

The Politician.

THE BRITISH PRESS.

From Lloyd's London Weekly Newspaper  
March 1.

LORD DERBY IN CHINA.

Lord Derby has appealed to the humanity of the country through the house of Lords, and to the Lords Spiritual in their own body, to pass condign ignominy upon what is called the Chinese war. Very masterly was Lord Derby's speech on the occasion; fluent, vigorous, and especially bold; for, in the teeth of all evidence, his lordship contended that the *Arrow* *lorcha* was, to all intents and purposes, a Chinese craft; even though she sailed under the British flag, and carried British papers. Suddenly, a citizen of the world, Lord Derby discovers in the Chinese character the most amiable, the most equitable dispositions. The Chinese are lambs, and the British lion, a lion destitute of all leonine magnanimity, roaring and, at any vantage, seeking to devour them. Governor Yeh, a man to whom massacre has been a familiar exercise, is the most placable of mandarins; his peacock's feather the feather of a dove, and Mr Consul Parkes a blustering buccaner, a Black Beard predetermined on pillage. Could Lord Derby's speech be translated into Chinese, and circulated among the people of the 'flowery kingdom,' we think they would hardly recognise in the Derby Yeh the monster Governor who has been the great carcass-butcher of the Chinese rebellion, having executed tens of thousands of his countrymen as needful sacrifices to peace and quiet. Lord Derby's Yeh is a pattern Chinaman to be shown at Exeter-hall. A man so overflowing with the milk of human kindness that his very presence would be abounding profitable at the largest tea-parties. According to the compassionate conservative, the poor Chinaman has been entrapped into a quarrel by the avaricious unscrupulous English authorities at Canton; and the country is called upon to stand between him and the despotism of authority. Moreover the Church is called upon to raise its voice and pronounce a veto upon cannon-balls. We marvel how many bomb-shells may be neutralised by one bishop.

As we insisted last week, if trade is to be continued with the Chinese, it is only to be pursued by compelling them to respect the English power. The whole history of our commercial dealings with these people abounds with examples of their treachery, their cunning, their injustice. They hate us heartily; but their hatred is only a little less than their avarice. They call us foreign devils, but they are willing to deal with demons themselves if they can only turn a penny by the infernal commerce.

With every desire to believe in the wide philanthropy of Lord Derby, we can scarcely believe that Yeh would have been presented to the British public under such a beneficent aspect—a perfect Howard with a pig tail!—if the *Arrow* had been seized under Lord Derby's administration. Because Lord Derby is out, Governor Yeh is comely; because Lord Palmerston is 'master of the situation,' Yeh is a suffering martyr. Had Mr Disraeli been Chancellor of the Exchequer when Yeh hauled down the British flag, would Mr Disraeli have so intensely felt the virtues and the wrongs of the Chinese character, as at the present hour? Would the bishops have been called upon to drop a tear into their morning tea, reflective on the unchristian violence caused by that otherwise consoling beverage?

Again we say, let us forego all commerce with the Chinese, or let us so establish its usages between us, that they shall be once and for all instructed that they are not to violate a treaty with impunity. Lord Derby speaks with amiable horror of the disadvantages under which the barbarous Chinese labour when at war with the British power. For our own part we think it is quite as well that they are as inferior to us in arms, as in the arts of cruelty, treachery and deceit, they are superior, let us hope, to any other known nation of the earth. The bishops have been appealed to by Lord Derby to stop the war. Very well; they may possibly stop the cause of all future wars by preaching a crusade against the use of tea. Let them in the name of peace exhort every housewife to shiver to pieces on the domestic hearth the domestic tea-pot. If they can do this, their spiritual lordships may stop even the chance of future bloodshed, with stoppage of future profits to the Exchequer; if, however, they cannot do so—if the love of bohea prove too strong for the persuasion of bishops,—let us take sufficient care that we bind over all future Yehs to keep the peace, by keeping with us good faith. But, unhappily to respect us, they must fear us. A Chinaman with the dimmest notions of equity, ducks to the arguments of a forty-two pounder.

BATTLE OF THE BUDGET.

