

The OregonianEntered at the Postoffice at Portland, Or.,
as second-class matter.

REVISED SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

By mail, one month in advance—	\$.50
Daily, with Sunday, per month	7.50
Daily, with Sunday, per year	75.00
Monthly, per year	2.00
The Weekly, per year	1.50
Daily, with Sunday ex- cepted	.50
Daily, per week, delivered, Sunday in- cluded	.15
PORTAGE RATES.	.20
United States and Canada—	10 to 14-page paper.....
Newspaper, 48-50 Tribune building, Chi- cago; rooms 510-512 Tribune building.	14
The Oregonian does not buy poems or sto- ries from individuals and cannot undertake to return any manuscript sent to it without solice. No stamp should be inclosed for this purpose.	20
FOREIGN rates, double.	20

EASTERN BUSINESS OFFICE.

S. C. Borchardt, Special Agency—New

York Office, 42-50 Tribune building, Chi-
cago; rooms 510-512 Tribune building.The Oregonian does not buy poems or sto-
ries from individuals and cannot undertake
to return any manuscript sent to it without
solice. No stamp should be inclosed
for this purpose.

KEEP ON SALE.

Chicago—Auditorium Annex; Postoffice
News Co., 172 Dearborn street.Denver—Julius Black, Hamilton & Kend-
tik, 102 Seventeenth st., and Prentiss

Blvd., 602 16th st.

Kansas City, Mo.—Rickrecker Cigar Co.,
Ninth and Walnut.

Los Angeles—B. F. Gardner, 239 South

Spring and Harry Drapkin,

Oakland—C. W. H. Johnston, Four-

teenth and Franklin st., 50 South

Third; L. Regesburger, 217 First avenue

South.

New York City—L. Jones & Co., Astor

House.

Orono—F. R. Godard and Myers and Har-
ris.

Omaha—Harklow Bros., 1612 Farnam;

Maguire Stationery Co., 1805 Farnam;

Salt Lake—Salt Lake News Co., 77 West

Second; J. K. Cooper Co., 746 Mar-
ket street; Foster & Crear, Ferry News

Stand; Goldsmith Bros., 236 Butter; L. E.

Lee, Palace Hotel News Stand; F. W. Pitts,

1908 Market; Frank Scott, 80 Ellis; N.

Wright, 83 Stevenson; Hotel St. Francis

News Stand.

Washington, D. C.—Ebbitt House News

Stand.

PORTLAND, SUNDAY, DEC. 11, 1904.

THE ENDLESS DEBATE.

It has always been a thought that mind and matter are not two, but one. It is a thought that has descended to us from the oldest speculations of the human race. Mind finds its expression, so far as we know, only through matter. Here is the basis of the outstanding controversy between science and faith. It is no nearer solution than it was ages ago.

Through the trend of the argument in one direction, this material universe, then, may become, as one writer has put it, the living garment of God. Gross matter, as the argument of Berkeley would have it, becomes a mere inference, a mode of appreciating an idealistic cosmic reality, in which we live and move and have our being—the whole existence, then, infused and suffused with immanent Deity. Modern science shows us a self-contained and self-sufficient universe, not in touch with anything beyond or above itself—the general trend and outline of it known;—nothing supernatural or miraculous, no intervention of beings other than ourselves being considered. On the other hand, in the concepts of religion, there is a universe dependent for its origin and maintenance upon the power and good will of a being or beings of which science has no knowledge.

There is no new way of handling this problem. One may study the whole debate "from the Greeks to Darwin," and he will end always where he began. The concepts are not comparable, nor is the terminology of the two parts of the subject commensurate.

The creed of the ancient Israelites was well, or at least strikingly, summarized by Huxley in one of his Nineteenth Century articles (1886). He there said: "The chief articles of the theological creed of the old Israelites, which are made known to us by the direct evidence of the ancient records, . . . are as remarkable for that which they contain as for that which is absent from them. They reveal a firm conviction that, when death takes place, a something termed a soul, or spirit, leaves the body and continues to exist in Sheol for a period of indefinite duration, even though there is no proof of any belief in absolute immortality; that such spirits can return to earth to possess and inspire the living; that they are in appearance and in disposition like-mindedness of the men to whom they belonged, but that, as spirits, they have larger powers and are freer from physical limitations; that they thus form one of a number of kinds of spiritual existence known as Elohim, of whom Jahveh, the national God of Israel, is one; that, consistently with this view, Jahveh was conceived as a sort of spirit, human in aspect and sense, and with many human passions, but with immensely greater intelligence and power than any other Elohim, whether human or divine." The mere statement of such a creed was held by Mr. Huxley to be a sufficient refutation.

But, says a writer in the *Hobbit* Journal of 1902, "we need not limit ourselves to the Old Testament, where doubtless some supposed facts may be abandoned without detriment, as belonging to the legendary or the obscure; we may be constrained by science to go further, and to admit that even fundamental Christian doctrines, such as the Incarnation or non-natural birth, and the Resurrection or non-natural disappearance of the body from the tomb, have, from the scientific point of view, no reasonable likelihood or possibility whatever. It may be, and often has been, asserted that they appear as childish fancies, appropriate to the infancy of civilization and a pre-scientific credulous age; readily intelligible to the historian and student of folk-lore, but not otherwise interesting. The same has been said of every variety of miracle, and not merely of such dogmas as the fall of man from an original state of perfection, of the comparatively recent extirpation of the human race down to a single family, and so on."

