

# THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 295. (VOL. VII.—16.)

CHICAGO, APRIL 20, 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.

## WHAT IS A LIBERAL EDUCATION?

BY F. M. HOLLAND.

MOST of our schools and colleges seem to be planned on the supposition, that the early history of mankind was substantially this. Adam and Eve were created on the sixth day of the week, and taught to read and write on the seventh. They were told that they must do nothing in the Garden of Eden, except study; but they ran away from school, in order to climb trees and steal apples. They were more studious after they had been turned out: and the first murder was due to the jealousy of Cain, at being outstripped by Abel in the junior class. It was fondness for improper books which brought down the deluge to drown them as well as their readers; the ark was built in order that the decent part of antediluvian literature might be preserved; and the first public library was the tower of Babel. The credit of inventing the printing press may be divided between Noah and Prometheus; but it is certain that Nimrod was a mighty hunter after mistakes made by other authors, and probable that the cause of the Trojan war was a quarrel about international copyright. All this must be believed devoutly, in order to justify the old-fashioned system of education; and it must also be taken for granted, that King Arthur and his knights were merely a band of daring young critics who conducted a quarterly review at Camelot, that Charlemagne published a daily newspaper, that William the Conqueror flooded England with pamphlets in support of his title, before he crossed the Channel, and that the main purpose of the crusaders was to distribute tracts.

Not one of these suppositions is so absurd, as it would be to pretend that the course of study, in most of the schools and colleges, is either a liberal or a practical one, according to the great principle long ago announced by Pestalozzi, and stated by Herbert Spencer in his book on "Education" as follows: "Alike in its order and its methods, education must conform to the natural process of mental evolution." "Of course this fundamental principle of tuition, that the arrangement of matter and method must correspond with the order of evolution and mode of activity of the faculties,—a principle so obviously true that when once

stated it seems almost self-evident—has never been wholly disregarded. Teachers have unavoidably made their school-courses coincide with it in some degree, for the simple reason that education is possible only on that condition. Boys were never taught the rule-of-three, until after they had learned addition." (Pp. 110, 111.) No good teacher, I may add, would set children who could barely read words of one syllable to study Browning's "Sordello," or even Spencer's "First Principles." The rule of letting the easiest books come first is so well established, that no teacher would disregard it deliberately; and a proposal to reverse it, and begin with the most difficult books, would be universally condemned as preposterous. This word literally means, putting that first which ought to be last; and it might properly be applied to the idea that education has to begin with using any book.

In order to get rid of all that has been preposterous in our methods of education, we ought to give more attention to some of the plainest facts in the early history of mankind. The first men knew as little about books and newspapers, as the animals from whom they had been developed. It is doubtful whether they could even speak in the earliest ages; and it is certain that they could not read or write. The period which has elapsed since the invention of any alphabet is in all probability very short, compared with the untold ages of absolute illiteracy. The skulls of the men of even that primitive period, however, show that the human brain had already become much larger than that of any lower animal, in proportion to the size of the body. The brain power of these primitive illiterates seems to differ but little from our own, in comparison with its vast superiority to that possessed by the lowest vertebrates. Long before there was any reading or writing, there was an immense period during which men developed a great deal of mental power by using tools and weapons, as well as by coming in contact in other direct ways with the external world of realities in which they lived. At the same time, they acquired a large amount of useful knowledge, as must be admitted by all who consider how well trained many illiterate savages are in the best way to hunt, fish, cook, and in other ways adapt themselves to the cir-

cumstances, which have been their principal teachers. Of course, what was learned before the invention of the alphabet, was worth very little compared with what has been learned since; but there has never been a time when all knowledge came solely through books. What literary life there was before the present century has been, for the most part, among people who were few in numbers, compared with the rest of the population, and who did so much riding, hunting, dancing, and fencing as to keep their muscles in much better training than most scholars do at the present day. This could not, of course, be said of the Catholic clergy, who had almost a monopoly of learning during the Middle Ages; but they did not materially aid the transmission of brain-power by inheritance. It is true that the literary class was very large and not very athletic during the latter days of the Roman empire; but it is also true that these scholars did not display much mental power in their contests against the illiterate barbarians who overthrew the empire, and who substituted governments which were in some respects more advanced, for instance in recognising the advantages of local self-government, and in introducing trial by jury. It should also be remembered that we, citizens of the United States, are much more largely descended from these men of the North than from the comparatively scholarly men of the South. In short, our brains are the results of two factors, a muscular training, which has been enjoyed by all our ancestors for untold ages, and a literary training, which has been possessed during recent times by a few of the ancestors of a small part of our population. To try to educate the brain of every child as if it had been entirely produced by a small force which has but lately come into play, is simply preposterous.

