

# THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 303. (VOL. VII.—24.)

CHICAGO, JUNE 15, 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.

## OPEN STILL!

BY F. M. HOLLAND.

THE World's Fair had been closed for three successive Sundays, before the gates were thrown open, on May 28, to more than a hundred thousand orderly and well dressed people, who crowded even the broad aisles in the great halls. It was the plain desire of great multitudes to enter on previous Sundays that secured this opportunity at last. The only obstacle in their admittance from the first was a contract with Congress, which may possibly oblige the managers of the Fair to forfeit a sum estimated at but little less than \$2,000,000. This would be the heaviest fine ever levied upon Sabbath-breakers anywhere. It is also threatened that the gates will be closed on subsequent Sundays; but a Chicago judge has decided that the Sabbatarian contract had previously been broken by Congress and cannot be enforced. Judge Stein also refused to admit the plea, that the Fair ought to be closed because this is a Christian nation, and held that position "clearly untenable in a country of religious freedom." Whether our country really is so might, however, have been doubted by those who saw on May 28, the government building and other national exhibits closed and guarded against the people. The stars and stripes, too, were forbidden to be hoisted in prominent places. To carry out fully the pious intentions of Congress, our flag ought now and henceforth to bear this national motto, in big black letters "To be kept hauled down every Sunday." I wonder what has become of the little boy who was asked in Sunday-school, in 1861, what he thought the best text in the Bible, and answered, "If any man tries to haul down the American flag, shoot him on the spot." There has been much discussion about what is to be selected as our national flower; and the principal difficulty has been to find something really ornamental and not in the least sectional; but all such attempts must be given up. It will be impossible to find any flower which is so distinctively American as to keep closed every Sunday. No blossom wicked enough to break our national Sabbath need apply.

The question now before us is how far our government ought to interfere with our individual liberty, in

order to encourage Sabbatarianism. The Fair is not carried on for private profit, but for public benefit, especially in encouraging art and manufactures in our own country. It has deserved all the state and national aid which it has received. It is too good a place to be closed, Sunday after Sunday, either against laborers who cannot afford to go on other days, or against visitors who are thus obliged to lose the benefit of part of the time which they spend at Chicago. This amounts to being forced to pay a Sabbatarian tax. Other visitors who could have afforded to visit Chicago for two or three days, if they could have entered the park on Sunday, have been kept away. In these and other ways, the stock-holders have suffered heavy pecuniary loss; the exhibitors have failed to receive all the remuneration they might have had; and the philanthropic objects of the enterprise have not been attained fully. All this Congress has done without even trying to find out whether it was acting according to the wish of the majority of the citizens. How that majority really feels may be judged from the admission of the Presbyterians, in the General Assembly this year that, "The friends of Sunday closing have received little or no aid from the secular press." What they have received from the best representatives of public opinion is almost unanimous censure.

Our national Constitution says that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion"; and a treaty which is part of "the supreme law of the land," declares that "The government of the United States of America is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion." These guarantees of national impartiality should not be set aside in deference to sectarian clamor. They are founded on a great principle which may be illustrated by the following story. A business firm in New York, composed of three Jews and a Presbyterian, once got possession of a valuable horse in payment for debt. The Presbyterian wished to have him sold, but the Jews preferred to have him kept and used by all the partners in turn; and this was decided by a majority vote. The next question was when each man should take his turn; and the Presbyterian said, "My religion does not allow me to ride for pleasure on Sunday, and the only time

I have for it is Saturday afternoon. Let me use the horse then, and you can arrange for the other six days among yourselves." "No," said the Jews, "You believe as we do in the commandment to keep the Sabbath-day holy; and we, who are the majority, keep the Sabbath on Saturday. You know that was the original day, and the one observed by the first Christians. We wish the horse to rest on that day; but you can have your turn during the six days when it is right to use him." "No," said the Presbyterian, "I want to use him Saturdays, or else have him sold." "Well then, we will sell him by and by; and when we do, you shall have your quarter of the price." Some weeks elapsed without any attempt being made to sell the horse; and then the Presbyterian said to the Jews, "You admit that I own one fourth of that horse." "Oh yes. We have admitted that all along." "All I have to say then is, that if he is not sold pretty quick my quarter of him will get shot."

