense' that it is the duty of Indian Christians to pay for the religious services administered to them by Indian Christians. Let me only give expression to the wonder I felt in reading the often adduced words of Mr. Tucker in their true connexion, in No. 24 of his 'Thoughts &c.' Mr. Tucker really wrote the words to prove that the Native church should be 'self-supporting, self-propagating and as a natural consequence self-governing,' (and throughout the whole of his valuable suggestions he considers it a matter of course, that a Native Agency is cheaper than an European one. *Vide* No. 3. 19. 22.) How astonished he must be in finding such principles evolved out of his 24th point. What Mr. Tucker really means in adding there the word 'pay,' I cannot say; but if he means anything it can in this connexion signify only:—"Do not stand in the way of educated Ministers, if their congregations be able and willing to give them high salaries." And certainly we will not hinder the congregations, we will encourage them, and we will be highly pleased, if the churches of India will remunerate their pastors much better than European and American Churches are in the habit of doing."

We shall refer to only one other reply which we have received from a Correspondent who signs himself N. Our correspondent says:—

"There must then be a flaw in your argument somewhere. It proceeds on the principle quoted from Mr. Tucker, but as it seems to me, misapplied by you, that 'knowledge all over the world means power and pay.' I trust that you will pardon me for saying that you have taken an erroneous view of the drift of Mr. Tucker's remark. The point he is urging is *not* that native agents are to receive *from Missionary Societies* larger pay; but that 'a clear line of distinction should be drawn between the evangelistic agency of the foreigner and the indigenous native Church organization.' 'The latter,' he says, 'ought to be self-supporting, self-propagating and self-governing: when we give education,' he argues 'we must expect it to excite

ideas of independence and self-advancement' (the italics are my own); and then he adds 'knowledge all over the world means power and pay.' Mr. Tucker means good pay, no doubt, but pay *coming from native source*. My strictures therefore on the sentiment refer not to Mr. Tucker's statement, but to what I regard as its misapplication. To proceed then, you express the wish that the above axiom should be 'inscribed in letters of gold on the walls of mission offices and society houses in England.' To my narrow-mindedness as an English Missionary, your correspondent will perhaps attribute the feeling, when I say that it was with something like horror I thought of these words as thus inscribed in Salisbury Square."

"But," continues our correspondent, "what with reference to natives? I reply in the first place, it is not the province of a foreign missionary society to support native *ministers* at all. What shall a foreign country send missionaries to the land; gather out a body of converts; appoint from amongst their number native pastors; and then supply them with their salary, a house, a horse and conveyance and all etcetera! Such would indeed be a 'hot house' system; effecting the very opposite of that which we stated, at the commencement, to be the object of Christian Missions."

It will be seen that the arguments of these three different writers are exactly of a piece. They are just of the same nature. And sure we are that never before we had the misfortune of meeting with a more fallacious, more malicious and more suicidal piece of reasoning. The gist of the argument of these several writers seems to us to consist in the distinction which they make between *Native and European or American, or foreign Churches*. Native ministers and missionaries, and (we may say) Christian teachers too, belong to what they call the *Native Church*. It is true that these native ministers and missionaries and Christian teachers may belong to the same Mission, may be doing the same work, may possess the same qualifications with their European coadjutors. It is true that they may have one Lord one faith, one baptism, may be allowed to be sent as representatives to presbyteries, synods and general assemblies may be addressed as brethren in the Spirit and fellow-labourers with Christ. All this may be true. But what then? Are they not *Natives* after all, and do they not belong to the *Native Church*? Are they not black niggers whose complexion is—

"The shadow'd livery of the burnish'd sun."

who therefore must stop downstairs, and whose church must therefore be a separate one? Such in general appears to us to be the nature of the arguments made use of by those who have condescended to reply to our late remarks on Missionary Agency. The arguments may be quite satisfactory to the persons who have made use of them. But we have not the least hesitation to declare that the spirit which dictated those arguments and the spirit of genuine Christianity, are "wide as the poles asunder."

"For how can envious brethren own
A Brother on th' eternal throne,
Their Father's joy, their hope alone?"

