

390.

THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 342. (VOL. VIII.—II.)

CHICAGO, MARCH 15, 1894.

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.

PROF. PFLEIDERER ON THE GENESIS OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY JOHN SANDISON.

PROFESSOR PFLEIDERER of Berlin whose philosophical works are well known and who has with great persistence endeavored to work out a Hegelian conception of the history of religion by applying it to all the early religions as well as to Christianity, but who it is but right to add, is opposed by a large and increasing number of theologians following in the footsteps of Ritschl—is, at present, engaged in delivering the Gifford Lectures in the University of Edinburgh. I was present at his address on Saturday the 2d of February, and thinking that it might be of interest to the readers of *The Open Court*, I noted the substance of his lecture which was on the "History of the Genesis and Development of Christianity."

The learned Professor proceeded to point out that the scientific investigation of this history, was of recent date, being not more than one hundred years old. What made it impossible sooner was a double hindrance—(1) a false idea of the nature of the revelations upon which Christianity rested; (2) a false idea of the character of the sources out of which we were able to obtain a knowledge of this genesis. To investigate a history meant to trace up the connexion of its causes and to make it intelligible to the understanding. This presupposed that in what had once happened there existed such a connexion of causes and effects as was analogous to our general experience and what happened among men, and was therefore intelligible to our understanding. But according to the old tradition the origin of Christianity was said to have lain in events outside of the connexion of human causes and events, incomparable with all other experience and inconceivable by any understanding—in other words, an absolute miracle, which again could only be known in a miraculous way, and could only be believed on authority. Christianity had arisen according to this account in a divine being. The Second Person of the Trinity had once on a time assumed a human nature by miraculous birth from a virgin, had made known His divine nature by many miracles, by His death had delivered men from the divine wrath, and had afterwards returned to His heavenly kingdom.

Certainly beautiful conceptions, continued the Professor, which from of old and even now came home to the fantasy and hearts of men; and in them we should never cease to honor the venerable vestments of sublime truths.

But was all this intelligibly conceivable history? No. These representations did not contain such history, nor could, nor ought they at all to contain it. The appearance of a Heavenly Being for an episodic stay upon earth broke the connexion of events in space and time upon which all our experience rested, and therefore it undid the conception of history. And nothing was altered in this position by showing how the appearance of the Heavenly Being had been prepared on earth by the course of history; how the Roman government of the world favored the spread of the Gospel; how the state of things in the heathen and Jewish world had been so desperate that men were the more willing to receive the tidings of the Divine Redeemer and such like. Considerations such as these, which were always at home in the apologetics of the church, certainly contained much truth; but they nevertheless remained attached to the surface of things and did not penetrate to the inner connexion of Christianity with the preceding history. It was overlooked that here too, as everywhere in the historical development of humanity, when the old was dying out, the new was prepared, not only negatively but positively, that men no longer found any satisfaction in the old forms of consciousness and life only, because the presentment of the higher truth already lived in the depths of the soul and evoked their longing for elevation to a higher consciousness of themselves and of God. What broke the old forms to pieces was first the new spirit itself, which, therefore, already pre-existed in germ, under the shell of the old, and which struggled for liberation from the hindering bonds and strove towards formation in personal and social existence. It was first on this account then, that the appearing of this new spirit in a powerful prophetic personality could be recognised and greeted as the fulfilment of the hoping of all, because they found in Him their own growing spirit, their better selves. This was the true, the positive and inner connexion of the new with the old in all human history; and so it was too in particular in the

case of the rise of Christianity. Only thus could its genesis be really comprehended as history, while under the presupposition of an absolute miracle it remained to us forever inconceivable. If Christianity had appeared as an absolute miracle in the person of a God upon earth, the knowledge of this appearance and of its significance could also have been communicated only through a miracle to men. Hence supra-naturalism logically assumed that the Bible, to which we owed this knowledge, was a work of the absolutely miraculous inspiration of the Holy Spirit, who had unveiled to the prophets the mystery of the future appearing, and to the apostles that of the accomplished appearance of the God-man, and who had noted down the record of this revelation for the coming generations even to its wording—nay, had specially dictated it to an amanuensis. As the Bible, according to this view, did not contain human history, but superhuman miracles, neither had it arisen in a historical way; it was not a collection of divers human testimonies about human experiences out of different times, but it was from beginning to end the homogeneous work of one divine author who had only employed different men as secretaries, to whom He dictated the oracles of His supra-rational revelation.

