

THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 357. (VOL. VIII.—26.)

CHICAGO, JUNE 28, 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.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN FRANCE.

BY THEODORE STANTON.

THE energetic effort being made in New York State to have the Constitutional Convention strike out the word "male" from the article establishing the qualifications for the exercise of the elective franchise, has called wide-spread attention to the question of woman suffrage. It has occurred to me, therefore, that it might be interesting to see what has been thought and done in regard to this same subject in France, which in the field of ideas, at least, has always led the world. Though it is true that France has accomplished less than several other European countries in the practical amelioration of woman's condition, it long ago solved theoretically the "woman question," as it has solved nearly all of the other great political and social problems of the nineteenth century. What her thinkers and reformers have written and spoken, other more favorably situated nations have put into practice.

Condorcet, whom Mill pronounces "one of the wisest and noblest of men," spoke out repeatedly and plainly, on the eve of the French Revolution, in favor of the rights of women. He did not hesitate to declare for their political enfranchisement. Nor did he stand alone in holding this opinion. Michelet paints a vivid picture of the celebrated orator and member of the Convention, Abbé Fauchet, speaking, in 1790, on this subject, with Condorcet among his listeners. Sieyès, Saint-Just and other leaders of the epoch have left on record eloquent appeals for the enlarging of woman's public sphere.

Neither was the press of the Revolution silent on the subject. Besides the numerous tracts, pamphlets, and books written for and against the question, several newspapers came out warmly for extending the liberties of women. And more than one bill passed by the Assembly and Convention put these ideas on the statute books in the form of laws.

Nor were women themselves passive spectators of this movement in their favor. Several petitions, drawn up by female pens, prove this. One of these petitions, bearing the date of 1789, prays for the granting of women's civil and political rights and their admission to membership in the legislature, while another begs

that both sexes be placed on an exact equality and that even the pulpit be opened to women,—not a slight request in a Catholic country.

Thus the advocacy of great men and the activity of women themselves seemed, in the early days of the Revolution, to portend the opening of a new era for the female sex. But what followed would appear to justify the assertion which has been made, that the authors of the revolt were only using women for the advancement of selfish ends. It is certain that when the revolutionary movement was well under way, these men deserted their early coadjutors. In the beginning, women were encouraged to found clubs and their ardor in the cause was applauded, but the object gained, these clubs were abolished, this ardor checked and women saw themselves finally thrust back into their old dependent and circumscribed position.

The Republic was gradually merged into the Empire, which was the *coup de grace* to the aspirations of the women of 1789. The Empire not only dissipated their day-dreams, but it fastened the Napoleonic code about their necks, with all its indignities and injustices, which, with scarcely an exception have remained in force even down to the present hour. It was a fatal hour for women's interests. The general public had not forgotten the many disorders in which the female revolutionists had participated and was unfriendly to the weaker sex. The codifiers were dry old followers of the Roman law, and Bonaparte, woman's evil genius, was all-powerful among them. The spirit with which the Emperor entered upon his task may be judged from this remark to his colleagues: "A husband ought to have absolute control over the actions of his wife. He should have the right to say to her: 'Madam, you shall not go out; Madam, you shall not go to the theater; Madam, you shall not see such or such a person.'"

Then came the reactionary Restoration whose views were well exemplified in this *ipse dixit* of one of its philosophers, M. de Bonald: "Man and woman are not equals and can never become such." Divorce was abolished and an attempt was even made by the government to re-establish primogeniture, which would have been a tremendous blow to women, for the French law of inheritance places daughters on an absolutely

JUN 28 1894

equal footing with sons, one of the very few provisions of the Napoleonic code treating both sexes alike.

With the liberal reawakening of 1830 the Woman Question revived. The socialists, individual women, societies, and the newspapers began to turn their attention to the subject. During Louis Philippe's reign two or three women's rights journals appeared at Paris. One of these was edited by Mme. Poutret de Mauchamps who used the same argument to prove that the Charter of 1830 conferred political rights on French women as do the American advocates of woman suffrage in their interpretation of the United States Constitution. She took the ground that in proclaiming the political enfranchisement of French men, the generic term was used, so that the new Charter of Liberties included French women in its provisions. Every issue of Mme. de Mauchamps's paper—*La Gazette des Femmes*, which is to be found at the Paris National Library—contains a petition addressed to king and Parliament praying for reforms in the code, for political rights, for the admission of women to the Institute and to the universities, etc. These petitions were ably drawn up, sensible in their claims and some of their demands—the opening of the universities to women, for instance—were granted in subsequent years. They were sometimes reported by the Committees of the Chamber of Deputies and briefly discussed, but were heaped with ridicule and soon forgotten,—a striking commentary on the seriousness of French legislators and their high opinion of the capabilities of the other sex. It should be added, however, that what was true in 1830 would not be true in 1894. Some progress has unquestionably been made, in this respect, in France during the past sixty years, as will be shown further on in this article. But much more still remains to be made.

