

worlds of matter, life, intelligence, morality and love, Natural Science declares:

(1) All living physical organisms are expressions of spiritual laws and forces.

(2) Human love and altruism are ethical phenomena governed by the intelligent soul.

Thus it is that the higher science accepts, only in part, the system of evolution as promulgated in "The Descent of Man." Thus it is that it accepts, only in part, the evolution of love as embodied in "The Ascent of Man."

Without rejecting the minutest physical fact which has, as yet, been discovered by modern physical science, Natural Science hopes to show to the careful investigator that modern intelligence has not as yet correctly interpreted its own array of fact.

On the contrary, the reader is asked to note the fact that the propositions of Natural Science enclose the discoveries and deductions of physical science, as the law of motion and number encloses the principles and propositions of Euclid.

ARTS Split Pro

CHAPTER VIII.

THE LAW OF NATURAL SELECTION.

Darwinism is no longer disputed in so far as the logic of actual physical facts is concerned. The physical evolution of man from lower forms is the generally adopted theory—of physical evolution.

While that elaborate system contains philosophic errors, its recorded facts constitute one of the great steps in the higher intellectual evolution of man. Through Darwin's noble life work the common intelligence is familiarized with the idea of evolution, if not with all of its facts and principles.

The world, however, has been unduly impressed and depressed by the Darwinian doctrine itself, by those mere theories by which Darwin accounted for the physical facts he brought to light. The world somehow gives that great scientist credit for furnishing the facts as well as his opinions concerning their origin.

Nature, it must be remembered, furnishes these facts. Mr. Darwin only discovered them to the world.

More than this, Darwin discovered but a limited range of data. He was not in a position to demonstrate all of the facts of the evolution of man. His theories, therefore, as to the factors and causes of evolution, are of no greater value than those of any other intelligent reasoner having the same physical facts before him. It seems inevitable, however, that the public once having accepted the tangible evidences discovered by a man, will accept his opinions also.

Darwinism forcibly illustrates this. For years his opinions filled the world with consternation. It requires considerable re-

flection to see that a physical fact of Nature is one thing, and a theory explaining that fact is quite another.

It requires a certain amount of independence to declare that Darwinism does not account for man as he really is, an intelligent and moral being, as well as a physical one.

In this connection it will be recalled that Alfred Russel Wallace wholly dissents from Darwin's theories. Mr. Wallace, the co-worker with Mr. Darwin for thirty years, and his collaborator in "The Descent of Man," yet disagrees with the doctrines of physical materialism. During his entire life of investigation as a physical scientist Mr. Wallace was investigating another line of phenomena than those attaching to the physical evolution of man. For fifty-three years he has been investigating modern spiritualism. In this investigation he brought to bear all of the tests and experiments known to physical science. He also brought to bear the cold rational judgments of a man trained in the practical methods of that school.

The result is that Alfred Russel Wallace declares that the phenomena of spiritualism are not demonstrable under physical laws, nor according to physical methods of analysis. He declares, therefore, that Nature has a super-physical, or spiritual side which demands the best efforts of science. "The Descent of Man" stands for half the life work of this profound student of Nature. His late work, however, "Miracles and Modern Spiritualism," stands for judgment rendered after a lifetime of investigation.

Thus, it appears that the two men who were co-workers in the same field of science and discovered the same physical facts, have reached diametrically opposite conclusions as to the meanings of those facts. This demonstrates, perhaps, more clearly than any other well-known example, the value of mere opinion.

Mere protest, however, against Darwinism, is no proof of its fallacy or insufficiency. To protest against, or to deny that elaborate array of fact and theory, is quite another thing from disproving either part of it. Mere intuition and faith in super-

physical phenomena prove nothing. There is but one class of proof that can be brought to bear in refutation of physical materialism. That proof is simply a personal and exact knowledge of the spiritual side of Nature and the persistence of life after physical death.

While Darwin's doctrine contravenes Nature, its apparently solid basis of fact renders disproof extremely difficult.

This detracts from Mr. Wallace's judgments. Valuable as have been his observations and significant as are his conclusions, they are, nevertheless, only observations and conclusions as far as the public is concerned. Mr. Wallace merely reports those phenomena which are visible and tangible to the physical senses. He is not himself a demonstrator of the spiritual side of Nature. He is not personally able to analyze or to control spiritual elements and forces. He is not in a position to either see or hear the sights and sounds belonging to the spiritual plane. He is not in a position to communicate independently with spiritual people. He is not in position to analyze spiritual material, nor to exercise his psychical powers upon the spiritual plane.

Mr. Wallace is simply a physical scientist reporting the physical effects of unseen, unanalyzed and unconquered spiritual principles, elements and forces. For this reason his carefully collated evidences can have but a limited value. He does not say, "I know." He says, "I believe thus and so." He does not say, "I have traveled in that country; I report the evidences of my own spiritual senses. I know whereof I speak."

