

47

# THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 484. (VOL. X.—49.)

CHICAGO, DECEMBER 3, 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.

## WHY CHAMBORD WAS NOT MADE KING OF FRANCE.

BY THEODORE STANTON.

THE National Assembly, which met at Bordeaux in February, 1871, was chosen solely to decide whether the war with Germany should continue or a peace be negotiated. But when the Monarchists found, much to their surprise, that they had some two hundred majority in the body, they then announced that the Assembly enjoyed constituent powers, and that it should not dissolve till they had foisted on France a monarchy in the place of the nondescript republic which then existed.

But these "resurrected" Royalists soon discovered that serious difficulties lay in the way of the accomplishment of their object. In the first place Thiers, the idol of a day, whom they had almost unanimously placed at the head of the state and clothed with well-nigh unlimited powers, began to turn against them, to lean towards the definitive establishment of a conservative republic, and, what was even more alarming, to take over with him to the enemy's camp no mean following from their own.

A second, and not less serious obstacle, was the divided state of the anti-republican majority. Led by three rival princes, all of whom were trying to sit on one throne, as Thiers happily put it, the hostile Orleanist, Legitimist, and Bonapartist contingents presented a very broken front to the common republican enemy. And scrutinising more closely the two grand divisions of the Royalists, still further disunion was apparent. Towards the middle of 1873 four distinct "groups" or factions could be differentiated among them.

On the Royalists' left wing was the Right Centre, which, while conserving its affection for, and fidelity to, the Orleans princes felt that the monarchy could not be and perhaps ought not to be re-established except in the person of the Count of Chambord. But while thus going over to the ultra-conservative grandson of Charles X., these liberal heirs of the July monarchy required of him in return certain constitutional guarantees and the maintenance of the tricolored flag as the national standard. This group was about one hundred and twenty strong.

On the other wing was the Extreme Right, com-

posed of some four score antiquated Ultramontanes, clinging to the old régime of divine right, the hereditary enemies of the French revolution, and the blind followers of the Count of Chambord, ready to go wherever and however he should lead—in a word, more Royalist than the King.

Between these two extremes stood the Moderate Right, who were convinced that a monarchical restoration could be brought about only through mutual concessions on the part of the Extreme Right and the Right Centre, and the union of all Royalists on a common platform. There were about a hundred of these measured and conciliatory deputies who acted as a mollient link between the two rather distrustful and repellent wings of the party.

And lastly there were some forty Monarchists who, for one reason or another, did not care to "train" with any one of the other groups, and so gradually united in a little body known as the Changarnier Reunion, named from the venerable general and deputy who presided over it. Their political views do not seem to have differed from those held by the generality of their congeners of the majority.

When the insurrection of the Paris Commune had been suppressed and the final arrangements been made for the last fragment of the Prussian war indemnity and the removal of the remnant of the German army still quartered on French territory—this had all been accomplished by the autumn of 1873, thanks to Thiers's energy—the majority breathed more freely and felt that they could now turn their serious attention to the object nearest their heart,—the restoration of the monarchy. So it was decided to remove forthwith the two chief barriers in the way,—Thiers in the presidency and the divisions among themselves.

Thiers, who had now declared openly for the Republic, was consequently pushed from power on May 24, 1873, and a tool of the Right, Marshal MacMahon, was put in his place, while the Duke of Broglie, a Monarchist of the Orleanist stripe, became Prime Minister and confidential adviser of the new President.

A few weeks later—in August—a veritable *coup de théâtre* occurred in the direction of the union of the

Royalists,—the Count of Paris, head of the Orleanist branch, went to Frohsdorff, near Vienna, the residence of the Count of Chambord, and acknowledged him as "the sole representative in France of the monarchical principle." The Government, the majority in the Assembly, and the pretenders themselves, were now at one in so far at least as regards the principle of a monarchical restoration and who the monarch should be.

