

# The Open Court.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Devoted to the Work of Conciliating Religion with Science.

No. 205. (VOL. V.—23)

CHICAGO, JULY 30, 1891.

{ Two Dollars per Year.  
{ Single Copies, 5 Cts.

## COMMUNAL ETHICS.

WITH STUDIES OF AN ENGLISH PRINCE AND AN AMERICAN CABINET MINISTER.

BY MONCURE D. CONWAY.

A SUMMER School of Ethics beside Plymouth Rock is so picturesque that one longs for a Bunyan to interpret it. Plymouth Rock, as we know, is mythical: the little bit of stone in front of Pilgrim Hall which does duty for the Rock, disappoints us because we had swelled it with all the dogmatic stone which the pilgrims imported from the metamorphic world for their daily bread. When one thinks of all the liberalism developed by the descendants of the pilgrims it would be appropriate to inscribe on the Bethel, "Thou makest thy nest in a rock." The gentler religions have always sprung up in reaction against such hard sacrificial systems. Jainism, Parseeism, Buddhism, were nests of the religious affections built in cruel crevices of Brahmanism; Sufism was a nestling on Mahometan, and Unitarianism on Presbyterian Puritanism. All of these movements were results of the moral sentiment, but their seed was sown on theological clouds. The milder deity came, but the régime of the old one remained. Religious culture has raised over us a new heaven, but the corresponding new earth does not arrive. The new moral world awaits the development of ethics related to our new conception of the invisible world. For thousands of years this earth was a mere altar before a universe deemed divine, but now known to be fictitious. These fictions have been largely cleared away, but at the cost of rigidly preserving the moral system based on them. It was necessary for speculative heretics to try and surpass the orthodox in what is popularly called morality, even while this was mainly an inheritance from the theology they were discrediting. It is to be hoped that the lectures and proceedings of the Summer School will be published, so that the country generally may know how far its new ethical teachers are prepared to transfer the moral world from a theological (i. e. fictitious) to a real and rational basis. The urgency of such transfer is continually pressed upon the attention of thinking men by events revealing the ethical confusion of those especially devoted to the moral welfare of society.

If we compare the deity worshiped beside Plymouth Rock two hundred and seventy years ago with the deity of Channing, or of Parker, we must discover that the difference between them is as the difference between the organic and inorganic worlds. The one is a personification of the phenomena and forces of nature uncontrolled by man, and supposed to be working with some purpose in the depths of the universe to which human purposes must be subordinated or sacrificed. The modern theistic deity is a Father, he is Love, Pure Reason; that is, he is Man without limitations. Being without limitations this new deity is without needs. We cannot therefore owe any duty to God. What does he need? If we pray to him it is not to serve him but ourselves. We cannot transgress his laws. Has the Infinite to fence in his private property, or protect his prerogatives? The word "sin," originally meaning violation of divine as distinguished from human laws, can have no application to a being who has no interests or personal enjoyments subject to the will of man. "Sin" can only mean a man's offence against his supreme moral selfhood,—a thing for which he is amenable to his own conscience alone.

Before a new foundation can be laid where one has crumbled the debris of the old must be cleared away. The new moral world involves the removal of all so called duties to God. Duties are solely for those to whom they are due, because they can be benefited by them.

The corollary of all this is that fundamentally there is but one moral law,—Justice. To a civilised community there can be but one social evil,—Injustice. No conduct is rationally punishable that has not demonstrably injured another. In the early stages of social evolution sins (offences against the deity) are punished because of the belief that the sin, if unpunished, may bring divine judgments on the community. Blasphemy could not injure a community except by exciting the wrath of God against it, and for imperilling his neighbors, who to such wrath ascribed calamities, the blasphemer was punished. It was the ignorant application of a right principle. The ignorance having measurably passed away, statutes originally enacted to protect the deity's privileges or interests have survived under the pretext of preserving morality.

But a community has no right to punish immorality. If an individual's conduct can be proved to have damaged another it is not an immorality but a crime,—that is, an injustice. A law that punishes any conduct which has injured nobody, unless the agent himself, is an unjust law. Boccaccio says, "A sin concealed is half pardoned." It sounds dangerous; yet what is it but equivalent to saying, "A transgression of what the majority suppose a moral rule, but by which nobody is injured, is nobody's business." Where anybody is harmed the "sin" is no longer concealed. Thereby it would become a crime, an injustice. Nor can conduct be justly punished on the ground that it may possibly injure others. On that ground offences against God were punished. It was for the supposed tendency of their ideas to injure the community that Socrates and Jesus were assassinated; and, if punishment of conventional immorality be admissible, all attempts to introduce a higher morality might be repressed, and ethical culture or progress rendered forever impossible. Much ancient morality is now immorality, and much that is now popularly deemed moral is immoral to the wise, and allowed to remain only because it can be disregarded at will.

