

390

THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 331. (VOL. VII.—52.)

CHICAGO, DECEMBER 28, 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.

LIBERTY.

III. OUR LINGERING CHAINS.

BY MONCURE D. CONWAY.

In the same year, 1859, appeared Darwin's "Origin of Species" and Mill's "Liberty." Darwin taught us that all development of organic life, from the zoöphyte up to man, had resulted from the ability of some small variation to preserve itself against the majority of its species until a new species incorporating that variation is established. Mill proved that all social progress depended on the ability to develop mental and moral variations from the majority. In the two books we may trace evolution, from the sponge up to Shakespeare, as an unbroken struggle for larger liberty, by differentiation; had it been permanently defeated even in a worm, man could not have existed; had it been permanently defeated in the first human brain that differed from its fellows, in every race, civilised man could not have existed. This is still the law: freedom of individual difference to develop itself is the condition of all progress, social, moral, and physical. If to-day any moral or other differentiation in any mind can be silenced or repressed by authority, or by the fear of it, all advance of mankind is arrested.

Among our faculties the moral sense now alone claims absoluteness, and in these days, when the moral sentiment is borrowing the enthusiasm of religion, it is important to consider whether this reinforced power is using scientific methods, or merely giving new lease to notions related to discredited systems. The increasing tendency to invoke legal authority for the regulation of private conduct has succeeded to the declining authority which regulated religious belief and worship. As it is now certain that the enforcement of creeds retarded religious progress for many ages, it may be fairly suspected that moral legislation will retard ethical, consequently social, progress, unless the enforced morality be perfect and infallible. But it would require human omniscience to determine such perfection; and by consensus of ethical philosophers our moral systems are defective, their social results unsatisfactory: legal repression of moral differentiation is therefore, so far as effectual, practically prohibitive of improvement, from the danger of the general prin-

ciple involved in such laws. Of course, the reference here is to strictly private conduct; that is to conduct which directly concerns the individual agent alone. Human laws exist only to prevent one from injuring another, or others; that is, from violating individual rights or public order. The law has no right to enslave a man; and it does make a slave of that man whose free will is coerced in matters directly concerning himself alone. That amounts to a majority of numbers suppressing, by brute force, a variation, which, however popularly abhorred, may be as useful and productive as the variation of a crucified Jesus or a poisoned Socrates. It is truly claimed by moral coercionists that a man's private conduct necessarily involves others; but the laws cannot justly deal with indirect injuries, which cannot be defined. A person may injure his or her relatives by becoming a monk or a nun, or marrying out of their station, or emigrating. Men's virtues even sometimes turn out to others' harm, and their vices incidentally cause some benefit. The virtuous Roman emperors, Marcus Aurelius for instance, were moved by their sincerity to persecute Christians, who were tolerated by the hypocritical, who inwardly despised the gods they outwardly worshipped. The just law cannot deal with inferential and uncalculable, but only with actual, injuries. The greatest legal crimes of history have been done in the name of morality, as in the execution of Jesus for his "immorality" in violating the Sabbath laws and blasphemy laws of his country. Many a man has similarly suffered, whose immorality is now morality.

Admit that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the legal repression of conduct is really hurtful to the agent, and indirectly to others, there remains the possibility that the hundredth interference is with the moral variation of a Jesus or a Socrates, in whose freedom is involved the elevation of the human race. All the possible evils of sparing the ninety-nine were more than compensated in the liberty of the one, whose differentiation means another step in civilisation. It may be thought that enough liberty is secured when all are free to defend by argument new moral theories, or even conduct generally deemed immoral. Granting for the moment that such freedom exists, it must be remembered that the world is not moulded by ab-

stractions. There must be freedom of experiment in social as well as in physical science. Diversities and eccentricities of conduct must be admitted if the potentialities of human nature are to be brought out, and ethical evolution advance. We need not merely theoretical, but substantial, improvement in manners and institutions. It is true that in moral evolution there is such a thing as reversion. Freedom incurs the risk of decline. And this might be a very serious consideration if we possessed a social condition entirely satisfactory. We have no such condition. The majority of people under so-called civilisation are unhappy. In the commercial world there is a steady decline of morality, owing to the immunities given to fraud, in freeing directors and trustees from liability. The virtuous law pounces on boys who play pitch-and-toss for their own nickels; but if they grow up to be men and gamble with other people's dollars, and ruin families on a large, imposing scale, they are pretty safe. So far as our moral system is sound, it is likely to be preserved by its advantages and by habitude.

