

quoted from an elaborate article on his life and work, illustrates his immense work in these two fields.

What I wish to call attention to in this connection is, that amidst all this stupendous work, he found time to be what we might term the model citizen of his city and his country. For 42 years he was a member of the Berlin municipal council, and for many years he was also a member of the Prussian lower house and of the German reichstag. In all these positions he was a leader, and by his voice and pen took a leading part in agitating the public questions of his time. In 1849 he was dismissed from his position in the Berlin university on account of his political affiliations, but in 1856 he was recalled and given a professorship, in spite of the fact that his political activities did not cease. At one time his criticisms of the war policy of the government were so caustic that Bismarck challenged him to fight a duel.

Let the life of the great Virchow be an answer to, the little croakers that we sometimes hear say: "I am doing scientific work. I haven't time for politics or the discussion of public questions. They are quite out of my line."

In examining the life of Virchow I find a very interesting fact. I thought that I was the only one that ever combined politics and medicine in the same magazine. I find that "in June, 1848, with Leubuscher, he edited a paper, both medical and political, called *Medicinische Reform*." Let only men who confess themselves not large enough to be both a medical man and a citizen be only a physician. At the same time, let such men confess that they are not fit to live in a country like this. They ought to go to Russia or China, where they would be prohibited, if necessary, from taking any active part in public affairs. —The Medical World.

#### IS DARWINISM ON ITS DEATH-BED?

An article in *The Literary Digest*, of October 18. The translations in the article were made especially for the *Digest*.

The persistent opposition of the late Prof. Virchow to the teachings of Darwinism has usually been of late years the most important feature of the international conventions of European scientists, of which he was the leading spirit. His recent death has again brought into public prominence the attitude of German and other continental scholars toward this school

of philosophy, with the result that the opponents of Darwinism claim that it is practically on its death-bed. One of the prominent advocates of this view is the well-known Christian representative of the natural sciences, Dr. E. Dennert, perhaps the most pronounced representative of that class who maintain that perfect harmony exists between the teachings of the Scriptures and those of nature correctly interpreted. His latest work on this subject is entitled "Vom Sterbebeger des Darwinismus" (At the Death-bed of Darwinism), a pamphlet of 83 pages, which contains the views of dozens of naturalists, zoologists, biologists, etc., who are opposed to the Darwinian philosophy. Of the actual status of the present controversy on the continent, Dennert has this to say:

Some 20 years ago it was perfectly justifiable to identify the ideas of Darwinism and the doctrine of the descent of man, for at that time Darwinism was the only theory of descent extant. The few who would not accept this could easily be numbered. Only occasionally a scholar, such as Wigan, Kolliker, Nagel, and a few others dared to raise their voices in protest. Now all this has been changed. Practically all naturalists now make a sharp distinction between Darwinism and the doctrine of descent. A survey of the field shows that Darwinism in its old form is becoming a matter of history, and that we are actually witnessing its death-struggle.

A fair examination of the leading naturalists of the continent justifies the claim that the doctrine of descent or evolution is now generally accepted as a demonstrated theory by nearly all scientists. But, on the other hand, it cannot be denied that Darwinism, in the sense of natural selection by means of the struggle for existence, is being crowded to the wall all along the line. The bulk of modern scientists no longer recognize it, and those who have not yet discarded it at any rate regard it as of subordinate importance. In place of this, older views have again come into acceptance, which do not deny development, but maintain that this was not a purely mechanical process.

The comments made on the position of Virchow by many periodicals are of the same character, so the *Germania* says. The same journal adds:

The great bacteriologist, Pasteur, was an outspoken opponent of the materialistic explanation of the origin of things known as the *generatio aequivoca*, or the development of organic beings out of inorganic, in the Darwinian philosophy. He stated his opposition in these words: "Posterity will one day laugh at the foolishness of the modern materialistic philosophers. The more I study nature, the more I stand amazed at the works of the Creator. I pray while I am engaged in my work in the laboratory."

Virchow was not a professed Christian, but he was as much opposed as was Pasteur to the theory of Darwin-

ism. At the last convention of anthropologists, held in Vienna, Virchow said: "The attempt to find the transition from animal to man has ended in a total failure. The middle link has not been found, and will not be found. Man is not descended from the ape. It has been proved beyond a doubt that during the past 5,000 years there has been no noticeable change in mankind."

