

London Advertiser

Published by
THE LONDON ADVERTISER
COMPANY, LIMITED
London, Ontario.

MORNING. EVENING.

TELEPHONE NUMBERS.
3670

From 9 a.m. to 5:30 a.m. and holidays
call 76. Business Department: 76. Editors
and Reporters: 174. Composing Room:
76. Circulation Department.

London, Ontario, Tuesday, October 3.

Reformer or Liberal?

THE terms Liberal and Reformer are often used by speakers and writers with the idea of referring to the same political party. Both words have long been connected with the party, and discussion has frequently taken place as to which one is preferable.

Many Liberals of the old school hold to the word "Liberal." They believe that in that word they find all they need to signify the aims and ideals of the party. Against the word "Reformer" there are many of the same school, and they prefer "Liberal" for much the same reason as they dislike "Reformer." To their mind the word "Reformer," as applied to the individual, or "Reform," as used to denote a party, has been overworked by its application to many forms of propaganda, carried on against certain specific wrongs, ailments and shortcomings of the human family.

Liberals in public life have a decided preference for the term "Liberal." For instance, Dr. D. J. SINCLAIR, M.P. of North Oxford, has a decided preference for plain "Liberal," because he holds that "a Liberal is one who advocates the greatest freedom in political institutions. Also a Liberal is one who is always looking forward for the principles of government. A Tory looks backward. I believe," states the North Oxford member, "the term Liberal came into use under Mr. Gladstone, representing the political party opposed to Toryism or Conservatism, and claims to be the originator and champion of political reform and progressive legislation. It claims to represent the government by the people by means of trust in the people, in a sense which is denied the other political parties."

The danger of causing confusion is pointed out by W. D. EULEY, M.P. of North Waterloo, who states that he prefers "the name Liberal to that of Reformer chiefly for the reason that it is more comprehensive and therefore more accurate. The term Liberal includes everything implied in the name Reformer and a good deal more. Liberalism applies itself not only to reform, but also to the maintenance of those things we now possess which we know to be good. It connotes to my mind more of freedom, progressiveness, broad-mindedness and fairness (all of which are characteristic of Liberalism) than is included in the more restricted term. Moreover, a so-called Reformer party might possibly be confused with what might be called the Moral Reform party of these later years. These may be related, but not necessarily so. It is just as well to keep them distinct. The word 'Liberal' describes accurately the ideals and principles of the party, according to my conception of them."

Another old-time Liberal who talked on the matter claimed "the word Liberal is much the better. It has always appeared to me," he said, "that the word 'Liberal' is much better and more comprehensive than the word 'Reformer,' and when you speak of the Reformer it more or less brings to my mind, at least, a sort of pedantic view of certain things, and a tendency to see things from only their own angle. This may be a bit narrow on my own part, but the word 'Liberal' seems to me much broader and more comprehensive than the word 'Reformer,' and gives the idea that you are willing to consider the other fellow's viewpoint, and see whether or not it is a better way. My own view is that 'Liberal' party is much fuller-mouthed and more wholesome than the term 'Reform party,' and hence my preference is for 'Liberal party' and 'Liberalism.'"

THE ADVERTISER sought the views of several, but in no case was there a champion to be found for the word "Reformer" or for "Reform" when applied to the party. Some held that by usage it had been applied more to the Liberal party in Ontario, and to their mind it seemed to have a significance attached to activities some years back. In all cases, though, there seemed to be a preference for the word "Liberal" in either provincial or federal spheres.

The matter has been discussed in these columns in a general way on previous occasions, but this time it is done with the definite knowledge that the word "Liberal" has many more backers than the term "Reformer." So, bowing to the will of the majority, in future "Liberal" it shall be.

Good Managers.

STRANGE that people never think of that cracked grate in the furnace until the day they want to light the fire. Queer, too, that they should never have noticed the hole in the stovepipe big enough to throw a cat through until it was time to operate the heating plant. It's not time to put on the storm windows and doors yet, so don't worry about them. You know there are two or three panes of glass that will have to be replaced, but never mind, there's apt to be a few days or so of warm weather, and there will be plenty of time to fix the broken windows when you decide to put them on.

You haven't much coal, but you have not ordered any wood yet to help you out. The weather has been

favorable, and so we just let the thing slide.