This story is also told of a Jew in partnership with three Presbyterians who insisted that the horse should not be used on Sunday; but in both cases the principle is the same, namely that no majority is justified by its opinions about religion in preventing the minority from using the common property, in a way which would be acknowledged to be legitimate if it were not for those opinions. Neither the Jews nor the Presbyterians had a right to tell their partner that he must not use a horse which was his as well as theirs. The same rule applies to a reading-room or library which the majority wish to close, and the minority wish to use during Lent. The right of the minority who wish to use the room is not annulled by the creed of those who do not wish it used by anybody. The case is the same when some of the members of a club wish to have the reading-room open Sundays. What other principle can be accepted in the case of a reading-room, library, or museum which belongs to all the citizens in common, and which many of them wish to use on Sunday, because they can go at no other time? The majority have no right, merely for the sake of religion, to make it impossible for their neighbors to make any use of the common property. The majority have a perfect right to sacrifice their own property to their religion; but they have no right to force any one else to make such a sacrifice as to give up using the common property on the only day when he is able to do so.

A government is even more strongly bound than a club to abstain from taking sides with the majority against the minority in religious questions. A club may have been organized for merely sectarian purposes. No one blames the Bible society for covering up its exhibit at Chicago of costly copies of the Scriptures on Sunday, as if the books were too holy to have

even their covers looked at by Sabbath-breakers. This was simply ridiculous. Our national government was not intended to be run like a Bible society. It was founded for the good of all the people, and not merely in the interest of a few privileged sects. When governments thought they ought to take sides in religion, the results which followed inevitably were such scenes as the crusades, the burning of Servetus, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Such atrocities are not likely to be repeated; but this is because the principle of governmental impartiality in religion has been finally established by centuries of agitation. What has been gained with such great difficulty and delay must not be suffered to be lost. We must choose between the two principles of governmental interference or impartiality in religion. There is no middle ground. Partiality has never been shown without interference.

Our government has no more right to close that Fair on Sunday, than it would have had to forbid eating meat on Friday. It has no right to keep its own buildings at Chicago and Washington closed for Sabbatarian reasons against visitors. It is an abuse of the powers entrusted to Congress by the people to put such needless restrictions on the use of public property for the public good. The money voted by members of Congress in aid of the Fair, was not theirs, but the people's. It was collected under a solemn obligation to be used only for the public benefit. Its use for the public injury was a breach of trust. The Sabbatarians who frightened the last Congress into closing the Fair, are already boasting that they will frighten the next Congress into stopping the transportation and distribution of the mail on Sundays. If they do not succeed, it will be because the people are waking up.

#### CHRIST AND THE CHRISTIANS; A CONTRAST.

For the sake of convenience, let us distinguish between Christ and Jesus. While the name Jesus denotes an historical man, who, as we have good reason to believe, lived about two thousand years ago, we understand by Christ that ideal figure, which has been the main factor in forming the Christian church and which is represented in the gospels.

Whether Jesus was Christ, in other words, whether the account of the gospels is historical or mythical, is a problem which we do not care to discuss in detail here. The problem is of a purely scientific nature and has nothing to do with practical religion, except as it may open the eyes of those who are as yet under the spell of the paganism which still prevails in our churches.\*

\* The problem of Jesus can now be regarded as solved, and the results of all the laborious researches into the accounts of the gospels have been summed up by H. Holtzmann, Professor of Theology at the University of Strassburg i. E., in his *Hand-Comentar zum neuen Testament*. Professor Holtzmann's works are the more valuable as they are the statement, not of a

It is quite immaterial whether or not the accounts of the gospel are historical; yet it is not a matter of indifference whether or not the Christ-ideal is true; and we say that it is true; and so far as its truth has been recognised, the spirit of Christ lives and moves and has its being.

The belief in the miraculous, which existed at the time of Christ, quite naturally entered into the gospels, and we cannot regard it as an absolutely injurious element, whose presence ought to be deplored. On the contrary, miracles and the belief in miracles indicate the power of the Christ-ideal. All great historical movements are soon surrounded by more or less beautiful legends, and these legends frequently reflect the meaning of history better than the historical facts themselves, for the legends reveal to us, in a poetical vision, the thriving power of historical movements. There we peep, as it were, into the minds of mankind; we see their yearning, aspiring, wondering, and we learn their conception of the ideals that move in their hearts. Christianity would have been insignificant and insipid, if it had not produced such a mythology as we possess now. There is no fault to be found with the mythology, but only with those who misunderstand the part which mythologies play in the evolution of religious ideas.

We have to accept the results of science in its investigation of the historical pretensions of the gospels, yet at the same time we insist on the fact that Christ is a living presence even to-day, and our whole civilisation is pervaded by his spirit. Christ is the key-note of the historical evolution of mankind since the second century of the Christian era, and it seems improbable that the influence of this ideal will ever subside, or that its glory will ever be outshone by a greater star to come; for the Christ-ideal is a tendency, rather than a type; it indicates the direction of moral progress, and not a special aim; it represents an aspiration towards perfection, and not a fixed standard. Thus, with all moral rigidity, nay, sternness, with all definiteness and stability, the Christ-ideal combines an extraordinary plasticity; it is capable of evolution, of expansion, of growth.

