

223

The Open Court.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Devoted to the Work of Conciliating Religion with Science.

THE
NEWBERG
LIBRARY
CHICAGO

No. 216. (VOL. V.—34)

CHICAGO, OCTOBER 15, 1891.

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

A CRUMBLING CORNER-STONE.

BY CHARLES K. WHIPPLE.

THE assumption that Jesus of Nazareth was and is the Christ is the corner-stone of Christianity; and the buttress of this corner-stone is the claim that, after dying on the cross, Jesus returned to bodily life by the exercise of his own will and power. Are these assumptions firm enough to support the superstructure raised upon them? Or do they themselves fail to be supported by either facts or probabilities?

Up to the time when Jesus began his ministry, the meaning, and the only meaning, of the epithet Christ or Messiah was a personage not already existing, but expected some time to appear in Palestine, there to accomplish certain things predicted by Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, namely:

Deliverance of the children of Israel from Roman and all other oppressors; the assembling of all of that race in the land of Palestine, and the permanent establishment of them there in peace and prosperity, under the rule of a descendant of their famous king David. This, I repeat, was the real meaning, and the only recognised meaning of the word "Christ" when it was asked respecting John and Jesus—Is not this the Christ?

Not only have these minutely specified and oft repeated predictions of three of the chief Hebrew prophets never been fulfilled, not only has no such Messiah ever appeared, but the history of the Jews since that time has reversed every one of the specific predictions in question. Far from having been delivered from oppression, the Jews have never ceased to be oppressed, even to the present day. Instead of having been collected in Palestine, they have ceased to be a nation, and have been scattered more widely than ever among all nations. Instead of having a ruler of their own, of Davidic stock or other, they are vassals of other rulers all over the world.

Since the Jewish people remain thus scattered and oppressed, it is plain that no such Davidic ruler and deliverer has appeared, and plain therefore that Jesus of Nazareth was not that personage. If the title Christ or Messiah, bearing a new signification, and in utter disregard of its original and appropriate meaning, has been fastened upon him, those who thus pervert it must justify themselves as they can; but it is certain

that the prophecies in question remain unfulfilled, and that the claims of Christians in regard to accomplished Messianic prophecies are false, misleading, and utterly without foundation as far as the three great prophets above mentioned are concerned. Jesus can be claimed as the Christ of their predictions only by disregarding and reversing their manifest meaning, and the understanding of them current in the time of Jesus himself.

The claim which may truly be made in regard to Jesus is that his teaching not only made needed modifications in the doctrines of the Jewish faith, not only excelled that system by emphasising that spiritual part of it which had been neglected and undervalued by the official teachers of Israel, but that it formulated such great religious truths, and gave such an eminent example of practical adherence to them, that the nations called civilised have felt constrained to profess allegiance to him, and to accept as the true religion that which claims him as its leader and ruler. It is plain, moreover, that the spiritual truths declared by Jesus have given us a far higher and juster idea of God, and have accomplished a vastly greater welfare for human beings than the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies would have done.

The religious system now recognised as Christianity, (founded on the claim set forth in Paul's epistles that Jesus was really the Christ,) and the creeds and customs of the Christian churches of the present day, show material differences from the body of religious truth taught by Jesus. The dogmas on which those creeds and customs are founded are merely such "traditions of the elders" as Jesus stigmatised in the system conducted by the scribes and Pharisees of his time. And when, in our own day, Tolstoi claims that those who pretend to be "followers" of Jesus ought to live as he lived and obey in their daily lives the most characteristic of his precepts, it is pre-eminently the Christians who denounce and oppose him.

One special feature of all the Christian churches is that they follow Paul in making more account of the death of Jesus than of his life or his teaching. It is true that they praise his teaching, even while they notoriously fail to follow it; and that they call him Lord and Master, while their daily lives disregard both his precepts and his example. But that upon which they lay most stress in propagandism is the doc-

trine that Jesus died on the cross as an atonement for their sins, and that occurrences so wonderful and so unexampled as his spontaneous resumption of life and appearance in the body to his disciples amounts to proof of such divinity that it entitles him to be received by all mankind as Lord and Master.

The question now arising is—Did the wonderful and unexampled occurrence so claimed really occur? Did Jesus really die on the cross, or was this statement as void of foundation as the claim that he accomplished the work assigned to the Messiah by the Hebrew prophets?

