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On the arrival in England of the news of a treaty having been signed with the Emperor of China, the Stafford Foreign Affairs Committee issued an address to their fellow-townsmen, in which this paragraph occurred:—"Well may the Chinese call us barbarians, for what else are we? Will that ill-used people, think you, receive Christianity from hands stained with the blood of their countrymen?"

This address was dated October 1, 1858. Thereupon, Mr. Urquhart addressed a letter to the Committee, pointing out the error of supposing that any religion remained amongst the English people. This letter was as follows:

"Your Address to your Fellow-townsmen is an admirable one, yet it contains a fatal mistake,—the assumption that it is Christianity that is so preached. I refer to the passage, "Will that ill-used people receive Christianity from hands stained with the blood of their countrymen?"

"To know a Christian there is the simplest of rules, which is also a divine commandment,—it is 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' You, not deceived in that matter, must surely know that in this land there are no longer Christians, and without Christians how can there be Christianity? When Christianity does not exist how can it be preached?

"The men inhabiting this land are, according to our Saviour's definition, Children of Hell; because, not being Christians, they seek to make Proselytes. Their fruits rise up in judgment against them—not merely those of bloodshed, but of proselytism attempted—and if, unhappily, they were to succeed, they would merely destroy, in the miserable so-called converts, that law which has been planted in them, and make them twofold more children of hell than those who have been engaged in proselytising them.

"Be not deceived as to the missionaries, and by that arch-heresy first invented by a Roman Pontiff, in derogation to the history and maxims of his Church, that religion has nothing to do with politics. If there were amongst the missionaries a single Christian, he would not be found in China or in Hindostan, but in England, denouncing a people of malefactors, and calling them to repentance.

"Our business, if we are not false hypocrites, does not conclude with restoring the Laws, or even commence there. We have to preach and teach our religion—the Religion of Christ; to refund Christianity in that place, where, above all on earth the task is difficult. The Pagan has, within himself, a natural reverence for that which real Christianity enjoins; and to him, that Christianity is not a mortal offence as it has now become to Englishmen, who will call you an infidel when you tell them what they are."

The Stafford Committee added this letter to their original address, and in this shape it was circulated as a handbill extensively throughout England. Thence it was that arose the question, "Are we a Christian people or are we not?"

It was then that the Bishop of Oxford, who had so emphatically denounced in the House of Lords the nefarious proceedings out of which that state of things had arisen which had ended in the treaty, attended several public meetings at which he applauded the treaty, not as a wise act of Ministers, but as a Divine interposition; and some correspondence had taken place between him and Mr. Urquhart on the subject which led the latter to infer, or to hope, that the like scandal would, if not stoned for, at least not be repeated.

However, on the 1st of December, the Bishop of Oxford attended another meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and again spoke. On that occasion he moved this resolution:—"That it is the duty of a Christian people to avail themselves of every new opening which is made for the preaching of the Gospel in heathen lands." In supporting it, he referred in the following terms to those who held that a people guilty of such deeds were not Christians, and could only become so by repentance and reparation:

"There were those in this country—though he believed their numbers were but few—who maintained that the nature of our present connexion with China, and the mode by which that land had been opened up to us so that we might enter with the message of the Gospel, were of so peculiar a character as to make it unlawful for us as a Christian people to use them for the spread of Christianity. That argument was addressed to those who, like himself, had felt it their duty to oppose to the utmost the late Chinese war. Now, he had neither heard, read, nor seen anything which induced him in the slightest degree to alter his opinion as to the character of those hostilities. He still believed that our ground of quarrel was unjust, and one which a Christian people ought not to have taken up. But it was said that, holding that opinion, it was inconsistent for him to assert that the Providence of God had opened up a country to our missions, when it had in fact been opened by the issue of a war the origin of which he thus condemned. However honestly this reasoning might be put forward, it seemed to be based on an utter misapprehension of the relations of this world to its Almighty Governor. A single verse in the second lesson for that morning would set this before every Christian man in the clearest light. In the account given by inspiration of the greatest crime ever committed by man on earth—the crucifixion of our Lord—what were the words used?—'Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain.' The relation was obvious. Man raged sometimes in his open sin, sometimes in his darkness as to what was right or wrong. But far above the results of this lower world and the all-mighty and all-righteous Governor, whose exclusive attribute it was to bring good out of evil, and to join together His own omnipotent administration with the free will of the creatures of his hands. And, therefore, when the fact had been accomplished, it became the duty of His people to sit down and read the indications of the result of Providence, and instead of seeking—which was impossible—to go back to the state of things that existed before the recent change, to bring the healing influences of the truth to bear upon that which had been shattered by those convulsions, and to do, even as Nature did—to clothe the débris of the mighty earthquake with the beauty and fertility with which the vegetable growth surrounded it. He held, then, that there was no inconsistency in believing that the war in its origin was unjust, and in saying that we ought now to use the results of that war for the benefit of the people whom we had injured. Nay, if his argument was sound, that only bound a new obligation upon them as a Christian people, because, if it was wrong for us to have engaged in that war, how was it possible for us now to wage the wrong? We could only cut off the entail of its judgments by declaring that the more we believed we had incurred responsibility by what had already passed, the more we would strive to turn its issues into a blessing."
Proselytism substituted for Righteousness.

First Letter.

Riverside, December 6, 1858.

My dear Lord,—Since that of Lord Lyndhurst on the Chinese Resolutions, the only speech I have read is your own of the first of this month, which I have just finished, and cannot lay down without addressing you, not in reference to its subject-matter, but on its historical bearings.

That speech is spoken, not to the audience at Wilius's Rooms, but to objectors to the propagation of the Gospel in China and Japan, whose views you explain, so far at least accurately, as not being opposed to Christianity, but as adopting a different standard of Christianity from yours. These objectors you describe as few in number. It is indeed a matter of surprise that any should exist. The purport therefore of this letter is to explain how they came into existence. I mention this that you may throw the letter in the fire, should such a narrative be without interest to you.

If there be a history connected with them, it is that their growth has not been a spontaneous one. The adoption of a new standard of morals involves a painful and humiliating effort, the impulse to which must come from without. There are none of them who have not cost me, some, hours; some, months; and some, years: so that while their numbers may appear to you remarkably few, they do appear to me surprisingly many.

These men had no previous homogeneity; some were earnest and pious; some benevolent and methodical; some frivolous and idle; some rude and disorderly. Whatever the intellectual interest of this diversified and incessant combat, the description would have no attraction, as its character must at no time be spare by a mind like yours, and will be perceived to consist not in conveying anything to them, but in inducing them to give up something which prevented them from being themselves.

The question will then arise, how the original transformation happened in myself. It did not come by any effort of my own, far less any purpose. I owe it to an accident, which was no other than the perception of the sense of rectitude in regard of public duties. I had just before been engaged in the function and every duty. I had just before been engaged in the duty of a human being, on being held in untutored men a sense of right and wrong, in respect to the grand field on which operates human passion—one in regard to which our enlightened religion has at once abrogated every function and every duty. I had just before been engaged in the war between the Greeks and the Turks; I had, therefore, been, and was a pirate; and had not so much as known it. What I suffered I can only portray by saying, that, with the feelings of a repentant felon, I should have gone and offered myself to justice had there been a tribunal to take cognizance of such crimes. It was only towards the morning of a sleepless night that the sense came home to me of the condition of the whole of my countrymen being parallel to what my own had been, and not only my countrymen, but all the European nations; and it was then that the idea of a possible atonement presented itself in devoting myself to the ationgment of awakening them from their judicial blindness. From that hour I date my intellectual existence; to it I refer every purpose and all the enjoyments of life.

Perhaps the first surprise was to find such thoughts amongst the professors of a creed which I then believed to have been extended by the sword. My first study, therefore, was of the Koran, which I found, no longer to my surprise, contained the elements of international law, even as it might be expounded by Vattel, and without the exclusion on the score of religion, which blemishes the exposition of Grotius.

The shock given to me by the sight of what my fellow-countrymen really were, had for a time unsettled my mind in all respects. I was in that very state which in England and in Europe has driven men into infidelity, atheism and revolution. The perusal of the book of a religion to which, at least, compared with Christians, its followers conformed themselves in their lives, might have afforded an escape, and I might have become a Mahomedan, had it not been that my next study was the Bible, perused now no longer as a thing of rote, or repeated as mere words, but striving after its sense and purpose; and then I saw that the Christian religion was not to be understood by the lives of its professors. It is this experience that enables me to cope to-day with the unbeliever and the atheist. I came home to England with the express purpose of applying myself to the study of the laws, generally of nations, and particularly of England. During the period of three years, in which I was so engaged, I spoke with no man: I lived in a desert. I knew that it was my duty to qualify myself first, and if it was God's will that there should be profit for others, I was satisfied that He would prolong my days.

But in this silence I shrink not from stating, and words to that effect did even then escape me which others have recorded, that on the due application of my mind to the objects on which it was then engaged depended the future fate of my country. This is the story I have to tell of the origin of the objectors to proselytism, as attempted by those who are themselves the daily crucifiers of Christ; objectors, whose zeal and numbers cannot fail to be increased by your speech.

It of course did not require the commission of such a crime as that perpetrated by us in China for me to know either that it would be perpetuated, or that it would be accepted when perpetrated, and justified when accepted. I had elaborated the case and argument by anticipation, and that argument was contained in the pamphlet I sent you, published sixteen years ago (Duty of the Church of England in regard to Unlawful Wars, 1849), and as that argument went to the charging upon the Church every moral deliction in the State, alike as the result of its not having taught it right, and of its not having denounced it when wrong, I did expect that you would have deemed it fitting to the subject, your station, and your intellectual endowments, to have disposed of these charges by a refutation, before again urging the people to "undo the wrong," not by repentance in themselves, and atonement to the aggrieved, but by contributions of money to hire missionaries.

I now ask you either to refute that pamphlet or to return it.

Now, admitting that your crimes are God's work; that it is just and fitting for religious men to accept and use this, their own crime, for religious ends; that it is possible for them under this stain, according to least to the notion of Pagans, to convert to their own creed the professors of other faiths; admitting all this,—which I imagine to be all that you contend for,—may I not ask...
you as a fellow-countryman for your protest against the indemnity clause in the Chinese treaty. Your “opinions in respect to the war are unchanged,” the treaty itself has not yet become an “act of God’s Providence,” it is still one of human deliberation; it is so because the worldly members of the Government recoil from it as too atrocious.

Surely you will not allow it to be said—neither yourself nor any other clerical member of the Church has remained otherwise than dumb when evil was to be prevented. The Indemnity Clause is the assertion that we have been wronged by the Chinese. If your speech of the 1st instant you assert that the Chinese have been wronged by us. In your judgment, therefore, the indemnity clause is a direct falsehood. If it is maintained, it makes your words a falsehood; if you assent to it in silence, you accept the interpretation. It seems to me, therefore, that your honour as a man, no less than your consistency as a politician, leaving entirely out of view the apostolical character which must appertain to missionaries if the conditions of that mission be fulfilled, and the prelatic character in connexion with the political integrity and Christian conduct of the land, requires from you, not merely a solemn protest against that clause of the treaty, but the exercise of all your powers to support the reluctance of the Government in appending to it the seal of ratification by the Queen, our Sovereign.

I can tell you that lay members of the Church, and men in high positions has called upon the bodies you refer to as “objectors to exert themselves to support the Government in its present dilemma against what they hesitate not to designate, the “insane fanaticism” which pervades the land. Let me moreover tell you that the appeals of those bodies, and their neighbours, have already been conveyed to the foot of the throne by her Majesty’s responsible advisers.

I will crave your indulgence for an endeavour with you still once more.

