

MATERIALIST COLUMN

Edited by Eliza Mowry Bliven, Brook-
lyn, Conn.

A REPLY TO REV. MR. PHELPS

The difficulty in replying to Mr. Phelps is not because any one thing he says, as a rule, is hard to answer, but in boiling down into a space as short as our side is allowed in The Journal, a long string of assertions. He comes at one in a sort of tumultuous, mob fashion, a helter-skelter, tail-formost, head-end backward sort of way, though outside of this fault he writes well. To take up each assertion in detail and answer it would require a whole newspaper.

In the issue of The Journal for October 2nd he gave us a long list of scientists who upheld the Biblical account of creation, including Humboldt and Cuvier. He certainly got his information out of the religious newspapers, for the statement is out of harmony with the generally accepted views of scientists, as well as a large portion of the ministry itself. Take Humboldt: After his return from his world famous tours, he delivered sixty lectures on the Cosmos, and in the lot he did not mention a God once as having had a hand in creation, so it is said by those who have examined them. To infidels and atheists he is always one of their number. It is not likely that he at any time taught such a doctrine. However, Hugh Miller did undertake to harmonize scripture with geology, as shown, especially in his book, "The Testimony of the Rocks," but he most certainly failed. Literary men, I think, generally admit that he failed to establish their harmony, though there are a lot of people who do not think so, just as there are still immense numbers of people who believe in ghosts, palmistry, fortune telling, astrology and omens.

In the issue for October 9th Mr. Phelps undertakes to belittle evolution and quotes Huxley, Sir Charles Bell, Sir David Brewster, etc. Even if his quotations are correct, which I do not concede, for I think that they are on a parity with the oft quoted authority that Paine and Ingersoll recanted on their death beds, which Mrs. Ingersoll and her daughter deny under oath. As to Col. Ingersoll it must be remembered that men at a later age often times disavow what they had said at an earlier. After the Darwinian theory was announced there was a world of conflicting opinion, but at a later date most scientists and very many clergymen accepted it, as for instance the well known Rev. Dr. Washington Gladden. If Huxley ever denied the truth of evolution, and that is what Mr. Phelps is wanting to make clear, he certainly accepted the theory later, for it is the very essence of his celebrated book, "Man's Place in Nature," in which he shows and discusses the connection between man and the man-like apes.

Mr. Phelps claims that man has not changed since his first appearance on earth, which he says was not till after the ice age, which was a recent event. And, yet, in the very preceding paragraph he gleefully claims that since 1610 the average height of English soldiers has decreased six inches and that some pre-historic men were from six to ten feet high, all of which shows, if true, that the stature of men changes. Men do change. How any one can claim that they do not in the face of the presence of the different races and of their mental and physical development, I cannot understand, except on the ground of perversity. Horses and cattle are changed by the breeders. This is done by artificial selection. According to Darwin, changes were made by natural selection. The wolf has been changed into the faithful and obedient dog. Burbank has worked wonderful transformations in the fruit and vegetable worlds. Changes in environment have probably been the cause of the changes in the complexion and characteristics of men. The desert of Sahara is undoubtedly responsible for the negro race. It is said that there are black Jews living along the Sahara whose ancestors came from Palestine.

What has made the difference between the Bushman of Australia and the Caucasian like Humboldt, Haeckel, Pasteur, Webster and Lincoln, for there is a difference! Surely, Phelps' God did not make the Bushman with his low mentality and at the same time make the Caucasians, Humboldt, Lincoln and Webster. If he did, why did he make the difference? I remember reading a while back about the Neanderthal skull, and of another skull more recently found, but which antedated the other. These skulls, which belonged to people far back in the history of the earth, are not high type skulls. Some have called them the skulls of the missing link, and yet, after all, there are scientists and thinkers who claim that there is a bigger difference between the lowest order of man today and the highest, than there is between the lowest man and the higher type of the man-like apes.