The best statement of evidence in regard to this subject I have ever seen has been furnished by a French author, who prefaces his investigation by the question—How came Mary Magdalene to think, when Jesus spoke to her, that he was the gardener? The true answer obviously is that he was dressed in the gardener's clothes. His own clothes, the Evangelists tell us, were divided among the Roman soldiers, and his body, supposed to be dead, was wrapped in a linen cloth by Joseph of Arimathea, in whose tomb it was to be placed, with the assistance, as John's gospel tells us, of Nicodemus, who brought spices to embalm him. The question now is—How came the living body of Jesus, which Mary Magdalene saw after the crucifixion, to have the gardener's clothes on?

The narratives of the Evangelists leave no doubt that Joseph and Nicodemus applied themselves Friday afternoon to the work of embalming the body, which could not be lawfully done on Saturday, the Sabbath. If, under their hands, in the process of washing and anointing, the supposed corpse revived, showing that it was in a swoon, and not dead, when it was taken from the cross, what could they do with the awakened Jesus? The first thing to be done was to clothe him; and the readiest means for that purpose were the clothes of Joseph's gardener, in whose house, adjoining, he would probably be placed for shelter, concealment, rest, and food. How otherwise can we account for the statement in John's Gospel that Mary Magdalene, looking upon her intimate friend Jesus, and after hearing his voice, supposed him to be the gardener?

Those who accept the theory current among Christians that the death on the cross was real, and the revivification miraculous, are wont to lay great stress on the closing and sealing of the sepulchre by request of the chief priests and by the order of Pilate. But in Matthew's Gospel we find that even the request for this sealing was not made until some time on Saturday, the Sabbath. From the entombment on Friday afternoon then to the execution of Pilate's order for sealing the sepulchre some time on Saturday, Joseph and Nicodemus were free to make such arrangements as were needful for the awakened Jesus, to clothe,

shelter, warm, and nourish him, and to conceal him both from priestly enemies and from Roman soldiers.

It is commonly assumed also that the spear-wound in the side gives absolute assurance that Jesus was already dead; whereas, on the contrary, the flowing blood gave proof that, though insensible, he was still alive. A dead body does not bleed when wounded.

Of the precise time when Jesus recovered consciousness of course no one knew but Joseph and Nicodemus; and equally of course there was every reason why they should keep silence respecting it until Jesus had decided in regard to his own course. He was probably at rest in the gardener's hut on the estate of Joseph of Arimathea in which was the sepulchre, while his enemies supposed themselves to be securing the prison of his dead body. But when, very early on Sunday morning, Mary Magdalene came to finish the work of embalment, Jesus felt sufficiently restored to accost her, and to send brief information of his survival to the other disciples. His next appearance to any of them seems to have been on the road to Emmaus, when, weary with the long walk, and hungry, he supped with two of them who, like Mary Magdalene, failed at first to recognise him in the gardener's clothes. Afterwards it is related that he made his way to a place where the eleven apostles were assembled, and there again asked for food. A third occasion of his meeting some of them was on the shore of the sea of Tiberias, where he ate with them of the fish which they had caught.

Thus it appears that, at every interview of the revived Jesus with his disciples, he took food with them. This was first, no doubt, because travelling on foot in an enfeebled state, he was necessarily hungry; and then because it was really needful to dissipate their superstitious fears by showing that he was not a ghost, but a mortal needing food and drink like themselves.

Had Jesus really possessed the deific character ascribed to him by the popular Christian traditions he might have openly appeared, confounding both Jews and Romans by the obvious exercise of supernatural power, and causing his disciples to triumph in sight of their opponents. But he evidently avoided those opponents, held himself apart from the general population, both friends and enemies, and held only short and rare interviews even with those who had been most intimate with him.

To sum up, the theory of the anonymous Frenchman above sketched has the advantage of accounting better than any other, for several statements in the Gospel narratives, namely:—it explains the strangeness, at which Pilate himself wondered, of apparent death so soon succeeding crucifixion; it shows that the spear-wound after apparent death did not prove

the death actual, while, on the contrary, the effusion of blood proved the continuance of life ; it shows the worthlessness, as evidence, of that sealing of the sepulchre which was done only after the resuscitated Jesus had left it ; it explains, without miracle, the absence of a dead body from the tomb on Sunday morning ; it explains why Mary, and afterwards Cleopas and his companion, and still later some of the eleven apostles, did not recognise the resuscitated Jesus when they saw him ; it explains why, after his revival. Jesus held himself aloof not only from the chief priests, scribes, and pharisees, but also from that populace of Jerusalem who had so lately shouted hosannas before him, hailing him as the son of David, because they expected him to assume the throne and the regal authority of David ; it explains that reality of his bodily presence of which he felt obliged repeatedly to offer proof to Thomas and others ; and it explains that hunger, the relief of which is three times recorded after his supposed death.