In approaching the Bible with this assumption men made quite impossible to themselves the understanding of its actual contents, which were as different as the times and the men from which they sprang. Naturally with this view, all interest in a higher, thorough study of the sacred Scriptures was lost; men supposed they knew beforehand what was everywhere to be found in them—namely, just the mysteries of revelation, the sum of which was already possessed in the dogmatic system. Hence the Bible was only further used as a mine of proofs for the established dogmatic system. Thus it happened that just in the age of the dominating orthodoxy whose doctrine of inspiration deified the letter of the Bible, the true study of the Bible reached its lowest ebb, and an understanding of the actual development of religion in the Old and New Testaments was completely wanting. It was a merit of the rationalistic movement that it broke with the prejudice of the unhistorical dogma of inspiration and recognised the Bible as a book written by men for men. The Professor further pointed out, however, that the rationalism of the period of enlightenment also still lacked the unbiased historical sense and was still entangled in dogmatic assumptions, and he traced back the beginning of a historical understanding of the Bible to Herder, the friend of all natural, original, and powerful feeling in poetry and religion. But in the words of Hayne, "Herder wanted still the critical mediate conception between poetry and faith—the conception of the myth." This defect was rectified

by Strauss and Baur, the great critics of Tübingen. The merit of Strauss was that he answered clearly the question, If the primeval history of all other peoples and religions is full of myths and legends, why should not the biblical history be so, too? and that he then also applied the point of view logically to the whole Gospel history. The strength of his "Life of Jesus" lay, it was true, more in negations than in positive results, in the removing of the hindrances to positive results, more than in the building up of such knowledge. But in order to come to this knowledge there was needed a more fundamental criticism of the sources of the Gospel history. This foundation of a positive history of primitive Christianity was still wanting in Strauss, and here was the point where the epoch-making achievement of his teacher Baur came in. The Professor then showed that Baur opposed to the old method of subjective criticism an objective criticism, which judged of the biblical writings not by the ecclesiastical traditions which arose accidentally, but by the contents of the several writings themselves.

If the contents of a writing were such that it was not possible without contradictions to connect it with the relations of the time and the person to whom it was hitherto ascribed, then the origin of this writing must be transferred to another time, whose relationships it most naturally fitted into, and out of whose ecclesiastical as well as theological interests it was most easily to be explained. Emphasising the most important results of Baur's method as applied to the New Testament, the lecturer showed first that by thorough investigation of the Pauline Epistles and of the Acts of the Apostles, the critic came to the conclusion that it was through Paul that Christianity had been first recognised as the universal world religion in distinction from the Jewish national religion, and that Paul had been able to carry through the original apprehension of Christianity only by hard conflict with the Jewish prepossessions of the primitive Church, and therefore that the real history of the apostolic time did not show the peaceful picture of ecclesiastical tradition, but a development from the beginning through strong opposition, out of which the one universal Catholic Church did not proceed till towards the end of the second century. Another equally important result of Baur's criticism, the Professor went on to say, related to the Fourth Gospel, which he came to the conclusion contained a Christian Gnosis, clothed in the form of a life of Jesus. But that such a representation, determined by ideal motives of a didactic kind, could lay no claim to historical value, had been established by a running critical comparison of this Gospel with the Synoptic Gospels.

This criticism of Baur had been much attacked, yet it had not been refuted to the present day; whereas

all further investigations had always only contributed anew to confirm it in the main.

The Professor then referred to the Synoptic Gospels, in his criticism of which Baur had been less successful. His hypothesis respecting their relations to each other might be regarded as antiquated. We were still far from having reached a certain result on this question, and would assuredly never come to such a result unless some entirely new material source of information were yet discovered. The Professor then pointed out that no one of the Synoptic Gospels dated from the time of the first apostolic generation, but somewhat later than the year 70 A. D. Up to that time oral tradition was still the only source of the communication of the Evangelic history. He further pointed out that in such oral tradition the connexion in which the individual sayings of Jesus had been originally spoken could not possibly be exactly retained, and that the free form of the oral tradition of the sayings of Jesus could not exclude transformations and additions. Even in the case of some of the parables there were cogent reasons for distinguishing between an original simple kernel which pointed back to Jesus, and an artificial interpretation, explanation, and transformation which might well be a later addition. Again we saw already in every-day life how the recollection of a life which was dear to us was wont to be transfigured, idealised by the unconsciously working fantasy. Still more was this the case when the life in question was one which was of great significance to many. The ideal motives which worked determiningly upon the formation of the Evangelic tradition might, if he saw rightly, be referred to three sources, (1) the existing Messiah idea of Judaism, (2) the figurative modes of speech used in the Old Testament and by Jesus, (3) the religious experiences of the community of the disciples.

Mark was the oldest of the Gospels which, in comparison with the others, bore the stamp of greater originality and definiteness; especially striking was its dogmatic *naïveté*, the want of Christological considerations and interests. Mark still knew nothing of the miraculous birth of Jesus, or of the miraculous power of Jesus, which according to his representation was as yet no absolutely supernatural power, but was conditioned partly by physical means and partly by the faith of the sufferers.

