THE FAILURE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.
BY PROF. E. D. COPE.

It is generally understood that government has been established for the purpose of securing safety to life and property, and the protection of mankind from interruption and loss while in the pursuit of their avocations. During the recent labor strikes there has been a lamentable failure on the part of numerous officials of the city and State governments where these strikes have occurred, to secure these necessary benefits for which government exists. This has resulted from incompetency on the part of these officials, and in some instances from sympathy with the criminal acts of the strikers. Under the head of incompetency I include that demagogy which fears to execute the law, when law-breakers are sufficiently numerous to constitute an important body of voters.

Governor Waite of Colorado has displayed the most signal failure to protect the lives and property of his constituents. It never before occurred in the history of our country that a Governor of a State ordered out the militia to prevent a sheriff and his deputies from arresting law-breakers in open insurrection. Now that the people of Colorado have had a taste of what anarchism in office means, it is scarcely probable that such a usurpation can happen again. It is a fit termination of such a farce that the adjutant-general of the militia of the State was tarred and feathered! The general government stepped in and arrested without form of local warrant the people whom Governor Waite was protecting. The general government was the only resource of the people of Colorado, since their local government had completely failed.

Governor Pattison of Pennsylvania has not shown the anarchistic tendencies of Waite, but an imbecility, which may be interpreted as demagoguery or timidity. For several months riots of a most destructive character have taken place in the coke-burning and coal-mining regions of the interior of the State, with little hindrance. Thousands of dollars worth of property have been burned and many lives sacrificed by strikers. Many men who have been willing to work have been brutally abused and rendered incapable of supporting their families for longer or shorter periods. The deputy sheriffs, in spite of much courage and hard work, have been unable to suppress these destructive proceedings, although they have done good service on several occasions. Several of them have lost their lives. The only action that the Governor took for several weeks was to consult with somebody as to the possibility of settling the difficulty by arbitration. But the Governor well knew two things: first, that measures were not needed to terminate strikes, which are perfectly lawful proceedings; and, second, that measures were needed to protect life and property in certain parts of the State. It is not good government to propose to arbitrate with the murderer who has just killed your friend and who has just burned your house. After the riots had nearly spent themselves, the Governor, stimulated by the press, sent a few troops to another region, where the situation was not worse than it had been elsewhere for several weeks. It looks as though hunger had done more to suppress murder and arson in Western Pennsylvania than any other agency. But the lost lives and property cannot be restored. Justice requires that payment for these losses shall be made, but who shall be the payer? With such a man as Pattison in the presidential chair, one would tremble for the country.

In the same spirit of fear of something, Mayor Hopkins of Chicago, instead of promptly suppressing incendiaryism, malicious mischief, and assaults on workmen, wasted his time in talking about arbitration. Such a course of conduct shows either fundamental ignorance of the uses of government, or something worse. It makes no difference what the grounds of the strike, whether just or unjust; the question before the Mayor was a totally different one. The practical result was that the destruction went on unhindered, until, under the President's proclamation, the troops of the general government appeared on the scene. The tardy action of Governor Altgeld hardly counted for much in the result, except to show that local government in Chicago and in Illinois was as great a failure as in Colorado and in Pennsylvania. The destruction has occurred, lives have been lost, many men have been brutally assaulted, and immense loss has accrued to both the laboring and capitalistic classes. Of course, the capitalistic class can stand it better than the laborers. Now, Mayor Hopkins was
the candidate of the "people," which probably includes many of the workingmen of Chicago. Perhaps in future they will look a little more carefully into the qualifications of the man in whose hands they place the protection of their lives and properties!

But what shall we say of California? For a week the entire State was in control of a mob. Not a wheel turned on a railroad. The capital of the State was occupied by an armed insurrection. The Governor (Markham) humbly asked permission of the strikers to be permitted to ride on a train to San Francisco from his summer retreat. He was promptly refused. So he said where he was, ignoring the water communication at his disposal. The conditions being too bad to be overlooked, he dispatched a few companies of militia to Sacramento. On being ordered to expel the rioters from the railroad property, one company promptly threw down its arms. The pretensions of the mob were up to the highest standard of old time California inflation. Having possessed themselves of the State; they would drive off the regular troops of the Government. The State government was a conspicuous failure; Governor and militia; mayor, sheriff, and deputies, were alike overawed. But mark the result. Before the United States regulars appeared at Sacramento, the boastful rioters had betaken themselves to safe retreats, and the rebellion was over. Their only act of resistance was a dastardly piece of cowardice; the tampering with a trestle, so that a train was wrecked, and two trainmen and three soldiers were killed. In California the failure of the local authorities was more general than elsewhere; while the mischief done by the rioters was not equal to their pretensions. Here as elsewhere the failure of the local government rendered the intervention of the national government necessary.

