

THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 443. (VOL. X.—8.)

CHICAGO, FEBRUARY 20, 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.

ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

BY MONCURE D. CONWAY.

THE article of Prof. E. D. Cope (*The Open Court*, January 16) fills me with dismay. I cannot help trembling for the outcome of our discussions, when a man of culture can be misled into such statements as, for instance, the following: "In endeavoring to carry out this policy [Monroe Doctrine] with reference to the supposed attempt of Great Britain to seize territory belonging to Venezuela, successive administrations have been for about eighteen years endeavoring to secure from the former country her consent to a commission to arbitrate the question. Our proposition has been peaceable, but Great Britain has rejected it." Could that assertion be supported by verifiable facts it would have a tremendous effect on English opinion. Professor Cope may have access to documents unknown to the rest of us, but one might suppose they would be known to the Secretary of State, and that he could hardly have omitted reference to them while making out his indictment of England in July last. Eighteen years! According to Mr. Olney's history our Government's first communication to England on the subject seems to have been made ten years ago, and it was not a proposal for arbitration at all, for both England and Venezuela desired arbitration: the dispute was between their respective schemes of arbitration, and on this our Government offered England its "mediation." It was only eight years ago that we even mentioned arbitration to England, and then not specifically: the desire was expressed "to see the Venezuelan dispute amicably and honorably settled by arbitration *or otherwise*." (My italics.) England is given no reason to suppose that we preferred "arbitration" to a settlement "otherwise." And where does Professor Cope find our proposal of a "commission"? The dispute between Venezuela and England being between their different plans of arbitration, our Government in 1890 assured Great Britain of its "neutrality" on the question, and proposed a "conference" between the two disputants and herself. The breaking off by Venezuela of all relations with England made the acceptance of that plan difficult, and though in July, 1894, the United States proposed arbitration it did not take the ground that Eng-

land should surrender its restricted plan of arbitration for the plan of Venezuela; nor was it urged as a matter of political importance to the United States. Professor Cope would have been nearer the mark had he said eighteen months instead of eighteen years, but even that would convey an erroneous impression, for it was only at the close of last summer that the Venezuelan scheme of arbitration was insisted on, and connected with our United States "Doctrine" and policy. Whether this new attitude might not have been effective had it been courteously stated, who can tell? But it was a demand accompanied by menaces and claims that rendered acceptance impossible, e. g.: "That distance and three thousand miles of intervening ocean make any permanent political union between a European and an American State unnatural and inexpedient will hardly be denied." Thus England finds a specific scheme of arbitration, selected by her opponent, suddenly adopted by our President, and instead of being proposed "peaceably," put as an angry demand, to which, apart from its dictatorial character, emphasised by our Commission, she cannot yield without agreeing that her tenure of any territory at all in the New World is "unnatural and inexpedient."

It will be observed that Professor Cope's unsubstantiated assertion that the President's message, whose "inflammatory" character he does not deny, was preceded by about eighteen years of "peaceable" endeavors to secure England's consent to a commission for arbitration, is not a mere incidental point in his article: it is fundamental, and it is vital; it should either be withdrawn or proved by the Professor. For on this really rests his whole position, that the Monroe Doctrine is possibly involved, and that this is the real issue with England. On this ground he slights Professor James's reproof of the unconciliatory form of the executive action, and says, "all parties will forget the matter of form when they get to considering the questions involved, in a serious and rational frame of mind." But the more seriously and rationally the matter is considered, the more plainly does it appear that in this as in many other cases form and substance are one. By the form in which our administration has put the matter upon England, the interests of Vene-

zuela have been supplanted, and the Monroe Doctrine buried away, under a totally new issue, viz., whether England has any right at all to her American colonies, any of them, or whether she is to administer her affairs under our presidential suzerainty, with fear and trembling? It is the "serious and rational" consideration of the situation which has gradually revealed the formidable fact that the English government has been thus left no freedom of initiative.

The editor of *The Open Court*, in his able article on the Monroe Doctrine, quotes President Monroe as saying, "With the existing colonies of any European power we have not interfered, and shall not interfere"; but our executive makes it a condition of acceptance of arbitration that she shall admit her American connexions "unnatural and inexpedient." Her consent to arbitration she could not now offer without proclaiming that fear induces her to yield to menaces of a strong power what she had denied to a weak one. Did those who put the matter in that "form" intend that the dispute with Venezuela should, in the language of our Secretary in 1888, be "amicably and honorably settled by arbitration"? What language could have been devised by Secretary Olney to *prevent* any acceptance of our demand that should not involve a total, timid, and dishonorable surrender by England? It appears incredible that the President should have deliberately meant to force upon England the alternatives of surrender under menace or war, or that he could be so ignorant of English history as to imagine that the alternative of national humiliation would be even conceivable. "The President of the United States," said the Rt. Hon. John Morley in his speech yesterday, "might have known that to claim the right of the United States Government to enforce any settlement that they might choose in any dispute between Great Britain and any South American Government was a demand to which no country with ordinary self-respect could be expected to listen." Did the President, then, really expect it?

