

The Open Court.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Devoted to the Work of Conciliating Religion with Science.

No. 176. (VOL. IV.—46)

CHICAGO, JANUARY '8, 1891.

} Two Dollars per Year.
| Single Copies, 5 Cts.

MR. GRANT ALLEN'S MILLENNIUM.

BY JOHN GARDINER.

It is an indication of progress in the discussion of the "Woman Question," that the problem to be solved is no longer "Will women in the future differ from those of the present?" but rather, "In what respects will they differ?" The former question has been settled in the affirmative after years of dispute, and now the other occupies the field. It might be as well to let things take their course and help or regulate the progress of women just so much as might seem necessary at any given time, but that is not our nature. We must always be peering into the future and trying to find out something of our future destiny, and since the triumph of the theory of evolution, the dim forms and outlines that we can see have something more of definiteness to them than in times past. The biologists, as might be expected, are among the most prominent seers of the future of women, and it is to a vision put forth by one of these, Mr. Grant Allen, who has already written on the subject in the pages of the *Forum*, that I wish to draw attention. His theories are worth examination, both because they come from Mr. Grant Allen, and because of their very extraordinary nature.

In the May issue of the *Universal Review* of London appeared an essay by Mr. Allen on "The Girl of the Future." It is rather surprising, after some of Mr. Allen's utterances, to find that the girl of the future is to be exceedingly well educated. She is to be trained in "gymnastics, music, hygiene, propædantics; in logic, mathematics, chemistry, physics; in astronomy, geology, biology, psychology; in history, sociology, politics, economics; in æsthetics, ethics, and the application of all these to her own functions;" she is to be taught "how to play at games for pure love of them," while her sense of fun and humor is to be simultaneously encouraged. Truly a most excellent and complete curriculum! It would now appear that Mr. Allen's former fulminations were aimed solely at the study of languages and some parts of mathematics, and at the methods of teaching which he supposes to prevail in Girton and Newnham and other girls' colleges. In this article he has some of his characteristic flings at the colleges; girls are "crammed with mathematics like Strasbourg geese with Indian meal"; they are

"stuffed with Sophocles and examined in the rudiments of faith and religion till they are as flat as pancakes and as dry as broomsticks." But could Mr. Allen be induced to visit Smith College, or Wellesley, or Bryn Mawr, or any one of half a dozen Western coeducational State universities; or would he even examine candidly the system and workings of Girton or Newnham, he would find that the girls in these institutions are receiving an education on lines not very different from those of the ideal for which he hopes.

But it is not with the details of this system of education that the article deals; it is with its effect upon the girl of the future. That effect is to be, first, emancipation from the established moral order, and then polyandry. The *Universal Review* is not widely read in this country, so it may be permissible to condense Mr. Allen's argument, though it loses much in the process.

"The question of questions for every modern State is—how are we to be recruited in future with the best possible citizens?" The present system of marriage is not favorable to this end, linking together as it does, good and bad, healthy and diseased, and allowing them to bring any and every kind of children into the world. Monogamy itself works against the end in view. If we have a fine horse or bull, we do not tie him down to one partner throughout life and rest content with the offspring of a single union; we try him freely round a large field of choice, and by mingling his qualities with the qualities of various mares and heifers we produce strains of diverse and well-mixed value. Just so it ought to be with men and women. We waste the good qualities of a great athlete or a great thinker by tying him down irrevocably to a single partner, and similarly with women. Now, when women are educated, they will be emancipated, among other things, from the old moral order. Maternity will become to them a religious act; it will be their sacred duty to bring into the world only the best, soundest, sanest children, and, consequently, they will freely choose who shall be the father of each of their children, and will not tie themselves for life to any one, no matter how worthy he may be.

Mr. W. T. Stead in the *Review of Reviews* characterises this theory as "detestable." The word is too strong, unless one is to regard the present prevailing

system of ethics as fixed and immutable. But the statement with which Mr. Stead begins his article is perfectly correct: "Mr. Allen looks at humanity from the point of view of the stud-groom." Mr. Allen himself would accept the expression, for the whole aim of his essay is to show that the production of men and women ought to be controlled by essentially the same principles that prevail on every well-regulated stock farm. And if men and women were animals in all respects similar to horses and cattle we might accept the principle of polygamy and polyandry without more dispute. But it so happens that they are not.