In striking contrast to the imbecility displayed by the local authorities already referred to, stands the conduct of Governor Brown of Maryland, and Governor Matthews of Indiana. Both these executives had sufficient force at the scenes of rioting so promptly, that little or no damage was done in Maryland, and the riots at Hammond, Indiana, were promptly suppressed.

It is to be hoped that no serious riots will occur in Detroit during the term of Mayor Pingree, as he appears to be afflicted with the Hopkinsian rickets. His desire to have the mayors of the chief cities of the country to join in a request to the Pullman company to arbitrate, shows that, should Detroit be fired by rioters, he may play the arbitration fiddle while the city burns!

The sum of the matter is that in four States of the Union, three of them of the most wealthy, life and property have not been safe at numerous points and over a considerable period of time. I have not referred to two other States, West Virginia and Ohio, where much destruction took place during the miners' strike, just prior to the railroad strike. In both States the suppression of the disorders was exceedingly slow, and in one or two cases in Ohio, the militia are reported to have proved inefficient.

It will be henceforth a question with some capitalists in the States in question, whether it will be safe to continue business there. Capital must seek regions where its enterprises are protected, and where life and property are safe. In such States population and wealth will increase, while in those where such protection is not assured, the reverse process will take place. It may also be confidently expected, that if in future, the local governments prove as incompetent, as they have done during the recent strikes, the national government will take their place. In fact it is demonstrated already that the local machinery of sheriffs and deputies is unfit to cope with serious disorder. And if governors must wait until a few deputies are killed before they grant them the support of the militia, it will be difficult to find men to serve as deputies.

Something may yet be done to save the repute of municipal and State government. If Pattison, Altgeld, Waite, and Markham, with Mayor Hopkins, are impeached, the future will be better assured. The court-martialeding of the company that threw down its arms at Sacramento is absolutely necessary to convince the world that California is not governed by hoodlums. The rapidity with which their opponents disappeared on the approach of danger, renders the position of this unfortunate company all the more ridiculous. But let all be done that can be, it still remains that the democratic doctrine of State rights has received the severest blow it ever experienced. Even the results of the war have not such a potent effect on public opinion as this failure of the constituted authorities to protect the ordinary life of the communities.

There have not been wanting some humors of the situation. According to E. V. Debs, the strikers, after having lost their wages and their positions, have won "a great victory." This can only be predicated on the immense damage they have inflicted on the public, including the railroads. The proposition to arbitrate remains as absurd as ever it was; and the condition that the American Railway Union will not "consent to arbitration" until the strikers are reinstated, is one of the humors referred to. This is like a previous observation from the same source;—that "the strikers will not assist the military." A remark which is distinctly Chicagoesque, showing that E. V. D. & Co. imagine, like some of their fellow citizens, that they "possess the earth." When justice is done, however, by the courts both local and national, many cheerful destroyers of other people's property, will have found that they have pursued a wrong course. Property and life will be secure ultimately, no matter what vicissitudes
our government may pass through in order to secure it. Democrats and Republicans are alike agreed on this point, and those who differ with them form but a small part of the population. Laborers may strike or use any other lawful means of increasing their wages, but they must not interfere with men who are willing to work while they prefer to be idle.

Ultimately it will be discovered that the rate of wages, is like the price of commodities, subject to the law of supply and demand. This is a natural law, and if it works hardship, it only does so where too many men wish to perform the same kind of labor. The cure for this is to go into fields of work that are not already full; or if all be full, to migrate to new pastures, of which the world is full.

Paine's Escape from the Guillotine, 1794, and His Escape from the Pious Pillory, 1804.

BY M. D. CONWAY.

