CURRENT TOPICS DISCUSSED BY VARIOUS WRITERS

LATEST WORD OF SCIENCE ON ORGANIC EVOLUTION

How Darwin's Theory of Natural Selection Has Now Not a Single Fact to Confirm It in Nature

BY FATHER EDWIN V. O'HARA.

IT frequently happens after peace has been declared by contending powers that outlying bands who have not kept in touch with the base of operations prolong the conflict with unabated acrimony in a series of guerrilla skirmishes. An analagous event occurs in the wide field of speculative controversy when, in the present state of science, the theory of natural selection is made an occasion for dispute.

To understand the change which has come over scientific speculation since Hugo de Vries, in 1901, published his epoch-making work, entitled "Die Mutations-theorie," one must at the outset get clearly in mind the problems involved in the scientific theory of organic evolution. The man of science, on passing in review the myriad forms of living organisms, is forcibly struck by two sets of facts. In the first place, he observes the wonderful structural dissimilarities which distinguish the various species; then on closer investigation he perceives the no less remarkable structural similarities between certain species which for that very reason he classifies in the same group. Science has long recognized that the simplest explanation of these resemblances is to be found in the hypothesis that these species are genetically related, i. e., that they derive their descent from a common parent species. This theory is concerned with the genetic relation of systematic species, genera and families. It is opposed to the theory of the constancy of species, and has proved most valuable as a working hypothesis. As yet the evidence for it is inferential, rather than direct. Only in a few instances has the origin of a new species been directly observed, and then only in closely allied forms. The botanist, Dr. Vries, however, has witnessed the origin of new species of the evening primrose, and Father Wasmann, the veteran zoologist, has observed the origin of a new species in the beetle genus Dinarda. The observations of these scientists will be of importance when we come to consider the "mutation-theory."

It is an easy task to find indirect evidence of the genetic relation of many organic species to each other and to forms represented by fossil remains. We may instance here the various species of the horse family, and the ammonite group. Similar conclusions may be drawn from a study of various insects, especially of those which live as "guests" with ants and termites and adapt themselves in many ways to their hosts. The theory of descent does not require that all species of plants and animals be derived from a single original form. The paleontologist, Professor Steinmann, in his inaugural address as rector of the University of Freiburg, in Breisgau, pointed out that the evidence now before the world of science indicates that evolution has been polyphyletic, rather than monophyletic; that is, there have been a number of independent genetic series in the process.

Such is the theory of descent which, thanks to Darwin, is regarded with practical unanimity by all men of science as the simplest explanation of the structural similarity of species within the same group. Now, admitting that the resemblances are to be accounted for by a genetic relation, the scientist is confronted with the problem of explaining the striking points of contrast. If the species of each group are descended from a common source, how account for their divergence from their common type? In answer to this question two solutions have been proposed, namely, the theory of natural selection and the theory of mutation. To find out precisely what Darwin meant by natural selection, we should turn to his great work, "The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection." In the third chapter of that work he observes that small "fortuitous" variations in individual organisms, though of small interest to the systematist are of supreme importance to his theory since these minute variations often confer on the possesor of them some advantage over his fellows in the quest for the necessaries of life and thus in the struggle for existence become the "first steps" toward slight varieties, which in turn, lead to sub-species and finally to species.

This principle by which each slight variation, if uesful, is preserved, Darwin denominated 'natural selection.' This hypothesis was confessedly unsupported by scientific evidence; indeed, by its very postulate of unlimited time for the transmutation of species, it was beyond the possibility of experimental demonstration. Still, the hypothesis provided such a simple and, at first blush, so plausible an explanation of the structural diversity of related species that it soon gained very general acceptance. During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, however, the selection theory was found to be incompatible with the facts. The history of the Ptolemaic theory of the circular motion of planets was repeated. When scientists discovered that the motion of various planets would not conform to the circular motion prescribed by the theory, they resorted to the hypothesis of epicycles. So with the theory of natural selection. A score of subsidiary factors were proposed as operative in the evolutionary process, and a school of scientists became associated with the defense of each factor.

