

## D.G.E. Hall, Empire, the Evangelists, and History

By Tze Shiung Ng (OC, 1987-1992)

The year 2011 carries a great significance for Caterham School. It marks the bicentennial of the founding of what was christened 'The Congregational School' by the Rev. John Townsend in south London in 1811. Townsend's Congregational School, as we know, after relocating twice during the nineteenth century, re-established itself at Caterham.

2011 and 1811, interestingly, also introduces another anniversary for Caterham. The school's wartime headmaster, D.G.E. Hall, was born in 1891. Many old boys, however, especially those of us who grew up in the Thatcher era and after, will fail to recognise the importance of this individual. This ignorance extends widely. Except to his students and colleagues at Caterham between 1934 and 1949, and at the School of Oriental and African Studies in the 1950s, the name of D.G.E. Hall in British public memory seems to languish in obscurity. Even Hugh Stafford's history of the school manages to be quite brief on him. In the United States, Australia, and Southeast Asia, however, Professor Hall, even after 30 years since he passed away, remains a giant of a figure. He was a prominent historian of Asia, and especially of Burma, where he lived and worked before coming to Caterham. He was the first to write, and write very successfully, a broad but detailed history of a region that was then becoming popularly known as 'South East Asia'. This seminal work was published in 1955, and immediately became *the* standard reference for scholars, diplomats and businessmen all over the world.

It is true, nevertheless, that Dr Hall's reputation as a historian developed largely during his SOAS, Cornell, and Monash years after Caterham. Why he went to Burma and why he went to Caterham, however, are still unclear. Yet this unlikely connection between imperial Rangoon and suburban Caterham is what strikes me most about Dr Hall. Given that his position as Professor of History at Rangoon University (in my opinion) easily outshone a Headmaster's job at a Surrey grammar school, it becomes curious to know what Dr Hall had seen in Caterham in comparison to Burma, and indeed what the Caterham board had seen in his Burma experience prior to his appointment. What did Dr Hall think of the world, and his place in it, after returning to England in 1933? I do not presume to be an expert on Dr Hall; that privilege is reserved for his friends and descendents. What interests me is Professor D.G.E. Hall the 'Scholar of Burma in Caterham'. His papers, mostly archived at SOAS, will reveal more deeply of his thinking, but a vigorous research will have to wait. Writing as I do in Malaysia, we do well enough under the circumstances to try to understand Dr Hall from what we already know of his public life.

Dr Hall is unusual to Caterham in two respects. Here was a headmaster who came not only from abroad, but from India - from the British Raj. And unlike his predecessors at Caterham, his family background has no non-conformist or Dissenting connection whatsoever. There is in Dr Hall's *alma mater*, King's College, London, a hint of an Anglican association, but the probability is that far from any religious devotion, let alone the Calvinist tradition of Townsend's Congregational School, Dr Hall was non-denominational in the entire scope of the word. He was, I believe, a modernist in the early twentieth-century *avant-garde* sense. As a modern historian, he took after the liberal imperial mould of Macaulay, Lord Acton, and G.M. Trevelyan. 'Faith' and 'Salvation' he would likely interpret as 'Liberty' and 'Progress'. As an intellectual, he may have been influenced by the *Annales* ideas of Lucien Febvre, perhaps even the Hegelian philosophy of

Benedetto Croce. Dr Hall's history was vast across time and space, yet also obvious in the present. My mentor at the Australian National University, Professor Anthony Milner, who was a student of Dr Hall in the 1960s, says that he was 'a grand, serious figure'.

A 'Great Tradition' of history can be attributed to Dr Hall. Although he will probably disallow such a description, his works do reflect a sumptuous view of the past. His Masters' thesis on the mercantile aspect of English foreign policy during the reign of Charles II, for example, indicates not only an understanding of constitutional law, government, and policy in societies of the past, but an interest in the relations between these societies. Charles II pursued a *dirigiste* mercantile policy like his cousin Louis XIV – England's Colbert was Josiah Child of the East India Company. In the East Indies, however, the two kings were always outsmarted by the Dutch East India Company, and by the late seventeenth century could only manage to secure a poor base in Bencoolen, Sumatra. They did, however, penetrate into the Asiatic continent. The Bourbon, Ayutthaya, and Qing empires exchanged embassies, and various English, French, Siamese and Manchu representatives rose to dominate the courts of Versailles, Delhi, Ayutthaya, and Peking. English and French cavaliers even became governors of the port of Mergui, the departure point of portage to the South China Sea. Free passage between east and west was lost when the Stuarts were deposed in 1688; Ayutthaya also experienced its own revolution of 1688; but the grand diplomatic *entente* and intercontinental exchange between these eastern and western monarchies prior to 1688 must have figured prominently in the thought of Dr Hall. Indeed, throughout his life his published works concerned mainly the historical relations between Britain, India and the East.

