

The Open Court.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Devoted to the Work of Conciliating Religion with Science.

No. 260. (VOL. VI.—33.)

CHICAGO, AUGUST 18, 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.

THE HOMESTEAD AFFAIR.

A CRITICISM OF THE REMARKS OF GENERAL TRUMBULL, AND
A GENERAL CONSIDERATION OF THE LABOR-PROBLEM.

BY E. C. HEGELER.

IN *The Open Court* of July 21st, General Trumbull, in the department "Current Topics," discusses the recent events at Homestead. In this article he endeavors to throw the entire responsibility of the tragedy there enacted upon the shoulders of Carnegie. He also makes remarks, or, rather, allusions, regarding the problems which these events involve, that in my opinion are not correct. Lest, therefore, my silence, as publisher of *The Open Court*, should be regarded as an endorsement of that article, being myself an employer of labor, I deem it proper to show wherein I dissent from the views and opinions expressed by General Trumbull. I shall take up: first, the personal remarks directed against Carnegie, which in my opinion amount to charges; second, the Pinkerton system in its connection with the rights of employers and the duties of the state; and third, I shall advance some general considerations and suggestions regarding the solution of the labor problem.

As to my remarks under the first head mentioned, I do not wish to appear in the light of an apologist of Carnegie, but simply desire to examine whether the remarks of General Trumbull are founded on fact and are *prima facie* plausible.

1.

Referring to the congratulations which Carnegie sent to the President on his renomination, General Trumbull says:

"Sinister blessings are unlucky, as for instance, those bestowed upon the President of the United States by Mr. Andrew Carnegie of Cluny Castle, Scotland, 'The American people know a good thing when they get it. Heartiest congratulations. You deserve this triumph.' Better for the President if instead of these crooked compliments he had heard the grim and ghastly raven croaking, 'Nevermore!' The flatteries given by Carnegie and accepted by the President, are stained by the blood of working men slain on the battle-field of labor."

I cannot find anything improper in Carnegie's congratulations, nor anything to justify the charge that they are "crooked," or, secondly, that they are "flat-

teries," or, thirdly, that they are stained by the blood of working men. As to the last charge, the Homestead riots had not occurred when the congratulations were sent by Carnegie, and accepted by the President. Further, there is no evidence to show that they were not sincere. I understand that Carnegie is an ardent republican, who has, perhaps, largely contributed to the republican campaign fund; and it is possible also that Carnegie is a personal friend of the President, and entitled by that reason to send him congratulations.

Further, the President, as a candidate for re-election, is on a plane of social equality with every other citizen, and it is not presumption in any man to congratulate him; nor does the President lower the dignity of his office by accepting congratulations. Carnegie is not to be blamed for trying to occupy a conspicuous place, and also to appear as the associate and friend of any man. He has, by special ability and energy, founded large manufacturing works, and created a large fortune, and perhaps justly considers himself the equal of any man who, by skill and services in another sphere of action, has become President of the United States.

General Trumbull says:

"The spirit shown by the working men at Homestead in resisting the Pinkerton invaders, will make their fight heroic like the fight on Bunker Hill. In mimicry of George III., Mr. Carnegie, at a safe distance, hires from the Grand Duke of Hesse-Pinkerton mercenary legions to subjugate the aspiring laborers at Homestead."

I am not certain that the first comparison is correct, because the numbers of the working men were large in proportion to the Pinkertons and also as their conduct after the surrender of the Pinkertons was (the leaders perhaps excepted) very reprehensible.

Nor can I conceive that the remark is justified that Carnegie kept at a safe distance. I do not know Carnegie's age, but I cannot blame him if, after an active life, he has gone back to his native land and is living there at some pleasant country-seat, which probably cost him a small sum compared to the fortune and estate produced and administered by him. Further, also, in having bought an old castle, he represents the industrial classes as the equal of any other prominent classes who may have occupied castles in the past. I have not

heard that he is guilty of any extreme waste of money; if he were, I should blame him for that. And, moreover, it is probable that he did not suppose that the Homestead affair would take so serious a turn; if he did, he should have gone there.

If the poem quoted by General Trumbull is meant especially to refer to Carnegie when it says, "At whose word we were slain," I think the fact is that Carnegie employed the Pinkerton men to defend the non-union men whom he was expecting to bring to Homestead; and that those union men who were killed in the fight were not slain at Carnegie's word, but were slain in their attack on the Pinkerton men who would not have hurt any one if they had been let alone. They came entirely for defensive purposes. At the end of the poem it is said of Carnegie, "Whether he turns his Bible's leaf or quaffs his foaming wine." I have to ask if he is not an economical and frugal man; and therefore wronged by the application of these lines to him?

General Trumbull says:

"It has come to this at last that any man made of money, and out of jail, no matter how coarse his moral fibre, nor how impudent his flunkey spirit, may patronise the President of the United States with complimentary slang."

