

If preservation of physical life be the first law of life, how shall we account for the fact that men risk death in every conceivable form, too often for causes that are trivial and unnecessary?

The history of man is the history of war, of life risked in battle. If self-preservation of physical life were the fundamental law of life there had never been war, nor deeds of daring and courage, nor heroes, nor sacrifice even down to death. There had never been suicide, nor suicidal neglect of physical life. There had not been a vast army of religious martyrs.

Darwin's law of natural selection covers also what he terms sex selections. Sex, in its physical and functional capacities, receives minute analysis. Sex selections, however, are interpreted to meet the requirements of the general law of natural selection, or selection by compulsion. Primarily, sex is considered purely as a physical desire for reproduction. Sex attraction is interpreted as something compelled by and dependent upon biological need for reproduction. While the value of sex selection is admitted, the sex relation itself is construed to meet the theory of evolution by necessity. Indeed, sex passion and sex love are defined as a "procreative mania," by force of which organic intelligences are driven into obeying "Nature's first command—reproduction."

Thus, even that profound and voluntary bond between the two great powers in Nature is construed as a relation compelled and forced upon animal and man by a gross physical passion, which amounts to a "mania." Sex, according to Darwin, has no other uses than the physical. Those uses are solely in the interests, not of the individual, but of species. When it has thus analyzed sex it is done with it. Anything higher, by way of intellectual or moral necessity, is undreamed of.

The force and value of physical breeding are exhaustively treated by Darwin. The numerous phases of heredity are noted. He claims, however, that all variety in traits or conditions are but the effects of repeated processes of feeding or of repeated experiments in breeding.

This is a theory of the evolution of man and the uses of sex in Nature, which is fairly logical as long as we consider the physical organism only. When we come, however, to questions relating to increase of intelligence and the origin and development of love and altruism, the theory hopelessly fails. Intelligence is so distinctly super-physical that it refuses to be accounted for by the automatic operations of the digestive organs. Love is so distinctly a super-physical phenomenon that no amount of physical fact nor ingenious theory can explain it as a mere efflorescence of a "procreative mania." Sex passion, considered by itself, scarcely suggests to intelligence what intelligence observes and feels and knows as sex love. Lust without love is everywhere recognized as the most selfish of human passions; whereas, love, including physical passion, is the most unselfish sentiment known in this world. Mere physical sex passion and pure sex love are so unlike in their nature and expression as to appear the very reverse of each other.

While Darwin refers sex love to the physical passions, he escaped the embarrassment of seeking to account for morality and altruism. He is satisfied that the personal love relations of human life are the outgrowth of the procreative tyranny. When he comes, however, to that class of ethical phenomena which we know as morality and altruism, he avoids the issue by defining them as "abnormal." Finding no logical cause for such phenomena in the battle of the strong against the weak, they are dismissed as unnatural, and therefore unaccountable in science. Having decided, according to the law of compulsory selection, that Nature sought the survival of the physically fittest, Darwin condemns philanthropy. He condemns it first, because it is unnatural, and next, because it cares for the unfit and incompetent children of men.

Physical materialism thus sets up standards of life and conduct which are worthy of savagery. It inculcates principles which would destroy civilization.

Nobody believes that Mr. Darwin really wanted to check

philanthropy or to exterminate the weak and incompetent. That, however, is his doctrine. The probabilities are that Darwin himself was a philanthropist. His personal life undoubtedly contradicted his own theory. He probably cared as tenderly for his own family, when weak or incompetent, as would the reader. It is likely that he would have been the first to protest had England passed a law to kill all of the weak and unfit subjects of that realm. This barbarous suggestion, which nobody has ever thought of applying to society, simply illustrates how far a man's theories may contradict the common impulses and the common sense of mankind.

This is an interpretation of man and his evolution which fails to satisfy human intelligence. The best intelligence of the age insists that whatever is, is natural. It insists that whatever exists as universal phenomena is susceptible of analysis and demonstration under natural law. It insists that phenomena, universally attaching to organic life under given conditions, must be natural. This includes phenomena which are intellectual and ethical as well as physical and material. It holds that no doctrine of evolution is complete until it accounts for man as he is, an intelligent and moral being, inhabiting a physical body.

Intelligence claims that there can be no "law of natural selection" except at the same time it is a *natural* law of selection, viz., a law of selection whereby the intelligent selector voluntarily chooses to do or not to do a given thing. These are the claims of intelligence. These claims constitute a demand upon science. This is a task for which physical science is not equipped. It is one which the higher science undertakes.

A fundamental error of Darwinism has become a fundamental error of physical science in general, viz., the suppression or obscuration of the individual.