We therefore get a glimpse of how Dr Hall's interest and ideas had led him to travel east. The opportunity, I believe, could have come by way of his connections with the intellectual set in London. As President of the Union Society and editor of the King's College Review, Dr Hall was not inactive within this circle. He may have personally known the Bloomsbury people. These connections could explain his appointment as history teacher at Bedales, a progressive and secular boarding school then recently founded by Cambridge radicals and socialists (definitely not a Congregational school!). The man who probably signalled the need for a modern historian at Rangoon was a classical historian and philologist who already taught there, Gordon Luce. Dr Luce was a Cambridge Apostle, and I speculate that he played a generous role in endorsing Dr Hall for the job.

Rangoon University was established in 1920 from two constituent colleges. When Dr Hall arrived in 1921, it was already a hotbed for Burma's anti-colonial student movement. Anti-colonialism was nascent in the East at the close of the war; Rangoon University's student protest of 1920 came at the heels of the May Fourth Movement in China. Its resentment was directed against the very charter by which the constituent colleges, Government College and the Judson Baptist College, were amalgamated and given university status. But where the Baptist College was formerly independent, Government College already was an offshoot of the imperial university at Calcutta and functioned as a training institution for the 'native' civil service elite (or *Babu*). To Burmese nationalists, the license which the charter grants for Government College to swallow up the independent Baptist College portended an expansive British colonial state that also threatened the independence of 'indigenous' institutions such as the Buddhist Burmese monastic school. Dr Luce was employed by Government College, but as a philologist he shared with his brother-in-law, the Burmese scholar Pe Maung Tin, a great respect for the accomplishments of the founder of the Baptist College, Adoniram Judson. Their interest in the 'indigenous' manuscript and artefact also made them sympathetic to the Burmese student, as radicalised as he was. Dr Luce

was the only non-Indian Civil Servant in a history department of Indian Civil Servants, and in him Dr Hall, not quite an establishment figure himself, naturally found a ready collaborator and friend.

The distinction between the Civil Servant-scholar and the 'pure' scholar is highly relevant in the historiography of the British Empire. The scholar-administrator, as he is known, by virtue of his job often ends up writing history based upon documents which he (or his colonial predecessor) had produced himself. History therefore cannot be separated from policy, which it serves. This is particularly true in the British protectorates of the Malay States, whose mythological past was in the 1920s and 1930s rigorously being rewritten through the efforts of the Director of Education, Richard Winstedt. Winstedt's 'histories' reflect a 'British Malayan' society founded upon traditional institutions not dissimilar to those espoused by Edmund Burke in the late eighteenth century. Winstedt's conservative view in fact concurred with the post-war view of Stanley Baldwin's conservative government at the time. It idealised an insular Little England with ties to the colonies that were no longer based on dominionship but on a commonwealth of confederated home-ruled colonial states like Little Malaya. Burma, it would seem, proved to have benefited from a different interpretation of London's policy by the scholar-administrator. John Furnivall was a prominent historian at Rangoon University, but his Civil Service position as a senior land settlement officer led him to recognise the plight of the Burmese farmer, and to identify the latter's redemption in the autonomous ownership of his land.

It is pertinent to ask how D.G.E Hall, as a 'pure' historian, had in this electric environment of intellectual debate which involved students, teachers, and officials alike, envisioned 'British Burmah'. It is not an easy question, because in Dr Hall arises the contradiction of the grand history professor of the British Raj who, remarkably, was so revered by the same nationalistic students who later took up arms against Britain and helmed an independent Burma. An OC, William P. Edwards, for example, relates his experience in post-war Burma that 'he could do no wrong' after mentioning 'that Dr Hall had been his Headmaster'. Was Dr Hall, then, a Winstedt or a Furnivall? The answer, I think, lies in seeing the situation not in the colonialist-vs-nationalist context of the 1920s and 1930s, but in that timeless context *in loco parentis* between teacher and student, or father and child.