But, as after events showed, the most formidable obstacle—the bringing of the Count of Chambord into line with his supporters—remained to be removed, if removed it could be. And to the history of this part of the enterprise M. Chesnelong's new book<sup>1</sup> is an important and interesting, though a little too tautological, contribution. The author, who is now a distinguished life Senator, was then a Deputy to the National Assembly, where he sat among the members of the Moderate Right. He it was whom the Committee of Nine, of which he was one, made up of representatives from the four Royalist groups and charged with the whole management of the preliminaries of the Restoration, sent to explain to "the future King" the political situation in France, and especially in the Assembly, and to try to bring about an accord between him and his parliamentary supporters. And when the campaign came to an ignominious end a few weeks later because of the absence of such a harmonious understanding, M. Chesnelong was made the scapegoat thereof in many quarters. For nearly a quarter of a century he has borne in silence what he pronounces to be unjust imputations, "a silence," he tells us, "which seemed imposed by respect and duty." But to-day, now that the two chief royal actors in the scene are dead, that "the flag question," which was then such a burning one, has ceased to exist, and, in a word, that monarchy in France appears buried for many years, if not definitely, and the Republic, to use a most expressive slang phrase, "come to stay,"—M. Chesnelong has concluded to speak, and has extracted from his memoirs, written in 1885, all that part which has to do with the monarchical campaign of the summer and autumn of 1873, and published it in the present volume. Although this is evidently an apology *pro domo sua*, still it carries with it such an air of truthfulness, honorability, and exactness that the author wins the sympathy and confidence of the reader, who feels that the book possesses real historical value.

After much careful consideration and more than one compromise, the Committee of Nine finally authorised M. Chesnelong to convey to the pretender a series of propositions. In the first place he was to

be informed that the Assembly would call him to the throne by virtue of his hereditary right, as the only legitimate representative of the national, hereditary, and constitutional monarchy. In the second place, the Assembly, at least the Committee of Nine said so, did not wish to impose on the King, as a condition of his elevation to the throne, a constitution made without his co-operation, but, on the contrary, the future constitutional bills would be laid before the Assembly by the King's Government. The Committee of Nine did not feel any anxiety as to how these two propositions would be received. But they were not so assured concerning the next one.

In order to anticipate the falsehoods which the Committee felt sure would be put in circulation the moment the coming restoration was announced, it was proposed to the Count that a general statement be made concerning the nature of the new monarchy. The public was to be given to understand that the authority would be exercised conjointly by the King and the Chambers; that the former would be charged with the executive power, that his person would be inviolable, and that, as a consequence of royal inviolability and the co-operation of the Chambers in the government, ministerial responsibility would be recognised. The future constitution, it was still further to be declared, would acknowledge the civil and religious liberties of the nation, the equality before the law of all classes of citizens and their free access to every civil and military employment; would stipulate that all taxes should be voted annually by the representatives of the nation, and, in a word, that the guarantees which constitute the public law of France should not be attacked.

These three requests seemed to meet with the Prince's approval; and then M. Chesnelong took up the more difficult part of his mission. The question as to whether the future standard of France under the Restoration should be the tricolor of the Revolution and Empire or the white flag of the old monarchy had nearly wrecked the enterprise in committee before it ever got squarely before the Count of Chambord. The Right Centre at first made it the *sine qua non* of their participation in the campaign that the text of the law of the Assembly calling the Count of Chambord to the throne should stipulate in advance that the then national ensign should be changed in no respect and at no time. And they seemed justified—in justification were needed—in taking this stand by Marshal MacMahon's private communication to the Committee, that he would have nothing to do with the venture if the tricolor were repudiated; and with the President even lukewarm, the most sanguine Royalist knew that a restoration was at that time impossible.

<sup>1</sup> *Un Témoignage sur un Point d'Histoire: La Campagne Monarchique d'Octobre, 1873.*

The Extreme Right, on the other hand, if not so positive in their advocacy of the claims of the white flag as were the Orleanists for the tricolor, shared the antipathy of their Prince against "the banner of the Revolution." A compromise, therefore, was absolutely necessary, and the following resolution was unanimously agreed to by the Committee of Nine: "The tricolored flag is preserved, and it cannot be changed except through the accord of King and Assembly." The first clause satisfied the Right Centre and the last portion the Legitimists; or, rather, as is always the case with compromises, each party was only partially contented, though the former got more—this being an instance of Bismarck's *beati possidentes*—than the latter.

The ingenious advocate of the Committee, in his delicately-worded glossary on the text of the resolution, admitted to the Prince that, while it was true that he would be first greeted, on his entrance into France, by the tricolor, the second clause of the resolution reserved to him the right of presenting to the country, at the hour he should think fit, his own solution of the difficulty. But—and here came the rub—M. Chesnelong trusted the Prince shared the view of the Committee, that the matter once laid before the Assembly by the King both parties would come to a common understanding; otherwise, he pointed out, this flag difference might give rise to a conflict between the executive and legislative branches of the government with all the grave dangers that such a clash would be sure to bring upon a country like France.

