

The Open Court.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Devoted to the Work of Conciliating Religion with Science.

No. 192. (VOL. V.—10.)

CHICAGO, APRIL 30 1891.

Two Dollars per Year.
Single Copies, 5 Cts.

EMERSON FIFTY YEARS AGO.

BY F. M. HOLLAND.

On the last day of February, 1841, Emerson wrote thus to Carlyle, about what Matthew Arnold thought "the most important work done in prose during the present century": "In a fortnight or three weeks more, my little raft will be afloat. Expect nothing more of my powers of construction—no shipbuilding, no clipper, smack, nor skiff even, only boards and logs tied together." He meant the first volume of *Essays*, containing those on "Self-Reliance," "Compensation," and "The Over-Soul." His little book entitled "Nature" had appeared in September, 1836; most of the Addresses and Lectures, which were collected in 1849, into a volume of *Miscellanies*, had been delivered and published separately before 1842; his "Problem" had just been printed in the *Dial*; and he had done a large part of his best work in both prose and verse, for some of the earliest pieces written were among the last to be given to the world. Thus he stood fifty years ago, at his full height of thought.

He was already widely known for the work of which he speaks thus in the *Essays*, "I unsettle all things. No facts are to me sacred; none are profane; I simply experiment, an endless seeker, with no Past at my back." On the first page of *Nature* stand these words: "Our age is retrospective. . . . Let us demand our own works and laws and worship." In one of his earliest lectures, he said, "Every church, even the purest, speedily becomes old and dead. . . . Only a new church is alive." His address in Divinity Hall and his essay on "Self-Reliance" protested against a religion of traditional beliefs and rites; exaggeration of the merits of ancient personages, and conformity to "usages that have become dead." It was because this seemed to be the case with the communion service, that he had himself left the pulpit; and he said in his great book, "As men's prayers are a disease of the will, so are their creeds a disease of the intellect." All his reverence for Jesus did not prevent his insisting that "The soul needs no persons," and that religious truth "cannot be received at second hand." Such sayings seem to be harmless truisms now, but they were terrible innovations fifty years ago. Even Unitarians were furious against the heretic; but

he went on his way serenely, until the Church caught up with him. No opposition prevented his insisting that not only religious but political institutions were too often held sacred merely because they had come down from the past; and he did a timely service to art and literature by declaring that their culture in America was too timid and too submissive to classic and European models. We may date the birth of a really American literature from the time when Emerson said that it must be the daughter of liberty.

His best work, I think, was in making the old intolerant form of religion, which hated new ideas, forbade amusements, resisted philanthropy, and neglected moral duty, give place to one full of good works, friendly to reform, helpful to social pleasure, and hospitable towards new truth. Our popular religion has become philanthropic instead of intolerant, because it has caught new inspiration from Emerson, Parker, and other prophets of the Inner Light.

It was because he was a prophet that Emerson was an iconoclast. He denied in order to affirm. To know what he affirmed, we have only to read *Nature*, the address at Divinity Hall, or the essay on "The Over-Soul." These and other pages written at least fifty years ago are bright and beautiful with words which no one else could write. "The need was never greater of new revelation than now." "Religion is yet to be settled on its fast foundations in the breast of man." "Here is the fountain of action and thought." "From within or from behind, a light shines through us upon things, and makes us aware that we are nothing, but the light is all." "O, my brothers, God exists! There is a soul at the centre of nature, and over the will of every man; so that none of us can wrong the universe." "The league between virtue and nature engages all things to assume a hostile front to vice." "All things are moral. . . . Therefore is nature glorious with form, color, and motion, that every globe in the remote heavens; . . . every change of vegetation, from the first principle of growth in the eye of a leaf, to the tropical forest and antediluvian coal mine; every animal function from the sponge up to Hercules, shall hint or thunder to man the laws of right and wrong, and echo the ten commandments." "The world is nothing, the man is all: in yourself is the law of all nature." "In self-trust all the virtues

are comprehended." "Every man . . . knows that to his involuntary perceptions a perfect faith is due." (The passages abridged are from *Miscellanies*, p. 38, and *Essays I*, p. 57.)

These principles have transmuted religion, and made her pure and precious as she never was before. They have given us an original literature, full of life and strength, and taught our colleges the duty of encouraging independent thought. At the darkest time in all our national history, when the authority of the Constitution and the Supreme Court, of both political parties, of all the great sects, and of the Bible itself, was appealed to in defence of slavery, then Emerson brought deliverance by announcing the superior authority of the Higher Law. It was the philanthropy of Transcendentalism, not that of Science nor of the Church, which freed the slaves. The Suffragists, too, have relied mainly upon intuitional conceptions of natural rights. Neither of these reforms was much aided by Emerson until after 1841, but even then, he made a suggestion which has not yet been adopted as completely as it should be in our schools. In his lecture on "Man the Reformer," he urges "the claims of manual labor as a part of the education of every young man," and adds "We must have a basis for our higher accomplishments, our delicate entertainments of poetry and philosophy; in the work of our hands"; "not only health but education is in the work"; "Manual labor is the study of the external world."