As to a final disappearance of Jesus by the ascent of his body of flesh, blood and bone into the air in sight of his disciples, our French writer notices that this ascension is reported only by Mark and Luke, who were not there, having become converted to Christianity only years after. John and Matthew, who might have testified as eye-witnesses if the occasion had really taken place, do not mention it. And he adds, The writers of the Gospels have told us what they really believed about these things ; but their narrative itself demonstrates that they believed without either serious examination or scientific proof. They judged by appearances, in an age which was accustomed to believe strange things miraculous.

Since the credible accounts of the appearance of Jesus after his crucifixion represent those events as few, and as soon finished, it is probable that his actual death soon followed. How and when this took place was probably known to Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus ; but since they did not reveal it, this information is hopelessly lost. Why, indeed, should they reveal it ? Disappointed in their expectation of a Messiah, knowing the rumor of a resurrection to be erroneous, and liable to reproach and punishment if their concealment of the life of Jesus after his entombment should become known, it was both natural and probable that they should keep silence.

The official defenders and eulogists of Christianity, assuming the reality of a fulfilment by Jesus of the predictions of Hebrew prophecy, of his death on the cross and his resurrection afterwards, confidently claim that religion to be divinely authorised, and thus assured of steady increase, permanence, and ultimate universality. Its present prosperity seems assured by the number, zeal and assiduity of its officials engaged

in the work of propagandism. The statistics given in their publications, unless carefully scrutinised, give an impression of enlargement and prosperity ; but sundry existing facts throw grave doubts upon the ultimate success of their efforts.

If, as above suggested, there be no basis of fact for the claims, either of a fulfilment of the Messianic function by Jesus, or of his death on the cross, or of a return of his body from death to life, a system which rests on these unfounded assumptions as its cornerstone can neither rationally claim divine origin nor expect ultimate success. The time is past, never to return, when either State or Church could prevent free inquiry on all subjects, and free criticism by the voice and the press. The thorough examination of church creeds and church customs now taking place everywhere must necessarily cause their revision, abridgment and simplification, and tend to bring them more and more into harmony with truth and fact. And the prospect seems to be that a gradual decay of Christianity (the assemblage of doctrines which have clustered around the Christ-theory) will leave a better field for the influence of those two great truths, the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man, in which the great Teacher Jesus summed up his doctrine.

The statistics of religion and theology, of late more accurately collected and recorded than ever before, give small encouragement to those who claim prosperity and predominance for the system founded on recognition of Jesus as the Christ.

Of the 1200 millions of the world's population, 390 millions are nominally Christian. Less than one-third of them, perhaps 110 millions, are Protestants, and these Protestants declare the Christianity of the others to be seriously defective, both in regard to faith and practice. The Protestants in the United States number 30 millions, but of these only 9 millions are church-members or communicants, that is, Christian in the meaning assumed to be the correct one by the clergy and the churches. But since these 9 millions of actual Christians are divided among forty-five sects, which seem to insist more on their distinctive and divisive peculiarities than either on the beliefs which they hold in common or the purpose they pursue in common, they surely cannot have the efficiency of an army under a single leader. Their character as churches militant is shown rather by their contests with each other than by united warfare against the vice and ignorance everywhere around them. Holding very diverse and often opposite opinions, they all refer to the Bible as their rule, and as the only and sufficient rule of life and duty. And yet this assumed allegiance to the Bible, far from tending to unite the five varieties of Presbyterians, eight of Baptists and twelve of Methodists, actually helps to keep them

separated. Investigation and criticism, though opposed by a majority of the clergy, are constantly tending towards still further division. Thus, contact with American ideas has caused division even among Roman Catholics; and the Episcopal church, ranked as one among the forty-five above-mentioned, has its practical division into High, Broad, Low and Reformed.

Critical investigation, as I have said, is now pursued in all civilised countries more persistently than ever. Nevertheless, so far has clerical teaching effected a popular distrust of reason in reference to religion, that an immense majority of the church-members in this country still hold firmly to beliefs which research, scientific and literary, has thoroughly disproved; such, for instance, as the unitary character and divine inspiration of the Old and New Testaments.

If the foundation fails, what will become of the edifice? If the corner-stone crumbles, what will avail the claim that the building was founded on a rock?

THE CORNER-STONE OF CHRISTIANITY.

MR. CHARLES K. WHIPPLE'S article "A Crumbling Corner-Stone" suggests the questions: What is the corner-stone of Christianity? What in general are the corner-stones of such religious institutions as is the Church? and also, What is the corner-stone of Religion?

