



The Open Court.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Devoted to the Work of Conciliating Religion with Science.

No. 170. (Vol. IV.—40.) CHICAGO, NOVEMBER 27, 1890.

Two Dollars per Year.
Single Copies, 5 Cts.

STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS.

BY M. M. TRUMBULL.

The after-dinner debate at the Sunset Club on the 6th of November was unusually grave and earnest, as became the ominous theme, "Strikes and Lockouts." In a kindly endeavor to soften flint and steel, so that fire might not fly from their collision, the Secretary sprinkled over the tables a hatful of congratulations on the good work the Sunset Club was doing, "in making the radical less radical, and the conservative more liberal." The hint was lost, for no man tempered his language, except so far as toleration and courtesy required. The radical yielded nothing, neither did the conservative, and each was right. Men cannot be too radical for a truth seeking recognition, nor too conservative against an error crowding in. In morals every man must follow his individual conscience. Whatever an honest man believes, that is the truth to him; and he has no more right to yield any part of it, than he has to surrender the multiplication table; for the laws of ethics are as radical as the laws of mathematics. Whatever a time-server believes is of little consequence; it is merely a matter of self-interest with him, and outside the catalogue of moral agencies. A true man in the wrong, is of more use in this world than a false man in the right.

Strikes and Lockouts are interconvertible terms. Each is intended to be a measure of self-defense and a protest against wrong. The lockout is merely a strike of the employers against their workmen, and its moral and political character, like that of a strike, must be determined by its own circumstances and the motives by which it is controlled. Each side was ably represented in the debate, the employers getting a little the worst of it, because, having the opening, they pitched the keynote a little too low, and estimated the profit and loss of Strikes and Lockouts by a money standard; whereas in many cases they are efforts to vindicate a principle without counting or caring for the cost. Here is the keynote, as it was pitched by an employer of labor who opened the debate:

"This carpenter's strike has been a great loss to the capitalist, builder, contractor and laborer, but I cannot see where the working man got the benefit of what he struck for. Nearly all the great strikes for the past ten years have been defeated in the end. . . .

If they succeeded in getting a small increase, that increase was totally wiped out in the great amount of money they expended to get what they demanded."

The weakness of that argument was its "Does it pay" character, a consideration which has never yet controlled the efforts of men towards liberty. Every victory won by justice in the social conflict has been the culmination of disasters and defeats. John Hampden found that there was no profit for him in his contest with the king over a trifling matter of taxation; and yet the defeat of Hampden in that famous lawsuit, was one of the great political victories of the English people. The "profit or loss" argument was easily answered by a member of the club who belonged to the "working man" element. His reply was this:

"It is said that even if the strike is won the waste of wages incurred is far greater than the added compensation, which is gained. Take the Burlington strike, which resulted in loss of wages to thousands and thousands of dollars, and the strikers were not even successful. But what was its effect? The next railroad company, when their men have a grievance, will think twice, before they permit a strike of such magnitude. If the working men never struck, no man can tell to what point the monopolistic power of this country would be led."

And another one said:

"I have myself been conversant with the facts in a few cases where strikes have been agreed to where there was no possible hope of ultimate success, but simply with the idea of entering an emphatic protest against the demands of an unreasonable or tyrannical manager or employer."

This was a novel view of the subject to some of the employers present, but it revealed the moral foundation of that expensive system of resistance which takes the form of strikes, wherein the working men surrender to present loss and poverty, in order to protect themselves from greater poverty and humiliation in the future. When the first speaker said that in the matter of disputes between the employer and the employed, he favored a settlement by arbitration, he made a concession to the other side, because without strikes there would be no arbitration.

He said some other things, and very ugly things they were. Referring to the coercion tactics practised by the striking carpenters towards the men who chose to work instead of strike, he said:

"I have seen men coerced by a 2 x 4 scantling on their heads. The methods of the strikers were not of the kind laid down in books of etiquette. They would take hold of the first man they

could find, and if they could not convince him in a very few words they would take him and throw him off the building, and his tools would follow."

To this indictment there was no answer, and for that reason the "Strike" side of the debate was very much impaired. It limped around on crutches furnished by the most eloquent debater there, who said:

"The tyranny of working men we hear so much about, consists mainly in their anti-tyrannical refusal to allow the other side to make both ends of the bargain. . . . We hear a great deal of the turbulence of the working man. The misdeeds of the working man are serious enough, but they are holiness itself by the side of the Pinkertons and Gatling guns which Christian chaplains used for the conversion of the heathen and the strikers."

Neither excuse is valid, and the *tu quoque* argument is fallacious because the men thrown off the building were not Pinkertons, but carpenters earning bread. To respect the liberty of others is a hard lesson to learn, but mechanics, as well as millionaires, must learn it.

Among the liberal and humane sentiments eloquently expressed by one of the speakers was this:

"Historically it is only yesterday that working men ceased to be slaves. The cap that is put on the domestic, and the suit that is put on the coachman, are all survivals, which show we have not outgrown the barbarism of the days when work was all done by slaves."