This raising by our Government of an issue entirely distinct from the Monroe Doctrine renders the situation so grave that surely public teachers should weigh their words strictly; and I must submit, Mr. Editor, that in speaking of Lord Salisbury's "cool refusal of his [the President's] offer of arbitration in the Venezuelan question," you might fairly have added that it was rather an alternative proposal of arbitration. This alternative offer by the Premier might surely have been courteously dealt with before the President's thunderbolt-message was launched; and if this limited arbitration had been agreed to it could hardly have failed to elicit the facts which our Commission is seeking, and bring to light anything untenable in the claims of Great Britain even to lands settled by her subjects.

Even after Secretary Olney's insulting despatch, Lord Salisbury reminds him that Her Majesty's government have "repeatedly expressed their readiness to submit to arbitration the conflicting claims of Great Britain and Venezuela to large tracts of territory which, from their auriferous nature, are known to be of almost untold value."

To your historical remark that the Monroe Doctrine originated in "the suggestion of a great English statesman" it may be added that it has never been repudiated by an English statesman, and that Lord Salisbury, while reminding our Government that it is not international law, expressed his adhesion to Monroe's principle, "that any disturbance of the existing territorial distribution in the Western hemisphere by any fresh acquisitions on the part of any European State would be a highly inexpedient change." (Lord Salisbury was too polite to remind us that the Doctrine is not even American law, and that until it is framed in exact law it is open to any administration to commit our country to any perversion of it that the current jingoism may invent.) Yesterday the Premier reiterated emphatically his concurrence with Monroe, and his leading ministers have as publicly done the same. An opposition leader, the Rt. Hon. John Morley, proclaimed Thursday: "There is no longer any dispute as to the usual acceptance by Great Britain of that Doctrine. Mr. Balfour, Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Michael Hicks Beach—have all said in the frankest way, that leaves nothing to be desired, that they accept that Doctrine. . . . The Americans may take it for certain that to that Doctrine there is no demur in anybody's mind in this country."

To the question of the applicability of the Monroe Doctrine to the Venezuelan dispute, Professor Cope answers "we do not certainly know," and until we do "all confident assertions are premature." Let the Professor read again Mr. Olney's despatch, and say whether it was not premature to insult England, to put words into her mouth never uttered, to accuse her of bullying Venezuela because it was weak, and all the while without knowing whether England is not in the right. It may be said that this was because England refused the particular extent of arbitration which we desired; but that is a *petitio principii*: the Commission may decide that she was right in refusing arbitration concerning lands which she says were in her possession before Venezuela existed. All of this knowledge might have been searched out as well before Mr. Olney's "confident assertions" as after them. Was it not "premature" to demand of England a different kind of arbitration from that she offered, and to demand it with menaces, when we are not even yet certain that she is not right? The United States would not submit to arbitration anything she deemed

vital, nor would we submit to have our right to accept or refuse arbitration determined for us by another power. If the foreign power is apprehensive that the issue on which arbitration is declined is an issue vitally affecting itself, it has an equal right to decide for itself, but it has been the usage among civilised nations to make their inquiries and reach their conclusions before making accusations that may prove unfounded, or warlike proclamations that deprive peoples of free will, and may have to be either revoked with shame or fulfilled with both shame and crime.

I have pointed out one momentous statement by Professor Cope (whom I esteem) which appears to require substantiation or withdrawal. There are others that might be questioned, but I must limit myself to a comment on his remark that the "privileged classes" in England "hate America and everything American." Now it is the privileged classes that find most to admire in American institutions. Several noblemen, among them Lord Salisbury and the late Lord Tennyson, have particularly applauded parts of our Constitution, and proposed to adopt especially our method of preventing hasty changes in the organic law.

I do not know whether Professor Cope has visited England or not, but I have resided here many years, and have mingled with all classes, and my confident testimony is that America has not one single enemy in England, and that friendship for America and for Americans is a chief characteristic of this people, pervading every class of society. And if among the thousands of loyal Americans resident in England there is one who would testify otherwise, I have never heard of him.

MR. CONWAY ON THE VENEZUELAN QUESTION AGAIN.

BY PROF. E. D. COPE.

