

# THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 284. (VOL. VII.—5.)

CHICAGO, FEBRUARY 2, 1893.

} 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.

## RECIPROCITY AND SOUTH AMERICA.

BY GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL.

IN *The Open Court* of December 29th, commenting on the letters of Earl Grey, I spoke of "Reciprocity," and I now desire to illustrate the subject by the light of The South American Commission and The Pan-American Congress. The experience of the Commission and the Congress demonstrates clearly that the "reciprocity" expedient is a free-trade sign, for it shows the natural desire of every people to trade freely with every other people, if their governments will permit them to do so. The reciprocity device hinders, for the present, the free-trade movement, but it strengthens it for the future by exciting the appetite for freedom. When the United States of America sends agents to other nations, asking them for custom and making bids for business, it confesses that international trade is a good thing, and we have a right to suppose that the more of it the better.

A few years ago the United States government sent three commercial travellers to Mexico, Brazil, and the South American Republics, asking those nations to buy some goods of us, politely assuring them at the same time that it was against our principles to buy any goods of them, excepting, only such goods as we could not get anywhere else, and such as we could not produce at home. Of course, the commercial travellers came back without making or giving any bargains; in fact, without bringing any orders for any goods at all; and there is not among the "archives" at Washington a more comical state paper than the melancholy "report" of those three commercial travellers. One of the most laughable chapters in it is the story of their interview with the President of Uruguay, and from that story I quote the following paragraph:

"The President of Uruguay and his minister, after expressing with great ardor their admiration for the United States, their efforts to imitate our government in all things, and their desire for closer relations, accepted, without discussion, each and all of the propositions submitted by the commission, except that which relates to a reciprocity treaty with the United States. To this they would readily have consented also, had the commission felt justified in encouraging them to expect that the Congress of the United States would consent to a reduction or a removal of the duty on wool, this being the chief product of Uruguay."

Of course, the three commercial travellers did not see that the President of Uruguay was laughing at them; they could not detect the keen irony in the desire of Uruguay to "imitate our government in all things," including, of course, its restrictive policy. "The President of Uruguay and his minister" must have been very much amused at the simplicity of useless commissioners, wandering over South America with an ungracious message from Washington to the South American states, asking them to trade with us, and rudely telling them at the same time that we decline to trade with them.

It is easy to imagine the dialogue that must have been had between the commercial travellers and the President of Uruguay. "We have come soliciting trade," say the travellers. "Very well, says the President, "what have you to trade?" They answer: "Woolen goods." "Will you take wool for them?" says the President. "Oh, no," reply the uncommercial travellers; "our firm is forbidden by law to take wool." "All right," says the President; "England will take it and give us cloth in exchange." Then the uncommercial travellers go to Chili, and the Chilians offer them copper for their goods, but they are not allowed to take that either; and so, at last, they discover that they cannot trade with South America to any great extent, because the protective-tariff policy of their own country will not permit it. Finally they try the Argentine Republic, and the President of that country advises them to go home and tell the American Congress to "do something at once to make the markets of the United States accessible to the Argentine producers." If they had been keen enough to see the sarcasm in that advice, they would hardly have put it in the "Report."

Not satisfied with the experiment of the uncommercial travellers, our government invited a Pan-American congress to convene in the city of Washington, to promote Pan-American peace and closer and more liberal trade relations among all the nations of the American continent. The congress met, but the United States tariff, like a barricade in Paris, blocked the way to all the supposed purposes of the congress, and, as might have been expected, it merely

sharpened the free-trade appetite. It showed that an invitation by the United States to the nations of New Spain for closer commercial friendship, on the basis of commercial hostility to Old Spain, is a paradox. Never did protection make a greater mistake than it made when it inspired Congress and the Secretary of State to issue that invitation. The very purpose of the congress was larger freedom, better acquaintance, and more ships. All these mean greater freedom of trade. Even the cool equipoise of Senator Sherman was disturbed by the mere inspiration of the conference. His habitual self-restraint gave way; his well-trained politics grew insubordinate; his soul made a break for liberty; and this man, erroneously supposed to have "no pulse," broke into enthusiasm, and said that he "was almost inclined to be a convert to free trade, if that free trade were confined to American nations." The qualifying clause counts for nothing. The speech of Senator Sherman proves that in thought and by conviction he is a free trader. It is true, the speech was made at a banquet, but sometimes the soul of a man is revealed at a banquet, although successfully concealed elsewhere.

That Pan-American banquet was given at Cleveland, Ohio, but another one given at Chicago was equally full of paradoxes, the most colossal incongruity being the chairman, a Senator in Congress from the State of Illinois; a protectionist in theory, in practice a free trader; by politics a Republican, by occupation a veteran importer of "pauper-made goods from Europe"; a statesman who demands free trade with one hemisphere, and commercial war with the other; a geographical economist who thinks that commerce ought to be longitudinally free, but latitudinally slave. Proposing a toast to the healths of the Presidents of the South American Republics, and addressing the guests from South America, he said:

"We must as soon as possible establish steamship lines to your countries and liberally subsidise them. We must offer you our exports as cheaply as others do; and to that end I shall favor such legislation as will bring about this result, even to the extent of uninterrupted trade between all the countries of this hemisphere.

