

# The Open Court.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Devoted to the Work of Conciliating Religion with Science.

No. 221. (Vol. V.—39)

CHICAGO, NOVEMBER 19, 1891.

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

## IMMORTALITY AND SCIENCE.

It appears as though the problem of immortality had to be solved anew by every generation. How often has the question "When a man dies shall he live again?" been answered in the affirmative as well as in the negative? But it appears that a final answer has not as yet been given. Before the court of science the religious answer "Man *shall* live again!" is a mere assertion. It is the expression of a sentiment, and we may grant that the sentiment is quite legitimate, it is a strong sentiment, and to many people it is the most religious, the most sacred sentiment. It is a holy hope without which they cannot live. How deep the roots of this sentiment are buried in many souls will be seen from the following extract from a letter which I received from a well educated gentleman whose life has been spent in teaching and who was devoting the leisure of his old age to philosophical studies. Having explained some of his scientific doubts concerning the immortality of the soul and having rejected at the same time the arguments that are generally brought forth against this belief, he adds these thrilling words :

"I am now seventy-four years old, but instead of growing more cheerful and assured, the reverse has been the case. Accordingly my present state of soul is lamentable and pitiful. Whether I shall end my life in distraction and insanity or in confidence in myself and God, I cannot say."

Granted that the belief in immortality is a legitimate sentiment ; it may be a postulate and an indispensable condition of our religious life, yet as long as it remains the mere expression of a sentiment, it is one-sided and insufficient.

However, the unbeliever's answer, which so often boasts of being the voice of science, is no less one-sided. And the denial of immortality is religiously not so heterodox as most unbelievers suppose, for it has been forestalled in the Biblical sentence of Solomon :

"I said in my heart concerning the estate of the sons of men that God might manifest them,\* that they might see that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts ; even one thing befalleth them ; as the one dieth, so dieth the other ; yea they have all one breath ; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast : for all is vanity. All go unto

\* The Hebrew *leharom ha Elohim* is more correctly translated in the Septuaginta, *ὅτι διακρίσει αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός* "that God will distinguish them." The sense is: I pondered on the nature of men, whether God distinguishes them, but it appears that they are beasts.

one place ; all are of the dust, and all turn unto dust again." Solomon in Eccl, iii, 18—20.

It appears from this quotation that either side of the question is quite biblical.

\* \* \*

Goethe says :

" 'Hast immortality in mind  
Will thou thy reasons give?'  
—The most important reason is  
We can't without it live."

The belief in immortality is of paramount importance because it is a moral motive. It is perhaps the most powerful moral motive man has, and it is of great importance because if man regulates his life as if he were immortal, he will survey a larger field than if he limits his interests to the narrow span of his own individual life. In other words, the belief in immortality is useful ; it induces men to adapt themselves more fully to the great social organism of mankind ; it makes their life more moral. On this account it has been proposed : Let us foster the belief in immortality among the masses, although it may be untenable as a scientific conception.

This proposition has been called a *pia fraus*—a name invented for its justification, and the pious fraud method has sometimes received more credit than it deserves. Is it necessary to add that pious fraud should be denounced as immoral and objectionable under all circumstances?

If, however, the belief in immortality is indeed useful, I maintain that it must contain a truth. A falsity may be useful once or twice, or a hundred times, but it cannot be useful in the long run, for centuries and millenniums. The belief that death is no finality and that man shall live again, which so generally prevails in all our many churches and religious societies contains a truth in spite of the apparent and undeniable counter-truth that man is "like grass which groweth up ; in the morning it flourisheth, and groweth up ; in the evening it is cut down and withereth." [Psalm xc, 5-6.]

What is this truth? Has science, especially through the discovery of its latest great truth, the doctrine of evolution, shed any new light upon the problem? and if it has, what is the new conception of immortality as it appears from the standpoint of the evolutionist?

This magazine has been founded mainly for the

purpose of throwing light upon the idea of immortality. The founder and publisher of this magazine has repeatedly expressed his view on the subject. We quote from his articles in *The Open Court* the following pertinent passages:

"A deeper insight into the nature of the soul is furnished by modern psychology; an erroneous conception of its individuality is destroyed, but its immortality is given back to us. The souls of posterity, it is shown, will be the further evolved souls of men of to-day.

