

done so. It is not so big as some others, but it is a marvel of wise and tasteful contrivance, and has some features which, in this country at any rate, are entirely new. The most attractive among them all is its large staff of appropriately uniformed, intelligent, and civil attendants. It is possible to get a courteous answer to a question, and a traveler arrives and departs with a new and strange feeling that he is something else than a trespasser or an idiot—a conviction not unnaturally resulting from the treatment which travelers ordinarily receive when seeking necessary information.

It is an improvement which might wisely be imitated in other quarters. The "gentlemanly conductor" is a person often met with in the local columns of the provincial newspaper. But elsewhere he is largely an extinct species; and as for the other varieties of the genus "railway employé," they are, as a rule—well, not engaging. There is about them an air of bored impatience, an abruptness and indifference, and, when it comes to questions of baggage, of physical savagery, which makes them often simply a terror to timid people.

Of course, there is a reason for this in the manners of travelers themselves. We Americans complain generally of the rudeness of servants in hotels, porters upon railway trains, and elsewhere; forgetting that the manners of those who serve are but the coarser reproduction of those who are served. In the matter of a pleasing voice and courteous address, who has not been charmed with the English maid-servant, even in an inn? But these things are the product of a civilization which inculcates gentle manners in the classes who serve, through a scrupulous observance of them, toward everybody, by those who are served. And it may as well be understood that we shall never have any substantial improvement in these particulars until reformation begins at the top. The wild Irishman who dashes your dinner down on the table before you, at a hotel, as if he were playing quoits with the plates, will not acquire a more considerate fashion of ministrations unless, somehow, he is softened and subdued by the gentler bearing of the traveler whom he serves.

But, meantime, it is worth while to remember that the growth of great corporations, and of the American system of doing things on a grand scale, affords a good opportunity for introducing into their administration a more thorough discipline in this matter of good manners. If the great railways are to own and govern the country, let them commend their sway, as in Philadelphia, by the considerate thoughtfulness which is exercised. Let them encourage travel by handling the traveler a little less as if he were a bale of dry-goods, to be shoved and pushed and hustled without mercy. The public will prefer routes of travel where the last person who is considered is not the passenger, and where the servants of the company are promoted or dismissed in accordance with some fixed rule which construes fidelity to include courtesy.

So much for the traveler in his relations to the corporations that transport him. And now a word as to the relations of travelers to one another. It is common to say that, in losing the old stage-coach, we have lost that comfortable sociability which once made travel so great a charm. But we have lost something more. We have lost that humane instinct which, in the olden times, made all travelers considerate of one another. Travel

—*travail*; the derivation of the word is suggestive. It was work, and hard work, in the old days, and out of the common strain and the common hardship came a coöperative and fraternal spirit which transformed its hardships into pleasurable memories. But the Pullman car is a refrigerator. In transporting fruit from California, the first condition is that there shall be coldness, and then—isolation. The nectarines must not touch each other. In like manner, as we multiply the luxuries of travel, we multiply barriers between the travelers. It is not merely that there are parlor-cars: it is that in these, and in the ordinary American railway carriage, also, the first consideration comes, more and more, to be personal comfort, and not mutual consideration. The grudging answer, the reluctance to impart information, the almost brutal struggle for the best, which increasingly disregards weakness and age and woman—these are things which one sees now more frequently and unpleasantly than of old. We talk of the garrulous and interrogative American: but where is he? Vanished, as utterly as the Massasoit Indians. An English gentleman, who lately traversed the continent, said that he had never traveled in a country in which his fellow-travelers were so reserved.

It is a mistake, if it is no more. There is no one whose horizon may not be widened if he will only avail himself of the wholesome education of the fellowships of travel. It is easy to be too much upon one's guard. All travelers are not swindlers, and courtesy is not necessarily familiarity. As it is, one is reminded of that countryman of ours who, having crossed the Atlantic with a room-mate who, from the beginning to the end of the voyage, had not addressed to him one word, parted from him, saying airily: "Well, good-bye! You will now proceed, I suppose, to your home at the Deaf and Dumb Asylum!"

#### Darwin's Attitude toward Religion.

It is no longer customary to greet every mention of Darwin's name with a jest concerning the ancestral ape. The development theory has grown and thriven in spite of the various phases of adverse feeling which have indicated the attitude of orthodoxy toward it. Thirty years ago the discussion of the whole matter was confined to scientific circles. The public did not recognize its existence as the great modifying influence in the world of thought, which it was so sure to become. This indifference was succeeded by a sudden alarm. The suggestion that a secret conspiracy against Christianity was hatching roused the fears of its advocates. Nobody seemed to think it was at all worth while to find out what this terrible new doctrine was. Discretion formed a small part of the valor which assailed it with every imaginable weapon. The age did not countenance the rack and the thumb-screw, so the next best thing must be done, and faithfully it was done. No effort was spared to denounce, sneer, laugh the Darwinian theory out of existence. It was the Antichrist, and Darwin himself the great High-priest of Atheism. It was credited with the most preposterous ideas; odds and ends of hypotheses and reasoning were patched together, and when the man of straw had been elaborately constructed he was speedily demolished.

