The Sun.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1901.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, per Month	$0 50
DAILY, per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, per Month	70

Postage to foreign countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.

PARIS—Kiosque No. 12, near Grand Hotel, and Kiosque No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

If our friends who favor us with manuscript for publication wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Only One Verdict in the Schley Case.

The conclusions of the Court of Inquiry which Rear Admiral SCHLEY tardily demanded last July are conveyed in the findings of fact and in the statement of opinions signed by Admiral DEWEY as President and by Captain LEMLY as Judge Advocate General. There is no other decision of the Court. These findings of fact and characterizations of conduct constitute the unanimous judgment of the three distinguished officers called upon to pass upon Admiral SCHLEY'S professional and personal behavior; except so far as they are modified, in the way of individual dissent as to details, by the memorandum attached to the report by Admiral GEORGE DEWEY.

The points on which Admiral DEWEY dissents from the prevailing opinion of the Court are by him specifically stated. None of them is vital to the main charges affecting Admiral SCHLEY'S professional competency or personal honor. These minor matters of difference are here exhibited:

The Court.—"Commodore SCHLEY should have proceeded with the utmost despatch off Cienfuegos."

Admiral DEWEY.—"The passage from Key West to Cienfuegos was made with all possible despatch, Commodore SCHLEY having in view the importance of arriving off Cienfuegos with as much coal as possible in the ships' bunkers."

The Court.—"He should have maintained a close blockade of that port."

Admiral DEWEY.—"The blockade of Cienfuegos was effective."

The Court.—"He should have endeavored on May 28 to obtain information regarding the Spanish squadron by communicating with the insurgents at the place designated in the memorandum delivered to him at 8:15 A. M., of that date."

Admiral DEWEY.—"He expected to obtain information from the Adula when she came out."

The Court.—"He should have proceeded from Cienfuegos to Santiago de Cuba with all despatch."

Admiral DEWEY.—"The passage from Cienfuegos to a point twenty-two miles south of Santiago was made with as much despatch as was possible while keeping the squadron a unit."

The Court.—"He should have disposed his vessels with a view of intercepting the enemy in any attempt to pass the Flying Squadron."

Admiral DEWEY.—"The blockade of Santiago was effective."

This is every word of dissent recorded by Admiral DEWEY in regard to any controverted question within the scope of the Court's inquiry. We have been careful to indicate the exact extent of this divergence of opinion, in order that it may appear clearly to what extent Admiral DEWEY concurs absolutely with the judgment of the two other members of the Court. He puts himself on record as concurring with the other members in finding SCHLEY guilty:

1. Of neglecting to communicate with the insurgents near Cienfuegos.

2. Of improperly delaying the squadron for the Eagle.

3. Of making a pretext of insufficiency of coal supply, through official reports which were "inaccurate and misleading," to excuse his retrograde movement toward the Yucatan channel and Key West.

4. Of direct disobedience of the Navy Department's order of May 25.

5. Of not doing his utmost to capture or destroy the enemy's vessels which he attacked on May 31.

6. Of losing distance and position for the Brooklyn and delaying the attack in the battle of July 3 by the so called "loop" movement.

7. Of injustice to Lieutenant-Commander Hodgson in publishing only a portion of the correspondence between them relative to the colloquy.

8. Of general "vacillation, dilatoriness and lack of enterprise" in his professional conduct in connection with the Santiago campaign, prior to June 1, 1898, the date of SAMPSON'S arrival off Santiago.

Such is the unanimous verdict of the Court in the Schley case. It is a verdict in which Admiral DEWEY absolutely concurs. After a most exhaustive and impartial investigation, lasting for many weeks, and a careful weighing of all the testimony in conflict with Admiral SCHLEY'S shifty defence of evasions, explanations, pretexts and heroics, all three of his brother officers constituting the Court for which he asked have pronounced this judgment as to his competency, his loyalty, his truthfulness and his character as an officer and a gentleman. It is not even necessary to examine closely Admiral DEWEY'S phrases of qualification to determine how far they express real dissent on the immaterial points concerned. Wiping out every part of the Court's judgment which is traversed by DEWEY'S memorandum of his individual views, there remains the most crushing verdict ever rendered against a high naval officer of the United States, and it is pronounced by the Court to which he himself appealed, a Court made up of his brother officers in the service, the highest and fairest tribunal to which he could possibly appeal.