Nevertheless, while prepared to claim that there should be larger freedom in the moral direction, I believe there should be more legal restraint in the criminal direction. The freedom of ignorance and disease to diffuse themselves should be, albeit cautiously, restrained. The law should prohibit the free manufacture and sale not only of poisons, but of weapons made solely for homicide,—as pistols. Every man's property should be liable for losses incurred under any company or enterprise sanctioned by his name. Even for speech that has incited to any actual crime a man should be liable. Violence must not be allowed shelter under liberty. That was the slaveholder's liberty. If tyrannicide is given shelter in our republic, president-murder may find asylum in a monarchy. If a private individual is permitted to constitute himself judge, jury, and executioner for an official he does not approve, the rule will apply not only to protect the assassin of a czar, but the murderer of a Lincoln. Wilkes Booth cried as sincerely as any Nihilist, "*Sic semper tyrannis.*" All lynchers, rioters, "political assassins," are tyrants; they are the worst enemies of liberty, for they compel governments to relapse from civil order into the barbarism of military rule. A man has, of course, freedom to defend by argument the principle of tyrannicide, or duelling, or lynching; but he has no right to incite to a particular crime, and should be held liable for any exhortation that can be proved to have caused a particular crime.

If, under my principle that the law may justly restrain the free trade in poisons and pistols, a prohibitionist claims the right to suppress alcoholic beverages, he must prove that these are mainly murderous. The proposal is that trade in poisons and pistols should

not be free; pistols, not useful for any sport, must be under control of the military authority, which possesses the right of homicide; poisons must be under official medical control. Whether alcoholic drinks should be put under similar control, need not be argued here; it is sufficient to say that prohibition has not yet gained for its case a consensus of ethical, scientific, or social philosophers. If, then, the conventional moralist claims, under my principle of restraining the freedom of poisons and of diffusing diseases, the right to suppress immoral literature, it is to be answered that he is liable to mistake moral for immoral literature. For immemorial ages statutes have been suppressing, as wicked and immoral, works of greatest worth. Divorce was deemed immoral until lately, and the marriage of a divorced woman, declared by Christ to be adultery, was considered immoral. The books burned for their heresy are known to have been good books; the books suppressed for immorality may also be good books. The laws framed to protect religion were based on a superstitious belief that an offender of the gods might bring down their wrath on the whole community; those laws survive in all laws for the punishment of individual immorality, and in the related laws against immoral literature. The pious laws did not benefit the gods, but did retard religious progress by punishing new ideas as blasphemy; that the moral statutes equally retard ethical progress appears to me equally certain.

Related to the word "liberty" (from *libet*, that which pleases) is "libertine." Originally meaning a heretic, it acquired a moral connotation through the belief that nothing kept people from villainy except orthodoxy. So "miscreant" (literally, a misbeliever) came to mean a scoundrel. The unorthodox having been shown by experience to be as virtuous as the orthodox, both words have nearly lost their original sense. The clergy can now only prop creeds once believed essential to public order by invoking the laws for a moral system largely based on those creeds. All Sabbath laws and blasphemy laws contain the old virus of theological persecution and ecclesiastical authority. Their worst effect is not palpable. By the laws that have fullest public support, those of obscene libel, it is doubtful whether any good whatever is done. A few really obscene fellows are caught and punished, but their trade is benefited; their wares are advertised, and the price raised by such generally ineffective efforts at suppression. On the other hand, such laws, for the sake of catching a few rats, tamper with the foundations of the social house. The freedom of thought and utterance, the foundations of social civilisation, are tampered with by all laws that cannot be equally applied. No law against immoral literature can be framed, which, fairly administered, would not

expurgate the Bible and the majority of classics. A law against indecent pictures, equally applied, would invade every art-gallery. Every such law involves the submission to a few persons, necessarily unfit, the circulation or suppression of productions that may be of especial importance to mankind. Nearly every work of genius was burnt by the common hangman, up to the Reformation, and many since—not to mention the grand works of art piously destroyed by the Puritans.

Liberty can admit no libel except on persons. That some abuse freedom of the press by coarse publications is no more reason for the suppression of that freedom, than suicide is a reason for suppressing razors. And although that word "suppression" is not applicable to the obscene literature at which it is mainly aimed, it is, unhappily, applicable to ethical literature that is much needed. Our literary censorship and inquisition are concentrated on one kind of immorality,—sexual. This whole theme, though of supreme importance, is by such statutes branded as indecent. The greatest genius, able to announce the most important discoveries on that vital subject,—sex,—might easily be silenced by the liability of his work to accusations of indecency. Where such statutes destroy one obscene book, they prevent a hundred needed ones from ever being born. Both moral and physical science are intimidated, the real knowledge of sexual laws obstructed, and by this suppression the impetus is given to the obscene dealer's trade. For such legal restrictions on moral themes are felt most profoundly by moral people, by responsible thinkers. To a sensitive moral man, who reflects on the evils that may result from disregard of law, nothing can be more painful than the consciousness of having violated any law. And even if a responsible author could deal with this forbidden subject in such a way as to keep within statutory limits, he would hesitate long before publishing anything that might influence others to take up any position which might bring them into unhappy social relations. John Stuart Mill once got into trouble with officials by a connexion, real or supposed, with the circulation of Malthusian literature, now perfectly free; and it may have been this browbeating that prevented him from alluding to the question of immoral literature in his work on "Liberty." It is these responsible thinkers, the best friends of mankind, who are silenced by laws restricting moral freedom. It is not light-minded and reckless people, who care not whether they violate laws or not; not the obscene dealer, whose books are made more costly by prosecution. The suppression falls just where liberty is most needed; it falls on the serious philosopher, who understands the importance of law, and who writes for the benefit of mankind. Some acquaintance with such men in every part of the world has convinced