Other naturalists have also raised their voices against the Darwinian views. Notably the zoologist, Prof. Rute Meyer, who has written a special work directed against Haeckel, the alter ego of Darwin in Germany. In this book, he charges Haeckel with "playing with the public and with natural sciences."

The Strassburg professor of zoology, Dr. Goette, has published in the *Unschau* a natural history of Darwinism, which he depicts as having passed through four stages of development, namely (1) the beginnings, when it was received with great enthusiasm; (2) the period in which it flourished and found general acceptance; (3) the period of transition and sober second thought, when its principles and teachings were called into question; (4) the final period, upon which the scientific world has just entered, and when its days will evidently soon be numbered, while the germ of truth it contained will become a permanent possession of modern science.

#### THE DOUKHOBOR PILGRIMS: A LATTER-DAY QUEST FOR THE HOLY GRAIL.

An article written by L. L. Knefelter for the November number of the *Farmers' Institute*, published in the *Herald*, of Mason City, Ia., from which we copy it. Since this article was written most of the Doukhobor Pilgrims have been returned to their homes by the Canadian police. The article opens with an extract from a Winnipeg daily paper.

Sixteen hundred Doukhobors, men, women and children, reached Yorkton to-day.

They are a part of the Swan River colony, and have come for an entire distance of a hundred miles on foot. They say they have set forth in search of Christ, and expect to march onward until they find him.

At various places on their journey, here and there, large stones have been found overturned by them, evidently with the thought that it might be the stone before the sepulcher.

Among the pilgrims are a number of old people and several sick, who are too feeble to walk. These are carried on rude stretchers by their fellow travelers.

The Doukhobors are strict vegetarians, believing it to be sinful to eat anything that has ever lived. They come from Russia, and there are seven or eight thousand of them in various counties in western

Canada. It seems that several "missionaries" from Russia have been holding a religious revival among them, with the result that 1,600 enthusiasts have set out on a search for Christ, whom they hope to find almost any time.

They have left comfortable homes in the colonies, and whole families together have tramped thus far in their crazy quest. When they came to Yorkton, the government procured suitable quarters where the women and children will be cared for, while the men will be allowed to continue their journey.

They are a harmless lot, one of the religious tenets being non-resistance. They will not wear any article of clothing that is made from wool or leather, use no tobacco or liquor. The men carry their provisions, which consists wholly of bread, in a sort of knapsack. When they come to a stream they hold a sort of religious service, after which they dip the bread in water, a very necessary operation, before eating.

There was a great deal of mourning among the women because they were not allowed to continue the march, because they believed that their husbands would find Christ and they wanted to be with them.

Before starting out on their journey these Doukhobors turned all their horses and cattle loose upon the prairie, saying that they had no right to use dumb beasts against their will. The government rounded the live stock up and sold it at auction, and now has some \$20,000 as the result of this sale, which will be used to take care of the women and children.

After the authorities had gathered in the women and children, the men went out of town about a mile into a small grove, where they sang and prayed until late into the night, after which they lay down on the bare ground and slept until morning, when they resumed their journey along the railroad in the direction of Winnipeg. No alarm is felt, as the amiable and peaceable character of the Doukhobor is well known. The ladies of Yorkton are doing everything in their power to help the authorities in taking care of their rather unwelcome guests.

The foregoing is an account in plain, newspaper correspondent's phrase of what is really one of the most striking and most pathetic movements that the world has seen in centuries. Striking, because it presents the remarkable spectacle, in this hard-headed money grabbing twentieth century, of nearly 2,000 human beings renouncing all their worldly possessions except the barest necessities and setting out at the beginning of the winter season upon the search after an idea. Pathetic because of the suffering which must follow as the inevitable result of the movement.

At the dinner table in Winnipeg the other day I asked a man at my right: "What kind of people are these Doukhobors, anyway?" "Oh, they are a lot of dirty foreigners that the government has brought over from Russia and given some of

the best land in Canada. They are a curse to the country and the present government ought to be turned out of power for bringing them here." It was plain that he belonged to the opposition, which is trying to make political capital out of the Doukhobor incident as out of everything else, for our Canadian cousins are just as bitter partisans as any of us Yankees.