We have only these remarks to make at present concerning the verdict rendered unanimously by the Court.

It fixes SCHLEY'S place in history. No further agitation of the case by his foolish friends can change it.

It would drive him disgraced from the service, but for the merciful interposition of time and the laxity that was rightly or wrongly inspired by the ultimate success of SAMPSON'S blockade of Santiago.

It removes the stain that rested on the honor of the American navy so long as his conduct in the matter of the HENSON correspondence went judicially unrebuked.

Under other circumstances—that is to say, but for the amazing fortune which averted the disastrous consequences directly invited by his lapses from duty, his disobedience of orders and his general inefficiency in a crisis of war—this same verdict would have marked him for the severest penalty that martial justice can inflict.

The Devil of Salem.

A few days ago we were obliged to record that the Devil was still doing business at his old stand in Salem, Mass. Perhaps he has a fondness for the scene of his old seventeenth-century deviltries. Perhaps it tickles his devilish sense of humor to raise himself and perturb the august propriety of the most respectable of towns. At any rate, he roused the Salem folks to mutiny and rage and malicious mischief in their City Hall; and the old rascal is still gambolling there.

The present Mayor of Salem is the Hon. JOHN F. HURLEY, specifically known as "JOHN F." The outbreaks of devilry having occurred under JOHN F., the more solemn and delectable Salemites determined to drive out both JOHN and NICK. So they sought a former Mayor, a man of distinguished ancestry and appearance, the Hon. ROBERT SAMUEL RANTOUL, and asked him to save them from Old NICK and JOHN F. Mr. RANTOUL consented, no doubt at great personal sacrifice. JOHN F. hurries, hustles, makes a noise. He is a discord in Salem. His methods are too brisk. Mr. RANTOUL is dignified, impressive, in tune with Salem. We might compare him to the Massachusetts Historical Society and JOHN F. to a brass band. JOHN F. means well, but after all he is scarcely one of the real Salem folks. Now the RANTOULS come from Beverly, we believe, but they are adopted and accepted as Salem folks. It was RANTOUL against HURLEY, conservatism against radicalism. Could there be a doubt that Salem would be true to herself?

The Salem folks forgot that the gentleman with the horns is older even than they by several diameters. When the votes had been counted, ROBERT the Good had 2,911 and JOHN F. had 3,700.

Let us go with a reporter of the *Boston Globe* and call on the victor:

"Mayor HURLEY'S big diamond stud vied with the sparkle of his eye and his silk hat had an extra polish as he strode downtown this afternoon to his office at City Hall, where he found numerous letters and telegrams of congratulation. Success had not shifted the cant of his Honor's tile, for the rim still chafed his left ear, and he had not doffed the sack coat for the more impressive frock. The Mayor has been fighting ever since he was inaugurated, but he is going to suspend the strenuous life until after the new year. Then, with four Aldermen ready to support him, he intends to roll up his sleeves and 'weed out some of the old fossils that impede the progress of public business in Salem.'"

Weed out some of the old fossils! The phrase is mixed but ominous. What is the world coming to if fossils can't rest in peace in Salem? But who is that fellow in a steeple-crowned hat on Gallows Hill? Is he chuckling? As sure as the Devil, it is the Devil chuckling over the triumph of JOHN F. over the discomfiture of ancient Salem, over the Mayor of Salem who wears a big diamond stud, a sack coat and a tall hat tipped over his left ear. JOHN ENDICOTT is lucky to be dead.

England and the Dual Alliance.

It is not surprising that the recent outbreak of Anglophobia in Germany should have caused a good many sensible Englishmen to consider the expediency of reversing their country's traditional policy toward Russia. The *National Review*, which is understood to speak for several influential members of the Salisbury Government, warmly advocates a cordial understanding between England and Russia, and to that end is willing to see large concessions made to the Czar and also to his French ally. The London *Times* in a leading article seems disposed to favor the same change of front, provided the concessions made to Russia do not include a naval station on the Persian Gulf. Such French papers as the *Débats* and the *Matin* receive the overture in a friendly spirit, and express the opinion that, under certain conditions, the suggested understanding would be entirely practicable. Naturally, the German newspapers are not pleased at the proposal, for it is obvious that England's adhesion to the Dual Alliance would upset the balance of power in Europe.