There was material for solemn thought in that, for no man can deprive another of self-respect without endangering his own. It is not well to disfigure any honest employment with a badge of servitude. To mark any man with livery in this land is an offense against all other men. It is the vulgar insolence of riches. No magnanimous American, proud of his country and its freedom can look upon another man in livery without a feeling of pain and humiliation; if he can, he has forfeited his American quality, and has passed into the brotherhood of snobs. He is a menial in spirit, a Jeems Yellowplush, trying to establish Noodle-ness in the United States, "on the European plan."

There were some other statements just as eloquently made which are open to adverse criticism, for instance, this: "The working man claims the right to know why he has been discharged, and not to be discharged without cause." And this: "Trades Unions exist to maintain the sacred rights of labor." And this: "The working men are often wrong, but theirs is always the right side." If the first proposition is correct, and the claim be allowed, the obligation should be mutual, but the working man claims the right to discharge his employer at any time, and without giving any reasons at all. The second proposition never was true as to outside labor, and it never will be true until the Trades Unions recognize the "sacred right" of every man to labor without hindrance or molestation from them. As to the third proposition, it is enough to say that right ought never to be main-

tained by wrong, and that the right side may become the wrong side if defended by wrong means. No man has power to absolve the working men from sins by anointing them with the soothing unction that "theirs is always the right side."

Legislative therapeutics, as a cure for Strikes and Lockouts, had some able advocates, and of course they wanted "to have a law passed"—against the earthquakes and the storms. Leaning with confidence on the physical force theory of persuasion, a very energetic speaker declared, in a tone of indignant scorn, that, "To say that Strikes and Lockouts could not be controlled by law, would be to confess the failure of our free system of government." Here the legitimate conclusion from the premises was reversed, because if Strikes and Lockouts cannot be controlled by law, that fact is evidence that free government is a success. If the speaker had omitted the word "free" there would have been symmetry in his logic, but the admission of that word was fatal to the sentence. Strikes and Lockouts, whether wise or foolish, just or unjust, are signs of a free people, and wherever they can be "controlled by law," that government is not free. They are some of the forms of a spiritual unrest, seething down there in the very centre of the social world, and beyond all statutory control. No doubt the people of Naples, offended by the smell of brimstone, might "have a law passed" to suppress Vesuvius, and it might be within the powers of modern police engineering to stop the mouth of that mountain, and silence its noisy agitation; but in that case, the discontent below would burst through the crust of the earth elsewhere, perhaps under the city itself. Our calf-bound books are bloated with laws already; how would the repealing of laws do by way of experiment? Suppose we try that.

WHY WE WANT A REVOLUTION.

IN REPLY TO DR. PAUL CARUS.

BY MORRISON I. SWIFT.

A revolution is not, by necessity, accompanied with violence, as Dr. Carus seems to think. The *London Methodist Times* perceives this clearly in pronouncing that "England is in the midst of a social revolution. Old things are passing away and all things are becoming new at an unprecedented rate. And yet because the greatest revolution in our history is not accompanied by bloodshed, few realize its magnitude and far-reaching significance."* Revolution is evolution,

*The remainder of the paragraph is also good:—"If men were really able to take the late Matthew Arnold's advice, and see things as they are, the rate at which the social revolution is progressing would be enough to take their breath away. If our rulers in Church and State really could understand what is taking place under their very eyes, such events as the proceedings of the Trade Union Congress at Liverpool last week would agitate them too much. A gathering of workmen, which, twenty short years ago, was treated with mingled merriment and contempt, has already become so important that it almost rivals the imperial Parliament in public attention. We are on the threshold of a new socialism."

only it is the evolution of ordinary times accelerated. It is the characteristic of a revolution to be complete in its work. Revolution is emphatic. In ordinary evolution men are not so conscious of what they wish to part with and what to acquire, and they are not thorough. Witness our antiquated fantastic mechanism of laws. Men are slow to see; revolution makes them see vividly. Men are skeptical of their insights; revolution infuses them with faith in their insights. Men are timid to act; revolution makes them bold to act. Men remember what revolutions taught them. No one thought it amiss that some should live on grass before the French Revolution; now, if men are anywhere obliged to eat grass, it is acknowledged to be out of the right order of things.

At this time there are some things that need uncommon emphasizing, and nothing but a revolution will accentuate them sufficiently. One of these is this, that so long as there is want anywhere there shall be nowhere excess. Another is that no right of possession of one man amply cared for shall debar another man from the development he might have if that so-called right of possession did not exist.

There is a higher code of laws than anything written in the books. Chief of them is that all living men and women shall be granted development up to the full material capacity of the earth on which they live. That another man claims ownership and orders them off does not confer ownership or the right to order them off, if keeping off obstructs their development. That the law says, "This property belongs to Blank, and you cannot have it for your adequate nourishment and education, because he desires it for dinner parties," has no weight against the superior law, and the revolution has come to establish this superior law. Now, no man should wish to corral what would develop others, and use it for his surfeit. But this is what the rich do, and herein lies my charge against them. Because the lower written law allows them to do what the higher law forbids, they corner the material things of the earth and bar out whom they choose from welfare and progress.

