

asking that law shall abrogate the decrees of Nature by adopting the same measures and the same standards for both men and women. This demand for equality is, at its foundation, merely the demand for equality of opportunity and for recognition in those enterprises and activities which she feels competent to enter. No true woman would repudiate the natural leadership of strong and masterful men. The protest is not against such men. It is rather against the dictation and domination of men whom she knows to be her intellectual, as well as moral, inferiors.

The protest of the "new woman" is, in fact, a protest against the lamentable scarcity of masters.

This highest relation in which man and woman are to realize the ideal is being slowly but surely wrought out by time.

The intellectual dependence which man seeks from woman, and the intellectual equality of which woman dreams, are one and the same thing, and are already foreshadowed in the higher races. The processes of the higher evolution are slowly but surely adjusting these two powers into perfect balance.

This intellectual and moral interdependence, reciprocity and companionship of two intelligent beings, is the highest ideal of which the human mind is capable, and a philosophy which conserves Nature declares that this ideal is already working itself out as a very practical, tangible, earthly reality.

This ideal is realized wherever the principles of aggressive and receptive intelligence strike the true balance in any individual man and woman.

Every woman acknowledges that principle when she finds the Master.

## CHAPTER XV.

### THE SPIRITUAL BASIS OF LOVE.

"All the laws of Physical Evolution cannot explain the first genesis of mind."

Thus declares the reviewer of "Evolution" in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

If this applies to mind, how much more forcefully it applies to the phenomenon of love.

By love is meant that highest form of intelligent attraction and intelligent sympathy which exists between man and woman, between children and parents, and between relatives and friends.

This term also includes those peculiar individual sympathies and affections which exist between animals in their own relations. It also includes those sympathies which bind them to human beings.

Those preceding chapters on the genesis of physical life, the basis of evolution, and the natural law of selection, go to show that individual life and individual intelligence come into the world by the operation of a universal law of affinity, or the law of correspondence between positive and receptive energies.

This chapter is intended to show that love comes into the world by the same intelligent spiritual principle. The orderly and sequential development of love under this spiritual law of affinity, constitutes the Harmonics of Evolution.

The great common sense of the world is beginning to demand of science that it shall give an account of universal phenomena which shall accord with universal experience and with the common impulses, aspirations and ideals of mankind. Every intelligent student and observer of life knows that love is a universal

phenomenon attaching to intelligent, sentient life under normal conditions. Animals as well as humans love and seek love in others of their kind. Animals as well as humans may entertain sex love that is not physical passion. Animals like humans may love their offspring, may experience friendship for others of their own species, or of other species. They may love human beings.

Not man alone, but the animal also, is engaged in that universal struggle for individual adjustment and an ethical content which depend primarily upon the love relations.

Physical materialism no more accounts for love than it does for the genesis of life or the individualizing of intelligence. Feeding, breeding and battle no more account for love than they do for matter, motion and space. It undertakes, however, to account for it. That is to say, physical science claims to have at least discovered the basis of love between man and woman. Familial love, it casually explains as a matter of physical inheritance, or a habit. Friendship is translated as self-love or love of approbation. As to altruism, physical science frankly confesses that it has no theory. So convinced was Darwin of its abnormality that he deplored that character of philanthropy which cares for the unfit children of men. He saw in this a direct defiance of Nature's primal purpose, viz., preservation of species through a battle of the strong against the weak.

Physical science, however, does claim to have found a natural physical basis for that love which exists between man and woman, and whose power and influence give life its permanent values. Scientific skepticism finds the basis of this character of love in an "overshadowing instinct for reproduction."

Darwin's contribution to science is unquestioned. His facts are of tremendous value. In theory alone he is disappointing. It is not physical fact, but intellectual dogma, that has degraded the sex relation to a "biological need."

It is, therefore, not fact, but mere opinion, that the higher science encounters in a discussion of this question.

The position of physical science as to the origin and nature

of love, will be better understood by direct quotations from recognized authority. Such authority declares:

(1) "Man is a mammal like any other, and only distinguished from the animals of his class by a greater cerebral development."

(2) "Generation is the outcome of nutrition."

(3) "The tyrannic need of procreation is the overwhelming and overshadowing principle of individual human development."

(4) "The institution of marriage has had no other object than the regulation of sexual unions. These have for their aim the satisfaction of one of the most imperious biological needs—the sexual appetite."