That this demand for women's political rights attracted some share of public attention during Louis Philippe's reign is evidenced in several ways. Thus, at one of the elections several voters cast their ballots for the candidate's wife, rather than for the candidate himself, as a protest against the exclusion of women from political life. During this same period Laboulaye published an important essay on the civil and political condition of women, and M. Legouvé, whose father sang, in 1801, the "Merit of Women" in a celebrated poem, lectured in the College of France on the "Moral History of Woman," these lectures being brought together later into a volume with the foregoing title. The book is very liberal in tone and written in a charming style. It was soon read all over Europe and is still remembered. "Equality in difference" was its keynote. "The question is not to make woman a man, but to complete man by woman," the author says elsewhere in the volume.

While this Platonic consideration of the Woman

Question was in progress, the revolution of 1848 suddenly burst upon France, and for a moment it seemed as if the era of female emancipation had come at last. But the magnificent dreams of the second Republic were never realised, at least in so far as women were concerned. "In 1848 there was a grand agitation," Laboulaye once wrote me, "great demands, but I know of nothing durable or solid on this question." Victor Considérant (who died in Paris last winter), the well-known disciple of Fourier, made a strong effort—as member of the Committee on the Constitution in the Assembly—to have woman suffrage introduced into the Constitution of the new Republic. But he labored in vain. However, his was not the only endeavor to advance and protect the interests of French women. When, in the summer of 1851, it was proposed in the Chamber to deny them the right of petition in political affairs, three distinguished public men—Laurent de l'Ardeche, Victor Schœlcher, and Crémieux—opposed the motion and it was defeated; and when, in November of the same year, the subject of the reorganisation of the municipal system came up for consideration, M. Pierre Leroux, the famous Socialistic Radical, offered as an amendment to Article I. of the bill that "the body of electors shall be composed of French men and women of legal age." He supported this amendment in a speech which filled three columns of the official *Moniteur*—the number for November 22, 1851—but which was received with shouts of laughter. The French Deputies of 1848 seemed to have been as risible as those of 1830 whenever woman suffrage was broached.

The Republic fell, the Second Empire rose on its ruins and the progress of the woman's movement was again abruptly checked, though speculation on the subject in the form of newspaper or review articles, pamphlets or books, was rife than ever before. Several authors of repute came out squarely for woman suffrage, and the late Senator Eugène Pelletan said in his book entitled "The Mother": "By keeping women outside of politics, we diminish by one half the soul of the country."

But it is since the advent of the present Republic that the Woman Question, like every other liberal measure, has gained new life and fresh vigor. At the beginning of 1871, Mlle. Julie Daubié, "one of the worthiest women I have ever known," Laboulaye once remarked, and the first female bachelor of arts in France, having taken her degree in 1862, I believe, announced in the public prints the approaching organisation of an Association for Woman Suffrage. But this promising reformer died before accomplishing her object, which was very dear to her.

The question of woman suffrage, in one form or another, has come up several times, during the past

twenty years, before the French Parliament. In 1874, when the Versailles National Assembly was preparing a new election bill, one member moved that every married man or widower with a child should be given the right to deposit two ballots. Another Deputy supported the motion but would so amend it that the widower would have two votes even if childless. Count de Douhet went still further: he would give every married man, first a vote for himself, another for his wife and finally one for each child. The committee to which these motions were referred favored the idea contained in them, and Article 7 of the bill which they reported read as follows: "Every married voter, or widower with children or grandchildren, shall have a double vote." Although this article failed to secure a majority and although one of the objects which its supporters had in view was, probably, to increase the very low birth-rate in France, still it shows that many public men do not consider women sufficiently represented at the polls under the present system.

Another proposal of the committee was quite as significant. It moved an amendment to the law governing municipal suffrage by which tax-paying women would vote under certain circumstances. Though the measure was rejected, the Government voted with the minority.

Five years later, in 1879, M. Laroche-Joubert declared in the Chamber of Deputies that he would vote in favor of the admission of women if one should be elected to a seat,—a situation that would not arise, however. But the declaration was commented upon at the time.