Even the higher science cannot furnish, by publication, what is meant by "proof," nor does it undertake such a task. It pretends to do no more than science does everywhere by publication, viz., to report what has been proved by scientific methods. It adopts the usual and only method that any science can pursue by publication, viz.:

(1) It presents an array of scientifically demonstrated facts of Nature.

(2) It refers each inquirer to Nature itself if he demands actual proof of the statements made.

This is all that any student or any specialist or any school of science can do by mere publication.

There is but one known way of proving anything in Nature. It does not matter whether the thing to be proved belongs to the physical or to the spiritual plane. Actual proof rests upon personal investigation and personal demonstration of each particular fact.

For illustration: No man can prove the science of numbers without acquainting himself with the rules and practice of arithmetic, algebra, etc. He may, through hearsay, believe in mathematics. Proof, however, is self-demonstration.

The world at large has accepted the doctrine of evolution upon its faith in the integrity of Darwin and faith in his report upon Nature. The average Darwinian is no more prepared to prove the facts set forth by Darwin than the theologian is prepared to demonstrate the fact of life after physical death.

After all, public education is conducted mainly by faith. The average mind accepts as truth that which it believes emanates from sane and truthful teachers and investigators. Nor is the world mistaken in its faith. Experience shows that men do not knowingly nor knavishly propound false systems of religion or philosophy or science. The intention of intelligence and the trend of development are ever toward the truths in Nature.

In this respect the higher science looks to public faith in its integrity just as physical science does. It can do no more than to state facts of Nature and challenge the world to an investigation.

Darwinism is something more than a scientific treatise. It is also a system of philosophy. The skillfulness with which the bare, tangible, physical facts of Nature are interwoven with Darwin's theoretical factors and causes, renders criticism difficult. This Darwinian doctrine is nothing more than the best interpretation which Mr. Darwin could put upon the actual, tangible

facts which he discovered. Those theories are ingenious. They are not, however, so broad as those of Mr. Wallace. The one propounds a theory which might account for the evolution of the physical body, while the other suggests laws and forces which might account for the higher phenomena of intelligence, morality and love. The one insists that all phenomena are based upon physical laws and forces, while the other holds that spiritual phenomena have super-physical causes.

The Darwinian theory is well summed up in that now famous proposition which reads, "The Struggle for Nutrition compels Natural Selection with Reproduction as a consequence, entailing divergence of character and extermination of less improved Species."

This proposition which is set forth as the unalterable fiat of Nature is, instead, but an assumption of Mr. Darwin himself. It is merely the summing up of his individual opinion as to the factors and causes of evolution.

According to Darwin, this law of natural selection includes that multiplicity of acts and expedients to which all living things are driven by reason of a struggle for nutrition in the midst of a hostile environment. As will be seen, this law rests upon the assumption that the primary cause of all struggle on the part of a living entity is a demand for food. It assumes that there are no other principles involved than the preservation of physical life. According to this law, all that a man is or can become is referable to the original hunger of the original life cell, and the hostile environment which compels a struggle for nutrition.

This theory rests upon two assumptions, viz.:

(1) That of physical hunger as a compelling motive for action.

(2) That Nature, so prolific in the generation of life and so lavish in nutriment of life, is yet hostile to life.

With this construction put upon Nature, the law of natural selection becomes a law of self-defense. The selections dealt with are simply alternatives and expedients to which animals and

men are driven in the struggle for nutrition. This view of life and the progress of life excludes any principle of a really *natural* selection. It excludes the operation of an individual will and desire on the part of an entity to do thus or so. According to this doctrine progress is effected, not by any innate impelling principle, but is compelled by exterior conditions which force the individual in this or that direction.

This is all that Darwinian doctrine means when one accepts feeding as the original and only necessity and hostility as a compelling principle. This reading of Nature leaves no place for natural selection, that is, for acts and accomplishments brought about through the uncompelled choice of an organized intelligence. When we say of an organized intelligence that it does thus or so naturally, we mean that it responds voluntarily to a natural and innate impulse. It is meant that an intelligent entity, either animal or man, voluntarily seeks an individual satisfaction in this or that direction. We do not mean that it does thus or so because it is driven into a corner by hostile environment and compelled to make this or that selection in self-defense.

For example, take cattle that are grazing in a meadow which adjoins a field of corn. The cattle, barred from the corn, are feeding upon the grass. In this act of feeding we see the struggle for nutrition. In that the field of corn is fenced, we note the hostile environment which, in this case, is an artificial environment, erected by superior intelligence. If, however, the bars are let down, the cattle at once abandon the grass for the corn. They refuse to feed upon grass.