(5) "The prime cause of marriage and the family is purely biological; it is the powerful instinct of reproduction."

(6) "If we are willing to descend to the foundation of things, we find that human love is essentially rut in an intelligent being."

Here, in brief, is the ultimatum of physical science as to the love principle in Nature. Thus is man reduced to the level of the animal. Thus is he accepted as a result of physical functions.

Not physical facts of Nature, but Darwin's interpretation of those facts, misled even so great an intelligence as Hæckle. Here was a man of keen spiritual intuitions as well as of rare rational powers. It was always under protest that he forced his reason to accept what intuition denied. The result was, a theory as to the basis of love which satisfied neither Hæckle himself nor convinced the world.

When contemplating the sex attraction of two microscopic cells and the transcendent powers of love in the human world, the great naturalist is led to say:

"We glorify love as the source of the most splendid creations of art; of the noblest productions of poetry, of plastic art, and of music; we reverence in it the most powerful factor in human civilization, the basis of family life, and, consequently, of the development of the state; \* \* \* so wonderful is love, and so immeasurably important is its influence on mental life, that in this point, more than in any other, 'supernatural' causation seems

to mock every natural explanation." Hækle also says: "On the other hand, we fear love as a destructive flame; it is love that drives so many to ruin; it is love that has caused more misery, vice, and crime than all other calamities. \* \* \* Notwithstanding all this, the comparative history of evolution leads us back very clearly and indubitably to the oldest and simplest source of love, to the elective affinity of two differing cells."

In a certain sense Hækle was right. The principle of elective affinity is, in fact, the true love principle. The naturalist, however, drew his conclusions without any knowledge of the spiritual side of Nature. To him this conjugation of cells was therefore a physical act only. Love was therefore to him the efflorescence of that physical affinity. Moreover, had he possessed actual knowledge of the true love principle, he could not have confused the constructive nature of love with the destructive nature of uncontrolled physical passion.

On the contrary, he would have realized that it is lust and not love that drives to ruin. He would have known that a principle of harmony never yet engendered either misery, vice or crime.

With what satisfaction such an intelligence as that of Hækle had pursued the higher science. What pleasure such a soul would have in the analysis of a principle which accounts for love rationally and in accordance with his highest intuitions. He would have then understood that there is nothing supernatural in love, nor yet anything that seems to degrade our highest ideals of it. On the contrary, an actual knowledge of the principle of elective affinity would have revealed a natural and purely scientific pathway of love, from its lowliest point in atomic activity to its summit in the life of the soul.

The Darwinian theory has brought confusion and dismay to many other honest and intelligent minds during the past half century. Unable to dispute his facts, they have felt compelled to accept the theories against which every intuition rebelled.

As long as the mind confines itself exclusively to the opera-

tions of the physical functions, those theories appear logical. The moment, however, that the mind is diverted to other equally palpable facts, the commonest facts of intelligence, morality and love, that moment physical materialism fails and we must construct other theories to account for things.

The conflict between reason and intuition is never so sharp nor so clearly apparent as in the case of those scholars who accept Darwinism with such unmistakable loathing and humiliation. The man who stops for a moment to consider the motives and ideals of his own life, can scarcely bring himself to believe that those motives, ideals and aspirations had their root and nourishment in the absolutely unconscious and purely selfish demands of nutrition and reproduction. He cannot bring himself to feel that what he cherishes as his individual power and capacity, and what he experiences as his individual ambition or patriotism or love or altruism, is the mere efflorescence of a blind digestive apparatus, or a blind procreative passion. He cannot believe that all he is—as an individual—is but an ephemeral combination of matter, an infinitesimal physical contribution to species.

The higher science formulates two grave charges against scientific skepticism, viz.:

(1) That it obscures the Individual in Nature.

(2) That it levels intelligent love to "the instinct of reproduction."

Though physical science asserts it as a fact, it is not able to show that man, even physically, is an animal only removed from the ape in point of time and additional feeding and breeding. Physically, man is an animal. \* Structurally, he is related to the ape. However, he is not an ape either physically, structurally, mentally or morally.

Though the ape appears to be a rudimentary man, he is not a man. There are differences physiologically, as well as mentally and morally, between the highest ape and the lowest human thus far discovered.

It must be remembered that actual proof of Darwin's theory

rests upon this still "missing link." Until this is found, the whole elaborate theory means nothing in science. Even in a physical sense Darwinism fails to bridge the gulf between animal and man.