The Parliamentary friends of woman's rights have not been satisfied, however, with these academic discussions and propositions. They have made two or three attempts to get some of their demands formulated as laws and they are now on the point of succeeding in one of these efforts. A bill granting women engaged in business participation in the choice of the members of the Tribunals of Commerce will probably be a law before this article appears in print. It has already passed the Senate and is now in the hands of a committee of the Chamber that has decided unanimously to report it favorably. When in March 1881, the late M. de Gasté, one of the pioneer advocates in France of woman suffrage, introduced this bill into the Chamber, it was rejected, and Gambetta, who was then Speaker, seized the occasion to perpetrate a witticism at the expense of its friends. It should be explained that the Tribunals of Commerce pronounce decisions concerning the bankruptcy of merchants and trades people and settle disputes which may arise among them. It should also be added that while the new law will make business women voters it will not make them eligible to election to the tribunals.

Another step in this same direction is being taken. A bill has been introduced into Parliament conferring on working women the choice of members of the Councils of Prud'hommes, one of the few institutions of the old régime which have been preserved by modern France. The duty of this body is the settlement of all difficulties arising between workmen and their employers. "They are the industrial justices of the peace," says a French writer in his definition of Prud'hommes. The bill has already passed the Chamber of Deputies, and Senator Jean Macé, who is not unknown to American readers by his once popular "History of a Mouthful of Bread," who carried through the Senate the Tribunal of Commerce Bill, informs me that he means to father this new project also.

Many writers of reputation go farther than the politicians in this matter of woman suffrage. About a decade ago M. Alexander Dumas, while in an optimistic mood, declared in a spirited pamphlet that French women would vote within ten years. The late M. Rodière, the distinguished Professor of the Toulouse Law School, came out squarely for woman suffrage in his "Great Jurisconsults," published in 1874. Several similar examples might be cited.

During this same period the professional reformers have been many and zealous. Two of these cannot be passed over in this *résumé* of the history of the Woman Movement in France. M. Léon Richer, now breaking down under ill health and years, has done good work among the more moderate advocates of the cause, while Mme. Maria Deraismes, one of the most eloquent female orators France has ever produced and who, I regret to say, died this past winter, was the standard-bearer of the more radical element.

Three International Woman's Rights Congresses held in Paris since 1878 were due chiefly to the initiative of these two persons. The one which occurred during the World's Fair of 1878 brought together many reformers from all parts of the globe, but the question of political rights was kept rather in the background. During the Exhibition of 1889 there were two of these congresses. The first, under the presidency of Mme. Deraismes, was more radical than the second, which, recognised by the French Government and included in its list of official congresses, was presided over by Senator Jules Simon, while, at the close, the members were given an evening reception by M. Yves Guyot, then a Minister, the first time in the history of France that such governmental honors were bestowed on the advocates of woman's rights.

The important International Council of Women held in Washington in 1888 and the Woman's Congress at Chicago last summer, at both of which the suffrage debates overshadowed every other topic, produced a

deep impression among the leaders of the movement in Paris, who were represented at Washington and Chicago by Mme. Isabelle Bogelot. On her return from America, Mme. Bogelot, on both occasions, presented enthusiastic reports of all that she had seen and heard at these gatherings. The fact that this energetic lady was made a member of the Legion of Honor last April by the French Government—a distinction very rarely bestowed upon women—has given a sort of official stamp to her mission and increased weight to her utterances.

When Mrs. Potter Palmer arrived in Paris in the summer of 1892, bent on securing the official participation of France in the Woman's Department of the Chicago Exhibition, she found that the fame of the Washington Council of 1888, spread by Mme. Bogelot, had prepared the way for her. So Mme. Carnot placed herself at the head of the French Woman's Committee and had associated with her several ladies who were pronounced advocates of woman suffrage.

It is evident that French public opinion is being slowly prepared to accept the political rights of women, though the day when complete woman suffrage will be introduced into France is still far distant. But during the past twenty years great progress has unquestionably been made in that direction. Two or three instances of this have been given already. To them may be added the creation by Parliament in 1878 of a State system of high school education for girls, due to the persistent labor of M. Camille Sée;¹ the re-establishment of divorce, brought about by M. Naquet in 1884;² the law authorising workingwomen to deposit their earnings in the postal savings banks without the consent of their husband, a derogation, it should be noted, of the code which is so oppressive to married women; the recent employment of female clerks in several State administrations; the new custom adopted by the great railroad companies of assuring positions to the widows and orphan daughters of faithful male employees; the introduction into the platform of the Workingmen's Party, which is gaining such a strong foothold in the Chamber of Deputies, of "planks" demanding for women "equal pay for equal work" and their complete political emancipation, measures adopted only after a hard struggle at several workingmen's congresses; and the increasing number of French women who frequent the universities and win degrees.