Emerson's life was as beautiful as his thought; no one else was so highly honored in the village where he dwelt; and my own reverence has made me slow to criticise. But we must remember that Theodore Parker, while preaching essentially the same philosophy as his friend, and declaring that there were "None who work so powerfully to fashion the character of the coming age," admitted the "actual and obvious contradictions in his works," which, he added, "do not betray any exact scholarship." "We sincerely lament," said Parker in the *Massachusetts Quarterly Review*, "the want of logic in his method, and his exaggeration of the intuitive powers." "Some of his followers . . . will be more faithful than he to the false principle which he lays down and will think themselves wise because they do not study, . . . and inspired because they say what outrages common sense." The brief popularity of Fourierism was greatly aided by Emerson's saying, in the famous *Essays* of 1841, "No man need be perplexed in his speculations. Let him do and say what strictly belongs to him, . . . though very ignorant of books." "Trust the instinct to the end, though you can render no reason. . . . It shall ripen into truth." "We know truth when we see it." His highest authority was what he called the Reason, a purely intuitive power which, as he admitted,

"never reasons, never proves." Parker complains that he "discourages hard and continuous thought." He opened the door for abolitionism, but it has also let in socialism, anarchism, spiritualism, mind healing and free coinage. Brownson stated, soon after his renunciation of Transcendentalism in 1844, that some English adherents of that philosophy were trying to introduce the practice of free love, and that, sternly as Emerson and his friends denounced such a perversion of their system, "They cannot avoid this conclusion." He appeals to such passages as "The only right is what is after my own constitution; the only wrong what is against it." "Our moral nature is vitiated by any interference of our will." "Our spontaneous action is always the best." "If the single man plant himself indomitably on his instincts and there abide, the huge world will come round to him."

We need not say with Brownson, that free love is "Transcendentalism in full bloom," or that it is the legitimate conclusion from Emerson's philosophy; for that is so wide and vague as to make no practical conclusion more legitimate than any other. Emerson was neither more nor less consistent, when he came out plainly as an abolitionist in 1844, than when he yielded so far to his introspective tendencies as to declare in 1841, "If I am just, then there is no slavery, let the laws say what they will." "Give the slave the least elevation of religious sentiment, and he is no slave." Zeal for reform could scarcely be expected of an optimist who thought

"That night or day, that love or crime,
Leads all souls to the Good";

but philanthropy finally took the lead in his philosophy. Such were the fruits of the reaction from being guided badly by old Mother Church, into trying to dispense with all guidance or restraint, except that furnished from within. Fifty years more have shown, not only that men still need guidance, but also that the true guide to duty is Science. Her value is much plainer now than when he first wrote; and if her method is sufficient, his is outgrown. The spring in which he died was unusually backward; and his favorite flower delayed so long to bloom as to call forth these lines:

Why did the Rhodora blossom so late,
And the Spring keep back her flowers?
Did the May-day know of her poet's fate,
And was Nature's grief like ours?
He came in a time of gloom and need,
As a prophet of joyful May;
And he bade New England's wintry creed
To a sunnier faith give way.
His words were a flood of life and light
Which has burst that icy chain,
And awaked a glory of blossoms bright
With a promise of golden grain.
The summer of thought draws near,
Bringing truth hitherto unknown;
But the herald of spring is dear;
And the might of his work we own.

CHILDREN AS TEACHERS.

BY E. A. KIRKPATRICK.

From olden times, it has been thought that adults should be the teachers and children simply learners, but in this Nineteenth Century of civilisation, the greatest find that they can learn from the little ones. The best educators are those who have learned most from little children and the most successful primary teachers are those who can see and feel things as children see and feel them. Authors of literature and text-books for children must now know child nature or fail. Scientific philologists are beginning to recognise the fact that children just learning to talk can teach them more about how languages are formed than can be learned by years of patient study of dead and living languages. Even the philosopher and psychologist are turning to the child for the solution of some of the problems that have so long baffled them, and the practical moralist turns from theories to learn of children how moral ideas are formed and moral action called forth. While Carus Sterne has shown that they exercise a direct influence on their parents.

The development of the race is epitomised in the development of the child, and the observer may read it in the unfolding psychical activity of the innocent child with more pleasure and profit than in the learned histories of civilisation.