You asked at the public meeting not only for money for missionaries for China and Japan, but also for the prayers of your audience for God’s blessing on this work. The “opening of the door,” as effected by troops is only put by you as to be profited by through the “self-denial,” implying, of course, the estimable conduct of those who are to profit by it. Would it not, therefore, be of advantage in the premises to do something which would show to the Chinese, on the part of the religious community, some regard for the Christian religion, and would not the missionaries be more useful in their vocation in consequence of such an act? Now, the Bible having been translated into the Chinese, and the people of that empire having the opportunity of reading it, they are acquainted with the injunctions laid upon us; as, for instance, in the sermon on the Mount, when Christ says: “If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother and then come and offer thy gift.”

Of course, the merely not consenting to the demand for money from the Chinese, under the form of indemnity for our expenses in slaughtering them, would not be a reconciling of ourselves with our brothers so as to afford grounds for our continuing to offer up prayers for them. Christians, I still think, do not mean to be convulsions, misunderstandings, or, finally, wars from the nearer parts of the East and from the New World, all equally results of the same “predetermined system”—whether it be revolts of other colonies and dismemberments of the empire, again results of the “predetermined system”—whether it be, finally, the terrors of French invasion and war with France, the ultimate crown of the “predetermined system.” You, a Missionary Churchman, having revolutionised the fallacy of a distinction between religion and politics, must accept the consequences of the contrary truth; having done away with the idea of the religious classes who had betrayed the nation into this course? In what position will then be the political classes who had betrayed the nation into this course? What position the religious teachers, who have stepped out of the limits desired by the people guilty of them. The second is, that that system, in which it will be prudent to sit down beforehand and count the costs. From the eyes of common men these costs are at present veiled. Speeches, encouraging of passions—and specially religious passions—are sure to be applauded. It is never difficult to commend the Athenians to the Athenians. You have no risks to run from the Dissenters or the Roman Catholics; their moral standard is no higher than your own. These facilities, which conceal the coming costs, also prepare them; foundations in sand are easily dug.

* House of Commons, February 3, 1857.

Mr. Disraeli:—“I cannot resist the conviction that what has taken place in China has not been in consequence of the alleged pretext, but is, in fact, in consequence of instructions received from home some considerable time ago. If that be the case, I think the time has arrived when this House would not be doing its duty unless it earnestly considered whether it has any means of controlling a system which, if pursued, will be one, in my mind, fatal to the interests of the country.”

Lord Palmerston:—“The right honourable gentleman (Mr. Disraeli) says, the course of events appeared to be the result of some system predetermined by the Government at home. Unfortunately it was.”
A People which has ceased to be Christian cannot convey Christianity.

Second Letter.

Jan. 26, 1859.

My Lord,—I wrote to you a letter on the 6th of December, on your speech delivered on the first of that month. That letter was published. You replied to me on the 14th, and marked your reply "Private." I answered by a detailed examination of your letter and sent it to you in type, accompanying it by a private letter, asking your reason for marking "private" upon a letter having solely reference to matters of public business and religious duty. You replied to this in a letter marked "Confidential," requiring the suppression of your letter: this involved the suppression of my reply. I replied by saying that I should not publish your letter, but that I should enclose it to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

However, having since, however, taken legal opinion upon the subject, I am advised that his Grace, even if so disposed, could not act upon that letter, as it would come under the head of a "privileged communication." I am, therefore, reduced to the necessity of canceling that portion of my reply which bears upon the terms of your letter.

Nor do I regret the necessity, seeing that the fountain of reflection which it suggests is so inexhaustible, that it is on your own abundance that you must charge my words. You quote a passage from the first—"if I may so call it—missionary preaching of the Gospel. There are two such, presenting a singular contrast—the one, of St. Peter to the multitude; the other, of St. Stephen to the scribes and Pharisees ("those of the Council"). The hearers, in the first instance, were "pricked to the heart," and three thousand were converted; in the second, the hearers were "cut to the heart," and "grasped with their teeth.

The argument in both was the same: "Do not imagine that you have power against God because you have been able to crucify Christ; do not imagine that it is His will you have been doing in committing that crime. Learn that you are murderers, having shed innocent blood. Repent, therefore, that ye may believe and believe that ye may be saved."

We are not in possession of the counter arguments which prevailed in the Council, but we are in possession of the result obtained in the multitude. We do know that through the latter Christianity was established; and we also do know, that the—"for the time—triumphant argument of the Pharisee ultimately failed.

I have the honour to be, &c.,

David Urquhart.

Might I suggest the other side: the application of a powerful mind to the "predetermined system"—the bringing to bear thereon the knowledge of the law and the rule of conduct commanded by religion. One so armed, and, moreover, speaking with the authority of the Church, becomes an eye to a darkened political understanding and a conscience to a falsified religious profession. This, too, would be a war. This would be martyrdom, but to truth and faith. Then welcome the storms men's violence might arouse, the disasters which messengers might bring—welcome even the ruin and extinction of the land—for one conscience would have been saved, if not a remnant of just men preserved, witnesses against evil times and harbingers of a better day.

I have said that I would not allude to the subject-matter of your speech, and if I do so in conclusion it is only because the fountains of reflection which it suggests are so inexhaustible, that it is on your own abundance that you must charge my words.

For men in public office to put the words "private" or "confidential" on letters of public business, then only an understanding and a conscience to a falsified religious profession. One so armed, and, moreover, speaking with the authority of the Church, becomes an eye to a darkened political understanding and a conscience to a falsified religious profession. This, too, would be a war. This would be martyrdom, but to truth and faith. Then welcome the storms men's violence might arouse, the disasters which messengers might bring—welcome even the ruin and extinction of the land—for one conscience would have been saved, if not a remnant of just men preserved, witnesses against evil times and harbingers of a better day.

I have said that I would not allude to the subject-matter of your speech, and if I do so in conclusion it is only because the fountains of reflection which it suggests are so inexhaustible, that it is on your own abundance that you must charge my words.
and said as succinctly as emphatically, in my short letter to the
Stafford Foreign Affairs Committee, out of which the whole dis­
}usion has arisen, was—

A people which has itself ceased to be Christian
cannot convey Christianity to others.

And yet these words contain nothing new. They are but the
application of your own in the House of Lords. You then and
there asserted the impossibility of Christianity being introduced
by us into China in consequence of this "Chinese war;" you
further showed how that war, in itself and by its reaction, had ex­
tinguished Christianity in this land, for it had made us a people
of "wolves." Men may cease to be Christians without becom­
ing wild beasts, but no one ever heard of wild beasts belonging
to any religion whatever.

The declaration in my letter to Stafford was, moreover, in per­
fect accordance with the opinions of your followers, and of the
subscribers to the Chinese mission. Had it been otherwise, they
must have contradicted you at the time and at Willie's Rooms
they must have called upon you to recant the heresy you had
uttered, or, at all events, to explain how, after declaring the imprac­
ticability of conversion in China, and in the inhuman and un­
christian character of the English race, from the date of the
Canton massacre, you could now call upon them as Christians to
subscribe money for this conversion.

I do not say—but the very reverse—that it is not desirable
that the Chinese should be made partakers of the blessings of Chris­
tianity. I had corresponded with you only because I proposed
to make Christians of the English, and declared that what you were
doing to make the Chinese Christians could only harm the morals of
the English. The falsification of the argument you are pretend­
ing to reply to is so remarkable as this. That reply consists in
putting "duty" against "unlawfulness," while you can only speak
of "duty" in the case by assuming two things to be true which
my real argument was a denial of—namely, that we are a Chris­
tian people, and that the infamous Chinese treaty, obtained by
wicked violence, was "an opening for the preaching of the
Gospel."  

The disorders of a State come from the mental weakness of its
people; errors are not the fruit of the proper use of man's faculties.
This weakness exhibits itself in, and if I may so say, strengthens
itself by, erroneous views, which enable a man to escape from what
he has to examine. The character of every great mind has therefore
been, abhorrence of generalities; and the history of such a mind is
its struggle with them.

Recognising your powers, I should have expected that, even if
indifferent before to what you might have called "the acts of the
Government," on the plea that "religion has nothing to do with
politics," you would have been startled out of that dream when you
found the consciences of your flock put in jeopardy through falacies
destructive of the understanding, and made into a cloak for
infamies revolting to the human sense of the leastcultivated
of mankind.

My letter was devoted exclusively to China. It would have
been indeed worse than useless had I linked together China and
India so far as our conduct was concerned. First, because of the
entire dissimilarity between that which has been done in China
and that which, until quite recently, has been done in India;
and secondly, because I should then have been propagating, not
counteracting, the new fallacy by which the nation cheats itself,
or is cheated, out of the sense of doing its duty. This is by say­
ing, "We were bad before and we are not worse now; nothing
new has happened, and therefore nothing that is not familiar has
to be thought of. We have hitherto accepted whatever the
Government did; why should we not do so now? We have
been very great rascals in India; we cannot have been greater
rascals in China. We admit that we were wrong; what more
do you want?" It is not by powerful arguments that nations
are ruined, but by weak phrases, which sometimes require
ert in their construction.

There was indeed in my letter the indication of a connexion
between China and India, but it was not as passing from India to
China, but as reacting from China upon India.

On the arrival in this country of the unexpected news of the
Canton massacre, the leader of the Opposition in the House of
Commons said that this event could not have originated in China,
but in instructions sent from home. He further said that these
instructions were part of a "system," and that the system endan­
erg the honour of the British name, and the stability of the
British power. The Minister did not deny, that the events which
had occurred at Canton, had been the result of instructions from
home; he did not deny that instructions had been issued, but mere
in conformity with the general purposes of the
Government, for which he accepted the word "system" together
with the qualification "predetermined." But while pleading
guilty to the charge, he put in a protection, which was no less
than the concurrence in this very system of the very men who
charged him. "You," he said to them, "came into office at the
close of the last Chinese war. It was you who made the former
treaty with China, and that treaty bore its natural and necessary
fruits in the predetermined incident of the lorcha, and the sys­
tematic massacre which ensued." His vindication was triumphant.
Now in my letter to yourself I had quoted these words, "predeter­
mined system," as connected with the fatuity of our recent course
of un instructed action, with the barefaced assumption of the
"system" that could explain it or the physical power that could
enforce it; and I showed that the "predetermined system" which had commanded the
massacre of Canton for a lie, had extinguished our Indian army for a
bit of grease, and had annihilated our English army on a Cim­
erian excursion; the whole picture illustrating a house made
use of by an enemy, and China, no less than India, equally pre­
pared to Russia's hands. The word "predetermined system" was,
therefore, adding a new ingredient to administrative crime, and a
darker hue to popular agitation and religious fanaticism.
Here were either momentous truths or contemptible illusions.
The writer had by you either to be disregarded as a maniac, or
his statements to be dealt with in earnest sobriety. But all this is
passed by, except that out of it is extracted the occasion to
renew the delusion that nothing new has happened, that we are
perfectly honourable and secure, on the grounds that we have
always been immoral and base.

The phrase "predetermined system" was the successor to "con­
nivance and credulity," itself the successor to "conivance or
credulity." The substantive "system" indicated completeness
and generality, coherent so that it should attain its ends, expan­
sive so that no portion of the surface of the earth should escape
its action. The adjective "predetermined" marked the explana­
tion not to lie in accident, but in the prior and powerful, though
secret and disguised, operations and efforts of some human mind.
"Predetermined system" was a polite paraphrase for TREA­
SON.

But, indeed, treason can be perpetrated only against a people
who are true to themselves, or have something to which they can
be true. You, my Lord, who hold murder without passion in its
purpose or limit in its application to be an act of God's provi­
dence, must hold treason in a minister to be praiseworthy in
itself, since it has been the active cause of the breaking of the
Ten Commandments by y' ar country to open a Chinese door for
the Gospel. I am constrained to contest these points with you
because being now the antagonist with whom I have to deal in
England, I have to show to your followers the futility of every
attempt on your part at a logical reply. But do not for a moment
suppose me guilty of the discourtesy of imagining that I am
addressing such arguments to your own mind.

