

"WHICH STRAIN AT A GOAT AND SWALLOW A CAMEL."

---

ALL

THE ARTICLES

OF

THE DARWIN FAITH.

BY

THE REV. F. O. MORRIS, B.A.

Rector of Northwold, Yorkshire.

Author of "A History of British Birds," dedicated by permission  
to her most gracious Majesty the Queen, etc., etc.

---

"*Etiam non sedit, sed non sedit, sed non sedit.*"—HORACE

---

LONDON:  
MOFFATT, PAIGE, AND CO  
4, Paternoster Buildings, E.C.

1878.

DEDICATED

BY PERMISSION

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

THE COMMON SENSE

OF THE

PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.

"O ye fools, when will ye understand? ... He that made the eye; shall He not see?"—Psalm xciv. 8, 9.

---

ALL THE ARTICLES  
or  
THE DARWIN FAITH.

---

I BELIEVE that we are the people, and that wisdom shall die with us.

I believe that my theory of natural selection is right, and that every one who does not hold it is in the wrong, although the difficulties "are so grave, that to this day I can never reflect on them without being staggered." (Darwin).

I believe that man, and all the animals, birds, fishes, reptiles, and insects in the world have descended from one single original, and not any of these from ancestors of their own kinds; that the gnat and the elephant, the cat and the mouse, the bat and the butterfly, the whale and the ant, the toad and the swallow, the hare and the tortoise,

the crocodile and the lamb, the humming-bird and the snake, the mole and the monkey, and then the man, are all one species—and only one.

I believe this, although I see that whilst animals of the several species described by naturalists breed solely together, and that their offspring are prolific, in like manner, generation after generation, any others which may exceptionally breed together have no progeny, except in very rare cases, and that any they may have leave no descendants, except still more rarely for perhaps one farther generation or so.

I believe that all the various creatures on the earth have sprung from a single parent, although I hold that each new species has "supplanted and exterminated its original parent and all the transitional varieties between its past and present status." (Darwin).

I believe that the drooping of the ears in domestic animals is due to the disease of the muscles of the ear, from the animals not being much alarmed by danger, although I see the horse with erect ears, and the hare and the rabbit with strikingly drooping ears.

I believe that the temporary variation of several races of



any one species of plant is a proof that permanent so-called species are thus produced, although I see that the varieties if left for many generations in a poor soil would to a large extent by degrees, and in the end wholly, revert to the form of the wild aboriginal stock.

I believe that I am using an able and sensible argument in saying that the mistletoe may metaphorically be said to struggle with other fruit-bearing plants in order to tempt birds to devour and thus disseminate its seeds rather than those of other plants.

I believe that the eye of every living creature was produced by natural selection, although in some species it consists of 4,000 lenses, in others 12,000, 17,000, or 25,000, and in others of various other vast numbers.

I believe that my theory is right, although I allow that according to it "all nature" ought to be "in confusion" instead of the species being, as we see them, "well defined." (*Darwin*).

I believe—"there seems to me no great difficulty in believing"—(*Darwin*)—that the swim-bladder in fishes "though originally constructed for one purpose," has been "actually converted" "into a lung or organ used exclusively for respiration."

I believe that the "electric organs of fishes" have been produced by "natural selection," although it is "impossible to conceive by what steps these wondrous organs have been produced." I believe this, although these organs only occur in species "widely remote in their affinities," while we "might have expected" (on Darwinian grounds), that they would all "have been specifically related to each other. I believe the same in the like case of luminous insects.

I believe that the most simple parts of species are due to natural selection, although I see that their "importance does not seem sufficient to cause the preservation of successively varying individuals."

I believe that the tail of the giraffe has grown by degrees into a "fly-flapper" (1), although I cannot explain how the species did without it in previous countless ages before it grew to its present length.

I believe that every "well-developed tail" in a water animal has been worked in as a "fly-flapper" for land animals, or as a "proboscis instrument," or to "help them in turning;" although I see that in the dog it is of next to no such use at all, and that the hare "can double quickly enough, though with hardly any tail."

I believe that long tails are necessary to animals in hot countries to give them the "power of resisting the attacks of insects," although I see that sheep have heavy tails which they cannot and do not make use of for any such purpose, and are especially attacked by flies on their heads, which, if their tails were ever so light, they could not possibly reach.

I believe that—as I hold that the swim-bladder in creatures of the sea is modified into lungs in their descendants changed into land animals—the tail, having been so useful to the former as a means of locomotion, still proves its origin in the latter, though of so little use to them.

I believe that the green colour of the green woodpecker is due to selection by the male or female bird, because I see that there are black and pied woodpeckers also.

I believe that it is not the case that many structures have been created for beauty in the eyes of man, or for mere variety, although I "fully admit that many structures are of no direct use to their possessors."

I believe that there is "no logical impossibility in the requirement of any conceivable degree of perfection through natural selection," although I must admit that

the case of the eye is "more than enough to stagger any man."

I believe that the American ostrich "is not yet perfect," although I can give no proof whatever that it is in the process of becoming so.

I believe that the "most wonderful of all known instincts," that of the hive bee, can be explained by me, as a Darwinite, and the illogical way in which I have accounted for it in my work on "The Origin of Species" I believe to be a master-piece of reasoning, though nine out of ten of its facts prove nothing whatever by way of conclusion for it.

I believe the same in the case of the working of sterile ants, though "how the workers have been made sterile is a difficulty;" that is to say, in itself, but none whatever to my more "fertile" brain, which thinks nothing of any difficulty that stands in its way.

I believe that the difficulty, though "appearing insuperable," "disappears" by my imagining that selection may be exercised by a whole "family" as well as by an "individual." I choose to forget that families are made up of individuals.

I believe that on my theory no account need be taken of the "prodigious amount of difference between the fertile and sterile individuals of many insects."

I believe that my theory is perfectly correct, although there is a 'climax of the difficulty' beyond all those that I have yet stated, some of the neutrals differing even from each other to an "almost incredible degree;" some "with jaws and instincts extraordinarily different;" others with forms "the use of which is quite unknown."

I believe that I am right, and all the world else wrong, although it will be thought that I have an "overweening confidence in my own wisdom," which makes me "not admit that such wonderful and well-established facts at once annihilate my theory."

I believe that I must be right, although I can't "pretend that the facts given in this chapter (VII.) strengthen in any degree my theory," and all that I can say is that they do not "annihilate it;" ergo I must be right.

I believe that the sterility of hybrids is no disproof of my theory of natural selection, which is that it acts for the good of the creatures which exercise it, although it could not possibly be of any advantage to the several animals,

and although I think that the importance of the fact has been "much underrated by some writers."

I believe that my theory of hybridism is right, although it does not "go to the root of the matter" and "no explanation is offered" of the main fact. "*Ibrida quo pacto sit*" is quite beyond me.

I believe that "no part of the structure of any one species has been formed for the exclusive good of another species," though "natural selection" can and does often produce structures for the direct injury of other species; and though I see that the aphid voluntarily uses its structure for the sole good of the ants, and I can only "probably" imagine that it is of any convenience to the aphides themselves.

I believe that tumbler-pigeons have been produced by the long continued selection of such in many generations, though I can't at all tell how they first came to have the habit, or why it should have been fortunately noticed by some fancier, or how he came to think that it might be propagated and preserved, and succeeded in doing so.

I believe that I strengthen my argument by saying that dogs only rarely require, when young, to be taught

not to attack sheep, etc., though I see that it is the commonest thing possible that some dogs can never be broken of the habit, and that there is not a dog in existence but might be encouraged to it.

I believe generally that "natural instincts are lost under domestication," although I have the preceding fact and numberless others staring me in the face to show me the exact contrary, and that they are at the most but dormant, and ready to be restored to their former fulness.

I believe that young chickens have lost by habit the fear of dogs and cats, although I have no possible proof whatever, and cannot possibly have any proof, that they ever had such.

I believe that the cuckoo "once upon a time" did not lay her eggs in other birds' nests, but has acquired the habit by degrees, some "old bird" or other profiting by the mistake, or the young being made stronger by it, viz., by being tended by a foster parent instead of by their natural one, and so becoming "apt to follow" that unnatural practice; and this though I see that various birds "occasionally" lay their eggs in other birds' nests, and yet have acquired no such habit.

Although in spite of an "enormous accumulation of probabilities, we yet stand without the direct production of a new species from one common stock," nevertheless, against the evidence of my senses, I believe that such has been the case with all the so-called species in the world.

Although the remains of the horse existed in geological strata of "enormous antiquity" long before any indications of the existence of man have yet been found,—and although those remains show that the horse and the ass at that remote period exactly resembled in nearly every respect the horse and the ass which now run wild in many parts of Asia and Africa,—and although, "going still farther back to the Upper Miocene period, the horse is still found with its present peculiarities, and the two differ from each other only in minute details,"—yet as the remains of the hipparion or "little horse," are found in the same deposit as the horse, namely, the Upper Miocene, so that it could not have been its ancestor, though like it in several respects, and as the remains of the archæotherium are only found in the Lower Miocene, so that there is a wider gap between it and the hipparion than between the latter and the horse, still, for all that, inasmuch as in the archæotherium the leg bones are still more separated, as it has three bones on the



fore limb, which "theory requires that it should have," "it being impossible to obtain evidence more complete in kind than this of the origin of the horse," ergo I believe that the horse is descended from the ancotherium.— Q. E. D. (Huxley.)

Horses have sometimes been born with extra toes, ergo I believe that "the horse must at one time have had the leg and foot bones complete, although they were blotted out before the horse was turned into a perfect running machine" ! (Huxley).

The Darwin Doctrine therefore being *intra* (!) "made out in this one case of the horse," I believe that it is strong evidence that "similar modifications have taken place in all cases." (Huxley.)

I believe that the common saying that one "cannot draw blood out of a stone" is the reverse of the truth, and that not only bones, sinews, and life can be produced from them, but also, mind, reason, and the voice of conscience,—which though would-be philosophers and atheists brave out in daylight, they are so "horribly afraid" of in the dark.

I believe that I alone am right, although I see that though slight crosses beneath the offspring, greater crosses,

i.e., those of widely separated species, produce sterile hybrids, and I "cannot persuade myself that this parallelism (III) is an accident or an illusion."

I believe I am right, although I see that the widely different forms of the pigeon among birds, and the cabbage and other varieties among plants, are productive together, while other species "though resembling each other most closely are utterly sterile when crossed," and I admit that the former is "almost invariably the case."

I believe that the "imperfection of the geological record," showing no regular chain of species, and so giving no proof of my theory, and therefore the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against it, may nevertheless be assumed by me as conclusively proving it.

I believe that it is a sufficient answer to the question what has become of the innumerable forms which must have existed before the Silurian deposit, that "long before that" the world "may have," then, "presented a totally different aspect;" that the older continents, "may" now "all be in a metamorphosed condition," or "may" "lie buried under the ocean;" that there has "probably" been

more extinction of species during the periods of subsidence, and that the duration of each formation was "perhaps" short compared with the average duration of specific forms.

In fine, I believe that although the Mosais account of the Creation is borne out by the "Testimony of the Rocks" in a most wonderful manner, yet as it does not suit the theory I have taken into my head, it cannot possibly be true, and I do not believe a word of it.

I believe that if ever there was such a person as Moses, the five books called the five books of Moses were none of his at all, but a mere compilation of some impostor or victim of delusion.

I believe that no one who believes in the Bible has any sense or wisdom compared with me.

I believe that such persons in former times as Sir Isaac Newton, Herschell, Lord Bacon, Dr. Johnson, Milton, Locke, Sir Matthew Hale, etc., etc., etc., who were Believers in the Bible, were far behind me in intellect and knowledge.

I believe, in like manner, that others in the present time who are Believers also, as they were, such as Sir Roundell Palmer (Lord Selborne), Lord Haibucley, Lord Shaftesbury,

Paraday, Sir David Brewster, etc., etc., etc., and others who like them have taken the highest honours in the Universities, and distinguished themselves in the highest departments of art, science, and politics, are quite beneath me in mind and attainments, for if I am right, as I must be, and therefore am, they of course must be wrong.

I believe that mine is a much more valuable opinion, and much more to be received than that of Humboldt, who said of Strauss "what displeases me in him is the scientific levity which causes him to see no difficulty in the organic springing from the inorganic, nay, man himself, from the Chaldean mud."

I believe that the following suppositions guesses are "worthy of all men to be received," and should be accepted by all the world as scientific facts and truths, inasmuch as "I have spoken;" namely,—

I believe, "By considering the embryological structure of man—the homologies which he presents with the lower animals—the rudiments which he retains—and the reversions to which he is liable,—we can partly recall, in imagination, the former condition of our early progenitors, and can approximately place them in their proper position

in the zoological series. We thus (!) learn that man is descended from a hairy quadruped, furnished with a tail and pointed ears, probably arboreal in its habits, and an inhabitant of the Old World. This creature, if its whole structure had been examined by a naturalist, would have been classed amongst the quadrupeds, as surely as would the common and still more ancient progenitor of the Old and New World monkeys. The quadrupeds and all the higher mammals are probably derived from an ancient marsupial animal; and this, through a long line of diversified forms, either from some reptile-like or some amphibian-like creature, and this again from fish-like animal. In the dim obscurity of the past we can see (?) that the early progenitor of all the vertebrate man has been? an aquatic animal, provided with branchiae, with the two sexes united in the same individual, and with the most important organs of the body (such as the brain and heart) imperfectly developed. This animal seems to have been more like the larva of our existing marine Ascidians than any other known form."

I believe that an argument based on that which seems, is quite as valuable as one based on that which is; a chain

with gaps in the links, is quite as firmly held together as one without; and to lack no evidence but that of facts is amply sufficient for me, of which the following will serve for examples.

I believe—"I cannot doubt, that the theory of descent with modification embraces all the members of the same class." "I can indeed hardly doubt that all vertebrate animals having true lungs are descended by ordinary generation from an ancient prototype, of which we know nothing, furnished with a floating apparatus or swim-bladder."

I believe—"It is conceivable that the now utterly lost branchia might have been gradually worked in by natural selection for some quite distinct purpose, in the same manner as . . . it is probable that organs which at a very ancient period served for respiration, have been actually converted into organs of flight."

I believe that the opinion of Dr. Carpenter on the non-progressive character of the *Foraminifera* is as valuable as that of "any other man in England" (except myself); and therefore whereas Dr. Carpenter distinctly asserts there has been "no advance in the Foraminiferous type

from the Paleozoic period to the present time," and states his conviction that "the present state of scientific evidence, instead of sanctioning the idea that the descendants of the primitive type or types of Foraminifera can ever rise to any higher grade, justifies the anti-Darwinian inference, that however widely they diverge from each other and from their originals, they still remain *Foraminifera*," I believe that as I think differently from him, he must be wrong, and I must be right. Q. E. D.

I believe that an assertion "not proven" is as good as or better than one that is proved.

I believe that I must admit Dr. Carpenter's assertion as an "absolute matter of fact;" but for all that, as it does not suit my theory, I must hold that "as we do not know under what forms, or how, life originated in this world, it would be rash to assert that even such lowly endowed animals as the Foraminifera, with their beautiful shells, as figured by Dr. Carpenter, have not in any degree advanced in organization!"

I believe, therefore, that we can thus "partly recall" the former condition of our early progenitors; though even that "partly" is "in imagination!" Thus too, we can "approximately place them in their proper position" ("in

imagination"). "We thus learn," also "in imagination," about the "tall and pointed ears," "probably derived" from *something*—or from *something else* ("some reptile-like, or some amphibian-like creature") or "this again from some fish-like animal." Thus "in the dim obscurity of the past, we can see" (?) what this animal "must have been;" or rather what I must after all own it to have been.

I believe this is a highly satisfactory and conclusive result of the "eleven years," labour I have expended on my last publication.

I believe that all the wisest men of the world for the six thousand years since it is commonly supposed to have been created, or six hundred thousand million years, or any number more, as I believe, have been altogether wrong, and that it has been reserved for me in this so-called nineteenth century to set them all right and lay down the law for ever.