MR. CONWAY'S criticism of my article on the "Monroe Doctrine in 1895," in No. 438 of *The Open Court*, shows how easily a man's environment may color the view which he takes of questions which involve the personal element. He finds that the fault in this dispute does not rest with the people among whom he lives, but with the government of the United States. He also believes, apparently, that the aristocratic caste of Englishman is friendly to the United States and to Americans. He says that our Government has not been negotiating with that of Great Britain for eighteen years, but for ten years only; and that it proposed arbitration at a still more recent date, having proposed *mediation* in the earlier stages of the discussion.

I find the difference between mediation and arbitration to be unimportant in this connexion. They are practically identical, and the relation of the affair to the Monroe Doctrine is the same in either case.

Nor do I think that the difference between ten years and eighteen years of refusal to listen to our suggestions on the part of the British Government is sufficient to seriously affect the situation. The plain fact remains that Lord Salisbury refused consistently for many years to submit the question to an arbitration or mediation, and professed to regard the relations of Great Britain to Venezuela in the matter, as not coming within the scope of the Monroe Doctrine. This transparent subterfuge was properly rebuked by our administration. For all that appeared nothing but the vigorous language of the President and Secretary of State, would have roused Lord Salisbury from his indifference, and awakened him to the fact that the Monroe Doctrine is not a mere form of words. A good many other people were awakened at the same time, and among them Mr. Conway. The awakening was somewhat rude, but it seems to have been necessary.

As to the friendship of the privileged classes of England for Americans, I supposed that the reader would understand that the "hatred" to which I referred is not of the personal sort. We may hate the institutions of a country without personally hating the people. It is a common form of mental obliquity to suppose that hatred of a man's ideas necessarily signifies hatred of him personally. Englishmen hate Americans personally for the same reasons that Englishmen hate each other, where they are so unfortunate as to entertain such sentiments; and Americans do the same, *mutatis mutandis*. I do not believe that there is any international hatred between the two English-speaking nations. But to suppose that the aristocratic caste in England has any friendship for American institutions is to think in the face of history, of experience, and of common sense. I suppose that many Americans who, like myself, believe our form of government is in the main the best, have, like myself, many warm friends in England, and much admiration for particular Englishmen and certain English institutions.

A LOST SENSE.

BY S. MILLINGTON MILLER, M. D.

THE Curator of the Burlington Fine Arts Club of London, England, recently received a consignment of exquisite lacquered ware from Japan. Upon searching through his treasures to find if there was anything newer, or more fascinating than usual among them, he lighted upon a quantity of lacquered boxes from six inches to a foot square, and when he opened one of them he found a veritable surprise in store. They were samples of the Japanese "Game of Perfumes." The lacquering had been done by the great Japanese artists of the eighteenth century, Komas, Kajikawas, and Shunshos.

The incrustrated illustrations on the covers of these boxes referred mostly to mediæval tales of Japanese chivalry, such as the Oriental scholar discovers blazoned through the romances of *Genji Monogatari*. The contents consisted of tiny receptacles full of fragrant wood of various descriptions; of a minute brazier; of a silver spatula; and of a silver-plated mica platter. There were also a few pieces of carefully prepared charcoal, and a very considerable number of daintily designed counters accompanying each box—each corresponding in name to a certain one of the perfumes to be burned.

The game was thus begun. One of the incense-bearing jars was emptied of a small part of its contents (by means of the silver spatula) on to the silver-plated mica platter. A piece of charcoal was then inserted in the brazier and lighted, and while it was burning the silver platter containing the incense was suspended by its handle over the flame until the fumes of incense permeated the air.

The point of the game (which could be participated in by any number of people who could sit around the table comfortably) was to guess the name of the perfume consumed, choose out the counter corresponding to it, and put it in its proper place on a checker-board, which also accompanied each box.

It is clear that the Japanese were more skilled in distinguishing odors than the inhabitants of modern western lands.

Incense was first brought into Japan by Buddhist missionaries in the sixth century. They came, no doubt, from any one of the various Tatar Lamasaries in Thibet, or beyond. The earliest mention that I can unearth from Japanese literature of this "incense game" occurs in the tenth century, among the *Genji Monogatari* romances already referred to. It was not, however, until the close of the fifteenth century, which marks the most flourishing era of the Japanese renaissance that this "incense game" was most in vogue. It was at this period in Japanese history that the olfactory sense or the sense of smell was raised to the level of a fine art.

In searching for a similar condition of affairs in other parts of the globe, I find that Didron, the French archæologist, describes in one of his works a Brittany peasant who came to Paris with a cabinet of drawers ingeniously devised which he called a "perfume harmonium." He intended to give a concert of odors therewith, but the intelligence of that gay capital was not sufficiently advanced to afford him a remunerative audience; he was generally daubed as a crazy man, and went home with considerable experience and very little money.

