LIBRARY

The Open Court.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Devoted to the Work of Conciliating Religion with Science.

No. 249. (Vol. VI.—22.) CHICAGO, JUNE 2, 1892. Two Dollars per Year. Single Copies, 5 Cents.

Copyright by The Open Court Publishing Co.—Reprints are permitted only on condition of giving full credit to Author and Publisher.

FARMING AND THE COMMON SCHOOLS.

BY PROF. CALVIN THOMAS.

In a recent issue of *The Open Court* (No. 245) Mr. E. P. Powell draws attention to what he regards as a conspicuous defect of our common schools, the fact, namely, that they universally neglect the sciences that "make the land and things on the land pre-eminently interesting." These sciences, by which he means especially botany, zoölogy, geology, and chemistry, Mr. Powell thinks "should of course compose the burden of early education." Instead of these however the pupils learn precisely those things "that point toward trade and town life." And this Mr. Powell thinks particularly unfortunate since at the present time "the deepest political problem of England and Germany, as well as of America, is how to reverse the drift toward urban residence."

The educational theory here propounded is novel and interesting, and I desire, in a purely scientific and not at all in a controversial spirit, to examine it from a point of view which must either have escaped Mr. Powell or have seemed to him to lie aside from his path.

It is safe to assume, probably, that most thoughtful people would agree with Mr. Powell in deprecating the present cityward tendency of our American population. Whether it is really "the deepest political problem" of our day is another question. Personally I incline to the opinion that the danger is not so great as it is often imagined, and that the evil will tend to correct itself from purely economic causes. But granting the gravity of the situation and the desirableness of enlisting the school-master in the interest of a reaction, I raise the query whether Mr. Powell's diagnosis of the case is correct and whether the remedy he proposes would prove efficacious.

Stated in simplest terms the question is this: Would the teaching of botany, zoology, geology, and chemistry in the common schools have a tendency to check the influx of young people from the farm to the city? I think not. Mr. Powell seems to assume without argument that all that is necessary to make farm life attractive to boys and girls, is to turn their attention early in life to the sciences that "make the land interesting" to an adult of scientific proclivities. He expects that the boy who knows something of the facts of botany, zoölogy, etc., will therefore be ready, or at least much more ready, to devote his life to the tilling of the soil. But where is the experience to justify such an expectation? The agricultural colleges of the United States have been founded in part for the express purpose of educating farmers, but it is well known that they have not been conspicuously successful in this part of their mission. In every quarter the complaint has been heard, and most often from the farmers themselves, that the young men, after receiving at considerable expense a farmer's education, persistently refuse to become farmers. (By a "farmer" I mean here one who earns his living by tilling the soil; farmers by proxy, political farmers, etc., are expressly left out of consideration). But now, if the agricultural colleges, working upon youths who are at the right age to derive most profit and a most decided bent from scientific instruction,—if the colleges find it so hard to create a taste for farming among their students, is there much to be hoped from a smattering of three or four sciences learned at an early age in the common schools?

I say a smattering, since it is evident that nothing more than that could be attained in average cases. Mr. Powell would have the land sciences "compose the burden of early education"; but surely reading, writing, and an elementary knowledge of numbers must come first. Learning to read is the indispensable foundation of all other learning whatsoever; and really it takes a long time to learn to read. There are also good grounds for wishing to have a little American history, and a modicum of geography taught in the common schools. A little drawing is also very desirable. With these the usual subjects taught (and I fail to see, by the way, how any of them can fairly be said to "point toward trade or town life" more than to any other life), there is little time left for instruction in the sciences "that make the land interesting." But suppose that little, increased as much as possible by the processes of curtailing and wedging-in, to be used for such a purpose. Suppose the time given to a series of science-primers, or to elementary object lessons, if the latter

were deemed better: what would be the practical result in average cases? Anything more than a useless smattering? Would the pupil take with him any really inspiriting, character-building scientific knowledge such as would sustain him in following the plow or tend to repress his cityward yearnings?

I think there is no doubt how the great mass of intelligent teachers, even those most in sympathy with the end proposed, would answer these questions. They would say that in three cases out of five the instruction would produce no appreciable effect whatever on the mind and character of the pupil; that in one of the other two it would blight an otherwise promising scientific curiosity by setting tasks for which the mind would not be ripe. (I make this remark because we could not expect geniuses to teach science in the common schools, at least not as wages now are); in the remaining case they would say that a real bent for scientific study might be imparted. But then, they would add: The first effect of that bent, when the pupil had gone to work upon the farm, would be to make him long to be away that he might have time and opportunity for further study.

In short it strikes me that Mr. Powell does not discriminate sharply enough between a love for the sciences that make the land interesting and a love for the art of digging one's living out of the ground—two things that are not at all identical, not even functions of each other. Nor does he allow sufficiently for the difference between the instincts of youth and the reasoned opinions of the philosophical adult who has seen something of life in divers phases and can tell the better from the worse. There is a certain youthful emotion, called in German "world-thirst," and referred to by Tennyson in the well-known lines of "Locksley Hall":

> "Eager-hearted as a boy when first he leaves his father's field,
> Yearning for the large excitement that the coming years would yield."