This position is further justified by those recent investigations into the functions and structure of the brain, which show that its various parts correspond closely, and perhaps exclusively, to the activity of the different muscles and the impressions made upon each of the senses. Every muscle has its own special centre in the brain, as may be seen at length in works like "The Soul of Man," by Dr. Carus, and "The Principles of Psychology," by Professor James. The brain has plainly been developed mainly under the influence of muscular activity, and scarcely at all under that of literary culture. Its structure confirms what Maudsley says of the muscles, namely, that "Their actions are essential elements in our mental operations. The superiority of the human over the animal mind seems to be essentially connected with the great variety of muscular action of which man is capable." How much can be done for the brain by training the muscles was shown by an experiment in the Elmira Reformatory, where this agency alone was found suffi-

cient to enable convicts who had become stationary in the lowest grade of school-work, and who seemed "incapable of prolonged mental efforts," to rise to the first grade in the school. We are told that their faces became much brighter and more intelligent than before, and that "The stride in mental and moral development was almost beyond belief." (See "Annual Report of Managers," January, 1887, and *Popular Science Monthly*, for July, 1889, Vol. XXXV, pp. 338-340.)

The method of education originally followed by our race, and still recorded in the structure of our brains, is precisely that which is found sufficient to develop the mind of the child before he goes to school. He goes there because he needs further development of mind and brain. To try to give them solely through literary culture, is no wiser than it would be to try to make a tree grow rapidly and symmetrically by watering and manuring the roots in only one little spot.

Our present system of education is not to be condemned as a failure; but many of the successful pupils get a great deal of muscular training outside of the school-room; those who get none are apt to fall into narrowly introspective or retrospective habits of thought; and the thinkers who have done most to mould public opinion in recent years, have brains which have presided for many years over the delicate manipulations necessary for scientific investigation. A muscular movement which is made consciously and deliberately is much more beneficial intellectually than one which takes place automatically. The latter can make a good workman, but the thinker is best developed by those efforts which require most thought. A painter who was asked how he mixed his colors, answered, "with brains"; and pupils who are taught sewing, cooking, wood-carving, Swedish gymnastics, or modelling in clay by an instructor who takes care to keep their minds as active as their muscles, are doing at least as much to develop their brains as if they were committing spelling-lessons to memory, or even translating Greek. Emerson was right in urging "the claims of manual labor as a part of the education of every young man," and declaring that "We must have a basis for our higher accomplishments in the work of our hands."

I am not recommending that this trade or that be taught in our public schools and colleges, but only that their course be made broad enough to develop the brain to the greatest possible fitness for any kind of work. A liberal education does not consist in preparation merely for mechanical work, or merely for literary life either. That education is most liberal which is developing the brain for the widest range of work by using the widest range of agencies; and muscular training ought not to be left out.

## THE PSYCHOLOGY OF LEGERDEMAIN.

BY MAX DESSOIR.

[CONCLUDED.]

V.

Spiritualism is jugglery! This is a statement we often hear from uninformed people, and some enthusiasts give themselves great trouble to prove the fact by "antispiritualistic demonstrations." But the inaptness of the comparison is evident from the fact that the number of believers in the new teachings is constantly increasing, and also that in spite of exposures and explanations, many eminent scholars still espouse the cause of mediumistic facts. The chief reason of this seems to be the following. In our scientific age neither science nor religion offers to the masses a sufficiently clear explanation of the problem of existence, while a metaphysical necessity still prohibits thoughtful minds from entering the barren waste of materialism. Now spiritualism enters the lists and says: I will show you that there *is* a life after death. Is it surprising that such an experimental ethics should find a loud echo in inquiring hearts, or that a social movement should arise whose germs have existed in all ages and among all people?

Yet against such tendencies science is entirely powerless. No argument of reason will convince one who has taken spiritualism to heart, as our judgment is always subordinate to our feelings and desires. It is therefore a vain task to pour a few drops of water on the glowing coals of a psychical epidemic.