The evidences of the wide existence of a taste for odors in ancient civilisations is patent in many direc-

tions. The early people of the globe seemed to regard the gods who had gone before them as even more amenable than themselves to this kind of pleasure. We all remember the thick clouds of flesh-smell from the burning sides of the oxen which were thought to appease the hunger of the gods in Homer's "Iliad" and "Odyssey." And Milton gives the custom an even hoarier antiquity when he speaks of the delights of travellers when

"Off at sea north-east winds blow
Sabean odors from the spicy shore
Of Araby the blest."

The blind poet also tells in this same "Paradise Lost" how well pleased Satan was with the odorous sweets of Paradise, and how Asmodeus was driven from the spouse of Tobit's son by fishy fumes.

The prevalence of incense burning in all ages of the Roman Catholic Church and the costly and ancient thuribles still extant, as relics of the early universality of the custom, are known to the public at large. At the present day, outside of church ritual it is only in the toilet of women that the art lives.

But the subject has an exceedingly interesting physiological bearing. The sense of smell is only vestigial in man at the present day. And yet such an eminent physiologist as Michael Foster points out in the last edition of his work on physiology that the olfactory nerves, or those nerves which carry the sense of smell to the smell-centre in the brain (behind the fissure of Rolando) have the most direct connexion with their centre of any of the sensory nerves in man, or, in other words, that the nervous system in man is so constituted as to carry such olfactory sensations by an unusually direct course to the brain.

The "end organs" of olfaction are the hair cells on the mucus surfaces of the nose, which present very much the same appearance as the hair-cells in the cochlea of the ear, as the organ of Corti in the internal ear, and as the "rods and cones" in the retina. All of these end-organs of sense bear a very close resemblance, in extreme miniature of course, to the arrangement of some great minster organ. All of them are evidently intended to produce their effect, not by a single stroke or impulse, of sense; but by a harmony thereof. So that the poor Brittany peasant who laid all his plans to lead in bondage the noses of a Parisian audience was either far ahead of his time, or else very far behind it.

Certain drugs produce faintness or dizziness, when held to the nose and inhaled, and others, such as nitrite of amyl and hydrocyanic acid kill by the intensity of their olfactory effect upon the brain-centres. Death is caused by paralysis of the heart. This is another proof of the new physiological fact that every sense-centre in the brain is connected, not only with the higher intellectual centres, but also with the motor

centres in the cortex of the cerebrum. Anything, therefore, which has an annihilating effect, so to speak, upon any one centre of sense is as the arms of Samson, which pulled down the whole temple on his head with the crumbling of two of its pillars. In fact, the better conception we have of the idea that the brain consists of an endless number of cells (with different functions), connected with each other by an endless number of nerve-fibres or wires (all of which are conductors only), the better we will be able to understand the *raison d'être* of that much misunderstood organ.

In the lower vertebrates, and by this I mean in all those animals which have a backbone, but which are lower in the scale of evolution than man, the size of the olfactory lobes in the brain is inordinate. They form the very fore front of the nervous system in all such ascending types. It is only in the "heir of all the ages" man that these lobes are masked by the cerebral convolutions in which he transacts his distinguishing function of the association of sensation and thought. Even in man himself the nerve (consisting of its bundle of myriad fibres) which carries the sensations of smell to his brain, is nerve No. 1 in the cerebral spinal system of nomenclature.

When we descend to the dog, the whole face of the case changes, and we find, in hunting-dogs particularly, a vast preponderance of olfactory lobes over the rest of their brain. What would such a dog be without his *flair*? All of which goes to prove, what I have elsewhere insisted upon, that the brain of the dog, as well as that of the idiot and of the normally intelligent child, are all capable of an endless amount of development. Development dependent upon two things only:—the period of brain-growth at which the process of artificial education is begun, and the length of time allowed to the educator in which to perfect his task.

If the hunting-dog's sense of smell has been developed to such a marvellous extent that he is able to remember the smell of his master's hat, and extract it from a pile of rubbish were it has lain for ten years, it becomes a by no means impossible thought that a similar amount of time and care spent in developing a dog's vocal chords and increasing the number of cells in his centre of speech, would enable him to talk with those whom he serves so well. Just as the child, deaf and dumb at birth, whose vocal chords and speech centres are not a whit better developed than those of the dog, learns after six or seven years' education to use that speech centre and those vocal chords as well as the rest of us.