Christ is an invisible and superpersonal influence in human society, guiding and leading mankind to higher aims and a nobler morality. Christ is greater than every one of us, and we are Christians in the measure that his soul has taken its abode in us.

The Christ of the gospels, however, who has become the religious ideal of Christianity, is very different from the Christ of the Christians—or, let us rather say,

of those who call themselves Christians, who worship Christ in a truly pagan manner. Those who call themselves after Christ are, upon the whole, the least worthy of the name, for, if he came unto his own, his own would receive him not.

The so-called faithful Christians have made themselves a religion little better than that of fetish worshippers and practice in many respects an ethics exactly opposite to the injunctions of Christ. Their worship consists in adoration and genuflections and other heathenish rituals, but they violate his commands. They believe in the letter of mythological traditions, and fail to recognise the spirit of the truth.

Let us here briefly pass in review some important religious issues which present a strong contrast between Christ and the so-called Christians.

\* \* \*

Christ is the way, the truth, and the life, but those who in public life ostentatiously set themselves up as Christians bar the way, dim the truth, and impede life. They demand a blind belief in confessions of faith and other man-made formulas, while they trample under foot any one who dares to search for the truth or walk in the way of progress.

Christ is the way, which means, the spirit of evolution, of a constant moral perfectionment; but the Christians, in name, have become a clog on the feet of mankind, so that they are known as the chief suppressors of truth, liberty, and progress.

Says Christ:

“Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites as is written, ‘This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me.’

“Howbeit in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.”

“For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men! . . . Full well ye reject the commandment of God that ye may keep your own tradition.”—Mark, vii.

Which is the will of God: the injunctions preached by preachers and priests, or the everlasting revelation in the book of nature? The former we have to accept on trust; the latter every one can find out for himself by experience. The former are inconsistent, varying and unreliable; the latter can be investigated and verified. The literatures of all nations, including especially the scriptures of our religious traditions, have been written in order to assist us in deciphering the revelations of God as they appear in the immutable laws of nature. Let us search the scriptures, and let us study the works of our scientists. But always bear in mind that truth is God’s revelation, be it pronounced by Isaiah or Darwin, and not this or that formula, or holy writ, or sacred tradition, and, least of all, a *quicunque*.

Freethinker, but of a Christian and a theologian by profession. They are reverent, but scientific and critical.

Holtzmann’s results remain positive. Jesus is, in his opinion, an historical person, whose human character and fate can best be traced in Mark, the oldest of the gospels.

When certain of the Pharisees said to the disciples of Jesus the same things that are said to-day to the directors of the World's Fair :

"Why do ye that which is not lawful to do on the Sabbath days?"

Jesus, answering them said :

"What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it and lift it out?"

"How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days."

"The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath :

"Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath."

The Christians of the first century abolished the Sabbath and introduced Sunday as a sacred day ; and their Sunday was not a day of rest, but a remembrance of Christ's resurrection. The Christians of our time, however, know not how to celebrate the day. Although they believe in the myth of the resurrection, Christ has not risen in their souls.

The name-Christians revive the old pagan notion that the Sunday is to be regarded as a *dies ater*, an ominous day on which it is not advisable to undertake anything. They make of man the slave of Sunday ; they close places of harmless pleasures and useful information, and in such efforts they find a strong support by men of evil enterprises, who offer to the people more spicy and less innocent amusements. Must Christ come again to repeat the question :

"Is it lawful on the Sabbath days to do good or to do evil? to save life or destroy life?"

Is there any one who doubts that museums, libraries, and the World's Fair furnish recreations which exercise a strong influence for good upon the development of man's mind. They provide a wholesome mental food, educating without the toil of study and broadening our views. They are not idle pleasures ; they are building up and life-saving, and Christ teaches that it is right to heal, to help, and to save on the Sabbath.

Some of the early Christians continued to celebrate the Sabbath after the Jewish fashion, and the apostle St. Paul suffered them to do so; yet he insisted vigorously upon liberty in such matters. We read in the epistle to the Romans :

"One man esteemeth one day above another : another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.

"He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord ; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it."

In his letter to the Galatians, however, who piously abstained from the desecration of the Sabbath, the apostle writes :

"Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years.

"I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain."