Tiederman, Darwin, Taine, Alcott, Romanes, and other learned men have studied their own children scientifically, and taken notes on their development, while Perez, Kussmaul, and others have made observations on a number of children. Humphreys, Holden, and Noble have collected and examined the vocabularies of several children two years old, in order to discover the general laws of speech. Emily Talbot has collected observations of mothers on young babes. The most thorough and accurate study has, however, been made by Preyer, who carefully observed and experimented upon his boy during the first three years of his life, noting down each day everything calculated to throw light upon the capacity of children and the order of the development of their powers. Much light has been thrown on many subjects by these investigations, but a sufficient number of carefully verified facts has not yet been collected to enable us with certainty to distinguish characteristics common to all from individual peculiarities. It has been made evident that not only must there be persevering exactness in observing and recording the facts, but that many of them can be accurately observed and correctly interpreted only by one versed in physiology and psychology.

Considerable interest has been aroused and many plans proposed designed to increase scientific knowl-

edge on the subject, to bring parents into new and pleasanter relations with each other and to preserve records of interest and value to the family. Probably no more acceptable or more valuable present could be given a child who has just attained his majority than a little book containing a record of his life from babyhood. The data contained in such a record would make it possible for him to obey the maxim, "Know thyself," and to guide himself by that knowledge, while the little incidents of childish life that give so much pleasure when remembered and related by the parents would be preserved and enjoyed by himself and his descendants.

It will probably be years before the observations of many scientists on children can be collected, but, in the meantime, a father, mother, or older sister of ordinary intelligence can by exercising patience and care observe and record certain facts of child development that will be as important and reliable as those furnished by the most learned scientist. These observations, also, are those made at the most interesting age of the child's life,—the period of the development of speech. With a little care the mother can easily record the development of language in her cunning little prattler,—an evolution as remarkable and full of interest as that traced by the philologist in the languages of the various races in different ages, and throwing as much light on the origin of speech in man and the laws of its development.

The one who will carefully make out a list of all the words now used by a child, and then carefully note down new words as they are learned, will secure facts of prime importance in the further development of psychology and pedagogy. The more scientific student may be enabled to suggest still more fruitful lines and valuable methods of investigation in infant psychology.

There are two principal things to notice in such a study. (1) the development of the power of articulating and (2) the development of the intellect; hence it is necessary to keep two lists of words, one containing all words articulated by the child with indications as to how they are pronounced, and the other all words used understandingly, those used only in direct imitation, only at sight of pictures in a book, or only from memory, as in nursery rhymes, being omitted from this list. The first list would indicate the common difficulties encountered in learning to articulate, and an examination of a sufficient number would make it possible to determine whether there really are any general laws of mispronunciation such as have been proposed. The second list would indicate the intellectual progress of the child as it learns new words and learns to use old ones with increasing accuracy and to put them together into phrases and sen-

tences. Words that are invented by the child and those used in a sense different from the ordinary meaning are especially interesting and throw considerable light on the subject of how children classify and generalise. A child who saw and heard a duck on the water called it "quack," and this word being thus associated with the bird, and with the liquid upon which it rested, he therefore called all birds and all liquids "quack," and later seeing the eagle on a coin he called that and other coins "quack." The observing mother will note many similar peculiar yet natural uses of words by her little one who is getting acquainted with this complex world of ours and learning the strange language of its inhabitants.

After the child's present vocabulary has been obtained as accurately as possible, its further progress can easily be recorded by noting down, in alphabetical order, the words learned in each succeeding month. On the backs of the sheets containing the vocabulary for each month may be given the peculiar meanings attached to words, the earlier attempts at putting words together, the later sentences of interest, especially those showing the characteristic grammatical errors, and any other items of interest. Such lists of words kept from the time a child begins to talk until he is three years of age could not fail to give interesting and more or less important results, and a comparison of a number of vocabularies of children under three years of age, such as could be obtained by a few months of observation, would have a similar value. How much do the vocabularies of children in cities differ from those in the country or in villages? What is the effect on the vocabulary of associating with other children of nearly the same age? What difference does ease or difficulty of pronunciation have upon the adoption of words into the vocabulary, and what is the effect of special teaching by parents? These are a few of the many interesting questions that might be answered by such vocabularies, accompanied by the necessary information. Notwithstanding these various influences, many of the same words would probably be found in all of the vocabularies. I found 64 words used in common by four little girls two years of age. Besides the facts suggested above, the age and sex of the child, and the nationality of the parents should be sent with the record.

It is to be hoped that such observations by parents of children who are just learning to talk will soon become common. If those who have begun or will begin such observations will send me the record for several months, with any comments or suggestions they see fit, I shall be pleased to compare the records and make the results public.

Those who intelligently and sympathetically study

the intellectual and emotional development of the child from day to day will find it more interesting than any continued story, and will gain more knowledge of human nature than by reading the most vivid character delineations.

Worcester, Mass.

