

THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 437. (VOL. X.—2.)

CHICAGO, JANUARY 9, 1896.

{ One Dollar 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.

PHILOSOPHIC SOCIALISM.

BY HUDOR GENONE.

THE adage, "to give a dog a bad name," has no better application than can be found in the abused, vilified, and misunderstood word, "Socialism." The avowed Socialists are to a very large extent men of small means and less influence. They are mostly men usually occupied with bread-winning in those arduous vocations which leave little time for the luxury of deep learning. They are—many of them—bright, "brainy" men, but men of few and narrow ideas, one-sided, men of segments, not circles, to their intellectual development.

They are mostly good talkers, rather than practical doers, generally "infidels," rather than followers of any creed or religion, and, to a great extent, foreign born.

All these inhibitions have had their natural tendency to discredit their testimony to the advantages that are claimed for co-operation as a substitute for competition, and to the great mass of respectable, law-abiding, practical citizens socialism is regarded as nothing but a new and noisome economic cult, now dreamy, but liable, perhaps, if encouraged, to prove dangerous.

The socialist and the anarchist have been ranked together, and among almost all are regarded as alike visionary and as alike disturbers of the peace.

Curious as it may seem, socialism and anarchy represent exactly opposite poles of thought; they are as widely divergent in their theories of economics as the agnostic and Puritan are in the region of religion. Anarchy means individualism,—absolute nihilism of law; socialism means the dominancy of law,—the sinking of self in business (as now in government) in the State.

The average man of business has little time to chase to their lairs the countless rapacious ideas which steal up unawares, and seem to him nothing but vexatious marauders, anxious only to filch some of his substance.

This sober, sensible, average man of business has probably read Mr. Bellamy's book, and his notions on the subject are a vague compound of chimerical pictures, in which underground chambers figure, and

credit-cards, and restaurants, where Chinese, negroes, and Hottentots dine on terms of social equality with perhaps himself as waiter.

Now socialism may continue to be, as it now is, rejected of men; but to be despised of them it ought not to be, since in theory it contains, not only possibly the germ of a nobler and better civilisation, but certainly that vitality in affairs whose principles have evolved our present great advancement.

As an animal, man is essentially social; his first condition was patriarchal, then tribal; in both communistic. The institution of private interests was a sport upon the flower of evolution, which survived because selfishness made it fittest to survive; and now, after the lapse of centuries of custom, these private interests have expanded into what we call vested rights.

The progress of civilisation tended more and more to emphasise this principle of selfish individualism. The beneficent religion of Jesús, at first bringing about a revival of the early communism, essentially altruistic, yet in a few centuries became debased by the dominance of an ecclesiastical system as rigid as the Pharisaic Judaism it supplanted.

The selfish principle of single individual soul-saving, contrary as it is to the pure and perfect Christian Gospel, naturally aided and comforted its companion system of single individual goods saving, till these two companion evil spirits culminated in the middle ages in a debauched and degraded Church and in the countless castles of robber-barons blotting the fair face of Europe.

Well might these be called "Dark Ages," when nothing but might made right, and the population of the world was divided into two great classes—slaves and freebooters.

How slowly the people grew towards emancipation history's painful pages tell. Gradually the spurious assumption of divine right in kings has become vested, more or less, in the people. Arduously religion has become purer and purer, and through many vicissitudes the condition of labor has been ameliorated. Freedom in these several lines has gone on since the days of Magna Charta and the mendicant friars, broadening down from precedent to precedent, but always,

increment after increment, the vested privileges of the few have given way to the eternal rights of the many.

Wherever a number perform a service for all which might be performed by each for himself, the service becomes social in its nature. Wherever a community agrees to delegate any power to its government not strictly limited to the preservation of peace and order to the extent of its delegated functions, that government becomes socialistic.

Examples of the simpler sorts of socialism are found primarily in the natural family and in communities in sparsely settled districts, where all unite for the individual weal in "bees," house-raising, and log-rolling. A firm is socialistic, a corporation much more evidently so, and in all the various departments of government, wherever a departure is made from the necessary powers which sustain order there is a phase of socialism, whether in this country it be federal, state, or municipal.

In the national administration several departments are of this character: the Post-Office, the Patent-Office, and the Department of Agriculture are radical departures from the prime purpose of government; they are business institutions conducted for the benefit of the entire people, and by the duly qualified representatives of the people.

