

Results of my unfortunate carelessness.

As the first rays of the morning sun brightened the tops of the little houses another wonderful sight was in store for me. It seemed as if the entire country had been transformed over night. People were streaming from the cities in every direction; some were pitching tents on the unused grounds. Others were going father away. Never had I seen such a happy people. The elders romped and tumbled over the ground like little children while the younger ones laughed and shouted as if possessed. In front of the factories were the owners frantically beseeching their former workmen not to desert them; from other buildings large signs were displayed offering fabulous sums to all who would remain and accept the invitation to work. The little puffing toys were spinning along the rails crowded with people, and every where it seemed that an entire nation had been released from bondage and were enjoying a national holiday."

Here a break occurred in the manuscript. But I have often wondered just how these liliputians used their newly found freedom; whether they guarded it as a priceless heritage, or whether they exchanged their glass case for the prison that we have erected for our people with bars of paper deeds.

A BRIEF ESSAY ON LAW.

(*For the Review.*)

BY CHAS. H. PORTER.

All knowledge is relative. Whether derived inductively or deductively all our conclusions are based upon acquired conceptions. If the latter be contrary to right reason the former cannot be faultless. "A conclusion is the absolute and necessary result of the admission of certain premises, and sound premises, together with their necessary conclusions, constitute a demonstration."* For the purpose of correct conclusions nothing is more important than proper conceptions, or sound premises,

for upon them depends the progress of mankind.

It is my purpose here to suggest that possibly our accepted ideas of law are erroneous. If so they are not keeping us in the path of truth and are retarding progress. It is not now my object to trace the particular results of this possible misconception, but merely to state my conception of the law, leaving to others who may have the inclination to make use of it in their own deductions.

There are almost as many conceptions of law as there are relations between animate beings and inanimate things. Montesquieu says,† "Laws are the relations subsisting between it and different beings, and the relation of these to one another." Assuming that the translation is correct, it is incomprehensible why he should use the term in the plural and in the same breath personify them with a singular pronoun. His treatise, however, leaves no room for mistaking his conception of law, which is that of plurality. This conception reduces law to anarchy, separate and distinct laws regulating or governing each special condition. Thus conceived there are divisions of law or laws. Thus we have divine or spiritual laws, of which nothing can be positively known. More or less included in this division are the so-called moral laws. Then come natural or physical laws, or those pertaining to matter and motion. Still another division is that of human laws, a patent impossibility. These embrace numerous subdivisions, such as political or international laws; civil, military, maritime and municipal laws, so that it might almost be said that there are both natural and artificial laws, as well as positive and negative laws. Montesquieu further says that "law in general is human reason, inasmuch as it governs all the inhabitants of the earth." Manifestly, then, this conception of law even though here spoken of as a unity, is something not independent of man, but a part of and in a manner emanating from him, a conclusion which the veriest tyro must reject.

It may be a convenient way of covering up our lack of knowledge to allow such a

conception of law, while on the other hand it may in a measure aid as in a hypothesis in treating special subjects to designate uniform occurrences under the same conditions as special laws, but to my mind the term should have a more definite meaning, and the operation of law under manifold conditions should be expressed in other terms.

To my mind law is something positive, as constant and persistent as it is positive, and in itself not subject to division or variation. A pebble sinking into the stream is governed by the same law as the bubble which arises, even though when one is not the sequence of the other. The rushing torrent, the ruthless cyclone, the raging fire, is each subject to the same law as still waters, the created vacuum, or cold ashes; and this law is just as imminent in the moral and mental sphere. Thus conceived law is a unity and can be spoken of only as such. As an entity it is the unknowable, transcending human comprehensibility, to which all things are in direct relation, exhibiting variation in phenomena, which, within spheres of manifestation, are uniform. The observation of phenomena arising from changed relations, the attempted classification or systematization of these within limited spheres of action, have given rise to a nomenclature which creates a division of law, while the fact seems to be that these "laws" are but manifestations of the operation of a single law. Law can not be set down by definition. It can not be analyzed or explained because no one can know just what it is or comprehend its nature. All that can be known of it is the resultant phenomena, and these come by discovery alone. This observation obtains universally so far as we can see. It is as applicable to what is called legislation as it is to so-called laws in other spheres of action. A legislature does not make law. It attempts to discover the manifestations of law. It formulates rules the observance of which is expected to induce certain changed relations. These are necessarily subject to the operation of constant law, bring up about new conditions that are the manifestations of law. A scheme of human legislation is thus only

a system of experimentation for the discovery of proper relations in order to realize through the operation of Law that which we call good government.