The Professor then pointed out that the writer of Luke was a Hellenist Paulinist of the post-apostolic time; that it is the richest of the Gospels, eminently poetical and artistic, and remarkable for setting forth the love and mercy of Jesus, and that the author adopted a conservative attitude towards the universal mission of Christianity.

Matthew, on the other hand, the Professor stated,

was the youngest of the Synoptic Gospels and was a faithful mirror of the dogmatic consciousness of the Catholic Church of the second century.

SENATORIAL REFORM.

BY MONGURE D. CONWAY.

It is a curious sign of our time that just as an able political writer was pointing out in *The Open Court* the anomaly of our Senate, an eminent English writer should propose to import it, partly, as a substitute for the House of Lords. Dr. Alfred Russell Wallace, to whose article in the *Contemporary Review* (January 1894) I refer, calls himself an "extreme radical," and, if he be such, supplies another example of the mental confusion which has often led extreme radicalism to change king log for king stork. His scheme bears all the marks of having been rapped out on his table by the "spirits" with whom he is so familiar, but the spirits might have made a different revelation had they consulted the shades of Franklin, Randolph, Mason, Madison, and other constitutional fathers as to their impressions of the Senate after its hundred years. Though Dr. Wallace is credited with the discovery of the principle of natural selection, simultaneously with Darwin, his reputation is not enhanced by this venture in political selection. The constitution of the United States Senate historically represents a concentration of "survivals" in America of the basest characteristics of the reactionary reign of George III, which the American Revolution had resisted. The thirteen colonies claimed, as a result of the Revolution, a severer sovereignty more despotic over their subjects than had been claimed by the royalism they had unitedly overthrown. These thirteen sovereigns were so jealous of their autocracy that it was only under the continued menace of England, which still held six military posts in the North West, its ships commanding our coasts, that they could be induced to form any union at all. It was really a military union, the president being a half-civil, half-military chieftain (which accounts for the unrepudiated majesty of that officer). The constitution of 1787 was really a treaty between thirteen sovereigns, the smaller empires refusing to unite unless their inherited supremacies were secured the power to overrule the voice of the nation. This was the real foundation of the Senate. But in the discussions of the Convention (1787) that doctrine of sovereignty, discredited even in England, was veiled, though the veil was as discreditable as the motive concealed. The necessity being first of all to get the second Legislature established in the Constitution, it was done with an innocent air, and without discussion, on the mere statement that England had two Houses, and that two Houses had always proved favorable to Liberty. Both were untrue: England had only one

House, so far as the powers given to the Senate were concerned; and even her two unequal Houses were at that time unfavorable to Liberty. But worse remained. When the subject of disproportionate representation in the Senate came before the Convention, it was supported as a principle only on the ground that in the British Parliament small places with little population were represented equally with the largest constituencies. Thus, the infamous "rotten borough" system of England, long discarded, now a proverb of governmental absurdity, was avowedly imitated in our American Constitution. And to crown the dishonorable proceeding, the Convention, laying aside the fundamental principle of the Revolution, gave our peage of States as much hereditary perpetuity as it could, by excepting from the normal powers of constitutional amendment the right of each State to equal representation in the Senate. Should the population of Rhode Island be reduced to the one family that used to elect the two Commoners for Old Sarum, that State would still equal New York in Congress.

It will therefore be seen, that in our Senate are historically embodied the most antiquated principle of State sovereignty (to which we owe the civil war, and State repudiations), the "rotten borough" principle, the peage principle, and the base attempt to fetter posterity to these unrepresentative and irrational principles; by all of which the United States is held far behind Western Europe in constitutional civilisation. It should be said that even Dr. Wallace does not propose to invade our monopoly of the "rotten borough" feature of the Senate.

The perpetuity which, as one of your correspondents has pointed out, the Convention of 1787 gave to the representation of each State in the Senate, would not prevent the nation from abolishing the Senate altogether. The Convention did not venture to control the future so far as that, though no doubt many of the members would have been willing to do so. The law is that, so long as the Senate lasts, no State can be deprived of its equal representation in it, without that State's consent. The constitutional reformer, therefore, has first to consider whether the entire abolition of the State comes within the range of practical politics. I think not. The Senate has gradually taken deep root in American snobbery, it offers a number of lordly offices for eminent office-seekers, and it represents provincial pride. Furthermore, besides being "in the European fashion" (superficially, for in no other country is there a second chamber so constituted), it has been as a fashion repeated in all the States. Had the substance as well as the form of the national Senate been reproduced in the several States the whole system must have long ago broken down, like the "rotten borough" anomaly in England. But as in the States there is no