But this consideration I do submit to you. That you cannot
maintain your present position with regard to the Chinese war
without doing violence to your filial piety. According to you,
your father set himself up against the will of Heaven in striving
to arrest the crimes of one set of men and diminish the sufferings
of another; because he did not rejoice in the capture of men in
wilds of Africa; he did not call it an act of Providence to
make them partners of the blessings of Christianity; he did not
attend meetings to hire missionaries for slave ships; he did rot
say "The slave must not be cast forth to perish although his capture was a crime," but to "cut off the entail of judgments" (say "crimes"), he must be kept in bondage and converted to Christianity." That was the argument on the other side, as it is of the slavemaster to this day.

My letter concluded with a proposal, which was also an appeal—a proposal based upon, and the necessary sequence to, your own emphatic declarations on the 1st of December. This was, to protest against the indemnity clause of the Chinese treaty. I pointed out that, having said that "we had wronged the Chinese," an indemnity—the meaning of which is, that we have been wronged by the Chinese—made your words a falsehood, and that your not protesting against that clause, was to accept on your part that interpretation. In replying to me you avoid all notice of the Chinese indemnity.

That which I called for might have been treated distinctly from the great question at issue, which is whether you be Christians or not. That protest could have been made without interference with missionary labours, and must to the humblest apprehension—even to that of those who expect success—have been manifestly conducive to that end.

On this point, however, you have not been equally reserved with others, and have assigned, as your grounds for not protesting, "the impracticability of such a measure"—which means, that you desire to do as proposed but cannot.

That which it was proposed to do, did not depend for the doing upon others, but solely on yourself. You chose to do it, or you did not choose to do it. The negative answer could only be "I do not choose." In so far as this was concerned, the act of protest could only come when other men had failed. Protest is the reservation of rights invaded by force, and is, therefore, practicable only when other courses are impracticable.

That which was called for was a specific declaration by a Christian prelate against a deadly sin in actual progress. If that be impracticable, the Church has no power to reprove sin; such a Christian prelate against a deadly sin in actual progress. If that be impracticable, the Church has no power to reprove sin; such a Christian prelate against a deadly sin in actual progress. If that be impracticable, the Church has no power to reprove sin; such a Christian prelate against a deadly sin in actual progress. If that be impracticable, the Church has no power to reprove sin; such a Christian prelate against a deadly sin in actual progress. If that be impracticable, the Church has no power to reprove sin; such a Christian prelate against a deadly sin in actual progress. If that be impracticable, the Church has no power to reprove sin; such a Christian prelate against a deadly sin in actual progress.

But the Church, which is too weak to palliate and which is too weak to denounce, is also, too weak to remain silent; in the alternative between charging a Minister of State with murder, and calling God a murderer, it chooses the latter.

Such is my perception of the history of the case; if confirmation was requisite, I should find it in the ambiguity of your words written in reply to myself, and in the absence of any specific scheme for effectuating the breaking of the entail of which you speak, as will be revealed by the impossibility in which you will find yourself of affording me any answer on the practical points which I shall have to put to you.

The description I have given of the change effected in England during the last five and twenty years is but the counterpart of what I had announced in anticipation. I then said that by crime, if a member of the Cabinet could so effectually overreach his colleagues as to enact it on a great scale, this nation would find itself placed absolutely in the hands of the man who had conceived the plan and executed it. But I also showed that that Minister, acting for Russia, was endowed with her intellectual power and received her political support. I enclose a corroborative extract. *

I now pass to the scheme which you propose for the acceptance of your contrymen.

The word "crime" has been used by you: that is a term conveying the results of a judicial sentence, and therefore carrying consequences with it: those consequences are, the execution of the sentence. When, then, it is used to designate any particular act, or a description by which that act is to be known, it will be subjected to the torture of the law according to the nature of the crime which it constitutes. In the present instance, being murder, the life of the murderer is forfeited in an individual case; in a collective case the life of those engaged in the crime is forfeited; the rest of the community being only acquitted of murder in so far as they have brought down the penalties of law upon those by whom it has been individually planned and carried into effect. All these consequences are contained in the epithet itself, and it is only in so far as this sense has been so contained in the word that there has existed, or can exist one hour of safety or tranquillity for the human race. And so powerful has been the sequence of thought, that whenever crime has been committed, the task and
the ingenuity of the evil-doers has consisted in disguising its character, and their hardihood exhibited in calling it by some other name.

Your words seem to imply a disavowal of the term from its consequences, and therefore I have to ask you for a specific answer as to whether you hold crime to be commissible without being followed by punishment; and sin, the religious term for crime, commissible, in the case of Christian men, without being followed by repentance, atonement, and reparation.

I now proceed to the particular crime which we have committed in China. It consists in breaking four out of the Ten Commandments.

We have broken the Ninth Commandment by lying; first, by bearing false witness against him; and, secondly, by proposing to steal from him a sum of money, under a pretext which causes him to bear false witness against himself (the indemnity clause).

We have broken the Eighth Commandment by the seizure and destruction of his property.

We have broken the Sixth Commandment by slaying without the forms of war, or so much as a pretext, which is murder. There is no difference between us as to the nature of these acts, which you have already described in their progress, and which you speak of in their inclusion as entailing the curse of God.

Such acts are also forbidden by the Reformed Church of England and Ireland as established by law. If required citation of authority on such a point, I would refer to that one of the Thirty-nine Articles which defines a Church to be "an assembly of faithful men," and that other article which permits to "Christian men the use of weapons at the command of the magistrate," from which it follows that the men ceasing to be faithful the Church ceases to exist, and also that the men who use weapons otherwise than as so specified—that is, under the sanction of law—cease to be Christians.

As there is no article specifying any process or performance by which unfaithful men shall be reinstated as Christians; and as no article contains any form of Indulgence for sin and crime, and Proselytism is not so much as even mentioned in any article of our faith, either as a duty standing by itself, or as a means of compensation for sin or crime, general or specific, I have to ask you, first, for a direct answer upon the point raised for myself in my position in which I stood before the breaking in this manner of the believer or the penitent knew what he had to pay and what he was to receive. The word "entail," as familiarly a portion of our existing legal Constitution as "curse," applies to succession of useful possession, and that the sense you use it in is the reverse; but this conversion involves a deeper meaning in the mind, which has therefore to be interpreted thus. The beneficial use or property which you held in yourselves, in your religion, in your laws, in your wealth, and in your country, and which to descend in your line, is converted into a negation of those terms, which negation is to be continued in your line. On the part of your Maker, you are smitten with the penalties which by treason you would incur from an earthly ruler; your property escheats; the brand of infamy is upon your persons; perdition lies upon your soul; you are excommunicated on earth, you are cut off from the Church of God. These forms of condition must continue in you, and be transmitted through you to your descendants.

In this case nothing can be more explicit than your terms, nothing more vivid than the representation of the condition so defined. But as that condition is given only to pass off to something else, the explicitness and the vivacity must be transferred to the operation which you suggest for the redemption of the individual and the State. As you pass by the spiritual remedies provided in such a case—viz. those of repentance and atonement—the scheme must be one of business; in fact, you propose that something is to be offered to God, so very agreeable to Him as to induce Him to forego his judgments, declared by Himself to be eternal. This being of course effected, not through any act of valition, but through a change of the will or any purpose of the mind, for in excluding the spiritual operation as regards sin, this view of the case is entirely shut out; it comes to be a mere value, not desired for your creditor, but placed in his hands. To that creditor you have forfeited England. You propose to re-enter into possession, by an exchange; but the equivalent not being in your possession your scheme amounts to this: that you shall levy out of England before surrender, a contribution, by means of which you shall obtain the religious possession of China, which you are then to exchange for England. The operation is put in this very formula by the Bishop of Victoria.

Now, before this scheme can be accepted, we must sit down and count the costs. As it is your proposal, it must be for you to present a schedule of the numbers and property of those liable to contribute. We must have a specification of the rates to be imposed, of the sum to be levied, of the numbers and qualifications of the agents to be employed; and we must also have some idea of the time which the operation would require for the conversion of a population exceeding in numbers tenfold the population of Great Britain and Ireland, and situated on the other side of the globe. Mere alms-giving, as in the case of the widow's mite, may have a religious value, not ratable by a mere monetary standard; but in this case, money is the very essence of the operation.

In this revival, under a new form and for a new purpose, of those practices of the Church of Rome which led to the Reformation, it is impossible not to refer to the precedent for instruction which the mediaeval Church of Rome were not left vague and indefinite, even although it was not as prevalent by means of them to cut off any entail whatever, far less to secure an extraneous possession through which the bargain was to be effected. A rate was specified, sum and figures were fixed, and the believer or the penitent knew what he had to pay and what he paid it for. I, in like manner, ask you to inform me what sum of money I am individually to pay, under your scheme, to resume
my station of Christian without repentance amidst a community of murderers? Let me add that I am amazed, seeing you hold such consequences to be involved, that in replying to my letter you did not call upon me for my quota of the redemption-money.

But, supposing that you were to give me an explicit answer as to what you mean, by substituting any scheme of practicable proselytism for repentance—which you are bound to do in evidence that you are sincere—still, as again sincerity would amount to nothing more than the denial of the holy writings and of the articles of faith of the Church of England, you would leave me in equal embarrass— and that, even if I were prepared to accept a decision of the Church to-day as superior to all antecedent commandments of Heaven, or enactments of men, for in that case the authority of a synod would be required to draw up new articles of faith.

The basis of the scheme for the redemption of England is the money to be subscribed for the conversion of the heathen. This must be in our power to withhold, for otherwise the granting of it could ensure us no equivalent. You, however, designate the conversion of the heathen, and therefore the means for that conversion, as something which it was not in our power to withhold, and consequently unavailable for obtaining an equivalent. You call it "Duty." If a duty, we are bound to its performance, irrespective of anything else; and you could not speak of a duty as a work of Supererogation, which must be which ensures us an Indulgence; the non-performance of a duty would be a dereliction, entailing its own curse. If it be a duty the scheme fails to the ground at once; if it be a duty, the performance of it is entailed on each individual believer, and we must all of us sail away for China. If it be not a duty, it must be a work of Supererogation, and the scheme is based upon works of Supererogation. The understanding of the scheme thus requires that you should be explicit in answering the question: how, conversion being a duty, it can be offered as an equivalent? And as here are further involved at once doctrines now invented for the first time, as well as the revival of those which immediately led to the separation of the Reformed Church from the Church of Rome, namely, works of Supererogation and Indulgences, which propositions it is not for a platic to put ambiguously and inferentially, I beg for an explicit answer on these points: whether the performance of a duty can be a work of supererogation? whether you hold works of supererogation as a doctrine of the Church? and whether you admit the practice of indulgences?

As you propose that the duty is to be redeemed by a sum of money, another new dogma is involved—the vicarious performance of duties. If a duty so essential in itself and so awful in its secondary consequences can be vicariously performed, what duty is there that cannot be performed in the like fashion?

The Christianity of the Church of England will henceforward be conducted on the old militia system, by substitute. We may then hire a man to go to church for us, to be honest for us, to be truthful, to be charitable for us; the effect of which must again be that we shall ourselves enjoy the contrary habits—a condition of things which, doubtless, the scoffer will explain as a religion by which a man may go to heaven by hiring another to go to hell. You will, therefore, see that I cannot avoid putting to you the question: Does the Christian dispensation admit vicarious performance of duties? and what contribution to the missionaries cut off from me the entail of curses? The Mahomedan Church has one circumstantial duty, which may be vicariously performed, viz. the pilgrimage to Mecca.