me that the most well-meant laws for the regulation of private morality, and for the repression of immoral literature, do far more harm than good. Generally ineffective for the suppression of vice or indecent literature, even the small advantages claimed for them are obtained at the disproportionate cost of fettering the pens, which might convey to the world a vast amount of knowledge, now secret, by which the human race might be improved physically and spiritually.

There is an optimistic superstition that truth, however crushed, rises again and must prevail. The dismal testimony of history is that mankind never recovers from any long suppression of mental and moral freedom. The effect is cerebral. Now that reason is legally free in religious matters, it is found to be, like the long-immured prisoner of Chillon, unprepared to avail itself of liberty. Amid the blaze of sciences, the wealth and strength of Christendom is bent to the support of superstitions transmitted from savage ages. It must be many generations before mankind recover from the long repression of its religious faculties, if they ever do. Ethical reformers should take the sad lesson to heart, and do their utmost to rescue moral freedom from any further suffering a fate similar to that which preserves among men otherwise civilised the superstitions of chimpanzees.

LAST SUMMER'S LESSON.

BY F. M. HOLLAND.

WE all agree that the hard times, last summer, were due to bad laws and fear of worse. It is not worth while for me to argue now about which party has made the worse mistakes. We all know that both parties have made many blunders. What we ought especially to remember is, that the only way to avoid having bad laws is to watch the makers more closely. Those who think it was a mistake for the government to buy silver for the benefit of owners of mines can see how unfortunate it was, that no outburst of popular indignation prevented Congress from passing the Bland Bill over the veto of President Hayes in 1878. If we had paid more attention to politics, then and since, we should have had no gaunt spectre of coming poverty to keep away visitors from the great Fair. The tariff question has been studied more carefully; but there is by no means the unanimity there should be about a purely scientific problem. Our politicians have wrangled about it for a hundred years, because our people have not, even yet, acquired that knowledge of political economy which would take the tariff out of politics.

Another problem of great national importance, but still sadly far from a successful solution, is how to have public officers appointed no longer for party or private ends, but solely for the public good.

Another black fact, and one about which there is little difference of opinion, is that our large cities are governed badly. Worse, say good judges, than any others in civilised lands. We all know that there is comparatively little corruption in our towns and villages. In these latter, the administration is on so much smaller a scale as to be more easily watched. The men in power are so well known to the average voter that he takes more personal interest in their doings, than if he lived in a great city. Another reason for the superior purity of rural government is that country people have much more time than city people to talk politics. When I was in college, we had to write a composition about "The Citizen of a Free State Who Takes No Interest in Public Affairs"; and one of my classmates handed in a statement, that the farmers in his town in New Hampshire knew a great deal more about politics than the Cambridge professors.

Perhaps the elections for President call out too much interest in politics; but this is only once in four years, and the interest is mostly of the wrong sort. What the country needs is not periodical fits of passion for doing the will of party-leaders, right or wrong. Our country demands that every citizen keep constantly and coolly on the watch against bad laws and corrupt candidates, especially those proposed by his own party, and that, when he thinks his party is going wrong, he do his utmost to set it right by open protest and even by dissenting vote. This may really be the best thing for his party in the end; but at all events his first duty is to his country. Her interests require constant and disinterested vigilance; and the man who takes no thought of her welfare is not worthy to be a citizen of a free nation.

There are many influences at work making us better citizens; and where I reside a great deal is done by the women in the Suffrage League. We have many clubs, but this is the only one which makes any attempt to study public affairs systematically. It has just held the only meeting we have had in town to consider the silver problem; and it is the only organisation which has had the tariff discussed in joint debate, I mean by opponents speaking on the same evening and dividing the time in public. It has also carried on a regular series of readings from a book about methods of national government; and such subjects as the functions of town-officers have not been forgotten. All this is done to carry out a general plan, which is followed by similar organisations in this and other States. Study of public affairs is a legitimate part of the suffrage movement; and I have heard that movement opposed by a clergyman, on the ground that it was leading women to take too much interest in politics. He was invited by the Concord League to

state his objections publicly; and this was the one most earnestly pressed. The ladies did not deny the charge, for they knew it did them honor. We must remember that women are already citizens of Massachusetts; for they can vote, though as yet only for school committee. The only question is, whether they are to be good citizens or bad ones. The suffrage agitation is already making them more patriotic.

