

290  
223

THE  
NEWBERRY  
LIBRARY  
CHICAGO

# The Open Court.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Devoted to the Work of Conciliating Religion with Science

THE  
NEWBERRY  
LIBRARY  
CHICAGO

No. 203. (VOL. V.—21)

CHICAGO, JULY 16, 1891.

Two Dollars per Year.  
Single Copies, 5 Cts.

## EDUCATIONAL REFORM.

BY FELIX L. OSWALD.

PHILOSOPHERS have often demonstrated the fact that the products of the soil would abundantly suffice for the needs of the human race, if the labors of husbandry were confined to the cultivation of useful, or even harmless, crops, and a similar rule might be applied to the harvests of the mind. Nearly all the chief reform-problems of our age might be solved by educational reforms.

The ignorance of absolute barbarism is, indeed, hardly worse than the waste of educational efforts, for, since the dawn of civilisation, the social, moral and intellectual aberrations of every century have proved to be proportioned to the degree of that waste. The progressive culture of Greece and Rome was largely due to the principles of common sense applied to the problems of education, at a time when the welfare of the commonwealth and the hope of victory in the struggle with the powers of darkness and savagedom were known to depend on the judicious training of the young, and when the interests of the living present were never sacrificed to the traditions of the dead past.

The antithesis of that theory of life was the anti-naturalism of the monastic Middle Ages, when the claims of temporal needs and the welfare of the body—nay, of earth itself, were persistently disregarded in the pursuit of ghostland phantoms. The leaders of that pursuit, indeed, then reached the zenith of their power, but for nearly seven hundred years the noblest nations of the Caucasian Race remained in a state of abject ignorance; commerce and industry declined, monstrous superstitions raged with the destructiveness of epidemic plagues, science became a tradition of the past, common sense a stigma and free inquiry a capital offence.

The worst spectres of that dismal night have vanished at the dawn of reviving science, but its mists will not disappear till our system of education has been thoroughly emancipated from the traditions of the unprogressive ages. Our schools train the memory, rather than the judgment of their pupils, and to a degree which future ages will hesitate to credit, the work of instruction is still devoted to retrospective studies. We still sacrifice the present to the past. Not in

Spain and Portugal only, but in England, in Prussia and in the United States of America, colleges and academies still abound with students whose protracted, and yet often ineffectual, struggles with the grammatical intricacies of two or three different dead languages have left them no time to acquire a fair degree of proficiency in the use of any modern tongue, whose lore of mystic traditions obscures their perception of living facts, and who are much more at home in the legends of Egypt, Babylonia and Palestine than in the current history of their native lands.

In the acquisition of knowledge the standards of utility must, of course, vary with the choice of vocation, but the merit of completeness, or even of moderate adequacy to the requirements of the times cannot be claimed by any system of education that ignores the importance of health and the progress of secular science. But before enumerating the advantages of remedying that mistake, we should remember Thomas Carlyle's axiom that "no error is fully confuted till we have seen, not only that it is an error, but how it became one; till, finding that it clashes with the principles of truth, established in our own mind, we also find in what way it had seemed to harmonise with the principles of truth, established in other minds." In other words, the most effectual manner of exploding an inveterate fallacy is to explain it.

How then shall we account for the far-spread delusion which still persists in sacrificing the study of the contemporary world to the rehearsal of antiquated legends? How did rational beings of our species ever come to prefer the pursuit of graveyard meditations to the naturally far more inviting task of investigating the phenomena of the living world? The solution of the enigma can be best understood by an analogon familiar to the students of human pathology, viz. the circumstance that the use of certain remedial drugs is apt to become a confirmed habit, which often continues to afflict its victims for years after their apparent recovery from the evils of the original disease. During the "Millennium of Madness," the intellectual reign of terror, enforced upon forty successive generations by the ascendancy of ghastly superstitions, the study of classic literature became for thousands a refuge from the peril of insanity. Science, reason and earthly happiness seemed to have been buried under the ruins

of the Roman Empire, the sun of learning cast only feeble rays through the clouds of supernaturalism—

“Dark was that light, but bright the gloom  
Around the funeral pile,”

—and from the tyranny of monkish Inquisitors hundreds of persecuted thinkers could still escape to the haunts of Homer and Virgil, as, in spite of chains and guards, a Siberian exile may in dreams return to the lost paradise of freedom. Knowledge, too, could still be delved from the treasure-mines of pagan erudition; from the heights of a classical education philosophers could still investigate the problems of life as revealed in the thoughts and actions of normal human beings, and the study of the past became thus identified with the chance of intellectual salvation.