All men could not perform it. Of those who possess the means for its performance, some might be personally incapacitated, in which case a substitute is permitted. This substitute himself derives no spiritual advantage therefrom. This point has to be considered and settled in reference to the missionaries. Do they receive into themselves, and, receiving, do they absorb, the righteousness, produce of supererogation? Do they merely transmit the righteousness to the investors in the funds? Can they, and to what extent, participate in the righteousness by separate investment, by extra hours of service, or proceeds of conversion exceeding some calculated rate? And, if so, what is the method of distribution and the process of adjudication?
conscientious duty is involved in taking what care I can, that my
fellows and fellow countrymen shall not be exposed to the
civil and moral penalties arising out of this additional curse, by the surrender of
their faith to sentences the meaning of which they have not the
penetration to discover or the courage to demand.

As regards the results of the proposed scheme, in your speech in
the House of Lords you state conversion to be “next to impossible,”
on the grounds of the hatred aroused in the breast of the Chinese.
But on the 1st of December, in moving a general resolution, that it
is a duty for us to avail ourselves of every opening for conversion,
you specify China as one of these openings. You do not retract
what you had said in the House of Lords, nor even refer to it, but
throw in a new element, and that is, “the fears” excited in the breast
of the Chinese people. As this new consideration is neither reli­
gious nor ethical, but diplomatic, it has, it appears to me, to be
submitted to professional men in that branch, and was by no means
within the province of a churchman. As a diplomatist I should first
have to distinguish between fears affecting a Government and
as affecting the individuals. I can admit “fear,” under actual
circumstances, as operating on the first, but I must deny its opera­
tion on the second. If you will make the effort of placing your­
self in the position of a Chinaman in each category, you will have
no difficulty in perceiving the distinction and in following the
application. Suppose yourself a mandarin administering the
province of Canton. You will at once understand in what direc­
tion your “fears” of England will operate. You will have to
violate the decencies of your society in the manner of receiving an
English political agent or sea captain. You will have to submit
to coarseness and outrages on their part, or on that of any drunken
sailor. You will have to wink at the infraction of the Customs
Laws, the Navigation Laws, and the Police Regulations. You
will have to render unjust sentences on the judgment seat. You
will have to furnish money as bribes to all sorts of persons.
On entering the office, you will be in purgatory. But the alternative
will not be left to you of conversion. If you did become a con­
vert you would not be spared one ounce of pressure on the part
of the Barbarian intruders, while you would risk being torn to
pieces in the streets by the horror which your apostasy would
excite amongst your fellow-countrymen.

The case of the provincial mandarin is that of the Emperor
and his servants in the capital. The English Government, or
rather the “predetermined system” in putting its hand on their
throat, does not say, “I will take it off when you repeat the
Athenian creed, and acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the
Archbishop of Canterbury.” But “you must accept the
predetermined system” for a band of fanatics, and knows full well that the missionaries are employed only
to increase the present pressure and provoke the ultimate catastrophe.

If you will now put yourself in the place of a trader at
Pekin, you will see at once that the “fears” in question will not
come down to you, and therefore you will not take them into
account when listening to a missionary, denouncing the pains of
hell against yourself and your people if they do not fall down and
worship the print and binding of a volume which he holds up in
his hand. For “fear” to operate in such a case, a man in a red,
not a black coat, is required, not with the Bible, but a sword in
his hand.

The only sensible proposal I have seen is that of the Americans,
of an “armed missionary operation.” British opinion is evidently
making progress in this direction. The first diplomatist of our
times, Sir John McNell, tells us that a “religious civilisation is
worth fighting for.”

As, therefore, the “fears” which you directly apply to the
Government, by expeditionary coercion on the coast, are not
directed to enforce a change of religion on the Emperor and his
court, and these “fears” do not come to bear upon the individual
members of the community, it is clear that your first task will be
to change and convert the “predetermined system,” and constrain
it to offer to the Chinese Government conversion in exchange for
coercion.

This I can assure you, as being thoroughly possessed of
the source, narrative, strength, and purposes of that system is as
entirely beyond your strength as it would be for vapour to battle
with the wind or repel the thunderbolt. This, indeed, you have
experienced, as the result of your own endeavours in the House
of Lords, and you have seen the same impetus to Lord Lynd­
hurst as well as to Lord Derby and his party. Resistance—at
least such resistance as you can dream of making—can only end
in (as is again your case) lending your co-operation, and (as in
the case of Lord Derby) being told that you are only attacking
yourself.

Let us grant, however, for argument’s sake, that you bring over
the “system,” inducing it to renounce its scheme of converting
China, converting it to a belief in God, making its belief consist
in proselytism, and applying this to the Chinese Government.
I will go further, and admit the Chinese Government to be
converted. What then will happen? Of course universal rebellion.
Then will come the question of the troops, ammunition, and
munition, which you will have to send out; first, to put down the
rebellion; and only after that, you have to consider the forces
which will be requisite for bringing the element of “fear” to
bear on each individual Chinaman.

On a practical point, such as this, the Society for the Propaga­
tion of the Gospel should consult professional men. The most
capable will tell you that the attempts of a similar nature in India
now impose for its mere retention the yearly sacrifice of twenty
thousand British soldiers, England meanwhile descending in
Europe to the rank of Holland. Thus, without a conscription,
we have already reached the limit of the possible performance of
the duty of conversion by gunpowder.

The “armed missionary” system must therefore be in the
nature of the Crusades. The wise Governments and virtuous
nations constituting Christianity and civilisation must combine
their resources. This will entail some preliminary difficulties in
respect to Anglican bishops, &c. Supposing these adjusted to
your satisfaction, then comes the question, whether the entire
resources of Great Britain, France, Italy, Spain, Germany, the
Scandinavian kingdoms, and the states of North and South
America, will suffice to bring upon the Chinese people individually
bodily fear sufficient for the saving of their souls.

The case of the Crusades which I adduce is parallel in one
respect, but not so in another. The analogy will hold as regards
the combination, but not as regards the merits of the operation of
its purpose. Christendom possessed by treaty the right of free
pilgrimage to the shrines of Jerusalem. This right being in­
grained in consequence of the country being overrun by hordes
from Central Asia, Christendom had a standing-place in court,
so far as it required free pilgrimage. It only exceeded the limits
of its possession. Although religious, the end sought was merely territorial; they fought for
dominion; they did not pretend to make a Christian of every
Saracen.

Again the religious motive was confined to the performance in
themselves of what they considered their duty; it did not pass
by themselves to consist in what they forced certain other persons
to believe.

This distinction, established, the great event and catastrophe
of the Crusades cannot fail to be instructive at this moment. But
it would be the reverse of instruction that they would afford were
we to accept in reference to the new crusade the conclusion of a
philosopher in regard to the old one, that the geography of the
Crusades had closed the dark ages for Europe.

The Chinese, it is true, are very warlike. Their constitution
and their habits being patriarchal and mild, they have not acquired
the military dexterity which results from disorder and ferocity.
But evil passions being now administered, and having become
familiar both with “hate” and with “fear,” it is to be expected,
with the instruction afforded them by the naval and military
forces of her Majesty, that civilisation in this respect will be of
rapid growth, and that they will become formidable in arms. If
destitute of science in the art of war, they are destitute neither of
courage nor of obstinacy, and we have seen the Chinese by
hundreds preferring death to the disgrace of mere defeat. On
these grounds I am inclined very much to doubt whether the
element of fear be in their case available for converting them, to
whatever extent it may be applied.
As we have to take into account a certain number of deaths on our own part, and as these deaths will not be of missionaries, but of mere soldiers and sailors, who cannot be supposed to be in a state of preparation, some arrangement seems requisite in the sense of that of Mahomet regarding the souls of our own people, whose bodies are to be sacrificed for the propagation of the faith.

But here is revived another of the practices of antiquity, human sacrifice; and again in masquerade. The sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter was in performance of a vow; the bloody sacrifices of the Carthaginians, the surrender of the Canaanitish children to Moloch, the human victims of Beelzebub and Phansigar, were and are still in vogue. The religious significance of the human sacrifices of the Ionian and others, required voluntary submission. To avoid every sign of resistance which would invalidate the atoning act, the bones of these victims were broken: thence the meaning of the unbroken bones of Christ; of Him who was a willing sacrifice for our sins. But Philistine, Carthaginian, and Phansigar, in the darkest hour of their bloody superstition, never attained to the boldness of your conception as to numbers, nor to the desperate impetu of sending them forth, armed assassins, to glut their vengeance and their hate on unoffending nations, on the plea of a false and sacrilegious atonement.

Now let us suppose all these objects successfully accomplished; that you constrain the English Government to render fear of assault conducive to conversion; that you convert thereby the Chinese Government; that you then combine all Europe to send out forces to enforce the conversion of the Chinese Government, and to convert its subjects; that you do convert its subjects, and that the Empire of China is added to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, what then will follow? I, my Lord, have had experience amongst the professors of other creeds, and opportunities of judging of their conduct and character, and I must suppose that, if you are not anxious, you may at least be curious to ascertain the judgment of a person so situated in reference to the people who are Christians and the people who are not. That judgment I can best convey by stating that I could only contemplate such a conversion with fear and sorrow. I do not speak of the character of such individual converts as have been made. I put them aside as exceptional cases, the lamentable results of which are not to be drawn into precedent in regard to an operation such as you contemplate. The change of an entire people which will make them entirely different in religion, in the character of their rulers, and in the character of their subjects, will, I must say, make these conversions an absolutely different thing from that which you propose, the very proposal of which suffices to triumph of the Devil was the conversion of the barbarians to Christianity, and caused that religion successfully enforces the duties of a Christian and the virtues of man. The universe would be reduced to the level of that with which you are now playing. Theocracy, as was announced by the Holy Alliance, but a Demonocracy.

In your plan for using the "dread of the Chinese for the superior might of the European nations" to "evangelise" them, Christianity is only a step to Anglican bishops. You say that otherwise your hearers could not expect "the blessing of the Church's Divine Head." These words are directed against the dissenting bodies of England and against the Roman Catholic world. This appears to me to be in use, in the very sense that the "premeditated system" desires it, the new Chinese treaty—to exasperate religious passion among the so-called Christians as preparing the way for an equal number of conversions in Christendom, which Russia is working for just as intently and as successfully as she is working for wars of opinion, wars of class, and wars of ambition, in order to prepare that chaos to escape from which we shall accept her as our Providence. But leaving the historical bearings of the proposition aside, how does this affect your immediate purpose as regards England and China? The Dissenters and the Roman Catholics constitute one-half of the British people. The curses are equally entailed upon them as upon the members of the Church of England. Their redemption is to be through the episcopal missionaries of the Church of England. Are these Dissenters and these Roman Catholics to contribute to the funds of the Church of England? Will their contributions, if offered, be accepted? Will the religious benefits be conferred on them in the same manner as would be enjoyed by one who submits to the "secret of success" in the "earthly attempt to master another race" by the concentration of effort and localisation of authority? I can tell you, from my own experience, that the very reverse is what you have to expect. Wherever an English embassy is established, the disposition even of Christians of other denominations to adhere to Protestantism is repelled by the dread of their being brought into connexion with that embarrassment. Mr. Gladstone, who is now seizing the opportunity in the Ionian Islands of preaching insurrection to the subjects of the Porte, is in possession of proofs that a most important Christian community of the East made overtures to this effect, stipulating that the connexion should not be with the Church of England, on the grounds that I have stated.

But there are many other obstacles, one of which, though not incidental one, may be worth mentioning. It once happened in China that the parent was struck by the child. The horror arose by the deed was such that the Emperor went into mourning. The village was razed to the ground. The Emperor went into mourning. The village was razed to the ground. Emperors have been known to take the same measure because their own daughter was in performance of a vow; the bloody sacrifices of the Ionian and others, required voluntary submission. To avoid every sign of resistance which would invalidate the atoning act, the bones of these victims were broken: thence the meaning of the unbroken bones of Christ; of Him who was a willing sacrifice for our sins. But Philistine, Carthaginian, and Phansigar, in the darkest hour of their bloody superstition, never attained to the boldness of your conception as to numbers, nor to the desperate impetu of sending them forth, armed assassins, to glut their vengeance and their hate on unoffending nations, on the plea of a false and sacrilegious atonement.