Life is development and history brings changes. What was Christianity at the beginning, when the first congregation of Christians was founded at Jerusalem? What did Christianity become under the influence of the Apostle St. Paul? What did it become in Alexandria, in Constantinople, and what in Rome? What did it become among the Franconians, what among the Saxons in Great Britain, what among the Saxons in Germany? How does the Christianity of the Nicene Council differ from that of Pope Gregory the Great, and how does Pope Gregory's Christianity differ from Luther's? And in fine what resemblance to these many conceptions has the Christianity of a modern savant who has imbibed all the knowledge of the nineteenth century without being willing to give up the spiritual treasure of the Christian tradition which has become holy to him?

Christianity in all these phases is sometimes as different as black and white. And if we ask the different representatives of all these many conceptions "What really is the salient feature of Christianity?" they will make and they did make most prominent their special vagaries. Original Christianity was communism and when Ananias and his wife Sapphira kept secretly back a part of the money which they had received for the sale of a possession of theirs, they were declared to have committed the greatest sin imaginable—to have

tempted the spirit of the Lord; and their sudden death was considered as sufficient proof that God had condemned them. The report in the Acts (chap. v) is too mythical to derive any conclusions from it; yet if there is some fact in the account, it might have been a similar event as happened in the case of Arius, who taught that Jesus had been a most perfect man and that therefore he deserved divine honors. He was not equal to God, but like God, i. e. similar to him, not *δμοούσιος* but *ὁμοιούσιος*. Arius suffered from a fatal disease and it happened that he died suddenly as soon as he had recanted his so-called errors. Had he died as suddenly before recanting what a strong argument would it have been for the imputation that he committed the sin against the Holy Ghost.

David Friedrich Strauss devoted a chapter of one of his books to the question "Are we Christians still?" and taking Christians to mean those who believe that Jesus was Christ, he answered the question in the negative. I observe however that there are many Christians who continue to call themselves Christians without believing that Jesus was Christ. Whether Jesus was Christ is a mere historical question. And should the affirmative of it really be the only possible corner-stone for such a great institution as is the church? Have those who have ceased to believe in Jesus as being Christ lost the right to call themselves Christians? The disciples of Jesus believed that he was the Messiah to rescue the Jews from the Roman yoke. Later Christians ceased to believe in a worldly Messiah and yet they called themselves Christians. Should not the Christians of to-day have a right to purify their idea as to the meaning of the title Christ? Do they cease to be Christians because they surrender the mythological views of Christianity and try to reconcile their religion with scientific truth? According to the opinions of the dogmatic believer there can be no doubt that Christians who have ceased to believe in the Christ of orthodox Christianity have lost the right to the name Christian. But is the dogmatic believer an impartial and a competent judge? How do matters stand with himself? Does he believe in the original Christ or Messiah? No, that idea has been surrendered for ever. Has the Roman Catholic the right to call himself a Christian when we consider how little of the spirit of Christ is preserved in that church and how many heathenish customs, traditions, beliefs, rituals have crept in? Has the Presbyterian a greater right to that name? Were the rigidity, the narrow-mindedness, the lack of charity, the eagerness to have as many people damned as possible, traits of the figure of Jesus, the Christ of the Gospel? It seems to me that the most rabid infidel who calls our church authorities, the present pharisees and scribes, hypocrites and a generation of vipers has the same right to

the title "Christian" as any one of the faithful. For he also resembles Christ in one point; he resembles Christ in the boldness of denunciations, and according to Josephus's account the Jewish pharisees, the sadducees, and the scribes were serious, honest, aspiring men, some of them having great virtues, some of them erring yet striving after the truth. We have no reason to believe that they were vicious; and upon the whole they were no worse than are our clergy to-day.

Who has a right to call himself a Christian? I might just as well ask, who has a right to call himself this or that? Who has a right to call himself a Knight? There are lodges of the Knights of Pythias, of the Knights of Honor, and of the Knights of Labor. Have they a right to the title Knight? Is not a knight a man in an iron armor sitting on horseback or lying somewhere in ambush? What is a title, what is a name? All depends upon what we mean by it. If people mean by "Christian," that their religious views, whatever they are now, developed historically from that great mythical figure called Christ, they have a right to do so. One of the ancestors of Mr. Smith was most likely a real smith. Has Mr. Smith of to-day lost the right to his name because he no longer is a smith. Has an Athenian only a right to call himself an Athenian so long as he believes in a personal goddess Athene as the protector of his city?

I do not say that we should continue to call ourselves Christians although we have ceased to believe in the various details of Christian mythology, but I do say that those who actually continue to call themselves Christians, as do for instance the Unitarians, have a right to do so, as much and perhaps more than the most orthodox believers.

