

THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 294. (VOL. VII.—15.)

CHICAGO, APRIL 13, 1893.

} 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 HAWAIIAN TREATY AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

BY G. KOERNER.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND having very wisely withdrawn from the Senate the Hawaiian treaty concluded by President Harrison in hot haste within the closing hours of his administration, an opportunity is presented of considering the treaty in all its bearings and aside from partisan politics. Thus far its advocates have almost monopolised the public ear. It is, however, not my purpose to go into an examination of the treaty, and I wish to confine myself to one point, which some of its supporters have raised by contending that the annexation of the Hawaiian Island group would be in accordance with what they call the principles of the Monroe Doctrine. Those principles, they urge, have been, at a quite early period of our national life, promulgated by our glorious forefathers and have "been canonised in the hearts of the American people." Indeed, Mr. Harrison himself, in his message to the Senate accompanying the treaty, seems to justify it, if not directly, yet implicitly on that Doctrine.

Perhaps it may not be quite uninteresting at this time to take a somewhat closer look at the origin and inwardness of this Doctrine, and see whether or not it had or ever could have had any practical application in the politics of our country. The history of it is as follows :

Soon after the overthrow of the empire of the first Napoleon, the rulers of Russia, Austria, France, and Prussia formed an alliance for mutual protection, not against aggression from foreign powers, but against revolutionary movements within their own states. At a congress held by the allied powers at Troppau (1820) it was agreed that the main purpose of the alliance should be to maintain the principle of the legitimacy of the existing dynasties; and that if this principle were threatened in any country *in Europe*, the allied powers should preserve it by actual and armed interference. Popular risings having taken place in Piedmont and Naples, they were put down by the armed forces of Austria, in pursuance of measures taken at the Congress of Laibach (1821), and the revolution in Spain against Ferdinand VII. was suppressed by

French armies, in consequence of resolutions taken at the Congress of Verona (1822).

At the first two congresses the English government, then represented by Castlereagh, had, although not strictly one of the allied powers, participated in and sanctioned the proceedings. But, at the point of starting for Verona, Castlereagh committed suicide, and George Canning, became Secretary of State.

It was soon felt by the allied powers that under the new administration they could not further rely on England concerning intervention in the sense given to it at the Congresses of Laibach and Verona, and they very soon opened their batteries on the Canning Ministry. They charged it with having supported the revolted colonies of Spain by allowing Englishmen to enter their armies, by furnishing them arms and warlike stores, and encouraging trade and commerce of English subjects with the rebels. While Canning stoutly asserted that strict neutrality had been maintained by the English Government, he as stoutly contended that English subjects had a right to trade with the colonies in revolt, at their own risk, the more so as they were practically governments *de facto*, that had not only been recognised as belligerents, but as independent states by the North American Republic. Very angry debates took place in Parliament. The Tories generally were on the side of the allied powers, and the Radicals thought that Canning had not gone far enough in favor of the South American Republic. While Canning had really at first shown some hesitation as far as the question of intervention in Europe was concerned, he utterly opposed such intervention in regard to the American continent. In one of his masterly speeches, early in 1824, he informed the House that Spain had proposed repeatedly to hold a congress to deliberate on the South American question with a view of assisting Spain in reconquering her transatlantic territories, but that he had most positively declared that he would have nothing to do with such a congress. This explains a passage in the "Memoirs" of Prince Metternich (see "Memoirs de Metternich," Vol. VI, p. 97), in which he says, that in 1824 a note was addressed to the allied powers by the Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs, proposing a conference to

be held at Paris, to take into consideration the regulation of Spanish-American affairs and to which England should be invited; that France, Austria, Russia, and Prussia adhered to the plan, but that the invitation was met by Canning with an "almost brutal" refusal.

As early as in the summer of 1823 Mr. Canning mentioned his suspicions as to an intervention on the part of the allied powers regarding the Spanish-American colonies to Mr. Rush, the American minister in London, and expressed his great desire to have the United States join with him in endeavoring to thwart the object of the allied powers. Speaking of a cabinet meeting held in September, 1823, Mr. J. Q. Adams, then Secretary of State to Mr. Monroe, says:

"The subject for consideration was the confidential proposal of Canning, Secretary of State, to R. Rush, and the correspondence between them, relating to the project of the holy alliance upon South America. The object of Canning appears to have been to obtain some public pledge from the United States ostensibly against the forcible interference of the holy alliance between Spain and South America, *but really or specially against the acquisition by the United States of any part of the Spanish possessions.*"*

Mr. Adams thought lightly of the matter,† but Mr. Monroe and other members of the cabinet, particularly Mr. Calhoun, were, as Mr. Adams says, "very much in fear that the holy alliance would restore all South America to Spain." Upon long and careful consideration it was finally agreed to express some disapprobation of the scheme in the message; and the passage relating to this subject, and also another, relating to the claim of Russia to part of the northern Pacific Coast, was much debated, and also submitted as finally adopted by the cabinet to Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison.

