

The Open Court.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Devoted to the Work of Conciliating Religion with Science.

No. 159. (Vol. IV.—29)

CHICAGO, SEPTEMBER 11, 1890.

Two Dollars per Year.
Single Copies, 10 Cts.

THE UNITY OF TRUTH.

TRUTH, thou art but one. Thou mayest appear to us now stern and now mild, yet thou remainest always the same. Thou blestest him that loves thee, thou revealest thy nature to those that seek thee, thou hidest thy countenance from him that disregards thee, and thou punishest him that hateth thee. But whether it is life or death thou givest, whether thy dispensations are curses or blessings, thou remainest always the same, thou art never in contradiction with thyself; thy curses affirm thy blessings, and thy rewards show the justice of thy punishments. Thou art one from eternity to eternity; and there is no second truth beside thee.

There was a strange superstition among the learned of the middle ages. The Schoolmen believed in the duality of truth. Something might be true, they maintained, in philosophy, which was not true in theology; a religious truth might be true so far as religion was concerned, but it might be wrong in the province of science, and *vice versa* a scientific truth might be an error in the province of religion.

The *Nation* of August 7th, 1890, contains a criticism by an able pen of the aim which is pursued by *The Open Court*. But the criticism is written from the standpoint that the duality of truth is a matter of course; whereas it is merely a modernised renascence of the scholastic doctrine that that which is true in science will not be true in religion.

The criticism of *The Nation*, which was quoted in full by Mr. Hegeler, in his article, "Science and Religion," (No. 157), characterizes the effort to conciliate religion with science as a foredetermined conclusion—a struggle that implies a defect of intellectual integrity and tends to undermine the whole moral health. . . . "Religion," it is maintained, "to be true to itself should demand an unconditional surrender of freethinking."

It is true enough that many religious doctrines stand in flat contradiction to certain propositions that have been firmly established by science; and the churches that proclaim and teach these doctrines do not even think of changing them. There are dogmas that defy all rules of sound logic, and yet they are retained; they are cherished as if they were sacred truth. But church doctrines and dogmas are not religion; church doctrines and dogmas are traditions.

They may contain many good things but they may also contain errors, and it is our holy and religious duty to examine them, to winnow them so as to separate the good wheat from the useless chaff.

Let us obey the rule of the apostle, to hold fast only that and all that which is good. And what is good? Let us enquire of Truth for an answer. That is good which agrees with truth. Good is not that which pleases your fancy, however lofty and noble your imagination, and however better, grander, or sweeter than the stern facts of reality you may deem it to be. You will find that in the end all things that appear good, but are not in accord with truth, are elusive: they will be discovered to be bad; usually they are worse than those things which are bad and appear so to us at first sight.

What is religion? Religion is our inmost self; it is the sum total of all our knowledge applied to conduct. It is the highest ideal of our aspirations, in obedience to which we undertake to build our lives. Religion in one word is truth itself. Religion is different from science in so far as it is more than scientific truth; it is applied truth. Religion does not consist of dogmas, nor does the Religion of Science consist of scientific formulas. Scientific formulas, if not applied to a moral purpose, are dead letters to religion, for religion is not a formulation of truth, but it is living truth. True religion is, and all religion ought to be what Christ said of himself and of his mission, "the way, the truth, and the life."

If a teacher tells his pupil never to be satisfied with his work until the result when examined agrees with the requirements, and to work his examples over until they come out right; is that a predetermined conclusion? In a certain sense it is, but not in the sense our critic proposes. If objection is made to a duality of truth, and if it is maintained that religion and scientific truth cannot contradict each other, is that an effort which "implies a defect of intellectual integrity and tends to undermine the whole moral health"? Just the contrary; it is the sole basis of intellectual integrity, it is the indispensable condition of all moral health.

