By 1834 the British Empire’s growing interest in India had spread to native education. At the time, William Bentinck, the Governor-General of India, was trying to decide whether native Indians seeking higher education should be educated in English, the Anglicist position, or in Arabic and Sanskrit, the Orientalist position. His advisors who composed the General Committee of Public Instruction were equally divided. Scholars once argued that it was the arrival of Thomas Macaulay as a legal advisor and his essay on the subject in February of 1835 that tipped the balance in the Anglicist direction, resulting in Bentinck’s Resolution of March 1835. More recent scholars have pushed Macaulay's "Minute on Indian Education" into the background and have argued; instead, that Bentinck had already effectively made his Anglicist decision before Macaulay even arrived. Recent scholarship; however, has not sufficiently taken into account the persuasive force of Macaulay's imperial rhetoric. Though Bentinck was clearly in favor of the Anglicist position even before he read the "Minute", it was Macaulay's uniquely unrestrained ability to explain why, as he so famously wrote in his "Minute", that "a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabic" and thus why the education of Indians should be taught English.

In "Bentinck, Macaulay and the Introduction of English Education in India" Suresh Ghosh argued that "Bentinck had been steadily pursuing a policy of gradual introduction of English education in India since 1829."[1] He was a firm believer in Utilitarian principles and took advantage of the peaceful times of his governor-generalship to mobilize these principles against what were considered the "social evils" of India. Bentinck outlawed Sutee, the burning of widows, in 1829 and also took measures to curb Thugi, the practice of ritual murder.[2] Because Bentinck had a history of attacking what he saw as barbaric practices, it seems obvious, Ghosh argued, that he would have formed his own Anglicist opinions about education. "General Education is my [Bentinck's] panacea for the regeneration of India. The ground must be prepared and the jungle cleared away before the human mind can receive, with any prospect of real benefit, the seeds of improvement."[3] Even before Macaulay, Bentinck had opened subordinate positions in judicial and revenue sections of the government to natives who had an understanding of English. "It is the wish and admitted policy of the British Government to render its own language gradually and eventually the language of public business throughout the country," wrote Bentinck.[4] However, when Bentinck came to power, the Orientalists held a majority on the General Committee and the Governor-General could not initiate any major changes in this area without the permission of the Board of Directors of the East India Company in London. This was an issue because when Bentinck signed the Resolution, he did so without their involvement.[5] According to Ghosh, Bentinck did it without the Board’s consent because he had thoughts of retiring his post as Governor-General after the Tories returned to power earlier in the year. "He did not want to leave the fate of a subject so dear to his heart to a successor and acted immediately in coming to a decision."[6]
Percival Spear in "Bentinck and Education" argued against Macaulay's influence as well. "Macaulay is often credited with being the driving mental force behind Bentinck's educational policy. But before accepting that conclusion there are other factors also to consider." [7] Spear argued that Bentinck made his decision impulsively because of his desire to do the "right thing" as a humanitarian reformer. Unlike Macaulay, "he was no man of letters, and once confessed that it was only with effort that he read anything." [8] When challenged with the decision between English or Oriental education, Bentinck's impulsive actions, out of desire to do the right thing in the amount of time allotted to him, were stronger than his respect for ancient Indian institutions. [9] When "confronted with the educational tangle his natural impulse was to take the common sense' view that Western knowledge was naturally desirable, and that English was the obvious language in which it must be imparted." [10] Spear also argued that economics somewhat motivated Bentinck. "One of [Bentinck's] main labors was to economize the administration, and one of the main items of expense was the high pay of English officials." [11] Bentinck saw an opportunity to offer Indians subordinate positions in the judicial and revenue branches of the government if they spoke English. "For these reasons it must not be assumed, as has often been the case, that Bentinck was influenced by Macaulay alone, that his mind was a tabula rasa upon which the moving finger wrote as Macaulay willed." [12]

Spear noted that in order to argue for Macaulay's "Minute" as the catalyst event, one must believe that without Macaulay something different would have occurred. He wrote that it cannot be maintained that Macaulay's "Minute" was the "decisive influence in an otherwise equal contest." [13]

For this to have been the case, it must be assumed that without his intervention the result might have been otherwise. Macaulay has been too much praised and too much blamed; his contribution was like the lightning flash which vividly illumines the storm and reveals the landscape, albeit in fantastic proportions and bewildering lights, but which neither directs its course nor ordains its conclusion. [14]

He then stated that in order to see who truly influenced Bentinck's decision one must look towards England. The source of thought in England for a new educational policy in India came from the growing influence of Utilitarian and Evangelical ideas. [15] He wrote that by 1830 the Board of Directors had already lost respect for Indian learning. "All that was needed by 1834 [the year Macaulay arrived in India] was an educational expert to sanction and a reformer to implement new ideas." Macaulay and Bentinck filled these parts flawlessly, therefore becoming "more in the position of accessories after the fact, than of the instigators of new policy." [16] In this case Bentinck and the Directors only asked Macaulay to write his "Minute" because he was an education expert and also conveniently the Law Member of the Government. Macaulay's job description was an advantage because "the strongest argument of the Orientalists was a legal one, that the Committee was bound by the Act of 1813 to encourage Oriental Learning as well as Western learning." [17] Therefore, this explained Bentinck's request for Macaulay's "Minute". It was written as a "preliminary and rather perfunctory consideration of the legal aspect, and [was] a full and slashing attack upon Oriental learning." This was important because Macaulay realized there really was no legal argument for the Anglicists; instead, his "Minute" was merely "an Olympian statement of opinion that the Act of 1813 intended the exact opposite of what its words implied. Then [came] the attack on Oriental learning to cover up the nakedness of the legal land" [18] As a result, "the main body of the Minute was thus in the nature of an intellectual red herring drawn across the legal track to distract attention from the absence of a legal case. He brought in the new learning to redress the balance of bad law; and he succeeded so perfectly that from that moment the legal issue was forgotten in discussion of the rights and wrongs of Arabic, Sanskrit and English." [19] Consequently, Macaulay's "Minute" worked; it "gave to Bentinck the cue for which he had been waiting, the confidence to go forward on a subject upon which he lacked the necessary intellectual though not the moral
conviction. But the fact remains that it neither instigated nor dictated new policy, nor even decided a doubtful issue."[20]