OUR FUTURE POLITY.

BY T. B. WAKEMAN.

THE article by Louis Belrose, Jr., in the *Open Court* of April 2d, on "Comte's Gospel of Wealth," introduces a topic which should have immediate and general consideration. The question is whether the Industrial Feudal System of the Monopolists shall replace Our Republic and the republican institutions of our fathers, while the Roman Catholic church system takes charge of the religious, social and general interests of the people, under the rising oligarchies of the future. This was substantially the Polity which Comte projected, and it is the one now rapidly taking form, as is clearly pointed out in the able article referred to. The question is, Will it be final? Shall we have a repetition of the Catholic Regime and the Feudal System of the Middle Ages upon an industrial scientific and higher plane? Comte thought there was no escape from it. As soon as war in the progress of Civilisation was replaced by industry and *Capital*, the Capitalist and the Captain of industry merely replaced the Soldier and the Baron of the former system. The Republic of equals, of well-to-do people, the Republic of Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson, gradually vanished. There is no civilisation of industry without *CAPITAL*, those who own and control that control all. The census, and the articles of Thomas G. Shearman on our growing Plutocracy and the nascent Billionaire, give the true readings of the signs of the times. Gradually the conditions of the life of the many are passing into the hands of the few.

In a similar way the rapid growth of the Roman Catholic Regime in the world of religion and social affairs is equally manifest. It is amusing to notice how that Church assures the millionaire that he is "God's steward" and will get safe into heaven through the "eye of the needle," if he will only submit to and pay the Church; then to the poor she is always the "Mother," Friend and Protector. Thus she holds both Plutocrat and Slave in her control as parts of the dispensation which keeps her as a necessity, and enables her to claim mediation between the two while using both. Without them her occupation would be gone. Comte, therefore consistently prophesied and re-instated the Catholic Regime upon laws and dogmas of science, when the theological dogmas should become no longer credible, as an inevitable necessity of the new Feudal System. As Dr. Congreve teaches,

we are to have Positivism, i. e. CATHOLICISM, *minus* theology and *plus* science.

It is now about a quarter of a century since this Comtean Polity came over the Atlantic as the alleged outcome of the positive science and religion of mankind. Many of the open minds and hearts of the more aspiring students of sociology in America, and especially in New York, gave this new Gospel a thoughtful consideration. There was felt to be much of the highest value in Comte's Positive Philosophy, and much in his conception of a human religion, but this Polity was the stumbling-block over which there was no passing for many of us. We could see how the Philosophy and Religion could be revised and brought up to date truly and usefully. Under the influence of Mr. D. G. Croly, then editor of the *New York World*, and Mr. Courtlandt Palmer, founder afterwards of the Nineteenth Century Club, both of whom have now gone over to the majority. Some of us attempted a Statement or Epitome of Positive Philosophy and Religion, of which a copy now lies before me, a sort of mile-stone in the history of our evolution. The point that makes it relevant to the present discussion is that it regards Comte's Polity of Aristocracy and Catholicism as a necessary but only a *temporary* phase of progress, and distinctly avows that the Utopia of the Future will be finally a re-integration of Plutocracy and Catholicism into some form of "Socialism"—a Republic of social industrialism, just as far removed from Comte's notion of an industrial Feudal System, as our Political Republic is, or rather *was*, removed from the castles and robbers of the Middle Ages. Just as the old Feudal System finally consolidated and ended in the modern royal dynasties of Europe; France, England, Germany, etc., so surely the Industrial Feudal System of Monopolies can only end in their consolidation. Condensed capital, machinery and intelligence are seen to be irresistible. Will they ultimately and forever be controlled by a few Captains of Industry under the *moral* influence of a Catholic church? The Frenchman, Comte, said Yes, but his American students have never been able to agree to that answer. The result was that Positivism, or Constructive Liberalism, received a check in its hopeful progress from which it has never recovered, either in Europe or America. Herbert Spencer, then chiefly through the efforts of Prof. E. L. Youmans and the Appletons as publishers, took the lead of Liberal Thought, and held it against Comte's Catholicism, as he now holds it against Carl Marx's Socialism.

But the question constantly recurs, What is our future Polity to be? Mr. Spencer gives us agnostic Philosophy with frightful verbosity. But his religion, morality and, above all, polity—where and what are they? It is plain enough that these four factors of

the future must be settled together as parts of one mighty whole. Until we know to what port we are sailing—in a word, what is to be our future Polity—we are simply drifting without chart or compass. Nor if we, some of us, at least, have a pretty deep conviction as to the general nature of that polity, can we embark in ships plainly sailing under Comte's influence to a mirage of the Middle Ages, or under Spencer's to Monopolistic Feudality or Anarchy?