It was only after the spirit of free principles had thoroughly permeated the populace that these innovations began to take shape. Since the day that the village blacksmith Wat Tyler stood before King Richard on London heath, leading his motley crowd of villeins "against the Lord's anointed, because his ministers had made him odious," from time to time the rabble have risen with always one battle-cry upon their lips—equality.

To him who has mastered the philosophy of history, and who understands the nature of mankind, equality for the human race must always appear what it really is—the baseless fabric of a dream.

Equality is not equity, and it has been only the ignorance of the masses that ever believed a process of levelling to be practicable. And yet, little by little, the functions of government have become enlarged, growing continually with the growth of freedom.

There are those who denounce socialism who are yet themselves recipients of governmental assistance to which custom has so reconciled them that they fail to perceive the source, and, drifting with the current, become themselves partakers of motion till they have lost the sense of motion.

The social agitator is one who seems never to lose the sense of motion; he is all action,—nerves, muscles, all the energies of both body and brain ever in a state of vigorous oscillation. His eyes are keen as

a hawk's to see iniquity, and his imagination alert as a romancer to detect the remedy. The individual ought not to be obliged to do what the State can do better. Let the individual do what he can do for himself better than the State can do for him. On these two theories hang all the ideas and wishes of the radical socialist.

Difficulties have no terrors for him, and from his lexicon has been erased the word impracticable. It is one thing to approve of collectivism as a philosophical principle to be wrought out patiently generation after generation, and quite another to be a radical collectivist and shriek co-operation continually and always.

In this city of New York we have an example of the beneficence that flows from an enlightened enlargement of the privilege and power of the municipality. The Croton water, led into the city by huge aqueducts and ramifying everywhere to innumerable faucets and hydrants, serves, as perhaps no other single artificial influence does, to conserve the public health, and to each individual's needs adds comfort, and to comfort luxury.

Yet the Croton water is a socialistic function of the city government. It was established only after years of arduous effort, and against the most strenuous opposition. Many, many years ago a few far-seeing capitalists, actuated perhaps as much by philanthropy as self-interests, sought to give their native city the benefit of an adequate supply of pure water. The former system of pumps and wells had become grossly unfitted for use in the crowded sections, and the remedy was sought in a system of conduits. It was, I believe, the Bronx river in Westchester county which was contemplated as the source of supply. For this work of utility—a great one in that day—a charter was the first requisite, and this Aaron Burr, then an attorney in New York, procured from the legislature.

With that acumen for which this celebrated man is noted there was incorporated in the charter a simple financial provision by which the company organised under it was enabled to do a general banking business. At this day the water-works corporation is still in existence. Any one who chooses can supply himself with fresh water from its pump, but this is kept solely to comply with its charter, for it now exists as a great financial institution—the Manhattan bank on Wall street.

There are those, seeing the inestimable benefits flowing from a community of effort for the common weal, who believe that the principle of governmental control, so successfully applied in the two instances we have noted, can be extended till perhaps, not encroaching upon, but rather benefiting individual lib-

erty, it shall comprehend many if not all of the necessities of life.

Some say that it is only a question of degree and not of kind; only a question of time, opportunity, and development till the same centralisation which now gives us a splendid, strong, coherent, and effective system for the transportation of various kinds of mailable matter shall be extended so as to include, not only letters, printed matter, and small parcels, but all sorts and conditions of merchandise, and eventually all transportation—express, freight, and passenger.

Some say that if the sweet waters of the Croton can be so readily and cheaply provided for our citizens, why may not this principle be extended to other matters equally essential to mankind. What inherent obstacle is there to the provision of light—gas or electricity, of heat for warmth or cooking, of ice, milk, meat, vegetables, groceries, dry goods, all the multitudinous matters that civilised man requires, and which could doubtless be provided better, easier, and quicker by united than by individual effort?

It is, I think, safe to say that there is no inherent obstacle. As for the difficulties that must beset progress on these lines they are easy to conceive. In the past, rightly studied, may be found samples of the future. The magnificent system of the Federal Post Office did not spring, like Minerva, fully equipped to life. The difficulties confronted by Franklin in this country and Rowland Hill in England have not even yet been overcome, and it was not more than ten years ago in this very city that private enterprise yielded to the mandate of the law and ceased to convey letters for a consideration.

Was the putting down of these private posts in any sense an encroachment upon individual liberty? Not at all, but rather an enlargement, since it gave greater freedom, ampler opportunity, and better service to that enterprise established by the people and for the people.