My indictment against the rich is not, as Dr. Carus concludes, "that they do not use their power to overthrow the social order," it is that they do not use their power to change the social order. They are the ones who can change it without that "break-down of society" which Dr. Carus and I, equally with him, deplore. But if they set their faces to keeping the social order as it is for their private joy and supremacy, then just because so much power is in their hands the change will require a preliminary breaking down and dissolution to get selfish obstructionists out of the way. And the cause of the breaking down and dissolution will be the selfish obstructionists themselves.

It is no fanciful assertion that the ability to change the social order is in possession of the rich. The rich critic of my paper approving revolution, who said it was not agreeable for him to be pilloried by name,* knows this, as all know it, and acknowledges it in protesting in his own defense that because there are writers who, like myself, 'try to focalize prejudice and hatred against the rich,' "many men who accumulate means, hide from public notice. They refuse to identify themselves with movements which would ameliorate if not cure the troubles of the poor and unfortunate, while those who are sympathetic and active are assailed." This contains my indictment against the rich in a kernel. They might "ameliorate if not cure the troubles of the poor and the unfortunate" if they wanted to, and they do not want to. I know of no way to get them to want to by persuasion. The whole past of mankind is an evidence that they have not been amenable to persuasion, for here are the poor and unfortunate still, and here still are the rich, abounding in exceeding luxury, with the power to 'ameliorate if not cure the troubles of the poor,' folded away in a napkin. I think that all time has been proving that a revolution is the thing needful to induce the rich to do what they have ample power to do and refuse to do cheerfully and willingly.

A revolution will bring to light those who "hide from public notice" to escape being pilloried, though it was never seen that such brought themselves to public notice philanthropically: before the practice of pilloring arose, else why were the poor and unfortunate not ameliorated long ere now? But a revolution is hardly less requisite for the sake of the rich who do 'come forward to identify themselves with movements to cure the troubles of the poor and unfortunate,' and if I succeed in making this point appreciable, I shall not have breathed the vital air of earth vainly. For how far do these philanthropic rich advance in their philanthropy? Do they show promise of granting all men and women their development up to the full material capacity of the earth now? Not so. They must first set off for themselves and their families the choicest homes, and fabrics, and viands, and appurtenances for display and migration, and then they identify themselves with a charity or found a college. Mr. Astor, avers the hero of one of Mr. William Matthew's anecdotes,† is "found, and that's all. The houses, the warehouses, the ships, the farms, which he counts by the hundreds, and is often obliged to take care of, are for the accommodation of others. . . . He can do nothing with his income but build *more* houses and warehouses and ships, or loan money on mortgages for the convenience of others. He's *found*,

* The *Open Court*. Oct. 30, 1890.

† *Ibid*.

and you can make nothing else out of it." A slight oversight is here. How are Mr. Astor and the rich "found?" In Newport villas or the Berkshire valleys in summer, and at winter in their metropolitan palaces, or domiciled in some sunny capital of the mother world. They are "found" in pocket money enough weekly to educate thousands of young men and women, and this they expend in receptions kindred to barbarian festivals, and in theatre parties and stables. I do not object to luxury when all have it, but when it defrauds the millions of development I object to it.

The difference between being "found" thus and being "found" as the common workers who create the Newport mansions and princely incomes for the rich, is that life for one class is life, and for the other a mere vanishing adumbration of life, with less than a taste of joy to let them dream what it should and could be. The difference is that the crowd whose development is intercepted by the suppers of the rich can only become imperfect shadows of men, with instincts starved, as Professor James tells us, because their proper objects were not presented at the right time. "In a perfectly-rounded development," says this candid scientist, "every one of these instincts would start a habit toward certain objects and inhibit a habit toward certain others. Usually this is the case; but, in the one-sided development of civilized life, it happens that the timely age goes by in a sort of starvation of objects, and the individual then grows up with gaps in his psychic constitution which future experiences can never fill. Compare the accomplished gentleman with the poor artisan or tradesman of a city: during the adolescence of the former, objects appropriate to his growing interests, bodily and mental, were offered as fast as the interests awoke, and, as a consequence, he is armed and equipped at every angle to meet the world. Sport came to the rescue and completed his education where real things were lacking. He has tasted of the essence of every side of human life, being sailor, hunter, athlete, scholar, fighter, talker, dandy, man of affairs, etc., all in one. Over the city poor boy's youth no such golden opportunities were hung, and in his manhood no desires for most of them exist. Fortunate it is for him if gaps are the only anomalies his instinctive life presents; perversions are too often the fruit of his unnatural bringing up."*

Dr. Carus conjectures that in this extremity I "would repeat the demand of Christ: 'Go and sell all that thou hast and give to the poor,'" but I do not require this. I would only require them to abandon every extravagance and dispose of every luxury, and turn the volume of their superfluities into channels for development of the outside millions. I would only have them apply their talents to devising a system

where there will be none rich at the expense of others, and substitute that system for the one they now operate, where the rich are rich because the poor are poor.