We scarcely need point out how much Russia would have to gain from a combination with England, even though the latter Power should persist in prohibiting the construction of a second Port Arthur on the Persian Gulf. The Czar could only desire a fortified harbor on the seaboard of southern Persia for the sake of its strategic position on the flank of the Suez route to India. Such an acquisition would be useless to him from the moment he should have made up his mind definitely to forego an assault upon the Anglo-Indian Empire. On the other hand, England has it in her power to render him inestimable services in the Mediterranean and on the Pacific coast of Asia. Let her once withdraw her support from the Sultan, and nothing could prevent a Russian fleet from capturing Constantinople. The Turks would fight, no doubt, but the loss of their European capital would compel them to withdraw to Anatolia, and Russia, planted on the Bosporus, could proceed at leisure to absorb the rest of the Ottoman Empire. We observe that the *Times*, while firmly opposed, as we have said, to the creation of a Russian naval fortress on the Persian Gulf, has not a word to say against a realization of the design imputed to PETER the Great. Its reticence on the subject is due doubtless to a recognition of the fact that, since England became mistress of Egypt, her relation to the question of the Near East has been materially changed.

Of singular importance for Russia is it to secure England's good will with reference to Manchuria and Corea. Were the existence of a friendly understanding between the London and the St. Petersburg Governments made known, China would at once sign the convention by which Manchuria would be gradually converted into a Russian province, and Japan would renounce in despair her present purpose of resisting Russia's acquirement of ascendancy in Corea, or even the construction of a Russian naval fortress on the southeastern end of the peninsula, which would assure the command of the direct route from Vladivostock to Port Arthur. Neither have we yet summed up the whole of the advantages that might accrue to Russia from England's friendship. M. DE WITTE is aware that, as a borrower, he has gone almost the length of his tether in France. It is as yet uncertain whether even the Czar's last visit has made it possible to float a new Russian loan in Paris. To the Russian Government, therefore, it is a matter of transcendent moment to gain access for its securities to the London market. Thus, and thus only, could M. DE WITTE be perfectly sure of obtaining the funds needed to carry out the canals, railways and other public works that have been planned on a colossal scale.

Hardl less patent is the profit that France might derive from England's adhesion to the Triple Alliance. As it is, the combined naval force of France and Russia is more than a match for that of Germany, Austria and Italy. With the weight of England thrown into the French scale, the German Navy would be reduced to impotence, and German commerce would be annihilated. With England's countenance, moreover, France would find it relatively easy to pursue a policy of expansion in Syria, in Central Africa, in southwestern China and perhaps in Morocco also. Above all, she would be relieved from the drain on her financial resources to which she has been subjected by her Russian ally.

As for England, it seems manifest that a friendly understanding with Russia and France would put an end to all her troubles. It would free her from apprehensions of attack in India or in any other part of the globe; would deliver her from the necessity of adopting even a modified form of conscription, and would leave her at liberty to acquire ascendancy in the vast basin of the Yangtse Kiang.

The Paris Automobile Show.

The detailed accounts of the International Automobile Show in Paris indicate that the French manufacturers have taken the automobile world completely by surprise. Instead of adhering rigidly to the principles of construction which have heretofore characterized their product, they have, to an extent almost incredible, abandoned those principles and have adopted substantially those by which the automobile makers of the United States have been governed since the very beginning of the industry in America. The result is that this industry in France has lately undergone a striking transformation.

The prime purpose of the French manufacturers in the past has been to produce vehicles capable of high speed regardless of their weight, and there is no doubt that that purpose has been accomplished. The demand for such machines, however, was comparatively limited, owing not only to their great cost, but also to the fact that they were poorly adapted for any other use than that for which they were specially designed. Automobiles were wanted which should be light and suitable for everyday service on the road; which should accommodate comfortably as many persons as wished to ride in them; which should be durable and attractive, and, though not even approaching the record-breaking qualities of the heavier machines, should be capable of travelling at a fair average speed.

It has seemed in this country as if the French manufacturers were somewhat slow to appreciate these facts, and there has been slight intimation that they contemplated any radical changes in their machines. So widespread had become the craze of Europeans for speed that that feature of automobiling, it was believed, would continue to occupy most of the manufacturers' attention. But here is where the prophets have been in error. There never has been any doubt as to the ability of the Frenchmen to produce light automobiles that were highly satisfactory. Indeed, enough of such vehicles have been for a long time in use among them to demonstrate clearly that they could do so, if they desired. The question was, would they devote the greater part of their energy to the construction of machines of that sort, and abandon, to any appreciable extent, the building of racers.

