

THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 417. (VOL. IX.—34.)

CHICAGO, AUGUST 22, 1895.

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.

IN MEMORIAM.—ROBERT LEWINS, M. D.

Born 28th August, 1817. Died 22nd July, 1895.

A SOMEWHAT striking figure in London literary circles has passed away in the person of the above.

Dr. Lewins was known to the readers of *The Monist* and *The Open Court* as an occasional contributor. In the thought-world generally, he was known as the excogitator, and unwearied advocate, of the philosophic faith commonly called *Hylo-Idealism*; as the accomplished friend and mentor of the late Miss Constance Naden, and also as the writer in 1873 of a recently republished essay, entitled *Life and Mind on the Basis of Modern Medicine*. When it is added that Dr. Lewins was a retired Surgeon Lieutenant-Colonel, that he had served in the Crimea, the Indian Mutiny and in several other campaigns; that he was mentioned in the famous "Letters," by the irate Carlyle, as "an army-surgeon who writes me incessantly from all quarters of the globe" (upon philosophic matters, presumably), almost all has been told that is specially notable about this now-ended life. He was not given to push himself into prominence. The man himself was too much overshadowed by the doctrine which he expounded, in and out of season. But those who have once met this philosophic and scientific thinker are not likely to forget him!

Wisdom is justified of her children, and Robert Lewins was exceeding *wise*. He was a fine example of what culture, world-wide travel, and intercourse with men and things will accomplish, even when conspicuous genius is lacking. This man had, apparently, been almost everywhere on the surface of our planet, seemed to know everybody worth knowing, to have seen nearly all that it is possible to see, and to have inwardly digested all available intellectual nourishment. If on this account alone, he was a most fascinating companion. His was a most amiable nature—strong, steadfast, self-sacrificing to a fault, ever generous and noble.

I do not know of any purely intellectual friendship more touchingly beautiful than that which existed between him and that rare latter-day personality Miss Constance Naden. He was interested in her from her

early years, discerned instinctively her surpassing genius, watched her career, directed her studies, arranged for her foreign travel,—cherished this opening flower which promised so highly, until her blossoming life became so much bound up with his own, that her untimely death affected him as deeply as if she had been his only daughter. I shall never forget his letters at that sad time. If ever there was a purely intellectual passion without baser alloy, it was that which existed between these two. He wrote to me after her death: "This world for me, now, has its *Gethsemane*, and its *Golgotha*!" And what does she say to him, in that pathetic last letter of hers? "The thought that my illness gives you pain, is almost more than I can bear." There were unfathomed depths in these two master-minds. Now, both are not. Lovely and pleasant in their lives, in death they were not long divided.

During the last ten years, I have probably corresponded with Dr. Lewins more frequently than any other person. How full of wisdom these, often barely decipherable, letters of his are—marvels of compressed and microscopic handwriting! They range in tone from grave to gay, from lively to severe—for, like his fellow countryman Carlyle, he could, upon occasion, blight and blast with an epithet. Always circling round in the end however, to his pet theory of solipsism. "*See all in Self and but for Self be born,*" was his refrain. Naturally, he was misunderstood. No man has been less perfectly understood. Rigid definitions he abhorred. And there was a certain amount of tautology in his exposition which repelled many.

But I, for one—I, who in every way have gained so much from him, am persuaded that this man's feet were resting on the *true* "Rock of Ages"—the rock of truth, and that the world, in time, will come to see itself as he saw it. This is not a proper occasion for discussing his world-scheme. I try to think, now, in this life which, without him, and without that other fair spirit who companied with us both for a time, to me is so lonely,—I try to think how patient *he* was in this respect, and how, if any one spoke to him of lack of appreciation for his teaching—of the difficulty of persuading the Philistinism of his day, he would smilingly say: "*Wait!*" Everything comes to him who

can wait, and a faith which is true can afford to wait—*endlessly!*

With faltering hand, I lay this poor wreath upon the coffin-lid of my lost friend.

GEORGE M. McCRIE.

THE LATER PROPHETS.

BY PROF. C. H. CORNILL.

THE narrow Judaising tendency of Ezra and Nehemiah must have exercised a fatal influence on prophecy, as the issue soon proved. The next prophetic book is that of Joel, which some people in consequence of an almost inconceivable confusion of ideas still declare to be the oldest of all. Few results of Old Testament research are as surely determined and as firmly established as that the Book of Joel dates from the century between Ezra and Alexander the Great.

In Joel for the first time that distinctive note is wanting which in all the older prophetic writings without exception, from Amos to Malachi, was the chief concern of the prophets, namely, censure, constant reference to the sins of Israel. Joel describes Israel as devout and pleasing in the sight of God; all is as it should be. In the regularly and conscientiously conducted ritual of the Temple, Israel has the guarantee of the grace of God; the most beautiful promises are held out to it, while the heathen will be destroyed by God and his angels as the harvest is cut down by the sickle and grapes trampled in the press; and moreover, the Jews shall turn their "ploughshares into swords and their pruning-hooks into spears." The celebrated pouring-out of the spirit will only affect Jewish flesh; the Gentiles will no longer be considered.

The small Book of Obadiah, written probably at an earlier date, has the same aims; it is the revision of an older prophecy concerning Edom already known to Jeremiah. To this book are appended the hopes and expectations of the time.