But beside the fanatics of spiritualism are many who regard it their duty to test with unbiassed minds the remarkable reports and to investigate the phenomena of spiritualism, or at least take a certain external interest in the matter. For these and these only, are the following remarks intended, as a kind of application of our former observations.

Our knowledge of mediumistic performances has been obtained almost without exception, from written reports. In other words: we have never learned what has occurred at any time, but only what other persons *believe* has occurred. Between these two, as we have seen, there is a great difference. A person sees an orange vanish in the air without being able to explain the miracle, he imagines he has tested eight rings when he has really had only two in his hand, he thinks he has drawn a card at will when it was thrust into his fingers, he believes he is holding fast an object which is really somewhere else,—and if he afterwards describes to a third person these tricks, they are naturally pronounced incredible. It must therefore be regarded as a piece of rare *naïveté* if a reporter asserts that in the description of his subjective conclusions he is giving the exact objective processes. Davey's experiments furnish a striking proof of this. This gentleman, a

member of the London Society for Psychical Research, and an amateur prestidigitateur, attained by continuous practice, such great facility in the so-called "slate writing," that he could give exhibitions before numbers of persons with success. He never told his guests that his performances were accomplished by the aid of spirits, or by sleight-of-hand, but each was left to think as he saw fit. At the close of the *séance*, to which no admission fee was charged, Mr. Davey requested all present to communicate to him on the following day in writing what they had observed. He then published the letters received, and their character is so exuberant that one might really believe superior powers were involved. "Writing upon slates locked and carefully guarded by witnesses—writing upon slates held by the witnesses firmly against the under surface of the table—writing upon slates held by the witnesses above the table—answers to questions written secretly in locked slates—correct quotations appearing on guarded slates from books chosen by the witnesses at random, and sometimes mentally, the books not touched by the 'medium'; messages in languages unknown to the 'medium,' including a message in German, for which only a mental request had been made, and a letter in Japanese in a double slate locked and sealed by the witness, etc. And yet, though 'autographic' fragments of pencil were 'heard' weaving mysterious messages between and under and over slates, and fragments of chalk were seen moving about under a tumbler placed above the table in full view, none of the sitters witnessed that best phenomenon, *Mr. Davey writing.*"

The sources of error through which such strange reports arise, may be arranged in four groups. First, the observer interpolates a fact which did not happen, but which he is led to believe has happened; thus, he imagines he has examined the slate when as a fact he never has. Second, he confuses two similar ideas; he thinks he has carefully examined the slate, when in reality he has only done so hastily, or in ignorance of the point at issue. Third, the witness changes the order of events a little in consequence of a very natural deception of memory; he believes he tested the slate later than he actually did. Fourth and last, he passes over certain details which were purposely described to him as insignificant; he does not notice that the "medium" asks him to close a window, and that the trick is thus rendered possible. *Everything* cannot be retained, much less written. How difficult it is to put in writing in a form admitting of no criticism even an every-day occurrence! And how much more difficult is it to describe an event which partakes of the character of the inexplicable, and which by reason of interruptions and incidents, renders continuous observation almost impossible.

Add to this that most people visit a spiritualistic *séance*, expecting something marvellous. Mr. Davey has experimentally shown that of equally capable observers, those who know that sleight-of-hand is concerned, are in a much better condition to understand the *modus operandi* than others. It is evident that intense expectation, the charm of mystery, the rude playing upon the holiest affairs of the heart (through messages from departed relatives) must greatly excite the nerves and dull the vision. Moreover, the medium makes a special point of leaving in doubt the interpretation of what is seen and heard, and this psychic state of the spectator accounts for many otherwise inexplicable occurrences. The slightest noise becomes a loud knock, every light-reflection a ghost, and every accidental touch a manifestation from a higher sphere. The observer overlooks, on the one hand, the natural, physical explanation, and, on the other hand, creates a miracle out of nothing; he imparts his excitement to others, and is in turn influenced by them. The form in which a disinterested spectator sees the concealed figure of the medium, is regarded by others as the true image of persons entirely unlike when living. An American naturalist declares that he has heard the same puppet successively addressed as "grandmother," "my sweet little Betty," "Papa," and "little Rob." Every one sees what he expects to see, and what most closely touches his interest. Create a belief and the facts will create themselves.