We may agree to Mr. Allen's statement of the problem which confronts the modern state, and to his estimate of its importance. We may admit that the system of marriage which permits parents to sell their daughters, girls to sell themselves for money or a title to old *roués* or young ones, which permits consumptives and syphilitics and lunatics to hand down their disease to generation after generation, that such a system is not perfectly adapted to the production of good citizens. But for all that we are not bound to accept Mr. Allen's conclusions. Granted that in the breeding of stock polygamy possesses important advantages over monogamy, may not and does not monogamy possess still more important advantages over polygamy in the matter of the production of good men and women.

These advantages, the possession of which has led to the survival and general prevalence of monogamy rather than polygamy or polyandry, are two—Love and the Family. The brute lust of the lower animals and of our ancestors has undergone in the course of ages a wonderful transformation, and to-day most people recognize that love, the love of one man for one woman, of one woman for one man, is the greatest power in the world. Those who know it best often say least about it; the task of telling its glories may be left to the poet, but daily and hourly love more than anything else, helps and strengthens men and women in the weary struggle of life.

And of love Mr. Allen would deprive us, for love would be impossible in his ideal commonwealth, and in return for it he gives us what? An exaggerated altruism which subordinates everything else to the task of providing sound and sane citizens for the State. It is more than doubtful if Mr. Allen has any adequate conception of conjugal love at all. If he has, he thinks it of so little importance that its loss would not matter. He believes that men are in their nature polygamous, and that women would be polyandrous but for the subjection in which they have been kept. A superficial view of humanity is certainly apt to lead to the former conclusion, and at one time or another of their lives it is accepted as certain

by probably the majority of men, but to one who looks below the surface and compares the present with the past, a different state of things is visible. He sees that the tendency to polygamy is but a survival from the times of our brute and savage ancestors, like the useless muscles in our ears, only not so far on the way to disappearance, and that gradually, though slowly, we are outgrowing it. And he sees, further, that even within the diminishing ranks of those who practice polygamy in their youth, many, or even most, sooner or later marry, not for money or economy, or for the purpose of continuing their name in the world, but because they have at length experienced love. Love is not the same thing as lust, Mr. Allen to the contrary notwithstanding; it is impossible without passion, but it is higher than mere passion, and its very existence shows that it, rather than lust, has been selected by nature as the fittest kind of sexual emotion for civilized men.

Mr. Allen cites four instances of emancipated women who "showed themselves supremely contemptuous of man-made or slave-made ethics." They did, but they showed no tendency to polyandry, unless, possibly, in the case of George Sand. Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Godwin, George Eliot, were all true wives, though they disbelieved in the priestly theory of marriage. But the instances of polyandry, on which Mr. Allen, apparently, most relies for support, are the negroes of Jamaica and the factory girls of Lancashire. He states that he has observed in these classes, that when a woman is capable of supporting a family on her own means or earnings, "marriage ceases to be the necessary rule for the sex and the bearing of illegitimate children is no longer an offense against the unwritten moral law of the community." Well, the negroes of Jamaica are among the most degraded in the West Indies, and though there are very many good men and women among Lancashire factory hands, they can hardly be reckoned in general as high examples of the human race; furthermore, they are not the best, but the worst individuals of these two classes of women who practice polyandry. We must protest against Mr. Allen's false logic when he concludes that, because beasts, and because low types of humanity do this and that, therefore much more will the highest types of men and women do the same thing. It would be just as rational to say that because Dr. Lumholtz has found that the black-fellows of Queensland have a taste for human flesh, therefore a plate of roast leg of man ought to be acceptable to the *habitué* of Delmonico's.

Absolutely nothing is said of the manner in which the children are to be reared when Mr. Allen's millennium shall have dawned. Presumably, however, if

the example of the Jamaica negroes and the Lancashire factory girls is to be followed, they are to be brought up by the mothers. But whether this is to be the case, or each father is to provide for his own children, or the State is to act as parent to all its citizens, our present ideal of the family will be entirely destroyed. And with the family will perish the virtues, and they are many, which originate in, or are fostered by family life, and the State will suffer by the loss of them. Fatherless and motherless families are not rare now; there must always be many of them; and it is notorious that the children of such families are very frequently among the worst citizens in the community. So far as we can judge, the abolition of the family would be a sure mark of the degeneracy of the race, a half-way house on the backward road to utter savagery. Our author must have as little belief in the efficiency of family training and the power of family affections as he has in love, to be able to contemplate calmly the possibility of a commonwealth without families.

As Mr. Allen points out, the recent discussions on marriage and divorce have familiarized people's minds with the idea of "free unions," or "free temporary relations." And he mentions two other tendencies which make, as he thinks, in the same direction, the growing movement toward (in Mr. Besant's phrase) the endowment of the daughter, and the tendency, which he regrets, for women to earn their own living and to lead an independent, bachelor life. But do these tendencies in reality make for the state of things which Mr. Allen desires? I doubt it.