In order to understand Macaulay and his ideas presented in the "Minute", one must understand the imperial discourse of the time and the thoughts that fueled such beliefs. According to Uday Singh Mehta, "Imperialism is simply the process or policy of establishing or maintaining an empire."[21] Imperial discourse focuses on how these ideas for maintaining an empire were expressed rather than centering on the actual physical power that maintained the empire.[22] India was a unique colony because the British were outnumbered; already an established culture, religion, and way of living existed there that would be difficult to eradicate or overthrow. Therefore, the ideas that regulated the empire were unique. Mehta's Liberalism and Empire explores the application of British Liberalism in the Indian Empire. He did this by "focusing on the particular amplifications and inflections in liberalism that get revealed in the writings of liberals on India and the empire," including Macaulay's writings.[23] Liberal imperial discourse was easily applied to India as it became the "promise land of liberal ideasa kind of test case laboratory."[24] This was so because India was not like the British settler societies; instead of boosting the English population, and therefore English culture and government, India was seen as a project that needed to be reformed. "Reform was indeed central to the liberal agenda and mind-set. To that end they [the English] developed a particular conception of what really constituted a history along with a related view of what counted as progress."[25] This principle of comparison and then reform was generated from two major themes of imperial discourse, paternalism and emphasizing the unfamiliar. Macaulay employed both of these themes in his "Minute" when he expressed the need for educational reform in India. It was these two liberal discourses and his pure representation of them in the "Minute" that contributed to Macaulay's success in the education debates.

In most writings on imperialism and empire, the metaphor of the colonizer as a parent and the colonized as a child is used to initiate the need for and duty to carry out reform. "India is a child for which the empire offers the prospect of legitimate and progressive parentage and toward which Britain, as a parent, is similarly obligated and competent."[26] The "parent" was explicitly more knowledgeable than the other, and the child was to be taught this new curriculum. "The child/deviant, whose difference threatens the legitimacy of the father must therefore be assimilated in a power that "knows" or offers a progressive future in which the ambivalence of "not-being-one-of-us" and being "one-of-us" will assuredly get resolved."[27] Macaulay implied this idea strongly in his "Minute" when he stated that English education could create a new class of Indians in color, but English in opinions and taste.[28] This idea leads to another in the imperial discourse of the Indian Empire. The British were more advanced compared to India because they possessed the knowledge and history to be considered the "parent." Therefore, a new relationship emerged in which knowledge equated to power.

We should admit rather that power produces knowledge (and not simply by encouraging it because it serves power or by applying it because it is useful); that power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field or knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations.[29]

This type of knowledge-power relationship was exercised over the Indians and used by Macaulay in his "Minute" to justify the removal of oriental learning. Through this knowledge-power relation, the English "invest[ed] human bodies and subjugate[ed] them, by turning them into objects of knowledge."[30] One also gets a sense of paternal imperial discourse "in the frequently used expressions our Indian subjects,' our Empire,' our dependents.' The possessive pronoun simultaneously conveys familiarity and distance, warmth and sternness, responsibility and power."[31] The continuous use of possessive pronouns has an underlying effect that conveys the power to direct or even coerce much like a parent has with a child.[32] This can be seen in Macaulay's characterization of the
British, who in the context of empire must be like fathers who are "just and unjust, moderate and rapacious."[33] British intellects of nineteenth century imperialism assumed this position because they saw it as their duty, or as Kipling put it, their "White Man's burden," to assert "a higher order of things; a superior knowledge, a more credible science, a more consistent morality, and a more just and free politics."[34]

The second major theme of imperial liberal discourse is the idea of the unfamiliar and the need to change this into something that is familiar. This idea greatly influenced Macaulay and eventually led him to be so passionate about Anglicist education and the success it would warrant. Macaulay viewed the stranger merely as an embodiment of an abstract type that is then judged, reformed, and often assessed by reference to another set of abstract ideals of rationality, individuality, the morally sanguine, the imperatives of politics, and most generally, to the requirements of progress.[35] He believed through English education, British values and cohesiveness would replace the strangeness of the Indian. Therefore, "Macaulay's strategy recalls and repeats the arduous process through which the effortless, the rational, the gentlemanly, and the civilized are made to appear natural, via complex interdictions of liberal education."[36] As a result, when asked "what was the response of liberal theorists as they cast their gaze on an unfamiliar world? In a word, it was to see those experiences, those life forms, as provisional."[37] Only temporarily would India remain different because the English had a duty to improve India into a proper English subject. This type of unfamiliar discourse relates to the ideas of paternal imperial discourse linking them together; it was the duty of the "parent" to correct the strangeness so the "child" would be familiar when compared to the parent. The view of India as unfamiliar and different produced the view that India was simply irrational, backward and stuck in history. "People who literally claimed to "see" and "touch" multiheaded or winged gods singlehandedly moving mountains, by simply casting those conceptions in clay or bronze and imbuing those "idols" with the status of divinity, had more than just deformed imaginations or strange beliefs."[38] Macaulay believed that Anglicist learning would bring truth to India and replace the superstitious and false beliefs of Indian society.

In an attempt to remove the unfamiliar qualities of Indian culture through Anglicist curricula, another power relation existed, the power to determine truth. Michael Foucault summarizes that, "There can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth which operates through and on the basis of this association. We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth."[39] So, nineteenth century liberals advocated rationalizing India in order to instigate their progress just like the English had done in their own history. "In the repetition, the presumption, and assertion of the familiar, what is denied is precisely the archaic, the pre-modern, the religious, the Indian in a word, the unfamiliar, along with sentiments, feelings, sense of location, and forms of life of which they are a part."[40] However, through this process, India's culture was disregarded. India became one of those "places that when identified by the grid of Enlightenment rationality," it was seen as only a spot "on a map or past points on the scale of civilizational progress, but not dwellings in which peoples lived and had deeply invested identities."[41] Macaulay overlooked Indian culture and ways of living because he saw their laws, history and religion as wrong, backward, and most importantly, useless in their path to an enlightened and rational civilization.

Macaulay's unique imperial discourse found in his "Minute" can be better understood by exploring Macaulay as an historian. His most famous historical writing was his History of England published in 1848. Even though this came after the "Minute on Education," the History was a process and a goal of Macaulay during his time in India. His knowledge and opinions of England combined with his experiences of empire in India influenced Macaulay's overall view of history and the role it should play in every nation as well as answering why England was so exceptional compared to every nation. By understanding Macaulay's opinions on England and its history, it becomes clear why he so fiercely advocated for Anglicist reform in the "Minute".