Thus, there is a healthy and growing tendency in France to avoid extremes in the advocacy of woman's emancipation. The namby-pambyness of Diderot, who says "when woman is the theme, the pen must be dipped in the rainbow and the pages dried with the

dust of the butterfly's wings," is rapidly disappearing, along with its antipode, the "vile-wretch-man" spirit. Horace's "golden mean" is rapidly becoming the rule,—"the presage of victory," to quote Milton's words.

THE CIRCLE SQUARER.

[CONCLUDED.]

The Progressive Thinkers' Club met at the home of Mr. Whyte, and Mr. Gorner made his appearance half an hour before the lecture was to begin. He was received with great cordiality by Mr. and Mrs. Whyte. Soon afterwards Dr. Richard Werner made his appearance, a young man and a tutor at one of our Western universities, who had just returned from a trip abroad, where he had visited the universities of England and Germany. He was introduced to Mr. Gorner as a cousin of Mrs. Whyte, and Mr. Whyte added: "Our cousin is a very promising youth, who will soon be professor and make his mark in the world. He is not a member of our club, but a guest only."

Mr. Gorner began a conversation with Dr. Werner and was at first quite taken with him. The Doctor had a student-like frankness, and his discourse was full of humor. Having talked much of the Old World, and mentioned its good and its humorous sides, he asked: "What, pray, is to be the subject of your lecture to-night?"

"I shall explain the problem of the squaring of the circle," said Mr. Gorner, gravely; "but understand me aright: I am not one of the vulgar crowd of circle-squarers who in their imperturbable vanity believe that the problem has been settled. No, I am not one of them. I propose to attack the problem in a strictly scientific manner."

This remark was aimed at the professional mathematicians, but Dr. Werner misunderstood the meaning of Mr. Gorner's words. Taking for granted that what Mr. Gorner called "strictly scientific" was what he himself would give that name to, he rejoined sarcastically: "I am sorry for you, for you are throwing your pearls before swine. You will soon find out that this club of advanced thinkers is a society of erratic minds. You know, birds of a feather flock together. There is no one among the members of your audience to-night who is not slightly unlinged. There is, for instance, Mrs. Hilman, the fantastical lady who just entered; she believes in astrology. The lady who follows her is her friend Mrs. Holborn, the spiritualist. My cousin, Mr. Whyte, is full of eccentricities, and so are all his friends. Mr. Single studies Volapük. You will hear him to-night, for I am sure he will recite us a poem in the world-language, which is nowhere spoken or understood. Mr. Bommel is a social reformer; he calls himself an ideal communist, and expounded na-

¹ Described more at length by me in the *Century Magazine* last October.

² See "Divorce in France," by M. Alfred Naquet, the Deputy, in the *North American Review*, Dec., 1892.

tionism long before Mr. Bellamy published his novel, 'Looking Backwards.' Mr. Hamlin is an Englishman who has made himself ridiculous at home, and has crossed the ocean to do the same in America."

"I am sorry," said Mr. Gorner, "that I have accepted Mr. Whyte's invitation. I was under the impression that I should meet here the flower of scientific thinkers."

The Doctor laughed so loudly at this that he attracted the attention of the guests, who in the meantime had filled the parlor. "The flower of scientific thinkers?" he repeated, interrogatively. "Rather say subjects for an alienist. I am a student of psychology, and I take great interest in abnormal specimens of mankind. That is the reason I am here. I take pleasure in listening to the rampant talk of lunatics and circle-squarers, because I study them."

Here the conversation was interrupted, and Mr. Whyte called the meeting to order. He introduced Mr. Gorner as the speaker of the evening, greeting him with courteous words, due to a man of high distinction and extraordinary accomplishments.