I have not learned enough of Carnegie to know whether or not these words are justified. So far as I have learned, Carnegie has worked himself up from a simpler sphere of life. It may be that his actions in the political world are wanting in a certain higher finish. If that be the case there are many of us like him in America, and we ought not to censure him on that account. Is it just to speak of him as a man made of money, when the money is the result of his own talent and energy?

Speaking of Carnegie, General Trumbull further says:

"He may even annoint the American people with flatteries, fawning and insincere, receiving thanks and gifts for his cajoleries. With a cunning leer in his eye, showing that he is making fun of the American people, a canny Scot, gold-plated by the taxation of Americans, prints a book full of rant and fustian in praise of our 'triumphant democracy,' which gives millions of dollars to him, and a few hawbees to his men."

I have to ask, did Carnegie intentionally and knowingly flatter the American people? Did he write insincerely? Did he receive thanks and gifts for his cajoleries?

The charge of insincerity should not be made without giving definite proof. It may be that Carnegie has made a very large amount of money through the tariff bounty, but others had the same chance. Further, on the whole, the tariff, so far as it is not wasted, goes as much into the pockets of the workmen specially skilled in the protected industries as into those of the manufacturers. General Trumbull says, "The offering of this cheap incense is offensive enough," and he calls

it "counterfeit adulation." I say again, may not Carnegie have written honestly and perhaps enthusiastically? Did he offer "counterfeit adulation"?

General Trumbull describes Carnegie as "A guest of this free land." Why call him a guest? I, who was also born in a foreign land, am no guest here. I would not have come here as a guest. I came here under the contract written in the constitution of the United States and the declaration of independence. I would not have come on any other terms. I did not come to get favors. My education I received in the old country, also the means to start with; consequently, my obligations in this respect I owe to my native land. America has received with me the benefit of my education and the money I brought with me. I apply the same principle to Carnegie until something to the contrary is proved. Further I have not seen any evidence as yet that Carnegie is "morally and mentally incompetent to understand the genius, intent, and promise of American democracy." These are hard charges on Carnegie and should be proved or retracted.

General Trumbull asks, "What will the world think of us for allowing ourselves to be wheedled by a pretender whose only claim to notice is that he chinks when he walks upon the ground." I think this is unjust to Carnegie and to the whole class of men who have founded large industries and created large amounts of valuable property and who deem it to be their duty to administer that property without loss or waste. William Mathews has made some very appropriate remarks on this point (in "Getting on in the World") which I shall here quote:

"The owner of capital really reaps the smallest portion of the advantages which flow from his possession, he being, in fact, but a kind of head bookkeeper, or chief clerk, to the business community. Though rich as Rothschild, he can neither eat, drink, nor wear more than one man's portion of the good things of life. The Astors and Stewarts, whose wealth is counted by tens of millions, are, after all, only the stewards of the nation, and, however selfish, grasping, or miserly they may be, are compelled, even when they least desire to do so, to use their accumulations for the public good. Their money-making talents enable them to employ their capital, which would soon melt away in the hands of a spendthrift or bad financier, to promote the common welfare and to increase the general prosperity. The rich man in this country, who is ambitious to increase his riches, does not waste his money in luxuries or foolish schemes, but, as one has well said, he invests it in all sorts of enterprises, to the selection of which he brings enormous natural shrewdness, strengthened by the experience of a lifetime, and in every one of which it is devoted wholly to the employment of labor. If he puts it in unproductive real estate even, as he doubtless does sometimes, he releases some one else's money, which goes into production. If he builds houses to let, he employs labor and helps to lower rents; if he makes railroads, he employs miners, iron founders, machinists, and helps to transport commodities; if he goes into spinning and weaving, or gardening, the result is still the same—labor is employed, and employed with such sagacity that it is sure to return the capital and something more. If he

loaded himself with diamonds, filled himself every day to the chin with French dishes and wines, and wore cloth of gold, and lived in a palace, it would be found that his salary was low. If we dismissed him, that is, took his property from him, and employed a philanthropist or editor or lyceum-lecturer to manage it in the interest of "humanity," the probabilities are that there would not be a cent of it left at the end of five years. It would have been put into the production of goods that nobody wanted, of roads on which nobody would travel, or stolen by knaves and wasted by visionaries."

11.

We now come to the connection of the Pinkertons with this affair. How and why were they called in?