It is this emotion, in some one of its many phases, that draws the country boy, to some extent the country girl also, away from the farm to the city. It begins to be borne in upon him in early boyhood, that the life of the farm is a narrow, monotonous life of hard work, small pay, and meagre opportunity for action, enjoyment, or improvement. He goes to the city in search of a better opportunity. Doubtless it would be better for him in most cases to remain upon the farm, but *he* does not know that until experience has taught him. He knows from books or from hearsay of men who have left the farm and found fame, money, or excitement in the city. He knows nothing of the battles they have fought, nothing of the difference between himself and them, nothing of the countless failures that he has not heard of. He feels himself drawn away. The more knowledge you give him, knowledge that tells of an outside world in which men are doing, studying, finding out all sorts of interesting things, the more you add fuel to the flame.

I conclude, therefore, that very little can be done by the common schools to check the drift toward the cities. For this we must rely chiefly upon economic forces. Whatever tends to improve the economic status of the farm-industry and to elevate the plane of the farmer's life, will tend to correct the evil. What little the schools *can* do can best be done, in my opinion, by ethical rather than by scientific instruction. For it is a question of character, rather than of knowledge, that we are here concerned with, and it is the character-building studies that I should wish to see "compose the burden of early education.".

DEAD-LETTER DOGMAS

BY FELIX L. OSWALD.

When the naturalist Bonpland was arrested by order of Dictator Francia, he whiled away his leisure by exploring the neighborhood of a military hospital, where one day the post steward showed him a tame snake which at once attracted his attention by its peculiar appearance.

It was a full-grown specimen of the harmless rock-serpent, often domesticated in Paraguay on account of its rat-catching talents, and from its head to the middle of its body exhibited the steel-blue metallic lustre of its species, but the remaining portion of its skin had turned gray, and the terminal vertebræ seemed to drag along like an appendage of inert matter. Seeing that the strange creature could be handled, the naturalist examined it more closely, and was surprised to find that a full third of its body had become atrophied so completely that it felt like a shriveled piece of bone and could neither be bent nor compressed. According to the statement of the hospital steward, the snake had existed in that condition for nearly a year, and it seemed a puzzle how its internal organism could have accommodated itself to the abnormal predicament and how it could move without apparent inconvenience.

That mystery is, however, rivalled by the marvel of semi-ossified creeds. In the course of the last thirty centuries the history of ethics has at least four times recorded the phenomenon of prosperous religions surviving the credibility of their tenets and continuing their ceremonial functions—or even the progress of their propaganda, apparently unhindered by their connection with a defunct dogmatic appendage. About three thousand years ago the Moloch worship of the ancient Phoenicians was transplanted from Tyre to the north-coast of Africa and the temples of the cruel creed towered among the palaces of Carthage, but the merchants of that enterprising city contented them-

selves with paying their quota of the annual tithes and would have requested a lunacy commissioner to investigate a proposition to avert droughts by the sacrifice of a child.

During the first two centuries of our chronological era the shrines of polytheism continued to multiply throughout the thirty-five provinces of *Orbis Romanus*, and the emoluments of the priesthood may be inferred from the fact that even in third-class towns the incumbents of sacerdotal offices were generally able to minister to the financial, as well as spiritual needs of their relatives. Yet at the same time the results of rationalistic inquiries had become a decidedly open secret. Lucretius and Cicero professed tenets strikingly similar to those of our latter-day pantheists. Quintilian ventured to speak of an "all-sustaining God of Nature," and the disciples of Epicurus compromised the question by admitting the possible existence of Gods who, for all one could know to the contrary, might reign in heaven, but evidently had not the slightest disposition to interfere in terrestrial affairs. Diagoras, the Grecian Ingersoll, delivered popular lectures on the absurdities of ancient myths, and Xenophanes called attention to the suspicious circumstance that the gods of Africa were black and those of the Thracian highlands fair and blue-eyed. Natural philosophers were *ex officio* sceptics, though, like some of the more cautious modern followers of Spinoza, they used the word "god" as a summary of the cosmic powers. "The universe and the sky," says Pliny ("Hist. Nat. II. 1.) "in whose embrace all matter is contained, may be deemed a God, vast and everlasting, never begotten and never to perish. This we may admit, but to search for secrets beyond this is of no profit to man, and, indeed, transcends the limits of his faculties."

The Sicilian Euhemerus suggested that the gods might originally have been kings, whose history in the course of ages had become interwoven with myths, and even before the time of Constantine, the oracles (once by no means confined to Delphi) had been so mercilessly ridiculed that some of them were abandoned from want of patronage. Legendre in his "Traité de l'Opinion, ou Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoir de l'Esprit humain," has collected a most amusing miscellany of witticisms at the expense of the practice of divination. If a convivial Roman laid in a new supply of wine his friends acquainted him with a revelation to the effect that fate had "doomed him to pass a night in the sewer, harassed by gutter-snipes and squeaking rats"—imitating the mystic style of the Pythoness. A libertine was favored with a prognostic of his gallant adventures and a gambler with what our sportsmen would call "tips," concerning the chances of more profitable investments. Even the Roman street Arabs played at augury, pretending to read the decrees of fate in the entrails of drowned cats. Considering such changes of public opinion it seems certainly strange that Roman patricians continued to compete for the honor of hierarchic functions, or that at the end of the second century the total number of oracles should still have exceeded a hundred, in Eastern Europe alone. In every campaign augurs were consulted on the chances of success, though the Roman general Sertorius was apt to "correct fortune" by instructing his soothsayers to furnish verdicts favoring his private plan of operations.

