

The Dominion Review.

VOL. II.

SEPTEMBER, 1897.

NO. 9.

THE POPULATION QUESTION.

BY JOHN M. ROBERTSON.

In most of our large towns, as many people have noticed, you may generally gauge the degree of poverty of the inhabitants by the number of the children seen playing in the streets. Without going to the worst slums, where perhaps the misery acts as a special check on the numbers, you can always reckon that they swarm most in the streets inhabited by the more poorly-paid workers. In that stratum there is just enough bread and butter to feed them, just enough of wages to keep them passably clothed. Often they strike a passer-by as surprisingly healthy. That is because they are so much in the open air, though it is the air of the street, their chief play-ground. But if you study closely, you will see that in general they are not really good specimens of the human animal. Fed mainly on bread and tea, they are mostly undersized to begin with. And yet those you see are the survivals of a much larger number born, a great percentage of infants being unable to struggle through the first few years of unhealthy conditions. Take the average family as a whole, and you find this state of things: an overworked mother, prematurely old; small and stuffy rooms, with little comfort in them, so that the father is always tempted to spend his few hours of leisure outside; bad air, inferior food, and poor clothing for the children, and such a number of young ones that the mother cannot attend to them, and the little girl of six or seven is burdened with the care of the younger ones whom she can barely carry, a weary toiler before her time. Everybody in the family is the worse off because there are so many. A number of infants die; but a number live, destined to grow up as cheap labor for the labor market; and the father, like the mother, is aged before his time by his burden. Were there only three or four children altogether, at intervals of a few years, the whole household could be better fed, better tended, better housed. It may even happen that the mother brings forth a dozen children in eighteen years, yet rears only one or two of them to maturity. She has all the dolour and almost none of the joy of motherhood. But with all the enormous sacrifice of life, there is preserved enough of cheap life to make cheap labor.

The main facts are not disputed even by those who dispute what is called "the law of population." That law is just this—that mankind tends to breed faster than it increases its food supply. This does not

mean that population always increases faster than food supply. Obviously that cannot happen, and the people who take great pains to show as much show little understanding. What is meant by "tends to increase" is this: extra children get born, but, in the nature of the case, the extra number cannot grow up. Where too many are born, so many the more must die, which is just so much needless misery all round. *Nett* population cannot increase beyond food supply, be the food good or bad, abundant or scanty, but in the *gross*, population is always going beyond it. Roughly speaking, it is killed off as fast as it passes the limit. The census returns show only the *nett* increase. The gross increase can only be got at by counting the excess of births every year over deaths. That is the skeleton record of waste of life and happiness.

It will be seen at once, then, that much of the talk against the "law of population" is in the air. To show, as some people do, that "wealth" increases faster than population, is the merest muddling. "Wealth" includes all sorts of increase in mere money values: if the total rental of a country rises, if the selling values of all old pictures rise, that is counted as an increase in national wealth. All this is delusive. To sustain life, there is needed food. That does not increase faster than gross population; it does not even increase faster than *nett* population; or if it does, it is only in the sense that unnecessary forms of food are increased in greater proportion than the necessary.

There are only two answers that are worth considering to the statement that too many children are born, and that there ought to be fewer. These answers are—

1. That plenty of food *could* be raised for all the children that are born.
2. That plenty of work *could* be found to employ to good purpose all available labor power.

Now, in the sense pointed to by the words italicized, both of these assertions are true. We all realize that much more food could be raised if only the nations set themselves to the task. And even those who reject Socialist principles and Socialist economics can realize that, if the nations set themselves to employ their labor-power, they could do so, at least for a time, to a much greater extent than at present. In short, society certainly wastes, in the sense of not using, natural resources and labor-power. But those of us who preach the law of population are just as anxious as anybody else to develop these resources and that labor-power. Many of us are Socialists, and hold that the anti-Malthusian Socialists, who deny that "there is any population question," have not fully learned the lessons of social science. The case may be thus put in a nutshell: There are too many people for the available supply of food; there are too many hands for the existing labor market. Which is the proper course: to go on producing multitudes of children who

mus
low
to
task
weig
that
the
prof
powe
reall
sickl
Only

Le
cond
the v
he w
some
small
of w
work
fort.
consc
But
down
it.
dema
cloth
thing
off b
woul
the v

I d
whol
of th
grad
aliza
miser
all in
towar
who
drive
that
sition
whic
And
from

must either die in infancy through bad conditions or grow up to earn low wages—to go on in this fashion *till the social system is reformed*, or to teach all men and women how to limit their families, and bring to the task of reform the freer and happier energies of men and women not weighed down to the dust by their burdens? Does the reader believe that the weary and the wretched are better able to reform the world than the strong and the cheerful? That seems to be the opinion of some professed Socialists, who say that the misery of the poor is “motive power.” Could there be a more lamentable delusion? To talk so is really to make out that misery is more progressive than comfort, and sickness wiser than health. Misery may rebel, but it cannot reform. Only wisdom joined with strength can compass that.

Let it be asked how a lowering of their birth-rate would affect the condition of the workers, and the case will become clear enough. First, the worker with a small family has so far a more comfortable life than he would have with a large one. He will get the same wages. It is sometimes argued that if his family is smaller, his wages will fall to the smaller need; but that is a delusion. The bachelors get the same rate of wages as the married men, other things being equal. True, if the workers, in lessening their families, did not raise their standard of comfort, making the home life better all round for the fewer children—if they consented to take as little as they could live on, then wages might fall. But that is not how wage-earners would act in such a case. What drives down wages is over-abundance of labor in proportion to the demand for it. And the lessening of workers' families would not lessen the total demand for labor. It might lessen the demand for cheap children's clothing, but it would permit of a greatly increased demand for better things. Finally, when the supply of apprentices and factory girls fell off by reason of there being fewer poor men's children, wages per head would rise; and as the purchasing power per head would thus increase, the whole working class would be in better case than before.

I do not for a moment pretend that this change alone would solve the whole industrial problem. There can be no final solution of that short of the socialism of all sources of wealth, which can only be reached by gradual steps, such as Old Age Pensions, Graduated Income Tax, Nationalization of Railways, of Mining Rents, of Land, and so on. But as all misery and poverty are waste of power, because they are waste of life, all immediate lessening of them is not only a good in itself but a help towards further progress. The most efficient workers for that are those who work for it freely and intelligently, not as “dumb driven cattle,”—driven by the goads of hunger and hate. It is indeed difficult to believe that any Socialist in his heart doubts this. Rather the Socialist opposition to family prudence seems to come of that dangerous perversity which refuses all light save what comes from within one's own party. And the result of this perversity is that saving knowledge is withheld from thousands of women whose lives might be lightened and brightened

by it, and the mass of miserable existence remains unchanged where it might be greatly lessened. The fact that, on the average, the largest families are found among the poorest workers, is a proof, not that poverty causes fecundity, as some think, but that fecundity goes with ignorance, and helps to make poverty. This is not only a labor question, it is a physiological question for myriads of women who through sheer ignorance are condemned to a life of chronic suffering and constant slavery, where a modicum of information and guidance would work a world of difference.

I have said that there are only two arguments worth consideration against the statement of the law of population. But a good deal of use has lately been made of an argument which, though it does not deny the evils of over-population, suggests that these are less than the evils which might come of family limitation. There is a danger, it is said, of prudence being carried too far. In France, in some years, there are more deaths than births, and this is set down to the excessive practice of family limitation. But the truth is that the people of France are thus prudent by reason of the enormous burden of their taxation; and if their rulers want a larger population, they must just lighten the financial burdens and give more freedom to the industry of the people. What happens when the births are fewer than the deaths is, that foreign population tends to come in. But this has been happening in France for centuries; it was traced last century, in respect of population coming from Switzerland and the Low Countries; and so long as the total population does not fall away, there is no real decline in French wealth and power. Meantime, it is in every way better that the births should be lessened than that children should be born who, in the terms of the case, must grow up to misery. And there is a certain clear gain from the present state of things. Patriotic anxiety is leading the French people to take more care of what children they have, and in recent years their infantile death-rate has been noticeably reduced. On the whole, we may be pretty sure that there will always be births enough, relatively to the comfort possible for parents and children. In Great Britain, the trouble is that, though fortunately the birth-rate *has* fallen a great deal within the past ten years, there are still far more births than there should be, and accordingly far more misery than exists in France. And those who encourage such misery in order merely to keep up the census figures are really unworthy of being listened to on social problems.

Apart from all the above forms of argument against family prudence, we are constantly met in practice by the protest that such prudence is "unnatural;" and some very coarse people tell us that the conveyance of the necessary knowledge is indecent. This kind of protest has been flouted by men of the most grossly vicious lives. To these we need offer no answer. But to decent people, who, through simple modesty, shrink from the subject, the answer is easy. Firstly, if the restriction of families be unnatural because it is a divergence from animal instinct,

then clothing is unnatural, cooking is unnatural, and chastity and monogamy are unnatural. If "nature" is to be followed in one point, let it be followed in all. It is surely time that men recognized that all civilization is just a modifying and controlling of "nature." Secondly, to a thinking man or woman there can be no more of "indecent" in giving or acting-on the knowledge necessary for right living in this matter than there is in teaching physiology to students, or in doctors attending women in child-birth and disease, or in nurses attending male patients. It is really a species of mental disease, set up by morbid religion, that makes people recoil from the grave and decent handling of such profoundly important questions. There is no need for the slightest coarseness in the public or printed discussion of these matters; and as far as my experience goes, the coarseness is nearly always on the side of those who raise objections in the name of propriety.

But there is a worse form of folly, which must not here be passed over. In a recent sermon by the Rev. Charles Voysey, of the Theistic Church, London, I find the following:

"I abjure Malthus and all his works, as I would abjure the Devil if there were one. Under the semblance of a wise philosophy, and even wearing the garb of conscientious regard for others, Malthusianism is a rude and impious slap in the face given to our Mother Nature and to Nature's God. I do not say there is no sin in reckless marriages and in unbridled proletarianism; but there is far greater sin and a world of infinitely deeper moral danger and pollution in the hindrances set by society and by the adoption of Malthusianism in the way of marriage and parentage. Celibacy, if sometimes a virtue, is more often a crime which leads to vice. I am sorry to say this is not the place in which these matters can be safely discussed in detail. But this is the proper place and the proper time to declare without faltering that children and the fruit of the womb are an heritage and gift that cometh from the Lord: and that it is a crime against heaven as well as a crime against young men and maidens to frustrate their divine right to fulfil the law of their being. It is not only a crime but a blunder, not a mere choice between evils nearly balanced, but a faithless neglect of duty through lack of trust in the bounty and faithfulness of God, and a wilful adoption of means to outrage Nature and to ruin mankind."

Mr. Voysey is a very confused person, who has rejected part of the popular religion, but talks as much unreason about the rest as anybody else does over the whole. In the above passage he first avows that there is "*sin* in reckless marriages and in unbridled proletarianism"—that is, in poor men having a large number of children. Now, all that Malthus practically did was to warn people against these things. His advice, though well-meant, was bad in so far as he counselled poor men to put off marriage till they had saved a good deal of money, that is, till late in life. Such counsel can only lead to prostitution. But the neo-Malthusians correct his error by teaching young men and maidens how they may marry in their bloom without fear of ruinously large families; whereas Mr. Voysey, after admitting the "*sin*" of procreating children

for a life of misery, goes on to utter the rankest folly about the checking even of "parentage," giving us afresh the old and empty babble that children "are a gift from the Lord," and that we ought to "trust in the bounty and faithfulness of God." He adds that "God" is "the real ruler of the world, of every minute event of time and space, . . . the bountiful giver of all our children." If this be true, what was meant by the previous admission of the "sin of reckless marriages and of unbridled proletarianism"? The priest of God does not know his own mind, much less understand the subject he treats. He is just encouraging foolish people to commit the "sin" of which he has spoken. He knows as well as we that for men as for beasts and fish and birds and insects, there is *no* "bounty and faithfulness" in Nature; that myriads of every species die yearly of famine and cold and disease and ravine; that men are no more supernaturally provided for than rabbits. By his own doctrine, finally, this very pamphlet, counselling family prudence, is the act of God, who "rules" it; and the prudence itself would be God's doing, even as the births and the deaths.

But a lifetime of vain babbling about "God" leaves the priest unfit to counsel men. Under the guidance of Godism such as his, the world has for ages been a scene of perpetual, immeasurable, useless misery, the priests all the while giving "glory to God in the highest." Such men are not worthy to be listened to on their own or any other subject: they live by a delusion. There is no salvation for men save what they can compass for themselves. And this paper is an attempt to point them one of the paths by which they may make some headway.

