

The Open Court.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Devoted to the Work of Conciliating Religion with Science.

No. 244. (VOL. VI.—17.)

CHICAGO, APRIL 28, 1892.

Two Dollars per Year.
Single Copies, 5 Cents.

COPYRIGHT BY THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.—Reprints are permitted only on condition of giving full credit to Author and Publisher.

REFORM ON SCIENTIFIC PRINCIPLES.

BY F. M. HOLLAND.

It is following these principles which makes a man really a reformer and not merely a crank. Cranks whirl round and round, each in his own little orbit, which is changing its shape incessantly. The real reformer presses steadily forward in the direct line of social progress, preferring to advance slowly rather than wander astray. All motion takes place according to fixed laws; and those by which our race has advanced thus far are not likely to be repealed. To know how to improve the present, we must remember how we have improved on the past. Look back to the state of things a thousand years ago; and we see that men differed much less among themselves in beliefs, occupations, and habits generally than is the case in civilised countries to-day. In these countries there has been great progress during the last two or three centuries; it has been accompanied by a growing diversity in ways of living and thinking; and the lowest savages continue to live alike and think alike, as the first men did in all probability. Men become more dissimilar as they advance in civilisation; and it is well known that the change to ever higher and higher forms of vegetable and animal life has been marked by ever-growing dissimilarity. These and many other facts establish the truth of Herbert Spencer's famous law of differentiation, according to which social progress must involve an ever-growing diversity of occupations and opinions. To enable the diversities in society to increase, it is, of course, necessary to let people think and act as they choose. The recent period of rapid progress is also one of decrease of governmental interference with religion, literature, wages, amusements, food, and dress. No State in our Union would think of passing such laws on these points as were obeyed without opposition in Massachusetts two hundred and fifty years ago. The law of progress is also the law of liberty. Loss of individual freedom would take us back towards barbarism; and increase of the power of government means loss of liberty. Herbert Spencer is perfectly right when he speaks of "Conservatism, which stands for the restraints of society over the individual, and reform, which stands for

the liberty of the individual against society," and again when he tells us that, "The progressive extension of the liberty of citizens, and the reciprocal removal of political restrictions are the steps by which we advance." ("First Principles," pp. 512 and 513. Am. ed.). Mill took substantially the same ground in his great book "On Liberty"; and I do not know of any student of social problems by the scientific method who thinks otherwise; but I claim for Mill and Spencer only such authority as is justified by the fidelity with which they state plain facts of history.

To call Spencer's definition of reform worthless, would compel us to say that Garrison, Phillips, Douglass, Sumner, and the other abolitionists were not reformers. Those who would imitate them will find quite enough still to do in extending the liberty of our citizens, and diminishing the power of society over the individual. There for instance are those laws against Sunday amusements, due, as stated in the "Study of Sociology" (p. 17), to "ascetic fanaticism in generations long past." To the Puritan, pleasure meant sin; but we know that it means health, and to that extent duty, as is shown in the chapter on "Pleasures and Pains" in Spencer's "Psychology." Neither church nor State has any right to forbid dancing or base-ball on the only day when active amusements are possible to the majority of our citizens. To tell people they must not have any work on Sunday, nor any amusement either, is simply trying to reduce them to the condition of criminals in the worst of jails. Rest must include amusement for healthy people who are wide-awake. When our citizens do awake to full knowledge of their rights, the laws against Sunday amusements will go where those for burning heretics went. One reason this tyranny is borne so tamely is that it presses most heavily on the poor. The rich man gets amusement enough on Sunday in his carriage, yacht, or parlor. To the poor man no place is open in many of our cities, except the saloon. No wonder that the brewers seem as anxious as the clergymen to have the World's Fair next year kept shut on the day it is needed most. Fortunately Chicago is already liberal enough to open her theatres; and I have no fear that she will suffer either her guests or her own poor citizens to be op-

pressed. One thing worth remembering about Sunday laws is that they are being repealed as fast as they become dead letters. The best way to reform them is to violate them.

Spencer has much to say about the need of making "the administration of justice prompt, complete, and economical," and giving better protection for property and reputation to the poor against the rich, as well as to the individual against the government. This reform is not so much needed here as in England; but the Chicago anarchists are said to have been maddened by failures to obtain justice peaceably. Another reform which Spencer strongly favors is likely to be the main issue in this year's presidential campaign. A prominent protectionist, Ex-Governor Ames, said at the recent celebration of Lincoln's birthday in Boston:

"In the last campaign we Republicans claimed that we wanted to revise the tariff on the lines of protection, that we Republicans intended to reduce the tariff all along the line: but instead of that, we raised the duty on manufactured goods, and it didn't need any prayers that fall for rain. We were completely flooded and swept away on account of the McKinley bill."