Attention was called to this "remarkable turmoil over a scientific question" by Oscar Hertwig, Director of the Anatomical and Biological Institute of the University of Berlin, in an address on the "Progress of Science During the Nineteenth Century," delivered on September 17, 1900, before the Congress of Scientists assembled at Aix-la Chapelle. "Darwinist, anti-Darwinists, ultra-Darwinists, neo-Darwinists, Haeckelians, and Weissmannists," says Hertwig, "mingled in the fray." It was not until 1901 that the Kepler of Biological Science appeared in the person of Hugo de Vries to sweep away the selection theory with all its subsidiary factors. In that year the celebrated Dutch botanist proposed to the scientific world the "mutation" theory. Reserving for another article a full consideration of the mutation theory and the reception it has met at the hands of men of science, we will conclude this paper with a brief presentation of the reasons which caused the rejection of the selection theory.

Apart from the fact that naturalists could discover no evidence of a struggle for existence of such a sanguinary nature as the selection theory postulated, there were three classes of recognized facts to which that theory stood in irreconcilable opposition. In the first place there is the fact of adaptive structures in organic forms. The most complete study of these phenomena in the English language is from the pen of Professor Thomas Hunt Morgan. In his work entitled, "Evolution and Adaptation," he passes in review the various kinds of adaptation which are to be accounted for, e. g. form and symmetry, mutual adaptation of colonial forms, protective coloration (once the boast of the selection theory), organs of extreme perfection, tropisms and instincts, etc. In regard to each of these, Morgan was forced to abandon the selection hypothesis as hopelessly inadequate.

It will suffice to call attention to his conclusions concerning the regeneration of organs since it was by his research along this line, that he won international recognition among men of science. While prosecuting his studies in this field, Morgan became impressed with the utter bankruptcy of the natural-selection theory. The evidence indicated to him that in no case could the power of regeneration have been acquired through natural selection. If an earthworm (allolobophora foetida) be cut in two in the middle, the posterior piece regenerates at its anterior cut end, not a head but a tail. "Not by the widest stretch of the imagination," declares Morgan, "can such a result be accounted for on the selection theory." Quite the reverse case presents itself in certain planarians. If the head of planaria lugubris be cut off just behind the eyes, there develops at the cut end of the head-piece another head turned in the opposite direction. "These and other reasons," concludes Morgan, "indicate with certainty that regeneration cannot be explained by the theory of natural selection."

The second series of facts relate to the history of organic development as outlined in the geologic record. It has been pointed out repeatedly by foremost men of science that if species originated by the accumulation of minute variations, there must be countless transition forms between any two well-defined species. Paleontology fails to support such a supposition. Natural selection has been shattered on the geologic rocks. "The complete absence of intermediate forms," says Carruthers, "and the sudden and contemporaneous appearance of highly organized and widely separated groups deprive the hypothesis of (gradual) genetic evolution of any countenance from the plant record of these ancient rocks. The whole evidence is against it and there is none for it." (cf. History of Plant Life and Its Bearing on Evolution by Carruthers.) "The selection theory," declared Professor Fleischmann, of the University of Erlanger, in a recent work. Die Descendenztheorie, "the selection theory has not a single fact to confirm it in the realm of Nature."

The third count against the theory of selection concerns the possibility of building up a new species by the accumulation of minute individual variations. It has been the wont of the advocates of this theory to base their speculations on the assumption that "an inconceivably long period of time" could effect almost anything in the matter of specific transformation. But the evidence which has accumulated during the past 40 years leaves no doubt that there is a limit to specific variability which neither time nor skill avail to remove. "All investigation and observation make it clear," says Blanchard in his "La vie des eires animas," "that, while the variability of creatures in a state of nature displays itself in very different degrees, yet, in its most astonishing manifestations, it remains confined within a circle beyond which it cannot pass." How the theory of mutation proposed by De Vries, meets these difficulties will be seen in a subsequent paper.