And if men in olden times did derive an ecstasy of sense from the deft mingling of odors—the harmony of odors—there is no reason in the world why a special education of smell-centres equivalent to that which

is given to the deaf and dumb child should not render what is now practically a lost sense, a source of the highest emotional pleasure to its possessor.

No one doubts that a man can think. A great many people do hold that a dog cannot. But when I tell them that it has been shown beyond a peradventure that crows can count as high as five or six, that nightingales can do almost as well, and that Professor Lubbock taught one dog to find the square root of certain numbers, and another dog to tell him (not by his voice, but by choosing out cards) when he wanted food and when he wanted drink and when he wanted to go out and run—when all these facts are understood, I hope that we shall come to believe that man is not such an exclusive being after all, compared with his dumb servants, and that if we only gave them a chance they might exceed our wildest imaginings in the way of mental improvement. If mental improvement rendered them no less true to their master, what invaluable friends we might make of them.

Helen Kellar, the deaf, dumb, and blind girl, who has been rendered famous by the triumph of special sense-development over her infirmities, and is now completing her education in a private school for the deaf in New York City, shows an unusual development of the sense of smell. The gentleman who is instructing her tells me that she is always conscious of the presence of another person, no matter how noiseless his entrance into the room in which she is at the time being. He explains this knowledge by the acuteness of her sense of smell. She is able to detect presence by odor.

Another case of much the same kind is now living in the person of a man who resides in one of the towns on the Hudson River in New York State. He is deaf and blind, and uses his sense of smell to recognise and distinguish those with whom he comes in contact.

Upon first introduction he takes hold of the hand of the person so presented and sniffs at it with his nose, just as the dog seems to gather with his sensitive nostrils and store in his mind every scent that is in the breeze.

Having thus firmly established the identity of the odor peculiar to this individual, the man in question is able to recognise the person when he or she passes in the street at moderately close quarters.

This manifest possibility of the extreme development of the sense of smell reminds me of the famous James Mitchell, whose case is reported in medical works. This boy was born blind and deaf, and lost very early in life the finer qualities of his sense of touch, as well as of his general sensation. But to make up for this universal affliction, he developed in time a *flair* equal in many respects to that possessed by the best breed of pointers and setters. Each per-

son that he met was individualised in his memory by odor, and he was able to draw sharp distinctions in this way between various people. Nay, more, from their odor it became possible for him to form excellent opinions of their respective character. The olfactory centres in this boy must have been unusually developed.

CHARLES GUTZLAFF ON BUDDHISM.

SPEAKING of Christian critics of Buddhism, we must not forget to mention the Rev. Charles Gutzlaff, a German missionary to China, who enjoys an undeserved reputation for scholarship among people unacquainted with his writings. His two-volumed work, *China Opened*,¹ is full of the grossest errors, which are scarcely pardonable in an illiterate man who lived only a short time in the Middle Kingdom. Note only this tremendous mistake: Speaking of Confucius, who, as is well known, was not an original thinker or author, but a conservative preserver of the wisdom of the sages of yore, Gutzlaff says:

"Antecedent to him, China does not appear to have possessed any men of genius; or if it did possess them, both themselves and their works have long passed into oblivion."

As though Fu Hi, Yü the Great, Wu Wang, Wen Wang, and innumerable other sages, among them Lao-tsze, who were born before Confucius, had either not existed or passed into oblivion! The Shu King is a collection of songs, all of which are older than Confucius.

Other blunders, such as attributing to Confucius himself the well-known classic on filial piety, which is written either by Tsang-tsze or by a scholar belonging to the school of Tsang-tsze, are scattered throughout Gutzlaff's book.

Gutzlaff pretends to have read books of which he knows very little. In explanation of Lao-tsze's term *tau* (reason, logos, path), he says:

"Commentators differ as to the meaning of this word. We cite the opinions only of the two most celebrated of them. According to the best author, Taou is the art of governing a country; but another observes, that the Taou is shapeless, or invisible, and maintains and nourishes heaven and earth. It is devoid of affection, but moves the sun and moon; it is nameless, but contributes towards the growth and sustenance of all creatures. It is something undefined, to which it is difficult to assign a name, which however may be called Taou, for want of a better."

Gutzlaff does not name these "two most celebrated commentators," for it is one of his habits never to quote authorities or to give references. But any one who ever glanced through this short booklet could not have overlooked that these "opinions" are simply loose and inaccurate quotations from Lao-tsze's Tao-teh-king.

Mr. Meadows, Chinese interpreter in H. M. Civil Service, in his book, *The Chinese and Their Rebellions*, is not too severe on Gutzlaff, when he says (p. 376):

"Probably few men have excelled Dr. Gutzlaff in the capacity for rapidly inditing sentences containing a number of propositions not one of which should be correct. In fact all his labors are characterised by a superficiality, a lack of thorough research, and a profusion of unfounded assertion."