The annual message of 1823, contained the following sentences in regard to the first point:

"We owe it to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and the allied powers to declare, that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. *With the existing colonies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere; but with the governments which have declared their independence and maintained it, and whose independence we have, on great consideration and principles, acknowledged, we could not view an interposition for oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States.*"

In another part, with reference to the Russian claim of occupation, and also, perhaps, as Mr. Adams suggests, with reference to a supposed cession by Spain of part of its colonies, in case of success, to

* (*Memoirs of John Q. Adams*, by Charles F. Adams, Vol. VI, p. 177.) For Mr. Rush's dispatches of August 23, 1825, see *The Court of London, 1819-1825*, by R. Rush, republished by his son, London, 1873.

† See his diary of September, October, November, 1823, *passim*.

other European powers, which might colonise some of the sparsely settled Spanish possessions, the following expression occurs:

"The American continents should no longer be subjects for any new European colonial settlement."

In these passages is found what has since been called the "Monroe Doctrine."

Considering the great power then exercised over the whole of Europe by the allied monarchs and the submission everywhere yielded to them, even in many instances by England herself, this declaration on the part of the United States, then comparatively a weak power physically, by Mr. Monroe, was a bold patriotic manifestation, and the spirit which dictated it will ever be highly appreciated, as it was at the time, even in Europe, by all the liberal classes. It strengthened England in her opposition to European intervention, and hastened her recognition of the independence of the Spanish-American colonies.

The meaning of this declaration was very plain. Some of the colonies founded by Spain on this continent, had declared themselves independent and had thus far successfully maintained that independence. The United States having recognised their independence, there was reason to believe that the allied powers contemplated interference between those independent governments and Spain, according to the system of intervention which they had proclaimed in Europe, and just carried out with so much success. Against this *intervention* the government of the United States might feel bound also to intervene. Nothing was said about the United States abandoning the neutrality which it had hitherto observed between Spain and her rebellious colonies. If Spain would reconquer them, she might try, but the United States would not permit that to be done with the assistance of the allied powers, who were bent, not only on sustaining and propagating absolute monarchical government in Europe, but also on introducing that form of government into the new world by their system of intervention.

This was the view Mr. Jefferson took in his reply to Mr. Monroe, when the message had been submitted to him. He expressed himself as follows:

"I could honestly, therefore, join in the declaration proposed that we aim not at the acquisition of any of those Spanish-American possessions; that we will not stand in the way of any amicable arrangement between them and the mother country; that we will oppose with all our means the forcible interposition of any *other power*, as auxiliary, stipendiary, or under any other form or pretext, and most especially their transfer to any other power by conquest, cession, or acquisition in any other way."

To leave no doubt on the true construction of the Monroe declaration, and to do away with false impressions which had even then begun to prevail with some, the House of Representatives in 1825 passed the following resolution:

"That the United States ought not to become a party with the Spanish American republics, or either of them, to any joint declaration for the purpose of preventing interference by any of the European powers with their independence or form of government, or to any compact for the purpose of preventing colonisation upon the continents of America; but that the people of the United States should be left free to act in any crisis in such a manner as their feelings of friendship toward those republics, and as their own honor and policy may, at the time, dictate."

In other words, the United States should not be fettered by any doctrine or programme, but left free to act as the occasion might require. Mr. Calhoun, one of the advisers of Mr. Monroe, and who took most interest in the declaration,* speaking of the Monroe Doctrine, in the debate in the Senate on the question of the acquisition of Yucatan, asserted most emphatically that:

"The United States was under no pledge to intervene against intervention but was to act in each case as policy and justice required." (See note 36 to p. 97, Wheaton's "International Law," by Dana.

A resolution introduced by Mr. Clay, January, 1824, in the House of Representatives, "deprecating European combinations to resubjugate the independent American states of Spanish origin," and thus giving support and emphasis to the declaration in the message of December, 1823, seems never to have been acted upon, and was not referred to any committee. Mr. Benton in his "Abridgment of the Debates of Congress, 1789-1856," Vol. VII, p. 470, accompanies the paragraph of Mr. Monroe's message given above, with an extensive note in which he says:

"This paragraph contains the doctrine so much quoted then and since as the "Monroe Doctrine"; and the extent and nature of which have been so greatly misunderstood. It has been generally regarded as promising a sort of political protection or guardianship of the two Americas—the United States to stand guard over the new world and repulse all intrusive colonists from its shore. Nothing could be more erroneous, or more at war with our established principles of non-interference with other nations. The declaration itself did not import any such high mission and responsible attitude for the United States; it went no further than to declare that any European interference to control the destinies of the new American states, would be construed as the manifestation of an unfriendly spirit toward the United States. This was very far from being a pledge to take up arms in the defense of the invaded American states; and the person of all others, after Mr. Monroe himself, and hardly less authoritative on this point—Mr. Adams, his successor in the presidency—has given the exact and whole extent of what was intended by the declaration."