Modern psychology has been called a psychology without a soul. This is a great error. Nothing but the bad egotistical part of the soul-conception has been destroyed, the barrier between our soul and that of our fellow-beings, and also the barrier between each of us and the great continuous All has been removed." (No. I. p. 21.)

"I imagine I had died and another man was formed of living matter, so that in him the atoms were in the same relative position as in me; he would be my continuance, he would be the same man that I am, as I am the same man that I was yesterday; he would know all I know, he would feel as I do, would act as I do under the same circumstances, would give the same answer to the same question; he would have the same character, the same conscience, the same morals, *he would have my soul.*

"We can preserve and elevate the soul of the present generation and of posterity. To preserve and to elevate the quality of the human soul, that is the basis of ethics." (No. 15, p. 396.)

"And the mightiest instigation to such a preservation of the soul seems to me to be the conviction that we thereby again build up ourselves." (No. 127, p. 2068.)

The question of immortality is not beyond the pale of science. It is not only our right to investigate whether man's instinctive longing for a continued existence is justified, it is also our duty to attain to clearness concerning one of the most important and basic problems of psychology, and also of ethics. Also of ethics! For the immortality idea forms the centre of all ethical questions. It affords the strongest motive to moral action. Indeed what is morality else but the regulation of our actions with an outlook beyond the grave, it is a building up not only sufficient to hold for our life-time, but for eternity.

\* \* \*

All living beings have a dread of annihilation; everything that exists has a tendency to continue its existence; and it will continue to exist, for there is no annihilation. Being can never change into not-being. There is annihilation only in the sense of dissolution. A certain combination ceases to exist in this form because it changes into other forms. Being exists, it is eternal, and it cannot be annihilated. Not-being does not exist and will never exist. Not-being is a nonentity, a mere fancy of our imagination. There is no reason whatever for anything that exists to fear annihilation. We may dread change, but we need not dread annihilation.

Our dread of losing consciousness is not justified. We lose consciousness every night in sleep, and it is a most beneficial recreation to us. The boiling water

may be afraid of being changed into vapor. But its fear is groundless; nature will again change the vapor into drops of water. From the surface of our planet all organised life may die off. Our solar system may crumble away into world dust, but what is that in the immeasurable whirl of suns? There are other parts of the milky way in which new worlds are forming themselves, and we have sufficient reasons to believe that the tide of life ebbs and swells in the whole universe not otherwise than autumn and spring change alternately in the northern and southern hemisphere on this planet of ours, not otherwise than waking and sleeping, activity and rest, day and night change in our lives. The single forms of life can be destroyed, but life remains eternal; life is indestructible, it is immortal.

This truth has been maintained again and again; yet many declare that it gives no satisfaction to them unless their persons are included in the general law of preservation and it is generally supposed that before the tribunal of science there seems to be little chance for proving the persistence of personality.

Nevertheless, there is a truth even in the idea of the preservation of the individual soul, and we do not hesitate to say that it is the most important aspect of the immortality idea. That the individual features of our souls are preserved has been proved by evolution. Evolution takes a higher view of life. It considers the whole race as one and recognises the continuity of life in the different generations.

Humanity lives and the individual is humanity incorporated in a distinct and special form. Humanity continues to live in spite of the bodily deaths of the individuals—and truly it continues to live in the distinct and special, in the personal and most individual forms of the individuals. Bodies pass away, but their forms are preserved and their souls are here still. The preservation of experience from generation to generation, is the condition of intellectual growth. The preservation of that which is contained in and constitutes the very personality of man is the basis of progress. In one word the immortality of the soul makes its higher evolution possible.

Evolution teaches a new conception of the soul. It destroys the old-fashioned idea of an individual. It shows that the birth of an individual so called is not a new beginning, but it is only a new start of prior life. The baby which is born to-day is a product of the sum total of the activity of its ancestors from the moment organised life first appeared upon earth. And organised life, what else is it but a special form of the cosmic life that animates the whole universe?