These are very moderate demands, and I cannot think that anything short of them will satisfy the spirit of revolution now abroad in the earth. It has been taken as axiomatic that we must have these differences of wealth, and assumed that they betokened some superiority of virtue in the wealthy, and that wealth is divinely appointed to continue its rule; but just these honored "truisms" the revolution is on its way to abolish. The reason I welcome revolution is that I do not want this noble transformation half done. To the man of trade, absorbed in operations that seem to him as organic as gravitation, I know this demand shades into complete madness; and just because he cannot see that it is not madness, I sorrowfully recognize that nothing will reach him and accomplish the change but revolution.

There is nothing that we may not cheerfully suffer for this event. If life is to be sterile, growing ever less endurable to those who rise above a certain line of enlightenment, the old way will do; but if we are still to prize it, if it is to hold our interest and respect, and preserve the qualities of virtue that the ages have loved, it must be established on new foundations. The introduction of christianity was the establishment of the world on new foundations. The old life was worn out. Our old life is likewise worn out. A new conception of living must replace it or we shall go to ruin. And we had better go to ruin than to live on as we are living, for the ruin to which our false manner of living is plunging us is worse ruin immeasurably than the outward dissolution of institutions. The ruin is in us, a dry, consuming rot; and we think that if we can keep the rot invisible by activity in the Chicago Board of Trade it will cure the rot. Christianity arrested the rot because the Roman Board of Trade went down in visible ruin and left the soil free for a new life; because 'the barbarian nations of the north flooded and drowned all which this civilization was, and thought, and knew, renewing the infancy of the world.' We are indebted to Matthew Arnold for setting us right about the value of these old civilizations. For the establishment of Christianity in the form that it took "the extinction of the old civilization was necessary," he says. And to teach the lesson of the evanescent value of civilizations compared with the creation of life, he continues: "Professor Clifford execrates Christianity as an 'awful plague,' because its success thus involved the ruin of Roman civilization. It was worth while to have that civilization ruined fifty times over, for the sake of planting Christianity through Europe in the only form in which it could then be planted there. Civilization could build itself

* Professor William James, *Psychology*, Vol. II, p. 447.

up again; but what Christianity had to give, and from the first did give in no small measure, was indispensable, and the Roman civilization could not give it." *

What we call our civilization, is nothing compared with a new system of life. Our civilization can be reproduced, but if the new life is lost it cannot be recovered. Civilization can build itself up again; but what the spiritual germ now seeking entrance to the world has to give is indispensable, and our civilization cannot give it. I can only say of those who are eloquent about the value of our civilization, that they, like Professor Clifford, had they lived in the days of Rome, would have defended the Roman civilization against the coming Christianity. But most now accord that it was altogether well for that civilization to fall. Two thousand years after an event it is easy to be on the right side about it. Two thousand years from now none will be timid to say that the nineteenth century civilization was not worth preserving against the thought which had in it the new creation of the world.

But whatever the opinion of the fortieth century may be, the edict has surely gone forth in the renewed consciences of many, that if by any means at the disposal of man it can be prevented, no one shall much longer inflict suffering on another under the mask of hereditary practice, or industrial rights, or enacted laws, making their lives hard and dull. The men who profit may say, This is economic necessity, or, It is legal. The defrauded reply: We do not care for law or economic necessity; we are suffering and you are the cause. The first may exclaim, But you will not destroy society? Do not rashly bring on the dissolution of that which is so hard to build again! The lower millions return, Do not think we will forever keep you in fatness and suffer you to make our lives unlovely and cheap, though the world comes to an end for what we do. We are at last spiritually emancipated and we must break the yoke that kills us, or take our own lives in pusillanimity and self-contempt.

And they are right. It will be worth while to have our civilization ruined fifty times over, for the sake of planting the new life principle among the races. We do not want to keep up a civilization in which the abominations of our's survive. But it is not proved that civilization need go down to plant the new life. The revolution is going on while we sleep.

PLASMOGENY.

BY DANIEL BRIGHT.

It is an established fact that protoplasm is the physical basis of life and the primary condition of all organic matter and organized bodies. And Prof. Haeckel has conclusively shown that the germ-cells of the highest vertebrate animals down to the moneron have all an equal form-value. Even the nucleated egg-cell of the

human organism is, in the process of fertilization, reduced to a non-nucleated germ stage, the so-called "monerula" form.

But how can there be so vast a difference of organic motor-value as exists in so small a capacity and sameness of form? The involution of the highest complexity of organic motion into the purest physical simplicity is the most profound process in Nature, and propounds, Sphinx-like, the deepest problem for mankind to solve.

This primary organic substance contains, however, higher properties and attributes than those at present demonstrated. Science has shown its form-value and its chemical composition; but beside these it possesses bio-chemical and histogenetic value, biogenetic quantity and psychic quality. But these higher properties lie beyond the reach of merely artificial experimentation, since in the process of chemical analysis that peculiar motion which distinguishes animate from inanimate matter is of necessity destroyed. That vibration which we denominate the bio-chemical and histogenetic motion, and which both organizes and preserves the organized bodies, being driven out, the hitherto animated body becomes inanimate and the process of decay and decomposition sets in. We may call this peculiar dynamic property the *animus*, and this, in connection with the still higher attributes, constitutes what we claim to be the unknown, but knowable truth, and also truth which for the time is unknowable.