I believe that it may help my argument, if I can find people simple enough to believe that humble bees are common in gardens, and scarce elsewhere in comparison, in consequence of being preyed on by field-mice which are kept down by cats about houses; the fact being, as any national-school boy can see, that those bees abound near



woods, or in any other wild places where thistles and other wild flowers which bees are fond of are found, a hundred-fold more than they do in gardens, and that if they are found more or less numerous in gardens, it is only because of there being more flowers there, for which they will fly for miles, there being no more nests there than anywhere else, and in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred nothing like so many.

I believe that all creation is derived from some one form, a mere monad, although I admit that "no one can at present say by what line of descent the three higher and related classes, namely, mammals, birds, reptiles, were derived from either of the two lower vertebrate classes namely, amphibians and fishes."

I believe that it requires several generations of cultivated talent to make the mind equal to high intellectual attainments, but I find it convenient to forget that it is just as easy a supposition that the debasement of the intellect at any given time, even assuming it as thus to be slowly recovered from, may have been acquired gradually by neglect from a previous height equal to that to be finally attained to.

I believe that there is no such art as logic, at least, if

there is, it is quite beneath me to be guided by it, and that one premise, or at all events a number of single premises strung together so as to give a great appearance of argument to those who know no better, is amply sufficient to prove any conclusion.

I believe that the Christian is the happiest of men, because he evidently has a hope for another world in addition to the peaceful happiness he enjoys here.

I believe that an Infidel or Unbeliever is "of all men most miserable"; nevertheless I have done all I could to make others as wretched as I am myself, and have given, and can give them, nothing in return but a dreary blank. If you ask me about the future, there, I confess, I am in the dark; all I can say is that I believe that you and I will "melt into the infinite sea of the past," (Tyndall), (whatever that may mean). I repeat that I believe that Christian Believers have a peace of mind which I own I have not myself. They have "a good hope" for the future, which I must admit I have not myself, "having no hope, and without God in the world." I do my little best, or worst, to shake their faith and rob them of their peace of mind, but I have nothing better, because I have nothing at all to give them in the place of it.

cannot offer them any happiness in the next world or in any future state, because I do not believe that there will be any future state, so that if you ask me what is the real base of all I have written I cannot tell you. I offer you no happiness here or hereafter, and all I can do is to rob those of you who are fond and foolish enough to take up with the idle conceits of my "vain philosophy," of their present hope, and therewith of their expectation of future happiness, which but for me they might have.

I, (Huxley) believe that there is a good deal to be said for the hypothesis, that animals are mere machines, as much so as if they were mills or steam engines, and that they have no feeling; that they do not hear, see, or smell, and that their "apparent states of consciousness," as they seem to us, are only the results of a "mechanical reflex process." ("Sicem tenentis animi?" This is philosophy! This is science!). It is true I believe that I am only an animal, come from one of them myself, and therefore you may argue that I have no feelings, and may ask me to allow myself to be experimented on accordingly for the good of science, but I must beg of you to excuse me. It might interfere rather unpleasantly with my theory, and with the calmness,—or to speak more truly, the cool

assurance—which a “Philosopher” ought to exhibit to the public when he lays down the law to them.

I believe it would be highly imprudent in me to accept the challenge which was thrown down to me at the meeting of the British Association in 1874, to meet the challenger face to face before the public and discuss the truth or otherwise of my assertions. On the contrary, though I have the advantage of a good memory, a fluent tongue, and any amount you please of assurance, if you will oblige me by using so mild a term, I altogether shrink from the touchstone of common sense. Theory and assertion are all I have to do with, to which I always make it a rule (a very convenient one) to bend any given number of facts.

I believe that though Professor Salzer has shown that Darwinism is a mere scientific imagination, not a scientific fact, nevertheless the human species is descended from the *monstrum*, and this again from as low an origin as the larva or caterpillar of some sea animal.

I therefore believe, for all the above satisfactory reasons, that the origin of man is to be derived as follows:—

1. Marine animals, resembling the larva of existing *Actinæa*.

2. Fishes as lowly organized as the lancelet.
3. Fishes like the *Lepidosteus*.
4. Amphibians.
5. Reptiles.
6. Monotremata.
7. Marsupials.
8. Placental Mammals.
9. Lemnids.
10. Simiids.
11. Old World Monkeys.
12. Man.

"O most lame and impotent conclusion!"

I, (Tyndall) believe that I can "prolong my intellectual vision backwards, into regions where the unscientific cannot follow, (no one but myself and those who think with me are scientific—in my opinion), and can discern in matter the promise and potency of every form and quality of life." All who are opposed to me I, (Harley), pronounce *ex cathedra*, to be "pigmies in intellect." This is a very easy way of setting down opponents, and especially becoming, I think, in a "scientific man," who calls himself a "professor" of science, when before the annual meeting of a scientific society. (*At Belfast, 1874.*)

As to "prolonging my vision" forward, there I am in the dark, even on my own confession. I am compelled to acknowledge that a time may be coming when even a "professor" of irreligion and science "falsely so called" may have to say to religion, "give us of your oil, for our lamps are gone out" into "outer darkness."

I, (Tyndall) also believe that life is a "continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations," by which process some original tissue "vaguely sensitive all over" has come by degrees to be "differentiated" into man!! "(O Sapientia!)" I do not believe with Darwin in a "Primordial form," the origin of all living beings; I cannot tell whence he proposes to derive it, but neither can I tell you whence my original—(very original!)—"tissue" came. (Doctors differ you see.)

All this is science! knowledge!! philosophy!!! very clear, as well as very useful, and very profitable, is it not? as clear as the "Chaldean mud."

It is really difficult to say whether Huxley or Tyndall talks and writes the most senseless meandering. These are some of their choicest sayings.—"These be thy gods, O Israel," and "miserable comforters are they all."

I will supplement the above, *per contra*, with the

opinions of *The Times*, which are not so flattering to the scientific attainments or reasoning powers of the Darwinites as their own estimate of themselves.

"For this reason we must needs express our disappointment with the more important part of Mr. Darwin's book. His discussion of the faculties of man in comparison with those of animals appears to us utterly inadequate to the subject, independently of its being insufficient to sustain his theory. As it seems to us, he has not merely failed, but he has not duly grappled with the essential difficulties of the question. He has thought it possible to leap by the aid of a few illustrations over the momentous and arduous questions respecting the mental powers of man and animals, and the moral nature of man is dissected with a most rapid and unpenetrating hand. We can only express our conviction on this point by saying that on these subjects Mr. Darwin appears quite out of his element."

"For a natural philosopher to appeal to such superficial resemblances is much the same as for an astronomer to appeal to the apprehension of the vulgar with respect to the motions of the heavenly bodies."

"But the truth is that Mr. Darwin's argument is at every point supplemented by enormous assumption.

The utmost he proves, not merely in his present but in his former book, is not what has been, but what may have been, and he converts the 'may' into a 'must' by the sole force of the ever-present assumption that all forms of nature have been developed out of other forms. To our minds, the book bears in its very mode of expression, of which we have given some illustrations above, a character which is wholly unscientific. Science tells us what has been, what is, and what will be. But Mr. Darwin's argument is a continuous conjugation of the potential mood. It rings the changes on 'can have been,' 'might have been,' 'would have been,' until it leaps with a bound into 'must have been.'"

"When Mr. Darwin is confronted with the extremely remote and uncertain nature of the agencies on which he relies, he continually falls back on what 'might have been' in the lapse of unlimited periods of time. Such a style of argument is, to say the least, destitute of any scientific value. It is impossible to say what might or might not have been during periods so vast that we have no experience of them. For all we know, the vitality of species might wear itself out in the lapse of ages, or by some law of cyclic change, they might assume new forms.



To call in aid such an indefinite agency is a mere veil for ignorance. It may even be doubted whether to assert that a process takes effect in an infinite time, be not simply a round a roundabout way of," etc. etc.

"If in short, in its general application, Mr. Darwin's hypothesis is utterly unsupported by observed facts, it is still more destitute of such support in its application to man."

"This is precisely the solution which Mr. Darwin is unable to apply to his instances of approximation between species. If he could say in a single instance, '*admirar ambulando,*' 'here is a case of one true species having passed into another,' we should have a practical proof that the kind of approximation he brings to light is of such a kind as to end in coincidence. But this, as we have seen, is what he has not done. It is, in fact, not a little curious that the finite time which Newton demands is the very condition most energetically repudiated by Mr. Darwin and his followers. They place no limit whatever to the amount of time which their process requires. The knowledge of so prolonged a proof, would have been of no practical avail even to Methuselah.

"We are reminded, in fact, by such speculations, of the famous story which Corporal Trim endeavored so effecti-

ally to recite to Uncle Toby. "There was a certain king of Bohemia," said Trim; "but in whose reign except his own, I am not able to inform your honour." Uncle Toby was more accommodating than we are able to be from a scientific point of view. But we recommend the gracious permission he accorded to the corporal as a most appropriate motto for speculations of this kind. "Leave out the date entirely, Trim," said my Uncle Toby. In almost similar language 'There was a certain Monkey,' says Mr. Darwin; of that he is quite sure, and he frequently reiterates the assurance; 'There was a certain monkey; but in what period or country, except his own, I am not able to inform my readers.' The certainty, unfortunately, is hypothetical, and the particular monkey unknown."

"We are at a loss to understand the value of all this complicated guess-work. It represents a kind of Ptolemaic theory of creation heaping supposition on supposition and multiplying cycles of action as each supposition requires to be supplemented. It is the most conspicuous example yet afforded of that 'use of the imagination in science,' on which professor Tyndall dilated with such unscientific enthusiasm last autumn. Mr. Darwin's imagination is inexhaustible, and his power in this respect con-

tributes greatly to the charm of his strictly philosophical writings, but he does not hesitate, in accordance with Professor Tyndall's advice, to let it take the place of science when the means and methods of science fail."

"In section D (Anthropological Department) the meeting was held in the great lecture theatre of the museum, so as to accommodate the large number of persons who desired to attend. The question of human relationship to the ape was again talked about (for it cannot be said to have been discussed) by many speakers who vied with one another in loudness of declamation and shallowness of argument."

"This assumption is the very point to be proved. To argue from it is to assume the whole doctrine of evolution. The assertion in question is scientific or not, according as it is true or not. The only scientific question is whether, as a matter of fact, species have been developed by force of circumstances out of other species, and man out of an ape. It is certainly no scientific argument to assume that they must have been."

"Starting from the unsubstantial presumption just indicated, Mr. Darwin proceeds to speculate on the manner of man's development, without being able to address the

slightest evidence that facts correspond with his hypothesis. The history, however ingenious, is purely imaginary from beginning to end."

"Further consideration has led him to perceive an imperfection in his hypothesis of natural selection. 'He had not,' he says, 'sufficiently considered the existence of many structures in animals which appear to be, as far as we can judge, neither beneficial nor injurious;' and this he believes to be one of the greatest oversights yet detected in his work. In other words, the action of Natural Selection will not of itself sustain the theory of the continuous evolution of all organized beings from inferior forms."

"That, at all events, is the practical result for all the purposes of life. If, as seems to be admitted even by the most advanced Evolutionists, species be so permanently fixed that millions of years would be necessary to transform them, it follows that for all human purposes they must be treated as permanently independent."

"It is impossible to maintain unbroken gravity in discussing such a dream. But let us turn to Mr. Darwin's investigation of the physical basis of his conclusion,

which appears to us scarcely less unsatisfactory than his inquiry into its mental and moral bearings. He simply accumulates a variety of points of similarity between the human frame and that of animals."

"There is much reason to fear that loose philosophy stimulated by an irrational religion, has done not a little to weaken the force of these religious principles in France, and that this is at all events one potent element in the disorganisation of French society. A man incurs a grave responsibility, who, with the authority of a well earned reputation, advances at such a time the disintegrating speculations of this book. He ought to be capable of supporting them by the most conclusive evidence of facts. To put them forward on such incomplete evidence, such cursory investigation, such hypothetical arguments as we have exposed, is more than unscientific—it is reckless."

"We wish we could think that these speculations were as innocuous as they are unpractical and unscientific, but it is too probable that if unchecked they might exert a very mischievous influence. We abstain from noticing their bearings on religious thought, although it is hard to see how, on Mr. Darwin's hypothesis, it is possible to ascribe to man any other immortality or any other spiritual

existence, than that possessed by the brutes. But, apart from these considerations, if such views as he advances on the nature of the moral senses were generally accepted, it seems evident that morality would lose all elements of stable authority, and the 'ever fixed marks' around which the tempests of human passion now break themselves, would cease to exert their guiding and controlling influence."

"It should be the work of science to reveal this difference, not to construct theories on its mere apparent magnitude. But Mr. Darwin urges that this homological construction of the whole frame in the members of the same class is intelligible if we admit their descent from a common progenitor, together with their subsequent adaption to diversified conditions. 'On any other view,' he says, 'the similarity of pattern between the hand of a man or monkey, the foot of a horse, the flipper of a seal, the wing of a bat, etc., is utterly inexplicable.' We fail to see the inexplicability. What is there unreasonable in the supposition that they have all been formed on the same general plan? Mr. Darwin's only objection is that 'this is no scientific explanation,' but this is simply to beg the question."

"We fear the truth is that the study of mental philosophy, under the disastrous influence of one or two popular writers, has of late years become extremely loose and superficial, and Mr. Darwin does but illustrate the general vagueness of thought which prevails on such subjects."

Here are a few more instances of the way in which these would-be Philosophers have been set down by the London Press. The next is from the "*John Bull*."

"There is still, it seems, some uncertainty at one stage of the evolution :—

No one can at present say by what line of descent the three higher and related classes—namely mammals, birds, and reptiles—were derived from either of the two lower vertebrate classes, namely, amphibians and fishes,—(Vol. I, p. 212.)

The remaining steps, however, 'are not difficult to conceive.' Possibly not, if you start as Mr. Darwin does, by assuming his principle of evolution as the sole origin of species, and rejecting separate creation as 'unscientific.' In other words, you must first grant that man is descended from a monkey, and then it is 'not difficult to conceive' the intermediate steps; but if you decline to admit this *petitio principii*, you are wilfully closing your

eyes to what Mr. Darwin assures you is the fact. Such is the entire circle of this gentleman's logic. The book is full of interesting observations on natural history, exhibiting more or less relevancy to the argument it seeks to sustain; but the induction never advances a step without a confession of logical defectiveness. We are treated to tendencies, and probabilities, and conjectures, which derive all their force from a previous assumption of the point to be proved. Take away this, and there is hardly a proposition in the whole work which could pretend to the character of a logical conclusion.

The job-masters who swallow for science all that comes from scientific men were confounded to hear of this secret laboratory of imagination. The *Times* protested against the notion that experimental philosophers ever draw bills. But Tyndall and Darwin know better.

Mr. Darwin's present book is a conspicuous example of this utterly unscientific process. It begins by assuming evolution in the exact sense which Dr. Salmon justly called a scientific imagination, not a scientific fact. From a plausible conjecture that some species may be modified descendants of other species—the very most that Darwin-



ism can logically pretend to—its author quietly infers a universal law, and so sets himself to inquire in the present book 'whether man, like every other species, is descended from some pre-existing form'! Having by this good beginning accomplished more than half his work, he proceeds in like manner to 'take for granted' the high antiquity assigned to man by M. Boucher de Perthes, Sir Charles Lyell, Sir John Lubbock, and others, together with Professor Huxley's 'conclusive' proof that 'man differs less from the higher apes than these do from the lower members of the same order of primates.' Now here are at least four unproved hypotheses to be accepted in the dark before the new argument can see daylight. Of the first Mr. Darwin himself confesses that 'of the "older and honoured chiefs in natural science, many unfortunately are still opposed to evolution in every form." His greatest authority only denies the independent creation of every species, though Mr. Darwin, in quoting his words, enlarges them into an assertion that 'species'—instead of "some species"—are the modified descendants of other species. From this universal proposition, the induction is at present ludicrously scanty, while the facts and reasons on the contrary side are overpowering?