A wrong conception of the Sabbath is an indication of paganism ; and wherever paganism prevails the spirit of true Christianity bestows its labors in vain.

Woe to ye hypocrites, who make religion ridiculous. Woe to ye Sabbatarians, who make of Christianity a nuisance. Ye are blind leaders of the blind, a disgrace to the holy name which you write upon your altars.

We do not mean to abolish Sunday, or to deprive the laborer of his rest on the seventh day. On the contrary, we insist on keeping Sunday as a religious and also as a secular holiday. But we object to a wrong usage of Sunday, as if it were the Sabbath of the Pharisees. We protest against the barbaric regulations belonging to pre-Christian ages which have been given up by all Christian nations with the sole exception of the English, who, in the beginning of the middle ages dug them out of the misunderstood religious traditions of a remote past.

We want a Sunday, but not such a Pharisaic Sabbath as is foisted upon the nation by modern Pharisees. We want a day of rest, of recreation, of edification, and not that superstitious *far niente*, which means a cessation of all wholesome activity. We want a liberal, a religious, a spiritual, and truly Christian Sunday.

\* \* \*

Christ never requested his disciples to eradicate reason, or to believe anything irrational, or to accept any of his doctrines in blind trust. On the contrary, he wanted them to examine things, to discriminate between the false and the true, and to discern the signs of the times. Our senses should be open to investigation, and our judgment ought to be sound in order to comprehend things. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear, and he who has thoughts to think, let him think.

How different are Christians ! Christians demand blind belief ; they do not want investigation ; they have a distrust of sense information and place no reliance upon reason.

What in the world shall we rely on, if reason ceases to be trustworthy? If the light of reason be extinguished, all our sentiments, our enthusiasm, our aspirations, avail nothing, for without reason, we grope in the dark. Says Kant :

"Friends of mankind and of all that is holy to man, accept whatever, after a careful and honest inquiry, you regard to be most trustworthy, be it facts or rational arguments, but do not contest that prerogative of reason, which makes it the highest good upon earth, viz., to be the ultimate criterion of truth. Otherwise you will be unworthy of your liberty and lose it without fail." (Kant, "Was heisst : Sich im Denken orientiren." Edition Hartenstein, Vol. IV, p. 352.)

\* \* \*

Christ abolished prayer in the sense of begging God to do our will, for he truly knew that God, unlike

man, is immutable, and his will cannot be altered by supplications.

Christ makes no supplications, no praise, no glorifications of God; he demands no genuflection or self-humiliation. He does not beg for miracles or exceptions or special favors, and in the most wretched moment of his life he remains faithful to this spirit, which lives in his prayer, saying: "Not my, but Thy will be done."

Christ said in the Sermon on the Mount:

"When ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do; for they think they shall be heard for their much speaking.

"Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him.

"After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name.

"Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.

"Give us this day our daily bread.

"And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.

"And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.\*

"For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you:

"But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses."

There is but one prayer for our bodily needs—for our comforts, merely for the needs which, as we must not forget, nature supplies out of her wealth only when we work for them. There is no prayer for the fulfilment of our particular desires, and all the other requests are variations of the third prayer, which says, "Thy will be done."

The name-Christians actually do use "vain repetitions," so that prayer has almost ceased to have the sense in which Christ used the word.

While recognising the error that obtains in the Christian's habit of praying, we do not mean to discourage the Christian when he wants to pray, for prayer is the moving of the spirit of Christ in the souls of those who know not what Christ is. If their prayer be honest, it will help them, it will mature them, it will calm their anxieties and make them composed, it will strengthen them, it will make them grow and develop out of their paganism into the Christianity of Christ. The more they grow in their spiritual life, the more will they cease to prattle to God in childish talk; they will learn to pray like Christ, until their whole being becomes a performance of God's will.

Any sincere Christian who proposes to himself the question, What shall I pray? in order to pray in the spirit of the Lord's prayer, will come to the conclusion that to ask for special favors is childish as well as useless.

Prayer must be made not with a view of altering God's will, but our own will. We grant, however, that

\*The words, "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen," are a later addition.

in a certain sense it is true after all that prayer has an influence upon God. Prayer affects our attitude toward God, toward the world, toward our fellow-men, and in so far as our attitude is altered, the attitude of our surroundings will be altered, too. Whether we are impatient and afraid, or calm and self-possessed, makes a great difference, and the whole situation in which we are may change when we pass from one condition into the other. The facts which we face, the dangers which we confront, the duties which we have to perform, assume another countenance; and this change may and very frequently will be the most decisive factor in the final result of our actions.