Mr. Benton concludes this note as follows:

"The occasion for the Monroe Doctrine was this: Four of the powers which overthrew the great emperor, Napoleon I—Russia, Austria, Prussia, and France—having constituted themselves a holy alliance for the maintenance of the order of things which they had established in Europe, took it under advisement to extend their care to the young American republics of Spanish origin, and to convert them into monarchies, to be governed by sovereigns of

European stock, such as the holy alliance should put upon them. It was against the extension of this European system to the two Americas that Mr. Monroe protested, and being joined in that protest by England, the project of the allies was given up."

Since that time there never was any real occasion to press the Monroe Doctrine into service. It went into the domain of past history. The only time, perhaps, when apparently there was a similar concatenation of circumstances to those of 1823, was when an auxiliary army of French and Belgians invaded Mexico, to assist Maximilian of Austria, in securing to himself the imperial throne offered to him by a powerful faction of the Mexican people. But even then, Mr. Seward repudiated the "Monroe Doctrine" as not applicable to the circumstances.

In a dispatch to Mr. Motley, the American Minister at Vienna (Oct. 9, 1863), who had expressed great alarm at the expedition of Maximilian, and sought instructions as to asking the emperor of Austria for explanations, and had also referred Mr. Seward to the Monroe Doctrine, Mr. Seward instructed the Minister not to interfere, using these remarkable words:

"France has invaded Mexico, and war exists between the two countries. The United States hold in regard to those two states and their conflict, the same principles as they hold in relation to all other nations and their mutual wars. They have neither a right nor any disposition to interfere by force in the internal affairs of Mexico, whether to establish or maintain a republican or even a domestic government there, or to overthrow an imperial or foreign one, if Mexico shall choose to establish or accept it."

Mr. Seward communicated this dispatch to Mr. Motley, to the Ministers of the United States at Paris, at Madrid, and at Brussels, undoubtedly for the purpose of advising those foreign governments about his views. When he saw his road clear, after the Union was saved, he, quite independently of the Monroe doctrine, caused the French to withdraw from Mexico in a very short time.

In a popular and much wider but indefinable sense, the Monroe Doctrine means what Mr. Benton said was a misconstruction of it, that is, a sort of political protection or guardianship of the two Americas, to be exercised by the United States.

The true American doctrine is the one which the German politicians call the "freehand policy." Applied to the Hawaiian question it means, that if the true interests of the United States require their annexation without the shedding of blood or waste of treasure, let them be annexed. All Polynesia is not worth even a small war, this source of corruption and "relic or barbarism." To base the acquisition on a pretended national pledge would in this instance be the more ridiculous, as even the most extravagant construction of the Doctrine never went beyond the boundaries of *this continent*, to which President Monroe in his message had confined himself.

* See Adams's *Memoirs and Diary* of September-December, 1823, *passim*.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF LEGERDEMAIN.

BY MAX DESSOIR.

IV.

The principles discussed in the preceding section embrace all the rules which the pupil usually learns as the A, B, C of his profession. These rules so clearly prove that the basis of sleight-of-hand performances is psychological and not technical, that I cannot refrain from giving an outline of, and explaining, them.

“Do not perform the same trick twice in the same evening.” In the first place, the most perfect trick loses its charm by repetition: the observer being no longer surprised at it. In the second place, the audience know what is coming, and strain all their powers to find out the point that originally deceived them. With a little tact and presence of mind one can always avoid an *encore*; and if it comes to the worst, something may be substituted which in its initial features resembles the first trick, but has a different culmination. On the other hand, the skilled performer usually has at his command two or more methods of doing a trick. The disappearance of a pair of gloves, for instance, is effected in two totally different ways. A very pretty little trick is that called “the ambitious card”; it consists in a certain card, no matter in what position it is placed in the pack, being always found on top. If one should here always employ the same *modus operandi*, say the *volte*, or toss, an attentive audience would readily detect the trick; consequently, the *volte*, Voisin’s movement, the *passé*, and filiation are alternately used. Each new method renders the detection of the others more difficult. A last resource is the use of false cards, although no artist who places any value on his reputation will ever resort to such expedients. Naturally all illusion is destroyed by such means. If used, they should be secretly substituted for a real pack, or borrowed, by previous arrangement, from a spectator; borrowed articles always being accepted by the public in good faith.

“Never tell beforehand what you are going to do.” The audience, informed at an early stage as to the outcome of the trick, have an excellent opportunity of concentrating their attention on the right point, and of detecting the ruse. Here is an example. A handkerchief is borrowed and given to a person to hold. When it is reclaimed, it is found to be cut up into small bits. It is rolled up again and handed back to the same person with the directions to rub it in a certain way that the damage may be repaired. When unfolded, it is seen to be changed into a long strip. These effects are accomplished by skilful substitutions, immediately following one another, and the whole art of the trick consists in concealing at the right moment the necessary exchange. Had the performer previously told his audience that the handkerchief would

now appear in pieces and now in strips, they would at once guess that the trick was to be accomplished by substitution, and successfully await the moment of exchange. But when the actor simply rolls up the handkerchief and entrusts it to the care of some person, no one guesses that a substitute is given, and after the exchange has been made, the possibility of discovery is over.