The germ-cells of these diversified organisms, from the moneron to the human egg-cell, are like sensitized plates on which photographic impressions of various objects have been made, which however must pass through a certain course of "development" in order to bring out and fix the images or pictures, and display their diversities. The undeveloped plates have all equal chemical properties and equal form-value; yet the greatest diversity is here contained in perfect uniformity. There is a "thing" involved in the atoms which cannot be weighed, or measured, or taken cognizance of by any of the five senses of man.

The difference between the impressed photographic plates and the parent-cells of the various organisms is this: the one receives its impression by a non-animalizing motion, the others by animalizing molecular vibrations. Hence the one contains an inanimate form and picture, the other an animated image and living ideal. The one comprises purely chemical color-vibrations, the other organic and histogenetic, and the still higher molecular motions of a psychic nature. But no purely chemical nor physico-chemical experimentations can develop these vital impressions made on those plastic bodies, and fix them in material form-expression.

Let us now inquire into the question: What produces bioplasm? To this we lay down the postulatam that there is a force, or vibratory motion in Nature which compounds the elements into these basiliary life-forms and this primary organic condition and holds them in the plastic, animalized state. This plasma-producing motion is the primary as well as the ultimate factor in the vast laboratory of Nature; it is the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end of all organic matter and organized bodies. Every vegetal organism is a botanical retort in which this peculiar motion compounds the elements into the primary substance of all-organized forms; and every animal organism is a bio-chemical retort in which the vegetable plasma is animalized, and biogenetically and psychically qualified.

Our observation teaches us this fact: No organism can raise the propagative protoplasm into a higher degree of complexity of organic motion than its own. Hence these laws: 1st. Every parent-cell is described and circumscribed in its development and growth by the degree of this motion hereditarily transmitted to it by the parent organisms. A fountain cannot rise higher than its source. 2nd. By the law of transmission the parent organism limits this motion in the process of involution and evolution of the propagative cell, or germ.

* *God and the Bible*, Preface, xxiii.

Viewing now the human body, the most complicated mechanism of nature, we find two great centres, the brain and the heart, which, with their systematic ramifications, form the two principal systems in the vital economy of its nature. The contents coursing through one of these systems, the blood, constitute the building material of the organism. Here we find plasma in a fluid state, in an organic but unorganized condition, a chaotic mixture. The other system, the brain, the spinal cord and the nerves, constitutes a cosmos, or a little universe. All the substance of this system is that condition of plasma which I would call cosmically integrated bioplasma, which is the physical basis of all the higher functions of the psychical and spiritual attributes of man, or mind. In it resides the ego-subject and the ego-object, the legislative and the executive, the ego that evolves and organizes and also the ego that is being evolved and organized. There is an interdependence between these two factors, or focalized centres of energy. They constitute an inseparable duality, or, in other words, a differentiated unity.

The accumulated mixture of vegetable and animal plasma, of which, after digestion, the food taken into the body consists, is in a state of disarrangement and disorder. For, although the individual cells have all an equal form-value, they are vastly different in their molecular motion. When these structureless sacs or cells enter the human blood they are gradually charged from the brain, through the nervous system, with a higher degree of vital motion, until they reach the degree of motor-complexity of the human organism.

Naturalists have traced anthropogenesis, or the evolution of man, with a great deal of research and skill, from the earliest ages of organized life on our planet, through phylogeny, or tribal history, deduced from evidence gathered from paleontology and biology up to the present. But they deal more with morphology, or the forms of organisms than with physiology and psychology, or their functional actions and their higher mental attributes. But they have traced man's history not only phylogenetically, but also ontogenetically. In embryology and metamorphology they describe very minutely the development of the human organism from its parent-cell. This displays the subject of evolution on a smaller scale, and brings it within the grasp of the human intellect and the comprehension of the finite mind. The subject, however, has hitherto been investigated principally from the standpoint of morphology and zoology. Prof. Haeckel says: "The germ-history of the functions, or the history of the development of vital activities in the individual, has not yet been accurately and scientifically investigated." This is evident. Such investigation—into "the development of the vital activities in the individual"—lies in a different direction. It will change the question from a morpho-zoological to a psycho-physiological one.

The investigation into the development of the dynamics of the individual in embryology does not only vastly enlarge the subject itself, increasing it in importance and interest, but it also opens an avenue into a new field of research, and leads into an unexplored domain of physico-philosophy. Ontogeny (including embryology and metamorphology), or the evolution of the fertilized egg-cell into the perfectly developed human organism, is the compressed reproduction of phylogeny, or the formation of the many various species of animated forms in Nature; and the biogenetic quantifying and the psychic qualifying of the plasson or plasma into the fertilizing sperm, is the compressed reproduction of ontogeny. The adult human body,—the result of ontogeny and further growth,—is the compressed or miniature expression of all animated forms of this mundane sphere or planetary cosmos; and the very active "protoplasmic thread" is the compressed or minimum expression of the adult human being. In it man is reduced to extreme concentration, and compressed into the least physical form; the human life-forces are brought into ultimates and into the low-

est condition of condensation; the organizing motions are geometrically proportioned, arithmetically computed to the polarity of the human body, and focused in its image which is impressed, a living ideal, on the atoms, or plastidules, of the protoplasm, constituting man in extreme compression, condensation, and concentration with a rudimentary body,—a single cell,—which we call a caudated nerve-cell, or a brain-centre.