On quitting the Prince, after a vigorous presentation of the case, M. Chesnelong flattered himself that the Count of Chambord fully acquiesced in the views of the Committee. But scarcely had the latter reached his private apartments, when he sent word to the former that, while he consented to the two first propositions—the tricolor being left untouched, provisionally at least, and his laying before the nation, when once on the throne, his own solution—he could not accept the third proposition, the King and Assembly agreeing as to what the solution should be—"which," he declared, "would place me, so to speak, at the mercy of the Assembly."

When this message was conveyed to him, M. Chesnelong admits that he was "thunderstruck." "It was plain to me," he continues, "that the Prince, after having at first consented to the third declaration, regretted having done so, changed his mind, and, in a word, would no longer stand by our first understanding. This was a symptom that alarmed me, and I began to ask myself, if, after our departure and when no longer influenced by contact with us, the Prince, left to the workings of his own mind, would

not return to his position of absolute resistance to the whole flag matter and reject the two first declarations as he had just done the third." And this is just what did happen, as the sequel will show.

But if he could prevent it, M. Chesnelong did not mean to let the obstinate Prince blast in this way his own political future and that of his friends. "So after much reflection," he says, "I thought I had discovered a way of restoring the situation." A third interview occurred in the night, just before the Prince started for the Salzburg station where he took the midnight train for Frohsdorff. Although the Count of Chambord could not be moved in his determination not to accept the third declaration, he did consent, at M. Chesnelong's earnest solicitation, not to forbid his followers of the Extreme Right in the Assembly voting for the article of the Committee—"the tricolored flag is preserved and it cannot be changed, except through the accord of King and Assembly,"—it being understood that they could afterwards support the solution proposed by the King.

This modicum was the only concession which M. Chesnelong could obtain, and on parting with the Prince he felt forced to say to him: "I trust that the monarchical campaign can be entered upon, although the ground on which we can manœuvre in common is very narrow, much reduced from what I had hoped it would be, and whose limits it will be difficult not to overstep."

It must strike a cool, foreign observer that the situation was even worse than appeared to this optimistic advocate of a cause dear to his heart; and this on his own showing. The Prince evidently made more than one mental reservation. Throughout the interview there was a continual straining, on the part of M. Chesnelong, of the meaning of the adage "Silence gives consent."

Thus, after having laid before the Prince the constitutional portion of the Committee's programme, M. Chesnelong makes such comments as these: "His assent, though silent, seemed to me so manifest that I made a note of it." "The Prince, without pronouncing a single word of reservation, made me a sign of acquiescence." "The plan of the Committee of Nine was accepted without restriction and even without the least observation. The Prince approved all, or at least opposed nothing." Even M. Chesnelong himself was surprised at the easiness of his task. He says: "The result corresponded with my hopes. I may say it even surpassed them. So when later I had to give my colleagues an account of this part of my negotiation, I could truthfully say: *Je n'avais eu qu'à enfoncer une porte ouverte.*"

When the flag portion of the mission was entered upon, this "policy of silence" was naturally empha-

sised. Thus: "The Prince made no answer, and no sign from him could enable me to make out his impression. From the moment I took up this new line of ideas, his physiognomy was as if enveloped by an impenetrable impassibility." When the direct question was put to him, whether he and the Committee were at one as to the modification of the flag being the joint work of King and Assembly, this was all M. Chesnelong got for an answer: "The Prince remained impassible and did not abandon his silent attitude." And when it was suggested that the solution "should be found in the fusion or in the co-existence of the two flags," "a smile, somewhat veiled with sadness, greeted these words. However, he did not interrupt me." Even not being interrupted carried with it a sort of affirmative significance to the eager ears of M. Chesnelong. One more example: "After a short silence, where I would have welcomed a reply, but which was not forthcoming, I continued my unpleasant *exposé*." And finally, when the second and last interview had been held and M. Chesnelong had returned to some of his impatiently waiting colleagues, he describes himself as "radiant as after an unexpected success. . . . They expressed astonishment that the assent of the Prince had been so complete, and that no reservations were mingled with it. I answered that after the first conversation I indeed did not look for such a good ending, and that I was surprised at it."

And yet, the Count of Chambord could speak out, and very plainly, when he wanted to. But when he did so, M. Chesnelong would not accept his words. Thus, when the scheme of the fusion of the two flags was being developed, M. Chesnelong "noticed a visible expression of discontent spread over the Prince's face," and when the proposal was pressed home, "the Prince interrupted with an accent of gentle firmness, as if speaking to himself: 'I will never accept the tricolor flag.' But I immediately replied with respectful emotion: 'Monseigneur will permit me to consider that I did not hear those words. At least he does not charge me, I think, to convey them to Paris; for if I were to do so, the monarchical campaign would be given over forthwith. I shall forget, therefore, what Monseigneur has just said. He will be kind enough, at the end of our conversation, to convey to me the final reply that I shall have to take back. Whatever it may be, I will faithfully transmit it. But that is the only one I shall feel bound to carry.'" The Prince's answer was: "Very well; but you see what are my real feelings on the subject."