This opposition Darwin expected. In "The Origin of Species," published in 1859, he says :

"Although I am fully convinced of the truth of the views given in this volume under the form of an abstract, I by no means expect to convince experienced naturalists, whose minds are stocked with a multitude of facts all viewed, during a long course of years, from a point of view directly opposite to mine, \* \* \* but I look with confidence to the future, to the young and rising naturalists, who will be able to view both sides of the question with impartiality" [p. 436].

What he evidently did not expect was, that in the turn of the tide of popular sentiment the violent invective and ignorant condemnation which had, at least, the dignity of earnestness, should be followed by an equally ignorant levity. An eminent English scientist, a personal acquaintance of Mr. Darwin, speaking of him some years ago, said that a remarkable change had come over him with this change of popular feeling. He had become so utterly disgusted with meeting on every hand flat jokes and silly travesties of his views, that he became almost a recluse from the society in which he was liable to encounter them. It is not difficult to see how a man tremendously in earnest should be ready to meet any violence of opposition, however unjust and ignorant, and yet shrink away from pointless jokes about what was the serious work of his life.

In order to look fairly at the attitude which Darwin sustains toward religion, it is necessary to clear away some of the rubbish with which the question has been encumbered. Science is not *ir*-religious, it is simply *extra*-religious. Science and religion do not deal with the same questions, they do not cover the same ground. Within their own proper limits they touch only on one side—the Theistic. Science, strained to its last legitimate point, can only confirm the truths of natural religion. With the truths of revelation, from the very nature of the case, it can have nothing to do. It bears exactly the same relation to the Koran, the Rig Veda, and the Zend Avesta that it does to the Bible. The logic of its facts teaches the existence of a Creator and a Lawgiver to the universe. Science deals not with the nature of the first cause, but only with processes, and it does not even undertake to give the *rationale* of these processes. It is only when science exceeds its proper limits that it trenches upon religious belief; as it is only when religion outruns its powers that it condemns true science. There can be no real antagonism between the two, since each is an expression toward man of the mind of God. It is because of what is false in each that any seeming antagonism exists. The responsibility for this antagonism lay, in the first instance, at the door, if not of religion, at least of the Church. The older sciences in their youth sought her protection and were thrust out to perish. In view of this the Christians of the present should at least be honest and fair, they should make the small concession of examining the subject before undertaking to refute its arguments or denounce its errors.

The first book in which Mr. Darwin published his theory was the "Origin of Species," 1849. This differs very widely from the works he has published since; it is a "general statement" of his conclusions, backed by comparatively few facts. His later method

is to publish little more than a full record of his close and careful observation of nature.

The publication of this "abstract," before his facts were ready to be given with it, may have been a mistake. He was urged to the course by his failing health and the fear that the results of his life-work were about to be anticipated by some other man. His earlier work would have taken a different position if he had given a full record of the phenomena, and let the theory take care of itself. It is so much easier to refute general statements than specific facts. Oratory will do the one, while it would take solid years of honest work to vitiate the testimony of the other. Mr. Darwin's later works are marvels of skill. They seem to be mere records of observations taken with every precaution against error, and told with a directness and simplicity that make the writing seem mere child's play, and yet written and arranged with such consummate ability that while one is following the facts, the theory is read between the lines.

From the character of his earlier and his later work, we are forced to go back if we would find any didactic statement of Mr. Darwin's attitude toward religion. In the "Origin of Species," p. 429, he says: "I see no good reason why the views given in this volume should shock the religious feelings of any one. It is satisfactory as showing how transient such impressions are to remember that the greatest discovery ever made by man, namely, the attraction of gravity, was also attacked by Leibnitz, 'as subversive of natural and inferentially of revealed religion.' A celebrated author and divine has written to me that 'he has gradually learned to see that it is just as noble a conception of the deity to believe that He created a few original forms capable of self-development into other and needful forms, as to believe that He required a fresh act of creation to supply the voids caused by the action of his laws.'" Again he says (pp. 436-7): "Authors of the highest eminence seem to be fully satisfied with the view that each species has been independently created. To my mind it accords better with what we know of the laws impressed on matter by the Creator, that the production and extinction of the past inhabitants of the world should have been due to secondary causes, like those determining the birth and death of the individual. \* \* \* There is a grandeur in this view of life with its several powers, having been originally breathed by the Creator into a few forms or into one; and that while this planet has gone cycling on according to the fixed law of gravity, from so simple a beginning, endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been and are being evolved."