Christianity is said to destroy, caste. And most certainly it does destroy it but only when it is faithfully followed. It is not, however always that it is so faithfully followed even by missionaries themselves. The spirit that can make a distinction between a Native and a European Church, can also make a distinction between a Brahmin and a Sudra.

But the most remarkable feature in the replies we are now noticing, is that not one of them even pretends to deny it to be a fact that native ministers are not on a footing of equality with their European brethren. All the three writers who have so kindly come forward as counsels for Missionary Societies, have made their clients plead *guilty* to the charge that was brought against them. All that the counsels have attempted to do, is to *justify* their clients' doings, on the plea that native ministers and missionaries belong to the Native Church, and European ministers and missionaries to the *European* (?) Church! Well may Missionary Societies exclaim, "Save us from the tender mercies of our friends."

The extracts which I had made in the above article from the writings of three different Missionaries are fully impregnated with that pride of race and colour which the Missionary so abundantly possesses. The contentions of the Corinthian Christians of old made the great Apostle of the gentiles put the question, "Is Christ divided?" In these latter days of the world the pride of colour which the false missionary so shamelessly exhibits and for which he makes a distinction between Native and European Churches, compels us to repeat the same question, "Is CHRIST DIVIDED?" Is his body which is the church universal broken into separate parts? And must the broken parts be so placed and put up as no more to continue members of the same

body, but one to become something altogether *foreign* and another to remain as some thing *native*? Must the gospel of the Son of God which in every age and country has brought together the rich and the poor, the mighty and the low, the conqueror and the conquered, the learned and the ignorant, the Jew and the Gentile, the bond and the free—must this Gospel only now and in this country separate the Native from the European? Must that religion which unlike all others, teaches a universal Fatherhood and a universal brotherhood, and which aims at every thing universal—a universal kingdom, a universal obedience a universal communion, must that religion separate the Church of God into Native and European Churches? And what is more strange, must it do all this only because that thereby the European Missionary might draw a monthly salary of four hundred rupees and the Native only a hundred? Is this the power of that Cross which is the centre of the religious universe, which draws together the disordered fragments of our being, which unites our hearts “producing a wholeness or unity which no object of less powerful attractiveness could accomplish?” Is this the power of that cross which heals up every breach and brings together nations separated by mountains and seas and to which the great Augustine addresses,—“Colligis nos” (thou gatherest us together) is this the power of that cross? Is its power now to be exhibited not in uniting, but in separating, not in bringing together hearts but in disjoining one heart from another? If its power is thus to be exhibited then it is no more the cross of Christ the universal Brother! It must be the cross of the Devil and his followers. But thank God, the cross is still really the same. It is like the Lord Himself the same yesterday, today, and forever, and therefore however much the Missionary’s pride of colour and race may try to separate the Native from the European, the Native and the European shall yet be gathered together, and be united into one universal Church. The prayer of the Great Head of the Church of the faithful, “That they all may be one; as thou Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us,” this prayer of the Great Head of the Church shall yet be fulfilled and the black and the white shall yet be one in Christ!

But asks Mr. N—, a missionary, “How can there be equality of power and pay between European and Native ministers and missionaries? Knowledge may mean power and pay all over *the world*; but in the noble work of *Missions* at least, we might expect to find an

exception, to find some *unworldly* principle prevailing. Ought not a distinction be made between the world and the mission-field or the Christian Church? Mr. N.—seems to possess a very pious heart, but we doubt very much whether he has an equally sound head. No one denies that a distinction ought to be made between the world and the Church, but one must be a *Missinary* before he can understand why that distinction ought to consist only in an inequality of power and pay between Native and European Ministers and Missionaries; why it should consist only in the white man's possessing all the loaves and fishes on the Mission-table, and the black man's being content with the bare crumbs that might fall from it. If a distinction ought to be made between the Church and the "world" and if that distinction ought to consist, as contended by Mr. N.—, in the "unworldly principle" of *inequality and injustice*, then Mr. N.—, would excuse us when we say that the distinguishing inequality should not consist as it does at present in the *European Missionary's* enjoying more power and pay, but it should rather consist in the *Native Missionary's* enjoying those things, seeing that the former is *so much more self sacrificing and disinterested than the latter!*