“Never give an explanation.” The most incorrect one does harm; for it is not so much a matter of importance that the uninitiated should have a true explanation, as that he should regard the performance as natural and expected. I have experienced this. Whenever I see a new experiment, or hear of one, after some reflection I always think of a possible way of accomplishing the result, and although my conjectures frequently fail, they nevertheless destroy for me the charm of incomprehensibility which forms the very kernel of modern magic. I must admit that I envy all who can enjoy such performance without the longing of explanation.

“Try to obtain as large an audience as possible.” It may be thought that it is easier to deceive one than a hundred. But just the contrary.* In the presence of a small number of observers the prestidigitateur has not free play; he cannot move about at will or perform all the little ruses of diverting attention, which we spoke of above. In a small audience he is beset with questions and interruptions of a very disagreeable character, and he cannot, as is necessary in many tricks, pass off the same card in three places as a different one, or practise similar deceptions. Finally, he has not the desired choice of persons. A prestidigitateur cannot perform every illusion with every person. Some tricks require a very distrustful subject, others an innocent one; in some, only ladies can be used with success, in others, children. An experienced player will not ask *any one* to assist him; but for the most insignificant manipulations, as the drawing, holding, or placing of a card, will select certain individuals. Only a practiced physiognomist and perfect student of human nature can be sure of success in this line.

So much for the results of theoretical investigation in the actual practice of legerdmain. We now come to its relations to scientific psychology, which are many and varied.

Let me first recall Robert Houdin’s experiments on the instantaneous perception and counting of numbers of objects. These experiments deserve consideration for pointing out a new way of fixing numerically

* The extent to which the attention of thousands can be diverted, is best seen at a circus. Clown A gives Clown B a resounding box on the ear. In reality he only touches his cheek. But at the same moment, B claps his hands. No one notices this, because all eyes are directed on A’s movements, and B’s face.

the *higher* faculties of psychical life. Psychophysics has hitherto exclusively restricted itself to the lower psychical functions of sense perception, including reaction in movements and judgments; only a few years ago did Mr. Ebbinghaus begin to put complicated processes in figures.

This investigator endeavored to find how many words, or meaningless syllables, one could remember after the first hearing; further, how often one must repeat a definite number of syllables to be able immediately to repeat them again, and how often, for the same purpose, after a few hours or days, one must do the same, and what influence is exerted in this by the puzzling factor, practice. A similar idea lies at the basis of Houdin's experiments. Here the object of inquiry is, the ability (acquired slowly, like memory) of recognising a definite number of objects, by once seeing them, i. e. without conscious addition, as this or that number; in other words, the experiments refer to a remarkable feature of human development which may be designated as unconscious calculation. According to Houdin's statements, occasional remarks of Professor Preyer, and my own observations, it appears that the limit of instantaneous recognition lies between 5 and 6; and this agrees in a remarkable manner with the limit of retention of monosyllabic words after one hearing. At any rate, the new, and remarkable possibility is here opened to us of fixing in data and numbers the secrets of our inner psychic life. Of course, as soon as we demand the description as well as the number of the objects seen, the question becomes complicated in a manner which renders its solution unusually difficult. Then "interest" plays an important part. A lady, who can barely catch four similar objects at a glance, can yet describe in detail the toilet of another lady rapidly passing in a carriage. Accordingly, with Houdin's second series of experiment's psychology will for a while, not be able to accomplish much.

The trick of making an orange disappear in the air at first looks like a positive hallucination. We should, then, be confronted with the notable fact that in entirely normal men, images may be produced which possess the character of externally awakened sense-perceptions, with no corresponding external reality to awaken them. But, in the first place, the appearance of a uniform and frequently repeated sensory irritation is necessary to produce these images; and this removes them from the realm of hallucination and places them in the category of sensations of repetition. And, in the second place, the external suggestion is not entirely wanting. There is indeed no object in the air which may be made the foundation of the false perception of an orange, but simply a motion and the sense-impression of this motion is quite sufficient to

awaken the repetitive image of the object associated with it. We have to do with an illusion, to the extent of a subjective falsification of objectively presented material of sensation. Illusions are possible with people entirely sound both in body and mind, especially if fear or other emotions excite the imagination.* In our case, it is intense expectation that induces the favorable state. That the concentration of the mind on a certain effect has that effect as its subjective result is no new fact to those conversant with hypnotism.