THE APPLE TREE.

WHEN Adam was in Paradise
 He'd been a canty chiel,
 Had he never donn'd an apron
 Or listened to the deil,
 But sported 'mang the roses reid
 An' lilies white as snaw,
 An' ta'en toddy wi' the angels,
 The brawest 'mang them a',
 An' sung in heaven's chorus
 Wi' rantin', jolly glee,
 An' kissed his ain dear Eva
 'Neath the bloomin' apple tree.

But he listened to his Eva,
 The Eden glades amang ;
 He listened to his Eva,
 An' a' the world gaed wrang,
 Even to us puir callants
 Sax thoosan' years away
 Frae the apple an' the serpent
 An' that deevil o' a day.—
 An unco eerie day's wark,
 My frien', for you an' me,
 That hanged us a', ere we were born,
 On that auld apple tree !

W. STEWART ROSS.

THE DOOM OF SPAIN.

BY J. M. WHEELER.

"Who can positively say why the Spanish nation, so dominant at one time, has been distanced in the race? The awakening of the nations of Europe from the dark ages is a still more perplexing problem. At that early period, as Mr. Galton has remarked, almost all the men of a gentle nature, those given to meditation or culture of the mind, had no refuge except in the bosom of a Church which demanded celibacy; and this could hardly fail to have had a deteriorating influence on each successive generation. During this same period the Holy Inquisition selected with extreme care the finest and boldest men in order to burn or imprison them. In Spain alone some of the best men—those who doubted and questioned, and without doubting there can be no progress—were eliminated during three centuries at the rate of a thousand a year."—CHARLES DARWIN, "Descent of Man," part 1, chap. 5.

In his careful style, Darwin states the two-fold way in which the Christian religion, as exhibited in its greatest Church, has inflicted incalculable evil upon humanity. It first drained some of the most refined and cultured, in an age of barbarism, and thus prevented them from recruiting their race with a progeny of finer quality. Then it eliminated all who showed strong tendency to vary from the orthodox standard. The actual data of the martyrdom and imprisonment of heretics in Spain, between 1471 and 1771, are 32,000 burnt, 17,000 burnt in effigy (they mostly died in prison or escaped from Spain), and 291,000 condemned to various terms of imprisonment. Mr. Francis Galton, who gives the figures, says, in his work on "Hereditary Genius:" "It is impossible that any nation could stand a policy like this, without paying a heavy penalty in the deterioration of its breed, as has notably been the result in the formation of the superstitious, unintelligent Spanish race of the present day."

Four hundred years ago Spain stood at the pinnacle of nations. Its Moslem-founded universities had been the first and the finest in Europe. It had discovered a New World. Its dominions extended from Mexico to Malacca, and it had great soldiers who were also men of mind, like Bernal Diaz, Lope de Vega, Hurtado de Mendoza, Calderon, and Cervantes. But even then its priest-led rulers pursued the short-sighted policy of lopping off the heads of its tallest citizens. It drove out not only the alien Moors, but the native Moriscoes, who maintained a fine strain of Oriental art and culture in Granada. Its Inquisition relentlessly persecuted the Jews, who had aided its commerce, medicine and learning. Under Torquemada, the confessor to Isabella, in one year two hundred and eighty were burned in the city of Seville alone; seventy-nine were condemned to perpetual imprisonment; seventeen thousand suff

milder terms. In the following year not less than two thousand were burned.* In March, 1492, every Jew unbaptized by July was ordered to leave the kingdom. Probably over three hundred thousand were thus banished, many to terrible sufferings and death. The Inquisition maintained against all heretics the policy pursued towards the Moors and the Jews. In the fact that Spain has fallen from its high estate some may see "the hand of God in history." For my part, I trace but the natural consequences of its own acts.

And this short-sighted and cruel policy, which is as absurd as it is atrocious, is still pursued by pre-eminently Christian Spain. Only last year some wretch at Barcelona threw a bomb at a religious procession. It must have been the work of some madman, or one provoked by the police. For no priest was injured; the procession was over when it was thrown, and only a drummer boy and some of the populace were injured. The panic was made the occasion for seizing over five hundred citizens; known Republicans, leading Freemasons, the heads of Trade Unions, the writers on Radical papers, Socialists, and philosophical Anarchists—all in any way obnoxious to the civil or ecclesiastical authorities—were arrested. Immediately before this the government had demanded 200,000 men to be sent to Cuba, and the humanitarians of Spain had made a protest. The bomb was an opportune one for the government, for it secured its tottering seat by enabling it to bag those it regarded as dangerous enemies. All were branded as Anarchists, a term of obium which is as recklessly employed as was "Atheist" in former days. Five were shot, many imprisoned for life, others detained without trial, and tortured to extract proofs of conspiracy. At length public attention was drawn to these uncivilized proceedings, and the Government graciously liberated those against whom there was no evidence, and who could pay, or find friends to pay, their passage to another country. Only those were set free who had not been convicted of crime. And now these men are visited with odium for Golli's crime, in which they can have had no share; and again two hundred more are arrested and cast into the Spanish prisons.

There are real crimes, and priest-made crimes. In Spain, it is a crime to read a book unauthorized by the priest; a deadly crime to marry without his blessing, or to bring up children without his baptism. All who act thus are criminals in the eyes of the priest. But humanity has another voice. The worst enemies of morality are they who obscure its natural foundations by inventing a multiplicity of pseudo-crimes. A child made to regard Sunday amusements as equally sinful with cruelty to animals is in a fit state to have its morals easily overturned. I have heard of an inscription written for a certain charitable institution:

"This hospital a pious person built,
But first he made the poor wherewith to fill't."

*"Crimes of Christianity," p. 160.

A similar inscription might serve for the prisons of Spain, and of many another country.

The man who throws a bomb anywhere is a real criminal. He is invading the lives, to say nothing of the rights and liberties, of others. Let the person aimed at be ever such a tyrant, in constituting himself judge, jury and executioner the assassin or tyrannicide becomes a criminal, whose sole excuse is that he must be insane to so constitute himself. But righteous indignation at murder should not be vented on the innocent. And the Spanish exiles are not assassins, but victims. In this I write that which I know. I have seen them and have examined the evidence which is available. I have seen that one at least has been terribly tortured. They are certainly not the scum of the earth, not criminals, but intelligent men, with the conscience which comes from intelligence, —the very men who in propitious circumstances might help to redeem their country.

When Louis XIV., instigated by his priestly advisers, commenced the persecution of Protestants in France, he made a step towards the Revolution, and decisively benefited our country while injuring his own. Mr. Samuel Smiles, in his work on the Huguenots, has clearly shown that to them we owe very many of our industrial arts, and much of the most valuable life-blood of our race. To Freethinkers it should be necessary to mention but one name—that of Harriet Martineau. Had I lived four centuries ago, I would rather have been with the stigmatized few who raised their voice against the expulsion of the Jews; had I lived two centuries ago, I should, I trust, have sided with, and if possible helped, the Huguenots; and now I would at least say my little word for the outlawed Radicals, Freethinkers, Socialists and Anarchists of Spain. It is easy to over-estimate or under-estimate contemporary events, but history has decidedly set its mark on the character of the policy of Christian Spain.

Freedom of opinion cannot thus be stamped out forever. In Mexico, Cuba, and South America are a race of Spaniards, republican, free-thinking, and cosmopolitan in sympathy. That New Spain is reacting, and will react, on the old country. So with Germany. The Emperor may repress Socialism, deprive Freethinking professors of their chairs, and imprison all advanced speakers for *lese Majesty*; but in America a new Germany is growing, which will surely make its influence felt on the Fatherland. It is folly to sit on the safety-valve. In the Macchiavellian phrase, it is worse than a crime—it is a blunder. The crimes and stupidities of Anarchists are often pointed out. I am not one to defend them. Rather let me emphasize the fact that the bomb-thrower at Barcelona was the occasion of the wholesale imprisonment of hundreds of innocent men and women, and that Golli, by his assassination of Canovas, gave excuse for the fresh *razzia*. But who shall write of the crimes and stupidities of Governments? It would need the pen of a Swift and the patience of a Mommsen.*

* Reprinted from London FREETHINKER.

GOLDWIN SMITH ON THE DESTINY OF CANADA.

THE *New York Nation* recently published this letter from Mr. Goldwin Smith:

"Sir,—In your number of August 5, speaking of the relations between Canada and the United States, you say: "Separation has become our settled policy, and the commercial union with England which we have forced on Canada will grow closer and stronger as years go on. You seem inclined to think that the situation created by the Dingley tariff, combined with the Jubilee fever, will be lasting, and will decide the destinies of this continent. How often has the action of the great forces, sure in the end to prevail, been suspended, and long suspended, by that of the secondary forces or by adverse accident! How often did the unification of Italy and that of Germany miscarry, though certainly destined at last to arrive! Protectionism will run its course. The Jubilee fever will abate. The time will come when American statesmen, now so indifferent to this question, will see that if it was worth while to spend all that blood and money in averting the establishment of an antagonistic power to your south, it is not less worth while to bestow political effort in averting the establishment of an antagonistic power to your north, and that the British Canadian is at least as desirable a citizen as the southern white or negro. British statesmen, on the other hand, will learn the hopelessness of their attempt to keep five millions of North Americans out of North America and attach them to Europe. The day will come, though men of my age are not likely to behold it. Already, in spite of all the wrangling among the politicians, the two sections of our race on this continent are rapidly fusing. Hardly anything now divides them but the political and fiscal line.

"Yours respectfully,

"GOLDWIN SMITH.

"Toronto, Aug. 14, 1897."

There are a few points in this letter that call for comment. Mr. Smith may be able to read the lessons of "the great forces, sure in the end to prevail," possibly better than most other men; but it is clear that we live in an age when the majority of mankind do not feel so cock-sure of the ability of one on-looker to correctly interpret events in face of the adverse opinions of practical statesmen and the well-defined demands of extensive business interests. In politics, dealing with diverse interests of varied classes, success alone can be held to be a criterion of right. To be out of time is as bad as to be incorrect or unjust in principle; and the only justification for assuming a dictatorial tone in a political question, is the undoubted correctness and evident benefit of the proposed policy. In the present case, the unification of Italy and Germany are cited, as showing how the great forces, after various suspensions, have asserted their dominance. This seems to be a most provincial and limited view of the case. In the first place, the unification of Germany is not yet by any means completed, nor is it at all certain (1) that it can be maintained, as far as it has been accomplished, against

foreign attacks and internal dissensions ; or (2) that it can be completed by the absorption of Austrian Germany, the Netherlands, etc.

Then we are met by a question as to how far this "unification" shall extend. Are we to carry it out to nationalities, or languages, or geographical boundaries? Shall we allow the Vosges mountains or the Rhine to be the correct boundary between France and Germany? If there are more French-speaking people than German-speaking ones in Alsace-Lorraine, how shall we settle their destination? Is Denmark's claim to North Schleswig to be abandoned when Germany has succeeded in Germanizing all the inhabitants? Or shall we have a plebiscite at once to settle these matters? Can Mr Smith see the destiny of Canada more clearly than the trusted statesmen of the people's selection? Is the goal of the "great forces" a unification of the British Empire or of the Anglo-Saxon or English-speaking peoples? A union of the Latin races of France, Italy and Spain has been mooted. Why not? Indeed, if this chamber-philosophy is to be carried out logically, why not a unification of the human race? The solution of all these problems would seem to be merely a question of present expediency. If it appears that a policy of protection and partial isolation from our southern neighbors is essential for the present well being of this country, then that policy should be pursued, in preference to one which, however attractive in appearance and however forcibly put forward by political freeshooters, does not meet the approval of the bulk of the people and their responsible leaders.

Mr. Smith, however, is not content to merely put forward his views of our national destiny, but distinctly encourages "political effort in averting the establishment of an *antagonistic* power to your north." To a man who knows how very dangerous political efforts of this kind undoubtedly are, the recommendation comes as little short of direct incitement to forcible interference by the States in the internal affairs of Canada and the British Empire. If Canada should become independent, or if it should assume the position of an integral province of a British Federation, why should it be "antagonistic?" Mr. Smith must know perfectly well that, if antagonism arises between Canada and the United States, the antagonism will probably be entirely the outcome of the action of the latter in endeavoring to force their views upon Canada.

When, too, Mr. Smith talks of "keeping five millions of North Americans out of North America, and attaching them to Europe," he seems to be talking poppycock. The "unification" craze has overmastered his judgment. While the Central American republics are forming a federation to protect themselves from United States Monroism, and when the South American states have repudiated the suzerainty implied in the Monroe doctrine as recently put forward by United States jingoes, it is hardly the time to impress upon us the necessity of annexation to the States, or upon American politicians the advisability of entering upon a political campaign to enforce the doctrine upon unwilling Canadians.