Messrs. Disraeli and Gladstone have prophesied to no account in the house. The stiff-necked Commons will not believe that 1860 will see us with a short-coming supply and increased expenditure. The *Zaidkel* for Buckinghamshire, and the *Raphael* for Oxford, have donned their conjuring gowns and draw their circles, but to

no effect: a majority of eighty denounced the imposture; an imposture severally put off with a gravity that deepened into dullness, with a vigour that rose to violence. Perhaps never was Mr Disraeli so dismal, never was Mr Gladstone so vehement. To the satisfaction of all men willing to be converted to absolute hopelessness Mr Disraeli proved the inevitable declension of England, weighted with the Chancellor's present budget. M Ledru Rollin himself—who finds very convenient shelter in the country that is fast breaking up about him—would have been gratified by hearing such a sympathetic prophecy of the Decay of England. We must perish, and nothing—short of the Disraeli nostrum—should help us. In the matter of tea and sugar, Mr Disraeli became absolutely pathetic. To twiddle with the duty on tea instead of boldly reducing it to a shilling in the pound was, in fact, to display a fiscal hardness of heart in no way to be softened by the best and holiest domestic influences. The tea duties had ever been denounced by the philanthropic statesman as a tax warring with the kindest instincts of humanity. With respect to the income-tax, the continuing sequestration in lieu of the promised reduction was a gross breach of faith with the people; whilst, it could be safely prophesied from the budget for 1857-8, the income-tax must remain, must in fact become an institution, continuing from 1860. Now, Mr Disraeli's Budget was a budget for posterity; a prophetic measure that would give us the balance of every year almost for all time.

Mr Gladstone's quarrel was the non-adoption of his own budget of 1853. With the passionate love of an anxious parent, he insisted upon its many beauties and virtues; and making no converts to his own partial opinion, became almost outrageous in the indignation of his disappointment.

And so the Chancellor of the Exchequer carried for his Budget a majority of eighty; the house acknowledging in the principles of the measure those very principles that still in operation, would extinguish the hateful income-tax in 1860; The country is of one accord as to the injustice, the household nuisance of the impost, only to be tolerated as a provision against impending calamity. Long ere 1860, we are to have a general election; and is there any doubt that the first and fullest pledge required of every candidate will be a repeal of the income-tax? Even as the Ministry saw and felt the impossibility of continuing in 1857 the war ninence, even so will the Ministry, however composed, acknowledge in 1860 the doom of the peace sequestration.

THE DANUBIAN PRINCIPALITIES.

The London organ of the British Government has put forth a reply to the declaration of the French government in favour of an union of the Danubian Principalities. In that reply it is stated that the objections entertained against the union are those which suggested themselves to Austria and to Turkey than from any conviction or requirements of her own. This is an honest confession, and we believe it to be the truth. Lord Clarendon, in the conference of Paris, found nothing in his own judgement, or in British traditional policy, to make him oppose the union. It was only when Austria and Turkey insisted on setting aside this proposal that England concurred in their views.

Now, let it be admitted, that Austria and Turkey are powers which ought to have great weight and voice in these eastern questions; still, as their governments are neither long-sighted nor wise, we should examine the value of their objections, instead of adopting them servilely, in order to pay court to ministers and influences at Vienna and Constantinople. Austria objects to the Principalities being joined together, because this makes them progress to the state of a nation—gives them force, and com, pactness, and independence. Why is Austria opposed to the Roumans becoming a nation? It is because Austria hopes one day to appropriate or annex the Principalities, or a portion of them. And it is that, having several millions of Roumans within the empire, inhabiting Transylvania and the Bukovina, it fears that a free Rouman state might affect the tranquility of Rouman provinces ruled by Austrian despotism.

Surely reasons like these, however vehemently held and put forward by Austria, are not such as a British statesman can countenance. Austria first of all, if put in possession of these provinces, or even one of them, could only keep possession on the terms on which she keeps Lombardy—that is, by a military force greater than the possession would be worth. Besides, Austria could never maintain herself in these provinces but with Russian support; and Russia would never consent to give this without sharing in the spoil. This would be sharing Moldavia and Wallachia between Russia and Austria.—Is that the result for which we underwent the campaign of Sebastopol?

Then are we to deny five millions of Roumans the enjoyment of national rights, freedom, and independence, because, forsooth, this might render another couple of millions of Roumans uneasy under Austrian despotism? The French province of Alsace is peopled by Germans—shall the Emperor Napoleon forbid the Grand Duke of Baden to establish constitutional government or freedom of the press in his dominions, lest this might disturb the silent slavery of Alsace?