Another consequence would be the diminution of the slender chances still existing, through their means, of a rectification of ourselves through the terms of comparison afforded by the varieties of man. The universe would be reduced to the level of that with which you are now playing. Theocracy, as was announced by the Holy Alliance, but a Demonocracy.

A man lives in himself and judges by himself; and as I owe whatever perception I have of the duties of a Christian and the precepts of my religion to the life and manners of the professors of one of the religions you seek to destroy, I am bound to bear this testimony, and further, to add that, until I see those who name the name of Christ putting away iniquity, I cannot but consider and condemn the vows of other religions that exist on earth, the course of some of which transcends the opening of history, would be the last and heaviest blow that could fall upon Christianity itself. Dr. Arnold has said that the greatest triumph of the Devil was the conversion of the barbarians to Christianity; but that greatest of triumphs is as nothing to that which you propose, the very proposition of which suffices to destroy peace upon earth, and to render Christendom not a

Theocracy, as was announced by the Holy Alliance, but a Demonocracy.

But all this sinks into insignificance as compared with the astounding event of your drawing into this discussion the crucifixion of our Saviour as an analogy similar to that of your emancipated negro "left to perish." You quote the words of St. Peter: "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain;" and you say upon this "The relation is obvious."
And so it is, and far more than obvious. You are the crucifiers of Christ anew, and you put the words of St. Peter into the mouth of the Jews, who crucified Christ, and that is the obvious position in which you stand. St. Peter was charging the Jews with their crimes, and telling them that it was not by their power, that they might not glorify themselves in their strength, but might learn that it had only been permitted to their "wicked hands" to do what they had done to bring damnation upon themselves. It was not the Jews who replied to Peter, "Our wicked hands have done this, and therefore we are the agents of God, for we are God's providence." The purposes of God's providence were wrought out by these wicked acts against a corrupted people and a perverted faith, and so will God's purposes be wrought out in you. For any man to believe that such a Church or such a people could escape, he must deny God's providence. "Shall I not visit for such things, saith the Lord, and shall not my soul be avenged on such a people as this?"

The good work out by the wicked hands of the crucifying Jews was for others; the vengeance was for themselves. The good was for those only who separated themselves from the nation, and for the Gentiles. You cover up this instruction from the nation, and disguise its warning by the fallacy that our acts are the acts of others; and so of which you can present at one and the same time as of the Empire of 1858 as the Apostles of a crucified Saviour, and as the Jews who crucified Him.

Supposing that you were a prelate of the Church of Rome instead of that of England, and were required in auricular confession to assist the consciences of your flock, and a penitent presenting himself in the confessional revealed to you that he had robbed the till of a bank, would you say to him, "Be joyful, God's power has manifested itself in you; go build a church with what you have got; go rob again, and build a cathedral!" This is what you say not to England penitent, approaching the door of the confessional; but to England, impenitent, hard-hearted, impious, and imbecile; whilst you in doing so run no risk. Why, Sir, it is just the same. You are not at the Cross of the Empire of 1858, for the Apostles of a crucified Saviour, and as the Jews who crucified Him.

I am aware that between us hangs the veil of an intellectual difficulty. While I am ready to concede much in favour of your sincerity, I must also do my best to remove it; and that best consists in the description of it. It has never entered into your mind, no more than that of any man in this country, to consider the question of whether he be a Christian or not. The repetition of the words of Christ, "By your fruits ye shall know them," awakens no sense of such investigation as applied to ourselves. To us Christianity exists in the name and in the ceremony of baptism, and so we ourselves become Christianity to ourselves. To you, Christianity is not so far removed from our intellectual state as to question whether we are Englishmen or not. Starting from the point that we are Christians, and that what we do is Christianity, then it is possible to say anything—to say all that you have said; and nothing is comprehensible that is said on the other side.

The point we have arrived at is but a stage in a very long journey; that journey commenced when an anticipatory impunity was conferred on her Majesty's servants for employing her Majesty's troops unlawfully. As no man sitting on the bench of bishops has ever raised his voice against the unlawful employment of those troops in anticipation, and as none except yourself has so raised his voice after any one deed was in process of consummation; and, further, as none, yourself included, has proceeded to the adoption of the measures which such crimes impose; that of arresting the murderer in his course and bringing him before the proper tribunal, the prelates, as a body, are parties to whatever action is taken to the law, have redeemed by my own blood the nation from this delusion. I then stood alone in Parliament, but still obtained that pledge, through the threat of obstructing public business by dividing the Committee of Supply on every item of the expenditure. The pledge so extorted was violated the next day; it would not have been so violated, and consequently our career of atrocities would have been arrested, had but ten men in the House of Commons, instead of one, understood that unlawful war was murder. Far more impossible would it have been had there been in the House of Lords a single bishop with the judicial knowledge possessed by a Mahometan peasant, and the conscience and courage requisite to apply it. I then said (11th of August, 1848):—

I quote this passage to show that no man in these times can be otherwise than an associate in crime, unless he has courage to peril his life for right, as millions are ready to do for discipline.

I have referred to the part you have taken as preparing a future convulsion not in Asia only but in Europe, through the perfect immunity now conceded by the fact that the very men who, on political and religious grounds, had denounced the crime, now justifies it on religious grounds, and pursues it as a political fact, that the "political intrigue with which Christianity had mixed itself up," has become as once the policy and religion of the state.

But before the crime of commission was possible, a far greater one of omission had been committed. When wickedness breaks out in a novel and startling fashion, and on each such successive occasion a chance of recovery is afforded, the indifferent may be startled, the unconscious may be quickened. It is the part of wise, just, and religious men to seize every such occasion to bring home to the people the evidence and the sense of their wickedness. To pretermit such occasions is all that guilty rulers can wish at the hands of an Erastian Church. If the nation is not aroused on such revelations, each successive one becomes a load to press and hold them down. The co-operation of the nation is not wanted; its indifference, under our system of Government, is all that is needed to give to its rulers the disposal of its entire strength and resources for any wickedness it may plan, so that, in so far as regards men in office, the introduction of the crucifixion of the nation may be an analogy for their benefit; the designating of them in their acts as God's providence; the new doctrine of crime being God; the proposal of vicarious services, indulgences, works of supererogation, entail of curses, and the rest, were mere works of supererogation.

Far, indeed, from rendering them a service, you have done the very reverse; you have inflicted torture upon the minds of several of the very members of the Government; you have aroused a deeper spirit of inquiry by your justification than had been awakened by the acts themselves; and in preparing for internal convulsion you have prospectively injured the whole class which has most to lose, both in property and position, for revolution is in hand in human nature, and atheism, and that must be the ultimate result of your teaching.

In my former letter, I dwelt upon the position of the religious world, from the moment of its association with the results of those "politics," the antecedent steps of which it had never dreamt of,
and of the spring of which it was in utter ignorance. I showed that its religion—that is, its self-love—was at stake in every piece of news conveyed by telegraph from any part of the world. That an insurrection in Italy, a war with Austria, or with France, or any other event whatever, must be held by it to be its own performance. But I should beg to call your attention, from what it is to be made henceforth to believe, to that which it is actually effecting. You propose a crusade of the Anglican Church against the whole human race. The absurdity of the proposition prevents any importance being attached to it by ourselves or our neighbours, you said, to sixty subscribers, as well as non-subscribers, as a pretext, and believed to be nothing but a pious dream. In India, for instance, your act is established, each word in this sense acquires the deepest meaning for each of its inhabitants, because they look therein for the key to the arts of their rulers. There are in that region one hundred and fifty millions very indifferent to political opposition, but very desperate men when their faith is touched, or when they believe it to be assailed. Somewhat of similar dispositions exist in China, where you are not in "possession," with its three hundred and fifty millions. Westward of India, and up to the shores of the Mediterranean and the Adriatic, you have, under the name of Tartars, Afghans, Persians, Circassians, Arabs, and Turks, to which may be added the adherents of the Eastern Church, some seventy millions, who will all be affected in the same way, so that words spoken may be made to appear insignificant that can well be imagined for England, for France, for Germany, for Austria, and for Italy, rule become incentives of the deepest order to five hundred millions of men, inspiring them with dread of the British power and with abhorrence of the British race; thus placing them at the disposal of a Government which they know to be the antagonist and the enemy of Great Britain. Your proposed crusade will not indeed come into operation; but, nevertheless, it will bring its reaction.

I have announced, years ago, the ultimate triumph of Russia through the mutual overwhelming of Europe and Asia by each other. I have announced the occupation of Paris and London by Poles, Hungarians, and Turks, whom we have successively betrayed, led by Russia, to whom we have betrayed them. And this—supposing Russia nought to hold and her mind not to become disordered—is as sure as that I am writing this letter. This was to be brought about by mere political agency; how much more certainly when to secular perfidy is added religious fanaticism.

Hitherto the consciously guilty portion of public men were subject to one restraint, the fear of detection and the dread, when the discovery was made, if not of judicial consequences, at least of social consequences or popular vengeance. This check existed solely because murder, usurpation, robbery, and high treason were considered crimes. That check is now withdrawn by your act and that of your companions; for, although you have not convinced your fellow-countrymen that God is crime, you have at least demonstrated crimes. That check is now withdrawn by your act. For many years I have endured the suffering of a sufficient sum of money to hire missionaries, and that the words and the life of Christ as his guide and rule is not bound by Poles, Hungarians, and Turks, whom we have successively betrayed, led by Russia, to whom we have betrayed them. And this—supposing Russia nought to hold and her mind not to become disordered—is as sure as that I am writing this letter. This was to be brought about by mere political agency; how much more certainly when to secular perfidy is added religious fanaticism.

My life has hitherto been occupied in a struggle with the political men who, during the last thirty years, have been engaged, without the nation's assent or even knowledge, in bringing about our public condition of guilt and danger. My contest with them now closes to be opened with yourself. You have stepped, in protection, beyond their deeds, covering them with the stigma of religion. You few words, like Aaron's rod, have swallowed up the miracles of the magicians. You have placed the religion of the land in its acts; the very acts by means of which, up to the present time, I have been endeavouring to establish its irreligion. For me, therefore, beyond that which concerns private conscience, there is also at stake the rescuing of this empire from not remote extirpation by meeting you on this very ground; by advancing you the honor of being numbered among the political men, and taken upon yourself the charge, not only of killing this state, but of rendering it wholly unworthy to live.

Besides, if you are right, what has been my whole life? To apply oneself to the examination of transactions subordinated in our State to the supervision of the laws; to seek the restoration of the law so that communities may live in an orderly manner, and peace and good-will be maintained on earth, is nothing short of sacrilege; and law itself, from the Ten Commandments to the most recent and most absurd parliamentary statute, one common rebellion against God; as equally must be the arresting of a forger or murderer, or the seizing of a rioter in the streets. If whatever is done is, by the fact of its being done, God's providence, Providence departs from acts and your words, and therefore, as to which you have come into operation; but, nevertheless, it will bring its reaction.

These consequences, however, I do not deprecate; on the contrary, I invoke them: I call upon you, after the denial of the objects of religion and the objects of government, to apply your rule, and to proceed to abolish the vain forms of the one, and the useless instrumentality of the other. Shut up the churches, let for clubs the courts of law, disband the police, give free course to the horse-stealer and the assassin, and, so far from doing anything in my judgment injurious, you will be prescribing the only remedy that the case admits of, letting these men see and feel what the desolations in my country might spring to a new original from the very causes which in every state have called into existence these social institutions, which even in the last century, as Lord Lyttleton observed, were devised to put down those practices in which the art of government now consisted.

Again, if God's purpose, that a certain people called Chinese should profess Christianity, were contingent upon an "opening" being made in a particular fashion, at a particular date, for certain foreigners, and that that opening depended on the success of certain hired assassins, and was to be profited by through the raising of a sufficient sum of money to hire missionaries, and that the whole operation should be conducted in such a manner as to render the introduction of Christianity "next to impossible," and to entail the vengeance of God (see your speech in the Lords) on this larcenary race of proselytisers, in what manner do you circumscribe the omnipotence of our Maker?