All rational men must wish to live on terms of friendship with their neighbors; but friendship cannot be maintained on a one-sided basis. If it is to be permanent, it must be established on a just foundation, and this is always difficult to determine as between a small and a large nation. If it were for Canada a mere question of choice between Britain and the United States for an ally, it would, we feel sure, be decided by the great bulk of Canadians that three thousand miles of water offers no such obstacle to a political federation as such irritating measures—small and mean as they are—as the Alien Law and the Dingley Bill. The efforts Mr. Smith suggests that the United States politicians should take to prevent Canada settling her own destiny, however well-meant and innocent they might be, could not but result in a disastrous conflict, and one in which all classes of Canadians would be as staunch and self-sacrificing as were the founders of the Republic itself. If the politicians of the United States should ever contemplate taking Mr. Smith's advice, let them study the history of their own country, and count the cost before they finally decide on it.

PROF. MICHAEL FOSTER ON PHYSIOLOGY.

THE following are the concluding sentences of Prof. Foster's paper on Physiology, read at the recent meeting of the British Association, in which he deals with the nervous system :

Physiology, even in the narrower sense of which, by emphasis on the wavering barrier which parts the animal from the plant, it is restricted in this section, deals with many kinds of being, and with many things in each. But, somewhat as man, in one aspect a tiny fragment of the world, still more of the universe, in another aspect looms so great as to overshadow everything else, so the nervous system, seen from one point of view, is no more than a mere part of the whole organism, but, seen from another point of view, seems by its importance to swallow up all the rest. As man is apt to look upon all other things as mainly subserving his interests and purposes, so the physiologist, but with more justice, may regard all the rest of the body as mainly subserving the welfare of the nervous system, and, as man was created last, so our natural knowledge of the working of that nervous system has been the latest in its growth. But if there be any truth in what I have urged to-day, we are witnessing a growth which promises to be as rapid as it has seemed to be delayed. Little spirit of prophecy is needed to foretell that in the not distant future the teacher of physiology will hurry over the themes on which he now dwells so long, in order that he may have time to expound the most important of all the truths which he has to tell, those which have to do with the manifold workings of the brain.

And I will be here so bold as to dare to point out that this development of his science must, in the times to come, influence the attitude of the physiologist

towards the world, and ought to influence the attitude of the world towards him. I imagine that if a plebiscite, limited even to instructed, I might almost say scientific, men, were taken at the present moment, it would be found that the most prevalent conception of physiology is that it is a something which is in some way an appendage to the art of medicine. That physiology is, and always must be, the basis of the science of healing is so much a truism, that I would not venture to repeat it here were it not that some of those enemies alike to science and humanity, who are at times called anti-vivisectionists, and whose zeal often outruns, not only discretion, but even truth, have quite recently asserted that I think otherwise. Should such an hallucination ever threaten to possess me, I should only have to turn to the little we yet know of the physiology of the nervous system and remind myself how great a help the results of pure physiological curiosity—I repeat the words, pure physiological curiosity, for curiosity is the mother of science—have been, alike to the surgeon and physician, in the treatment of those in some way most affecting maladies, the diseases of the nervous system. No, physiology is, and always must be, the basis of the science of healing; but it is something more. When physiology is dealing with those parts of the body which we call muscular, vascular, glandular tissues and the like, rightly handled she points out the way not only to mend that which is hurt, to repair the damages of bad usage and disease, but so to train the growing tissues and to guide the grown ones as that the best may be made of them for the purposes of life. She not only heals, she governs and educates. Nor does she do otherwise when she comes to deal with the nervous tissues. Nay, it is the very prerogative of these nervous tissues that their life is, above that of all the other tissues, contingent on the environment and susceptible of education. If increasing knowledge gives us increasing power so to mould a muscular fibre that it shall play to the best the part which it has to play in life, the little knowledge we at present possess gives us at least as much confidence in a coming far greater power over the nerve cell. This is not the place to plunge into the deep waters of the relation which the body bears to the mind, but this at least stares us in the face, that changes in what we call the body bring about changes in what we call the mind. When we alter the one, we alter the other. If, as the whole past history of our science leads us to expect, in the coming years a clearer and clearer insight into the nature and conditions of that molecular dance which is to us the material token of nervous action, and a fuller, exacter knowledge of the laws which govern the sweep of nervous impulses along fibre and cell, give us wider and directer command over the moulding of the growing nervous mechanism and the maintenance and regulation of the grown one, then assuredly physiology will take its place as a judge of appeal in questions not only of the body, but of the mind; it will raise its voice not in the hospital and consulting-room only, but also in the Senate and the school.

BRUNO AND HIS PHILOSOPHY.

BY ANDRÉ LEFÈVRE.

BORN about the year 1548, in the Terra di Lavoro, Giordano began his career with the most zealous orthodoxy, entering as a Dominican friar into the special order of the Inquisition. But either the passionate love of nature and his own meditations, or the study of the Arab Neo-Platonists and the successors of Marsilio Ficino, or else the sight of horrors daily sanctified in the name of Christ, or perhaps all these things combined, soon weaned him from the religion of his youth, diverting his love and his worship to another ideal. It was about his thirtieth year when he succeeded in escaping from the "narrow and dark prison in which error had so long kept him confined." For some ten years he is met ever on the move, in Italy, Switzerland, France, England, Germany, in all the university towns, everywhere welcomed by the great, everywhere admired by the young, in the end banished from every place. The frankness of his opinions ever destroys the effect of his personal charms and brilliant eloquence. Dogged, watched, at last betrayed by a certain Mocerrigo, by whom he had been attracted to Venice, he pines for six years (1592-1598) under the "Piombi," handed over to the Holy Office, he mounts the scaffold after two years of torture, condemned "to be punished with all possible lenience, and without the effusion of blood." His heroic fortitude never quails throughout this interminable agony, and his last words are: "You dread more to utter than I do to hear my sentence." The execution of Bruno ushers in the seventeenth century, and the abashed judges, already alarmed at the new times, conceal instead of trumpeting his death, so that for eighty years his fate remained shrouded in mystery.

Bruno was not condemned for his teaching, with which the old and more recent Fathers of the Church were familiar, and which many of the schoolmen had contrived to reconcile with orthodoxy. But this knight-errant of Pantheism furiously assailed the Church, sparing neither Geneva nor Rome, preaching a new religion, nay more, everywhere opposing freedom to authority. "Why," he wrote, "always appeal to authority? Between Plato and Aristotle who shall decide? The supreme judge of truth is evidence..... Authority is not without but within us." Thus he undermined all the sham foundations of society: hence it was that the universities repelled him, princes proscribed, Protestants rejected, and the Church burned him as an Atheist.

The Church saw clearly enough that Pantheism is equivalent to Atheism, nor is the equation in the least affected by the enthusiasm and religious sentiment so conspicuous in Bruno. Parmenides, Zeno, Plotinus, and Spinoza are quite as much Atheists as Protagoras, Straton or Lucretius. A god reduced to a sort of universal virtuality ceases to be anything, for

he neither adds to nor takes aught from the reality of things. Pantheism is metaphysics applied to materialism, the quintessence of anthropomorphism blended with the universe. Its god is the *nature* of Lucretius endowed with the *will* of Schopenhauer, the efficient and final cause, a subjective illusion superadded to the aggregate of facts and combinations certified by experience.

We have everywhere met, and shall again everywhere meet, with this Pantheism, or "Monism," as it is now called, because it is the intermediate phase between anthropomorphism and science, the at times almost imperceptible line separating the two philosophies, those of logical reason and experience. Bruno is second to none of his predecessors or successors in the subtle art of intermingling matter and spirit while still keeping them distinct, in identifying the universe and God, God and the creature, the one and the manifold, without confusing them. From these contradictions he escapes with fine formulas concealing dialectic subtleties, and especially with fiery hymns to the infinite, to force, to the *natura naturans* or *naturata*, recalling at one time Lucretius, at another Marcus Aurelius. He is evidently sincere when he tells us that he had adopted the Copernican system before reading Copernicus, and when, with Lucretius, from the universal force and from the immensity in which it is diffused, he infers the infinity of the solar system, of the stars and the constellations that whiten the Milky Way.

Giordano Bruno's originality consists not only in having, by reminiscence less than by instinct, reproduced and combined all the hypotheses of the old Materialists and Panthesists, but also in having sketched the theories, and employed the very terminology destined to play such an important and preponderating part in modern philosophy. Throughout his works are scattered, either in germ or *de facto*, the methodic doubt, the evidence, the infinity of the world and the vortices of Descartes; the God consubstantial with the universe, the immanent cause, the *natura naturans* or *naturata* of Spinoza; the monads, the atoms, the ascending and descending circulation, the pre-established harmony, the optimism of Leibnitz; the identity of Schelling, the *minimum* and *maximum* of Hegel, to say nothing of the efficient and final cause, will, the inconscient, etc. Had the Inquisition allowed him time to sum up and reduce his doctrines to order, the history of philosophies would have been shortened by one-half.—*Philosophy: Historical and Critical*.

MAN can never be so sufficiently assured of the course of his thoughts as to swear fidelity to this or that system, which for the time being he may regard as the true one. All that he can do is to consecrate himself to the service of Truth, whatever she may be, and to incline his heart to follow her wherever he thinks that he sees her, and this though at the cost of the most painful sacrifices.—*Ernest Renan, Letter to Cognat*.

THE BASIS OF PSYCHOLOGY.

BY THE LATE THOMAS H. HUXLEY.

SURELY no one who is cognizant of the facts of the case, now-a-days, doubts that the roots of psychology lie in the physiology of the nervous system. What we call the operations of the mind are functions of the brain, and the materials of consciousness are products of cerebral activity. Cabanis may have made use of crude and misleading phraseology when he said that the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile; but the conception which that much-abused phrase embodies is, nevertheless, far more consistent with fact than the popular notion that the mind is a metaphysical entity seated in the head, but as independent of the brain as a telegraph operator is of his instrument.

It is hardly necessary to point out that the doctrine just laid down is what is commonly called materialism. In fact, I am not sure that the adjective 'crass,' which appears to have a special charm for rhetorical sciolists, would not be applied to it. But it is, nevertheless, true that the doctrine contains nothing inconsistent with the purest idealism. For as Hume remarks (as indeed Descartes had observed long before): "Tis not our body we perceive when we regard our limbs and members, but certain impressions which enter by the senses; so that the ascribing a real and corporeal existence to these impressions, or to their objects, is an act of the mind as difficult to explain as that [the external existence of objects] which we examine at present." (I. 249). Therefore, if we analyse the proposition that all mental phenomena are the effects or products of material phenomena, all that it means amounts to this: that whenever those states of consciousness which we call sensation, or emotion, or thought, come into existence, complete investigation will show good reason for the belief that they are preceded by those other phenomena of consciousness to which we give the names of matter and motion. All material changes appear, in the long run, to be modes of motion. But our knowledge of motion is nothing but that of a change in the place and order of our sensations; just as our knowledge of matter is restricted to those feelings of which we assume it to be the cause.

It has already been pointed out that Hume must have admitted, and in fact does admit, the possibility that the mind is a Leibnitzian monad, or a Fichtean world-generating Ego, the universe of things being merely the picture produced by the evolution of the phenomena of consciousness. For any demonstration that can be given to the contrary effect, the "collection of perceptions" which makes up our consciousness may be an orderly phantasmagoria generated by the Ego, unfolding its successive scenes on the background of the abyss of nothingness; as a firework, which is but cunningly-arrayed combustibles, grows from a

spa
cas
can
of
tha
syst
tho
bec
con
com
of t
com
idea
of p

THE
pres
devi
seve
the
Ven
of th
depa
the
figur
lowi
hour
or th
the f
Venu
the v
tatio
proc
estal
Dies
into
inste
own
Rom
and

spark into a coruscation, and from a coruscation into figures, and words, and cascades of devouring fire, and then vanishes into the darkness of the night.

On the other hand, it must no less readily be allowed that, for anything that can be proved to the contrary, there must be a real something which is the cause of all our impressions; that sensations, though not likenesses, are symbols of that something; and that the part of that something which we call the nervous system, is an apparatus for supplying us with a sort of algebra of fact, based on those symbols. A brain may be the machinery by which the material universe becomes conscious of itself. But it is important to notice that, even if this conception of the universe and of the relation of consciousness to its other components should be true, we should, nevertheless, be still bound by the limits of thought, still unable to refute the arguments of pure idealism. The more completely the materialistic position is admitted, the easier it is to show that the idealistic position is unassailable, if the idealist confines himself within the limits of positive knowledge.—*Life of Hume.*

THE CALENDAR.