The mandate of the law would have been quite ineffectual without the greater potency of public opinion.

Another object lesson the people have before them of the efficacy of consolidation: within the last thirty years private business methods have seen a complete revolution; the old time slow, plodding ways, by which business men, under stress of competition, engaged in affairs always more or less limited in their scope and operations, have given place in large measure to an entirely new system whereby a few are enabled to seize, control, and direct vast industries, on so great a scale and with so strong a hand as virtually to put down all opposition and eradicate to a great extent competition in their respective lines of trade.

It is needless to amplify upon the method by which this has been accomplished. The principle of the "trust" in all its manifold ramifications is becoming

daily more and more the potent factor in the world of business.

The success of the Standard Oil Company is perhaps the best known of all these combinations. There a few able, energetic men, directed by the masterly intellect of a Rockefeller, gradually united into one vast mechanism the many small concerns, till now in the production of crude mineral oil, its refinement and distribution to the trade, it constitutes one single corporation, big enough to overshadow and bold enough to defy a rival.

It is not with the moral results of this sort of concentration that we have to deal; but to point it out as an example of the mode of operation by which unity takes the place most effectually of variety in action.

The powers of such a corporation could never have stood as they have, practically unimpaired by the law, if they had not been employed upon the whole beneficently. Had not the price of kerosene been so materially reduced, as it has been by the Standard people, they would have been legislated out of existence long ago. But with an acumen, not the least of the brilliant thoughts of these men, they made oil cheap; they called it the light of the people, and the people love to have it so. If the principals in this consolidation made their hundreds of millions, the little consumer saved his goodly percentage on the gallon. If iniquity it was, the people have been willing and active coparceners in it.

Of all the suggestions looking towards municipal control of our requirements none has taken more definite shape than that which looks to the manufacture and distribution of gas by the cities. This has been tried in Philadelphia and some other cities, not always with the best or even with very good results. And yet it is a matter of general notoriety that it might be accomplished if popular desire sustained the movement.

In New York it is notorious that the owners of gas plants are more effectually entrenched than in any other city of the country. In the case of the Consolidated Gas Light Company alone there is a capital stock of about thirty-five millions, worth at present market prices over fifty millions. The officers of this immense corporation are very shrewd, always alert, and rarely unable to carry any point in the legislature. Some years ago, in the face of a very active and pronounced demand, a general disposition to use kerosene (which item brought some of the Brooklyn companies to the verge of bankruptcy) and the encroachments of the electric systems, they were compelled to reduce the price to \$1.25 per thousand cubic feet. They struggled against this reduction, claiming that it would seriously cripple them. How much they were crippled may be observed from their increased

rate of dividends, and the rise in the price of the stock of nearly 100 per cent. in ten years.

It is believed that the entire gas plant of this company, works, holders, mains, service-pipes, and all, could be duplicated to-day for a very small fraction of its capital, and gas made by the city and delivered to consumers at a cost not to exceed twenty-five cents per thousand, which would amply suffice for every charge.

It is needless to say that the change from corporate to municipal control of the gas-works is not imminent. There are too many stockholders, and these are too rich and too influential; the political parties are too evenly matched, and above all the sentiment of the community too staunchly conservative, for any such attempt to succeed. The people of the city of New York, frightened at the spectre of socialism, will continue probably for many years to come to hold tenaciously the old gas companies in their position, and to pay roundly when the gas bills come in out of their pockets for the privilege of peace.

It is not the purpose of this paper to delineate or even indicate the practical process by which the expansive principle now dormant in almost every branch of industry shall be awakened. It is enough that the principle is demonstrated. It is no part of its purpose to reply seriatim to the countless objections that spring to their feet. That the future civilisation of the world must expand, if at all, upon the lines above indicated, is but to state a truism as infallible as cause and effect, as certain as the calculations of a trajectory when the elements of motion are given. Reform has always come in just one way: the philosopher has thought, the fanatic struggled and raved, and, finally, and often through long and sometimes bloody effort, the common sense of the people has asserted itself, and by their representatives embodying the practical genius of an epoch the results have been attained.

As in the past it came slowly, so it must be in the future; but in civilisation the factor of collectivism will continue to increase, and of individual and wasteful competition to decrease, till the daily grind of heartless and overburdened existence shall be displaced by a stable system, essentially mechanical, yet freeing men from the thrall of mechanism, leaving room and time and an increasing desire for a broader and an enduring individual liberty. This is the socialism of evolution, destined to development as an applied art of the science of religion.