While, therefore, positive hallucinations may be wanting in the realm of illusion, there are plenty of negative hallucinations. A positive hallucination consists in seeing something where nothing exists, a negative hallucination in seeing nothing where something exists. Who has not hunted for an object that was directly before his eyes? The sense-impression exists, is taken up, but not elaborated in consciousness, and there thus arises a momentary state of mental blindness, in which negative hallucination may take place. The prestidigitateur artificially produces such a state of absent-mindedness and uses it systematically for his purposes. Mr. Moll,† in speaking of the fact that we can prevent hypnotised persons, by suggestion, from perceiving external objects, very truly says: "If we look at the hands of a magician and watch closely enough, we can see him conceal objects and exchange cards directly before the eyes of his audience. The juggler knows the art of diverting the attention of his observers by skilful phrases, so that even those who are looking at his hands are not in a condition to give an account of his doings. The exchange of cards, for example, falls within the observer's range of vision, the sensory irritation is made, but it does not come to consciousness." In pointing out analogies between the psychology of hypnotism and that of prestidigitation, one may go much further than this.

In conclusion, we may mention a contribution which legerdemain has made to the psychological problem of the freedom of the will. The well-known trick of permitting a card to be drawn at random, and immediately guessing it, is based on the fact that the observer only believes he has freely drawn, while in reality the performer has restricted his will and diverted it in a definite direction, either by placing the card to be chosen in a convenient position, or by pushing it forward at the moment when the selector's fingers reach for it. I do not think that anything could offer a better illustration of the determinism of all our actions. Even in the game of life we do not grasp the chosen cards, but those which are presented to us by a definite law.

[TO BE CONCLUDED.]

* Compare Dessoir, *The Double Ego*, Part I, p. 36, of the publications of the Society of Experimental Psychology in Berlin. Leipzig, Ernst Günther, 1890.

† *Hypnotism*, by Dr. A. Moll, p. 65. Berlin, 1889.

CURRENT TOPICS.

SINCE Grover Cleveland ascended the civic throne a month of hope has gone, and to hungry petitioners for office the month of despondency has come. The promises that bloomed in March, begin to droop in April, and in May they will wither in despair. The pathos of it moves our pity, because many of the disappointed have betted three or four months of time and much money on their importance to a government which foolishly believes that it can get along without them, although at the late election each individual man of them won for the Democratic ticket a ward, a township, a county, or perhaps a state, which, without his opportunity exertions, must have gone the other way. Has he not certificates to prove it, from the chairman of the committee, the senators, the congressmen, and even from grateful men who now have places in the cabinet? Was he not confidentially told in the winter by persons near the throne that Mr. Cleveland gratefully remembered him for the skilful manner in which he carried Brush Creek township for the ticket? And must he now exclaim with Wolsey, "Oh, how wretched is that poor man that hangs on princes' favors!" Where are those trustees of Mr. Cleveland's powers, his intimate friends, who could promise and did promise anything and everything in his name? Alas, at the beginning of the new reign it was discovered that they had no more influence at court than Falstaff had in the reign of Henry the Fifth. On the strength of his relations to the Prince of Wales, Falstaff had borrowed money of Justice Shallow, whose hospitality he was wasting when the news came that Henry the Fourth was dead, and that the Prince of Wales was king; "Away, Bardolph," said Falstaff, "saddle my horse,—Master Robert Shallow, choose what office thou wilt in the land, 'tis thine." So, when on the 8th of November in the evening, news came that Harrison the Second was defeated, and that Grover the First was coming to the throne, the political Falstaffs who pretended to have "the ear of Cleveland," patronised the working patriots and shouted: "Choose what office thou wilt in the land, 'tis thine." They chose; and now, weary and heart-sick, they find that the Falstaffs have been discarded by the king.

* * *

While I pity the needy expectant of an office who thinks that he has earned it and deserves it, and who does not see how he can get along without it, having made his calculations upon it, I envy his more fortunate neighbor, that miraculous man whose quality is higher than any office, who towers above dignities, who can have any place he chooses to put his finger on, but who would not condescend to accept even a cabinet portfolio if offered him on a silver dish. While some worthy patriots are famishing for spoils, others are being followed about by offices actually biting them to attract their patronage, but without ruffling a hair of their ambition. Here, for instance, is a man who has been persecuted in that way ever since the election, but whose pride has not relented yet. Listen to this, the latest news from Washington: "It is the opinion of many of the more prominent Democrats that Mr. Whitney will yet be induced to accept a high position from Mr. Cleveland." While others are pleading for anything, high, or low, or middling, how can we help envying a superior person who cannot even be "induced" to accept the highest place upon the list, although he knows that without him this country can hardly hobble along. Office fascinates most men like a necromantic spell, a truth impressed upon my mind the other day by an old comrade, who for the past twelve years has been "holding down," as he expressed it, a lucrative position in that ancient ruin, the Chicago Custom-house. Pointing affectionately at the deformity, he said: "It hurts my feelings to have that building slandered. I have seen it every day for twelve years, and every day I see new beauties in its graceful curves and its harmonious proportions. The vaunted architecture of Greece and Rome cannot hold a candle to it.