It is all futile, wholly futile. These ideas cannot abide any scientific discussion, for the thought escapes the terms in which men attempt to clothe it. The tendency of science, however, is not so much to throw distrust upon the existence of Deity itself as upon adjectives applied to the Deity. "Infinite" and "eternal" may pass, and "omnipotent" and "omniscient" may reluctantly be permitted to go with them—these infinitive adjectives relieve the mind, without expressing more than is implicitly contained in the substantive God. But concerning "personal" and "benevolent" and other anthropomorphic adjectives, science is exceedingly dubious; nor is omnipotence itself very easily reconcilable with the actual condition of things as we now experience them. The present

state of the world is very far short of perfection. Why are things still imperfect if controlled by a benevolent omnipotence? Why, indeed, does evil or pain at all exist? All very ancient enigmas these, but still alive; and the solution to them remains as much a puzzle as in the day when the problems were first stated.

It is the world's one great subject. It has always engaged the attention of man, and everything has been said upon it and about it; yet—admit the paradox—everything remains to be said. That the subject always has engaged the attention of man, and doubtless always will engage it, is proof at least that he belongs to the infinite and that the infinite is in him.

A PHASE OF THE ENGLISH DRAMA.

The production on the stage at Portland of one of the old Morality plays, which have their place, and an important one, in the history of English dramatic literature, is an incident which should set our students of literature in English at work. The morality play was one of the early forms of the English drama. It followed close upon the mystery plays—religious in their conception and development for the drama, as every other form of literature, and every form of art, has its roots in the religious nature of man and is but an expression, or an effort of the "divine thrusting on" in human nature. The drama in Greece had similar religious origin. So in France. So in Germany. English drama is no exception. It was in the history of the English drama, when the form and the expression were passing out of the representation of religious mysteries into personification of secular ideas, that the morality play appeared. Through secularization of the drama, the morality play appeared, as a substitute for the miracle play, near four centuries ago. From this stage it passed on into the wide human scheme of the next predecessors of Shakespeare, and finally into the mighty stream that was poured into the great Shakespearean ocean.

The main source of the English drama was the liturgy of the Church, and in the course of time the term "mystery" was applied to the religious service of any of the great festivals of the calendar, and even to the services of the church in general. These exercises passed imperceptibly into a kind of dramatic representation. It was natural enough that on any of the high religious' festivals, on the anniversary of any important religious personage or event, that personage or event should be represented in visible form, with such details as either Scripture, legend or the imagination of the author could supply. Some idea may be formed of these old religious dramas from the titles of such of them as have been preserved—as "The Creation of the World," "The Fall of Man," "The Story of Cain and Abel," and "The Crucifixion of Our Lord." Large traces of the universality of these dramas may be found in the early works of sculpture and painting, yet extant in Europe. From this first stage the drama passed into another kind of representation, entitled a "Moralit." "Everyman" is one of a type of these, though not the earliest—yet among the earliest that have been preserved. This is one is printed entire in the first volume of Hazlitt's edition of Dodgson's Old English Plays. "The subject of this piece," says Dr. Percy, in his analysis, "is the summoning of the man out of the world by death, and its moral, that nothing will avail him but a well-spent life and the comforts of religion." It was produced and published about four centuries ago. "Everyman" is the human race. Death delivers his message to Everyman, who at once appears upon the scene, and tries in vain by pleas and bribes to turn the summoner away. He applies in vain to Fellowship and Kindred, but they successively renounce or forsake him. Then finally he calls to mind one other friend whom he has loved all his life, and who surely will prove true to him in his distress. "Goodes" this abstraction is called—Property would be the modern equivalent. But Goodes, in the presence of this enemy, can do nothing, and Everyman must "go." He, however, betakes himself to Good Deeds, who, after upbraiding him with his long neglect of her, introduces him to her sister, Knowledge, and she leads him to the holy man Confession, who appoints penance. This he inflicts upon himself, on the stage, and then withdraws to receive the sacraments from the priest. On his return he begins to wax faint; and after Strength, Beauty, Discretion and the Five Wits, each personified in the drama, have all taken their final leave of him, he gradually expires on the stage.