THE HOLY SPIRIT, THE FEMALE OF THE GODHEAD.

BY FRANCIS JAY.

At the outset, I wish to give credit for this thought. The idea itself was first received from the Rev. Mr. Schultz of Royersford, Pa. Others I know who have

hinted at it, or have believed in it directly. A pupil of the Mount Morris German Baptist Bible School, Ogle Co., Ill., in an essay on the Holy Spirit, called Trinity the "Heavenly Family." The Rev. J. T. Myers of Oaks, Pa., I find, has entertained this view of the Trinity for years, but does not remember of having received it from any human source. While these persons are not widely known, yet their views show that this idea is not confined to myself alone. Although the doctrine itself, the seed-thought, is not original with the writer, the following development of it is almost, if not entirely, so.

Let us now turn to revelation to see how this view of the Holy Spirit is supported. We do not profess to be able fully to treat our subject, but hope to be able to awaken thought which may stimulate to further inquiry and lead to fresh discovery.

Let us first look at Genesis i., 27. "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." Mark you, the first clause states that man was created in the image of God, and the second one emphasises this fact. The third clause is a striking statement "male and female created he them." Man was created in the image of God, they were created male and female. Now, if there are not male and female in the Godhead, how could man, created male and female, be created in the image of God? Note how this point is also brought out in Genesis v., 1, 2. We shall now venture another assertion: *the full image of the Godhead was not perfected in humanity until Adam and Eve had offspring.* Father, Mother, Offspring—God the Father, the Holy Spirit, and the Son—constitute the eternal nature of God. Our first point then is this: Man was created in the image of God; he was created male and female; hence, there are male and female in the Godhead. The place of Father and of Son in the act of generation is readily seen; the place of the female alone remains to be filled, and the Holy Spirit is the only remaining person to fill it.

The second reason for ascribing femininity to the Holy Spirit is that the Hebrew word, ruah, is feminine. The office of brooding in Genesis i., 2, is that of the female among fowls. She hatched out, as it were, the life of the earth, and then, like the old cluck, protected it with Her outspread wings. "She was the mother of all living." Genesis iii., 20.

Next, we come to the "rib story." God the Father is the one person of the Godhead who is independent and who may be said to stand alone; the existence, the origin of the other two persons are ultimately traced back to Him. So with humanity, which is created in the image of God. Adam was first created and was alone. The Spirit is God according to an eternal procession. When Adam was without an help-

meet, "the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and (of) the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made He a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man." Genesis ii., 21-23. "For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man." I Corinthians xi., 8. The "rib story" is, therefore, a concrete setting forth of its great antitype in the Godhead, the eternal procession of the Spirit. The longing of Adam for a companion is a concrete setting forth of a similar longing of the Eternal Father. Eve is a type of the Holy Spirit.

Let us now turn to the New Testament, Luke i., 35. "And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." First, the Holy Spirit takes up Her abode (I use the feminine possessive) in the Virgin Mary; then the "power of the Highest," the Father, overshadowed her, representing the generative act, which the Father eternally performs with His Spirit, now, however, the act takes place in the womb of the Virgin, that she may give a human nature to the Divine Eternal Offspring, consequently that "holy thing," which was born of her, was called the Son of God. The Holy Spirit did not impregnate the human ovum in the Virgin with divine life. Both the Spirit and the Virgin were receptive. The first principles of life come from the male. The first principles of the life of Christ came from the Overshadowing Highest, the Father, as He hovered over both the Virgin and the Spirit, who now lay in the womb of the Virgin—two females, as it were, submitting to the generative act, each contributing of her substance to the fertilising substance of the Father for the formation of the New Being, who has hitherto been the great enigma of science and religion. The Spirit's office in bringing Christ into the world was that of a female.

We might draw arguments from the nature of the Spirit. She is gentle like a dove. She comforts like a mother. She leads the little babe in Christ into all truth. She *abides ever* with the believer. The father and the sons wander abroad, but the mother abides ever in the home, beautifies it, and keeps it in order. So the Saviour says that He will send us the other Comforter, the Spirit, who shall *abide with us forever* (John xiv., 16); and we may rest assured that the Heavenly Mother will instruct us and make us all beautiful within. Then still further, the sin against the Holy Spirit. A son may go beyond the influence of father and brethren and still be reached by mother.