Is not the true line of evolution that which leads us to the supremacy of THE PEOPLE over the conditions of their comfort, welfare and civilization? A Feudal System or a Monarchy cannot be made tolerable to the American People by any church or "spiritual power." But as pointed out by Mr. Belrose what else can we expect? We answer the continuance of our Republic, saved by gradually passing to the people the monopolistic powers that of old went to Lords and Kings, but which can never go to them again, or to corporations or a Plutocracy, in substance their successors.

If Sociology is a science, merely drifting without regard to our future is blind and wicked folly. For that future our religious, political, social and moral life is a preparation, or life has no end or object at all.

If the solution we have intimated is not correct, let him answer better who can.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THIS Italian question reminds me of the "foreign subject" imposture, as it was practised in this country during the war. When the draft was ordered, regiments of patriots who for years had been conspicuous as hustlers and knockdowners at the polls, marched gallantly up to the office of the Provost Marshal, and claimed exemption on the plea that they were "foreign subjects" of all sorts of emperors, kings, and queens. They owed allegiance to every flag under the sun, excepting the American flag, and they "demanded" that their names be stricken from the lists. Public spirited fellows long eminent for skill in that branch of civil engineering which directs caucous machinery swarmed at the consulates clamoring for safety. In comic paradox appeared Hungarians invoking the aid of Austria, Poles appealing to Russia, and fierce Fenians demanding the protection of the British flag. What is more wonderful still, they got it. The consuls knew that the United States could not afford to quarrel with other nations then, and with an air of imperious dictation they required that those "foreign subjects" be released from liability to service in the army. Some of those very same non-combatants went back to the old country, and when arrested for political offenses there, declared themselves to be citizens of the United States, claiming the protection of the American flag; and what is most wonderful of all, got it.

* * *

A new sect, or combination of sects, has appeared in England. It seems to be a rival of the Salvation Army, and is called the "Gospel Messengers." The officers, while having rank and grades like those of the Salvation Army, are known by other titles, having at least the merit of originality. The nicknames of honor which have amused our vanity so long, are thread-bare, and the Gospel Messengers deserve praise for inventing another set. The officers of this new propaganda are Comets, Planets, and Stars, correspond-

ing as nearly as may be to Colonels, Majors, and Captains. Inferior to these are First Lights, and Second Lights, answering to First and Second Lieutenants, while below these again are a sort of Cadets, who are known as Coming Lights. There are no privates in this army to dilute its quality; the lowest grade in it being that of Coming Light, a great improvement on some other armies I have known. Their temple of worship is called a "Haven," which by the way, is more of a naval than a military term, and for musical torture they have a banjo and brass whistle, something more harrowing to the souls of sinners than even the tambourine and drum. Although but recently formed the new sect already has its martyrs, the chief of them being John Routledge, a Sergeant of Police in London, who has been dismissed from the force because he had become a Comet, as erratic, though not so bright; the excuse of his persecutors being that Comet Routledge was neglecting his duty as a policeman to blaze as a meteor in the gospel sky. Several years ago I was travelling down the Mississippi River in company with a gentleman who had seen much of the world, and as we passed Nauvoo he took off his hat and saluted the Mormon temple. I asked him why he did so, and he answered: "I salute every old religion,—and every new one," and in that spirit I suppose we may welcome the "Gospel Messengers."

* * *

The doctrine of international reciprocity has extended beyond the boundaries of commerce into the domain of ethics and religion. For many years England has been sending missionaries to convert the heathen in foreign parts; and now the heathen, in the gentle spirit of reciprocity, is returning the favor by sending missionaries to convert the Christians in England. The Nizam of Hyderabad, moved with pity for the benighted condition of the English people, and piously believing that their poverty and sins are due to Christian practices, has sent missionaries to convert them to the religion of Mahomet. He has done this at his own personal expense, and without taking up any collection. The report is made, although there is no harm in doubting it, that those missionaries are having greater success in England, than the English missionaries ever had in Asia or in Africa. The head of the movement is an English lawyer named Quilliam, who was converted to Islamism several years ago. While Mr. Quilliam directs the missionaries where to plant the standard of the Crescent, the Nizam furnishes the funds. Sooner or later it must have come to this. The English could not for ever go on exporting their own religion to Hyderabad without importing some of the religion of that country in return. The principle of reciprocity required this to preserve the balance of trade, which in religion at least, had been for a hundred years largely in favor of England. She had exported so much religion to foreign parts that very little was left for home consumption; and this movement of the Nizam will restore the equilibrium. Should he succeed in improving the manners and condition of the English people, the Nizam will find a good field of operations for a few missionaries right here in the city of Chicago. If he could spare them now, and convert us in time for the World's Fair it would be so much the better.