I am not yet altogether done with the article I have quoted above from the *Friday Review*. I have yet to relate the events that followed the publication of that article. These events will serve to illustrate further the character of Missionaries in some very important respects. And here again I shall quote another public journal, and this a non-christian one and therefore not, in the least partially inclined towards a Native Christian. The *Hindoo Patriot* of the 21st October has the following in a leader entitled "The Free Church Mission":—
 "Another case has lately occurred which does not speak well of the Christianity of the Mission. An article headed "Native Church" appeared in the organ of the Mission,* the *Friday Review* for the 4th instant, deprecating invidious distinctions of race and color in the distribution of Mission patronage. The writer wrote some plain truths in plain language. * * * The Missionaries in charge of the

* The *Patriot* was wrong in calling the *Friday Review*, the organ of the F. C. Mission. The *Friday Review* was not the organ of the Free Church Mission, or of any other Mission whatever. It was simply a weekly Review of Politics, Literature, Society and Religion, conducted by a highly qualified Native Christian Minister.

*Review** were mightily annoyed at the plain and unvarnished tale unfolded by the writer of the article on the "Native church," and in next issue of their paper [rather the paper which they took into their hands very cowardly and by making use of means not at all honorable] they charged him with "abusing the trust put in him." They defended their cloth in the best way they could, which is not saying much, and called upon the "young man"—! oh! what an unpardonable sin it is to be "young!"—to "concur in the disapproval and regret they themselves expressed * * *

"The matter however did not end there. Baboo B. L. Chandra, who, we are informed was the author of the article in question happened to be Assistant Professor in the Free Church Institution. The obnoxious article appeared on Friday the 4th instant, and on Sunday following, Mr. Chandra we are assured was told by (the Rev. W. C. Fyfe, the Senior Missionary of the Bengal Mission of the Free Church of Scotland and Superintendent of the Free Church Institution, Calcutta, that a paper would be handed to him which if he would sign it would farewell with him; otherwise he would be dismissed from the Institution, and the rent of his house which belonged also to the Mission would be doubled. Wednesday came and the paper was duly handed to him. He was required to state, so says our informant, that all that he had written in that article had been "falsehood." Mr. Chandra was too good and firm a Christian to say that. He replied he could not conscientiously say so and has as threatened, so we learn, been punished by being turned out of the Institution and the rent of his house doubled!" I need not say that the above statements of the *Hindu Patriot*, are in the main quite correct. The writer of the article was really an assistant teacher in the Free Church Institution; the "heretical" article—for certain perfect and saintly Missionaries have characterised it as such, thanks to their unimpeachable orthodoxy—the heretical article did appear on Friday the 4th October. Next Sunday, immediately after divine service in the Church, the writer was really told by the Rev. W. C. Fyfe "that a paper would be handed to him which if he would sign it would fare well with him; otherwise he would be dismissed from the Institution and the rent of his house would be doubted." These were not *exactly* the words used by Mr. Fyfe on the occasion.

* Here the *Patriot* has committed another mistake. The *Review* was not at the time in charge of any Missionary.

So far as I can remember them rightly they were rather to the following effect,—all your connections with this Mission shall cease and the consequence will be that you will be a breadless wanderer in the wide world. On Wednesday following as said by the *Patriot*, the paper was duly handed to him. In the paper the writer was really required to state that in the article in question, he had “given currency to a falsehood”—these latter are the very words of the paper, though I quote them only from memory. The writer refused to sign it in the midst of repeated warnings from the Missionary in the words “remember the consequences,” and the Missionary true to his words that he “felt it his duty to make the writer breadless and homeless,” actually dismissed “the poor teacher” from the Institution and also doubled the rent of his house. But perhaps the most beautiful part of the story the *Patriot* has not mentioned. He has not mentioned that the writer was ousted from the Mission service *not* on the day when he refused to subscribe to Mr. Fyfe’s paper, but he was told that day that he *had been already* ousted from the service, he had been ousted the very day he published the condemned article! And the rent of his house *had* been doubled too on the self-same day! People generally are dismissed from service after being previously informed of it. Tenants also have their rents increased after being served with due previous notice. But the tender conscience of a Christian Missionary would not be satisfied by any thing less than by making a Christian convert “breadless and homeless” all on a sudden without any previous notice! Else how can a Missionary’s wrath be duly satisfied! How can the revengeful anger of him who prays every day, morning, and evening, in the words of his Saviour, “And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors,” how can his revengeful anger be otherwise duly satiated!