The battle, in short, has yet to be fought before Darwinism can make good this first step in its hypothetical series. The antiquity of man is another battle ground where it is hardly set up its banners. Assuredly it can boast no victory. On the existence of man before the Tertiary period all is yet the merest conjecture, and that of so slender a structure that it may at any moment vanish away. Sir John Lubbock's theory of a savage origin is a third hypothesis more in want of proof for itself, than able to afford proof of another. Not a single fact is established which is not quite as easily reconciled with the opposite theory. Against it is the unbroken testimony of history that while in many nations civilization has decayed and died out, in none has it sprung up and flourished without extraneous assistance. If man were originally savage, and acquired civilization by his own exertions, we ought occasionally to find him on the rise. There are savages enough within the sphere of history, and even of present observation, to give full scope for the experiment. How is it that we never see them improving themselves, till some one comes to improve them? Why did New Zealand remain in cannibalism till visited by missionaries within our own recollection, and then spring almost at a bound to a

level beyond many parts of Europe? That the New Zealander was capable of civilization is proved by the result; if it be a natural acquisition, why did he never acquire it before we found him out? On the other hand, if he received the gift from the Briton, as the Briton from the Roman, the Roman from the Greek, and the Greek from the Egyptian, we are conducted back to an original civilization from which the separated fragments fell, and to which they return again when the long lost connection is restored, as water returns to its level when the intervening mass is pierced without. Against this invariable testimony of history the most that is offered is that all existing nations were originally barbarous; but to infer from this that all ancient races were barbarous also, is again to beg the question. Our contention is that they were not, and we have some evidence in our favour in the remains of ancient Egypt and Assyria; to assume without evidence that these were in turn preceded by an unknown period of barbarism, requires us to admit the very point to be proved. If civilization (we repeat) did spring spontaneously out of barbarism at the first, why has it never done so since? To this question there is no reply. But if the original savagery is still an improbable conjecture,

instead of an established fact, the whole basis of Darwinism is gone.

Mr. Huxley's doctrine is in the same category of assumption without proof and against evidence. He is not more logical than his fellows, because he is more peremptory and scornful. Granting that in physical structure man approximates nearer to the ape than the ape to the lowest monkey, this is no argument for either being descended from the other, till we have admitted the two previous unproved hypotheses, universal evolution, and the savage origin of man. Again, physical structure is only one element in specific classification, and in the case of man the least important. His moral and intellectual nature is emphatically his specific difference from other mammals; and here it is easy to retort Mr. Huxley's argument. The highest ape is morally and intellectually more removed from the lowest savage than the latter from the most eminent philosopher. The savage may become a philosopher, but the ape never becomes even a savage. Neither can we detect the slightest tendency to such moral or intellectual evolution. Mr. Darwin does, indeed, collect some interesting anecdotes of quasi-human reason and affections in the lower animals, but it requires an enormous exercise of

'imagination' to elevate them into anything approaching to the nature of man. Of this he seems to be aware when he asks with a ludicrous sentimentality, 'Who can say what cows feel when they surround and stare intently on a dying or dead companion?' Yes, who indeed? There is nothing novel or scientific in this sort of stuff; we have heard of dreaming dogs, and reasoning elephants, and arithmetical pigs, and beavers' houses, and the wonderful instincts of bees all our lives, and the common sense of mankind, gentle and simple, has long ago, repudiated their real community with the moral and intellectual nature of man. Does Mr. Darwin hope to overcome the verdict by telling us that:—

If men were reared under precisely the same conditions as hive-bees, there can hardly be a doubt that our unsexed females would, like the worker-bees, think it a sacred duty to kill their brothers, and mothers would strive to kill their fertile daughters, and no one would think of interfering?

What would be said if any advocate of Revelation resorted to such puerile trifling? In the case supposed, the creatures would not be men, but bees, and not like other bees. But that bees ever think anything a 'sacred duty' is one of the thousand forms of begging the question artfully scattered up and down the book. Curiously enough, the best examples are found, not among the apes,

from whom we ought to inherit, but among creatures so remote in physical structure as the dog, the elephant, and the bee.

Amid all this irrelevant gossip, Mr. Darwin notices, with the feeblest attempt at refutation, the crucial arguments that man alone is capable of progressive improvement, and that man alone fashions implements for a special purpose. To the first he can only answer that in the hunting countries fens are more wary than in districts where they are not disturbed; and, to the second, that the chimpanzee cracks nuts with a stone, and other apes build temporary platforms (as birds build nests), which 'might readily 'grow into a voluntary and conscious act.' Nighi! But does it? And could it, unless we admit intellectual evolution, and so once more beg the question? It is astonishing how persistently this artifice is resorted to throughout. It pervades every part of the book, till, by dint of repetition and incessant assumption, often veiled in the most subtle implications, the reader is led to think a point demonstrated for which not a shadow of evidence has been presented. Of the courses of things, when reason, language, and religion have been once "acquired," Mr. Darwin writes as coolly as if such "acquisitions" were of

common experience, instead of being the wildest speculation, contrary to every conviction of our nature, and never in a single instance confirmed or indicated by experiment. It is really an abuse of language to call such writing 'scientific: to mistake the "Arabian Nights" for history would be far more excusable.

Such being the character of the thesis, we need not spend much time on the new hypothesis. The moment he attempts to draw any conclusion, Mr. Darwin himself is sensible of the exceeding tenuity of his premises. Showing us plainly enough what he is in quest of, he writes of what he has found either in the optative or conditional mood. In place of what is, we hear of what might, could, would, or should be—of what is probable or may be easily conceived—and unhappily the probability is often in inverse ratio to the importance of the conjecture. Here again Darwinism failing to establish its point by any kind of proof, is obliged to take refuge in imagination.

Its author, meanwhile, with as much assurance as if he had completed a mathematical demonstration, boldly apologises for the shock to our taste and our religion, by avowing that, for his own part, he would rather be decess-

ded from a monkey than a Fœgian savage: he adds that "it is not more irreligious to explain (?) the origin of man as a distinct species from some lower form, than to explain the birth of the individual through the laws of ordinary reproduction." The first excuse overlooks the little fact that the simian ancestry involves the savage also."

Again,

#### DARWINISM AND ASTRONOMY.

##### TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—After the many solid arguments adduced in your late admirable and most welcome notices of Mr. Charles Darwin's recent work, I should like to make only one suggestion. Mr. Darwin's theory requires us to believe that animal life existed on this globe at a period when, according to a theory much more plausible than his, the earth and all the planets with the sun constituted but one diffused nebula. Astronomers really have some data on which to found this theory of theirs, since marked variations in the conformation of several nebulae within historic times are now on record; whereas all the variations which Mr.



Darwin has been able to point out in species, and especially in man, within the same limits of time are either zero or of an extremely nebulous character.

I remain, Sir, yours faithfully,

April 10.

ASTRONOMICUS.

---

Thus much from the *Times*, now from the *Globe*,

"The other point to note is Professor Huxley's speech. The learned gentleman is not only abandoning himself to a bad habit of mischievous talking; he is becoming insane. What did he mean by entertaining a company like that assembled around the board of the Royal Academy with a wretched retch of the old story that man is a cooking animal, with the obvious variation *à propos* of the occasion that he is distinguished by the power to 'draw'! Professor Huxley must either be running rapidly to seed himself, or he has a very low opinion of his contemporaries when he expects them to be amused—even after dinner—with such feeble wit."—*Globe*, May 1st, 1871.

"On Geology and Darwinism "Dagobert" holds decided opinions. He regards the former as a science so completely in its infancy that to attempt to reconstruct our theology in reference to it is simply absurd:—"Late

researches have, I think, proved more clearly than ever it was proved before—first, that man is a very recent inhabitant of this planet; and, secondly, that man has not been produced by any process of selection or development. . . . Darwin has left the origin of species, not where he found it, but darker than ever; for he has proved that there ought to be no species at all; and if his views were true, there could have been no such thing.” This is admirably put and not easily answered, and the following reply to the scientists who object to the argument from design is irrefragable. ‘The professor who sees in nature no traces of a Creator, will find in a wretched piece of flint, as he peers enchanted through his spectacles, the long-lost proof of pre-Adamite man.’ The truth is that neoteric science is ruined by the shallow scientist, the lecturing professor, who, the moment a new notion strikes him, airs it to an audience of ladies at Albemarle-street or South Kensington. ‘Natural selection’—‘protoplasm’—‘air germs’—come into fashion and go out again like *passiers* and *chignons*.”

*Globe.*

—And lastly our friend “Punch” whose wit has always a good deal of wisdom in it.

" Darwin's speculation  
Is of another sort ;  
'Tis one which demonstration  
In no wise doth support.  
Time, theory's dispeller,  
Will out of mind remove it ;  
We say, as said old *Weller*,  
" Prove it." And he can't prove it."

Punch.

The following is Dr. Carpenter's opinion, the President of the British Association.

" There is a great deal of what I cannot but regard as fallacious and misleading philosophy—'oppositions of science falsely so called'—abroad in the world at the present time. And I hope to satisfy you that those who set up their own conceptions of the orderly sequence which they discern in the phenomena of nature, as fixed and determinate laws by which those phenomena not only are within all human experience, but always have been, and always must be, invariably governed, are really guilty of the intellectual arrogance they condemn in the systems of the ancients, and place themselves in diastrophical antago-

nism to those real philosophers, by whose comprehensive grasp and penetrating insight that order has been so far disclosed."

And, another,

"It must not be supposed that there is much unity among these "philosophers." But in this they all agree, they all argue *a posteriori*, and they are all infallible."

#### "LOOK ON THIS PICTURE"

##### WORDS OF THE WISE.

There is a path which no fowl  
knoweth, and which the vulture's  
eye hath not seen.

The lion's whelps have not  
trodden it, nor the fierce lion  
passed it.

He putteth forth His hand upon  
the rock; He overthroweth the  
mountain by the roots.

He cutteth out rivers among  
the rocks; and His eye seeth  
every precious thing.

He blindeth the floods from  
overflowing; and the thing that  
is hid bringeth He forth to light.

But where shall wisdom be  
found? and where is the place of  
understanding?

Man knoweth not the price  
thereof; neither is it found in the  
land of the living.

"It cannot be valued with the  
gold of Ophir, with the precious  
onyx, or the sapphire."

#### "AND ON THAT"

##### WORDS OF THE WISEACRE.

"What little I know about the  
matter leads me to think that if H.  
Carter, had possessed the slight-  
est acquaintance with biological  
science, (Philosophers disagree, it  
seems) he would have turned his  
philosophy upside down, and  
have found that we can have no  
knowledge of the great laws of  
life, except that which is based  
upon the study of natural living  
beings." (Huxley!!!)

"If there is one thing clear"  
(clear!) about the progress of  
modern science, it is the tendency  
to reduce all scientific problems  
except those which are purely  
intellectual to questions of  
molecular physics, that is to say  
to the attractions, repulsions,  
motions, and coordination of the  
ultimate particles of matter. So-  
cial phenomena are the result of  
the interaction of the complements  
of society, or men with one another  
in the surrounding universe, but  
in the language of physical science,

The gold and the crystal cannot equal it; and the exchange of it shall not be for jewels of the gold.

The Topaz of Ethiopia shall not equal it, neither shall it be valued with pure gold.

Whence then cometh wisdom? and where is the place of understanding.

Seeing it is hid from the eyes of all living, and kept close from the fowls of the air.

Destruction and death say, We have heard the fame thereof with our ears.

For He looketh to the ends of the earth, and seeth under the whole heaven;

To make the weight for the winds; and He weigheth the waters by measure.

When He made a decree for the rain, and a way for the lightning and thunder.

And unto man He said, Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding.

Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?

But ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee: and the fowls of the air, and they shall tell thee.

Who knoweth not in all these that the hand of the Lord hath wrought this?

In whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind,     *Job.*

which by the nature of the case is materialistic, the notions of men, so far as they are recognizable by science, are the results of molecular changes in the matter of which they are composed."

"To a certain extent indeed it may be said, that imperfect ossification of the vertebral column is of an embryonic character, but on the other hand it would be extremely incorrect to suppose that the vertebral columns of the older vertebrates are in any sense, embryonic, in their whole structure."

*Huxley.*

"Matter and spirit are both names for the imaginary substance of groups of natural phenomena."

*Huxley.*

"In itself it is but of little moment, whether we express the phenomena of matter in terms of spirit, or the phenomena of spirit in terms of matter."

*Huxley.*

"The extension of the province of what we call matter or materialism, and the concomitant gradual banishment from all regions of human thought, of what we call spirit and spontaneity."

*Huxley.*

"Traced back to its earliest state, the matter arises as the man does, in a particle of radiated protoplasm."

*Huxley.*

Wall wrote Canon Kingsley:—"All we have to do is to wait. Nominalism, and that Sensationalism which has sprung from Nominalism, are running fast to sea. Comptism seems to me its supreme effort, after which the whirligig of time may bring round its revenge, and Realism and we who hold the Realist creed may have our turn. Only wait—the end of that Philosophy is very near." "The tide is setting in against Darwinism."

---

Dedicated by Permission to the Right Hon. LORD SELBORNE,  
Lord Chancellor of England.

---

THE HUMANITY SERIES  
OF  
SCHOOL BOOKS,  
FOR NATIONAL AND OTHER SCHOOLS.

EDITED BY  
THE REV. F. O. MORRIS, B.A.,

Senior of Northampton, Yorkshire,  
Author of "A History of British Birds," Illustrated by Permission to  
the Great Northern Railway Co., &c., &c., &c.

---

"THE CREED IS FATHER OF THE DEED."

WORDSWORTH.

It is hoped and believed that this series of books will be found useful in the schools of the upper classes, as well as in all parochial ones, and for giving away as rewards or prizes to young persons and children, for presents to farm-servants, and servants generally, gamekeepers, drivers of carts and carriages, bargemen on rivers and canals, emigrants and others, for the encouragement of humanity and of "every good word or work."

MOFFATT, PAIGE & Co., Paternoster Buildings.

---

BOOKS AND FORMS

FOR THE USE OF

SCHOOL BOARDS.

FORMED UNDER

THE EDUCATION ACTS,

*Published & Supplied by*

MOFFATT, PAIGE & COMPANY,

4, Paternoster Buildings, London.

**ALL SCHOOL REQUISITES.**—Carriage paid on all orders. School books, stationery, furniture and apparatus. Schools completely fitted up. Estimates given. Carriage post free. Moffatt's School Board books and forms.

**MOFFATT'S INFANT SCHOOL READING SHEETS,** Price 2s. 6d. Mounted mostly on card board, 2s. These sheets are twenty in number, and are printed in very bold and clear type. The lessons are very carefully graduated, and are made up of subjects suitable for infant reading.

**PRINTING PRESSES** furnished with type, galleys, dabbles and ink.

Press to print a surface of	4	12
3 by 24 inches	...	6 6
Press to print a surface of		
4 by 44 inches	...	13 6
Extra type, an assortment		
of 48s.	...	10 0

**MOFFATT'S ARITHMETICAL TEST CARDS,** adapted by the London School Board. Standard I. Set A, B, C; Standard II. Set A, B, C; Standard III. Set A, B, C; Standard IV. Set A, B, C; Standard V. Set A, B, C; Standard VI. Set A, B, C. *Digby Rules* for examining Pupil Teachers. 25 packets in each set, and 2 copies of Answers. Set A. Mechanical Rules, Set B. Rules and Problems. Set C. Problems.

**MOFFATT'S EXPLANATORY POSTICAL READER.**—Adapted by the London School Board. The third edition is now ready—cloth, red edges, 1s.

The book contains carefully selected poems, with full notes and questions. Suitable for the recitations of Standard IV, V, VI.

**MOFFATT'S BOX OF FORM AND COLOUR.**—Adapted by the London School Board and by the Home and Colonial School Society. Special care has been taken to make the box strong. It contains an entirely new set of forms, both plain and ruled, and a sheet of 24 of the principal colours. Price 10s. 6d.—

**MOFFATT'S INFANT SCHOOL PUBLICATIONS.**—Adapted by the London School Board and by the Home and Colonial School Society. *Moffatt's Box of Form and Colour*, 10s. 6d. *Moffatt's Lessons in Colour*, on card 2s. *Moffatt's Lessons in Form*, on card, 1s. 4d. *Moffatt's Box of Coloured Cards*, with names, 2s.