Senator Farwell meant of course the western hemisphere, so-called; but suppose he cuts his orange equatorially, what then? And what if he thus divides the globe? In this case the United States will be in the same "hemisphere" with England, France, and Germany. Will the laws of political science change on that account? If it is wise to trade southward, can it be foolish to trade eastward? A geographical political economy is like a geographical arithmetic, which adds and multiplies by opposite rules in opposite "hemispheres."

The Governor of Illinois, also a Republican, and a protectionist, followed Senator Farwell, and he knew

enough to know that there can be no definite "hemisphere" until a line is drawn to make it, and he declined to draw the line. He expanded the "uninterrupted trade" felicity far beyond the contracted "hemisphere" patronised by Senator Farwell. The Governor enlarged it until it covered all the world. He said:

"Industry found here new incentives; enterprise and invention found large rewards, head and heart joined alike in the service of humanity; and the inanimate forces of nature harnessed by the devices of free thought to the car of progress, carry to-day the burdens once borne by unrequited toil. The swift interchange of thought, wherein, as by the lightning's touch, the heart-throbs of the Nations are felt in the pulses under the embracing sea, tends to make brothers of all mankind."

Somewhat stilted, but ethically true, because the brotherhood of man is broken whenever governments forbid brother to trade with brother. A misprint has marred the beauty of the sentiment, and "free thought" has been carelessly interpolated for "free trade." The context proves that "free trade" was the Governor's word, otherwise there is no adequate cause for the consequence he praised. He knows that "the heart-throbs felt in the pulses under the embracing sea" are telegraph messages concerning trade. For ten "throbs" about thought, that "pulse under the embracing sea," ten thousand pulse in reference to trade.

Reciprocity treaties rest on the assumption that imported goods are an injury to the country that receives them; and therefore it is only fair political retribution that the country sending them should suffer a corresponding injury by importing something in return. The cheaper the goods the greater the mischief, while to get them for nothing would be the greatest calamity of all.

#### EPICURISM, i. e. ATHEISM, THE CROWN OF CREEDS AND PHILOSOPHIES.

BY R. LEWINS.

"O Happiness, our Being's end and aim."—*Pope*.

IT CAN be easily shown, if things be envisaged in the right way, which they so seldom are, owing to the triviality and wrong-headedness of the mass of mankind, that the above postulate is true. Epicurism, which involves a belief in the eternity of matter, of cosmos or chaos, and therefore which disposes of "Creator" and "creation," quite incompatible with ancient or modern evolution, is without doubt the most rational, indeed the *only* rational, theory of the Universe, but is also the grandest and most sublime. It is even more, for it includes and categorises all other philosophic sects, even the sternest stoicism and asceticism. Happiness, or at least, satisfaction to the instincts and impulses of each nature, is the end and aim of all philosophies that have come down to us from antiquity. Just as much, though in a more cryptic

sense, as of epicurism. Even St. Simon Stylites, on his pillar, amid his sores, absurd battering of Heaven with prayer, including his twelve hundred reverences and genuflections in the twelve hours, is no exception to this rule. He could have descended and led an ordinary life if he had cared to. But there is no disputing about tastes and he could only have remained where he did simply because he preferred the one course of life—eccentric and criminal as we must regard it—to the other more natural, general, and genial one. *The one pleased more than the other.* Consequently even his unparalleled asceticism, and seeming self-denial, was as much self-indulgence, as is even that of the most degenerate “epicure”—falsely called after the name of its founder, whose system really postulated just as much antecedent self-denial and self-effacement as did that of the Portico, or any other philosophic school. All men must seek, consciously or unconsciously, most often the latter—the gratification of their own “pleasure,” the absence of which results in *mal aise*, not *bien aise*, or content. Man never can enjoy self-satisfaction, or anything resembling it, until that *nisus* is realised. Just like the squirming infant in the bath, which generally illustrates the advertisement of Pears’ soap, with the legend, “He never will be happy (easy) till he gets it.”

I think all who read this with an impartial mind must see its relevancy. Only impartial minds are, alas! in such a dire minority. Quite like Virgil’s ships of Æneas: “*Rari nantes in gurgite vasto!*” Dualism, which infers spiritualism, in any shape or form, seems quite untenable when we fathom its heights and depths, with Epicurus and Lucretius. Just as much as with hylo-idealism, which is only the coverse of hylo-zoism or materialism (motherism). In the latter synthesis there is no pretence to deal with objects in advance of the age. For to no mortal is it given to anticipate his era and its *Zeitgeist*. All predicated by automorphic egoism has been in the air, even to dunces, for at least two generations past. Just as Luther said of reformation principles, which he traced back for two centuries to the mysticism of Johann Tauler and others, and as certainly was also the case with Columbus. Only it is the rare exceptional mind that possesses the power of converting facts into general principles. As I have often said, I am willing to rest the whole fabric of hylo-zoism and hylo-idealism on Wöhler’s artificial manufacture of a vital (organic) secretion out of inorganic elements—a matter now sixty years or more old. If this development from inorganic into organic be a “true bill,” of which there is no doubt, and of which grape sugar, indigo, etc., are also examples, all *animism*, on which divine worship is based, is eliminated. It can only exist as a supererogation and useless surplusage. In fact, on the above *data*,