It would be but doing simple justice to the writer of the “Native Church” if I quote here his written explanations of certain expressions used in that article. The explanations were submitted at the request of a mutual friend, to an “offended” Missionary who, by the way it ought to be said, was perfectly satisfied with them.

1. “A whole nest of hornets.”—These do not include Dr. Wilson as he was not the writer of the article to which we referred. Among the “hornets” however, are included not only the three writers referred to in the leader, but also several others who *spoke* on the subject.

2. “Poor creatures.”—These are the “hornets.”

3. "Professional Missionaries."—*i. e.* Missionaries by calling only. [The word "professional" being used in the sense of "false", in which sense it is used also by De. Quincy.]

4. "Fat livings."—in comparison with the livings of native Missionaries.

5. "Snoring away &c."—In reference to their ignorance of the feelings of Native Christians and others with respect to them.

6. "Owl."—*Vide* Note 5.

7. "Self sacrificing."—Because they say that they are so, *vide* Bowen's article.

8. "Consciences &c."—Of the Hornets &c. *Vide.*, Note 1.

9. "Malicious."—To make a distinction between a Native and a European Church the writer really believes to be an act of malice.

10. "Wide as the poles asunder," *Vide.*, Note 9. It will not be pretended that Christianity really makes a distinction between Natives and Europeans."

The readers of these pages must have observed that I have dwelt at some length on this article-affair. I have not dwelt on it however at so much length without just reasons. The whole of the above affair reads to me as the most eloquent commentary on the character of Missionaries; how very proud they are of their race and colour; how very revengeful, malicious, un-self-sacrificing! But besides this the above is also a fair statement of the manner in which my connections with the Free Church Mission have come to cease. Whether I have been justly deprived of the patronage of a Mission which I had served, I trust, faithfully and to the best of my powers, for a space of nearly three years, on account of my having published the article I have quoted above at full length, it is not for me, but for the public to say. Already however, a portion at least of the mighty public of this great metropolis has passed its impartial opinion on the subject, and I am glad to notice that that opinion has been so far, clearly unfavorable to the Missionaries. The *Hindu Patriot*, justly considered as a faithful exponent of the views of the Hindu population of Calcutta thus remarks on the subject:—"Comments on this case are superfluous. Where are, we ask, Christian freedom, Christian toleration and Christian charity? Is conduct like this calculated to raise the character of Christian Missionaries in the estimation of the Heathens whom they have come to teach better principles, better morals, and better religion? We are sincerely sorry

we repeat, that the Free Church Mission once the most respected among the Indian Missions, is thus lowering itself." The *National Paper*, the organ of the old Brahma Somaj has thus expressed its sentiments :—"Here is a Native Christian gentleman giving his independent opinion in a public journal, for which he is not only dismissed from service in a different Department, but the rent of the house (for that is also in the cognisance of the party dismissing) in which he lives with his family just come out of the Zenana is doubled. If this is not despotism of the hardest type, we fail to understand what is. Supposing the article in question was very strong and unnecessarily severe, perhaps libellous on the character of European Missionaries, the remedy for it was in court and in the bar of Christian public opinion, not in the single hand of a gentleman still following the barbarous principle of flogging boys from time to time and for which he was once dragged to the Police. If the writer did any offence to the Christian community, why was not a public meeting of the Christian community convened to bring him to his senses? But no! the Reverend Mr. Fyfe would not stoop to do that. He takes upon himself the whole power of punishing the Native gentleman for an offence which is supposed to be done to the whole body of European Missionaries. We are aware that the Native gentleman was directly subordinate to Mr. Fyfe, but it should be remembered that he was directly subordinate to him not in respect to his conscience and principle, but simply as respects educating the boys of the Institution—any fault in which direction if found of the party concerned was certainly punishable by him. But the fault—if fault at all it was, of the Native Christian gentleman—was not in that direction, and therefore both morally and according to the rules of the Institution the step taken by its superintendent was unwarrantable to the extreme and for which we hope the whole Christian community, both Native and European will call from him an explanation."