Whether for reasons or without reason (and if the latter, then unjustly), Mr. Frick, the manager of the Carnegie works refused to discuss the wages question with representatives of his old employés and with the Amalgamated Association. The situation is summed up in the following extract from *Harper's Weekly* of July 16th :

"Angered by this refusal, the whole population of Homestead became a mob. On Tuesday, July 5th, the sheriff of Alleghany County went to Homestead, and ordered the mob to disperse. He was assured by the leaders of the mob that he had better return to Pittsburg and attend to less serious business. He then swore in a number of deputies at Pittsburg, and sent them to Homestead. Upon their arrival they were met by the mob, and told that if they remained they would do so at serious peril. The deputies of the sheriff returned to Pittsburg. Meantime the Pinkerton detective agency at Chicago had employed several hundred men to act as watchers at the mills. These men, engaged in New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago, were taken quietly to Pittsburg, and not informed of the exact nature of the work expected of them, nor of the location of the property they were to watch. Having arrived at Pittsburg these men were taken to boats that had been prepared for them. There were some 270 of them."

Whether the demands of the working men in this case were just or unjust, is foreign to the present discussion. The point here in question is this. They had threatened that they would use force; they had placed themselves in opposition to the written law, the law of the state, under which law Carnegie had built his works. The quotation cited shows that the authorities of the county in which Carnegie's works are situated were absolutely incompetent to protect the property-rights guaranteed to him by the law. Nor did the executive authorities of the state interfere. Now it is my firm conviction that if the state is, by laxness and inefficiency, unable to protect a man's property, it is his sovereign right to stand up for it and fight for it with all the means of civilised warfare. This, it seems, is the view which the manager of Carnegie's works took: he decided to defend the rights which the state gave him, by the means by which the state should have defended them. As a fact, the Pinkerton men were not called in until the people had shown themselves utterly incompetent to do their duty under the law.

I admit that some of the preparations for defence, such as putting a barbed wire fence around the works and connecting it with an electrical machine, were unwise measures and calculated only to irritate the opposite side. If Carnegie wanted to fight, he should under the circumstances have tried to engage sufficient numbers and thoroughly drilled them; and he should have engaged men knowing exactly for what they were engaged. It appears, from the quotation, that the men did not know what they were to do; they were not volunteers: and this is reprehensible in those who employed them. I think that it is very likely that if they had thus openly proceeded, the state government would have been brought to its senses and would have stepped in to uphold the law.

I think the Pinkertons must be brave men, as a rule. As to their being hired, the United States regulars are also hired men, and so are the police in our larger cities. A professional soldier frequently goes into the service of foreign governments; as an instance I may mention Von Moltke, who for a time was in the service of the Sultan of Turkey. During our civil war many foreign soldiers entered the service of our government, and their principal motive was, I believe, employment in their profession as soldiers. Americans also served the Khedive of Egypt. Moreover, great numbers of men in our civil war enlisted merely for the sake of the bounty. The moral criterion of all such conduct is in my opinion this, that a man should not hire out his fighting abilities, whether it be to a government, large or small, or to an individual, even in the capacity of a fighting watchman, unless he is in moral sympathy, in a general way at least, with the cause in which he enlists.

I do not approve of the Pinkerton system, but I do not feel justified in blaming Carnegie and his company for having had recourse to it; of course as a means of self-defence, and not of subjugation. I remember that for quite a while we travelled from La Salle to Chicago under the protection of Pinkerton policemen, that our train might not be thrown from the track by strikers. Possibly General Trumbull has travelled so himself, also Senator Palmer, and also trades-union workmen. The Rock Island Railway would probably not have gone to the expense of hiring the Pinkerton police if the people and the sheriff of Cook County had done their duty under the law.

In the senate, Senator Palmer speaks of the Pinkerton men as "enemies to mankind that ought to be hunted down." What he means is probably this, that among their other services they also hire themselves out to protect legal property-rights where they are no longer held to be just towards striking workmen. I agree with him in his demand in this sense, that the Pinkerton system should be forbidden. But Mr.

Palmer should not put the blame belonging to inefficient law-makers upon the men who help to execute the laws as they are, by calling them "enemies of mankind." General Trumbull shows a similar unjust hostility towards the Pinkertons.

III.

We now come to the question of the rights of working men and employers respectively.

The writer in *Harper's Weekly* before referred to says that all the men who lived at Homestead were employed in the Carnegie mills. Now, by building his house in the neighborhood of a manufacturing works, a working man's house becomes more or less worthless if he is not employed in the factory; and doing this with the consent and even the assistance of the owner of the factory, a certain claim to employment, though without foundation in the law books, becomes established. The manufacturer sees an interest of his own in this, for the reason that it gives him steady workmen who have a real interest in the permanent success of the factory through having invested their individual earnings in residences near it.

I say with Senator Palmer, that workmen having obtained special skill in a certain manufactory, and been at the pains and trouble to come by this, have acquired a claim to employment in that particular factory. But on the other hand, a manufacturer, in having furnished the means for such men to acquire that skill, has actually become dependent on them, and it may be also said has thereby acquired a claim on them to stay.

Now, as such a claim of the manufacturer cannot be directly secured, a substitute is found in inducing the men to build houses and make themselves a home in the neighborhood of the factory. By this means the manufacturer secures to himself skilled labor; but on the other hand he is also the cause of making a man a permanent resident in his neighborhood, and this man thus has a claim to employment. And such a claim, workmen will maintain by fighting competitors.