Now just consider how many men take pews, buy pictures, and subscribe for philanthropic institutions, because their wives and daughters desire it. Solid literature, as well as art, philanthropy, and religion, keeps a hold on busy men through female influence. Get that mighty force directed to making those men attend public meetings, and read what the magazines and independent papers say about public affairs, and this will insure much better management of our schools and post-offices, police and fire departments, currency and tariff, army and navy, internal improvements and relations with foreign powers. These are some of the interests which will be cared for better when men and women pay more attention to politics. These subjects, too, will be much more ably and fully discussed in our newspapers and magazines, as well as in books, when there is an increase in the number of women who will not only read such matter themselves, but will persuade their sons, brothers, and husbands to do so. And this will enable reformers to find more general hearing for methods to check the growth of corruption in politics.

We can remember a dark, sad time when our nation's existence depended on how dear her welfare was to her children's hearts. That terrible war would not have broken out, if the patriotism of the North could have been called forth earlier to right the worst of wrongs. Our citizens went on paying no attention to politics, or doing little besides follow old-fashioned methods, until our country suddenly found herself plunged into civil war. Then our salvation was due to the amount of patriotism among our women, as well as among our men. There was urgent need of all the public spirit which could be awakened in either sex. How much public spirit may develop in the next war will depend on how much there has been throughout the intervening years of peace. We are not in the slightest danger of another civil war; but we have recently come so near to hostilities with other republics as to show the urgent need that the people should watch the President. We can never afford to be so weak as to invite attack; and the strength of our country depends on how willing all our people are to make sacrifices for her defence. The safety of Sparta was in having such mothers as she who told her son, as he went forth to battle, that he must prove he had stood his ground by bringing back his shield, or else he must

return borne upon it. The advantage of having women take more interest in public affairs is great enough to go far to answer the familiar arguments against letting them vote, especially as these aged antagonists have little strength left except to knock down each other. We are told, for instance, that a woman would merely follow some man in politics. Perhaps her doing that might make him press forward more rapidly; but we are further told that women who vote might differ from their husbands; and that might enable both of them to see that there are two sides to every question in politics. The man who will let nobody differ with him is not the sort of citizen to be encouraged. Herbert Spencer tells us that women are too impulsive; but that is all the better for their interest in public affairs. He also urges that they are prone to religious fanaticism. This must be admitted; but there is reason to think that familiarity with public duties and responsibilities would make the fault diminish. It is a significant fact, that the lady-managers at the World's Fair were decidedly in favor of opening it Sundays. The only State where women have as yet really done much voting, has a remarkably lax Sunday law; and its House of Representatives has recently passed unanimously a concurrent resolution, declaring "That the possession and exercise of the suffrage by the women in Wyoming for the last quarter of a century has wrought no harm and done great good in many ways; that it has largely aided in banishing crime, pauperism, and vice from this State, and that without any violent or oppressive legislation; that it has secured peaceful and orderly elections, good government, and a remarkable degree of civilisation and public order; and as the result of experience we urge every civilised community on earth to enfranchise its women without delay."

METEOROLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITIES.

BY THEODORE STANTON.

SOME time ago, Prof. Cleveland Abbe of the Government Weather Bureau at Washington published an article, in which he called upon some friend of education and science to establish, in connexion with one of our great universities, a school of meteorology, offering, at the same time, to present to such a school his valuable scientific library of five or six thousand books and pamphlets. When I wrote him, suggesting that he seize the occasion of Cornell's recent quarter-centennial celebration to make this gift, reminding him of the fact that this institution had a meteorological bureau and gave much attention to the science, I received a long letter from the distinguished meteorologist, from which I make the following extracts, with his permission:

"I earnestly hope that Cornell may speedily comply with the conditions under which I had hoped to donate my library as a farther encouragement to the study of meteorology. I propose to give my scientific books, which have, I suppose, cost me about \$10,000, to a meteorological school or institute in connexion with some well-endowed university, provided that there be also a special endowment for this meteorological department, so as to secure the professors, the buildings, the apparatus, and the permanence that is essential to success.

"Although Cornell University has recognised the importance of meteorology and is doing all it can to build up a system of observatories in the State of New York, so that it has become a central office for the New York State Weather Service, yet it has not provided for any instruction in meteorology, nor has it recognised this as a science which a student may make a special feature of his course of study. In this respect, all of our universities are still deficient. There is not one that makes any adequate provision for meteorology. A few teach climatology in connexion with geology or agriculture; others deal with special features of climate in connexion with engineering and irrigation. But all this falls far short of the needs of the country and the importance of the subject.