Some of the oracles of northern Africa continued to turn out horoscopes till the followers of Mohammed suppressed them by force of arms, but Islam itself, with all the religious conservatism of the oriental nations, has not escaped the influence of scepticism. The tenets of the Sufists, who as early as A. D., 1400 counted their disciples by tens of thousands, seem to be a mixture of Buddhism and gnostic mysticism, but had certainly little, if anything in common with the doctrine of the Prophet, whose memory they nevertheless continued to honor with orthodox rites and pilgrimages. The Koran prohibits the encouragement of arts tending to imitate the explaks of the creator by the handiwork of his creatures, very his Imperial Highness, the Sultan of Morocco, seems to have arrived at the conclusion that the specifications of that interdict cannot be applied to photography which "being the effect of the sun, cannot be properly designated as the work of human hands,"—at all events his majesty appears to have taken a personal interest in a collection of photographic views of the Chicago exhibition grounds, and intimated a desire to get similar souvenirs of his commissioner's visit to other cities of the western continent. The agent of a patent medicine firm seems to have been equally successful in persuading the citizens of Constantinople that the prohibition of wine cannot be applied to medicated bitters," but Mohammed Baber Khan, the conqueror of northern Hindostan, went a step further, and argued that wine itself might be lawfully drunk at the source of the Indus, under climatic circumstances so different from those of the Arabian deserts.

That shrewd observer, Count Benso Cavour, remarked that the multiplication of sects in England and North America may have something to do with the appreciation of the propriety to modify the name of "Christians." But with or without that change of nomenclature we must admit that in many countries of Christendom the prevailing practice of the inhabitants has come to imply, not only a modification but an absolute antithesis of the prevailing creed. If a pious Hindoo should devote his holidays to lectures on the duty of sparing the lives of all fellow-creatures

and divide his week days between slaughterhouse work and parforce hunts, the incongruity could not be more glaring than that of our practical comments on the doctrine inculcating the merit of voluntary poverty. "Take no thought for the morrow," "provide neither gold nor silver," "neither have two coats apiece," are precepts endorsed by Sunday school teachers who make the accumulation of wealth, nay of excessive and superfluous wealth, the object of a restless pursuit, and who would promptly agree to take the risk of passing the needle's eye of the heavenly kingdom with a hundred camel-load of coin.

The wickedness of homicide, even in self-defense, and the duty of passive submission to injustice, are preached in countries that expend an enormous percentage of their revenues in the manufacture of life-destroying machinery, and oblige every able-bodied citizen to become a graduate in the art of systematic manslaughter. There are communities where a lecturer on the fallacies of the scriptural formula for the cure of diseases would be arrested for blasphemy and where, nevertheless, a practical attempt at faith-cure would be promptly followed by an indictment for malpractice.

"All republics should combine," said the swashbuckler Cortina at the reception of the American consul, and under the stimulus of applause then proceeded to wax eloquent: "all true republicans should be friends, whether they worship the cross, the crescent, or the stars and stripes of the United States." "Say, what *is* the religion of the Yankees?" was the *sotto voce* inquiry of the doughty General's adjutant.

The orator scratched his head, but might have answered in the words of Ibrahim Pasha: "As to the creed of these western Giaours, accounts differ, and all that can be said with certainty is that it has changed."

THE HIGHEST TRUMP IN ARGUMENT.

Willie Smith went to school in town, but his parents lived in the country. When he came home during vacation he brought with him a rifle which he had bought with his pocket money. The little fellow was very proud of his gun although it was not of extra quality, as may be judged from the behaviour of the sparrows who were little alarmed when the young hunter appeared in the yard.

Will did not care so much for the opinion of the sparrows as for the admiration of his little friends in the neighborhood. So he went to Pat Runy, the son of the blacksmith, to show him his new gun.

Paddy was not the boy to be easily imposed upon. He had seen better guns in his life and he thought little of "that toy." Will had to bring forward some argument to impress upon Paddy the idea that his gun was something extraordinary; so he said: "The barrel and the trimmings are of silver."

"They are not!" said Paddy.

"That's silver," repeated Will indignantly, "look how it glitters in the sun."

Paddy was a little older than Will and had sometimes helped his father in the shop. So he said with an air of superiority: "The barrel is plain iron and the trimmings are nickel plated. They are not silver."

"How do ye know?" replied Will. "We don't know anyhow what silver is."

"Just ask Tom!" Paddy shouted, eager to corroborate his assertion by the authority of his elder brother who had attended a course in chemistry at college. "*He* must know; *he* knows all about metals."