"Religion to be true to itself should demand," and that religion which *The Open Court* proposes, does demand not "an unconditional surrender of free-

thinking" or of free enquiry, but an unconditional devotion to truth. Does science demand free thinking? Perhaps the answer may be "yes," and there can be no objection provided that free-thinking means free enquiry, and the absence of all compulsion. But the free-thinking that is demanded by science means at the same time an absolute obedience to the laws of thought. The same free-thinking, which is at the same time an unconditional surrender to truth, is the cardinal demand of religion. The great reformer Martin Luther called it the freedom of conscience and considered it as the most precious prerogative of a Christian.

The Open Court does not propose to conciliate science with certain Christian or Mosaic or Buddhistic doctrines. This would be absurd and such an undertaking would justly deserve a severe criticism, for it would be truly a predetermined conclusion in the sense that our critic intends. It would "imply a defect of intellectual integrity and undermine the moral health." Autocracy and individualism are not reconcilable, but socialism and individualism are reconcilable. Order and liberty are not such deadly enemies as may appear at first sight. Superstition and science are irreconcilable, but religion and science are not irreconcilable. Indeed, the history of religious progress is a constant conciliation between science and religion.

Religion and science, it is maintained, must "seek each a self-development in its own interest." Certainly it must, but this does not prevent that which we deem to be religious truth being constantly examined before the tribunal of science, and that which we deem to be scientific truth being constantly referred to religion. Our critic seems to have no objection to religion and science coming into accord, but he proposes to wait until they approach completion. If this maxim were universally adopted, there would be no progress in the development of religion. Is not "completion" a very relative state? Waiting for completion would be about equivalent to stopping all social reform until mankind has reached the millennium. Every social reform is a step onward along the path to the millennium, and every conciliation between science and religion is a step onward in the revelation of living truth.

The religion of the middle ages was a religion of dualism, it proposed the duality of truth. The religion of the future will be a religion of Monism; and what means Monism? Monism means unity of truth. Truth is invincible. It never contradicts itself, for there is but one truth and that one truth is eternal.

A SHEEPISH TAX.

BY F. M. HOLLAND.

THERE is a good deal of romance about the shepherd with his pipe and crook. Our American shep-

herd's crook, however, throws too heavy a burden of taxation upon our people; and we pay him exorbitantly for piping the tune to which we all have to dance. How badly the poor are fleeced to enrich the wool-grower, was shown in my previous article;* and I now wish to show how the tax for his benefit is actually collected, and also what effect it has upon the prosperity of manufactures and on rates of wages in factories.

This duty, in the case of merino and other fine wool, such as is used for clothing, is ten cents a pound for grades not worth more than thirty cents a pound; for more costly grades the rate is twelve cents; and the average increase of price in consequence is fifty per cent. Coarse wool, used for carpets, is taxed two and a half or five cents a pound, according to value; and in this case the duty amounts on the average to about twenty-five per cent. The result is higher prices of American as well as foreign wool, and also of all woolen goods, wherever manufactured. This is precisely the way in which the duty was meant to act; and if it did not work so, it would be abolished at once. The duty on wool was intended for the benefit of the grower; and the only way it can help him is by keeping up the price of his fleece. His gain is his neighbor's loss. Even protectionists admit that "protection raises prices"; and they would not want it if it did not.

It is estimated that one-half of all the wool used in America is imported, partly in the form of woolen cloth. In taxing the half which is imported, government raises the price of the half which is grown here also, and of all the woolen goods sold in America. Every dollar thus raised by the government costs the people two dollars, one of which goes as extra profit to the wool grower, who could not be protected otherwise. This makes the tax on wool twice as oppressive as if it were laid on articles not produced in this country, like rough diamonds. They come in free of duty; but every dollar taken from our people by taxing them would go straight to the government.

It must also be noticed that this tax on wool is not intended to protect the manufacturer in the least; and its actual effect is to make him pay twenty-five or fifty per cent. more for his wool than his rivals do abroad. Every other nation which has factories lets them have wool and other raw materials free of duty.

Our National Association of Wool Manufacturers complained, some years ago, that they were thus put under "disadvantages from which our foreign competitors are wholly exempt;" and the Wool Consumers' Association, largely made up of owners of factories in New England, has asked in vain of Congress, "that American industry may be relieved of this un-

* See No. 150, of *The Open Court*.