Such pretensions on the part of Austria are preposterous even for Austria; and for us to listen to them is as disgraceful as ridiculous. If such are the objections of the Austrians to the union, what are those of the Turks? The Turks simply desire to retain the septennial nomination of two hospodars, because each hospodar spends about £150,000 at Constantinople for his installation. This goes amongst the pachas.—Moreover, the place of hospodar suits the Fanariot families. The Callimakis and Mayrocordatis can get no other government under the Porte, and the Porte is anxious to retain the means of rewarding them. This reason of patronage and pecuniary profit weighs far more with Turkish statesmen than reasons of policy. It is in vain to tell them, that with the divided provinces and their septennial hospodrate, Russia or Austria were every day gaining ground in the Principalities, or actually occupying them, appointing governors or dethroning them—and that the whole system was but a series of servility, and corruption, and chaos. But the Turks think this a very good and profitable system to renew. They want to continue the last century, which is quite sufficient for their indolence and their gain. Are English statesmen to abet these stupid and interested ideas and aims of the Turks?

As to the French, they support the union because they know it to be the first desire of the inhabitants of Moldavia and Wallachia; and they hope, by flattering the national desire, to have a party there. The Russians pursue the same policy, however sorry they would be to see the union accomplished. But both France and Russia know and calculate that much may be built hereafter on the attachment and gratitude of the Roumans. France and Russia build upon the influence which they hope to gain by favouring the wishes of the Roumans, whilst the English are recommended to join Austria and Turkey in thwarting the people of the Danube, and thereby rendering themselves as detested as the Austrians. By flinching away her just influence.—For according as she now treats the Moldo-Wallachians, so the Servians, Bosnians, Bulgarians, and all the Christian or semi-Christian tribes of the Levant will judge of English justice, liberality, and wisdom. We are in fact paying court to sovereigns and spurning the people—a kind of policy so foreign to our national habits, character, and interest, that it cannot be preserved in without bringing upon us mortification, and disgrace and defeat.

From the London Morning Post.

THE MILD AND JUST CHINESE.

After Lord Derby's appeal to the bishops in favour of the innocent and unoffending Chinese it may not be amiss to point out to the reverend prelates the playful manner in which their brethren are dealt with by the enlightened inhabitants of the flowery land. We find in the correspondence lately printed the following statement addressed by M. Livois, procureur-general of the French missions in China, to Sir John Bowring, under date Hong Kong, July 12, 1856:—

'I have just learned that M. Chapdelaine, a French missionary of our society, was put to death on the 29th of last February by the mandarin of Siesin, a place situated to the west of Quang-si, near the frontier of Yunnan. Arrested on the 24th of February, he was brought before the tribunal: the mandarin began by ordering 100 blows on the face to be inflicted upon him with a leather shoe sole. He then made him lie down, and he was beaten with 300 strokes of a cane. As during this double torture M. Chapdelaine uttered no complaint nor groan, the mandarin, attributing this long suffering to the influence of some charm, caused the throat of a dog to be cut, and sprinkled the poor sufferer with its blood to dissipate the magic. Next day the mandarin learning that M. Chapdelaine was still able to walk, he ordered him to be beaten till his strength should be exhausted; when it was announced that the victim could no longer move, they put upon him a sort of apparatus with springs that crushed him as in a press. In this condition he was hung up. Lastly, when on the point of death, he was decapitated. His head was hung up to a tree, but the children pelting it with stones, it fell down, and was devoured by the dogs and pigs. The body was, some say, interred: others affirm it was thrown into the sewer; but previous to this it was opened, and the executioners tore out the heart, cut it in pieces, and cooked it in fat; they then ate it. Two converts were decapitated with their pastor for having refused to renounce their religion. Fourteen or fifteen more were in prison.

That, dear sir, is the way treaties are observed in China, and that is the manner in which the chiefs of a people which is often boasted of as a polished nation actually conduct themselves.'

SWITZERLAND.—Berne.—The Paris Presse gives us a piece of news the fact that Paris is definitely fixed upon as the place where the Neuchâtel conference is to be held; but, although the plenipotentiaries may possibly meet towards the end of the month, it thinks that the day of meeting is not yet fixed. The mission of Colonel Manteuffel to Paris is contradicted.