Gutzlaff's opinions on China and Buddhism would certainly not be worth mentioning if he were not sometimes regarded and quoted as an authority whose statements are willingly accepted on account of his supposed scholarship and long residence in China.

Gutzlaff devotes a long chapter to religion; speaking of Buddhism, he says:

"The life of the founder of this idolatry is enveloped in so much mystery, that his very existence has been doubted by some, whilst others have presumed, that there lived and taught, at different periods, various persons of this name."

"His name greatly varies according to the countries where his tenets have been received. Thus we have it pronounced Budha, Budhu, Budse, Gautema, Samonokodam, Fuh, or Fo, etc., all designating one and the same individual."

As if the title Buddha, the Enlightened One, were a name, and of the same kind as "Gautama"! Gutzlaff continues:

"He inculcated mercy towards animals, prohibited the killing of any living creature, and enjoined good-will towards all mankind. His disciples wrote down these instructions, which, inclusive of the commentaries, amounted to two hundred and thirty-two volumes. The writer has perused several of them in the Siamese Pale, and if ever any work contained nonsense, it is the religious code of Budhu."

Siamese can only be the language spoken in Siam, and Pale (or as it is now commonly spelled Pâli) is the vernacular spoken in the kingdom of Maghada in Buddha's time, which has become the classical language of Buddhism. What Siamese Pâli may be, no one except the Rev. Mr. Gutzlaff knows.

Gutzlaff continues in the next paragraph, "his [Buddha's] own uncle rose against him," probably meaning Devadatta, his cousin. He further says:

"The most superficial observer will discover in this system some resemblance to a spurious kind of Christianity. If we do not admit that the human mind will always have recourse to the same follies, we may presume that these ceremonies were borrowed from the Nestorians of the seventh century, a period which exactly coincides with a great reform in the Tibetan system of Buddhism."

"The providence of God, in permitting so many millions blindly to follow this superstition, is indeed mysterious. We can only adore where we are unable to comprehend. Yet, amongst all pagans, the Budhuists are the least bigoted. They allow that other religions contain some truth, but think that their own is the best, and the most direct road to heaven. Amongst the myriads of idols they worship, there are no obscene representations, nor do they celebrate any orgies."

We do not doubt that Chinese Buddhism is full of distortions and superstitions, but even here we find

¹London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1838. The author's name is spelled "Gutzlaff" in the English edition. The German spelling is "Gützlaff."

still preserved the purity, the breadth, and the moral earnestness of the great founder of the Religion of Enlightenment.

The Buddhistic description of Hell, as given by Gutzlaff on page 224, differs from the old-fashioned Christian Hell only in unimportant details, and the injunction to repeat the refuge formula, *O me to Fuh!* on all occasions for the sake of "having Fuh both in the mind and in the mouth," is quite analogous to the constant repetition of the Lord's Prayer, which is practised in all Christian countries. The worship of Fuh, as prescribed by various sects, is neither more nor less pagan than the worship of Christ among Christians. Gutzlaff quotes from a Buddhist work, the title of which he does not name, the following passage:

"Let each seek a retired room, and sweep it clean; place there an image of Fuh, every day burn a pot of pure incense, place a cup of clean water, and when evening comes, light a lamp before the image. Whether painted on paper, or carved in wood, the figure is just the same as the true Fuh; let us love it as our father and mother, venerate it as our prince and ruler. Morning and evening, let us worship it with sincerity and reverence, fall prostrate before it like the tumbling of a mountain, and rise up with dignity like the ascent of clouds. On leaving the room, report it [bid it farewell]; returning, let us give notice [greet it]; and even when we travel, at the distance of five or ten le, let us act as in the presence of our Fuh."

Among other extracts from "native works," Gutzlaff quotes the following passage:

"The laws of Buddhism are boundless as the ocean, and the search after them is as little tiresome as that after precious stones. He who has transgressed them ought to repent; he who never acted against them may silently ponder upon them, and thus know the purity of exalted virtue."

Happening to know this verse as a formula in common use among the Chinese and Japanese Buddhists, I can from memory point out a few gross mistakes in Gutzlaff's translation, without even having at present the original at hand. It must read about as follows:

"The religion of Buddha is as boundless as the ocean. The search after it is more remunerative than that after precious stones. He who has transgressed Buddha's injunctions ought to repent. He who has never sinned, may in silence ponder upon them. Thus he will comprehend the purity of exalted virtue." P. C.