What is man's soul but his perceptions and thoughts, his desires, his aspirations and his impulses which under certain circumstances make him act in a certain way. In short, man's soul is the organised totality of

his ideas and ideals. These ideas and ideals of man have been formed in his brain through experience which is transmitted from generation to generation, and in preserving them we preserve the human soul.

Man's soul is not the matter of which he consists at a certain moment. Man's soul is that particular activity of his which we call his thoughts and motives. So far as our brother has the same thoughts and the same motives, he has also the same soul; and since the doctrine of evolution has become a truth recognized by science, we can with a deeper meaning repeat the ancient saw of the Hindoo sages, "*Tat twam asi—That art thou.*" All living creatures are ourselves; they are in possession of souls like ourselves, and the more they feel and think and act like ourselves, the more have they our souls.

It is true that from this standpoint our souls are not something exclusively our own, they are not, as it were our private property. Our souls are in part inherited and in part implanted into us by education. The former part consists chiefly of our physical constitution and general disposition, the latter part embracing our thoughts and ideals is by far the most important one; it represents the highest and most human elements of our souls.

There is accordingly a truth in the Buddhistic doctrine of a pre-existence and migration of souls. And this truth holds good for the past as well as for the future. Soul is not an essence, but a certain kind of activity; it is a certain form of impulses, on the one hand conditioned by innumerable experiences of the past—"inherited memory" it has been called by physiologists—and on the other hand conditioning in its turn the future. This latter fact, viz. that our present soul-life is conditioning the future, it will at once be understood, is the most important ethical truth. It must be borne in mind when we are about to act, that every act of ours continues in its consequences. The act may be unimportant, and the consequences may be unimportant too, nevertheless it continues with the same necessity as that every cause has its effect.

Death is no finality, and we must not form our rules of conduct to accord with the idea that the exit of our individual life is the end of all. Says W. K. Clifford in his essay "The Unseen Universe":

"The soldier who rushes on death does not know it as extinction; in thought he lives and marches on with the army, and leaves with it his corpse upon the battle field. The martyr cannot think of his own end because he lives in the truth he has proclaimed; with it and with mankind he grows into greatness through ever new victories over falsehood and wrong.

For you, noble and great ones, who have loved and labored yourselves not for yourselves but for the universal folk, in your time not for your time only but for the coming generations, for you there shall be life as broad and far-reaching as your love, for you life-

giving action to the utmost reach of the great wave whose crest you sometimes were!

The preservation of the special and most individual contents of man's personality, the preservation of that something in him which he regards as the best and most valuable part of him is the strongest motive for moral action. Even an unclear idea of the immortality of the soul is therefore better and truer than the flat denial of it. And this is the main reason why the churches survived in the struggle for existence against those people who looked upon death as an absolute finality. The ethics and ethical motives of the churches come nearer the truth than the ethics of those who believe that the death of the individual ends all of the individual, body and soul.

\* \* \*

Here I might rest my case. But I feel that those who attach to the belief in immortality the idea of a transcendent existence in some kind of heaven, are disappointed because I have not as they suppose, touched the most vital point of the subject. I grant that from their standpoint, I am guilty of this mistake. The reason is that I have tried to state the positive view of the problem and not its negative aspect.

Immortality means the continuance of life after death; continuance means a further duration of the present state. If you mean by immortality, the soul's existence in the shape of a bodiless ghost, you should first prove the existence of bodiless ghosts. Our experience knows only of souls which are the activity of organisms in their awareness of self. You cannot preserve what you do not have, and you should not worry about losing something you never possessed; in fact you cannot lose it. If immortality of the soul means an existence as pure spirit, this would not be a continuance of life after death, but the new creation of an entirely different being about the mere possibility of whose existence we can form no more a conception than about an immaterial world in which there would be no display of forces. What is the use of racking our brains as to whether an ethereal world can exist and what comfort can we derive from a belief in its possibility?

The old view of "the resurrection of the body" as it has been worded in the apostolic creed, is certainly more in agreement with modern science and with the doctrine of evolution, than the later belief of a purely spiritual immortality.