The weakness of the modern community is that the awful sanctions originally devised to protect the rights of God have been alienated from the rights of Man. They have gone to enforce on one man what another thinks he ought to do, but what, in justice to himself and others, he possibly ought not to do. While it was supposed that God had interests apart from man's, but requiring legislative protection from man, these religious laws were much stronger than secular laws. Sacrilege was more severely punished than felony. And we now find the wrath of religious people turned against other peoples' alleged "vices" with such fervor that the actual communal wrongs, the injuries of others, appear venial. The inculcation of ethics has fallen chiefly into the hands of the professional guardians of God's personal and private interests, and if any instance of misconduct elicits their special fulminations it is pretty certain to be one which touches some law supposed "divine" rather than any interest of man. The Prince of Wales recently committed a most dishonorable action. He got from Sir William Gordon Cumming a virtual confession of cheating under pledge of not revealing an incident, which, however, he did reveal. As every other party to the agreement has formally and under oath denied having disclosed it, no vague denials, unsigned and unsworn by the Prince, relieve him of the crime of this virtual assassination of Sir William's reputation. For Sir William's ruin came by his signing the paper. It was a heavy price extorted and paid for silence; the Prince broke silence; he got the confession under

false pretences; he cheated Sir William. Yet this mean injustice, this fraud on another, goes unpunished, and is almost forgotten, through the concentration of pious horror on that part of the Prince's conduct which harms only himself. In all the resolutions passed by religious bodies, and all the sermons, so far as I can learn, only the guilt of card gambling has been rebuked in the Prince. But why card gambling particularly? About the same time the Prince won \$125,000 on a horse race, and no censure was heard. Had he won a million by betting on the rise of a railway stock his shrewdness would be praised. He bets five pounds on a card and Non-conformist England talks of abolishing the throne. His broken faith with Sir William, involving the disgrace of several people is ignored in this blast against card-playing.

The wrong of gambling is its injustice: a man has no right to risk on chance his means of fulfilling his obligations to others; but those who denounce the Prince give no such argument. That their intensity of horror against card gambling is pious prejudice is proved by the indifference to wagers on horses and speculative ventures. Cards are relics of appeals to the goddess Fortune, and still used by fortune-tellers. They were deemed efforts to wrest the determination of events from the hands of Providence. The ideas of either chance or luck are especially heresies to the predestinarian mind. I have serious objections to gambling, but the Prince is equally entitled to hold contrary opinions. There is a law against public gambling, but so there is against working on Sunday; it has nothing to do with what a man chooses to do in his own castle. There is nothing wrong in a man's carrying his bacarat counters or his chess-men on his excursions. In fact the outcry against the Prince on this score is nothing more than a sort of "White Cap" propensity to coerce other people's moral ideas and habits. It is an invasion of personal liberty. The Prince is lucky to have the attack directed against his rights instead of against his wrong to others, in breaking his pledge of secrecy.

This is all the more base because there is no law by which the crime can be reached. And it is just here that the Summer School of Ethics may render good service. Society, long trained to regard offences against God—fictitious offences—as the worst, needs the instruction that its exclusive province is to restrain acts of injustice to others. And because many such injuries cannot be reached by procedures of law it is necessary that the communal sentiment, diverted by lingering superstition against conventional "vices" (which may prove virtues, and at any rate affect only the individual agent) shall be turned against the subtle forms of injustice.

I have drawn from abroad an illustration of the

ethical confusion, left by decaying dogmas. But unfortunately a more deplorable one is before us at home. At the moment when many of our moralists, of pulpit and press, were basing on the Prince's fondness for baccarat a case against monarchy, our own "republic" is involved in a scandal tenfold worse. We have an administration of boasted piety. Our President cannot be persuaded to travel on the "Lord's Day." Our Postmaster General journeys to Philadelphia weekly to superintend a Sunday school. But it is in evidence that a Cabinet Minister, secretly informed of the approaching failure of a bank, kept the secret, and prevented the bank's closure, until he had safely got out his own money and a religious fund of which he was trustee. Others were permitted to go on depositing their money in the concern which was thus able to secure the Cabinet Minister and the Almighty from loss. Having presently discovered that the bank was in the hands of dishonest officers, he does not try to rescue the public by reporting the fact, but uses the secret to blackmail the corrupt officers and induce them to pay him for some stock they declare fraudulent. That he believed the stock genuine was sufficient evidence that those trying to get it from him without payment were bandits, to be instantly denounced. But the Minister offered a bargain of secrecy with them, on condition of receiving payment for the doubtful stock. Had he gambled away his fortune, instead of sacrificing others to save it, he might have been pelted with all the stones crumbled from Plymouth Rock. Our presbyterian president would not have kept him in office. Yet that would have been morality itself in comparison with the game played by this devout suppressor of lotteries, who arranges blanks for his neighbors and prizes for himself, and for a god made in the image of that self. (Reverence requires the spelling of such a god with a small "g.")