Michael Angelo himself could never have designed it. Its ventilation is perfect, for it is always cool in summer and warm in winter. Notice the air upon the street; you can cut it with a knife, but this murky atmosphere never enters there. In my office up there in the third story the air is ever salubrious and the zephyrs pure. They say the noble structure is liable to tumble down at any moment, and perhaps it is; but let me hold office there until it falls, and then bury me in its ruins."

* * *

So many false reports have gone into circulation about the imaginary "extortion" to be practised at the World's Fair that Mr. Higinbotham, the president, has made a proclamation contradicting the sensational stories, and declaring that there will not be any extra charges made for necessary accommodations. This proclamation, so far as it is definite, is enough to set the "malicious reports" at rest, but when obscure, it helps to strengthen them, as in that part of it, where, answering the accusation that visitors will be charged a fee for sitting down, Mr. Higinbotham says, "Ample provisions for seating will be made without charge." Standing alone, that statement ought to be satisfactory, but immediately under the proclamation the newspaper printing it says: "At the same time, camp-chairs, of light construction, will be offered to those who would rather pay a small fee for them than take seats among the multitude." If this is true, then part of the seating privilege has been farmed out, and the management has laid upon itself the burthen of contradictory obligations. It cannot be just and liberal to the public in the matter of seats and also to the persons who have bought the privilege of charging for sitting on the camp-chairs. The "small fee" may be trifling as the bite of a mosquito, but it will cause irritation and annoyance, because the tired victim will not know anything about it, until he has planted himself in the chair. A few years ago I was taking a stroll through Hyde Park, London, where "ample provisions for sitting are made without charge," but I incautiously sat down on a camp-chair in the shade of a tree. Hardly had I made myself comfortable, when a man came up and demanded a penny. The authorities had sold him the privilege of setting camp-chair traps for unwary foreigners like me. The charge was very small, but the imposition was very large, and I resented it, because there was no indication anywhere that the seats were private property. Better sit on a tack, than on one of those camp-chairs; and when the weather is very hot, Mr. Higinbotham will be surprised at the vast quantity of profanity that may be provoked by a "small fee."

* * *

These remarks will apply also to the extra toilet-rooms, "of a costly and handsome character," for the use of which a charge of five cents will be made. There ought not to be any serious objection to that extra charge, provided the visitor knows before he enters a toilet-room that he must pay for the use of it. To make the "costly and handsome" rooms profitable, the free toilet-rooms must be either numerically insufficient or objectionable. When a visitor, after going in, is charged five cents which he knew nothing about, he becomes angry and spiteful, not that he cares for the five cents, but because he thinks he has been played for a simpleton. The positive expression, "five cents," is, at least, open, frank, and honest, but the defect in the character of the "small fee" is its want of candor; it fears to say how much it is, and this defect attaches to that part of the proclamation which declares that "fifty cents will entitle the visitor to see everything within the Exposition grounds, except the Eskimo village and the reproduction of the Colorado cliff dwellings. For these, as well as for the special attractions on midway plaisance, a small fee will be charged." That is ambiguous, if not equivocal. What is the exact amount of that "small fee," expressed in terms of money? Men who have attended shows, entertainments, fairs, and the like, know how much extortion is concealed in the professional jargon

"small fee," "trifling extra charge," "usual slight advance," and phrases of that kind. They are catchpenny cries, altogether below the dignity of the Columbian Exposition. I shall never forget the first time that Barnum's great circus visited Marbletown. Everybody within a fifty-mile radius came to the show, and the crowd was like a rush of mighty waters, but Mr. Barnum was equal to the occasion, and he issued a proclamation to the effect that "persons wishing to avoid the crush at the ticket wagon can obtain seats at Kelly's book-store for the usual slight advance." The price of a ticket was fifty cents, but when I went into Kelly's and bought five tickets for myself and the folks, I found that the "slight advance" was twenty-five cents a ticket, which I paid "under protest," a protest which never gave Mr. Barnum one moment's remorse down to the day of his death. Let everything be candid, and there will be no grumbling.

* * *

As I do not like to use a word so harsh as treachery I will compliment the Chicago politicians on their genius for diplomacy, and their skill in balancing themselves between opposing forces so as to win with either side. It is not easy to perform this feat, because in the game of double dealing the player himself is liable to be betrayed, as in the case of the crafty gentlemen who have been detected in the legerdemain of signing the petition of one man for the office of postmaster, and then recommending his rival for the same place. Since the well known case of that "Heathen Chineese" there has not appeared such a pathetic story of guile as this which appears in the Washington dispatches of April 5th.