"I have laid out a four years' course, which could be contracted to three years, covering the following subjects: (1) instruments and their errors; (2) climatology and its relations to agriculture, navigation, engineering, hygiene, and geology; (3) the physics of the atmosphere, namely, the mechanical and thermal phenomena; (4) empiric methods of prediction; (5) the dynamical problems which are severely mathematical and lead to the beginnings of a rational deductive method of weather predictions.

"All these subjects must be studied, if young men are to take high rank as meteorologists. There are many whose plans and ambitions lead them to take only the first or second of these branches of the subject. But the leaders in meteorology must take the whole course, and our universities should make it possible for young men to enter upon this field of study and work.

"I think that a school of meteorology could so arrange its courses that two years of instruction could be given without much mathematics and with only elementary physics, so that it would be a popular course for the ordinary undergraduate. But for the post-graduate course and for the special students who make this a 'major' in the arrangement of their studies, there would be required much mathematics and much experimental physics.

"The great objection that has been urged by my friends to my embarking in some such collegiate course, is the consideration that there seems to be no field of employment for such graduated masters of meteorological science, that there is here no inducement to study, like that offered by medicine, law, civil engineering, etc., because neither the Signal Office nor the Weather Bureau has taken any proper steps to enlist or employ men of this kind; that the whole spirit and the whole atmosphere of those institutions have been monopolistic, antagonistic, and depressing; that promising college graduates will not enlist as privates or sergeants, and that those who have become expert by years of college study, cannot bring themselves to seek political influence and submit to civil service examinations in order to secure positions.

"On the one hand, I think that matters are not quite so discouraging as all this, and, on the other hand, I believe that there is a large field of employment for weather experts outside of the Weather Bureau. Chemists, engineers, and many other scientific experts find abundant support without going into the Government service. And I would propose educating a class of meteorological experts, who would, I predict, very quickly find employment among business men.

"I have always hoped that I might be able to establish a school of meteorology in New York City, which was my birth-

place and home, and whose interests I have had in mind from the moment when, as a boy, I began to study meteorology and finally started the weather predictions.

"I have, by my work of the past thirty years, demonstrated to the satisfaction of every one that what was once considered impracticable, or even impious, is now successful and of the highest practical value. The splendid success of my predictions of the last three hurricanes may serve to emphasise my statement that the country has not yet even dreamed of the possibilities that are in store.

"The time will come when every detail of the weather will be foreseen two days in advance, and when the general characters of the seasons, as to droughts, temperature, and wind, will be foretold six months or a year in advance. But this class of work is not going to be empiric; it is not to be a matter of jumbling up averages or relying upon the laws of probabilities. It will be a matter of the most painstaking computation, based on a most thorough knowledge of the laws of nature and on an international system of observations and maps."

Men who can do such work as this described by Professor Abbe, will not need to be in the Government employ; nor is it likely that the people will ever willingly pay the expense of such work. The present system of the Weather Bureau seems to meet the ordinary popular demand sufficiently well, and is about the class of work that can be carried on by the average army or naval officer, or Government employee. So far as one can judge of the future from the past, every effort to introduce a higher order of astronomer into the Naval Observatory, or of geologist into the Geological Survey, or of geodesist into the Coast Survey, or of meteorologist into the Weather Bureau, will be opposed by the "powers that be," as supported by, or representing, the uneducated masses of the people. It is to be hoped, therefore, that Professor Abbe will see his way to pass out of his present sphere of work and proceed to the next important step in the development of meteorology in America; and it is furthermore to be hoped that this will be made possible by some one of our universities founding a first-class school of meteorology.

CURRENT TOPICS.

I rejoice that the election is over, not because I care much about the result of it, but because I take an interest in the spiritual welfare of the newspaper editors in this town, who ever since the campaign began have been laying upon their souls the burthen of nearly ten million lies a day. Take, for instance, the two principal Republican papers, and the two leading Democratic papers, and their united circulation will be about two hundred thousand copies a day. Now allowing them only a hundred campaign lies apiece, and this is a "conservative" estimate, these multiplied by the total circulation give us a daily allowance of eight million lies; and this, notwithstanding I found this legend every morning in each paper, "Another lie nailed." Each of the candidates was "The avowed enemy of Trades Unions," and "The friend of Organised Labor," according to the party color of the paper giving the censure or the praise. Each of them, according to the rival organs, was appealing to "race-prejudice and religious bigotry"; and each of them would certainly be elected by ten thousand majority, or

any other number you chose to name. One day, Dan O'Grady of Marbletown was arraigned before the court on a charge of assault and battery, and having pleaded "Not guilty," Jem Ferguson, the town liar, took the stand as a witness, whereupon Dan said: "Yer honor, is Jem Ferguson goin' to swear aginst me?" The court answered "Yes," and Dan replied, "Thin I plade guilty yer honor, not because I am guilty, but for the sake of Jem Ferguson's sowl." For the sake of the souls of the editors, it is well that the elections are over for the time.

