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From the Battle of Plassey to the advent of *Midnight’s Children*, beginnings and endings pervade the history of British India. One aspect of that narrative, however, commands renewed scrutiny. Traditional scholarship has treated renewal of the East India Company’s charter in 1813 as an episode of missionary legalization, a sovereign moment for an imperial senate, and a signpost in relations of Crown and Company. Post-colonial scholarship has been no less confident. In her work on sati Lata Mani treats the 1813 charter renewal as a formative event, hastening “consolidation of missionary discourse in the period after 1813.” Literary scholar Siraj Ahmed is more pointed:

This paper, by contrast, treats charter renewal in 1813 as a tactic in a contrived Reformation of British India. It examines imposition of denominational rhetoric upon India; the network of parliamentary pamphleteering that re-fashioned the rules of the East India Company; and the chronology of debates between evangelicals and East India Company men that produced charter renewal with ironic consequences.

Consensus Evangelium

Prior to charter renewal in 1813, some Anglicans and many dissenters appealed for the necessity and prudence of Christian missionary outreach to Hindus and Muslims. Proof texts for this view were the sayings of Jesus “Go and teach all nations” and “Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.” A universal context is clear in the statement of Oxford’s Joseph White that “Christianity, whether we consider the
promises of its founder, or the spirits of its laws, is calculated for universal use, and claims universal belief. "

John Thomas, a Baptist who served as a surgeon in the EIC, made three visits to Bengal prior to 1801. Thomas openly sought other Christians for the practice of evangelical devotion and preached—without official opposition—the Christian faith to native Indians. Thomas does not mention EIC attempts to control his activities and two converts praised him and sent a letter asking other Baptists in England to send more Christian missionaries to India.

George Hill, a Scottish Reformed minister, likewise understood the universal implication of Christian missions. In 1790 to the assembly of the Church of Scotland, he remarked,

> How delightful to those who are animated by the true spirit of Christianity...How pure the joy which piety and benevolence inspire, in looking forward to a time, when all the children of Adam, recognizing their common origin, shall be united the knowledge of Him, who hath made of one blood all nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth; when the sentiment of religion...shall...express itself every where by a pure offering, ascending, through the mediation of Jesus Christ, to the God and Father of all; when an acquaintance with the provision made in the gospel, for restoring the virtue and happiness of the human race, shall reach as far as the fruits of the first transgression.

British sentiment against Christianizing native Indians hardened evangelical responses. One missionary wrote that “opposition of our own countrymen in India to missionary efforts, formed another serious obstacle to the formation and progress of missions.” Missionaries discovered that their role not only included converting native Indians to Christianity but converting British subjects to an ideology of missionary toleration or even Christianity itself. Dr. John Thomas reported in 1794 that the story circulated “that every European, on his way to India, always left his religion at the Cape of Good Hope.” Thomas’s colleague, William Carey reported that sailors and passengers on his 1793 Indian voyage demonstrated the “most awful proof of the effects
of human depravity when heightened by bad principles.” He argued at length with
deists to whom he referred as “presumptuous wretches.”

The EIC regulation against proselytizing in India stated “That the missionaries
shall not in the smallest degree interfere with the political concerns of the countries in
which they labour [and] . . . whoever shall transgress this rule, will be immediately
dismissed with shame.” William Ward, a colleague of Carey’s in Serampore, said of
the EIC, “A happy number of the Hon. Company’s servants have become truly devoted
christians. Chaplains of evangelical sentiments and feelings have wonderfully increased,
and are very useful in diffusing the light of the gospel.” Yet, Ward deplored the
Company’s policy against missionaries. In a sarcastic tone, he wrote,

our brethren found the government of India decidedly inimical to the introduction of missionaries. They predicted nothing short of the loss of the country, if the prejudices of the natives were interfered with. A former Governor-general would sometimes observe to one of the chaplains, that he thought the wisest policy the East India Company had ever adopted was, never to disturb the prejudices of their native subjects. This view of the subject made the government decidedly hostile to missionary labours . . . To realize the formidable nature of this hostility, we must consider that no individual can reside or travel in India without special leave from the head of the government.