Will remained undaunted. "Tom knows nothing about silver. He melts the metals in his retorts and weighs them; he knows what they look like and such things. But he does not and cannot know what silver really is. No one knows that."

"Don't he?" asked Paddy with scorn.

"No, he don't," emphasised the little agnostic with an assurance that results alone from the confidence of proposing an unanswerable argument. "No one knows what silver really is."

Paddy had a glib tongue. He always was ready with an answer. But this time he was silenced. Philosophers do not know what things are in themselves. How should he know? Scientists know only what things appear to be. Closely considered they know nothing.

Paddy was not a philosopher but he was a smart boy and that means more; for a smart boy can at any time most easily become a philosopher by turning agnostic.

Paddy became a philosopher; and now whenever in a controversy he is at his wits end, he will jump at his adversary with the plain declaration that, in his opinion, the wisest man is he who openly confesses his ignorance and frankly acknowledges that he knows no more than the stupidest fool. If anyone dares to know somthing, he is mercilessly pilloried for arrogance, and our modest philosopher who on some other occasions pretends to know so much, smiles in the consciousness of superior wisdom with an air of Socratic modesty.

CURRENT TOPICS.

The Squanders of Castle Squander were a rollicking Irish family, made famous by Carleton in one of his humorous and delightful novels. After Carleton exposed them they came to America, took to politics, and had amazing luck. Every male descendant of them is a member of congress, and Castle Squander is now the capitol at Washington. The Billion dollar congress held high revelry at Castle Squander two or three years ago, and rehearsed Belshazzar's feast, but the Trillion dollar congress now in session there, promises by sumptuous magnanimity and bountiful generosity

to make the other appear by comparison parsimonious and mean. It is the comfort of patriotism in this country that party spirit will never again become dangerously sectional or bigoted so long as we enjoy the blessing of a public treasury where all parties may meet in the fraternal spirit of national grand larceny, and reconcile one another to a common flag by a just and fair division of national spoil, in that broad, exuberant and continental temper that knows no east, no west, no north, no south. So long as the rains fall, and the waters flow to the sea there will be River and Harbor festivals at Castle Squander, where the Democratic House and the Republican Senate may sit in political concord and divide among themselves the revenues of an empire. Even the Blue and the Gray blend their colors into a sort of dingy brown, and wear a common uniform when forming themselves into scouting parties to make raids upon the treasury.

* * *

When the Honorable Member for the Marbletown district, demanded an appropriation in the River and Harbor bill to improve the West Fork of Catfish creek, he showed that while New York harbor and the Mississippi river always had *some* water in them, it often happened that when the people who lived in the valley of the West Fork had a picnic in the bed of the stream, they were compelled to go out on the bank to get water to make their coffee; therefore it was unjust that money should be squandered on those big rivers while streams that needed water were neglected in the bill. "And moreover than that," said the Honorable Member, "I won't vote a cent for New York harbor or the Mississippi river, unless I get twenty five thousand dollars for the West Fork of Catfish creek." This threat proved effectual, and "our hustling and wide-awake member," as the *Catfish Chronicle* called him, got his twenty five thousand dollars. In that way the River and Harbor Trust, unlimited, scatters the public money into numerous trout ponds, frog nurseries, and terrapin plantations. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are thrown into bayous and creeks having no visible place on any American map. Few grants in the River and Harbor bill could stand alone. Their only chance is to form a syndicate, and blackmail the great harbors and the navigable streams. The River and Harbor bill now pending at Castle Squander, and which the people "view with alarm," could not have the smallest chance to become a law, except by promising on the honor of a thief to make a fair division of the stolen goods. New York bay cannot obtain a grant unless the member from Cheesequake's creek gets one likewise. The Mississippi river may choke with sand, but it shall not receive any assistance from the national government except by paying tribute of blackmail to the Big Sunflower, or the Little Pedee, and allowing them place beside it in the River and Harbor bill. The people are fairly safe against individual, unconsolidated, and retail pillage, but they are powerless against a combination of three hundred members of congress to divide among their several "districts" fifty million dollars.

* * *

A few years ago, a citizen of Chicago was appointed Chief Justice of the United States, and immediately we all began to wriggle around him, and grovel, as our obsequious custom is; although the day before his appointment we were too independent and proud to give him even the honor and respect that were properly his due. It may be unworthy of us to fawn upon the judges, but it is at least prudent, for we know not the day nor the hour when we may be plaintiffs or defendants in a court of law. In our ignoble flattery of the bench we follow the lead of the daily press; for no matter how scanty and thin may be the legal wardrobe and equipment of a judge, he always appears in the newspapers as a "jurist." It therefore causes wonder when a Chicago newspaper of importance concedes, though merely in an incidental way, that our judiciary is morally and mentally of inferior quality. Judge Blodgett of the United States District Court, having resigned his office, the editor advises the President that no inferior lawyer ought to be appointed successor "to a scholar and a jurist like Blodgett." In showing the President his duty, the editor drops into contemptuous criticism of the judges whom we pay to administer the laws of which they know very little except the forms. The comedy of it is that should the man whom that editor regards as the most worthless of the "incompetents" get the appointment, he would become at once in the estimation of the paper, "a scholar and a jurist like Blodgett." This, however, is of less importance than its humiliating testimony to "the superiority of the British bench to the American"; and the concession that "While the integrity of the bench of the United States has rarely been stained, intellectual attainments of the judges must be confessed mediocre, and therefore injurious to the people." And yet in the idiom of journalistic snobdom, every one of those judges is "a scholar and a jurist like Blodgett."