And yet, notwithstanding their vulnerable and rather slippery candidate, the United Right hopefully began to build up its new throne on this bed of sand, and the more optimistic believe that they would have

completed it and the second restoration would have been an accomplished fact in the autumn of 1873, if it had not been for the famous letter of October 27 in which the indignant but narrow Prince put a brusque end to all the quibbling, hair-splitting, and tweezer which had been in progress in Parliament and in the press since the campaign began, and which he felt placed him in a wrong light. With one sweep of the pen the Count of Chambord cut the ground from under the feet of his political henchmen and once more firmly placed himself on his native heath,—the old régime, absolutism, the counter-revolution, the white standard of the Bourbons. In a word, the Prince had simply repeated what he had said a few days before to M. Chesnelong at Salzburg: "I will never accept the tricolor flag."

#### LAO-TSZE'S TAO-TEH-KING.

##### III. LAO-TSZE'S ETHICS.

UPON his faith in the seasonableness, goodness, and unflinching rightness of the Tao, Lao-Tsze builds his ethical system, trusting that through the Tao the crooked shall be straightened, the imperfect shall be made complete, the lowly shall receive abundance as sure as valleys naturally and without any effort of their own fill themselves with water. But he demands the surrender of personal ambitions and personal strivings. His aim is not to fashion, not to make, not to push or force things, but to let them develop according to their own nature. He who acts a part in the world, as a player does on the stage; he who endeavors to bring about artificial conditions; he who meddles with the natural growth of society, will fail in the end. This is what Lao-Tsze calls *wú-wéi*,<sup>1</sup> or "not acting, not making, not doing," and he assures us that for him who accepts the principle of not acting, "there will be nothing that he will not be able to accomplish."

Lao-Tsze's proposition appears paradoxical, but it is simple enough. He who attempts to alter the nature of things will implicate himself in a struggle in which even the most powerful creature must finally succumb. But he who uses things according to their nature, directing their course, not altering their nature, can do with them whatever he pleases. Build strong walls and heavy dams to prevent the landslide caused by the waters that sink into the ground, and the waters will break through and carry your dam down into the valley; but provide the under-ground water with outlets in the places where it naturally endeavors to flow, and there will be no danger of a catastrophe.

The same is true of the social conditions of man-

<sup>1</sup>See *Williams's Syllabic Dictionary*, pp. 1059 and 1047.

kind. Lao-Tsze requests the government not to govern, but simply to administer. Rulers should not interfere with the natural development of their people. They should practise not-acting, not-meddling, non-interference, or, as the French call it, *laissez faire*,<sup>1</sup> so that the people shall scarcely know that they have rulers. Thus they will make the nation great. The less laws and prohibitions there are, the less crime will there be. The less the welfare of the people is forced by artificial methods, the greater will be their wealth and prosperity.

Lao-Tsze's principle of "not-acting" is obviously not inactivity; it is simply not acting a part; not doing things in an artificial way; it is not forcing the nature of things. It is the utter omission of the peculiar and particular Tao of oneself (i. e., of man's Tao, *zhin tao*) and following the course prescribed by the eternal Tao, *ch'ang tao*. It is, briefly, not "non-action," but "non-assertion."

Chwang-Tsze, Lao-Tsze's most accomplished disciple, characterises non-action as follows:

"Non-action makes one the lord of all glory; non-action makes one the treasury of all plans; non-action makes one the burden of all offices; non-action makes one the lord of all wisdom. The range of the true man's action is inexhaustible, but there is nowhere any trace of his presence. He fulfils all that he has received from Heaven, but he does not see that he was the recipient of anything. A pure vacancy (of his own and private affairs) characterises him. When the perfect man employs his mind, it is a mirror. It conducts nothing and anticipates nothing; it responds, but does not retain. Thus he is able to deal successfully with all things, and injures none."

The ideal of non-action as the basis of ethics in the sense in which Lao-Tsze understands it, is very different from the expressions and moral preachings that the Western people, the energetic children of the North, are accustomed to. Nevertheless, there are remarkable coincidences with Lao-Tsze's ethics not only in Buddhism but also in the Bible and the literature of the Western sages.