The change from one set of phrases as articles of belief to another, is an incident so familiar amongst our fellow-countrymen as articles of belief to another, is an incident so familiar amongst our fellow-countrymen, which even in the last century, as Lord Lyttleton observed, were devised to put down those practices in which the art of government now consisted.

The change from one set of phrases as articles of belief to another, is an incident so familiar amongst our fellow-countrymen and throughout Europe that nothing less consequent can be spoken of than individual conversion. But the idea of secession is an event unparalleled, as resting on the grounds of the wickedness of communicants. For many years I have endured the torture of presence in congregations repeating words as prayers to their Maker which were the condemnation of themselves, and the still greater suffering of the reading of such words and the preaching therewith of pastors, themselves "the blind leaders of the blind." Besides this, there was the terror of words being uttered from the pulpit which would render it necessary for me to rise and leave the assembly. In the parish where I at present reside I have had to undergo great pain in reference to what appeared a very minor matter, namely, contribution to the schools. My difficulty has been to convey, without giving offense, conscientious objections to contributing towards bringing up the young as to be like the old.

Suppose a member of the Usock community—that pirate state which for a time from the Adriatic commanded the Mediterran-
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ranean, and who were, nevertheless, a strictly religious people—had made the discovery that piracy was not innocent in the eyes of men nor praiseworthy in the sight of God, and was then asked to subscribe for purposes of education, that man would have stood precisely in my position here. He, like me, would have found his motives liable to misconception had he answered, "Although I am a Roman Catholic, I cannot contribute to bringing up young Usooks." The pious and the honourable men in that community have taken the reason as a denial at once of religious and patriotic.

In the parish where I last resided, the rector being a man above the ordinary level, I had to endure pain of a much higher order. Reasons for conduct having to be debated, and the Canton massacre having only just occurred, I was constrained to lay that case before him in its bearing on the conscience and faith of everyone. The first effect was so far favourable that he accepted my proposition to move the clergy of the diocese to an act of investigation, to be followed by a proposal of a general fast and humiliation for the sins of the people. But of course the regular effect followed from communication with others. Down he went with the stream, and then, knowing more than the rest, came falsification. The intimation of his broken pledge was conveyed to me in a sermon which I heard on the following Sunday, on the atonement of Christ establishing peace on earth irrespective of repentance.*

I enclose, in confirmation of this statement, the letter which I wrote to this clergyman at the time, and to which no answer was returned. It is, besides, a record of the attempts which I have been unceasingly making since the first Chinese war, to move the clergy to this judicial intervention in respect to the iniquities of the land, on the grounds stated in my letter to the Bishop of Exeter, with which you are acquainted.

Now take the case of a mind made up at once as to the iniquity of the individuals composing the Church of England, as to the judicial blindness affecting the mass and the enlightened infidelity of the leaders, as to the universality of this condition, as to its pervading cause, and to the futility of his own efforts to change it. In what a frightful position does he stand! The disputant about words in seceding from one sect finds refuge elsewhere, and is received with open arms. But the man who cannot stay because he will not communicate with evil, finds refuge nowhere. The reasons which exclude him from one communion prevent him from entering any other. None of those at this present day who name the name of Christ put away iniquity—neither the petty iniquity charged by Christ upon the Jews as individuals nor that grand iniquity which belongs to Imperial Power.

The condition which I describe is that which has prepared the way for that recent innovation—Infidelity and Atheism. I have in my former letter explained how my early acquaintance with the Mahommedans has rescued me from that danger. I am now putting before you the suffering of an individual mind, hoping that your sincere feelings of humanity may be touched as to the miseries you are about to inflict on many of your fellow-creatures, by lending your talents to hurry on the Church and the people of England in their present insane course. But still the sight presented this day by the Christian world might well lead a man to deny the existence of a God, had the founders of our faith not announced a contrary state of things as the result of the teaching of its doctrines. As it is, we behold around us the confirmation of that faith in the conduct of its professors; for all this has been true. The enunciation, which was, "God has opened China." From this had to be inferred as above, that everything which a Government did or could do was God's act, since the intermediary steps must have been His, for the final one to be said to be His. But at Willis's Rooms you tell us that "after a fact has been accomplished," it is for us to sit down and read the indications of the results of Providence," by which process we will be enabled to "clothe the fragments of an earthquake with a vegetable growth." It thus appears that, after all, the Government and Providence are not identical; that some only of its acts are providential; but that we have nothing to do with them except to wait for the results, and then to find out which are providential and which are unprovidential. The context as well as the metaphor point to those of convulsion and destruction as pertaining to the Divine origin; and then transposing the parts; all good things flowing from the minister in his human capacity, whilst his evil deeds invest him with the attributes of Providence.

The last mail from China has brought intelligence which might have induced me to make a last appeal to you, even had this letter been despatched before its arrival. The conduct of the authorities at Hong-Kong has been brought into that place which has still left in England a refuge for justice, truth, honour, faith, and sense—a court of law. It has there come out in evidence that proceeds of piratical enterprises were received in the way of business by the public officers, and that the local Government, from its head downwards, instead of indignation at the discovery of such a crime, was engaged only in its concealment, and had destroyed papers containing the evidence. It further appears that these piratical proceedings were connected with the lorch Arrow. In face of facts such as these it seems to be impossible that you or any other man can go on supposing that our state shall remain such as it was after altering our notions; and that some, at least such as are endowed as you are, should not begin to perceive that we are at last breaking up.

I now conclude, by submitting to you a proposal, which I mean also to be a last test: that is, to move the obtaining of a day of fast and humiliation for sins which you confess. They did dare, in reference to India, to put a lie in a prayer which the Church accepted for its fast or feast day; and they dared to do this, because they knew that the Church contained no single priest who either knew that it was a lie, or, knowing that it was a lie, would refuse to utter it. But although a Bishop of London has been found to utter the words "God has blessed us by success in war," they have not dared to propose a day of thanksgiving for China.

Is the new religion, which is to consist of politics, so destitute of courage, as neither to offer thanks to God for what it calls "His blessing," or to humble itself for what it calls its own "crime"? If you will not demand a day of humiliation, at least relieve us from suspense, and call for a day of thanksgiving for China.

I have the honour to be, your Lordship's obedient servant.

DAVID URQUHART.

To the Right Reverend the Bishop of Oxford.

ENCLOSURES.

No. 1.

Crime the Road to Power.

FROM TRANSACTIONS IN CENTRAL ASIA—PUBLISHED IN 1839.

The few men, moreover, who control Great Britain, and in whose individual thoughts lie her political destinies or her moral character, occupy stations of
part of another letter to the Bishop of Oxford is subjoined; the only reply to which, was an acknowledgment of its receipt, to which the Bishop added that as yet he had not had time to read it. The writer sent the Bishop the Stafford placard, before the speech at Will's Rooms was made.

Mr. Attwood to the Bishop of Oxford.

(Extract.)

For more than thirty years have I been held in doubt and trouble, between the hope that there did, and the evidence that there did, not remain amongst us any portion of that living and all-saving faith which Christ came down to teach us. It is hard to pierce entirely through that outward crust which can effectively conceal amongst professors, from themselves and others—as it did amongst the Scribes and Pharisees—the knowledge of their true condition. I saw in part, but not so thoroughly as these events have taught me, how completely an intellectual idolatry had been substituted for gods made by the sculptor out of wood and stone.

I saw the Christian nations fast becoming no more the best, and possibly becoming little better than the worst, religious section of the human race. I saw how this idolatry affected, as it had done amongst the Jews, those men the most who, by their zeal for what they thought religion, might otherwise have been the best. And I could understand this well by the example of St. Paul, when making proselytes to doctrines, not to righteousness, till the light smote him from above and his eyes were opened.

These late events, and your own share in them, have taught me to discern the truth in all its horrible extent. I see that it is true, as was alleged in the paper which I sent you, that there are now "no Christians in this land," that preaching, missions, and conversion must begin at home, that we cannot, till then, convert the heathen, except to make them worse than our own selves. I see that "Christianity has to be refounded in this land;" and I moreover see that this cannot be done, at first at least, but amongst the poor and lowly, whose minds have not been as yet so deeply blinded by the abuse of learning, unless, indeed, some new St. Paul, commissioned by his priestly office to convey the truth which saves, although without the voucher of the power of miracles, should rise amongst the Pharisees themselves, to teach his own class—possibly in vain.

I have already shown that that crime, which you would not bear with so long as it confronted you with its naked,ucciencing visage, you have come to welcome under its religious mask. It seems to take a consecrated character from the moment that you are able to connect it with one of the romance attaching to it, as a kind of new crusade. You have been believed to continue the same resistance to the final consummation of the scheme of plunder by continuing such a protest as you had uprightly recorded against its first degrees; against the enforcement of that loathsom spoliation, the ransom of the booty. You were besought to call a meeting for the purpose of such protest; since, Parliament not being in session, it was the obvious as well as the most proper and almost only mode of action open to you.

The answer which you gave was to the effect that, being convinced of the impossibility of success—of success, as I presume, in preventing the reception of the plunder into the Queen's Exchequer—you must decline adopting the suggestion. It might have been impossible to avert the completion of the crime, but it was not impossible to have remonstrated. Your testimony might have been borne along with that of others, as moved, perchance, by your appeal, and many consciences were saved from sin, and some foundation laid for saving many more.

Moreover, to confess success impossible was fully to confess that the people of this country, so easily involved in sin, could not in any way be moved to repentance. Now what is this but to acknowledge that "this is not a Christian land?" Can they be Christians whom neither their own consciences nor any teachings of the Church can move towards repentance? Or can that church be Christian which, thus acknowledging the people's sin, can find in its impudence excuse for not endeavouring to call it to repentance? It is the "Shepherds" who have first been "smitten." No wonder that "the sheep are scattered abroad."

The dead bones in the valley of Jehoshaphat may come to move and live. But it must be that they should first be called. The Prophet calls not; for, he says, it is in vain. Perchance the time may come when they, whose special function it should be to raise that call, may come to hate those "few" (as you have called them) and humble men, who feel that the burden has devolved on them to do so in the Church's stead; to go out in the highways and declare that unless we all repent we shall all perish.

There is a passage in the Scripture which declares that he who sees a thief "consents to him." Is it not a strange condition of a nation, and declare that unless we all repent we shall all perish. You now see the prelates of the land, not men like you, professing to care nothing and to know nothing, but on a judicial occasion, and in an imperial senate, granting an absolution to crimes past, and encouragement for their further prosecution.

The interval of these few weeks has therefore sufficed to introduce as a rational subject of inquiry those two propositions which I am sure you set down when you heard of them first from me, as evidences of insanity.

We have both failed in the performance of a promise—I in not sending to you my pamphlet on "The Duty of the Church of England in reference to Unfruitful Wars," and my excuse is, that the occasion was such as to require the use of the one or two copies of it to be found in the most effective manner, and I have reason to believe that from the employment of it proceeded Lord Derby's appeal to the Beach of Bishops. I send you, however, a newspaper which contains an extract from it.

The promise in which you have failed, was to consider the bringing forward of the events of Canton, with the view of moving the clergy of the diocese to ask for a day of public fast and humiliation—for I accepted your sermon of last Sunday, when you took for your text, "Peace, as obtained by the Atonement of the Cross," carefully avoiding the condition of repentance, as an answer in the negative.

I remain, &c.,

DAVID URQUHART.
Change in a Nation Imperceptible, being caused by a change in each Man.

There is no duty more solemnly impressed on the mind of man, and no practice more uniformly maintained, than that of directing the young mind aright. The whole human race consciously or unconsciously, by reason, or by instinct, does apply itself to the teaching of the young, and this motive sways alike the careless and the careful, the vicious and the virtuous, the difference of manner of execution corresponding of course to the difference of disposition.