THE week, as we have it to-day, was originated centuries before the present division of the year into months. The week is purely a Roman device and of astrological origin. The ancient Romans knew of but seven celestial bodies outside of the stars. They were the following, in the order of their distance from the earth: Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Sun, Venus, Mercury, and the moon. These planets were, with the exception of the sun and moon, named from the gods who presided over the various departments of men's activities. The Romans had previously divided the apparent day into 24 equal parts called "hours." Their wise men figured that, if the first of these hours be given to Saturn and each following hour to the next planet in rotation, the 25th hour, or the first hour of the following day, would belong to the sun, and the 49th hour, or the first of the day following, would belong to the moon, and so on, the first hour of successive days falling to Mars, Mercury, Jupiter and Venus. It was decided that each celestial body was to be the regent of the whole day whose first hour fell to its lot by this scheme of computation. The sun, capturing the first lot, was given the first place in the procession of days, and the chronology of the Roman week became established as follows: Dies Solis, Dies Lunæ, Dies Martis, Dies Mercurii, Dies Jovis, Dies Veneris, and Dies Saturni. This nomenclature crept into the customs and language of the nations of Northern Europe, who, instead of using the names of the Roman gods, used the names of their own gods, who represented attributes corresponding to those of the Roman deities. In selecting names for the Anglo-Saxon week, German and Scandinavian gods were impartially honored. For instance, the

Roman Dies Jovis (the day of Jupiter) appeared in the Anglo-Saxon as "Thor's day," which became our Thursday. Thor was the Scandinavian God of Thunder who ruled the heavens as the Roman deity Jupiter did. Dies Martis (day of Mars) became "Tiw's day" in the Anglo-Saxon, in honor of Tiw, the German god of war, who corresponded to Mars, the divine superintendent of Latin hostilities. The following shows the days of the week in the Latin, and how they appeared in English, via the Anglo-Saxon route :

LATIN.	SAXON.	ENGLISH.
Dies Solis.....	Sun's day.....	Sunday.
Dies Lunæ.....	Moon's day.....	Monday.
Dies Martis.....	Tiw's day.....	Tuesday.
Dies Mercurii.....	Woden's day.....	Wednesday.
Dies Jovis.....	Thor's day.....	Thursday.
Dies Veneris.....	Friga's day.....	Friday.
Dies Saturni.....	Seterne's day.....	Saturday.

It was centuries after the names of our week days travelled from the Latin through the German languages into the early English that the names of the months as we have them, were formally adopted by English-speaking people, and this was done by Act of Parliament only 24 years before the American Declaration of Independence.

Romulus, the founder of Rome, is credited with the invention of the scheme of division of the year into months; but Romulus's year had only ten months of 304 days, and began with our March. As Romulus was accounted a son of Mars, the Roman God of War, he naturally named the first month of the year "Martius," in honor of his father. The second month he called "Aprilis," in token of the "opening" of the earth to vegetation. The third month was called "Maius," in honor of Maia, mother of the Greek god Mercury. Junius, the name of the fourth month, was in honor of Junius, a Roman family of great power and influence. The rest of the month-names were merely numbered with Latin numerals. The months of the early Roman year therefore read thus: Martius, Aprilis, Maius, Junius, Quintilius, Sextilis, Septem, Octo, Novem, and Decem. There were all sorts of changes and all kinds of confusion until the year 47 B.C., which had 445 days and was called the "last year of confusion." The year following (46 B.C.) Julius Cæsar renovated the whole calendar and tacked two months on to the beginning of the year. The first month, "Januarius," was named in honor of the God Janus, who kept the doors of heaven, and the second month was called "Februarius," from "Februa," the fast-days of expiation, which correspond to our Lenten season. The name of the fifth month was changed from Quintilis to Julius in his own honor, and Sextilis (the sixth month) was changed to Augustus in honor of Cæsar Augustus, a grandson of the Dictator's sister Julia, who was the heir apparent to Julius Cæsar's throne. Julius ordered the "odd" months, that is, the first, third, fifth, etc., to have 31 days, and the "even"

numbered months 30 days, except Februarius, which should have 29. This made the 365 days. Augustus, who was then but 17 years old, got mad because his month had but 30 days. Julius therefore took a day from Februarius and added it to Augustus, whereupon the youngster was satisfied. This gave the month of Augustus 31 days and left Februarius but 28. In order that three months of 31 days might not come together, Septem and Novem were reduced to 30 days, and the two days divided between Octo and Decem. But Julius still had about six hours surplus for each of his years. This he arranged by giving Februarius an extra day every four years. This practice remains as our "leap year." Even this year proved to be too long by enough minutes to amount to about a day in 128 years. In 1582 these minutes had accumulated to about ten days, and Pope Gregory ordered that ten days be suppressed from the calendar. As these minutes amounted to about a day in a century, Gregory commanded that every centennial year be celebrated by omitting the leap year day. Hence we still have the Gregorian rule that a day be added to each year the number of which is exactly divisible by four, excepting centenary years, which are leap years only when divisible by four after leaving off the ciphers. Thus the last centenary leap year was 1600 and the next will be 2000. This calendar was immediately adopted by all Catholic countries, and is now adopted in all Christian countries except Russia. The names of these months passed directly into the English language without travelling through the German tongue, as did the names of the week-days. The Latin names were merely Anglicised by the addition of the Saxon suffix "ber" to the numbered months and the changing of the Latin termination "us" or "ius" to "y" in the others. These names leave us in an awkward fix. As "Decem" means ten, December in name is the "tenth month," while in fact it is the twelfth month. November, October, and September are likewise misnomers. It was not until September 3, 1752, that the British Parliament formally adopted the Gregorian calendar, which we use to-day.—*N. Y. Voice.*

If we could only see in one view the torrents of hypocrisy and cruelty, the lies, the slaughter, the violation of every obligation of humanity, which have flowed from this source—the doctrine that honest disbelief is a moral offence—along the course of the history of Christian nations, our worst imaginations of hell would pale beside the vision.—*Huxley.*

EVERY one who looks back and compares his early impressions respecting states of things in his own society with the impressions he now has, will see how erroneous were the beliefs once so decided, and how probable it is that even his revised beliefs are but partially true.—*Herbert Spencer.*

WHOEVER imagines himself a favorite with God holds other people in contempt.—*Ingersoll.*

A FAIRY TALE AND ITS APPLICATION.

BY THOMAS INMAN, M.D.

IN a charming collection of fairy tales from the pen of Andersen, there is a story which has often recurred to my mind since I read it. It tells of an old king who reigned in the realms of Fancy, and who wished to pass for being very wise and peculiarly excellent as a sovereign; but he had some secret misgivings about himself, and some very strong doubts about the capacity and real worth of his ministers. To his town there came a set of adventurers, who professed to weave the most beautiful garments that had ever been seen, and whose especial value was enhanced by the fact that they were invisible to any individual who was unfitted for the station which he held. The monarch, hearing of the wonderful invention, and believing that it would be a means of testing the worth of his officers of state, ordered a handsome suit of this apparel. The weavers demanded and obtained a large sum of money for the purchase of the necessary material, and very soon announced that the work had begun.

After waiting a reasonable time the king sent his house-steward, of whom he had grave suspicion, to examine the dress and to report progress. The man went and, to his horror, saw nothing more than an empty loom, although the weavers told him that the garment was nearly half done, and asked him to notice the harmony of color. What was to be done? If he acknowledged that he saw nothing, it was clear that he must resign his post as being unfitted for it. This he could not afford to do, so he pretended to see it, and then warmly praised the invisible garment and nodded profoundly as the sharpers pointed out this color and that pattern, declaring that he had never seen a more lovely product of the weaver's art. He then told the king of the glories of the new dress, and the sovereign concluded that the man was not such a fool as he thought him. After each member of the court had gone through the ordeal with a like result, the adventurers declared that the robes were completed, and they solicited the king to appoint a day on which he would parade in them, so that the public might see and admire the wondrous apparel. Relying on the reports which had been made by the courtiers, the adventurers succeeded in drawing large sums of money from the monarch ere the new clothes were tried on, and thus were prepared to leave the town as soon as the procession should be formed.

The day arrived; the weavers waited on the king, bending, apparently, under the weight of the magic robes which they carried; but oh! what horror seized the king when he found he could not see them. Yet all his officers had seen them, and had thus showed themselves fitted for their posts, and should he alone

declare himself unworthy to hold the position which he occupied? To proclaim himself the only fool in his court was too much for his magnanimity, so he "made believe" to see, and greatly to admire, the wonderful dress, sitting shivering in his shirt and small clothes, whilst the artificers clothed him with the gorgeous robes of their making. He felt some surprise at their lightness, and was informed that airiness combined with beauty were the special characteristics of the garments, and that the discovery of this showed how peculiarly wise was the wearer of the dress. At last the ceremony of robing was completed, and the monarch took his place under the canopy of state. A procession through the town began, so that all might see the wondrous dress of which so much had been said. But everybody, who saw the king, recognized the fact that he had nothing on but his shirt and breeches, yet none dared to say so, lest he alone of all the population should be thought a fool. So the people unanimously applauded the work of the fairy laborers, as being something unheard of before. Yet amongst the crowd was a little child, who, having no reputation for wisdom, had none to lose; and she, with all the heartiness of youth, cried out, "But the king has got nothing on him but his shirt." "Hear the voice of innocence," was then the common cry, and each recognized how silly he had been.

Now it seems to me there are many such foolish kings and courtiers amongst ourselves, and that the voice of one who dares to say what he thinks is often necessary, to enable others to trust to their own sense and senses. There have risen up amongst us a set of men, who declare that they weave the robes which are necessary for the court of Heaven, and without which none can enter that august assembly. They descant upon the beauty of the material, the loveliness of the pattern, the grace which the garments confer upon the wearers, and their superiority over all besides. Into that fraternity of weavers many an apprentice enters; but in it he can only remain on the condition that he consents to see and admire the invisible garments, and to induce others to do so too. As a result the artisans, and all who put implicit trust in their statements, concur in praising garments which they cannot see, and of whose real existence there is no proof whatever. Sometimes even the wearers quarrel as to the fashion of the cut, the excellence of the pattern, or the color of the web which they declare to have been woven. They all agree in saying something which they do not believe, or which they know they should disbelieve if they ventured to use their judgment, which amounts to the same thing; and they all make the same confession, lest by speaking their minds they should be thought unfitted for their station, and be set down as fools.

If a bishop, no matter what his learning may be, ventures to doubt the value of the raw material out of which the magic robes are woven, an attempt is made to remove him from the society of weavers, as unfitted for his office. In vain he points to Huss, Wickliffe, Luther, Latimer, Ridley, and others, whose memory is

held in the highest respect, to show that other artisans have struck out new methods of weaving, and have dissented from the laws which regulated their trade union. In vain he points out that our Savior himself was a heretic of the deepest dye, according to the judgment of the rulers of the church in his own times ; and that the first step towards improvement in dress is the recognition of flaws in the old garment.

There was a time when all Christendom recognized the apocryphal books of the Bible as undoubtedly inspired, there are many Christians who do so still ; yet the Reformers, on whose energy we pride ourselves, did not rest till they expunged those volumes from the canon of Scripture. As man once sat in judgment upon what was said to be the result of a divine command, so may he do again. The power which was assumed by men three hundred years ago, may be again wielded by other mortals now, and we may hope to see in the nineteenth century a change analogous to that which took place in the sixteenth. Yet it is very difficult to initiate a change in any profession from within. There is scarcely a single art, science, profession, business or trade in which the most conspicuous improvements have not arisen from individuals who are, so to speak, "outsiders" It has most certainly been so with the Established Church, and it is difficult to decide, in the present day, whether she has been most influenced by "Papism" or by "Methodism."

To such a church, the utterance of a child who has no reputation to lose, who has not entered into the fraternity of manners, and who ventures to express the thoughts which pass through his mind, may be of service ; a saying for which a bishop or other dignitary of the church is punished, a layman can enunciate with perfect impunity. A writer who is not in the clerical trade union cannot be driven with ignominy from the weaver's guild ; for him excommunication is like the mock thunder which he has heard behind the stage of a theatre, and the ordinary volley of hard words which are hurled so copiously by priestly clerks upon their adversaries are to him evidence of weakness in argument.—*Ancient Faiths Embodied in Ancient Names.*

"Speaking about childish blunders as to proper names," said one of a party of romancers, "your story reminds me of one which my wife's parents told of her when she was a little one. The folks were one evening commenting on the fact that there were no family names, or surnames, mentioned in the Bible, and she took exception to the statement. 'Why, you forget about the first chapter of Matthew,' she cried triumphantly, 'where it tells about Abraham Begat, and Isaac Begat, and the whole Begat family.'"