The next great universal catastrophe, however, was to find a more joyful echo, even in prophecy: the destruction of the Persian empire through Alexander the Great. The extremely remarkable coherent fragment, which we now read as Chapters 24 to 27 of the Book of Isaiah, dates, according to sure indications, from this time. We again find in this a reflexion of the old prophetic spirit. The dissolution of the whole earth and the judgment passed over its inhabitants is the chief theme. But this dissolution is thoroughly justified through the sinfulness of the world, and there, as in Kaulbach's Hunnenschlacht (the battle of the Huns), the decisive struggle takes place, not on earth, but on high. God conquers the host of the high ones; takes them prisoners, and shuts them up for many days in the prison. Israel itself takes no part in the struggle;

it merely waits on God as a psalm-singing community, and receives this command:

"Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee; hide thyself for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast. For behold, the Lord cometh forth out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity."

The final object of this judgment is the conversion of the earth. Even the imprisoned spirits will be pardoned, when they have lived out the time of their punishment.

"With my soul have I desired thee in the night; yea, with my spirit within me will I seek thee early: for when thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world learn righteousness. Let favor be shewed to the wicked, yet will he not learn righteousness: in the land of uprightness will he deal wrongfully, and will not behold the majesty of the Lord."

Then will God prepare on Mount Zion a great feast for all these converted nations and will destroy the face of the covering that is cast over all people and the veil that is spread over all nations, and the kingdom of peace shall begin, whose walls and bulwark are salvation. Only Moab will be excluded from this general salvation, and its destruction is described in revolting imagery—and thus we find again in this usually pure blood a drop of poison.

The most remarkable of all in this fragment is, that the resurrection of the dead appears for the first time as a postulate of faith, though indeed only that of the pious Israelites. Now, this postulate, too, takes its origin in the Messianic hypotheses. Among those devout dead will be many a martyr who has suffered death for his God and his faith. Are these, who deserve it before all others, to be excluded from the glory of the kingdom of the Messiah? The justice of God demands that they shall rise again from the dead. Moreover, the living Jews are far too few to become in reality the sovereign and dominant people in the Messianic kingdom; to fill up this want, all the devout Jews who have previously departed must live again. An enlivening dew sent by God shall drop upon these mouldering bones, the dead arise again, and the earth give back the departed spirits.

We find in single sentences of these four chapters much that is beautiful and deep. They show upon the whole a magnificent picture, which shines all the more brightly, when compared with the production which follows next in point of time.

This is the fragment which we now read as Chapters 9 to 14 of the Book of Zechariah. It dates from the beginning of the third century, from the time of the struggles of the Diadochi, when it certainly seemed as if the dominion of the Greeks established by Alexander the Great would fall to pieces. This fragment marks

the lowest degradation of the prophetic literature of Israel. The fantasy of the writer positively wades in the blood of the Gentiles; their flesh shall consume away while they stand upon their feet, their eyes shall consume away in their sockets, and their tongues in their mouths, while the sons of Zion, whom God has aroused against the Greeks, will drink their blood like wine and be filled with it like bowls at the corners of the altar. Jerusalem alone shall remain grand and sublime, and even the bells of the horses and every pot shall be holy unto the Lord. The remaining heathen will indeed turn to God, but how will this conversion show itself? By eating kosher (i. e. after the manner of the Jews) and by going up every year to Jerusalem to keep the feast of tabernacles.

It is impossible to turn the mind of an Amos or a Hosea, of an Isaiah or a Jeremiah, into a worse caricature than is done here. The unknown author of this fragment in the Book of Zechariah will not even be a prophet: we find a very remarkable passage in this fragment, which shows that men distinctly felt that prophecy was at an end, and that the prophetic inspiration in Israel was dying out.

"And it shall come to pass in that day, said the Lord Zebaoth, that I will cut off the names of the idols out of the land, and they shall no more be remembered: and also I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirits to come out of the land. And it shall come to pass, that when any shall yet prophesy, then his father and his mother that begat him shall say unto him: Thou shalt not live, for thou speakest lies in the name of the Lord: and his father and his mother that begat him shall thrust him through when he prophesieth. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the prophets shall be ashamed every one of his vision, when he hath prophesied; neither shall they wear a hairy mantle to deceive: but he shall say, I am no prophet, I am an husbandman; the field is my possession and my trade from my youth up. And if one shall say unto him, What are these wounds thou bearest? he shall answer, . . . I was wounded in the house of my friends."

The prophets deceivers of the people, who must be put to death, prophetic inspiration an unclean spirit, put on the same level with idols—what a change, what a transition! Here we have the whole difference between Israel and Judaism.

Nevertheless the prophetic genius of Israel had not yet utterly died out; it had still sufficient health and strength to enter a strong protest against this caricature of itself, and to pronounce upon it the sentence of its condemnation. This is the special and lasting significance of the little book, which we must look upon as the last of prophetic literature, the Book of Jonah.

LORD PALMERSTON'S BOROUGH.

Mr. Harney's Reminiscences.

The Tiverton election described in the last number of *The Open Court* took place in 1847. Mr. Snell in the book we are noticing publishes the following communication from Mr. George Julian Harney, written in 1894—forty-seven years after the event:

WHO WERE THE CHARTISTS?