This impulse is not a simple and primitive one, as is the search for food, or the shrinking from a blow; it is a compound one, arising out of a mental operation, based itself upon an intellectual conclusion. It is this, the prowess of the human mind to failings, whether of disposition or of reason, or of both conjoined, that is to say—vices, errors, and fallacies.

The imagination of man cannot attain to the representation of a human being destitute of this conception of himself, and the universal purpose of education, shows such to be, not only the estimate which he forms of himself, but the one on which he acts.

Yet, if we take up any work which commands public applause or excites public attention, whether it be historical, philosophical, or imaginative, we will not fail to find it enunciated therein, not only as a profound maxim, but as a discovery of the author, that mankind is always the same. Such passages, if we observe our fellow-men in perusing them, will always be those which afford them satisfaction.

If we reflect, and it is so, can there arise a question of deeper interest in the study of mankind than the solution of the mystery? That solution is not difficult to find when it is methodically sought for. The satisfaction at listening to the proposition that care is useless, for such is the meaning of the maxim, arises from, and can only arise from, the consciousness that the attempt to "bring up" properly has failed.

The proposition may be treated mathematically, and the proofs sought for in the counter-operation. Take the case of a well-organised community where the child obeys and respects the parent, where the people obey and respect the rulers, where the rulers obey and respect the laws, where the word of man is his bond, where charity and hospitality are habits, can you conceive it possible that the proposition should be uttered or listened to, that care is useless. Such a community must be always on the alert and watchful, and there can be neither watchfulness nor energy among men who admit as a maxim, that care is of no avail.

But if we are all conscious that the conduct and character of the individual is daily and hourly dependent upon the influences which surround him, and with which he surrounds himself, it is evident that the universal conduct and character, that is the conduct and character of a whole people, is in like manner subject to change. It must be so subject in a far greater degree than in an individual case, for the change in a man may be counteracted by some unknown agency; a community, must be always on the alert and watchful, and there can be neither watchfulness nor energy among men who admit as a maxim, that care is of no avail.

If men were always the same, history would stand still, whether in the annals of the Old Bailey, or those of Greece, of Carthage, of Rome, and of those states to which we belong, and by which we are surrounded. If men were always the same, there would be no more poor-rates to-day than there were under Henry the Tudor, there would be no more national debt to-day than under Charles the Stuart, there would be no more taxes to-day than under William of Holland, there would be no more expenditure for military establishments than in the last reign of William the Guelph.* If men were always the same, the people of England of the present day, would be in receipt for their labour of as much as they were in receipt of under the Norman princes, under the houses of York and Lancaster, the Tudors and the Stuarts.+ The change in the condition of the aggregate nation is, however, itself the result of change in the individual, change resulting from failure in the success of his education. The change in each man which acts upon us, in increased taxation, bad laws, infraction of good laws, oppressions at home, atrocities abroad, sufferings by misery, sufferings by deaths, sufferings by battles and defeats, sufferings by rebellions of provinces, or sufferings ultimately by successfully avenging arms from without, proceed originally, though by long and stealthy steps, from the failure of each individual parent, to inculcate on each individual child, respect and observance of that which is right, abhorrence and resistance to that which is wrong. And thus it is, though by an extensive and complicated machinery, that the ways of Providence work themselves out by the method of justice, making the rules given to us for our spiritual conduct, to be followed by temporal consequences, the recompense in well being and prosperity for the nation that obeys the will of God, punishment in political adversity and national decline for such as refuse it.

At the final meeting at the East India House, several of the Proprietors declared that they saw no reason against, but every reason for, the Directors of the East India Company being also nominees of the Government. Now, in the by-laws of that very Company, of which the Proprietors are a constituent part, it is enacted, that no Director shall hold any office under the Government. Assuredly these Proprietors would be the very men to feel peculiar gratification in meeting in any work with the maxim, that men are always the same; not that they would be in ignorance of the fact that Hindostan, after a century of unbounded submission, had at last rebelled, or that the East India Company, after two centuries of unparalleled splendour and success, had at last been extinguished, but because it would be gratifying to them to be able to say that the disasters in India, and the extinction of the Company had not been the result of the difference in conduct and in character between themselves and their predecessors. You may subdivide the may fracture of a pin, or the government of an empire, but you cannot subdivide man. There Providence has placed a bourn to his inventions. The man can no more be corrupt than virtuous, in part: when the taint once enters it affects equally the field of foreign relations and domestic policy; of domestic duties and of social intercourse; of moral conduct and religious enjoyments. If you be changed in reference to your conduct in India, you will be changed in every other matter, and changed in a similar manner.

Virtue has its preventive part and attributes; without that part it can have no existence. That part consists in taking care that it shall not itself be led astray, and far more, shall do nothing unconsciously. In the words of Jeremy Taylor, it must see that counsel precedes action.* This part being in our case wanting, the change in a man may be attributed to the failure in the success of his education. The general result of education, shows such to be, not only the unconscious, but because it would be gratifying to them to be able to say that the disasters in India, and the extinction of the Company had not been the result of the difference in conduct and in character between themselves and their predecessors. You may subdivide the may fracture of a pin, or the government of an empire, but you cannot subdivide man. There Providence has placed a bourn to his inventions. The man can no more be corrupt than virtuous, in part: when the taint once enters it affects equally the field of foreign relations and domestic policy; of domestic duties and of social intercourse; of moral conduct and religious enjoyments. If you be changed in reference to your conduct in India, you will be changed in every other matter, and changed in a similar manner.

Virtue has its preventive part and attributes; without that part it can have no existence. That part consists in taking care that it shall not itself be led astray, and far more, shall do nothing unconsciously. In the words of Jeremy Taylor, it must see that counsel precedes action.* This part being in our case wanting, the change in a man may be attributed to the failure in the success of his education. The general result of education, shows such to be, not only the unconscious, but because it would be gratifying to them to be able to say that the disasters in India, and the extinction of the Company had not been the result of the difference in conduct and in character between themselves and their predecessors. You may subdivide the may fracture of a pin, or the government of an empire, but you cannot subdivide man. There Providence has placed a bourn to his inventions. The man can no more be corrupt than virtuous, in part: when the taint once enters it affects equally the field of foreign relations and domestic policy; of domestic duties and of social intercourse; of moral conduct and religious enjoyments. If you be changed in reference to your conduct in India, you will be changed in every other matter, and changed in a similar manner.

* Under William IV, this branch of expenditure amounted to 11,000,000L, under the present Queen it has attained to 47,000,000L.

+ It is the admission of Hallam that the working-men of England in those so-called barbarous times received double the value for their labour, as compared with the time in which he wrote.
The Englishman of this age having no sense of judicial action except as regards petty crimes and solitary malefactors, cannot continue to reprove, where he feels himself powerless to resist, and he therefore comes to approve under the consciousness of servitude. As the act itself has been one of tyranny, so does the complicity in the act become one of slavery; and through this loathsomc partial he passes down to the condition of corruption in the adjusting of his conscience to the course that has been committed, and of dishonesty, in the degradation that he has incurred.

Thus it is that the sins of the fathers are visited upon the children. For the disregard of duties, to pass into the prone acceptance of servitude, guilt and suffering, requires a lengthened period of time, it may be ten, it may be a hundred generations of gradually deteriorated men; but in the breast of each of those living at this moment in England are treasured up the results of every evil step of their fathers downwards from the time that their steps first deviated from the path of duty.

For any one man to recover himself it is requisite that he should lift from off himself the incumbent pressure of the ages that have gone before him; all the wrong that has been meditated and accomplished; all the failacics that have been invented and despised; all the false respect that has been generated and inflamed; all the evil passions that have been simulated and instilled. Whilst clearing the eye of his mind so that he shall no longer take darkness for light, so that he shall not be utterly crushed by the throng pressing upon him, so as to temper his spirit, and to arm his faculties to stand up against false authority, and not to sink before hatred and contempt—it is not enough for him to see through the hollowness of an intellectual pretence; he must dare to break with his friend, relative, benefactor, teacher, and come out from amongst a generation of vipers, no less than fools, slaves pretending to be free, children of hell considering themselves the depository of God’s truth upon earth.

Who is there equal to such a task? Not men who have grown into wrymouth at least, or into the slavery whose life consists in standing well with others. Whilst Christ was on earth no man of worldly station came to him but by night. The apostles were selected from among the operatives of Judea. When times are evil, it is that false judgments prevail, and the rectifiers are not to be sought for in the educated classes; it is the “bringing up” that has done the mischief. What is wanted, is that the ignorant should know that their strength lies in being free, from the learning of the wise, and the cowardice of the great.

“Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the mighty.” These words are to be found in the Bible, a book that might even yet convert Englishmen, if they happily called themselves Buddhists or Hindus.

D. U.

Pledge of the Government not to employ Troops Unlawfully.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, AUGUST 11, 1848.

(From "Honour’s Debates.")

Mr. Urquhart rose to postpone until Monday his motion relative to the expenditure for diplomatic agents abroad.

So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the continuance of the functions of the diplomatic members of the Ministry, and I hope that we shall not be long absent from the public eye and the press of the country. I am aware that there are matters of importance which have for many years been the subject of discussion, and that the public are entitled to a return of those matters which have been dealt with judicially.

Mr. Urquhart—If I will assure the honourable and gallant member for Westminster that he is perfectly correct in the statement that he has made regarding himself; he has hit the right nail on the head. It was the share I was to labour to awaken others in like manner, and thereby to recover the sense of law and right among a nation from whose breast within a single generation it has utterly passed away. The hon. and gallant member has said very needlessly sensitive at once, and contemptuous in reference to certain epithets which I have used, and which he chooses to say, and says justly, apply to myself no less than to those in reference to whom I had used them. But if I remember correctly, and if I have read aright, discussions which took place in former years in this House, the hon. and gallant gentleman was not merely characterised as a pirate, but as a condottiere; consequently if the hon. and gallant gentleman now says that he is indifferent to such an allegation as coming from General D’Agstilia, Colonel Brotherton, and Brigadier General M’Doughal.

He thought the hon. member was not justifying speaking in such terms of disparagement of those who served their country by serving in the armies of her allies, and that which has been held an honour, have all equally fallen in the recesses of the mind of each individual of the community, in which are combined the consciousness in each of his powerlessness to act, and the pretence in all of the possession of free institutions.

If there was one claim to honourable distinction amongst the nations of the earth which every Englishman prided himself upon, holding it at the same time to be a distinguished inheritance, and an unparalleled protection, it was the institution of Trial by Jury. It was so held until the hour when a judge announced his intention of moving a law for its suppression. That announcement produces no indignation, no assembly of nobles at Runnymede, no popular pilgrimage of grace at York; there is no voice raised to exclaim, "Nolumus leges Anglias mutari;" and this institution will go just as the Prerogative of the Crown, the Rights of the People, the Power of the Parliament (its legal power), and the honour of the Land.

In this process of accepting what is done, because it has been done, there is first afforded an irresistible temptation to do evil to those persons who are peculiarly exposed to seductions of this description by their possessing power. Such persons had to be strictly watched and stringently controlled even when they stood in their proper position of having to obtain a prior consent before acting. Now they are placed between the alternative of encountering obstructions in carrying out their purposes if they submit those purposes to any species of deliberation; and of the most perfect facility, if they simply pass by all forms of the constitution; they have only to act in secret, and then this being a free country, every man holds himself a party to the act, and his honour is involved in maintaining it. Take, for instance, the Parliament returned upon the bombardment of Canton.

To the people the effect of the process repeated on each successive step, that is to say, on each succeeding event, is accumulation at once of cowardice and corruption. When the Englishman that has said to-day, "Am I dog, to do this thing?" learns to-morrow that it has been done, he does not accept it as a proper thing simply because it has been done, but because having been done, he seen no means of rectifying it.