In 1792, Carey’s pamphlet on the necessity to undertake the spread of the
Christianity to the “heathen” contained a pertinent irony. Carey used the term “charter”
as a synonym for God’s demand for Christians to take the gospel to the heathen, and he
used the term “company” as a term for Christian communal support. Carey wrote that
Christians’ “charter [emphasis ours] is very extensive” and “the returns promised
infinitely superior to all the gains of the most lucrative fellowship.” And further,
“Suppose a company [emphasis ours] of serious Christians, ministers and private persons,
were to form themselves into a society, and make a number of rules respecting the
regulation of the plan, and the persons who are to be employed as missionaries.”
Prior to his reinvention of the terms “charter” and “company,” Carey had excoriated the EIC for its unbridled willingness to capitalize on opportunities for gain. Though he perceived the contrast between the Christian charter and the Company’s charter, he would have to wait twenty-one years before he could enjoy a political solution to his theological vision of unencumbered missionary outreach in EIC lands.

Other dissenters and Anglicans argued for the legitimacy of a Christian presence in India. In the Bampton Lecture of 1784, Joseph White, an eminent Anglican, had argued for the fusion of religious devotion and public establishment of Christianity in India as he remarked that British Christians had failed in evangelizing the East. He remarked,

> Let it not be said, that even at this boasted period of humanity and science, when we are diffusing the blessings of civil freedom over the remotest branches of the empire, no attempt is made to emancipate them from the chains of superstition.

> Our settlements in India occupy a far greater extent than the British empire in Europe; yet in no part of these wide provinces has one single effort been exerted to introduce the glorious light of the gospel and to dispel the gloom which has for ages enveloped [sic] the wretched inhabitants.

White pronounced favor on the union of civil and religious interests, when he said, “I regard not the cold and mistaken policy of some, who would separate our religious from our civil interests. . . . Narrow therefore and false is that philanthropy, which pretends to be solicitous for the rights and liberties of mankind, while for their eternal welfare it employs no measures, and even professedly feels no concern.” White detected no conflict between commercial interests and the spread of Christianity into India. The role of government was to protect “The extreme importance of Indian wealth to our commerce, and the growing connection between the principles of that commerce, and of the government.” According to certain Anglican, Reformed and Baptist Evangelicals,
there was no cultural, commercial or imperial impediment to Indian evangelization that could withstand argument.

**Blue-Water Denominationalism**

Evangelicals agreed that reforming Christianity at home (as outlined in William Wilberforce’s *Practical View*) meant joining the issue on an imperial stage, but there accommodation ceased. One source of antagonism was the race for historical and political primacy exemplified in competing tracts and missions. Anglicans like White and David Brown, later to become an Anglican chaplain in Calcutta, brought their arguments to the public before the Baptists did. Brown circulated a proposal for establishing protestant mission in Bengal in 1787 and sent it to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Llandaff. Nevertheless, unconstrained by ecclesiastical bureaucracy and safe under Danish protection, the Baptists surpassed the Anglicans during the first decade of the nineteenth century by producing numerous Bible translations and mission stations.

Lata Mani has argued that missionary rhetoric changed according to whether the audience was colonial or metropolitan, missionary or governmental. While clergy played politics, commercialists turned theological. Evangelical sympathizers within the East India Company, like Charles Grant, and the governor-generalship, like John Shore, Lord Teignmouth, provided points of contact for Anglican chaplains promoting missions and for Baptist missionaries desperate to avoid deportation. Yet, when Grant would not condone the extra- or circum-legal techniques of the Baptist missionaries in Danish Serampore, he drew from the Baptist Fuller the charge that he was “contending for an Episcopal establishment in India.”
Terms of ecclesiastical trade were reversed in India. Preferred at home, Anglicans were limited to East India Company chaplaincies, whilst Baptists under pressure in Calcutta could scurry back into Serampore. The result was accommodation and ambivalence. Anglicans Henry Martyn and Chaplain David Brown cooperated with Serampore Baptists but privately doubted the efficacy of their preaching, the reliability of their translations, and the charity of their attitudes toward Brahmins. Anglican chaplains looked down upon the Baptists because the Baptists were socially disqualified and uneducated in classical languages. Accordingly, when William Carey was enlisted to teach at Fort William College on the recommendation of Rev. David Brown (who had earlier treated him coldly) Carey was not granted the title of professor and had to explain this slight to Baptist constituents in Britain. No wonder that the Baptist Andrew Fuller continued to warn of Brown as epitomizing “Mr. Worldy-Wise Man” and his “worldly religion.”

