

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD.

VOL. XVII. No. 12.—*Old Series*.—DECEMBER.—VOL. VII. No. 12.—*New Series*.

THE PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS: A REVIEW.

BY THE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF.

A famous American orator used to say that he had "but little foresight, but plenty of *hindsight*," the latter being found very trustworthy.

More than a year ago the Parliament of Religions took its place in history. Then, in common with many, we felt compelled to testify against the whole scheme, convinced that, at the very basis of it, there lay a blunder; and that, without impugning the motives of its originators and abettors, its final outcome must be evil rather than good. Before dismissing the matter, we cast a backward glance for a true *review*; and, instead of intruding merely our own judgment, let others also be heard from this forum of enlightened public opinion as to this attempted amalgamation of the one and only true faith and saving Gospel with the imperfect, iniquitous, idolatrous systems of so-called "religion."

I. Perhaps the Parliament of Religions was a mistake, first of all, in its *inadequate presentation and representation of Christianity*.

Some, who were promoters of the scheme, have since confessed disappointment and even chagrin that the true faith was feebly advocated, or appeared to disadvantage, while, on the other hand, heathenism and various systems of error are jubilant over their success.

There was a natural reason for the disadvantage at which Christianity was placed. The advocates of these foreign faiths were speaking to audiences in which were few who were competent to answer them, and where no reply or rejoinder was allowable. They were skilful masters of the art of presenting the best phases of their systems, and the only way to expose sophistry, fallacy, or even falsehood, was to have had the other side shown by equally competent parties. Such a course alone was fair to the hearers. Suppose, for example, the committee had provided two men equally able to present Buddhism; one, if they pleased, its high priest, the other, one of its most intelligent, fair-minded opponents. What if Sir Monier Williams could have set forth the radical defects of Buddhism, and so offset the