Take, for instance, our knowledge of nature. The laws of nature have remained the same; but while the savage trembles before the forces of nature, we utilise them to our advantage. The same electricity which was so formidable to our ancestors is to us beneficent. Truly, there is no change in the laws of nature, but a change in our own attitude changes the situation in such a way that it amounts to a most radical change of nature itself.

If knowledge can bring about such wonderful changes, should not the good-will of a religious attitude have the power to reform, to bless, and to save?

\* \* \*

Should prayer mean supplication, it would be better that all prayer ceased. And, indeed, the Lord's prayer contains the injunction that we must cease to ask God to do our will.

While Christ's prayer is an act of self-discipline which attunes our will to the will of God, the Christian's prayer is, as a rule, a beggar's supplication, which tries to work miracles. The Christian's prayer may be more refined, but it is actually of the same nature as the medicine-man's incantation, which is supposed to take effect by some mysterious telepathy.

The great Königsberger philosopher uses the word "prayer," not in Christ's sense, but in the sense in which it is used by the name-Christians. He says:

"To expect of prayer other than natural effects is foolish and needs no explicit refutation. We can only ask, Is not prayer to be retained for the sake of its natural effects? Among the natural effects we count that the dark and confused ideas present in the soul are either clarified through prayer, or that they receive a higher degree of intensity; that the motives of virtue receive a greater efficacy, etc., etc.

"We have to say that prayer can, for the reasons adduced, be recommended only subjectively, for he who can in another way attain to the effects for which prayer is recommended will not be in need of it.

"Further, psychology teaches that very often the exposition of an idea, weakens the efficacy it possessed, while still whole and entire, although dark and undeveloped.

"And, finally, there is hypocrisy in prayer; for the man who either prays audibly, or who resolves his ideas internally in words, regards the Deity as something that can be grasped by the senses, while it is only a principle which his reason urges him to assume.

"A man may think, 'If I pray to God it can hurt me in no wise; for should he not exist, very well! in that case I have done too much of a good thing; but if he does exist, it will help me.' This *Prosepopöia* (face-making) is hypocrisy, for we have to presuppose in prayer that he who prays is firmly convinced that God exists:

"The consequence of this is that he who has made great moral progress ceases to pray, for honesty is one of his principal maxims. And further, that those whom one surprises in prayer are ashamed of themselves.

"In public sermons before the public, prayer must be retained, because it can be rhetorically of great effect, and can make a great impression. Moreover, in sermons before the people one has to appeal to their sensuality and must, as much as possible, stoop down to them.

It is especially noteworthy that Kant says "he who has made great moral progress ceases to pray"; and he adds the curious observation "that those whom one surprises in prayer are ashamed of themselves."

The Lord's prayer is no prayer in the common sense of the word. It is not an incantation that exercises a supernatural influence through "vain repetitions." The Lord's prayer must be lived, rather than spoken. We need not pray it, if we but live it. Its spirit must become part of our soul, so that our whole life becomes an exemplification of the sentiment, "Thy will be done."

\* \* \*

While Christ's prayer means resignation to the will of God, the Christian's prayer is a superstitious trust in miracles, in the hope that they will be performed for his advantage. Christ's prayer is an effort to change our own will, not God's will; it is a self-exhortation which helps us to be satisfied with God's will and to perform our duties.

These are striking differences between Christ and Christians, between Christ's faith and the Christian's faith, between Christ's prayer and the Christian's prayer, between Christ's religion and ecclesiasticism. Christ is a savior, a liberator, a reformer; the typical Christian is a stumbling-block, and a cause of annoyance.

There is a wonderful saving power in the words of Christ, but the name-Christians do not know it. They walk in darkness and are not even aware of it themselves. They believe themselves to be saints, and are in fact the spiritual successors of the scribes and Pharisees.

If ever the name of Christ be dimmed in its glory, it will be done by the vices of his followers in name, and the freethinker will have to be called upon to restore the lost halo of the greatest reformer and the staunchest defender of free thought and liberty.

The religion of science is not and cannot be the Christianity of those who call themselves orthodox Christians, but it is and will remain the Christianity of Christ.

P. C.

#### CURRENT TOPICS.

THE trial of Dr. Briggs for heresy was the trial of the Presbyterian Church, its catechism, and its creed. Many of his judges have seen this from the beginning and feared it. They would gladly have settled the case out of court, if Dr. Briggs would have yielded anything to compromise; but this he refused to do. Therefore, they must either excommunicate him, or let him excommunicate them. The trial of Dr. Briggs is ended, but the trial of the church goes on, and soon there will be more heretics than judges, for heresy grows with argument, and the nerve-centres of doubt lie just behind the brow. When Dr. Briggs asserted that good men might go to heaven by other than Bible roads, and without so much as a passport from the Presbyterians, he tried to expand the creed of his church to the size of a nineteenth century brain, and thereby broke his ordination vow. He is deposed from the Presbyterian ministry, but the truth has always vacant pulpits, and there is a call for Dr. Briggs.