The American is far worse than the English case, as a matter of individual morality. As the prince, by breaking his promise, gained nothing and lost a good deal, we may suppose his offence unremediated. But no such palliation can be found for secret transactions carried on through months. And as a national or a communal wrong the prince's offence is trivial as compared with that of our Minister, for this man remains our representative, and we are all involved in his anti-social action. We are responsible for our administration, which adopts and sanctions that action. Had a member of the English government, elected by the people, been guilty of the prince's action, and retained office, the case would be parallel to our own. But nobody ever voted for the prince; he possesses no political power; he cannot claim to represent the nation, nor determine any of its affairs. The fact that no instance of corruption in any member of an English

government is known to recent history is significant. Although England and America are under the same ethical conditions, suffering equal confusion in the transition from a superstitious to a rational moral régime, the former is an old nation, of confirmed habits, of fixed and potent traditions. The course of the country is largely predetermined by foregone ages, and does not depend much on the conduct of its people, much less of any individuals. But our young and changing nation must live, as it were, from hand to mouth; its integrity depends on the virtues of those who manage it, and are making it over and over again. There is a superiority potential in our situation, but it will require much higher ethical standards and forces, and such as are completely humanised, to build in America the new moral world. We have not made much progress. A hundred and fifteen years ago when our revolutionary fathers declared their political independence they straightway proved their moral thralldom by decreeing that there should be no more balls or dances in the city where they sat. It was a conciliation of the Presbyterians. From the same city now comes our Sunday-School Cabinet Minister who compounds for sacrificing public interests to his own by damning all the "sins" he has no mind to. Liberty is still limited by dogma; moral malaria results. The Summer School of Ethics has been too long delayed, but it comes in an hour of sore need. It is to be hoped that these builders of the Golden City will not be found in the same case with some æsthetic pilgrims who journeyed to a distant isle where they would build the beautiful city. The architects and the artists built and decorated the villas, each according to his taste, but, alas, presently the sea bit away the shores, and among all the company none was found who knew how to drive a pile, or build a digue. The Golden City perished for lack of foundations. Transcendental ethics, moral philosophies, are of much interest; but the architects of the Golden City will labor in vain if the common foundation of their varied domes is sinking. When communal justice is ensured, and the whole tribe of embezzlers, bribers, lynchers, (beside whom gamblers, fornicators, drunkards, are virtuous) we may find the nation itself a school of Ethics.

#### BREATH AND THE NAME OF THE SOUL.

BY THE HON. LADY WELLY.

In his article in *The Open Court* for June 11th, upon the discovery of the soul, Prof. Max Müller tells us that if we follow the most revealing of vestiges—those of language—"we shall find that here also man began by naming the simplest and most palpable things, and that here, also, by simply dropping what was purely external, he found himself by slow degrees in possession of names which told him of the existence

of a soul." I venture, not to object or differ, but to ask here certain prior questions which are by most of us more or less begged, but on the answers to which it seems to me depend all our ultimate inferences. What then is the "purely external"? Certainly not the heart or brain, for they are literally internal,—inside the "body." And when by an unexplained wrench of paradox, the early man begins to reckon the content of his skin-boundary (which is the most "purely internal" thing he knows) as "external" why should he ever "drop it" at all? Surely as well "drop" language to think, or colors and paper to paint, or violin and bow to "play"!

However by means of this strange and paradoxical instinct to "drop" the first and foremost and most emphatic reality, the external and internal which are simply as the inside and outside of a nut, we come to the conventional conception of the soul as "an invisible, intangible, immaterial object." But may I suggest that the moment any expression for We, Us, I, Me, began to emerge, they did so simply as the symbols of that personal identity which is the only value of a "soul"? Their appearance, as the philosophical philologist has taught us, was due to that growing self-consciousness which learns more and more clearly to distinguish between owner and owned, between what we have and what we are. The distinction has from the first been provided for by the contrast of I or We and My or Our. Whatever we can properly place after a My or an Our is ipso facto thus relegated to a secondary or derivative place, as a belonging, not a being. Thus we come into sight of what I would suggest as one of the most prolific sources of confusion in that chaos of ambiguity, modern civilised language. Even when we say Our or My Father, Our or My GOD, we invert and cannot help inverting the relation expressed, since Our or My imply as their principal the We or the I. And the fact that we do not notice or intend this no more effects the fact than our not noticing or intending that our retina should invert the position of external objects. Now all modern western words for soul or spirit, even for self, admit the Our or My before them. But so far as we can (if at all) speak of My Ego we are simply degrading that term to the second rank. "I AM that I AM," not what I HAVE. If we want to express that which we ARE that which possesses or uses a self, a soul, a mind, a spirit, a life, a body, and all else which we may be said to *have*, we must use the term Man itself (since only in joke or metaphor can we say Our or My Man) or simply We and Us or I and Me, as we cannot say Our we, Our us, or My Me.