THE inclination to sink into the slumber of dogma is so natural to every generation, that the most uncompromising critical intellect must without intermission stand upon the watch against it.—*Otto Pfeleiderer.*

PSYCHICAL RELIGION AND RAJA YOGA.

BY J. A. RISSER, TORONTO.

In the first instalment of this article, published in the *DOMINION REVIEW* for last month, the purpose and object of the Yoga exercises, as described by Vivekananda in his book, were fully set forth. In brief, the aim of this training is to give every man the power to discover the true basis of religion each for himself. Although the exercises are clearly described, the author says that they can be practised safely only by direct contact with a teacher; that if there exists a desire for further information, the teacher will not be wanting. We are also warned against the danger of frittering away our energies by taking up an idea only for its novelty and then giving it up. The views expressed are those of Mr. Vivekananda—in part in his own language, and in part condensed by the present writer.

The exercises in Raja Yoga are classified into eight different stages or steps; the Hindoo names for which are respectively as follows:—1, Yama; 2, Niyama; 3, Asana; 4, Pranayama; 5, Pratyahara; 6, Dharana; 7, Dhyana; 8, Samadhi.

YAMA.

The exercises that regulate and control thoughts that result in non-killing, truthfulness, non-stealing, continence, and non-receiving of any gifts, are called Yama. The suppression of all desire to give pain to others purifies the mind and makes the body finer and more sensitive. The way to practise the virtues that have been stated is by holding thoughts of an opposite character in the mind. When the idea of stealing comes, non-stealing should be thought of. When the idea of receiving gifts comes, replace it by a contrary thought. When a man receives a gift from another man, the theory is that his heart becomes impure, he loses his independence. By the establishment of continence, energy is gained. The chaste brain has tremendous energy, gigantic will-power—without it there can be no mental strength.

Every vicious thought will rebound, every thought of hatred is stored up, and will come back to you with tremendous power in the form of some misery here. The brain is a battery that projects vibratory forces into the surrounding ether, that correspond in quality with the thoughts which produce them. This idea explains the ethical theory that you must not hate, and must love, because, just as in the case of electricity, or any other force, the modern theory is that the power leaves the dynamo and completes the circle back to the dynamo. So with all forces in nature: they must come back to the source. Therefore, do not hate anyone, because that force, that hatred, which goes out from you, must in the long run come back to you, completing the circuit.

NIYAMA.

Niyama includes exercises in the cultivation of regular habits and observances, austerity, study, contentment, purity and worshipping God. Fasting (not starving), or in other ways controlling the body, is called the physical austerity. Repeating the sacred verses and sacred words—that is, those verses from any of the sacred books or other sources that teach the highest morality—at the same time thinking of their meaning, is called study: the mind and body are both purified by study. The purification of the body is by water, earth or other materials. Purification of the mind by truth, and by all the other virtues, is what is called internal purification. Both are necessary. Worship is by praise, by memory, having devotion to God—not the anthropomorphic God, but the pantheistic or cosmic God. By these practices the mind will become concentrated and cheerful; other results will follow immediately, such as heightened powers of vision, hearing things at a distance, etc.

ASANA.

In the practice of Raja Yoga, a series of exercises, physical and mental, is to be gone through every day, until certain higher states are reached; therefore it is quite necessary that we should find a comfortable posture in which we can remain long. For one man it may be very easy to think in a certain attitude, but this may be very difficult for another. That posture which is the easiest for each one is the posture to use. We will find later on, that in these psychological studies there will be a good deal of action going on in the body. Nerve currents will have to be displaced and given a new channel. New sorts of vibration will begin, the whole constitution will be remodelled. But the main part of the action will lie along the spinal column, so that the one thing necessary for the posture is to hold the spinal column free, sitting erect, holding the three parts—the chest, neck and head—in a straight line. Let the whole weight of the body be supported by the ribs, and then you have an easy, natural posture, with the spine straight. You will naturally see that you cannot think very high thoughts with the chest in.

Do not practise in places where there is fire, or in water, or on ground which is strewn with dry leaves, or where there are wild animals, where four streets meet, or where there is too much noise, or too much fear, or where there are many wicked persons. Do not practise when the body feels very lazy, or when the mind is very miserable and sorrowful, or when the body is ill. Go to a place which is well hidden, and where people do not come to disturb you. Do not choose dirty places. Rather choose beautiful scenery, or a room in your own house which is beautiful. Until you can get a firm seat, you cannot practise the exercises which follow. The seat being firm means that you do not feel the body at all. When you have succeeded in conquering the body and keeping it firm, your practice will remain firm; but while you are disturbed by the body, your nerves become disturbed, and you cannot concentrate the mind.

PRANAYAMA.

The whole universe is composed of the ultimate ether (akasa) and the ultimate cosmic force (prana). The ether is the omnipresent, all-penetrating substance. Everything that has form, that is the result of compounds, is evolved out of the ether. It is so subtle that it itself cannot be perceived; it can be seen only when it has become gross, has taken form. It is, however, purely passive and cannot of itself be manifested in all the many forms in the universe. It is by the power of the universal force (prana) that the ether is manifested in so many ways. All activities, all forms of energy, as gravitation, magnetism, electricity, nerve currents and thought force, are but different manifestations of prana. Any one form of force may be converted into any of the other forms and also into that primitive simplest form of energy from which all of them have been evolved. Nature is perpetually converting these forces from one to other forms and we do not see how it is done. But if we could get this knowledge, more particularly if we could grasp the most primitive and simplest form of force and understand how it is being converted into every other form of manifested energy, we could do all that nature is doing at our pleasure by mere effort of the will, and gain power beyond the most vivid dreams of the imagination. To gain this knowledge and power is the end and aim of Pranayama.

One peculiarity of the Hindu mind is that it always enquires for the last possible generalization, leaving the details to be worked out afterwards. The question is raised in the Vedas, "What is that, knowing which we shall know everything?" If a man wants to know this universe bit by bit, he must know every individual grain of sand, and that means infinite time for him; he cannot know each separate atom. Then how can knowledge be? It is impossible for a man to be all-knowing through particulars. Behind all particular ideas stands a generalized, an abstract principle; grasp it, and you have grasped everything. All forces have been generalized into prana, and he who has grasped the prana, has grasped all the forces of the universe, mental or physical. He who has controlled the prana has controlled his body, and all the bodies that exist, because the prana is the generalized manifestation of force.

Each man must begin where he stands, and must learn to control the things that are nearest to him. This body is the nearest thing to us, nearer than anything in the universe, and this mind is the nearest of all. This little wave of the prana which represents our energies, mental and physical, if we can succeed in controlling that, then alone we can hope to control the whole of prana. The finest and highest action of prana is thought, and thought may be divided into three degrees of fineness. The lowest plane of mental action we call instinct, or unconscious thought. All reflex actions belong to this plane. The next higher plane is reason, or conscious thought. Yet that is not all. We know that

reason is limited. The circle within which it runs is relatively very small. Like the coming of comets certain things are coming into this circle, and it is certain they come from outside the limit, but the reason and the intellect cannot reach beyond. But the mind can exist on a still higher plane, called intuition or superconscious thought. When the mind has reached that state it goes beyond the limits of reason, and comes face to face with facts which no instinct or reason can ever know. All these manipulations of the subtle forces of the body, if trained, give a push to the mind, and the mind goes up higher, and becomes superconscious and from that plane acts.

That which naturally takes a long time to accomplish can be shortened by the intensity of the action. A man may go on slowly and unconsciously drawing in this energy from the infinite mass that exists in the universe, and perhaps he will require several million years to become perfect. Given rapid growth the time will be lessened. Why is it not possible, with sufficient effort, to reach perfection in six months or six years? Why cannot the soul by intensifying its action attain to that goal in this very life? All beings will at last attain to that perfection, we know. But who cares to wait millions of æons? Why not reach it immediately in this body even? The whole science of Yoga is directed to that one end, to teach men how to intensify the power of assimilation and thereby shorten the time for reaching perfection, instead of slowly advancing from point to point, and waiting until the whole human race has become perfect. All the great prophets, saints and seers, in one span of life bridged the whole length of time. In this life they perfected themselves; they had no thought for anything else, breathed for nothing else, never lived a moment for any other idea, and thus the way was shortened for them. This is what is meant by concentration or intensifying the action; and Raja Yoga teaches us how to gain the power of concentration.

Let us take a fact from physics. We have all heard of electricity and various other forces of a similar nature. What is the difference between them? If all the molecules in a body are made to move in the same direction it will make a gigantic battery of electricity of that body. Now let us take a fact from physiology. The nerve-centre which regulates the breathing-system is located opposite the thorax in the spinal column. It has a sort of controlling action over the system of nerve currents and also exercises some control over the secondary centres. Now we shall see why it is necessary to practice certain exercises in breathing. From rhythmical breathing will come a tendency of all the molecules in the body to have the same direction. The nerve currents show a similarity to electrical currents, because the nerves are proved to show polarity under electrical action. When all the motions of the body have become perfectly rhythmical, the body has become a gigantic battery of will. This is a physiological explanation of the exercises in rhythmical breathing.

What we want to do is to feel the finer motions that are going on in the body. Our minds have become externalized and have lost sight of them. If we can begin to feel them, we can begin to control them. These nerve-currents are going on all over the body, bringing life and vitality to every muscle. The Yogi says we can learn to feel them. How? By taking up and controlling all the motions of the prana, beginning with the motion of the lungs, and when we have done that for a sufficient length of time, we shall also be able to control the finer motions.

BREATHING EXERCISES.

When you have learned to command a comfortable posture, as described in the third stage, Asana, the first lesson is just to breathe in a measured way, in and out. When you have practised this for some time you will do well to join the repetition of some word to it, as "Om," or any other sacred word, and let the word flow in and out with the breath rhythmically, harmoniously, and you will find the whole body is becoming rhythmical. Our usual mode of breathing should not be called breathing at all. It is very irregular.

After practising the first lesson in breathing for a few days you take up a higher one. Stop the right nostril with the thumb and slowly draw in the breath with the left; then close both nostrils with thumb and forefinger, and imagine that you are sending that current down and striking the base of the spinal column; then take off the thumb, and let the breath out through the right nostril. The way the Hindus practice this would be very difficult for this country, because they do it from childhood and their lungs are prepared for it. Here it is well to draw in the breath four seconds, hold in sixteen seconds, then throw out eight seconds. This exercise should not be practised too much. Do it only four times in the morning and four times in the evening. So, very cautiously and carefully increase the number, as you feel that you have the power, to six instead of four. It may injure you if you practise it irregularly.

The next exercise is to draw the breath in slowly, and then immediately throw it out slowly, and then hold it out, using the same numbers. The only difference is that in the previous case the breath was held in, and in this one held out. The first effect of these practices will be that the face will change; harsh lines will disappear; calmness will come over the face. Next, beautiful voice will come. These signs will come after a few month's practice.

PRATYAHARA.

Making the mind introspective is the fifth stage, or Pratyahara. All the powers of the mind must be directed inwards upon the mind itself. This cannot be done successfully if the senses are left free to play upon the mind to attract its attention outwards to external objects. The sense organs, therefore, must first be brought under the control of the will.

Eyes do not see. Take away the brain centre which is in the head, the eyes will still be there and yet they will not see. So the eyes are only a secondary instrument, not the organ of vision. The organ of vision is in the nerve centre of the brain. Sometimes a man is thinking intently with his eyes open. The light is there and the picture is there, but a third thing is necessary; mind must be joined to the organ—we need also the brain centre and the agency of the mind. Carriages roll down a street and you do not hear them. Why? Because your mind has not attached itself to the organs of hearing. These experiences are common. In such cases, however, the mind is entirely cut off from the sense organs spontaneously and unconsciously. The results thus reached unconsciously, may also be accomplished, after some practice, by a conscious effort of the will. When the power to connect or disconnect the mind from the sense organs has been fully acquired, we may feel pain, or whatever the nature of the sensation may be, or not feel it, just as we please, and further, the mental powers that now are directed willy-nilly, to external things will be released from their thralldom and, at will, the full strength of the mind may be turned inwards upon itself for a searching self-examination.