Most of the old plays of this class, in English, have been lost. The most notable ones that have been preserved have been made accessible to modern readers, through Dodgson's collection. They afford an extremely interesting and curious study of language and forms belonging to the transitional period of English—the time when it was passing out of archaic into modern forms. "The Interlude of the Four Elements" is one of the earliest moral plays in the English language known to exist. Its peculiarity is that Science is attempted in it to be made popular through the medium of theatrical representation. It is founded on the old notion of the existence of four elements—earth, air, fire and water—or their supposed qualities and properties, and of the generation and corruption of things made of the combination of them." The persons of the drama are allegorical, who one after another attempt to set forth ideas of astronomy and cosmography and various conceptions of natural phenomena. The play sets forth certain conclusions proving that "the earth must needs be round, that it hangs in the midst of a state to be found records that attest to self-sacrifice and personal heroism of the simple and enduring type equal to those that follow the country doctor on his rounds. In the folk-lore stories of New England he figures prominently as friend, confidential adviser and alleviator of suffering. A sympathetic listener to the woes of the neighborhood. Whether he brought hope and confidence to the birth chamber, soothing touch to the brow of the fever-tortured, consolation to the dying or comfort to the house of mourning, he was honored and trusted and loved. His face, bronzed by Summer heat or reddened by Winter gales, wore an expression of benignity that was beautiful to see. His old-fashioned gig standing at the door conveyed to every passer-by the knowledge of human life in peril, and of a dependable force to the rescue. No storm was severe enough to make him shrink from responding to a call for help, and no purse was slender enough to make him

it. Even the catalogues of the new publications are immense; and it is not likely that the literature of any country or language has been more deeply explored than that which we call our own.

TANNER CREEK ONCE MORE.

The Mayor has ascertained that no mistake was made by the original committee of experts who examined the Tanner-Creek water. He took great pains to learn the exact facts, and to that end employed his own engineers to go over the same ground covered by the City Council's engineers. Any assumption that it was the purpose of Mayor Williams to minimize the importance or significance of any unpleasant or damaging facts in his supposed desire to protect the City Engineer was wholly unwarranted. The Engineer is a responsible officer of the city administration, and the Mayor as its head took his own method of learning the truth. That the findings of the Mayor's experts and committee of taxpayers agree in all essential particulars with the first report is not more a vindication of the original inquiry than it is a vindication of Mayor Williams' purposes and policies.

Now that it is agreed on all sides

finally and beyond any chance of further dispute that the Tanner-Creek sewer is a rotten job, what are we going to do about it? Somebody, or perhaps several somebodies, is to blame; and somebody, probably several somebodies, must be held accountable. The initial fault is with the City Engineer. He was elected by the people expressly to direct the work of public improvement, construction and repair in bridges, streets and sewers, and he alone subscribed to an oath under the charter to perform those duties faithfully and to the best of his ability. Now we find him making a public statement in which he seeks to evade his clear responsibility in the following:

In the practical administration of politics in the City of Portland the City Engineer has not been permitted to name one of the most important works of the city. The political organization through its management and civil service commission has selected and named every one of them.

In other words, the inspectorships were all political jobs whose award was turned entirely over to the local machine. But that does not meet the question. The City Engineer has merely explained. He has not excused nor justified. He erred just as seriously in surrendering these appointments to the machine as he did in accepting the inspectors' reports without scrutiny or personal investigation—if indeed that is all he did—or rather, all he did not do. If he could not get the office without yielding to the politicians, he had no business to take it. Or, having taken it on a specific contract with the politicians to turn over all his appointments to them, he cannot now, when things have gone wrong, repudiate the bargain and blame it all on the "system." The "system" cannot be officially impeached, removed from office or indicted by the grand jury. The City Engineer can be, if he deserves to be.

So can, possibly, be indicted the contractor who imposed this most wretched job upon the city. It is nonsense for him to pretend that he was deceived and betrayed by his own workmen. What was he doing during the entire period of construction that he did not see the hasty, unworkmanlike and unsafe manner in which the labor was performed? Of course he saw it. Anybody can see it now. Perhaps the grand jury has seen it.

As for the political machine—it did, no doubt, what all political machines do when they can. If they could not, there would be no political machines. When we reform our politics we shall then we shall go on turning out one machine and putting in another, and shall continue to be very unhappy that we must do with either or any.

THE COUNTRY DOCTOR.

Dr. R. H. Barber, whose death in the Siwash River occurred recently, was a true hero. Over and above his military record of bravery and endurance in the Philippines—a record which was bright with duty faithfully discharged—stands undimmed his right and title in the annals of peace to this high rating. He was known long and intimately in the military service of the state as a member of and officer in the First Regiment, Oregon National Guard, and later as First Lieutenant and Captain of the Second Oregon Volunteers. Upon his record in both of these organizations there is no shadow. It is the record of a competent and faithful officer.

But not in the cause of his country, in camp or on the battlefield did Captain Barber meet death. It was Dr. Barber, riding alone in the darkness and the storm, over an unfamiliar country, which was drenched with Winter rains and furrowed by Winter torrents, in answer to a call of human need and in the hope to allay human suffering, that the grim messenger overtook and made him twice a hero. The final note of his life rings out high and clear above the voices of the storm and the surge of the engulfing waters that sounded his requiem.

Above all the chronicles of war stands the simple record of the surrender of his life at the call of humanity, as it spoke to him in the heat of the slavery contest, and later, when the vision of both was blurred by blood. Hence to these concluding words of Professor Mims's review many thoughtful men of both sections will give assent:

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two. The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.

The spirit of Lee had prevailed in the South and the spirit of Lincoln had prevailed in the North, and the South was the weaker of the two.