Denominational periodicals displayed rivalry and agreement. Agreement often took the form of surveying and publishing information regarding the activities of mission societies and trying not to encroach on one another’s missionary territory. Concord extended to plagiarism in case of Baptists printing (somewhat selectively) Buchanan’s pro-mission work. Yet Baptists regarded it as “foolish” and “arrogant” when Anglicans denominated their London (or Church) Missionary Society “the Missionary Society.”

Rupture

In 1804, creation of the British and Foreign Bible Society, an interdenominational project of Bible translation, exposed the nerves of the evangelical/Baptist alliance. Doctrinal contradiction created rhetorical fragmentation. The doctrinal problem involved the
translation and practice of baptism.  The rhetorical problem arose from the posturing of Claudius Buchanan. A Scot who graduated in mid-life from Cambridge and became Vice-Provost of Fort William College in Calcutta, Buchanan wrote *Memoir of the Expediency of an Ecclesiastical Establishment for British India; both as a Means of Perpetuating the Christian Religion among our own Countrymen; and as a Foundation for the Ultimate Civilization of the Natives*. Knowing the disapprobation of the term “missionary” in Britain, Buchanan subscribed a political rationale for Anglican establishment in India. Aligning missionaries with heroic figures such as Christian Friedrich Schwartz, David Brainerd, and the Moravians of a prior generation, Buchanan said,

> Let us first establish our own religion among ourselves, and our Asiatic subjects will soon benefit by it. When once our national church shall have been confirmed in India, the members of that church will be the best qualified to advise the state as to the means by which, from time to time, the civilization of the natives may be promoted.

Buchanan’s argument may rest, in part, on ideas published by George Hill, Joseph White, William Carey, and John Thomas. Though Carey had criticized the EIC for its profit priorities, Carey was not so naïve as to think that Christian missions was a religious quest alone. Carey understood Christian missions as a cure for souls and a means for effecting civilization. He wrote,

> After all, the uncivilized state of the heathen, instead of affording an objection against preaching the gospel to them, ought to furnish an argument for it. Can we as men, or as christians, hear that a great part of our fellow creatures, whose souls are as immortal as ours, and who are as capable as ourselves, of adorning the gospel and contributing by their preaching, writings, or practices to the glory of our Redeemer’s name, and the good of his church, are enveloped in ignorance and barbarism? Can we hear that they are without the gospel, without government, without laws, and without arts, and sciences; and not exert ourselves to introduce amongst them the sentiments of men, and of Christians? Would not the spread of the gospel be the most effectual mean of their civilization?

Carey was not alone in such views, for Dissenters and Establishmentarian Anglicans supported the evangelization of India as a civilizing force. A most graphic form of this
union occurred in White’s essay which declared, “When European science has dawned upon their [native Indians] minds, we may see them less tenacious of their old opinions. The auspicious effects of our laws will create some kind prejudice in favour of our religion” [emphasis ours].