But (it will be objected) as all words to denote what we now call the mental or spiritual or rational can (if analysable at all) be traced back to a material

origin, the We and Us and the I and Me must always have meant primarily that entity which can be felt, which resists, suffers, etc. Thus as the need for distinction grew, a word was wanted for the activity or power which moved "from within" that feeling, or resisting, or suffering entity. "From within" took on the meaning, from it. How then are we to name that which is not merely the "within"—since that implies no difference of nature from the "without"—but something which apparently "lives" inside and sends out "orders"? Prof. Max Müller here gives us what is constantly ignored, the claim of the blood or heart to furnish the first name for the spiritual self or soul. But he goes on to suggest as better still the breath . . . "which went in and out of the mouth and the nostrils." But now comes the question, why? What was it that the primitive mind saw to make it prefer Breath before all other possible terms,—even those of blood or heart which must so constantly have obtruded themselves as the essential marks of life? If we say that this breath was from the first conceived as an object, a thing, like in nature to those which could be taken up in the hand, or on which one could stand, against which one could lean, and so on, then this supposed object was invariably found alternately passing in and out of nostrils and mouth. But do we ever find this idea among the endless complexities of early animism? If such a notion existed—in however elementary a form—it would follow that in the pause after expiring a deep breath, the man's "self" would be supposed to be outside his body, and we should find warnings against hurting the man's spirit which for that moment was sitting somewhere in front of his chest? But do we really mean to credit the early man with thinking that the soul as breath walks in from outside and departs again at every breath? For if so why should it be reckoned as any more within the man during life than without him? It would be all against the grain to ignore the breath as drawn in from outside, and only notice it as coming forth from inside. Experience would be necessarily re-affirming the contrary.

What then shall we postulate as the real reason why breath was chosen as representative of life and identity? The word "chosen" of course does not here involve any intellectual process but rather a sub-conscious automatism, the descendant of that "rhythm of motion" on which Herbert Spencer lays so much stress. In this sense then was not the choice of breath originally owing to its being obviously conspicuous example of the interaction between what we now call "organism" and "environment"? When this "give and take" (which it actually is) ceased, so did the activities of the animal. At all events one thing is plain; we thus come to a possible explanation of the choice of breath (or pulse) as the main term for animal or

vital energy, which, in accordance with the whole drift of modern thought, is given in terms of the dynamic instead of the static. The "spirit" is thus no entity but a rhythm, a beat, a thrill, a sequence of throbs. And this stops instead of departing at death. If we hold that some "immaterial object"—the "psyche"—is inside the body during life and outside it after death, then the infant must have been inflated with a breath-soul at birth and at once well corked down until at the moment of death the cork was drawn and the breath-soul rushed out! But if ideas of this class were of later accretion and the earliest and simplest thought was that not of "dropping" this or that among the conditions of reality in order to acquire a "spiritual" world, but of giving motion and not matter the primary place in trying to express the essential "self" or "soul" of things, then the way is cleared for further inquiry on the same "dynamic" line which may prove to be rich in suggestion even if, as yet, in nothing more.

#### RUSSIA AND THE UNITED STATES.

ONE of our readers in Russia sends us the following translation from a Russian newspaper article. He writes: "I doubt whether you will accept this short note from one of our best Riga papers, *Zeitung für Stadt und Land*. I send it, to give you an idea, that even with us, public feeling is stirred up." We publish the translation of our correspondent, the copy of which was sent to Gen. M. M. Trumbull with the request to add in a few comments what he had to say on the subject.

#### AUDIATUR ET ALTERA PARS.

Public opinion has for the last year undergone a decided change in the United States concerning the unbounded liberty, emphatically praised by the democracy of the whole world, and the good of it, or better the evil consequences, are rightly judged, as being too great and too many. The American people begin to think that it is time to cut the root to all the evils, in this republican paradise—where as might be paraphrased in the words of the author of "Candide": *Tout est bien dans le meilleur des mondes*—healthy and poisonous develop and flourish equally well and strong, as in a hot-house atmosphere. This reaction manifests itself in the emigrant bill of the Union, which aims in the first place at the prohibition or at least restriction of the exodus of Anarchists to America and of all such elements, who have nothing to lose in the wide world and everything to gain by crime. But the law has come too late; the celebrated, heavenly praised liberty of the Union has done its duty, crime has become a part of the whole, an amputation lest the whole organism will come to grief has become impossible. Criminality has become an integral part, an ingredient circulating in the blood of this mighty organism, called the United States of North America, and there is no remedy, no purgative, no disinfectant, no antiseptic to it. A powerful revolution, a catastrophe alone are the *ultima ratio* to change the present state, and this cataclysm will, it must come.

Almost incredible is the power of criminality; look at them from which point you like, beginning with those political canvassers and economic flibusters, who by influencing through temptations of every kind and bribery the polls of voters, rule at Washington's Congress and give the impulse to the mighty state machine, filling their pockets with money, and down again to the lowest grades, that shameless, boasting mob, which under the bloody flag of communism, proclaims the regeneration of society and state by

means of dynamite. It is a mighty realm which American republican liberty has fortified in the course of its evolution to such dimensions, that all healthy and noble aspirations and elements of this great country are prone to succumb in the battle against it. Notwithstanding the very good laws of the greatest Republic in the world, excess of liberty has brought it to utter lawlessness. In no country self-help plays such a prominent role in questions of justice as in the United States. For years and years, in hundreds and thousands of cases, the bowie-knife and the revolver are the means of execution of lynch justice, especially in the southern and western States, where a general lack of confidence in verdicts from the bar are remarkable.