This law has raised the duty on women's and childrens dress goods, with woolen woof and cotton warp, to 128 p. c., so that a piece of 53 yards, which was sold at the English factory for \$14.31, costs \$18.15 more than it would if we had free trade. This and similar taxes compel every buyer of woolen goods to pay much more than the real value; and a large part of the extra price goes into the pockets of wealthy manufacturers. Give individual liberty to buy goods for what they are worth, without interference from the government; and you give the poor protection against the rich.

No reform of recent date has done so much as the Australian ballot to establish the poor man's right to vote according to his own convictions, without risk of being thrown out of work. This law of liberty is already in force in thirty-three states, according to *The Forum* for last January: but the forms adopted in seven of the thirty-three are shown to have serious defects. Of the two methods in use in twenty-six states, that preferred in Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio, where a man need not make more than one mark in order to vote for his party's entire ticket, has the advantage of greatly shortening the time needed not only for casting but for counting ballots.

The best men in both parties support this reform, and also one for which there is such an opportunity of working at present as will not come again until four years hence. The Russian government gives all the offices to its most faithful partisans, with little heed to what they are otherwise; and thus the administration has become so inefficient for all good ends that the people starve. We expect this of a despot-

ism; but a republican government should not be permitted to rob the citizens of their right to have the money they pay into the public treasury used solely for the public good. My liberty to use my money as I choose is violated, when it is taken from me in order to keep in power men whom I want to have turned out. This will not, perhaps, be an issue at the next election, and certainly not the leading one. The best time to work for it is before the nominations. Every Democrat ought to do his utmost to prevent his party from choosing any candidate who has sinned against civil service reform as deeply as Hill and Gorman; and it will be no sign of fidelity to it for the Republicans to renominate Harrison.

These reforms in politics deserve a party pledged to carry them out; and we should have one if the Democrats were true to the Jeffersonian platform. Their original principle, that of maintaining individual rights against interference by the central government, has been sacrificed again and again to catch votes. It is difficult even now to say how the party stands in regard to civil service reform; and there is some danger that the golden opportunity to reduce the tariff next year will be thrown away in order to propitiate fanatics for a wild scheme which is advocated as a way to improve business by governmental interference, but is denounced by leading Democrats as certain to debase the value of the many millions of hard-earned money, deposited in savings banks by industrious citizens. This party seems likely, however, in spite of its inconsistencies, to do more than its opponents for reform, as may be judged from the fact that the leading organisation of New England reformers was once composed almost entirely of Republicans, but has now an overwhelming majority of Democrats, though the same men still fill the seats. It is hard to say which party is most likely to increase personal liberty in a way strongly favored by Mill, and also by Spencer in his first book but not at all in his last. Women are said to be all born smugglers; and I do not see why they should not have a chance to say at the polls, how they like having the price of dry-goods and table-ware raised, in many cases to two or three times the free-trade value, by the tariff.

Spencer's definition of reform need not be taken so narrowly as to forbid promoting the welfare of society in ways which do not restrict liberty, though they do not enlarge it. Every school, for instance, ought to give a prominent place to manual training, if only because this enables the child's brain to develop by the same process which has made the brains of our race so much larger and mightier than they were originally, I mean working over things instead of names, and using tools much more than books. Much needs still to be done for the protection of children in factories;

but I think it has been proved by Atkinson and Cabot, in *The Popular Science Monthly* for February, 1892, that men and women ought to be allowed "to work according to their own will, and to control their own time according to their own judgment." Prohibitionists should not be permitted to invade our liberty on a bare chance of gaining ends which are actually reached without any tyranny in Norway and Sweden, by a plan described in *The Nineteenth Century* for December, 1891. As regards socialism and its cheap edition, nationalism, I have only space enough left to refer to D. G. Thompson's lecture on "Evolution and Social Reform," (published by James H. West, 196 Summer St., Boston), in addition to many well-known essays and chapters by Herbert Spencer, whose last book, that on "Justice," ends thus, "What can be a more extreme absurdity than that of proposing to improve social life by breaking the fundamental law of society?"

FAITH AND REASON.

A REVIEW OF FECHNER'S METHOD OF CONCILIATING RELIGION WITH SCIENCE.

GUSTAV THEODOR FECHNER is the founder of psycho-physics, i. e., the science which determines the relation between sense-stimuli and sensations, thus explaining the interdependence between bodily functions and psychical phenomena. Prof. E. H. Weber had set up the law that the increase of a stimulus to be appreciable must always bear some fixed and definite proportion to the intensity of the stimulus with which it is compared. For instance if we can just distinguish between 16 ounces and 17 ounces, we shall be able to distinguish between 32 and 34 ounces, not between 33 and 34. The fraction $\frac{1}{16}$ must be the same. This fraction, the smallest noticeable difference, which is to be found out by experiment, is called the "difference threshold" of muscular sense.

Fechner took up Weber's investigations and stated Weber's law with greater precision in a mathematical form thus: "The sensation increases as the logarithm of the stimulus." He made this law of the relation that obtains between body and soul the basis of a new branch of science which he called "psycho-physics."