religion, as usually understood by the term, becomes a *reductio*, first *ad absurdum*, and finally *ad impossibile*. How can we worship Deity, when we never can escape from *all-inclusive* monistic egoity? Indeed, even on theistic *data*, all divine worship is hylo-ideal. If we look far enough into the millstone, which so *very* few care or dare, to do, we must be landed in the same conclusion. Clericals, as at the present Church Congress in Folkestone, prate of the “crown rights of the Son of God” (Christ). But, properly speaking, we are all Christs, (equally with that lofty idealist, on the hypothesis of an existing Deity,) i. e., Sons of God. A complete illogicality presides over the very initiative of supernaturalism, which is equally implied in monotheism (Jehovah-ism) or polytheism. One God is as much superhumanism as are the 300,000 of the Hindu Pantheon.

#### A MODERN CHRIST.

WE read in Matthew xxiv, 23, and also in Mark xiii, 22: “If any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there, believe it not.” In spite of this warning, men who pretend to be Christs have arisen at all times; they are still among us, and the State of Illinois, it seems, is at present more blessed with Christs than any other country in the world. Would it not be advisable for the World’s Fair Auxiliary to open during the World’s Fair, a congress of Christs? It is to be hoped that it would be a better success than all the congresses of learning that are planned! It would be something unprecedented and unrivaled, something extraordinary.

Harold Brodrick is the latest pretender to that great title, which mankind has attributed only once, to the Nazarene prophet, the patient sufferer on Golgotha. Mr. Brodrick has announced his coming in two volumes of a work entitled “The Son of Man.” The second volume states on the title page that it is written “By the Christ,” and its dedication reads:

“To my dear Father, God, this volume is dedicated by his son Harold: the Christ.”

In this he tells us all the main facts of his life, his experiences in an English insane asylum and how he came to believe that he is Christ. The man is apparently in earnest, and we do not doubt his sincerity. There is much nobility about him, which lifts him high above Schweinfurth, Teed, and other fellows who assume the same honor to themselves.

Mr. Brodrick’s story is interesting from a pathological point of view. The ecstatic states, of which he speaks, when “the spirit of God came all about” him, (II, p. 124,) and in which God “revealed to him spiritual pleasures,” were succeeded the following morning by a collapse, in which he felt tired. (II, p. 126.) The physicians treated him as an epileptic. The state-

ment of the case, as presented by Mr. Brodrick himself, would be of great interest to Professor Lombroso, of Turin. It should be supplemented, however, by notes of the physician who attended to Mr. Brodrick. Whether or not he was correctly treated, it is impossible to surmise. This much is certain, that our alienists, as a rule, enter too little into the *minds* of their patients. They neither try to gain their confidence, as they ought to, nor do they trouble much to find the mental key to their aberrations, which, if mental, cannot be cured by drugs. It may be true that public insane asylums are too overcrowded to allow of much individual discrimination among their occupants, yet this does not apply to private institutes which receive payment for patients. And a man like Brodrick deserves an exceptional treatment, not only for his personal qualities, but also for all the lessons which his case can teach us.

Mr. Brodrick had ecstatic states, in which, as he says, God spoke to him, and he is eccentric in his ways. That exhausts the case; there is, so far as his own apparently very sincere and complete statement goes, no madness about him. He is not insane in the proper sense of the term; he is no lunatic, and to treat him as such in an asylum might be a serious blunder.

His book is a strange mixture of abnormal extravagances and sensible ideas, which latter compare very favorably with those of religious maniacs and even of cranks. He says, for instance:

"Son of Man is a collective term, and anything that happens to any man on earth happens to the Son of Man." (II, p. 67.)

"There are more men than Harold Brodrick knows of who may yet be Christs." (II, p. 71.)

He regards himself as Christ, because he says:

"I have overcome sin." (I, p. 43.)

and

"God is the most Glorious Father to me. He has chastened me and afflicted me with fever and with those things that are brought on by immorality." (II, p. 39.)

When detained in the asylum, Mr. Brodrick was visited by a friend from his native country, New Zealand. Mr. Brodrick says:

"My father, in the flesh, sent him. . . I told him that I was all right, and he said, I hear you claim to be the Holy Ghost. I laughed and told him that the Holy Ghost dwelt in me, and I was only trying to practically teach people that He dwells wherever truth is." (II, p. 162.)

It is surprising that he has no spiritualistic tendencies. He says that "nature" is only another word for God, and it is quite consistent for him to say that "God acts as God and as the devil." (Vol. II, p. 148.)