* * *

I give a welcome hail to the new nation just born in the South seas, "The Commonwealth of Australia." In extent of territory it is greater than the United States of America, and it contains more people than the United States had when Washington was elected President. While nominally, for the present, a part of the British empire, because it prefers to be so, it is essentially an independent republic. In blood and spirit, in laws, language, religion, history, and traditions, it is another England, founded by the descendants of those energetic tribes the Angles, Jutes, and Saxons, that strange confederation, prophecy of the United States, which in the woods and marshes between the Weser and the Baltic sea proved unconquerable by either Gauls or Romans; a restless race

who passing over to Britain in boats not much better than canoes, conquered that island, abolished its language, and changed the very name of it to Angliland. Overflowing that country, some of their posterity crossed the Atlantic, colonised North America, and created the political communities known as the United States and Canada, while another portion of them, a curious mixture of exiles and voluntary emigrants, occupied the great continent in the Southern Hemisphere, and as a sign of their latest conquest, proclaim the new nation "The Commonwealth of Australia." The Constitution is said to be modelled partly on that of the United States, and partly on that of Canada. No matter, constitutions grow; even the Constitution of the United States, with all its conservative precautions against its own amendment, has been amended fifteen times in the space of a hundred years, and the Constitution of Australia will be changed as often to meet the requirements of new conditions and the demands of human progress.

* * *

Like a journey through a famous land, or a voyage up a mighty river, to the philosophical student is the charm of traveling by the aid of history up the devious pathway of an ancient people to contemplate the landmarks of their glory. Still greater is the pleasure of anticipating the achievements of a new nation for the coming thousand years. There are wise persons in Chicago, I see their advertisements in the papers, who can tell our fortunes, good or evil, for a dollar. They do it by a knowledge of the planets, but who shall cast the horoscope of a nation? What system of astrology can do that? This prescience is not given even to the genius of the stars. Yet we would like to lift the veil that hides the future, and see the noonday of Australia. We can speak for the present at least, and say that the young commonwealth starts with a bodily and mental constitution healthy and strong; and with some advantages which no other nation has had. She has all the experience of the older nations, with only a limited share of the consequences resulting from their vices, their misfortunes, and their trials. Her people will be homogeneous, and the race question will not vex them. There will be no "Negro Problem" in that new country to divide the citizens and perplex their politics. Australia is too remote for war with any of the older nations, and will save the cost of armies. Not having to study the politics of war her mental powers can be employed in moral statesmanship, and in learning the ethics of law. Her penal code will be merciful, for in her time of anger Australia will remember that among the founders of her greatness were men whose fathers had been transported in chains from England, many of them for misfortunes which the law called crimes. If Australia has borrowed some parts of the American constitution it is only a fair exchange, because many of the states of the American Union have borrowed the election law of Australia, and all of them must do so if the will of the people is to be fairly recorded and loyally obeyed. Out of her education will come Shakespeares and Schillers, Newtons and Franklins, poets, philosophers, statesmen, inventors, greater perhaps than any the old world has yet made in its weary evolution of man. Her territorial sway will be imperial for the natural resources of Australia are greater than those of any other nation, save the United States alone; and perhaps they will be found equal to these when the explorations are all done. Advance, Australia!

M. M. TRUMBULL.

CORRESPONDENCE.

LAW AND THE FREEDOM OF WILL.

To the Editor of The Open Court:

WHEN I illustrated man's relation to the universe by the hands of a clock, the regulator was included as a part of the works which move the hands rhythmically. Man is like the hands of a clock because he is subject to the laws of his organisation. As he

is organised so must he express himself, and that is why men differ one from another. They are different instruments with but one performer. Because we can carry out some things that we wish, that does not prove that we are free; it only shows that we have no opposing environment. Because the hands of the clock meet with no obstacles it does not prove that they are free; they are subject to the mechanism which the clock-maker combined to move them. So man, in all that he does, is subject to the mechanism of the combination which was combined by the great clock-maker of us all. The clock did not make itself, neither did man make himself. A clock that is not properly balanced needs a regulator. It is the same with man. Being vicious by nature, and vicious in degree, his regulators are his opposing environments—the laws of church and state. If a clock is properly balanced and needs no regulator, the hands are not free but still are forced to move by perfect works. It is so with man: If he acts morally without an opposing environment he so acts because he has an organism that forces such an expression. Such an one will be repelled by an immoral environment and an immorally organised man will be repelled by a moral surrounding.