* * *

Like the famous apple of discord that brought on war in the olden time, the conundrum of Mr. Stead is still at work dislocating the minds of inquiring people in Chicago, and making Christmas miserable. Last Monday, at the meeting of the Methodist ministers, the Rev. Dr. Gray made a guess at the riddle and with proper self-confidence told his brethren what Christ would not do if he were in Chicago now. He decided *ex cathedra* that "Christ would not feed a professional tramp; because to feed a tramp is to interfere with God's work in assisting the worthy destitute. The spasm of sympathy," he said, "that gathers together a horde of tramps, and feeds them may be creditable to the heart, but it is not Christianity." It may not be Christianity now, but it *was* Christianity when Christ was here upon the earth, if the Scriptures are to be believed. And by what new inspiration is it that Doctors of Divinity can affirm that Christ would not do in Chicago what he did in Judea when he gathered together a horde of what we call tramps to the number of five thousand, and fed them on loaves and fishes, so that "they did all eat and were filled"? Now mark the context; the Scripture, my brethren, does not say "some," or "a few," or even "many," my brethren, but it says "all." If a tramp is one who walks about, looking for work or food, then the multitude that Christ fed was composed of tramps, for they had tramped after him three days. Gathering together a horde of tramps, was one count in the indictment against Christ; and his accusers clamored in the ears of Pilate, "We found this fellow perverting the nation." And Pilate, like some of our modern judges, being rather afraid of popular opinion, gave judgment of death against the man who "stirred up the people" and gathered the tramps together.

* * *

While it appeared to be the opinion of Dr. Gray, that much valuable charity was wasted in attempting to save the bodies of the poor, he also thought that a great deal of effort was thrown away in the equally difficult attempt to save the souls of the rich. "Another thing," he said, "the church spends too much time and energy and money in attempting to save the aristocratic." This is heresy, for the rich man as well as the poor man is within the plan of salvation. It may be harder to save the rich man, but the effort ought to be made; and even if it does take extra time and energy and money, the churches ought not to give him up as lost, for without the money of the rich men there would not be any churches; at least, not any of those poems in architecture and temples of luxurious worship such as we have now. It is impossible to spend too much time and energy and money in attempting to save the aristocratic, for the soul of the rich man is as precious as that of the poor man in the eyes of the Lord. That it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven is poetically but not theologically true. The comparison is nothing but a figurative bit of word-painting intended to show how great are the temptations that the rich man has to overcome. He may conquer them, however, and obtain a higher seat in the celestial kingdom than the poor man who never had any such temptations. Lazarus was carried up to Heaven in Abraham's bosom, and Abraham was the richest man of his nation and his time.

Thirty years ago, two antagonistic American armies were discussing on the battle-field this critical problem, Are we a League or a Nation? For a time it was thought that Appomatox was the solution of it, but the controversy is revived through a simple sentence in the President's message, "The United States are"; and around that phrase the hostile forces are gathering again, but without the arguments of swords and guns. If the dispute concerns the rhetoric or grammar of the President, it is trivial enough; but if the form of words used was intended to express a political opinion, the words themselves may become important. All depends upon the spirit that animates the sentence. If the person using it intends it as a shibboleth by which he may be recognised, the plural form gets dignity and character when adopted by the President of the United States, for it may be regarded as a denial of our nationality. The singular form, "The United States is," describes correctly the American Republic as a Nation, while the plural form describes it as a League, or partnership of States. Many persons use either form indifferently, as meaning the same thing; but sometimes words are signs bigger than ships, and if men deliberately refuse to say "National," when speaking of the American Government, but persist in saying "Federal," we have a right to suppose that they use the word as a shibboleth, and that they attach to it not merely a grammatical and geographical, but also a political, meaning. Whatever the theoretical United States may have been, is of little consequence now. The United States of America is a political fact, like Germany, France, or Spain, and, therefore, we may as well reconcile ourselves to "National" and "The United States is."