TEMPERANCE REFORM THAT REALLY REFORMS

How Norway Has Been Transformed From One of the Most Drunken Nations to One of the Most Sober

APPENDED hereto is an article which recently appeared in the Scottish Review. It forms an interesting contribution to the question of regulation of the liquor traffic, a question which has been for some time and still is of much importance in this state; and I trust that you will be so good as to give it a place in your columns, as it will doubtless be widely read with interest.

JOHN BAIN.

THE Scottish Temperance Legislation Board may congratulate itself on the success of its commissioners in Norway this Summer. The interim report of their investigations has now been published, and deserve close attention, for, in the words of the commissioners:

"Within the past half-century Norway has been transformed from one of the most drunken of European nations into one of the most sober. Apart from the general advance in education, the result is due to two main causes:

"(a) The growth of a strong temperance sentiment, which, while present in all sections of the community, is most powerful in its earnestness and intensity among the working classes.

"(b) Progressive temperance legislation, under which the people are invested with powers of local control, with considerable latitude in the choice of means of control. The sparsely populated country districts have the power of local veto, while the towns have, in addition, the option of 'management' by disinterested companies known as Samlags.

"The effectiveness of each of these two factors in sobriety depends upon its co-operation with the other. The temperance movement would have been largely ineffective had it not been supported and aided by wise legislation; and, conversely, the power conferred by such legislation would have remained unused but for the driving force of an ever-growing temperance sentiment. So far from being antagonistic forces, they aid each other. The force of temperance opinion keeps the Samlags up to a high level of efficiency; and the Samlags stand as a bulwark against reaction, in the event of a too stringent application of the law."

Such is the statement of the commissioners. Those who know Norway know that it is true. The sobriety of the Norwegian towns has repeatedly impressed foreigners residing in them even for a short time. It is a triumphant vindication of the principle of local option, which in Norway includes (a) Samlag management, (b) spirit prohibition.

"In the thinly peopled country districts the epoch-making law of 1845 is still in force. Under it all houses for the retail sale of 'branvin' (the native spirit or brandy) are prohibited unless specially sanctioned by the local governing body. The results appear to be satisfactory. No one thinks of making any change.

"But Norwegian prohibition must not be confounded with prohibition as prevailing in Maine and in other American states, and as advocated in Great Britain. In Norway prohibition does not extend to beer and wine.

* "Interim Report on the Liquor Licensing Laws of Norway."

"The law of 1871, which authorized the formation of these disinterested companies in towns, introduced into the licensing system certain important changes, which may be summarized in the following list of the aims and principles of the Samlag system:

"(a) The elimination of private profit; (b) the reduction of the number of licenses; (c) the easy enforcement of the law; (d) the destruction of the power of the spirit trade; (e) the furtherance of all progressive measures of reform."

The towns, under the act of 1894, have the dual option mentioned above. Every six years, if one-twentieth part of the electors (all men and women over 25 years of age) demand a poll, a vote is taken on the management-prohibition issue. A majority of all electors, not merely of those voting, is required to effect any change. Those not voting are held to be in favor of the status quo. No provision is made for a reversion to private license. When the local option law was passed (1894) there was a Samlag in nearly every town in Norway. By the operation of successive local option votes, 27 of these towns are now under prohibition, and 31 under Samlag management. The latter are, with very few exceptions, the larger towns. Seven were for a time under prohibition, but have since returned to the Samlag system.

"A Samlag is a specially authorized company under government control with municipal supervision, which holds the monopoly of the retail trade in spirits. Its operations are confined within the limits of the town in which it is established.

"The directors receive a small honorarium for their services; and the rate of interest on shareholders' capital is 5 per cent. No difficulty is experienced in inducing prominent and reliable men to act as directors."

The profits of the Samlags are applied thus:

"(a) To the state, originally 25 per cent, now raised to 65 per cent; (b) to the municipality, in lieu of larger license duties now abolished, 15 per cent; (c) to objects of public utility, not being chargeable on any rates, but operating as counter-attractions to the public-house; in towns 10 per cent, in surrounding country districts 10 per cent—20 per cent. (Originally this 20 per cent went exclusively to the municipal exchequer; but under the act of 1904 10 per cent is allotted to adjoining rural districts.) Total, 100 per cent."