We must add that the law is approximately true in the case of sight, hearing, pressure, and the muscular sense, it is most exactly true of sound, but it is uncertain for the chemical senses of smell and taste. It is most exact in the middle regions of the sensory scale but becomes unreliable when we approach either the lower or upper limit of sensibility.

Fechner called attention to the duality of sensation and motion; yet he proposed to conceive this duality as two aspects only of one and the same thing. Fechner's philosophical ideal was monism, yet we must add

that, in our opinion, he has not fully realised his monistic ideal. His imaginative powers were those of a poet and we find that his views of God and soul and immortality are sometimes bordering on or even entering into that kind of fanciful spiritualism which is generally called supernaturalism.

* * *

This is a short description of Fechner's position and importance as a psychologist. At present we do not intend to give any further explanation of his metaphysical, or psychological, or philosophical views, but to describe his attitude toward religion. No one perhaps could feel more deeply and earnestly the demand of the soul to have science and religion conciliated. He was a man of science; his life was devoted to most intricate investigations and experiments, but he never lost sight on the one hand of the religious importance of scientific work and on the other hand of the indispensability of religion to science.

Fechner argues:

Knowledge and faith are intimately interconnected. Science cannot live without faith. I know that I have a sensation of red or green or yellow, I also know that the sum of the angles in a plane triangle are equal to 180 degrees. But I do not know in the strictest sense of knowledge that another man has the same color-sensation when he looks at the same objects. I do not even know that space is tri-dimensional, I may have (and we cannot say that we do not have) good reasons for believing the one and the other, but this belief, certain though it may be, rests upon our faith in the regularity and cosmic order of the universe, which is the result of an inference but not an object of direct knowledge. Fechner starting from such considerations, says, it is the duty of the man of science not to abolish faith but to replace it so far as possible by exact knowledge.

Faith originates because we need it, we are in want of it, it is a necessity of life. We cannot extend our knowledge without faith, we cannot act without it, and that faith an essential feature of which is the aspiration to extend knowledge is superior to the self-sufficient faith of the Moslem who burns the books and spurns science.

The basis of religion lies deeply buried in the nature of man and human society, so deeply that many cannot detect it. Many propose the principles of humanity or pure ethics as a surrogate in the place of religion. But they forget that these principles of humanity are a product of religion and would not exist without it. Humanity and religiosity rise and sink together. We may imagine the stones in the foundation of the building useless, because they are hidden from sight, but if we should take them away the house must fall.

Religion holds and keeps human society, and human society is such an immediate presence as the air we breathe. To discard religion and keep humanity or ethics is about the same as to propose that we can dispense with the air so long as and because we have breath.

Fechner maintains that there are three essential elements in religion and no religion is perfect unless it proposes a belief in all three. These three elements are the belief in (1) God, (2) an immortal soul, and (3) spirits. God is to him not only the ground of all existence but also the soul-tie of all spirits among whom Christ is our ideal as the foremost revealer of God.

* * *

We do not intend to give further explanations of Fechner's views and are satisfied in having outlined his religious standpoint. We shall now attempt to construe his views satisfactorily to our world-conception.

Fechner's conceptions of God, the soul, and the spirit-world are not without fantastic notions, and we cannot accept the arguments he proposes, especially for the last and most favorite of his three religious ideas. We do not deny the spirituality of the world, for we ourselves are spirits, not pure spirits but spirits after all, and our innermost nature is spiritual. But we deny Fechner's peculiar conception of a spirit-world above the spirituality of nature.

Let us see whether we can give to Fechner's views an interpretation that will stand the test of scientific critique.

The idea of a spirit-world is strange, but if interpreted allegorically it has a deep significance. Among Christians it finds its expression in the mythology of angels, saints, and devils. Yet this idea of a spirit-world, although it is mythology, contains (as all mythology does) a great and important truth. If we decipher the mythological meaning of the belief in saints and translate it into a statement of facts, we should say that the soul-life of all humanity is one great stream; all sentient creatures that lived on earth since organised life began form one great empire, one large republic of interdependent citizens. A man's life does not begin with birth, nor does it end with death. There are no individuals in the strict sense of the word. The soul-life of past generations flows through the present generation into future generations. Our ancestors' souls are not lost; our dead are not dissolved into nothing; they continue; so long as we speak their language, think their ideas, and act according to their maxims; they are with us all the time and will be with us even unto the end of the world. In so far as their presence is effective of evil, they are demons, in so far as it is effective of good, as their influence leads the race onward and upward, they correspond to the saints of the church.