He expresses his ideas of heaven and immortality as follows: "There are no such places as heaven; heaven is in us." "There are no hells, except what

men are in now." (II, p. 44.) He says: "there is no life after death; when men get to be of the ideas of Jesus and of his way of living, then they overcome death." Or, in another passage (I, p. 57):

"God said to me, when I was in prison: 'You shall live for more than a thousand years.' . . . That means only that the spirit of truth that dwells in me shall dwell in all men."

Mr. Brodrick's description of how he recovered his old faith in God, is very touching. He says:

"As a child I had the most perfect faith in God. I did not know where God was, but I used to work on and on, and do my lessons at school as well as I could, and wait on my mother, who was ill; and then after her death I don't think I ever was happy again. I wanted to go to Heaven to be with God. That idea I had for a very short time after her death. Then, I don't know how it began, but I gradually ceased to think there was a God. I have clinched my teeth with rage, and I have blasphemed the name of God many a time since." (I, p. 33-34.)

When travelling from Montevideo to England, he became "as happy as he ever had been." He says:

"It was a very quiet kind of happiness. Perhaps it made me look as if I had been crying, and possibly I had. The fact is that I had got back my old faith in God. I felt that He was taking care of me. (I, p. 32.)

"And I do not mind confessing that I sobbed like a child. I had longed and hungered for that love of God for many a long year." (I, p. 33.)

If Mr. Brodrick had said and written and done nothing but what is in accord with these quotations from his books, no one would have thought of confining him in a lunatic asylum. But there are some additional facts which explain the situation, and some of them are so comical, that even Mr. Brodrick confesses:

"In plain words, God made me a fool in order that I may teach others what fools they are." (II, p. 128.)

and

"It was a foolish thing of me to announce myself as the messenger of God." (II, p. 116.)

The way in which he tried to announce himself must have created a sensation. He may tell his story in his own words. He sometimes speaks of himself in the third person. He says:

"On Monday, the 19th of October, 1891, he went to the public telegraph office in London, and he handed cables in which were to be sent to many parts of the world, and those cables announced that he was the messenger of God. . . He handed in messages to the President of the United States and to the Governors of the English colonies, and to the Prince of Wales, and with those messages he handed in one that was an ordinary business telegram to Otto Bemberg, of Buenos Ayres. It told him simply that Harold Brodrick did not intend to buy the Elortondo colony, which he had formerly proposed to do. They took those messages after having refused many times, and they thought I did not know what I was doing because I called Jesus my brother; and then, because in another of the messages I said He was my father; and then, in another I said I was the son of Christ. Now Jesus taught men about two thousand years ago that he who believed in Him was His son and brother and father and sister and mother. Those words mean, in the Spirit. They did not send

my messages although they promised to do so. It took me from about ten o'clock in the morning until five in the evening to get those messages out of my hands. I was determined that they should take them. I made them do so by persuasion. They looked solemn until they came to one addressed to the Fiji Islands, and then they smiled, and said that there was no wire to Fiji.

"I was pretty well aware of that fact, but they might, nevertheless, have wired it to New Zealand, and sent it from there by post. However, that is of no consequence. All I wanted was to let men see I was in earnest, and to make them understand that I was the messenger of God." (II, pp. 104-107.)

This is only one of Mr. Brodrick's eccentricities. There are more of them, among which may be mentioned his visit to the Prince of Wales, his anthropological revelations about the inhabitants of Asia and New Zealand, his enunciation of oracular sayings attributed to God, etc., etc. His style betrays the nature of his mind. His sentences are abrupt, and his thought is erratic; a fact which is most striking at the beginning of his book and least apparent in a systematised collection of quotations as presented here.

Whether or not he can be prevailed upon to give up his eccentricities is difficult to say. Being born in 1861, he is too old for a radical change of character and too young still to be entirely unamenable. How he will develop if quietly left to himself it is difficult to say. Let us bear in mind that whole nations have passed through stages of almost incurable eccentricities! And yet they overcame them, at least in part. We are still at work conquering some of the eccentricities of mankind, which the present generation has inherited from mediæval times, and a public teacher is in this respect a wholesale alienist. The editor of this journal, at least, sometimes feels like it when confronted with officially established absurdities, compared with which Mr. Brodrick's eccentricities are trifles.

\* \* \*

Mr. Brodrick being the living example of a man who arrived at the sincere conviction that he is Christ, naturally suggests a comparison between him and Jesus of Nazareth. But this comparison, as must be expected, does not show Mr. Brodrick to advantage. While Jesus is a great figure, powerfully stirring the people of his age, and, through them, all mankind, Mr. Brodrick is simply a curiosity, an anachronism, a phenomenon of mental atavism; he is out of date and (as he is very well aware himself) can only appear ridiculous to his fellow-beings. How grand, simple, and yet pithy are the words of the Christ of the Gospel! There is a moral spirit in them that touches to the quick. How poor is this modern "Son of Man," who has not one great thought of his own! Granted that he is pure of heart and sincere, he is lacking in those qualities which made Jesus the moral leader of mankind. Mr. Brodrick's best ideas are only distorted repetitions of

his elder brother, whose shoe's latchet he is not worthy to unloose.