What would be the result of controlling the mind? It then would join itself to the centres of perception instead of those of sensation, and, naturally, feeling and willing would be under control. Is it possible? It is perfectly possible. The faith-healers teach people to deny misery and pain and evil. Their philosophy is rather roundabout, but it is a part of Yoga into which they have somehow stumbled. In those cases where they succeed in making a person throw off suffering by denying it, they have really taught a part of Pratyahara, as they have made the mind of the person taught strong enough to refuse to take up the record of the senses. The hypnotists, in a similar manner, by their suggestion excite in the patient a sort of temporary morbid Pratyahara.

The first lesson is to sit for some time and let the mind run on. The mind is bubbling up all the time. It is like a monkey jumping about. Let the monkey jump as much as he can; you simply wait and watch, with your consciousness keenly alert. Until you know what the mind is doing you cannot control it. Give it the full length of the reins; many most hideous thoughts may come into it; you will be astonished that it was possible for you to think such thoughts. But you will find that each day the mind's vagaries are becoming less and less violent, that each day it is getting calmer. In the first few months you will find that the mind will have a thousand thoughts, later that it will be toned down to some hundreds, and after a few months it will have fewer and fewer, until at last it will be under perfect control. But we must practice patiently every day.

DHARANA.

The sixth stage is called Dharana, or mental concentration—forcing the mind to feel certain parts of the body, to the exclusion of others.

For instance, try to feel the hand to the exclusion of other parts of the body. Along with this practice, it is better to have a little play of the imagination. For instance, the mind should be made to think of one point in the heart. That is very difficult; an easier way is to imagine the heart to be full of light, or to think of the brain as full of light.

SOME RESULTS OF PRACTICE.

Such is the power of good that even the least done will bring a great amount of benefit. It will not hurt anyone, but will benefit everyone. First of all it will tone down nervous excitement, bring calmness, enable us to see things more clearly. The temperament will be better and the health will be better. Defects in the voice will be changed. This will be among the first of the many effects that will come. Those who practise hard will get many other signs. Sometimes little specks of light will be seen floating and becoming bigger and bigger, and when these things come, know that you are progressing very fast. As the organization becomes finer and finer, at first you will notice that the least thing will throw you out of balance. One bit of food more or less will disturb the whole system, until you get perfect control, and then you will be able to eat whatever you like. You will find that when you are beginning to concentrate, the dropping of a pin will seem like a thunderbolt going through your brain. The organs get finer and the perceptions get finer. Give up all argumentation and other distractions. It only throws the mind off its balance and distrbs it. Give up all vain talk. Read only those books which have been written by persons who have had realization.

DHYANA.

The seventh stage is called Dhyana, or meditation. The meditative state is the highest state of existence. So long as there is desire, no real happiness can come. It is only the contemplative study of objects that brings us permanent enjoyment. The animal has its happiness in the senses, the man in his intellect, the perfected man in spiritual contemplation, or what, in other words, has sometimes been described as intuitive or illuminated vision. It is only to the soul that has attained to this contemplative state that the world has really become beautiful. To him who desires nothing, and who does not mix himself up with them, the manifold changes of nature are one panorama of beauty and sublimity.

The following ideas have to be understood in this stage. We hear a sound. First, there is the external vibration; second, the nerve motion that carries it to the brain; third, the reaction of the mind, along with which flashes the knowledge of the object which was the external cause of these different changes from the ethereal vibrations to the mental reaction. Now, these three processes, which are quite distinct, have been mixed up in such a fashion that they seem quite indistinct. In fact, we

have lost the ability to perceive any distinction between them; we only perceive the effect of the three processes, which effect we call the external object. But there is no reason why we should not see each process distinctly. The mind should be employed, first, in perceiving the external causes of sensations, then the internal motions, and then the reaction of the mind. When it has succeeded in perceiving the external causes of sensations by themselves, it will acquire the power of perceiving all fine material existences, all fine bodies and forms. When it can succeed in perceiving the internal motions by themselves, it will gain the control of all mental waves, not only in itself, but also in others, even before they have translated themselves into physical forces. When it is able to perceive the mental reaction by itself, it will acquire the knowledge of everything—as every sensible object and every thought is the result of this reaction. Then you will have seen the very foundations of your mind, and it will be under your perfect control. Different powers will come to you, but if you yield to the temptation to get pleasure by exercising them, the road to your further progress will be barred. Such is the evil of running after enjoyments. But if you are strong enough to resist the temptation to use these miraculous powers, you will reach the goal at last, the complete suppression of the waves in the ocean of mind; then the glory of the soul, untrammelled by the distractions of the mind or the motions of the body, will shine in its full effulgence.

Among many examples of meditation that are suggested for exercise are the following: Think of a space in your heart, and in the midst of that space think that a flame is burning. Think of that flame as your own soul, that inside that flame is another space full of light, and that that is the soul of your soul, God. Meditate upon that in the heart.

SAMADHI.

As the first six stages will bring all the unconscious movements within the body into the field of consciousness, so the completion of the seventh stage will also bring all the superconscious faculties of the mind, together with a knowledge of their functions and operations, into the region of consciousness. The three-fold division of mind such as we have just described—the unconscious, the conscious, and the superconscious—will then disappear, for the mind will have become a conscious unity, where lines of division like these cannot be drawn. The last stage consisted simply in putting into practice the superconscious powers thus made conscious.

At present, every attempt to go beyond human reason is impossible, yet it is beyond this circle of reason that lies all that humanity holds most dear. All these questions—whether there is an immortal soul, whether it has lived before in other bodies, whether there is a God, whether there is any supreme intelligence guiding this universe—are beyond the field of reason. If reason is the highest faculty of man, then the mental attitude of the Agnostic is the only one that can be de-

fended; the answer must be, I do not know either yea or nay. Yet these questions are so important to us. Without a proper answer to them human life will be impossible. The great preachers of all religions have substantially given the same answers to these questions, and the minds and hearts of men have responded to them. Can it be explained satisfactorily how it is that millions of men have clung so earnestly and tenaciously to their religious ideas without being able to give any reason for them, if they did not come from the unconscious exercise of a mental faculty higher than reason? For it must be granted that the possession of a faculty or an organ is not dependent upon our knowledge of it. It is evident that religious ideas are not instinctive, for the animals which have instinct do not know them. Man, the only religious animal, possesses reason, a conscious faculty, and yet reason knows nothing about them. Whence, then, did they come?

In studying history we find one fact held in common by all the great teachers of religion; they all claim to have got these truths from beyond reason, only many of them did not know what they were getting. For instance, one would say that an angel in the form of a human being with wings came down to him and revealed the message. Another says that a bright being came to him. Another says he dreamed that his ancestor came to him and told him all these things. He did not know anything beyond that. But this thing is common to all claims, either that they saw angels, or heard the voice of God, or saw some wonderful vision. All claim that this knowledge came to them from beyond reason. What does the science of Yoga teach? It teaches that they were right in claiming that all this knowledge came to them from beyond reason, but that it came from within themselves. A breaking-out of the super-conscious faculties may come spontaneously to a man, as well as by a scientific course of discipline; in such cases, he stumbles into it, as it were, without understanding its science, and he interprets it as coming from the outside. This explains the varying accounts as to the way inspired men have had the revelations brought to them. The mind brought the knowledge by its own nature, but the finding of it was interpreted according to the beliefs and education of the person through whom it came. There is great danger to a man who stumbles into this state. The brain is liable to be destroyed; he will grope in the dark, and generally has along with his knowledge some quaint superstition. Whenever a prophet got into that state just by heightening his emotional nature, he brought away from that state some truths, but also some fanaticism, some superstition, which injured the world as much as the greatness of the teaching did good, as was the case with Mohammed.

REASON THE TEST OF INSPIRATION.

To get harmony out of the incongruity we call human life, we must transcend our reason, but we must do it scientifically, slowly, by regular practice, and we must cast off all superstition. We must take it up just

as any other science. Reason we must have to lay our foundation ; we must follow reason as far as it leads, and when reason fails us, reason itself will show us the way to the highest plane. These three states of the mind—instinct, reason, intuition, or the unconscious, conscious and superconscious states—belong to one and the same mind. There are not three minds in one man, but one develops into the other. The real inspiration will not contradict, but will fulfil. Just as we find the great prophets saying, "I come not to destroy but to fulfil," so real inspiration always comes to fulfil reason, and is in direct harmony with reason ; and whenever it contradicts reason, you must know that it is not real, but false inspiration.

Inspiration is just as much in every man's nature as it was in the ancient prophets'. These prophets were not unique ; they were just the same as you or I. They had gained superconsciousness, and you and I can get the same. When each one of the steps to Samadhi has been faithfully practised, we shall be surely led to the desired end. Then will all sorrows cease, all miseries vanish ; the seeds of actions will be burned, and the soul will be free for ever.

ANTHROPOMORPHISM.

ANTHROPOMORPHISM was from the first, and still remains, the inherent vice of thought. The natural illusion which compelled man to regard himself as the centre and end of all things, obliged him also to make the world in his own image, to endow things, then groups, then the universal aggregate, with intentions, will, design, whence gods, forces, Providence. Man projected himself, his life and his intelligence, into a nature indifferent to all these things ; he attributed passions to phenomena, thus personifying them. Bowing down before these factitious beings, whom he had invested with authority, 'fearing the hatred and the wrath of the gods whom he had invented,' he wasted thousands of centuries in regulating imaginary relations between them and himself. Clever knaves, half dupes to their own devices, constituted themselves the interpreters and ministers of these powers, making them speak, and selling in their name fancied favors in this life as well as in the next ; profiting on earth by the caprice of events, in heaven by the presumptuous credulity of man. Promises, whose fulfilment could not be verified, became articles of faith, axioms, principles, which logic has pretended to deduce from and base upon experience."—*Andre Lefevre.*

EVERY man has freedom to do all that he wills, provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man.—*Herbert Spencer.*

MEN are often capable of greater things than they perform.—*Walpole.*

BACK TO ROME.

BY G. W. FOOTE.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury, and the other right reverend fathers-in-god of the Church of England, did not look very far ahead when they got up that St. Augustine celebration at Ebbsfleet. They did not see that they were creating a splendid opportunity for the great rival Church of Rome. In commemorating the alleged introduction of Christianity in the south of England by St. Augustine and his brother monks, they overlooked the fact that all those missionaries were Roman Catholics. But this fact was very naturally not overlooked by Cardinal Vaughan, who at once proceeded to work it for all it was worth. He began to organize a great counter demonstration at the same spot in the county of Kent, taking care that it should outvie the other one in every important feature. There should be more clericals, a greater variety of costumes, and a bigger procession; and, above all, England should be reminded that the Romish Church, which brought Christianity here, was still waiting to welcome back this country to her maternal embrace.

Cardinal Vaughan's counter demonstration took place a few days ago, and seems to have been a pretty show. Ecclesiastical millinery and ritual tonfoolery were displayed in a manner which showed that the Church of England is dull in comparison with the Mother Church from which it seceded.

The Catholic Church beats all others in the matter of scenic display. On Sunday last it held its annual procession in the East-end of London "in honor of Our Lady, and in commemoration of the thirteenth century of the conversion of England to the Catholic and Roman faith." From the circus point of view, it was a tremendous success. There were hundreds of men and women; children in white carrying baskets of flowers; a contingent from the Italian Church, dressed in scarlet, and carrying a gigantic crucifix; priests in surplices, and acolytes in blue and white; a distinguished Father vested in a gorgeous cope, and a statue of Virgin Mary surrounded by lights and flowers. According to the *Westminster Gazette*, the attitude of the vast crowd of spectators was sympathetic and even reverent; in fact, our contemporary regards it as "extremely remarkable, and as denoting the extraordinary change of public opinion towards the Roman Church during the last few years."

One incident of the procession was worthy of particular notice. At the site of the scaffold in Trinity-square a halt was made, and prayers were said in honor of Sir Thomas More, Cardinal Fisher, and other Catholic "martyrs," who were executed there, or elsewhere, in the reign of Henry VIII. This would be a touching incident if we did not know that most of those "martyrs" sent other people to the flames with the utmost cheerfulness. More himself sinned against

the light. He had set forth the justice and advantages of religious toleration in his *Utopia*, on the ground that force cannot change opinions, and that threats only manufacture hypocrites. But afterwards, as an apologist for the persecution of the Lutherans, he argued that "the burning of heretics" was "lawful, necessary, and well done." This has always been the doctrine and policy of the Catholic Church. As Cardinal Vaughan once said, perhaps in an unguarded moment, it has "never spared the knife" in its treatment of heretics. Whenever possible, it has always let blood to cure the headache of thought. And those who are conversant with its history, and aware of its present doings in countries where it is strong enough to command, will only laugh contemptuously at its simulated love of religious liberty in countries like England, where its weakness compels it to assume a certain air of humility.