**MOFFATT'S STANDARD MENTAL ARITHMETIC.**—Intended to supplement the ordinary lessons in Arithmetic. Six parts, each part corresponding to the Standards of the New Code. Price 1d. per part. The *First Form* *Memento of Numbers*, 400 lines, with careful, full notes and questions. Price 2d.

**MOFFATT'S INK POWDER** will make one quart of black ink by adding hot water. Post-free 4d.

**MOFFATT'S SELECTED PENS.** Moffatt's School Pen, a strong useful Pen, suitable for Schools, per gross, 1s. Moffatt's No. 851, fine point, per gross, 1s. 6d. Moffatt's No. 852, medium point, per gross, 2s. 6d. Moffatt's J Pen, broad point for bold writing, per gross, 2s. 6d. Moffatt's Swan Pen, useful for general writing, per gross, 1s. 6d. The *Author's Pen*, specially adapted for rapid writing, per box of three dozen, 1s.

**MOFFATT'S PREPARED EXAMINATION PAPERS.** Per packet of 50, 1s. 6d. post free.



[The lecture referred to in the following letter was on "Darwin's Theory of Conscience, its Relation to Scientific Ethics," in the *Index* of March 12, 1874. The *Index* had been removed from Toledo, O., to Boston, Mass., on Sept. 1, 1873.]

Down, Beckenham, Kent,  
March 30, 1874.

My dear Sir,

I have received your kind letter of the 3<sup>rd</sup> and the copies of the *Index*. You have put with remarkable clearness and conciseness my views on the moral sense; and you must allow me to say that your eulogium on what I have tried to do in science is the most magnificent one ever passed on me; and I heartily wish that I deserved the half of what you say.

I have read your article with much interest, and

with all the attention of which I am capable. But it is the truth that, from having had no practice in following abstract and abstruse reasoning, I put no trust in my own judgment in such cases. To make any point clear to myself, I must put it under a concrete form.

Therefore my opinion on your Essay is worth very little; and I must say that I cannot see how morality is "objective and universal!" yet I have approached the subject with a wish to be convinced. It would be of no use to give my doubts in detail; perhaps I shall best show where my difficulty chiefly lies by the following remarks.

The lower social animals may be said to be under an obligation not habitually to kill each other, and the mothers to protect their offspring. I think this mutual bond may be called an obligation, as the species could not exist in

society without it. No one would call it a moral obligation, and most persons would call it instinctive. Would you consider this an "objective and universal fact"? I suppose certainly not, as instinct is subjective, and the obligation would exist differ to a certain extent for different species. Now as soon as a social animal became in some slight, incipient degree a moral creature, — that is, was capable of approving or disapproving of its own conduct, — does it follow that its obligation would at once become moral? Would not the obligation remain, to a large extent, of the same so-called instinctive nature as before? And if so, its obligation could be only to a small extent objective and universal. Even if the obligation of a moral being must be of necessity moral, I cannot see why it should be an objective and universal fact,

any more than with the instinctive or  
~~mutual~~  
 bond between the lower social animals.

I have expressed myself obscurely, and I should not be in the least surprised if my ~~views~~<sup>ideas</sup> were shown to be quite confused; but I have thought myself bound to tell you my impression. I need not say that this letter is private, and it is obviously of no value. I much wish that I were better able to follow out abstract reasoning, and that I could agree with you. Allow me again to thank you cordially for your very kind feelings towards me; and believe me,

My dear Sir,

Yours very sincerely,  
 Charles Darwin

Down, Beckenham, Kent,  
 Railway Station, Orpington, S. E. K.  
 April 15, 1880.

My dear Sir,

I believe that I owe to you a copy of the Literary World with a capital review of a Lawyer's book on Evolution, and which I imagine is written by you. I had seen something about this book in a little article by Asa Gray, but did not know how abusive it was. It appears to be a production worthy of an ignorant lawyer.

For some time I have been intending to write and thank you for sending me the Index, and which I gratefully accept. But I now enclose a cheque for 5 £, which will pay for copies for some little time. I always read a large part of your excellent journal, and should certainly read every word, had I time and strength sufficient. But reading much more than

the papers, &c, which are necessary for my scientific work now-a-days tires me greatly. —

Most heartily wishing you success in your admirable endeavours in the good cause of truth, and wishing you prosperity in all ways, I remain,

My dear Sir,

Yours sincerely,

Charles Darwin.

P. S. Will you kindly send me a Postcard acknowledging receipt of the small cheque?

Copy  
of  
(1)

a no. J. C. Costerus  
& N. D. Boedes.  
The University  
Utrecht  
Holland.

March 12 1873  
Down, Beckenham, Kent.

Gentlemen

I thank you cordially for your very kind letter. It is the highest satisfaction which any writer can hope for, to interest other students, especially the younger ones. Your letter has consequently been very welcome to me. Perhaps you would like to possess a photograph of me, as a souvenir of our correspondence, and therefore I send two copies.

Your advice about cheap edition is good. About a year ago I did publish in England a small and much cheaper edition of my Origin of species; but still it is not so cheap as many books on the continent.

With my renewed and sincere thanks, I remain, Dear Sirs, yours very faithfully,  
Ch. Darwin.

(2) a no. N. D. Boedes  
(Postmark: London) The University  
Confidential. Utrecht  
Holland.

April 2 1873  
Down, Beckenham, Kent.

Dear Sir,

I am much obliged for the

Letter published in Standard

Monday Oct 22 1883.

as appearing in a work just issued

Down. Bookham. Kent.

Dear Sir,

It seems to me absurd to doubt that a man can be an ardent Theist & an Evolutionist. You are right about Kingsley. ~~But of course~~ As a Geol. the eminent botanist, is another case in point. What my own views may be is a question of no consequence to anyone but myself. But as you ask, I may state that my judgment often fluctuates. Moreover, whether a man deserves to be called a Theist depends upon the definition of the term, which is much too large a subject for a note. In my most extreme fluctuations I have never been an atheist in the sense of denying the existence of a God. I think that



photograph of yourself and friends. I am  
sure that you will excuse my writing at  
length, when I tell you that I have long  
been much out of health, and am now  
staying away from my home for rest. It is  
impossible to answer your question  
briefly; and I am not sure that I could  
do so, even if I wrote at some length.  
But I may say that the impossibility of  
conceiving that this grand and wondrous  
universe, with our conscious selves,  
arose through chance, seems to me the  
chief argument for the existence of God;  
but whether this is an argument of real  
value, I have never been able to decide.  
I am aware that if we admit a first  
cause, the mind still craves to know where  
it came and how it arose. Nor can I  
overlook the difficulty from the immense  
amount of suffering through the world. I  
am, also, induced to defer to a certain  
extent to the judgment of the many able  
men who have fully believed in God;  
but here again I see how poor an  
argument this is. The safest conclusion  
seems to be that the whole subject is  
beyond the scope of man's intellect;  
but man can do his duty.

With my best wishes for your success  
in life, I remain, dear Sir,

Yours faithfully  
Ch. Darwin.

generally. (I think & more as I grow older), but  
not always, that an Agrarian would be the  
more correct description of my state of mind.

Dear Sir, yours faithfully, Ch. Darwin

From C. Darwin to N. D. Dodes.

1873

Whitch.

W.

502

CD to JD Hooker

original is at Kew

in CD letters to W.T. Thwaites Dyer  
letters.

Copy

Miss Woodington's  
The Common, Sevenoaks

Oct 10 -

My dear Hooker

I am very much vexed about the  
Drosses. I am sure it was an oversight of  
Lettington's & not carelessness, as he was very  
proud of the state of D. Capensis.

I will send your mem to Parlow today, but  
I am very doubtful whether he will be able to aid  
you. I was very much struck with Mallot's paper.

but

but do not remember it enough to see  
how it bears on the inward dipping of mountain  
basal strata. In none of the theories founded on  
secular refrigeration can I understand how the  
same area should have been repeatedly lifted  
up & down. The admission of water to the heated  
rocks seems now universally accepted as the  
immediate cause of volcanic outbursts; but the  
moon, now destitute of aqueous (!) vapour, & yet  
so studded with craters seems to me difficult  
to reconcile with this theory.

I forgot in my last note to thank you

+ Prof. Dyer for his paper, which interested me  
immensely; by its aid & my own reflections  
I have managed to strake off pretty well Dr  
Baillieu; but I never did for a moment  
admit his extreme cases.

He seems to me a very able man, & I  
(Generation)  
think spontaneous gen to a composed talent  
will some day be proved.

Yours affectionately

(signed) Ch. Darwin.

# Speech of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury

IN PROMISING AND MOVING THE ADOPTION OF THE REPORT  
AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOUTH AMERICAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY,  
APRIL 22, 1855.

The Most Reverend CHAIRMAN, who was hailed with cheers on rising, spoke as follows:—It gives me great pleasure to be here to-day. I have come from the country on purpose to be here; and, at the same time, I have to regret very much that I must undertake a task which was not originally intended for me. The adoption of this Report was to have been moved by the eloquent Bishop of Exeter, and although we are all satisfied that he in doing his duty is relieved by being thus to-day, we cannot but regret for ourselves that we are missing an opportunity of hearing him put in his own magnificent language such remarks to scenes and events as have marked the Society's history this year, remarkable as it is for the greatness of its enterprise and for the vastness of the scale upon which it proposes to go forward. If this Society proceeds as it has begun it must become very great indeed. The work appears to me, from all I can learn about it—and I have studied the Report very carefully—to be done in a thorough, steady, earnest, progressive way, and I am sure that the Spirit of the Lord is animating those who are doing such work under such great difficulties. (Hear, hear.) Beginning modestly, and having so vast an enterprise before us, if we only will possess the spirit of prayer, and live in the faith that God will give great things into the hands of those who trust Him, we may believe that the work of this Society will be one of the greatest hereinafter that shall have been accomplished in the history of the promotion of Christianity. (Cheers.) The various scenes of the labours of this Society are extraordinarily picturesque. We have upon this platform the presence of those who stretch out their hands, as it were, from the very beginning of the Society to this day, and whose work in the past, and whose state of preparation for work in the future, present together wonderful scenes in the Society's life. We have here Admiral Boscawen (cheers), who found the bodies of Allen Gardiner and his devoted crew, who was well acquainted with the early history of the Mission, and assisted in planting it. Admiral Selwyn, too, is here (cheers); and we have also Mr. Hood (cheers), who is about to step into the dangerous place vacated by the lamented death of Mr. Lockyer. The Bishop of the Falkland Isles is a person round whom, as chief agent of this work, our interests centre. The Bishop of the Falkland Isles! A little spot in geography, but his church in South America, all but British Guiana, just as if there were a bishop of the Isles of Scilly, who had the episcopal care of the whole continent of Europe. One of the first picturesque associations of this day is what we have heard about the "Allen Gardiner." To Admiral Boscawen I am sure it must come with a strange, thrilling feeling to think that he whose memorials he brought away more than that sad and most devoted mission field has, as it were, invested—and will, I trust, for generation after generation invest—with the interest of his own, and with the living spirit of his influence, the land for which he died. This little vessel, whose adventures are told in the Report—told so graphically by the Bishop—is a living Allen Gardiner to Terra del Fuogo.\* Such a region! I recollect that my first acquaintance with it began upon a headland in Scotland, where I was reading Peinners Cooper's "Sea Lions," and the description of Cape Horn and the natives filled my imagination upon the wild headland where I was just at that moment. It is among the inhabitants of that wonderful region that the work of this Society began; and we have been hearing of the immense call for teachers, and the field that is opening out at the other end of this little diocese of the Falkland Isles, where a marvellous work is in progress at the isthmus of Panama. This Society would have great claims on the public, and on their liberality, if all that was known about it was that it was the only Church of England agency which attempts to deal with either the heathen or the Christians in South America. But also this Society touches so many points of general interest that we have additional ground for encouragement. When we think that it drew the attention of Charles Darwin, and made him, in his pursuit of the wonders of the Kingdom of nature, realise that there was another Kingdom just as wonderful and more lasting (hear, hear); and when we think that it drew his earnest support

\* The voyage in question was made in the "Messenger," a 10-ton cutter, especially intended for the Bishop's use at the Falkland Islands.—Ed.



and his gratitude towards the Mission, that alone—to have drawn the attention of so great a man of science to this subject, occupied with such different things, and to have obtained from him that opinion which we are all familiar with as often quoted—in a wonderful thing to have done for the whole cause of missions. (Hear, hear.) Another greatly interesting fact about this work is what we have been listening to with respect to the Argentine Republic, and all that Colonel Lannere has been doing. His last word is "civilisation." For a long time past we in England, and the Anglo-Saxon peoples that belong to us, have been carrying what we call "civilisation" to the ends of the earth, and a very happy-go-lucky affair in many an instance have we made of it. To us it ought to come with a great feeling of shame that this Argentine Republic is moving about civilisation with some understanding of what it really is—that is, setting clearly before itself what are the great aims to be gained. When we think of the territory that we have ourselves acquired by fire-water, and the unscrupulous way in which we have possessed ourselves of territory after territory—I may almost say of continents after continents, of river after river—by doing the poor unhappy natives with fire-water, we must admit that it is a great thing to see the Argentine Republic putting forth, as one of its regulations, that everything in which the Indians are concerned is to be conducted with the same strict honour as towards the white man, and that there is to be no sale of spirituous liquors under any circumstances. (Cheers.) When, also, we think to our shame that there are Indian tribes with whom the name "white man" is the one that they use for "har," when we reflect upon such an awful fact as that, told to me the other day by the Bishop of Minnesota, we must indeed feel full of hope for the future work in South America now that the Argentine Republic is ready to help, saying that there shall be no profit from the making of human beings drunk for the first time in their lives, and then drunk for ever; and that there shall be nothing gained by any transaction which would be dishonourable if conducted among white men. (Hear, hear.) Now we must leap quite away to another part of the world, and while some of our friends are questioning whether the Welsh Church is worth preserving, it is something to read that that Church is doing a great work upon that continent (cheers); and to read the quiet observation with which the Report ends, and which says they do trust that the work begun by the Welsh Church will be a great means of religious union on the other side of the world, and they have reason to think that these are not vain words. (Hear, hear.) Again, we find ourselves in the midst of a strange body of Indians, who gather together with the cross in their centre, and worship it as a god. They seem to do so, at any rate; and to have strange remnants of baptism and of the Holy Communion—things that have floated down from the time when the first Jesuit missionaries taught them, and then were obliged to go away and leave them. There has been left in the hearts of these wild children of the forest a strong and burning inclination towards receiving the real meaning of all that remains with them, and which is at present but a kind of service-cremity. Then, again, Panama must be near to the hearts of us all. It is but yesterday that Mr. Lockyer, of the University of London, went out there, full of hope, and fell so soon a victim to the climate. We trust that with more precautions and care his successor may be preserved to direct and to do the work for many years, and to sow the seed of great future good. (Hear, hear.) I should be sorry to sit down without paying a tribute to Bishop Stirling himself. I saw something of him when he was here last, and I was much impressed with the single-hearted, powerful surrender of a very holy soul to the work which it was impossible for him to face, except by the simplest reliance on the guidance of the Holy Spirit and on God's good providence. You can scarcely read the account of his voyage in the *Illustrated Messenger's* book, when he got into that great reef, without feeling that God's presence is most closely with him, and that He had hidden him amid the war of elements in the hollow of His hand. (Hear, hear.) I was myself present at the consecration of Bishop Stirling in Westminster Abbey. I shall never forget it. It was on St. Thomas's day, one of the darkest winter mornings that I ever was at church in. The darkness hung over the Abbey until just the end of the service when it broke up into a very bright ray. In the midst of that bright ray I was going round the cloisters, the ceremony being over, when I saw a little scene that touched me to the very quick. There was a little girl waiting at the corner of the cloister. Bishop Stirling came out in his new bishop's dress. His little daughter, the child whom I had caught sight of a moment before, sprang forward and clasped him round the neck, her eyes full of tears.

and her face full of love, to welcome her father as a bishop, and to know at the same time that it was a parting. (Hear, hear.) Since that moment he has always been in my mind. I never knew him to speak to till I saw him the other day, when we knelt down together in my room and prayed for constant guidance and help for him. I trust there is no supporter of the South American Missionary Society who, while giving him and his work all possible material support, forgets to give him his most earnest prayers. He is in my heart-rod, and ever will be. I remember that when a boy I was on the top of the central tower of St. Omer, at Rouen, and looking over the clerical seminary below, where a large number of the students were to be seen, I talked to my guide about the misdirectness through which the French clergy were passing at that time—so poor, so hindered in the work of education, so starved almost, officials high and low making it difficult for them to do their work at all, despised by such a large proportion of the population in their then temper, and I said, "It really is wonderful, considering all these men go through, that there are still some found to come forward to fill up their places and to carry on work which involves a life of so much disappointment, vexation, trial, and even suffering." My guide, a simple French peasant, looked at me with a smile, and said, "Où / monneur, il s'en manque pas." May God grant that it be so with your missionaries! (Hear, hear.) May we be able to say of them, as we have good hope of doing, that for the love of God and the glory of His great name, and that man may believe in Him who died on the cross, *Il s'en manque pas*. May they never fail! You must remember that the future of this Society depends on you, on those whom you interest in it, and on those whom you bring into it. We must earnestly commend the secretaries to the local Associations, that they may support them well, and may increase that really trifling sum which is at the disposal of the Society to deal with South America in the name of the Church. But do not forget, at the same time, that what you do and say, and the way you live, and the way in which you manifest your interest in the great missionary work which you love, may increase this Society manifold. (Cheers.)