The remedial tendencies of Nature have prevailed against the fever-dream of monachism, but the convalescents still cling to the anodyne of their ancestors, though in many respects the scientific basis of their predilection is becoming more and more untenable. The republican institutions of Greek and Rome have ceased to be supreme models of political wisdom, but even in their ideal features their value, as standards of reform, depends in a large measure upon the simultaneous study of contemporary problems of national development. We can no longer steer our way by the loadstars of pagan antiquity. Many of its, once attainable, elysiums have vanished like the lost Atlantis; we have to encounter the perils of oceans unknown to the charts of ancient navigators, and can depend upon no oracles but the revelations of each day and hour. The early study of those revelations would help to acquaint our young men with that “current tendencies,” which philanthropists and patriots cannot afford to ignore, and which has only too often thwarted the most heroic endeavors of reformers who ventured to defy the power of its stream.

And equally often the attempt to avoid the “dis-harmonising influence” of an early acquaintance with the discord of opposing factions and the contradictions and vindictive recriminations of the partisan press, is apt to defeat its own object. The peace of ignorance is sooner or later doomed to a rude disturbance of its dreams, and it would nearly always be the wiser plan to let timely experience fortify the principles of truth by the evidence of practical tests. Let me illustrate that fact by an extreme case—the virulence of the Temperance controversy. Can it benefit a young disciple of Total Abstinence to remain unacquainted with the arguments of its opponents? Have those arguments not aided the ablest champions of reform in avoiding the mistakes of their predecessors, and is there a doubt that a freer scope of investigation would frequently obviate the reproach of inconsistency? The defenders, even of a noble cause, cannot afford to shut

their eyes to the exposure of its weak points or the illusion of its devotees, for their adversaries would not fail to avail themselves of every opportunity to profit by the consequences of that blindness.

An apostle of social reform describes a school master of the future inviting the opinion of his pupils on the last debate of the legislative assembly and reading to his class a synopsis of transatlantic cable-dispatches. There is nothing improbable in that prediction. From an utilitarian point of view the cognisance of current events would, indeed, supply a serious defect in the conventional method of historical studies, and the solidarity of mankind will soon be sufficiently recognised to enhance the interest of every topic of international importance.

It would be equally safe to predict the advent of a time when the discussion of sociological problems will no longer be considered below the dignity of a public educator. The study of those problems would facilitate the rare, yet often extremely important, art of reading the signs of the times. It might have enabled the statesmen of the eighteenth century to interpret the significance of the portents preceding the cataclysm of the French Revolution, and might yet save contemporary politicians from the mistake of Scandinavian Thor, who wished to test his dead-lift abilities on a big household cat and found that he had got hold of the world-encircling Midgard Serpent.

Nor will the public discussion of religious controversies be much longer considered an offence against the canons of good taste. The right of free inquiry is the first condition of progress, and dogmatists who dispute that right, virtually impeach the evidence or the morality of their own dogmas. The genuine principles of ethics can only gain by free discussion, and, in the words of a social reformer, “it will not be really well with society until men generally are brought to recognise that there is such a thing as truth, and that its claims upon them are paramount . . . and that a child, in the course of education, should be early familiarised with the method of investigation and in every possible way encouraged to ask for proofs.”

And with few exceptions our methods of scientific instruction could be greatly improved by the assiduous study of modern discoveries. Our whole system of intellectual and physical training should, from time to time, be harmonised with the advancing standards of knowledge. The triumphs of science have been achieved only by progressive revelations, and no axiom should be accepted as too conclusive to admit the recognition of modifying evidence.

Practical educators are not agreed that it would do more good than harm to obtrude that *provisional* character of human knowledge upon the cognisance of young children, but misconceptions, in that respect,

should not be permitted to bias the judgment of after years, and the frequent discussion of scientific questions of the day would be the most suitable manner of acquainting the students of our colleges and academies with the fact that the discovery of new phenomena incessantly demands the revision of established theories, and that in the realms of Science constant vigilance is the price of freedom—from error.

#### THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL.

IT is a most remarkable sign of the times that the very foremost representatives of the conservative powers in the world recognise the paramount importance of the labor question. The young Emperor of Germany considers it as one of the noblest duties of the throne to regulate, according to the best of his abilities and insight, the relation between employer and employee, on the ground of justice and with due consideration of the rights of the oppressed, and Pope Leo XIII. devotes a long encyclical to "The Condition of Labor," giving his well weighed and carefully considered advice to the Roman Catholic world as well as to humanity at large, as to what way in his opinion a solution of the social problem should be attempted.

This land of ours is pre-eminently a protestant country, and the constitution of the United States is founded upon Protestantism. Nevertheless we have large numbers of Roman Catholics among us and the opinion of the recognised leader and sovereign pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church will naturally not only be of interest to all of us, but we shall also respect it as coming from a man whose high position and great range of experience will make it worth listening to—although we may disagree with the views he proposes.