The investigation of the unfolding of the vital activities in embryology, or the transformation of the potential into kinetic energy, naturally leads into the investigation of the *infolding* of the vital activities in the individual, or the transformation of kinetic into potential energy in the energizing process of maturing simple plasson into the specialized cell or fertilizing germ. This we call Plasson-history, or the dynamo-involution and plasma-evolution of propagative protoplasm, or, briefly, Plasmogeny.

CORRESPONDENCE.

SCIENCE AND ZOÖPHILY.

To the Editor of *The Open Court* :—

While on a visit to Mrs. Charles Bray, and her, sister Sarah Hennell, at Coventry, England, they called my attention to an anonymous attack on me in the London *Zoöphilist* (Oct. 1), suggestive of a tendency in "Zoöphily" to adopt the fang along with the cause of the animal. Miss Sarah Hennell (author of "Present Religion") and Mrs. Bray (author of "Elements of Morality," "Our Duty to Animals," and other little books that should be in every home and school) knew perfectly well the injustice of the attack, but expressed a doubt whether any reply would be admitted in the paper. Possibly their doubt was well-founded, for although my reply was promptly sent, I find the same article re-hashed in *The Open Court* (Nov. 13), without any reference to my answer.

The word "Zoöphily" is not in my Webster, but it appears to mean the sacrifice of man to animals. Being only a man, I should have been more careful to keep far from the knife of the *Zoöphilist* vivisector. I gave myself away, in my article on "St. Anthony's Day," by wrongly placing the date of the English Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. Graciously, too; for the substance of my contention is that the modern sentiment towards animals came through the discovery of man's physical relationship to them. This discovery long antedates Charles Darwin, who merely found clue to the process by which the development of man took place. Following Buffon, who said "There is but one animal," Erasmus Darwin's "Zoonomia" (1793), Goethe, Lamarck, and Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, proclaimed the unity of organic forms, and caused wide-spread excitement. Thomas Carlyle told me that in his youth there was a mock debate among college students, whether man came from a cabbage or an oyster. The idea was thoroughly popularized, and it was when the scientific eyes of all Europe were bent on the problem afterwards solved by Charles Darwin, that the first Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was founded in 1824. According to Chambers' *Encyclopædia* our American Societies for Prevention of Cruelty were all founded since the publication of Darwin's "Origin of Species," and I was not aware that the English Society was earlier. Probably the English bulls and bears (baited down to 1835), and the dogs that drew London carts till 1839, and domestic animals first protected in 1845, were equally unaware of so long an existence of the Society. I was writing in Rome, far from any English Library of reference, and could only make inquiries of persons I supposed well-informed. And although Edward Berdoe triumphs over my *erratum* in your columns, the article in the *Zoöphilist*—which he either wrote or plagiarises—shows that he did not know the date himself. In answer to my assertion that the said So-

cieties followed Darwin's "Origin of Species," he there replied, "So *post hoc ergo propter hoc!*" In thus arguing that the Society was not "on account of this because after this" the *Zoöphilist* adopted my error, betraying an ignorance prevailing in its own London office beside which mine in a Roman hotel seems rather venial. In fact, these Societies, though so Christian and biblical, according to *Zoöphilie*, are not alluded to in most Encyclopædias—whether religious or secular,—and my censor probably found his dates where I did, in a brief paragraph added to the new edition of Chambers.

With reference to the omission from my essay of a tribute to St. Francis d'Assisi, I can only say that an effort to repair this oversight failed because of my great distance from *The Open Court*. I could not, indeed, load its columns with references to the moderns—like Cowper and Coleridge—who have written tenderly of animals, but I ought to have mentioned the old Saint of Assisi, who used to say "I thank the Lord my God for my little sisters the birds," and similarly fraternised with other innocent creatures around him. I cannot wonder that my pious critic, in his inability to cite a text from the Bible, or an edict from any church, advising compassion, for animals, should be jealous for this voice from Assisi, which alone broke the indifference of a thousand years to the animals—though Pope Innocent III called it the voice of a madman. And, by the way, there is a significant reference to this Saint in Neander's Church History: "That sympathy and feeling of relationship with all nature, by virtue of its common derivation from God as Creator, which seems to bear more nearly the impress of the Hindoo than of the Christian religion [led] him to address not only the brutes, but even inanimate creatures, as brothers and sisters. He had a compassion for brute animals, especially such as are employed in the Sacred Scriptures as symbols of Christ. This bent of fanatical sympathy with nature furnished perhaps a point of entrance for the pantheistic element which in later times found admission with a party among the Franciscans." I find this quotation from Neander in the "Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature," (Harpers, 1870) edited by the eminent Methodist Doctors of Divinity, McClintock and Strong, without any remonstrance against the description of the Saint's "*Zoöphilie*" as "fanatical," and rather Hindoo than Christian.