In the October 9th issue, Mr. Phelps sneers at Mrs. Bliven's explanation as to the eye; and commends, implicitly, the supposed god-made eye. And this reminds me that I have had some correspondence with Sir Hiram Maxim, the inventor of smokeless powder, the machine gun, and it is claimed the real inventor of the incandescent light system. Last winter he sent me a copy of the Pall Mall Gazette containing his reply to a distinguished English clergyman on the design theory. The minister claimed that as the telescope and flying machine showed a designer, so did the lark and the human eye show a greater designer. I will quote only a line or so of this reply:

"The Doctor compares the modern flying machine with the lark, very much to the disadvantage of the former, and the telescope of Galileo he compares to the eye behind it. The flying machine has been developed in about twenty years and there might have been a hundred failures. It took nature more than twenty millions of years with many billions of failures to develop the lark, and the same may be said of Galileo's telescope and the eye of the observer." * * * * * If every plant grows and every living thing has been designed, it follows that he must have designed many living things to prey on mankind." Then he speaks of the mosquito, the flea, the tse-tse fly, venomous snakes and the more deadly animalcules, including the terrible tuberculosis germ. Were they designed by a wise and loving God to prey on mankind, etc.? * * * * * There is not a man, and there never has been one, who can show the least tangible evidence that there is anything other than material in the universe. Remove all the material, and what would be left? An infinitely cold, dark, black and silent vacuum; there would be no up, nor down, no right nor left; heat, light, electricity and the attraction of gravitation are only properties of matter—remove the matter, and they would all cease to exist." I would like to extend the quotation and say something myself, but I remember the space.

On October 16th Brother Phelps goes into ecstatic rapture over the great doings of the church, over missionary work, etc., and wants to know what the unbeliever has done. Well, I can tell him. He has by "bucking" your Bible and its God made this world fit to live in. Your Bible and your God and your church took the great Athenian and Roman civilizations, and in the course of a few hundred years almost destroyed them, and plunged Europe into the dark ages. Who else did it but your boasted preserver, the church? It was in the saddle all during this long, black history and ruled with an iron hand.

This singing of panegyrics on the church is a good deal like singing the sweet songs of, "Jesus Love," etc. around a pulpit smothered with roses, while just underneath it are victims screaming and writhing on racks and other instruments of church torture. Why, my dear Mr. Phelps, there is nothing on earth today that has got the long, black, devilish history back of it that the subject of your ecstatic rapture has. Even the history of Moloch and the Aztec war god pale into insignificance beside your church history, for their ignorant devotees only burnt and immolated. Yours tortured and gloried in the torture.

Talk about what infidels, the unbelievers, the "buckers," against your book and the inspired sayings of your God,—have done! Why, bless you, who got rid of iron boots, thumb screws, racks, black stakes, spiked collars and other pet educational agencies of your divine institution? Not the priests and preachers who practiced these gentle arts; not these but the unbelievers, those who had to fight your church's religious notions. After flogging and burning, quartering and hanging nearly a million of women on the charge of witchcraft, so it is estimated, in Europe, after your church got into power, who made it safe for a woman to live where the Gospel was preached? Not the believers in the book, for it taught witchcraft. It said in Exodus, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." Witchcraft had to be overthrown by those who repudiated the book as an authority on women's lives. In the fight against superstition, torture and inhuman cruelty, one Voltaire, the infidel, was worth all the church, just as one Wendell Phillips was worth all the southern orators and newspapers, for freedom. But that is not all. Who persecuted the astronomers? Who called chemistry the black art? Who fought geology and then later on claimed it for its own and tried to harmonize it with the moth-eaten Mosaic account? Who hates science to this day and wishes it ill? Who has been the arch enemy of the liberty of thought? Who has been in favor of religious persecution, of ostracism, of the boycott, for opinion's sake? Who defended slavery on the authority of a book, a book that was written by a semi-savage people? Who hates the modern investigator in the domain of science, if perchance he should go contrary to the ignorant dictums of "the book?" Why, who else, but your very benevolent church? Why, my dear Sir, it has been science and knowledge

REPLY TO MATERIALISTS

By Guy Fitch Phelps

In The Silvertown Journal of October 30th there are two replies to me by materialists; on by S. H. Van Trump and the other by Otto Wettstein. I will take up the Van Trump article first. There is very little in either that really merits consideration for the simple reason that the writers take good care to keep clear of the real issue in the case.