Having been courteously invited to narrate my recollections of the stirring episode of 47 years ago, I comply with the request, understanding that my statement must be brief, and (I will add) fair, and, as far as may be, impartial. It may first be well to answer the question: "Who and what were the Chartists?" They were the direct political descendants of the men who, dissatisfied with the merely mob-ebullitions of those who shouted themselves hoarse with cries for "Wilkes and Liberty," began to band themselves together soon after the commencement (and more especially after the termination) of the American war, to obtain a Reform of Parliament. Subsequently arose the "Society of the Friends of the People," and other patriotic associations, led by such men as the then Duke of Richmond, Earl Stanhope, and several Parliamentary celebrities, with such efficient auxiliaries as Major Cartwright, Horne Tooke, Thelwall, and other "men of light and leading" who subsequently, and after the commencement of the excesses of the French Revolution, were stigmatised as English Jacobins. A reign of terror, the opposite to that in France, consigned the Scottish Martyrs—Muir, Palmer, Gerald, Margarot, and Skirving—to penal transportation; and in England wholesale arrests, severe punishments for political "libels," sentences of imprisonment for sedition, and on the other hand a signal triumph in the acquittal of Hardy and other members of the "Corresponding Society," marked the varying fortunes of the Reform movement in its first stage.

THE FIRST RADICALS.

A lull ensued. But the first decade of the Nineteenth Century was hardly over when new actors appeared on the stage. The people were tired of the long war, and again the cry for Parliamentary Reform was heard in the land. In Parliament the moderate Reformers were led by Grey, Brougham, Russell, Mackintosh, Romilly, Whitbread, and others, including Burdett, who, however, may be also classed with the outside leaders. Of such leaders the most marked were Cobbett, Hunt, Hone, Wooler, and many more. The poetry of Byron and Shelley largely contributed to fan the flame of reforming enthusiasm. It was about the time of Waterloo that these Reformers began to have applied to them the nickname of "Radicals," or men who proposed to make a root and branch reform, and tear up the abuses of the representative system by the roots. The repressive measures of the Castle-reagh-Sidmouth Administration, including the tyrannical "Six Acts," the "Manchester Massacre," the executions in Glasgow, Derby and London; the nefarious acts of spies spreading distrust and terror; these and other causes again brought collapse and apathy; and so ended the second stage of reform.

"THE BILL, THE WHOLE BILL, AND NOTHING BUT THE BILL."

The French Revolution of 1830 awakened public spirit from its torpor, and contemporaneously with the Belgian Revolution, the popular movements in Germany and Italy, and the sanguinary and heroic, but unfortunate struggle in Poland, the third stage of Reform commenced. Soon the cry of "The Bill, the whole Bill, and Nothing but the Bill" reverberated through the land, and

England seemed to be in the very throes of Revolution. This time, despite lamentable scenes at Nottingham and other places, and the ever-to-be-deplored, disgraceful, and disgusting anarchy of which Bristol was the theatre, the cause of Reform triumphed. The middle classes were practically unanimous. They were aided by the Liberal section of the aristocracy, and had at their back the support of the working classes. The movement was as spontaneous as national. There were Unions of various names, the most famous of which was the Birmingham Political Union; but the immense gatherings of the people were not got together by any caucus-like machinery. Reform was in the air. The vast majority of the people obeyed the inspiration. The opponents of Reform saw that further opposition was useless, and the Reform Bill became the Reform Act on the 7th June, 1832.

THE PEOPLE'S CHARTER.

But soon the voice of disappointment was heard. There had been all along an "extreme Left" among the Reformers, who, with Henry Hunt, demanded Universal Suffrage. That section was represented by a small but active and organised body. During the stress and storm of the agitation, 1831-32, there had been in London two popular organisations:—"The Political Union," mainly representative of the middle classes, and "The National Union of the Working Classes." On the passing of the Reform Bill the Political Union was dissolved, or died away. The Union of the Working Classes struggled on. But the general enthusiasm had evaporated. The National Union of the Working Classes had ceased to be heard of, when in 1836 William Lovett, a native of Newlyn, Cornwall, and by trade a cabinet maker, conceived the idea of establishing what he called Working Men's Associations to accomplish a Radical Reform of Parliament, and for other legal, constitutional, and praiseworthy purposes. The movement spread. Working Men's Associations were formed in various parts of the country; other associated bodies also came to the front, including the revived Birmingham Political Union, and the Northern Political Union, the headquarters of which were at Newcastle-on-Tyne. It was determined by Lovett and his associates to formulate their demands in the shape of a Bill to be enacted by Parliament.

The leading principles of that measure were:

1. Universal Suffrage.
2. Equal Electoral Districts.
3. Vote by Ballot.
4. Annual Parliaments.
5. No Property Qualification.
6. Payment of Members.

There was nothing novel in these demands; they had been those of ultra-reformers for over fifty years. In the main they had been endorsed by the Duke of Richmond, Earl Stanhope, Cartwright, Burdett, and other past leaders. The only novelty was their embodiment in a Bill which quickly received the name of "The People's Charter." Its author was William Lovett, though Mr. Roebuck supplied the preamble; and that gentleman with one or two more assisted to lick the Bill into the rigmarole shape, which seems to be indispensable in manufacturing Acts of Parliament. In my humble room a sheet copy framed and glazed hangs by the side of Magna Charta.

"THE NORTHERN STAR."

Toward the end of 1837 Feargus O'Connor founded *The Northern Star* at Leeds. It quickly obtained a large circulation. Subsequently other Chartist newspapers appeared, but none of them achieved the success commanded for some years by the *Northern Star*. Published at four-pence-halfpenny a copy, a the height of the agitation it had a circulation of over 40,000 a week. It probably had half a million of readers.

THE NATIONAL CONVENTION.