Dr Hall's understanding of Burma originates from the historical standpoint. It is founded upon the manuscripts of the ancient kingdoms on the Irrawaddy which Dr Luce had built a reputation from collecting. In a collection of essays by his protégé, Professor Oliver Wolters (who was a mentor to Dr Milner), Dr Hall is said to have complained that 'the history of Southeast Asian peoples had been overwhelmed, "thrust into the background",' because the 'authors of works on Southeast Asia tended to treat the first fifteen centuries "as only a preamble to the five succeeding ones".' On the other hand, Dr Hall's grasp of British constitutional history meant that he saw Burma's past relative to Britain's past, and Burmese society vis-à-vis British society. He was particularly fascinated by the first Commissioner of Burma, Sir Arthur Phayre – also the subject of his research that earned him his D.Litt – and it stands to reason to think that Phayre's attempts to educate the Burmese about British thought and culture in his own Buddhist Burmese environment was a huge influence on Dr Hall.

If he professed a political view, I think Dr Hall recognised that Burma will not necessarily benefit from British institutions, but rather that the British approach to liberty and progress could enable Burma's rich civilisation to acquire new knowledge, adapt to change, and negotiate for itself a Burmese modernity. To him the Burmese and his culture transcended the many shades of politics imposed by the west. Unlike Furnivall, Winstedt, or the Dutch planners of the Ethical Policy in

the Netherlands East Indies, Dr Hall did not agree to impose a wholesale policy on society. He believed instead that both the Burmese and the westerner stood to gain from an intellectual and cultural exchange, which the opportunity of empire provided. In the political sense, therefore, Dr Hall lay between Richard Winstedt and John Furnivall. He admired the values of Burma's past but did not think to reconstitute present society in its image. He was sympathetic to the British Burmese subject and yet he prized Britain's liberal tradition as the key to the Burmese subject's emancipation. To the Burmese, Dr Hall thought to repay the Burmese thought and culture that had enriched his learning by returning the same in his own British context.

Both as a teacher and as the warden of a student residence, the influence Dr Hall wielded on the development of the young Burmese was immense. The wealth of Burma's past which Dr Hall promoted must also have shaped the perspective of his students. Without doubt he contributed to the student's nationalist thinking in this way. Indeed, his students included the future leaders of independent Burma, Aung San (father of Suu Kyi) and U Nu. But Dr Hall's understanding of Burma was not the narrow one which appealed to Aung San and U Nu. As mentioned, he saw himself to have inherited the intellectual legacies of both Burma and Britain. To his students, therefore, he felt it noble to impart the values which he held dear. Liberty was not the zealous self-determination which Aung San would come to adopt, but the independence of the individual to make sensible choices for himself. Progress was not a nationalist or socialist utopia, nor the Raj, but the intellectual and economic development for the improvement of society without severing the first fifteen centuries of its history. 'Britain's attitude', Dr Hall would write in 1950,

'...sprang from a genuine desire to retain the friendship of the Burmese people. One of the most noteworthy features of British administration, too often overlooked by its critics, was the real understanding and friendship, which, individually, Britons and Burmese have always shown towards each other.

The Burmese desire for national independence was natural and inevitable. It took some at least of its inspiration from the system of education introduced by the British themselves. We taught them our language, our literature, our history and our political philosophy, all of which are steeped in the principles of freedom and popular self-government. Through such a medium, and through personal contacts with British teachers, have their best minds learnt to study the problems of the modern world.'

It is a credit to Dr Hall as both a teacher and a warden that his students in Rangoon acquired a sophisticated ability to interpret their society, their past, and their future in their own terms, even if the conception it produced was an anti-British one. The same broad and receptive approach to the world, Dr Hall introduced at Caterham – although, if he was a sanguine liberal upon starting at Rangoon, he may have after the ideological wars and economic recession of the 1920s and 1930s been a more cautious, if less spirited, liberal upon coming to Caterham. I conjecture whether at Caterham Dr Hall had tactfully condoned as reading material George Orwell's bluntly anti-colonial novel, 'Burmese Days'. I doubt, however, if he was selective over the schoolboy's exposure to ideas, for it is in keeping with his scholarly attitude to believe that he encouraged as wide as possible a scope of thinking within his students. This is aptly shown in an appreciation prepared by an OC for a reunion in 2008, in which he recalled the appointment under Dr Hall's tenure of one Lesley Daw:

'To our comfortable conservative Surrey there burst in this man, who was a SOCIALIST! He was a PACIFIST! He was a METHODIST LAY PREACHER! And most alarming of all, he

came from SMETHWICK, which appeared to us as a place of roaring blast furnaces in another world. Importantly, he taught English Social History, and for me, changed my worldview.'