I have received many inquiries concerning the authenticity of the story of Paine's escape from the guillotine, through the accident of his cell-door being open and flat against the wall when the turnkey passed in the night, marking the doors of those doomed for the morning, the chalk-mark thus being brought inside. Most of Paine's biographers have been shy of this story, either because there is in it suggestion of a mythical derivation from the destroying angel, or because Paine's first narrative of his escape said nothing of the chalk-mark. Thomas Carlyle, for crediting the story in his "History of the French Revolution," has been sharply attacked by an English writer, J. G. Alger, who has gathered his articles from magazines in America and England into two volumes,—one "Englishmen in the French Revolution," published some years ago, the other "Glimpses of the French Revolution" (1894). In the first of these entertaining but uncritical and inaccurate books, Alger challenged Carlyle's statement, but revealed his ignorance of the source of the story. He had got hold of a legendary version of it in an obituary of Sampson Perry, printed in 1823, and says this "is the sole authority I have been able to find for the fable," etc. This story is certainly fabulous, for it makes out that Paine and Perry occupied the same room in Luxembourg prison, and that both escaped by the fortunately misplaced mark. "Later in the day," adds the Perry obituary, "the keeper came round again, was astonished to find Paine and Perry there, but before he could take any steps he was shot by an infuriated mob, who had burst open the prison and liberated the captives just as Robespierre was being led to the scaffold." Alger leaped to the conclusion that this fable was told by Perry, who was not lodged with Paine, and concluded that he had a clear case against Carlyle and the story.

Unfortunately, however, he had not read Paine, who told the story twenty-one years before the Perry obituary. This Alger discovered before writing his new volume. He now attacks Paine's version also, but makes misquotations and comes to grief over the whole thing. The only point of importance made is the fact that in 1795 Paine expressed his belief that it was owing to a violent fever, in which he lay insensible, that he was not carried out to execution, and in 1802 explained his escape by the chalk-mark story. There is, however, no inconsistency, as Alger would have discovered had he read the documents recently published concerning Paine. In the Luxembourg prison Paine was placed in the same room with three others, one of these being a Belgian named Vanhuele. Paine was delirious with fever, and when he came to his senses Robespierre had fallen. His room-mates had disappeared. He learned from Barère, who had been one of Robespierre's committee-men, that a sentence had issued against him, and indeed the committee who after Robespierre's death examined his papers reported in the Convention an entry for Paine's "accusation." Paine wrote (Preface to the "Age of Reason," 1795): "From what cause it was that the intention was not put in execution I know not, and cannot inform myself; and therefore I ascribe it to impossibility on account of that illness." But because Paine was not informed in 1795 it does not follow that he could not be informed in 1802, when he first published the chalk-mark story. His comrade and fellow-prisoner, Vanhuele, became Mayor of Bruges, and in the year 1800 Paine paid him a visit there. The two then for the first time had an opportunity of talking over events in the Luxembourg, and there is little doubt that Paine learned from Vanhuele the curious incident by which their lives had been saved. There is no reason to doubt the truth of the story. It is not one that Paine could have invented. In saying that "the destroying angel passed by" his door Paine perceives the resemblance to the biblical story of Israel in Egypt, but this story, and the marking of the oil-jars in the tale of the "Forty Thieves," simply show how natural and universal was the method of identification used in the Luxembourg prison. Paine also says "it happened, if happening is the proper word." He was answering his theological antagonists, and may have meant that if anybody could show providential interposition he could; but he perhaps suspected that some of the prison officials had connived in an artifice to save him. However this may be, he published the story in a work which he knew would be at once republished in England and France, and that not only his three fellow-prisoners, but thousands would be able to contradict his statements if untrue. There were numerous religious enemies of Paine in England and
America who would certainly have ferreted out any inaccuracy in a story which Paine’s friends were utilising against those who called him an “infidel.” Providence, they said, seems to be on the side of infidelity. Apart from the fact that the story is intrinsically one which Paine could not have invented, it seems certain that unless true it could not have passed unchallenged through the life-time of thousands familiar with the events of the time and place, to be questioned only after ninety years by the hasty and inexact Mr. Alger. His aim was not Paine, but Thomas Carlyle. He will have reason to remember Emerson’s advice to the young man who criticised Plato: “He who shoots at the king ought to kill him.” Alger’s arrow, after proving a pointer to Carlyle’s historical carefulness, has recoiled on himself.