In our mind the main difference between the Catholic and the Protestant is this, that the Protestant, in opposition to the Catholic, considers his conscience and his judgment as free and not bound by the dictates of any other man, be his position ever so high, be he revered as the Vicar of God and be he clothed in the robes of holiness and sanctity as is, indeed, in the belief of the Roman Catholics, the holy father of the Church, the Bishop of Rome.

Protestantism has rejected, it has protested against the idea of a Vicar of God on earth; it recognises no mediator between God and man, no intercessor between the moral authority and the conscience which aspires to conform to this moral authority. Protestantism is a religious republicanism; and our political republicanism is based upon this religious idea. If the citizens of a republic are not men with free consciences who dare to judge for themselves, the republic will be a failure. Wherever the consciences can be bound by human authority, even though this authority may be exercised bona fide as repre-

senting God's will, a real republic will become an impossibility or be degraded to a mere sham. Roman Catholicism, therefore, will either come into conflict with the spirit of American institutions, and that opinion is not unfrequently pronounced, or it will have to conform to republicanism, it will have to accommodate itself to the protestant idea of the liberty of conscience, so as to let the Pope be the spiritual adviser only and not the infallible Vicar of God. In a republic the law is sovereign and not the ruler of the administration, not the president or governor. So in the spiritual realm of religion and science Truth is supreme. No priest, no pope, no infallible human authority can be recognised as the sole and supreme mouthpiece of Truth. The humblest mind has the same right to search for and investigate the truth as the highest, and the utterances of the highest, the wisest, and the greatest are not so absolute and without appeal as to be above criticism.

Judging the Pope's encyclical from this our protestant standpoint we have to acknowledge that it is a document of remarkable wisdom, and it is apparently dictated by paternal solicitude as well as by a sincere love of truth and justice. The sentiment with which it is inspired is humane. We cannot, however, agree with the Pope concerning his views of Christian charity, and we must declare that the encyclical lacks any positive encouragement of progressive ideas.

\* \* \*

The main subject of the encyclical is a criticism of socialism and socialistic principles, and the Pope undertakes to prove that "private ownership is according to nature's law." "Every man," he says, "has by nature the right to possess property as his own; this is one of the chief points of distinction between man and the animal creation, for the brute has no power of self-direction." In private property is included also the private property of land, for "men always work harder and more readily when they work on that which is their own."\*

While upholding the principle of the inviolability of private property, the Pope demands that the laws should first of all protect the right of the poor man, because, as he expresses it beautifully, "his slender means should be sacred in proportion to their scantiness."

The suppression of the rights of the poor is emphatically denounced in the encyclical. The employer is expressly warned "never to tax his work-people beyond their strength, nor employ them in work unsuited

\* This view of the matter would not condemn the single-tax idea. The single-tax idea, i. e. the proposition of taxing real estate only, is quite distinct from the abolition of private property in land. While the latter appears to be a retrogression to the old tribal socialism of semi-civilised peoples, the former is a practical plan well worth the consideration. A land tax need not be so high as to make the land worthless, so that its introduction would amount to actual confiscation, but only sufficient to cover the expenses of the commonwealth.

to their sex or age. . . . To make one's profit out of the need of another is condemned by all laws human and divine." The Pope says :

"Let it be granted then, that as a rule workman and employer should make free agreements, and in particular should freely agree as to wages. Nevertheless there is a dictate of nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If through necessity or fear of a worse evil the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or a contractor will give him no better, he is the victim of force and injustice."

On the other hand the workingman is earnestly advised to be economical. "He will not fail by cutting down expenses to put by a little property. Nature and reason would urge him to do this. . . . The law should favor ownership and its policy should be to induce as many of the people as possible to become owners. . . . If working people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land, the result will be that the gulf between vast wealth and deep poverty will be bridged over and the two orders will be brought nearer together."

The basis of civilisation is family life and the socialistic plan to let the state supersede the family is rightly not regarded with favor by the Pope. He sums up his view in the following sentence :

"A state chiefly prospers and flourishes by morality, by well regulated family life, by respect for religion and justice, by the moderation and equal distribution of public burdens, by the progress of the arts and of trade, by the abundant yield of the land—by every thing which makes the citizens better and happier."

Any measures which tend to threaten or to interfere with the existence of family life are not only unjust but also in the highest degree injurious. "The sources of wealth would themselves run dry, for no one would have any interest in exerting his talents or his industry."

Considering the right of property and family life as being in accord with the laws of nature, the pope insists also on the right of heredity. He says :

"It is a most sacred law of nature that a father must provide food and all necessities for those whom he has begotten; and similarly nature dictates that a man's children who carry on as it were, and continue his own personality, should be provided by him with all that is needful to enable them honorably to keep themselves from want and misery in the uncertainties of this mortal life. Now in no other way can a father effect this except by ownership of profitable property which he can transmit to his children by inheritance."