If an object suddenly disappears or changes its place, the spiritualist sees in it an evidence of super-human power, just like the Papuan, who, knowing nothing of powder, imagines a spirit behind every cannon-ball; he lacks a certain knowledge, without which it is impossible to form a true judgment. A sound mind alone does not render one competent to judge of the safety of fastenings; only a man practised in the mechanism of knots and familiar with the various modes of tying can claim any competency on this point. To decide whether a conclusion is true, a certain technical knowledge is necessary. Most people imagine that a person entirely unprepared can step into a spiritualistic *séance* and form a conclusive opinion as to the presence or lack of prestidigitation; but such an idea is as childish as to suppose that a layman could decide the genuineness of a seal of the Middle Ages, or the nature of a nerve-affection. I will illustrate. The juggler often employs the artifice of making a process prominent by referring it to a foreign cause. In the trick of causing a watch to strike at will, a little instrument concealed in the vest-pocket makes the sound, and the manipulation of the watch is only for show. One who does not know this would hardly guess that Monck and Home's harmonica, played by invisible hands, was to be explained in the

same manner. A performance of Dr. Monck was to place a musical clock on a table, cover it with a cigar-box, and cause it to play or be silent at will. General explanation, "spirits." In reality the sound came from a small music-box, concealed in the performer's wide trousers, above the knee, and put in motion by pressing against the table. Here again the old psychological rule is verified: the simpler the trick, the more difficult it is to discover.

One great advantage a deceiving medium has is the fact that he is allowed to fix his own conditions of success, and, if it comes to the worst, can put the blame of failure upon the spectators, or the spirits. Semi-darkness is also advantageous, because it is "positive," that is, one can never see where something is in process of development, or what else is effected there. Mrs. Sidgwick, the wife of the well-known Cambridge professor of philosophy, and president of the Society for Psychical Research, has set forth five grounds for suspicion against Slade's performances: his efforts to divert attention; his position, which enabled him always to operate with his right hand upon the table; the vague character of the communications; the limiting of the number of spectators to two or three; and their arrangement, which precluded every possibility of looking under the table. She might have added, that according to the observations of the Seybert commission, Slade and other mediums, with true sleight-of-hand cunning, executed their tricks without announcing beforehand what was to be done.

But we must admit that *a few* tricks, such as those of Professor Crookes with Home, concerning the possibility of setting inanimate objects in motion without touching them, *appear* to lie entirely outside the sphere of jugglery. And so, personally, I must close with this confession, doubtless unexpected to many readers, that I feel unable to explain a certain small portion of spiritualistic manifestations by means of the psychology of jugglery. I do not mean that these *cannot* be traced back to deceptive manipulation, or at least to the employment of known means; I only frankly and honestly admit, that up to the present time such a method of explanation has not been found.

#### THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE, A CATECHISM.

##### INTRODUCTION.

We are born into the world as living, feeling, and thinking beings. We live for a while and then we die.

And what is our life? We toil, we suffer, we hope, we aspire, we work. Our joys are fleeting and many of them leave behind them the lees of regret and disappointment. Only a few hopes are realised, only some aspirations are fulfilled, and only a part of our efforts is crowned with success.

Thus our life appears as a transient phenomenon, narrow in its field, short in its span of years, and limited in its power of achievement.

What shall be our aim and purpose?

Shall we look for satisfaction in the little gratifications that come from the pleasures of life? And is there no higher object than to live and be merry and pass away as though we had never been.

We anxiously look for support in tribulations, for comfort in afflictions, and for guidance in the vicissitudes of life. And the assistance that we find is our religion.

How can we acquire information concerning ourselves and the world in which we live? How shall we find a religion?

Information can be had only through inquiry. We have to prove all things and hold fast that which is good. Says Jesus of Nazareth: "Seek and ye shall find."

The methods by which we try to find a religion to support and guide us must be the same as those that we employ in other fields of life and which are comprehended under the name of science. In this sense we say, the religion we seek is the religion of science.

#### THE PRINCIPLES, THE FAITH, AND THE DOCTRINES OF THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

What is religion?

Every religion is, or should be, a conviction that regulates man's conduct, affords comfort in affliction, and consecrates all the purposes of life.

What is science?

Science is the methodical search for truth; and truth is a correct, complete, invariable, and comprehensive statement of facts.