"The working men," says *Harper's Weekly*, "had announced that not only would they not themselves work at the offered wages, but that they would prevent, by force if necessary, any other men from taking the places they had left vacant."

The workmen here openly defied the law, and *were not interfered with by the state*; and this custom, being a long established one, has created for them something of a "property-right"; a right which the founder of a factory takes into account. Anything in the law books to the contrary is in reality a dead letter; it is an established fact, and it certainly does not pay to oppose it. It is a fact of our industrial system, that the workmen possess a certain claim to employment

in the factory, which is not to be violated for purely arbitrary reasons.

The Amalgamated Association is a powerful and well organised body and it constantly endeavors to acquire for its members greater rights. This is perfectly proper. But on the other hand the manufacturer also must assert his peculiar rights, the rights that belong to higher intelligence, the rights of those who produce more than they consume, and who do not cease to work when their own transient needs are satisfied, and who are in fact the guardians and increasers of the wealth of the nation.

Thus, in reference to what General Trumbull calls "the aspiring laborers" at Homestead, I hold it to be possible that they were more than "aspiring," and that the Carnegie Company thought the men unreasonable and unbearable, and that, if submitted to, they might even ruin the business. I learn that the iron industry has been greatly depressed by over-production.

So I believe those laborers honestly thought that they were fighting for a right that their class had already acquired by repeated struggles; namely, that the manufacturer should use no other means of warfare against them than the stoppage of his works, and that the executive part of the local or state government ought not to assist him in engaging new men.

On the other hand, I think that Carnegie also will have honestly thought that he was fighting for the manufacturer's rights; namely, that the same should not be compelled to pay higher prices for his labor than his competitors had to pay. Carnegie may have thought also, that he had given his men greatly improved machinery by which they could do more work and make greater product through his genius and capital without any special merit on their part.

Also it should not be forgotten that manufacturers in the situation of Carnegie indirectly step in for the workmen who do not belong to the unions; not for their sake, it is true, but with the result, nevertheless, that they aid them. These people are not organized and consequently are helpless against the secret and powerful organisations of the union working men. Neither does the state help them; for, not being organized, their votes are held of little account and not sought after.

Ordinarily the non-union men do not know what their real interests are, and are easily persuaded by the high-sounding generalities of union men.

Most important of all are efforts to find practical advice concerning the solution of the labor question, and these we should make instead of criticising and tearing to pieces those who have to suffer from the difficulties of the problem.

My belief is that a manufacturer should rather assist than prevent his employé's openly* organising and advocating the interests of their particular class and endeavoring to enhance its human value. Also organisations of the various trades should unite for the purpose of promoting the interests which they have in common. The working man should feel sure of his position as long as he fills it properly and is careful of the interests of the whole. He should not be dependent on the arbitrary caprice of his employer.

Just as the working man should uphold the interests of his class, so should the manufacturer. This is a moral duty; both should be willing and able to fight for their rights through the instrumentality of the "strike,"† always standing up for their rights and honor.

We have international law for the strifes of nations, and a wise and just diplomacy or statesmanship is exercised to avoid in this sphere unnecessary struggles; so we should have rules, practices, and written principles for the struggle between laborer and employer.

The main practical question at present is, When and how should the state interfere in strikes and lockouts? The existing laws are yet wholly on the side of the employer. This fact is mitigated by the other fact that the executive officers of the state, supported by the public opinion of the masses, are lax in the enforcement of the law; so lax in fact, that the manufacturer no longer reckons upon their aid even where the moral law is wholly on his side, and where a whole community suffers.

These questions might be decided by the institution of courts of arbitration. Such courts should embrace men from all the different professions and trades, farming included; they might be nominated by existing public associations representing the several professions and confirmed by the governor. They should ascertain and be guided in their decisions by considerations like these:

- 1) What wages are paid for the same or similar work in other parts of the country where the cost of living is the same and the conditions for manufacturing as favorable.
- 2) Whether the wages in the profession or calling in which the strike is in progress are out of proportion to the wages paid in the other trades and callings in the land, the skill and abilities required in the several fields being taken into consideration in such estimates.
- 3) Whether there are men out of employment in the same trade with the strikers who are desirous for work therein and are skilled in their work.

* Not secretly. Secrecy is only justifiable against tyrannical oppression.

† I know very well that the suspension of a factory is ordinarily called a lockout, but a manufacturer should look upon it and feel concerning it as a strike for his rights, telling his men "I will not work for you any longer."