The effect of Darwinism upon the uninformed mind is universally the same. It leaves the individual reader profoundly impressed with the utter insignificance of individual life, aspiration and effort. On the other hand, it advances species to

formidable proportions. Nature appears an insatiate monster, engaged in grinding out species at the expense of every individual. There are no forces but mechanical ones, no principles except compulsory ones, no environment that is not hostile. There are no processes except those of battle and competition. There are no motives except selfish ones. There are no rewards for intelligence except physical and material benefits. There is no future for the individual intelligence except as he physically contributes to species.

There is no escape from these conclusions when once the mind accepts the Darwinian theory as to the factors and causes of evolution.

Darwinism is the effort to analyze and account for species. It does not undertake a study of the individual as an individual. To determine the causes which differentiate and improve species is the motive of Darwin's effort. This complete absorption in species almost entirely obscures the individual. The origin and development of species overshadow the life and the purposes of the individual. Absorbed in the study of aggregates, the units lose their value, except as an integral part of the whole. The individual has no place in Nature, except as he conserves or contributes to the whole; that is, to the sum of physical life.

The effect of this doctrine upon the human mind is deplorable. When applied to animals the theory seems rather plausible, for the lives and the employments of animals appear very gross to us. We have little sympathy with the struggles of the individual animal. When we come to man, however, it is very different. Here we protest against any science or any philosophy which wipes out the value of individual life and effort.

History, experience and intuition unite in disclaiming these deductions of physical materialism. They unite in proclaiming the value of the individual, both to himself and to the world.

In still another respect the individual suffers in both Darwinian science and theory. Whatever attention he does receive in the study of species is attention confined to the operation of his

physical functions. How and why it feeds, how and why it breeds, are the only questions put to the individual by physical science. Nothing is considered except that which an organism absorbs and digests, or that which it absorbs and reproduces. Living itself is ignored. Neither animal nor man is considered apart from the physical functions. Life is ignored for that which sustains life, and for that which perpetuates life.

Even in the sex relation the individual plays only a physical part. He is simply the victim of a "procreative mania" which compels sex selection. He is never seen as the voluntary co-operator with another individual for the attainment of an individual object. Physical science discovers nothing in sex but its physical uses and purposes. A particular, intellectual and moral purpose, it has never yet perceived.

The relation of man and woman is held to be the same relation as that which obtains between animals, viz., a physical one for the purposes of procreation. No higher implications as to sex have ever been discovered by physical science. No higher purpose has been seen in that universal cleavage and attraction between Nature's positive and receptive powers.

So completely has this unfortunate doctrine fastened itself upon modern science that one eminent specialist\* publicly deplores our monogamous system of marriage. Instead, he gravely advocates a practically free selection with children reared by the state.

So continually has this erroneous sex doctrine been exploited by physical science that a new moral philosophy is based upon the theory that sex is but a "physical device for reproduction" and that sex love is "essentially lust."

This degenerate view of the sex relation and office is the inevitable result of a science which deals with the physical side of Nature only. This is the inevitable doctrine of a school which subordinates the mental and moral development of the

\*Letorneau.

individual to the physical improvement and preservation of species.

Physical science has never yet undertaken to define the sex principle. Indeed, sex has never yet been analyzed, as a principle, to modern intelligence. It has been taught by science in its physical, functional capacity alone. This is an error of science which is reflected back upon society through false literary and social doctrines involving sex questions and relations.

"The Ascent of Man," already quoted as the exponent of a new moral philosophy, falls a victim to these scientific errors of the modern school.

The life and the profession of the author of this new moral philosophy satisfied him that morality, love and altruism are perfectly natural phenomena. His observation and experience among men satisfied him that these are legitimate facts in life, resultant from natural causes. His determination to seek the cause and to explain the process of the moral order in Nature is commendable. His attempt, however, based as it is upon the assumptions of physical materialism, necessarily proves a failure.

In accepting Darwin's "physical basis of evolution," he accepts the "law of natural selection" with scarcely a qualifying clause. That is to say, he agrees that everything that is in the physical world came to be through compulsions or enforced selections. The moralist goes even further than does physical science. The Darwinian is content to say that everything physical and intellectual was evolved by the operation of a law of self-defense.

The moralist not only admits this assumption, but he goes so far as to say that everything moral was evolved by a law of self-sacrifice imposed upon the female in Nature. Physical science is satisfied to say that physical and intellectual phenomena arise by compulsions. The moralist, however, insists in so many words that love also came into the world "at the point of the sword."

"The Ascent of Man," therefore, practically agrees with the

principles laid down in "The Descent of Man." The moralist enlarges the view of Nature only by the introduction of a second class of physical compulsions and a different line of effects which have been overlooked by physical materialism. The moralist simply turns from a consideration of enforced physical competitions to enforced physical sacrifices. He merely insists that the reproductive function equals that of nutrition in power and effect. In both systems the individual is equally the victim of Nature. In both systems the law of selection is a law of compulsion.