\* \* \*

Judging by the proceedings, and especially by the sentence, Dr. Briggs has been condemned, not for thinking heresy, but for speaking it. He is to be reinstated whenever he shall recant his heresies and deny his own rebellious words. He may think that the Bible contains errors here and there, but he must not say so, for on the ridges of Mont Blanc a very small sound may shake down snow enough to smother a village, and one small word with truth in it may start an avalanche of heresy big enough to break into pieces the Presbyterian church. There are not enough genuine believers in the Westminster confession to form a court big enough to try all the Presbyterian ministers in good standing who are thinking heresy to-day. When a minister sees a heretic every time he gazes in the looking-glass, and yet shows an orthodox face to his congregation, he feels like a theological harlequin and wishes his father had made him a cobbler, a tinker, or a tailor. He is entitled to sympathy, for preaching is his profession, the pulpit is his workshop, and he cannot learn a new trade. He must not quarrel with his bread, especially if a wife and children appeal to that nature which towers above all religions, and so he locks up his unbeliefs and preaches as much truth as the Sanhedrim will allow.

\* \* \*

When a man becomes a thoroughly obedient and servile partisan, the little bit of spirit he formerly had leaves him, and the soul of him becomes absorbed into the great Nirvana of the Republican party, or the Democratic party, or the Populistic party, or some other "time-honored" or "grand old" corporation. Once I had occasion to rebuke a teamster for whipping a mule, and the fellow had the impudence to tell me that the mule enjoyed it,— "as a counter-irritant," because the flies were bad. I do not know how it may be with mules, but I certainly know that there are men who enjoy a whipping given by the party-lash, and who feel proud that they are of sufficient importance to be thus honored by the driver. I present as a notable example of this wriggling abasement the taming of three or four members of the Illinois Legislature, who for several days had been rollicking in the unlawful enjoyment of personal and political independence. The official account of the taming reads like a chapter from "Roughing It," or "Huckleberry Finn."

\* \* \*

The question before the house was the passage of the new Democratic gerrymander, known as the Congress Apportionment Bill; a division of the state into districts that baffle the definitions of geometry. The old gerrymander was a bit of Republican "fine work," ingenious enough in its way, but far inferior to the present contrivance as a scheme for disfranchising the minority. Shocked by the extreme wickedness of the bill, four "high-spirited" and "independent" Democratic members of the house declared they

never would support it, and, as it required all four of them to pass it, the mule-drivers of the party became alarmed, because if the bill should fail, the Congress districts would remain under the old Republican gerrymander, so they determined to apply the whip, and they began on Mr. Thomas Carson, the leader of the dangerous revolt. He was invited to a private interview with the governor, and he went, rearing his proud crest in defiance of governor, president, and the whole Democratic party. When he went in, he looked very much like the imperious race-horse Cruiser, who was in the habit of eating all the grooms and jockeys that came near him; but when Mr. Carson came out, he resembled Cruiser after that rebellious horse had been honored by a private interview with Rarey, the horse-tamer. So humbled and subdued was Cruiser after that interview, that the most insignificant stable-boy could wipe his feet on him; and after Mr. Carson's interview with the governor, he came back into the House, but his haughty crest was drooping and his martial air was gone. Docile as a Chinaman, he said: "If I vote for this bill, I must surrender all the rights of the people whom I represent. While there has been a great cry and a great deal of brutality on the part of the majority, I feel that I cannot afford to defeat this bill, I therefore vote aye." (Great cheering from the Democratic side.) One by one the other three independent members, having relieved their consciences by denouncing the bill as full of abominations, submissively voted for it. They will never again try to break out of the corral.