disproportionate representation in the second chamber, nor any really different origin of the two Houses, the bicameral system is substantially the division of one representative body into two. The fairly smooth working of the double-legislatures of the States has been accepted by many people as a warrant for the soundness in principle of the national Senate, though there is no analogy between the two. The normal State Senate represents the somewhat delocalised interests of each district, a larger community and a more constant popular sentiment, but the constituencies of both Houses being the same people, there is little danger of one body obstructing the other. The national Senate represents local interests, antiquarian pride, sectional sentiment, traditional notions of sovereignty as superior to justice, and the power of a minority to weigh equally with a majority without being superior to it. Instead of its being the conservative, calm, mature wisdom of the nation, the Senate has been the centre of disintegrating elements. It may, I think, be proved that had there been no Senate there had been no civil war. Yet I remember a conversation with Charles Sumner, after he had been felled in the Senate, in which, when I stated these objections to such an unrepresentative body, he—even he, scarred monument as he was of its provincial violence—urged in reply the smooth working of the senatorial system in the States!

The raising of this question in *The Open Court* revives in me an old hope that there may be formed in America "Constitutional Associations," like those founded in England a hundred years ago, for the study of the science of government. And I do not know any place where such a society might better be founded than in the most American of our cities—Chicago. It is not only the Senate that should be dealt with, but other institutions, more especially the presidency. Concerning this unrepresentative office I shall have something to say in a future paper, but will now confine myself to some reflexions about the Senate.

The argument which has recommended the bicameral system to political philosophers, is the liability of a single House to impulsive and precipitate action. This liability finds apparent illustrations in the history of the French Revolution. In the first constitution of Pennsylvania, framed mainly by Franklin and Paine, there was but one legislative chamber; but very early in the French Revolution Paine came to the conclusion that, though there should be one representation only, the elected representatives should be divided, by lot, into two chambers,—No. 1 and No. 2, or A and B. Measures should be introduced into one or the other chamber (alternately). While the measure was debated in No. 1, No. 2 should listen. Then when it passed to debate in No. 2, the representatives in the

latter would come to the subject without being committed, and with the advantage of knowing most of what could be said for and against it. The joint vote of the two chambers would decide the matter. This plan it will be seen, is not inharmonious with that adopted in the majority of American States.

But beyond this lies another question, one which the enfranchisement of vast masses of ignorant people renders of increasing importance. A legislature should be the collected wisdom and knowledge of a nation, not a mere reflexion of its prejudices and errors; and how is this to be selected from masses of people who are not wise, nor learned in the principles of government? It is notorious that in democratic countries the ablest and best men shrink from vulgar competition for the popular vote and do not generally enter public life. The enlargement of the franchise in England has been accompanied by a marked decline in the character of Parliament. It is not easy to see how high statesmanship can be developed in any country where the representative is more and more expected to be a mere messenger to carry to the legislature the programme of his constituency, and may be cashiered for any independence of thought. Nor can congressional eloquence be developed when the orator is dealing with a foregone conclusion, formed at the polls. This kind of mere delegation might as well be intrusted to postmen or telegraph-boys. In England, the House of Lords is sometimes wrongly obstructive where its class interests are involved, but on general questions it exercises an independence above that of the Commons, whom the next election holds in awe. Thus, it is known that a large majority of the Commons are in favor of opening the museums and galleries on Sunday, yet they regularly defeat that measure, through fear of their remote Scotch and Welsh constituencies; whereas the Lords have passed the measure which the Commons invariably reject. I have no doubt that the people generally would vote for the ablest man; ignorance does not love ignorance; but the advantages of his ability should be secured from their prejudices, and he should be secured from his own timidity.

This, I believe, could be secured by the introduction of the (secret) ballot into Congress. The people would then have to choose the wisest and best man, with more care than at present, knowing that they could have no control over his vote. On the other hand, the representative would be unable to play the demagogue by parading his votes in favor of popular prejudices. The representative might thus also be withdrawn from the pressure of party leaders and "whips," as well as from liability to bribery. Men will not pay for votes they can never be certain of obtaining.