That question is answered emphatically by the exhibits at the show now in progress. Most of the machines there are light and graceful and possess, above all, the requirements of comfort. Excessive speed has been subordinated to all-around utility, and the mechanical devices necessary to produce such speed have disappeared. In other words, the French automobiles for next year will be characterized by their relative cheapness and comfort and simplicity of construction.

What will be the effect of this change upon the automobile industry in the United States? It is reported that several Americans are at the show examining the machines and buying a large number of them for shipment to America. Moreover, the competitive test to confirm the rumor lately circulated that the Mors Company is to have a factory in this country, and is to build here all of the several models, ranging from eight to fifteen horse power, which represent the new product of that concern. Only a few weeks ago it was announced that the firm of PANHARD & LEVASSOR had effected arrangements for the manufacture of the machines in this country, and that its factory would be in full operation by next summer. But the so-called Mors and Panhards are not likely, by any means, to be the only imported machines prominent on our highways next year, two or three other French concerns whose latest product closely rivals that of the companies referred to expect to find ready customers here.

It is clear that this state of things is not apt to modify the feeling of dissatisfaction at present exhibited by the Association of American Automobile Manufacturers toward the chauffeurs in this country, owing to the latters' use of foreign-made vehicles. But, so far as concerns the ultimate success of the present movement on the part of the Frenchmen, people who are familiar with the competitive resources of the American manufacturers will be slow to believe that it will work very much injury to the automobile trade on this side of the Atlantic.

The Unacted Dramatist.

The American dramatist never was in such demand as he is to-day. His opportunities were never greater and he need only show himself to enjoy every reward that comes to the man that is needed.

The supply of acceptable plays from both foreign and native sources falls so far short of the demand that the theatre managers are in a serious predicament on this account more frequently than the public ever suspects. In this country the support of the drama is more generous than it is anywhere in the world.

At the same time it is more exacting. The kinds of plays that appeal in the fullest sense to the American people are fewer than they are in any other part of the civilized world. Not only are the subjects to be treated more limited here, but so are the characters to be introduced.

Every manager knows the sort of a play to be avoided; his experience soon teaches him that. Learning the kind that may be liked is a more difficult part of his business.

It is the refusal of American audiences to take an interest in more than a limited number of subjects on the stage that has made the European supply less useful than it was in the past. The theatre is still regarded here as a place of entertainment only, and as that view no longer directs the composition of plays in Europe, unless England be excepted, it has become necessary for our managers to turn more frequently to the native writers for the stage. Their good work will always be received with gratitude. They will get more from one successful play than most bank Presidents earn in a year.

The scarcity of suitable plays for the American stage may be understood from the situation that existed recently in one of the best known New York theatres. Its manager was on the point of abandoning dramatic performances altogether in his theatre and disbanding his company on account of the difficulty of finding a play suited to his public. It was the tardy discovery of a drama that seemed to promise success that saved this theatre to New York. Musical performances would otherwise have been given in place of the plays that had previously been seen there. When such a crisis arises in the business of amusements, the demand for the American dramatist is urgent; yet he comes forward too slowly for the managers to welcome him as they would like to.

Sometimes there are grounds for doubt that this talented and unappreciated playwright exists in sufficient numbers to accomplish what is asked of him. A recent competition, that offered $1,000 for the best play of American authorship, resulted in nothing more satisfactory than the selection of a drama avowedly unfit for public representation. The quality of the other works submitted to the committee led its members to the conclusion that there was no great amount of American talent awaiting recognition.

Previous competitions have shown similar results. They rarely bring forth available plays of real merit. Most of the efforts submitted have already been under the observation of managers. Difficult as it may be for the unacted dramatist to get a hearing, he is not altogether overlooked. If worthy plays had for several years been ignored by the managers, assuredly some of them would have come under the eyes of the judges in charge of this latest competition and they would not have been compelled to award the prize to a drama unfitted for the stage. This author had probably heard a like opinion of his play before, but without the accompaniment of the gratifying financial reward that came after its last consideration.