The virtue of the Taoist, which is "tranquillity," "quietude," "rest" corresponds to the Biblical injunction: "Rest in the Lord!" (Psalm, 37, 7) and "In quietude shall be your strength!" (Isaiah, 30, 15), or, as the Apostle has it: "We beseech you, brethren, that ye study to be quiet."

This tranquillity, if acquired by all, becomes peace on earth to the men of good-will, and in this sense the ideal of Lao-Tsze's virtuous men is equivalent to the peacemakers to whom Christ promises the inheritance of the earth. The Bible characterises God in words that would have been very congenial to Lao-Tsze. We read:

"He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth; he

breaketh the bow and cutteth the spear in sunder; he burneth the chariot in the fire." (Ps. 46, 9.)

And the ethics of this God, who is the ideal of peace on earth, is stillness. The Psalmist continues:

"Be still and know that I am God."

That God should be conceived as non-action was a favorite idea of Philo, the Neo-Platonist, the same who for the first time used the term Logos in the sense in which it was adopted by the author of the Fourth Gospel. Philo calls God *ἀποιος*, the non-actor, not in the sense of being passive but as absolute existence, as the *ὄντως ὄν*. Indeed, "activity is as natural to God as burning is to fire" (*Leg. all.*, 1, 3), but God's activity is of a peculiar kind; it is efficiency, not exertion; it is not a particular work that he performs, but an omnipresent effectiveness which Philo finds difficult to characterise without falling a prey to mysticism. Philo was a mystic, and God to him is the Unnamable, the Unspeakable, *ἀκατονόμαστος καὶ ἄρρόητος*, which again reminds us of Lao-Tsze's doctrine that the eternal Tao is *wú míng*, "the Nameless."

Stillness, that is to say, self-possessed tranquillity, or quietude of soul is the condition of purity. Anything that agitates the mind disturbs it, for troubled waters cannot be limpid. Chwang-Tsze says:

"Sadness and pleasure show a depraving element in virtue; joy and anger show some error in their course; love and hatred show a failure of their virtue. . . . It is the nature of water, when free from admixture, to be clear, and, when not agitated, to be level; while, if obstructed and not allowed to flow, it cannot preserve its clearness;—being an image of the virtue of Heaven. Hence it is said to be guileless and pure, and free from all admixture; to be still and uniform, without undergoing any change; to be indifferent and not self-asserting; to move and yet to act like Heaven:—this is the way to nourish the spirit."

It is a remarkable coincidence that Tolstoi, who in many respects is similar to Lao-Tsze uses literally the very term *le non-agir*, which in Chinese could only be called *wú-wéi*. And Tolstoi's conception of non-acting is not passivity, not a total cessation of work, not indolence, but a tranquilisation, *ein sich besinnen*, the attainment of that peace of soul which is the condition of all well directed and properly guided work in life. Tolstoi actually indicts labor not as being activity, but in so far as labor is restlessness. Labor, in his opinion, is no virtue; labor is useless, nay, pernicious, for labor, such as keeps men too busy to leave them time for thought, is the curse of the world. Most of us, says Tolstoi, have not time for the consideration of truth and goodness, because we are rushed. An editor must arrange his journal, the general organises his troops, the engineer constructs an Eiffel tower, men of affairs arrange the World's Fair, the naturalist investigates heredity, philologists must count the frequency of various phrases in certain authors, and no one has leisure enough for a moment of rest; no one

<sup>1</sup>The term *laissez faire* has its exact counterpart in the Chinese *wú wéi*.

has time for finding that peace of soul which the world cannot give. They do anything except that which they ought to do first.

Yet it is thinking that reforms the world, not working, not laboring. Thought is the rudder that changes the course of the ship of toiling mankind; the energy of the steam that labors in turning the wheels is useful only so long as it is controlled by thought in the right way. For acquiring the right ideal that will guide us in the right direction, says Tolstoi, we need not labor, nor need we exert ourselves, on the contrary, we must abandon all exertion and become calm; if all men would only employ the tenth part of the energy that is wasted on the acquisition of purely material advantages, to settling the questions of their conscience, the world would soon be reformed.

Virtue, according to Lao-Tsze, is simply the imitation of the Tao. The Tao acts, but does not claim; it begets and quickens, but does not own; it directs and arranges, but does not lord.<sup>1</sup> The sage will not make a show of virtue, of benevolence, of justice, of propriety; he will make no pretense of being virtuous, but simply imitate in all things Heaven's Tao.<sup>2</sup>

The Tao's movement is "homeward or returning" (chapter 16, 40 *et passim*), which reminds us of Isaiah, who says:

"For thus saith the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel; in returning and rest shall ye be saved; in quietness and in confidence shall be your strength: and ye would not.