Among wicked men her influence always lasts the longest. Woe unto the man whose heart no longer warms at the mention of that name! Woe unto the soul that can no longer be moved by the gentle wooings of the Holy Spirit! Such a one is in danger of eternal damnation.

The Bible, nature, and reason, all proclaim that there is a female in the Godhead; and the heart cries out for a Heavenly Mother with tenderest longing: "Oh, God, my Mother!" We speak of mother as one of the dearest names to mortals given. On earth we have a father, brethren, a mother; in heaven we have a Father, an Elder Brother; in that perfect home is there lacking a Mother? The heart cries, "No! no!! no!!! In a perfect home I must have the name of MOTHER!"

THE DOGMA OF THE TRINITY.

WE TAKE pleasure in publishing in the present number a short article on "The Holy Spirit, the Female of the Godhead," which comes to us, signed with a *nom de plume*, from one of the theological seminaries of this country and is written by a man who is apparently still in the bondage of a literal belief in the Christian dogmas. The article commands a peculiar psychological interest in so far as it reveals to us modes of arguments that were used in the days gone by, when in the times of early Christianity the various dogmas began to assume the rigid forms which they now possess. The pseudonym author of the article is not aware of the fact that the proposition which he makes is not new, but very old. His conception of the Trinity preceded that other conception which is now recognised as the orthodox view accepted by all Christian churches and formulated in the Athanasian *Quicumque*. No wonder that the article is unacceptable to such Christian publications as have not as yet fully freed themselves from Christian paganism. Those who have not as yet received the light of the new dispensation (which is the faith in a religion based upon the eternal laws of existence, such as can be found and stated by inquiring into facts with scientific methods) are naturally unwilling to be confronted with instances of atavism, which, however, crop out in our religious life as naturally as in the domains of biology.

How serious our well-meaning author is, can be learned from his letter, in which he says of his article:

"Some five months ago this same article was sent to *The Sunday School Times*. The thoughts were gleaned, and it was returned. In like manner it was sent to *The Outlook*, which was too modest to print it. If thoughts lately seen in print were gotten from this article, it is a case of literary theft; if they were original with the writer of them, it shows that God is bringing this truth to many minds. And this fact is a further proof of the truthful-

ness of the doctrine. . . . This was written several months ago, and the writer has developed the subject much further than it is developed here. He would be glad to give these advanced views later. He is ready to meet the jeers and scoffs of those who walk only in the beaten paths. The expounders of God's word, according to the Lord Jesus, are to bring out *new* things, as well as to review the old, from His treasury."

We publish this passage on the fate of the manuscript at the request of the author,¹ and did not fail to inform him about our own views on the subject, which we proposed to publish in a separate article alongside of his.

The doctrine of the trinity of God does not occur in the New Testament, and was unknown to the early Christians. Nevertheless, it is deeply founded in the Greek conception of Christianity which identifies the Messiah with the Logos that was in the beginning. The Unitarians, like other dissenters from the old traditions of the Church, took the letter of the dogma seriously, and thus regarded it as either implying a tritheism or an irrational proposition which, in contradiction to the multiplication-table, made three equal to one. But even so orthodox an authority as Neander was plain enough on the question. After stating that the only passage in the New Testament which alludes to the Trinity by speaking of the three that bear witness (in 1 John, 5) is an interpolation, he set forth the triple relation in which the world is conceived to stand with God, as "its ground, mediator, and goal; or as the Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier of mankind, which triple relation exhausts the entire God-cognition of Christianity."² And truly this idea that God is, firstly, the eternal condition of existence, its law and *raison d'être*, secondly, the ever-progressive evolution and manifestation of the eternal law, its living revelation, as it appears in the rationality and moral aspiration of thinking beings; and thirdly, as the ideal, i. e., the goal to be reached, or the purpose that rational life sets itself, is so deeply founded in the nature of things that other nations, like the Hindus, developed the same ideas. That the Christian Trinity should be a mere imitation of the Brahman Trinity is not probable, but we can trace it back to Plato, who says:³

Ὁ θεὸς ἀρχὴν τε καὶ τελευτὴν καὶ μεσὰ τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων ἔχων.

"God holds the beginning, the end, and the middle of all things."

The doctrine of the Trinity was worked out by the Church gradually, and it is natural that several attempts were made in formulating it, which in the end had to be rejected by the sober-minded as conveying

¹ He writes in a postscript: "If you publish this article, I want you to place at the head of it the second paragraph of this leaf."