HOW NEW DISCOVERIES AFFECT THE WORLD.

It is interesting to watch the attitudes of different people when a new discovery has been made. Some belittle it, others claim to have known it long ago, and still others let their imagination revel in wild speculations. Thus *Nature*, the well-known English journal of natural science, after publishing a short note (in No. 1368) stating what Professor Röntgen *claims* to have done, publishes (in No. 1369) an article which begins as follows:

"The newspaper reports of Professor Röntgen's experiments have, during the past few days, excited considerable interest. The discovery does not appear, however, to be entirely novel, as" etc., etc.

Further, we read in other reports that Röntgen's discovery is due to mere accident. This is true, for Röntgen makes this statement himself. There is an element of accident in all discoveries, but it shows the stamp of genius to comprehend the importance and novelty of an accident, and to trace the law which underlies its appearance.

It is peculiar to find a great number of people who have discovered the Röntgen rays before Röntgen. But as soon as their claim is investigated it vanishes in thin air. We mention as an instance an essay by Dr. Heinrich Kraft of Strassburg, which appeared in one of the greatest Frankfort journals, and was re-printed and quoted in others.

Dr. Kraft claims that his countryman, Reichenbach, had anticipated Röntgen in his discovery of the "od," made in 1845, which, however, by Du Bois-Reymond was branded as one of the dreariest aberrations of the human brain and as a worthless fable. And what is this "od"? It is an all-pervading energy which ought not to be mixed up with light, heat, magnetism, or electricity. Not finding an odometre or an odoscope, Reichenbach relied upon the information received from so-called sensitives, but as the sensitives are few and the non-sensitives many, says Dr. Kraft, Reichenbach was ridiculed and his last hope, that of being recognised by Fechner, failed. Thus he died a martyr to his convictions; but Röntgen, thirty years after his death rediscovers his "od" and makes it known to the world under the name of "x-rays." As the "od" permeates all solid substances, even rocks and metals, so the x-rays pass through wood, walls, books, and the human organism, and for this reason Dr. Kraft declares that Röntgen's great merit consists in having found an intensifier of the "od," and an odoscope. The Röntgen rays, he concludes, ought to be called "od-rays."

Every one who knows anything about the actual facts of Röntgen's discovery, will object at once that Röntgen's x-rays have nothing to do with, and do not prove the reality of, an all-pervading substance such as Reichenbach describes his "od."

But what will the spiritists and their kin say of the new invention? They appear to be a little slow in utilising the new discovery for their purposes, but they will do so without fail. They will find explanations for the appearance and disappearance of psychic effects, of spirit photographs, of telepathy, and of all the various miracles with the investigation of which they are engaged. In a word, the Röntgen rays will soon be famous among them as the paths upon which the spirits walk.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"THE MONROE DOCTRINE."

To the Editor of *The Open Court*:

Why not open the door of your *Open Court* and keep it wide open, in fact remove the hinges, the door, and permit all to go in and out while the "Court" is open. I do not care to mount the platform, the "bench," if you please, I will speak from the floor, and to the effect if you will permit, that wiser words were never written than the caustic, timely, true analysis of the American State by Mr. Conway. I read his article, "Our Cleveland Christmas," with interest and approval. The two following were not relished by me, particularly so the effort by the editor.—with pardon and the kindest regard for him. Mr. Conway, in my opinion, builds for a noble State for man, enduring temples of justice. May his voice again and again be heard in your much esteemed *Open Court*.

I. A. LANT.

TARRYTOWN, N. Y.

To the Editor of *The Open Court*:

You will see by reference to what I sent you, that I did not say Jefferson's letter was to *Mr. Rush* but to *Mr. Monroe*. Rush

was in England, and of course did not communicate Canning's proposition to any one but the President. He, Mr. Monroe, after deliberating over the matter in his cabinet, sent all letters and documents to Jefferson at Monticello. The response from Jefferson I sent you. Please correct in *The Open Court*, as just now, and indeed always, what we need in all investigation is accuracy.

I do not think you made a mistake in publishing Conway's hysterical article. If Americans of note are thinking after this manner, it is high time we knew it. The remedy must come, as Aristotle said, by "going back to first principles." The question is, was not Jefferson right, that a people that has its roots in so much history must make history a very large part of popular education? Yet here we were so totally ignorant of Canning's great strategic move in statesmanship—the greatest political event of this nineteenth century—that we supposed the Monroe Doctrine meant a defiance of all the world to secure an area of land on the Western Hemisphere. E. P. POWELL.