* * *

That editor critic of whom I spoke in the last paragraph attempts to explain "the superiority of the British bench to the American"; and why the British bench "is one of incorruptible integrity, and of intellectual and moral acumen unsurpassed in any past time and doubtless unequalled in that of any other country." He accounts for that excellence and superiority by the fact that, "the judges are independent of the crown, holding their places for life, adequately compensated, and subject to no passing influence of politics or mobs." These are strong reasons, and if sound, they are sufficient; but he gives others, and says that the superiority "is quite as much to be attributed to the education of the British lawyer before admission to the bar and preceding his appointment to the bench." He then explains that admission to the bar is easy in the United States and very difficult in England; that applicants in England must have a better general education, and a better special education than is required in the United States; and "therefore, men who are transferred from the bar to the bench in the United Kingdom, are those who, by demonstrated ability in general practice, have shown themselves to be expert in every branch of law." Those reasons although plausible and very popular are fallacious. They assume that the measure of a lawyer is the knowledge gained by him before admission to the bar; whereas, the true test of him is the knowledge he acquires afterward. The proof of that is that although hundreds of young men are admitted to the bar in England only a few of them survive as lawyers; no more than would survive of any other like number admitted without any preliminary knowledge of the text books at all. And the same rule applies to the United States. One reason for the superiority of the British bench is that there are few judges in England, and they live to a great age. When a judge in that country considerately dies, which is not often, the prime minister in making the new appointment has all the bar to choose from; and it is therefore easy for him to select a man of established reputation. The main question, however, is, not the superiority of the English bench, but the inferiority of our own; to which may be added this, how can our own judicial system be improved?

M. M. Trumbull.

CORRESPONDENCE.

IS NATIONALISM CHEAP?

To the Editor of The Open Court:

In the article "Reform on Scientific Principles" in *The Open Court* of April 28th, Mr. Holland notices some well-known facts about the growth of government non-interference with beliefs, amusements, etc., says that people differentiate with progress and from these facts, which no intelligent socialist or nationalist ever thought of disputing or wishing to change, he infers substantially that Spencer and his followers really have a monopoly of social

science. Mr. Holland calls nationalism cheap; but the elaboration of two dogmas which have been set forth in about every magazine in the country along with the truism, accepted by every one, that some kinds of cloth are higher under protection—government interference—than under free-trade, does not seem to the common mind a particularly expensive philosophy. It may be a cheap fact, and it may take a very scientific mind not to see that this is an age of machinery which is rapidly changing the old order, that when one machine, as the spinning jenny, for instance, does the work that one thousand men once did, if the people shall insist on a nominal "right of private contract" and a lot of other precious *names* which make up the individualistic theorist's idea of Liberty, then thousands and ever increasing thousands must have no work while countless others must be overworked slaves.

Nationalism as a remedy is cheap in one sense—so much the better—but if it's so unscientific why do the costly and scientific aristocracy never answer any of the real hard questions, why do they only repeat over and over three or four dogmas which no one disputes? What will the scientists do for the overworked and the unemployed, or rather what will they allow them to do for themselves? What shall be done with monopolies which in every country are crushing the life from governments and people? Why need men strive physically, mentally, and morally in a country where inventions have made leisure and culture for all as possible as any work of civilisation? What indeed shall be done with a class of men and women whom evolution is surely turning out with increasing rapidity in spite of Spencerian objections, whose sympathies are so deep that they cannot rest in ease while others suffer injustice and needless misery? Can any philosopher specify what particular right or price of Liberty he now enjoys which nationalism must necessarily wrest from him? Suppose the nation should assume control of telegraphs as Mr. Wanamaker recommends and messages be sent at cost, what would happen to our Liberty?

It can never cease to be a logical wonder that the one and only school of science has never noticed in man's evolution, from barbarism, along with progess in individualism and in perfect harmony with it, the equal or greater progress in socialism. According to these teachers, the most barbarous parts of our civilisation are the post office, roads, parks, sidewalks, bridges, common schools, i. e. nationalism, while the most highly civilised man is the hermit who lives apart and entirely independent of his fellows.

Hartford, Conn. ELLA ORMSBY.

BOOK REVIEWS.

PAGANISM AND CHRISTIANITY. By *J. A. Farrer.* New York: Henry Holt & Co. Chicago: McClurg & Co. 1892.

The author of this book is a Protestant Christian who holds aloof from the theological controversies of sectarianism and asserts the same freedom to form his opinion about the Fathers as about the Popes. He takes up in the present volume the cause of Paganism versus Christianity, not as if he intended any hostility toward his own religion, but simply because his sense of justice is hurt on account of the disparaging judgment the Christians are wont to pass on the whole ancient world of Paganism.