\* \* \*

"There is no new thing under the sun," says the Scripture, and I wonder whether or not all the popular sayings attributed to famous men come within that rule. Until I read the book, I did not know how much of our modern wisdom and how many of our socialistic theories are borrowed from Sir Thomas More's "Utopia," and even as it is, I cannot quite get rid of the feeling that Sir Thomas plagiarised his ideas from some of our modern reformers and dreamers of dreams. So it surprises me to find that Shakespeare's fine description of Cardinal Wolsey is borrowed almost literally from the old historian Hollinshed. The expressive and homely phrase, "Every tub must stand on its own bottom," is preserved in Benjamin Franklin's maxims, but it is curious to find that it was used by John Bunyan, and recorded by him in "The Pilgrim's Progress," before Benjamin Franklin was born. It really seems disloyal to question the origin of Lincoln's lofty description of our government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," yet, in looking over some old sermons delivered by Theodore Parker in 1846, I find this: "The aristocracy of godness, which is the democracy of man, the government of all, for all, and by all, will be the power that is." It is a sentence easy to make by any man who has ever been puzzled by a lesson on prepositions, and very likely it was used by orators in praise of popular government hundreds of years ago.

\* \* \*

The Anti-Trust convention which met in Chicago on the 5th of June promptly resolved itself into a voting-trust for the masculine monopoly of the ballot. Two ladies were present in the convention, Mrs. Marian Harland, and Mrs. Corinne Brown, either of them equal in ability and statesmanship to any of the men, and so it was magnanimously resolved that they be given the privilege of speech, but that they must not be allowed to vote upon any question that might come before the meeting. Then the delegates proceeded in the old familiar way to denounce every trust, combine, conspiracy, and monopoly except their own. A "pool" was formed, by which the official honors were divided among the "three great parties." Judge Thomas H. Walker being elected second vice chairman, for the astonishing reason that he was a "true, sound, unswerving, and unflinching Democrat." This apparent inconsistency was quite consistent with the programme, because as the chairman was a "true, sound, unswerving, and consistent"

Republican, and the first vice-chairman a "true, sound, unswerving and consistent" Populist, a Democrat had to be taken into the partnership to complete the "combine." By this tripartite agreement the non-partisan and independent Anti-Trust element was ruled out. As might have been expected the convention broke into discordant pieces, the conservatives adopting one set of resolutions, and the radicals another.

\* \* \*

The most conspicuous men in the Anti-Trust convention were Gen. James B. Weaver of Iowa, and Mr. Ignatius Donnelly of Minnesota, two competent statesmen, well equipped for leadership because they have been "true, sound, unswerving, and unflinching" members of every political party that has existed since they were old enough to vote. They are versatile men, eager in the pursuit of political idealities, and able to skip over the hard problems of actual existence as easily as children skip the hard words in reading. Where the money is to come from to buy anything troubles them no more than it did poor Harold Skimpole. They can be ready at a moments notice to buy up all the coal mines, the iron mines, the woods and forests, the railroads, the steamboats, and the telegraphs, and pay for them by promissory notes redeemable "after harvest"; and such a trifle as the right of a man to be heard before being condemned in matters of life, liberty, or property is not worth a statesman's consideration. Mr. Donnelly proposed to confiscate the real and personal property of all trusts and combinations and to deny them access to the courts to enforce their claims. That the judges must hear before they can decide is no impediment at all in the way of Mr. Donnelly.

\* \* \*

Mr. Donnelly proposed also to use grand larceny as a moral agent and a social remedy. He would withdraw the protection of the law from all the property owned by trusts, and any person prosecuted for stealing the property of a trust, should be discharged at once by the court. This is no visionary scheme of reform; it is eminently practical, because when all the property of a trust is stolen the trust will at once go into liquidation. It also imposes upon us an additional moral obligation, for the reason that when Mr. Donnelly's plan becomes law, it will be the duty of every good citizen to steal, in order to abolish the tyranny of trusts. It may weaken the moral sense a little, and there may be some trouble over a fair division of the spoil, but if the trusts are punished what matter about the means? The plan appears to have merit in it especially to those who want to do some stealing, and yet it is hazardous too, for if private citizens may steal for public reasons, the reasons will always be, and we shall never want an excuse for larceny. Flighty and unreal as those remedies are, they appeal to the imagination, and when advocated with eloquence and spirit they impose upon multitudes of men.

M. M. TRUMBULL.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

### A CONVENTION OF CAPITALISTS TO SOLVE THE LABOR QUESTION.

*To the Editor of The Open Court:—*

I inclose a plan which I am just putting out in the same manner that I did the other one, and I would be glad if General Trumbull would give his opinion of it and publish both together, as before. I think there is a great deal to recommend this proposal, and I wish it might be pushed.

Very truly yours,

MORRISON I. SWIFT.

Capitalists stand in a most responsible position. Through the development of the industrial system, they are, by a certain accident, at the summit of industrial concerns. Being owners and managers, they control, to a degree which all the rest of society

combined cannot control, the direction which industrial evolution shall take. The well- or ill-being of society rests, therefore, exceptionally in their hands. This makes their responsibility paramount.

