

The difference between Darwinism and Drummondism, thus appears to be a difference only in degree. The one subordinates both man and woman to the struggle for nutrition, while the other subordinates man to nutrition and woman to reproduction. The moralist plainly says:* "Man's life, on the whole, is determined chiefly by the function of nutrition; woman's by the function of reproduction. Man satisfies the one by going out into the world, and in the rivalries of war and the ardors of the chase, in conflict with Nature, and amid the stress of industrial pursuits, fulfilling the law of Self-Preservation; woman completes her destiny by occupying herself with the industries and sanctities of home and paying the eternal debt of Motherhood."

If these words mean what they say, they do not remotely suggest the realization of those ideals and aspirations which are individual to the intelligent soul itself. Were this, indeed, the case of Nature, then the individual man must accept as fulfillment of his destiny the most successful struggle for nutrition and physical benefit which he can make. Woman, on the other hand, should cease to look to a more personal and individual destiny than that of paying the debt of motherhood.

Here we have graphically presented two great struggles said to be taking place in Nature, viz.: "The Struggle for Life" and "The Struggle for the Life of Others." The first is a purely egoistic struggle for physical benefit. The other is an enforced physical sacrifice for posterity, which process the moralist defines as altruistic.

These are held to be the two great struggles of all living Nature, the two main activities of intelligent life, the two great motives of action, the two sources of inspiration to human endeavor. Here, in brief, are shown the two factors of evolution, the physical causes of all we know as life, of all we admire as intelligence and of all we reverence as love.

The first theory, as will be seen, conceives Nature as working

*"The Ascent of Man," p. 257.

out its physical and material benefits under a law of self-defense. The second theory conceives Nature as working out its moral purposes and benefits under a law of self-suppression and self-sacrifice. Neither of these theories finds a purpose in Nature which justifies these physical competitions for life, nor these physical sacrifices for the life of others.

Both of these doctrines agree that Nature is a monster. The one theory sees Nature improving species at the expense of the individual man and woman. The other holds that Nature is improving the family at the expense of the individual woman.

Neither materialistic science nor materialistic theology perceives a principle in Nature that impels but does not compel. In neither struggle depicted is there a hint of that higher struggle which sustains intelligence during its struggle for nutrition and its struggle for reproduction. Nowhere in these doctrines is there any recognition of that universal motive which inspires every created thing to action, from atom to man. Nowhere is there any recognition that intelligent human nature embraces a principle of life, of progress and of love, which is neither competition nor sacrifice. Nowhere is there recognition of the principle of co-operation and fulfillment, which is the principle of individual content.

The failure to recognize the universal principle of affinity in human life is especially surprising, since the moralist so clearly observes it in the under-world of unconscious substance. Not until he closes his work does he really discover the principle upon which his argument should have been based. Here he catches a glimpse of that universal law which governs the evolution of love from its faint foreshadowings, in the mere rest or equilibrium of two unconscious atoms, to the self-conscious happiness of two intelligent souls.

In his closing chapter the moralist says:* "The earliest condition in which science allows us to picture this globe is that of

*"The Ascent of Man," p. 337.

"a fiery mass of nebulous matter. At the second stage it consists of countless myriads of similar atoms, roughly outlined into "a ragged cloud-ball, glowing with heat, and rotating in space "with inconceivable velocity. By what means can this mass be "broken up, or broken down, or made into a solid world? By "two things—mutual attraction and chemical affinity. The moment when within this cloud-ball the conditions of cooling "temperature are such that two atoms could combine together "the cause of the Evolution of the Earth is won. For this pair "of atoms are chemically 'stronger' than any of the atoms immediately surrounding them. Gradually, by attraction or affinity, the primitive pair of atoms—like the first pair of savages— "absorb a third atom and a fourth and a fifth, until a 'Family' of "atoms is raised up which possesses properties and powers altogether new, and in virtue of which it holds within its grasp the "conquest and servitude of all surrounding units. From this "growing center attraction radiates on every side, until a larger "aggregate, a family group—a Tribe—arises and starts a more "powerful center of its own. With every additional atom added, "the power as well as the complexity of the combination increases. As the process goes on, after endless vicissitudes, repulsions, and readjustments, the changes become fewer and "fewer, the conflict between mass and mass dies down, the elements passing through various stages of liquidity finally combine in the order of their affinities, arrange themselves in the "order of their densities, and the solid earth is finished.

"Now recall the names of the leading actors in this stupendous reformation. They are two in number, mutual attraction and "chemical affinity. Notice these words—Attraction, Affinity. "Notice that the great formative forces of physical evolution have "psychical names. * * * In reality, neither here nor anywhere have we any knowledge whatever of what is actually "meant by Attraction. * * * To Newton himself the very "conception of one atom or one mass, attracting through empty "space another atom or mass, put his mental powers to con-

"fusion. And as to the term Affinity, the most recent chemistry, "finding it utterly unfathomable in itself, confines its research at "present to the investigation of its modes of action. * * * "Here, as in every deep recess of physical nature, we are in the "presence of that which is metaphysical, that which bars the way "imperiously at every turn to a materialistic interpretation of the "world."

Thus, the philosophy of the moralist recognizes a metaphysical principle in unconscious Nature which he has previously denied to conscious Nature. He recognizes the affinity of atoms as the impelling power in the lowest kingdom, yet postulates competition and sacrifice as the compelling forces in the highest kingdom. The author of "The Ascent of Man" was evidently inspired by the vision of a solid earth, slowly evolved by individual atoms settling in the order of their affinities. At the same time he turns with disdain from the suggestion that a spiritualized and moral humanity was evolved by individual intelligences uniting in the order of their affinities. He recognizes a "psychical affinity" between mineral atoms, but he finds only physical passion as the bond uniting man and woman.