No, I do not know all that is to be known about "these profound subjects." I lay no claim to such knowledge; but I have gone into the matter far enough to know PERFECTLY that Materialism and Evolution are just bluffs put up by those who have a senseless, bitter desire to build a universe without the aid of a Supreme Being. I have talked to hundreds of infidels and without exception I have found them DETRIMENTED not to be convinced or to admit anything contrary to their views. The last thing on earth a materialist wants to find is that there is a God in this universe—Why???

Evolution IS NOT A SCIENCE. Science is founded on facts, so is faith. Seeing that NOT ONE POINT OF EVOLUTION HAS BEEN DEFINITELY PROVED AND ESTABLISHED, even to the satisfaction of evolutionists themselves, it follows that it cannot be a science. Mr. Van Trump evidently does not recognize the difference between science and a working hypothesis. Let me say here that the evolution of the horse is considered the clearest case in all the claims of evolution, and this is utterly overthrown by the fact that according to evolutionists themselves the horse has developed from the complex to the simple, or from the many organs to the few; whereas, the whole theory of evolution stands or falls by the very reverse of this. They claim the first horse had several toes, and he lost them all and came to a hoof, and this happened while all the toes were in use. Will evolution please tell us how evolution could produce toes on a limb because they were needed, and then discard them while in use? Mr. Van Trump is invited to take a few weeks off and give us an answer. And yet he tells us that Huxley came pretty near establishing the evolution of the horse. Remember, now, that the horse is considered the very best case evolutionists have to present, and when stripped of their cant it is utterly devoid of reason or scientific facts. I challenge the world of evolutionists to controvert what I have said here on this point. We are told that all forms evolved from the lower forms; that one cell became many cells and simple forms became complex forms; till the body of a man appeared with its thousands of parts and features, and yet in the case of the horse, because materialists are short on facts, they tell us that the whole law of evolution was reversed, and that the horse began with perhaps five toes, and shed them all but one, which turned into a hoof. And this is the very best Evolution has to give the world. What a foundation for the reason! Did materialists, who tell us of the easy glide of evolution, never hear of the trouble Darwin had of finding the connecting link between men and apes? Who has bridged that gap? Not one. Let materialists roost a little closer to the ground till they have something to present.

Mr. Van Trump challenges my reference to Huxley. I quoted him correctly; I did not say he was not an evolutionist, but that he repudiated Darwin's theories of the origin of species. That has fit up the world and made life worth living, and every infidel is a friend of science. Can you say the same of every Christian?

In the October 9th issue, you speak of evolution and use the words, "Darwin fell in there and drowned, theory and all." Why did you so gleefully say that? I can tell you. You had been trained to hate science, and you wanted science to fail. Why do you speak of this latter day science like as your church used to speak of the theories of Galileo, of Copernicus and Kepler, except that you want it to fail as it wanted them to fail?

You want to know what infidels have done. Do you know that Washington, Paine, Jefferson and Franklin were all, practically, infidels—that Paine's ideas as to the Bible and Christianity were largely those of the other three? Do you know that both Grant and Lincoln were unbelievers in church beliefs, and yet this country owes a good sized debt to these six men. Cornell University, Girard College, the Smithsonian Institution at Washington, the great Lick Observatory, and other public benefactions were established by unbelievers. Even the great giver of libraries is said to be an unbeliever in your church doctrines. In proportion to their numbers, the free-thinkers have done more for humanity than any other class, far more. They have made life worth living on the globe. Columbus, O., October 27.