Is there also a truth in the belief in angels? Certainly there is! If those features of nature's all-being which produce and uphold the spiritual world of man's soul-life, are called in their harmonious totality God, we should say that the single powers of nature tending to advance God's work in the world, are, mythologically expressed, his messengers and servants. If we conceive the sun merely in his physical effects, we are overwhelmed with his grandeur, his awfulness and beneficence. Through him we receive directly and indirectly most of the boons that produce and sustain life. The sun is not a mind, yet we stand in a relation to the sun that is, on our part, of a personal nature. We can and often do regard him with gratitude, and to represent him as an archangel of God is by no means an inappropriate allegory. It is mythology, but the mythology has a meaning.

Our consciousness is the effect of the subconscious spirituality of our organisation. This subconscious spirituality is, as it were, our attending angel, our familiar, the spirit that nourishes and bears our mentality, it is the pedestal upon which our conscious life rests.

It is a wrong conception of nature to think of nature as a dead machine regulated by the law of inertia. Nature is life, nature is spontaneity, nature is spirituality.

If we weigh the materialistic conception, (which considers solely and exclusively what we define as the objectivity of nature i. e. matter in motion, dropping that source of psychical life which we call the subjectivity of nature), if we compare materialism with the mythology of ancient and modern religions, we should say that the former is radically wrong and the latter, the modern and even the ancient religions, are right in the face of the former. The latter are wrong only in so far as the truth is symbolically expressed and not in exact scientific formulas. But the truth is there nevertheless.

* * *

Fechner concludes a little volume which he has written on the subject, with a peculiar confession. He says in his "Drei Motive und Gründe des Glaubens":

"As free as the position is which I advocate in this work and have advocated in former writings, yet the orthodox position where I have met it elsewhere, has on the whole, though not in every case, pleased me better than the free. . . .

"To this firmness of faith is attached a wonderful blessing. When I observe that many enjoy this blessing even now and apply it in their principles and actions, in as far as it is possible in this time of imperfection, relying partly on the need of such blessing and partly upon the truth and goodness of the principal tenets of the Christian religion, I am thereby filled with a secret admiration and joy. I see in this on the one hand an expression and on the other hand an acceptance of the meaning and fact of a perfect religion, an acceptance, which can only take place in so far as the respective religion is looked upon as that which accord-

ing to its idea it intends to be in completion, and in so far as its historic sources are considered entirely reliable. . . .

"Religion should furnish to reason the highest, safest, and surest points of view; and now it is left to the function of the individual reason to govern, to improve, to judge and to sift these views; that is to reverse the whole subject, and in the place of the unity settling all things which we must expect from religion, we now get in addition to the other causes of dissent we already have, also the confusion and contention about religion itself, so that we easily lose all religion."

Let us pause here for a moment and ask, What is "the individual reason"? Reason is reason in so far only as it agrees with that feature of reality which makes of the world a cosmos. Objectivity accordingly is the nature of reason; and "individual reason," denoting a subjective kind of reason is a contradictory term.

The individual reason (supposing that the term means subjective rationality, a rational taste or fancy) is not and cannot be an absolute criterion of truth. That is not true which pleases the taste of a rational being best, but that which agrees with reality; not that which satisfies one's conception of rationality, but that which is in conformity with actual facts. There are some people who believe that that is right which their conscience tells them to be right, and that that is true which pleases their peculiar sense of rationality best. But their position is false. The standards of truth and error, and of right and wrong, are objective not subjective; and the very instrument of reasoning, man's organ of arranging the facts of experience in proper relations, his mechanism of formal thought is but a copy of the world-order, an imitation of the ways of nature, and a systematised recognition of the forms of existence. Through reason the scientist can formulate the regularities of the universe in laws and through reason alone living beings are enabled to set themselves purposes for their actions.

Religion is the recognition of authority. It stands on the recognition of something that is independent of our wishes and tastes; of something that is as it is whatever we think of it; it stands on the recognition of reality. But religion is not based alone on the recognition of reality, it implies also the demand of finding out the nature of reality. Religion demands cognition, and so the proper employment of reason is an essential part of religion.

* * *

Fechner proposes three principles which lead to faith, (1) the historical principle, (2) the practical principle, and (3) the theoretical principle. The first and second are the main stays of orthodox religion for they lead to religion whatever it may be, the third principle, however, which includes critique and science, is that which purifies religion and leads on to that ideal religion of which the mythological conceptions are dim prophecies. Fechner continues:

"And why then do I not place myself upon the ground of unconditional faith in what has become historical? I cannot, and hundreds and thousands cannot. The theoretical principle asserts itself, too, and must assert itself. And if implicit faith in what has generally been accepted, for those who have such faith, has its advantages which nothing could replace, yet with the impossibility that all have it and that reason be sacrificed to faith under all circumstances, another task of history comes into play, that is the task to make the advantages, which those believers alone can have almost exceptionally and yet not in a perfect degree, because they look upon the yet imperfect religion as already perfect, the common property of all, by really advancing religion to its perfection and thus making it possible for it to reach its culminating point.