---
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Macaulay had many distinctive characteristics that make him a famous and recognized historian. Lord Melbourne put it best when he said, "I wish, I was cocksure of anything as Tom Macaulay is of everything." This reputation emerged because he was "exceptionally well equipped" for the task of historian. He was an extraordinary linguist familiar with Latin, Greek, French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, German and Dutch. He not only had an incredible memory, but was also well connected to a wide circle of learned acquaintances that gave him access to multiple sources of information. Finally, he had the experiences of working closely inside the government, which made him familiar with administration, legislation and the direction of high policy. "He was, in fact, one of the comparatively small body of historians who have understood the world of politics from within, as it is, rather than as academic historians think it must or ought to be, and in this he resembled the great historian of antiquity whose works he so constantly studied." As for the subjects of his historical writing, Macaulay,

Articulated the mid-Victorian center: optimistic, patriotic, marked by evangelical morality, superficially protestant, with a profound belief in common sense, a conventional respect for separate spheres and success in business, a delight in domestic detail and the idea of family, strong patriotic sentiments, a love of pageantry and melodrama, and a conviction that nation and empire were distinctly different the one in part defined by its rule of the other.

But what really set Macaulay apart as an historian was his style. He believed each kind of writing had its own individual rhetoric style and for history it was particularly incomparable. It was this distinctive style Macaulay fiercely used that made his "Minute" a success. Macaulay was extremely confident in his abilities as a historian. He once said, "There is no merit, no doubt, in Hume, Robertson, Voltaire and Gibbon[,] yet, I have a conception of history more just, I am confident, than theirs." This confidence resulted in Macaulay's fixed opinions that were so easily impressed upon others. His self-assurance, his knowledge, his political beliefs and not withholding any element of these in order to be polite and refusing to accept that he could be wrong, made Macaulay's histories convincing and famous. In fact, some critics believed his biggest flaw was his use of extreme exaggerations. "Macaulay's real weakness, in fact, is neither inaccuracy nor excessive partisanship but the love of exaggeration and the tendency to overstatement which make his partisanship so offensive to those whose views differ from his. A Love of exaggeration and a tendency towards overstatement were personal characteristics of Macaulay" While this may be seen as a disadvantage to Macaulay's historical writing and discourse, it was not when it came to his "Minute". Instead, this very exaggeration contributed to Macaulay's success over his less forward Oriental and Anglicist colleagues. "It is not merely that Macaulay's blacks are always too black and his whites always too white but he paints everything more than life-size and summons to his aid all the colours of the rainbow."

Macaulay's most famous historical writing is his complete History of England. The tone and construction of this massive volume has many parallels to his "Minute on Education." Although it discussed a different region, government, and culture, the way he wrote about England gave insight into his reasons for passionately pursuing Anglicist policy in India. In the History, Macaulay created a perfect English history that lived on as a legend and still manifests English nationalism. "Macaulay's History brought him immense celebrity in England, gave him global recognition, made him a rich man, and has never been displaced as England's myth of origin. It is a classic tale of nation building, combining epic with romance." The History was an idyllic story and one that Macaulay truly believed occurred and was possible in other countries. "The ideological work of the History that Macaulay began in 1839 was to represent the triumph of the untied and tolerant English race and nation as a peaceful process, achieved through reform rather than revolution." However, this perfect history also was what made England
superior and more knowledgeable regarding how to maintain a nation better than any other in the world. "They (Englanders) had distinctive national peculiarities: they were islanders not merely in geographical position, but in their politics, their feelingstheir manners' and their language. They valued the constitution, the common law, limitations on absolutism, the freedom of press, and the freedom of speech."[54] This mindset greatly affected Macaulay in his judgments of India and its culture, as well as his position in the Education Debate. In his History, he defined England and the Englishman clearly, fabricating a particular identity that everyone should master. It was this identity that Macaulay fought to establish in India and that he thought was possible with English education alone. This "Englishness" was unrivaled and therefore it was England's occupation to expose India to such an esteemed life style full of knowledge in regards to literature, government and economics. In the History, Macaulay wrote, "We have classical associations and great names of our own, which we can confidently oppose to the most splendid of ancient timesOur liberty is neither Greek nor Roman; but essentially English."[55] Just as England had associations with classical antiquity and their own fame, so too could India have their own heroes and be associated with England. Another major theme found in his History was the idea of history as a means of tracing progress. England had not only mastered a specific identity but it had also achieved progress first hand which also placed it above other cultures. "His interest in history was not antiquarian; good historians were those who asked, Were men of the past going in the right direction?' The History of England is emphatically the history of progressit was this that made it exceptional."[56] This progress separated it from India and gave England, in Macaulay's mind, the duty to implement the English language and culture into India's stalled civilization. "Maritime power, medicine, the mechanical arts, literature and science," Macaulay explained "had all contributed to making English the acknowledged leaders of the human race', and nothing would be more interesting and delightful' than tracing the steps of that progress."[57] This progress was the goal for India. Macaulay believed that India could attain this type of progress if a proper English education was made available to the Natives. Not only would India benefit, but England would also be praised for doing so. Therefore, Macaulay's history celebrated England, its government and its traditions but "at the same time the History told the story of the emergence of an imperial people, the makers of nation and empire."[58] "It told of the making of the nation, providing a master narrative of descent, defining who belonged and who was outside."[59]

Britain's empire as Macaulay represented it, "was an empire of language and letters [rather] than of violence and coercion."[60] Therefore, Macaulay focused in regards to empire on the ideas of exclusion and assimilation rather than military involvement. Macaulay compared England to the other countries that were a part of the British Empire in order to emphasize England's clear nationhood, identity and progress. "The savage Indians of the New World, the enslaved Africans of the Caribbean, the fabled Moguls of Indiathese peoples marked the outer peripheries, the ghostly presences of the History, making possible the delineation of the nation."[61] This exclusion of India was seen in Macaulay's "Minute" when he attacked Indian culture and languages then later praised England and its superior knowledge. The English needed to introduce their education to India so that the gap between the two in history could begin to narrow. England had succeeded as a more "advanced" nation, and Macaulay believed this was the tale of England's history. Therefore, England continued to make history as it progressed into the future. India on the other hand, was stuck in the past and needed to be stimulated. "In depicting the peoples of India as living at varied levels of barbarism such as Europe had experienced centuries before, he [Macaulay] was demarcating between one kind of people and another; those who had a history and those who had none."[62] Since India's history had not produced a superior nation and Britain's history had surpassed everyone else's, it only made sense to Macaulay to assimilate India into the history of England. Not only did Macaulay believe English education to be the solution because it would help India, he also favored principles of assimilation at home and abroad. "Sameness was Macaulay's solace, and too much difference represented danger: it was an anathema. This psychic stateprovided a key motif for his narrative of nation formation."[63] When Macaulay arrived in India, it was too different from England. If India ever wanted to progress as England had, India
would have to assimilate into a proper nation, and Macaulay was the one to promote this change. "It was that small secure world [Macaulay] longed for, one peopled by men like him. India was a place of exile, a place on which he could impose what he saw [as] necessary improvements."[64] Therefore, Macaulay's History, "was a powerful narrative, a heroic story of a homogenous people and a progressive nation. But it was structured by its systematic exclusions, grounded in binaries of here/there, homely/unhomely, English and other. Strategies of instantiation, both temporal and spatial, reliance on knowing and not knowing, marked disavowal, a classic but unspoken English virtue, as at the heart of Macaulay's history."[65]