Many of the most brilliant as well as the most religious minds of the century have for years felt entirely free from anxiety in regard to the growth and spread of the theory of evolution: feeling that it did not touch, that in the nature of the case it could not touch the essential Divine truth. They held the view just quoted from Darwin, that science deals not with the nature of the power which works, but with the methods by which it acts: it is a question not of the initial cause, but of processes. It would be as absurd to accuse Stephenson of denying the existence of steam, because he concentrates his attention upon the development and the explanation of the steam-engine,

as to assume on the evidence of the evolution hypothesis that Darwin denies the existence of a Creator, because he is occupied in making clear the laws under which He creates. There is a confusion of thought in regard to the meaning of the word law, when applied to nature, which occasions much of the difficulty. Law is not a power, but merely the recognized mode in which some power acts. It is surely a nobler

thought of God to hold that He acts in some coherent and logical fashion, than to believe that He is governed by mere caprice; it does not lessen the dignity of power to recognize that it works through reasonable methods. Physical law is merely the formulation of the orderliness of the Divine working; it is not a rival power seeking to displace God, but only the witness to man of His omnipotence.

---

## LITERATURE.

### Von Holst's "Calhoun."\*

THE life of Calhoun is necessarily a record of the growth and development of his opinions. Dr. Von Holst has not made it much more, for he could not. Of his private and domestic existence no records have been preserved, and we can only trace his career through the debates of Congress over the slavery question. It was in these that he waged, fought, won, and also lost his battle. It was in these that, as a statesman and leader of opinion, Calhoun made his mark upon the history of his time.

Dr. Von Holst, who with patient industry has unraveled the progress of Calhoun's opinions from the opening to the close, seems to think that he was a great man. That such will be the judgment of history we can hardly believe. His rôle was that of an "expounder" of the Constitution. Dr. Von Holst shows very conclusively that in his early days, before he became absorbed with the idea of the importance of slavery, he was a liberal constructionist of the Constitution. At the time of his first appearance in Congress the word "nation," which later on he "struck from the political and constitutional dictionary of the United States as having no basis whatever to rest upon, either in fact or in law," was frequently on his lips. National interests were first in his mind. He was in favor of internal improvements, of a national bank, and of a tariff for protection. Dr. Von Holst probably goes too far in saying that in considering such questions he proceeded, "as a matter of course," from the assumption that "the first question a statesman has to ask himself is not what is constitutional, but what is wise and politic, unless it contravenes a provision of the Constitution, and to take it for granted that the constitutional power exists, until the contrary is proved." With a written constitution there can hardly be such a thing as a presumption that powers have been granted, or a burden of proving that they have not been granted, upon those who deny it. Here, as in a few other cases, Dr. Von Holst betrays a slight unfamiliarity with the legal conceptions which lie at the bottom of our system of government. Questions of constitutional interpretation do not strike him precisely as they would an American; but the difference is so slight as to have little substantial effect upon the value of the conclusions he reaches.

Calhoun, at any rate in early life, took broad views of the powers of Congress under the Constitution. Later, he went to the opposite extreme, and devoted all the powers of his mind to resolving the Union into a mere confederation of States. The central idea of the resolutions which he introduced in the Senate in 1837 was simply this. Dr. Von Holst devotes some space to an analysis of them. They all are models of worthless reasoning. Every state entered the Union by its own voluntary act. Consequently any interference with the "domestic institutions" of any of them, "with a view to their alteration," was not warranted by the Constitution. It followed from this that it was the duty of the Federal Government to use its power in such a manner as to give "increased stability and security" to the domestic institutions of the States that compose the Union. Here we perceive the early federalism of Calhoun coming very queerly into play to reënforce his later narrow system of interpretation. Each State was sovereign, and no one could interfere to ameliorate the institution of slavery; there was no objection, however, to interference for the purpose of making slavery more enduring. Consequently, not only must all attacks on slavery in the States in which it already existed be discouraged and repressed, but it must be introduced in new territories and States whenever such an extension would give to the Southern and South-western States any advantage which would need to strengthen or render them more secure as Slave States.

There is obviously no coherent system in all this. It is impossible to reconcile the different theories of the Constitution from which such views spring. If Calhoun had been a consistent, strict constructionist, he might have deduced the principle of States' rights, and even that of secession, from the Constitution; and though he would have had no very solid ground to stand upon, the conclusion would have logically flowed from the premises that the Government was merely a new confederation. On the other hand, by adopting liberal principles of construction, he might have reached the conclusion that the Central Government had full power over the domestic institutions of the Territories, and could foster the growth of slavery in them as much as it pleased. But what he endeavored to do was to frame a system which should be one of strict construction at one point and liberal construction at another, and we therefore find naturally enough that what he really produced was not

\* American Statesmen. John C. Calhoun. By Dr. H. Von Holst. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company. 1882.