The agreement of the moralist with physical materialism is disclosed in the following statement:\* "What controls it (life)," says Mr. Drummond, "are its functions. These and only these determine life; living out these is life. \* \* \* The rationale of living is revealed for us in protoplasm. Protoplasm sets life its task. \* \* \* The activities even of the higher life \* \* \* are determined by these same lines."

The differences indicated here, as between the theories of the moralist and those of the materialist, are differences without distinctions. The materialist simply centers upon nutrition as the cause of physical and intellectual phenomena. The other selects reproduction as the cause of all ethical phenomena. Thus, the moralist admits what the skeptic claims, viz., that the evolution of man has a basis in the physical functions and is governed by hostile environment. The skeptic evolves a physical and intelligent being out of the universal struggle for nutrition in the midst of a hostile environment, while the theologian evolves a moral being out of the struggle for reproduction as made by the female in the midst of a hostile environment.

Thus, observing those two bright intellectual stars, Darwin and Drummond, from the same point of view, there is no parallax.

It will be remembered that the moralist sets out to show that love comes into the world by reason of the physical sacrifices imposed upon the female half. To do this, it must be proved that

\*"The Ascent of Man," pp. 14-15.

sex plays no part in the evolution of life. It must be demonstrated that sex love is a biological need. It must be demonstrated that sex is simply and solely a physical device for reproduction. The author begins his arraignment of sex by saying:\* "It (sex) may be the physical basis of a passion which is frequently miscalled love, but love itself, in its true sense as self-sacrifice \* \* \* has come down a wholly different line."

However, before the moralist can clear the ground for his theory as to the origin of love, he is forced to meet and dispose of this obtrusive sex question. His review of sex, in this connection, is remarkable as an exhibition of human reason bewildered at every point by spiritual intuitions. His line of reason, based upon physical science, had been carefully marked out. When he began to talk of sex he had intended to show that no natural relationship existed between sex attraction and love.

How well he kept to his carefully prepared line of reasoning may be determined from his own words. Those visions of the sex principle as perceived intuitionally by the learned Doctor, might well stand as the literary effort of some enthusiastic student of Natural Science.

At the very outset the moralist confesses his total inability to grapple with the profound mystery of sex. Astounded by its universal sympathies, he confesses his ignorance of its ultimate meaning and purposes. He does not realize that a few pages further on he is to forget this confession and drag down his sublime mystery to a physical "device for reproduction."

No more graphic vision of the sex principle was ever recorded than is contained in the following quotations:

†"Realize," says the moralist, "the novelty and originality of "this most highly specialized creation, and it will be seen at once "that something of exceptional moment must lie behind it. Here "is a phenomenon which stands absolutely alone on the field of "Nature. There is not only nothing at all like it in the world, but

\*Page 224.

†Page 245.

"while everything else has homologues or analogues somewhere  
 "in the cosmos, this is without parallel. Familiarity has so ac-  
 "customed us to it that we accept the sex separation as a matter  
 "of course; but no words can do justice to the wonder and nov-  
 "elty of this strange line of cleavage which cuts down to the  
 "very root of being in everything that lives. No theme of equal  
 "importance has received less attention than this from evolution-  
 "ary philosophy. \* \* \* How deep down, from the very  
 "dawn of life, this rent between the two sexes yawns is only now  
 "beginning to be seen. Examine one of the humblest water  
 "weeds—the spirogyra. It consists of waving threads or neck-  
 "laces of cells, each plant to the eye the exact duplicate of the  
 "other. Yet, externally alike as they seem, the one has the  
 "physiological value of the male, the other of the female. \* \* \*  
 "When we reach the higher plants the differences of sex become  
 "as marked as among the higher animals. Male and female  
 "flowers grow upon separate trees, or live side by side on the  
 "same branch, yet so unlike one another in form and color that  
 "the untrained eye would never know them to be relatives. \* \* \*  
 "Sex separation, indeed, is not only distinct among flowering  
 "plants, but is kept up by a variety of complicated devices, and  
 "a return to hermaphroditism is prevented by the most elabo-  
 "rate precautions. When we turn to the animal kingdom again,  
 "the same great contrast arrests us. Half a century ago, when  
 "Balbiani described the male and female elements in microscopic  
 "infusorians, his facts were all but rejected by science. But  
 "further research has placed it beyond all doubt that the begin-  
 "nings of sex are synchronous almost with those shadowings in  
 "of life. From a state marked by a mere varying of the nuclear  
 "elements, a state which might almost be described as one ante-  
 "cedent to sex, the sex distinction slowly gathers definition, and  
 "passing through an infinite variety of forms, and with countless  
 "shades of emphasis, reaches at last the climax of separateness  
 "which is observed among birds and mammals. \* \* \*  
 "Through the whole wide field of Nature, then, this gulf is fixed.