The idea of the continuity of life from one generation to the next following is strongly emphasised in the encyclical. "The child belongs to the father" (it is maintained in quotation of the old Roman tradition) "and is, as it were, *the continuation of the father's personality.*" (Italics are ours.) The idea of futurity is indispensable in ethics. Says the Pope :

"Exclude the idea of futurity and the very notion of what is good and right would perish."

The idea of futurity is here employed in another sense than we would use the phrase. This world is considered by the Pope "as a place of exile, and not as our true country." Nevertheless we can see a truth in the Pope's saying even though we conceive of the idea of futurity as an immanent immortality and a continuation of life in this present world of ours.

The right of property is sternly insisted upon. But how should possession be used? The encyclical answers in the words of Thomas Aquinas :

"Man should not consider his outward possessions as his own but as common to all so as to share them without difficulty when others are in need."

This is after all socialism, although it is different from the socialism of the socialist agitator. That much is true that all the property a man owns, he holds and should hold for the benefit of humanity. And a rich man using his means wisely will under all circumstances promote the interests of mankind.

\*  
\*  
\*

We cannot agree with the Pope's view of the duties of the rich. He insists on charity and he expressly states that "Christian" charity is needed. "Charity as a virtue," he says, "belongs to the church." Now we all are fully agreed that charity should be practiced; man should help man wherever he can. But "Christian charity" as it is actually practiced in Roman Catholic countries is a grave mistake, for it is not charity that the poor want, but justice. Man should help his unfortunate fellowman, but his help should not consist in feeding the poor gratuitously and in the distribution of alms. Alms are a curse to the giver and the receiver. They make of the giver a pharisee and of the receiver a pauper. Help in need should consist only in affording the means or offering the occasion to those in need so that they can help themselves. That alone is charity in the good sense of the word. It cannot be practiced without bringing sacrifices, yet it stands in a strong contrast to the pious but mistaken theory of an almsgiving charity.

The Pope acknowledges the right of the working man to organise societies for the promotion of their interests; he says :

"Speaking summarily, we may lay it down as a general and perpetual law that workmen's associations should be so organised and governed as to furnish the best and most suitable means for attaining what is aimed at, that is to say, for helping each individual member to better his condition to the utmost in body, mind and property."

This is a good principle as it recognises the rights of laborers to help themselves with all the legal and righteous means at their disposal. The Pope complains of the destruction of the ancient guilds and says that "no other organisations took their place." Yet

this is an error, for our labor unions are in many respects and very strangely even in several details exact copies of the old guilds. Are they perhaps not recognised as guilds in the encyclical, because they do *not* "pay special and principal attention to piety and morality" in the way the Catholic church demands it, and which the encyclical also considers as indispensable? There have been indeed conflicts between certain labor organisations and the church, because the church would not recognise them and forbade Catholics to join them. It seems as if they are to be recognised by the church only on condition that they submit to the spiritual guidance of priests. And that it appears is also the meaning of the Pope when he says:

"What advantage can it be to a workman to obtain by means of a society all that he requires and to endanger his soul for want of spiritual food."

This idea of the pope certainly is right, if it be rightly understood. The worth of a soul is more than all worldly advantages. Life is more than meat and the body than raiment. But in what consists the worth of a soul?

The worth of a soul, we deem it, is the truth it contains in its ideas as applied for doing and achieving; and the truth in a soul applied to practical life makes man virtuous and moral. Worldly advantages are nothing when compared to morality and virtue, but worldly advantages will be added unto him who aspires for virtue. The idea of the Pope concerning the endangering of the soul however is wrong if it is interpreted by another passage of the encyclical that "he who turns his back on the church (i. e., the Roman Catholic Church) cannot be near to Christ." The Roman Catholic Church, it appears to us, would be greater, if it could give up the narrow-minded claim of being an institution which alone is in possession of the truth and which alone can show us the way of salvation. "There is no virtue," says the Pope, "unless it is drawn from the Sacred Heart of Jesus Christ." In our opinion, virtue remains, virtue, as truth remains truth, whether we draw it from Confucius, or Buddha, or Christ, whether it comes out of the mouths of prophets, the sages of antiquity or modern scientists, be they members of the Catholic Church like Pater Secchi, or heretics like Kant and Darwin.

We take a broader view of the subject than the pope. Therefore, although we can fully appreciate the wisdom of his views, we see at the same time that he unnecessarily troubles himself about the rapid changes which take place in our time. He says:

"It is not surprising that the spirit of revolutionary change which has so long been predominant in the nations of the world, should have passed beyond politics and made its influence felt in the cognate field of practical economy."