\* \* \*

Let me add here a few words in answer to the anxiety of the old philosopher who finds himself on the verge of despair because his hope in an unbroken continuance of his consciousness after death somewhere in an unknown cloudland finds little or no support in science. The scientist, the philosopher, the thinker, should never trouble himself about the results to which

his inquiries lead. A sentimental man who wants his preconceived views proved, who hopes for a verification of favorite ideas, is not fit to be a thinker. I do not mean to say that sentiment is not right, but that sentimentality is wrong. It is not right that sentiment should perform the function of thinking. Thinking requires courage and faith, it requires faith in truth.

Truth often appears to destroy our ideals. But whenever it does destroy an ideal, it replaces it by something greater and better. So certain features of the old immortality idea are untenable before the tribunal of science; yet the idea of immortality which is taught by science, is surely not less sublime, not less grand and elevating than the old one. It teaches us not only a general persistence of all that exists, but a continuance even of that which constitutes our personal individual life.

In looking around and studying the facts of life, we find that we can everywhere improve the state of things; there is no place in the world where there is no chance for improvement, for useful work, for progress. Yet there is no chance whatever for improving the cosmical conditions of the world, the order of the universe, or the laws of nature. And truly it is good for man that he cannot interfere here, because he could never succeed with his improvements. Dominion is given to man over the whole creation, but his dominion ceases where the divinity of nature, the unchangeable, the eternal, the unalterable, of cosmic existence begins.

If there is a God, it is this something "that is as it is," expressed by Moses in the word "JAHVEH." Confidence in God, if it means that we expect *him* to attend to that which can be done by *ourselves* is highly immoral, but confidence in God in the sense that the unalterable laws of nature just as they are, are best for us and for everything that exists, and that it would be mere folly on our part to wish them to be different, is a great truth, and belief in it is no superstition; it is true religion, it is the faith of the scientist, of the philosopher, of the thinker; it is our trust in truth.

The idea of a purely spiritual, a transcendent immortality would be possible only if the name and being of Jahveh, if the revelation of God in the reality of nature were either a great sham, a lie on his part, or a huge error on our part. The view that nature is unreal and that outside of this great cosmos of ours exists another and purely spiritual world is called dualism. There are no facts in experience to support dualism or a dualistic immortality. However, the idea of an immanent immortality is based upon facts demonstrable by science. It is an undeniable truth—undeniable even by the dualist, who in addition to it believes in a purely spiritual immortality somewhere beyond the skies.

Goethe whose view of life was an harmonious and consistent monism, expresses his belief in immortality in the following lines:

"No being into naught can fall,  
The eternal liveth in them all.  
In all-existence take delight—because  
Existence is eternal; and fixed laws  
Preserve the ever living treasures  
Which thrill the All in glorious measures "

#### THE PRINCE OF WALES.

BY MONCURE D. CONWAY.

In the Library of the British Museum there is an old book entitled: "Directions for the Education of a Young Prince, till Seven Years of Age. Which will serve for the Governing of Children of all Conditions. Translated out of French by Pierre du Moulin, the Younger. London, 1673." The following sentence, from a chapter on "Pride," is a fair sample of the work. "Let him learn that because he is a Prince he must be humble; if he is born to be a King, he is born to be a great Servant, and that he has need to subdue those by humility and kindness that must one day be subject to his authority."

Last year, after finding this old book, I was conversing with the venerable Professor F. W. Newman, who related an anecdote which he gave me leave to use. While a Professor in University College, London, he was invited with other eminent educators to dine at the house of a Cabinet Minister. Something being said at table about the importance of educating the Princes, the Minister said, "I cannot agree with you; our Princes need no education except how to amuse themselves." I withhold the name of the Minister, who is not living; but he was a good liberal, and I have heard somewhat similar opinions from so-called "radicals" in England.

Between the book on the education of Princes, and the Minister's declaration that they are better without it, stretch two centuries with their revolutions and evolutions, which brought about the bizarre conditions of English self-government. George the Third's mother instructed him daily, "Be a king!" That moral and religious king, who despised amusement, lost for his country the greater part of its domain, and bound his subjects in chains, which only began to break when George the Fourth left politics for pleasure. The English republic has been developed under the long reign of a Queen who renounced politics as unbecoming her sex, but the régime has yet to undergo the ordeal of kingship.