The question of the historical origin of the gospels is a very complex and difficult problem. The literature on the subject is immense. It is a most fascinating and interesting problem, but it has not much more practical value than the investigation of Greek or Hindoo mythology. Christianity as an institution does not depend on the results of such investigation. The corner-stone of Christianity is not whether Jesus was Christ—Christ in the mythological sense of the word—or whether Jesus was at all an historical person; or whether Jesus did really revive after the crucifixion. The corner-stone of Christianity, as of any religious institution, is the need of Christian ethics in humanity. The question is, Are the ethics of Christianity sound and is humanity in want of such ethics? Is the Christian conception of life desirable?

The rationalistic interpretation of the gospel accounts have been as much abandoned as the rationalistic explanations of Greek or Roman mythology. We are told that Romulus and Remus were nursed by a she-wolf, and one of the rationalistic expositors says,

that the shepherd's wife who found the babes was called "Lupa" or Mrs. Wolf. And similarly Jesus's resurrection was really a revivification from a deep swoon. That which made Christianity is not its myths, but the ideas conveyed in these myths. If we read Homer, or Faust, or any poem of a mythical nature, who would think of a rational explanation of the wonderful stories? We are moving in a mythological atmosphere and it is not necessary to explain the appearance of spirits as hallucinations of Faust's or perhaps as the effects of a magic lantern. The marvellous is a matter of course in the world of fairy tales and the supernatural is natural in mythology.

The corner-stone of the city of Rome was not the legend of Romulus and Remus, but the courage, the virtue, the greatness of the Romans. Rome's life, strength, and growth depended upon the ideals of her citizens. In the same way the corner-stone of Christianity is not this or that legend concerning its mythical, or at least half-mythical founder, but the ideals of the present Christians. And these ideals in order to be valuable should not be ideals of the past, but of the living presence which will help to build the future of mankind.

Whether Christianity will remain the religion of civilized mankind is not an historical question to be settled by the investigations of comparative mythology. It is a live question of to-day which can only be settled by the Christians of this generation. Humanity has grown and its horizon is broadened. If our churches decide to grow with the times, they will live. If they attempt to stifle the spirit of progress, they will not only not succeed but they will also perish. The spirit of Christ is the true cornerstone of Christianity; and the spirit of Christ is rather to be found in the denunciations of the infidel than in the pedantic conservatism of churchiness, rather in the bold scientific search after truth, than in the blind belief of obsolete dogmas, rather in the spirit of social and religious reform than in the suppression of the aspirations of progress.

What road the churches will choose, is difficult to foretell. Let us hope that they will find the narrow gate that leadeth unto life.

THE TRADES UNION CONGRESS AT NEWCASTLE.

BY M. M. TRUMBULL.

THROUGH the kindness of my old friend Mr. George Julian Harney, of England, I am in receipt of a large book containing a full report of what was said and done at the Newcastle Congress of Trades Unions in September. This book is printed and published by the *Newcastle Chronicle*, at the low price of sixpence, and it gives more useful information about the "Labor Problem," than any ten books of the same size

written in scientific and theoretical cold wisdom. Here we have the visible facts of labor hot from the mine, the factory, and the shop. Six hundred delegates were present, representing more than a million of working men, and the moral force of such a convention must be very great in England. In this book we see the "eight hours" question, and other questions, beaten into political shape by strong men, as iron is beaten on an anvil, but with more noise and less music than the hammers and the anvil make. A few chapters by way of introduction give an admirably condensed history of English labor from the days of Wat Tyler to the present time. The congress was unwieldy because it was too large, but its turbulence was the sign of a rude and healthy zeal. The delegates had the good sense to put an autocrat in the chair, whose amiable despotism saved them from utter dispersion in a Babel of tongues. Without his imperial domination they would have accomplished nothing. It was hard to resist the humor of his candid intolerance, when he said of his own ruling, "This is gaggling discussion; it is stifling debate. But it is necessary. And it will be carried out."

Every delegate had his mouth with him, and billows of oratory dashed against the chairman like the sea on Beachy Head. The most animated contest was over the "eight hours" question; not over the necessity and importance of the "eight hours" principle, for all were agreed on that, but as to the mode of enforcing the eight hours rule, whether by Act of Parliament or by Act of the Trades Unions. There was a fierce dispute upon this question like that quarrel between the two negroes who went out to hunt a possum. They disputed all day as to whether they would broil him or boil him. When they reached home at night, the problem had solved itself; they had not caught the possum. There was a good deal of kettle-drum speech, and at the end of it the state socialists, or as they called themselves, the "legalists," had the worst of the argument and the best of the vote, for they carried their doctrine through by a good majority, and decided that the "eight hours" reformation must come from the State in such form as might be ordered by the Trades Unions. Said the most vigorous of the kettle-drummers, "We must by our votes get the State to step in and confirm by law what the Trades Unions have secured." And the possum still in the tree.