The spirit of this "revolutionary change" is in the light in which we view the subject the spirit of progress, it is a sign of a higher evolution of mankind. The social question and the urgency of the social question, we believe, are not a lamentable affair, they are not a misfortune which must "fill every mind with painful apprehension." On the contrary it is the indication of a further and higher growth of mankind. We have to look forward to changes, yet these changes, we confidently hope, will in the end prove to be for the better.

Says the pope in a mood of ultra-conservatism:  
"Humanity must remain as it is."

This is true in a limited sense only. The natural laws of human development must and indeed will remain as they are. Yet on the other hand, humanity must *not* remain as it is. Humanity will certainly not be leveled down to a socialistic homogeneity, but if the natural laws of human development remain in full play, if they are not interfered with by the reactionary spirit of those who are afraid of progress, humanity will most assuredly *not* remain as it is; and we welcome the change as the natural result of evolution.

\* \* \*

The papal encyclical attempts to solve the social problem through the application of right and justice. But when we ask where these principles of right and justice are comparatively most lived up to, we seek in vain among the properly Roman Catholic countries. In the protestant countries the laborer stands higher, the poor are less in need of charity, and justice is better administered. The social question is more agitated in liberal countries, not because there is more of that "general moral deterioration" of which the Pope speaks as an evil sign of the times, but because there is more progress. And progress is after all the test by which we shall recognise the worth of moral principles.

We believe in conservatism, because we believe that the future must develop out of the past. We find no fault with the pope's conservatism. There is, however, an ultra-conservative sentiment underlying the Pope's encyclical which we cannot consider as promoting progress.

In speaking of poverty, which "in God's sight is no disgrace," he advises "the rich to incline to generosity and the poor to tranquil resignation." "Generosity" together with "charity" would make a poor substitute only for justice, and "tranquil resignation" can never beget the spirit of reform. Progress is the hope and desire of those who toil and our deepest instincts move us to obey its laws. It is the motive principle of human action in its highest form. To be better and to be better off, is a virtuous aspiration, and "tranquil resignation" with our own misery

should be termed "indolence." Bad institutions that oppose our elevation ought to be improved, but they cannot be improved by tranquil resignation. We must labor to improve them, we must aspire and struggle for progress. We must study the truth freely and fearlessly, and the truth is found with the help of "right reason" and by a cognition of "the laws of nature."

It is noteworthy how much the Pope endeavors to base his arguments upon natural laws and reason. In one passage he goes even so far as to propose "right reason" as a test for what is the eternal law of God. He says: "Laws bind only when they are *in accordance with right reason, and therefore, with the eternal laws of God.*" (Italics are ours.) We agree with the Pope, but we fear that many dogmas and church institutions do not agree with this saying of the Pope's, if his words mean what they purport.

Those who live up to the truth may have to pass through hard struggles and will find little leisure for tranquil resignation, but their ideals will survive, and their souls will march onward in the grand procession of mankind as the torch-bearers of progress.

"All roads lead to Rome" is an old proverb which originated in the times of the Roman Catholic supremacy in former centuries. We should say, "All roads lead to truth." Yet there are many round about roads. The shortest road and the straightest is that of "right reason," which leads to truth by a study of nature and the laws of nature. For what is truth but a correct and orderly arranged representation of nature, i. e. all the facts of reality, in the brains of feeling and thinking beings?

P. C.

## CURRENT TOPICS.

In a New York newspaper of some importance I notice the following commendation, "America for the Americans in the broadest and most liberal sense has been the rule of the administration." A curious misprint has made a discord of the whole sentence, and the sleepy proof reader did not see that the words "broadest" and "liberal," had been substituted for "narrowest" and "illiberal." Of course it may be advisable and sometimes necessary to refuse help and hospitality to a stranger, but we never boast that we shut the door against him in "the broadest and most liberal" way. We rather apologise for shutting it, on the ground that we were out of provisions, that we had no room, that the baby was cutting teeth, that the hired girl had gone for a holiday, or something of that sort by way of explanation and excuse. The very motto "America for the Americans" expresses an illiberal sentiment, in selfish contrast with the generous old 4th of July welcome, "America for all," which in former days was hope and inspiration to the weary and heavy laden of every nation under the sun.

\* \* \*

The reason why I suppose the words "broadest" and "liberal" in the foregoing paragraph to be a misprint is that in the same paper from which they are quoted appears the triumphant solution of a portentous international problem which for several days had perplexed the "Administration." A citizen of Chicago, fond of children, had imported into this country a riksha from

Japan, and also a couple of Japanese experts to "run with the machine," all for the amusement of the girls and boys in Garfield Park. The interesting novelty was a donation from the citizen to the children's pleasure fund, but a certain Dogberry, sitting in judgment on the case, declared that it was "most tolerable and not to be endured"; so the citizen was notified that in trying to be a benefactor, he had become a malefactor with dire penalties hanging over his head. He had violated the contract labor law or some statute equally magnanimous. It was made an administration question, and the ruling of the government was that the riksha runners must be taken back to Japan. It was also mercifully promised that should the orders of the "Department" be promptly obeyed, the offending citizen should not be beheaded. He has promised to send the riksha runners back. And this is what is meant by "America for the Americans in the broadest and most liberal sense."