There is no constancy except it be of law. In that domain we are not permitted to enter. We can only discover and classify some of its manifestations. All else is change, whether in mind or matter, and these arise through differentiation under uniform law operating incessantly. Progress is change but all change is not progress. That which distinguishes progress and retrogression is not so much the law as it is the relation into which mind or matter is brought with the law, these being the conditions of differentiation. Progress is fruition of intelligent adaptation of conditions of differentiation, conscious effort to so place things in happy relations that change shall be progress, but whether it be progress or retrogression it is the product of the same uniform and constant Law. The so-called laws of physics, of psychology, or of any other science, are not laws at all, but are the varied manifestations of a single law, one and indivisible. There is but one law of the universe and of the infinitesimal. We understand only such of its manifestations as come within experience, but do not understand the law itself. As in psychology faculties have been spoken of as acting independently of, and in opposition to, one another, so laws have been distinguished with no stronger basis for support. There is no more a special law for gravitation, for the conservation of energy, or for any other condition or thing, than there are special faculties controlling cognition, the feelings, or the will. Psychological classifications are of psychological elements and not of laws. By psychological elements we understand the different sides or qualities of the states or of the phenomena of consciousness. By manifestations of law are understood all the effects of its operation under the varying conditions of mind and matter upon which it operates. These manifestations are always uniform when the conditions are uniform, and are as variant as the conditions are variant. To classify these as special laws is unsatisfactory and mis-

leading. From our conception of the unity of law is deduced the relativity of knowledge, and progress based upon discovery and not upon mandate.

*English Synonyms by Fernald.

†Book I., Chap. I.

‡Hoffding's Psychology, page 88.

great ancient graft, the Nemesis of nations, the terrible curse that has followed close on the heels of every civilization that arose on this earth since our tree swinging and cave-dwelling ancestors, gibbering and chattering in the tropics, huddled together for mutual protection.—BENJAMIN F. LINDAS.

GIVE THE FLOWERS MORE LAND.

That a man who keeps an attractive lawn and home surroundings should, for that reason, be taxed higher than his indifferent neighbor next door, is all wrong. It should be the other way around.—*The Florists' Exchange*.

A GLANCE BACKWARD

We review the achievements of that mighty nation that once ruled the world from Imperial Rome on her seven hills. When it was at the height of its power we find its citizens scarcely superior to serfs. A few wise law makers recognized the danger and sought to limit that land that an individual might hold. Laws with these ends in view were passed and then systematically ignored. Tiberius Gracchus sought to secure their proper enforcement and was murdered; during the existence of the Republic practically all the land of the nation had been absorbed by the capitalistic group. Agriculture declined; vast estates were farmed with slave labor; productive farms were turned into pleasure grounds; the homes of the sturdy Roman who had conquered the world gave place to parks and ponds and play-grounds for the rich. Well was it said that "Great estates ruined Italy." And so it has ever been. Egypt is now but a name; Babylon and Nineveh are desolate ruins; shattered pillars and ruined temples are all that is left of the once all-conquering Greece and Rome. All these nations were founded on a lie, and so could not endure; nations that legalized the monumental graft that robs the worker and brings unexampled splendors to the few and untold misery to the many; the

THE TRUE RIGHT OF PROPERTY.

The world has yet to recognize some all important truths. Let me call your attention to two great fundamental principles. What God furnished for humanity He furnished as a gift for the equal enjoyment of every one. What man earns from these opportunities he earns for himself. Thus there are two distinct kinds of property. The ignoring of this distinction is the source of much confusion. Prudhon said, Property is robbery. This statement is true or false, just as we interpret the word "property." If I make for myself a home, that home is mine. Let any man try to dispossess me, and I resent his action as robbery. I built it and therefore it is mine. From the forest that God gave I should be allowed to take enough timber to make myself a shelter, just as I have a right to appropriate the light of the sun or to breathe the atmosphere. But when I take my share of the timber, that gives me no right to charge my fellow-man for access to that forest. That is the gift of God, for every one equally. In the same way I have a right to the crop I raise, and I have a right to charge for that crop. But that gives me no right to charge my fellow-man for the opportunity to live, move and have his being on the face of the earth.—W. A. DOUGLASS, from address before the Ontario Educational Association.

WILL PRESIDENT WILSON BE ANOTHER LLOYD GEORGE?

"In Mr. Wilson," he says, "the country has at last given birth to a thinker," and "I don't know, but I believe from what I have read of Mr. Wilson's messages and addresses, what I know of his honesty of