The letters that J.C.C. Sutherland, the Secretary of the General Committee, sent to Bentinck on 21 and 22 of January 1835 outlined the positions of the Education Debate. Both of the letters were written with a sort of "balanced" prose expected from bureaucrats and government officials; they are full of ambiguity and both were written by Sutherland, who was an Orientalist. The first letter described the views of the Anglicists. "The one great duty of England towards India [was] that of improving in the minds and elevating the Character, of the Indian People."[66] In order to achieve this goal, two main changes had to be accomplished in education. First, England had the obligation to teach Western literature and science. The Anglicists believed the Oriental system of learning was deficient in this knowledge. It was not acceptable to offer an education Englishmen themselves would not tolerate, or to have a separate education for the English in India and an inferior education for the natives.[67] Secondly, this Western knowledge needed to be communicated through the English language instead of translations into Sanskrit and Arabic. The Anglicists criticized translations because they required the government to find teachers who understood both languages. Also, translations made it impossible to accomplish the ultimate goal of creating "a new character and energy of thought in the Native minds, to animate it by that nobler and freer spirit of moral and intellectual action, which has been the Chief source, and forms the first glory and security of European Improvement."[68] Instruction in English was clearly superior "when contrasted with the barren result of all attempts at instruction through the means of translations into Oriental languages."[69]

The second letter outlining the Orientalist position centered on the General Committee's original responsibilities as outlined in Clause 43 of The Charter Act of 1813. This clause granted the General Committee the right to oversee the funds appropriated by the government for institutions of higher education in India for the "revival and improvement, and the encouragement of learned natives of India."[70] Orientalists interpreted this phrase to mean that the official policy was the revival of native literature and education. The Orientalists had two major goals. First, they needed to win the confidence of the educated and influential classes of India, because "it was felt that the funds and means at their disposal were but a mite in their hands when considered with reference to the vast population whose literary and scientific improvement it had been made their object to promote and encourage."[71] The Orientalists believed that they could use existing Sanskrit and Arabic scholars to diffuse knowledge to the masses. Teaching in the local languages of learning also avoided the native concerns of education becoming a means of proselytizing for Christianity. Indians feared that "the faiths of their ancestors would be assailed or insidiously undermined in institutions supported or directed by Europeans of a different faith."[72] Using Oriental languages was thus less offensive. Secondly, to move funds away from Sanskrit and Arabic and replace them with "rudimental studies in a language strange to the people requiring devotion of years before the student attain[ed] the proficiency to be able to read a common book," was inefficient.[73] The Anglicist position was thus both provocative and uneconomical.

Macaulay arrived in India in December of 1834 after being appointed the first Legal Member of the Council in 1833. Macaulay began his career with Indian affairs in 1831 when he served on the Board of Control, the governing body in charge of supervising the East India Company's transactions, until 1832. He was also a key Member of Parliament active in passing the Charter of Act of 1833 that centralized India's imperial government by promoting
the governor-general of Bengal to governor-general of all of India. At the time of his arrival in India, the Orientalists were a majority on the General Committee. Macaulay and Bentinck quickly became friends and Bentinck, noticing his interest in education, appointed him President of the General Committee in 1834. Not surprisingly Macaulay's "keen eye at once detected very many grave errors in the system of public instruction which had been adopted,"[74] though he remained aloof from the debate at first. Yet it was not long before Bentinck formally requested his opinion, which Macaulay gave him on February 2, 1835.

The Orientalists' strongest argument was their interpretation of Clause 43 of the Charter Act of 1813, which seemed to support teaching in Arabic and Sanskrit exclusively. The Orientalists also noted that in order to change the standing interpretation of this legislative act, Macaulay needed approval from the Board of Directors of the East India Company in London. "As it seems to be the opinion of some the Gentlemen who compose the Committee of Public Instruction that the course which they have hitherto pursued was strictly prescribed by the British parliament in 1813, and as, if that opinion be correct, a legislative act will be necessary to warrant a change."[75] Macaulay directly attacked this argument in his "Minute" as the Legal Member of the Council of India. He argued that oriental policy was very exclusive in the sense that under its policies it labeled an "educated person" as someone who was rehearsed in native knowledge, which seemed incomplete to Macaulay because it lacked the extensive knowledge of the West.

It is argued, or rather taken for granted, that by literature the parliament can have meant only Arabic and Sanskrit literature; that they never would have given the Honorable appellation of a learned native' to a native who was familiar with the poetry of Milton, the metaphysics of Locke, and the Physics of Newton; but that they meant to designate by that name only such persons as might have studied in the sacred books of the Hindoos all the uses of Cusa -Grass, and all the mysteries of absorption into the Diety. This does not appear to be a very satisfactory interpretation.[76]

He stressed the silliness of binding a government indefinitely to a certain policy, and especially to one he thought useless. "To talk of a Government pledging itself to teach certain languages and certain sciences, though those languages may become useless, though those sciences may be exploded, seems to me quite unmeaning."[77] He demonstrated how ridiculous this argument was by asking Bentinck to "suppose that the Pacha of Egyptwere to appropriate a sum for the purpose of reviving and promoting literature, and encouraging learned natives of Egypt,' would any body infer that he meant the youth of his Pachalik to give years to the study of hieroglyphics?"[78] Macaulay also pointed out that the exact wording of the clause in question was quite vague. "It does not appear to me that the Act of Parliament can by any part of construction be made to bear the meaning which has been assigned to it. It contains nothing about the particular languages or sciences which are to be studied."[79] Although it mentioned the revival and improvement of literature, it also discussed the introduction and promotion of knowledge. An Anglicist interpretation was at least as plausible according to Macaulay.