Among the foreign participants in this Catholic celebration is the famous Cardinal Perraud, Bishop of Autun, and a member of the French Academy. He was the preacher at the Brompton Oratory on Sunday. He discoursed in French, and the place was "crowded with a fashionable congregation." He asked his hearers to pray constantly that England might be brought back to the fold. Bossuet's prophecy that England would return to the faith was being gradually fulfilled.

Cardinal Vaughan struck the same note in his speech the next day at Ramsgate. "The change that had come over England," he said, "during the present century was without parallel in Christendom. England was not indeed yet Catholic—far from it—but multitudes had swung so far round that they were more than half Catholic." A curious and an ambiguous remark, which was greeted with loud cheers.

There was no superfluous modesty about Cardinal Vaughan. He plainly told the Anglicans that "not to be in continuity with the one true Church of Augustine was confessedly to be in schism and heresy, and, if culpably, out of the pale of salvation." We dare say, however, that Archbishop Temple will bear up under this terror with a great deal of fortitude; at least, until he is convinced that Cardinal Vaughan, or his master at Rome, holds the keys of heaven. It will take more than this, we imagine, to frighten the Archbishop out of his fine position and his fifteen thousand a year.

History was treated by Cardinal Vaughan with the same assurance. The Church of Augustine, he said, had served the people of England for nearly a thousand years, when "a tyrant arose in his lust and overthrew it." This is an allusion to Henry VIII., whom we are not going to defend. He was very much like other kings in most respects, only he had a strong will, and God's own Church (as Cardinal Vaughan would call it) went down before him when it stood in his way; a fact which shows us how much more force has had to do than persuasion in the establishment of religion. At the same time, it must be

admitted that Henry VIII., forceful and imperious as he was, could not have bowled over the Catholic Church by himself. Opposition to Rome had been growing ever since the days of Wicklif. The Reformation had spread widely in England, despite the efforts of the Catholic Church to crush it. And a still greater movement had been in progress, that which is known as Renaissance, the new birth of science and philosophy. Henry VIII. counted for something, but the successful revolt against Rome would certainly have taken place (sooner or later) without him. He struck at the Pope in his anger, but the time was ripe for the blow, and the forces of Protestantism which he liberated were not of his own creation. He simply transformed latent power into potential energy. A single spark will do that in a barrel of gunpowder. Some people call the spark the cause of the explosion, as though it would have caused an explosion had it fallen on a barrel of sand!

But let us leave history for the affairs of the present. Cardinal Vaughan calls himself the unworthy successor of Augustine, and we will not quarrel with the description. He tells us that he wears the same pallium (how dirty it must be!), exercises the same metropolitan jurisdiction, teaches the same doctrine, uses the same holy water (how it must stink!), venerates the same relics, and offers the same sacrifice of the Mass. It is with this rubbish that Cardinal Vaughan aims at the conquest of England—the England of Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer. We venture to prophesy that he will fail. England shows no signs of going back to Rome. The Catholic Church will doubtless sweep into its net a growing number of respectable superstitionists from other churches. But science is against it, philosophy is against it, democracy is against it, freethought is against it—and history is against it. It is all very well to censure the tyranny and lust of Henry VIII., but when did the Catholic Church denounce the vices or the crimes of a king who served its interests? Cardinal Vaughan weeps over three hundred English Catholics who “suffered death for the spiritual power of the Pope” under Henry VIII. Has he ever dropped a tear over the Protestants who were sent to the fire by Mary? Has he mourned over the butcheries of Alva in the Netherlands? Has he deplored the frightful massacres of St Bartholomew? Has he sighed over the wholesale torture and extermination of the American natives by the Christian Spaniards? Has he regretted the agony of a single victim of the dread Inquisition, the bloodiest tribunal ever established on earth?

Back to Rome! Back to relics and holy water, and childish superstition, and cunning, unscrupulous priestcraft, and suppression of liberty, and persecution and murder of heretics! Back to the glorious condition of Spain! Back to the state of Italy under Papal dominion! Never! England must cease to be England before this can happen. Rome may go on capturing idle rich men, and fantastic professionals, and the poorest of the poor who admire charity above justice; but the moment she imagines the time has come to dare as she once did, she will have to face millions of free men, who would fight lions in defence of their rights, and would soon settle an army of wolves.—*Freethinker.*

THE STORY OF THE GREAT INDIAN MUTINY.

BY E. W. L.

VIII.

BLOODY records are now to be rehearsed. On May 28th a torrent of blood was shed by the Hurriannah battalion and the 15th and 30th B.N.I. A little south-west of the main thoroughfare from Delhi to Kurnaul are Hansi and Hissar. These places witnessed the murder of every European who fell into the hands of the Hurriannah Sepoys. At Nusseerabad, in Rajpootana, the 15th and 30th followed the example set at Meerut, and began to murder and pillage. The 1st Bombay Lancers succeeded in rescuing some of the Europeans, but they were not strong enough to accomplish much. The mutineers, after looting Nusseerabad and its environs, marched off to Delhi. On May 30th the Lucknow brigade revolted, and on the next day the Bareilly brigade followed suit. In a few days Oude and Rohilcund (Agra and the little spot held by the British at Lucknow excepted) were under native rule.

That holy river, the Ganges, has for one of its tributaries the Goomtee. On the right bank of this tributary is built Lucknow, the Corinth* of India. The Grecian city was noted for its vice, its wealth, and its splendor—and, it may be added, for its extravagances. An ancient proverb says, "Not many ships can sail in Corinthian waters." So was it with Lucknow: beautiful—viciously beautiful. To the west stood the Residency, a number of stone buildings near by; and above the Residency was the Muchee Bowun fort. Near the Residency was an iron bridge; higher up, a stone bridge crossed the stream. On the left bank, a mile or two from this stone bridge, were the "lines" of the native regiments. Native regiments lived in "lines": villages of mud huts, with bazaars and small shops in them. Sir Henry Lawrence was the Chief Commissioner; Mr. Gubbins the Financial Commissioner. Col. Inglis commanded the 32nd Foot, the only European regiment in the place; and Brigadier Grey was in command of the native troops, numbering 4,800 infantry, 2,100 cavalry, and two batteries of artillery. The odds against the British will be better seen by taking into account the whole of the Oude force: of natives, 19,200 men; of British (including one company of artillery), 800! A few civilians, merchants and their assistants, may

* Delhi is called the Rome of India; with greater applicability, I think, Lucknow may be styled the Corinth of India. The beautiful palaces of Lucknow, furnished with extravagant costliness, were the dwellings of native princes and the women of their seraglios. In marble palaces and in mud huts filthy orgies were constantly being carried on.

be added to the 800 ; but it must be borne in mind that the help given by these civilians, much valued as it was, had this drawback ; many of them were married men with families ; incumbrances, under the circumstances, which outweighed the worth of the men.

Oude had been but recently annexed. The native population had been told that the British Government heavily oppressed those over whom they ruled. The natives of Oude knew from bitter experience how grievous was the burden laid upon them by their own rajahs. It was somewhat on this plan. Rajah A called for his prime-minister B and bade him collect ten lakhs of rupees by December. B forthwith ordered half-a-dozen C's to bring him fifteen lakhs of rupees by November. The six C's commanded two dozen D's, under grave penalties, to hand them twenty lakhs before Oct. 1. The 24 D's called together 100 E's and threatened them with decapitation unless the 100 E's deposited in the hands of the 24 D's thirty lakhs of rupees on or before Sept. 1. And so it went on ; the rajah little recking the means resorted to provided he received his ten lakhs of rupees in December. (And the English system was supposed to be worse even than this !) Naturally enough, whenever they dared, the villagers rebelled against such oppression. And so the natives of Oude were already prejudiced against the British (the British system of taxation not being yet understood) ; the population sided rather with the Sepoys than with the Europeans. When the Punjab was annexed, the men thereof were disarmed ; not so had the men of Oude been dealt with. They were allowed to retain their weapons, and these weapons they were now ready to turn against the British.

The more one delves into the history of this mutiny the more one is surprised at the extraordinray fatuity of the British officers in the native regiments, and the blind trust they reposed in the fidelity of the Sepoys. In spite of all that had come to light since the 10th of May, when the Sepoys at Meerut broke out into mutiny and slaughtered all the Europeans they could catch, Brigadier Grey still believed the native troops in Lucknow would remain true to their colors. On May 30th a sepoy reported to the brigadier that that very evening the native troops would rise and massacre all the Europeans. Brigadier Grey simply shrugged his shoulders and smiled incredulously. Such a trifle was not worth reporting. But as the sun was setting on that very day the brigadier must have had forced upon his conscience the ugly fact that he was verily guilty of the blood of many of his brethren. Without other warning than the oft-repeated reports of many muskets, the murderous revolt began at twilight. The officers were at the mess house ; it was their dinner hour. Perhaps one of them, of a saturnine turn of mind and sad with gloomy forebodings, was humming to himself the last verse of Captain Dowling's famous song, thinking the while of the author's fate.*

* Captain Bartholomew Dowling, of the H.E.I.C.S., at a time when hundreds were

"Cut off from the land that bore us,
 Betrayed by the land we find,
 Where the brightest have gone before us,
 And the dullest remain behind.
 Stand! stand to your glasses steady!
 'Tis all we have left to prize;
 A cup to the dead already,
 And hurrah for the next who dies!"

Suddenly Sepoy muskets joined the chorus. But the Sepoys were balked. Sir Henry Lawrence had ridden to the camp of the 32nd Foot. In a few minutes the men were ready for work. Guns, too, were brought up. The Sepoys made one charge; a dose of grape greeted them. It was enough. Brigadier Handscomb, however, was killed; and as the Sepoys retreated they came across Lieut. Grant; him they shot. An appeal to the native troops resulted in coaxing over to the British side a few men of the 71st, 200 of the 13th, and 57 of the 48th. The mutineers seized the powder magazine, and looted all the European houses that were not protected by troops. All night the European troops and those of the Sepoys who had declared themselves faithful remained under arms. When daylight permitted, Sir Henry Lawrence attacked the mutineers, who fled before him. Mr. Gubbins, who was accompanied by four Sepoys belonging to Fisher's Irregulars, joined in the pursuit and did some good service. A remarkable confession was made by one of the four Sepoys: "We like our colonel, and we shall not allow him to be harmed; but if the whole army turns, we shall have to turn too." Mr. Gubbins remembered these words when he heard the news that Fisher's Irregulars had mutinied, and had stood calmly by to witness the murder of their *beloved* commander.

The revolt of the Sepoys was followed by an uprising of the riff-raff of Lucknow; Sir Henry, however, was well able to cope with them. A body of 3,000 police was raised, Captain Carnegie was given the command, and many of the riotous rascals were caught and punished. To prove that the native population of Oude was at first disposed to side with the Sepoys it is only necessary to mention that Sir Henry Lawrence, two days before the mutiny broke out in Lucknow, sent out a reconnoitring party, under Captain Hutchinson, to watch the movements of the mutineers between the Goomtee and the Ganges. This small force was, in its turn, watched and reported upon by armed villagers.

The mutiny broke out at Lucknow on May 30th; at Barcilly and Shahjehanpore on Sunday, May 31. At Shahjehanpore the 28th B. N. I. tried to surprise the Europeans at church; they partially succeeded. Mr. Rickatts and some

dying of a mysterious pestilence, wrote a poem called "The Song of the Dying." The last verse was scarcely penned when the author showed symptoms of the plague, and died in a few minutes.

others were murdered in the church; Major James was killed on the parade ground. Many, however, escaped to Mohumdee. Captain Orr was at Mohumdee in command of a company of the 9th Oude and fifty men from Seetapore. These men and the native officers solemnly swore that they would escort Captain Orr and party (eight ladies and four children being among them) to Seetapore. Relying on this oath, the Europeans accompanied their escort. Soon they were turned adrift, and told to go wherever they pleased. Hardly were they left to themselves than a gang of murderous Sepoys came upon them when they were near Aurungabad. Captain Orr (who for some unknown reason was spared, and a drummer boy with him) thus describes the cruel tragedy. "We all collected under a tree and took the ladies down from the buggy. Shots were fired from all directions, amidst the most fearful yells. The poor ladies all joined in prayer, coolly and undauntedly awaiting their fate." Not long had they to wait; in ten minutes it was all over. Women and children butchered, as well as the men of the party—all except Captain Orr and the little drummer boy. The dead bodies of the murdered were stript of all clothing and left for jackals to feast upon. Captain Orr and the drummer boy were taken to Mithowlee and handed over to Loonee Singh.