I accept the definition, that "determinism teaches that willing is determined by law" and that is why I declare the will is not free. When I use the term law I mean cause. There are two things, therefore, law and will. Man cannot will without a cause. He wills to remain where there is attraction and he wills to leave where there is repulsion; and the attractive and repulsive forces of matter have to be there as a part of the combination of his actions, or he would not will one way or the other; he would be like the governor when not belted and pulled to the crank-shaft. I must take ground against the statement that "Nature is not the slave of law." "Nature acts in a certain definite way," because it is *forced* to act that way. I make this statement from the standpoint of reason. Nature cannot make a planet revolve both ways at once, nor travel both ways in its orbit at the same time. A man is a slave when he must work at his master's bidding; so Nature is a slave when it must work at the bidding of its master, the impossible. The magnet *must* point to the north because it is conditioned to point that way. Demagnetize the metal and Nature can't make it point toward the north.

I cannot accept the term "man's own will," because that would destroy monism. Man does not possess anything that is his own. All that he has Nature has loaned him, and makes him pay it back. His will is not his own any more than the governor is the engine's. Monism cannot contemplate man as independent of Natural Law, nor can the thing formed resist the combination of the former; it *must act as it is conditioned*; there is no miracle in Nature. A man free from natural law would be a miracle. Herein is man cleared from the charge of rebellion against his maker, and that justification comes from science, not religion.

I perfectly understand your definition of freewill: When a man acts without any obstacle in his environment—when he carries out his desire—you say he is free and is not under law. Here is where I beg to differ, because he, like the hands of the clock, is subject to the works which Nature endowed him with, the same as the hands of the clock are subject to the works which the clock-maker endowed it with. You give no credit for the natural causes within man which force him to express himself as he does. In the order of evolution man cannot react back upon the Power that evolves him step by step. Herein is hope and comfort for all mankind. Religion has taught that folly, but it is the function of science to stamp it out. Professor Clifford is no credential for proof. Men speak as they are organized. The credential to an assertion must come from Nature, and as there is no effect in Nature without a cause, man cannot act free from natural law. The prime cause of his every action is where the balance of Power is—either in the organism or in the environment. JOHN MADDOCK.

[I have to protest against Mr. Maddock's presentation of my view, that "when a man acts without any obstacle in his environment, . . . he is not under law." Man's actions are always according to law. I accept Determinism unreservedly.

[I object to Mr. Maddock's expressions that a man who acts as he wills is a slave of law, that man is subject to the laws of his organisation, that as he is organised so he must express himself, and that nature is a slave of law. All these expressions contain the dualism of law and reality. As a man is organised *so he is*. What is man aside from his organisation? Nature acts in a definite way, and a man of a certain character (being a part of nature) acts also in a definite way. There is no law imposed upon nature; law (i. e. uniformity) is a feature of nature.

[Mr. Maddock says "that when I use the term law I mean cause." I do not use "law" and "cause" as synonyms; law being a uniformity of nature, and cause some motion that produces a change.

[I have repeatedly called attention to the error that lies hidden in the expression "laws govern"; the laws of nature are not ukases imposed upon nature. Objectively considered, they are uniformities of nature, and subjectively considered, i. e. regarded as generalised statements formulated by science, they do not govern, they *describe*.

[If I speak of "man's own will," I do not mean to attribute to man any independence of nature. "Man's own will" is a term describing nature's action as it takes place in man. The power that produced man is not outside of man as a clock-maker is outside of the clock; it is in him and he is a part of it.—Ed.]

To the Editor of The Open Court:

I am interested in the freewill discussion, and in a conversation with Mr. Maddock, I found out that he by no-means considers that his position cannot be moved. I think, however, that we can come to an understanding on this matter if we will only agree on a statement of the question.

Mr. Maddock, in our conversation, took for illustration a hungry man and a dinner. He says that I must eat my dinner because of the laws which control my organisation and that I cannot will otherwise, therefore my will is not free. I think Mr. Maddock must agree that the will comes with the organisation condition and did not exist until it did. The will and the organisation condition are one. For instance, special conditions of reality bring about a special organisation (in this case man), and with this special organisation comes special organisation conditions; but those organisation conditions are not entities in themselves; the organisation and the condition are one. Take away either and neither remains. It cannot be said one is the slave of the other, for they are one. There is no more duality than there is between the two sides of the curved line, although one side is concave and the other side is convex.

So with organisation conditions comes will. The organisation conditions are not laws controlling a will which is something separate. Mr. Maddock may say "I want you to will that you are not hungry, but you are hungry and you cannot will that you are not." Yes, I am hungry, (this is the way I symbolise my organisation condition) and he asks me to not only change my will but my organisation with its conditions; then he says "If you cannot, you are not free." How can I be and still not be?

The special conditions of all reality that brought about my special organisation with its conditions exist no longer—they are me, so they do not control me. Of course, I am a part of all reality and cannot be exempt from all reality condition. I and reality with its condition are one, however.

Thus we see that all specials are reduced to generals, and those generals are generalised until they reach the one complete

generalisation. The trouble is that although we claim to be monists we are not. Reality and the order of reality are one. Law is a symbolical expression of this observed order.