There are certain historical personalities by whom the movements of civilisation may be measured. Events have made them into ensigns. Lord Brougham said (I quote from memory) that political civilisation might be measured in any country by what men generally thought of George Washington. The Washington in his mind was not the individual as critically revealed, but a representative character. In the same sense I remark the present position of Paine in England as a sign of the time. And here I must give some experiences at the risk of appearing egotistical. I am continually asked to lecture about Paine, and though compelled by my occupations to decline many of these invitations, in the instances where I have complied, the audiences, to me strangers, have manifested the utmost enthusiasm for the outlaw of 1793. Paine has been the means of my first appearance in an orthodox chapel in London. Since the death of Spurgeon, the leading Baptist minister in London is the Rev. Dr. Clifford, who is eloquent, and much more generous in his sentiments towards heretics than Spurgeon, though quite orthodox. The young people of his society have a large Bible class, and have instituted courses of lectures from “representatives of various schools of thought.” Not long ago they had a lecture from a Jewish rabbi, and were fiercely attacked in one or two Christian papers for that. But, unsubdued by that attack, they straightway requested me to lecture to them about Paine, without the slightest suggestion of any restriction on my liberty of utterance. On the contrary, it was made evident to me that they desired introduction to the genuine Paine, just as he was, and that I tried to give them. The beautiful Westbourne Park Chapel was filled. Dr. Clifford was in the pulpit with me; the usual prayer, hymns, and Scripture readings preceded; and the applause during the lecture, especially at passages read from Paine, and the speeches that followed from Dr. Clifford and others, showed that the demonstration was by no means to the lecturer but to the “doubly-damned Tom Paine.” And although the event has elicited from the religious organ which jealously guards Baptist orthodoxy demands for disciplinary dealings with Dr. Clifford, I observe that it is all on my account, nothing at all being said against Paine. In fact, although most of the English papers have recently contained articles or reviews concerning Paine, I have not seen one which has assailed him as a religious heretic. His political principles cannot now be objected to, being really the present Constitution of England, or what liberal Englishmen wish it to be considered. Your readers will, I trust, understand that it is not merely the biographical interest of these gleanings concerning Paine which have induced me to occupy lately so much of your space with them. By history this Thetford Quaker has been set for the falling and rising of many, a sign to be spoken against, that thoughts out of many hearts should be revealed; and his epoch will not be quite closed so long as the world is without one genuine republic.

Westbourne Park Chapel gave me a good point of view from which to inspect a collection of political coins and medals struck a hundred years ago, and now in the British Museum. One is a half-penny of January 21, 1793: Obverse, a man hanging on a gibbet, with a church in the distance; motto, “End of Pain.” Reverse, an open book, inscribed “The Wongs of Man.” A token: Bust of Paine, with his name; reverse, “The Mountain in Labour, 1793.” A farthing (1791) with Paine gibbeted; reverse, breeches burning, and legend “Pandora’s breeches”; beneath, a serpent decapitated by a dagger, the severed head being that of Paine. Another farthing with Paine gibbeted; reverse, a number of combustibles intermixed with labels issuing from a globe inscribed “Fraternity”; the labels inscribed “Regicide,” “Robbery,” “Falsity,” “Requisition”; legend, “French Reforms, 1797”; near by, a church with flag, on it the cross. Half penny, not dated, but no doubt struck in 1794, when the rumor reached London that Paine had been

1 Some time ago I wrote for The Open Court an article pointing out the unrepresenational nature of disproportionate representation as embodied in the United States Senate. I owe apologies to two respected writers who criticised my statement in your columns. Their estimates of the Senate seemed to me to require only a few sentences of reply, and these I did not doubt would be supplied in one of those admirable mutes which were appearing in your columns from the pen of General Trumbull. Also, I knew not that the pen was falling from that faithful hand in which it was wielded as bravely as the sword, and like it only for human welfare. As for the critics, I cannot see that they really touched the issue made by General Trumbull and myself. They assert that the Senate is essential to the State-system of America, but that does not prove the system to be good. There are large provinces in France (Brittany, Normandy, etc.) and in Great Britain (Scotland, Wales, etc.) but they do not require to be made into a legislative chamber. In a republic the unit of representation is the human individual, not a geographical province, like Scotland or Rhode Island. The theoretical utility of a second chamber is to restrain popular precipitation by graver, older (Seniores — Senators) revision. Is the Senate now doing that? It has never done that; and it is impossible for an assembly representing provincial pride and local self-interest to exercise any such influence. It must proceed from the concience and patriotism of the whole nation.
guillotined: Paine on gibbet; above, a devil seated, smoking a pipe; reverse, a monkey dancing, with legend, “We dance, Pain swings.” A farthing: three men hanging on a gallows; inscription, “The three Thomas’s, 1796.” Reverse, “May the three knives of Jacobin clubs never get a trick.” The three Thomases were Thomas Paine, Sir Thomas More, and Thomas Spence. (In 1794 Thomas Spence, an author, was imprisoned seven months for advocating the republican principles applauded in Westbourne Park Chapel, and especially for publishing some of Paine’s political works at his press, which he called the “Hive of Liberty.”) Among these coined curses, much repeated, there are two of an opposite character. One farthing represents Pitt on a gibbet, against which a ladder is resting; inscription, “End of P [here an eye] T.” Reverse, face of Pitt conjoined with that of a devil, and legend, “Even Fellows.” Another farthing resembles the last, the inscription on reverse being, “Such is the reward of tyrants, 1796.” These anti-Pitt farthings were struck by Thomas Spence, 8 Little Turnstile, Holborn, a few steps from the bookstore of freethinking works long kept by the venerable Edward Truelove, who owns the table on which Paine wrote several of his republican works. Should there ever be a Paine Exhibition in London, it will bring forth many historical relics, and exhume strange facts and records that have never seen the light.