Under such a state of accepted criminality the late dreadful events at New Orleans might be explained, events, which, by the time this is written, can have turned to a serious conflict between Italy and America, and of which the consequences cannot be foretold. The fact that many prominent citizens of the southern capital took a most active part in this act of lynch justice, is very striking and illustrative for southern lawlessness. The massacre of foreigners, whose crime was not proved, and five others, who had nothing to do with Hennessy's death, reminds one of the time of the Paris commune, with this difference, that it took place in a great American town in the last decennium of the 19th century, and was directed by the citizens against the integrity, the holiness of an institution, sacred in the rest of the civilised world—a judge. Where is the corruption? will truth unveil the motives? It might be an expression of public opinion to upset at last an utterly rotten bench of judge and jury. In such a case judge Lynch has proved, that the time has come, where cowards, who fear for their lives, by proclaiming murder as murder, ought to be done away, unless State government in America is to be broken to pieces, and society submitted to a miserable state of lawlessness, and its existence is only a question of time.

With great anxiety the whole civilised world looks to America; McKinley's bill has not produced half the emotion that now vibrates in the old world, since this mournful news reached us from New Orleans.

*Justitia fundamentum regnorum*—we hope, that the epigones of George Washington will remember this eternal truth.

#### REMARKS BY GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL.

A friendly critic in Russia grieving over the political and moral decay of the American Republic and answering our censure of Russian tyranny by the admonition, "Physician, heal thyself," presents us with a wholesome antidote to national self-righteousness; a corrective, which though bitter to the taste, may do us good.

While our politicians are bidding for the Israelite vote by resolutions denouncing Russian proscription of the Jewish people; and while the rigidly righteous assembled in humanitarian convention at Philadelphia implore the American government to interfere in behalf of the Nihilists and other political prisoners in Siberia, a Russian moralist and scholar, from the political darkness of Livonia, not in anger but in sorrow, deploras the corruption of American politics, the time-serving and self-seeking of our statesmen, and the irrational, capricious, and revengeful Czarism of Populus Americanus. This Russian by the Gulf of Riga, first mixes a little tincture of iron with the scriptural rebuke, and then prescribes it for Populus, "cast out first the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to pull out the mote that is in thy brother's eye." And Populus must drain the chalice to the dregs.

While the Russian critic sees more clearly than many Americans can see the pustulous pimples on the face of the American body politic, and while also he perceives with remarkable clearness for a foreigner the inside inflammation of which those im-

purities are outward signs, he goes too far when he says that crime has become an integral part of us, an ingredient of our national blood. There is not yet in the American situation, nor in the American character that spiritual stupefaction which can only be thrown off by a "powerful revolution." The mental and moral energies of the American people will not grow tired for a thousand years to come; and these will reform the state by an evolutionary process without calling for help on a "cataclysm."

There are millions of Americans who will sympathise with even Russian censure of those "political canvassers and economic filibusters" who influence voters by bribery, and who gamble with ballots for office and pelf. They will not listen with patience to the doctrines of those red reformers who "proclaim the regeneration of society and the state by means of dynamite." They will accept some of the Russian criticism but they will not concede the "utter lawlessness" of American society, nor that the Americans have become savages through "excess of liberty." There is a good deal of liberty in America as there is of wealth; but like wealth, liberty is unequally distributed; and many of the evils deplored by our Russian friend, result not from the excess but from the scarcity of liberty.

As to the New Orleans affair, it was a savage thing, an ignominious thing; and our pride must bend under the scorn of the Tartar and the Cossack, who pointing to New Orleans exult in their own higher civilisation. Out of the controversy with Italy we did not come with glory, for we made our diplomatic escape by breaking a hole through the wall of our own citadel. In extenuation of the New Orleans madness we may fairly plead that it is not the habit of Americans to overthrow with violence the verdicts of juries and the judgments of courts, even when those judgments are ignorant and unjust. The high caste anarchy at New Orleans was not a fair specimen of American public temper.

#### POLYANDRY, PROMISCUITY AND SURVIVAL.

BY SUSAN CHANNING.

THE critic, in *The Open Court* of May 28, in arraigning the facts in my article, "The New Ethic of the Sexes," errs in maintaining "there is no testimony that tribes addicted to polyandry reared no children," and that "the testimony of science concerning these assertions is, as far as known to-day, that all people started alike in universal promiscuity," etc.

Of course all evolutionists must admit that all organised life at first united with the opposite sex as blindly and unconsciously as the magnetic needle turns to the pole, or, as the crystal shapes itself into proper form, or, as ships roll towards each other in a calm. But this state of things must have been short-lived. Instinct, whose very essence is to act without reason, and which at first ruled animal man despotically, was soon developed into a directing force or brain. As Professor Draper says in his "Conflict of Science and Religion," "What we call spirit sleeps in the stone, dreams in the animal and awakes in man." Chastity is instinctive in the race. In primeval man this instinct must have been stronger than in civilised man, for it is recognised by all anthropologists that the advance of man in intellectual power is too often but retrograde in his instincts.

Darwin maintains that man had reached quite a step in civilisation before he thought of enslaving woman. The female, he says, has no weapons of defence and yet she has been able to survive.