In the course of 1838 great meetings were held in all the principal cities and towns at which the Charter and a National Petition were adopted, and delegates were elected to what was commonly termed the "National Convention"—the actual name being "The General Convention of the Industrious Classes." One of the three delegates elected at Newcastle-on-Tyne was G. J. Harney, destined to make the acquaintance of the people of Tiverton nine years later. He was the youngest member of the Convention, being not quite 22 when the delegates held their first meeting on the 4th of February, 1839.

It is impossible to give in this place even the briefest sketch of the proceedings of the Convention—its lofty aspirations, mistakes, and failure; nor can more than mention be made of the unhappy affair of Frost at Newport, the wholesale arrest and imprisonment of Chartist leaders and speakers. Suffice it to say that in spite of manifold errors, and the repressive effects of political persecution, Chartism was still a power in the land when the writs were issued for the General Election in 1847.

CHARTIST INTERVENTION IN ELECTIONS.

The intervention of the Chartists in Elections was quite legitimate, and politic on their part. When their candidates were nominated, they had the opportunity to address audiences not obtainable at any other time; and lords, esquires, manufacturers, farmers, and shopkeepers had to listen to expositions of the "Six Points" and other matters, to which at other times they would have turned a deaf ear. Chartist candidates had appeared at some of the most important elections in 1841; and a greater number came forward in 1847. Mr. Harney had shared in the West Riding nominations in 1841, when the candidates were Lords Morpeth and Milton, and Sir John Stuart Wortley and Mr. Becket Dennison. Harney was now Editor of the *Northern Star*, which four years previously he had joined as sub editor. More than any Chartist leader he had given attention to foreign politics, and so it came to pass that he elected (and was selected by the Tiverton Chartists) to oppose Lord Palmerston. Of all the Chartist candidates in 1847 only Feargus O'Connor was elected at Nottingham as the colleague of Mr. Walter of the *Times*.

"GETTING AT" LORD PALMERSTON.

Mr. Harney knew that the election of a Chartist at Tiverton was impossible; but that was not his object. His purpose was to "get at" Lord Palmerston; and in that he was not disappointed. Mr. Harney arrived from London at Tiverton, July 27th, 1847, and was met at the entrance to the town by a large concourse of his friends and conducted to Fore street; where from a window of the house of Mr. Norman, draper, he delivered his introductory speech, taking for his text Lord Palmerston's Address to the Electors. His comments elicited much enthusiasm. On the evening of July 28th Mr. Harney again addressed his friends at the same place, speaking on the topics of the day; and with much acceptance as far as the Chartist element in the town was concerned. A third meeting, also in Fore street, followed on the evening of the 29th, when Mr. Harney was supported by Mr. Wilkinson, an ex-Mayor of Exeter. The town was now in a very lively state; some thousands were at the meeting, and the enthusiasm of the Chartists rose to the highest pitch when Mr. Harney concluded a lengthy and impassioned appeal with the somewhat grandiloquent sentence—"To-night we sleep upon our arms; to-morrow we march to battle and to victory!"

THE COMBATANTS.

Mr. Harney was then 30 years of age, and though he had experienced some warnings of the loss of voice which ultimately, and not long afterwards, befel him, he was at the time in good

"fettle" for the fray—indeed better than if he had been five or ten years younger. Lord Palmerston was much older, being his opponent's senior by 33 years. All the advantages were with his lordship: a collegiate training, great natural talents perfected and adorned by culture, early entrance into public life, a parliamentary experience of 40 years, and an official experience of 38 years. A fluent, if not an eloquent, speaker, dowered with the gifts of witty repartee and keen, but never ill-natured, sarcasm; Palmerston's varied attainments were completed by an air of easy non-balance and winning *bonhomie*. Mr. Harney's equipment comprised little more than his comparative youth, and an earnest, if ill-regulated, enthusiasm; but when was genuine enthusiasm ever well-regulated?

THE NOMINATION.

Friday, July 30th, was the day appointed for the nomination. The candidates and their leading supporters assembled at the Guildhall, where the Mayor, Mr. T. W. T. Tucker, and the Town Clerk went through some preliminary performances, warning all concerned to avoid "bribery and corruption." Then the proceedings were adjourned to the hustings in front of St. Peter's Church—an edifice for its size and beauty almost worthy of being counted with the cathedrals. The two former members took their stand on the right of the Mayor, and the Chartist on the left. (A joker might have said "the extreme left.") After a short address from the Mayor, Mr. Heathcoat was first put in nomination by Dr Kettle, seconded by Mr. Gemlen. Lord Palmerston was nominated by Mr. Hole, seconded by Mr. W. Anstey. In a characteristic speech Mr. Rowcliffe nominated Mr. George Julian Harney, seconded by Mr. Burgess.

Mr. Heathcoat, who was cordially received, delivered a brief address, defending Parliament as then constituted from the charge of class-legislation, and enumerating measures of reform and amelioration adopted by the late Parliament. He looked to the diffusion of education as the best means of paving the way for an extension of the suffrage. A little by-play then ensued. According to wont and usage Lord Palmerston should then have spoken, but his lordship said as he understood he was to be attacked he would waive his right to speak now. He would first hear the attack and then make his speech in reply.

Many of the Chartist candidate's friends urged him not to forego his right of speaking last, he having been proposed last. But Mr. Harney, addressing the Mayor, said he wanted only fair play; he would therefore speak first; his lordship might then make his reply, and he (Mr. Harney) would then make a second speech restricted to the topics of the Charter and other necessary reforms. After some debate, principally engaged in by a few of Lord Palmerston's supporters, who evidently were disinclined to show much fairness to the Chartist candidate, the arrangement proposed, as above, was agreed to.