Since the writings of Darwin physical science has discovered a most interesting and important fact which bears directly upon this point. It is now discovered that the brain measurements of men and monkeys disclose a radical difference in actual quantity. Between the highest type monkey and the lowest type man the balance of actual brain matter is largely on the side of man. The ratio of difference is about 60 to 100.

More than this, man, one of the weaker mammals, is born unclothed, and practically defenseless from the elements and the stronger animals. From birth to death man is the one being who must live, attain, enjoy or suffer in the exact ratio of his own independent and rational self-development.

The resemblances, however, between the higher apes and low type men are distinct enough to logically show the physical relationship. If we were to compare an ape and a man, merely as a physical organism, the Darwinian theory would have much weight. The moment, however, that we compare an ape and a man as individual entities that moment the theory fails.

The distinction between man and animal is the absolutely impassable gulf of rational and moral capacity.

Thus far finite science has discovered no natural link between an intelligent being endowed with the higher capacities of the soul element and one that is not. In the very lowest reaches of human society the child is born with capacities which no animal possesses, viz., capacities for rational and moral development. In this particular the lowest human transcends the highest animal just as the nucleated life cell transcends vegetable substance in its energies and capacities.

The demarcation between the lowest human and the highest animal is even more distinct than that between the lichen and

the rock, or between low animal forms and certain vegetable growths.

It is true that an undeveloped human resembles an animal. It is also true that he may live on indefinitely, looking mainly to animal appetites and passions for his satisfactions. Indeed, the neglect of the higher nature reduces man below the animal, so far as external conduct and habit are concerned. The very fact that he does possess the power of individual reason, means that he has the capacity to disregard general principles, choose his own course, and thus apparently fall below the level of the brute.

Nevertheless, the low type human—unlike the ape—may at any stage of beastliness and degradation, rise from that condition to one of rational and moral life. By force of the inherent powers of the soul he may at any time abandon animalism and assume the higher rôle of the human. Proofs of this are those facts which show the rapid development of low born children under civilized systems.

If man were, indeed, merely an improved animal, two conditions would obtain:

(1) The earth would teem with hybrids, physical, mental and moral. There would exist an infinite series of experiments between apes and men, entities which could be classified as neither animals nor men.

(2) Low type men could no more be suddenly raised to rational and moral standards by highly developed systems, than could the ape.

Neither of these conditions obtains, but the reverse is the fact.

Physical science has no difficulty in distinguishing men from apes. One is distinctly human and the other is distinctly animal. No amount of culture will raise the chimpanzee to the rational and moral plane of man. Every normal human infant, however, is susceptible to both rational and moral development.

For illustration, negro children, offspring of the lowest full-blood Africans, show remarkable development under a system of

education. That advance is as marked physically as it is intellectually and morally. The first generation shows an improved head, enlarged brain and modified features. The physical animal resemblances are wonderfully modified, while the mental and moral superiority to low type parents appears magical.

This change, however, physical, mental and moral, is not due to education alone. It is due to the latent capacities of the intelligent soul. Education merely develops those latent possibilities of the soul. It does not create the soul itself.

By reason of this higher element the energies and activities of man are fundamentally superior to the energies and activities of the animal. The Darwinian theory lacks the one important link which alone could verify its elaborate speculation. That link is still missing. Neither physical science nor any other science has discovered or will discover such link between man and the ape. It does not exist in this world nor in the next.

Does it not seem singular that a science which recognizes the fundamental differences between a rock, a tree and an animal, fails to recognize the same fundamental differences between a Plato, a Shakespeare, a Darwin, and the ape?

A science that does not take into account the psychical element in man, necessarily analyzes him as it would the pure animal. It is therefore bound to closely relate the highest activities and attributes of man to the activities and attributes of the animal. Interpreting man through his physical functions, means the interpretation of love, as well as intelligence, through the same causes. Physical science, from its present point of view, can do no better than to define love as "essentially rut in an intelligent being."

Nature, however, contravenes this position. Science that deals with two worlds of intelligence, love and ethical activity instead of one, arrives at a far different conclusion. The higher science which takes into account the fact of love in two worlds, holds this phenomenon to be the expression of a spiritual principle and not that of a physical passion.

