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## HOW SCIENCE IS ANNIBILATED.

Everybody admits that a man who sets up as a doctor with out first submitting to a careful medical training is a knav or a fool. Everybody admits that to practise medicine properly requires a very thorough preliminary education, and no little practical observation of the ills that flesh is heir to Yetnine persons out of every ten stand ready on all occasions to offer advice in case of sickness; and those who know least of medicine are least conscious of their unfitness to prescribe. It is very much the same in Science. To be able to read a book of Science, or even floating paragraphs about it, is taken by very many people as evidence enough of their ability to by very many people as evidence enough of their ability to
criticise it, especially if they happen to have some little right criticise it, especially if they happen to have some little right
to speak in some other department of thought. Unmindful to speak in some other department of thought. Unmindful
of the fact that the errors of scientific theory have always of the fact that the errors of scientific theory have always
been discovered by scientific men only, the unscientific and been discovered by acientific men only, the unscientific and
antiscientific hold themselves ready at all times to point out the mistakes in the deductions of men who have spent a la borious lifetime making themselves acquainted with the facts of the case, meeting the cautious suggestions of men like Lyell or Darwin with a confident assurance that would be justified by nothing short of infallibility. As a rule, we smile at these volunteer champions of ignorance, and let thei vaporings pass. Now and then, however, they afford typica illustrations of antiscientific reasoning too good to be illustratio
slighted.
Of this character was the lofty rebuke to Science adminis tered the other day by a somewhat prominent Doctor of Di vinity, in a morning paper : a rebuke, we may add, which has been the source of great consolation to more than on dear soul alarmed at the spread of knowledge, in proo whereof we have, in a subsequent issue of the same paper
letters of rejoicing in regard to the Doctor's championship. The special science which falls under the Doctor's con demnation is geology-if, indeed, it is in any way worthy of being called a science. Particularly is it robuked for malking of periods of time more protracted than the Hebrew serip tures provide for: Facts of its own finding condemn its as sumptions. For instance, one of the remote periods of geol ugy is the cretaceous, or age of chalk. Between that time
and this, incaloulable ages have come and gone, say the geo logists. Sheer assumption, says the Doctor, for deep sea soandings prove that chalk is now being deposited in the At lantic ocean; today is the chalk age, and your long drawn periods of time are pure myths!
Again, the geologists set the carboniferous epoch so far back that the six thousand years of Hebrew history dwindle to insignificance. All that time is wiped out with a para graph, a floating paragraph which the Doctor has discovered going the rounds of the country newspapers, to the effect that the wooden supports used in certain of the Hartz minen have been converted into lignite since they have been put in only a few centuries ago. See! cries the Doctor: a thousand only a few centuries ago. See! cries the Doctor: a thousand
years at most suffice to convert wood into coal ; how dare you, in the face of such evidence, presume to say that sixty cen turies would not suffice for the production of your carbonife rous strata?
'. What will geologists say to that?" asked an excellent lady, after reading the Doctor's triumphant overthrow of their science-" falsely so called."
We could not say, though we modestly surmised that, if compelled to notice the indictment,they would probably say "What of it?" What has chalk to do with the antiquity of the cretaceous era? Who that knows anything of geology imagines that the age of a coal seam is in any way depend ent on the time required to tarn wood into coal? The chem ist can do that in a few hours. Shall we say, therefore, that the carboniferous period was yesterday, and that all the stu pendous changes that have since taken place in the earth and its inhabitants, happened last night?
Besides, if that is the line of argument, why stop half way? Any geologist will willingly furnish the Doctor with arguments ever so much more sweeping than those he uses For instance, in the South Seas, the corals of today are form ing strata that are the exact counterparts (fossils excepted) of-say-the Trenton limestones. In other parts of the world sand deposits,such as composed the Potsdam sandstones, are now forming. Why not say, therefore, that the silurian period is a flgment of the imagination: that it is now, yester day, or any time this side of Adam's day? Still worse: it was discovered last year that, in the deeper parts of the At lantic, strata of mud are now forming, precisely like the strata which make up certain slates of the so called azoic pe riod. The next time the Doctor demolishes geology, let him declare that this fact proves that the Laurentian period, in declare that this fact proves that the Laurentian period, in stead of being countless ages old, is altogether modern! It
will make his case seem much stronger to the ignorant, and will make his case seem much stronger to
will not weaken his argument in the least.
That it is at all necessary to comprehend a theory or an ar gument, or the bearing of known facts upon either, seems never to occur to critics of this sort. Indeed, the first requi site of an anti-science critic would rather appear to be a thor ough and radical misapprehension of what Science teaches That enables him to mispresent Science boldly, with no risk of being charged with a wilful perversion of truth
A very pretty, though very mild, case of a scientific misap prehension occurs in an editorial in the last issue of th American Garden. It would not be noticeable in a strictl evangelical family paper, but seems a trifte odd in
The editor, very properly, dubs the article "Scientific Va garies." Its subject is a paragraph from a recent lecture by Sir John Lubbock, upon the natural relations of insects and flowers. After mentioning the observations of Sprengel and flowers. After mentioning the observations of Sprengel and
Darwin, Sir John remarks that it is to insects that we owe Darwin, Sir John remarks that it is to insects that we owe
the beauty of our gardens and the sweetness of our fields, and that the flowers owe to them, not only their scent and color, but their very existence in their present form. "Not only have the brilliant colors, the sweet smell, and the honey of the flowers been gradually developed by the unconscious agency of insects, but the very arrangement of the colorsthe circular lands and the radiating lines, the form, size, and position of the petals, the arrangement of the stamens and pistils-all have reference to the visits of insects, and are dis posed in such a manner as to insure the great object whic these visits are destined to effect."
This, says our critical editor,scornfully, is a fair sample of the errors and vagaries into which intelligent men may be led-men who see things from only one point of view, and ' endeavor to twist and bend every fact or circumstance in Nature to make it fit the theoretical structure of which their preconceived notions suggest the plan
" No doubt," our critic adds, "the color and scent of flow. ers atcract insects to them for the purpose of aidiag or bring ing about the fertilization and consequent fructification of he seed for the continuation of the species--this latter be ing the end and aim of all physical life." [Whatif Darwin had said that?] It is freely admitted, also, that the intricate and wonderful arrangement of floral appendages are often peculiarly striking, and apparently throw in the way of the fertilization of the flowers obstacles that can be counteracted only by the aid of insects. But-and this is the culmination of the argument, " but the idea that insects, ages and ages ago, went to work, consciously or unconsciously, to develop the various scents, the multitudinous shades and combinations of colors, and the marvelous structure of flowers (and this last as an obstacle to their own labors) is-what? We should say a curiously stupid misreading of very plain English; but the critic suspects nothing of the sort, boldly pronouncing it " something absurd and overtasking the credulity of man "! "Is it not," he asks, "more easy to believe that there is an intelligent Creator, First Cause, or Primal Cause (as men have variously expressed it), who has created things as they are?" etc., etc.-as though easiness of belief had angthing to do with the matter. Then he winds up with this ingenious dobble question: "Are not the ideas of Sir John Lubhock