The report proceeds: "A deep impression was created in our minds by the emphatic declarations made by Norwegians of all classes in favor of the Samlag management system. The unhesitating approval of the system by statesmen, clergymen, physicians, town Councillors, police authorities, the press, employers of labor, labor leaders, and workingmen was very remarkable. But more significant than this was the agreement among 'Totalists' and Prohibitionists that the Samlag was a powerful aid to sobriety, inasmuch as it helped to restrain excessive drinking, and thereby raised the moral standing of every town in which it was at work. It is hardly possible to represent, by the mere written word, the earnestness and sincerity with which gray-headed veterans in the campaign against drunkenness testified to the power of the Samlag as a reforming agency, and as a step towards their own ideal.

"As a ready means of eliciting opinion, we made it an invariable rule to state fully to our informants various arguments against any form of 'management.' We argued that 'the profits of drink management demoralize and corrupt the community by exciting its cupidity and making it indifferent to restrictions.' The undoubted force of the argument was freely admitted, but it was pointed out that it lost all meaning if the profits of the traffic were properly applied. The Swedish method of using the profits to reduce the rates was admitted to be a great mistake—a mistake which the Swedes are now beginning to rectify; but the Norwegian plan of handing over two-thirds of the profits to the central government and only one-tenth to non-rate-aided local objects was everywhere held to be free from danger.

"We argued further that 'the public house would be made respectable, the prestige of the traffic enhanced, and drinking thereby increased, especially among the young, if the bars were managed by prominent citizens.' It seems that this danger was at one time dreaded by Norwegian 'totalists,' but we found it impossible to persuade any one to listen seriously to our contention. They had had 30 years' experience of the business, they said, and the danger did not exist. Indeed, the marked contrast between the state of affairs suggested by the arguemnt and the actual results of the strict Samlag discipline invariably raised a smile.

"A third argument which we brought forward was that 'with company management the introduction of reforms would be hindered,' and especially that 'the total abolition of the traffic would be seriously delayed.' Most emphatically were we told by all our 'Totalist' informants that this fear was groundless; that the very reverse was the case; that the Samlag had a strong educative influence; and that with its aid public opinion had advanced in some towns to the point of the prohibition of retail trading in spirits. Many minor changes had been quietly introduced by the managers of the Samlags—later opening, earlier closing, reduction of alcoholic strength, and the prevention of treating by restricting the number of drams. Had an attempt been made to impose such changes on a privately-owned trade the attempt would have failed.

"Several prominent men whom we met held the opinion that the strict regulation of the Samlags tended to encourage drinking in clubs and at home, a danger more acutely felt the nearer the approach to prohibition. Many expressed their dread of a sweeping reaction or of flagrant breaches of the law in the event of a too rigid application of the prohibitory regime. In this respect they regarded the Samlag, with its adjustment to local conditions, as a useful and sensitive gauge of public opinion, and a most valuable aid to public morality."

LABOR UNIONS SHOULD BE TEMPERANCE UNIONS

Appeal by a Workingman to His Fellows to Save the Money That Goes to Support Saloons

BY J. H. DAVIS.

I HEARD a workingman bewailing his hard lot. He had steady work at $3.50 per day. He complained bitterly of social conditions, of the high price of everything. He couldn't save any money; was in debt, rent unpaid and his family suffering. And there are many of this class in Portland; they are found in all cities. Their name is legion.

This man, a good mechanic, was a regular patron of the saloon. There is where his money went. And there is where the money of many men go who find fault with wages, prices and social conditions. As a Socialist, I would much prefer that the Government be managed on lines mapped out by the National Socialist platform. I am a steadfast advocate of Government ownership of the railroads, and municipal ownership of street cars, lights, water, sewerage, coal, wood, etc., etc.