CHAPTERS FROM THE NEW APOCRYPHA.

BY HUDOR GENONE.

CAESAR’S TREASURE.

While Jesus tarried by the seaside, certain of the multitudes which had heard him came unto him.

And one of these asked him concerning the doctrine of the Kingdom of Heaven, saying unto him:

Rabbi, explain unto us this saying of thine that the last should be first and the first last, for many are called, but few are chosen.

Now, there were on the sea many ships; and as they sailed towards the haven where they would be, even unto where Jesus and they that questioned him stood. Jesus lifted up his voice and saith, O men of Israel, behold yonder ships; which of them, I pray you, beareth the greatest treasure?

And they looked upon the ships; and when they had looked they said unto Jesus, How can we tell? Lo, every ship hath sails set alike, and every ship draweth nigh unto the land.

Jesus saith unto them, Look again. Are all the ships alike?

And they, having looked again, said, Nay, but some are greater and others are less.

Jesus saith unto them, Doth the greater ship bear the greater treasure?

They answered him, We cannot tell.

Jesus saith unto them, Look again. Though some of the ships be greater and some be less, are they yet all alike?

They answered him, Nay, but some be swifter than the others.

Jesus saith, Doth the swifter ship bear the greater treasure?

They answered, Nay, Lord; but the swifter ship hath, more likely, the lighter burden.

Jesus saith again unto them, Ye cannot tell which of the ships hath the greater treasure; for though some be greater, and some swifter; yet it may well be that not by greatness nor by swiftness can ye tell.

They said unto him, True, Lord; we cannot tell.

Now the ships drew nigh unto the land. And that ship which came first was empty.

And the next likewise. But others were laden; some with wheat and corn, and yet others with spices and fruits.

And when the last ship came unto the haven, behold, that ship was the least of all the ships.

But, as they stood by, the captain of that little ship called unto all the people, saying, Give room, for I bear a gift from Caesar unto Pilate.

And all the people and all the other ships gave room for him who came with authority from Caesar, even for him who bore Caesar’s treasure.

And Jesus saith unto them who were round about him: Learn a lesson of the ships. For the gift is not always in the great, nor the treasure in the swift.

And again, only they who be in the treasure-ship know of the treasure it doth bear.

Save only Caesar, and him unto whom Caesar sendeth the treasure.

THE LATEST DEVELOPMENT OF AN OLD DISEASE.

There was a man apparently in the best of health who on awaking one morning after a jolly evening of merry-making found the limbs on the right side of his body paralysed. The physician was sent for. He came and examined the patient; and considering all the symptoms shook his head deliberately and said, “There is some disturbance in the capsula interna, left side. It may be a tumor but it most probably is due only to the rupture of a small blood-vessel. You must have been extremely merry yesterday, flushed with liquor and hilarity. A number of blood-corpuscles in your brain got too much excited and, overconscious of its own importance, a vessel has burst, shedding its contents between the lenticular body and the nerve-fibres. If this is the case you will remain paralysed for about nine days, until the blood is reabsorbed by the surrounding parts of the capsule. But if the cause of the disturbance be a tumor you will be paralysed for life.”
The patient looked aghast: "Paralysed for life—a whole life-time?" he interrupted the doctor's speech. "Don't be alarmed," continued the physician patiently, "your case is not bad. A life-time under such circumstances won't be very long. The tumor will spread over the adjacent parts of the brain and that will end the whole sickness at once."