Males, from the first, must have treated her with great tenderness, kindness, and deference, and have respected her choice of mate, for, although most females yield to the stronger wooer, and the one best able to protect her, she has often mated with the weaker. Sexual congress therefore in primeval times had its elements of chivalry and love.

The origin of the marriage tie, as Darwin points out in his

"Descent of Man," (pp. 590-591), has been best and most carefully studied, by McLennan, Sir John Lubbock, and Morgan. But there is great divergence of opinion among these authors upon several points. Darwin differs from them in their belief in communal marriages, and advances the following argument in support of his belief: "The strength of the feeling of jealousy all through the animal kingdom and particularly among those nearest to man induces me to believe that absolute promiscuity never existed; the Orang is monogamist, as are the Indian and American Monkeys; therefore, looking far enough back in the stream of time, and judging from the social habits of man as he now exists, the most probable view is that, he aboriginally lived in small communities, each with a single wife, or, if powerful, with several, whom he jealously guarded from all other men."

"Filiial, parental and conjugal affection are virtues which have existed in every gregarious association. These qualities were possessed by our progenitors before the development of language, before the separation of the foot and the hand. For, in order that the offspring may be produced two animals must enter into partnership, and in order that the offspring may be reared this partnership must continue a considerable time. All living creatures of the higher grade are memorials of conjugal affection and parental care."—Winwood Reade.

My critic finds, in the language of the Chinese and others, that there exist terms as "fossil-relic, which proclaim polyandry and promiscuity as the past condition of the society in which they were coined." The fossil-relics of a language may confirm anthropological data, but not correct it, just as the coins of a people may confirm history, but cannot correct it. It is as useless to attempt to interpret the past of our race by appealing to the fossil terms of languages, as it is to appeal to the etymological meaning of certain words which rose to the surface ages ago, and which have been changing their meaning from century to century so that now they express the very opposite of what they originally meant. In the study of the fossil-relics of a language "the danger of mistaking metaphoric for primary igneous rocks is much less in geology than in anthropology."—F. Max Müller.

"What terms and what conceptions are truly primitive would be easy if we had an account of truly primitive men. But there are sundry reasons for suspecting that existing men of the lowest type forming social groups of the simplest kind, do not exemplify men as they originally were. Probably most of them, if not all, had ancestors in a higher state."—Herbert Spencer.

There is no adequate evidence that the lowest savages have always been as low as they are now. However that may be, as Geddes says, in his "Evolution of Sex," "we cannot determine the past of our race by appealing to the practices of the most degenerate savages and races." The extinction of the people of vast regions of the earth within the last three centuries, notably in New Caledonia, West India islands, Cape of Good Hope, Australia, New Zealand, and Van Diemensland, is due to the causes I have pointed out, and not to the pressure of the stronger races. These people were incapable of supporting civilisation with its vices. And we too, as Galton asserts in his "Hereditary Genius," "the foremost people in creating this civilisation, are beginning to show ourselves incapable of keeping pace with our own work."

We maintained and still maintain that families and nations become extinct simply from the absence of chaste customs. Some men and some women, like some savages, fail to trace the multiplied evils consequent upon the want of virtue in youths and chastity in the married. If they had read Dr. Henry Maudsley on the "Physiology and Pathology of the Mind," Bebel's book entitled "Woman," Geddes on "Evolution of Sex," Bumstead on "Venereal Diseases," Lecky's "European Morals," and "The Criminal," by Havelock Ellis, and studied the history of prostitution in modern Europe, they would have seen that *virtue* is the

key-stone of the social arch, that the family is the archetype of the State, and that from it has sprung justice. The modern sociologist has found that he cannot abolish the family and the laws of inheritance, for unless a man be married to one woman and one land and remain faithful to them, and be allowed to retain the product of his labors while he lives and to leave at least the major portion of it to his children there will be no effective desire to save, and tribes and clans would never have developed into Nations. To labor for the State and for Humanity has a far reaching sound, but like the sonorous sound of the ocean it means nothing more in the mouth of the average man than the bursting of air-bubbles. To the man of ample knowledge, great intellect and heart it means much. Humanity in his mind is associated with the vast antiquity of the race; in memory he is able to recall its past with all its scenes of strife, horror, and desolation; the relics of magnificent empires awake in him feelings of awe and dread, but his enthusiasm is kindled when he remembers that matter and its inherent spirit are eternal, that there never was a creation, that creation is only a conjunction of atoms, a mixing up of things which have always existed, and destruction a dissolution; that man on this planet is immortal "until chaos comes again." "The grandest system of civilisation has its orbit and may complete its course, but not so the human race, to which just when it seems to have reached its goal the old task is ever set anew with a wider range and a deeper meaning."—Mommson.