But I am opposed to saloons as the worst enemy of the working class. And, sad to say, it is the working people who support the saloons. Why, if the laborers of Portland would boycott the saloons—if they would refuse to patronize them, the saloons would go out of business, and quickly.

The man with a family who patronizes the saloon robs his family of much or little, according to his bibulous habits. Every nickel given to a saloon is so much wasted, and worse than wasted, for the man contracts a habit which, if persisted in, loses him the respect of the community, loses him the respect of his employers, and finally his job; and the chances are that he becomes a vagrant, his home gone and his family a charge on the county or scattered and earning their own living.

The labor unions of the country should be temperance unions. Boozers should not be admitted to membership. The unions are a recognized power, and they can become a great moral force if they will take issue against the saloon. Labor unions should be something more than mere machines to keep wages at a certain rate. They should be fraternal organizations, caring for the moral as well as the pecuniary welfare of their members. As they are instituted for mutual protection against capital, so should they be guardians of the home as well. As an honorary member of the Typographical Union, I know the failings of my brothers, as well as of members of other unions, and I have long wished that the unions would make common cause with the Anti-Saloon League against the saloon, the deadliest foe of the laboring man.

There can be no possible argument in support of saloons. I have seen some of the brightest members of my own craft—young men with a brilliant future—printers, writers, artists in the art preservative, go to beggary and ruin through drink. And today there are thousands on the same broad, gilded road.

Prohibition always prohibits when there are officers behind the law who will enforce the law. Always! And saloons ply their nefarious avocations because they are permitted to do so by the officials.

It is pretended that cities desire a revenue from saloons. They do not. In fact, saloons are an expense to any city. Statistics of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Baltimore, and some other cities show that the revenues obtained from saloon licenses do not begin to pay the cost of policemen, crime, courts, jails, etc., caused by the saloons.

Count the cost right here in Portland, where an army of policemen are required because of the saloons. Count the cost of prisoners to the city, trial by court, the pay of officials, jurors, etc.; count all the costs and then see how much profit is derived from saloon licenses.

Now, suppose the laboring people of Portland put their earnings in the savings banks instead of into the saloon till. Where would the saloon be? Every Monday morning the saloon men take bags of dollars to the banks given them by the laborers and mechanics. Now, why not be your own depositors, fellow laborers? Why not take the money to the banks yourselves, instead of allowing the saloon man to deposit the money you have earned?

If the laboring people of Portland would do this, they could, in a short time, build and equip a line of steamers for the coast trade. They could establish manufactories, build a great workingman's hotel, run a big co-operative farm or a mammoth department store. There is not a laboring man in Portland who could not own his own home, if he would put his money in the bank instead of the saloon.

These are facts. The saloon-keeper piles his avocation because there is money in it—more money and easier money than he can make at anything else. He is in the traffic because the officials—not the law—allows him to be in it. And it is up to the laboring people, who patronize and are cursed by the saloon, to quit it.

The laboring people are the salt of the earth. Labor produces all that is produced. All the monuments of the earth, from the pyramids to the magnificent steel structures in Portland; all the agricultural and other machinery of the universe; all the ships which sail the waters; all the great network of railroads with their thousands of locomotives and cars, are the result of labor. Without labor none of these things could be. Labor is the creator of all wealth of whatever kind.

Now let the laboring people look about and ask themselves how much they own of all this wealth they have created? And then let them ask themselves why they have not their share of the wealth of the world. And when they "see themselves as others see them," they will know that their own improvidence is the cause of their poverty. They will see that by co-operation, banding together as brothers for mutual benefit; putting their earnings in savings banks instead of saloons, they would all be capitalists on a small scale at least, and that by the right kind of co-operation and management they could build up industries to rank with the greatest. Capital is not to blame for the misfortunes of laboring people. Their sorrows come from reckless and prodigal squandering of their wages.