The differences and distinctions of the two schools will be bet-

ter understood by sharp contrasts of their basic propositions. Physical science, as already stated, lays down as fundamental:

(1) That man is a mammal like any other, only distinguished from the animal by greater cerebral development.

Nature, on the contrary, demonstrates that man is a mammal, but fundamentally different from all others. He is distinguished from the animal by one additional element which engenders capacities, superior to those of any and all animals.

(2) Physical science claims that generation is the outcome of nutrition.

Nature, however, demonstrates that generation is the outcome and incident of the universal struggle for vibratory correspondence, which is the struggle for self-completion.

(3) Physical science declares that the tyrannic need of procreation is the overwhelming and overshadowing principle of individual human development.

Nature, on the contrary, demonstrates that the natural necessity for self-completion is the overmastering and overwhelming principle of individual human development.

(4) Physical science declares that the institution of marriage has no other object than the regulation of sexual unions.

Natural Science, however, shows that the institution of marriage has for its object the rational regulation of the sex relation as a necessary part of the struggle for completion.

(5) Physical science declares that the prime cause of marriage and the family is purely biological. It is the powerful instinct of reproduction.

Nature, however, shows that the prime cause of marriage is spiritual rather than purely biological; it is the powerful impulse for vibratory correspondence or for sympathy.

(6) Physical science declares that if we are willing to descend to the foundation of things we find that human love is essentially rut in an intelligent being.

Natural Science, however, finds that if we are willing to investigate the spiritual principle of affinity, we find that human love

is essentially an harmonic relation established between two intelligent beings.

Thus, while agreeing as to physical fact, it is yet possible for scholars to differ so widely as to formulate philosophies diametrically opposed. It must be remembered, however, that the one school bases its philosophy upon physical facts alone, while the other takes into account both physical and spiritual facts of Nature.

The higher science, taking into account as it does both spiritual and psychical principles, as well as physical functions, finds that love is an expression of the same principle which refines matter, increases vibratory action, generates life and individualizes intelligence.

The phenomenon of love which obtains among intelligent entities, is therefore as universal in principle and as normal in expression as are matter, motion, life and intelligence. It does not matter whether that love be manifested by animal or human, or whether expressed as sex love, or familial love, or as friendship.

Love is the sensation and emotion which accrue to conscious intelligence when vibratory correspondence obtains. It does not matter whether this affinity occurs in the higher or lower kingdom of intelligence, whether as between man and woman, between parents and children or between friends.

When an individual intelligence observes this principle as molecular action, he talks of the "law of vibration." When, however, he himself feels and enjoys the operation of that principle between himself and another individual, he calls that experience love.

Chemical union represents merely the vibratory correspondence of two material particles or atoms, while love and marriage represent the vibratory correspondence of material organisms, but they also represent the mutual sensations and emotions of two intelligent beings. The difference in effects between mineral marriages and human marriages can only be measured by the

difference between the energies and capacities of unconscious atoms and those of self-conscious intelligent souls. Sex Love, humanly speaking, is a complex activity in Nature. It embraces first, all of the unconscious or involuntary affinities of the lower elements; and second, it includes the direct self-conscious impulses, sensations and emotions of individual intelligence. These impulses, sensations, emotions and satisfactions of love, are simply the values which accrue to an individual intelligence as it cooperates with the universal law of affinity.

Nothing but a rational contact with the spiritual plane and a rational study of life upon that plane, enables the investigator to comprehend the nature of that activity defined as love.

Love is an activity of individualized intelligence. It is therefore an activity common to both animals and humans. Love, however, in animal and human life, represents widely different values. Animal love rises no higher than the potencies and capacities of animal nature. Human love, though an expression of the same principle, is an activity augmented, ennobled and illuminated by the potencies and capacities of the higher soul element.

The fact that animals do love their mates, their offspring, and those of their own and other species, must be accepted as proof that love is a possibility and normal accompaniment of all conscious intelligent life. When the psychical energies have been added to animal passions, the love nature rises correspondingly in power and scope. The capacity for loving is increased just as the measure of ethical enjoyment is enlarged.

More than this, the individual love relation of man and woman embraces greater ethical possibilities than any other love relations in the human family. This is true by reason of the fact that only between individuals of opposite polarity can there exist an affinity and union which may be at once physical, spiritual and psychical. Nor are such close harmonies possible even spiritually and psychically except between representatives of positive and receptive elements. Men and women who have vainly sought for ethical