HARNEY'S SPEECH AGAINST PALMERSTON.

Mr. Julian Harney, who was received with loud and prolonged cheering, commenced his speech. Now comes an insurmountable difficulty. It would not be more difficult to pour the full contents of a gallon-jar into a pint-pot, than it would be to give a fair idea of a speech of two hour's duration within the compass of a paragraph, or even a page or two. It must suffice to say that the speaker—after some compliments to Mr. Heathcoat on his speech, and complimentary reference to one Whig philanthropist, "the late Joseph Strutt of Derby,"—began at the beginning with Lord Palmerston, to-wit the noble lord's entrance upon public life under the Perceval administration. Remarking that in the course of his political career Lord Palmerston had been, like St. Paul, "all things to all men," Mr. Harney proceeded to stigmatise the Tory chiefs—from Perceval to Canning, under whom Lord Palmerston had served, describing Canning as "a

clever jester, or brilliant buffoon, a tax-eater almost the whole of his life, and the determined enemy of all reform." He then proceeded to pay his respects to the Duke of Wellington, Lord Melbourne, and others—all under the Chartist ban. Proceeding, he commented on the prosecution suffered by the Unstamped Press, on the New Poor Law, Ireland and the Irish famine, &c. In the course of his onslaught on the then Whig administration of which Lord Palmerston was a member, Mr. Harney referred to Lord Morpeth as "the best of the lot." "I remember," said he, "that six years ago I had the pleasure of opposing the noble lord at the West Riding election, and I remember the unaffected courtesy of that nobleman's manner throughout the contest. I am about to ask Lord Palmerston a favor, most likely the only favor I shall ever ask of him. It is this, that on his return to town he will be good enough to give my compliments to Lord Morpeth." Here Lord Palmerston took off his hat and bowed in token of his acceptance of the mission confided to him; the people meanwhile laughing and cheering. After comments on some more domestic matters, Mr. Harney proceeded to tackle the foreign policy of the Whigs and Lord Palmerston's conduct as Secretary of State for foreign affairs, taking a wide range over Holland and Belgium, Spain and Portugal, China, India, and Afghanistan. He was especially vehement in denunciation of the policy which, he alleged, was responsible for the utter destruction of the unfortunate British troops in their terrible and memorable retreat from Cabul. Strongly condemning the conduct of the British Government in India and Afghanistan, he yet took care to disassociate himself from the Manchester School of "Little Englanders" of that day (1847), protesting against any separation, but urging that colonies and dependencies should be held to the mother country by links of justice, and then the world might see the whole "floating down the stream of Time, one happy, one free, one triumphant British nation." Immense cheering greeted the sentiment. Mr. Harney then turned to Turkey, Egypt, Poland, and the recently absorbed Republic of Cracow. Other topics commented on cannot be repeated here. Mr. Harney's speech occupied over two hours in the delivery, and was favorably, indeed enthusiastically, received by over two-thirds of the large assemblage.

THE REPLY AND THE RESULT.

Lord Palmerston in reply spoke for upwards of an hour. Some, though necessarily a very imperfect, idea of his address has been furnished in the preceding article. Mr. Harney then delivered a second speech mainly in vindication of the points of the People's Charter. The show of hands was then taken, with the result announced by the Mayor:—"I declare that the show of hands is in favor of John Heathcoat, Esq., and Julian Harney, Esq." A tumult of cheering broke from the great majority of the crowd. On its subsidence Lord Palmerston demanded a poll. Mr. Harney then read a written protest against any poll being taken, affirming that Mr. Heathcoat and himself had been rightfully elected in accordance with the spirit of the constitution and the ancient usage of this country. Mr. Harney then moved a vote of thanks to the Mayor, which was seconded by Lord Palmerston, and adopted by acclamation. The Mayor acknowledged the compliment, and the proceedings, which had continued seven hours, terminated. The polling took place next day with the result which has been stated. The chairing of the members followed, and Lord Palmerston returned to London on the Saturday evening. Mr. Harney remained two days longer, and on Monday evening addressed a large meeting on the ground at the back of the White Ball Inn. On Tuesday, August 2nd, 1847, he left Tiverton for London.

MR. HARNEY'S PRESENT VIEWS.