Women who can support themselves in decent comfort, whether they be "endowed" by their parents with a sufficient income, or earn their own living, will be spared some of the temptations which most frequently lead to unhappy marriages—for instance, the desire to escape from a home in which the environment is uncongenial, and the desire to escape from surroundings of shabby-gentility or poverty to an atmosphere of moderate or great wealth. That is to say, the temptation to prostitution in the guise of marriage will be removed, and women will marry only for love. Then, again, in the good time coming, women are going to be educated, more or less on the lines which Mr. Allen lays down in his present essay, and their education—the physiology and biology especially—is going to teach them with what kind of men to fall in love, and what men and women have the moral right to become parents. And so there will be comparatively few unhappy marriages.

Mr. Allen laughs, and rightly, at the proposals to establish a system of "eugenics" by means of boards of examiners, and the result at which Sir George Campbell clumsily aims will be reached more effec-

tually, though indirectly, by the education of women. The girl of to-day, though she may sell herself to him, cannot love Mr. Quilp or Mr. Bultitude. The girl of the future will none the more, as a rule, be able to love a man with hereditary disease, a *roué*, a drunkard; one will be as repulsive to her as the other. When men are lovable in spite of weak or diseased frames, then marriages will still take place, but both parties will be aware of the grave responsibility they will incur should they bring children into the world.

The divorce laws of the future will be wide and liberal, but divorce will only be granted when the necessity for it has been clearly and indubitably shown, and it will rarely occur. Men and women will take pains in choosing their partners, and they will choose well and for life, for education will have taught them how to choose. But mistakes must happen occasionally, and then divorce will be sought and granted, for it will be recognized that often it is an act of greater justice to children as well as to parents to let a family be entirely broken up, than to endeavor to hold it together when it is permeated by the spirit of discord.

Mr. Allen has had at least two noteworthy predecessors in his line of thought; Plato and the founders of the Oneida community. He differs essentially from both, for he does not believe in any systematic, state-regulated system of "eugenics." He agrees with both in disbelieving in the power of conjugal love, and in regarding with equanimity the destruction of the family. Plato was excusable, for the Greeks had but little conception of what we understand by the family, and under the circumstances his scheme was an important one. But the Oneida fanatics and Mr. Allen must be bracketed together as entirely inexcusable, and as alike in at least one respect, that they glorify lust at the expense of love.

It may be that I am as much of a millenarian as is Mr. Allen. At the least my millennium is more in accordance with what we know of the past history of man, and of his tendencies for the future.

IN DEFENCE OF CIVILIZATION.

BY F. M. HOLLAND.

"And never a fact to perplex him
or bore him."—*J. R. Lowell.*

WE are informed in No. 166 of *The Open Court*, that there ought to be a revolution, and that "It will be worth while to have our civilization ruined fifty times over." The writer justifies these threats by declaring that "The rich are rich because the poor are poor," that "our false manner of living" is plunging us into ruin, and that the poor and unfortunate have not been "ameliorated." Not the slightest evidence is offered for these startling assertions in an article five columns long; but they are urged upon us as if they were in-

fallible revelations, or self-evident truths. And so we are told in the *Twentieth Century*, for August 21st, that "It is no longer denied that the rich are growing richer and the poor are growing poorer every year ;" and again, that "Within a few years blood will flow in the streets of our cities." "Before long laborers . . . will be ready to fight. Then mob will follow mob, and revolution will finally burst forth from the womb of despair."

Henry George's *Progress and Poverty* promises at the outset to reveal "the cause that associates poverty with progress," and declares, again and again, in pages that have had hundreds of thousands of eager, trusting readers, that "The enormous increase in productive power, which has marked the present century, . . . has no tendency to extirpate poverty, or to lighten the burdens of those who toil." . . . "It simply widens the gulf between Dives and Lazarus." . . . "The tendency of what we call material progress is in no wise to improve the condition of the lowest class in the essentials of human happiness." . . . "Nay more, it is to still further depress the condition of the lowest class." . . . "Material progress, does not merely fail to relieve poverty: it actually produces it." A follower of Henry George, who deserves our deepest respect for the power with which he has told the people how they are plundered by our tariff, has recently inquired in the *New Ideal*: "What is it which associates poverty with progress, and increases want with advancing wealth?" The gifted poet, William Morris, in his pamphlet on "True and False Society," declares that "Our civilization . . . is a failure," that there must be a "rebellion of open revolt . . . organized for a complete change in the basis of society," a necessary revolution," and that he does not "know of any thoughtful person" who believes that people generally are even contented under the present system.