Mr. Gorner, still under the influence of Dr. Werner's information concerning the character of the club, began his lecture, not without a certain diffidence; but when he began to denounce the arrogance of professional mathematicians, he was heartily applauded and he waxed warm; he became more and more eloquent in explaining his solution and dwelling on the importance of the rationality of the number π . "The area of any circle," he said, "is found by dividing the circumference of the circle into four equal parts: the square erected on one such part being equal to the area of the circle. The ordinary method of finding the square of a circle involves us in the gross absurdity of teaching the less as equalling the greater. Our professors of mathematics teach that the area of a circle is about one-fourth larger than that of its real square. But mathematical methods are rigid; they cannot be stretched like India rubber bands, and they possess no such property as elasticity."

In order to remove the last doubt in the minds of his audience, Mr. Gorner presented the contrast of the two methods of computing the areas of circles in a table, which he wrote down on a blackboard, saying: "If the circumference of a given circle be 4, each quadrant being equal to 1, the diameter of the same is 1.2732 , and the area, according to my solution, 1; but according to the rule in use it would be equal to 1.2732 . This is 0.2732 too much. Yet such is the perversity of professional mathematicians that they say, $1 = 1.2732$. If the circumference be 8, the area of a square on a quadrant is 4; yet mathematicians claim it is 5.0928 . Is not this the most stupendous fraud ever committed against sound reasoning? Yet the world

has patiently submitted to it, because people have an outrageous confidence in established authority."

The applause of the audience was tremendous, and Mr. Gorner felt himself richly recompensed for the martyrdom he had so long endured in the cause of truth. He ended his lecture by briefly alluding to the important questions which physics, chemistry, astronomy, and all the other sciences could derive from a sound solution of the bottom problem of existence. He ended with the enthusiastic words: "Here, at last, we have found a basis on which to establish a true and consistent theodicy."

The success of the evening was greater than Mr. Gorner could have anticipated. The audience was delighted, and there was no one who did not congratulate the speaker. His eyes beamed with joy, for he knew now that the old theory of π was dead and discarded, while his own solution had been adopted by the most progressive thinkers of the world. How narrow-minded and unkind was the judgment of Dr. Werner, and how sympathetically had these distinguished men and women accepted the truth!

When the first excitement began to subside, Mr. Whyte's gavel restored order, and a discussion of the lecture ensued. There was no speaker who did not express his unbounded admiration for Mr. Gorner's admirably clear exposition of the subject. Each one began with a bow to the lecturer saying a few polite things about the profundity of his researches and the world-wide fame of the learned mathematician, only to drift as quickly as possible into his own line of thought. Mr. Bommel preached nationalism as the true ratio of the social forces, and Mrs. Hilman expounded astrology, saying that the spheres of the planets had been squared by the Almighty from eternity. No one understood what she meant, but all were deeply impressed with her words. Mr. Single promised to translate Mr. Gorner's work into Volapük, and Mrs. Holborn assured the audience that several years ago she had received unmistakable intelligence from the spirit world that the time would come and was near at hand when the circle would be squared. "The future," she said with the voice of a prophet, "has still many stupendous surprises in store for us. We have seen great things. We have witnessed the invention of railroads, of electricity, of the telegraph, and of many more marvels of modern science. To-day we have learned that the deepest problem of mathematics has been solved. The circle has been squared. I myself am engaged in new inventions which will render the work of scholars, editors, and authors comparatively easy. In the Crystal-Gazing Club we discovered of late by a happy incident, that when two or several persons look into the same glass one can read in it the ideas of the others. We are now at work to

establish the conditions under which the phenomenon takes place, and as soon as we have succeeded, we shall duly publish the accounts in the *Spirit World* and other organs of spiritualism. The writers of the future will simply think the novels which they wish to write, gazing intently at a sheet of white paper hung up before them on the wall. The white paper will then be sent to the printers who, after some instruction in the deciphering of spiritual impressions, will be able to read the mental writing and at once set it in type. Shorthand and typewriter will be no longer needed and an enormous amount of labor saved." Mrs. Holborn alluded to some other inventions, such as a sieve of truth, which would retain in its meshes the erroneous elements of utterances spoken into it but would allow correct statements to pass through it without difficulty. A gentleman friend, of the patent office at Washington, an unequivocal authority on all patent affairs, had assured her that the invention was patentable.