Therefore a man of understanding and thought accepts and acts up to the beautiful sentiment first uttered by the haughty Roman aristocrat, Marcus Livius Drusus, that nobility constituted obligation, and like him turns away from the venality of his age and becomes its martyr in fighting against the tyranny of capital and in endeavoring to lighten the burdens of his fellow citizens. But it is not given to every man to be an idealist and a philosopher, hence the rank and file in the battle of life must be spurred into action by such words as the great Bruce addressed to his brave Scottish bow-men and pike-men at the battle of Bannockburn, "Men! To-day you fight for your country, your wives, your children, and all that a freeman holds dear." The down-fall of the Greek was due to his lax notion of the sex relation. As I pointed out in my article, after the defeat of Persia, marriage became unfashionable and was avoided by ambitious and accomplished women who became avowed courtezans and consequently infertile. Galton gives ample evidence in all his writings of the extinction of some of the greatest families in England from this very cause. The early Lord Chancellors he found left few children; most of them died childless. It was the custom in their day, says Lord Campbell, when a man was elevated to the wool-sack, to either part from his mistress or marry her, and to their honor be it said, most of them acted the man and made "honest women" of their former companions. But this restoration to respectability did not, as a rule, enable these wives to become mothers. As mistresses they had avoided the duties of maternity; as wives they could not restore their destroyed function.

Mr. Stead, in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, tried to do England a real service. He saw what her statesmen thirty years ago saw when they passed their "Disease Act," that something must be done to save the nation's soldiers and sailors from the results of their illicit relations, for these men were being disabled every year by tens of thousands. The poor, unfortunate women who herded in the sea-port and barrack towns of England at that time called themselves the "Queen's women" to indicate their sanitary condition. But, though they were subjected under the provisions of this Act to the most careful medical surveillance, they could not be kept free from syphilitic taint, and England in disgust soon repealed the Act, from the conviction that the violation of the fundamental laws of the sex relation imposed penalties which no medical skill could counteract.

We have never seen the argument advanced, but to our mind there is no better evidence that primitive man was monogamous, than the fact that syphilis was entirely unknown prior to 1494. It appeared in Italy in the latter part of that year at about the time that Charles VIII, King of France, entered Naples at the head of a large army. It struck terror into the heart of the troops by whose license and debauch it had been developed, for the most skillful physicians were unable to dissipate the symptoms of the new disease, and it soon spread all over Europe.

The sex question, as Geddes says, has been so much skirted, even naturalists have beaten about the bush in seeking to solve it. It is the custom to mark off the sexual function as a fact altogether *per se*, modesty defeats itself in prurency, and good taste runs to the extreme of putting a premium upon ignorance. But, every wise law giver both before and since Moses's time has looked this question squarely in the face and has declared that no nation is safe where licentiousness is tolerated. Mahomët, though he lived in a polygamous land was faithful to his old wife. He removed the facility of divorce by means of which an Arab could at any time repudiate his wife; he also abolished and rendered for ever hateful infanticide. This one man created the glory of his nation because he had the wisdom that springs from chastity. No sensuous man ever interpreted life correctly. It has been well said that the position which women hold in a country is, if not a complete test, yet one of the best tests of the progress it has made in civilisation. "Great material, intellectual and moral progress has in every country been accompanied with greater respect for women, and by a greater freedom accorded to them, and a fuller participation on their part in the best work of the world." [Bryce's "American Commonwealth," book ii, chap. 5.] It is true that we need a higher justice, a justice that will teach the rich man to follow Shakespeare's advice:

"Take physic, Pomp  
Expose thyself to feel the woes that wretches feel,  
So shalt thou shake the superflux to them;  
And show the heavens more just."

We want a justice, as Lord Coleridge said not long ago, that will revise the laws relating to property in order to facilitate all peoples' inevitable transition from feudalism to democracy, towards which, as Bryce says, all nations are travelling, some with slower, but all with unresting feet. But what we most need is the justice of justice. *Equality of virtue.*

#### CURRENT TOPICS.

THE "Jew" question is up again; this time in the form of a complaint by *The American Hebrew* against the publishers of the *Century* dictionary for its offensive definition of the word "Sheeny." Here is the opaque way in which the dictionary defines the word: "Sheeny, (origin obscure,) A sharp fellow, hence a Jew; a term of opprobrium, also used attributively. (Slang.)" The phrase "origin obscure," is the awkward apology of the dictionary maker for not knowing anything about the word, and a complacent insinuation that as the origin of the word was unknown to him, therefore it must be unknown to everybody else. His experimental guess at the meaning of it shows what a dictionary man can do with a word that he does not understand, "a sharp fellow, hence a Jew." Not the slightest etymological hint is given why "Sheeny" means a sharp fellow, nor why "sharp fellow" means a Jew. The insulting word is derived from *chien*, the French for dog, a pet name which for ages was given by the Christians to the Jews. In the gorgeous novel *Ivanhoe*, the insulting epithet is freely given to the meek and long suffering Isaac of York. Even that paragon of Christian chivalry, the haughty Templar, Brian de Bois Guilbert, can say nothing more courteous to Isaac than "Jew dog," and "Unbelieving dog." In the nations of the east,

"Sheeny" means a Christian, and the complimentary name by which an American or a European is saluted in Mohammedan countries is "Christian dog." Thus the law of retaliation travels round the world; and hate begets hate, and wrong begets wrong.