"The Record" correspondent secured access to-day to the records of the file-room in the postoffice department, wherein are kept under the closest privacy the applications and indorsements for postmasters. It disclosed the fact that quite a number of Chicago gentlemen had filed their applications for the postmastership. It also disclosed some of the peculiar methods of practical politics, as the names of quite a number of men were on file as earnestly urging the appointment of two different candidates."

Such duplicity is very shocking to the virtuous mind, and our pain is increased by the revelation that official documents which are "kept under the closest privacy" in the "file-room" of the Postmaster General were shown to the inquisitive correspondent of a newspaper. How did that happen? There must have been additional treachery there. Who gave up the secrets of the "file-room"? When a statesman ostentatiously telegraphs to Senator Palmer urging him to support one candidate, and then writes a "personal and private" letter to the Postmaster General in behalf of the rival candidate, he elevates political chicanery to the rank of the fine arts, and he may confidently aspire to any office in the catalogue of spoils. I am not surprised to learn that when Senator Palmer found it out, he felt that he had been "trifled with," and very likely the Postmaster General felt the same way. I suspect that out of dignified contempt for the double dealing, or else to make a comic scene of it, Mr. Bissell himself gave the correspondent "access to the records of the file-room." I once knew a lucky statesman who signed the opposing petitions of two rival candidates for the office of gauger, and then wrote a "personal and private" letter to the appointing power in behalf of a third man. He told me that he found it necessary sometimes in the trade of politics to assume a double or triple character, but he did not like it very well because it was not agreeable to hear his own two selves continually calling each other false and treacherous.

* * *

At the annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church held in Jersey City, April 5th, the Rev. H. C. Payne made the following announcement, "Brethren, the devil is celebrating a great victory in Chicago. Hell is having a jubilee to-day in honor of the election of a mayor who will turn the Sabbath into a day of amusement." That bit of demonology is not extravagant; it is in logical harmony with the tactics adopted by the opponents of

the successful candidate in the campaign at Chicago, and the result is a marvellous illustration of the manner in which a candidate may be carried on the shoulders of his enemies to victory. When he was nominated the chances were all against him. There was a schism in his own party, and a formidable revolt of the Germans led by the editor of the most influential German paper in Chicago. The so-called "business interests" appeared to be almost unanimously against him. The papers of both parties protested passionately that his election would be a calamity. They declared that he was in sympathy and confederation with all the criminal classes, the director and protector of the "gang." The pulpits thundered against him, and some of the newspapers pilloried him in caricature day after day. Every misfortune, from the anarchist riots to a hole in the sidewalk was charged against him, until at last the opposition looked like persecution, and thousands of his enemies drawn to him by sympathy became his friends, for this occasion only. The censure was overdone, and the reaction against it elected him by a majority of twenty thousand votes. But his punishment was quick and terrible. Two days after the election he had fled, far from the city of his home, and from the state where he had lived so long; fled from the swarming office-hunters to Fortress Monroe, where protected by the guns of that strong citadel he might find sanctuary from the importunities of his friends. The defeated candidate has a happier lot, he has no occasion to run away from the spoilsmen into self-exile, he can rest in the tranquillity of home, a little poorer than he was a month ago, but opulent still, and serenely doing business as before.

M. M. TRUMBULL.

THE UNIVERSAL SYNTHESIS.

BY F. DE GISSAC.

THE MONOS or God of our Monism (the Monism of *The Open Court* and of *The Monist*) is, if I understand it well, "the universal synthesis"—using, of course, the word "synthesis" in its largest meaning, the one used at least by French scientists. This meaning is that of essential unity, of unity in itself, instead of a mere reconstruction by our minds of various quantities into a unity. It is, in the words of Dr. Carus a unity which "is, has been, and will be, an indivisible one." By "a chemical synthesis," French scientists mean the *essential* unity of a thing, that which constitutes its being, of which each of its primary chemical elements are merely the subordinate and incomplete components, such as are the little pieces of marble that enter into the artistic mosaic, as said Dr. Carus in the last number of *The Monist*. There is in St. Peter's basilic at Rome the most admirable mosaic known; it is a copy of St. Petronilla, a masterly painting by Il Guercino, which is in the old Roman baths of Titus that are used to-day as the church of Sta. Maria de Angelis. The mosaic is reputed to be fully as good and powerful as the original masterpiece itself. Now, I should say that the "synthesis" is the same in both the mosaic and the painting, although the material—the *materia circa quam*, as said the scholastics—is entirely different. The idea or the ideal, the form is the same. The Monos of our Monism, God, is, according to Dr. Carus, the order or moral law of the Universe. It is, then, the Universe itself, including, but independently of, or rather "super," the mere *materia circa quam* of the Universe, exactly as the painting and the mosaic are the St. Petronilla, including, but independently of, or above, their respective *materias circa quas*, either the pigments or the chips of colored marbles. Once, conversing with a scientist about the lost arts of antiquity, I asked him how, in spite of our modern science and the wonders of our chemistry, we can remain unable to reproduce that wonderful bronze, harder than the hardest steel, with which the Egyptians used to cut so easily their adamantine granite into statues smooth as a plate glass and with such a perfection that their curved sur-