\* \* \*

I am curious to know what the Japanese riksha runners thought about the littleness of the great republic when they were ordered out of its dominion. What do they think of the American eagle? And what does the American eagle think of himself? His proud crest must have drooped a little on the 4th of July when he heard the illiberal decree. What will they say about us in Japan when the runners reach home? In our self-conceit it may be of no consequence to us what they say; and yet this nation is not great enough to despise the opinion even of those poor men if their estimate of us be correct. "Madam," said a servant girl, "I am going to leave you to-morrow, but I will give you a good character." In a material way the promise may have been of no importance to the lady, and yet in a moral sense there may come a time of sorrow and trouble when a good character from the poor may be a consolation to the rich and powerful. There are thousands of Americans in Japan who are earning good wages there under contracts made in the United States. Suppose the Japanese "administration" should order them out of the country under the contract labor law; what would we think of that?

\* \* \*

I wish that some of our immigration laws could be tested by the writ of *Habeas Corpus*. No doubt the government may lawfully prevent the landing of aliens upon its shores; and may for good reasons expel an alien enemy from the country, but after an alien *friend* has landed he becomes a part of the American population. He cannot be deprived of his liberty nor transported without due process of law, including a trial by jury. A few years ago some Irish immigrants after they had landed at Castle Garden were ordered back to Ireland by the "administration" under the plea that they were "*likely to become paupers.*" This breach of hospitality had no sanction in the character of the American people; and that it had any warrant in the Constitution was open to doubt. A suspicion of this appears to have haunted the immigration commissioners, and they appealed for instructions to the Secretary of the Treasury. He decided that those immigrants, although they had been for several days walking about on the main land of America, had not in reality landed. He decided that Castle Garden was constructively a wharf, and the wharf constructively a ship, and that the immigrant actually walking about Castle Garden was not there at all, but constructively out on the briny sea. "The fact that a passenger arrives at Castle Garden," said the Secretary, "does not imply that he has been landed." Certainly not; there is no implication about it. A passenger walking about Castle Garden *is* landed, and the implication that he is on board a ship is a fantastic subterfuge within which may be hidden more serious encroachments upon liberty.

\* \* \*

The reception of the German Emperor in England is the most extravagant and gorgeous demonstration of modern times. In

## CORRESPONDENCE.

CONCLUDING REMARKS IN THE DISCUSSION ON  
FREEWILL.

To the Editor of *The Open Court*:

I THANK you for being so patient with my pertinacity and hope you will kindly continue, because I am not through with the argument yet. I begin to observe some chance of agreement. My only object is to plant monism upon the "Rock of Ages." The doctrine of freewill dies hard like all others which have been a part of us, but they are all dying and no logic can save them. The development of the brain is their executioner. You have nearly killed the doctrine of freewill, but another blow is needed for the finishing stroke. I understand very well what you mean by freewill, but I have to object to the term. You say you use the term because you "trust it is the truest expression of things as they actually are." Now I respectfully say that it is your *trust* that I object to after you have accepted the facts of nature in determinism. When you declare for determinism you have credentials in nature to back you, but when you cross your track and declare for freewill you have none. Another term to express action is certainly needed; one that will not be in conflict with determinism, and that term is, harmonious action by cause. Confusion is here avoided and our logic is clear and straight, because freedom implies that which cannot be affected by causes. Because the earth, for instance, does not meet with any obstacle in its orbit, it would not be logical to say that it is free from cause; if it was free from cause it would not move a peg. When I say that Nature (man is included) is a slave to law I don't mean that its actions are inharmonious like the actions of a slave who is driven by a whip or fear, but I mean that Nature is obliged to work one way and therefore is not free to work any way. And when I say that man is subject to cause in all his actions I don't mean that he is bound to inharmonious actions altogether, but that he is bound to cause whether his actions are harmonious or inharmonious, because cause is a master that we must obey while freedom implies that we need not obey. The falling of a stone is owing to attraction and the condition of the stone; attraction is a cause and the condition of the stone is a cause. The earth could not attract a balloon. To make a stone gravitate to the earth both must be adapted to the result. If a man is to be attracted to a dinner, he must be conditioned for the dinner and the dinner for him. He would not be attracted by a stone, neither would he be attracted by a dinner if he were not hungry. Although hunger is a part of a man at the time, yet it is a condition imposed upon him by nature; he is not free from the cause which makes him eat. There is harmonious action when a hungry man eats, but there is not free action, because he obeys the law of hunger which Nature imposed upon him; if he were free he would not be influenced either by hunger or dinner. Matter affects matter according as it is conditioned by that unit which is within it, so to say that the earth must be conditioned to attract and the stone to be attracted, does not express dualism, because both are conditioned by one power. The conditions of matter are legion, but all proceed from one power that is within. There is no "palpable dualism" in showing that man is subject to the causes of his condition. He sees because he has eyes, hears because he has ears, moves because he has strength, and reasons because he has brains. He does all these because Nature so conditioned him, not because he is free. When it can be logically shown that man can act without constraint, then, and not until then, can it be said that he can act freely. When a man is hungry he is not without constraint, he is constrained to eat by the natural law of hunger a condition which Nature made, not that which he made himself.