The secret of Napoleonic despotism was to keep the people amused. If the people would rule must they not keep their king amused? The Prince of Wales would appear to have accepted the situation. He has kept out of politics, and lived a life of pleasure. But apparently the English Nonconformists are

not satisfied unless he takes their pleasures instead of his own. They have made a great ado about his card-playing,—a general amusement among the gentry of England,—and talked of abolishing the throne. The Prince of Wales, however, is no fool, and he has utilised the editorial enterprise of a Nonconformist spokesman to remind the country of the position in which it places an heir to the throne, and suggest a limit to their authority over him.

Before considering Mr. William T. Stead's important article on the Prince (*Review of Reviews*, August,) I hasten to note his denial of the wide-spread belief that the Prince broke his word of honor by revealing the charge made against Sir William Gordon-Cumming. In a recent paper of mine in *The Open Court*, on "Communal Ethics," the indifference of the religious bodies, which censured the Prince for what he had a right to do, to this dishonorable action, was cited in illustration of the theological bias in morality. Should Mr. Stead's denial be verified my illustration remains unaffected, as the indifference was shown while there was no denial. It would be a satisfaction to know that the Prince did not this wrong, but Mr. Stead's denial does not relieve him. Somebody revealed the secret which all had promised to keep. All have declared under oath that they did not reveal it, except the Prince. If he is acquitted one of his friends at Tranby Croft is liable to a suspicion of adding perjury to the dishonorable disclosure. It is conceivable that the secret leaked out through a servant, but the Prince ought not to be content with a merely imaginable alternative. According to Mr. Stead, the Prince, during the trial, keenly felt the imputation cast on him by the oaths which relieved the others, and "appealed to his counsel to be allowed to re-enter the witness box" and rebut the same. "The Prince's urgent application was overruled, and so the trial came to a close without any opportunity being afforded him of clearing up the suspicion." On this it must be remarked, (1) The unwillingness of the Prince's counsel looks as if he feared a cross-examination on this point, and rather increases the suspicion; (2) If the Prince felt the imputation so keenly he might easily have added a denial of it when apologising, through a member of the government, for his "error of judgment" in not reporting Cumming to his commanding officer; (3) The Prince's "opportunity" for denial did not end with the trial; it still remains; no oath is necessary, but simply his personal declaration that he did not reveal that which his honor was pledged to keep secret.\*

Mr. Stead having summoned the public to judge the matter cannot have his vicarious testimony ad-

mitted when direct testimony is accessible. How would a law court act? A. and B. come before the judge. One or the other has committed a crime. A. swears he did not. B. is present, but silent. But C. rises and declares that he has "the highest authority" for saying that B. did not do it. The judge can only say, "As B. is here to speak for himself, but remains silent, your 'highest authority' is insufficient to convict A. of both the offence and perjury." That Mr. Stead's authority is not the Prince is shown by the fact that elsewhere he quotes the Prince's private talk in quotation marks, which are not used on this point. But even had he given the Prince as his authority it would be inadequate because irresponsible, and liable to a suspicion of misunderstanding, as against the formal and responsible disclaimers of those whose characters are equally involved.

Personally I incline to the belief that the Prince did not make the disclosure; but it is well enough for him to be reminded that there are regions where there is no royal road to acquittal. In America the Prince will be judged like any other man, and nothing short of his own declaration will prove his innocence of culpable thoughtlessness, if nothing worse. But in England Mr. Stead's asseveration will probably find loyal acceptance, and the way be cleared for a consideration of the alternatives which, with the Prince's authority, he sets before the English nation. The plea of the Prince is, virtually: "You compel me to a life of idleness, and if I relieve its tedium by baccarat you have no right to complain. There is nothing unconstitutional in playing cards in a private house. If you want me to do something more serious give me something serious to do."