The words on which the supporters of the old system rely do not bear them out, and other words follow which seem to be quite decisive on the other side. This lac of rupees is set apart not only for the reviving literature in India,' the phrase on which their [Orientalists] whole interpretation is founded, but also for the introduction and promotion of knowledge of the sciences among the inhabitants of the British territories'words which are alone sufficient to authorize all the changes for which I contend.[80]

No new legislative act, or directive from London, was necessary to implement an Anglicist policy. "If the Council agree in my construction no legislative act will be necessary. If they differ from me, I will propose a short Act rescinding that clause of the Charter Act of 1813 [from] which the difficulty arises."[81] Macaulay concluded his
argument by reminding his readers that even if the words of the clause were not sufficient to support an Anglicist educational policy, Bentinck, as governor-general, had the power to stop the teaching of Arabic and Sanskrit as much as he was able "to direct that reward for killing tigers in Mysore shall be diminished."[82]

The second major argument the Orientalists used was that if Anglicist legislation was implemented, then students of higher education would be learning from rudimentary English curricula. "It is taken for granted by the advocates of oriental learning that no native of this country can possibly attain more than a mere smattering of English. They do not attempt to prove this."[83] Macaulay believed that history had already proven this wrong and cited the example of the Renaissance in Western Europe. During the Renaissance, the most worthwhile knowledge was contained in the Classics of antiquity. Macaulay wrote that had England ignored the writings of the Greeks and Romans, "had they confined their attention to the old dialects of our own island, had they printed nothing and taught nothing at the universities but chronicles in Anglo Saxon and romances in Norman French would England ever have been what she now is?"[84] If the English could conquer Greek and Latin, then it was not impractical to believe English was as difficult to the Indians as Greek was to an Englishman; therefore it was possible for the natives to learn it. "Less than half the time which enables an English youth to read Herodotus and Sophocles ought to enable a Hindoo to read Hume and Milton."[85]

Macaulay now turned to a full-blooded attack on Indian culture, languages and even religion. His "Minute" is the most unambiguous form of Anglicist conceit and set him apart from other Anglicist bureaucrats. The attack began slowly and obliquely. "The grants which are made from the Public purse for the encouragement of literature differ in no respect from the grants which are made from the same purse for other objects of real or supposed utility."[86] These grants were made to students who wished to learn the native literature in native languages so that the British government might gain the natives' cooperation. However, cooperation, according to Macaulay was not being achieved. Instead, Macaulay predicted that opposition was growing as more natives over time learned that their education was useless. Not only was this opposition growing, but it would also be prompted out of England's own policies and "headed by persons supported by our stipends and trained in our colleges."[87] Macaulay wrote that instead of securing cooperation from the native public, the government was withholding valuable knowledge and losing countless amounts of money on preserving Indian culture and oriental education.

We are forced to pay our Arabic and Sanscrit students while those who learn English are willing to pay us. All the declamations in the world about the love and reverence of the natives for their sacred dialects will never, in the mind of any impartial person, out weigh this undisputed fact, that we cannot find in all our vast empire a single student who will let us teach him those dialects, unless we will pay him.[88]

Students receiving stipends was considered a norm in Indian culture, and Macaulay wrote that some believed he lacked this understanding because he had not been in India long enough to realize this. However, Macaulay continued by attacking this notion of India culture and stated, "Nothing is more certain than that it never can in any part of the world be necessary to pay men for doing what they think pleasant or profitable. India is no exception to this rule. The people of India do not get paid for eating rice when they are hungry, or for wearing woolen cloth in the cold season."[89] Macaulay argued that continuing oriental education also cost the government more money in the long run because it left natives unprepared to find employment. He cited a petition sent to the General Committee by students who had been in school for ten to twelve years studying Hindu literature and science. These petitioners requested further aid from the government or a government position stating, "We want means for a decent living and for our progressive improvement which however, we cannot obtain without the assistance of Government."[90] They did not think their free education for twelve years was adequate compensation for what had been inflicted upon them. Macaulay replied, "And I doubt not that they [the
petitioners] are in the right."[91] Instead, "they have wasted the best years of life in learning what procures for them neither bread nor respect. Surely we might with advantage have saved the cost of making these Persons useless and miserable."[92] In addition to the public money wasted on oriental education, "about twenty thousand rupees a year" was spent on the printing of oriental literature, "adding fresh masses of waste paper to a hoard which, one should think, is already sufficiently ample."[93] In contrast, the School Book Society, an organization for printing English literature, was able to sell seven or eight thousand English volumes every year, and not only paid completely for the expenses of printing, but made a profit of twenty percent.[94] Macaulay then directly assaulted Indian knowledge. "It is", he wrote, "no exaggeration to say that all the historical information which has been collected from all the books written in the Sanscrit language is less valuable than what may be found in the most paltry abridgements used at preparatory schools in England."[95] Macaulay did not censor any part of his argument against Indian culture in order to be polite. Hindu and Muslim law, for instance, was wrong and had been requested to be reformed by Parliament anyway. Macaulay hoped that the law reform would be finished by the time the new students entering the colleges had completed their studies. Therefore, "it would be manifestly absurd to educate a rising generation with a view to a state of things which we mean to alter before they reach manhood."[96] However, unlike his Anglicist colleagues, he even attacked Indian religion. "It is said that the Sanscrit and Arabic are the languages in which the sacred books of a hundred millions of people are written, and that they are on that account entitled to peculiar encouragement."[97] The connection of oriental education and religion became an issue of utility; to Macaulay there was no real usefulness to one encouraging the other. He used a hypothetical scenario to justify his claims, ",suppose we commence the erection of a pier. Is it a violation of the public faith to stop works, if we afterwards see reason to believe that the building will be useless?"[98] Macaulay, quite simply, thought native religions were irrational and not a sufficient claim, whatsoever, to continue teaching oriental languages. "Can we reasonably or decently bribe men, out of the revenues of the state, to waste their youth in learning how they are to purify themselves after touching an Ass, or what texts of the Vedas they are to repeat to expiate the crime of killing a goat [?]."[99] Although the government took a formal position of religious neutrality, Macaulay argued that by favoring oriental literature they were actually favoring native religions, which were unreasonable and unnecessary. Are we "to teach false history, false astronomy, false medicine, because we find them in Company with a false religion [?]"[100] By subsidizing the teaching of oriental literature and oriental languages, Britain would be approving "medical doctrines which would disgrace an English farrier, astronomy which would move laughter in girls at an English boarding school, history abounding with kings thirty feet high and reigns thirty thousand years long, and geography made of seas of treacle and seas of butter."[101] This pure and uncompromising imperialist discourse, attacking even India's religions, set Macaulay apart from the other more restrained Anglicists on the General Committee.