Mr. Farrer very properly reminds us in the motto selected for his book of the following saying of St. Augustine's, "That "thing which is now called Christian religion existed among the "ancients and was from the beginning not absent in the race of "mankind." *

Taking this standpoint which no one familiar with the evolution of our religious ideas will deny, Mr. Farrer says in the introduction:

"If any great classical writers of the ancient world, like "Seneca or Cicero, could come to life again, nothing surely would "astonish them more than the descriptions they might read in our "books of the state of the world when they left it, of its moral "depravity, and the absence of all religious ideas. One would "gladly hear what they would say to it all; but, failing that, it "only remains to enter as much as possible into their tone of "thought, and to present the case between Christianity and Pa-"ganism as they might do if they could now speak for themselves, "and had at their command eighteen centuries of Church history "and all the writings of the Fathers and theologians.

"In assuming on their behalf and in their stead this advocacy "of a literature and philosophy, representing a civilisation to "which we still owe the main and better elements of our own, I "have simply endeavored to put the case of pre-Christian Pagan-"ism in its best and truest light, and to meet and controvert a "legion of writers from the time of Eusebius to our own, who, in "the zeal of their piety, have been wont to misrepresent the state "of the older world, by the simple process of adding black to its "places of darkest shadow, and of noticing in historical Chris-"tianity none but the regions of its higher lights."

The author adds, "The task of correcting this view involves no reference whatever to Christianity as a religion."

The contents of the book is a very careful compilation of all those ideas which Christian believers so often indulge in considering as the exclusive property of Christianity. The author is a man of great erudition, and the classical education which he received has become part of his soul and forms also part of his religion. He does not forget what our civilisation owes to the influence of the ancients. And thus his essays are an excellent exposition of the truth that the Christian era has naturally developed from germs contained in the life of Pagan-Antiquity. Indeed we should consider Judea which was by no means free from Paganism as a small but important part of the world of the ancients. Judea was important because in that little nation arose the leader of religious thought whose name had been placed at the head of mediæval and modern civilisation, and from whose birth we count a new era of mankind.

Mr. Farrer discusses in chapter first, Pagan Monotheism and shows how Polytheism was early overthrown by philosophy. If he had quoted all sentences and poems, breathing a spirit of a purified belief in one deity, the author might have filled a whole book on this one subject alone. Having alluded to many instances, he quotes the following lines of the poet Valerius Soranus, who wrote in the times of Sylla:

> "Jupiter omnipotens, rerum rex, ipse Deusque,
> Progenitor genetrixque, Deûm Deus, *unus et omnes*."

The second chapter is devoted to Pagan theology, showing the international character of ancient religion and proving the prevalence of a universal belief in Providence which acted through angels and demons, very much reminding us of the Christian mythology, which in various respects, at least in the conception of many, has still preserved the spirit of polytheism. The author proves the idea of a guardian angel not to be Christian but Pagan in its origin.

It is a very strange fact that baptism and purificatory rites were customary among the Romans and also the Greeks, and other ancient mysteries. Macrobius speaks of the ninth day after birth when children were purified (*lustrantur*) and named, as being called *dies lustricus*. And it is not impossible that the custom of baptism which was unknown among the Jews has been introduced in the pre-Christian era among the Essenes, the disciples of John and the early Christians under the influence of Pagan ceremonies. We know that baptism preceded the initiation into the mysteries of both Isis and Mithras; and it was also in use at the Apollinarian and Eleusinian games.

* Mr. Farrer quotes the original: "Res ipsa, quae nunc religio Christiana nuncupatur, erat apud antiquos nec defuit ab initio generis humani."

The theory of the soul which has for centuries been considered as an essential Christian conception, is properly Pagan, which can easily be proved by passages from Cicero, Seneca, Plutarch, Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, and others. All these Pagans believed, in a similar way as do the Christians, in a return of the soul to God into heaven. Indeed, the church has, in its further evolution adopted the Pagan idea of the immortality of the soul alone and has discarded the original and distinctly Christian idea of a corporeal resurrection. The latter view finds no representation in heathenish antiquity, and is scarcely now held among devout Christians.

A comparison of the Christian belief in hell as it was evolved from the earlier Homeric belief by such philosophers as Plato, Zeno and Lucian, bears a striking resemblance to the Christian idea of what is now generally called "sheol"; and also a belief in a doomsday is by no means exclusively Christian. In brief, the contrast of the best Christian and the best heathenish philosophers will lead us to the conclusion that the ancient philosophers were more Christian than the Fathers, and modern progress in our churches is actually a return to the principles of classic philosophy. If we consider the actual state of morality as it obtained among the early Christians, it does not compare so favorably with the noblest examples of heathen life as is generally supposed. There is Tertullian's evidence of the bad state of the church which is confirmed by Cyprian, Salvian, and Aristides. Says the author in concluding the last chapter of his book:

"The Christianity of the coming time need be none the less "true and real for its frank admission of the fact that, as hitherto "used in history, the word has been misapplied and misappropri-"ated, having been the appellation of men whom historical rec-"ords prove to have failed as signally in acting up to the Chris-"tian standard as in appreciating or comprehending its meaning. "And thus, while in one sense the world may seem to grow less "Christian, in another and better sense it may become more so; "for the further we place ourselves from Christianity as revealed "in history, the nearer shall we approximate in spirit to Chris-"tianity as originally propounded. In this way Christianity and "Philosophy, which need never have been divided, may come, to "the great benefit of the world, to be reunited and reconciled."