Finally, there remains to be considered the peril

of the tyranny of majorities. To this danger I have recently called the attention of your readers (in my treatise on "Liberty"),* and have little to add on the general subject. I am writing this in Paris, not far from where Condorcet, Brissot, Paine, and some others labored on a constitution which was to harmonise universal suffrage with individual liberty. They believed that this could be done by a Declaration of Rights. Around the individual was to be drawn a sacred circle, including his personal, natural, inalienable rights, which no majority could invade, and which could never be subjects of governmental control. This was Paine's Republic, as distinguished from a democracy. In America (1786), when the States were making preparations for a Constitutional Convention, he sounded his warning about majorities:

"When a people agree to form themselves into a republic (for the word *republic* means the *public good*, or the good of the whole, in contradistinction to the despotic form, which makes the good of the sovereign, or of one man, the only object of the government), when, I say, they agree to do this, it is to be understood that they mutually resolve and pledge themselves to each other, rich and poor alike, to support and maintain the rule of equal justice among them. They therefore renounce not only the despotic form, but the despotic principle, as well of governing as of being governed by mere will and power, and substitute in its place a government of justice. By this mutual compact the citizens of a republic put it out of their power, that is, they renounce, as detestable, the power of exercising, at any future time, any species of despotism over each other, or doing a thing not right in itself, because a majority of them may have strength of numbers sufficient to accomplish it. In this pledge and compact lies the foundation of the republic: and the security to the rich and the consolation to the poor is, that what each man has is his own; that no despotic sovereign can take it from him, and that the common cementing principle which holds all the parts of a republic together, secures him likewise from the despotism of numbers: for despotism may be more effectually acted by many over a few, than by one man over all."

With this principle Paine indoctrinated the real statesmen of France; and the Declaration of Rights prepared by him and Condorcet (translated in my "Life of Paine," II, p. 39) is by far the most perfect instrument of the kind ever written. Whether such a constitutional compact would have proved adequate cannot be known. The statesmen who endeavored to substitute it for the revolutionary despotism of Robespierre and his staff were guillotined, and a really republican constitution remains yet to be tried. But American experiences seem to show that popular prejudices and passions cannot be effectually prevented from overriding constitutional guarantees of individual rights, by legislative and legal quibbles, unless restrained by some such power as that represented by our executive veto, though sometimes in a mere partisan way.

Could not our Senate, since there is little prospect

* *The Open Court*, Nos. 327, 329, 331.

of abolishing it, be developed into such a restraining power? Might not its power as an equal legislature be taken away, its basis modified, and a function assigned it of useful revision? One of the two Senators of each State might be chosen by the alumni of its colleges and learned societies, placing in the revising council a compact force representing a common interest,—the Republic of Letters. The other Senator might perhaps be left as now to selection by the Legislature. These men, though liable to impeachment, should be chosen for terms long enough to save them from the temptation to cater to popular prejudices. They should not be eligible for other offices,—certainly not for the Presidency or the Cabinet. Their function should be to discuss and revise measures passed by the House of Representatives, this function being altogether withdrawn from the President (so long as that dress-coat monarch shall continue). This Senate would have a suspending veto. It might return a measure to the Congress twice (say), after which, if passed a third time, the measure to become law without any further action on it by the Senate. Experience might at some time suggest the necessity of requiring a somewhat larger majority of representatives than that which originally passed the measure, to overcome the objections of the Senators. For this body, so removed from the *aura popularis* and from corrupting ambitions, would thus represent the simple force of reason, of right, and argument. The mere cock-pit spirit which often arises between two equal houses, in a competition of mere force, could not be evoked when one side conceded in advance the superiority of the other in mere strength, and used no other weapon than argument.

POSTSCRIPT. Today (February 9), when the proof of this article reached me, it is announced that on Tuesday next the French Chamber of Deputies will begin their discussion of proposed changes in the Constitution. The first alteration proposed is to make the senatorial veto suspensive instead of absolute. The French bicameral system was avowedly borrowed from America, but the Senate is afraid to assert its equal powers against the representatives of the people, and is becoming a nullity. Probably, if it shall be turned into a revising and restraining body, it may become one worthy of being imitated in the country from which it was,—as a bicameral feature, though not with our "rotten borough" basis,—imported.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE dramatic ending of Mr. Gladstone's political career was not without some elements of comedy. At the very moment when he was threatening the peers, he was actually manufacturing two more of those Corinthian "pillars of the State." By very nearly the last official act of Mr. Gladstone, two commoners, Mr. Stuart Rendell and Sir Reginald Welby, who it is to be presumed have

done the State some service, have been "raised to the peerage," and this little bit of sarcasm contains within it all the subtle elements of refined humor. Declining a peerage, Mr. Gladstone creates peers. Refusing to be kicked up stairs himself, he does not scruple to kick up other men. By this rather inconsistent action, Mr. Gladstone says to Mr. Stuart Rendell and Sir Reginald Welby, "a peerage raises you, but it would lower me. I will not allow them to reduce me to the rank of a lord, but I will elevate you to that grade." The compliment seems equivocal, but no doubt the recipients of it are grateful for the honor, and their wives and daughters will be proud, because a woman of title belongs to the aristocracy by force of law, and social eminence is a luxury still in England. There are men in that country who regard a coronet as a barbarian trinket and yet accept it for the sake of their families and the social distinction it confers upon their wives and children. Sir Robert Peel, a great Prime Minister, not only would not be a lord himself, but he commanded in his will that no son of his should ever accept a peerage for any service done by their father to the State. One of his sons is now Speaker of the House of Commons, and for that reason will be made a peer, but he will be appointed for his own services, and not for those of his father.