JOHN MADDOCK.

[Freedom, as I use the term, and as I have stated repeatedly, does *not* imply that which cannot be affected by causes." Free-

grandeur and expense it resembles the ancient meeting of the kings of England and France on "The field of the cloth of gold." This dazzling pageant is too vast and magnificent for a simple family reunion between English and German royalties. It is a national affair, with the English government behind it; a political demonstration by Lord Salisbury himself, intended as a warning to France and Russia that England will sustain the *Dreibund*. Under the outward form of a welcome to the Emperor, the English nation gives to Germany assurance of support. People who think that the Emperor has just stepped over to attend the wedding of his cousin and to see his grandmother, are innocent of statecraft. France knows better, and so does Russia. The wedding came handy to Lord Salisbury as a family reason for the visit, and he made the most of it. As the Lord Mayor of London uses a gold box in which to tender to the Emperor the freedom of the city, so Lord Salisbury used the wedding as an opportunity to tender to the German Empire an English alliance in the acclamations of the English people. It is notice to the world that war to disturb the treaty of 1871, will not be permitted; and the peace of Europe gets a renewal of its lease. I rejoice in the *Dreibund* as the beginning of European unity; and I wish that France and Russia would join the confederation, to consolidate in a league of mutual friendship the United States of Europe.

\* \* \*

Oliver Twist was arrested again the other day, not in London but in Chicago. At least the tale told in the papers has such a close resemblance to the story of magisterial oppression told by Dickens, that I fancy the victim of it must be the genuine Oliver Twist; and again I see in active operation the municipal machinery by which children are driven devilward. I see the poor child cuffed by the beadle, tormented by the board of guardians, and condemned by the Police Justice, very much as told in the book that aroused my anger when I read it fifty years ago. The pathos in the Chicago story is not created by the imagination of a poet novelist; it springs out of the actual reality of an unjust judgment which by the law of moral retribution must rebound against the great city. Listen to this: On the 8th of July the Mayor of Chicago paid an official visit of inspection to the Bridewell. While he was there a bus load of twenty-six prisoners arrived, and the Mayor was taken over to the receiving room to see what the reporter sarcastically called their "welcome." Sure enough, right in the midst of them was Oliver Twist. The Mayor picked him out in an instant, and recognised him by his innocent face; but perhaps I had better tell the story in the language of the newspaper, thus: "In the batch was an innocent looking youth who was apparently feeling greatly embarrassed over his situation. His actions also indicated that he had never been in a prison before. His despondency and apparently honest face attracted the attention of the Mayor." By inquiring, the Mayor found out that the boy had been sentenced to fifty-three days imprisonment for the abominable crime of—peddling without a license. Listen to the rest of it; he was fifteen years old, born in Hungary; had been six days in America and had begun to earn an honest living as a merchant; his sister, a servant girl, furnishing the capital; he had bought some stationary and was selling it when he was caught in the very act, arrested, and sentenced for the crime. Not understanding a word of English, he could not have been more surprised had the Auditorium tower fallen on him than he was at his imprisonment; and better for him that the tower fall upon him than that he take a fifty-three days course in our college of crime called the Bridewell. The Mayor promptly pardoned him and gave him ten cents to pay his car fare to his sister's home. I wish that the Mayor could be at the Bridewell every day when the bus arrives with its load. Or have somebody else there.

M. M. TRUMBULL.

dom means the absence of compulsion, so that a man acts from motives which are his own. There is no conflict with determinism. We can say that the earth moving round the sun moves freely in space, because it moves according to the law of its motion and is not prevented from moving by some counter-acting force. If in the presence of a dinner there is no restraint upon a hungry man, (if his will is free, as I should say) he will eat it. If there is a restraint upon his will, if his will is not free, he will not eat it. His will is not curtailed in the former case but in the latter. If we call him in the former case the slave of the law of hunger, what shall we call actual slavery when a will is prevented from passing into act or when men are forced to act contrary to their wills? When I speak of free I mean, not under restraint and able to follow one's own impulse (see Webster). I have never used the term "free from cause"; it has been introduced by Mr. Maddock: Since that phrase is meaningless to me, I do not feel called upon to discuss it. Mr. Maddock is right in rejecting it. If Mr. Maddock prefers to call "harmonious action" what we have defined as "free action," we have no objection, although the term, in our opinion, is inappropriate. The action of a man who is not held in subjection to the will of others may be harmonious and inharmonious at the same time, all depends upon the question, Harmonious with what?—P. C.]