This is the square answer Mr. Stead has received, as spokesman for the Nonconformists, and their pious horror of gambling. The spokesman, feeling all the English fears of admitting a Prince or sovereign to political influence, suggests two fields of activity in which he may be employed. One is that of the colonies, the other that of the amelioration of the social condition of the people. He may be placed at the head of a commission for uniting the colonies more closely to the mother country, and on the royal Labor Commission, which deals with questions at issue between employer and employed." Mr. Stead states his case with ability, and points out that in both of these directions the Prince has expressed opinions and sympathies in harmony with those of the wisest Englishmen. He quotes the Prince as having recently said, "The time has come when class can no longer stand aloof from class, and that man does his duty best who works most earnestly in bridging over the gulf between different classes which it is the tendency of increased wealth and increased civilisation to widen." The lat-

\* On this point *The Open Court* disagrees from its honored contributor. See Notes.

ter clause is rather enigmatic, and sounds a little as if the Prince contemplated a new departure in the democratic direction. However, there is no danger that the Prince will turn out either a demagogue or a despot.

The only danger lies in establishment of a precedent that may play into the hands of some future monarch. In Mr. Stead's August *Review of Reviews* the article on the Prince of Wales is immediately followed by one on "Cromwell and the Independents; or, the Founders of Modern Democracy." The sequence is notable, if not purposed. Cromwell was King Stork; and though it was not a King Log he superseded, that would be the case should another such dictator get the upper hand in England. A strong and ambitious Prince with official power over a colonial commission, and over a commission where he might make friends with the mammon either of Labor or Capital, might control England to a perilous extent. It would be difficult also to draw around such positions a rigid line that would restrain all political influence. The English Constitution is the result of a long evolution by which the happy result has been reached of separating artificial and hereditary lustre from the honor gained by actual service. Were Gladstone Prime Minister he would not obtain social precedence over the stupidest lord. In America an ignoramus, with money and dishonesty enough to buy a seat in Congress, would have precedence over the ablest unofficial man in the nation. Of the two absurdities that of England is at any rate beneficial, in that political honor can be gained only by ability and real services. Should the fictitious lustres proceeding from the throne be again mingled with political influence the English republic, of which the crown is but a historic ornament, might relapse into the miserable corruptions of a hundred years ago. On the whole it would appear an unsafe experiment to confide public duties to any man merely because he was born to a certain social position. The colonies, and the laborers, and the employers should have their interests and issues entrusted to the most competent and trained men. Let the Princes enjoy themselves in their own way, and keep up the ornamental part of the nation. Their best service is to draw off the decorated butterflies, and leave the serious work of government to those who prefer honors gained in the service of their country and of mankind.

#### CURRENT TOPICS.

THE hoodlum is not peculiar to Christendom, and it seems to be the intention of England and Germany to punish China for the wrongs done to the Christian missionaries by the riotous heathen there. The United States has been invited to make a sort of *Dreibund* of it, and to take a hand in the pious duty of chastising the Chinese, but has not yet accepted the invitation. There is a

proper delicacy in thus declining to take part in the ceremonies, for our well-known hospitality to the Chinese in this country, is what the lawyers call an *estoppel*, a record that prevents us from resenting the wrongs inflicted upon Americans in China. "Not only have you offended God," said an Eaton schoolmaster to some boys he was flogging for stealing apples from his garden, "but you have injured me"; and this really appears to be the plea of England in this quarrel, "You have rejected God's word, and my calico." It is a question of merchandise not missionaries. This appears very plainly in the English dispatches, which inform us that "The Foreign Office here hopes that the ultimate result will be the extension of trade to important centres on the Yang-tse-Kiang which are now closed." Thus the heralds of the gospel become the agents of commerce; and thus the same guns can serve both God and Mammon by defending the missionaries, and at the same time opening to trade "important centres on the Yang-tse-Kiang."