When a functionary has not persuaded the council into a wrong course, but has acted without the council, taking advantage of his official station to issue orders, he has committed an act against which there is no recourse but punishment. Just as an agent who has violated his trust, a case is presented only to be dealt with judicially.

* We will not suffer the laws of England to be changed.

---

Mr. Urquhart rose to postpone until Monday his motion relative to the expenditure for diplomatic agents abroad.

So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the continuance of the functions of the diplomatic members of the Ministry, and I hope that we shall not be long absent from the public eye and the press of the country. I am aware that there are matters of importance which have for many years been the subject of discussion, and that the public are entitled to a return of those matters which have been dealt with judicially.

Mr. Urquhart—If I will assure the honourable and gallant member for Westminster that he is perfectly correct in the statement that he has made regarding himself; he has hit the right nail on the head. It was the share I had in that war, and the instinct of its injustice, that first led me to investigate this great subject; and when I did discover the delusion under which I had laboured in common with my fellow-countrymen I did feel myself oppressed with a load of shame and guilt, and I have been impelled unceasingly to labour to awaken others in like manner, and thereby to recover the sense of law and right among a nation from whose breast within a single generation it has utterly passed away. The hon. and gallant member has said very needlessly sensitive at once, and contemptuous in reference to certain epithets which I have used, and which he chooses to say, and says justly, apply to myself no less than to those in reference to whom I had used them. But if I remember correctly, and if I have read aright, discussions which took place in former years in this House, the hon. and gallant gentleman was not merely characterised as a pirate, but as a condottiere; consequently if the hon. and gallant gentleman now says that he is indifferent to such an allegation as coming from General D’Agstilia, Colonel Brotherton, and Brigadier General M’Doughal.

He thought the hon. member was not justifying speaking in such terms of disparagement of those who served their country by serving in the armies of her allies, and that which has been held an honour, have all equally fallen in the recesses of the mind of each individual of the community, in which are combined the consciousness in each of his powerlessness to act, and the pretence in all of the possession of free institutions.

If there was one claim to honourable distinction amongst the nations of the earth which every Englishman prided himself upon, holding it at the same time to be a distinguished inheritance, and an unparalleled protection, it was the institution of Trial by Jury. It was so held until the hour when a judge announced his intention of moving a law for its suppression. That announcement produces no indignation, no assembly of nobles at Runnymede, no popular pilgrimage of grace at York; there is no voice raised to exclaim, "Nolumus leges Anglias mutari;" and this institution will go just as the Prerogative of the Crown, the Rights of the People, the Power of the Parliament (its legal power), and the honour of the Land.

In this process of accepting what is done, because it has been done, there is first afforded an irresistible temptation to do evil to those persons who are peculiarly exposed to seductions of this description by their possessing power. Such persons had to be strictly watched and stringently controlled even when they stood in their proper position of having to obtain a prior consent before acting. Now they are placed between the alternative of encountering obstructions in carrying out their purposes if they submit those purposes to any species of deliberation; and of the most perfect facility, if they simply pass by all forms of the constitution; they have only to act in secret, and then this being a free country, every man holds himself a party to the act, and his honour is involved in maintaining it. Take, for instance, the Parliament returned upon the bombardment of Canton.

To the people the effect of the process repeated on each successive step, that is to say, on each succeeding event, is accumulation at once of cowardice and corruption. When the Englishman that has said to-day, "Am I dog, to do this thing?" learns to-morrow that it has been done, he does not accept it as a proper thing simply because it has been done, but because having been done, he seen no means of rectifying it.

When a functionary has not persuaded the council into a wrong course, but has acted without the council, taking advantage of his official station to issue orders, he has committed an act against which there is no recourse but punishment. Just as an agent who has violated his trust, a case is presented only to be dealt with judicially.

* We will not suffer the laws of England to be changed.
Pledge of the Government not to employ Troops unlawfully.

Correspondence relative to Lord John Russell's Pledge.

Invernesscot, Collunder, Perthshire, Oct. 9, 1848.

My Lord,—A correspondence relative to Naples, purporting to be official, has appeared in the Times of the 5th and 6th October, which imposes upon me the painful necessity of addressing your Lordship.

I will specially call your Lordship's attention to a letter dated Messina, 11th August, and signed by the Commanders of an English and French vessel of war, which threatens the use of force against the Commander of the Forces of the King of the Two Sicilies, and demands in its own name the surrender of a naval officer, Captain Evans.

This violation of the pledge given to me by your Lordship, that "the troops of her Majesty should henceforward be employed only according to the law of nations," was, I am bound to say, a matter of surprise to me, and to encourage me to use my influence with your Lordship to obtain the full and expeditious redress of the injuries which I am sure is the wish of the English nation.

The case arises which I had anticipated, but not in the form of an order entered in your Lordship's name, and which was not the subject of a previous intimation from your Lordship's Prefecture. The case is the following:—

A French officer, Captain Evans, arrived at Naples on the 9th August, and on the 10th he was detained by the Spanish authorities, because of his having been implicated in the landing of British troops upon the coast of Caffre, and of his having acted as an agent of the British Government.

Your Lordship's pledge of 9th August, "not to employ Troops unlawfully," is one of the plainest obligations which your Majesty can impose upon her officers, and one which your Lordship was bound to fulfill, and which I am bound to press home upon your Lordship's representatives, in order that the English nation may be enabled to act with dignity, and to enforce the rights of your Majesty by the means of the arms which are committed to her use.

I therefore request your Lordship to afford me the fullest information upon the subject, and to give such directions as may be necessary to the suppression of this violation of your Lordship's pledge, and to the protection of the rights of your Majesty, and of the English nation.

Your Lordship's obedient and humble servant,

[Signature]
Correspondence relative to Lord John Russell’s Pledge.

Minist., Oct. 12, 1848.

Sir,—I have had the honour to receive your letter of the 9th instant respecting a correspondence which has appeared in the Times newspaper of the 5th and 6th October.

It would not be fitting that I should enter into any explanation of the course which the Government intends to pursue with respect to the affairs of Naples and Sicily. You seem, however, to have misunderstood, or perhaps not have heard, the answer which I made to Sir John Walsh in the House of Commons. I said, in substance, that I would not bind or fetter the Government in any way as to its future proceedings; but that, as a matter of fact, no orders had been given to stop the Neapolitan expedition about to proceed to Sicily. With respect to the bearing of the law of nations on these transactions, it was not my meaning to subscribe to any interpretation which you might put upon that law.

I have the honour to be,

Your obedient servant,

J. RUSSELL

D. Urquhart, Esq., M.P.

Invertrossach, Callander, Perthshire, Oct. 18, 1848.

My Lord,—I have had the honour to receive your letter of the 19th, which I have perused with feelings of deep sorrow.

Your personal honour is pledged to a certain course. It is alleged by me, to whom that pledge was given, that it has been violated, and the question of the violation consists solely in the legality or illegality of certain acts. My allegation is, that coercion used against the King of Naples is a violation of the law of nations, and therefore of your pledge.

In your reply to me you do not deny that this act is such violation, but instead of accepting the consequences you offer two evasions. The first—that it is not fit that you should inform me respecting the future intentions of her Majesty’s Government in respect to Naples and Sicily. The second—that it was not your meaning to submit to my interpretation of the law of nations.

If the case was not such as I have stated it to be, it was for your Lordship to show that I was in error; but your Lordship does not even give me your interpretation. The meaning of the sentence is, “I gave you, it is true, my word not to break a certain law, but I reserved it to myself to interpret that law, and I know not what other meaning your Lordship could have had in giving it to me.”

Your Lordship is perfectly right in saying that I was not present when the explanation was given to Sir John Walsh, which induced him to withdraw his motion; but I am aware of their nature and effect. The object of that motion was to arrest intervention in the affairs of Naples, apprehended principally from the presence and menacing attitude of the squadron of Admiral Paken. These were explained by you by the existence of differences between England and Naples, upon three points affecting British interests exclusively, and in consequence of France. In 1834, two articles in the Augsburg Gazette, on the East, created considerable sensation. They were attributed to M. Von Hammer and other distinguished persons; and at once concluded that they were from the pen of M. Prokesch, from having perused a letter of his to a common friend on the subject of the East. I did not think that Germany could have produced two such men engaged in the same field.

"Amongst the papers of the Minister of War at Vienna a letter has been found, and an extract from it published, of the deepest importance to the European community. One of the first men of Austria there expresses his conviction that England was in understanding with Russia, and that France followed England. If this be so, a more alarming state of things could not be visualised. That it is so, I do as certainly know as I know that I live. This is allowed England. If this be so, a more alarming state of things could not be."

"The Radicale, a Vienna paper, publishes some letters found in possession of Latour. The following curious passage occurs in one of them, written by M. Prokesch, under date of 18th, 1848:

"What makes me most uneasy are our unfortunate relations with regard to Hungary. I think we ought not to deceive ourselves as to the complete separateness of that country, and it would be one of the greatest blunders possible to part the Hungarians with the means of affecting their object. I explain that state of affairs by the co-operation of Estebary and Lord Palmerston, and by the influence which the latter exercises with us. Now, I have for years considered Lord Palmerston our most decided enemy, and still consider him to be so; and to this I would add, that as long as that man guides her policy, appeared to me an anachronism scarcely to be explained."

"The writer of the letter then proceeds:—"

"We hear daily complaint that we want men. We have men; but we place the most important affairs into the hands of those who are not fit for them. That is, in fact, our deadly evil. The Russians gain ground in the Daubian Principalities. We have (in the year 1839), with an inactivity bordering on treason, allowed the mouth of the Danube to fall into their hands, and that at a very moment when the position of the Russian army was such that the cabinet of St. Petersburg readily would have listened to any protest. Perhaps even now we shall allow ourselves to be duped by phrases, and we shall assist the Russians in establishing their paramount influence as far as the Drave and Sava.

The Porte resists, but there is no one to back her. Prince follows in the train of England; England is in understanding with Russia; and Austria and Germany, who ought to take the lead, are nothing but zeros."

"M. Prokesch is a Sclavé, but not of the Greek Church; and if there be in Europe a race and a class calculated intellectually to cope with Russia it is this body, who are familiar with all the instincts of the Muscovite, but separated from his purposes. During the Levant negotiations, from 1837 downwards, M. Prokesch was Austria’s chef-d’etat major, and since 1838 he has been her minister in Greece. In 1834, two articles in the Augsburg Gazette, on the East, created considerable sensation. They were attributed to M. Von Hammer and other distinguished persons; and at once concluded that they were from the pen of M. Prokesch, from having perused a letter of his to a common friend on the subject of the East. I did not think that Germany could have produced two such men engaged in the same field.

"With talents of the first order, conjoined to integrity, M. Prokesch was removed from Vienna, and sent with sealed lips, under a diplomatic livery, to a spot where he could neither seriously inconvenience, nor minutely track, the workings of the system which has made the capitals of Europe, and especially Vienna, centres of intrigue, so as now to convert them into pivots of conjunction."

"The second extract of M. Prokesch bears on the commercial treaty with Austria. He blames Prince Metternich there, seeing one side only. In reference to this matter, I could bear testimony to Prince Metternich, whose purpose was to secure to England the navigation of the Danube; but that purpose was frustrated by the English minister ‘in understanding with Russia.’"

"But no allegation of criminal purpose like that of M. Prokesch could be made against a servant of the Crown, unless the nation and its leaders had become heedless to right and wrong; and, therefore, as connected with the same matter, I enclose a correspondence I have had with Lord John Russell on the violation of the pledge he had given me that British troops should be employed Henceforward only in conformity with the law of nations. It is only after the plain line of duty is past that there can be cunning design or treacherous purpose. In a betrayed state the traitor is not alone criminal—all he is not despicable."

The above correspondence appeared at the time in a Staffordshire paper. It was introduced by a letter, which is here subjoined, because of its linking so clearly political events and historical struggles with their real though unobserved cause; the corruption of heart of every man in a community which can be so disposed of.