The courts of arbitration to decide the dispute and fix the rate of wages thereupon:

- 1) If the manufacturer does not accept the decision, he to pay a daily fine for further suspension of his works, to go to the support of the families of the employé's.
- 2) If the employé's do not accept the decision, the state energetically to support the manufacturer in the engagement of new men.
- 3) If both sides do not accept the decision, the strike or lockout to go on—destruction of property to be prevented, but no special assistance to be given the manufacturer in engaging new men, and no self-help herein to be permitted to the manufacturer as that of engaging the Pinkertons.

THE BASIS OF MORALITY.

BY C. STANLAND WAKE.

WHEN we ask the logician what gives certainty to the process of reasoning, we are referred to the Mental Constitution as being governed by certain axiomatic laws, which are "the primary conditions of the possibility of valid thought," and therefore give validity to thought in its various forms. If we inquire, however, what gives certainty to moral judgment, we meet with no such response. We may be told that we possess an infallible guide to right conduct in the conscience or moral sense. But when we consider this faculty, we find that its operation, instead of being constant, varies in different individuals and even, from time to time, with the same individual. This fact shows that whatever obligation the individual conscience may have over personal conduct, it cannot be recognised as supplying a touchstone for moral conduct in general. It is different with the "general conscience," which is embodied in the written or unwritten laws of a society. This social conscience, like the "general mind," is the product of the experience of past generations, and it provides a standard by reference to which the conduct of the members of the society must be governed.

But if we trace the genesis of the general conscience, although we may learn the history of the development of moral ideas, we do not find the real source of moral obligation, even though it is ostensibly based on some supposed divine command. Revelation to man from a supernatural source is not possible, so far as its possibility may be judged of by past experience, except through a human medium. The divine word, whenever this is supposed to have been revealed, has always been communicated to men through men, and its divine origin is, therefore, necessarily very difficult to establish. Indeed, in the absence of proper credentials, a divine messenger could not hope to be received as such. Hence the value of miracles and other wonders, the performance of which was at one time universally regarded as evidence of a divine commission. The progress of scientific discovery, by throwing light on the operations of nature, has, however, destroyed the value of so-called miracles as divine credentials. It is true that science cannot perform all the wonders accredited to Moses or Jesus, or even to the ancient thaumaturgists. But it explains the non-scientific residue by reference to popular credulity, which was ever ready to ascribe to those who were supposed to have had a divine mission powers and performances which they had never claimed. Hence it has come to be affirmed, not only that there is no satisfactory evidence of any divine revelation ever having been made to mankind, but that it is not possible to furnish such evidence unless the revelation is made directly and by a visible "super-

natural" agent. However this may be, we may safely assert that there is no such sufficient evidence in favor of a divine origin for the moral ideas we now possess, as to justify the assertion that the moral law is based on divine command or that it has a supernatural sanction. We can go further, and affirm that the teaching which has been referred to a supernatural source originated in the human mind itself.

This conclusion may at first sight appear to render any firm basis of morality impossible. Whatever the teachings of a moral reformer, if they are accepted and acted upon they become in time part of the general mind which expresses itself as Custom, "the guide," says Mr. P. G. Hamerton, in *The Contemporary Review* for April 1891, "of the unthinking, and the refuge of those who are weary because they have thought too much." It is necessary to distinguish between this customary or habitual state of mind, which may influence a whole people or race; and particular customs which may be localised in either space or time, and may vary according to local conditions and circumstances. Nevertheless there is sufficient instability and variety of custom, in both its general and its particular sense, to justify the doubt as to its forming a sufficient basis of positive morality. It may act as a register to mark the progress made in moral development or as a standard of moral conduct, but it does not supply the sanction which stamps such conduct with the seal of obligation apart from the authority of human enactment.

But if custom does not supply a basis of positive morality, still less can nature do so. This point is well brought out by Mr. Hamerton, who shows that certain practices which are condemned by modern thought are not only in accordance with nature, but are "in precise obedience to the dictates of primitive reason." He shows, moreover, that the idea that immorality is always punished by nature is not well founded, and that "what seem to be nature's punishments for wrong-doing, and also for doing right are not really punitive, but are simply consequences." Mr. Hamerton rightly concludes that "modern philosophy inclines more and more to the belief that nature is not hostile but indifferent, and that she provides a ground which, by its very roughness and imperfection, and by the absence of succour, is favorable to the exercise of virtue."