We all know that complaints are very generally made, sometimes in mild and sometimes in sanguinary language, against what is called "cut-throat competition," individual ownership of land, private property of any sort, government, and other institutions which are not likely to be abolished peaceably. The speedy downfall of the second French Republic was brought about by the bloody attack made upon it by armed socialists; and I need only refer to the recent anarchist tragedy in Chicago. In short, we are threatened with bloody insurrection, on account of the failure of our modern society and industrial civilization to diminish poverty and "improve the condition of the lowest class."

Now there is one thing which ought to be said very plainly to all who urge and repeat this dangerous charge against society and civilization, namely "PROVE IT." No one has either a legal or a moral right to

make charges against his neighbors that he cannot prove; and the commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness," is good against all who bring up charges without evidence against society.

Some years ago, a farmer in Illinois, who was unpopular on account of his bad temper, had a violent quarrel with his hired man; and the latter disappeared. The neighbors took it for granted that he had been murdered; and a lynching party was about to avenge him, when it was found out that he was still alive in a city not far off. We all see that there ought to be some evidence of guilt before sentencing a single individual to death; and is there no need of evidence before condemning all society to be punished by insurrections, which may cost hundreds of innocent lives? The burden of proof rests upon the prophets of revolution. They are bound to prove the justice of their charges against society and civilization.

I do not doubt that these charges are made sincerely; but I see no reason to believe that those who make them have taken proper pains to find out their truth. No one denies that the poor suffer pitifully; and no one denies that our farms are infested with weeds; but this does not prove that our system of agriculture is making weeds more numerous and pernicious than ever before. So the mere fact that poverty still exists, does not justify the charge that it is increased, or in any way made more painful, by our present system of labor and government. To say that the poor are growing poorer, that the condition of the lowest class is becoming constantly more depressed, and that want increases with advancing wealth, is to volunteer statements which ought to be supported by a great array of historical and statistical facts. But I have yet to learn that any adequate attempt has ever been made to present any facts of the sort on this side.

Henry George does say: "As the result of much investigation, Hallam says he is convinced that the wages of manual labor were greater in amount in England during the middle ages than they are now." Strictly speaking, Hallam is not a very good authority as to the state of things "now"; for he died in January, 1859, at least twenty years before *Progress and Poverty* was published. Precisely when and where Hallam did make this statement was not mentioned by Mr. George. So far as I can find out it was in his book on the Middle Ages, which was published more than seventy years ago. What should we think of a man who should publish a book this winter, declaring republicanism a failure, but giving no better evidence than the assertion, "France is still contented under the despotism of Charles X?" The improvement in French politics, since the days of Bourbon supremacy, is not so great as that which took place in the condition of the working classes in England, between the

time when Hallam said what he did and the time when Henry George quoted it as still true.

My last statement is supported by many facts. Hallam wrote during a period of low wages and artificially high prices, which lasted throughout the century until the abolition of protection in 1846. Official returns, given in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," "Whitaker's Almanack," and Lecky's "History of England," show that the proportion of pauperism to population was nearly twice as great in 1846 as in 1876, and more than four times as great in 1803 as in 1888, in England. The actual number of vagrants, now arrested in London annually, is no greater than it was sixty years ago; but the population of England has doubled. Wages, meantime, have increased fifty per cent. for each workman on the average, while prices have fallen another fifty, showing that the laborer is more than twice as well off.

Another set of statistics show that the annual import of tea and sugar in Great Britain, in proportion to the number of inhabitants, trebled between 1840 and 1880, while that of cheese wheat and flour, became five times as great, that of butter seven times, and that of bacon and ham more than a hundred and fifty times. Some allowance may be made in the last case for decrease in domestic production; but there is no such difficulty in the case of tea and sugar, and very little in that of cheese and butter. England is much better supplied than she was fifty years ago with bread, butter, cheese, ham, eggs, tea, sugar, and other common articles of food. The rich man does not eat more of them than before, but less; for he has a greater variety before him. The increase in importation is due to the great increase of consumption among the poor, who now use as daily necessities of life what formerly were almost unattainable luxuries.