Finding he was hopelessly prejudiced, I turned to the man at my left, who seemed to be a fair-minded sort of fellow. "Do you know anything about the Doukhobors?" I asked. "Yes, I have been running a saw mill on Swan river for seven years and have had them work for me," he replied, adding: "I have no particular time for them, though." "Well," I said: "I am a stranger up here and wish to find out what I can about these people. Are they industrious or lazy?" "Oh, they are not lazy, they are good workers." "How are they as to honesty?" "Oh, you can trust a Doukhobor for any amount he agrees to pay. His word is perfectly good anywhere." "How about his personal habits? Is he cleanly or dirty?" "Oh, he is clean. Their villages are kept nice and clean."

"Are they moral in their relations as to sex?" "I guess they are a good deal straighter than most people about that."

"Are they intelligent or ignorant?" I asked. "As to that I can't say. I don't understand their language and they don't understand mine. It's about a standoff. They may be more intelligent than I think." This was probably the real reason why he "had no time for them."

I excused the witness at this point, feeling that he had somewhat reluctantly given the Doukhobor a pretty good certificate of character. I was also told that people like to buy cord wood that has been cut by a Doukhobor because every stick is exactly four feet long. In one case a wood contractor who had employed about 40 Doukhobors one winter made a mistake in settlement and overpaid them by \$50. When the head men of the colony went over the accounts they found the error and at once started a man back with the money. He went the whole distance of 80 miles and back on foot. Merchants trust a Doukhobor at any time. They say he will pay it with the first money he gets if he has to walk 100 miles.

So much for the worldly side of

the Doukhobors. But this world is the smallest part of the Doukhobor's trouble. His chief concern is about the world to come. He is by nature or education intensely religious and being also simple minded he believes that religion is a thing to be actually practiced instead of merely professed. He seems to be deficient in the matter of imagination and takes everything in a literal sense. When he sings "I'm but a stranger here, Heaven is my home," he backs up the sentiment by refusing to file on a homestead even though the government offers to remit the filing fee. Neither could he sing "I give my all to thee," and shut his eyes when the contribution box comes around to him. With him, to believe is to do. He believes it is wrong to eat of anything that has ever lived, and therefore is a vegetarian. He believes it is wrong to own land and therefore will have none of it.

This self-abnegation is probably due to the centuries of persecution which he and his ancestors have suffered in Russia. His doctrine of non-resistance and his devotion to the principles of peace have drawn on him the hostility of the military system and made him easy mark for the oppressor. Under such conditions it is not unnatural that his faith should lead him to seek his highest happiness in another world than this. Certain it is that his chances are not good in this world, whatever they may be in the next.

A thousand years ago men rode forth in search of the Holy Grail. Ancient legends told that the vessel in which Joseph of Arimathea caught the blood of Christ upon the cross had been brought by him to England and that it had been kept for centuries by guardians upon the one condition that they must themselves be pure in thought and chaste in deed. At one time the guardian had failed to "make good" in these respects and the cup or "Grail" disappeared. Afterward, "when knight-hood was in flower," it became the fashion for helmeted knights to ride forth in quest of the Holy Grail. No knight could hope to find it unless his own life was blameless, and a thousand years later Tennyson immortalized Sir Galahad in his poem, "The Holy Grail," because that virtuous knight had achieved the purpose of his quest and had found the Grail.

In those days, when men must needs have everything expressed in

symbol the Holy Grail meant the personal presence of Christ.

The plain, simple-minded enthusiasts upon the plains of Saskatchewan dispense with the symbol and seek for the Christ himself. Who shall say that in a thousand years from now the striking drama enacted beneath clear autumnal skies in western Canada by the 1,600 sincere and devoted seekers of the Master may not form a fitting subject for the pen of the laureate of that distant day.

Let us hope that as the world grows older it will grow more charitable toward the meek and humble in spirit and that some day the great mass of mankind will appreciate that high devotion to an ideal which the simple Doukhobor is so sincerely though perhaps clumsily seeking to express.

#### ANTHRACITE COAL, AND OTHER THINGS.

An extract from a personal letter to a young friend, published by permission of the writer of the letter.

The ideas herein expressed are not new, but they seem pertinent. Whether they are evolutionary or revolutionary is not as important as whether they are sound or unsound.