"It must finally arrive where reason will be fully satisfied and will be a pillar of the faith it now constantly shakes, instead of demanding impossible sacrifices of reason in behalf of faith. And for this end indeed the introduction of new positions in history is needed; the efforts of a reason no longer tied to rigid dogmas and its attempts to overthrow what is destined to fall at some time, require the greatest diversity of aspirations, a ceaseless fight from all sides and the failure of most of these efforts, so that, after all the false courses are exhausted and done away with, the right course may at least surely and safely remain."

There is much truth in what Fechner says and we sympathise with the position he takes; yet we propose to go further:

Fechner's third principle is the most important one of all. Without it the other two principles cannot produce religion. Without it, religion would be dogmatism, and would cease to be religion.

Fechner concludes his book "Die drei Motive und Gründe des Glaubens" with a poem which may be regarded as his confession of faith. Some verses express the author's sentiment in the words of Christian mythology and we must know his scientific faith in God as the all-and-one in order to avoid misconstruction. We here present a translation (made by Mr. E. F. L. Gauss, of Chicago, for this special purpose) which faithfully preserves the rhythm and the character of the original even in most of its details.

"In God my soul is resting;
He lives and therefore I;
Life is in and about Him,
I cannot live without Him,
He cannot let me die.

"In God my soul is resting;
Say that it ends who lists:
I have no care, for surely
For aye rests there securely
What aow in Him exists.

"In God my soul is resting;
My life with all its trim
In Him is hound and hidden,
And when He shall have hidden
My soul returns to Him.

"In God my soul is resting;
Though hid He from its sight,
The witnesses descending
Reveal Him without ending,
Foremost the Christ, the Light.

"In God my soul is resting;
The angels' host I see
In His pure heights of Heaven
In glory move, and even
One of them doth bear me.

"In God my soul is resting;
The tie of souls is He,
Faith, Love, and Hope forever
Will shun the soul's endeavor
Till this we fully see.

"In God my soul is resting;
In Him are ever rife
The truth, goodness, and beauty
That purpose be in duty
And harmony in life.

"In God my soul is resting;
What could the parcel be?
For what I'd fain be grasping,
Fear not, soul, in thy gasping
Salvation comes to thee.

"In God my soul is resting;
He is its very source,
His will my acts commandeth,
And though my will withstandeth
He holds His steady course.

"In God my soul is resting;
Although He never sins,
Yet with His children's aillings
He also bears their failings
And them to duty wins.

" In God my soul is resting;
Comfort in grief, sublime!
He's love and must unfold it,
And never can withhold it,
I still abide my time.

" In God my soul is resting;
This be my final word.
Though storms my bark encumber,
Yet peace attends my slumber:
He's my eternal port!"

We regard Fechner's method of conciliating Religion with Science as an attempt in the right direction, but we cannot say that we are fully satisfied with the conclusion at which he arrives. His expositions do not clearly show the boundary line between Faith and Reason, and thus his Faith actually interferes with his Reason.

There is one way that will hopelessly confound the issues between religion and science, which is, when faith performs the function of science. There is another way that will take out of life purpose, charity, and comfort, which is when cold and unimpressible reason performs the function of faith, i. e. when the sentiment and enthusiasm of the heart is chilled or entirely replaced by the figures of dry calculations. There is but one way that will reconcile science and religion and that is when science and faith harmoniously work together, each of the two in their coöperation performing its own function.

Faith when it performs the function of reason is called creed. Creed is injurious, but faith is wholesome. He only who is faithful will conquer.

Reason when it performs the function of faith is craftiness and guile. Craftiness is a vice but rationality is the human in man.

Faith is not knowledge, but an attitude of the soul. Faith is a moral not a mental quality. Faith is character, strength of will, loyalty to truth. There is no religion in a man unless he be faithful.

Reason is the arranging and systematising of knowledge so as to represent facts correctly, or in one word, so as to construct truth. Reason must be the torch in the hand of faith, so that faith may walk on the right path.

Reason without faith makes of man a machine without sympathy, without tenderness, without enthusiasm for his ideals. Reason in the soul without good-will, constancy and moral stamina, is a torch in the hand of a vicious man, and the mischief it works is great.

Faith without reason is superstition. It is like unto a man that is groping in the dark. He has eyes but either they are blind or he shuts them to the light. There is light and he might use the light to illumine his path, but he scorns the light. He rather relies upon what he imagines to be an inner light which is in reality luminous hallucinations that appear to him when he runs his head against the objects of his surroundings.

To sum up: Irrational faith is as much irreligious as faithless reason.

P. C.

CURRENT TOPICS.