The same OC described Dr Hall to have similarly sowed in him a revolutionary mode of thought in conceiving of the world:

'In the 6<sup>th</sup> form from 1944 to 46 we were helped and envisioned to see the world as it was developing: the end of the Indian Empire; the founding of the UN, ending of the War and the post war settlement; the Education Act, the new NHS; the coming in of the Attlee government.'

The ebbing of empire Dr Hall may have regretted, but the historian in him, I feel, would not grieve over its passing. He was not the Orientalist who is dazzled by the East, or the Sahib who relives memories of Curzon. And certainly he was not the ideologue who welcomes the replacing of an outmoded British century by a modern Asian one. Like Orwell, he understood that a new world can easily become rotten. I doubt, therefore, that he participated in the many competing 'Plans' which the colonial and foreign offices were then drawing up for India, Burma, Malaya, and the rest of the empire. As with the collapse of the Bourbon-Stuart-Mughal-Ayutthaya-Manchu world with which he dealt, change is the subject of the historian. He contemplates it; he does not paint it. Of the events since 1939, Dr Hall will have formed a philosophical view more than anything else. His epistemic approach to the changes in Burma and empire in the 1920s and 1930s, he repeated at Caterham in the 1940s. The object is to prepare the child for these changes through knowledge. But to embrace knowledge, the child needs first to be trained to open his mind.

Dr Hall's memory of Burma must surely include the drama of life and existence that he witnessed first hand. Burma was very much a terrain for both extremes of virtue and injustice – that is the fact of empire. Dr Milner informs that later in life Dr Hall 'enjoyed Flashman novels' because 'they reminded him of his own experience of empire.' The character of Flashman, of course, embodies all that was shallow, arrogant, and hypocritical about the colonial enterprise. The same allusions apply to Gilbert and Sullivan's character of Pooh Bah from the 'Mikado', which Dr Hall played at the Prep School in 1935 'with a rich bass voice and a fine appreciation of the part he was playing.' Dr Hall's Pooh Bah parodies a 'Lord High' of everything in whose power lie the fate of millions, but whose proud indifference makes him undeserved of this privilege. On the other hand, empire – more specifically, the British Empire – had people like Luce, Pe Maung Tin, and D.G.E. Hall. They are the Stuart cavaliers at the court of Ayutthaya and the Ayutthayans at the court of St James. To the school which Hall built, therefore, Dr Hall brought the mind of the Buddhist Pagan, Avan, or Taungooan, which even decolonisation should not deny. An OC recalls how,

'Our Sunday evening services were often conducted by one or another member of staff. In one term Dr Hall took all of the services and took as his subject for his addresses, one or another of the Far Eastern religions. I cannot claim to have gained any in-depth knowledge of the ground but I do still remember the sincerity with which he spoke, avoiding any invidious comparison or comment about that which to the western mind may seem to be bizarre.'

To his boys Dr Hall instilled the values and principles which he instilled at Rangoon, so that foreignness and newness became familiar, and they can emerge unafraid into the world to absorb its riches. There is something to be said about Dr Hall's nickname at Caterham: 'Pillar Hall and Upper Burma'. Apart from any rude reflection which 'Upper Burma' may construe, it does evoke the conception among the boys of a mental strength which Dr Hall was able to draw from his

Burma experience. I think Dr Hall saw that the world after empire could continue in the universal principles which empire had allowed people like him to disseminate in Burma. Rationalism, improvement, perseverance, independence, and respect – despite the apparent incongruity of his background to the school's Congregational heritage mentioned earlier, John Townsend will have approved of Dr Hall. To him these values define what was good about empire, if not empire itself. The world changes, but these changes do not have to affect us, as long as we remain resolute to the principles by which we should conduct our lives. The treasure of this world is not gained by conquest, preservation, or the ideological beliefs of man, but by our empathy with the next person. From the vantage of a shattered Britain in 1945, this is the only truth that a thinker of history who had experienced empire can identify. It describes, I feel, Dr Hall's gift of Burma to Caterham.