## BOOK REVIEWS.

ST. SOLIFER, with other worthies and unworthies. By *James Vila Blake*. Charles H. Kerr & Co., 1891.

A delightful book, and restful to the worried and wearied soul. There are fourteen stories in it, quaintly told like the fables of La Fontaine; and like them, each with a moral humorous and wise. Mr. Blake has caught the knack of story telling in the idiom and style made familiar to us by the old English masters of the art; a style, which, even to imitate well, requires genius, and a cultivated sense of humor.

There is wit of good flavor in the artful puzzles made out of Mr. Blake's imagination, by which a little mental exercise is forced upon us as we wonder and wonder, whether the characters he presents to us are in reality strangers, or old acquaintances clothed in poetical raiment entirely new, and made by Mr. Blake himself, as the boy made the wooden ship, "all out of his own head."

Some of his puzzles are made easy to us by Mr. Blake, after the manner of the riddle-man who kindly helps us to the answer by suggestive hints, nudges, mental telephoning, and clairvoyant winks. For instance, in "A Story from Menleville," beloved old Burton, quaint and wise, is disguised as Meuleville; the "Anatomy of Melancholy" as *Mastitio Incisa*, and Dr. Johnson as Jacquesfils. This gives a French appearance to the story delightfully misleading; but when Mr. Blake, fearing lest we be lost in the puzzle, like the children in the wood, leads us right up to the solution by revealing to us that Meuleville was born at Dindley in Leicestershire, he makes the conundrum too easy altogether. And therein lies a fault.

That fault is not repeated often; far otherwise. In fact, some of the legends purporting to be adaptations from the Zend Avesta and other ancient books, are so cunningly disguised, that our early reading is baffled in the memory. We are never sure the stories are not where they seem to be, nor are we sure that they are not. It is true that in the preface Mr. Blake has placed a signpost warning us where we must not go; but his illusions counteract his warning; and we wander pleasantly along; not certain whether we are in the lawful pathway, or walking on the grass.

There is a little irony sprinkled over the legends; not enough to scald, but enough to make some of our favorite conceits uncom-

fortable to hold. The sprinkling is mercifully done, as if the author himself had once cherished the same conceits, so that we are more flattered by it than annoyed. In many respects these little stories are better than Rudyard Kipling's; and they ought to be widely read.

M. M. T.

NEW THOUGHTS FROM A NEW SYSTEM OF THOUGHT IN THE SCIENCE OF ASSOCIATION, and the Key to disclose the Ideal in the Real, it being the substratum of all intelligence as based on the *Tint*, the *Speckle*, and the *One*. London: W. Reeves, 185 Fleet St., E. C.

This pamphlet must be considered as an excellent parody of certain mystical aspiration to find the solution of the world problems in symbolism. It explains the meaning of colors (for instance: white is the all, red is motion, blue is motive, yellow is mode) and of numbers. The best parts of the pamphlet are the designs. We are presented with symbolic vignettes depicting the seeds of evil, the triumph of comprehension, the triumph of co-operation, the ideal analysis of the internality of an animated primordial molecule, the law of entwinement and many more, all explaining the profundity of "comprehension." The pamphlet is calculated only for the few who are able to receive it. "New Thoughts" the author says, "are daily disclosed to their neglecting New Ideas to the possibility of their consolidating as abats." Sometimes the tone of the little pamphlet is so serious that we are induced to believe the author is as much in earnest as a regular Christian scientist or a metaphysician.

ORIGIN, PURPOSE, AND DESTINY OF MAN; or PHILOSOPHY OF THE THREE ETHERS. By *William Thornton*. Boston: William Thornton

The author calls life the first, heat, light, electricity, etc., the second, and "matter" the third ether. Life was first and at the beginning, being a creation of God—God being the ocean of thought to which all men are indebted for their abilities. The thinking part of man is a loan from the Almighty which he must sooner or later deliver up. The details of the book, how to make medicine a science and the Transmission Theory of Disease show much imagination but little knowledge of facts.

## 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. 203.

EDUCATIONAL REFORM. FELIX L. OSWALD.....	2875
THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL. EDITOR.....	2877
CURRENT TOPICS. America for the Americans. The German Emperor in England. Another Oliver Twist. GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL.....	2880
CORRESPONDENCE.	

Concluding Remarks in the Discussion on Freewill.

[With Editorial Note.] JOHN MADDOCK.....	2881
BOOK REVIEWS.....	2882