Thus a portion at least of the mighty Press of Calcutta has condemned in the most unqualified terms, the conduct of the Missionary above named. But it is not the Press only that has so condemned his conduct. Christians, Hindus, Mussulmans have been of one opinion on the subject. Even some of the best friends of Missionaries, yea some Missionaries themselves, while disapproving of the article, have condemned the conduct of the Revd. gentleman, as perfectly unjust

and uncharitable. The question has occurred to all,—“Why confound the Editor with the teacher? If the Missionary’s revengeful ire has been greatly excited, certainly it has been so excited by the Editor, why then should the Teacher be made a victim to it?” Ah! why? That is the rub. The why however is not a why similar to the one for which the Great German philosopher ministered his tender rebuke to the Duchess of Brandenburg. It is not an unanswerable why. On the contrary the answer to it is simply this, because the teacher in question was a Native Convert, and therefore according to most Missionaries perfectly unjustified in maintaining any independent opinion even in the capacity of an Editor. According to most Missionaries a Native Convert has no right to entertain or to give vent to any independent opinion on any important subject, however much he may wish to do so. “The very innermost thoughts of the convert,” say the Missionaries, “*must be* but the reflections of the thoughts of his Spiritual Masters”! In very truth the Missionaries like the one we have named above would fain have him who has left father and mother, brothers and sisters and every thing dear and valued upon this earth *only for the sake of liberty of conscience*,—the Missionaries would fain have him sell that very liberty of conscience so dear to his heart for what?—why, *for the inestimable gift of a post of, say a hundred rupees per month!* Our Saviour said to his disciples of old, “ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free”—free not only from the power and punishment of sin, but also from the bondage and slavery of cunning and tyrannical priests; and the Hindu convert of the present day, anxious to escape from the bondage of a wicked and gulling priesthood and relying upon the faithfulness of a Saviour who is the same yesterday today and forever, gladly forsakes every thing for the blessing of that freedom which can be derived only from the truth as it is in Jesus. But the false Missionaries to this country, ambitious of an undisputed domination over truth-freed souls, would with a diabolical grasp snatch that liberty from him! They would offer him money and house if perchance by that means they may induce him to sell into their hands the liberty of his soul! Would that all Native Converts under such circumstances could answer such Missionaries in the indignant language of the Apostle of old, “thy money perish with thee”! And, Good God! are these the teachers and preachers of the religion of *Christ!*

I have thus described to my readers the lives and the doings of the majority of Missionaries to India. I now ask them whether they still wander at the little or no success which attends the labours, such as they are of those Missionaries ; *Ex nihilo nihil fit*, out of nothing comes nothing. And certain I am that not a simple conversion would have taken place, had not conversion been the work of God, had not Christianity been the religion from heaven. Indeed nothing seems to my mind so strong an internal evidence of the divine origin of Christianity as the fact that notwithstanding the lamentable unfaithfulness of the so-called missionaries of the cross, Christianity is still progressing in the midst of the people of this country.