Why is this? How does Darwin's "law of natural selection" explain this simple act? How does it account for that instant, intelligent and voluntary choice and discrimination as between foods? How is this act explained by a struggle for nutrition in the midst of a hostile environment? In what sense was this preference for corn compelled by the struggle for nutrition?

Does it not rather indicate an innate power of selection in the animal which expresses itself as an individual choice?

A horse would possibly feed upon potatoes should food be scarce, that is, should conditions be hostile. This would be selection in accordance with Darwin's theory of selection, a choice compelled by hostile environment. No one doubts but the horse would return to oats on the first opportunity, with every sign of approval. This last act of voluntary selection is one, however, which Darwinism does not explain.

Indeed, physical science fails to explain the law which governs the selection and discrimination as to foods, on the part of animals as well as men. Attention to this one phenomenon alone would break down the theory of selection by compulsion, or evolution by hostile physical circumstance. It would be discovered that organized intelligence selects its foods in conformity to the law of vibration. Such investigation would disclose another principle of selection, viz., that of affinity, rather than that of hostility.

Darwin's law of natural selection is, in reality, a theory of unnatural selections. It is one that leaves organized intelligence the mere puppet of blind physical forces and of hostile physical conditions. Natural selection under this theory might well be likened to the natural selection a condemned criminal would make if given the choice of death by the rope or the guillotine.

Instead of natural selections Darwin's theory imposes a series of evils from which the victim, animal or man, must make choice or die. His law of natural selection involves simply:

- (1) Blind mechanical forces.
- (2) Hunger.
- (3) Organs of digestion.
- (4) Hostile conditions of Nature.
- (5) Repeated processes of feeding and breeding.

In the light of such assumptions man is the automatic result of mechanical principles, blind physical demands, hostile conditions and competitive processes. He comes to be what he is solely through physical re-enforcement from without and by compulsory selections brought about by hostile environment.

He is simply an effect of the digestive organs. He is a mass of inherited impulses, passions and sensations, acted upon by external physical forces and held together through processes of digestion.

This is a theory which precludes the idea that an organic entity is an individual operated by an individual and intelligent Will and Desire.

The famous Darwinian proposition, already quoted, could well be paraphrased to express yet another view of this "Law of Natural Selection." The struggle for nutrition means, of course, the struggle for physical life, from which may be derived another proposition laying down self-preservation as the first law of life. Darwin would be fairly stated if one were to say: "The struggle for self-preservation compels a battle of the physically strong against the physically weak, with survival of the physically fittest as a consequence, entailing the supremacy of the physically strong and extermination of the physically weak and incompetent."

Physical science, relying upon its "Law of Natural Selection," must also rest upon this correlated proposition which declares that self-preservation is the first law of being. By "self-preservation," physical science always means the self-preservation of physical life. With this as an underlying motive of all struggle, the battle of the physically strong against the physically weak, with survival of the fittest, becomes the natural and only mode of progress. By "fittest" it must be remembered, physical science always means the physically fittest.

There is but one flaw in this otherwise perfect theory, viz., Nature refutes it.

Science shows that this planet of ours passed from a stage of non-life to life. How? By hostility to life, or by hospitality to life? It shows that the simpler forms appear first. It reveals a steady ascent from lower to higher forms, from simple to complex. It reveals the extinction of certain forms of life.

Does it, however, show extermination or even diminution of the lower forms or of the physically weak? On the contrary,

does science not discover an increase of life in its simple and weaker forms? The earth, air and water teem with life in its very lowest form. The earth is simply alive with animalculæ. A whole world of this infinitesimal life feeds upon the blood and tissue of the physically strong. Indeed, the physically strong are the store-houses for the physically weak.

If competition instead of co-operation were really the fundamental principle in Nature, this solid earth had not been crystallized, the vegetable kingdom had not appeared, animal life would not have been a possibility, human civilization could not have been accomplished. If life from the beginning were a battle of the physically strong against the physically weak, the weaker insects and animals could not survive and multiply, nor would insect life feed upon the stronger animals and thus breed and multiply.

If evolution really meant a survival of the physically strongest, mastodons would occupy the place of mosquitoes. In truth, however, the mastodon is extinct while the mosquito survives in great abundance. If evolution were a survival of merely the fittest physically, lions and tigers and the strong rapacious animals would have rendered human life an impossibility. If Nature were, indeed, hostile to life, this planet had not progressed from its original state of non-life to this prodigious multiplication of life. When we consider the extinction of the mastodon and the persistence of the mosquito, is there not something absurd in this theory of the battle of the strong against the weak?

In the same way exception must be taken to the theory that self-preservation of physical life is the fundamental law of life. This is another of those "universal laws" which history and experience, as well as the higher science, contravene.

Love of life is a universal passion.

This, however, is not saying that the preservation of physical life is the first law of being. If so, what about the law which impels a widowed bird to refuse to eat, to droop and to die? What of the law which impels a dog to starve upon its master's grave?