\* \* \*

I was taught when a boy that it was flying "in the face of providence" to waste anything, or to complain of plenty; and it was little short of blasphemy to say that we could have too much of a good thing. Yet there are times when abundance appears to be a burthen. I once knew a man who gave as a reason for attending the Unitarian church, and paying for his pew, that he got less religion there than he could get at any other church in town for the same amount of money; and I have known persons when buying medicine, to beg of the druggist that he would give them the smallest quantity that he conscientiously could for a dollar. These, and similar instances, which will readily occur to us all, prove that there may be too much of a good thing; but I never thought that we could have too much fine climate, too much fertility of soil, or too many bushels of corn to the acre. While I approve of grumbling as a healthy and useful exercise, I think it is open to criticism when carried so far as it was by the "National Farmers' Congress" in a resolution thanking the Secretary of Agriculture for his efforts in "creating new avenues of outlet for our markets "overburdened by the excessive production of our fertile and prolific country." This appeals to the charity of the world, and all the nations will sympathise with suffering America, where the farmers are overburdened with the excessive production of a fertile and prolific soil.

\* \* \*

It seems that Nature herself can sometimes be a little inconsistent and capricious; for while it appears from the proceedings of the "National Farmers' Congress," that the crop of corn for making pork is "excessive," it also appears from the proceedings of the "National Broom Makers' Congress" that the crop of corn for making brooms is deficient. The Broom Makers' Congress was held in Chicago, and it was attended by representatives from twenty-four of the leading broom factories of the country, furnishing, indeed, nine-tenths of all the brooms used in the United States. It appeared from the figures presented by the chairman, that there is a shortage of 80,000 tons in the crop of broom corn; and owing to the shortage, the price had more than doubled, it had risen from \$70 to \$150 a ton, making it necessary to increase the price of brooms in proportion, according to the decimal system, which regulates the price of brooms; "every dollar a ton advance in the price of broom corn," said the chairman, "increases the cost of brooms one cent a dozen, so that an advance of \$80 a ton increases the cost of brooms 80 cents a dozen." It was then illogically resolved, in violation of the decimal system, to raise the price of brooms 50 cents a dozen although the cost of making them had increased by 80 cents a dozen; so that in a truly philanthropic spirit, the broom makers will patriotically continue for another year to make brooms at a loss.

At the recent election the Australian ballot was tried in Illinois for the first time. This importation from Australia may have been lively enough in the country, but in Chicago it made the elections extremely stupid and dull. Besides, it abolished a very important industry, the business of the ticket pedler, who may now be heard exclaiming, "Othello's occupation 's gone," an occupation which formerly gave employment to several thousand men, at the liberal wages of five dollars a day for a day of eight hours. Election day was a lonesome day for me, because the polling place was desolate. In fact I had to inquire where it was, although I was not more than a few yards away from it; whereas, heretofore, I knew it a quarter of a mile away, by the mob in front of it, that overflowed the sidewalk and made the air sulphurous with slang. And when I did get there the proceedings were very insipid, for I was not hustled by the hustler, nor slugged by the slugger, as in the good old times. Neither was I required by a prizefighter with a low brow and a high cheek to explain to him why I voted for Horriagan and why I did not vote for Corrigan. It seemed so dismal not to be knocked down by a brass-knuckled patriot for having "de wrong ticket," and not to be afterwards dragged off by the policeman for "making a disturbance." So, also, I missed the curbstone debating club where I formerly got so much information about the tariff, coinage, banking, taxation, monopoly, and all the other burning questions of the hour. Not a drink nor a cigar was offered me, and unless a plan can be devised for stuffing the ballot boxes, or stealing them, the Australian system must be pronounced a failure in Chicago. And this is the opinion of many public-spirited citizens who regard the law as a premium on dishonesty, because after a man buys a vote and pays for it there is no method of telling whether he gets it or not.

