

to be in the same condition as chemistry at the period of Lavoisier.

Professor Ross is among the foremost of the world's investigators in sociology, and possesses in a high degree the scientific spirit which is as ready to discard the useless as to search for the useful among the great and unchangeable facts which it is the obligation of the scientific man to discover and declare. To outlaw such a man from a university as punishment for his occasional statement of conclusions reached within his field of investigation is to inflict the greatest possible harm upon the institution itself.

Human knowledge was long restrained by this policy. No wise man blames the Egyptian Monk, Cosmas Indicopleustes, because fourteen hundred years ago his theory of the universe was incorrect. His elaborate system, which declared the world to be a parallelogram, flat, surrounded by four seas, and on their outer edge a wall inclosing the whole structure, with the firmament cemented to its top, was the best that man knew then of cosmography. But wise men do blame the latter Christian world for its inhospitality to the wider and truer knowledge of Bruno and Galileo, and the Mahometan world for its persecution of Averroes for the same offense of original investigation.

When it is known that science in a university is under bonds to prejudice or dogmatism, the usefulness of that university is at an end and its further existence is without reason.

Every issue that arises in the industrial and economic life of a people is properly the subject of scientific analysis. It is known beyond dispute that this is not a chance world, neither in its physical structure and considered as a mass of matter, nor in the movements of that humanity which is the highest expression of creative force. When the illuminating orb of science rose, never to set, dogmatism vanished like the night. Any such attempt as this to recall the shadows and bring night to replace the endless day of scientific knowledge is of necessity abortive. No authority can bring back the immovable world, nor back of that the flat world, with its brazen firmament. Nor can dogmatism and reaction recall the conception of human society as a lawless body, moving erratically and subject to varying moods and a fallible will that can, regardless of the fixed scheme of nature, dictate a premise and conclusion. The place of the sociologist in the world's system of culture requires that he investigate the laws inherent in the social body and demonstrate them. On its economic side the utility of his work is the prevention of waste of force in an expenditure on lines which uselessly oppose primordial law. Given knowledge of that law, man economizes his force by moving on its lines, and the race is

bettered in all its material conditions.

We do not say that it is always agreeable to man to know his limitations. The cessation of life is by virtue of law that none can repeal, but that knowledge of law has not made pleasant the certainty of death. The knowledge of social law, while bringing within the vision, apparent to the senses, a less terrifying prospect, may also be disagreeable to those who feebly despise limitations. But their fight against the law is as vain as would be a denial of the day by one who closes his eyes at the meridian and says, "It is night."

In all the wide fellowship of learning every citizen of the Republic of Letters will grieve to know that a university which has promised as much as Stanford, and has so far redeemed its promise so grandly, has suddenly been averted from its purpose, and appears ready to close its eyes to the daylight of science and say, "It is night."

WAR AND THE MOB SPIRIT.

No one who has introduced a change in the constitution of a state, Machiavelli tells us, need expect to stop it at his will or regulate it according to his pleasure. Those philanthropists who have lately been recommending war as a means of grace are now in a way to be convinced of the truth of this aphorism. Their code of morality recognizes war as a proper means of promoting humanity and propagating virtue. The ultimate end being the progress and happiness of the human race, the slaughter of a number of individuals, the outrage of their most sacred feelings, the destruction of their most cherished possessions, although intrinsically deplorable measures, become sanctified by their high purpose. In the same way the prosperity of our own country is an end sufficient to justify any war in which she engages, and the passions of hatred and envy and revenge and greed and cruelty and lust, which arouse and which are aroused by war, lose the reprehensible character which is attributed to them in time of peace.

Many recent occurrences should convince the world of what it might have been long ago convinced, that it is impossible to maintain different standards of righteousness for nations and for individuals. If our moralists are determined to justify bloodshed by national forces, and revenge for insults to national authorities and emblems, they cannot make the populace comprehend that revenge is an evil passion and that bloodshed is sinful. It takes an accomplished casuist to feel righteously revengeful when he thinks of the blowing up of the Maine, or the killing of an American by a Chinese mob, while he maintains an attitude of Christian patience concerning his own private wrongs. Such refinements are quite beyond the grasp of common people. When they are taught that it is right to kill a number of Spanish peasants, forced to bear arms by con-

scription, in retaliation for the destruction of the Maine, they cheerfully accept the doctrine, and they immediately extend it. They say that it applies to private as well as public morals, and in this country the negro race is now bearing the brunt of the application. White men in the southern states heard with joy the declaration of northern clergymen that dark people were inferior beings, and incapable of self-government, and these declarations are everywhere bearing fruit.

Colorado Barbarity.

The burning of a negro boy at the stake in Colorado, not by a mob, but by an orderly assemblage of citizens; the horrible barbarities inflicted on the Chinese by the troops of the "civilized" powers; the excesses of the London populace on the return of the soldiers from South Africa; these are illustrations of the natural effect of stirring up the spirit of war. It is absurd to suppose that soldiers in battle maintain the calm attitude of the sheriff who hangs a convict or of the judge who sentences him to execution. We have before us an Iowa paper (the Decorah Public Opinion, of November 14), containing a letter written by a young soldier in the Philippines to his mother. He describes an action in which he took part, and says that he and his companions killed 120 negroes. "We never left one alive. If one was wounded we would run our bayonets through him. There was nothing but dead negroes all around us." After the battle this brave fellow and his comrades burnt the neighboring town, looted the president's house, dropped a few tears over the grave of one of their company, and received high praise from their commander for their behavior. There is nothing in this story but the ordinary incident of warfare; nothing in the moral attitude of the writer of it that is not necessitated by war; nothing, we must add, in the effect on the heart and conscience of the mother who read it, which is not the natural result of war.

No doubt those benevolent people who encouraged their rulers to involve the country in war in the interests of humanity, are now condemning the torture of the negro malefactor in Colorado. The men who inflicted this torture will not be affected by such reproaches. They will retort, if they think it worth their while, that their proceedings were as deliberate as those of the American Congress when it declared war against Spain. They will say to the argument that the law should have taken its course and justice be done without violence, that congress would not wait for arbitration with Spain, and was commended for its refusal to delay by many of the clergy. To the reproach that the punishment inflicted was unusually cruel, they will reply with the question whether it is any worse than the sufferings of