"Each page of the million-leaved Book of Species must be, as it  
 "were, split in two, the one side for the male, and the other for the  
 "female. Classification naturally takes little note of this distinc-  
 "tion; but it is fundamental. Unlikenesses between like things  
 "are more significant than unlikenesses of unlike things. And the  
 "unlikenesses between male and female are never small, and al-  
 "most always great. \* \* \* What exactly maleness is, and  
 "what femaleness, has been one of the problems of the world. At  
 "least five hundred theories of their origin are already in the  
 "field, but the solution seems to have baffled every approach.  
 "Sex has remained almost to the present hour an ultimate mys-  
 "tery of creation, and men seem to know as little what it is as  
 "whence it came."

It was known to the date growers in Egypt years ago that  
 they must go to the deserts, secure branches of wild palm and  
 wave them over the flowers of the date palm. This had to be  
 done to insure a date crop. Modern science has explained this  
 peculiar custom. Palm trees, like human beings, are male and  
 female.

The garden date bearing palms were females. The wild palm  
 was male. The waving branches transferred the fertilizing pollen  
 from male to female.

Continues Mr. Drummond: "Now consider, in this far away  
 "province of the vegetable kingdom, the strangeness of this  
 "phenomenon. Here are two trees living wholly different lives,  
 "separated by miles of desert land; they are unconscious of one  
 "another's existence; yet so linked that their separation is a  
 "mere illusion.

"Physiologically they are one tree; they cannot dwell apart.  
 "It is nothing to the point that they are neither dowered with  
 "locomotion nor the power of conscious choice. The point is  
 "that there is that in Nature which unites these seemingly dis-  
 "united things, which effects combinations and co-operations  
 "where one would least believe them possible, which sustains by

"arrangements of the most elaborate kind interrelations between tree and tree.

"By a device the most subtle of all that guard the higher evolution of the world—the device of Sex—Nature accomplishes this task of throwing irresistible bonds around widely separate things, and establishing such sympathies between them that they must act together or forfeit the very life of this kind. Sex is a paradox; it is that which separates in order to unite. The same mysterious mesh which Nature threw over the two separate palms, she threw over the few and scattered units which were to form the nucleus of mankind."

Thus, the moralist, diverted from his rational purpose, practically disposes of his own theory.

Diverted but momentarily from the compulsions and sacrifices of reproduction to the co-operations and fulfillments of sex, he states the love principle in Nature without knowing it.

It will be observed that at one moment he terms sex "the ultimate mystery of creation," and again "the paradox of Nature." Is it not singular that in his very next lesson he defines sex as a "physical device for reproduction?" He nowhere explains how he becomes informed in the interval of those facts which explain sex as simply a physical device for reproduction.

It must, therefore, be clear to the reader that neither scientific skepticism nor theological speculation has discovered the true law of natural selection. Neither has set forth the true factors and causes of the evolution of a physical, intelligent and moral being. Neither has solved the problem of human life nor of human love.

It is almost unbelievable that physical science, familiar with the universal affinities of the positive and receptive energies in Nature, yet fails to discover a principle of co-operation or a law of selection by natural affinity. It is almost unbelievable that a teacher of ethics, conversant with Nature and Revelation, could yet seek a physical basis for love in the enforced sacrifices of the weaker half of all living things.

This is one of the paradoxes of human reason.

There is a science, however, which enjoys a broader acquaintance with Nature than physical science. There is a philosophy which interprets life and love from higher points of vantage than those upon which the churchman stood. This higher science operates upon two planes of matter, life, intelligence and love. This higher philosophy takes into account the spiritual and psychical principles of sex as well as its physical functions. This philosophy also takes into account, not only maternity, but paternity, in both worlds of life.

To this science and to this philosophy we must look for explanation of morality, love and altruism, according to the true law of natural selection. This is a science which explicitly denies the materialist's compulsory law of natural selection. This is a philosophy which clearly refutes the moralist's compulsory law of love. On the contrary, our science demonstrates a really natural principle of selection, and our philosophy elucidates a voluntary principle of love.

To this higher science the world must look for discovery of a struggle in Nature which is infinitely greater than either the struggle for nutrition or the struggle for reproduction. To the higher philosophy it must look for illustration of a principle that is far more potent in character and effect than either competition or sacrifice.

In short, the higher science and the higher philosophy, founded upon Nature, physical, spiritual and psychical, refute all theories of "Natural Selection," governed by compulsions.

They declare, instead, that there is a natural law of selection which is neither compulsory nor competitive. They declare that there is a natural law of love which is neither compulsory nor sacrificial.