The patient did not feel comfortable. At last he queried: "What do you call this sickness of mine?"

"Interference with the United States Mails," said the doctor.

"That is a new sickness! Is it not?"

"Yes or no, as you may take it. It is the latest development only of an old and long-known malady. Thus it is not quite new; it is as old as the existence of complicated organisms upon earth. The sickness is critical but it is in the nature of its conditions that it never lasts long. It will either pass by as quickly as it has come and give the patient a lesson to be more careful should he become a trifle too jolly again, or it will terminate the life of the whole organism. In the latter case, viz., if the interference is of a malignant character caused by a tumor or cancer, the illness may be protracted for years, but the patient will be in most cases as good as dead; he will be intellectually dead, for he will live in a continuous stupor without pains and ignorant of his sad plight."

Stricken with this strange malady, the patient was anxious to hear more about it, and the doctor gave the following explanation:

Organisms are centralised and the centre of the human organism is the brain. Now almost all the sensory nerve-fibres which ascend from the skin of the various limbs of the body to the brain, and also almost all the motor nerve-fibres which descend from the brain to the various muscles converge in each hemisphere into a narrow passage which is called by physiologists a capsule. There are two capsules, one large one breaking through the lenticular body and the caudate body called capsule interna, and another small one passing down on the outside of the lenticular body. The arteries and veins of the lenticular body are unusually delicate and may easily be ruptured. Now, suppose a rupture takes place right where the inner capsule is, a spot of coagulated blood would compress all the nerve-fibres and prevent any message of the brain reaching the limbs. This is what may properly be called interference with the United States mails, for it is a meddlesome with the business of the federal government of the body.

If Menenius Agrippa had lived in our days he would not have told his fable of the stomach and the limbs to the striking coal-miners and the striking switchmen, but the story of the inner capsule.

The blood-vessels of the capsule interna, he would have said to the Miner's Union and to the American Railway Union, got it into their heads that their services were indispensable and that they could run the whole social body in matters economical and political, if they only would persistently cut off the bounties under their control. It was easy enough to do so, on the supposition that they themselves would discontinue to attend to their work and allow no one else to take their places. They would only have to seize the opportunity and hold it by all means, whatever might come of it, and the rest of the world would soon have to come to terms. The proposition is simple enough, but is it feasible?

The details of the story of the internal capsule strike are mutatis mutandis similar to those of the fable of the striking stomach, and the application is the same. The strike of the American Railway Union is new in its peculiar complications only, but the case is as old as society, and the first great satire that to our knowledge has been written on it is Aristophanes's ingenious comedy entitled "The Birds."

More than two thousand years ago the Athenians devised a pretty scheme for running the universe. If they could but seize Syracuse they would be masters of the strait of Messina, as it is now called, then the main artery of commerce in the Mediterranean. That would surrender to them Sicily and Magna Græcia, the southern part of Italy. Dominating Sicily and Magna Græcia and controlling the sea routes of the Mediterranean, they would be masters of all trade and commerce of the then known world. What a fine scheme! But it stood upon a slender basis, for these sea routes were in the hands of other powers, the various great cities and States, and these powers would not be willing to surrender without a fight that would necessarily be for life and death; and Athens had neither the power, nor the perseverance and indispensable self-control, nor the wisdom to seize and to hold all these opportunities.

There were so many suppositions taken for granted, so many an "if this were so" remained unconsidered when the people of Athens ventured into this bold enterprise, that the end of it was the saddest and most complete wreck of the greatest and best equipped expedition that ever left the harbor of Athens. Not one man who went out ever returned to his native city, and the decay of the republic dates from this sanguine enterprise.

Aristophanes saw the danger and decided to give a warning to his countrymen. This was the occasion of his writing the comedy of "The Birds."