The anthracite coal operators say in effect: "We have a right to do as we please with our own. Give us federal troops to protect us in our rights." The miners say: "We are a species of serf chained to the soil, and have a right to a better life out of our labor in mining coal—and no one shall come between us and our right." The public say: "We have a right to the bounty of nature—coal."

In my opinion the miners and the public are nearer the truth in their "rights" than are the operators. If the coal operators actually own the coal lands in fee simple, they have by the feudal law of a thousand years ago, which we have preserved till to-day, the actual and exclusive ownership and control of a pyramidal wedge from the center of the earth to the coal area, with a base at the earth's surface of the size and outline of the coal area, or not exactly a base, but a cross section, for, by the extravagant liberality of the feudal law of a thousand years ago, the owner of a piece of land owns also all that section of the air and the firmament which rests upon it, even to Arcturus, the Milky-way and beyond.

By the law of to-day, therefore, if the coal operators chose to bite off their noses, they could shut down all operation and say to the inhabitants of the earth: "The coal is ours—trespass not—even though we refuse to work the mines at all." The operators are not likely to do this for selfish reasons—but a true right fails nowhere; therefore in testing a right we ought to view the outcome when that right is pushed to an extreme. It becomes instructive, therefore, to consider that, by their present legal title and so-called "right," the anthracite coal operators could, if for any reason they saw fit, put a paper fence about the coal fields, and refuse to work the coal mines themselves or permit anyone else to do so to the end of time.

I believe the anthracite coal area of this globe is about 500 square miles in the states of Pennsylvania and West Virginia, principally in Pennsylvania, and is all owned by some four or five sets of men. If instead of anthracite coal this were a lake of fresh water, and the people of Pennsylvania and New York had no other water supply and must take from this lake or die, the "right" of private ownership would be brushed aside in a minute; yet the difference is only one of degree, and we feel instinctively an absurdity in applying to these valuable natural deposits an antiquated law made for feudal barons, in a state of society that was radically different from ours, and when what was below the earth's surface was a matter of no consequence to anyone.

The remedy oftentimes spoken of is socialism, or government ownership—a most undemocratic theory advocated by the Democratic convention of New York. This seems to me so unsatisfactory an alternative that I, in common with a mass of others, pause. To me government ownership seems the worst "trust" of all, and I believe, attracted by rich spoils, a scheming few would control that socialistic government in their own interests, just as they control this one whenever it becomes worth their while to do so. For example, the great prize in every country is man's inheritance—the earth; and I'll venture to say this country and its people would be better off to-day if congress had never had any control over the public domain. The land bounties, railroad grants, swamp land acts, desert land acts, have all resulted in the valuable bulk of the public domain go-

ing into the hands of scheming rings which stood back of each of these ostensibly public and general acts. The stone and timber act gives every citizen 160 acres of land valuable only for stone or timber. What does a citizen want with an isolated 160-acre tract of such land? Obviously not to use it himself, but in practically every instance he secures it only to sell it at once to the timber speculators, who thus have gathered at nominal prices about all the timber land not in railroad grants (often calling perjury and fraud to their aid, and taking up the land by their own employes). President Cleveland, to preserve river sources, set aside certain mountain areas as timber reserves—a worthy act; but the grafters by their willing friends in congress passed an act permitting any person having land in a forest reserve to exchange it for an equal quantity (not value) out of the reserve. This exchange being wholly optional, railroads (and others) have kept all their good timber land inside the reserve, but have exchanged all their stony or burnt or otherwise worthless sections inside the reserve for choice timberland outside the reserve, till now there is but little good timber left in the public domain. What the babies to be born 50 years hence will say to this question of private ownership of all the timber, we cannot tell. It is a favorite axiom of the modern feudal baron that everyone has an equal opportunity. Obviously the babies to be born 50 years hence will not believe this as to timber, coal, iron, water power and other natural foundation stones of wealth. But let the babies give their own answer in due time. I digressed merely to give one instance from many, showing that wherever a government, national, state or municipal, has held lands, franchises or other rights of value, that government has been controlled by the shrewd few who coveted these things; and I cannot believe in government ownership till human nature be wholly changed to perfection.

To return to the coal mines: The fact is, if we divest ourselves of our inbred habits of thought, and think down to the ground, we shall see more or less clearly that we have few absolute rights. Our unqualified rights are those inherent and natural: I should say the right to life and liberty, so long as we respect the same rights in others, and the right to maintain that life by the