Here, in brief, are set forth two popular theories which rest wholly upon the physical functions of Nature. The first theorist, absorbed in the struggle for nutrition, declares that a physically fittest species is the highest result attainable through evolution. The other theorist, concentrating upon reproduction, declares that a morally improved family is the object sought in evolution.

It will be observed that both theories ignore Nature in one important particular. Neither considers that which forms the very basis of the physically improved species and the morally improved family, viz., the Individual, through whom Nature must improve species and perfect the family.

This, indeed, is the fundamental error of science and philosophy which seek to interpret man as a result of the physical functions. It is just here, and in this particular, that human intelligence rebels. It is here that the highly developed man finds

himself unable to accept the reading of physical materialism and of so-called rationalism. He admits the physical facts of Nature as reported by physical science. He accepts the doctrine of a physical evolution from lower to higher forms. He perceives in Nature a struggle for nutrition. He perceives, also, a struggle for reproduction. He may even attempt to force reason to accept the theories which attempt to explain how those facts came to be.

The common intuitions of man, however, revolt at the final conclusions of scientific skepticism. His intelligence refuses to accept those interpretations of himself which level him to the needs and requirements of his physical appetites and passions. He refuses to abide by those decisions which leave him a mere contribution to species or the mere progenitor of a family.

Against such interpretations of human life and destiny, the common intuitions, the common experiences and the common sense of man rebel. The self-conscious intelligent Ego knows itself to be an individual. Man feels and knows that every impulse of his nature, every concept of the brain, every act of his life, every aspiration of the soul, emanates from himself and has its effects upon himself as an individual.

Theories to the contrary, there is something in man which seeks explanation of himself as an individual, which seeks to wrest from Nature the cause of that individuality and the final purpose and destiny of his own being. Physical science and moral philosophy to the contrary, no theory of evolution of either the body or the intelligence or of life will be accepted if such theory obscures the individual as the mere contribution to species or to family. The individual intelligence will finally reject every theory that limits the destiny of man to the struggle for nutrition, and the destiny of woman to the struggle for reproduction. Individual intelligence demands of science some rational explanation for man, as he is, in his present stage of development. It demands of science that it shall analyze and intelligibly explain a being who possesses individual motives, impulses, aspirations and pow-

ers; one who believes that he has an individual place in Nature and an individual destiny to fulfill.

To this demand of intelligence physical science has not responded

Neither the theories of physical materialism, nor philosophy built upon those theories, has thus far recognized the individual principle in Nature. Neither has thus far suggested the true factors and causes which create an individual. Neither do these theories contain a hint as to the true destiny of the individual. The intelligence of man will no more accept a "physically improved species" as the highest result obtainable in Nature, than it will accept a "morally improved family" as such. These are theories which simply bewilder intelligence and leave man a greater puzzle to himself than he was before science and philosophy undertook to account for him.

Men and women demand of science that it shall furnish the key to the existence, the office, and the destiny of men and women as individuals. Science is asked to trace the path of individual evolution, to discover the purposes of individual life, and to forecast the possibilities of individual powers. Highly developed men and women find it impossible to accept themselves, with all of their individual impulses, ambition, aspiration and acquirements, as either the automatic results of nutrition or as incidental promoters of reproduction. Man refuses to believe that his individual destiny, as a man, is fulfilled and completed in the activities of nutrition and by contribution to species. Woman also refuses to believe that her individual destiny, as woman, is completed in "paying the eternal debt of motherhood."

Such, indeed, is the attitude of thinking men and women of to-day. Evolution has so far refined a large proportion of our western people that they will not accept physical materialism, even though it is clothed in the garb and authority of science. The natural processes of physical refinement have so far spiritualized and sensitized the average man and woman as to develop

spiritual intuitions of other forces and conditions and purposes than the physical.

Such as these, having only intuitions to guide them, nevertheless, refuse to accept theories which reduce life to the level of its physical functions, even when such theories appear to have a substantial basis of fact. Such as these who have no actual or rational proof of the spiritual side of Nature, who have only intuitions to support them, are still withholding judgment. They are looking eagerly to science for confirmation of those intuitions which declare that individual life is more than feeding and breeding and that individual destiny is not fulfilled in species nor in family.

Such as these are looking to the self-declared students of Nature for more rational answers to those universal questions: "Why I am I?" and "For what am I created?"

CHAPTER XI.

THE QUESTION ANSWERED.

The Completion of the Individual.

Natural Science lays down an intelligent principle of co-operation as fundamental in evolution.

It does more than this. It demonstrates that every operation of Nature conserves a definite purpose. These purposes, on the one side general, and on the other individual, are demonstrated as intelligent purposes.

The processes by which these purposes are wrought out furnish science the key to this marvelous upward movement in Nature which we term Evolution.

Evolution represents a stupendous mathematical design. It discloses an intelligent mode of operation. It foreshadows a sublime ethical purpose.

Universal intelligence is employed in working out the mathematical designs of Nature. Individual intelligence is employed in working out its own ethical purposes, as well as in discharging its spiritual and physical functions.

This primary purpose of Nature and this primary purpose of the individual govern the greatest known struggle in the universe, viz., the struggle of intelligence in the midst of a seemingly hostile environment. This greatest struggle in Nature displays itself:

- (1) As the struggle of universal intelligence to evolve and complete an Individual Intelligence.
- (2) As the independent struggle of the intelligent Individual to complete himself.