In conclusion I would request all my readers not to confound Christianity with the professors and preachers of it. I would request them not to confound the system of religion with the exponents of it. The religion of the Son of God is the only regenerator of fallen humanity. In every country, in every clime wherever it has travelled, it has renovated human nature, has freed innumerable souls from the bondage of sin and Satan, has broken down every barrier of separation ; caste, colour, creed, every thing raised up by the pride of unregenerate man to separate, disjoin and disperse the family of God on earth, the brotherhood of humankind, has evanished like mist before its genial rays, and "ten thousand, thousand" of the children of God, rich and poor, learned and ignorant, white and black, free and bond, have been brought together and made not merely the constituents of a community, but members of one mystical body ; not cemented together by the sense of mutual want, or strung one into another by the ties of the flesh, or the interests of the world, but firmly united by the love of one who is at once the Creator and Brother of men, the God—man Christ Jesus. And what this religion has done in other countries, it shall do here, in India, also. The prayer of the Sun of righteousness,—“that they all may be one ; as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us :”—the prayer which has proved so very effectual in other countries, shall not prove ineffectual in this. So then in India too as in Rome of old, the conqueror and the conquered, the European and the Native shall yet be knit together in the ties of a holy, Christian brotherhood, drawn into one family by the equal love of him who shall form the centre towards which their faith shall converge and whose truth shall bind them into an uniformity and oneness of thought and feeling. Foreign spiritual tyranny has truly inundated the Land. But

as truly shall that inundation pass away, and pass away too like the inundations of the "Father Nile," only to renovate the fertility of the soil and to enable her to grow on her bosom an indigenous Church beautiful as the Rose of Sharon and the Lily of the Valley. May God hasten such a day!

APPENDIX.

Thoughts on Boy—Baptism.

At a time when the subject of boy—baptism is giving rise to so many different opinions amongst all classes of people, it may not be quite amiss if I express here some brief thoughts of mine on the subject.

There are Christian Missionaries, like Dr. Ogilvie who condemn altogether boy-conversion. There are Christian Missionaries again, like Dr. Duff who, not content with merely baptising boys would fain set themselves up as their rightful guardians both *before* and after baptism. Missionaries of the Ogilvie-stamp *would not* baptise boys. Missionaries of the Duff-stamp would build “barracks” and “hot-houses” to give shelter as under a parent’s roof, to run-away lads, even before baptism.

Now, both Scripture and sound reasoning would, I make bold to affirm, condemn the practice of both these classes of Missionaries.

The Scriptural command to all Missionaries is, “*Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.*” He therefore is no Missionary, he is a false missionary, who refuses on any account to baptise nations which evidently are composed of men, women, boys and girls. Scripture thus condemns in the plainest possible language, the Ogilvian practice of not baptising boys.

Nor is the Duffian practice of setting one self up as the guardian of lads even before baptism, less condemnable. It must be evident to the shallowest reader of the Bible that it no where commands, nor even authorises Missionaries to build “barracks” and mission-houses, to keep in like prisoners who can be seen only after permission has been taken from the gaoler, boys desiring to be baptised. Fancy, a missionary, a foreigner in every sense of that term, giving permission to mothers or fathers “to see” their sons, some of whom are perhaps mere infants, lodged in missionary jails! Could there be any thing more unjust, more unnatural, more iniquitous?

What then *ought* missionaries to do? Why, they ought to do simply what Christ has commanded them to do, “*teach and baptise* ;” teach “all things whatsoever I have commanded you”; and baptise in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Nothing more, nothing less.

Let a missionary therefore teach people all things whatsoever Christ has commanded him and when a man, woman, boy or girl comes to him saying "Men and brethren what shall I do to be saved" let him answer in Apostolic language "Believe and be baptised". Should he or she be willing to be baptised, let the missionary perform the ceremony without delay. Such a practice would be just like the practice of the Apostles of old—the truest, the model missionaries.

As for the baptised individual, let him return in peace to his own house. Should he be repulsed from it, the missionary might then, but not till then, do whatever lies in his power to help his convert. But to this simple plan it may be said, would it be at all safe for the young neophyte to return soon after baptism to the bosom of a heathen family? Would not his parents compell him to renounce his faith? Renounce his faith! How? It must be either by threats or by persuasions. But cannot the neophyte overcome these? If he cannot, then I can have very little confidence in the sincerity of his faith, and I should not be at all sorry if he were to relapse to his former religion. Christianity had her martyrs in every country. Why should she not have her martyrs here also? Young neophytes should if need be, lay down their lives for the sake of Christ in the midst of heathen parents, relatives and friends, but should not for fear of death or persecution, become prisoners in Missionary Jails.