LEROY BERRIER.

Minneapolis, Minn.

BOOK NOTICES.

The Mystery of New Orleans. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.) This is a novel by Dr. Wm. H. Holcombe of New Orleans. The plot is unessential. The idea is "to illustrate the new discoveries in physio-psychology . . . ; to throw a little helpful light upon the race-problem; and to cultivate friendly sentiments between the North and South." Something is also said about vivisection, in strong condemnation of it. The author's chief conceptions are based on the results of scientific research in the domain of psychological science. That is they are ostensibly based on these results. But we know of no scientific investigations which support Dr. Holcombe in the mystical extension he has made of his data. In fact, all theories of "psychic ethers," "reflection of thought by mental mirrors," etc., etc., which make thought a substance, and moreover any kind of a substance to suit the purpose, do not need the support of the investigations of science. Not being based on facts they can be established just as well and just as solidly without facts. Only their solidity is limited, in this case, to their metaphorical character. For the rest, they are merely ideas mistakenly applied to provinces where they do not belong.

We have received the new catalogue and prospectus of the Princeton Preparatory School at Princeton, N. J. The curriculum of this institution, which is under the competent and wise administration of Mr. John B. Fine, Head-Master and Instructor in Latin and Mathematics, extends over a period of four years, and embraces a number of courses of thorough instruction in the English Branches, the Classics; Mathematics, Science, History, and the Modern Languages. The extension of the courses in science and mathematics, usually very meagrely represented in preparatory schools, is to be much commended.

The Upper Ten. A Novel of the Snobocracy. By W. H. Ballou. (New York: United States Book Company.) This is a short and entertaining novel, "of a new type of fiction," as the author says—namely the submarine type. It partakes of its type—is watery in some parts and sparkles in others with a deep-sea, cerulean-green wit. Some happy satirical hits are made at the society of the American metropolis, and the volume (paper-bound) is interspersed with some very pretty verses.

We have received from the Rough Notes Publishing Co. of Indianapolis their last annual *Digest of Insurance Cases* (brought down to Nov. 1, 1890). This publication is compiled by Mr. John A. Finch and epitomises, professedly, all the decisions of the courts relative to insurance cases and all the leading articles written on this vast subject. The present volume contains digests of three hundred and seventy-one cases.

NOTES.

Mr. Wakeman has presented the Brooklyn Ethical Association with an excellent contribution to their Evolution Series. It is his lecture on Ernst Haeckel, which tells us of Haeckel's life and work. The pamphlet contains as a frontispiece a neatly reproduced picture of Haeckel. Mr. Wakeman concludes his lecture in the following words: "When the old religions fall, what will you give in their place? We answer, *Religion!* Look around! The enchanted castle of existence of the past was but a half-seen, discolored prophecy of the truth which is replacing it, with a grandeur and a reality that terrifies the soul at first. People

"are frightened when science tells them that this world is the real one, and 'the other' its shadow. But this true world includes all—is The All! It brings with it a new philosophy, religion, morality, life, and motive, which is an enduring well-spring of energy, consolation, and hope—not of pessimism nor optimism, but of ever-victorious meliorism. Do not as an ethical society fear that the old moral lights will be blown out and darkness result. The true scientific foundation will replace the old, as in our cities the scientific electric light has come to take the place of the old smoky lamps. To secure such replacement, throughout the whole individual and social domain of human affairs, is the motive and inspiration of those scientists who, in Europe and America, put their conclusions before the people in the simplest language, yet ever eloquent with these new purposes and hopes. Of the noblest of such teachers and prophets none stands forth more prominently than Ernst Haeckel. From his concluding words at that Munich contest rings out the motto which, in a word, expresses the impulse of his own life, and of the creative era of the new faith of Monism: *Impavidum progradimur!* "Undaunted we press ever on!"

THE SOUL OF MAN.

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE FACTS

PHYSIOLOGICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY.

By DR. PAUL CARUS.

480 Pages, with 152 Illustrative Cuts and Diagrams.—PRICE \$3.00.

Printed on Extra-fine Paper, Handsomely Bound in Cloth.

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. 192.

EMERSON FIFTY YEARS AGO. F. M. HOLLAND. 2787
 CHILDREN AS TEACHERS. E. A. KIRKPATRICK. 2789
 OUR FUTURE POLITY. T. B. WAKEMAN. 2790
 CURRENT TOPICS. Foreign Subjects. The Gospel Messengers. Reciprocity in Religion. The Commonwealth of Australia. GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL. 2791
 CORRESPONDENCE.
 Law and the Freedom of Will. JOHN MADDOCK and LEROY BERRIER. [With editorial note.] 2792
 BOOK NOTICES. 2794
 NOTES. 2794