What is the religion of science?

The religion of science is that religion wherein man aspires to find the truth by the most reliable and truly scientific methods.

The religion of science recognises the authority of truth, scientifically proved, as ultimate. It does not rely on human authority, even though that authority pretends to have special revelations from some supernatural source.

The religion of science accepts no special revelations, yet it recognises certain principles. It has no creed or dogma, yet it has a clearly defined faith. It does not prescribe peculiar ceremonies or rituals, yet it propounds definite doctrines and insists on a rigorous ethical code.

What are the principles of the religion of science?

First, to inquire after truth.

Second, to accept the truth.

Third, to reject what is untrue.

Fourth, to trust in truth.

And fifth, to live the truth.

Is there a difference in principle between religious and scientific truth?

No, there is none!

There is a holiness about science which is rarely appreciated either by priests or by scientists. Scientific truth is not profane, it is sacred.

There are not two antagonistic truths, one religious the other scientific. There is but one truth, which is to be discovered by scientific methods and applied in our religious life.

Truth is one, and the recognition of truth is the basis of all genuine religion.

What are creeds and dogmas?

Creeds and dogmas are such religious doctrines as are propounded without proof, and the acceptance of which is demanded even though they may appear absurd before the tribunal of science.

The principles of the religion of science admit of no creeds, yet the religion of science has a faith.

What is the faith of the religion of science?

The faith of the religion of science is its trust in truth.

The difference between faith and creed is this: creed is a mere belief, faith is a moral attitude. Faith in creeds is the determination to be satisfied with unwarranted or unproved statements. The faith of the religion of science is the conviction that truth can be found, and that truth is the sole redeemer.

There are religious teachers who expressly forbid any investigation of their religious dogmas, and insist that rational inquiry shall not be tolerated in matters of faith. Their faith is called blind faith.

The religion of science rejects blind faith as irreligious and immoral, and preaches that it is our duty to inquire into all the questions that arise in life.

The religion of science is not a religion of indifference; it does not proclaim that kind of toleration which allows every man to believe and act as he pleases. On the contrary, it proclaims most positive and stern doctrines.

Religious indifference, as fashionable now as it has ever been in certain circles, is detestable to any one who is serious about truth.

Let us have honest belief or honest unbelief, and abandon that unconcerned apathy of a half-hearted religion.

He that is the first and is the last has said:

"I know thy works that thou art neither cold nor hot. I would that thou wert cold or hot. So then, because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth."

What the Roman church claims to be, the religion of science is. The religion of science is the catholic and orthodox religion.

We do not say that the truth as we know it now, is perfect and complete. Not at all. We know comparatively little, and the world is inexhaustible in problems. But we do know that truth can be attained step by step. Inquiry into truth is not only a scientific necessity, it is also a religious duty, and no pious devotion is of the right kind unless it be accompanied by the spirit of research.

While the religion of science rejects dogmas it is not without doctrines; its faith is not without substance.

What is the source of the doctrines of its faith?

The doctrines of the religion of science are the result of experience, not of one man only, but of the whole race.

They have to be proved and are always liable to critical revision.

What does the religion of science teach regarding rituals and ceremonies?

The religious life of the established religions consists to a great extent in the use of sacraments, ceremonies, and rituals, symbols instituted to convey in allegorical form religious doctrines, and to express by visible signs and outward forms the invisible spiritual relations between men and God. Baptism, confession, the holy communion, matrimony, are such rituals. The religion of science does not deny that appropriate forms are needed to express in a worthy and adequate way those transactions which are of a religious nature. Ceremonies are one way of consecrating life and the most important events of life. Yet the symbols must adequately express the ideas, and the ideas must be true.

The religion of science attaches no intrinsic value to symbols themselves, but only to their meanings. The symbols must not be conceived as the Indian conceives the spell of the medicine-man. They are meaningless and inefficient aside from the meaning that men put into them. There is no magic power in them. The religion of science has no objection to ceremonies, but it does not prescribe special and peculiar forms as essential to religion, or as indispensable conditions of salvation.

What are the doctrines of the religion of science?

(1) The religion of science propounds as one of its main doctrines that every act has its unavoidable consequences, good or evil, according to the nature of the act. (2) The religion of science teaches that the moral commandments in which almost all the established religions agree are sound. (3) That which is good and that which is evil must be found out by scientific in-

vestigation. (4) The religion of science accepts the verdicts of science.