Two Athenians, Peisthetairos, the persuader, and Euelpides, the sanguine hoper, leave their home to join the birds. They climb up as high as they can in quest of a world free from the tribulations of life [vv.
and make the acquaintance of the hoopoe, who, according to a Greek fable, had formerly been a man, and was changed into a bird. To him they propose their plans, which if carried out will give to the birds unequivocal control of the universe. Their advice is to form a strong union, to build a city in the air, and to fortify it. This done, they will govern mankind like grasshoppers and starve the gods into obedience [vv. 185-186], “for,” says Peisthetairos, “the air is in the middle between heaven and earth. When we want to go to the Pythian temple of Apollo, we ask the Boeotians, in whose territory Delphi lies, for permission. So, when men offer gifts to the gods, you must no longer allow the odor of the sacrifice to pass through your realm.” [vv. 188-194.] A great mass-meeting of the birds is called. After some difficulty the two Athenians succeed in persuading the citizens of the air that the feathered world was prior to the gods and had, at the beginning, ruled the affairs of the world; even now they were in possession of the means to reassert their old rights, and should boldly take the government that belonged to them. The motion is made to unite all birds into one great city, to secure the air by walls, and boldly ask Zeus to abdicate his power. Should he refuse, the celestials should no longer be allowed to pass through the city of the birds [vv. 548-560]. That will soon bring the gods to terms and make the birds actual rulers of the universe [v. 565]. The motion is carried and acted upon. The name of the city is Cloudland (νεφελωνια, i.e., the cloud-cuckoo-town).

Iris, the messenger of the gods, sent down to mankind by Zeus, who begins to feel the effects of the interception of all sacrifices, is stopped by Peisthetairos and treated with contempt. “Should we,” says Peisthetairos, “who rule the rest of the world, suffer your insolence? No, you must learn to obey us and recognise that we are more powerful than you.”

When Iris threatens that Zeus will use his thunderbolts, Peisthetairos turns the tables and declares that his divine palace will be burned down, and the chorus of birds proclaims an injunction upon the gods not to pass through Cloudland.

Now the victory is gained. Men from the dark walks of life, a hungry poet, blackmailers, informers, parricides, and criminals, join the cause of the birds, and Peisthetairos has great trouble to get rid of them. Peisthetairos, it appears, is as unable as many of our modern strike leaders to lay the spirits whom they called.

At last an embassy from Zeus appears, consisting of Poseidon, representing the gods by birth, Hercules, representing the upstarts among the gods, and Tribalos, representing the uncultured and barbarian deities. Following the advice of Prometheus, Peisthetairos demands unconditional surrender, and, isolating the old legitimist Poseidon, he gains all his points by making the committee vote. Hercules and Tribalos vote in favor of surrendering the sceptre of the gods and also Basileia or “Kingdom,” the beautiful companion of Zeus.

Peisthetairos ascends to the gods to receive all power in heaven and earth, and the comedy ends with a pean of glorification to the victor and master of demons.

The comedy is most ingenious and full of food for thought. It illustrates the clever idea of the Archimedian Δός μου πως στῶ παί ημήνω τὴν γῆν (give me a place to stand on and I will move the world). There are, indeed, places from which you can move the whole world; there are pivots on which a child may turn a colossal mass, which, if it fell, would crush numberless people. But he who would keep that place at the pivot must not throw the machinery out of gear; he must not wage a war against gods and men, which in the end will prove a hopeless undertaking, but must serve society and attend to its needs. He must not destroy, but build. He must not cause confusion, but preserve order. He must not tap the resources of the livelihood of his follow-beings, but create more wealth and increase the possibilities of a higher life.

It is easy for the capsula interna to paralyse the limbs of the body; it is easy enough to throw a well-balanced turn-table, be it ever so heavy, off its fulcrum; it is still easier to misguide a number of half-educated men who have become aware of their power for mischief: but it is difficult to keep the body politic in good health, and to manipulate the easy-turning machinery. Yet most difficult it is to point out the path of social progress.

P. C.

MR. MARTIN'S PLEA FOR NON-SECTARIAN RELIGION

To the Editor of The Open Court:

In your issue of June 21 appears an article by Mrs. C. P. Woolley upon “Liberal Religious Affairs in the West,” in which she comments upon my address as the “one discordant note” heard at the American Congress in Chicago. As a matter of justice and truth, let me say that I spoke reluctantly and merely as a member of the Committee on the Plan of Organisation, forced to submit a minority report because I could not indorse two phrases in the plan as finally formulated, viz.: (1) “Other non-sectarian churches,” the implication being that Universalist and Unitarian churches, for example, are non-sectarian, and (2) “absolute mental liberty,” because no churches can be organised on that basis without the surrender of their Christian or other sectarian connexions. No one regretted this enforced disagreement with the other members of the Committee more than myself. I made no “charge against the Congress of weakness and bad logic,” but merely stated what, from my point of view, consistency required. Mrs. Woolley has wholly missed the spirit of my remarks.
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as well as the friendly and fraternal attitude of my society at Tacoma towards the Congress. To assert that universal religion must be unsectarian, and that to represent it consistently one must be unsectarian as an individual, in his society, and in the fellowship of societies, seemed to me an obvious and irrefutable truth, and in no way implied any "self-assumption," or "ecclesiasticism," or "narrowness or bigotry"—particularly when asserted in the spirit of love and with deep regret because it seemed to detract from the glow of enthusiasm and rejoicing that prevailed throughout the sessions of the Congress.