* * *

In the good old times whenever the king and his courtiers went a-hunting, it was a rule of etiquette that every man in the party should swear that the king killed all the game; and if any of the courtiers made a claim for his own bow and arrow or spear, he was immediately handed over to the Lord High Executioner and beheaded. At the same time it was the duty of the Court chronicler to tell the story of the sport and multiply the number of the slain by seven so as to exaggerate the prowess of the king. The same etiquette and similar customs prevail in our own country at this day, as appears by the work of the court chroniclers who, after the manner of old Froissart, discourse of knightly chivalry and extol the warlike expedition conducted by the President of the United States in the year 1894 against the piratical ducks and drakes that vex the waters of North Carolina and the Lake of the Dismal Swamp. The chronicler who was on duty at Elizabeth City was probably new to the business, for on the 5th of March he telegraphed a mournful story to the effect that the President's party had killed only three swans and two geese. He was probably beheaded at once, for the court historian at Norfolk telegraphed the same evening as follows: "The President arrived here to-night. He said he had killed about thirty ducks and twenty geese and swans." Nothing so miraculous as that has appeared since Falstaff multiplied the men in buckram suits; three swans and two geese expanded into thirty ducks and twenty geese and swans. And the courtiers and retainers all declared that the half had not been told.

* * *

It was not until the President's triumphant hunting-party returned to Washington that we got any properly exaggerated return of the killed and wounded in that successful expedition. For exuberant and ornamental fiction we must go to the flattering scribes who, mentally dressed in the king's livery, hang about the gates of the royal palace and proclaim the exploits and the glories of the great. One of these in loyal adulation declares the net result of the expedition to be "thirty-one brant, thirteen swans, eight geese, six snipe, and two ducks"; and when the inhabitants of Snobdom, sixty-seven million of us, inquire who shot them, and how much glory is to be given to each gun, he pretends that information of that kind is a State secret that Court etiquette will not permit him to reveal. Cautiously, as if his own head and the heads of all the party were in danger, he says, "Nobody will disclose the tally of the individual shooting." Whenever any of the party does "disclose" anything, he is very careful to say that the President shot

the birds, as was the style in the days of old. Another chronicler while confirming the story of the shooting, shows us by what fine discipline the ancient etiquette is preserved. Speaking with becoming pride of the brant, and the ducks, and the snipe, and the swans, he says: "Secretary Gresham and Commander Evans insist that the President shot the most of them, even bringing down two swans at a single fire—one with each barrel." It is distressing to learn from this kitchen gossip that the President "looks as if he had been constantly in the sun and wind, and the skin has peeled off the end of his nose." Some persons think those tawdry personal details are not worth printing, but they are—to editors; and they will be printed so long as millions of people consider them worth reading.

* * *

For three or four weeks to come Chicago will be in the "maelstrom" of a political campaign. Township officers and city aldermen are to be elected in April and as the perquisites promise to be large this year there is a good deal of political activity in the different wards. The "Christian citizenship movement" is becoming rather troublesome to certain candidates, for its purpose is to support only the best men for office, independent of party nominations, and the "Christian citizens" are very enthusiastic and aggressive too. Many of the ministers are interested in the movement, and their churches will be thrown open every night for public meetings in behalf of municipal reform and honest men. A most encouraging beginning was made on the 6th of March at the Warren Avenue Congregational Church, where a very large and enthusiastic meeting was held. It was presided over by Mr. O. N. Carter, attorney for the drainage board, and the principal speaker was Mr. W. E. Mason, a veteran politician, formerly member of Congress, and one of the most effective campaign orators in the Republican party. His appearance was convincing evidence that the movement is entirely disinterested and non-partisan, because if it had any taint of partyism in it, Mr. Mason would not give it any countenance at all. He exhorted the congregation to vote "upon every question from the election of a town officer or ward alderman to the office of president." He even "wanted a law passed" compelling every citizen to vote, and especially to vote Mr. Mason's ticket, and in this he reminded me of my old friend Swarigton, who was Methodist minister at Marbletown. One night at the Marbletown Mutual Improvement Association and Hesperian Debating Club, the question being on the duty of the citizen to vote, Brother Swarigton arose and said: "Every man who votes right ought to vote, and every man who votes wrong ought to stay at home on election day; and what I mean by voting right, is voting the Republican ticket."