This does not mean that the opinion of every scientist is to be accepted as science, but only those statements which are proved by rational arguments and can be verified by experience, or, if possible, also by experiments.

What is the place of scientists in the religion of science?

Scientists, as seekers of truth, are prophets of the religion of science.

Prophets and priests have authority in the measure in which they represent the authority of moral conduct. They have no authority of themselves. Thus, to the faithful believer no amount of error or fraud in prophets and priests will overthrow their trust in religion.

The same is true of Science.

Scientists have authority in such measure as they have investigated, found, and proved the truth. They have no authority of themselves.

Scientists are subject to error, yet no amount of error can overthrow science and the authority of science.

The religion of science is based upon the authority of science, not of scientists, and science is not only physics or the so-called natural sciences, but it includes also sociology and ethics. Scientists as prophets of truth are indispensable helpmates of the preachers of morality. Yet scientists and preachers are mortal like other human beings, and both of them are liable to error.

As priests are frequently found wanting in religious virtues, so scientific professors are often lacking in the ethics of science.

Scientists object to popes; but how many of them revere their own persons as infallible vicars of truth! And how arrogant as a rule, how obstinate and per-  
vicacious is the tenor of their disputes! What stubborn sticklers are they for trifles! How great is their vanity! Happily, there are exceptions. Yet even if there were no exceptions, the authority of science would stand in spite of all the shortcomings of scientists.

It is to be conceded that scientific men are always at variance among themselves concerning truths to be discovered. This, however, does not contradict the fact that the truth can be found and clearly stated. Some questions have been settled for good, others are still open. The former are to be regarded as scientific truths. There are such as will be agreed upon by all those who take the trouble to study the subject carefully. The open questions only are the objects of contention among the searchers for truth, and their very disagreement is a most important means for the discovery of truth.

What is our relation to truth?

Truth is a correct statement of facts and the laws of its being; it describes a power independent of us.

Whether or not truth will be such as we desire it to be, is not the question. We cannot fashion or alter it. Being unalterable, we can only accept it and regulate our life accordingly. There is no choice left for us.

There is no reason, however, to be timid when finding ourselves at the mercy of a power beyond our control. We have developed into thinking, feeling, and aspiring beings, and our rational nature, which appears in its fullest efflorescence in science, enables us to make firm and certain steps. We can combat the evils of life, and better conquer them, the deeper and greater our insight is into truth. The very fact of our existence, such as it is, and the practical importance of truth, inspires us with confidence in that All-being, in which and through which we have originated, and the laws of whose nature are beyond our control. We have no choice left but to trust in truth, and we have also good reasons to do so.

\* \* \*

It is true that we are surrounded by mysteries, temptations, and afflictions. Yet these conditions of our life urge us the more seriously to search for the truth, lest we go astray and become the victims of our errors. There is certainly no other choice left for us than to take reality as it is, to understand it, and to act in concord with its laws. We cannot make the truth; we cannot fashion it at our pleasure; we can only accept it. But blessed is he who trusts in the truth, who hearkens to its behests, and leads a life in which obedience to truth is exemplified.

#### CURRENT TOPICS.

I DO NOT know whether there is any truth in it or not; I have nothing but the newspapers for it, but the story is that the Mohammedan Arabs at the World's Fair have adopted Christian ways already, and made themselves conspicuous by getting drunk. The report appears to be clear and circumstantial enough, but yet I doubt the truth of it although it specifically describes "a crowd of swarthy Egyptians imbibing Chicago fire-water and wearing misfit turbans to excess on down town streets." Further, it says that "in this hilarious party were several Mustafas, Mohammeds, and Ahmeds, and they went up against copper bottomed whisky with oriental assiduity and munificence." Still, I do not believe the story; I prefer to think that the "hilarious party" was composed of counterfeit Mohammedans, turbaned Englishmen, browned and dressed up to represent the natural and legitimate population of a "street in Cairo," which will be on exhibition at Midway Plaisance during the coming summer, and to which World's Fair visitors can obtain admittance by the payment of a small fee. At the Paris Exposition I saw a lot of Egyptians exhibiting a "street in Cairo" or some other Egyptian scene, and I was told that they were discharged British soldiers, Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen who had picked up some knowledge of oriental speech and customs together with a little sunburn during their army service in India and elsewhere. I wonder if these Mustafas, Mo-

hammeds, and Ahmeds are the same fellows. Their friendship for "copper bottomed whisky" is very suspicious as it gives them the appearance of mercenary impostors, and I fear they are no true sons of the prophet.