If our "*Zoöphilists*"—who have had to coin a name for their movement, despite their claim for its Christian character—will carefully study the literature of folklore, they will learn that many of our Fairy Tales, in which animals figure, originated as Hindoo and Buddhist parables showing man's ingratitude to animals that had helped him. For instance, "Puss in Boots," having made a vagabond into a Marquis, was in ancient versions afterwards left to the dunghill. Such tales after their migration into Christendom, generally lost the "morals" that pointed them, through the indifference of the Christian world to animal sufferings. This could not have been so had the Bible taught consideration for animals apart from advantages derived from them by mankind, and whether treading out our grain or not. I do not forget a tender verse in the oriental poem of Job, "Who provideth for the raven his food?" nor related verses of more strictly Hebrew origin which ascribe a certain watchfulness of the deity over creatures he has made. Perhaps this is what my critic means when, after saying that "an examination of the Old Testament with the aid of Cruden's Concordance" will rectify my error, he gives it up and says, "The teaching of *Zoöphilie* is *implicitly* if not *explicitly* in the Bible." But why is it not there explicitly? The demand that Jehovah's altars shall reek with animal blood is explicit enough. The unchecked dominion of man over the animals is explicit. "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth. And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air; with all

wherewith the ground teemeth, into your hand are they delivered. Every moving thing that liveth shall be food for you." What can a biblical *Zoöphilist* say to a vivisectionist who finds in such language "implicit" authority for cutting up animals as food for the scientific mind?

People intelligent enough to read *The Open Court* need not be reminded that personalities are the natural resort of disputants in dilemma. If Edward Berdoe could find texts he would not substitute fictions about myself. There was a person of his name who once attended my ministry in London, and who, I have heard, became a Catholic. If this be my accuser, I cannot think his new faith has benefited either his veracity or his manners. He says of me: "Some years ago I heard him defend the atrocities of vivisection in a lecture at South Place, London, when he demanded the abolition of the English restriction on physiological experiments." This is false witness. In a discourse on "Our poor relations, the Animals," and incidentally in other discourses in London, I uniformly maintained that vivisection for purposes of instruction, or of demonstration should be legally prohibited; and that it should be allowed only under jealous restrictions to specialists of capacity engaged in definite researches. I gave my congregation a careful account of the manufactured models I had seen in France, where the forms of typical species of animals were distributed over a table, and put together again,—every minute part exhibited,—and I insisted that these should alone be used in the education of physicians and surgeons.

I was indeed repelled from the anti-vivisectionists, now called *Zoöphilists*, by the venomous denunciations by some of their leaders of eminent scientific men who did not agree with them. Edward Berdoe's animus towards myself, who never met him but kindly, is a specimen of the spirit with which I could not work. Nor did I join the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty, partly because they never invited aid from so heretical a teacher (who as a foreigner needed invitation), and also because of their snobbish silence concerning the chief cruelties of England,—the aristocratic cruelties of the bearing-rein, fox-hunting, the battue, pigeon-shooting, and the repeated chasing of "Her Majesty's favorite hiud." Against all forms of cruelty and inhumanity I did not fail to bear witness in London, and if Edward Berdoe has indeed become a Catholic, I hope he can say as much of his priests and prelates. In the meantime he may be advised to learn the amenities of controversy, also its equities. He should know, for instance, that it is not fair, in criticising an opponent, to insinuate that he has said what he never said. He satirically puts in inverted commas, as a quotation, "the exploded superstition known as Christianity." Who ever said that, or anything like it? Probably nobody.

It is hard on the animals after ages of dumb suffering, that their cause should fall into the hands of foolish and abusive advocates, but the new moral sentiment concerning them will, I believe, survive even such patronage, based as it is on a scientific conviction of their fellowship in our human pains, and to a large extent in our affections and emotions.

MONCURE D. CONWAY.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE RAG-PICKER OF PARIS. By Félix Pyat. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. Boston: Benj. R. Tucker, 1890.

This story is intended to depict the darkest phases of Parisian society during the period between the Restoration and the Revolution of 1848. That the Communist leader has been successful in writing a powerful romance is undoubted, but the abruptness of its dialogue betrays its original form as a sensational play. That it was written at first as a drama will perhaps also account for the fact that some of its strongest situations are marred for a reader

by their improbability. Victor Hugo wrote to its author that in his play he had "proved the royalty of genius and the divinity of love," but to us it appears absurd, as has been done, to speak of Félix Pyat's romance as a rival of Victor Hugo's "Les Misérables." It is more of the nature of Eugène Sue's "Mysteries of Paris," and although virtue is finally triumphant over vice, virtue is rare and usually weak. The real object of work is to glorify the "Commons"—"each his own soldier, his own king, his own master." This is the apotheosis of anarchy and is not consistent with the social ideas of the New Philosophy. The *real* hero of the romance is the "workman with the hammer," who occasionally appears on the scene, and probably lives to act a great part in the approaching Revolution, while Father Jean the Rag-Picker, the self-denying guardian of Marie, seeks to end at the bottom of the Seine the struggle between his higher nature and his lower instincts. Ω.