EXTRACT FROM "DAILY NEWS" ARTICLE, APRIL 23, 1884.

"The Archbishop of Canterbury made an interesting statement at the meeting of the South American Missionary Society on Tuesday. 'It was this society (he said) which drew the attention of Charles Darwin, and made him, in his parents of the wonders of the kingdom of nature, know and realize that there was another kingdom—that of Christ, which was just as wonderful.' The statement about Darwin's theological views is so little in harmony with the general impression in regard to them, that one would be glad to know the Archbishop's evidence for it. As to Darwin's South American experiences, it is generally supposed that they were acquired, not in connection with the South American Missionary Society, but when Darwin went out on board H.M.S. 'Beagle,' as naturalist of the expedition under the command of Captain Fitzroy."

To his statement the following replies were sent and published in the *Daily News* of April 24th and 25th:—

"MR. DARWIN AND THE SOUTH AMERICAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

"We have received several letters in regard to the Archbishop of Canterbury's reference to this subject. The Rev. R. J. Simpson, Secretary of the South American Missionary Society, 11 Serjeant's Inn, writes:—'On February 3, 1847, Mr. Charles Darwin paid in to the funds of this Society, through his old friend Admiral Sir R. J. Salween, the sum of £5, and I have reason to believe he further contributed smaller sums yearly for the same object, in conjunction with former friends associated with him in the "Beagle."' Mr. Simpson says that Admiral Sir R. J. Salween, who was present at the meeting of the Society on Tuesday last, was on board the "Beagle" with Mr. Darwin, and he sends a long extract from a speech, made in 1841, in which Admiral Salween referred to some of his doubts as shipwrecked crews performed by Fuegians, and said that, on certain facts being communicated to him, Mr. Darwin wrote that 'he could not have believed that all the missionaries in the world could ever have made the Fuegians honest.' A year or two ago (said Admiral Salween) something which he had read in one of the

Society's magazines led Mr. Darwin to write to him on that subject. He had long said that nothing could be done by means of mission work, that all the pains bestowed on the natives would be thrown away, and that they could never be civilized. He afterwards admitted that he was wrong, and at the period to which he (Admiral Selwyn) had just alluded he wrote: 'I had always thought that the civilization of the Japanese is the most wonderful thing in history, but I am now convinced that what the missionaries have done in Tierra del Fuago in civilizing the natives is at least as wonderful.' Mr. Charles Hill, writing from 13 Bedford Row, W.C., says that the Archbishop's statement 'was probably based on the following passage from page 137 of a deeply interesting memoir of Captain F. W. Stephens, R.N., late of H.M.'s ship "Thetis," by Mr. B. Hayward, and published by Nisbet & Co.: "Many years ago the noted naturalist Darwin held that the Fuegians were incapable of receiving Christianity or civilization, but the work of this mission so changed his views on the subject that he became a contributor to the Society, that is the South American Missionary Society."—Capt. Parker Snow, writing from 1 Victoria Villas, Stanley Beach, encloses a copy of a letter which he received from Mr. Darwin in November, 1881. Mr. Darwin said: 'I hope that you may succeed in publishing a new edition of your cruise in Tierra del Fuago. You saw so much more of the natives than I did, that wherever we differ, you probably are in the right. Indeed the success of the missionary establishment there proves that I took a very erroneous view of the nature and capabilities of the Fuegians.'

—MR. DARWIN AND THE SOUTH AMERICAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

—To the Editor of the 'Daily News.'

Sir,—Your article in the Daily News of yesterday induces me to give you a correct statement of the connection between the South American Missionary Society and Mr. Charles Darwin, my old friend and shipmate for five years. I had been closely connected with the Society from the time of Captain Allen Gardiner's death, and Mr. Darwin had often expressed to me his conviction that it was utterly useless to send Missionaries to such a set of savages as the Fuegians, probably the very lowest of the human race. I had always replied that I did not believe any human being existed too low to comprehend the simple message of the Gospel of Christ. After many years—I think about 1865, but I cannot find the letter—he wrote to me that the recent accounts of the Mission proved to him that he had been wrong and I right in our estimate of the native character, and the possibility of doing them good through Missionaries; and he requested me to forward to the Society an enclosed cheque for £5, as a testimony of the interest he took in their good work. On January 20th, 1874, he wrote: 'The success of the Tierra del Fuago Mission is most wonderful, and charms me, so I always prophesied, when failure. It is a grand success. I shall feel proud if your Committee think fit to elect me an honorary member of your Society.' In the same letter, in reply to remarks of mine on the success of his men, he says, 'Thank God, all gives me complete satisfaction.' On June 23d, 1874, he wrote: 'I am very glad to hear so good an account of the Fuegians, and it is wonderful.' On June 16th, 1879: 'The progress of the Fuegians is wonderful, and had it not occurred would have been to me quite incredible.' On January 2nd, 1880: 'Your extracts (from a journal) about the Fuegians are extremely curious, and have interested me much. I have often said that the progress of Japan was the greatest wonder in the world, but I declare that the progress of Fuaga is almost equally wonderful.' On March 24th, 1881: 'The account of the Fuegians interested not only me, but all my family. It is truly wonderful what you have heard from Mr. Bridges about their honesty and their language. I certainly should have predicted that not all the Missionaries in the world could have done what has been done.' On December 1st, 1881, sending me his annual subscription to the *Orphanage* at the Mission Station, he wrote: 'Judging from the *Missionary Journal*, the Mission in Tierra del Fuago seems going on quite wonderfully well. I have much pleasure in sending you these particulars.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant.

—Barracomb, April 16th.

—R. J. Selwyn (Vice-Admiral).

We print these comments in this leaflet free, as many may wish to do with to have the exact report of the Archbishop's speech, and also the exact facts in regard to the connection of the late Mr. Chas. Darwin with the Society and its work in Tierra del Fuago.

SOUTH AMERICAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY, 11 Sergeant's Inn, Fleet Street, E.C.

Hon Secretary, Rev R. J. Selwyn, M.A. General Hotel, Barbican

DAR 139 (2)

Oct 3/84

56 George St

ans

My dear Frank

Henrietta tells me that she thinks you wd be glad if I were to write to you on the subject of my impressions as to your Father's attitude towards Belgium. It is a deeply interesting subject to me & my ideas about it are rather definite but I need not say I shd never have volunteered

any expression of them &  
that what I do say is in  
answer to what I understand  
as an invitation. At the  
same time you must remem-  
ber that I write without  
effort & that the attempt  
to gather up the fragments  
of memories & thoughts ex-  
tending over about 40 years  
is a valuable one to myself  
& may be very well its  
own object, if as is very  
likely what I say shd  
prove worthless to you.

I suppose what strikes every  
one in your father's writings  
is his complete neutrality on  
this side of our being. His  
books seem to tell me as  
little of his convictions in  
this respect as do those  
of a mathematician. I do  
not know any other great  
man of science of whom  
one could say this, & in  
my opinion it has been  
a great source of his  
influence. If he had ever  
said a word that was

either on the side of, or  
on the side against, what  
we mean by Religion, he  
cd not have taken the  
place he has <sup>done</sup>. His books  
wd have been in either  
case more interesting to a  
good many people, but  
as one cd have felt, as  
every one must <sup>feel</sup> do now,  
that they are a manifestation  
of Science in its absolute  
purity. This gives them a  
coolness & repose, unlike any  
other written in the last 30 years.

Now This is what everybody would say. But what I feel is that in looking back at the impression left on me by intercourse, it is rather different. Every one, I suppose, who feels Religion the ultimate infinitely the most important <sup>subject</sup> source of human attention wd <sup>be aware of</sup> feel a certain hostility towards it in his attitude, so far as it was revealed in private life.

And what is to me very remarkable I should say



that it was a growing hostility  
while all the apparent reasons  
for it were vanishing quantities.  
Many wd say he was driven  
into a certain antagonism  
by the attitude of the Church.  
If that is so I never saw  
anything of it. The Church  
or rather religious feeling everywhere  
has for the last 20 years  
been steadily & at last rapidly  
approaching a position of docile  
& eager acceptance of all  
that he & his like had  
to teach. And in the same  
proportion he certainly recedes  
from any sympathy with them.

He was far more sympathetic  
with religion when his books  
were considered wicked, <sup>by the religious world</sup> than  
when (as was the case for  
some years before he died)  
the dignitaries of the Church  
were eager to pay him the  
highest honour.

I think I partly see why  
this was the case.

I remember, of course dimly,  
in some sense, but very vividly  
in others a conversation

more than 30 years ago  
certainly long before the publication of *The Origin*  
in which he first told me a  
little of the scope of the

book, so far as <sup>that</sup> it was  
a scheme of what is now  
called Evolution — so far  
at least as that it was  
an alternative to the idea  
we then all held of the  
beginning of this world  
by an act of Creation.  
And I recall my own  
expression of extreme re-  
pugnance to this idea  
& the sense of loss in  
giving up the belief in  
Creation. I do <sup>hardly</sup> ~~not~~ remember  
a single distinct word in

the conversation, but just his  
 last words "I cannot conceive  
 any wish about the matter  
 one way or another" are as  
 clear to me as if they  
 had been spoken yesterday,  
 at least both the meaning  
 & the tone of voice & the  
 look comes back to me  
 now though perhaps the words  
 may not be exactly literal.  
 He felt that he was con-  
 fronting some influence that  
adulterated the evidence

of fact. And I think he  
felt this all the more because  
he was not so entirely within  
it himself as he thought  
he was. When he sat down  
to write he was entirely  
without it. But perhaps all  
the more a little of it -  
I mean of the spirit that  
mingles with with belief -  
crept into his attitude to  
other things, & it became  
something he recognized as  
a disturbing influence, or  
at least that he was invariably  
aware of in that light.

I am sure there was nothing in his mind hostile to the idea of creative will. Indeed almost the last words he said to me were what I took to be such an expression of <sup>this</sup> belief, at least of ~~an~~ a tendency towards it. It was one day when I was standing in the dining room, & he came up quite abruptly & began without any preface, in a way

as if the Subject had  
been much in his mind  
- "The reason that I can  
never give in to the belief  
that we are all naturally  
inclined to, of a first  
cause" he did not say  
a personal first cause, but  
he gave me the impression  
of meaning that "is  
that I cannot look on  
any feeling in man as  
different look upon all  
human feeling as traceable  
to some form in the animal

& then he went on to tell  
me why this seemed to  
him to conflict with the  
other. Alas I found when  
I afterwards referred to this  
last part of his reasoning  
that I had misunderstood  
it! I never understood  
what he did mean in  
that, why it sh<sup>d</sup> be any  
difficulty in the way of  
belief in God that we  
were the descendants of  
the animals & the inheritors  
of their impulses. I think



x author of the Creed of Rome

if you have his letters  
to Mr Graham, you  
will find some reference  
to it, but it will not  
be necessarily any clearer  
than what I have said  
for I pointed out to  
him that Mr Graham  
had ~~understood~~ <sup>just</sup> taken  
his words in just the  
same sense as I had.  
He saw this at once but  
he was not inclined, <sup>just</sup> then  
to explain himself, & a  
better opportunity never came.

But what I feel it worth while to give such a confused account for is the assumption, of which I am quite certain, that this tendency to look back to some initial will beyond the forces of Nature was one he recognised with a certain sympathy. I am quite certain of those words "that we are all inclined to" because I heard them with extreme surprise.

And I must say that my difficulty in understanding his difficulty gives to me a strong suspicion that it was not very dear to himself. I expected him to say some thing that I had felt myself. The tendency toward belief being recognized so broadly, & the expression of doubt being so subtle I cannot but feel the first the more of a reality of the two.

But though as I think this

proves & as many other things  
indicate to me (especially  
I remember his inviting me  
to criticise his account of  
the religious <sup>instinct</sup> ~~insight~~ in a  
manner that makes it  
perfectly easy to do so)  
— he had no hostility towards  
Religion, as a view of the  
ultimate origin of things,  
beginning to speculate just  
where Science left off, yet  
when Religion appeared as  
concerning itself with forces  
now at work in the world

when it dealt with spiritual  
influence which had its  
own cause distinct effects  
& could be taken ~~up~~ account  
of as something working  
here & now — then I  
think it always seemed  
to him a belief that was  
in disorder, & was hostile  
to all true Science. And  
so of course he was  
hostile to it. And as I  
have said this seemed  
to me an increasing  
feeling through the last 20  
years of his life.

I think he was aware of a change in himself. He twice referred to his turning back to books he had read with great interest in youth & finding ~~it~~ the interest was gone. One was Wordsworth's Poems, wh. as you know are full of his marks, <sup>as a young man</sup> & yet he sd that at the time he spoke (about 1874 or 5) he could not possibly read them, & found that he was always finding ob.

Curiosity where he never remembered any difficulty in the past. I sd "I think you must imagine some different kind of understanding from what poetry admits of. Nobody understands poetry in the sense that they can put the meaning of those words into other words" He sd "Ah yes I suppose it is, <sup>partly</sup> that, & nobody understands Science unless they can. The habit of looking for one kind of meaning I suppose

deadens the perception of another."

I felt this conversation throws a strong light on his attitude towards Religion.

I am so little aware whether anything I have said <sup>will</sup> possess any interest for you that I will send this to Henrietta first to forward or not at her discretion. It has been to me a most interesting & helpful effort to father



up these Regiments, &  
I shall not regret having  
done so if they are useful  
to us one but myself.

Believe me

dear Frank

ever sincerely yrs

F Julia Wedgwood

"WHICH STRAIN AT A GOAT AND SWALLOW A CAMEL."

---

ALL

THE ARTICLES

OF

THE DARWIN FAITH.

BY

THE REV. F. O. MORRIS, B.A.

Rector of Northwold, Yorkshire.

Author of "A History of British Birds," dedicated by permission  
to her most gracious Majesty the Queen, etc., etc.

---

"*Etiam non sedit, sed etiam non sedit.*"—HORACE

---

LONDON:  
MOFFATT, PAIGE, AND CO  
4, Paternoster Buildings, E.C.

1878.

DEDICATED

BY PERMISSION

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

THE COMMON SENSE

OF THE

PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.

"O ye fools, when will ye understand? ... He that made the eye; shall He not see?"—Psalm xciv. 8, 9.

---

ALL THE ARTICLES  
or  
THE DARWIN FAITH.

---

I BELIEVE that we are the people, and that wisdom shall die with us.