\* \* \*

In one of the pictorial papers is a picture of Mr. Blaine as a diplomatic Samson armed with a club, and surrounded by the prostrate rulers of Germany, England, Italy, and various other countries, who have all been overthrown by this imaginary champion of the world, the essence of Bismark, Gladstone, and Cavour, condensed into one Herculean statesman. That kind of pictorial swagger would be very imposing if its anticlimax were not continually bobbing up in the form of some international triumph like that which the United States of America has just obtained over Frank Sherman, formerly of Milwaukee in the State of Wisconsin. Frank is a lad who wandered away to New York, and there got a job of taking care of cattle on the "Nederland," bound from that city to Antwerp. From Antwerp he went to London, but finding no employment there he became homesick, and homesickness is a disease which appeals with rare magnetic force to human sympathy. It is a virtuous complaint, either in boy or man. Frank had no money, so rather than starve in London, he stowed himself away on board the National liner "England," and when discovered worked his passage to New York. He was detained at the barge office about a week, and then the acting Commissioner of Immigration ponderously decided that he must be driven from his native land, and taken back to London. In vain the boy pleaded that he was an American, and begged that he might be allowed to go to his mother in Chicago. His plea availed not, and sentence of transportation for life was solemnly pronounced against him; not by a court, nor on the verdict of a jury, but on the despotic and arbitrary whim of an acting Commissioner of Immigration. In violation of the Constitution of the United States, this friendless and bewildered lad was doomed to perpetual expatriation for the gratuitous and illegal reason that "no decent American boy would stow away on a ship." Mr. Justice Shallow himself was too deep to give so small a reason for so large a punishment. Suppose that when the boy reaches London, the English Commissioner of Immigration refuses to receive him, on the ground that he is an American emigrant, having no means, and likely to become a pauper, or a contract laborer, or some other wicked thing. Suppose the Commissioner over these orders him back to America. Then, in this puerile game of battledore and shuttlecock the lad will have to spend the remainder of his life in traveling back and forth from New York to London and from London to New York.

\* \* \*

It affords me great pleasure to say by way of a postscript, that the judgment against Frank Sherman has been reversed, and the prisoner set at liberty. Two or three weeks ago I expressed a wish in *The Open Court* "that some of our immigration laws might be tested by the writ of *Habeas Corpus*." The hint was not lost, for as soon as Frank Sherman's case became known in New York a public spirited local paper—I am sorry I do not know the name of it—resolved to apply the test in his behalf. Accordingly the necessary steps were taken, the papers made out, and application was about to be made to the Supreme Court for the writ, when the Acting Commissioner of Immigration surrendered; like the coon, who perceiving the famous marksman Col. Martin Scott about to fire at him, came down from the tree and gave himself up, remarking to the Colonel that he need not fire. Surely it must have been some Acting Commissioner of Immigration who provoked the contempt of Shakespeare for those tyrannical officials, who "clothed with a little brief authority play such fantastic tricks before high heaven as makes the angels weep."

It is a matter of national pride to the people of Bulgaria that the assassins of that country are very polite and gentlemanly men. A short time ago M. Constantine Belcheff, the Minister of Finance was unskillfully shot and killed while walking in the streets of Sofia in company with M. Stambuloff the Prime Minister. It was thought at the time that M. Belcheff was the victim of mistaken identity, and this belief has been confirmed by the following apology which has been carved on his tomb-stone, "Forgive us, we aimed at Stambuloff and struck you. The second time we will not fail." This explanation which ought to be satisfactory to the spirit of M. Belcheff, will have a tendency to make M. Stambuloff uncomfortable. And how do those affable assassins know that at the second attempt they will not fail? This promise is a feeble assurance to any other friend of M. Stambuloff who may be in the habit of walking with him in the streets of Sofia. The mistake reminds me of the winter of 1867 when we occupied St. Louis, and that city was under martial law. It was the duty of the patrol guard to scour the city and arrest all soldiers found out of barracks after nine o'clock at night. The saloons usually furnished a goodly number of delinquents, and it was a common practice for some of them to break away from the patrol. Then the guard would fire at them, generally missing the fugitives, and hitting a citizen or two. This caused the newspapers to request the commanding general to furnish blank cartridges for the patrol guard, or—better marksmen. The assassins of Bulgaria will do well to make a note of this, and take a course of instruction in a shooting gallery before they fire again at the Prime Minister.

M. M. TRUMBULL.

---

## 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. 205.

|  |      |
|--|------|
| COMMUNAL ETHICS. With Studies of an English Prince and an American Cabinet Minister. MONCURE D. CONWAY.....      | 2891 |
| BREATH AND THE NAME OF THE SOUL. THE HON. LADY WELBY.....  | 2893 |
| RUSSIA AND THE UNITED STATES. With Remarks by GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL.....   | 2895 |
| POLYANDRY, PROMISCUITY AND SURVIVAL. SUSAN CHANNING.....   | 2896 |
| CURRENT TOPICS. The Meaning of Sheeny. Sherman the Stowaway. The Courtesy of Assassins. GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL..... | 2897 |