Macaulay, a great stylist of the English language, believed fervently in the clear superiority of Western knowledge, especially when taught in English. "We know that foreigners of all nations do learn our language sufficiently to have access to all the most abstruse knowledge which it contains."[102] "Whoever knows [English] has ready access to all the vast intellectual wealth which all the wisest nations of earth have created and hoarded in the course of ninety generations."[103] According to Macaulay, he believed that the most successful form of literature the Eastern languages possessed was poetry, but even this did not surpass the grand English poets. When it came from works of imagination to works of fact, "the superiority of the Europeans [became] absolutely immeasurable."[104] He wrote that, "the literature in England is now more valuable than that of classical antiquity. I doubt whether the Sanscrit literature be as valuable as that of our Saxon and Norman progenitors. In some departments in history for example, I am certain that it is much less so."[105] Macaulay argued that acknowledgment of English guaranteed the Indians' enlightenment. "The claims of our own language it is hardly necessary to recapitulate. It stands pre-eminent even among the languages of the west."[106] Russia, for instance, had advanced,
Not by flattering national prejudices: --not by feeding the mind of the young Muscovite with old women's stories which his rude fathers believed: --not by filling his head with lying legends about St. Nicholas: --not by encouraging him to study the great question, whether the world was or not created on the 13th of September: --not by calling him a learned native' when he had mastered all these points of knowledge. But by teaching him those foreign languages in which the greatest mass of information has been laid up, and thus putting all that information within his reach. 

The success of India rested on the decision to implement the teaching of English. Only then could the government "form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we governa class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect." If the government enforced Anglicist policies, India would remain a loyal ally and commerce with the subcontinent could continue to flourish. "To trade with civilised men is infinitely more profitable than to govern savages." This was of high importance because Macaulay believed English was likely to become the language of commerce in the East with growing British colonies in South Africa and Australia. If the governor-general truly wanted what was best for India, then English had to be used to train its civil servants. The superiority of English was difficult to deny, Macaulay believed. "It abounds with works of imagination not inferior to the noblest which Greece has bequeathed us, with models of every species of eloquence, with historical compositions which, considered merely as narratives, have seldom been surpassed, and which, considered as vehicles of ethical and political instruction, have never been equaled." In short, "whether we look at the intrinsic value of our literature, or at the particular situation of this country, we shall see the strongest reason to think that, of all foreign tongues, the English tongue is that which would be the most useful to our native subjects." 

Macaulay concludes his "Minute" by summarizing what he believed was necessary to reform educational policy in India. Like the rest of the "Minute", the conclusion contained strong animation and force. He wrote that the printing of oriental literature needed to be stopped at once and certain oriental schools must be closed right away. Only the two major centers of Hindu and Muslim learning should remain open, if this occurred, Macaulay wrote, then "we do enough and much more than enough in my opinion, for Eastern Languages." He argued that if no schools were closed, then no school should receive government stipends either. Instead, "people shall be left to make their own choice between the rival systems of education without being bribed by us to learn what they have no desire to know." This money that would be saved from halting all stipends would be used to expand English schools and build new ones throughout India. Macaulay, unlike his Anglicist colleagues, took it further and stated that unless these requests were followed, he would resign his position as President of the General Committee. "If the decision of His Lordship in Council should be such as I anticipate, I shall enter on the performance of my duties with the greatest zeal and alacrity. If, on the other hand, it be the opinion of the Government that the present system ought to remain unchanged, I beg that I may be permitted to retire from the chair of the Committee." Macaulay believed that it was just as useless to have him in charge of oriental policies as much as he felt oriental education to be useless. If the Board was to continue withholding the truth from students then Macaulay refused to call it a board of instruction.

We are a Board for wasting the public money, for printing books which are of less valueless value than the paper on which they are printed was while it was blank, for giving artificial encouragement to absurd history, absurd metaphysics, absurd physics, absurd theologyfor raising up a breed of scholars who find their scholarship an incumbrance and a blemish , who live on the public while they are receiving their education, and whose education is so utterly useless to them that, when they have received it, they must either starve or live on the public all the rest of their lives.
Macaulay was to have no place in the destruction of education in the Indian Empire if his advice could not be clearly seen as the right path for India and accepted by the Governor-General. He concludes with, "Entertaining these opinions I am naturally desirous to decline all share in the responsibility of a body which, unless it alters its whole mode of proceedings, I must consider not merely as useless, but as positively noxious."[117]

After Macaulay's "Minute" was released to the General Committee, H.T Prinsep, an Orientalist in the General Committee and the Secretary to the government of India, wrote his own "Note" thirteen days later in an attempt to clarify and correct some of Macaulay's facts and assumptions about the Orientalist position and current Oriental educational policy. It was annotated by Macaulay himself and other prominent English government officials in India. Prinsep wrote, "It seems to me that there are some points touched upon in the Minute of the Hon'ble Mr. Macaulay that require to be set right by an explanation of the facts or by more clearly stating the views and principles against which the arguments of the minute are directed where these appear to have been misunderstood."[118] Not only was Prinsep attempting to correct Macaulay's mistakes, but he was also trying to convince the government not to make any decision regarding education too quickly. "For as the question before the government is of the first importance and the propositions to which it leads such as if any step be taken hastily the Government may be committed irretrievably to measures hateful and injurious to the mass of the people under its sway."[119] However, he was not fighting for the Orientalists' cause beyond these corrections. Instead of counterattacking Macaulay's forceful Anglicist discourse with equally blunt Orientalist discourse, Prinsep discussed Macaulay's faults without truly fighting for maintaining current Orientalist policy. Therefore, when compared with Macaulay's "Minute", Prinsep's "Note" was rather tame and ineffective.