² See *Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion*, Vol. I., i., p. 314.

³ Quoted by Neander *ibid.* from Plato *Legg.* IV., ed. Bip., Vol. VIII., p. 185, as an old saying, *παλαιὸς λόγος*.

ideas that would lead to a gross anthropomorphism; and not the least interesting conception of the Trinity was that which represents the three in one as God the father, God the mother, and God the child. In this conception, which appears first in the Old Testament Apocrypha, the second person of the Trinity is not called the Logos or Word, but the Sophia or Wisdom, which latter is a feminine noun in Greek, being in this respect comparable to the Sanskrit term *vdch*=word.¹ The author of the book, "The Wisdom of Solomon," says:

"I called upon God, and the spirit of wisdom came to me.

"All good things together came to me with her, and innumerable riches in her hands.

"And I rejoiced in them all, because wisdom goeth before them: and I knew not that she was the mother of them.

"And being but one, she can do all things: and remaining in herself, she maketh all things new: and in all ages entering into holy souls, she maketh them friends of God, and prophets.

"For God loveth none but him that dwelleth with wisdom.

"In that she is conversant with God, she magnifieth her nobility: yea, the Lord of all things himself loved her,

"For she is privy to the mysteries of the knowledge of God, and a lover of his works."

Among the synoptic Gospels we find that Luke, who is more familiar with Greek thought than Matthew and Mark, personifies the Wisdom of God, and speaks of *her* in similar terms to those of the author of the Wisdom of Solomon. He says:

"Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them shall slay and persecute:

"That the blood of all the prophets, which was shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation."

The doctrine of the Father, Mother, and Child Trinity of God possesses many beauties which are absent in the more abstract conception of the three male persons of the deity; and yet it has been rejected by the Church. The reason is apparent, and any unbiassed reader of the article on "The Holy Spirit, the Female of the Godhead" will discover it. If the dogma be understood in the letter (as was the fate of all dogmas during the period of their crystallisation), its absurdity is more apparent than in the other form of the trinitarian doctrine, which should not be conceived as a purely male trinity, but as a trinity in which all allusion to sex has been dropped.

The evolution of science is a slow process, and so is the evolution of religion. Religion, such as it is taught by many of our religious leaders, is still in the mythological stage in which symbols are taken in their literal sense, and abstractions are regarded as substances or concrete entities. But as astrology contained the seed of astronomy, and alchemy is a prophecy of chemistry, so the old dogmatism is a promise

¹ On *vdch* (a feminine noun) denoting "λόγος or word," see Professor R. Garbe's article "The Connexion between Indian and Greek Philosophy," *The Monist*, Vol. IV., No. 2, pp. 191-192.

which is sure to find a noble fulfilment in the cosmic religion of mankind, based upon the catholicity of scientific evidence, which is man's faith in the moral import of exact truth.

P. C.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"THE OLD SHOEMAKER."

To the Editor of The Open Court:

In your paper of September 19 is a noticeable article, "The Old Shoemaker," by Miss Voltairine de Cleyre.

It was the descriptive part which first struck me, wonderfully realistic, a most striking picture, reminding me of Maupassant. But with the description of the old shoemaker the truth ends—the real.

Who is the great Visitor?—Death? Why could not the "frightful old woman" have expected such a One? On the contrary, she must have expected him every day.

And what was the dignity of the Unknown? There is no dignity in Death; there is dignity only in Life.

What Miss de Cleyre calls dignity, is fear,—the old spiritualism. The old shoemaker looks alive, but is dead. Where has he gone? Where will he go?—To "Freedom." Freedom of the body;—"the soiled soul loses its dross and commonplace, and passes upward smiling to the Transfiguration."

How does it pass? If free why does it go to be transmuted?

How is the crust crumbled to an "impalpable powder"? The body is no powder. It is not even dead; it is alive, full of the activities of innumerable organisms.

What is the "white, fine, playing flame" which passed upward? There was no such thing. There was no passing upward. The weight of the old shoemaker's body would hold it down.

A drunken old shoemaker was dead. There was no dignity in it, no freedom in it, no transfiguration in it. As the shoemaker was poor and miserable, drunken and quarrelsome, it was a good thing for him to die.

What does the "heart of the long, life long watches of patience" mean? What was the patience, and what was the heart of it?