ONE LIFE: ONE LAW. By Mrs. Myron Reed. New York: John W. Lovell Company.

This is a very thoughtful production the text of which is: "In order that the Ideal may become the Actual, truth is revealed through consciousness; formulated in philosophy; demonstrated by science. Self-consciousness is the truth in which all other truths are known." Under the heads of the "Law of Natural Selection," the "Struggle for Existence," "Inheritance," "Use and Disuse," and "Surroundings," the authoress gives a sketch of the modern theory of organic development, and applies its laws to the development of the religious life. Ω.

NOTES.

This number contains Mr. Morrison I. Swift's reasons "Why we want a revolution." For the statement of our position, we refer our readers to the editorial article in No. 166, where will also be found a presentation of Mr. William Matthew's views concerning the use and abuse of money. We are working for progress, for enlightenment, for the amelioration of the race by disseminating, to the best of our ability, a deeper insight into the nature of things, but we cannot endorse the views presented by our contributor.

On the 15th of October the Society for Natural and Medical Science, at Amsterdam, celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of its existence. This centennial celebration receives a high significance from the fact that three hundred years ago was discovered in the Netherlands the most important instrument of investigation of modern times, the microscope; in 1590, the spectacle-glass-cutter of Middleburg, Zacharias Jansen, made the first compound microscope. The first naturalists, also, who employed this invaluable instrument of investigation in the observation of invisible nature, were Hollanders: Jan Swammerdam and Leeuwenhoek. When, ten years ago, the two hundredth anniversary of the death of Swammerdam was solemnized, the "Genootschap tot Bevordering van Natur, Genees en Heelkunde te Amsterdam" determined to establish to his enduring memory a gold medal, to be conferred every ten years upon the naturalist who, during this decennial period, had performed the most important work in the domain of microscopical natural research. The first "Swammerdam Medal" was received in 1880 by the Nestor of German zoology, the distinguished microscopist, Karl Theodor v. Siebold, of Munich. The second presentation was made this year to Prof. Ernest Haeckel, of Jena, in recognition of his ten years' investigations into the microscopic life of the deep seas, which he carried on in the years 1877—1887, with the material obtained by the "Challenger." About 4,000 new, and for the greater part quite original, animal species which Haeckel discovered in the wonderfully rich sea-slime brought in by the "Challenger," are described by him in four volumes of the Challenger work and illustrated in 230 plates. Professor

Haeckel had accepted an invitation to the above named Society, and was present at its centenary. After he had taken the gold Swammerdam medal from the hands of the President, he addressed the Society in a speech of thanks, in which, on the one hand, he laid stress upon the intimate connection of German and Netherlandish science and art, and on the other hand, pointed out the reciprocal influence of empirical research and philosophical enquiry, with especial reference to Spinoza, the contemporary of Swammerdam. In the great and animated banquet which followed the centennial ceremonies, three distinguished early pupils of Prof. Haeckel also took part: Prof. Fürbringer, of Jena, who for ten years occupied the chair of anatomy at Amsterdam with most commendable success, and then in 1888 returned to Jena to occupy a like position; his successor to the same Netherlandish instructorship, Prof. Ruge (of Berlin); and Prof. Engelmann, (of Leipsic) professor of physiology at the Utrecht University. Besides the diploma as honorary member of the above named society, Prof. Haeckel received a second diploma from the Royal Netherlandish Zoölogical Society "Natura artis magistra."

The Popular Science Monthly for December contains a translation from the *Revue Scientifique* of a communication recently made by Prof. H. Hertz, to the Heidelberg Congress of German Naturalists and Physicians, on the Identity of Light and Electricity. It is a popular résumé of Prof. Hertz's late electrical experiments and researches, a full exposition of which, as our readers will remember, was given with diagrams of apparatus, etc., in the pages of *The Open Court* over a year ago, from data sent us by Prof. Hertz himself.

THE OPEN COURT.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.

EDWARD C. HEGELER, PRESIDENT.

DR. PAUL CARUS, EDITOR.

TERMS THROUGHOUT THE POSTAL UNION:

\$2.00 PER YEAR.

\$1.00 FOR SIX MONTHS.

AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, AND TASMANIA, \$2.50 PER YEAR.

All communications should be addressed to

THE OPEN COURT,

(Nixon Building, 175 La Salle Street.)

P. O. DRAWER F.

CHICAGO, ILL.

CONTENTS OF NO. 170.

STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS. M. M. TRUMBULL..... 2611

WHY WE WANT A REVOLUTION. In Reply to Dr.

Paul Carus. MORRISON I. SWIFT..... 2612

PLASMOGENY. DANIEL BRIGHT..... 2615

CORRESPONDENCE.

Science and Zoöphily. MONCURE D. CONWAY..... 2616

BOOK REVIEWS.

The Rag-Picker of Paris. FELIX PYAT..... 2617

One Life: One Law. MYRON REED..... 2618

NOTES.

The Presentation of the Swammerdam Medal to Prof.

Ernst Haeckel.