

fessor. I am ready in like manner to believe there is much to be learnt from the real Buddhism.

Yamato.—As the Buddhist may learn from Christ.

Ashikaga.—The old system is beautiful, but it is the fineness of a knife of the stone age compared with the steel blade of this. The arms of the stone age are hopelessly antiquated for the uses of to-day. There is poetry in their passing away. Buddha and Christ have perhaps long ago met, communed about their work, and loved each other.

Yamato.—What is the difference between the past and the future? If they have not yet, they will. What is Time?

Sanderson.—I am curious to know what some of those 2,800 problems are.

Ashikaga.—Tell him, Yamato.

Yamato.—One is, "Has a dog the Buddha soul?"

Ashikaga.—Which means, "Has it the capability of becoming a Buddha, an awakened, and of attaining to Nirvana?"

Yamato.—When he has thought out that problem to the fullest limit of the pro and con, and become forever satisfied upon it, the priest might give him any other, such as: "Listen to the voice of your right hand."

Sanderson.—What is the meaning of that one?

Yamato.—It means that he is to hold up his right hand from his elbow and become so absorbed in attempting to hear its imaginary sound that he attains the state of complete self-absorption and passes through the world without disturbance by externals. Then his mind becomes free.

Sanderson.—There is a value in that, I can see.

Ashikaga.—Yes, though but a simple habit, you do not know what its value has been to millions who have suffered.

Yamato.—The fragrance of the locust-blossoms is very sweet in these night dews.

ALCHEMIST.

Criticisms of Some Magazine Articles.

PART II.—A CRITICISM OF MR. GOLDWIN SMITH'S ARTICLE IN THE CONTEMPORARY REVIEW.
"THE MANCHESTER SCHOOL."

MR. GOLDWIN SMITH deservedly ranks so high as an authority that his statements have great weight. It is consequently necessary when he errs on vital points that his mistakes should be explained. The great Earl of Chatham styled Hume's History of England "an apology for the House of Stuart." Mr. Goldwin Smith's article is practically an apology for the errors and shortcomings of the leaders of the Manchester School; who for more than twenty years greatly influenced public opinion in England. During that time the Radicals in the House of Commons numbered about 80—not one-fourth of the total Liberal party. About one-half of the 80 belonged to the Manchester School, the other half often voted against Cobden and Bright. All thinking men admit that they did great good in their time, but they also did much which was far otherwise. Where I differ from Mr. Goldwin Smith is in this: he praises them for many of their erroneous and wrongful actions, but I venture "to hold the mirror up to nature."

WHY RADICALS PARTED FROM THE MANCHESTER SCHOOL.

Like him, I was originally an adherent of that school—although an extremely obscure one, and with numbers of other Radicals regretfully parted from Cobden and Bright when they deviated from accuracy of speech and patriotism. As a consequence of some of their reckless assertions and actions I was forced to the conclusion (1854) that although a man might be a Liberal yet he was bound to speak the truth like all other men, and that because he was a Liberal, he was not thereby exempted from doing so. Liberals will laugh at this as a truism, but thinking men of wide experience will understand. Many so-called advanced men apparently think that statements made by their leaders must necessarily be true, but often the presumption is the other way.

PALMERSTON-PHOBIA.

Both Cobden and Bright suffered from Palmerston-phobia and wrongly blamed him for nearly all the wars, and a majority of the shortcomings of that period. There is a good story told of an old-time Shah of Persia. His delusion was that all human mishaps were directly or indirectly

caused by women. No matter what accident happened to a man his obsequious slaves were for safety-sake bound to state that some female had caused it. One day a workman about the palace fell off a scaffold and was killed. On hearing of it the Shah pithily and grimly asked "Who?" meaning what woman was in fault. His attendant maladroitly explained that there was no woman in the case; whereupon the Asylum of the Universe angrily stamped his foot, repeating "Who?" The terror-stricken slave, realizing that his neck was in danger, forthwith drew upon his imagination and stated that the unfortunate man had sacrilegiously looked at one of the Shah's female slave of surpassing beauty, that while gazing at her he had made a misstep; hence the calamity. This satisfied the Shah. His frame of mind represents that of Cobden and Bright when war and Palmerston were spoken of.

PALMERSTON A PREVENTER OF WAR.

Had Palmerston been premier or even Foreign Secretary in 1853-4 there would have been no Crimean War, for with all his shortcomings he was a masculine statesman; whereas Lord Aberdeen, the then Premier—although able and well meaning—was a grand-motherly one. Grand-motherly men are ill-adapted to awe masterful lawbreakers. The Emperor Nicholas subsequently complained that he had been deceived, that if he had been told the truth (which would certainly have been the case if Palmerston had been Premier or Foreign Secretary), namely, that England would, if necessary, go to war to hinder his aggressions, there would have been no war. Nicholas blamed those who cried peace when there was no peace. Cobden and Bright, like all other Englishmen, earnestly desired peace, but by unintentionally helping to mislead the Czar, they assisted to bring about war. Yet lacking self-consciousness they persistently laid their errors upon the shoulders of others.

If men ostentatiously proclaim beforehand to an intending housebreaker, "We have great influence and will do all in our power to prevent the officers of justice from interfering;" surely such persons encourage crime instead of preventing it. On the other hand if a leading man plainly says, "If you attempt to do so, I and others will promptly rally to the outraged, and will bring you to justice," then he probably prevents crime—at any rate he does his duty. Palmerston was just such a man. The Manchester School gave him no credit for the wars he prevented. He saved us from a great European war in 1831. He then resolutely forbade French aggression in Belgium. With a weak minister Belgium would have lost its independence, and a great European war would have been the result. All French statesmen notoriously hankered for the Rhine frontier, but Palmerston resolutely prevented the insertion of the thin edge of the wedge. He also, in 1841, averted a European conflict upon the Eastern question. His action in that case was a fine illustration of the poet's grand figure of speech, for "out of the nettle danger he plucked the flower safety."

THE DAILY ORGAN OF THE MANCHESTER SCHOOL.

Through the persistent wrong-headedness of Cobden and Bright they lost much of their old-time influence. The London Morning Star, their daily organ, subsidised by Cobden, Bright and others, died a natural death; for the Radicals as a mass refused to patronize it. Cobden publicly stated as a reason for discontinuing help, that a journal ought to be self-supporting. At one general election both he and Bright were rejected by their constituents for unpatriotic conduct. John Bull is patriotic and straightforward, and dislikes the reverse, but some politicians are slow to learn this. If the franchise was the same now as in 1883, the chief misleaders would discover like Othello that "their occupation was gone." The lower the franchise the easier for political shysters.

Mr. Goldwin Smith's article on the Manchester School is cleverly written, but it is far below his usual high average. As a great admirer, I regret its publication. There are various inaccuracies in it, some of which are caused by his relative lack of cautiousness—previously referred to—shown by his accepting the evidence of unreliable witnesses. He has also adopted and repeated a very gross and unfounded charge, brought by the leaders of that school against a meritorious public servant.

He claims for the Manchester School that it was "in opposition to the sympathy and alliance with the slave power." This wrongly insinuates that those who differed