

had hardly hoped to see more, and soon we steamed into our New Orleans dock. Our trip over, thanking the reader for his kind attention through this rather dry narration of a few of our experiences, I will now conclude with a hearty good-bye.

A Religious Animal.

Somebody, I have forgotten who—but that makes no difference—defined man as “the religious animal.” It was claimed by some that this definition was complete, because no other animal could be thus defined. But certainly it is not complete unless it includes ALL MEN as well as excludes ALL OTHER animals. This brings up the question, are all men religious? If there is or was such a creature as a man utterly devoid of religious sentiment or capability, and the fact could be demonstrated, it would overthrow the theory that man is necessarily a “religious animal” and vitiate the above definition, and also there ought to have been at some time and at some place a race or nation of people totally without this distinguishing attribute; but history shows conclusively that every race of men, no matter how ignorant or degraded, worship in some manner some real or supposed superior being. True, many people may seem to us to be entirely without religious sentiment. But if we think of the matter closely we arrive at the conclusion that they are merely lacking in the manifestation of some particular religion—the religion around about them. In this Christian land we call a man irreligious who does not conform to the Christian

religion. True he may not be a Christian, but he may be a heathen, or a Mohammedan, or a Confucian. But some may ask about the Atheist? My opinion is that a man who can look abroad on creation and deny the existence of a creator, should be classed either as an idiot or a liar.

The Lord of heaven and earth will provide for the former, and Satan knows his own children and will take charge of the latter. I do not believe that an intelligent atheist exists. A man may declare himself an atheist, but I am glad that no law compels me to believe him. For these and many other reasons I believe that the definition in question is complete.

B. C. P.

A Leaky Theory.

A well known Texas newspaper writer says boys ought not to be sent away from home to be educated, and gives as a reason that “they are liable to learn somethings not in the books.” If the facilities for an education exists “at home” there can be no question as to that being the best place to acquire it. But these facilities do not exist everywhere, or at all homes. How then? If an education were a thing that could be ordered by mail or express, or shipped as freight, then it might be best not to be had at home, one must go where it is to be had, or do without it. To adopt the views of the writer in question would be to deny to a large majority the advantage of an education, except possibly the merest rudiments—the three R’s for instance. The objection that the boys away from home are apt to learn some-