* * *

In the province of Kansas they carry the principle of a protective tariff to its logical conclusion. At the town of Concordia, in that province, the young lady teachers in the public schools are in the reprehensible habit of getting married and quitting work, sometimes in the very middle of the term for which they have engaged themselves to teach, thus causing much inconvenience to everybody but themselves. To correct this practice the Board of Education has adopted a rule providing that hereafter "should any of the lady teachers of the Concordia schools commit matrimony during the term for which they have been elected, they shall forfeit a sum of money equal to one half month's salary, provided they take a home man, and a sum equal to one month's salary in case the groom is imported from some other county or State." By this law a discrimination amounting to fifty per cent. *ad valorem* is made in favor of the home article, and against the foreign product. At this moment three of the lady teachers are engaged to be married, and their prospective husbands are all "foreigners," within the meaning of the law. The girls will resist the tariff on matrimony and will test its constitutionality in the

courts, for if contracts in restraint of marriage are not favored by the law, why should school board regulations in restraint of marriage be allowed.

* * *

Last week my family paper, the *Chicago Herald*, spoke of the American Senate as "a convocation of doddering idiots," a description altogether inappropriate, as the *Herald* will doubtless now concede. The senatorial manipulation of the Wilson Bill, instead of being idiotic, was a bit of crafty statesmanship worthy of the most thrifty patriots in any age. Every day for weeks the Senators with itching palms dexterously shuffled and cut the different schedules as if the Wilson Bill were a pack of cards; and every day they juggled the markets and bet money in Wall Street on their own game. Like monte men at the races, they allowed their confederates to show false cards to the fools, and when the victims bet, behold, another card was there. Pretending to honorable secrecy, they allowed false information to "leak out," and by changing it every morning and contradicting it every afternoon they kept the mercury running up and down in the stock market thermometer anywhere between 70 and 100, buying and selling according to the fluctuations they themselves had made. One day it "leaked out" that sugar was to be taxed one cent a pound, and this did very good service for a couple of days; then that leak was plugged up and another one opened, revealing the important fact that the tax was to be only half a cent a pound, and then it was to be only a quarter of a cent, and then an eighth; next it made a jump to a cent and a quarter, and then back again; then it "leaked out" that sugar was to be on the free list, and then the conjuring was all done over again and again; the people wondering all the time why it was that the Finance Committee of the Senate made no report upon the Wilson Bill; a conundrum that was correctly guessed out by some New York editors, who vehemently declared that the bill was delayed in order that certain Senators might cipher information to their brokers on the stock market with instructions to buy or to sell.

* * *

A general accusation to the effect that members of the Senate are using their legislative powers and their senatorial knowledge for stock-jobbing purposes may be borne with intrepid silence, but when it takes the form of a specific charge against individual Senators, pointed out by name, their silence is almost a confession. A New York newspaper having asserted that Mr. McPherson, Mr. Vest, and some other Senators whose names were mentioned, had been speculating in sugar stocks and holding back the report on the Wilson Bill for their own profit, Mr. McPherson "arose" in the Senate, as bold as brass, and said that he, and he alone, was responsible for the delay in reporting the bill, and that he had caused the delay because he wanted some changes made in the direction of higher duties. Further, it was true that his broker had bought for him a thousand shares of sugar stock, but without his knowledge or consent, and on learning the fact he had ordered him to sell it again, and he had not purchased any sugar stock since. Mr. Vest followed Mr. McPherson, and said that he had not bought any sugar stock, and that the man who said he had was a liar. The other suspected Senators answered not, and although, says the report, the galleries waited with some anxiety for the next senatorial confession or denial, it came not, "and the Senate soon settled down to its usually tranquil state." Unless the accused Senators, or those who are not accused, ask for a committee of investigation, suspicion will settle down upon the whole body of the Senate, and its tranquillity will be looked upon as that of a stagnant pool. Either way, as soon as the people find out that the men in the Senate who govern them are a sordid corporation, legislating for their own profit, and not for the public welfare, the days of the Senate will be numbered. Like the House of Lords, it must be "mended or ended."

M. M. TRUMBULL.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"MOTHER'S PIES."

To the Editor of *The Open Court*:

GENERAL TRUMBULL is no doubt a great thinker, a keen analyst and a puissant writer in the field of *belles lettres*, science, art, political economy, etc., and I intensely enjoy his weekly contributions, but when it comes to philosophising upon that most profound of all mysteries and its esoteric ingredients—"Our Mother's Pie"—then, to use a military parlance, "he shoots way off of the mark"! Of course his mother's pies, or mother Jones's pies, or any mother's pies were no better than the pies made by those who were not mothers, or by those who never will be mothers, or by those who never can be mothers—French male cooks, for instance. This he tacitly concedes—at any rate he does not contend to the contrary, but insists: "Nobody but your own mother ever can or ever could give to the elements of a pie that ethereal flavor, and that spiritual potency, which makes it, for you at least, a memory of home forever. Unless all their ingredients are mixed with her love, touched by her hands, and seasoned with her own spirit, there are no pies like your mother used to make."