But surely the inference is not justified that there is no basis of positive morality! Such an assertion entirely overlooks the real position of man in relation to nature. The laws of nature work without regard to consequences, and if man suffers through their operation he has only himself or his environment to blame. The fact is that, although man is part of nature as the universal whole, yet as the final term of organic development he is above nature, as this is understood by those who speak of nature's laws. By virtue of his physical organism man is subject to these laws, but as man by his mental constitution transcends nature, the laws which govern his conduct must transcend those which operate in nature. We are reminded here of Lewes's distinction between nature and human nature, and it is in the laws of human nature we must seek the basis of positive morality. Lewes points out that human psychology includes, in addition to the organic factor which enters into animal psychology, another important factor that permeates the whole composition of the mind, and complicates all its problems. Man is an animal in relation to nature, but in relation to culture he is a social being. "As the ideal world rises above and transforms the sensible world, so culture transforms nature physically and morally, fashioning the forest and the swamp into garden and meadow-lands, the selfish savage into the sympathetic citizen." Man is a social animal, and the differences which distinguish him from other animals depend on the operation of the social factor, "which transforms perceptions into conceptions, and sensations into sentiments." Mr. Lewes expresses so profound a view of the dependence of the development of human culture on social influ-

ences that his remarks deserve to be quoted at length. He writes:

"Let us suppose our knowledge of the organism to be enormously extended, it would still be incompetent to furnish an explanation of moral sentiments and intellectual conceptions, simply because these are impersonal and social, arising out of social needs and social conditions, involving, indeed, the organism and its functions, but involving these in relation to experiences only possible to the collective life. The higher animals have structures closely resembling our own; they have sensations, emotions, perceptions, judgments, volitions, generically like, though specifically different from our own; but their experiences are restricted to their personal needs, their emotions are never developed into impersonal sentiments, their logic knows nothing of abstractions and the construction of abstractions in science. . . . Driven thus to seek beyond the organism and its inherited aptitudes for the origin of a large portion of our mental life, we can find it only in the constitution of the social organism of which we are the units. We there find the impersonal experiences of tradition accumulating for each individual a fund of knowledge, an instrument of power, which magnifies his existence. The experiences of many become the guide of each; they do not all perish with the individual; much survives, takes form in opinion, precept, and laws, in prejudice and superstition. The feelings of each are blended into a general consciousness, which in turn reacts upon the individual consciousness. And this mighty impersonality is at once the product and the factor of social evolution." †

Morality is thus a social product, and it forms part of the general mind which has been evolved from the experiences of individuals and belongs to the race, and in connection with which it was said by Comte, "the past more and more dominates the present, precisely as in the individual case it is the registered experiences which more and more determine feelings and opinions." ‡ Let it be noticed, however, that the existence of the social factor is not alone sufficient to account for the general consciousness which underlies human culture, and therefore it does not form the ultimate basis of positive morality, any more than it does of logical thought. Mr. Lewes has not lost sight of this fact, and he affirms that the general consciousness rests on the evolution of language, as a means of symbolical expression: "Without language, no society having intellectual and moral life; without society, no need of language. Without language, no tradition; without language no elaboration of the common arts and skill which cherish and extend the simplest products of the community, and without tradition, no religion, no science, no art."* But why has language this marvellous result, lifting man out of the animal sphere and constituting him the creator of a spiritual world far superior to the world of material and organic existences from which he has sprung? It is because language is the instrument of thought, or rather is thought itself symbolised in words or signs, which are the ideal agents of his mental activity, and to thought activity therefore must we trace the development of moral and intellectual culture.

Before proceeding further in the search for the ultimate basis of positive morality, it is necessary to ascertain in what consists the difference between conduct which possesses a moral element and conduct from which this element is absent, or at least in which it is so subsidiary as not to require being taken notice of, that is, action in ordinary social relations. In both cases conduct is the expression of the will acting by virtue of the disposition, which is itself due to the influence of the impressions for the time being on the sentient organism. Subjectively, therefore, all conduct is alike, as being based on feeling and as being that which under the existing conditions and predominant influences, are the

* The Study of Psychology. Chap. IV.

† Ibid. P. 165.

‡ Psychology, p. 80.

most likely to be attended with pleasurable impressions in the agent, or with impressions which are least painful and therefore which are pleasurable by comparison; whether it be the performance of an ordinary social duty, or the execution of a high moral purpose, or even simply the exercise of the self-restraint in which passive or negative morality consists.

[TO BE CONCLUDED.]

CURRENT TOPICS.

It may not be brave, but it is at least pleasant and stimulating to sit in a safe place, and view the battle from afar; especially when you desire to see all the combatants "well peppered"; an admirable phrase which I borrow with many thanks from Capt. Sir John Falstaff. I am no longer in good standing with the republican party; and the democratic party is not in good standing with me, so I turn for sustenance and shelter to the third party, and the fourth; but although these are young in years, they have adopted into their political economy some venerable sins. I have therefore nothing to do but sit on the tall pinnacle of my own egotism, and urge all the fighters down below to pepper one another. I pray that all four of the parties may be defeated; and as three of them certainly will be, I shall have seventy five per cent. of comfort when the returns come in. The people's party has most of my sympathies just now; partly because the "people" perversely refuse to belong to it, but principally because it "points with pride" to the iniquities of all the other parties. Its impartial censure animates the campaign like a bonfire, and throws more glare upon our politics than a torch light procession ever threw. In democratic states it assails the democratic party for not redeeming promises known to be worthless when put in pledge; and in republican states it "views with alarm" the encroachments of the republican party upon the right of every man to draw fifty dollars out of the bank whenever he wants a little money. My newspaper for to-day was republican, and I have enjoyed a sort of political picnic in studying the charges and specifications preferred yesterday against the democratic party, by Governor Fifer in Illinois, and by Mr. Watson down in Georgia. My newspaper for to-morrow will be democratic, and I shall then have equal enjoyment in reading a longer and more inflamed indictment preferred against the republican party, by democratic and third party politicians in their orations to-day. The evidence offered will be abundantly sufficient to convict both delinquents and send them to the penitentiary for life.