It is tempting to picture Dr Hall the Headmaster as a twentieth-century version of Thomas Arnold, the Victorian headmaster at Rugby who was immortalised in 'Tom Brown's Schooldays'. The comparison is qualified and valid. Old Rugbeians have long featured in empire. They include the Flashmans, but Thomas Arnold's charges particularly distinguished themselves in the second half of the nineteenth century as scholars, educationists, and missionaries who were enlightened in their attitude towards mankind. Thomas French, later the Bishop of Lahore, founded a missionary school in India: St John's College at Agra. Another learned missionary was Augustus Shears, who translated the Common Book of Prayer into Burmese. Dr Hall will not find the values which they imparted through their services to the colonial subject to be unfamiliar. They are best illustrated by the experience of an Old Rugbeian whom Dr Hall had known well. Maurice Collis was, like John Furnivall, a historian who was also an Indian Civil Servant. As the district magistrate of Rangoon in 1930, he sentenced a British army officer to a relatively short term of imprisonment for causing the death of a person with reckless driving, and the Indian mayor of Calcutta to a similar term for making anti-British statements. This was a brave decision by Collis, because state prejudice demanded that the officer be freed and the mayor hanged. Collis was sidelined as a result, but it was a small price to pay in order to save the integrity of British Law over the prestige of the British Empire. Empire, and British Burma, meant nothing if the principles upon which they rested were not defended. Collis returned in 1934 and published these accounts in 'Trials of Burma'. It was hailed by Orwell in a review for the BBC.

Thomas Arnold, nevertheless, represents the Anglican establishment – two of his successors at Rugby became Archbishop of Canterbury. Arnold's is thus the face of liberal and progressive values in empire that history has recognised. The teleological mission of empire, however, had begun much earlier, and notably from outside the Church of England. The American Baptist missionary, Adoniram Judson, preceded Thomas French and Augustus Shears by half a century. Almost single-handedly he spread Christianity in Burma, founded the Baptist College, produced the first Burmese-English dictionary, and transliterated a mass of religious, literary, and scientific treatises into Burmese and vice-versa. Without question, the liberal and progressive ideal which is thought to have defined 'empire' was initially and largely conveyed by non-conformist missionaries. Partly, this was due to a crisis festering within the Anglican Church. In much the same way that the landlord and merchant elites had since the late eighteenth century defied challenges to their monopoly on power and the economy, so traditionalists within the Anglican clergy had reacted strongly against the evangelical revival that threatened their ecclesiastical sovereignty. Liberal Anglicans like Thomas Arnold and William Wilberforce thus represented a minority in a system controlled by Pooh Bahs. The Dissenter, on the other hand, by virtue of his ecclesiastical independence, was able to naturally relate Scripture with liberal and progressive

values and move unhindered towards the setting up of missions for evangelism, education, poor relief, and the abolition of slavery.

Accordingly, Judson was sponsored by the Baptist Missionary Society in London. The Society also sent the first missionary to India, Rev. William Carey, who in 1818 founded the first missionary school there, Serampore College. Interestingly, the East India Company at the time considered the Dissenter's views to be radical and a threat to its interests, and denied him passage on all its ships. Missionary educators and scholars therefore came via Danish ships, like Carey, or via America, like the most famous missionary of all (for me), Rev. Robert Morrison. Morrison was sent by the London Missionary Society, the effort of non-conformist preachers in the London area. In 1818, he set up the first missionary school in Malacca, and stated its object, besides the 'diffusion of Christianity', to be the 'reciprocal cultivation of Chinese and European literature'. Dr Hall, it would seem, continued this tradition in Rangoon and repeated the same at Caterham.

It is a true gauge of the Congregational missionary's success that the institutions of learning with non-conformist origins in Malaya and Singapore heavily outnumber the Anglican institutions. They even equal, if not also outnumber, the older institutions with Jesuit origins. (Many agree they also outperform all.) Nationalism and nationalisation has since compromised the principles and values intended by Morrison – something Dr Hall will comprehend – but the ubiquitousness of these schools demonstrates the prodigious faith which their founders had placed in the liberal and progressive ideal that these schools were intended to spread. In Burma and Malacca, they were in no small measure helped by friends within the colonial government. One of Maurice Collis' popular books is a biography of Sir Stamford Raffles, largely regarded to be the founder of Singapore. Whether or not Sir Stamford was entirely converted to the missionary's liberal and progressive values, he clearly opened up the East to the evangelical fount and patronised the missionary's vocation. It is possible that the Governor-General at Calcutta at the time, Lord Moira, felt to fulfil a duty to his grandmother, Selina, the Countess of Hastings, who was a leading financier to the evangelical movement. A more obvious reason, however, is the personal admiration which Raffles felt for his cousin, the Rev. Thomas Raffles, a minister at the Great George Street Congregational chapel in Liverpool and a rising personality among non-conformist circles.