Then again the great improvement which has been made in draining, paving, lighting, and cleaning the streets in all civilized lands, has plainly been of most benefit to the lowest class; and these latter have gained much more than the rich from the multiplication and amelioration of hospitals and asylums of every sort. Even the poorest are now able to get such medical attendance as could formerly be obtained only by the rich. What has been said of the improvement in the condition of the poor during the present century, may be made plainer by referring to the times when only princes could have glass windows and tumblers, white bread, stoves and chimneys, lamps and candles, carpets, cotton clothing and bedding, books, clocks, or newspapers. It would be very difficult to make out a list of inventions and discoveries which have not benefited the poor even more than the wealthy. The fact is that all the members of society are bound so

closely together, that it is impossible to increase the comfort of any class without in some measure increasing that of all the rest. Even the slave was benefited by the prosperity and injured by the adversity of his master; and it ought always to be remembered that there are no slaves any longer in civilized lands. No one tries to prevent any class from getting the full benefit of every increase in the general prosperity. On the contrary, great efforts are being made to assist those who enjoy the smallest amount of happiness to increase it; and it cannot be that these efforts are altogether in vain. The plain fact that a large part of our people is constantly improving its condition, proves that we are all advancing continually.

Enough has, I hope, been said to show how little there is of self-evident truth in such assertions as that the poor are growing poorer in the essentials of human happiness, that industrial progress increases and intensifies poverty, and that modern civilization is a failure. Those who make complaints of this nature are pretext for threats of bloody revolution may fairly be challenged to prove that such an insurrection would be any more justifiable and beneficent than the revolts of our Indians against the government which has fed, clothed, and armed them, or the ambuscade of Italian mountaineers to shoot the physician who has come to cure their wives and children of cholera, but who is accused of having introduced the disease by witchcraft.

THE EXPERIMENTAL METHOD APPLIED TO PERSONALITY.*

BY TH. RIBOT.

In order to lay hold of the real concrete personality, and not a mere abstraction that takes its place, it is not necessary to withdraw within our consciousness, with closed eyes, and obstinately to question it; on the contrary, we need to keep our eyes wide open, and observe. The child, the peasant, the workingman, the millions of people that walk in the streets and in the fields, who never in their lives have heard anything about Fichte, about Maine de Biran, who never have read dissertations upon the ego and the non-ego, or even a line of psychology—one and all of them have their definite personality and each instant affirm it instinctively. Ever since that long-forgotten epoch when their ego was constituted, that is, since their ego was formed as a coherent group in the midst of the processes assailing it,—this group maintains itself constantly while continually modifying itself. This coherent group is composed for the greater part of states and acts, almost automatic, that constitute in each the feeling of his body

* Translated from the French (*Diseases of Personality* Chap. II. 1.) b 270.

and the routine of life, and that serve as a support for all the rest, yet any alteration of which, even a short and partial one, is immediately felt. In a great measure also it is composed of an aggregate of sensations, images, and ideas representing the usual surroundings amidst which we live and move, together with the recollections that are connected with them. All this represents organised states solidly connected among themselves, reciprocally supporting each other, and forming a bodily whole. We verify now the fact, without seeking the cause of it. All that is new or unusual, any change in the state of the body or of its surroundings, is adopted without hesitation and classed by an instinctive act, either as making a part of the personality or as being strange to it. This operation is performed every moment, not through any clear and explicit judgment, but through an unconscious and far deeper logic. If we have to characterize by a definite word this natural, spontaneous and real form of personality, I should call it a *habit*, for it cannot be anything else, being, as we maintain, only the expression of an organism. If the reader instead of observing himself will rather proceed objectively, that is, observe and interpret by the aid of the data of his own consciousness the condition of those who have never reflected on their personality, (and this is the vast majority of the human species,) he will find that the preceding thesis is correct, and that real personality affirms itself not by reflection but by acts.

Let us now examine what is called factitious or artificial personality. When the psychologist through internal observation tries, as it were, to comprehend himself, he attempts an impossibility. At the moment he assumes the task in question, either he will adhere to the present, and then hardly advances at all; or in extending his reflection toward the past, he affirms himself to be the same as he was one year or ten years ago; in either case he only expresses in a more learned and laborious manner what any peasant knows as well as he does. Through inward observation he can only apprehend passing phenomena; and I am not aware that any reply has been given to the following just remarks of Hume: "For my part, when I enter most intimately into what I call *myself*, I always stumble on some particular perception* or other of heat or cold, light or shade, love or hatred, pain or pleasure. I never can catch myself at any time without a perception, and never can observe anything but the perception. If anyone, upon serious and unprejudiced reflection, thinks he has a different notion of himself, I must confess I can reason no longer with him. All I can allow him is, that he may be in the right as well as I, and that we

are essentially different in this particular. He may, perhaps, perceive something simple and continued, which he calls himself, though I am certain there is no such principle in me."* Since Hume, it has been said: "Through effort and resistance we feel ourselves cause." This is very well; and all schools more or less agree, that through this the ego is distinguished from the non-ego; but this feeling of effort none the less remains a simple state of consciousness like others, the feeling of muscular energy displayed in order to produce any given act.