Mr. Harney has requested publication of the following over his signature:—

After 47 years I cannot regret the part I played on that 30th of July. On the contrary that is one remembered incident of my Chartist career on which I can look back with unalloyed satisfaction. Of course my speech—from beginning to end—was not all words of wisdom; but in that respect certainly no worse than other election speeches. My views on most of the foreign topics discussed are much now as they were then. Called upon (were that possible, but it is not) to undertake a like part again, some phrases and forms of expression used 47 years ago, I would not care to repeat now. I cannot find any fault with Lord Palmerston's bearing on that July day. With all his natural tendency to caustic criticism, he was courteous and fair; and so, with but a few exceptions, were his supporters on the hustings. Mr. Heathcoat's bearing was not less gentlemanly. The Mayor presided with perfect impartiality. The conduct of the crowd of Electors and Non-electors was admirable. No rowdism, no brutalities of Nottingham "lambs," or Westminster "roughs." Every speaker was accorded a fair hearing. For my part I regret the suppression of the old-time constitutional procedure of open nominations. Now a Parliamentary Election is less interesting than that of a Parish Beadle. Lord Palmerston was an aristocrat; no doubt about that. But he was genial, frank, and generous. Moreover he abhorred cant in every form. I had never seen Lord Palmerston before I went to Tiverton, having never been in the gallery of "the House," for which I had but little respect and have still less to-day. In the Tiverton Guildhall I sat next to, without knowing, his lordship, and he engaged me in a momentary conversation, I only finding out who had been my interlocutor when we reached the hustings. After the Election I never met or saw Lord Palmerston again. In 1863 I went to the States. Coming over to England in 1878, I was told the following incident of Lord Palmerston, then dead some 13 years. It happened that some of the working class Radicals of the time were in the lobby of "the House" with the view of soliciting subscriptions from Liberal members for some unfortunate of the "advanced" corps, stricken down by disease, and suffering from that other and too common ill—impecuniosity; when the Premier was seen approaching. Said one of the party—"Here comes Pam, let us try him." The idea was pooh-pooh'd, but it was carried out by the suggestor. Lord Palmerston patiently listened to the story and responded with his usual kindly liberality, accompanying the gift by some pleasantry as was his wont. He had faced toward the chamber of the Commons, when suddenly turning back, he enquired, "Can you tell me what has become of an old Chartist acquaintance of mine, Mr. George Julian Harney?" The person addressed could not tell, but an older man of the group said he believed Julian Harney was in America. Lord Palmerston rejoined, "Well, I wish him good fortune: he gave me a dressing down at Tiverton some years ago, and I have not heard of him since; but I hope he is doing well."

I tell the tale as it was told to me. That must have been within a year or two of Lord Palmerston's death, and though a trifling incident, attests the geniality of his character.

GEORGE JULIAN HARNEY.

RICHMOND-ON-THAMES, 1894.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"HEREDITY AND THE A PRIORI."

To the Editor of *The Open Court*:

In regard to your comments upon my "Evolution and Idealism" article of the 20th of June, I have no wish to attempt a reply within the limits of a letter. But perhaps you will permit me to say a few words upon the relationship of the views you have expressed

to those of a better philosopher than I can ever hope to be,—George Henry Lewes, to-wit.

You write (in the note to your "Heredity and the A Priori" column) that such purely formal ideas as units of counting and geometrical space, "far from being latent in the mind and prior to experience, have been derived from experience and abstraction." Well, this is what Lewes, in the same connexion, says: "The objects of mathematical study are reals, . . . although they are abstractions. . . . They are intelligibles of sensibles: abstractions which have their concretes in real objects."

And again: "Our purpose will be to reverse Kant's procedure, and to show that the mathematical judgments are absolutely and entirely dependent on experience, and are limited to the range of experience, sensible and extra-sensible."

I am pleased to be able to point out an agreement between Lewes and yourself, where you are inclined to insist upon a difference.

The knowledge of Lewes's works which enables me to do this may possibly serve to suggest that you do me somewhat less than justice in imagining that I am ignorant of Kant's confined, not to say confused, use of the term "experience." Probably no one has pointed out more clearly and cogently than Lewes, how bewildered and bewildering Kant's usage of "experience" is. It is indeed because of Kant's avoidable blundering in terminology, as well as because of his unavoidable ignorance of the doctrine of organic evolution, that so many thinkers of to-day find Spencer and Lewes, in certain respects, more surefooted and consistent as philosophic guides than even the sage of Königsberg himself.

ELLIS THURTELL.

RETRIBUTION.

BY VIROE.

Across their lives men heedless go,
Like thieves o'er freshly fallen snow,
Who think,—if e'er they think at all,—
That through the night much more will fall
To cover up their footprints; so
With booty laden home they go.

But far away from sound or sight
The Power to whom the dark is light
Bids Nature send detectives forth,—
The swift, cold bloodhounds of the North,
To freeze their footprints in the snow
And tell the world which way they go.

BOOK REVIEWS.

LA RECHERCHE DE L'UNITÉ. Deuxième édition. By *E. de Roberty*. "Bibliothèque de Philosophie contemporaine." Paris: Félix Alcan, éditeur. 1894.

AUGUSTE COMTE ET HERBERT SPENCER; contribution à l'histoire des idées philosophiques au XIX. siècle. Deuxième édition. By *E. de Roberty*. "Bibliothèque de Philosophie contemporaine." Paris: Félix Alcan, éditeur. 1895.

M. de Roberty is a philosophical writer of no mean standing. He has previously published quite a series of similar contributions on sociology, ancient and modern philosophy, the unknowable, agnosticism, etc., which indicate the range of his philosophical powers. In the first of these two later works he treats of negative concepts in monistic theories, the unity of science, Spencer's universal postulate or test of truth, the inconceivability of the negation, the concepts of quantity, relativity, motion, transcendentalism, etc. He is a thorough-going monist, or at least, believes himself to be such, and lays down the three following definitions:

1. Rational unity is the product of *logical thought aided and controlled by direct observation or experience*, i. e. by "intuition," or "subjective research."

2. Scientific unity is the product of *logical thought aided and controlled by indirect observation or experience* (objective research).

3. Transcendental unity is the product of logical thought not controlled, or insufficiently controlled, by observation and experience, either direct or indirect.

He pronounces himself in the main in favor of the second of these, or scientific monism, and considers the relations of body and mind, or mind and matter. He roundly, and, as we think, justly rebukes the tendency of so many writers and thinkers of eminence to insist that after we have learned all that is known or ever can be known of these relations the two fields are still as far apart as ever. This form of dualism which goes beyond the *ignoramus* and postulates the *ignorabimus* is unworthy of the name of philosophy. His own position is summed up in the following words:

"We could fill pages and pages in explaining what we understand by true monism. We shall do this in a few words. All *general* distinction between mind and matter strikes us as pure logical nonsense."