That which constitutes the greatness of the Jesus of the Gospel is not his self-annunciations as Christ, but the moral contents of his preachings.

There is a mythology woven about the historical Jesus, and David Friedrich Strauss has endeavored to explain it and to trace the mythical threads to their various origins. The labors of critical inquiry are of great value, but that which Christianity is most in want of at present, is not the negative work of a vivisection of mythical figures, but a restatement of the mission of Christ in the light of modern science. The historical Christ is the spirit of Christianity, and the rise of the historical Christ announces a new era in the evolution of mankind. The historical Jesus, it appears, is one of the main factors that formed the historical Christ, and the mythological Jesus was one of the vehicles in which the historical Christ first took shape. The historical Christ, however, is a living presence even to-day, and the more we understand his mission, the less are we in want of any further incorporations of Christ—in the sense of specially chosen instruments of God; while on the other hand, as Dr. Lewins says in his article of this number: "Properly speaking we are all Christs, Sons of God."

#### CURRENT TOPICS.

CONSIDERING that the Isthmus of Panama is on the American continent, and that we have a Monroe doctrine, although nobody knows what it is, it seemed rather unfair that all the profits of the Panama swindle should go to the statesmen of the French republic, and none to the American owners of the Monroe doctrine, the diplomatic sandbag hitherto available whenever European governments have attempted any enterprise on this continent. While that opulent stealing was going on, the Monroe doctrine, instead of ramping round as formerly, lay peaceful as a kitten on a rug, chloroformed into quiet by the French Commissary Generals of the Panama canal. It seems from the evidence obtained in France that we were not altogether cheated out of our honest dues, for two million four hundred thousand dollars was distributed in America to keep the Monroe doctrine still. Our self-esteem increases when we learn that the French freebooters respected the vigilant guardians of the Monroe doctrine, and estimated their value at such a liberal sum. Like a blind man groping his way with a stick, Mr. Fellows, a member of congress from New York, offers a resolution calling for the appointment of a committee to find out who got the money.

\* \* \*

The long struggle over the office of United States Senator for Wisconsin has resulted in the triumph of Mr. Mitchell. This was inevitable, and according to the eternal fitness of things, for Mr. Mitchell owns many millions of dollars, and his proper place is in the United States Senate. His chief competitor General Bragg had nothing to recommend him but fame, services, and ability, therefore it was an act of presumption in him to aspire. It was thought by the innocents that on the break up of the Knight forces they would vote for Bragg, the poor man, but a person with no more foresight than a weather prophet might have known that most of them would flock to the rich man, as they did. One of them, voting for Bragg, said that he did so "because the sentiment

of nine tenths of the Democrats of Wisconsin is in favor of the soldier statesman General Edward S. Bragg. Therefore I vote for the choice of the people, for the choice of the democratic masses of the State of Wisconsin, General Edward S. Bragg." (Applause from the Bragg men.) Rarely do we see such a fine example of self-restraint. For thirty ballots, extending over three weeks of time, this eloquent advocate kept his enthusiasm down, and voted mechanically as a clock against "the soldier statesman, the choice of the people." It was very unkind in his colleague to remark in a taunting way, "Well, if you believed what you say, why didn't you vote for Bragg?"

\* \* \*

A week ago, in speaking of the statute that compels an aspiring genius to get a "diploma" before beginning to practice law, I suggested that the rule might be beneficially expanded so as to require a man to obtain a diploma before venturing upon the business of law making, and before attempting to practice as a statesman. I desire now to offer another amendment requiring any candidate for judicial rank to obtain from some competent authority a certificate showing that he is morally and mentally able to perform the duties of a judge. Such a regulation appears to be greatly needed, especially in Illinois. It is not pleasant for a citizen of this commonwealth to see the judiciary laughed at for its law, and condemned for its injustice. Long ago, one of the judges, now Governor of Illinois, showed in a book filled with evidence, that our jurisprudence is not only vacant of law, but also of that moral intelligence without which not even the decisions of a Marshall or a Mansfield can be relied on. And now the *Albany Law Journal* impeaches the Supreme Court of Illinois, and accuses that high tribunal of weakness, vacillation, inconsistency, and careless disregard of the Constitution and the law. The charge that the decisions are made by individual judges, instead of by the whole court, seems to be successfully denied by the clerk of the Supreme Court himself, who certainly ought to be believed; but the other accusations yet remain. The decisions quoted by the *Albany Law Journal* are so discordant, and so feebly reasoned, that they diminish our confidence in the learning of the court, and in its judicial impartiality. The indecision of the decisions deprives the law of strength and symmetry. No suitor, however just he knows his cause to be, can depend upon the law. No lawyer, however confident, can safely advise a client.