* * *

The minority of the Ways and Means Committee have presented their report in opposition to the Wilson bill. I have read the first paragraph only, and if the charge there brought against the bill is true, it is not necessary to read any more. Mr. Wilson has been guilty of statesmanship, by which, according to the minority report, "the larger burthen of taxation has been transferred from foreigners and put upon our own citizens." It will be a great hardship if our own taxes are to be paid by "our own citizens," instead of by the "foreigner"; but it is a pleasant thing to learn that at present the larger burthen of American taxation is borne by foreigners, who pay their own taxes and ours, too. Does Mr. Reed, who presented the minority report, really believe that the government of one country can get its revenues by taxing the citizens of another? And if it could lay its burthens on the foreigner, would it be a magnanimous, or even an honest thing to do? The miracle by which we lay our tax burthens on the foreigner is supposed to be performed by the protective tariff, which levies taxes on imported goods, and these taxes the foreigner has to pay before his merchandise can get into the American market. The miracle is benevolent, even where it is not economical, for as every nation except Great Britain works by the same political magic, it follows that each of them pays the taxes of the others, and none of them pays its own. England alone, of all the great nations, has not wisdom enough to adopt the plan; and having no protective tariff at all, she lays no burthen of taxation on the "foreigner." Besides, as England is the great exporting nation, "flooding" the markets of all the other nations with her goods, she pays not only her own taxes, but the taxes of nearly all the rest of the world.

M. M. TRUMBULL

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE VIEW FROM MY ROCK.

To the Editor of The Open Court:

Please allow me to make a few remarks on Mrs. Alice Bodington's article in No. 326 of *The Open Court*. "In discussions on religion there are almost as many opinions as thinkers." This

statement is a fact, and from the standpoint of scientific monism we cannot expect anything else, for the reason that all religions are natural adaptations to fit the differentiated characters of mankind, same as water to fishes and air to birds. Where there is a difference in mind there *must* be a different expression of subjective guess; so that "the different views taken by persons highly cultivated, conscientious, and with eyes wide open to the problems of the day, are largely a question of individual idiosyncrasy." This is the unerring result of natural laws, or causes, that work differentiation as revealed in every domain—in every chapter in the great Book of Nature, the only book that God did directly write; a book that defies the interpolation of man. If, as Mrs. Bodington says, "a religion of science does not exist at present,"—using the term religion as binding mankind together anew—an assembly, or church of science *will exist*, and the above liberal view of all sects from the *Rock* (not "ledge") of monism will be presented in one of its articles of true knowledge. For the articles of science will not commence with "we believe," but with *we know*. Science comes to justify, not condemn; therefore comes to bring "peace on earth and good-will among men." The agnostic represents the human mind in equipoise, waiting for the truth to give it a tip—a necessary tip. Men and women cry out for truth as if they could bear it, but superstition (a wise adaptation of nature) fits some minds a great deal better. According to evolution (which is monistic doctrine exemplified) there must be an adaptation with every unfoldment—an environment to suit the organism, hence there will be an assembly, or church of science, just as soon as minds are fitted and unfolded to form it. This is the exclusive work of natural causes, men and women being the defenceless but willing auxiliaries. But its articles of true knowledge will present invulnerable objective facts and "individual idiosyncrasies" (though we must respect them now) will be swept away as they become useless. Mankind cannot differ on object facts. Objectives are repellant to those who are fitted for subjectives. All things have their roots in nature; all forms and conditions in and among mankind are evolutions from one. This is monism; this, the basic principle of the assembly of science. He that has his eyes and senses *really* open will see and hear and will be attracted to it; will work for its advancement cheerfully, because he will be in harmony with the truth.

JOHN MADDOCK.

PROFESSOR VON HOLST ON GENERAL TRUMBULL'S ARTICLE.

To the Editor of The Open Court:

General Trumbull has done me altogether too much honor in *The Open Court* of December 7. Like most people having somewhat pronounced opinions and making bold to communicate them to the public, I have been treated to many a critical castigation. But I have never before been subjected to such a merciless thrashing—fitting another man's jacket. I am not the author of the article in the *Forum* entitled "The Senate in the Light of History," which the General attributes to me—nor does the *Forum* assert that I am. I regret that I am not even able to tell to whom I have had involuntarily to lend my back as *corpus vile* for the General to exercise the strength of his arm upon.

As to the first article in the same number of the *Forum*, I must plead guilty. The title, however, which fits the argument as well as "the fist the eye," has been manufactured in the *Forum* office at a time when neither the editor nor the sub-editor could, on account of illness, attend to any business. The heading I had chosen and which for reasons unknown to me was cancelled in the *Forum* office was: "Breakers Ahead!" To the few arguments of General Trumbull which are really directed against me, I cannot now reply. Before our summer vacation I shall not have the time to

prepare an answer worthy either of the subject or my adversary. Then I propose to venture upon the attempt. At full length—though that may be saying very little—I shall expose myself as target to the General's shafts. H. VON HOLST.

BOOK REVIEWS.

LES BASES DE LA MORALE ET DU DROIT. By *l'Abbé Maurice de Baets*. Paris: Félix Alcan. 1892. Pp. 381. Price, 6 fr.

L'ÉCOLE D'ANTHROPOLOGIE CRIMINELLE. Lecture faite à la conférence du Jeune Barreau de Bruxelles. By *l'Abbé Maurice de Baets*. Ghent: P. Van Fleteren. 1893. Pp. 56.