Dr. Werner was also urged to make his comments, but he refused to speak. However, when Mr. Whyte, the President of the Club, declared that his learned cousin had also succeeded in squaring the circle, and that he had invented an instrument to accomplish the squaring of the circle, Dr. Werner rose to make a few comments. He said: "I do not claim to be a circle-squarer like our distinguished friend Mr. Gorner. As my cousin alludes to an invention of mine by which the circle can be squared, allow me to make the following explanation. I side with the professional mathematicians and believe that the ratio of π cannot be expressed in whole numbers, be they ever so large. Mr. Gorner has not won me over, for his arguments rest on the assumption, disproved by elementary geometry, that the area of a circle is equal to the area of a square of the same perimeter. But while I still adhere to the old view I wish to say that when mathematicians speak of the impossibility of squaring the circle they simply mean that the feat cannot be accomplished by ruler and compasses. But while a geometrical construction of the square of the circle by these two instruments is impossible, it is easy enough to do it with other instruments. The area of the circle is $r^2 \pi$, which is easily proved. Accordingly, we have simply to unroll the circumference of a circle and find a mean proportional between half of it and the radius. To accomplish the unrolling of the circumference of a circle, I have constructed a little wheel, the diameter of which is two inches. In the circumference the point of a needle is inserted so as to make a mark when the wheel rolls over the paper. Now take a circle of a diameter of two inches and place a ruler so that it just touches the circle. Then turn the wheel till the needle stands at the point where the ruler and circle touch, and

roll it along until it makes another impression. The two marks enclose a line exactly equal to the circumference of the wheel or of a circle having a diameter of two inches. The mean proportional between half this line and the radius, is the required side of a square whose area is equal to the area of the circle. In giving this solution, I do not claim to have geometrically squared the circle, for I have employed an instrument not recognised by geometricians. On the one hand I am fully conscious of the truth that the numerical value of π can only be approximately ascertained. It has been computed more fully and accurately than will ever be needed and I can assure Mr. Gorner that we need not worry about the irrationality of π , for the universe is as grand and harmonious for all that."

Mr. Whyte concluded the discussion by requesting the lecturer to reply to his critics. Mr. Gorner was too full of happiness to express anything but thanks to the audience for their kind appreciation. As to the remarks of Dr. Werner, he said, that a close consideration of his objection would very clearly bring out the error of professional mathematicians and prove the correctness of his own solution. "For," he continued, "unroll the circumference of the circle and divide it into four equal parts. These four parts are equal to the four quadrants and a square constructed of them is equal to the area of the circle."

"A hopeless case!" murmured Dr. Werner.

The evening on which Mr. Gorner delivered his lecture before the Club of Progressive Thinkers was perhaps the happiest hour of this martyr of his own thought. He had grown in confidence, and at once pushed the publication of his booklet. It appeared, and he advertised it in the papers; but it was of no use; he found no buyers. He sent it out to professors and students of mathematics, but received no reply. He travelled long distances to see influential men, but could never convince one. He spent much money and wasted his health until he became weary, and, suffering from severe headaches, found himself obliged to retire to the summer resort of a famous physician, which had been strongly recommended to him by his friends. There he broke down completely, and fell a prey to a severe brain fever. He recovered, but was no longer the same strong, energetic man. His ambition had been to accomplish a great work for mankind, to take a foremost place in the ranks of the world's original thinkers, and to shine forth above all others by identifying himself with the greatest discovery of the age. But the original idea on which he had staked his life found no recognition, and with it he felt his very self rejected. He had concentrated upon it all his energies, had devoted to it all his love and enthusiasm, had spent on it a great part of his fortune, but all was vain. All his hopes had been

disappointed, his life had turned out dreary, and old age overtook him like a chilly November day. But while usually every autumn brings the returns of a rich harvest, his mind was empty like one whose fruits had been destroyed by hail-storms.

The physician of the institution in which he lay visited him regularly and encouraged his patient with kind words. "Take heart again," he said, "you will soon be better. The sole cause of your trouble is nervous prostration, and I hope, if you only promise to be cheerful, to restore you to your old vigor and health."

"No, Doctor," said Mr. Gorner, "there is no herb that can cure my ailments; my life is blighted, and unless I can bring out my discoveries, which are so important for the world, I shall never be cured of my nervous prostration."

"Do not speak of your discoveries, Mr. Gorner; forget them for a while; do not think of them for a whole year, until you have recovered your health. Try to think of them as an aberration, and begin a new life with other ambitions and with new aims."

Mr. Gorner shook his head: "No, Doctor! No, and No again. My discoveries are my own original ideas. They are my life-work; they are myself. To give them up would mean to give up my own soul. Do not speak thus to me again. I know, Doctor, you think like the rest of the world; you think they are aberrations, and treat me—Oh! such is my terrible fate! How have I deserved this tragic end? You treat me—as a lunatic. Your institute, I have known it long ago, is an asylum for nervous diseases. You have been kind to me, very kind, but it is humiliating, it is heart-breaking," and Mr. Gorner began to sob like a child.