MR. STEWART, of California, owns a half-interest in the far away colony of Nevada, and by right of eminent domain he represents in the Senate his half of that argentiferous province. Mr. Stewart raises crops of silver on his plantations and therefore advocates that silvery device which by legislative miracle is to give him a dollar for every sixty-six cents worth of his crop. He does not think, however, that it would be good politics to give the producers of wheat, or cotton, or tobacco a similar advantage in the national market. Senator Stewart is gifted in the art of speech, and it is an "intellectual treat" to hear him pour invective hot as boiling water on the "gold bugs" of the East, who wickedly discriminate against the people's money, the white metal of the West. A layer of comedy has been pasted on to Mr. Stewart's indignation by a prowling resurrectionist who has dug up from the archives of California no less than twenty-five mortgages given to Senator Stewart wherein it is required that the interest and principal of the debt secured shall be paid him in *gold coin*. A brother senator "on the other side" of the question, solemnly rose in his place a few days ago and asked the senator from Nevada how it was that believing publicly in silver, he should privately believe in gold. And why require his own debtors to put a golden stipulation in their bonds? The senator answered, "Because I am not a fool." These were not his very words, but when translated from the senate idiom into common sense, they meant exactly that. The senator on the other side feebly thought that he had exposed the inconsistency of the senator from Nevada but in this opinion he was wrong. Senator Stewart was entirely consistent according to the "double standard" of ethics which our statesmen use. In advocating the "silver bill" he was consistent with his own interest, as he was when stipulating with his debtors for payment in gold coin. The inconsistency is in the people, who hire law-makers "to promote the public welfare," and then permit them to legislate for the private welfare of themselves.

* * *

The election in Rhode Island confounds the political fortune-tellers who read the horoscopes of candidates, and give us "tips" upon the winners. For instance, my favorite soothsayer, an "independent" paper,—for I trust not any of the party organs, has been assuring me for several weeks that Rhode Island was going Democratic, because it went that way last year, and the year before, and the year before that; and for the stronger reason that the property qualification was now abolished, so that thousands of working men, heretofore disfranchised, had been added to the voting classes, and as these were mostly democrats, they would largely increase the majority for the democratic ticket; and moreover, because the secret ballot law would prevent the republicans from corrupting the voters and thus "defeating the popular will" as the custom formerly was. Well! Rhode Island went republican, and then the journalistic prophet impudently told me that such a result was to be expected, "because Rhode Island always does go republican in the gubernatorial election of a Presidential year," and also because "Rhode Island has long been the most corrupt state in the union in the matter of elections." What I complain of is that the seer in whom I trusted did not tell me anything of that before the election, for he knew it then as well as he knows it now. I do not place any reliance at all in the additional reason that it was revealed in the campaign that the democratic candidate "blacked his own boots," whereby the shoe-black vote was lost.

* * *

What is the use of worrying about the election when I can go any day in the week down to the Palmer House or the Grand Pacific Hotel and find men there who can tell me just what the result is going to be. They do it by some psychological means mys-

terious to me. Not only that, but they can tell the exact majority stated in thousands that any state will give, Sir, if somebody is nominated, Sir, and the number of thousands that state will throw the other way Sir, if somebody else is named. They predict and contradict with equal confidence. Lately I dined at the Iroquois club with a couple of democratic friends who were both ready and willing to give me pointers enough to win a fortune by betting on the election if I were a betting man. "If Cleveland is nominated," said one, "he will sweep the country"; and the other, equally well informed, replied, "He cannot sweep one side of it." I think it must be from those political magicians that the newspapers get the information on which they prophesy with so much bluffing power. Out of a multitude of discordant prophecies I select by way of sample only two. The *Memphis Appeal—Avalanche*, a paper whose ponderous name gives it great political weight, remarks, "With Mr. Cleveland at the head of the column victory is certain." This is positive, and it ought to be convincing, but a little further down the river the *Vicksburg Commercial Herald*, retorts in this fashion, "Cleveland has had his two innings, and has demonstrated his weakness. Let us look for a winner." This is excellent advice but weakened a little by the obstinate theory that we never can pick out the winner until after the election.

* * *

About a year ago I referred in *The Open Court* to the Nizam of Hyderabad, who out of gratitude to the English for sending Christian missionaries to convert his people, had returned the favor by sending a few Mohammedan missionaries to convert the English people. By *The Allahabad Review* for February, I learn the progress made by the Nizam and his missionaries down to November, 1891. The figures are for Liverpool only, so that I know nothing of what has been done in London, Manchester, Canterbury and other places. According to the roster published in the *Allahabad Review* it appears that the Mohammedan church in Liverpool numbers seventy-one members, forty adult converts, sixteen children, and fifteen born Moslems. Of the adult converts there are one Catholic priest, and three other Catholics, thirteen members of the church of England, two Spiritualists, one Jewess, one Atheist, and the rest "scattering." Their names and professions are given, and they have all signed the following very brief and very candid confession. "We the undersigned hereby acknowledge our belief in the Moslem Faith and that we hold the same and none other to be the true religion, and that we believe (1) That there is only one God. (2) That Mohammed is his prophet. (3) That the Koran is the inspired book and word of God." There is one Unitarian among the adult converts, but as the Mohammedans are Unitarians also, I do not place much value on his conversion, especially as he is described as "Clerk in the Ottoman Consulate," which as the learned Sergeant Buzfuz remarked in the famous trial of *Barrell vs. Pickwick*, "is in itself suspicious."