Both these works, the second of which is a mere pamphlet, turn about the same question. M. l'Abbé Maurice de Baets sees in the doctrines which have sprung up in the nineteenth century a disintegration of the real foundations of morality and right, and he regards the school of criminal anthropology as the most dangerous offshoot of this movement. Every idea of morality and of justice is compromised by the new theories and pre-eminently so by the last doctrine mentioned. He quotes the words of Madame Clémence Royer, who is an adherent of the new school, that "criminal humanity must be totally eradicated from society, crushed, as we crush the viper"; and he adds, according to this doctrine the criminal is simply a crime-perpetrating animal. He quotes again that a human being is not responsible for his virtues or vices; one can no more help being Regulus than Catiline, no more help being Newton than a vulgar pedagogue; and, he adds, here is no responsibility, no guilt, no ethics. Deny freedom, he says, and you deny ethics, you eliminate all ideals from life. He examines the theories of the great ethical philosophers, but finds that the old basis of morality alone is the right one. There is God, and man, who has sprung from God; submission to the will of God is morality. There are liberty and right, intelligence and will, crime and punishment, law and reparation, passions and free-will. That fecund ethics which is based on God alone will explain all.

M. l'Abbé Maurice de Baets's books are written in a forcible and fervid style and contain much clear reasoning on the subjects of which they treat. We have also recently received from him another short pamphlet, entitled *Un vœu du congrès de la ligue démocratique*, treating of the labor problem, which arises, he thinks, from the imperfect distribution of wealth, but which can be solved by charity—by Christian charity, which consists in loving one's neighbor as one's self, and is not limited to occasional donations of money, but means the assurance to every person of the means of economical independence. μκρκ.

TOOLS AND THE MAN. Property and Industry Under the Christian Law. By *Washington Gladden*. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1893. Price, \$1.25.

In his preface, the author, the Rev. Washington Gladden, pastor of the First Congregational Church of Columbus, Ohio, says: "By the study and observation of many years, I have been confirmed in the belief that the Christian law, when rightly interpreted, contains the solution of the social problem. I believe that Christianity not only holds up before us a beautiful ideal, but that it presents the only theory of industrial and social order which can be made to work."

"The end of Christianity," he further says in his first lecture, "is two-fold—a perfect man in a perfect society." The Christianization of society is a large part of the calling of the disciples and servants of Jesus Christ. Christianity, according to the author, is not individualistic in spirit, but socialistic. The struggle for existence is a law which Christianity only recognises in lower animal existence; in the human sphere it is checked by the higher spiritual law of sympathy and good-will; the Christian's aim is to save

those who are being worsted in the struggle for existence; the succor of the weak and unfit, accordingly, is one of the chief functions of the ideal Christian social state.

The lectures are the outgrowth of addresses made by the author at various colleges and academies of this country, and in their final form represent the first course of lectures in the Adin Ballou lectureship of practical Christian sociology at the Meadville Theological School of Meadville, Pennsylvania. μκρκ.

The Scriptural Tract Repository of Boston have published in book form (price, \$1.00) the sermon of Brevard D. Sinclair, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Newburyport, Mass., entitled "The Crowning Sin of the Age." The sermon is a severe arraignment of modern society for the crime of infanticide, and though fervently written, is not offensive, as such productions usually are. It has received commendations from some very prominent clergymen. (47 Cornhill, Boston, Mass.)

NOTES.

It will be important to our Chicago readers, and perhaps interesting to those at other places, to learn that the University of Chicago has made arrangements for the conducting of Saturday and evening classes in the University. It is part of the purpose of the University to put its advantages within reach of the largest number possible of the community, and the foregoing provision is accordingly made for the benefit of those who cannot come to the regular classes. Courses in almost all departments are given, a circular of which, with complete descriptions, may be obtained by addressing the Secretary of Class-work, University Extension Division, University of Chicago, Chicago. Notifications of intention to join the classes must be sent in before January 1, 1894.

THE OPEN COURT.

"THE MONON," 324 DEARBORN STREET.

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.

CONTENTS OF NO. 331.

LIBERTY. III Our Lingering Chains. MONCURE D. CONWAY	3919
LAST SUMMER'S LESSON. F. M. HOLLAND.....	3921
METEOROLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITIES. THEODORE STANTON.....	3923
CURRENT TOPICS: Feeding Tramps. Saving the Rich. The "United States Are." Taxing the Foreigners. GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL.....	3924
CORRESPONDENCE	
The View from My Rock. JOHN MADDOCK.....	3925
Prof. H. von Holst on General Trumbull's Article.....	3925
NOTES.....	3926
BOOK REVIEWS.....	3926