Olin J. Ross.

cies, and their variation. I would also say that Mr. Huxley was buried with the Christian burial service of the English Church, and the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians was read over him. If Mr. Van Trump asks for my authorities in making these statements, I will be glad to send them in. Meantime let him explain the two attitudes of evolution on the question of the horse.

He says that some of the men I referred to died before the evidence of evolution became known, and yet none of them have been dead over a century. This shows, by his own admission, that evolution is a hodge-podge of infidels seeking to build universe without the Infinite, and that it is of very recent date. But strange to say that Darwin—who got most of views from another man by his name who lived before him—was born in 1809, died in 1882. Thus we see that Darwin and Brewster lived their lives together. This is a sample of the take-it-for-granted way infidels are in the habit of putting up their facts. I have plenty of names of men to present backing my position and against materialism, but I will wait till Mr. Van Trump disposes of the twenty or more I have given. He refers me to Earnest Haeckel as a worthy authority. But I would remind him that Haeckel and Darwin did not agree at all in their theories. Darwin believed in a Divine beginning of the original life, or form-cells, and that life came from antecedent life; while Haeckel advanced the theory that life came from spontaneous generation, a theory which no real scientist of today believes at all. Let Mr. Van Trump explain these contradictions if he can. But he will do well not to quote from Haeckel.

He challenges me to show anything in nature that has not gone through a process of evolution, and then speaks of the soil as an illustration. How happy the thought. The ground proving evolution! His illustration proves that he has none. I will simply state that there is no evidence that any living form, either tree or animal, has ever been anything but what it is in its own species. The first we know of any form or animal it was just what it is now, and behind that positive knowledge evolutionists simply "guess," as Mrs. Bliven admitted. Bring on your half developed forms; set up your half shaped human bodies just throwing off the ape features; bring us a floating eye, or ear, or tadpole which is becoming a fish, and we will believe. I return his challenge by asking him to show one thing that has ever evolutionized at all. I happen to know that evolutionists have not got the facts to present, and they know it, and their bluff comes a little late. It is very easy for infidels to talk glibly about how all things have come up from the lower forms. That's easy, but to set out the evidence is quite another thing, and when we ask them to do so they usually begin to tell us what a bad lot preachers are and what a dandy boy Tom Paine was. And yet these are the folks who talk about reason and hoot at Christianity as superstition.

Mr. Van Trump misquotes me. I did not say people had to have a God to be moral (which would be true, doubtless). What I did say or ask was: "Can there be any right or wrong if there is no God?" Mrs. Bliven tried to answer this by saying that men learned right and wrong through commerce. One man had a thing and another wanted it. This led to the defense of rights. But the trouble with this is that it would be just as right for the man to want the object as for the man to keep it so both would be right or wrong. There can be no right or wrong if there is no infinite Holy God in the universe moral. This is clear to thinkers.

Now comes Tom Paine once more. It is laughable to see infidels parade their prophet. How short they must be for timber. It would take Christians a long time to give a list of their worthy members, but infidels have one real saint—Tom Paine. Well, now I assure my friend that I am glad to learn that Paine was not a drunkard. I don't want that to be a fact. Far be it from me to gloat over it if it were true. Moreover, the moral character of Paine proves nothing for evolution. In fact I wish some one would prove that Paine was an evolutionist. He was born of good Quaker parents, and believed there was a God. His works defend eighteenth century Deism. How do materialists like that? Paine was not a modern materialist at all. That he was the loyal friend of the liberty of man I am glad to admit. And that he did as much as any man of his class to strengthen the cause of liberty I am glad to say. He was a man of great ability, and did much for the cause of freedom. If I had marched with him in the ranks of Washington, as thousands of Christians did, I should have doubtless hailed him as a brother worthy and true in the cause of liberty. I take his hand in spirit and credit him with all he did for man. Yet it is a fact that he turned the grateful people of this land against him, so much so that even Washington refused to seek to liberate him from prison in France, and there must have



The Greater Oregon

With new buildings, better equipment, enlarged grounds, and many additions to its faculty, the University of Oregon will begin its thirty-ninth year Tuesday, September 15.