I believe that my theory of natural selection is right, and that every one who does not hold it is in the wrong, although the difficulties "are so grave, that to this day I can never reflect on them without being staggered." (Darwin).

I believe that man, and all the animals, birds, fishes, reptiles, and insects in the world have descended from one single original, and not any of these from ancestors of their own kinds; that the gnat and the elephant, the cat and the mouse, the bat and the butterfly, the whale and the ant, the toad and the swallow, the hare and the tortoise,

the crocodile and the lamb, the humming-bird and the snake, the mole and the monkey, and then the man, are all one species—and only one.

I believe this, although I see that whilst animals of the several species described by naturalists breed solely together, and that their offspring are prolific, in like manner, generation after generation, any others which may exceptionally breed together have no progeny, except in very rare cases, and that any they may have leave no descendants, except still more rarely for perhaps one farther generation or so.

I believe that all the various creatures on the earth have sprung from a single parent, although I hold that each new species has "supplanted and exterminated its original parent and all the transitional varieties between its past and present status." (Darwin).

I believe that the drooping of the ears in domestic animals is due to the disease of the muscles of the ear, from the animals not being much alarmed by danger, although I see the horse with erect ears, and the hare and the rabbit with strikingly drooping ears.

I believe that the temporary variation of several races of

any one species of plant is a proof that permanent so-called species are thus produced, although I see that the varieties if left for many generations in a poor soil would to a large extent by degrees, and in the end wholly, revert to the form of the wild aboriginal stock.

I believe that I am using an able and sensible argument in saying that the mistletoe may metaphorically be said to struggle with other fruit-bearing plants in order to tempt birds to devour and thus disseminate its seeds rather than those of other plants.

I believe that the eye of every living creature was produced by natural selection, although in some species it consists of 4,000 lenses, in others 12,000, 17,000, or 25,000, and in others of various other vast numbers.

I believe that my theory is right, although I allow that according to it "all nature" ought to be "in confusion" instead of the species being, as we see them, "well defined." (*Darwin*).

I believe—"there seems to me no great difficulty in believing"—(*Darwin*)—that the swim-bladder in fishes "though originally constructed for one purpose," has been "actually converted" "into a lung or organ used exclusively for respiration."

I believe that the "electric organs of fishes" have been produced by "natural selection," although it is "impossible to conceive by what steps these wondrous organs have been produced." I believe this, although these organs only occur in species "widely remote in their affinities," while we "might have expected" (on Darwinian grounds), that they would all "have been specifically related to each other. I believe the same in the like case of luminous insects.

I believe that the most simple parts of species are due to natural selection, although I see that their "importance does not seem sufficient to cause the preservation of successively varying individuals."

I believe that the tail of the giraffe has grown by degrees into a "fly-flapper" (1), although I cannot explain how the species did without it in previous countless ages before it grew to its present length.

I believe that every "well-developed tail" in a water animal has been worked in as a "fly-flapper" for land animals, or as a "proboscis instrument," or to "help them in turning;" although I see that in the dog it is of next to no such use at all, and that the hare "can double quickly enough, though with hardly any tail."

I believe that long tails are necessary to animals in hot countries to give them the "power of resisting the attacks of insects," although I see that sheep have heavy tails which they cannot and do not make use of for any such purpose, and are especially attacked by flies on their heads, which, if their tails were ever so light, they could not possibly reach.

I believe that—as I hold that the swim-bladder in creatures of the sea is modified into lungs in their descendants changed into land animals—the tail, having been so useful to the former as a means of locomotion, still proves its origin in the latter, though of so little use to them.

I believe that the green colour of the green woodpecker is due to selection by the male or female bird, because I see that there are black and pied woodpeckers also.

I believe that it is not the case that many structures have been created for beauty in the eyes of man, or for mere variety, although I "fully admit that many structures are of no direct use to their possessors."

I believe that there is "no logical impossibility in the requirement of any conceivable degree of perfection through natural selection," although I must admit that



the case of the eye is "more than enough to stagger any man."

I believe that the American ostrich "is not yet perfect," although I can give no proof whatever that it is in the process of becoming so.

I believe that the "most wonderful of all known instincts," that of the hive bee, can be explained by me, as a Darwinite, and the illogical way in which I have accounted for it in my work on "The Origin of Species" I believe to be a master-piece of reasoning, though nine out of ten of its facts prove nothing whatever by way of conclusion for it.

I believe the same in the case of the working of sterile ants, though "how the workers have been made sterile is a difficulty;" that is to say, in itself, but none whatever to my more "fertile" brain, which thinks nothing of any difficulty that stands in its way.

I believe that the difficulty, though "appearing insuperable," "disappears" by my imagining that selection may be exercised by a whole "family" as well as by an "individual." I choose to forget that families are made up of individuals.

I believe that on my theory no account need be taken of the "prodigious amount of difference between the fertile and sterile individuals of many insects."

I believe that my theory is perfectly correct, although there is a 'climax of the difficulty' beyond all those that I have yet stated, some of the neutrals differing even from each other to an "almost incredible degree;" some "with jaws and instincts extraordinarily different;" others with forms "the use of which is quite unknown."

I believe that I am right, and all the world else wrong, although it will be thought that I have an "overweening confidence in my own wisdom," which makes me "not admit that such wonderful and well-established facts at once annihilate my theory."

I believe that I must be right, although I can't "pretend that the facts given in this chapter (VII.) strengthen in any degree my theory," and all that I can say is that they do not "annihilate it;" ergo I must be right.

I believe that the sterility of hybrids is no disproof of my theory of natural selection, which is that it acts for the good of the creatures which exercise it, although it could not possibly be of any advantage to the several animals,

and although I think that the importance of the fact has been "much underrated by some writers."

I believe that my theory of hybridism is right, although it does not "go to the root of the matter" and "no explanation is offered" of the main fact. "*Ibrida quo pacto sit*" is quite beyond me.

I believe that "no part of the structure of any one species has been formed for the exclusive good of another species," though "natural selection" can and does often produce structures for the direct injury of other species; and though I see that the aphid voluntarily uses its structure for the sole good of the ants, and I can only "probably" imagine that it is of any convenience to the aphides themselves.

I believe that tumbler-pigeons have been produced by the long continued selection of such in many generations, though I can't at all tell how they first came to have the habit, or why it should have been fortunately noticed by some fancier, or how he came to think that it might be propagated and preserved, and succeeded in doing so.

I believe that I strengthen my argument by saying that dogs only rarely require, when young, to be taught

not to attack sheep, etc., though I see that it is the commonest thing possible that some dogs can never be broken of the habit, and that there is not a dog in existence but might be encouraged to it.

I believe generally that "natural instincts are lost under domestication," although I have the preceding fact and numberless others staring me in the face to show me the exact contrary, and that they are at the most but dormant, and ready to be restored to their former fulness.

I believe that young chickens have lost by habit the fear of dogs and cats, although I have no possible proof whatever, and cannot possibly have any proof, that they ever had such.

I believe that the cuckoo "once upon a time" did not lay her eggs in other birds' nests, but has acquired the habit by degrees, some "old bird" or other profiting by the mistake, or the young being made stronger by it, viz., by being tended by a foster parent instead of by their natural one, and so becoming "apt to follow" that unnatural practice; and this though I see that various birds "occasionally" lay their eggs in other birds' nests, and yet have acquired no such habit.

Although in spite of an "enormous accumulation of probabilities, we yet stand without the direct production of a new species from one common stock," nevertheless, against the evidence of my senses, I believe that such has been the case with all the so-called species in the world.

Although the remains of the horse existed in geological strata of "enormous antiquity" long before any indications of the existence of man have yet been found,—and although those remains show that the horse and the ass at that remote period exactly resembled in nearly every respect the horse and the ass which now run wild in many parts of Asia and Africa,—and although, "going still farther back to the Upper Miocene period, the horse is still found with its present peculiarities, and the two differ from each other only in minute details,"—yet as the remains of the hipparion or "little horse," are found in the same deposit as the horse, namely, the Upper Miocene, so that it could not have been its ancestor, though like it in several respects, and as the remains of the archæotherium are only found in the Lower Miocene, so that there is a wider gap between it and the hipparion than between the latter and the horse, still, for all that, inasmuch as in the archæotherium the leg bones are still more separated, as it has three bones on the

fore limb, which "theory requires that it should have," "it being impossible to obtain evidence more complete in kind than this of the origin of the horse," ergo I believe that the horse is descended from the ancotherium.— Q. E. D. (Huxley.)

Horses have sometimes been born with extra toes, ergo I believe that "the horse must at one time have had the leg and foot bones complete, although they were blotted out before the horse was turned into a perfect running machine" ! (Huxley).

The Darwin Doctrine therefore being *intra* (!) "made out in this one case of the horse," I believe that it is strong evidence that "similar modifications have taken place in all cases." (Huxley.)

I believe that the common saying that one "cannot draw blood out of a stone" is the reverse of the truth, and that not only bones, sinews, and life can be produced from them, but also, mind, reason, and the voice of conscience,—which though would-be philosophers and atheists brave out in daylight, they are so "horribly afraid" of in the dark.

I believe that I alone am right, although I see that though slight crosses beneath the offspring, greater crosses,

i.e., those of widely separated species, produce sterile hybrids, and I "cannot persuade myself that this parallelism (III) is an accident or an illusion."

I believe I am right, although I see that the widely different forms of the pigeon among birds, and the cabbage and other varieties among plants, are productive together, while other species "though resembling each other most closely are utterly sterile when crossed," and I admit that the former is "almost invariably the case."

I believe that the "imperfection of the geological record," showing no regular chain of species, and so giving no proof of my theory, and therefore the most obvious and gravest objection which can be urged against it, may nevertheless be assumed by me as conclusively proving it.

I believe that it is a sufficient answer to the question what has become of the innumerable forms which must have existed before the Silurian deposit, that "long before that" the world "may have," then, "presented a totally different aspect;" that the older continents, "may" now "all be in a metamorphosed condition," or "may" "lie buried under the ocean;" that there has "probably" been

more extinction of species during the periods of subsidence, and that the duration of each formation was "perhaps" short compared with the average duration of specific forms.

In fine, I believe that although the Mosais account of the Creation is borne out by the "Testimony of the Rocks" in a most wonderful manner, yet as it does not suit the theory I have taken into my head, it cannot possibly be true, and I do not believe a word of it.

I believe that if ever there was such a person as Moses, the five books called the five books of Moses were none of his at all, but a mere compilation of some impostor or victim of delusion.

I believe that no one who believes in the Bible has any sense or wisdom compared with me.

I believe that such persons in former times as Sir Isaac Newton, Herschell, Lord Bacon, Dr. Johnson, Milton, Locke, Sir Matthew Hale, etc., etc., etc., who were Believers in the Bible, were far behind me in intellect and knowledge.

I believe, in like manner, that others in the present time who are Believers also, as they were, such as Sir Roundell Palmer (Lord Selborne), Lord Haibacley, Lord Shaftesbury,



Paraday, Sir David Brewster, etc., etc., etc., and others who like them have taken the highest honours in the Universities, and distinguished themselves in the highest departments of art, science, and politics, are quite beneath me in mind and attainments, for if I am right, as I must be, and therefore am, they of course must be wrong.

I believe that mine is a much more valuable opinion, and much more to be received than that of Humboldt, who said of Strauss "what displeases me in him is the scientific levity which causes him to see no difficulty in the organic springing from the inorganic, nay, man himself, from the Chaldean mud."

I believe that the following suppositions guesses are "worthy of all men to be received," and should be accepted by all the world as scientific facts and truths, inasmuch as "I have spoken;" namely,—

I believe, "By considering the embryological structure of man—the homologies which he presents with the lower animals—the rudiments which he retains—and the reversions to which he is liable,—we can partly recall, in imagination, the former condition of our early progenitors, and can approximately place them in their proper position

in the zoological series. We thus (!) learn that man is descended from a hairy quadruped, furnished with a tail and pointed ears, probably arboreal in its habits, and an inhabitant of the Old World. This creature, if its whole structure had been examined by a naturalist, would have been classed amongst the quadrupeds, as surely as would the common and still more ancient progenitor of the Old and New World monkeys. The quadrupeds and all the higher mammals are probably derived from an ancient mammalian animal; and this, through a long line of diversified forms, either from some reptile-like or some amphibian-like creature, and this again from fish-like animal. In the dim obscurity of the past we can see (?) that the early progenitor of all the vertebrate man has been? an aquatic animal, provided with branchiae, with the two sexes united in the same individual, and with the most important organs of the body (such as the brain and heart) imperfectly developed. This animal seems to have been more like the larva of our existing marine Ascidians than any other known form."

I believe that an argument based on that which seems, is quite as valuable as one based on that which is; a chain

with gaps in the links, is quite as firmly held together as one without; and to lack no evidence but that of facts is amply sufficient for me, of which the following will serve for examples.

I believe—"I cannot doubt, that the theory of descent with modification embraces all the members of the same class." "I can indeed hardly doubt that all vertebrate animals having true lungs are descended by ordinary generation from an ancient prototype, of which we know nothing, furnished with a floating apparatus or swim-bladder."

I believe—"It is conceivable that the now utterly lost branchia might have been gradually worked in by natural selection for some quite distinct purpose, in the same manner as . . . it is probable that organs which at a very ancient period served for respiration, have been actually converted into organs of flight."

I believe that the opinion of Dr. Carpenter on the non-progressive character of the *Foraminifera* is as valuable as that of "any other man in England" (except myself); and therefore whereas Dr. Carpenter distinctly asserts there has been "no advance in the Foraminiferous type

from the Paleozoic period to the present time," and states his conviction that "the present state of scientific evidence, instead of sanctioning the idea that the descendants of the primitive type or types of Foraminifera can ever rise to any higher grade, justifies the anti-Darwinian inference, that however widely they diverge from each other and from their originals, they still remain *Foraminifera*," I believe that as I think differently from him, he must be wrong, and I must be right. Q. E. D.

I believe that an assertion "not proven" is as good as or better than one that is proved.

I believe that I must admit Dr. Carpenter's assertion as an "absolute matter of fact;" but for all that, as it does not suit my theory, I must hold that "as we do not know under what forms, or how, life originated in this world, it would be rash to assert that even such lowly endowed animals as the Foraminifera, with their beautiful shells, as figured by Dr. Carpenter, have not in any degree advanced in organization!"

I believe, therefore, that we can thus "partly recall" the former condition of our early progenitors; though even that "partly" is "in imagination!" Thus too, we can "approximately place them in their proper position" ("in

imagination"). "We thus learn," also "in imagination," about the "tall and pointed ears," "probably derived" from *something*—or from *something else* ("some reptile-like, or some amphibian-like creature") or "this again from some fish-like animal." Thus "in the dim obscurity of the past, we can see" (?) what this animal "must have been;" or rather what I must after all own it to have been.

I believe this is a highly satisfactory and conclusive result of the "eleven years," labour I have expended on my last publication.

I believe that all the wisest men of the world for the six thousand years since it is commonly supposed to have been created, or six hundred thousand million years, or any number more, as I believe, have been altogether wrong, and that it has been reserved for me in this so-called nineteenth century to set them all right and lay down the law for ever.

I believe that it may help my argument, if I can find people simple enough to believe that humble bees are common in gardens, and scarce elsewhere in comparison, in consequence of being preyed on by field-mice which are kept down by cats about houses; the fact being, as any national-school boy can see, that those bees abound near

woods, or in any other wild places where thistles and other wild flowers which bees are fond of are found, a hundred-fold more than they do in gardens, and that if they are found more or less numerous in gardens, it is only because of there being more flowers there, for which they will fly for miles, there being no more nests there than anywhere else, and in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred nothing like so many.

I believe that all creation is derived from some one form, a mere monad, although I admit that "no one can at present say by what line of descent the three higher and related classes, namely, mammals, birds, reptiles, were derived from either of the two lower vertebrate classes namely, amphibians and fishes."

I believe that it requires several generations of cultivated talent to make the mind equal to high intellectual attainments, but I find it convenient to forget that it is just as easy a supposition that the debasement of the intellect at any given time, even assuming it as thus to be slowly recovered from, may have been acquired gradually by neglect from a previous height equal to that to be finally attained to.