To the Editor of *The Open Court*:

Perhaps it is forwardness on my part, but I beg that you may not consider it forwardness in an Englishman who is deeply grieved to read that there is antipathy to his country in America, and who, though he has experienced friendship from many Americans, has no correspondent in the States, if I venture to write that I for one see no reason why all questions reasonably connected with the Venezuela boundary should not be referred to arbitration.

It is not true that the decision in all arbitrations has been given against this country.

I can't help thinking that if we had done what seems to me our duty to the persecuted Armenians, we should have been more respected as well as loved. T. W.

NOTES.

Dr. Hans Vaihinger, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Halle, a. S., announces a new periodical *Kantstudien*, which will be devoted to the investigation and elucidation of Kant's works. Professor Vaihinger urges that all philosophers after Kant had to start from his philosophy, even those who antagonised him, and also those who went beyond him; and there is scarcely any problem of modern thought, the discussion of which does not naturally lead back to Kant, which involves that very frequently the discussion of a subject is nothing but a coming to terms with Kant. In this sense Kant has rightly been called "the key to modern philosophy." Professor Vaihinger is better fitted than any one else for this undertaking, because he has done more than any other scholar in the line of Kant investigation. The *Kantstudien* promises to inquire into the circumstances and psychological conditions of Kant's philosophy, and will also give an interpretation of its substance both in its entirety and its details.

In order to preserve the international character of the undertaking the editor has gained the assistance of French, English, Italian, and American philosophers, who will publish their contributions in their own languages.

The new magazine will be a complement to the new Kant edition, to be published by the Royal Academy of Sciences in Berlin, which is now in preparation.

The *Kantstudien* will contain: (1) original contributions of various size which shall treat the problems created by Kant according to the demand of the present time; (2) reviews of all kinds of writings of Kant and Kant's works; (3) the annual reports of foreign Kant publications; (4) author's announcements and reviews; (5) exegetic and textual criticisms of difficult and obscure passages in Kant's works; (6) references to Kantian literature; and lastly, questions, communications, and anything that may have reference to Kant shall be treated under the title *Varia*.

Vaihinger's new magazine will appear in installments of about 480 pages. Price of a single volume 12 marks. Published by Leopold Voss: Hamburg and Leipsic.

The January "Monist"

A Remarkable and Important Number

"The last number of *The Monist* is a splendid one."—Prof. Joseph Le Conte, University of California.

"You are making your journal so valuable that I cannot be without it any longer, although I do not subscribe to its philosophy."—Prof. Henry R. Osborn, Columbia College, N. Y.

CONTENTS:

On the Part Played by Accident in Invention and Discovery.

PROF. ERNST MACH, VIENNA.

Pathological Pleasures and Pains.

PROF. TH. RILOT, PARIS.

Chinese Philosophy.

DR. PAUL CARUS, Editor.

Germinal Selection.

PROF. AUGUST WEISMANN, Freiburg i. B.

On the Nature of Mathematical Knowledge. PROF. H. SCHUBERT, Hamburg.

Reviews of the most recent and important works in philosophy, science, and religion by eminent specialists and scholars, and synopses of the foremost American, English, and foreign periodicals in these branches.

"I cannot refrain from congratulating you on the splendid but deserved success of *The Monist*."—Lester F. Ward, Washington, D. C.

"Your magazine is admirable and a credit to the United States."—Fred-eric R. Guernsey, Editor *Mexican Herald*, City of Mexico.

PRICE, 50 cts.; YEARLY, \$2.00.

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.

324 DEARBORN STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

N. B.—By special arrangements with the Cosmopolitan Publishing Company we are enabled to offer a full year's subscription to the two magazines, *THE COSMOPOLITAN* and *THE OPEN COURT*, at the unusually low price of \$1.75. This advantageous offer holds good for all new subscriptions and for renewals, until retracted.—*The Open Court Publishing Company.*

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:

\$1.00 PER YEAR.

\$0.50 FOR SIX MONTHS.

N. B. Binding Cases for single yearly volumes of *THE OPEN COURT* will be supplied on order. Price, 75 cents each.

CONTENTS OF NO. 443.

ENGLAND AND AMERICA.	MONCURE D. CONWAY....	4815
MR. CONWAY ON THE VENEZUELAN QUESTION AGAIN.	PROF. E. D. COPE.....	4817
A LOST SENSE.	S. MILLINGTON MILLER.....	4817
CHARLES GUTZLAFF ON BUDDHISM.	EDITOR....	4820
HOW NEW DISCOVERIES AFFECT THE WORLD.	EDITOR.....	4821
CORRESPONDENCE.		
The Monroe Doctrine.	I. A. LANT.—E. P. POWELL.—	
T. W.....		4821
NOTES.....		4822