\* \* \*

As if to justify the censure of the *Albany Law Journal*, the Supreme Court of Illinois now reverses the judgment in the Cronin case, for errors which it sanctioned in the Anarchist case. By this reversal it has passed a solemn sentence on itself, and conjured ghosts out of the shades of Mannheim, and into the temples and mansions of Chicago. We may whistle aloud to keep our courage up, but in spite of our affected bravery a mysterious fear creeps over us, that, perhaps, after all, the so called anarchists were denied a legal trial by jury. If the latter decision is right, the former decision was wrong, and its consequences a tragic and melancholy mistake. This fear awakens the general conscience and finds expression in the following words, which I quote from a leading paper in Chicago. Deploring the opinion in the Cronin case, it says: "An argument like this could easily have been made in the anarchist case, for there was an abundance of technical errors in that upon which a reversal might have been based. If there was a miscarriage of justice in the Cronin case for the reasons set forth in this opinion, there was also a miscarriage of justice in the anarchist case, and no other conclusion can be reached than that Spies and his fellow conspirators were judicially murdered." The inward, silent monitor that accuses us is neither to be deceived nor soothed by adjectives, and the "abundance of errors" cannot be exorcised by verbal incantations such as "technical." An illegal jury never was a merely technical error, but always a substantial

wrong, especially in trials involving life or death; but of course, in a time of mob frenzy and judicial anarchy a different rule prevails.

\* \* \*

The "immigration" question appears to be responsible for a great deal of "native" bad manners and inhospitality. It has become the fashion for men of words, especially at banquets, to lecture the "foreigner" on his duties, and to complain of his ways. Those patrician censors are very superior persons. They cannot condescend, like the rest of us, to be equal fellow-citizens of this country, because they own the country, and mounted on their oratorical stilts they patronise and criticise the foreigner in a very conceited and ungenerous way. Whatever he may do to please them, they are not satisfied. When he calls himself Irish, German, Scandinavian, or anything else, they tell him that he is disloyal to his adopted country, and that he ought to be an American, and nothing but an American. When he adopts that advice and calls himself an American, they tell him that he is using false pretenses and that he cannot be an American, because he was not born in America. When he tries to compromise the difficulty by describing himself more fully as an Irish-American, or a German-American, the hyphen makes them swoon, and they drop into a feminine faint. Is there anything disloyal about a hyphen, which innocently helps to describe an American citizen who is by birth a foreigner? Last week a New York American bearing the very Dutch and very honorable name of Roosevelt, spoke in Chicago at the annual banquet of the Hamilton Club on "Americanism and Immigration." With eloquent rage he pounced upon the "hyphenated American," and magisterially proclaimed who must not come into this country. Next year the Hamilton Club will invite him to come back and tell us who shall not stay. He would exclude the "uneducated"; a harsh proceeding, which might put Mr. Roosevelt himself in danger, if his description of America and the Americans is to be taken as a test of what he knows. He said: "America is more than a geographical expression, and Americans more than human beings who happen to inhabit a particular section of the world's surface." Only a very small fraction of that is true. To be sure, there are a few Americans, like Mr. Roosevelt and the members of the Hamilton Club, who are "more than human beings who happen to inhabit a particular section of the world's surface," but the most of us are merely human beings who are called Americans, because we happen to inhabit that bit of the earth which is known in geography as America. Mr. Roosevelt further said that "America, as a nation, is to be regarded as an organic whole, indivisible itself, and sharply sundered from all others." This is such an extravagant mistake, that I cannot help thinking that "America" is a misprint for "China," of which latter country the words of Mr. Roosevelt give a very fair description. They are less applicable to America than to any other nation on the globe. There never was a country, not even Rome, so closely connected with all others as the United States is now.

\* \* \*

That a man ought to be a good citizen is plain enough, and it is well to tell him so, but our political schoolmasters of the Roosevelt order think that nobody but the foreigner needs exhorting, and that the native is always good. I am sorry to confess that I have many times detected foreigners engaged in political rascality, but in every instance I found some native Americans among them, directing operations and sharing in the spoils. Mr. Roosevelt has no doubt that the Americanism worn by him and the Hamilton Club is the genuine article, and that every other kind is counterfeit; but, if we test it by the Declaration of Independence, by the Constitution of the United States, by the history and traditions of the American people we may find that it is not Americanism at all, but English Toryism covered all over with cobwebs, like old port of a vintage as far away as the reign of George the Third.

At the Hamilton Club the members applaud sentiments which are as contemptuously anti-American as anything ever uttered at the Carlton Club in London, and I cannot accept from them as Americanism of good quality the reactionary Toryism of Pall Mall. While they are lecturing the foreigner on his civic duties, they might profitably drop a patriotic word into the ear of the native, too. It is coming to this, that the foreigner, in order to satisfy his critics, must give up not only his political allegiance to his native land, but also the sentiments, manners, thoughts, and customs of his own people, and that natural allegiance of love and veneration which no good man ever withholds from the home of his forefathers. Mr. Roosevelt is separated from Holland by several generations, but has he no pride in the Dutch people from whom he sprung; a people who have done greater things with smaller means than any other people under the sun? I would not give much for the political allegiance to America of any foreigner who can renounce, as if it were an old coat, the natural allegiance which he owes to his native land.