News of the Week.

From English Papers to the 1st March.  
EUROPE.

SWEDEN.—*Ecclesiastical Tribunals in Sweden.*—From the last despatches we are informed that the religious strife is increasing with great intensity in the centre of the Swedish Diet, and the proceedings there forebode a storm which will be more or less felt in every political region. In the Chamber of the Clergy M. Landgreen, Prevot Ecclesiastique, had on the 27th ult., made a motion which has produced a deep sensation in the public mind.—This motion was called one for the Reform of the Discipline of the Church, and had for its object nothing less than the creation of ecclesiastical tribunals, whose missions should be the punishment of sins of the members of the State Church, in virtue of the same rights exercised by the ordinary tribunals, of punishing crimes and offences committed against the civil law. The following is the substance of the proposition.—

1st. Every pastor will be required to denounce to the Council of his Church every person who will be held guilty of any crime that had exposed him to exclusion from the community of the faithful, and that exclusion shall have been published by the Council of the Church upon a tableau placed in a prominent situation in the sacristy.

2d. Besides the crimes for which the civil law pronounced excommunication, this ordeal will be applied to every individual condemned for uttering bad money, for incendiarism, for perjury, &c. Likewise to every person who notoriously follows a life of impiety, and who, after receiving from his pastor exhortations to amend his conduct, obstinately continues in crime.

3d. The Council of the Church shall draw up against every individual charged with crime, an indictment which must be transmitted to the Prevot Ecclesiastique, who will, on the instant, convoke a tribunal, composed of 12 members of which the third at least, and the half at most shall be ecclesiastics.

4th. This tribunal will have the power to inflict upon any criminal an anathema for any period from three months to one year.

5th. No religious benediction can be granted to the individual suffering under an anathema, except he be in *actu moris*. He cannot marry, he cannot be admitted to serve as a god-father, and he ought to be denied even Christian burial.

6th. The anathema shall be accompanied with an exhortation conveying a diligent instruction in the knowledge of the Christian doctrine; and if the criminal should then prove penitent, if he should cease to live a life of impiety he shall be admitted to re-enter the pale of the Church.

7. The condemned can appeal against the sentence of anathema to the Chapter of the Cathedral, which will have the power, if it think fit of breaking the sentence.

This motion having been examined by the Chamber of the Clergy in the last sitting, a warm discussion took place upon its merits. Several of the Swedish Clergy denounced it as a renewal of the Inquisition with all its horrors, and as calculated to excite fanaticism on the one hand, and indifference and hatred to all religious worship on the other. It was declared to be characterized by a want of charity, which was very far short of the spirit of the Christian religion. Many of the clergy, however, as strenuously defended the proposition, denying that it did at all partake of the character of the hated Inquisition, for it prescribed neither torture nor corporal chastisement. The motion ultimately was adopted by a great majority of votes.

ENGLAND.—*Colliery explosion.*—One hundred and seventy lives lost.—Barnsley Thursday night.—A few minutes after twelve o'clock this day an awful explosion took place at the Lund-hill colliery, situated about half a mile from the Wombwell station on the South Yorkshire railway. The pit, which is about 220 yds. deep, belongs to Taylor and Co., and is worked by separate shifts of men night and day. The day workers, to the number of 180 men and eight lads, descended at 6 o'clock this morning. At twelve o'clock twenty-two of them, who reside near the pit, came up to dinner, the rest remaining to partake of that meal in the pit.—Shortly afterwards a fearful explosion occurred which shook the ground for a great distance around, and the frame in which the cones descend was blown up the shaft and lodged in the gearing above the pit-mouth. Numbers of men from neighbouring collieries flocked to render assistance, and up to seven o'clock sixteen men had been drawn up alive, some of them most seriously injured; this left 140 men remaining in the pit to almost certain death.

The interior of the pit was set on fire by the explosion, and the flames have spread with such rapidity as, it is feared, to cut off all chance of reaching that part of the pit where the 142 men are supposed to be. Some idea of the fearful nature of the fire may be gathered when we state that the flames ascending up the air-shaft, 220 yards deep, reach more than twenty yards above the top, illuminating the