The Nation

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE & ART

VOLUME LIV

FROM JANUARY 1, 1892, TO JUNE 30, 1892

NEW YORK
THE EVENING POST PUBLISHING COMPANY
1892

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

as Minister of the United States at the courts of Berlin and Vienna. He remained in Paris, however, for some months. At the end of January, 1778, Thomas Morris died. After a squabble with Ross, William Lee seized his papers and carried them off to Paris, and thus ended the affairs of the agency at Nantes.

In Austria, Lee accomplished absolutely nothing, and he did not go to Prussia. His one diplomatic achievement was the concoction of the draft of a treaty with a Dutchman named De Neufville, representing the Grand Pensionary of Amsterdam. This draft was never adopted by any person or corporation empowered to make treaties, and would be utterly unimportant were it not that a copy of it was found in the papers of John Laurens when the latter was captured at sea by the British in October, 1780, and formed the excuse for the outbreak of hostilities between Great Britain and Holland. William Lee's commission was recalled on the 8th of June, 1779, and he sank from comparative into positive insignificance. His chief characteristics were restless activity and suspicion of those about him. His sense of personal honor is shown by the attempt, which he made while waiting in Paris to go on his diplomatic mission, to use the early intelligence he was likely to receive as minister in stock-jobbing operations in London.

The volumes which contain this collection are very handsome in appearance. Mr. Ford has performed his task with industry and care. If the letters of William Lee were to be published at all, we could hardly ask that they should be better published. The editor's notes are painstaking and appear to be accurate. It is clear that he has not printed nearly the whole of the letters which have been before him. It is possible that a different selection might have given us more of the human and social side of William Lee and his correspondents; but we fancy that the fault here lies with the writer and not with the editor. There was not much in William Lee, and what there was was not very good.

Moral Teachings of Science. By Arabella B. Buckley. D. Appleton & Co. 1892.

ANOTHER subject so important, vast, and difficult it would be hard to name—a subject which not every philosopher of the first rank would be competent adequately to treat. Not mere clear insight into one aspect of philosophy is sufficient; a full appreciation of what belongs to the spirit of all the different leading schools of thought is required. To say that the subject is far beyond the powers of the authoress is no disparagement. Nor has she attempted any thorough or philosophical discussion. It is not science which has dictated her teachings, but traditional ideas, for which she ingeniously finds considerable countenance in facts of natural history. But these facts are somewhat isolated and sporadic; they are not the leading facts of any current scientific theory. That they play so little part in science perhaps indicates a defect in scientific theories.

Two widely different things might be understood by the "moral teachings of science." In the first place, the prosecution of scientific research necessarily requires and strengthens certain moral qualities, quite independently of what the results of that research may be, and the moral teachings involved must undeniably be good so far as they go, although they may be one-sided, fortifying only a part of the moral nature, and leaving another part neglected. The first of these teachings is perfect fairness and moral indifference as to the outcome of any inquiry. Suppose, for instance, the inquiry be as to the correct reading of a text of Scripture, "Thou shalt not steal," or "Thou shalt steal." (We purposely select an impossible case, in order to free the example from perplexities.) There is a conclusive argument to be drawn from the moral nature of man that the former and not the latter must be the correct reading. Nevertheless, in estimating the force of the purely historical evidence—in order to be scientific, in order to be logical—we must for the time being remove, if we can, all such prepossessions from our mind, and look upon the two commandments with an indifferent eye; not rejecting any considerations, but putting them aside for the time being. Many great scientists go to church, and are there very unlike what they are in their laboratories. At one time they are studying one aspect of truth, at another time another. To regard either aspect fairly and honestly, the other must for the time be excluded. If they conflict, the presumption, the faith of the scientific man is, that it is because the last word has not been said, on one side or on the other; at any rate, it must at least be hoped that there is an ultimate resting-place which will be satisfactory from both points of view.