And you remember that overcoat last winter. You were going to wear it a little longer, but it must go to the tailor shop to be lined and fixed up a bit. Well, wait until the first cold day and then rush down when every person else is urging the tailor to save a life by having the winter coat in shape.

Meantime the old garden hose cracks and warps as it hangs on the branch of the apple tree in the backyard, and the lawn mower is just where you left it ten days ago. The rake, the spade and the hoe are—well, we don't know, but we won't need them until the spring, so why worry about them now?

The Bank of England.

WRITING in an American financial paper, an expert on banking pays his respects to the Money Market of England, and to the Bank of England in particular. Concluding his remarks on the Money Market, he turns to the Bank of England:

"The center of it is the Bank of England, which is known throughout Great Britain simply as 'the Bank.'"

"The other banks are only buffers in any time of high pressure. Any sudden or prolonged strain comes on the Bank. This is the secret of the enormous strength and recuperative power of the Money Market."

"The Bank first opened its doors 228 years ago, and it has been standing the strain of wars, panics and European governments ever since. It has had eight generations of experience in withstanding financial shocks."

"There is no other bank like it. It is private and yet it has the government behind it. All other banks in the clearing house are required to keep balances in the Bank of England. It receives all taxes and carries all government overdrafts. It has full power to do anything that needs to be done to meet an emergency."

"No matter what happens, the Bank never stops functioning. When the outside discount houses refuse to discount bills, the Bank will, at its own price."

"To tell the truth, the Bank has good reason to like a crisis. It makes most of its profits out of stringencies. In every crisis, London bankers and brokers say that 'the market is in the Bank.'"

"If a very serious crisis comes, as it did at the beginning of the war, the Bank can declare a moratorium. It can prevent bankruptcies by the delay of payments. When the crisis is over payments are resumed."

"Then, if it comes to the worst, the Bank Charter Act is suspended, and the Bank can issue paper money without any gold basis. This was done in 1914."

So, the London Money Market is like a reservoir of rivers and reservoirs, all centering around a great central reservoir; and the keepers of the central reservoir have power to turn off all taps and to pump from a deep well."

"Such a system is as safe from panic and disaster as any human institution possibly can be. It does not depend upon any man or any institution or any government. It is a vast system of protection, improved by two centuries of vicissitudes."

Viviani and the Kaiser.

THE publication of the ex-kaiser's memoirs is being variously received. At some points it is bringing forth protests, based on the charge that the narrative is German propaganda, written with the idea of making it possible for the ex-kaiser to return to Germany, and once more tie imperialism on the neck of the German people. Eight years ago Wilhelm II. thought he was the most powerful man in the world. More than that he held himself accountable to no earthly tribunal. He talked glibly, even to the point of blasphemy of his divine right to rule and of the favor with which the Almighty looked upon his conduct of affairs in Germany. What he wished was of itself right and law. All who dared to oppose his policies were in danger of being broken and undone.

Such was the man who launched the world war, and such was the spirit of the men with whom he was associated.

What have we today? The man who regarded the Reichstag as an honorable and useful body only so long as it did what he wanted, now submits his case to the parliament of mankind. Such a change is hard to explain, especially as he writes in a tone of one who anticipated that the verdict had already been lodged against him.

Some of his excuses are accusations. One critic, who is following the series closely, remarks that even Napoleon III. at Sedan could preface his offer of surrender by the words: "Not having been able to find death at the head of my troops. . . ."

The ex-kaiser has not even access to this comforting phrase, and that excellent spirit of heroism and sacrifice must be the weight of events and the necessity of truth be eliminated from the memoirs of Wilhelm II.

THE ADVERTISER is running the Kaiser's memoirs because it believes it is a document of world-wide importance. It is not being used in order that the ex-kaiser may have an opportunity to set himself right with the world, for such a thing is impossible. It is a document of world importance, showing the workings of the mind of the man who was thrown with volcanic intensity in the face of the world in 1914.

In order that there may be no doubt of the stand of this paper in the matter, arrangements have been made, and contracts signed, whereby, on the conclusion of the memoirs of Wilhelm II., we will proceed with the publication of "The Mistakes of the Kaiser," written by RENE VIVIANI, the strong man of France, who has been a student of European history for years, and intimately in-

touch with the very things of which the ex-kaiser writes.