What is the "perennial ascension of the great Soul of Man"? What is a soul any how?

The fact is such writing has no real meaning, but through its vagueness appeals to the love of mysticism in the common mind.

It helps this out by the use of capitals—"Mighty One"—"Stranger"—"Face"—"Visitor." These acting on the imagination through their size, have an awing effect upon the ordinary mind—simply the effect of a Big Name.

Such writing aims to obscure the truth and to continue beliefs which are no longer beliefs to intelligent persons, because they are incompatible with the observations of real knowledge—those beliefs which make the old-time nurse look to see the spirit ascend on the last expiration of the dying person.

Why all this effort in *The Open Court* to dress up Death in cast off clothing,—to make it figure as the passage to Transfiguration—Freedom—Purity, and so on? Really it is an admission that spiritualism is a necessity to human happiness, even endurance of life.

Nonsense. While we live,—we live. Death ends all to us. This rubbish about souls passing into Freedom or into the Soul of Man is no consolation.

The consolation in Death is that *we are Not*.

We do not regret Life because we do not know Life any more. We are done—gone away—blown out like a flame.

But Life remains. Those who live,—enjoy, hope, strive,

love,—live. Let the living turn away from the dead as having longer personality; turn away to the Living.

The picture of the "Old Shoemaker" is a vivid piece of writing; it has a dramatic interest; but no spiritual interest, no moralising interest; no pathos, but the pathos of disgusting human nature.

No transfiguring Visitor in capitals came to him at all; but the same death that comes to every organic being. No transfiguring Visitor—but the police, the commissioner of the poor, the Potter's Field, naturally dispose of the body. It is perhaps an example of what G. Ferrero calls "Arrested Mentation" when an otherwise intelligent writer tries to make out that in such an ending death brought—Death—an ennobling change to the worn out human brute.

"The soiled soul passes up smiling to the Transfiguration." The fact is the smile was probably a relaxation of the muscles at the moment he ceased to feel pain, dispelling the habitual scowl his features must have worn, as he is said to have "gaped horribly when he breathed."

No fine writing can make death an agreeable thing. All of us would prefer continuing existence indefinitely if we could. But we cannot. Reason then urges us to make an examination of death as it is, and to familiarise our minds to it so as not to have it give us unnecessary anxiety. We must learn not to shrink from death. If dismissing reason,—in other words reality, we choose to believe in Transfigurations into the Soul of God, or the Perennial Soul of Man, very well. But otherwise, as Dr. D. G. Brinton declares, "every one ought to be familiarised with the sight of blood, the pangs of disease, and the solemn act of dying. Death and Pain should not be concealed; they are the greatest of all educators, for they alone teach us the highest value of Life."

Live as long as you can. Avoid Death. For there is no Transfiguration with a big T after that. And if you go into the "Perennial Soul of Man," depend upon it, it will be before Death, not after.

Since writing the enclosed I have read in the same number Miss de Cleyre's explanation of her article, and though it extenuates her intention to write the old spiritualism, it is otherwise as great nonsense as the article itself—what does "the painless life welcomes the animated good" mean? J. W. GASKINE.

[*The Open Court* does not admit that spiritism is a necessity, but it advocates the spirituality of man's soul which in spite of death is preserved from generation to generation. Death is in itself nothing but the ceasing of the life-activities in an organism; and being the close of a life, wiping away much of that which should be discarded forever, but often leaving untouched the better part of our aspirations, who will deny its pathetic solemnity? Death does not end all to us as Mr. Gaskine declares; for "man passes away" (as goes the Buddhist saying) "according to his deeds," which implies that as a man acted during his life-time so his soul will continue as a living and efficient factor in the further development of life upon earth.—Ed.]

THE STORY OF ADAM.

To the Editor of The Open Court:

Professor or Rev. Mr. Low's view of the story of Adam and its relation to the Christian system is rather inaccurate. (See his article in No. 433 of *The Open Court*.)

In Genesis Adam appears first as an innocent man, though not a fool. This was true of Mr. Low once, and of all men, so far as we know.

So far the story fits us all. Genesis shows Adam as meeting temptation, his first temptation. Somewhere, at some time, Mr. Low and every other man met his first temptation.

Adam did not resist his first temptation. He yielded to it and fell, as did Mr. Low and all men, so far as we know them.

If Mr. Low denies that he ever yielded to temptation, I will gladly make exception in his case.