faces are mathematically correct. He answered: "Yes, we have no difficulty in chemically analysing that ancient bronze, but we are unable to discover its synthesis. The analysis is nothing at all as long as we do not know the synthesis, for the synthesis is the thing in its unity, in its reality, in fact, it is the thing itself. Each reality, each thing, either animate or inanimate, concrete or abstract, is a synthesis. As soon as its synthesis vanishes the thing is dead and it necessarily disappears. Without knowing its synthesis, we cannot reproduce that Egyptian bronze, any more than a *chef* can make a dish without knowing its recipe. The recipe is the synthesis of the dish; it is the dish itself, although, I concede, an abstract recipe would not be a very satisfactory dish."

So the essential reality of the Universe is its synthesis, not merely its abstract but its concrete synthesis. The Universal Synthesis is the *ens* of true ontology; it is the God of true religion. For, borrowing again the words of Dr. Carus, God "is both objectivity and subjectivity combined," or "the reality that surrounds us and of which our very being consists."

Is it not more opportune to define God as "the Universal Synthesis," than to merely proclaim his universality, when we see that already, believing that "God is everywhere as a spirit," anthropotheists will readily accept "the universality of God"? They, as well as the Atheists and the Agnostics, would fail to grasp the positive character of our monistic idea of God. But to tell them that "God is the Universal Synthesis" may instantly awaken their mind to our positivist, truer, and grander understanding of what God really is.

BOOK REVIEWS.

EARL GREY ON RECIPROCITY AND CIVIL SERVICE REFORM. With Comments by *Gen. M. M. Trumbull*. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co. 1893.

Just before the presidential election, the venerable statesman, Earl Grey, formerly Secretary of State for the British colonies, wrote to General Trumbull two very interesting letters on "Reciprocity" and "Civil Service Reform." Those letters were published in *The Open Court*, and they have attracted great attention both in England and in this country. They have now been printed in pamphlet form by The Open Court Publishing Company, with General Trumbull's comments. Some of our readers may wish to preserve the letters and the comments in convenient form, and for that purpose they have been printed altogether in this neat and elegant pamphlet. The comments are in General Trumbull's most fascinating and convincing style, and replete with similes adapted to bring forcibly home to the mind the true conditions of this complicated question.

The political expedient known as "Reciprocity" has been very much discussed in the United States of late, and it has even been adopted into the platform of one of the great political parties. It is a subject greatly talked about, but little understood. The remarks of Lord Grey upon it, wherein he shows the manner of its overthrow in England, are very instructive and worthy of attentive study.

In the *Century* for March is an article on "Napoleon's Deportation to Elba," written by the captain of the ship that carried him to that island. He describes the conversations he had with Napoleon on the way, and the Emperor's account of the manner in which he compelled the American government to come to terms of "reciprocity" with him is very amusing when read by the light of wiser economic science.

At this moment, when the president of the United States and his cabinet ministers are literally besieged night and day by legions of office-hunters, demanding a speedy redistribution of the spoils, and when they demand that all public business be suspended until they are satisfied, the advice and opinions of Earl Grey on that subject will commend themselves to every thoughtful mind.

AFLOAT.

BY HIRAM H. BICE.

Afloat on a summer sea,
Where the sun shines bright,
And the heart is light,
And the ripples come and go.
There the breezes softly blow
From the green-clad land,
'Cross the hazy strand,
With scent from the orange tree.
O'er the silvery sheen
We lazily lean,
And our shimmering faces greet
In the waters 'neath our feet.
Bright visions gleam.
So we drift, we dream,
In our boat on the summer sea.

The soul on the drifting years
With the tide floats on,
While the heavens don
All the roseate hues of youth,
To the soul the type of truth.
And the breeze is light,
And fame's image bright,
No phantom of griefs or fears.
Without heed or care
We merrily fare
To the music of the dream.
Where the ending of the stream?
Ah, the bubbles break;
We start, we wake,
And the reaping—regrets and tears.

THE OPEN COURT.

NIXON BUILDING, 175 LA SALLE ST.,

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, Post Office Drawer F.

E. C. HEGELER, PUBLISHER.

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.

CONTENTS OF NO. 294.

THE HAWAIIAN TREATY AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE. G. KOERNER.....	3623
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF LEGERDEMAIN. (Continued.) MAX DESOIR.....	3626
CURRENT TOPICS: Choose What Office Thou Wilt in the Land. A Man Who Refuses Office. The Small Fee at the World's Fair. Mr. Barnum's Slight Advance. The Duplicity of Politicians. How to Elect a Man by Reviling Him. GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL.....	3628
THE UNIVERSAL SYNTHESIS. F. DE GISSAC.....	3629
BOOK REVIEWS.....	3630
POETRY.	
Afloat. HIRAM H. BICE.....	3630