I believe that there is no such art as logic, at least, if

there is, it is quite beneath me to be guided by it, and that one premise, or at all events a number of single premises strung together so as to give a great appearance of argument to those who know no better, is amply sufficient to prove any conclusion.

I believe that the Christian is the happiest of men, because he evidently has a hope for another world in addition to the peaceful happiness he enjoys here.

I believe that an Infidel or Unbeliever is "of all men most miserable"; nevertheless I have done all I could to make others as wretched as I am myself, and have given, and can give them, nothing in return but a dreary blank. If you ask me about the future, there, I confess, I am in the dark; all I can say is that I believe that you and I will "melt into the infinite sea of the past," (Tyndall), (whatever that may mean). I repeat that I believe that Christian Believers have a peace of mind which I own I have not myself. They have "a good hope" for the future, which I must admit I have not myself, "having no hope, and without God in the world." I do my little best, or worst, to shake their faith and rob them of their peace of mind, but I have nothing better, because I have nothing at all to give them in the place of it.

cannot offer them any happiness in the next world or in any future state, because I do not believe that there will be any future state, so that if you ask me what is the real base of all I have written I cannot tell you. I offer you no happiness here or hereafter, and all I can do is to rob those of you who are fond and foolish enough to take up with the idle conceits of my "vain philosophy," of their present hope, and therewith of their expectation of future happiness, which but for me they might have.

I, (Huxley) believe that there is a good deal to be said for the hypothesis, that animals are mere machines, as much so as if they were mills or steam engines, and that they have no feeling; that they do not hear, see, or smell, and that their "apparent states of consciousness," as they seem to us, are only the results of a "mechanical reflex process." ("Sicem tenentis animi?" This is philosophy! This is science!). It is true I believe that I am only an animal, come from one of them myself, and therefore you may argue that I have no feelings, and may ask me to allow myself to be experimented on accordingly for the good of science, but I must beg of you to excuse me. It might interfere rather unpleasantly with my theory, and with the calmness,—or to speak more truly, the cool



assurance—which a "Philosopher" ought to exhibit to the public when he lays down the law to them.

I believe it would be highly imprudent in me to accept the challenge which was thrown down to me at the meeting of the British Association in 1874, to meet the challenger face to face before the public and discuss the truth or otherwise of my assertions. On the contrary, though I have the advantage of a good memory, a fluent tongue, and any amount you please of assurance, if you will oblige me by using so mild a term, I altogether shrink from the touchstone of common sense. Theory and assertion are all I have to do with, to which I always make it a rule (a very convenient one) to bend any given number of facts.

I believe that though Professor Salzer has shown that Darwinism is a mere scientific imagination, not a scientific fact, nevertheless the human species is descended from the *monstrum*, and this again from as low an origin as the larva or caterpillar of some sea animal.

I therefore believe, for all the above satisfactory reasons, that the origin of man is to be derived as follows:—

1. Marine animals, resembling the larva of existing *Actinians*.

2. Fishes as lowly organized as the lancelet.
3. Fishes like the *Lepidosteus*.
4. Amphibians.
5. Reptiles.
6. Monotremata.
7. Marsupials.
8. Placental Mammals.
9. Lemnids.
10. Simiids.
11. Old World Monkeys.
12. Man.

"O most lame and impotent conclusion!"

I, (Tyndall) believe that I can "prolong my intellectual vision backwards, into regions where the unscientific cannot follow, (no one but myself and those who think with me are scientific—in my opinion), and can discern in matter the promise and potency of every form and quality of life." All who are opposed to me I, (Harley), pronounce *ex cathedra*, to be "pigmies in intellect." This is a very easy way of setting down opponents, and especially becoming, I think, in a "scientific man," who calls himself a "professor" of science, when before the annual meeting of a scientific society. (*At Belfast, 1874.*)

As to "prolonging my vision" forward, there I am in the dark, even on my own confession. I am compelled to acknowledge that a time may be coming when even a "professor" of irreligion and science "falsely so called" may have to say to religion, "give us of your oil, for our lamps are gone out" into "outer darkness."

I, (Tyndall) also believe that life is a "continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations," by which process some original tissue "vaguely sensitive all over" has come by degrees to be "differentiated" into man!! "(O Sapientia!)" I do not believe with Darwin in a "Primordial form," the origin of all living beings; I cannot tell whence he proposes to derive it, but neither can I tell you whence my original—(very original!)—"tissue" came. (Doctors differ you see.)

All this is science! knowledge!! philosophy!!! very clear, as well as very useful, and very profitable, is it not? as clear as the "Chaldean mud."

It is really difficult to say whether Huxley or Tyndall talks and writes the most senseless meandering. These are some of their choicest sayings.—"These be thy gods, O Israel," and "miserable comforters are they all."

I will supplement the above, *per contra*, with the

opinions of *The Times*, which are not so flattering to the scientific attainments or reasoning powers of the Darwinites as their own estimate of themselves.

"For this reason we must needs express our disappointment with the more important part of Mr. Darwin's book. His discussion of the faculties of man in comparison with those of animals appears to us utterly inadequate to the subject, independently of its being insufficient to sustain his theory. As it seems to us, he has not merely failed, but he has not duly grappled with the essential difficulties of the question. He has thought it possible to leap by the aid of a few illustrations over the momentous and arduous questions respecting the mental powers of man and animals, and the moral nature of man is dissected with a most rapid and unpenetrating hand. We can only express our conviction on this point by saying that on these subjects Mr. Darwin appears quite out of his element."

"For a natural philosopher to appeal to such superficial resemblances is much the same as for an astronomer to appeal to the apprehension of the vulgar with respect to the motions of the heavenly bodies."

"But the truth is that Mr. Darwin's argument is at every point supplemented by enormous assumption.

The utmost he proves, not merely in his present but in his former book, is not what has been, but what may have been, and he converts the 'may' into a 'must' by the sole force of the ever-present assumption that all forms of nature have been developed out of other forms. To our minds, the book bears in its very mode of expression, of which we have given some illustrations above, a character which is wholly unscientific. Science tells us what has been, what is, and what will be. But Mr. Darwin's argument is a continuous conjugation of the potential mood. It rings the changes on 'can have been,' 'might have been,' 'would have been,' until it leaps with a bound into 'must have been.'"

"When Mr. Darwin is confronted with the extremely remote and uncertain nature of the agencies on which he relies, he continually falls back on what 'might have been' in the lapse of unlimited periods of time. Such a style of argument is, to say the least, destitute of any scientific value. It is impossible to say what might or might not have been during periods so vast that we have no experience of them. For all we know, the vitality of species might wear itself out in the lapse of ages, or by some law of cyclic change, they might assume new forms.

To call in aid such an indefinite agency is a mere veil for ignorance. It may even be doubted whether to assert that a process takes effect in an infinite time, be not simply a round a roundabout way of," etc. etc.

"If in short, in its general application, Mr. Darwin's hypothesis is utterly unsupported by observed facts, it is still more destitute of such support in its application to man."

"This is precisely the solution which Mr. Darwin is unable to apply to his instances of approximation between species. If he could say in a single instance, '*admirar ambulando,*' 'here is a case of one true species having passed into another,' we should have a practical proof that the kind of approximation he brings to light is of such a kind as to end in coincidence. But this, as we have seen, is what he has not done. It is, in fact, not a little curious that the finite time which Newton demands is the very condition most energetically repudiated by Mr. Darwin and his followers. They place no limit whatever to the amount of time which their process requires. The knowledge of so prolonged a proof, would have been of no practical avail even to Methuselah.

"We are reminded, in fact, by such speculations, of the famous story which Corporal Trim endeavored so effecti-

ally to recite to Uncle Toby. "There was a certain king of Bohemia," said Trim; "but in whose reign except his own, I am not able to inform your honour." Uncle Toby was more accommodating than we are able to be from a scientific point of view. But we recommend the gracious permission he accorded to the corporal as a most appropriate motto for speculations of this kind. "Leave out the date entirely, Trim," said my Uncle Toby. In almost similar language 'There was a certain Monkey,' says Mr. Darwin; of that he is quite sure, and he frequently reiterates the assurance; 'There was a certain monkey; but in what period or country, except his own, I am not able to inform my readers.' The certainty, unfortunately, is hypothetical, and the particular monkey unknown."

"We are at a loss to understand the value of all this complicated guess-work. It represents a kind of Ptolemaic theory of creation heaping supposition on supposition and multiplying cycles of action as each supposition requires to be supplemented. It is the most conspicuous example yet afforded of that 'use of the imagination in science,' on which professor Tyndall dilated with such unscientific enthusiasm last autumn. Mr. Darwin's imagination is inexhaustible, and his power in this respect con-

tributes greatly to the charm of his strictly philosophical writings, but he does not hesitate, in accordance with Professor Tyndall's advice, to let it take the place of science when the means and methods of science fail."

"In section D (Anthropological Department) the meeting was held in the great lecture theatre of the museum, so as to accommodate the large number of persons who desired to attend. The question of human relationship to the ape was again talked about (for it cannot be said to have been discussed) by many speakers who vied with one another in loudness of declamation and shallowness of argument."

"This assumption is the very point to be proved. To argue from it is to assume the whole doctrine of evolution. The assertion in question is scientific or not, according as it is true or not. The only scientific question is whether, as a matter of fact, species have been developed by force of circumstances out of other species, and man out of an ape. It is certainly no scientific argument to assume that they must have been."

"Starting from the unsubstantial presumption just indicated, Mr. Darwin proceeds to speculate on the manner of man's development, without being able to address the



slightest evidence that facts correspond with his hypothesis. The history, however ingenious, is purely imaginary from beginning to end."

"Further consideration has led him to perceive an imperfection in his hypothesis of natural selection. 'He had not,' he says, 'sufficiently considered the existence of many structures in animals which appear to be, as far as we can judge, neither beneficial nor injurious;' and this he believes to be one of the greatest oversights yet detected in his work. In other words, the action of Natural Selection will not of itself sustain the theory of the continuous evolution of all organized beings from inferior forms."

"That, at all events, is the practical result for all the purposes of life. If, as seems to be admitted even by the most advanced Evolutionists, species be so permanently fixed that millions of years would be necessary to transform them, it follows that for all human purposes they must be treated as permanently independent."

"It is impossible to maintain unbroken gravity in discussing such a dream. But let us turn to Mr. Darwin's investigation of the physical basis of his conclusion,

which appears to us scarcely less unsatisfactory than his inquiry into its mental and moral bearings. He simply accumulates a variety of points of similarity between the human frame and that of animals."

"There is much reason to fear that loose philosophy stimulated by an irrational religion, has done not a little to weaken the force of these religious principles in France, and that this is at all events one potent element in the disorganisation of French society. A man incurs a grave responsibility, who, with the authority of a well earned reputation, advances at such a time the disintegrating speculations of this book. He ought to be capable of supporting them by the most conclusive evidence of facts. To put them forward on such incomplete evidence, such cursory investigation, such hypothetical arguments as we have exposed, is more than unscientific—it is reckless."

"We wish we could think that these speculations were as innocuous as they are unpractical and unscientific, but it is too probable that if unchecked they might exert a very mischievous influence. We abstain from noticing their bearings on religious thought, although it is hard to see how, on Mr. Darwin's hypothesis, it is possible to ascribe to man any other immortality or any other spiritual

existence, than that possessed by the brutes. But, apart from these considerations, if such views as he advances on the nature of the moral senses were generally accepted, it seems evident that morality would lose all elements of stable authority, and the 'ever fixed marks' around which the tempests of human passion now break themselves, would cease to exert their guiding and controlling influence."

"It should be the work of science to reveal this difference, not to construct theories on its mere apparent magnitude. But Mr. Darwin urges that this homological construction of the whole frame in the members of the same class is intelligible if we admit their descent from a common progenitor, together with their subsequent adaption to diversified conditions. 'On any other view,' he says, 'the similarity of pattern between the hand of a man or monkey, the foot of a horse, the flipper of a seal, the wing of a bat, etc., is utterly inexplicable.' We fail to see the inexplicability. What is there unreasonable in the supposition that they have all been formed on the same general plan? Mr. Darwin's only objection is that 'this is no scientific explanation,' but this is simply to beg the question."

"We fear the truth is that the study of mental philosophy, under the disastrous influence of one or two popular writers, has of late years become extremely loose and superficial, and Mr. Darwin does but illustrate the general vagueness of thought which prevails on such subjects."

Here are a few more instances of the way in which these would-be Philosophers have been set down by the London Press. The next is from the "*John Bull*."

"There is still, it seems, some uncertainty at one stage of the evolution :—

No one can at present say by what line of descent the three higher and related classes—namely mammals, birds, and reptiles—were derived from either of the two lower vertebrate classes, namely, amphibians and fishes,—(Vol. I, p. 212.)

The remaining steps, however, 'are not difficult to conceive.' Possibly not, if you start as Mr. Darwin does, by assuming his principle of evolution as the sole origin of species, and rejecting separate creation as 'unscientific.' In other words, you must first grant that man is descended from a monkey, and then it is 'not difficult to conceive' the intermediate steps; but if you decline to admit this *petitio principii*, you are wilfully closing your

eyes to what Mr. Darwin assures you is the fact. Such is the entire circle of this gentleman's logic. The book is full of interesting observations on natural history, exhibiting more or less relevancy to the argument it seeks to sustain; but the induction never advances a step without a confession of logical defectiveness. We are treated to tendencies, and probabilities, and conjectures, which derive all their force from a previous assumption of the point to be proved. Take away this, and there is hardly a proposition in the whole work which could pretend to the character of a logical conclusion.

The job-masters who swallow for science all that comes from scientific men were confounded to hear of this secret laboratory of imagination. The *Times* protested against the notion that experimental philosophers ever draw bills. But Tyndall and Darwin know better.

Mr. Darwin's present book is a conspicuous example of this utterly unscientific process. It begins by assuming evolution in the exact sense which Dr. Salmon justly called a scientific imagination, not a scientific fact. From a plausible conjecture that some species may be modified descendants of other species—the very most that Darwin-

ism can logically pretend to—its author quietly infers a universal law, and so sets himself to inquire in the present book 'whether man, like every other species, is descended from some pre-existing form'! Having by this good beginning accomplished more than half his work, he proceeds in like manner to 'take for granted' the high antiquity assigned to man by M. Boucher de Perthes, Sir Charles Lyell, Sir John Lubbock, and others, together with Professor Huxley's 'conclusive' proof that 'man differs less from the higher apes than these do from the lower members of the same order of primates.' Now here are at least four unproved hypotheses to be accepted in the dark before the new argument can see daylight. Of the first Mr. Darwin himself confesses that 'of the "older and honoured chiefs in natural science, many unfortunately are still opposed to evolution in every form." His greatest authority only denies the independent creation of every species, though Mr. Darwin, in quoting his words, enlarges them into an assertion that 'species'—instead of "some species"—are the modified descendants of other species. From this universal proposition, the induction is at present ludicrously scanty, while the facts and reasons on the contrary side are overpowering?

The battle, in short, has yet to be fought before Darwinism can make good this first step in its hypothetical series. The antiquity of man is another battle ground where it is hardly set up its banners. Assuredly it can boast no victory. On the existence of man before the Tertiary period all is yet the merest conjecture, and that of so slender a structure that it may at any moment vanish away. Sir John Lubbock's theory of a savage origin is a third hypothesis more in want of proof for itself, than able to afford proof of another. Not a single fact is established which is not quite as easily reconciled with the opposite theory. Against it is the unbroken testimony of history that while in many nations civilization has decayed and died out, in none has it sprung up and flourished without extraneous assistance. If man were originally savage, and acquired civilization by his own exertions, we ought occasionally to find him on the rise. There are savages enough within the sphere of history, and even of present observation, to give full scope for the experiment. How is it that we never see them improving themselves, till some one comes to improve them? Why did New Zealand remain in cannibalism till visited by missionaries within our own recollection, and then spring almost at a bound to a

level beyond many parts of Europe? That the New Zealander was capable of civilization is proved by the result; if it be a natural acquisition, why did he never acquire it before we found him out? On the other hand, if he received the gift from the Briton, as the Briton from the Roman, the Roman from the Greek, and the Greek from the Egyptian, we are conducted back to an original civilization from which the separated fragments fell, and to which they return again when the long lost connection is restored, as water returns to its level when the intervening mass is pierced without. Against this invariable testimony of history the most that is offered is that all existing nations were originally barbarous; but to infer from this that all ancient races were barbarous also, is again to beg the question. Our contention is that they were not, and we have some evidence in our favour in the remains of ancient Egypt and Assyria; to assume without evidence that these were in turn preceded by an unknown period of barbarism, requires us to admit the very point to be proved. If civilization (we repeat) did spring spontaneously out of barbarism at the first, why has it never done so since? To this question there is no reply. But if the original savagery is still an improbable conjecture,



instead of an established fact, the whole basis of Darwinism is gone.