Adam yielded. His character after that was different from what it was before. He then manifested guilt, shame, fear, and dishonesty. The same is true of all men, so far as we know, after their fall. The story of Adam outlines the moral history of the human race. Man has lost something. Man does need something. God, in the Gospel, offers something which man needs. I do not mean a "conventional" Gospel, but the Gospel of Christ as given in the Bible.

Begging Mr. Low's pardon, I am respectfully,
J. R. BARNES, Pastor Cong'l Church, Woodburn, Ill.

[The Rev. J. R. Barnes, in criticising the Rev. Mr. Low's view of the story of Adam, replaces his brother's interpretation by his own, and appears to believe that his view is the historically correct and orthodox conception. The Rev. Mr. Barnes's interpretation is already adapted to modern views, but it deflects from the path of tradition, and the dogmatism of this doctrine has given way to a moralising rationalism. It is in this shape unquestionably more appropriate for church sermons than the old view of the story. The Rev. Mr. Low, Rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church of Almonte, Canada, seems to be better informed in the theology than his Congregational brother, the Rev. J. R. Barnes.—EDITOR.]

BOOK REVIEWS.

SOUL-FRAGRANCE. By *Hannak More Kohaus*. Chicago: F. M. Harley Publishing Company. Pages, 170.

An unassuming little book, the cover neatly ornamented but print and paper showing signs of crudeness, reminding one of books "printed by the author." The little volume contains poems, some good, others mediocre. The authoress is especially unhappy where she harps on the string of Christian piety. As, for instance, in the poem "Ere Long," where she says:

"You shall see the King in his glory,
And hear his gentle voice speak;
Shall feel his breath on your forehead,
His kiss of peace on your cheek."

There are other poems which show decided talent, fervor, and broad sympathy, and even philosophical comprehension. For instance, she is at her best in the poem "Which?" on pp. 72-73:

"I am in love with Love—God-Love,
And I would fain
Entwine it in my heart of hearts.
For righteous gain.
I am in love with Good—All-Good,
And I will feed
My soul upon its substance sure,
With lavish greed.
I am in love with Truth—God-Truth;
E'en now I feel
Its potency omnipotent
All ill to heal.
I am in love with Light—God-Light,
And now through me
It shall reflect the God-derived
Divinity.
I am in love with mind—God-Mind;
In It I see
The Wisdom, Power, Intelligence,
That is for me.
I am in love with Peace—God-Peace;
It bathes my soul
With waters tranquil, pure, and sweet,
Which makes me whole.

And I will love; love more and more,
Drawing to me
The all of Love that is contained
In Deity.

Then will I permeated be,—
Dyed with its dye,—
Until I know not which is Love,
Or which is I."

The poem, "I Am," on page 134, is in a similar strain:

"I am stronger than my fears,
I am wiser than my years,
I am gladder than my tears,
For I am His image.

I am greater than my pains,
I am richer than my gains,
I am purer than my stains,
For I am His image.

I am grander than my names,
I am broader than my claims,
I am nobler than my aims,
For I am His image.

I am better than my deeds,
I am holier than my creeds,
I am worthier than my needs,
For I am His image.

I am truer than I seem,
And more gracious than I deem,
And more real than I dream,
For I am His image.

I have naught with death or birth;
I encompass heaven and earth;
Measureless my power and worth,
For I am His image.

He whose image thus I bear,
And whose likeness I shall share,
All His glory will declare,
Through the 'I'—His image."

These are gems of true poetry, and we hope that they will survive in the general struggle for existence that is waged in the literary world. 5.

THE OPEN COURT.

"THE MONON," 324 DEARBORN ST.,

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, POST OFFICE DRAWER F.

E. C. HEGELER, PUBLISHER. DR. PAUL CARUS, EDITOR.

TERMS THROUGHOUT THE POSTAL UNION:
\$1.00 PER YEAR. \$0.50 FOR SIX MONTHS.

CONTENTS OF NO. 437.

PHILOSOPHIC SOCIALISM. HUDOR GENONE..... 4767
THE HOLY SPIRIT, THE FEMALE OF THE GOD-
HEAD. FRANCIS JAY..... 4770
THE DOGMA OF THE TRINITY. EDITOR..... 4771
CORRESPONDENCE.
"The Old Shoemaker," with editorial note. J. W. GAS-
KINE..... 4773
The Story of Adam, with editorial note. J. R. BARNES 4773
BOOK REVIEWS..... 4774