The Doctor laid his hand on his patient's forehead. "Be strong, sir," he said, "be strong, and you will be cured."

Mr. Gorner continued sobbingly: "You try to cure me, but you cannot, you cannot. I am incurable. Do not tell me to forget my discoveries, for I cannot forget them—I will not forget them; nor tell me that I am mistaken, for the day on which I became convinced that my whole life had been a huge blunder, I should become mad; it would kill me; I should commit suicide. Do not tell me that I am mistaken; I could not stand it."

"Be composed, Mr. Gorner," replied the Doctor. "I am no mathematician and do not understand your discovery. But I take it for granted that while part of your ideas may be wrong, part of them will be true. And if nothing of them were true, I have observed that your heart is full of devotion to the truth, that is, to what you conceive to be the truth. You have suffered much, and you will be comforted again. Think of the fate of all martyrs, think of Christ, how full of

despair was his heart in the hour of tribulation, and He who so confidently proclaimed the great mystery of his Sonship felt himself desolate and forsaken by God and men in the agony of death. Let go the conceit of your discoveries, and rest in the confidence that whatever be the truth, the truth is best for us and for the world."

"Doctor," replied Mr. Gorner, "you do not know my heart. My conceit is not based on vanity. I am not anxious for glory, nor do I care to make my name immortal. I have searched my heart and purified my ambition of all egotism, and am willing to be forgotten, if but my idea conquer. But to give up the idea itself,—no, Doctor, I cannot do it. Rather die than that. To give up my discovery, that would leave my life desolate; it would be an utter annihilation."

Mrs. Gorner visited her husband from time to time, but the hope for his recovery was but slight. Being aware himself of his critical condition, he made his will, leaving twenty thousand dollars to his wife, ten thousand to his child, a little girl of about ten years, and fifty thousand for the propaganda of his discoveries. The poor man did not know that his fortune, which once amounted to almost one hundred thousand dollars, had shrunk to about twenty-five thousand, or even less.

Soon after he made his will, he no longer recognised either the Doctor or his wife. For three years he lay in a kind of stupor, indifferent toward all the world. A softening of the brain had set in, and he died at last peacefully, without agony or pain.

When his will was opened, it was found to contain the following confession:

"My aspirations flew higher than my strength would allow, and involved me in endless sufferings. My life was a constant sacrifice to the truth, yet the truth which I pursued was a shadow. I dared to be myself, such as I chose to be, but experience has taught me that God does not allow me to be myself. I am resigned and long for peace." P. C.

A LETTER FROM NEW ZEALAND.

We publish below some passages of interest from a letter received by a reader of *The Open Court* from a brother living in New Zealand. The passages relate to the new law which cancels all restrictions of citizenship, and gives the ballot to all persons without discrimination, male and female, that are above the age of twenty-one:

"What do you think of our last attempt at law-making? We have granted universal suffrage, that is, all males or females over the age of twenty-one are now entitled to be enrolled as intelligent electors, no matter what stake they have in the country so long as they are not resident in one of the colony's free lodging houses, that is the jail. But even such, immediately after they depart from their enforced quarters are as legally entitled to be considered electors as any free individual. Worst of all the people who are resident in our old people's home, or what is termed in the old

country as poorhouses, have equal rights with the best in the colony. This is real democracy, the suffering rate-payer must be taxed to keep these people, and then they are placed on an equal footing with their benefactors so far as political power is concerned; what more could democracy do? Even your boasted freedom cannot go so far as that. Then there are Relief Works all over the colony; single and married alike are put on these if supposed to be unable to procure work, but really the purpose is different. You see, we have our faults also in our government which require to be and are promptly exposed. Under an unscrupulous Government they are shifted at election time into districts where their party is weak, enrolled and made to vote at that party's will; and they do it knowing that if their candidate is not returned then their tenure of work is short.

We had such experience at the general election three months ago. It was well known that our member was one of the ablest politicians in the House and would let nothing wrong happen. He stood up nobly and denounced such trickery. This was too much for our *every* radical democracy. What did they do? They shipped down from other parts of the country to this district all sorts of people, about two hundred in number, and put them on relief works with the command to return their candidate. Our candidate must be ousted at any cost. And to our great regret the man who was an ornament to the country had to take defeat.