The one great curse, as I have said, of the laboring people is the saloon. And, unless laboring people combine to destroy this, their worst enemy, it will remain. Officials want to perpetuate the saloons as a means of graft, and that is why they are tolerated and protected. Saloons necessitate many officials and an army of policemen, whose occupation would be gone were the saloons put out of business. Temperance legislation is weak-kneed; the churches do not unite and work against the demon, drink, as they should. Christianity can never flourish where saloons rule a city. The churches should unite in one vast, aggressive, Anti-Saloon League, as they did in Ohio, and then, with the help of the laboring people, they will conquer.

Preaching against an evil is of no avail. Saloon men laugh at it. It does not hurt them nor their traffic. What is sorely needed is less preaching and more honest, courageous, united, determined work. In Ohio, where the preachers, the churches and all temperance people formed themselves into a United Anti-Saloon League, they elected a temperance Democrat (Patterson) Governor, by 60,000 majority over Herrick (Republican), who went into the office with 125,000 majority. Herrick was a good man, but he opposed certain temperance legislation, and laughed at the opposition. In all the history of American elections there never was such a wonderful moral victory. And the victory in Ohio can be repeated in any state where the moral forces will unite. In no other way can success be attained.

The only solution to the saloon question is "no saloon." The Government is a whisky government, officially perpetuated by the liquor power. The people are powerless to change things because they do not unite to do so. They fritter away their strength in controversy, when united work is needed.

The saloon-keepers cannot be blamed. There are good men in the traffic, which they, themselves, despise. They have told me so. And, so long as the people allow them to sell, they will continue. It is not the saloon man's fault that he sells liquor, but the people's fault. He will go into other business when the people given him notice to quit.

Portland, December 28.

EMPLOYMENT UNDER SOCIALISM

One Advocate Points Out a Way for Industrial Freedom for the Masses

BY D. M. BROWER, M. D.

I see by an Oregonian editorial that although you have at last found out that Socialism means an industrial democracy, you cannot see how the working people can have or would have industrial freedom or liberty in such an industrial state, and that you wished to be enlightened on the subject. Maybe we can help you solve your puzzle. To do this, let us use things you are familiar with to show you something untried or unfamiliar. At the present time we have a political Republic, whose Constitution grants or secures to every one a political citizenship who is born or naturalized in the United States. See amendment 14, section 1. Political equality is secured to said citizens in the last paragraph of section 9, article 1, while political liberty is secured to all in the 14th and 15th amendments.

Our forefathers faced the question of political monarchy, which had in it the political lord or political subject or slave, in which political inequality and political slavery existed. They solved the problem, not by saying they could not see the end from the beginning (which, stated a little differently, is what you complain of in your article headed, "A Mighty Puzzle"), but, by adopting a Constitution which could be amended, and solving puzzling or vexing questions as they arose.

The crucial point was political liberty, equality and political justice. Their political liberty is further secured by their collective ownership of the political machinery. All male citizens over 21 years of age in some states, and all citizens in others, have the right to use the ballot. Some use the ballot every time they have the opportunity, others do not. Some who live in incorporated cities can use the ballot once or twice, or oftener, every year; those who live in country districts only once every two years.

These privileges comes to us as a matter of choice, and are partly governed by ability and vocation, but politically, it works all right, and we know "who is who" and we adjust ourselves to various conditions due to locations, etc. Asking no more for ourselves than we are willing to grant others.

Using the seen to illustrate the unseen we first have or will have an industrial democracy, whose constitution provides for an industrial citizenship to all who are born or naturalized in the industrial state or subject to its jurisdiction, abolishing our present industrial monarchy, by refusing to recognize or grant deeds to land or title to industrial machinery, ownership in the above being secured through citizenship. The officials would be industrial ones, because the state would be an industrial state. Being a democracy, the laws would be enacted as in this state, where we use the initiative. The judiciary would be elective (subject to recall) and might appropriately be executive, as well as judicial in its power, i. e., having the power to appoint those whom it may need to execute the laws made by the people, or to enforce the penalties for their violation; an industrial board of trustees for each precinct, an industrial superintendent of districts and a National superintendent with an industrial board of arbitration would likely be all the elective officers needed.