As yet they have not recognised their responsibility, and they have done nothing with their opportunities. But the responsibility cannot be evaded any longer. The time has come when the social problem must be solved, and the industrial power and position of the capitalists require them to take the lead in solving it. They must do this by the individual initiative which we all so prize, not by leaving it to the impersonal, irresponsible "social system" to evolve progress and improvement without help.

It is not difficult to see how this important move can be taken. A convention of the capitalists of the country should be held next fall for the purpose, and continued annually. To prepare for the convention, the capitalists of every city and town should meet to consider the problems and to organise representative committees to arrange practical measures for the congress. These meetings should be monthly,—all the capitalists of the city, in organised association, being their basis. They should invite before them workingmen and women of every type, as well as special investigators, to hear their views and obtain suggestions.

The convention should sit at least a week. It would be better to continue a month, so that successive delegations of capitalists might attend and the plans be made wider, wiser, and completer.

The ablest experts on the social situation should be requested to prepare addresses and outline policies, in order to make the congress to the fullest degree instructive and practically effective. Committees of action should be appointed to take immediate steps, in conjunction with the capitalists, to relieve the most pressing evils of the industrial system. They would rely upon the local associations of capitalists to second and execute their proposals. Able men would take hold of organisation, and details and fuller plans would soon unfold themselves. It is easy to see that the whole labor controversy would be placed on an absolutely new footing as soon as this was done, confidence replacing hostility. This is the American way of solving the most weighty questions of the age, or of modern centuries. No example in the world could be truer to American traditions, nor given at an apter time than in this year of Columbian celebration.

Let American capitalists and leaders of thought and action bring the plan to realisation without waiting.

[Comments by Gen. M. M. Trumbull may be looked for in the next number.—Ed.]

#### ANALOGY BETWEEN RECENT CHANGES IN THEOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY.\*

To the Editor of *The Open Court* :

A Friend writes as follows :

"The true evolution will be not, as W. K. Clifford said, to lose the Great Companion, but to feel vivid and loving companionship with the total and spiritual meaning of all nature, and especially with all goodness at every moment and in every act.

"For anything we know, this pathetic yearning for a personal God may be a transitional state of mind; and the transit may be towards powers and ideas—of which many living men may feel the beginnings, like young wings shooting from their shoulders,—which may render communion with the Good Spirit seen in laws and making for righteousness, quite as real and emotional as special prayer for special providences or special graces has ever been."

So much for the change in theology. The evolution in psychology, though hitherto much less studied, is marvellously similar in character: the abdication of the central ego; the conformity of

\* "The Religion of Science, a Catechism,—The Soul." (*The Open Court*, No. 296.)

the developed ego with the ego which obtains throughout nature down to the molecule and the atom, in which the individual is not a nucleus possessing the properties of the molecule or atom, but their respective sums of properties taken together.

The two conceptions seem inseparable. Yours,  
HENRY H. HIGGINS.

#### COGITO ERGO SUM.

To the Editor of *The Open Court* :

Dr. Dreher, in his letter published by you May 18, says :

"Descartes's mistake is that he gives the axiom *cogito ergo sum* the form of a syllogism."

It is true that in the "Principia" Descartes appears so to regard the consequence. But that can only be regarded as a negligence of expression; for in his "Méditation" II, he had taken care to avoid saying that; and in a subsequent letter to Clerkselier he expressly says :

"*Je pense, donc je suis*, ne suppose pas la majeure, *Tout ce qui pense existe*."

The position of Descartes is that the mind proceeds from the recognition of *cogito* to the recognition of *sum*, by a clear act of perception, sure and irresistible; and that it is to no purpose that it is called illogical, because the movement of thought in question long antedates logic. I do not myself mean to defend this; far from it. I only wish to state the historical fact.

C. S. PEIRCE.

## THE OPEN COURT.

"THE MONON," 324 DEARBORN STREET.

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. 303.

OPEN STILL. F. M. HOLLAND.....	3695
CHRIST AND THE CHRISTIANS; A CONTRAST. Reflections on Prayer and the Sabbath. EDITOR.....	3696
CURRENT TOPICS: The Trial of Dr. Briggs. The Despotism of Party. No New Thing Under the Sun. The Anti-Trust Convention. Larceny as a Political Rem- edy. GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL.....	3700
CORRESPONDENCE. A Convention of Capitalists to Solve the Labor Ques- tion. MORRISON I. SWIFT.....	3701
Cogito Ergo Sum. C. S. PEIRCE.....	3702
Analogy Between Recent Changes in Theology and Psy- chology. HENRY H. HIGGINS.....	3702