And the Psalmist says:

"Return unto thy rest, O my soul," 116, 7.

The agreement between the New Testament and Lao-Tsze becomes more surprising still when both insist on the paradox that weakness is strength. Lao-Tsze says:

"The softest overcomes the world's hardest." (Chapter 43.)

"The weak conquer the strong, the tender conquer the rigid." (Chapter 78.)

St. Paul uses the same expression:

"God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty." (1 Cor., 1, 27.)

"When I am weak then I am strong." (2 Cor., 12, 10.)

"My (i. e., God's) strength is made perfect in weakness." (*Ib.*, v. 9.)

As the Tao is the same to all people, so the sage will be the same to all people. He will make no discrimination. He will not repay badness with badness and cunning with cunning. The good he will meet with goodness, and the bad he will meet with goodness. The faithful he will meet with faith, and the faithless he will meet with faith. For the Tao is good, the Tao is faithful. (Chapter 49.)

Since genuine merit can be accomplished only

through non-assertion, the condition of greatness is modesty or lowliness. As the water that benefits all the world seeks always the lowest places, so the sage abhors self-exaltation. As Christ says, "Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased," and "he that shall humble himself shall be exalted," so Lao-Tsze compares the Tao of Heaven to a bow (Chapter 77); he says: "It brings down the high and exalts the lowly." Lao-Tsze says that the imperfect will be restored, the crooked shall be straightened, the valleys shall be filled (Chapter 20), which reminds one of the words of Isaiah (40, 4).

Christianity and Buddhism are classified by Schopenhauer as the religions of pessimism, because they recognise the existence of evil in the world from which we must seek salvation, and it is remarkable that in addition to several other similarities the Taoist philosophy would fall under the same category. Chwang-Tsze lets the robber K'í express his view on happiness in these words which apparently voice the author's opinion:

"The greatest longevity man can reach is a hundred years; a medium longevity is eighty years; the lowest longevity is sixty. Take away sickness, pining, bereavement, mourning, anxieties, and calamities, the times when, in any of these, one can open his mouth and laugh, are only four or five days in a month. Heaven and earth have no limit of duration, but the death of man has its (appointed) time."

The world is full of anxiety and misery; and the salvation consists solely in a surrender of that craving for happiness and enjoyment which is in common people the main spring of action. This surrender is attained in *wú-wéi*, or non-assertion, leading to *chán*, truth; to simplicity, *p'òh* or *p'ú*; to sincerity, *chih*; to *shùn*, purity. The natural result of Lao-Tsze's philosophy is the ethical ideal of the sage, the saintly man, *shing zhín*, or, as later Taoists have it, the true man, *chán zhín*.<sup>1</sup> Chwang-Tsze says (Book XV.):

"The human spirit goes forth in all directions, flowing on without limit, reaching to heaven above, and wreathing round the earth beneath. It transforms and nourishes all things, and cannot be represented by any form. Its name is 'Divinity (in man)'. It is only the path of pure simplicity which guards and preserves the Spirit. When this path is preserved and not lost, it becomes one with the Spirit; and in this ethereal amalgamation it acts in harmony with the orderly operation of Heaven.

"There is the vulgar saying, 'The multitude of men consider gain to be the most important thing; pure scholars, fame; those who are wise and able value their ambition; the sage prizes essential purity.' Therefore simplicity is the denomination of that in which there is no admixture; purity of that in which the spirit is not impaired. It is he who can embody simplicity and purity whom we call the True Man." *Sacred Books of the East*, XXXIX., p. 367.

<sup>1</sup> For *Chán*, see p. 15; for *shùn*, p. 783; for *shing*, p. 773, and for *chih*, *sin cere*, p. 68, in *Williams's Syllabic Dictionary*. For *p'ú*, plain, see p. 710; its contracted form, *p'òk*, p. 711.—The pronunciation *shing shín*, "the holy man," is old; the modern pronunciation according to Williams is *shing zhín*.

An exhaustive description of the true man is given by Chwang-Tsze in Book VI., where we read:

"What is meant by 'the True Man'?"

"The True men of old did not reject (the views of) the few; they did not seek to accomplish (their ends) like heroes (before others); they did not lay plans to attain those ends. Being such, though they might make mistakes, they had no occasion for repentance; though they might succeed, they had no self-complacency. Being such, they could ascend the loftiest heights without fear; they could pass through water without being made wet by it; they could go into fire without being burnt; so it was that by their knowledge they ascended to and reached the Tao.

