

published lecture, *The Problem of Man*. Dr. Brass's statements appeared in two papers, and could not escape the notice of the Jena professor, who promptly called his accuser a "deliberate liar." Dr. Brass now comes back at him with the following declaration: "Haeckel has not only misrepresented the stages of the development of man, ape, and other mammals, in order to give plausibility to his hypotheses, he has also taken from the posthumous works of a scientist the figure of a makak, cut off its tail and made a hylobates out of it. He has committed the greatest possible crime against science. The proof of the justice of my accusation I shall bring in an illustrated pamphlet entitled *Ignorance or Falsification? Haeckel's Latest Embryo Pictures*. If Haeckel is again convicted of falsification, it will be, or ought to be, all over with his authority as a savant."

Faith of Scientists

From the same letter of the able and well-informed correspondent mentioned in the last preceding paragraph we extract the following: 'A prominent German naturalist, Professor Dennert, of Godesberg, in his latest book, *The Religion of the Naturalists*, examines the attitude of all the great scientists, ancient and modern, towards religion. Three hundred men of science pass in review, and the result is quite astonishing. In thirty-eight cases it was impossible to determine the religious position. Two hundred and forty-two are confessed theists [that is, believers in God], twenty are indifferent or atheistic, but only five are anti-Christian materialists in the real sense of the word. This means that of the 262 scientists, less than 2 per cent. openly declared hostility against Christianity and belief in God; about 6 per cent. were more or less indifferent. The overwhelming majority believed in God. How far their religion went it is not always easy to ascertain. Many were, no doubt, free-thinking and unsettled, but very many, too, were strict followers of a Church; in ninety cases this has been proved beyond all cavil. Professor Dennert next selects thirty-two names—the immortals, according to him (and few will disagree with him), in the realm of the natural sciences—beginning with Copernicus and Galileo and ending with Pasteur and J.-von Sachs. Of these, Scheele's religious attitude is unknown, Lavoisier and Laplace were atheists, Humboldt and Darwin were indifferent; of the other twenty-seven, at least fourteen—Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, Newton, Ray, Swammerdam, Leibnitz, Boyle, Euler, von Haller, Cuvier, Faraday, Pasteur, and Lord Kelvin—were practical adherents of a Christian denomination. Who can say, in the face of these facts, that religion and science are incompatible? Is not rather the contrary the truth? At least every Christian man of science can say he is in very good company.'

Adulteration

In his *German Society at the Close of the Middle Ages*, Belfort Box summarises (p. 216) some of the old guild laws against adulteration, scamped work, and the like. Some of these laws are well described by him, as 'ferocious in their severity.' In some towns, for instance, 'the baker who misconducted himself in the matter of the composition of his bread was condemned to be shut up in a basket which was fixed at the end of a long pole and let down so many times to the bottom of a pool of dirty water.' The same writer records how, in 1456, two grocers and the female assistant of one of them were burned alive at Nurnberg for having adulterated saffron and spices, and how a similar fate befell some dishonest members of the same profession at Augsburg in 1492. The same dread penalty of fire, we may remark, hung, till (we think) well on in the eighteenth century, over the heads of women who murdered their husbands.

Some time ago we referred to the adulteration of sundry common drugs by dangerous substances calculated to bring physical and moral ruin to the home. In his recently published book, *The Popes and Science*, Dr. James J. Walsh describes the following account of the manner in which a Sicilian law of nearly seven centuries ago regulated the purity and price of drugs:

'Nor must any licensed physician keep an apothecary's shop himself. Apothecaries must conduct their business with a certificate from a physician, according to the regulations and upon their own credit and responsibility, and they shall not be permitted to sell their products without having taken an oath that all their drugs have been prepared in the prescribed form, without any fraud. The apothecary may derive the following profits from his sales: Such extracts and simples as he need not keep in stock for more than a year before they may be employed may be charged for at the rate of three tarrenes an ounce. Other medicines, however, which in consequence of the special conditions required for their preparation or for any other

reason the apothecary has to have in stock for more than a year, he may charge for at the rate of six tarrenes an ounce. Stations for the preparation of medicines may not be located anywhere, but only in certain communities in the Kingdom, as we prescribe below. We decree also that the growers of plants meant for medical purpose shall be bound by solemn oath that they shall prepare medicines conscientiously, according to the rules of their art, and as far as it is humanly possible that they shall prepare them in the presence of the inspectors. Violations of this law shall be punished by the confiscation of their movable goods. If the inspectors, however, to whose fidelity to duty the keeping of these regulations is committed, should allow any fraud in the matters that are entrusted to them, they shall be condemned to punishment by death.'

THE SECULAR PHASE OF OUR EDUCATION SYSTEM

A DISCUSSION

(By the Editor of the New Zealand Tablet.)

The following articles on the above subject—the third and fourth of the series—appeared in the *Otago Daily Times* of January 28 and 30:—

III.—SOME RIDDLES TO READ.

The secular and the religious systems in education are (as already explained) mutually irreconcilable. The battle between them is not of merely local or academic interest. For it is a question of practical principles of philosophy and of pedagogy (the science of teaching), which are of universal application. The human race has everywhere the same native faculties, from New Zealand to Nova Zembla, from China to Peru; and these faculties follow the same laws of development under the moulding and formative processes which are collectively termed 'education.' Even on this outer rim of the world 'the battle of the schools' is in a real sense a world battle, inasmuch as it involves issues of world-wide importance and principles of world-wide application. The conflict upon which our secular system has entered is not a mere local strife with Catholic ideals of education; it is merely the local phase of a wider struggle against the whole principle of the union of religion and education which has been the common possession of Christendom—and of more than Christendom—from time immemorial. Being thus in possession, this must be deemed to be rightly in possession until adequate evidence to the contrary is forthcoming. The secular system appears in the role of a recent and rival claimant for the possession of the world's schools; it has, therefore, to establish its claims, and to establish them all along the line. Education, like all training, is dominated by the purpose that is in view. The end or purpose is (for Christians) determined by Christian philosophy and revealed religion; its processes by the principles of pedagogy or the science of teaching. The secular system must thus establish itself, if at all, by an appeal to these principles, and to the true teaching as to the origin and destiny of man. Its line of demonstration involves proof of one or other of the two following propositions:—

(1) Proof that the association of religion with education is contrary to, or inconsistent with, the true end or purpose of human existence, and the true principles of pedagogy (child-training); or (2) that the exclusion of religion from the working hours of the school is calculated to promote the true end or purpose of human life, and is, moreover, in accord with the true principles of pedagogy.

Proof of one or other of these two ugly-looking propositions is involved in the only scientific and effective defence which our secular system can set up. These propositions are in substantial harmony with the views of philosophies which do not accept a Personal God, and to which the post-mortem destiny of the human child is no nobler than that of hog or dog or codlin moth. If the exclusion of religion from our schools is defended on the lines of these or of any such philosophies, we shall know where we stand and how to meet them. But throughout these articles I assume that I am dealing with Christian men. I do not profess to know on what recondite principle of Christian philosophy or revealed truth or pedagogical science they uphold the divorce of religion from the school, and the curious situation (stated above) that it logically involves. To me, and to many besides, their attitude on this question is

As full of kinks

And curious riddles as any sphinx.

Here is a small selection of the first of these 'curious riddles' that occur to my mind:—

'It's selling well, because it's satisfying well.' Hondai Lanka Tea represents 'the most for the money.'

'Be kind tae auld Grannie.' Ladies appreciate a box of Hondai Lanka as a Christmas present.