Looking over a short survey of the VIVIANI series, one is forced to the conclusion that the writer has laid bare the places where the German monarch erred grievously and deliberately. He takes up the manner in which the Hohenzollerns conquered the throne, the manner in which Wilhelm was educated, and how he got rid of BISMARCK. From there he turns to the co-operation in Germany between militarism and capitalism—how four times, in 1905, 1907, 1911 and 1913 Europe was on the verge of war because of the attitude of Germany. Then VIVIANI comes to the fateful 1914, to the impression of the King of Belgium when he saw the Kaiser—VIVIANI's own story of his trip with POINCARÉ to Russia, and what they found in Petersburg—his supreme efforts to stop war, how France, England and Russia did all that was in their power to stop the declaration of war. The French writer then turns to the Kaiser with his twelve proofs that the Allies wanted war, and one which he disposes of.

In conclusion, VIVIANI compares the wealthy situation of the Kaiser now to the lot of Napoleon after his defeat, concluding with the appeal that democracy is the one and only thing that can save and remake Germany. The whole document of VIVIANI bristles with sharp passages, and has the weight of plain fact behind it. There will be little left of Wilhelm II. by the time VIVIANI finishes with him.

The readers of THE ADVERTISER in these two great narratives have before them a mass of world information, which it is not possible to secure in any other way. It is history written and discussed by the men who have made it.

LITTLE 'TISERS

The long skirts will cover a multitude of shins.

CONSTANTINE is in flight. Better that than in the cemetery.

It's a great thing to be able to look wise and not spoil it afterward.

LENINE is back on the job, and it appears his last illness was no more fatal than the others.

If this craze keeps up, Europe's big men will adopt the slogan, "If in doubt, write a memoir."

A man never knows how many things grow in tin cans until he keeps house for a few days.

Ladies first—shopping experts say they spend 76 per cent of the money that goes over the counter.

Coal miners went back to work at their old wages, which suggests that all they got was a five-month spell between pay days.

An exchange tells of the millions of toy balloons made in United States—all of which will give the folks there something to blow about.

Speaking of Canadian politics, Conservatives figure they won a great victory at the last election because they weren't wiped off the map entirely.

An acre of sea yields more food in the way of fish than an acre of the finest ground in the world. But, of course, there are poor fishermen as well as poor farmers.

Of statistics there be no end. Now we are told that United States people use an average of eight lead pencils per head each year. Some buy a lot, while others borrow them.

It is announced that Ford is richer than JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER. But it's a fact that Ford has ROCKEFELLER, for every car that is wheeled out of his plant means another customer for oil and gas.

United States uses two million tons of sand per year to make glass. Quite a heap, no doubt, and there must have been quite a few tons put into our friend Canadian Dollar Bill to make him get up from \$2 to 100 cents on Wall Street.

About time some of those "large and influential deputations" were getting around calling on prospective candidates. If a man's in the right expectant frame of mind it doesn't take much of a notion on his part to grow into said "large and influential deputation."

A movement is under way to eliminate the trained wild animal show. The claim is made that the training of these animals is done under conditions that are excessively cruel, because it is only through the introduction of the element of positive fear, brought about by torture, that the wild animals can be made to jump and perform at the crack of the whip.

When voters in Los Angeles go to the polls this fall they will have a chance to make more than 100 marks on the ballot paper. A dozen or so city measures are on the list, as well as matters under petition, state, congressional, judicial and legislative choices. If a man is missing for a week after election day it can still be said without alarming the relatives that he's just gone out to vote.

The referee's report in the famous STILLMAN case is a victory for the wife, and also establishes the legitimacy of her son, which was attacked. Surely the family have had their family affairs dragged through court enough to get out and stay out and forget any and all appeals. It

Brain Testers

There are two English words which contain, each of them, ten letters, and six of these are a b c d e and f, the first six letters of the alphabet. Can you build up either or both of these two words?

Yesterday's answer: Gray, Moore, Byron, Pope, Dryden, Gay, Keats and Hemans.

has been demonstrated that a man and woman in the millionaire class with divorce inclinations can spend a pile of money, make front-page material and get nowhere.

Just a few months ago some of the experts had the population sitting up nights wondering if they were eating or inhaling enough vitamins. It was a serious period through which these experts led us, but we were brave and followed. Now comes some medical man with seven letters behind his name and exposes the whole thing as a fraud, a snare and a delusion. Thus is our faith both vitaminized and undermined in the one season.