Mr. Martin's proposition that the Unitarians, Universalists, the Jews, and other churches represented at the Congress, being, after all, sects, "should pay the full price of unconditioned freedom by sacrificing their fellowship, name, and connexion," was made on the last day, during the business transactions of formulating the by-laws and electing the various officers of the new organisation. The feeling of the audience was that the various churches, represented, had given up all those principles which tie them down to tradition; and especially the Unitarians, by choosing truth alone for authority, seemed conscious of having broadened into a church universal. It is neither the name nor the number of adherents which makes a religion unsectarian or catholic, but the spirit.

The Roman Church claims to be catholic, and might be judged so if the matter had to be decided among all Christians by a majority vote, for it outnumbers all other denominations. But is the Roman Church for that reason truly catholic? No, it is not; it is after all a large sect only, for it recognises the authority of councils and popes as final; it is still in the bondage of tradition and human authority.

There is but one catholic or universal religion: the religion of truth, which not only allows, but demands, a free investigation of its tenets, rejecting any and all personal authority, and accepting that which according to the strictest methods of science can be proved to be true. There is but one institution on earth which is truly catholic in principle: it is science, and we shall have no catholic religion until we have a religion of science.

It is a great pity that Mr. Martin's proposition was not made at a more seasonable time, so as to allow it a thorough discussion, for he touched the most vital point, which should not have been left in the dark. A ventilation of his proposition would have led to a clear and comprehensive statement of the nature of the bond of union of the various members of the Congress.

In our opinion all the churches can retain their names and continue their various connexions and fellowships; they can even cherish and revere their tradition, if they but adopt the principle to recognise scientifically provable truth as the highest authority. Should some of the customs and institutions be incompatible with the spirit of science, they will soon enough find it out themselves and abrogate their antiquated traditions.

Says Kant:

"Friends of mankind and of all that is holy to man, accept whatever, after a careful and honest inquiry, you regard to be most trustworthy, be it facts or rational arguments, but do not contest that prerogative of reason, which makes it the highest good upon earth, viz., to be the ultimate criterion of truth. Otherwise you will be unworthy of your liberty and lose it without fail." (Kant, "Was heißt: Sich im Denken orientiren." Edition Hartenstein, Vol. IV, p. 323.)

We do not mean to advocate the crude rationalism that for a long time prospered in Germany, which in its one-sided narrowness rejected the poetry of symbolism on account of its irrationality, and with it the religious truth contained in the symbols. We advocate a new and higher rationalism, all-sided enough to understand the spirit of religious mysticism without being oppressed by its darkness, but leading it out into the light.

Mr. Martin quotes F. E. Abbot, who says: "Friend, you must come out of your shanty. You must give up your Mohammedanism, your Judaism, your Christianity." This method is a cure after the recipe of Dr. Ironhead of the German folk-song. He kills his patient to free him from pain. To relieve him of a headache he would cut off his head.

The various religions of mankind are not radically wrong; they contain good seeds, and these seeds can grow. We therefore say:

Friend, investigate your religion, be it Mohammedanism, Judaism, or Christianity. Distinguish between the essential and the accidental, between the good and the bad, between that which is true and helpful and that which is false and injurious. Keep the former, drop the latter, and grow spiritually, intellectually, and morally. If you find that, in your conception, your religion was in all its essentials intended to be the religion of truth, keep its name; if not, drop it. In either case, you must know that not the letters of a name possess saving power, but the spirit of your religion.—En.]

NOTES.

On page 4160 of the present number of The Open Court, Prof. E. D. Cope proposes the court-martialing of a company of California militia, which, in the face of the mob, threw down their arms. Professor Cope probably refers to a sensational newspaper report which made a statement to that effect but was promptly followed by a demur. We know of no company of militia guilty of disobedience or treachery. The facts in the mooted case, if we are well informed, were that a company of militia, called out to restore order, was forbidden by the local authorities to shoot, whereupon the officers declared that under these conditions the soldiers could not be expected to do their duty, and the officers of the militia themselves ordered their men to withdraw.
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