A gleam of the good time coming when they could oppress others as they themselves had been oppressed, comforted many of the delegates, and inspired them with hope of retaliation. They prophesied the time when the Trades Unions were to become a social tyranny with political power, dominating Parliament as the Jacobin club did the National Assembly. "We must

make the masters adapt and assimilate themselves to the standard which the men by law impose on them," said Mr. John Burns, who appears to be the Denis Kearney of England, so much does he resemble in style of speech the orator of the sand lots. "We are going to use the State," he said, "against those who have used the State against us." This may be a very proper policy after they have caught the possum, and got possession of the state; but the threat is premature now. It serves to array all the influential classes against the Trades Unions, and helps to postpone indefinitely the just cause of the working men.

Not only the masters, but also brother craftsmen are to be made outlaws without rights if they refuse to become subject and abject when required by the Trades Unions. Parliament at the dictation of the Unions is to pass a law forbidding employers to give work to any man who is not a member of the order. "The time is fast coming," prophesied the inexorable John Burns, "when the man who could not show a Union ticket would get no work." Fifty-five years ago, at the time of the "Document" the masters decided among themselves that the mechanic or laborer who *could* show a Union ticket should get no work. This was very properly resented as an attempt to enslave the working men. The parties to the wrong are changed, but there is no moral difference between the scheme of Mr. Burns, and that of the masters when they required their men to "sign the document" or starve.

There were present at the congress a number of women delegates, armed with needles and pins to prick bubbles with, and torment the men. One of these was Miss Abraham, Treasurer of the Women's Trades Union, London, who said that she "had little sympathy for the man who wanted eight hours for himself, and yet had a ten or twelve hours wife"; and another was Miss Whyte, Secretary of the Employed Women's Bookbinders Society, who, referring to "equal work, equal wages," said, "If it was contended that women who did men's work should have the same pay, it meant driving the women out." These were very sharp needles, and they stung like hornets, for it is always an unpleasant revelation to men that they have been found out; and Miss Abraham well knew that in the congress were plenty of eight hours men with twelve hours wives; and Miss Whyte was shrewd enough to know that under the plea of justice for women lay a sinister conspiracy of injustice, a scheme to drive women away from the trades and the professions altogether. In the "Wheelbarrow" papers, I warned the women long ago, to beware of this beautiful nosegay offered by "organised labor." If this demand of "equal wages for equal work" could be made into law by the "legalists," it would at once

drive women back to what according to the Pottawatamie idea is their "proper sphere," the very narrow circle bounded by washing, ironing, scrubbing, cooking, nursing, and sewing. I am proud to know that there are many men in the trades unions who make that demand in good faith, as an act of justice to women, but they give proof of their sincerity by demanding equality for women in other things; and in this they include their own wives.

The president of the congress was Mr. Thomas Burt, a working-man member of parliament, a Northumberland miner, I believe. He occupied a giddy eminence; and the temptation to play the demagogue, and speak in the "rantin' roarin', rantin' roarin'" style was very great. He resisted it, however, and while he commanded like a Field Marshal, he spoke like a statesman. Such leaders, in parliament or out of it, compel respectful attention to the demands of labor, and under such leaders the workingmen will eventually win all that ought to be won. It was a pleasant thing to read that the congress was welcomed by the Mayor, and feasted by the Common Council; so unlike the style of doing in my day, when we spoke for justice under menace of the soldier's bayonet and the policeman's club. By a curious coincidence, a few days after the meeting of the Trades Union Congress, there was, in that same old town of Newcastle, a Conference of the Liberal party, at which Mr. Gladstone made a Chartist speech that fairly bewildered me, because I remembered him as a tory statesman back yonder in the forties. I had to rub myself to make sure that I was awake, it seemed so like a dream; and I could not help asking with Bret Harte "Is things what they seem, or is visions about?"

CORRESPONDENCE.

EDITORIAL SUPERVISION.

Madras, India, June 12, 1891.

To the Editor of *The Monist* :

SIR: Having seen the advertisement of *The Monist*, I obtained the three first issues of it. The first article I read was that on "Immortality" by a Dr. Gould and which appeared in the April number of the magazine. I enclose for your information a copy of a letter I have addressed to the author of the article.

I consider it was a great pity that such a paper should ever have appeared in *The Monist*. If *The Monist* is to become worthy of the position its promoters desire it to hold, it will evidently be necessary that some supervision be exercised over the contributions, for it is impossible to conceive that the paper in question could have been published, had it been even superficially examined by any man of science. I am Sir

Yours truly,
R. E.