But, pray, how about the cook's pie or the hired girl's? Has any sound and healthy boy of ten or sixteen ever seriously discriminated between the "ethereal flavor" of the mother (!) or the seasoning of the cook?(!) Or discerned in such pie the gentle love of mother or the (often) churlish disposition of the servant? Have these psychological potencies, spirituelle cogencies or hypnotic emanations really exerted an influence upon the boy? Or is the sole secret—why our mothers are alleged to have been better cooks than our wives or any body else—the simple fact that, as a man, we have a different constitution—nature's processes of growth are completed; the necessity for food is not so urgent; hence that terrible gnawing of the stomach, concomitant with a ferocious appetite has subsided. Let us give our wives due credit: Nothing else ever made mother's (or the hired girl's) pie—though often doughy and greasy—taste so much better than the most fragrant delicacies served at our own home or at the finest table d'hôte.

If you have a boy, try it: Let his mother bake a pie and give each one half. Then if the boy does not place himself around the pie in half the time that you do, I pay for a fine cigar for both you and the General.

OTTO WETTSTEIN.

REMARKS BY GENERAL TRUMBULL.

I was afraid it would come to this; I thought at the time it was printed that I ought to have labelled with big letters my comment on pies, in order that logical men might understand it. Neglecting to do so, I am at the mercy of Mr. Wettstein, because, looking at a pie as merely a lump of dough, his criticism is mathematically sound. From an earthy point of view, Mr. Wettstein is undoubtedly right, because a pie being a genuine good-to-eat physical fact, practical "vittles," there is no idealism in it.

Taking a materialistic view of it, Mr. Wettstein resolves the discussion into a mere matter of chemistry, for he is able to analyse a pie and show that there is no sentiment in it, nothing but flour, and milk, and eggs, and fruit, and some other substantial elements. He can prove by his own taste and appetite that a pie has no ethereal flavor and no spiritual potency, whether it was made by his own mother, or by that inferior domestic whom he calls the "hired girl." Considering life as essentially pie and potatoes, and only these, Mr. Wettstein reasons well, but if somebody else fancies that his mother's cookery harmed the pies of his boyhood and gave them psychologic virtue, why not leave him the joys of his imagination? I know a man who thinks that a cup of coffee handed him by his wife is better than the identically

same article offered him by somebody else; and it is better—to him.

The pieman who advertises "pies like your mother used to make" may not be so learned in the mechanic arts as Mr. Wettstein, nor so skilful in brushing fancy from fact, but he is a more profound philosopher. He knows nature better, and he sees what Mr. Wettstein does not see, the electric powers in the soul that influence human action. He knows how delicious is the recollection of mother's pies, and he thinks that if he can touch the chord of memory that stretches back to childhood's home he will get a response in a call for pies. He boasteth not of his pie materials, their freshness and their other qualities, but he expresses every excellence in a single phrase, and promises that if you trade with him he will give you "pies like your mother used to make."

The man who says that a mother's pies are no better than any other pies would say that a mother's hands are no better than the hands of Sairey Gamp in smoothing a boy's pillow and tucking him into bed at night.

M. M. TRUMBULL.

NOTES.

A propos of the discussion on the National Senate in this number of *The Open Court* we take the opportunity again to remind our readers that Prof. H. von Holst, our great constitutional authority, has promised us an article on the subject. Professor von Holst's views, which are rather conservative, may be expected to differ from the suggestions made by the writers of this number of *The Open Court*.

Having been asked where President Harper's "Lectures on Genesis" can be obtained, we will state that they are to appear in *The Biblical World*, (University Press of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois,) beginning with January, 1894. The lectures, it will be remembered, are delivered Saturday evenings at the Memorial University Extension Centre, Oakwood Boulevard and Cottage Grove Avenue, and before the Faculty and students of the University Sunday afternoons. They are the same which have created such a stir in the theological world.

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.

CONTENTS OF NO. 342.

PROFESSOR PFLEIDERER ON THE GENESIS OF CHRISTIANITY. JOHN SANDISON..... 4007

SENATORIAL REFORM. MONCURE D. CONWAY..... 4009

CURRENT TOPICS: Mr. Gladstone and the Peers. The President and His Courtiers. Christian Citizenship. The Tariff on Husbands. Stock-Jobbing in the Senate.

GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL 4012

CORRESPONDENCE

"Mother's Pies." [With Remarks by General Trumbull.] OTTO WETTSTEIN 4014

NOTES 4014