The first thing Prinsep addressed was the legal question pertaining to Clause 43 in the Charter Act of 1813 and Macaulay's analysis of it. Macaulay wrote in his "Minute" that for the government to bind itself indefinitely to the teaching of oriental education was simply amusing and unlikely. Prinsep argued that when looking at the Clause one must do so in its proper historical context and the "intention of the Legislature of that day."[120]

These were the persons then intended to be produced and encouraged and it is surely forcing the words out of their natural construction when it is argued that the revival of native literature can best be effected by abolishing all institutions for teaching the literature that then existed and that had existed for ages before and by communicating instruction only in English.[121]

The Legislature, when writing the act, did not intentionally mean to refer to only native literature, nor did they intend to categorize a learned native' as one who had sufficient proficiency in that type of education. Macaulay wrote in the margin in regards to Prinsep's argument, "I leave my minute to defend itself on this head."[122] Prinsep's discourse was weak; instead of defending the Charter Act of 1813, he argued that it was outdated to some extent and should be improved, just not with Anglicist policy. Prinsep was also critical of the example Macaulay used to boost his opinions on the legal matter of the Charter Act, that of the Pacha of Egypt's hypothetical demand to return to hieroglyphics. He stated that if the Pacha of Egypt was to revive Egypt's native learning, it would not be a return to hieroglyphics but the "literature and language last existing in Egypt," which was Arabic.[123] Prinsep instead, took Macaulay's example and turned it to favor the continuation of oriental policy. "We [the Orientalists] do see him [Pacha of Egypt] cultivating and reviving that and teaching medicine and other sciences in that There is no talk there of reviving the mummy literature of Osiris nor in India of going beyond what we found prevailing throughout but languishing for want of encouragement."[124] Still here Prinsep does not explain why Arabic was the better choice, and simply states it as so in order to correct Macaulay's example.
Following this argument, Prinsep addressed the issue Macaulay discussed in his "Minute" about oriental schools being funded from the parliamentary grant established in the Charter Act. This particular argument was directed at the Madrasa School, an oriental university. This school was not funded by the parliamentary grant as Macaulay had believed and instead was funded by an endowment made years prior by Warren Hastings. The government, corrected Prinsep, was bound by separate legislature to maintain these schools although it was under the council of the General Committee. "It was transferred to the Committeenot as an institution under it and paid from the funds appropriated therein to Education but because the Committee was deemed the fittest organ for the execution of the functions of visitor."[125] This argument led to Prinsep's next point in regards to the removal of government funded Oriental schools as a result of Macaulay's Anglicist interpretation of the clause. "It is only in this country that it would be proposed not to improve and make perfect and correct errors in the institutions already established by the liberality of those who have gone before, but upon a vague impression that the object is not beneficial wholly to abolish and dissolve them."[126] Therefore, Prinsep stated that instead of choosing English and only supporting English universities, the government should simply correct or improve the faults found in the already existing legislature regarding oriental schools. By doing so, Prinsep openly admitted that flaws existed in the Oriental system. Also, Macaulay's argument was stronger, advocating in his "Minute" the total uselessness of oriental education and languages when compared to the superiority of English and Western learning. As a result, Oriental policy was beyond repair and needed to be reformed.

Prinsep noted that the superiority of English was undeniable when compared to oriental languages, which was clearly not beneficial to his argument for Oriental legislature. "There is no body acquainted with both literatures that will not subscribe to all that is said in the minute of the superiority of that of England."[127] However, Prinsep continued, "the whole question ishave we it[,] in our power to teach everywhere this English and this European science?"[128] He asked was teaching English as practical as Macaulay said it was in his "Minute"; the answer was no. The biggest issue, as brought up by Sutherland before, was the problem of having to start studies in English at the very beginning. It was not plausible that the youth of India could learn English quickly enough to be at a level necessary for university curricula because of the extreme foreign quality of English in India. "To the great body of the people of India English is as strange as Arabic was to the knights of the dark ages."[129] In order to establish Anglicist policies, "the Committee would have to commence everywhere teaching the English alphabet. It cannot be denied that this must be the beginning."[130] The government would have to replace the teaching of university level science and literature with rudimentary English. "The candidates for admission into our Arabic and Sanscrit Colleges know already much of those languages and are prepared to be taught science. The students we should get for English would require to be taught."[131] Macaulay annotated on this issue that proficiency in English was difficult but attainable. According to him, English was no stranger than "Greek was to the subjects of Henry VIII"[132] and "of course everybody must begin a language at the beginning."[133] But he reminded Prinsep to consider "whether we may reasonably expect in a few years to make an intelligent native youth a thoroughly good English scholar,"[134] which was the ultimate goal and possible with time. Therefore, Macaulay made a stronger point that while Anglicist policy had difficulties it was the only way to really create the most intelligent class of natives.

Prinsep then continued his argument, saying that not only was teaching English impractical, but there was also the risk that the youth might reject learning it. He wrote that he admits there was a desire for learning English in India; but this fervor was not apparent amongst the Muslims. "We have no reason yet to believe that the [Muslims] in any part of India can be reconciled to the cultivation of it much less give it preference to the polite literature of their race or to what they look upon as such."[135] This was so because of prejudice that existed in India among the natives against their English rulers. Macaulay and other Anglicists denied this prejudice, but Prinsep argued that it could become a major hindrance to Anglicist policy. "The prejudice is so general especially amongst the
Prinsep emphasized the false expectations Macaulay promised in his "Minute" if English teaching and Western curricula were established in India. In his "Minute," Macaulay drew parallels of the situation in India with the Renaissance and Europe and Russia and foreign knowledge. According to Macaulay, the outcomes that resulted from these two historical examples could be expected in India if English was chosen. In the first example, Macaulay stated the introduction or revival of Greek and Latin in Europe would have the same results as the introduction of English in India. Prinsep wrote that the government would be wrong to expect these results, because it was actually Oriental policy that would elicit a similar outcome. He wrote, "Latin and Greek were to the nations of Europe what Arabic and Persian are to the Mooslims and Sanscrit to the Hindoos and if native literature is to be created it must be through the improvements of which these are capable. He also noted that languages such as Latin were learned once before in prior European generations because of the Church, however, English has no history in India, "it is not the language of the erudite of the clergy and of men of letters as Latin always in Europe and as Arabic and Persian are extensively in Asia." Therefore to introduce English, a completely foreign language, would not create the intellectual fervor that the revival of the Classics did during the Renaissance. Instead, to revive Indian intellect and creativity, the languages that already flourished once before, Arabic and Sanskrit, needed to be stimulated.