The right of suffrage being granted to all industrial citizens of a certain age and under certain conditions, would give to every one industrial liberty and equality and economic justice to all. In other words, what our fathers secured for themselves and us politically we would secure for ourselves and our children industrially. Constitutional provision requiring or including regulation of labor similar to our present civil service law, and if placed in the constitution would regulate the industrial bureaus of each precinct so that all citizens laboring for the industrial state (of which each is a part) would have much more liberty than they now have. As he or she would get the full social product of his toil he would likely be satisfied. If not satisfied employment in nonproductive and nondistributive labor by individuals or committees desiring that kind of labor would be open to them. Valets, governesses, household servants, nurses, are some of the employments which would be opened to those who would not wish to employ themselves in working with their own industrial machinery. Supply and demand would regulate the reward and desirability of such employment. The industrial state need but monopolize the natural monopolies, while the individuals could not monopolize anything. Dirty or undesirable work could be made desirable by shortening the number of hours making a day's labor and by the use of machinery, water and deodorants. By providing for amending of the constitution, problems unseen at the time of its adoption could be met and solved as they arose. With economic justice as our battle cry let us go forward.

Ashland, Or.

ORIGIN OF ROAST PIG

Considered in Relation to Fire and New Drink Quencher.

Louisville Courier-Journal.

The pig was formerly a houshold pet in China, esteemed highly because of its affectionate nature, fine qualities of comradeship and general eligibility to admission into the parlor and into the bosom of the family. When a Chinese house burned down and several of the little four-legged playmates of the children were roasted in the ruins, celestial odors rose like incense from the ashes of the home and greeted Celestial nostrils. This marked the discovery of roast pig. At first the delicacy was expensive because it cost a home to cook a pig, but after a time a genius discovered that cheaper fuel was effective, and roast pig became an established dish.

The San Francisco fire resulted in the discovery of a new drink which might be called boiled champagne. The fire cracked 100,000 bottles of sherry. This flood of seething gold flowed into a cellar where reposed 10,000 quarts of champagne. For days the fire kept the sherry boiling. When the smoke cleared away the cellar was pumped dry and the champagne thus boiled in bottles was found—so San Franciscans assert—to be a wine that would tempt an anchorite and make driveling Silenus a youthful Bacchus. "Superb and unapproachable" was the flavor of the vintage, according to a correspondent of the Philadelphia Press who, after getting outside of what was inside of one of the 10,000 immortal quarts, wrote literature for his paper. The discovery is of equal importance with the discovery of roast pig if it is true that the wine was really refined by fire, but among those who have not known the pleasure of sampling the elixir there will remain, perhaps, a suspicion that after the fire, and when San Francisco was a Sahara, champagne in any style was nectar to the survivors, and that after all the boiling of the 10,000 bottles merely shows that the American thirst is adaptable and that the American palate abounds in grattitude for whatever comes its way in times of drought.

Washington as a Paperhanger.

New York Tribune.

"Old Time Wall Papers," just published in New York, shows the "Father of his Country" in an unusual light.

Miss Kate Sanborn, the author, referring to the fact that the paperhanger was regarded as almost a needless luxury in early American days, and that "the family often joined in the task of making paste, cutting the paper and placing it on the walls," states that it was not even beneath the dignity of George Washington to engage in this homely work of interior decoration. She writes:

"The story goes that the good Martha lamented, in the presence of Lafayette, that he would be unable to get the new paper hung in the banquet-room in time for the morrow's ball in honor of the young marquis; there were no men to be found for such work. Lafayette at once pointed out to Mistress Washington that she had three able-bodied men at her service—General Washington, Lafayette himself and his aide-de-camp. Whereupon the company fell immediately to work and the paper was hung in time for the ball.

SPURIOUS READINGS IN THE BIBLE

Quotations from Peter and Paul to Offset the Argument of Professor Jarvey

BY M. T. WHITNEY.