Nothing shows more the love with which the author has treated his subject than the appendix in which the best known sentiments of the leading Pagan moral teachers have been put in verse. We shall quote from it some lines in a future number of *The Open Court*.

Mr. Farrer is a Christian, and thus he believes, in agreement with such Pagan authorities as Plato, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius, that the soul is a stranger in this world, making a pilgrimage to another world, a spiritual world, a heaven. The body of man is considered as the prison of the soul and this idea naturally affects the whole world-conception, rending the universe in twain, and producing a disharmony which, if thought out with consistency, will appear as dualism and lead to pessimism. Did the author ever attempt to think of a monistic conception of soul and body which would be more in harmony with the results of scientific investigation and of a consistent philosophy? It seems to me that a superficial monistic conception overlooks too easily the more subtle relations of man's spiritual existence. Monism, as a rule, appears first as materialism. So at least it appeared in Greece, while in India it appeared first as spiritualism; and, materialists seeing no reality in the unseen laws of mental and moral being, it was but natural that humanity should emphasise the truth of the reality of the soul and the life of the soul. It took centuries, in which the whole attention of man's intellectual and moral teachers had to be concentrated upon this one subject, and it was but natural that the psychical world of the soul appeared during the era of such a concentration as a domain quite distinct from the physical world. Considering all in all, it appears that it was necessary for humanity to pass through an era of dualism and even of pessimism, and it seems to be certain that if those ideas which have come to be regarded as properly Christian, would have originated at any rate, even if Judaism has not existed, and if there had not flown from it that great movement which may be called early Christianity. If Jesus of Galilee had not come to be regarded as the Savior of the world, who knows but we should have worshipped in the times of the middle ages, Apollonius of Tyana, or some other moral teacher considered in his time as the son of God or a Messiah of mankind.

Similarly, in the East, Gautama has come to be almost universally revered among the Buddhists of Asia as the Buddha, but it is a very strange fact that in some part of India there is a numerous sect called the Jina, who profess a Buddhism which in some minor details is different from other Buddhism, but agrees with all its main doctrines, the main difference being that the person of their Buddha is another man than Gautama although their gospels relate about the same stories of his life. Stranger still that a similar parallelism obtains not only between Buddha and Christ, the Eastern and the Western Savior, but also between Jesus of Nazareth and Apollonius of Tyana. In the competition for being regarded as the saviors of mankind, the latter was worsted and the former conquered. And only when we consider that Jesus and Apollonius were rivals, can we comprehend the animosity with which Christian monks prosecuted the adherents of the heathen Messiah and were ruthless in exterminating all those writings which narrated about him similar, or even the very same marvellous accounts which they accredited exclusively to their own spiritual leader.

It would be a very interesting problem to investigate the reason why Jesus and not Apollonius, or any other moral teacher of antiquity, happened to become the Buddha of the East. And it seems to me that the answer would be, Jesus was more endowed with that practical spirit of morality which distinguishes all his famous, epigrammatic sayings. Apollonius and all the sages of antiquity were too much philosophers; their sentiments and moral injunctions showed too much the pale cast of thought. They exhibit the indirectness of reflection; they lack the immediateness and thus also the power of such Christ-words as are found in the gospels. Who can hear a sentence like "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God," or any of the other sentiments in the Sermon on the Mount, or the parables of the Prodigal Son, of the Lost Sheep, etc.,—who can hear them and not remember them for his whole life? Compare these sayings of Christ with the sentences of Apollonius, as an instance of which we quote from Mr. Farrer's book the following:

"The best and the true way of rendering to the divinity suit-"able worship, and of conciliating to us the favor and goodwill of "that God whom we name the First, of that one God separate "from the universe, and without whom the other Gods remain "unknown to us, is not to sacrifice victims to him, nor to light "fire, nor to consecrate to Him any of the things of sense, but al-"ways to address to Him the best language, that language which "has no need of words, and which is none other than silent thought, "pure and unaided intelligence."

The sentiments are the same as those in the New Testament, but Christ's words are more concise, more direct, more popular, and appealing immediately to the heart of the hearer. And herein, it seems to me, lies the secret of his success. This is the reason why the carpenter's son of Galilee from one of the obscurest provinces of the ancient world triumphed over all the sages and moral teachers of his times and became the leader of a religious reformation of mankind.

P. C.

THE THEORY OF DYNAMIC ECONOMICS. By *Simon N. Patten*, Ph.D. Professor of Political Economy, Wharton School of Finance and Economy, University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia. 1892. 150 pp.