Special training for Business, Journalism, Law, Medicine, Teaching, Library Work, Music, Architecture, Physical Training and Fine Arts. Largest and strongest departments of liberal education.

Library of more than 50,000 volumes, two splendid gymnasiums, eleven buildings fully equipped. Tuition Free. Boarding for men and for women. Expenses lowest. Write for catalog and illustrated booklet. Addressing Registrar, UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON.

Conveyancing

Brokerage

Phone Green 991

CASCADE REAL Estate Co.

MR. and MRS. G. H. DEDRICK, General Managers

OFFICE IN HOSMER BUILDING
Room formerly occupied by H. E. Brown
SILVERTON, OREGON

A BIG BARGAIN.

One acre, half in clover, an 8-room house, city water yard, good well, 40 young fruit trees, 15 old ones, chicken house, fine Jersey cow, 35 chickens, grapes, good barn—everything for only \$3250. Easy terms. No better bargain in Silvertown! See us over the Journal office.

Money to Loan

Notary Public

Phone Black 1242.

Coolidge Street.

BEN HOFSTETTER

General Contractor for Commercial and Industrial Building

EXPERT ENGINEER

In the Design and Construction of beautiful homes, business houses, schools and churches.

SILVERTON, OREGON.

been a reason. But that has nothing to do with evolution and materialism. Paine believed in a God, and defended the idea. Please drop Paine from the argument. All the good he knew he got from Christianity. Ingersoll was the son of a clergyman; Darwin was educated in Christ's College. So was Mr. Van Trump educated in a school which is the product of Christianity, for heathen did not have any, and do not have any, worthy of the name.

After looking over Mr. Wettstein's article I find there is nothing in it worthy of an answer. I surmise he is a Jew by his name, and would suggest that he do not disgrace his nation. He asks me to "define my God" and he will prove my views are "childish and absurd." I will do so in part and then he can come along. The character of God the Father is just like that of his son, Jesus Christ our Lord. He is all-wise, perfectly holy, and all-powerful. He has laws and these laws are based on his character. The transgression of them brings death and ruin, and to obscure them peace and health. Now come on with your proof.

Mr. Wettstein says nature is eternal, never was created. That is the nature we see about us has been so from eternity, trees, animals, grass, all forms of life and creatures of life are just what they have always been. There never was a beginning, so he says. Well, well, how will Mrs. Bliven and Olin Ross, and the rest like that? And what becomes of evolution, if Mr. Wettstein is correct? Ah, materialists Wettstein is correct? Ah, materialists are a flashing bunch. What harmony in their views. Mrs. Bliven said that the eye began by the sun falling on a mass of protoplasm, and so all eyes have come. But Mr. Wettstein tells us

FOR SALE

On Oregon City car line, most beautiful ride near Portland, splendid car service, 2 blocks from car. 4 room bungalow, 2 large lots 50x138, young orchard, family fruit, garden, chicken house and large chicken park, beautiful flowers and shrubbery. 1/2 mile from river, rich and slightly, fine view, this can be bought for \$1600 on installment plan, small payment down, balance like rent. This is an ideal home and easy to get. Cascade Real Estate Co.

SILVERTON TIME TABLE

Arrive from Portland	8.25 A.M.
" " "	11.05 A.M.
" " "	4.30 P.M.
" " "	8.15 P.M.
" " Salem	10.59 A.M.
" " "	5.05 P.M.
" " Brownsville	9.15 A.M.
Depart for Portland	7.30 A.M.
" " "	9.15 A.M.
" " "	2.00 P.M.
" " "	5.05 P.M.
" " Salem	8.25 A.M.
" " "	3.00 P.M.
" " Brownsville	4.30 P.M.