\* \* \*

Out of the furnace of debate comes the purification of doctrine, and the revision of creeds; even Presbyterian creeds, which formerly we thought were made of granite like the Alps. When we revise our creed we confess its errors, and proclaim that we believe not as our fathers did, nor as we ourselves believed in our younger days. To revise a creed is not a humiliation, but a virtuous achievement, and the man who has never done it is a consistent fool. That the "Westminster Confession" should hold authority as a creed for two hundred and fifty years, is a marvellous feat, when we consider the quantity of printing done in that eventful time. When a ship is leaking at sea the captain is always bewildered in deciding what part of the cargo he must throw overboard; and this appears to be the puzzle of the Presbyterian church; "How much of the creed shall we throw overboard in order to lighten the ship?" Some of the clergy think that all of it ought to go, while others believe that only that portion of it should be abandoned for which there is no longer any market. The Chicago presbytery appears to be of the latter opinion according to its new declaration wherein it advises a revision to be made "only in the light of holy scripture as now understood by the church, and not limited by the views of any one man, or of an assembly held in peculiar conditions two hundred and fifty years ago, which accepted interpretations of God's word many of which are discarded by nearly all the Christian scholars of this day, and were not approved by John Calvin himself." Startling is the avowal that for two hundred and fifty years the Presbyterian creed was based upon erroneous interpretations of God's word; but the most wonderful part of the recantation is the claim that Calvin was not a Calvinist, a vindication of that famous theologian, which coming from a presbytery will go far to redeem his name. Last year, during the "Little Red Schoolhouse" debate, a German scholar asserted that Luther was not a Lutheran, and proved it. People will form a better opinion of Calvin when they learn that he was not a Calvinist.

The plan to revise the Presbyterian creed has divided the church into three parties; the conservatives, who advise merely a new lock and stock for the old gun; the radicals, who want to give it a new lock, stock, and barrel; and the Bourbons, who maintain that the old flint lock musket is perfect as it is. At the meeting of the Chicago presbytery, a great sensation was created by the Rev. Dr. Stryker, the leader of the radicals, who, speaking of the "Confession of Faith," said, "If we are to make an alteration let us make it all over again. The General Assembly wants us to patch up the old creed, but they won't let us make a new one. We want a less metaphysical and a more biblical creed." He also accused some of the brethren there present of what he called "Theological Bourbonism." His proposal was defeated by 28 to 15, the majority favoring, "A radical recasting of our present confession"; but not the substitution of a new one. The thought that comes uppermost in reading the debate is this, Can a church survive its creed? And does not a new faith make a new church? Does not the rejection of the old creed carry the church with it? Dr. Stryker fits together a new lock, stock, and barrel, and throws away the lock, stock, and barrel of old. Very well, but after awhile some "Theological Bourbon" as Dr. Stryker calls him, finds the old lock, stock, and barrel, and fits them together again. Now, which of the two men has the genuine, orthodox, Presbyterian gun? There are two professions, divinity and medicine, which confess that for hundreds of years they have been wrong, and have just got right at last.

M. M. TRUMBULL.

#### AGNES.

TRANSLATION FROM IBSSEN BY MARY MORGAN (GOWAN LEA.)

AGNES, my charming butterfly

Soaring in ether so clear,

A net I am weaving to catch thee in:

And songs are the meshes, my dear.

"If I be a butterfly bright as gold

Flying through gardens fair,

And you be a gallant handsome and gay,

You may hunt me,—but must not ensnare!"

Agnes, my charming butterfly,

My meshes encircle thee round,

Why flutter in vain, sweet innocent thing?

In my net thou shalt surely be found!

"If I be a butterfly, delicate, light,

Born to hover o'er land and sea,

And you should entice me within your net,—

My wings would you spare to me?"

I'll tenderly set thee upon my hand,

And welcome thee into my heart,

Where freely, securely, henceforth thou shalt play,

Nor ever from it depart.

#### BOOK REVIEWS.

MEMORIALS OF JOHN DANIEL MORELL, M.A., LL.D., Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools. By Robert M. Theobald, M.A., M.R.C.S. London: W. Stewart & Co.

This little memorial volume of the late John Daniel Morell is elegantly got up and is a fitting tribute to the memory of a gentleman who is held in such high esteem by his friends and who has done so much by the industry of a long life to leave a noble impress on the thought and character of many of his nation. This last he did in his capacity as Her Majesty's inspector of schools, the former as an author of some well-known works in philosophy and pedagogics, the chief of which in philosophy are "An Historical and Critical View of the Speculative Philosophy of Europe in the Nineteenth Century" and "The Philosophy of Religion."