The last example and perhaps the most convincing evidence Macaulay used in his "Minute" was the impact English had on Russia. Prinsep stated that this analogy was not convincing to him whatsoever. He argued that the introduction of English did not bring Russia to the intellectual levels of its European counterparts. Rather the interaction, communication and imitation of the foreigners along with translations improved Russia's native literature. Prinsep wrote that "this is the method that is specifically advocated by those who despair making English the language of general adoption or the vehicle for imparting knowledge of the sciences to the millions who compose the population of India." Prinsep, like the Egypt example, used Russia as an example too but twisted the argument to his favor. According to him, Russia was improved by similar methods that the Orientalists were employing in India. Macaulay in his annotations wrote simply, "Not the fact. The Russian educated class has acquired all that it knows by means of English," and because of English, Russia was beginning "to imitate and translate." Macaulay asserted that "This is exactly the course which I hope and trust that the educated class of our native subjects will follow."

Finally, Prinsep discussed the misconceptions Macaulay made in his "Minute" in regards to Oriental education and culture. The first major issue Prinsep attacked was Macaulay's assertion that no one would be educated in the oriental tradition unless the government paid him to do so. He argued that if this was true and that there was "the slightest ground for believing that the great body of the Muslims did not venerate to enthusiasm their Arabic and Persian literature or to believe that the Hindoos as a body were not partial to their Sanscrit," then of course the cause would be forgotten. Macaulay defended his comment in his "Minute" that, while "men may have a great veneration for a language," they may not wish to learn it. Macaulay also mentioned that he had recently contacted Rhadacant Deb, a noted Bengali scholar and educationalist, who was the governor of the Hindu College in Calcutta. According to Deb, Macaulay wrote, "nobody in India studies Sanscrit profoundly without being paid to do so. Men of fortune learn a little superficially. But he [Deb] assures me that to the best of his belief there is not even at Benares a single student of the higher Sanscrit learning who is not paid." Prinsep argued that
these stipends were very similar to the scholarships English students received at English universities and wrote to clarify the issue that "they are given not as inducements to study the language but as rewards of successful study." Although Prinsep did admit that students were receiving financial aid of some kind in oriental universities, but this by no means was ample reason for Macaulay to assume that none of these students were learning the material without money given first.

Macaulay also spent a great deal of his "Minute" discussing the money lost to maintain oriental printing and translated literature. Prinsep actually agreed with Macaulay, saying, "the translations have been the most expensive and least profitable of these works."[146] Prinsep, in agreeing with Macaulay, did not do any justice to his already weaker Orientalist argument. But he disagreed with the reasoning that because the printing of oriental literature was not profitable, it meant that there was no desire for the literature at all. Even so, Prinsep wrote, "There is not I believe in the Committee of Public Instruction a single advocate for a continuance of the printing and translating business."[147] Macaulay wrote in reply, "I rejoice to hear it. For within the last few weeks several minutes have been recorded which would have led me to form a very different opinion."[148] Prinsep then discussed the misconceptions Macaulay had regarding oriental culture and Macaulay's extreme comments in regards to native religion and law. Prinsep corrected Macaulay and stated that it was against Hindu and Muslim culture to make students pay for education. "Everybody knows that it is meritorious to give instruction gratis and sinful to take hire or wages from the pupil who receives it."[149] Also on the topic of native religions, Prinsep noticed Macaulay was very contradictory when addressing religion's purpose in the debate.

The circumstance [that in regards to religion] has been referred to as both proving and accounting for the confirmed veneration these classes have for their respective literature and because it has sometimes been denied that the natives have any respect for their own literature which is quite inconsistent with the idea that all their religion is wrapped up in it.[150]

As for the connection of oriental education with the false laws of India, Prinsep stated that until these laws are actually reformed by the government, it was not an acceptable argument for the Anglicist cause that English should be implemented because these laws are expected to change. Prinsep wrote, "For so long as this intention is unfulfilled the motive for continuing instruction in that which is the law exists in full force."[151] Yet, Prinsep was once again just correcting mistakes Macaulay made in regards to native religion and law rather than justifying the necessity of oriental education and culture to India's future.

Prinsep's "Note" was nowhere near as effective when compared to Macaulay's "Minute" and was not even circulated among the General Committee, nor did it ever reach Bentinck before he made his decision in March of 1835. Prinsep was persuaded to remove his "Note" from circulation based on the promise that the General Committee would be given the opportunity to debate Macaulay's educational proposals.[152] However, Prinsep learned later that this never occurred. Bentinck refused to allow his "Note" to be formally recorded in the governments General Consultations "on the grounds that the opinions of secretaries had no standing in the face of contrary conclusions reached by the governor-general in council."[153] The fate of Prinsep's weakened discourse in his "Note" only solidified the influence of Macaulay more persuasive discourse in his "Minute on Education."

On March 7, 1835, Bentinck signed a resolution favoring an Anglicist policy for the future of education in India. In a letter to the General Committee, Macaulay wrote on Bentinck's behalf that, "The Governor General in Council agrees with those gentlemen who are of the opinion that our great object ought to be the promotion of European Literature and science among the natives of India."[154] Though Bentinck's resolution was not necessarily new legislature, it effectively codified the direction the General Committee was to pursue from this point forward.
Educational funds were to be used to teach Western curricula and books were to be printed in English alone. "It has been brought to the knowledge of the Governor General that a large sum has been expended by the Committee in the printing of Oriental works. His Lordship in Council is pleased to direct that no portion of these funds shall hereafter be employed."[155] Any native wishing to receive a classical oriental education had to do so at their own expense. "His Lordship in Council decidedly objects to the practice which has hitherto prevailed of supporting the students during the period of their education. He conceives that the only effect of such a system can be to give artificial encouragement to branches of learning which, in the natural course of things, would be superseded by more useful studies."[156] Oriental languages, such as Sanskrit and Arabic, were deemed too "remote from the masses and the vernacular languages were too crude for the level of knowledge."[157] English also replaced oriental languages as the official language of record in Courts of Law. Macaulay closed this letter to the General Committee with, "His Lordship in Council directs that all the funds which these reforms will leave at the disposal of the Committee be henceforth employed in imparting the native population a knowledge of English literature and science through the medium of English language."[158] It was no coincidence that the points Macaulay outlined in this letter to the General Committee were also the points Bentinck emphasized in his Resolution of 1835. It was Macaulay's unrestrained and pure imperial discourse from one gentleman to another that swayed Bentinck to formally pursue Anglicist policies. Although the next Governor-General, Lord Auckland, somewhat modified Bentinck's educational directive, the English education of native bureaucrats in India was now a set policy, with long-range implications for civilization on the subcontinent that created a modern Indian culture based on the English language and education.
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