(To be continued.)

INSTINCT AND REFLEX ACTIONS.

BY THE LATE THOMAS H. HUXLEY.

THE term "instinct" is very vague and ill-defined. It is commonly employed to denote any action, or even feeling, which is not dictated by conscious reasoning, whether it is, or is not, the result of previous experience. It is "instinct" which leads a chicken just hatched to pick up a grain of corn; parental love is said to be "instinctive;" the drowning man who catches at a straw does it "instinctively;" and the hand that accidentally touches something hot is drawn back by "instinct." Thus "instinct" is made to cover everything from a simple reflex movement, in which the organ of consciousness need not be at all implicated, up to a complex combination of acts directed towards a definite end and accompanied by intense consciousness.


But this loose employment of the term "instinct" really accords with the nature of the thing; for it is wholly impossible to draw any line of demarcation between reflex actions and instincts. If a frog, on the flank of which a little drop of acid has been placed, rubs it off with the foot of the same side; and, if that foot be held, performs the same operation, at the cost of much effort, with the other foot, it certainly displays a curious instinct. But it is no less true that

the whole operation is a reflex action of the spinal cord, which can be performed quite as well when the brain is destroyed, and between which and simple reflex actions there is a complete series of gradations. In like manner, when an infant takes the breast, it is impossible to say whether the action should be rather termed instinctive or reflex.

What are usually called the instincts of animals are, however, acts of such a nature that, if they were performed by men, they would involve the generation of a series of ideas and of inferences from them; and it is a curious, and apparently an insoluble, problem whether they are, or are not, accompanied by cerebral changes of the same nature as those which give rise to ideas and inferences in ourselves. When a chicken picks up a grain, for example, are there, firstly, certain sensations, accompanied by a feeling of relation between the grain and its own body; secondly, a desire for the grain; thirdly, a volition to seize it? Or, are only the sensational terms of the series actually represented in consciousness? The latter seems the most probable opinion, though it must be admitted that the other alternative is possible. But, in this case, the series of mental states which occurs is such as would be represented in language by a series of propositions, and would afford proof positive of the existence of innate ideas in the Cartesian sense. Indeed, a metaphysical fowl, brooding over the mental operations of his fully-fledged consciousness, might appeal to the fact as proof that, in the very first action of his life, he assumed the existence of the Ego and the Non-Ego and of a relation between the two.

In all seriousness, if the existence of instincts be granted, the possibility of the existence of innate ideas, in the most extended sense ever imagined by Descartes, must also be admitted. In fact, Descartes illustrates what he means by an innate idea, by the analogy of hereditary diseases or hereditary mental peculiarities, such as generosity. On the other hand, hereditary mental tendencies may justly be termed instincts; and still more appropriately might those special proclivities which constitute what we call genius come into the same category.

The child who is impelled to draw as soon as it can hold a pencil; the Mozart who breaks out into music as early; the boy Bidder, who worked out the most complicated sums without learning arithmetic; the boy Pascal, who evolved Euclid out of his own consciousness; all these may be said to have been impelled by instinct as much as are the beaver and the bee. And the man of genius is distinct in kind from the man of cleverness, by reason of the working within him of strong innate tendencies—which cultivation may improve, but which it can no more create than horticulture can make thistles bear figs. The analogy between a musical instrument and the mind holds good here also. Art and industry may get much music, of a sort, out of a penny whistle; but, when all is done, it has no chance against an organ. The innate musical potentialities of the two are infinitely different.—*Life of Hume.*



FROM OUR OWN OBSERVATORY.

THE LITERATURE OF MARRIAGE AND SEX RELATIONSHIP.

The Legitimation League.

THE New Woman—and the Old Woman, too—can hardly grumble at the amount of literature that has of late years been devoted to the discussion of the questions in which she is primarily interested, or at the radical nature of that discussion in the journals and books devoted especially to it. There seems, however, to be a considerable amount of confusion in the way the questions involved are handled, which leads to much misunderstanding, and often to angry recriminations. It seems to us that we can only deal satisfactorily with such questions by separating the advocates into two camps: (1) those who wish to remove all unjust restrictions, so as to place men and women upon terms of perfect equality in society and before the law; and those who advocate total abolition not only of all legal restrictions, but of our social ideas and customs in regard to what are to-day considered to be sexual offences and disabilities. We have received several works relating to these questions at various times during the last year, but have not had an opportunity to more than just glance at them. "The Bar Sinister and Licit Love," edited by Oswald Dawson, (W. Reeves, 185 Fleet Street, London, price 1s.) is the biennial report of the Legitimation League, an organization the prime object of which is to place on terms of equality with the legitimate children of a married couple, their "natural children that may have been born prior to the legal ceremony of marriage;" and a secondary object of which is to abolish the present marriage ceremony as a contract for life. The League recognizes "the advantage, almost the necessity, of some form of public registration of marriage and public acknowledgement of paternity"; it thinks that "all suitable persons should marry in some form, but it contends that the laws should place the poor man on a level with the rich, and that divorce should be obtained as easily as marriage is effected, so that an earthly hell might be often avoided."

With these objects we are perfectly in sympathy. We see no earthly use in forcing a couple to keep up a pretence of being "married and happy" when all chance of happiness has disappeared; we can conceive of no reason why, for good and sufficient cause shown before a judge, or even on a mere joint declaration before the registering officer, a decree of divorce should not issue, if, as in other dissolutions of partnerships, the contracting parties enter into proper securities for fulfilment of obligations incurred. And if, in the case of divorced persons who re-married, a proper registration of children were made, there could be no more dispute as to heirship to property than there is at present. Though the League thus favors a rational amendment of the law in this way, its object is

not to encourage what we notice to be referred to as "butterfly relationships;" and though it favors the relaxation of the present restrictions upon divorce, it favors monogamy as being the highest type of marriage relationship. In these respects, the objects of the League appear to be perfectly rational, and makes it difficult to understand the amusing episode related as to correspondence with Watts & Co. As publishers of the contemplated *Liberty Review*, Messrs. Watts & Co. applied for an advertisement of the publications of the Legitimation League, and in response Mr. Dawson sent an order for three advertisements. Before, however, the *Review* appeared, Messrs. Watts & Co returned the order and declined to insert the advertisements, as they "did not suit." This episode gives a funny commentary on the title "*Liberty Review*."

"The Dawn of Civilization," by J. C. Spence, a Vice-President of the Legitimation League, is a trenchant attack on present-day affairs, which are compared with those which the author supposes may exist in the twenty-third century. Mr Spence has something smart and interesting to say on all of the subjects he deals with. In the chapter on marriage he gives us a copy of the first contract of marriage entered on the register of the Marriage Reform League, which is to supersede the old-fashioned ceremony, and we are told that, in the new order, "If a man and woman lived together openly and by common repute as man and wife, the law treated them as such and their children as legitimate, whether there had been any marriage ceremony or not." This is but a rational notion. And the author continues: "Finally, the lawyers discovered that perpetual marriages were contracts of slavery, and therefore invalid in English law. Like other religious vows, such as those of monks and nuns, persons were at liberty to keep or to break them, but the law did not interfere in the matter."

In both of these works the marriage and sex questions are discussed in a rational spirit and in a style that renders them suitable for reading anywhere. The latter work is published by the League at a fraction of its cost for propagandist purposes. (Watts & Co., London.)

Anarchism in Marriage.

"The New and the Old Ideal," by Emile F. Ruedebusch, gives us another phase of the discussion. The author is a Free Lover, and his New Ideal seems to involve total freedom from all restraints of every kind in sexual relationships. In looking at present conditions, however, he wisely says: "I have positively no use in my theory for any State law, but I do not intend to argue the subject in this treatise. As I wish to show how the small minority should act *now*, I will be compelled to reckon with the laws that do exist, however absurd they appear to me;" and he takes for granted the individual rights "claimed by the most radical of Free Lovers," his one solution being "*Freedom!*" This freedom will be attained by a gradual disappearance of the monogamic family relation,

which will bring about a state of things described in very glowing colors by the author, but which he very wisely puts in the far distant future. Mr. Ruedebusch writes with much feeling, and says many sensible things in his 26 chapters; but he handles his subject in such very plain style, and takes up in some cases such unnecessary and offensive subjects (as in ch. 19), that his work will be decidedly objectionable to many people. He is a "varietist," and characterizes the present ideas of women in favor of monogamy as "a morbid craving which brings unhappiness to her and others, and of which we will try to cure her." We are inclined to think the task thus set for himself and his fellow Free Lovers is a pretty heavy one. Unquestionably, with all its drawbacks, monogamy presents for the mass of women such undoubted advantages, that the difficulty is to convince them that a change would be for their material advantage or their greater happiness. The marriage laws, too, are not felt by the well-intentioned and ordinarily sensible people to be in any way harsh or tyrannical, and with the amendments before hinted at would be acceptable to all but the anarchist, to whom all law is objectionable. The arguments in favor of "Variety" we look upon as simply the outcome of a morbid and abnormal mind.

"What the Young Need to Know; a Primer of Sexual Rationalism," by E. C. Walker (10 cts.; M. Harman, 1394 Congress St., Chicago), is another work in favor of the Free Love or Varietist view of sex relationship. It is not difficult for Mr. Walker, any more than for Mr. Ruedebusch, to show the evil effects of religious asceticism on the ideas and customs of modern nations. As a matter of fact, the arguments of these gentlemen would show that, in their ideas of modesty and chastity, the whole of the civilized world is lamentably out of date. The important fact seems to be, that to upset those notions, which are deeply rooted in the whole mentality and environments of the masses of both sexes, is a task for which the available resources appear absurdly unequal. This would not affect the validity of the arguments, of course, if it could be shown that the object to be attained was a legitimate outcome of the method advocated. Here, however, we beg leave to differ with both the writers. We advocate the utmost amount and the most rapid extension of freedom that are possible under present circumstances, but we cannot blink the fact that the great bulk of the people in every so-called civilized country are far from being fitted for self-government, and need marriage laws as well as other laws. To postulate an ultimate Utopia as the outcome of a reversal of our present marriage ideals is simply Quixotic.

But it is contended that, if all restrictions were abolished, and women and men were at perfect liberty to make or break their marital partnerships—to "go sloshing around," as friend Moore, of the *Blue Grass Blade* describes it—and to enter into temporary or permanent marriages as they chose (and this, to some extent, they can do now), the fittest couples would mate, and the race would be improved, as breeds of cattle are improved by artificial selection. The basis of

this argument seems altogether defective. Leaving out of the reckoning the fact that passions and circumstances that have no connection with the supposed object must always largely determine sexual companionships, the fact remains that the mass of the people, upon whose conduct ultimately the improvement or the degeneracy of the race must depend, are probably the least likely to be actuated by ideal motives, and certainly possess the smallest share of the intelligence needed to carry out the methods essential if an improvement is to be attained. In Utopia, of course, things will be different. All men and women will be intelligent, and well educated, and law-abiding—but there will be no laws, of course, for each man will be a law unto himself. But in this eon men do not appear to have been able hitherto to do without some restrictions in the marital relations of the sexes; and though we think some changes in the laws are urgently needed, we do not imagine that such freedom as Messrs. Walker and Ruedebusch advocate will ever be looked upon as anything but dangerous to morality and of no advantage to the race.

"The Adult" is a new monthly journal, published at the office of the Legitimation League, 16 John Street, Bedford Row, London (price 2d.) Its editor (George Bedborough) introduces it in this editorial note:

"*The Adult* is a protest against the theory that a man and a woman need the intervention of a lawyer or a priest in determining the conditions on which they may unite, temporarily or permanently. This protest, however, is but the beginning of our aims—a crusade against slavery is a preliminary to the constitution of a free community. Without freedom, nothing valuable, nothing noble, is attainable. But freedom is, after all, only the great potentiality. *The Adult* is open for the frank discussion of how this potentiality may be applied. The disbelief in liberty, and the rigid tabooing of free discussion, on the subject of the relation of the sexes, react on one another, and the current ignorance of sexual science is partly the cause and partly the effect, of the present-day survival of slavery, as seen in our marriage habits and ideals. The education of public opinion is infinitely more necessary than tinkering with the law. The displacement of an old theory by a newly-learned fact is immediately, as well as permanently, profitable. *The Adult* lives to learn as well as to teach. It takes nothing for granted except freedom."

In this journal, Free Love and "butterfly" relationships are advocated, and some of its pages show the same coarseness as we noticed in many of Mr. Ruedebusch's chapters. We see no necessity for this, and if we were not opposed to all press censorship, we should say that this sort of literature would be the most suitable subject for it we can imagine.