* * *

Taking the seventy-one Moslems out of the census, there still remained in Liverpool about five hundred thousand Christians; and these were jealous of the insignificant share of the population which had been given to Mohammed; so they proceeded according to their ideas of religious duty to "stamp out" the eastern heresy which had struck root into the soil of England. With the zeal of Peter the Hermit and the rage of the old crusaders they raised the banner of the Cross, and charged upon the Crescent as their forefathers did upon the field of Askalon, and again was heard the song of the Red Cross Knights, triumphant as that of Miriam.

"Oh! 'twas a glorious sight to see
The charge of the Christian chivalry."

The battle is thus described: On the 15th of November, in the evening, the Moslems of Liverpool were at their devotions in their mosque, and engaged in performing the "*Maghrab Nimas*" what-

ever that is, when several hundred Christians, chanting their battle hymn, "I do believe, I will believe that Jesus died for me," broke down the doors of the mosque, and pouring stones and lighted fireworks upon the kneeling worshippers, they scattered the astonished Moslems like stubble in the blast. Many of the Mohammedans were seriously injured, and one little boy narrowly escaped a violent death, as a "arf a brick" struck within a few inches of his head as he kneeled in prayer. There is a deep humiliation in all this, not only to those who believe in the Christian religion, but also to all of us who belong to the Christian race. The Nizam of Hyderabad protects the Christian missionaries in his dominions; he allows them liberty of worship, and freedom to proselyte his people if they can, while his missionaries and their converts are driven from their humble prayer house and pelted with stones in England. Oh, Nizam of Hyderabad! Send more missionaries to England, and especially to Liverpool.

* * *

Probably the most impressive Easter Sunday services were the devotions dramatically exhibited by the Knights Templars of Chicago, at the Episcopal Cathedral of Saint Peter and Saint Paul. The newspaper description of them has a martial sound, that reminds us very much of tinselled war as we see it represented on the stage. The Knights Templars are the heirs of the old Crusaders, and, although nobody outside the order knows their secret, it is generally believed that they are sworn to rescue the Holy Sepulchre from the hands of the Saracens. They will start for that purpose to Jerusalem, not as their forefathers did in the old crusades, but with first class tickets, and at excursion rates. As it had been announced in the Saturday papers that the knights would worship at 4 o'clock sharp on Sunday. "A large concourse of people," says the paper, "lined the sidewalk," and crowded the cathedral to see them do it. Those new crusaders made a gallant show as they marched along the boulevard with belts and swords, and helmets and plumes, and gauntlets and gonfalons, and red crosses here and there. "They filed into the cathedral," says the paper, "to the notes of a stirring martial strain," which is a great improvement on the ostentatious worship of the Pharisees, who never had the advantage of a brass band advertisement when they went up to the synagogue. Inside the cathedral the services were theatrical and to some religious minds irreverent. The knights were welcomed by a priest and forty choir-boys who marched up and down the aisle singing the harsh and fiery hymn, "The Son of God goes forth to war." When the singing was done, the captain gave this dress parade order, "To your devotions, Sir Knights," as if worship were tactics, and then the Knights went through the form of kneeling down to pray. It looked almost like profanation, when the Knights, as the priest began to read the Apostles Creed, all drew their swords and held them naked in the air until the saying of the creed was done. This bit of pantomime was applauded by many of the congregation as it really deserved to be. All this in the cathedral of St. Peter, to whom Christ said, "Put up thy sword." There are some people who do not believe in the Apostles creed, and I wonder if it was the intention of the Knights to flash their sanguine swords at them. Or was the menace intended only for the Saracens? I know that all this crusading show is intended for harmless play, and the adoration of helmets and plumes, but it sanctifies wrongs like those done to the Mohammedans in Liverpool.

M. M. TRUMBULL.

NOTES.

Professor Turner's book "The Only Good Thing in All the World" has received several reviews favorable, unfavorable, and intermediate. Among them are some which express their disapproval of the author's hurling of invectives against all the creeds of Christendom. That this is a feature of the book cannot be de-

nied and if the author is to be censured for that he is justly censured. But exactly this feature makes the book interesting. Consider that the author is a pious Christian. He is of an advanced age and means to leave to posterity the quintessence of his life's experience. The knowledge displayed in the book does not demand our attention. It is the man that speaks. Those who are interested in knowing the spiritual wants of religious men ought to read the book. Professor Turner's invectives are of a peculiar kind. They are not the invectives of the infidel, yet they are perhaps for that very reason no less severe. A few days ago we received a letter from Professor Turner, an extract from which will characterise him better than we can do:

