

pepsia! But, first, it is impossible; second, were it done, all mankind would be destroyed in a few weeks. Common sense says that when a man goes to professing the impossible he begins to be a cheat. And this is the practical trait of Buddhism.

They say the doctrine of transmigration is a great moral check, teaching the Hindus to avoid sin by the fear of migrating at death into some more miserable animal form. Is it not a better check to teach them that at death they will at once stand in judgment before an all-wise, just, and almighty Judge? May not that Buddhist doctrine also frequently incite living men to the fiercest brutality to animals, by the supposition that those animals are now animated by the souls of hated enemies?

The pantheism of China, India, and the moderns has common moral features. And the fatal influences are so plain that, while they are of vast and dreadful importance, they may be despatched in few words.

Then, first, when I act, it is God acting. You must not condemn me, whatever villainies I act, because that would be condemning God! Second, whatever men and devils act is but God acting. Then where is the possibility of God's having, in Himself, any rational standard of right, by which to condemn our sins? Does God's will in Himself judge and condemn His same will emitted in our actions? Or can that will be any moral standard at all which is thus self-contradictory? Such a moral ruler would be worse for the pulpit, than none at all—atheism less confusing and corrupting than pantheism. Third, God's existence and actions are necessary, if any actions are; but God acting, I have no free agency. But if not a free agent, I can not be justly accountable. Fourth, God is an absolute unit and unchangeable being, eternal and necessary. Therefore, if all happiness and misery in creatures are, at bottom, God's own affections, there can be no real difference between happiness and misery (Spinoza's own corollary). What will be the effect of this inference upon that excellent quality, mercy? The dogma must breed indifference to others' suffering, as much as stoicism under one's own. Its tendency is toward a hard-heartedness as pitiless as the tiger, the fire, and the tempest. Fifth, if God is all, there is but one substance in the universe. All other seeming personal beings are modal manifestations of the One. Hence, each creature is but a temporary phenomenon, a wavelet upon this ocean of being. Death, therefore, is a reabsorption into the One. It is *nirvana*, the absolute, eternal extinction of personality and consciousness—thus all pantheists. Then for this other reason there can be no personal responsibility, or reward, or punishment in the future. All the moral restraints of the doctrine of future judgment are as much swept away as by atheism.

We must be brief. Hartmann and Schopenhauer have shown that idealistic pantheism must lead to pessimism. But all our new-fangled