To R. E. Esq., Madras, India.

Your letter and enclosure are at hand. Your criticism of Dr. Gould's article is in many respects correct; but your supposition that the Editor of *The Monist* has been blind to the faults of Dr.

Gould's article is an unfounded assumption. If you had read the editorial of the same number of *The Monist* (No. 3), you would have become aware of the fact that Dr. Gould's article "stands in direct opposition to the views that have been editorially upheld in *The Open Court* as well as *The Monist*."* Dr. Gould's article was accepted because it was antagonistic to our views.

You say "that some supervision he exercised over the contributions." That is a good rule for a certain purpose. But we have another rule according to which we publish the severest and ablest criticisms of our own position. Dr. Gould's article was published for that reason.

The rule to exercise supervision over contributions must not exclude the raising of points by the unschooled, it must not produce an aristocracy of the learned, who do not deign to stoop down to the not-learned. The misunderstandings of the not-learned must also be heard, and the learned can profit by considering them. I do not mean by this to rank Dr. Gould among the unschooled. On the contrary, he is a very learned man and the author of valuable scientific works. But I regard his opinion in several most fundamental points as faulty and cannot approve of his manner of presentation.

An editor has in my opinion the right to exercise a supervision over his contributors, but he should use it as little as possible. We Americans are not very fond of police either in politics or in science. I have not used this editorial police right with regard to Dr. Gould's article at all, because I felt it least justifiable to tamper with the manuscript of an adversary.

You blame Dr. Gould for using such language as "confused and confusion breeding philosophers." Let me call your attention to the fact that this expression having reference to men who speak in "the interest of a theoretical monism" is directed against the editors of *The Monist*. In my answer to Dr. Gould (Vol. i, No. 3, p. 416 et seq.) I have attempted to show that the basis upon which Dr. Gould founds his view is untenable ground. The dualism which he so boldly defends is self-contradictory and thus all the conclusions he draws from it must fall to the ground.

Although your criticism of Dr. Gould's article may upon the whole be correct, it is nevertheless not fair to call attention to the faults of a man without doing justice to his virtues. Dr. Gould is of an impetuous nature, he always paints in glowing colors, he exaggerates, he makes people crawl, he uses strong language, even such as in my opinion is out of place. He is rash and assuming, and he takes an attitude as if his antagonist is not worthy of being listened to. These are great faults in one respect, but they are not without redeeming features in other respects. He is at the same time brilliant, and having a conviction, he convinces—that is to say he convinces a certain class of people who are influenced by his forcible way of saying things.

Dr. Gould is not a thinker, but a preacher. He is not a quiet investigator, but an advocate of an opinion, he is not in search of the truth, but a champion of what he thinks to be the truth. And such men of enthusiasm are as much wanted as scientists and patient enquirers. I should be glad if I could convince Dr. Gould of his errors so as to use the strength and vigor of his fervid mind in the direction which I take to be sound science and philosophy. But I have little hope of converting him.

Professor Lloyd Morgan of Bristol writes to me:

"Dr. Gould's 'Immortality' only wants a very slight modification to represent the monistic view. You have put your finger on the non-monistic assumptions. If a young man, he will (or would) come into the true philosophical fold."

Your letter is a severe criticism of our principles in editing *The Monist*, and it is for that reason of interest to our readers. We do publish articles which we cannot approve of; yet we did not expect that our motives for doing so would be misunderstood.

* This phrase is literally quoted from *The Monist*, Vol. i, p. 416.

I hope that you will consent to the publication of this our correspondence with the omission, perhaps, of your name.

Very Truly Yours,

PAUL CARUS.

A FEW COMMENTS ON SUICIDE.

To the Editor of *The Open Court*:—

I AM sorry that I did not see in *The Open Court* the article "Can Suicide be Justified" before this. Though a month has elapsed, I should not think it too late to refer to the mistake made by Dr. S. V. Clevenger in citing in the above article Schopenhauer in a misrepresentative manner. As proof of my assertion I enclose correct translations, covering the ground of the above mentioned matter. Schopenhauer treated this subject especially in his *Parerga and Paralipomena*, Vol. II, also in the book of *Ethic*, and saying what he says there, he never could contradict himself, in saying what Dr. S. V. Clevenger cites of him.

ON SUICIDE.

"The surest manner to hide from others the limits of our knowledge is not to trespass them."—*G. Leopardi*.