To seek through analysis to comprehend a synthetic whole like the personality, or through an intuition of consciousness that scarcely lasts a few seconds, to encompass such a complex thing as the ego, is to attempt a problem, the data of which are contradictory. So, as a fact, psychologists have taken another ground. They have considered the states of consciousness as accessories, and the bond which unites them as the essential element, and it is this mysterious *underlying something* that under the names of unity, identity, and continuity, has become the true ego. It is clear, however, that we have nothing here but an abstraction, or more precisely, a scheme. For the real personality there is substituted *the idea of personality*, which is altogether another thing. This idea of personality is, like all general terms, formed in the same manner as sensibility, will, etc.; but it does not resemble the real personality more than the plan of a city resembles the city itself. And as in cases of aberration of personality, which have led us to the present remarks, one single idea has been substituted for a plexus, constituting an imaginary and a diminished personality; in the same manner a fixed scheme of personality has been substituted by psychologists for concrete personality, and upon this framework, almost devoid of contents, they reason, induce, deduce, and dogmatize. It is clear, however, that this comparison is only done by way of *mutatis mutandis* and with many restrictions, which the reader himself will discover. There are still many other observations that could be made, but I am not engaged here on a strictly critical work.

In short, to reflect upon our ego, is to assume an artificial position, which changes the nature of the ego; it is merely to substitute an abstract representation for a reality. The true *ego* is the one that feels, thinks, acts, without making of itself an object of vision, for it is a subject by nature and by definition, and in order to become an object, it has to undergo a reduction, a kind of adaptation to the optics of the mind which transform and mutilate it.

[TO BE CONCLUDED.]

* In Hume's language, "perception" corresponds almost to what we now call state of consciousness.

* Philosophical Works. Vol. I., p. 312.

CORRESPONDENCE.

POSITIVE IDEALISM.

To the Editor of *The Open Court* :—

I HAVE read with interest Mr. W. J. Gill's letter, in *The Open Court* for 28th November, regarding my article "Positive Idealism," in No. 161. I reply with much pleasure.

I am not quite certain that I rightly understand Mr. Gill. His own philosophical position does not clearly appear on the surface of his letter. Surely he does not imagine that my article—"Positive Idealism"—was written from the editorial standpoint of *The Open Court*, or that I endeavor to reconcile "Psychological" Idealism with Dr. Carus's views? My paper was wholly an independent one in the interests of *Hylo- or Positive- (not Psychological) Idealism*, as excogitated by my friend Dr. Lewins. Merely "Psychological" Idealism could never be that either of Dr. Lewins or of myself, if for this reason alone that "all *psychological idealisms*"—to use Mr. Gill's own words—"make the known and "knowable world of sense purely subjective, an evolution from "and in the subject, *though this evolution is supposed to be aided by "an inconceivable something from beyond this known sense world."* The words which I italicise reveal a Fichtean leaning, with which *Hylo- or Positive-Idealism* has nothing to do. As to *Positive-Idealism* then, I shall be very happy to give any further explanation which Mr. Gill may desire, but as a (purely) *Psychological Idealist* I have none to offer, for the simple reason that I do not belong to that persuasion. My Idealism is as much *Physiological as Psychological*, because it is "positive," takes account of things as they are and not only as they seem to be—the "thing" of empirical science resolving into the "think" of metemprirics and *vice versa*.

I can however guess at Mr. Gill's dilemma. He is surprised at the logical result of the projection of the subjective as to include the objective. He finds that it lands in the all inclusive declaration "*l'univers c'est moi!*" Unquestionably *Positive Idealism*,—*Solipsism*—comes to this in the end. Half-hearted, halting, *psychological, Idealisms*—such as those of the late Prof. J. H. Green of Oxford, and the rest of the Neo-Kantians, try to shun this result. They do everything they can to evade the supreme logical conclusion (without which there can be *no Monism*) "I am the All" by substituting, on Green's part, an "Eternal or Infinite Consciousness" and, on M. Renouvier's part, foreign centres of representation—the combined judgments of other Egos—in which, we are told, the true external world resides. In passing I may perhaps observe that, to my mind, the ultimate philosophical position of *The Open Court* Monism lies as close to that of M. Renouvier as to any other. Much nearer, I think than to that of *Hylo-Idealism*. And I am confirmed in this opinion by Dr. Carus's editorial note to Mr. Gill's letter in which he seems to regard *Objectivity and Subjectivity* as vital and yet, somehow as not vital—"The "difficulty," he says, "is to draw a line of demarcation between "subjectivity and objectivity" and yet he admits, a few lines lower down that "he is aware of the fact that neither subjectivity "nor objectivity exist by themselves." Now where subject and object exist *at all* there can be *no Monism*.