Buchanan agreed with Hill, White, Thomas, and Carey on the universal claims of Christianity and the civilizing effect of Christianity, but hid the cart of establishment within the Trojan horse of missionary legalization. Buchanan’s works were published throughout a network that encompassed the English-speaking world. It even enjoyed patronage of religious insiders in places like Boston, Massachusetts. When Buchanan lost his position as Vice-Provost of Fort William College, he added the grievance of removal to the disability of chaplaincy. But his departure from Fort William allowed Buchanan the advantage of propagandizing from a posture of direct observation. Part of the effort was one of skullduggery and muckraking: to make Hinduism and its folk adjuncts seem reprehensible and fraudulent. But Buchanan also used the Baptists as rhetorical props, discarding them when convenient. Carey complained in 1804 that Buchanan had altered his address to the governor-general “(the whole of the flattery is his)” without informing him before it was submitted. “Mr. B’s design,” wrote Carey, “was to bring our mission forward upon that public occasion.” After Buchanan mounted a sermon campaign in favor of Bible translation in India, Baptists concluded that he was hijacking their project. Andrew Fuller, the BMS secretary, cautioned his missionaries against Buchanan:

Take heed lest you be entangled by his wily vanity. The noise & publicity of these translations, by letters written to Kings & Universities, is suited to a worldly & ambitious spirit, but does not correspond with that kingdom which cometh not with observation or parade; and instead of promoting the work I fear it will only retard it.
Terminated at Fort William College by 1807, Buchanan rehearsed an audacious plan to establish what he called the British Propaganda. It was to be headquartered, of all places, at the Baptist mission in Danish Serampore. The Baptists were furious. They could hardly condone Church of England efforts to “control the translations and to make the Serampore missionaries their servants.” Thwarted in that effort, Buchanan proposed “The Christian Institution in the East: or the College for translating the Holy Scriptures into the Oriental Tongues” to supervise all Bible translation in India under hegemony of the Church of England. Buchanan dispersed funds for the Bible Society to the prejudice of Serampore and endorsed competing translation efforts. Still, two years later Baptists joined with evangelical chaplains to form the Calcutta Corresponding Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society.

But limits to affiliation remained, made evident by Buchanan’s establishmentarian reference to tendencies in Hinduism toward Christianity, including analogies to the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Trinity. Contrary to Brian Young’s recent argument, it was Buchanan’s as much as William Ward’s “Hindoo” researches that prompted James Mill’s diatribe against Hindus in his History of India. For Ward what identified Hinduism, Anglicanism and Catholicism was their embodiment of the idolatry of religious establishment. This rupture of the missions consensus could be obscured amid the tactical necessities of parliamentary debate but suspicions prevailed precisely because conformity posed a historic temptation for Baptists. Joshua Marshman dined with the second Bishop of Calcutta, Reginald Heber, in 1824 when his colleague Carey was (conveniently?) “too lame to go out,” and was accused of apostasy when one of his sons entered unreformed Cambridge. In the aftermath of the parliamentary debates that
accompanied the 1813 charter renewal, Baptists might have been forgiven for suspecting their erstwhile friends more than their enemies at the EIC or indifferent and bemused Indians.

**Debating Pamphleteers**

Like the Henrician Reformation, the Reformation of British India was legislated in parliament assembled. Occasioned by a manuscript circulated by an EIC man named Charles Grant and by the moralizing rhetoric of the anti-slavery crusader William Wilberforce, missionary legalization had been broached with attempts to insert the “pious” or “missionary” clause into the charter during 1793. That debate provided two rhetorical cues that would later prove telling: assertions that missionaries catered to the dregs of society and a compromise formula that provided not for legalization of missions but for a coterie of EIC chaplains. The Vellore Mutiny of 1806 brought renewed debate, new peril for the Serampore missionaries, and heightened demand for reform of anti-missionary policy. Pamphlets arose from Anglicans, Baptists, and others. Pseudonyms like “A. Christian.” and “Indicophilus” denominated allegiance, but parliamentary debates on this matter hinged on three different but related problems: whether emendation of the charter would impair the EIC’s commercial success, whether legalization of Christian missionary activity would de-stabilize India, and whether “Hindooism” could be vindicated.