"We have to bear suicide is the greatest cowardice, and only possible in insanity, and more such absurdities, also this entire senseless sentence, 'SUICIDE IS UNJUST, although it is evident that everyone has nothing in this world, less indisputable than the right over his own person and life.'" (P. & P., Vol. II, Chap. XIII.)

"There are certain mistakes which are generally favored, and firmly credited, and by the countless daily with self-sufficiency repeated, and to those belong the sentence, 'SUICIDE IS A COWARDLY ACT.'" (*Ethic*.)

"The right to anything means the right to do it, or to take it, without injuring thereby anybody else. This is illustrated in the absurdity of the question as to the right of taking our own life, but as to the claim which others perhaps have on our person, rests on the condition that we are alive, and expires after. That he who does not desire to live any longer, should live only the life of a machine for the benefit of others, is an absurd claim."

"The forbidding of suicide by law is ridiculous, because what penalty can deter him who seeks death? To punish the attempt of suicide means to punish the awkwardness of ill-success," etc.

Yours respectfully,

AUG. D. TURNER.

BOOK REVIEWS.

HARMONIES DE FORMES ET DE COULEURS: Démonstrations pratiques avec le rapporteur esthétique et le cercle chromatique. By *M. Charles Henry*, Bibliothécaire à la Sorbonne. Paris: Librairie Scientifique, A. Hermann.

This little treatise reproduces a lecture delivered by M. Henry, at the Forney Municipal Library of Art and Industry, before an audience of persons engaged in the manufacture of furniture and of colored papers in the Faubourg Saint-Antoine, Paris. The object of the lecturer was to make known the principal facts relative to the physiological action of light, of color, and of form, and the laws of harmony to which he had been led by his personal inquiries. The subject is of a most interesting and important character, but it loses much in its present form of treatment from the absence of the illustrations by which the facts were verified. M. Henry shows that agreeable sensations can be correlated with the increase of reflex movements, and disagreeable sensations with the decrease of reflexes which usually accompanies hyperesthesia. It is possible, therefore, to express the pleasant and unpleasant character of sensitive impressions numerically. The rhythmic numbers which mark a variation of excitation are found in colors and forms, in the sensations of weight, muscular effort and sound. M. Henry illustrated the law of successive and simultaneous contrast of color by the use

of his chromatic circle which, in combination with certain other simple mechanisms, will become of pathological value in determining the commencement of nervous affections, as these disturb the senses. The law of contrast is applied by the author to the study of form from the esthetic standpoint, and certain rules are laid down for the construction of figures which will not weary the sight, and which will enable a vast science, that of *morphology*, to be constituted on a rigorously mathematical basis. M. Henry and M. Signac have treated this important subject more fully in a work already in the press entitled "Education du sens des formes." 42.

BOOK NOTICES.

We desire to call the attention of our readers who are engaged in practical literary work, to a publication that is especially designed to further and facilitate their labors—*The Writer, A Monthly Magazine for Literary Workers*, Boston, Mass. This magazine (24 pages) is made up, each month, of a series of short practical articles on literary topics, methods, and aims, of interesting stories and sketches of the literary profession, of a department of "Queries" in which the editors answer all manner of grave problems that perplex rising authors and discuss questions of style and the correct use of words; further, of a department called "The Scrap Basket" in which the subscribers discuss, criticize, or supplement the answers in "Queries," of "Book Reviews," and a department on "Helpful Hints and Suggestions" which is a vast storehouse of the experiences of practised writers on matters of literary *technique* and the material tools of composition. Each number contains a list of the literary articles that appear in the periodicals of the day, and also "News and Notes" touching the profession generally. Annexed to *The Writer* is a valuable Literary Bureau of which all authors who have not an established reputation should avail themselves. Primarily, *The Writer* addresses itself to the strugglers and the aspirants, but its close contact with the real world of literary activity and its current treatment of fundamental things, so often neglected, make it an instrument that even the thick-skinned virtuoso cannot afford to despise.

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

N. B. Binding Cases, for single yearly volumes of *THE OPEN COURT* will be supplied on order. Price 75 cents each.

All communications should be addressed to

THE OPEN COURT,

(Nixon Building, 175 La Salle Street,)

P. O. DRAWER F.

CHICAGO, ILL.

CONTENTS OF NO. 216.

A CRUMBLING CORNER-STONE. CHARLES K. WHIPPLE 2983

THE CORNER-STONE OF CHRISTIANITY. EDITOR. 2986

THE TRADES UNION CONGRESS AT NEWCASTLE.

GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL..... 2987
CORRESPONDENCE.

Editorial Supervision..... 2989

A Few Comments on Suicide. AUG. D. TURNER..... 2990

BOOK REVIEWS..... 2990

BOOK NOTICES..... 2990