M. M. TRUMBULL.

### THE DEAR OLD HAND.

BY G. L. HENDERSON.

She sits alone in her room;  
She knits the livelong day,  
Or clasps her hands in the gloom;  
Her thoughts are far away.  
'Tis dear old mother we know;  
The same dear hands knit the stocking,  
The same dear foot did the rocking  
Of our cradle long ago.

She's back in her mountain home,  
A loved one holds her hand.  
He says: "You are mine; oh, come!"  
She enters fairyland.  
Beautiful mother! we know  
The same dear hands knit the stocking,  
The same dear foot did the rocking  
Of our cradle long ago.

She hears the patter of feet,  
She kissed them every one,  
She works, they play in the street,  
Her work is never done.  
A busy mother, we know  
The same dear hands knit the stocking,  
The same dear foot did the rocking  
Of our cradle long ago.

One by one, they go away,  
Ever in memory stored;  
Same are dead—one brave son lay  
Where guns for freedom roared.  
A faithful mother, we know;  
The same dear hands knit the stocking,  
The same dear foot did the rocking  
Of our cradle long ago.

The heart she still loves lies cold;  
She's near his empty chair.  
Her love will never grow old;  
We kiss her silv'ry hair.  
Darling mother! we know  
The same dear hands knit the stocking,  
The same dear foot did the rocking  
Of our cradle long ago.

Life rolls on like a river,  
Purer, clearer, stronger.  
Love digs her channels; ever  
Broader, deeper, longer.  
Still other mothers, we know,  
Busily will knit the stocking,  
Lovingly will do the rocking;  
All as ours did long ago.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

### NO TRIBUNAL FOR RELIGION.

*To the Editor of The Open Court:*

I am not interested in *The Open Court*. Its name alone even without its expressed aim is enough to condemn it in the eyes of a Christian.

To insinuate that religion—the religion of Christ—is a thing to be brought before the bar shows a sad ignorance of the word of revelation that tells us "the faith was once delivered," or a sadder unbelief of that revelation.

A man might as well begin to inquire if he ever was made, as to examine and strive to find out the truth about God by reason. If God is a Spirit, the Infinite, the Almighty, the Adorable, how could man know much about Him unless it was revealed to him? That God exists the Bible assumes (not attempts to prove) and man's consciousness attests.

It seems to me like an insult to send such a paper to a clergyman.

When I have become familiar enough with the Bible to understand its obscurer parts, to know under what circumstances each part was written, perfectly well posted on all its geography and history, I may have time to reconcile science, so far as it is not merely so-called science with it.

I am afraid I have not written in a conciliatory spirit, so that you will hardly heed my request that you will make the Bible more your study, and literature less. If, however, you would do so and act upon what you find therein, you will not have the heart nor mind to sanction the utterly useless and debasing horrors of vivisection.

Truly yours,

B. ROTHER PLYMOUTH.

[We respect every sincere opinion, and are glad to let every side be heard. It is strange, however, that our correspondent imagines that he represents the cause of Christianity. "To insinuate that religion, the religion of Christ, is a thing to be brought before the bar," he says, "shows a sad ignorance of the word of revelation," etc. Yet to insinuate that we should not inquire into the truth and reliability of that which is regarded as the most important thing, denotes either a lack of religious interest or what is sadder still, of confidence in the truth of our religious convictions. Who ever saw truth afraid of being brought before the bar? Truth need not mind and does not mind the closest scrutiny. Thus, he who stands up for truth will rather encourage than prevent inquiry.]

Our correspondent advises us to study the bible. We have studied the Bible; not only its geography and history, but also its spirit, and we must confess that we regard the Bible as far superior to that orthodoxy which erroneously claims the biblical authority in its favor.

Revelation and tradition are two different things. A revelation of which we have no direct knowledge, but only the indirect information of traditions, is, as a matter of course, to be classed as a tradition. It is, first of all, the pretense of a revelation which has to prove its claims.

It is expected that during the World's Fair all the various

religions will hold public services. How shall we decide their respective claims except (as Jesus suggested) by their fruits? And how shall we judge of their fruits, except by closest scrutiny and most exact, most rigorous, and scientific inquiry?—Ed.]

#### BOOK REVIEWS.

**SOCIALISM EXPOSED AND REFUTED.** By the Rev. *Victor Cathrein*, S. J. A Chapter from the Author's Moral Philosophy. [From the German.] By the Rev. *James Conway*, S. J. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. Pp. 164, 75 cents.