The chief interest of Neo-Kantian speculation, from a *Hylo-Ideal* standpoint, lies in the prominence assigned to *Relation*. This *Relation* has met with the keenest criticism mainly from the surviving *Scottish Realists*. Professor Veitch, of Glasgow University, in reviewing Prof. J. H. Green's works, scouts the idea that *Relation* can ever be anything of itself,—regards it as a thing that can only exist where there are at least *two terms*. But really the highest flood mark reached by the Neo-Kantians is just this, their affirmation that the *Relation* is everything—the *Term* nothing. So-called terms, the all in all of the objectivist, turn out to be but

counters, points with position, but without magnitude. I find in the diagrammatic representation of color allied to in a recent issue of *The Open Court* an inkling of this *Supremacy of Relation*.

With the kind permission of the Editor I trust in a future article more fully to dwell upon the question of *Relation* as All and Everything. The limits of this letter forbid me to add more, and I am also under medical interdict for a few weeks as to literary work.

Cordially yours,

GEORGE M. MCCRIE.

BOOK REVIEWS.

A LOOK UPWARD. By *Susie C. Clark*. Boston: Lee & Shepard; New York: Charles T. Dillingham; Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 1891.

Here we have proclaimed the "gospel of health, of harmony, and perfect wholeness," which fitly begins with a discourse on the "Glad Tidings," and ends with "Emancipation." Its teaching is the power of mind, or as the votaries of "Spiritual Science" prefer to call it spirit, to "heal" the body. This doctrine, not being physical, is called metaphysical (healing), and they who attain to the power spoken of are called "healers." "Healing," says the authoress, "consists in the discovery that there is nothing to heal, that we are always well in spirit, in reality." Ω.

A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF THE PRINCIPLES OF THE NEW DISPENSATION. By *Joy Kissen Sen*, M. A.

THE NEW BRAHMIC REVELATION.

THE UPANISHAT-SAR; OR, ESSENCE OF THE UPANISHATS. Calcutta, Bidhan Press, 1882.

The New Dispensation is the outcome of the Brahma Somaj, or "worshipping assembly," founded by Debendra Nath Tagore to carry into effect the religious reform originated by Rajah Ram Mohun Roy towards the beginning of this century. It is interesting as showing the effect produced by Christianity over the minds of the most intellectual Hindus. Its fundamental teaching is the universality of the presence of the Divine Spirit, of which it claims to be pre-eminently the Dispensation and which becomes incarnate not merely in every great religious reformer but, to some extent, in every man who lives in accordance with its dictates. If the members of the New Dispensation remain true to themselves and to their principles there is probably a great future in store for their society, which is as much the result of a social as of a religious movement. It may be remembered that the original Upanishads had great influence over Schopenhauer.

A GUIDE TO THE LITERATURE OF ÆSTHETICS. By *Charles Miles Gayley* and *Fred. Newton Scott*, Ph. D. University of California. Library Bulletin, Berkeley, 1890.

The authors apologise for the incompleteness of the present *Guide*, which forms a Supplement to the Report of the Secretary of the Board of Regents, University of California, on the ground that it is mainly a list of the books in two libraries. Most of the works cited, however, have been found useful by the College classes of one or other of the compilers; and to add to the value of the compilation the most important subject matter has been indicated by definite references to volume and page. We learn from the Preface that this is only the first of a series of bibliographies designed to cover a considerable portion of the field of aesthetic inquiry, and that in the succeeding handbooks, "special topics of aesthetic criticism" will be minutely analyzed, and references bearing upon them, collected from available sources will be added. A bibliography dealing with *Literary Criticism* has already been prepared for press. Ω.

THE MONIST.

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE.

OF

PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, RELIGION, AND SOCIOLOGY.

CONTENTS OF NO. 2 (JANUARY, 1890) :

THE ARCHITECTURE OF THEORIES. CHARLES S. PEIRCE.
ILLUSTRATIVE STUDIES IN CRIMINAL ANTHROPOLOGY.

1. "LA BÊTE HUMAINE" AND CRIMINAL ANTHROPOLOGY.

2. PSYCHIATRY AND CRIMINAL ANTHROPOLOGY.

a. SECRETIONS OF CRIMINALS.

b. POWER OF SMELL.

c. TASTE.

d. WALK.

e. GESTURES.

f. MORPHOLOGICAL ANOMALIES—SKELETON, SKULL, WRINKLES.

g. TATTOOING.

PROF. CESARE LOMBROSO.

