

in a few days more." There was no response, but in half an hour he placed his hands underneath his head, and called out, "I am going to sleep, good night." When the nurse turned to him a few moments later he cried, "Why, Luff is dead!"

So ended the brief career of a young life. Thousands, since the war, have gone the same way, and in many homes, as in his, there is that sorrow and sadness which is only borne or lifted by intelligent, undying faith. Peace to the ashes, honor to the brave and true!

SCIENCE AIDS REVELATION.

"Why do we live?" is the important question discussed by Charles Richet in a French scientific journal, quoted by Literary Digest. He concludes that it cannot be answered, although he admits that everything connected with our physical existence points to a Designer. His argumentation is of great interest at a time when the tendency of scientific thought is in another direction. It proves that the philosophy which discards a personal Creator from its system is not satisfactory to the mind that looks beneath the surface of the mysteries of the universe.

Mr. Richet finds that the human mind is utterly unable to comprehend the cause of the world in its immensity, but this inability, he says, does not extend to every part of that world. Even the strongest adversaries of the so-called teleological argument for the existence of God must admit that. He argues:

"For example, is it possible to deny that the eye is intended for vision? We have taken the eye as an example, but we might equally well have taken any other organ; the ear, for instance, or the heart, or the stomach, or the brain, or the muscles. The animal machine is like a marvelous automatic apparatus, each of whose parts has its use. This is so true that when we have not been able to discover the use of an organ we go to work to find it. . . . Until recent years we were ignorant of the use of the thyroid gland, of the subrenal capsules, of the thymus and other glands; but we have now been able to discover their functions, so that the hypothesis of useless organs is becoming more and more problematic, or, we may rather say, untenable. Nature (it makes little difference whether we write this word 'nature' or 'Nature')—Nature has made no useless organs and has made all for a purpose."

Then speaking of the various organs with which animals are provided for the evident purpose of preserving their lives whether by procuring provisions or defending themselves against enemies, the author remarks:

"Now, whenever an account is given of these processes of protection, the writer falls necessarily into a finalist method of expression, since he is led to say that the various functions of defense have as an object the protection of the attacked organism. . . ."

"I am absolutely convinced that it is not possible to suppress the doctrine of final causes in anatomy, zoology, or physiology. All we can do is to use it in moderation, for I recognize that we have to do only with hypothesis, probable though it may be. When we say: the eye was constructed for vision . . . we state a hypothesis. In reality, if we desire to use no hypothesis, we should say: the eye serves for vision, the iris for accommodation. But the perfection of the instrument is so admirable that we have a right to see

in it an adaptation to a predetermined use.

"We may go still further, for in the search for final causes detail is not sufficient. We have seen that it would be ridiculous not to suppose that the organs have a function, an adaptation, a well-determined object. We must now ask whether living beings have no great general functions adapted to an end."

He next considers the instinct of reproduction, the purpose of which is the preservation of the species; that of fear, forcing us to avoid danger and disgust which keeps us from partaking of food dangerous to life, and draws the following conclusions:

"All the preceding propositions lead to the general conclusion that living beings are organized to live, whether we speak of the life of the species or that of the individual. Animated nature offers us the spectacle of living substance making every effort toward life, and trying, by all possible means, to realize a maximum of life. . . . But this struggle for life is only a fact; it is neither a theory nor even a hypothesis. Can we go further? . . . Ought we not to assert that life consists of a tendency to live, of a sort of proximate finality? Certainly. The ultimate finality is hidden from us, but we have made a step in advance if we have shown that beings tend to live and are organized for the purpose of life."

"To deny this proximate final cause would be to force a mutilation upon thought, and I do not know how to accept the truly heroic abnegation of the physiologist who in proving, for example, the sensibility of beings to pain, will not conclude, for fear of being thought a finalist, that pain is necessary to life."

Mr. Richet, as already stated, does not believe that this reasoning can furnish the reply to the question "Why do we live?" but he perceives that all nature gives evidence that there is a Will anterior to the existence of life, and in this he comes remarkably near the truth.

Even a Christian teleologist can, by his own reasoning, go no further. He finds himself in the midst of a world in which he is everywhere surrounded by evidences of order, not to say design. The more he studies the more striking this order appears to him. He sees it through the telescopes that reveal to him worlds in the starry sky, and through the microscopes, that reveal to his wondering eye worlds in the dust or the drop of water. He feels compelled to conclude that beyond this order there is the action and purpose of some intelligence vastly superior to his own. He knows, from observation in the sphere in which he himself moves, that the production of order means necessarily a purpose, a design. It is impossible for him to think of the world he contemplates otherwise as constructed by somebody. He is as morally certain that the earth that takes him across the immense space is built for a certain purpose as he is that the ship on which he crosses the ocean has an architect.

But he goes one step further than that. He finds that he himself is a part of the world, and consequently must look to the Constructor of the universe as the cause of his own existence. And when he recognizes that intelligence, power to will and to love and to discern between right and wrong, belong to a class of existences superior to those who are not endowed with these qualities, he necessarily concludes that the Cause of the universe is such a Being, a personal God endowed with the highest intelligence and moral qualities.

But here the Christian teleologist and the philosopher both stop. For further knowledge of God, and especially for a true knowledge of the duties of man to God, revelation is necessary. Mr. Richet's article suggests this truth. It proves that though human thought may convince us of the existence of Him who is our Origin, it is impotent to reveal Him to us. There is much food for reflection in this to those who believe in science only, to the exclusion of revelation.

LET US KNOW ALL.

Later reports give the difficulty between General Shafter and newspaper correspondent Scovel a decidedly different aspect. One account says that the general first slapped Scovel's face and the latter retaliated in kind, although realizing that his act was a capital offense. This would seem to show that he is a very courageous man, even for a journalist, because the severity and generally the certainty of the punishment would be likely to have a restraining effect upon most people, whereas to allow the natural impulse to return blow for blow to have sway, argues the utmost indifference to danger. It is an ugly affair at the best, but both sides and every feature of it should in justice be given to the world.

There seems something wrong with almost everything at Santiago. What it is or how it came about is not fully known, but enough has come abroad to show that the atmosphere thereabout has and has had a decidedly malodorous taint. It looks somewhat as if the lustre of the grand events in the bloody arena back of the town before its capture were becoming dim and fading steadily away, while all that has characterized the new rule has been unsatisfactory if not something worse. The American people are entitled to know what it is all about, what it amounts to, and why it is that reprehensible proceedings are not stopped at once if they could not be nipped in the bud. We all understand what an Augean task it was to undertake the cleansing and righting up of that locality, but are unable to understand why it is that affairs become worse instead of better. Troops have been dispatched to the scene and soon we hope to hear of better things.

OUR NEW PUBLIC LANDS.

A suggestion recently made regarding the preference of soldiers and sailors of the war in the matter of the allotment of the new lands acquired abroad by the United States, seems to be taking root and growing. The first man to give public expression to the idea of homesteading the lands was Col. John J. Astor, a man of infinite wealth and, as has been abundantly shown, ample courage and profound patriotism. In an interview by the New York World he gave not only expression but elaboration to the view, and this was added upon by that paper asking, why not open such public lands to our soldiers and sailors? It is pointed out that the outbursts of enthusiasm which greet everyone of those who comes back from the scene of strife and the preparations being made to give a heartfelt welcome to those ordered north to recuperate are significant signs of the way the people feel.

There is rapidly developing, says the World, a strong belief that the government should do something more than provide \$13 a month for the brave fellows who have braved death and disease, freed Cuba and captured Porto Rico. It is understood that in Cuba,