Managers are eager to recognize the genius of the dramatists who will supply them with plays that will interest the public. If these unappreciated writers are in existence they are not assertive. They are anxiously awaited. Fortune is in store for them. In the meantime the latest attempt to bring them before the public goes far toward proving the theory of the managers that little or nothing is to be expected from inexperienced writers for the stage. They must of course make a beginning at some time and those who are worthy have always succeeded in spite of the difficulties that confront them.

Trolley Mania.

Since long before the birth of ST. PATRICK, people have "seen" snakes and crocodiles and serpents of other ugly and terrifying reptiles, and some have seen things outside of the reptile family which made their shudder and shake at the knees, but it remained for Mr. WILLIAM HOYT of this city to "see" trolley cars.

Some time ago HOYT was struck by one of the cars of the Metropolitan Street Railway Company and received several injuries about the head and body, and the fact, is alleged, that he is now suffering from a peculiar mental condition described by his physician as "trolley mania" was disclosed on Thursday in the Supreme Court, where HOYT brought suit against the railroad company to recover $25,000 damages. The verdict in the case, rendered on Friday, awarded the plaintiff $10,000. The defence took exception to the verdict, and it is reported that the case will be appealed.

Although, so far as we know, the term "trolley mania" originated in this case, phrases somewhat similar to it have been for some time employed to express a sort of fear or apprehension felt by many residents of New York whenever they attempt to cross streets traversed by trolley cars. It is indisputable that some persons, generally those from the suburbs of this city, travel several blocks out of their way daily in order to avoid crossing a street in which the cars are run, and when necessity compels them to cross such thoroughfares they appear for some minutes to be in a dazed and nervous condition.

HOYT, it is said, fancies that everything in motion, from a wheelbarrow to an automobile, is a trolley car, and for trolley cars he is everlastingly on the watch. Trolley cars overtake him on the sidewalk and follow him home; they roll around the floor of his house like marbles; at night they go up on the roof, turn somersaults and come clanging down through the chimney, and once on the inside, they play tag around his bed and vie with each other in running down frail and unwary pedestrians.

The railroad company, it is said, has employed physicians for the purpose of determining whether trolley mania really is a new and prevalent disease. They will, no doubt, seek to ascertain how many persons, if any, have suffered from hallucinations similar to those described by Mr. HOYT, and will endeavor to learn the specific and technical cause of the malady, and also the percentage of cases wherein it has shown grave and refractory tendencies.

Trolley mania, if it actually exists, is not an affliction to be trifled with. It should receive the immediate and undivided professional attention of those who are best able to deal with it.

A very important bill has been introduced in the Senate by Mr. HALE, at the instance of the Secretary of the Navy, giving to naval courts-martial and courts of inquiry the power to compel civilian witnesses to appear and testify in proceedings before them. Such courts have continually been met with the refusal of civilians whose testimony was important to testify; and under the present law, this refusal is not a contempt of court. Within a few days has come the news that civilians in Samoa declined to testify before the court-martial trying Capt. TILLEY, U. S. N. An act signed by the President on March 2 last gave to army courts-martial the powers now sought for naval courts. Mr. HALE'S bill safeguards the rights of civilians, by directing that the question of contempt be referred to the nearest United States court; with the provision inserted that witnesses shall not be required to incriminate themselves, the bill should be passed promptly.

The schoolteachers of Pittston township, Pa., have gone on strike and locked out their pupils. The grievance of the teachers is the irregularity in the payment of their salaries. It is believed that most of the scholars heartily approve the strike and hope that the lockout may long continue. Santa Claus less than two weeks away and no school to go to—the youth of Pittston have great privileges.

MARKSMANSHIP IN THE GUARD.

The Decrease This Year Due to Many Reasons Not Likely to Be Repeated.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* The editorial on "Marksmanship in the National Guard" to-day is apt to give a false impression. The total number of marksmen this year is just 221 less than last year, to be accounted for as follows: The average strengths of the organizations practising vary from year to year and their attendance on general practice days also varies. During the season of 1900 every organization practised and qualified nearly its full strength, and more men qualified in the various classes than ever before in the history of the National Guard. The qualifications during the season of 1900 may be taken as a record, and it may also be assumed that the individual qualifications in the various organizations had during that year about reached the limit. While some of the organizations in New York and Brooklyn qualified fewer men than last year, others qualified more, owing probably to the decrease in the strength of some organizations and the increase in others. Take for example the Seventh Regiment, which qualified 961 men during 1901 as against 986 during 1900—a loss of 25, although every man in the organization during both years qualified. Squadron A lost, during 1901, 2 experts, but gained 14 sharpshooters, the aggregate loss being but 4 during 1901; the entire strength, however, qualifying both years, and so on through the list.