Here's a house for sale, advertised in the *Chester Enterprise*. It is solid brick, on the main street, and on a lot about 50x40 feet. Surely there must be something wrong about the size of that lot. The folks in the smaller centers poke no end of fun at the cities for the way in which the houses are jammed and crowded in one beside the other. The rural editors make rude jokes at the backyards of the city, where they assert, there is no room to swing a cat by the tail. Come now, tell us how it is that in the tidy little town of Chester they happen to "carve the lots 40x50 feet."

TO THE EDITOR

H. C. WELLS' HISTORY.

Sir,—Anyone who has taken the course in the universities on the early history of the human race will admit that the scientific epitome now running through The Advertiser, written by H. C. Wells, is a model of conciseness and lucidity. One feature that commends Wells' outline of history of primitive man for popular reading compared with most of the works on paleoanthropology is the minimization of mere speculation.

To the individual who has never pondered on the long series of arduous steps in the ascent of man, the oft-repeated saying, "We are the heirs of all the ages," can have little meaning. How much loftier a conception it gives of the work of the Great Architect to think of His breathing an immortal and responsible spirit into a living vessel, prepared to receive it, than the ruder theory that it is gradually superseding just as the round globe theory has almost superseded that of the flat earth. Even if by long-standing predilection one finds it impossible to allegorize the older theory, the careful perusal of Wells' history will remove his perplexity when he is asked to answer the question, Where did Cain get his wife?

What science has revealed of the history of primitive man has been in the past largely the limited possession of the university class, but now that the evidence of several of the important steps is generally accepted the interesting story is being written down to the capacity of school child-

ren. The current number of Primary Education, probably the most widely read journal that there is for elementary teachers, gives seven columns to lessons on the cave-dwelling stage of the human race—the ninth installment in this series for the junior grades. Teachers working out the course for their pupils will find these chapters of Wells' History very helpful reading.

MORE ABOUT WELLS.

Sir,—I have read the plaint of James D. Lamont of Forest, Ont., which appeared in your issue of Friday last under the caption: "Wells and the Bible," along with your editorial comment on the same. It would be easier to credit Mr. Lamont with absolute sincerity in trying to discredit Wells, and the evolutionary theory of man's origin, than with either critical or biblical or scientific attainments. This writer affects to take The Advertiser to task for printing "the rubbish that Wells writes about man being descended from an ape," etc. Expanding this he asserts: "Such rubbish is in direct contradiction to the Bible, which states in the first chapter of Genesis that 'God created man in His own image, male and female created He them.' To say anything else is to make God a liar."

This is a pretty strong charge to make, with nothing in such justification but a mere mechanical interpretation of the Bible, to back it up. The priestly account does indeed teach that "God created man in His own image," etc.; that is in the generic sense, male and female of the human race. In Genesis, chapter II., makes God create the man alone, from the "dust of the ground," (sime of the ground Vulgate). Here the making of the woman is an afterthought condition—on the welfare of the man and formed from an integral part of his body. Hence according to this second and independent narrative the woman was not so much made in the image of God as in the image of the man. This idea, Mr. Lamont, will please observe, is elaborated and endorsed by the Apostle Paul in I. Corinthians, xi., 7-9. Each of these creation stories has its own distinctive purpose and peculiar literary excellence, and the unknown compiler or redactor showed rare judgment in preserving them as parallel accounts. The Priestly account, and which may be called imaginative history sets forth God, or Elohim, as the author of all things and by a succession of six creative days, followed by a rest day, to settle the legality of the Sabbath law. The Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Now, to take statements from these ancient accounts as authoritative history to do, and to dispute on such ground the claim now very widely held by the foremost religious thinkers of the day, that man was a development from the ape or other animal ancestor, betrays as it seems to me, at least, poor judgment. Where the Jewish version is evidently mythical and sets forth, tentatively, by means of exquisite symbolism, the origin of the family and the home and the sanctity of the marriage tie.



H. G. WELLS' FAMOUS OUTLINE OF HISTORY The Romance of Mother Earth

A New Setting for the Human Drama.

TODAY'S INSTALLMENT—20.

It was about 12,000 or fewer years ago that, with the spread of forests and a great change of the fauna, the long prevalence of the hunting life in Europe drew to its end. Reindeer vanished, bringing with them new diseases. There may have been prehistoric pestilences. For many centuries