"The True men of old did not dream when they slept, had no anxiety when they awoke, and did not care that their food should be pleasant. Their breathing came deep and silently.

"When men are defeated in argument, their words come from their gullets as if they were vomiting. Where lusts and desires are deep, the springs of the Heavenly are shallow.

"The True men of old knew nothing of the love of life or of the hatred of death. Entrance into life occasioned them no joy; the exit from it awakened no resistance. Composedly they went and came. They did not forget what their beginning had been, and they did not inquire into what their end would be. They accepted their lot and rejoiced in it; they forgot fear of death and returned to their state before life. Thus there was in them what is called the want of any mind to resist the Tao, and of all attempts by means of the Human to assist the Heavenly. Such were they who are called the True men.

"The True men of old presented the aspect of judging others aright, but without being partisans; of feeling their own insufficiency, but being without flattery or cringing. Their peculiarities were natural to them, but they were not obstinately attached to them; their humility was evident, but there was nothing of unreality or display about it." *Ibid.*, p. 237, 238, 240.

Lao-Tsze declares that the true man is not hurt by fire or water, and that he need not fear either the rhinoceros or tiger, which is explained by Chwang-Tsze in Book XVII.:

"Fire cannot burn him who is perfect in virtue, nor water drown him; neither cold nor heat can affect him injuriously; neither bird nor beast can hurt him. This does not mean that he is indifferent to these things; it means that he discriminates between where he may safely rest and where he will be in peril; that he is tranquil equally in calamity and happiness; that he is careful what he avoids and what he approaches;—so that nothing can injure him. Hence it is said: 'What is heavenly is internal; what is human is external.'

"Virtue is in what is heavenly. If you know the operation of what is heavenly and what is human, you will have your root in what is heavenly and your position in virtue." *Ibid.*, p. 383.

The sage is above death; he is one with the Tao:

"Death and life are great considerations, but they could work no change in him. Though heaven and earth were to be overturned and fall, they would occasion him no loss. His judgment is fixed on that in which there is no element of falsehood; and, while other things change, he changes not. The transformations of things are to him the developments prescribed for them, and he keeps fast hold of the author of them."

It was natural that in the course of the further development of the Taoist movement the old philosopher was more and more regarded as *the* true man, beside whom all the others were mere aspirants for saintli-

ness. His life was adorned with tales which are strong imitations of Buddhistic legends, and he became the central figure of a triune deity called the Three Pure Ones, which are even in appearance very similar to the Buddhist Trinity of the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Sangha.

### MARTIN LUTHER.<sup>1</sup>

BY GUSTAV FREYTAG.

[CONTINUED.]

A LETTER OF LUTHER TO THE PRINCE-ELECTOR OF SAXONY.

To let Luther speak for himself we publish here a letter to the Prince-Elector Frederick the Wise, written in those days in which Luther had his whole strength most powerfully concentrated. The prudent Prince had ordered him to remain at the Wartburg, as he could not protect him at Wittenberg, for the angry Duke of Saxony, his cousin, would at once insist upon executing the sentence against the outlawed Luther. Luther wrote thus to his sovereign:

"Most serene and august Prince-Elector, most gracious Lord:—Your Princely Grace's writing and gracious warning reached me Friday evening, when I meant to ride away Sunday morning. That your Princely Grace has the very best intentions, requires neither proof nor witness for me, for I hold myself convinced thereof as far as human knowledge goes.

"But in my affair, most gracious lord, I answer thus: Your Princely Grace knows, or, if you do not know, I herewith make known to you, that I have the Gospel, not from men, but alone from Heaven, through our Lord Jesus Christ, so that I could well have praised and written myself a servant and evangelist, which I mean to do from this time forward. That I offered myself for hearing and judgment, however, was done not because I doubted the truth, but from excessive humility, to win over the others. I have done enough for your Princely Grace by having vacated my place this year to please your Princely Grace. For the Devil knows very well that I did it through no fear. He saw my heart well when I arrived at Worms, for had I known that as many devils were in wait for me as there are tiles on the roofs, I should still have leaped among them with joy.