The later and slightly smaller work on Comte and Spencer was, says M. de Roberty, originally intended to be embodied in the other, but was finally made a separate contribution. It deals entirely with what he calls their monism. It is doubtful whether the word *monism* (perhaps first used by Wolff, but long lost sight of till revived by Haeckel and Hartmann) occurs once in the writings of either of those authors. I remember recently reading a book on Hegel in which occurred the statement that he strongly condemned agnosticism! a word of Huxleyan mintage. Of this Roberty's treatise on the monism of Comte and Spencer naturally reminded me. Of course it may be said that the principles of agnosticism and monism existed long before their names, yet this use of a modern terminology in discussing older writers and philosophies in which a different terminology is employed verges too close upon anachronism to be approved.

Roberty, like too many other monists, makes monism a sort of creed, and speaks of dualism, or anything that is opposed to monism as essentially heterodox and unsound. That is, he makes his monism, instead of truth the norm, and seems to think the falsity of a doctrine sufficiently shown if it is proved to stand opposed to monism. In view of the fact that those who call themselves monists do not all agree as to what monism is, and have generally failed to give the rest of the world a definite idea of it, it would seem to be too early to set it up as the embodiment of all truth.

Barring this slight tendency to monistic partisanship, these little books of M. Roberty are very pleasant reading. The author's style is spicy and tends to be flowery, perhaps a little too much so for the character of his topics, but on the other hand it prevents them from becoming heavy and uninteresting. In his treatment of Comte he has proved one of the few Frenchmen who adequately appreciate the labors of their great countryman. He classes him with Socrates, Aristotle, Bacon, Descartes, Locke, Hume, and Kant, thinkers whose monism is accompanied by a mild form of agnosticism, in which latter doctrine he always scents some trace of the dreadful dualism. He calls him "the least sceptical, the least delicate, the least refined, but also the least calculating, the most sincere, the most naïve of philosophers." There certainly ought to be a common bond between positivism and monism. If the latter is nothing but the unintelligible dogma that mind and matter are the same thing, of course Comte has nothing to say about it, but if it means the great principle of the uniformity and invariability of nature's laws, this is the cornerstone itself of the positive philosophy, as it is of all science. True

monism ought to be simply the highest generalisation of known facts and phenomena. It ought to mean the great law which embraces all other laws. Now while Comte discarded as metaphysical, and therefore sterile, the vain search after *causes* he made the most thorough and successful search for laws that has been undertaken. On page 495 of Vol. I. of the third edition (1869) of the *Philosophie Positive* may be found an equation which, he says, may be regarded as embracing all the equations necessary for the complete determination of the various circumstances relative to the movement of any system of bodies acted upon by any forces whatever. It was in the same spirit that he attacked every other science, and although he admitted that the applicability of mathematics to the several sciences of the hierarchy diminishes as their complexity increases, still it was his aim in each case to reach an expression of the highest law that could be formulated. M. de Roberty has not wholly ignored this great service which Comte has rendered to science, and he justly gives him credit for having established a new science, that of sociology, upon the broad principles of historical development and human motive. He also recognises the importance of his law of the three stages of thought, of his classification of the sciences, and of his determination of the principal methods of reasoning in general.

To Herbert Spencer's monism he gives less space, and apparently somewhat less countenance. He classes Spencer along with Democritus, Bruno, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Fichte, Hegel, and Schopenhauer, "spirits bold enough to undertake the task of correcting agnosticism by monism, an excess of prudence by an excess of temerity." It is hard to say which would be the more indignant, Schopenhauer at being thus classed with Hegel, or Spencer at being called Comte's "*successeur en ligne directe*." Yet, as a matter of fact the latter *faux pas* is not as wide of the mark as Mr. Spencer's repeated and vehement disclaimers might lead some to suppose. The most that can be said is that their two systems, beginning and ending at the same points and passing through the same intermediate phases in the same order, were doubtless in the main elaborated independently of each other, although Comte's was completed and published (1842) at least ten years before Spencer's was begun.

Spencer's great sin is his "agnosticism," which somehow in our author's eyes constitutes a form of dualism, difficult as it may seem to others that no belief at all can be converted into two beliefs. Like most other attempts to analyse the synthetic philosophy, this one gets entangled in the meshes of the unknowable and scarcely gets beyond the first third of the first volume of the ten which make up this vast system. The most that lies outside of this relates to his *Principles of Psychology*, which, as has often been pointed out, was written out of its natural order, before the *Biology*, and therefore neither properly affiliated upon that nor made the basis of *Sociology*, though placed between these two in the system. It is the most metaphysical of Mr. Spencer's works.

In discussing the monism of Spencer M. de Roberty considers the following five essential points: (1) An ultimate criterion of all experimental truth. (2) Classification of the facts of consciousness subjectively (internal states), and objectively (external states.) (3) Hypothesis of a reality outside of consciousness. (4) The two hypotheses derived from the postulate of the unknowable or "transcendent." (5) Classification of the facts of consciousness as in time and space. This discussion is highly metaphysical and needs to be closely followed to be understood.