THE SQUARING OF THE CIRCLE. The History of the Problem from the
Most Ancient Times to the Present Day. HERMANN SCHUBERT.

THE CRITERION OF TRUTH. A Dissertation on the Method of Verification.
EDITOR.

FIVE SOULS WITH BUT A SINGLE THOUGHT. An Essay on the Psychology of the Star-Fish.
CARUS STERNE.

GERMAN PHILOSOPHY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.
PROF. FRIEDRICH JODL.

RECENT FRENCH PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS. LUCIEN ARRÉAT.
BOOK REVIEWS.

SUMMARY OF THE CONTENTS OF THE LEADING PHILOSOPHICAL PERIODICALS OF AMERICA AND EUROPE.

SINGLE NUMBERS, FIFTY CENTS.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION: \$2.00 a year, postpaid, to any part of the United States, Canada, and Mexico; to foreign countries in the Postal Union, \$2.25; single numbers, 60 cents; postpaid to New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Tasmania, \$2.50 a year.

The *Monist* was founded to continue a portion of the work done by *The Open Court*. The latter magazine is now published in eight quarto pages; it will be made more popular than it was before, and will be relieved of the more abstract and specifically scientific productions, which will find a fitter place for publication in the new Quarterly.

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY,

169-175 LA SALLE STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

LONDON: Messrs. Watts & Co.,

17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, E. C.

JUST PUBLISHED!

THE LOST MANUSCRIPT.

A NOVEL

BY GUSTAV FREYTAG.

In two handsomely bound and printed volumes. Authorised translation.

PRICE, \$4.00.

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY,

169-175 La Salle Street, Chicago, Illinois.

REFORMS ABOUT WHICH GOOD MEN MIGHT AGREE.

BY WM. M. SALTER.

A 23-paged tract. Price, 5 cents each; \$1.50 per hundred. For Sale at the Office of *The Open Court*.

Publications of THE OPEN COURT Pub. Co.,

THREE LECTURES ON THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE.

By PROF. F. MAX MUELLER.

With a Supplement "MY PREDECESSORS." Cloth, 75 Cents.

EPITOMES OF THREE SCIENCES.

1. COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY. By PROF. H. OLDENBERG.

2. COMPARATIVE PSYCHOLOGY. By PROF. J. JASTROW.

3. OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY. By PROF. C. H. CORNILL. Cloth, 75 Cents.

THE ETHICAL PROBLEM. By DR. PAUL CARUS.

Three Lectures Delivered at the Invitation of the Board of Trustees before the Society for Ethical Culture of Chicago, in June, 1890. Cloth, 50 Cents.

WHEELBARROW. ARTICLES AND DISCUSSIONS ON THE LABOR QUESTION.

Including the Controversy with Mr. Lyman J. Gage on the Ethics of the Board of Trade; and also the Controversy with Mr. Hugh O. Pentecost, and others, on the Single Tax Question. Cloth, \$1.00.

FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS. By DR. PAUL CARUS. (London Publishers: Longmans, Green, & Co.)

The Method of Philosophy as a Systematic Arrangement of Knowledge. Cloth, \$1.00.

THREE INTRODUCTORY LECTURES ON THE SCIENCE OF THOUGHT. By F. MAX MUELLER. (London Publishers: Longmans, Green, & Co.)

1. The Simplicity of Language; 2. The Identity of Language and Thought; and 3. The Simplicity of Thought. Cloth, 75 Cents.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ATTENTION. By TH. RIBOT. (London Publishers: Longmans, Green, & Co.)

Authorised translation. Cloth, 75 Cents.

THE PSYCHIC LIFE OF MICRO-ORGANISMS. By ALFRED BINET. (London Publishers: Longmans, Green, & Co.)

Authorised translation. Cloth, 75 Cents.

THE IDEA OF GOD. By DR. PAUL CARUS.

Being a disquisition upon the development of the idea of God in human thought and history. Price, 15 Cents.

ON DOUBLE CONSCIOUSNESS. By ALFRED BINET.

Illustrated experimental studies in the new psychological theory of double personality. Price, 50 Cents.

THE OPEN COURT.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.

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. 176.

MR. GRANT ALLEN'S MILLENNIUM. JOHN GARDINER..... 2659

IN DEFENCE OF CIVILIZATION. F. M. HOLLAND.. 2661

THE EXPERIMENTAL METHOD APPLIED TO PERSONALITY. TH. RIBOT..... 2663

CORRESPONDENCE.

Positive Idealism. GEORGE M. MCCRIE..... 2665

BOOK REVIEWS..... 2665