This is a learned and ingenious attempt to show the advantages of taxation as a creator of national prosperity. It is a very good sample of what is called the Pennsylvania school of economics. By the magic of a logic master the plainest truisms are lifted out of the actual up to the abstract, and so much disguised by metaphysical definitions as to become doubtful. The merit of the work is in the skill of its argument and the instructive manner in which the different "schools" of political economy are contrasted and compared.

With admirable boldness and originality Professor Patten tries to make the laws of social science flexible, according to the needs of local politics and the varieties of circumstance. He criticises those economists who try "to eliminate all facts and suppositions that depend upon local and other concrete considerations, and create a theory of economics that shall have universal validity." No doubt there are some theories of economics which grow out of local considerations, but there are also others inflexible as the multiplication table, and of "universal validity."

Like so many other writers on political economy, Professor Patten has fallen into the habit of conjuring words into phrases of difficult meaning, obscuring an easy principle with abtruse definitions, and resolving into bewildering puzzles the common phrases that everybody understands. "Subjective cost," "Objective values," and other similar expressions refined into subtle problems, require more time and harder study for their solution than the ordinary reader can afford to give. Take, for example, this, "The first and primary law of subjective values is, that value depends upon the final degree of utility." That sentence merely tells us in an artificial and expensive way, that the value of an article is what it is worth. In elegant contrast is the clear and elegant way in which Professor Patten shows how important it is that the values of products exceed their cost. "So long," he says, "as the costs of commodities equal their values, society has made no real progress."

Equally clear and easy to understand is the startling revelation that not only have the tangible gifts of nature such as land become private property and sources of rent, but also the very sunlight and the air. Professor Patten says, "In the early ages of social progress, fuel, pasture, and many kinds of food are free and enjoyed by all classes of society. Gradually these utilities are appropriated and must be paid for by the producing classes. At the same time another class of free goods, such as water, light, and air, lose their purity and excellence except under particular circumstances." He then shows how in cities if men live in the enjoyment of air and light, they must pay for them in rent, and hence, he says, "those free goods fall into the possession of the wealthier classes." This is full of melancholy instruction for it shows that the laborer with his wife and children must live where the air and the light are polluted and cheap.

The attempt of Professor Patten to explain the economic paradox which he calls "burdenless taxation" is necessarily a failure. That a tax is a burden on the man who pays it and on the man who is deprived of any comfort by it, is a fact on which we may safely build a theory of "universal validity." It is not within the resources of sophistry to explain away that. It is a mistake to say that "in an industrial society the object of taxation is to increase industrial prosperity." That is merely the claim of those who enjoy the tax. No matter what the pretended *object* of taxation may be the *effect* of it is always to decrease the industrial prosperity of the men who pay the taxes. There is no such thing as "burdenless taxation."

Professor Patten says that "the true test of a good tax is that it creates more wealth than it destroys." A "good tax" is a political anomaly; and he might as well say that the true test of a good rheumatism is that it creates more wealth for the doctor than it destroys for the patient. Before he can be allowed to claim that the tax is burdenless, Professor Patten must prove that it creates more wealth than it destroys for the man who pays it. Even admitting that it creates more wealth for somebody else or even for society at large, it is still a burden on the payer; and when it is taken from his industrial prosperity to increase the industrial prosperity of others, it becomes grand larceny, or petit larceny, according to the amount of the tax. M. M. T.

NOTES.

The third Congress of Criminal Anthropology will be held at Brussels from the 28th of August to the 3d of September of this year. The extensive programme includes nineteen groups of subjects to be considered. Communications are to be addressed to M. C. Dr. Semal, président, l'Asile de Mons, Belgique.

MR. C. S. PEIRCE has resumed his lessons by correspondence in the Art of Reasoning, taught in progressive exercises. A special course in logic has been prepared for correspondents interested in philosophy. Terms, $30 for twenty-four lessons. Address: Mr. C. S. Peirce, "Avisbe," Milford, Pa.

THE OPEN COURT.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.

EDWARD C. HEGELER, PRES. Dr. PAUL CARUS, EDITOR.

TERMS THROUGHOUT THE POSTAL UNION:

$2.00 PER YEAR. $1.00 FOR SIX MONTHS.

N. B. Binding Cases for single yearly volumes of THE OPEN COURT will be supplied on order. Price 75 cents each.

All communications should be addressed to

THE OPEN COURT,

(Nixon Building, 175 La Salle Street,)

P O.. DRAWER F. CHICAGO, ILL.

CONTENTS OF NO. 249.

FARMING AND THE COMMON SCHOOLS. PROF. CALVIN THOMAS 3263

DEAD-LETTER DOGMAS. FELIX L. OSWALD 3264

THE HIGHEST TRUMP IN ARGUMENT. EDITOR .. 3266

CURRENT TOPICS. Castle Squander. The River and Harbor Bill. Judges and Jurists. Contrast Between the English and the American Judiciary. M. M. TRUMBULL 3266

CORRESPONDENCE.

Is Nationalism Cheap? ELLA ORMSBY 3268

BOOK REVIEWS 3268

NOTES 3270