Mr. Watson is a member of Congress from the Tenth District of Georgia, and a leader in the People's party. It braces one up like a drink of bitters in the ague season to watch him hurling philippics at the Democratic party, and advertising boldly, like a magician in the market place, his own impossible panaceas. Mr. Watson will be found useful as a disturber of the political peace, galvanising into action the conservative Dundrearies of both parties. There is great use for him in this land. His return to his home was made a festal day in his own town, and my paper tells me that he was "royally received by his neighbors and friends." I am also told that "the ladies turned out before his arrival and decorated the town"; which I think is much better than having it painted red by enthusiastic men. Pleasant it was when "flowers were strewn on his pathway as he went to the grand-stand." I do not approve so much hero worship as a general rule, but I am willing to sanction it in Mr. Watson's case, because he was not ashamed to dower his wife there publicly with a full share of his glory. He spoke up like a man and said, "I thank you for this ovation, not only for myself, but for my wife, who shares every honor with me, and without whose company and help I should have been weak indeed." Then the crowd called out

"Three cheers for Mrs. Watson," which was a manly and proper thing to do. There was much intellectual refreshment in Mr. Watson's ridicule and censure of the Democratic party in Congress for promising so much and doing so little. "With 148 majority," said Mr. Watson, "they pretended that they had no chance to do what they wanted to do. It takes more chance for the Democratic crowd to do anything than any crowd that I have ever struck yet." Figuratively speaking, Mr. Watson skinned the Democratic party, and nailed its hide up to dry on the old barn door. I shall not have so much amusement again until to-morrow, when through the columns of my Democratic paper, I shall see the pelt of the Republican party nailed up alongside of the other on that same old barn.

Spread all over the United States, the politics of Mr. Watson may be rather thin, but when concentrated in the Tenth District of Georgia it makes a layer of statesmanship about four feet thick. I have not read anything more significant or more suggestive than "the account of his stewardship" which Mr. Watson rendered yesterday to his constituents at Thomaston, Georgia. After speaking of his efforts to promote national reforms, he said, "Not only did I do this, but, so far as possible, I attended to every detail in the work of the Tenth Congressional District. There is not a county in this district where I have not had established new post offices, or rendered more efficient the old ones." This was the appeal direct, smiting the chord of local patriotism, and getting a response in cheers. This post-office devotion to the country, this inferior civic spirit, stimulates that Republican and Democratic misrule which Mr. Watson criticised and deplored. In the excited faces of his people there, he could read this question, What have you done for us? How much of the public loot did you get for the Tenth District of Georgia? And Mr. Watson answered the silent question thus, "I made 2,000 packages of garden seeds go all over the district." (Cheers, and a voice, "and the best seed ever was in this country.") Here the high-spirited oration of Mr. Watson reached its anti climax and the moral greatness of the People's party appeared wrapped up in a ridiculous package of governmental garden seeds. Speaking of the arithmetical puzzle which he had to solve when distributing the seeds, Mr. Watson said, "There are 165,000 people in the district. I had only 2,000 packages of garden seed, so you see how difficult it was to make them go round." Certainly; anybody can see that. Five loaves and two small fishes; and what were they among so many! Mr. Watson, however, was equal to the problem, and while he could not multiply the seeds by miracle, he divided them with daring originality. He gave some of them to the negroes; a feat of statesmanship, which, in the language of the circus bills, had never before been attempted by any other performer. Instead of apologising for his action, Mr. Watson boasted of it. Addressing the negroes in the crowd, he said, "They denounce me because I sent some of you colored people garden seeds. Bear that in mind." (Applause from the sons of Ham.) "How many Democratic Congressmen ever sent you garden seeds before?" (Demonstrations from the negroes.) "Did I, or did I not?" (Cries, "Yes, Yes.") "It is nothing but right, and I expect to keep on doing so as long as I am in Congress." Bravely said; but Mr. Watson did not see that from those innocent garden seeds comes up a crop of Canada thistles choking public spirit and personal independence. "I give you garden seeds from the national warehouse, now give me votes," is a claim which involves indefinite servitude, and infinite money. It corrupts legislation and makes the ballot box "a medium of exchange."