The greatest loss in the State was in the Sixty-fifth and Seventy-fourth regiments, stationed at Buffalo, which fell off in the aggregate 23 experts, 80 sharpshooters and 180 total. This condition of affairs was mainly due to the Pan-American Exposition, which required almost continuous duty for these organizations for escort, guard duty, &c., it being extremely difficult for the men to attend the small arms practice at the conclusion of the Exposition, so much time during the summer having been given to this duty. Under ordinary conditions the loss made in these organizations would compensate for the other losses throughout the State and bring the season of 1901 nearly on a par with the record season of 1900.

In addition to the above it was found impossible this year to release the old range at Tonawanda for the Buffalo troops, and a new range was contracted for and built at Williamsville, which was not completed, however, until late in the season, and the practice here was on the range of the United States Government at Fort Niagara, requiring the transportation of the troops for full a long distance, which necessarily reduced the shooting time afforded them.

The number of days for supplementary practice in the companies a class of troops, and the reduced time allowed for supplementary and expert practice, and the rule to score double amount for the number of cartridges fired in the various experts, resulted in the Fifth and Second Brigades.

This scheme was approved by the Inspector-General, Army and Navy Journal, of these organizations, and not in the future. I am glad the result is so favorable.

If not the report is thoroughly understood, it is not better to be found to say that the shooting of the troops this year is fully equal to that of the preceding year.

[illegible]

Inspector-General and Ordnance Officer, N. G. State New York, Dec. 13.

Cyclonic to Ski

[illegible]

IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

A Rejector of the Dogma Replies to Mr. Goldwin Smith's Discussions of the Subject.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—*Sir:* Mr. Goldwin Smith is always interesting. His letter on the subject of the immortality of the soul in THE SUN of Dec. 1, is no exception to this rule. But he is not always consistent, and his many utterances on this and similar subjects afford some peculiar contrasts, to which I would draw his attention. In his "Guesses at the Riddle of Existence," he says:

> Science, moreover, Darwinian and genera, has put an end to the traditional belief in the soul as a being separate from the body, breathed into the body by a distinct act of the Creator, pent up in it as in a prison house, beating spiritually against the bars of the flesh, and looking to be set free by death. Soul and body, we now know, form an indivisible whole, the nature of man being one, enfolded at first in the same embryo, advancing in all its parts and aspects through the same stages to maturity, and succumbing at last to the same decay.

In this passage there is a clear-cut expression of opinion that science has destroyed the belief in immortality; and Mr. Smith follows it up with a series of arguments which conclusively prove that this is his deliberate judgment. For instance:

> The thought of eternal existence, even of a life of eternal happiness, if we dwell upon it, turns the brain giddy; it is a sort of mental torture to attempt to realize the idea. * * * The disproportion of eternal rewards and punishments to the merits or sins of man's short life is profoundly repugnant to our moral sense.

Many other passages might be cited to the same effect; and may we not ask, if modern science has really, for intelligent men, disposed of the idea of immortality, is it not rather late to call for some substitute as a foundation for our ethical sanction, for the phase of religious belief which has passed away? It seems to me that, even in his present letter, as well as in his "Guesses," Mr. Smith supplies his own answer. He tells us that, "if this life ends all, I do not see how conscience can retain its authority;" but he has already told us that

> Whatever turn may ultimately be taken by our convictions about a hereafter, society will uphold by law or social influence rules necessary to its own security and convenience here. It may even uphold them more rigorously, perhaps cruelly, if it is convinced that the present life is all. The natural affections, parental, conjugal, and social, will also retain their force.

It seems to me that Mr. Smith supplies a complete answer to his own doubts. Will he contend that the laws and social customs of society are anything more than the crystallized expression of the consciences of the people who have made them; and that the well-being of society, as the object of those laws and customs, is really their full and complete sanction? Even if we acknowledge that "divine" authority and a system of future rewards and punishments have often been claimed as sanctions for human conduct, it is quite clear that the present good of society has always been the real sanction of all moral codes. When the bodies of men were tortured and burnt in order to save their souls, there was always present the claim that this was done to protect society from heresy, and the consequent divine vengeance that might be its punishment.