"I have myself been to church almost every Sunday for eighty years, and to as many camp-meetings and week-day meetings as I could. I have been into and through all sorts of schools, both as pupil and teacher, from the gymnasium to the university, except the theological, which I have never stepped foot into and never intend to. I have read all the current criticism, higher and lower, German, Scotch, and English, theological and scientific, theories about the beginning and end of the world, the origin and destiny of being, God's mode of existence, the mode of existence and action of the human soul or spirit, of life and of force. Of course you will readily perceive that I have heard and read more lies about the Bible on both sides, for and against it, than there probably are words in it. Now the only reason that I do not advert to any of this stuff in my little book is simply this: Scientifically they have nothing at all to do with my subject; and having thrown overboard all the books and dogmas on which they are based, I have nothing more to do with them than I have about speculations about the man in the moon. I never propose to thrash this pile of rubbish over again, or to write an encyclopedia of the devil-hood of the old apostate church, or of methods by which it substituted its shameless dogmas for the simple truth of the Christ-word: the greatest fraud and crime ever committed on earth against our common humanity since the crucifixion of Christ. I turn rather to the simple Christ-word as it speaks to the conscious spirit in every human soul and only about that spirit; rising upward toward the ever-present spirit of the God and father of all spirits, and descending again only to shield and defend the equal rights of every man that walks the earth; beginning where he begins, and stopping where he stops; leaving each and all men free to believe, think, and do as they please outside of these few necessary things; accepting all that is in accord with them and repelling all that is at discord, whether in the Bibles or books or outside of them all. I should have said of Paul that, if he had been reasoning about the North American Indians or any other people, instead of the Jews, he would have come to exactly the same Christ-word for his conclusion. For to 'cease to do evil and learn to do well' is the only possible remedy for all human ills, whether of Jews or of Gentiles, bound or free.

"If you had read my last paper on 'Universal Law and Its Opposites,' I think it would have made this subject plainer, as I wrote it for that special purpose.

"But after all, I have to confess to you, that since writing that, I have myself fallen from grace. For the first time, in the eighty-seventh year of my life, I have myself signed a creed, which I never expected to do, as I have always been in the church protesting openly against all its creeds. I not only signed it, but I sent it down to our picture-framer, requesting him to put it into the finest possible frame, and return it to me. It now hangs in my library right before me, in the centre of my choicest book-case of American and universal law and science literature. So that righteousness and truth can kiss each other whenever they please. I did not hang it on my theological book-case; for I

"knew there would be a row at once, and I want a little peace in my old age, at least in my own library. It reads thus:

"I hereby agree to accept the creed promulgated by the Founder of Christianity—love to God and love to man—as the 'rule of my life.'

"Now if you will sign it too, I will count you as good a Christian brother as walks the earth, and you may think and write outside of it and about it just as you please; yea, a much better Christian brother than any Pope of Rome ever was or ever could have been or even any subscriber to an apostate church creed. The way this happened was thus: An article in the February number of the *Review of Reviews* on the 'Laymen's Movement' was read to me; I said at once, that is the trump for the resurrection of the dead—our dead churches and orthodoxies, and especially, our dead laymen—dead and buried fifteen hundred years ago under the piles of wood, hay, and stubble heaped upon them by the old apostate church, so deeply that they cannot move hand or foot, unless some sectarian priest pulls them out by the heels and thereafter leads them about by the nose as one of his peculiar show-case saints. I said I must inquire into this, so I wrote to all the gentlemen mentioned as interested in this country and in England, and soon came back an answer from Mr. T. F. Seward, East Orange, N. J., with a pair of creeds to be signed, one to keep, and the other to return. Men and ministers from all denominations and from outside all denominations in this country are freely joining it. So you see I was at last caught by my own petard, and obliged to confess.

Yours truly,

J. B. TURNER."

MR. C. S. PEIRCE has resumed his lessons by correspondence in the Art of Reasoning, taught in progressive exercises. A special course in logic has been prepared for correspondents interested in philosophy. Terms, \$30 for twenty-four lessons. Address: Mr. C. S. Peirce, "Avisbe," Milford, Pa.

THE OPEN COURT.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.

EDWARD C. HEGELER, PRES.

Dr. PAUL CARUS, EDITOR.

TERMS THROUGHOUT THE POSTAL UNION:

\$2.00 PER YEAR.

\$1.00 FOR SIX MONTHS.

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. 244.

REFORM ON SCIENTIFIC PRINCIPLES. F. M. HOL-	
LAND	3223
FAITH AND REASON. A Review of Fechner's Method of	
Conciliating Religion with Science. EDITOR.....	3225
CURRENT TOPICS. Silver Statesmen Demanding Gold.	
The Rhode Island Election. Party Soothsayers. Mo-	
hammadan Missionaries in England. Easter Worship by	
Knights Templars. M. M. TRUMBULL.....	3228
NOTES.....	3229