AS THE question of spurious readings in the Bible is an issue between you and Mr. B. Heimes, I will leave that subject, trusting that Mr. Heimes will give it his earnest attention, while I will notice your remarks on my last article. The editor denies the authenticity of Paul's statements, saying it is a statement that depends solely on Paul's word. Then he brings Professor James, of Harvard, as a witness, and examines him as to the validity of Paul's statements, and says he "has shown their utter invalidity as evidence." Then he shows that he doubts the evidence of his own witness, for he says that nobody can disprove them (Paul's statements).

In our courts it is necessary to impeach a witness before his testimony can be set aside. It seems to me that the editor has impeached his own witness instead of Paul.

Professor James lived some 1900 years after the Apostle had passed off the stage of action, and, of course, had to depend on the statements of historians. Are the class that he relies on the only reliable ones? Le us consult the historian, Dr. Luke, as found in the Acts of Apostles, who was Paul's traveling companion and intimate friend, who had an opportunity to know whereof he affirmed. He introduces him as a young man of prominence in the Jewish nation; with education and influence second to none; then as having authority to bind Christians and deliver them to the chief priests; of his conversion; his preaching; his miraculous works; his trial before Festus and before King Agrippa, and their verdict that they could find no evidence of guilt in him.

How glad the infidel Jews would have been to furnish evidence against him, but they could not.

Paul's career was continually before the public until his imprisonment.

The editor places the Bible, its authors and its means of preservation on the same level "with Hindoo idols, the Book of Mormon, the sacred stone of Mecca or the Alaskans' totem poles." Yet he wishes us to understand that he venerates Christ; he calls him "Master" and says that "we intended no enmity to Christ. The truth is not an enemy to that great personage."

If we accept his assertion as truth, then we have no evidence that there ever was such a person as Christ, and that historical evidence is no evidence at all, and can be set aside by any one merely asserting that it is untrue. But we find that every statement in the Bible is based on evidence that cannot be disproved. Isaiah says: "But the word of our God shall stand forever. Isa. 40:8. Christ says: "But my words shall never pass away." Hear Peter: "By the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." "But the word of the Lord endureth forever. And this is the word which by the gospel was preached unto you."

Professor Williams Lyon Phelps, of the English department of Yale, is quoted as having said a few days ago that priests, atheists, skeptics, devotees, agnostics and evangelists, all are agreed that the authorized version of the English Bible is the best example of English composition the world ever saw. It combines the noblest prose and poetry with the utmost simplicity of diction.

Chitwood, Or., December 20.

THE REAL DEMOCRACY.

Men Should Regard Work as a Public Function.

From G. Lowes Dickinson's "Eastern and Western Ideals" in the Century, a Reply to William J. Bryan.

The reorganization of property will be neither practical nor fruitful except in so far as it is accompanied by a moral revolution in the community at large, and especially in those who control capital. At present, business men regard business as a private function; and while, by their operations, they are in effect determining the destinies of individuals and nations, dealing out prosperity or ruin, happiness or despair, health or disease, throughout the civilized and uncivilized world, their only conscious motive appears to be to accumulate in their own hands wealth and power. They, not governments, really rule society; yet, they rule it without caring, almost without knowing, what they are doing. To inquire into the ultimate social effects of their operations would seem to them irrelevant and beside the mark. They regard business as a battle, government as the keeper of the ring and the prize of victory as simply and barely the acquisition of wealth.

A society so controlled, whatever it may name itself, is oligarchic through and through. There can be no true democracy until men come to regard their work, whatever it be, as a public function; to view it in those far-reaching consequences and interactions which alone give it significance and nobility; and to care more about performing it well than about the material benefits by which it may be rewarded. The attitude of mind implies an individualism, not only compatible with, but essential to, socialism. Independence, self-reliance, initiative, these qualities so justly prized by Americans, would be fostered, not suppressed, by a properly organized social democracy. Only their inspiration and goal will be not individual aggrandizement, but the welfare and greatness of the whole community. There is no antithesis between socialism and individualism. On the contrary, the one conditions the other in the only sense in which either is of value.

Fully one-third of the land in Great Britain is owned by members of the House of Lords.