It is pleasing to listen to the testimony borne by Mr. Smith to the "special value of the ancient masters of ethics, Plato, Aristotle, Marcus Aurelius and Epictetus," that "while they looked at human nature with eyess a clear as ours, they were free from theological prepossessions." In his "Guesses" he had said:

> In the great Stoics, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, there is no expression of belief in a personal life beyond the present. What they seem to expect is absorption in the universe, which, if personality is merged, would be the extinction of our personal selves. On the other hand, they show the profoundest faith in the divinity of the moral law, in the nothingness of present pleasures or pains, and in the infinite reward of virtue.

Will Mr. Smith tell us, if these, perhaps the noblest examples of the influence of the categorical imperative as the basic principle in morals we have ever seen, had no faith in a future life, with its rewards and punishments, as its ultimate sanction, what other sanction they could have had but one of a utilitarian character? If Plato thought he discerned a "distinct connection of virtue with a personal though unseen power of good," against him we may set Marcus Aurelius, &c., and our own Matthew Arnold, with his "Power, not man, that makes for righteousness." And is it not clear, also, that in such expressions as these our ethical teachers have only recorded their doubts in an admittedly difficult field? While, however, it seems to be admitted by all that a utilitarian basis is all that is needed for the concern and commonest actions of men, some higher sanction is claimed as necessary to explain the so-called nobler actions of the self-sacrificing martyr, patriot, or philanthropist. To whatever source we may, in such cases, trace the sense of duty, it seems to me that, in attributing it to a belief in a future life of rewards and punishments, we should really be founding it upon a basis of the meanest and most despicable personal utilitarianism. Leslie Stephen well remarked that the greatest difficulty in ethics is to make the ordinary man understand the duty of doing what is for the general (including his own) and ultimate good, if his immediate personal advantage stands in the way. We all honor the soldier or the philanthropist who performs deeds of heroism or benevolence for the good of his fellow men. It is, indeed, impossible to carry on society unless parents and children, friends and neighbors, make some sacrifices—or what appear to be sacrifices—for others; but is it not true that, in all these cases, the action chosen may justly be described as that which affords its performer his highest satisfaction?

I submit, sir, that on the leading question, the fact of immortality, the facts of science fully justify Mr. Smith's assertion, quoted above, that immortality has been disproved. Embryology and heredity clearly prove that each individual—soul and body—consists of factors the result of the union of germs from both parents, and it is simply a philosophical axiom that what has a beginning must have an end. Surely, man's craving for immortality—a craving equalled by his cravings for other impossibilities—cannot be regarded as any indication of its possibility. The fact that up to this time there is not the slightest direct evidence in its favor—that not one solitary soul that has passed beyond the veil has ever reappeared—is a strong argument against it. Of the physical body we can certainly say that it is not immortal, but what of the soul? Is it not about time that this last of the strongholds of the metaphysical mystery mongers should be stripped from the forces of the belligerent men? It has been pretended that the soul is a sort of duplicate of the body, but in matter of a far more refined and delicate nature than any of which we are cognizant. On the face of it, is it not evident that this is only another way of saying that the soul is something of which we know nothing? Is it not clear that our being—our soul, if you choose—is made up of sensations and impressions that only exist by and of the living organs of our bodies, and that if we could imagine ourselves living in the ethereal manner supposed by our theosophical friends, these sensations would be entirely different from those we now experience? In other words, we might be angels, but we should not know ourselves.

The claim that "justice" demands a future life in order to make compensation for wrongs suffered in this life is one of those blows which not reason at defiance. In the discovery of good and evil, the being or Power that guides the universe, is such a characteristic and definitive character that he has to arrange a new set of conditions to repair the damage done in the old one! What reason have we to imagine that he can administer effective justice in any set of conditions? That is another, I repeat, and insuperable difficulty. Power, governing the universe in one and all of its parts, may be supposed to be able to do all things, and yet we find it, in our experience, allowing the innocent to suffer and the guilty to escape. Shall this state exist and last? The one theory is simply upset the moment we consider the immortality of absolute scoundrels, men who have made the world worse for their presence, men who have suffered half a century of struggle to be transported to a place of all that is good and pure. Is it reasonable to suppose that the Power governing the universe is now and forever powerless to do justice?