Less space is given to the great unitary law of evolution with which Mr. Spencer's name is more closely connected than that of any other philosopher. He asks the question: "Is the unity realised by mechanics and physics of the same nature as logical unity?" and answers it by saying that "the unity of the inorganic world presents itself in its turn (in the form of *knowledge*) as an aspect of logical unity." Our author deserves special credit for perceiving

AUG 23 1895

and pointing out that Spencer's evolution consists in fact of two different processes, one for the inorganic and another for the organic world. I called attention to this eighteen years ago,¹ but, so far as I have been able to learn, no other author before Roberty has treated it. Instead of dismissing it as a "dualism" I attempted to reconcile it with the law of unity, and, as I still think, successfully, although it certainly does require that all evolution be explained as the result of the interaction of the two decidedly dualistic principles of gravitation and radiation.

Enough has perhaps been said to indicate the general scope of these works as well as the character of M. Roberty's writings as a whole. One cannot too strongly commend the manner in which this and other publishing houses in Paris, and to a less extent in other cities of the Continent, bring out works of this class. It is inexpensive and highly satisfactory both to authors and readers. We Americans might well imitate it and thus make it possible to issue a great many excellent books that are never even written. The brochure style is good enough for this class of solid reading, and there is no excuse for the wretched fine type and thin sleazy smeared paper that are used in this country for the so-called "cheap editions" of our books. LESTER F. WARD.

An interesting collection of politico-economical debates has recently come to us from England in the shape of the second volume of *Transactions of the National Liberal Club, Political Economy Circle*, edited by J. H. Levy (London: P. S. King & Son). The discussions cover a vast variety of topics, such as the economic effects of an eight-hour day for coal miners, pensions for the aged, agricultural distress and its remedies, the land question, the monetary situation, etc. The debates have all the zest and spirit of free parliamentary discussion, and in most cases are the utterances of prominently known men. The lack of a table of contents and index is partly made up by bold-faced marginal titles. The same publishers and editor also issue *A Symposium on Value*, a little brochure of fifty-eight pages, consisting of papers by Mr. Ernest Belfort Bax and others on the conception of economic value.

The *Freidenker Publishing Co.* of Milwaukee have just published a little German pamphlet by Dr. Adolf Brodbeck, *Die Existenz Gottes*, being a commentary upon an address delivered by the Very Rev. Augustin F. Hewitt at the Chicago World's Fair on the "Being of God." The Rev. Mr. Hewitt's address was a demonstration of the existence of God from the Roman Catholic point of view. Dr. Brodbeck gives a synopsis of the speaker's arguments, and answers each critically. The author would not reject the term "God," because of the deep and just problems which it contains. His sole effort is to clarify the idea. The pamphlet is a good one and the argument well conducted.

Fully as significant as the new reaction against the scientific method are the able replies which that movement has called forth. No doubt the attack will have little other effect than the salutary repair of the defences of science. Two noteworthy rejoinders to M. Brunetière's *Bankruptcy of Science* reach us from distant lands: one from Prof. Enrico Morselli of Italy, entitled *La preteso 'Banca-rotta della scienza'* (Palermo: Remo Sandro); and one from Hungary by Sigmund Bodnár, translated into German under the title *Ueber den Bankrott der Wissenschaften. Offener Brief an Ferdinand Brunetière* (Budapest: Eggenberger).

The *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Philologico-historical Department, 1895,

¹ "Cosmic and Organic Evolution." *Popular Science Monthly*, Vol. XI., New York, October, 1877, pp. 672-682. See also, *Dynamic Sociology*, New York, 1883, Vol. I., p. 247 et seqq.

No. 2, contains an article of considerable interest to biblical scholars, on *The Return of the Jews from the Babylonian Exile*, by J. Wellhausen.

NOTES.

It is with deep regret and sorrow that we receive the sad news of Dr. Robert Lewins's decease. He was an unusually deep thinker, thoroughly versed in all schools of philosophy, and representing a school of his own which he called hylo-idealism, or solipsism. He was radical in his opinions, even to extremes, and seemed to take delight in the denunciation of theism in any form. He was a severe adversary of religion and repudiated its very name. Nevertheless, in his personal friendship, as well as in his philosophical convictions there was a deeply religious love of truth, and the religious influences of his early youth could easily be traced in his emotional life. He was by birth and blood a Scotchman, by education a German, and a pupil of the Moravian Brotherhood at Neuwied on the Rhine. He loved to speak German, and introduced more German, Greek, and other foreign expressions into his articles than any other English author. He studied at the Universities of Heidelberg, Vienna, Paris, and Edinburgh. In his philosophy he appears to have been mainly influenced by Schopenhauer, and perhaps also by Fichte. He found enthusiastic admirers and expounders of his theory in Miss Naden and Mr. McCrie. Articles and letters from Dr. Robert Lewins's pen appeared from time to time in both *The Monist* and *The Open Court*. In spite of a strong agreement as to the monistic principle in philosophy, we could not accept his identification of the universe with self, and have on various occasions presented the reasons for our disagreement. Perhaps the tersest explanation of his theory is contained in his article "The Unity of Thought and Thing" (Vol. IV., No. 2, of *The Monist*). We shall publish a few posthumous papers of his in subsequent numbers.—P. C.

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. 417.

IN MEMORIAM.—ROBERT LEWINS, M. D. GEORGE M. MCCRIE 4607
THE LATER PROPHETS. PROF. C. H. CORNILL 4608
LORD PALMERSTON'S BOROUGH. Mr. Harney's Reminiscences 4609
CORRESPONDENCE.
"Hereditv and the A Priori." ELLIS THURTELL 4612
POETRY.
Retribution. VIROE 4612
BOOK REVIEWS 4612
NOTES 4614