Of course the wives followed their husbands, and we, who were permanent residents, must put up for a time with their selection. And these slaves to democracy will again, as occasion suits, be shifted for a like purpose!

I am sorry to say, it is by such a party we are at present governed. Of course things might have been altered had those who really had some stake in the country rolled up to vote with their wives and families, but failing to calculate upon the radical change which had taken place on the granting of female franchise, a listlessness was apparent, and then those who were working for their ends caught at the opportunity and rolled up with their cousins and their aunts to the surprise of all and for such we have to suffer now for a time.

It serves us right. I do not believe in female franchise, nor does my wife. Yet when granted we took advantage of it, and had all done likewise, we should have carried the day. Woman has a place in society, where she shines and becomes beloved by all, but once put on a political level with man she loses her place and power over her male partner, and I can only hope that the franchise will again be relegated to the shades of oblivion.

Wonderful to relate, in granting such concessions to woman, these pliant politicians, fearful that she might attempt to usurp their places, which means £240 per annum, payable monthly, they considerably inserted a clause, making her ineligible as a representative. Why, when they had such respect for her voting-power, did they not give her the opportunity of attaining to such exalted positions as representatives? I verily believe, had such been made the law, that several women would have gone up as a burlesque on our very indulgent powers that be.

Next month (March) we will have another election tussle. This time it will be the licensing elections under altered conditions. Previously the rate-payers in each district elected their committees to control the licensing in their respective districts, but now, it is to be carried out on the same lines as a parliamentary election, that is, every one having the right to vote who has placed his or her name on the roll, irrespective of being rate-payers."

BOOK NOTICES.

Comparatively few people are aware that in the Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution a General Appendix is printed which furnishes brief accounts of important scientific discoveries,

reports of investigations made by collaborators of the Institution, memoirs of its members on special scientific topics, and selected scientific essays from foreign journals and proceedings. Appended to these articles also are full bibliographies which can scarcely be obtained elsewhere. We have just received the annual report for 1891. The following is a list of the general scientific articles which it presents: "Celestial Spectroscopy," by William Huggins; "Stellar Numbers and Distances," by A. M. Clerke; "The Sun's Motion in Space," by A. M. Clerke; "A Southern Observatory," by A. M. Clerke; "Applications of Physics and Mathematics to Geology," by C. Chree; "Origin of the Rock-pressure of Natural Gas," by Edward Orton; "Geysers," by Walter Harvey Weed; "The General Circulation of the Atmosphere," by Werner von Siemens; "The Gulf Stream," by Alexander Agassiz; "Absolute Measurement of Hardness," by F. Auerbach; "The Flow of Solids," by William Hallock; "The Scientific Work of G. S. Ohm," by E. Lommel; "Autobiographical Sketch of J. von Liebig"; "Divergent Evolution Through Cumulative Segregation," by J. T. Gulick; "The Struggle for Life in the Forest," by James Rodway; "Difficulties of Aquatic Insects," by L. C. Miall; "Geographic Distribution of Mammals," by C. Hart Merriam; "The Corbin Game Park," by John R. Spears; "The Home of the Troglodytes," by E. T. Hamy; "Summary of Progress in Anthropology in 1891," by O. T. Mason; "The Mounds of the Mississippi Valley," by Lucien Carr; "The Use of Flint Blades to Work Pine Wood," by G. V. Smith; "Time-keeping Among the Chinese," by D. J. Magowan; "Navajo Dye-stuffs," by Washington Matthews; "Some Possibilities of Economic Botany," by George L. Goodale; "The Evolution of Commerce," by Gardner Hubbard; "The Relation of Natural Science to Art," by E. du Bois-Reymond.

MONISM.

BY HORACE P. BIDDLE.

The universe and time, diurnity;
Infinity and space, eternity;
Truth, indestructible and uncreated,
Eternal, infinite, and unrelated—
These constitute, with God, the One, the whole,
Of which God is the universal soul—
The omnipresent, and the All omniscient,
Omnipotent, supreme, and ever prescient,
Throughout eternity, infinity—
The only God, and sole divinity.

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 NOTE:
\$2.00 PER YEAR. \$1.00 FOR SIX MONTHS.

CONTENTS OF NO. 357.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN FRANCE, THEODORE STANTON.	4127
THE CIRCLE SQUARE. (Concluded.) EDITOR.	4130
A LETTER FROM NEW ZEALAND.	4133
BOOK NOTICES.	4134
POETRY.	

Monism. HORACE P. BIDDLE. 4334