A few years ago, a certain political party in England courted the plebeians by giving all sorts of popular entertainments in the gardens and pleasure grounds of the nobility. To those festivities the common people were made welcome, and even the condescending countess herself sometimes invited 'Arry and 'Arriet to partake

of lemonade. The experiment worked finely for a time, and it really looked as if the working man vote was going over to the aristocracy. The rival party, jealous of the movement, called it in derision "Government by picnic," and the sneer killed it like a dose of poison. Improving on the scheme, the Americans have developed it into a higher type of ballot culture which may truthfully be called "Government by garden seeds," a more triumphant example of our capacity for self-rule than the English picnic system ever was. Glorifying government by garden seeds, Mr. Watson inconsistently condemns Congress for giving \$2,500,000 to the Chicago Fair. His own criticism turns him into a comical contradiction, because that gift is nothing but our allowance of garden seeds commuted into money. Mr. Watson is morally confused when he praises himself for distributing two thousand packages of garden seeds among his own constituents, while he condemns our congressmen for getting two million five hundred thousand packages for us. The farmers in Mr. Watson's district take their congressional benevolence in the form of garden seeds; but we take ours in the shape of dollars, because we have no longer any use for garden seeds in the city of Chicago. The form and the size of the donation may vary, but the principle of it is the same. Whether they be literally in the shape of garden seeds, or in that of pensions, river and harbor grants, railroad lands, bounties for beets, subsidies for ships, or any of the hundred other generous methods of taking money from one man and giving it to another, the various elements combine at last into a consolidated scheme of Government by garden seeds. The balance of power in the United States to-day lies in the garden seed vote, and the party that can show the largest distribution of garden seeds will very likely win. Members of Congress rely on garden seeds for re-election, and the main question they must answer to their constituents is this, How many garden seeds or their equivalent did you get for us? The World's Fair was made a political question in Chicago, and we vehemently swore that we would not vote the Democratic ticket at all unless the five million grant was made. We know the value of those little arguments that fall like snowflakes on the sod, and execute the freeman's will as lightning does the will of God. We are willing to vote the ticket, like loyal citizens, but before we drop our snowflakes into the box we want our garden seeds.

* * *

A morning contemporary,—this I believe is the professional form of reference when you wish to be especially severe,—a morning contemporary, with chivalrous eagerness to blame Queen Victoria for something or other, drops into a gush of gratuitous sympathy for Mr. Gladstone, "in his eighty-third year, with known infirmities." The "discreditable" conduct of the queen consisted in "compelling Mr. Gladstone to take the tedious and, for him, dangerous trip to the Isle of Wight, for the ceremony of kissing her hand as head of a new government." This pungent mixture of blame for the queen and pity for Mr. Gladstone, supposes the Isle of Wight to be somewhere in the South Seas, or at least in the neighborhood of Japan; whereas, geographically, and not hyperbolically speaking, it is only two hours ride from London. Also, it is just as far from the Isle of Wight to London, as it is from London to the Isle of Wight; the trip is just as "tedious" one way as the other, and not any more "dangerous" for Mr. Gladstone going down than for the queen going up. Besides, the comparative infirmities of men and women expressed in terms of age makes the queen older at seventy-four than Mr. Gladstone at eighty-three, and, being a woman she is entitled to greater comfort and indulgence. In commanding Mr. Gladstone to go down to the Isle of Wight to meet her, instead of going up herself to London to meet him, the queen acted with magnanimous grace and courtesy, treating him with delicate compliment as the younger and more vigorous of the two. Had she acted otherwise,

had she spared Mr. Gladstone a journey to the Isle of Wight because of his "known infirmities," the whole Gladstone family would have regarded her solicitude as an affront, a condescension which Mrs. Gladstone certainly never would forgive. A man who chops down big trees before breakfast; who travels hundreds of miles "stumping" through England and Scotland; the leader of a great party in a great parliamentary conflict; who chinks in the spare moments of his life with articles for the magazines; who talks all night if necessary in the House of Commons; and who is about to enter upon the onerous duty of governing the British empire, does not claim the privileges of old age at the expense of a woman, a venerable great-grandmother laden with a burden of sorrows and "infirmities" greater than Mr. Gladstone ever bore. And that very same contemporary tells me in another column that "Mr. Herbert Gladstone is very much annoyed by stories about his father's failing health; and he declares that the sensational rumors about his father's infirmities are put into circulation by political enemies."

M. M. TRUMBULL.

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. 260.

THE HOMESTEAD AFFAIR: A Criticism of the Remarks of General Trumbull, and a General Consideration of the Labor Problem. E. C. HEGELER..... 3351

THE BASIS OF MORALITY. C. STANILAND WAKE..... 3355

CURRENT TOPICS: Both Parties Under Fire. Masterly Inactivity. The Ballot Box as a Medium of Exchange. Political Garden Seeds. Mr. Gladstone and the Queen. GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL..... 3357