\* \* \*

Any man with a heart in him, and a soul sensitive to pain, will sympathise with Governor Altgeld in his protest against the "appropriate ceremonies" appointed for the dedication of the Illinois building at the great World's Fair. The Governor probably thinks that there is no more sense in having the edifice "dedicated" than in having it consecrated, but he says nothing about that, and merely complains of the "weak, washy, everlasting flood" of talk provided for the occasion. First on the programme is "Prayer," which can hardly be less than fifteen minutes long considering the importance of the festival; and then comes "the formal turning over of the building" to the Governor by the proper officer, with a speech from north to south about the length of Illinois. The stately pavilion having been "turned over," the Governor makes a speech and "hands the building over to the board," after which comes the "Dedicatory Address" by an orator from Springfield. This gentleman coming a long distance will make a long speech, as also will the orator from Bloomington who is appointed to deliver a comprehensive lecture on "Illinois." This intellectual treat is to be followed by another address by somebody on that new and interesting subject "The Columbian Exposition," and then, to make the torment unendurable they have actually put in the prospectus a speech on "Chicago" by Carter Harrison. It is that last bit of elocution that has driven the Governor into rebellion, and he hurls defiance at the committee in these words:

"I will approve almost any programme that your board may see proper to arrange for that occasion, but it seems to me that the programme has too frightfully much oratory on it. It may be the right thing to have a lot of useless oratory on such an occasion, but as it is usually found to be tiresome to most everybody I would suggest getting along with as little of it as possible, and if there must be so many speeches as I notice on the programme, then I would suggest that the board limit the time of each and make it very short."

There is a good deal of self-interest in Governor Altgeld's objection to the oratory prepared for dedication day, and he is to be excused for that, because the rest of the congregation can slip out when they have had enough of it, but he must remain until the end. As an honored guest of the occasion, he will have a seat on the platform, and there he is a prisoner. He cannot escape without making a scene inconsistent with his dignity. For the general audience the anticipated oratory will be "tiresome" only, but for him it will be "too frightfully much"; and the alternative by which he seeks to "limit the time" of the speakers is an impossible relief. For instance, how is a man to give a ten-minutes lecture on "Illinois," and describe its aptitudes and resources, its history, geography, geology, mineralogy, and botany, its prairies and its timber, its railroads, lakes, and rivers, its agriculture, and its commerce, to say nothing of its infinite possibilities? Who is to limit the time of Mr. Harrison, when that grandiloquent magistrate mounts his favorite hobby, "Chicago"? Suppose the limit is fixed at one hour, and Mr. Harrison "raises the limit," what can the governor do? Mr. Harrison, being mayor of the city, is master of the situation, because if the chairman should call upon the police to suppress the orator, they would obey the mayor and suppress the chairman. More than that, Mr. Harrison can station policemen at all the doors and windows, with orders to arrest any unfortunate visitor who may try to make his escape from the building. There is only one resource remaining to "His Excellency," and that is to order out the militia beforehand, and have a couple of regiments ready to call time on the speakers whenever their "tiresome" oratory becomes "too frightfully much."

\* \* \*

The naval review at New York and the lawsuit between Great Britain and the United States now being tried at Paris, present a

moral contrast, clear and distinct, as the difference between good and evil, for the points of comparison are the visible symbols of war on the one hand and peace on the other. The lesson of it will be the most religious and benevolent that humanity has learned in a hundred years. At the very moment when the guns of England and the guns of our own country have reached their maximum capacity for mischief, they become useless to those two nations as against each other, and their awful thunders are overpowered by the feeble speech of men, mere lawyers pleading on opposite sides the merits of an international dispute before an impartial tribunal selected by the litigants themselves, and hearing the cause not in Washington or London, but in the neutral city of Paris. A few lawyers and judges are quietly doing the work of a hundred ships and a thousand guns. Between two of the most warlike nations in the world war ceases to be an argument, and their admirals and captains, when they meet in the harbor of New York to salute each other with obsolete cannon, may say:

"Farewell!