This booklet is a translation from a chapter of Cathrein's comprehensive work on "Moral Philosophy." It was published separately in the original German and met with a most cordial reception. Five translations have already appeared, in French, Italian, Spanish, Polish, and Flemish. The English translation is the sixth one. Its German origin will be a sufficient explanation why the criticisms of the book are so little applicable to American life. Our conditions are so different, and having no Social Democracy, few people will understand the refutations hurled against its doctrines. The author explains (in Chap. I) the nature of socialism as well as its development up to the time of the Erfurt programme, and avers (Chap. II) that the principles of socialism are untenable. He declares that there is no absolute equality of the rights of all men as demanded by socialism, that undue emphasis is given to the industrial phase of life, and that human life is treated only from its temporal or earthly standpoint. The socialistic theory that value is created exclusively by labor is rejected, and liberalism is declared to be the root of the evil. The impracticability of socialism (Chap. III) is treated of in six sections. The author grants more to socialism than from the premises of the first part could be expected. He says:

"We do not maintain that a social order, such as that devised by the socialists, involves a contradiction or is impracticable under all conditions. If men generally were entirely unselfish, industrious, obedient, filled with interest for the common weal, always ready to give everybody else the preference, and to choose for themselves the last and most disagreeable place—in short, if men were no longer men, as they are, but angels, a social order, according to the plan of the socialists, would not be impossible."

Now, the experiment has been made repeatedly, not only several times of late in America, but once almost 2000 years ago in Judea; and we do not doubt that the first Christians who had all their goods in common, thus making a noble experiment from which later generations could learn, were truly religious, unselfish, serious, diligent, obedient men, filled with the interest for the common weal, and yet they failed in their aspirations.

We think it is strange that the Rev. Father does not even mention that Christianity in its very origin was socialism. If he had kept this fact in view, he might have judged the socialistic aspirations in a less unfavorable light.

#### NOTES.

The German branch of the Society for Ethical Culture is now publishing a weekly journal, entitled *Ethische Kultur*, the editor of which is Prof. George von Gizycki. The first number contains an editorial, explanatory of the aims of the society. "By 'ethical culture,' the society understands a state in which justice, truthfulness, humaneness, and mutual esteem obtain," and an article by Professor Jodl answers the question *Was heisst ethische Kultur?* in a similar sense. We believe in the necessity of preaching morality, so we wish that the new society may prosper and do a good work. We do not believe, however, in the maxim proposed by the Society for Ethical Culture that ethics can be preached without regard to science, religion, and philosophy; and this error of

theirs has been pointed out at once by Prof. Ernst Haeckel, in *Die Zukunft*, and by Dr. Th. Barth, in an editorial of *Die Nation*. We fully agree with both critics; and this is the reason why we have little confidence in the future of the societies of ethical culture on this side as well as on the other side of the Atlantic. Nevertheless, we trust that their good intentions are worth something, and their labors will not be entirely lost. Yet the main value of their work, it seems to us, lies in this, that the churches receive with this new competition a fresh impetus, which will strengthen the liberal, humanitarian, and moral elements in the churches, so as to overcome the old, narrow dogmatism.

# THE MONIST.

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE

OF

PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, RELIGION, AND SOCIOLOGY.

CONTENTS OF VOL. III, NO. 2, (JANUARY, 1893):

THE DOCTRINE OF AURA. By PROF. C. LLOYD MORGAN.  
EVOLUTIONARY LOVE. By CHARLES S. PEIRCE.  
RENAN: A Discourse Given at South Place Chapel, London. By MONCURE D. CONWAY.  
INTUITION AND REASON. By CHRISTINE LADD FRANKLIN.  
CRUELTY AND PITY IN WOMAN. By GUILLAUME FERRERO.  
PANPSYCHISM AND PANBIOTISM. EDITOR.  
LITERARY CORRESPONDENCE.  
1) France—LUCIEN ARRÉAT.  
2) Germany—CHRISTIAN UFER.  
CRITICISMS AND DISCUSSIONS.  
BOOK REVIEWS.  
PERIODICALS.

SINGLE NUMBERS, FIFTY CENTS.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION: \$2.00 a year, post-paid, to any part of the United States, Canada, and Mexico; to foreign countries in the Postal Union, \$2.25; single numbers, 60 cents.

# THE OPEN COURT.

NIXON BUILDING, 175 LA SALLE ST.,

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, Post Office Drawer F.

E. C. HEGELER, PUBLISHER.

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.

#### CONTENTS OF NO. 284.

RECIPROCITY AND SOUTH AMERICA. GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL.....	3543
EPICURISM, i. e. ATHEISM, THE CROWN OF CREEDS AND PHILOSOPHIES. R. LEWINS.....	3544
A MODERN CHRIST. EDITOR.....	3545
CURRENT TOPICS: Was the Monroe Doctrine Bribed? Rich Men for the Senate. Diplomas for Judges. The Cronin Case and the Anarchist Case. Spurious Americanism. Natural Allegiance and Political Allegiance. GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL.....	3547
POETRY.	
The Dear Old Hand. G. L. HENDERSON.....	3549
CORRESPONDENCE.	
No Tribunal for Religion. [With Editorial Comments.] B. ROTHER PLYMOUTH.....	3549
BOOK REVIEWS.....	3550
NOTES.....	3550