Arguments tended to reflect prior pamphleteering, but because the structure of parliamentary debate promoted two sides, however, vindication and appropriation were at a premium. Proponents of missions raged in unison at the speech of Charles Marsh, who had asked why intelligent Hindus should trust Baptist preachers. *The Baptist Magazine*
cited Marsh as “awful proof that the carnal mind is enmity against God.” Opponents solaced themselves with reliance upon Warren Hastings’ theologizing. A man accustomed to defensive polemic, Hastings argued that the so-called Great Commission recounted in the Gospels applied only to apostolic times. Baptist missionaries were contested as subjects of debate in a rhetoric that prolonged metaphors drawn from Reformation and English civil war polemic. Sydney Smith’s reference to Baptist missionaries as “Anabaptists,” a nest of consecrated cobblers, “mechanic preachers” compelled Anglicans to defend those with whom they disagreed. Did one adopt Prendergast’s Cromwellian image of William Carey haranguing Calcuttans on a tub? Or did one treat Baptist missionaries as humble if slightly misguided heroes demonstrating what even disadvantaged Christians might accomplish, as in Buchanan and Robert Southey’s version brought to the floor of the Commons by Wilberforce? Baptist missionaries had become figures of parliamentary speech, placed in the ironic position of opposing a clause for establishment which their example was adduced to support. By June 22, 1813, after committee reports and Commons and Lords debates, the vote on Christian missions had been decided in the affirmative. Legislative decoupling of the establishment and legalization issues, which had been vigorously blurred in the pamphlet literature, maximized Anglican tactical advantage. The result was that they could practice in all geo-political regions of missionary activity and enjoy the preferential advantages of establishment and the competitive advantages of legalization.
Toleration or Comprehension?

The Charter Act of 1813 augmented the ecclesiastical establishment in Calcutta and instituted an Episcopal see there, granted missionaries “regulated access” to native Indians, and provided an annual subvention for education of native Indians. Charter renewal provided an opportunity to Anglican friends of missions. Signs of the transition that was taking place included growth of Church Missionary Society gifts to the Calcutta Auxiliary Church Missionary Society from £250 in 1807 to £3000 in 1824. Charter renewal occurred under conditions that were not unlike religious conditions that attended the American Revolution. “Established” dissenters sought to repel an attack by an incipient state church on their franchise of Christian worship. In each case an undermanned, outgunned Anglican church tried to enforce metropolitan preference upon a colonial context. In India in 1813, unlike England in 1688, toleration meant comprehension. For Anglican chaplains, caught between the results protected by the Danes in Serampore and the prejudices of Old Company Men against rippling the waters of commerce, their position afforded them the means, motive and opportunity to plot creation of their own establishment as a measure of toleration.

From the perspective adopted by proponents of Indian missions, a consensus had formed in a series of treatises, splintered in practice, became effectively one side for parliamentary purposes, and then gave way to hegemonic competition. The case of J. C. Marshman for Baptist missionary heroism under such circumstances does not quite capture the subtleties they confronted:

To the hostility of Government…they opposed a spirit of Christian meekness and calm perseverance. They stood in the front of the battle of Indian missions; and during the arduous struggle, which terminated with the charter of 1813, in granting missionaries free access to India,—they never, for a moment, deserted their post, or despaired of success.
The marginalization of Baptist mission efforts was an effect not a cause of the 1813 debates.⁵ The Charter renewal is famous for breaking up the EIC monopoly on trade in India. What is less well known is that it also broke up the effective monopoly of the Serampore missionaries who had previously made a franchise from their unique arrangement of safe haven under Danish protection.

Charter renewal in 1813 carries implications for method and theory in the history of British India. It suggests that denominationalism, unlike denominational history, has much to tell us about how the intramural politics of Indian empire were conducted. Pamphlet and parliamentary debates that effected the diversion of charter renewal can best be understood in a polemical context. The Missionary Clause debates of 1813 had less to do with missionary legalization than with establishment of chaplain-style Anglicanism. They did not, contrary to what Allan Davidson suggests, offer “an important stimulus for the growth of the British missionary movement in the nineteenth century.”⁶ Nor, as C. A. Bayly has recognized, did they create “a godly public sphere in which the paganism of the Company would be argued away and India flooded with improving pamphlets.”⁷ As British India’s contribution to the Long Reformation, the Missionary Clause debates help to explain why William Carey’s Christian Charter did not become part of the “civilizing mission” of British India.
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