The spirit-stirring drum, the ear-piercing fife,  
The royal banner; and all quality,  
Pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war!  
And O, you mortal engines, whose rude throats  
The immortal Jove's dread clamors counterfeit,  
Farewell! Othello's occupation's gone!"

I see by the programme that every ship in the congregated fleets at New York will salute the flag of every other according to the number of guns that etiquette prescribes, "gun for gun"; then all of them together will salute the President of the United States, and the various admirals and commodores will salute themselves, until a cloud of sulphurous incense rises to the sky, a dread rehearsal of what the reality might be if war were in the wind. To the participants and the multitudes of spectators, the "rude throats" of the artillery will roar mere compliments to the dignitaries and the flags, but I translate the speech of cannon according to my own judgment of its latent meaning, and above all their mutual flatteries I can hear from the unwilling lips of every gun a salute national and international to the court of peace and arbitration over there in Paris. That calm and rational tribunal will settle the Behring Sea dispute without the aid of any artillery whatever, except what shots may happen to come from the "rude throats" of the lawyers on either side. M. M. TRUMBULL.

#### BOOK REVIEWS.

HUME'S TREATISE OF MORALS: AND SELECTIONS FROM THE TREATISE OF THE PASSIONS. With an Introduction by *James H. Hyslop*, Ph.D. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1893. Pp. 275.

The ethical series which the Messrs. Ginn & Co., are now publishing is to consist of a number of small volumes devoted to the presentation of the leading systems of modern ethics, in selections or extracts from modern works. The editor is Mr. E. Hershey Sneath of Yale University. Six volumes are already projected: "Hobbes," by Prof. G. M. Duncan of Yale University; "Clarke," by President F. L. Patton of Princeton University; "Locke," by the Editor; "Hume," the present volume; "Kant," by Prof. John Watson, Queens University, Canada; and "Hegel," by Prof. J. Machride Sterrett of Columbian University. The idea of the series, which is to supplement instruction in the history of ethics by the reading of such selections from the original works of the authors as give the basis of their systems, is an excellent one and should be imitated in all departments of science. The present volume by Dr. Hyslop is made up of the whole of Hume's original "Treatise of Morals," and of selections from his work on the passions. It is supplied with a bibliography on Hume's works, biographical, critical, and other references, a biographical sketch, and an introduction of moderate length; it is to be hoped that the introductions to the other volumes of the series will not exceed the

length of the present one; long introductions are bad and interfere with the main object of such works as this. We are also glad to see that the book is not overloaded with editor's notes. Dr. Hyslop has done his work well, and readers should be glad that the essential parts of Hume's ethical system can be obtained in this convenient form. μκρκ.

LEITFADEN DER BOTANIK. By Dr. *Richard von Wettstein*. Vienna: F. Tempsky. Leipzig: G. Freytag. 1891. Pp. 202. Price fl. 1.60.

This little work is another in the series of text-books for high schools which we mentioned in *The Monist*, Vol. II. 617 and Vol. III. 322, in the review of Professor Mach's work on Physics, and Professor Graber's work on Zoology.

This work is intended for European readers, and its descriptive or systematic parts would be of little value to the American student. As the fundamental types here studied are in minor regards different from those in Europe, its chief interest to American students and readers will lie in the conception and plan of the work, which is founded on the most modern state of scientific botany. The anatomy, morphology, and physiology of plants are treated in chapters distinct from the systematic part of the work. These parts are especially well handled. The last section of the book is on applied botany where domestic plants are treated. This is a new and very valuable feature of text-books, and gives the work in question a very practical direction. Two very pretty colored plates are added to the book, respectively reproducing, on a scale of one-half, edible and non-edible mushrooms. The cuts are excellently executed and the work a cheap one. μκρκ.

## 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. 295.

WHAT IS A LIBERAL EDUCATION? F. M. HOLLAND 3631

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF LEGERDEMAIN. (Concluded.)

MAX DESSOIR..... 3633

THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE, A CATECHISM. EDITOR 3634

CURRENT TOPICS: Degenerate Sons of the Prophet.

Too Frightfully Much Oratory. Calling Time on the

Speakers. Arbitration Instead of Guns. GEN. M. M.

TRUMBULL..... 3637

BOOK REVIEWS..... 3638