Perfect candor in recognizing facts and their bearings, without trying to explain away real difficulties so as to make out a decided conclusion, is the very first point of scientific morals. To get at the facts of observation, uncolored by any theory or doctrine, moral, political, or physical, is what the scientific man must strive for. It does not please him at all to have his observations agree too well with one another. It makes him suspect that something is wrong. An obstinate discrepancy is his delight, because it shows that he is on the road to learning something he does not yet know. It was a little discrepancy in the place of the planet Mars, of a fourth of the breadth of the moon, that forced Kepler, who would not blink it, to the discovery of his first two laws, and so made the discovery of Newton possible, and opened the way for all modern science. Nothing, it is true, is more common than to find admirable scientific men strangely incapable of seeing the force of certain kinds of evidence; as many medical men long were blind to the evidences of the germ-theory of acute constitutional diseases. Perhaps they are even better scientific men for that, within a limited field; but in a broader field it is a fatal defect. Let lawyers have their rules for excluding certain kinds of testimony if they will, but science must exclude nothing, not even the fancies and traditions of men. On the other hand, science must not confound different orders of premises. It must let instincts and superstitions have their say, unchecked, and listen to them; and then it must let scientific observation have its say, equally unchecked. Science will erect a theory which shall do full justice to both orders of facts, if it can. But whether it can or not, it will collect new facts in all departments to see whether they confirm an existing theory or suggest a new one.

But Mrs. Buckley Fisher rightly understands by the "moral teachings of science" something different from such teachings of scientific logic. She means the moral and spiritual beliefs and tendencies which are in harmony with the discoveries and theories of science. Now, to hold that *these* moral teachings of science are necessarily sound and wholesome is an utterly unscientific belief, because it is not borne out by facts, but is merely an airy optimism. Science is incomplete; it is *essentially* incomplete, for what we mean by science is the sum of human activity at any epoch in the path of discovery; and were everything once found out, this activity must cease. True science never pronounces an ultimatum. Philosophical writers are always doing so. Men like Spencer lay down the principle of the conservation of energy as an ultimate, primordial principle of the universe; but a pure scientist is puzzled to know what can be meant by such a truth. For him the conservation of energy is a principle which he may safely assume in all reasoning about large and unorganized masses, and with little hesitation for molecules and atoms, and which is certainly applicable, to a great extent at least, in regard to living matter. But what absolute universality means, or whether it means anything at all, he does not know nor greatly care. Science is dealing only with what is likely to come into the field of experience in a moderate time. It has nothing whatever to say about eternal verities, and its moral teachings are necessarily defective if such verities have anything to do with morals. But science really makes no pretence to teaching spiritual things; and what are rightly enough called its moral teachings—that is to say, the views of spiritual questions which have a general resemblance to the discoveries science has made up to date—are doctrines for which science does not vouch in the least.

Nobody who analyzes these teachings understandingly and without bias can well deny that, so far, they have been in the main distinctly anti-Christian. The first general feature of nature which attracted the attention of modern scientists was the prevalence of mechanical law; and Robert Boyle, one of the most devout of Christians, formulated the mechanical philosophy according to which the universe works like a machine. Make this proposition absolute and universal, and it jars utterly with the creed of Christendom, for it leaves no room for final causes. Boyle himself made room for them by limitations of the proposition. For instance, he held that in the beginning there was no such mechanism, until God had made his plans; and that, that done, the whole character of his action was changed. There is a fearful want of philosophical unity about such a conception. The natural "teaching" of science, though far from being a scientific conclusion, is that all appearance of final causation is illusory. Christ taught that God loves his children, and that not in an entirely inscrutable way, but humanly, so that there is intercourse between each man and God, and prayers are sent up and answered. Yet the "teachings" of science reduce God to the condition of a limited monarch, acting under laws which leave no room for personal favors. This view has penetrated so far that when Tyndall proposed a prayer test, the attitude of the clergy was less courageous by far than that of Elijah towards the Tyndalls of his day.

Recollections of a Happy Life. The Autobiography of Marianne North. Macmillan & Co. 2 vols., pp. 351-387.

MISS NORTH was in many ways a notable woman, and when she died in 1890, she left behind her this interesting record of her travels, which has been edited by her sister, Mrs. John Addington Symonds. Of many minor errors we note a few which might be corrected in a second edition: Brooklyn for Brookline, Ongar for Ogden, Tahoo for Tahoe, Denning for Deming, Alldine for Aldine, Puebla for Pueblo, Bernard for Barnard; while okra is dis-