Thomas Raffles was born in Spitalfields, London. In his youth he was particularly influenced by the Congregational preacher Rev. William Collyer of Peckham. It is likely he was a familiar worshipper at other south London chapels, including Rev. Rowland Hill's Surrey Chapel at Blackfriars, Rev. John Rippon's New Park Street chapel at Southwark, and the Jamaica Row chapel at Bermondsey. In 1812 he succeeded the retiring minister at Liverpool, and in his letters to his cousin, now Governor of Java, he wrote of ambitions to train great numbers of lay missionaries to proselytise the East Indies. Rev. Raffles, however, did not build his theological school until 1840, when with two others he established the Lancashire Independent College at Manchester. Today it is affiliated to the University of London. If the building of the school was a busy undertaking in the empire, it was no less so in England. Rev. Raffles' college followed a long line of seminaries which went back to the eighteenth century and to the first theological academies that were neither at Oxford or Cambridge. Rev. Raffles was himself a product of Homerton Academy, reconstituted a preacher's training school in 1768 and today part of New College London. Homerton was sited at Hackney, and there another seminary was established in 1783 that was called Highbury College. Yet, shortly after, in 1802, another seminary was also set up in Hackney, known as Hackney Academy.

This sudden burst of college-building was not accidental. Homerton, Highbury, Hackney, and other similar institutions like David Bogue's Academy at Gosport were all founded by the same group of Congregational ministers who also founded the Missionary Society (known later as the London Missionary Society), the Religious Tract Society, and the British and Foreign Bible Society. This group constituted a second generation of adherents of the Calvinist Evangelical preacher George Whitefield, the disciple and rival of John Wesley. Their seminaries were staffed by lay instructors such as John Pye-Smith and George Collison who, though never properly schooled, possessed a breadth of intellect that raised the bar for future theologians like Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, the star pupil of Thomas Arnold's who became Dean of Westminster. Their activism for humanitarian causes such as Abolition too provided the foundation for Wilberforce's political agitation. Significantly, these pioneer seminaries and teachers produced third generation ministers like Thomas Raffles who in turn built more outreach seminaries elsewhere, and also fourth generation academy-builders like Charles Spurgeon. From the London Missionary Society meanwhile came lay instructors like Robert Morrison, who started the first in a great line of Anglo-Chinese Schools in the East Indies. One amongst this pioneering second generation of Congregational ministers was, of course, Rev. John Townsend, of the Jamaica Row and Orange Street chapels. Townsend, too, built in south London not only a Congregational School for the sons of the manse, but also what will become the Royal School for the Deaf.

What is more astonishing than this tremendous school building since the early nineteenth-century is the tremendous influence of its scholars and educators. The grand sweep of non-conformist colleges from Britain to Burma and the East Indies is matched by a grander *history* of young men and women throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries who were taught to see the world in similar terms of liberty and progress. In these men and women is reflected an epistemology of *empire* that was disseminated by scholars and educators from John Townsend to D.G.E Hall. Of course, there have been exceptions. Sir Stamford Raffles' own Raffles' Institution of 1823 in Singapore deviated from his cousin's (and Morrison's) college for the unprivileged layman. Like the later University of Calcutta, Rangoon's Government College, and Winstedt's Malay College, Sir Stamford's school was a political institution of the East India Company and the colonial government – i.e. it trained the *Babu* for the function of reproducing the authority of the Establishment. Raffles' Institution thus represents an epistemology of Empire which not only was naturally opposed to the colonial subject's conception of his conquered world, but also differed essentially from the values and principles represented by the non-conformists' network of schools.

These different conceptions of 'empire' led to a conflict of attitudes towards 'empire' which I have alluded to throughout this essay; i.e. Baptist College vs Government College vs Buddhist College, or Maurice Collis vs the Flashman Army Officer vs the Mayor of Calcutta. They resulted in different experiences of 'empire'. From our retrospective position in the twenty-first century, it is obvious that while the British Empire had long extinguished itself, many post-colonial national societies have also since either violently or peacefully reformed, reinvented, or revolted against themselves. Meanwhile, that grand, intellectual, and humanistic *empire*, in which fundamental values of humanity and freedom had permitted Stuart and Ayutthayan to exchange the intellectual gifts of their respective civilisations, continues to flourish in the present. This *empire*, which was envisioned by people like Townsend, Judson, and Morrison, and championed by people like Collis, Luce, and D.G.E. Hall, is the very story of existence itself. It is, I think, how Dr Hall understood, and lived, history.

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>.  
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.  
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.