"Now, Duke George is very unlike even to a single devil. And since the Father of inscrutable mercy has by the Gospel made us joyful masters over all devils and death and has given us the wealth of confidence that we may say to him, 'Dearly beloved Father,' your Princely Grace may yourself conjecture that it would be the highest disgrace to such a Father if we did not have confidence in Him that we are also masters of Duke George's wrath. As for myself, I know well I would ride right into his Leipsic—your Princely Grace

<sup>1</sup> Translated by H. E. O. Heinemann.

will pardon my foolish speech—though it should, for nine days, rain only Dukes George, and each one was nine times as furious as this one. He thinks my Master Christ a man waddled together of straw, which this my master and myself may well suffer for a while. But I will not conceal from your Princely Grace that I have prayed and wept for Duke George not once but very often that God might enlighten him. I will pray and weep once more, afterwards nevermore. And I beg your Princely Grace will also help and have prayers said that we may turn from him the misfortune which, O Lord God! is moving upon him without intermission. I might strangle Duke George quickly with a word if that would end the matter.

“This is written to your Princely Grace in the thought that you know that I am coming to Wittenberg under much higher protection than that of the Prince-Elector. Nor is it in my mind to require protection from your Princely Grace. Nay, I deem I could protect your Princely Grace more than you could protect me. Even if I knew your Princely Grace could and would protect me, I should not come; in this matter no sword can either counsel or help; God must here work alone without any human assistance. Hence, he who believes best will here protect best.

“Since, then, I feel that your Princely Grace is still very weak in the faith, I can nowise regard your Princely Grace as the man who could protect or save me.

“Since your Princely Grace desires to know what to do in this matter, particularly as you think you have done far too little, I answer most humbly your Princely Grace has already done entirely too much and ought to do nothing. For God will not and cannot suffer your care and action or mine. He wants it left to Himself and none other. Your Princely Grace may govern yourself accordingly.

“If your Princely Grace believe this, you will be secure and have peace; if you do not believe, still I believe and must allow the lack of faith of your Princely Grace to torment itself with that care which all who lack faith justly suffer. Since, then, I will not follow your Princely Grace, you will be excused before God should I be captured or killed. Before men your Princely Grace should conduct yourself in this wise. As a prince-elector you should be obedient to authority and allow imperial majesty to do in your cities and lands in regard to life and property as is proper according to the laws of the empire, and must not defend yourself or resist, nor seek opposition or any obstacle against that power should it want to take or kill me. For no one shall break that power but He alone that instituted it, otherwise it is rebellious and is against God. I hope, however, they will use reason and understand that your Princely Grace was

born in too lofty a cradle to become my jailor. If your Princely Grace leave the gate open and observe the safe-conduct of the Prince-Elector, if the enemies themselves come to fetch me, or their emissaries, your Princely Grace will have done enough to satisfy obedience. They cannot require more of your Princely Grace than that they want to learn of the whereabouts of Luther from your Princely Grace. And that they shall have without care, labor, or danger to your Princely Grace. For Christ did not teach me to be a Christian to the injury of another. Should they be so unreasonable, however, as to order that your Princely Grace yourself lay hands on me, I shall then tell you what is to be done. I will secure your Princely Grace from injury and danger of body, goods, and soul in my cause, whether your Princely Grace believe this or not.

“So I commend your Princely Grace to the mercy of God; we will discuss further measures when it becomes necessary. For I have made this writing ready hurriedly that your Princely Grace may not be seized with sadness at the rumor of my arrival, for I must and shall become a solace to all and not an injury if I would be a true Christian. He is another than Duke George with Whom I am treating; He knows me quite well, and I know Him not ill. If your Princely Grace had faith you would see the glory of God. But because you do not yet believe, you have not yet seen anything. God be loved and praised forevermore. Amen.

“Given at Borna, in presence of the guide on Ash Wednesday, A. D. 1522.

“Your Princely Grace’s humble servant  
“MARTIN LUTHER.”

[TO BE CONCLUDED.]

---

## THE OPEN COURT.

“THE MONOR,” 324 DEARBORN ST.,

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, POST OFFICE DRAWER F.

E. C. HEGELER, PUBLISHER.

DR. PAUL CARUS, EDITOR.

---

Terms: Throughout the Postal Union, \$1.50 per year, 75 cents for six months; in the United States, Canada, and Mexico, \$1.00 per year, 50 cents for six months.

---

### CONTENTS OF NO. 484.

|   |      |
|---|------|
| WHY CHAMBORD WAS NOT MADE KING OF                       |      |
| FRANCE. THEODORE STANTON.....                           | 5143 |
| LAO-TSZE'S TAO-TEH KING. Lao-Tsze's Ethics.             |      |
| EDITOR.....   | 5146 |
| MARTIN LUTHER. (Continued.) A Letter of Luther          |      |
| to the Prince-Elector of Saxony. GUSTAV FREYTAG... 5149 |      |