Mr. Huxley's doctrine is in the same category of assumption without proof and against evidence. He is not more logical than his fellows, because he is more peremptory and scornful. Granting that in physical structure man approximates nearer to the ape than the ape to the lowest monkey, this is no argument for either being descended from the other, till we have admitted the two previous unproved hypotheses, universal evolution, and the savage origin of man. Again, physical structure is only one element in specific classification, and in the case of man the least important. His moral and intellectual nature is emphatically his specific difference from other mammals; and here it is easy to retort Mr. Huxley's argument. The highest ape is morally and intellectually more removed from the lowest savage than the latter from the most eminent philosopher. The savage may become a philosopher, but the ape never becomes even a savage. Neither can we detect the slightest tendency to such moral or intellectual evolution. Mr. Darwin does, indeed, collect some interesting anecdotes of quasi-human reason and affections in the lower animals, but it requires an enormous exercise of

'imagination' to elevate them into anything approaching to the nature of man. Of this he seems to be aware when he asks with a ludicrous sentimentality, 'Who can say what cows feel when they surround and stare intently on a dying or dead companion?' Yes, who indeed? There is nothing novel or scientific in this sort of stuff; we have heard of dreaming dogs, and reasoning elephants, and arithmetical pigs, and beavers' houses, and the wonderful instincts of bees all our lives, and the common sense of mankind, gentle and simple, has long ago, repudiated their real community with the moral and intellectual nature of man. Does Mr. Darwin hope to overcome the verdict by telling us that:—

If men were reared under precisely the same conditions as hive-bees, there can hardly be a doubt that our unsexed females would, like the worker-bees, think it a sacred duty to kill their brothers, and mothers would strive to kill their fertile daughters, and no one would think of interfering?

What would be said if any advocate of Revelation resorted to such puerile trifling? In the case supposed, the creatures would not be men, but bees, and not like other bees. But that bees ever think anything a 'sacred duty' is one of the thousand forms of begging the question artfully scattered up and down the book. Curiously enough, the best examples are found, not among the apes,

from whom we ought to inherit, but among creatures so remote in physical structure as the dog, the elephant, and the bee.

Amid all this irrelevant gossip, Mr. Darwin notices, with the feeblest attempt at refutation, the crucial arguments that man alone is capable of progressive improvement, and that man alone fashions implements for a special purpose. To the first he can only answer that in the hunting countries fens are more wary than in districts where they are not disturbed; and, to the second, that the chimpanzee cracks nuts with a stone, and other apes build temporary platforms (as birds build nests), which 'might readily 'grow into a voluntary and conscious act.' Nighi! But does it? And could it, unless we admit intellectual evolution, and so once more beg the question? It is astonishing how persistently this artifice is resorted to throughout. It pervades every part of the book, till, by dint of repetition and incessant assumption, often veiled in the most subtle implications, the reader is led to think a point demonstrated for which not a shadow of evidence has been presented. Of the courses of things, when reason, language, and religion have been once "acquired," Mr. Darwin writes as coolly as if such "acquisitions" were of

common experience, instead of being the wildest speculation, contrary to every conviction of our nature, and never in a single instance confirmed or indicated by experiment. It is really an abuse of language to call such writing 'scientific: to mistake the "Arabian Nights" for history would be far more excusable.

Such being the character of the thesis, we need not spend much time on the new hypothesis. The moment he attempts to draw any conclusion, Mr. Darwin himself is sensible of the exceeding tenuity of his premises. Showing us plainly enough what he is in quest of, he writes of what he has found either in the optative or conditional mood. In place of what is, we hear of what might, could, would, or should be—of what is probable or may be easily conceived—and unhappily the probability is often in inverse ratio to the importance of the conjecture. Here again Darwinism failing to establish its point by any kind of proof, is obliged to take refuge in imagination.

Its author, meanwhile, with as much assurance as if he had completed a mathematical demonstration, boldly apologises for the shock to our taste and our religion, by avowing that, for his own part, he would rather be decess-

ded from a monkey than a Fœgian savage: he adds that "it is not more irreligious to explain (?) the origin of man as a distinct species from some lower form, than to explain the birth of the individual through the laws of ordinary reproduction." The first excuse overlooks the little fact that the simian ancestry involves the savage also."

Again,

#### DARWINISM AND ASTRONOMY.

##### TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—After the many solid arguments adduced in your late admirable and most welcome notices of Mr. Charles Darwin's recent work, I should like to make only one suggestion. Mr. Darwin's theory requires us to believe that animal life existed on this globe at a period when, according to a theory much more plausible than his, the earth and all the planets with the sun constituted but one diffused nebula. Astronomers really have some data on which to found this theory of theirs, since marked variations in the conformation of several nebulae within historic times are now on record; whereas all the variations which Mr.

Darwin has been able to point out in species, and especially in man, within the same limits of time are either zero or of an extremely nebulous character.

I remain, Sir, yours faithfully,

April 10.

ASTRONOMICUS.

Thus much from the *Times*, now from the *Globe*,

"The other point to note is Professor Huxley's speech. The learned gentleman is not only abandoning himself to a bad habit of mischievous talking; he is becoming insane. What did he mean by entertaining a company like that assembled around the board of the Royal Academy with a wretched retch of the old story that man is a cooking animal, with the obvious variation *à propos* of the occasion that he is distinguished by the power to 'draw'! Professor Huxley must either be running rapidly to seed himself, or he has a very low opinion of his contemporaries when he expects them to be amused—even after dinner—with such feeble wit."—*Globe*, May 1st, 1871.

"On Geology and Darwinism "Dagobert" holds decided opinions. He regards the former as a science so completely in its infancy that to attempt to reconstruct our theology in reference to it is simply absurd:—"Late

researches have, I think, proved more clearly than ever it was proved before—first, that man is a very recent inhabitant of this planet; and, secondly, that man has not been produced by any process of selection or development. . . . Darwin has left the origin of species, not where he found it, but darker than ever; for he has proved that there ought to be no species at all; and if his views were true, there could have been no such thing.” This is admirably put and not easily answered, and the following reply to the scientists who object to the argument from design is irrefragable. ‘The professor who sees in nature no traces of a Creator, will find in a wretched piece of flint, as he peers enchanted through his spectacles, the long-lost proof of pre-Adamite man.’ The truth is that neoteric science is ruined by the shallow scientist, the lecturing professor, who, the moment a new notion strikes him, airs it to an audience of ladies at Albemarle-street or South Kensington. ‘Natural selection’—‘protoplasm’—‘air germs’—come into fashion and go out again like *passiers* and *chignons*.”

Globe.

—And lastly our friend “Punch” whose wit has always a good deal of wisdom in it.

" Darwin's speculation  
Is of another sort ;  
'Tis one which demonstration  
In no wise doth support.  
Time, theory's dispeller,  
Will out of mind remove it ;  
We say, as said old *Weller*,  
" Prove it." And he can't prove it."

*Punch.*

The following is Dr. Carpenter's opinion, the President of the British Association.

" There is a great deal of what I cannot but regard as fallacious and misleading philosophy—'oppositions of science falsely so called'—abroad in the world at the present time. And I hope to satisfy you that those who set up their own conceptions of the orderly sequence which they discern in the phenomena of nature, as fixed and determinate laws by which those phenomena not only are within all human experience, but always have been, and always must be, invariably governed, are really guilty of the intellectual arrogance they condemn in the systems of the ancients, and place themselves in diametrical antago-



nism to those real philosophers, by whose comprehensive grasp and penetrating insight that order has been so far disclosed."

And, another,

"It must not be supposed that there is much unity among these "philosophers." But in this they all agree, they all argue *a posteriori*, and they are all infallible."

#### "LOOK ON THIS PICTURE"

##### WORDS OF THE WISE.

There is a path which no fowl  
knoweth, and which the vulture's  
eye hath not seen.

The lion's whelps have not  
trodden it, nor the fierce lion  
passed it.

He putteth forth His hand upon  
the rock; He overthroweth the  
mountain by the roots.

He cutteth out rivers among  
the rocks; and His eye seeth  
every precious thing.

He blindeth the floods from  
overflowing; and the thing that  
is hid bringeth He forth to light.

But where shall wisdom be  
found? and where is the place of  
understanding?

Man knoweth not the price  
thereof; neither is it found in the  
land of the living.

"It cannot be valued with the  
gold of Ophir, with the precious  
onyx, or the sapphire."

#### "AND ON THAT"

##### WORDS OF THE WISELACK.

"What little I know about the  
matter leads me to think that if H.  
Cannon, had possessed the slight-  
est acquaintance with biological  
science, (Philosophers disagree, it  
seems) he would have turned his  
philosophy upside down, and  
have found that we can have no  
knowledge of the great laws of  
life, except that which is based  
upon the study of natural living  
beings." (Huxley!!!)

"If there is one thing clear"  
(clear!) about the progress of  
modern science, it is the tendency  
to reduce all scientific problems  
except those which are purely  
intellectual to questions of  
molecular physics, that is to say  
to the attractions, repulsions,  
motions, and coordination of the  
ultimate particles of matter. So-  
cial phenomena are the result of  
the interaction of the complements  
of society, or men with one another  
in the surrounding universe, but  
in the language of physical science,

The gold and the crystal cannot equal it; and the exchange of it shall not be for jewels of the gold.

The Topaz of Ethiopia shall not equal it, neither shall it be valued with pure gold.

Whence then cometh wisdom? and where is the place of understanding.

Seeing it is hid from the eyes of all living, and kept close from the fowls of the air.

Destruction and death say, We have heard the fame thereof with our ears.

For He looketh to the ends of the earth, and seeth under the whole heaven;

To make the weight for the winds; and He weigheth the waters by measure.

When He made a decree for the rain, and a way for the lightning and thunder.

And unto man He said, Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding.

Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?

But ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee: and the fowls of the air, and they shall tell thee.

Who knoweth not in all these that the hand of the Lord hath wrought this?

In whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind,     **Job.**

which by the nature of the case is materialistic, the notions of men, so far as they are recognizable by science, are the results of molecular changes in the matter of which they are composed."

"To a certain extent indeed it may be said, that imperfect ossification of the vertebral column is of an embryonic character, but on the other hand it would be extremely incorrect to suppose that the vertebral columns of the older vertebrates are in any sense, embryonic, in their whole structure."

*Huxley.*

"Matter and spirit are both names for the imaginary substance of groups of natural phenomena."

*Huxley.*

"In itself it is but of little moment, whether we express the phenomena of matter in terms of spirit, or the phenomena of spirit in terms of matter."

*Huxley.*

"The extension of the province of what we call matter or materialism, and the concomitant gradual banishment from all regions of human thought, of what we call spirit and spontaneity."

*Huxley.*

"Traced back to its earliest state, the matter arises as the man does, in a particle of radiated protoplasm."

*Huxley.*

Wall wrote Canon Kingsley:—"All we have to do is to wait. Nominalism, and that Sensationalism which has sprung from Nominalism, are running fast to seed. Comptism seems to me its supreme effort, after which the whirligig of time may bring round its revenges, and Realism and we who hold the Realist creed may have our turn. Only wait—the end of that Philosophy is very near." "The tide is setting in against Darwinism."

---

Dedicated by Permission to the Right Hon. LORD SELBORNE,  
Lord Chancellor of England.

---

THE HUMANITY SERIES  
OF  
SCHOOL BOOKS,  
FOR NATIONAL AND OTHER SCHOOLS.

EDITED BY  
THE REV. F. O. MORRIS, B.A.,

Master of Marlborough, Wiltshire,  
Author of "A History of British Birds," Illustrated by Permission to  
the Great Eastern Railway Co., &c., &c., &c.

---

"THE CREED IS FATHER OF THE DEED."

WORDSWORTH.

It is hoped and believed that this series of books will be found useful in the schools of the upper classes, as well as in all parochial ones, and for giving away as rewards or prizes to young persons and children, for presents to farm-servants, and servants generally, gamekeepers, drivers of carts and carriages, bargemen on rivers and canals, emigrants and others, for the encouragement of humanity and of "every good word or work."

MOFFATT, PAIGE & Co., Paternoster Buildings.

---

BOOKS AND FORMS

FOR THE USE OF

SCHOOL BOARDS.

FORMED UNDER

THE EDUCATION ACTS,

*Published & Supplied by*

MOFFATT, PAIGE & COMPANY,

4, Paternoster Buildings, London.

**ALL SCHOOL REQUISITES.**—Carriage paid on all orders. School books, stationery, furniture and apparatus. Schools completely fitted up. Estimates given. Carriage post free. Moffatt's School Board books and forms.

**MOFFATT'S INFANT SCHOOL READING SHEETS,** Price 2s. 6d. Mounted mostly on card board, 2s. These sheets are twenty in number, and are printed in very bold and clear type. The lessons are very carefully graduated, and are made up of subjects suitable for infant reading.

**PRINTING PRESSES** furnished with type, galleys, dabbles and ink.

Press to print a surface of	4	12
3 by 24 inches	...	6 6
Press to print a surface of		
4 by 44 inches	...	13 6
Extra type, an assortment		
of 48s.	...	10 0

**MOFFATT'S ARITHMETICAL TEST CARDS,** adapted by the London School Board. Standard I. Set A, B, C; Standard II. Set A, B, C; Standard III. Set A, B, C; Standard IV. Set A, B, C; Standard V. Set A, B, C; Standard VI. Set A, B, C. *Digby Rules* for examining Pupil Teachers. 25 packets in each set, and 2 copies of Answers. Set A. Mechanical Rules, Set B. Rules and Problems. Set C. Problems.

**MOFFATT'S EXPLANATORY POSTICAL READER.**—Adapted by the London School Board. The third edition is now ready—cloth, red edges, 1s.

The book contains carefully selected poems, with full notes and questions. Suitable for the recitations of Standard IV, V, VI.

**MOFFATT'S BOX OF FORM AND COLOUR.**—Adapted by the London School Board and by the Home and Colonial School Society. Special care has been taken to make the box strong. It contains an entirely new set of forms, both plain and ruled, and a sheet of 24 of the principal colours. Price 10s. 6d.—

**MOFFATT'S INFANT SCHOOL PUBLICATIONS.**—Adapted by the London School Board and by the Home and Colonial School Society. *Moffatt's Box of Form and Colour*, 10s. 6d. *Moffatt's Lessons in Colour*, on card 2s. *Moffatt's Lessons in Form*, on card, 1s. 4d. *Moffatt's Sets of Coloured Cards*, with names, 2s.

**MOFFATT'S STANDARD MENTAL ARITHMETIC.**—Intended to supplement the ordinary lessons in Arithmetic. Six parts, each part corresponding to the Standards of the New Code. Price 1d. per part. The *Trial from Memorandum of Venice*, 400 lines, with careful, full notes and questions. Price 2d.

**MOFFATT'S INK POWDER** will make one quart of black ink by adding hot water. Post-free 4d.

**MOFFATT'S SELECTED PENS.** Moffatt's School Pen, a strong useful Pen, suitable for Schools, per gross, 1s. Moffatt's No. 851, fine point, per gross, 1s. 6d. Moffatt's No. 852, medium point, per gross, 1s. 6d. Moffatt's J Pen, broad point for bold writing, per gross, 1s. 6d. Moffatt's Swan Pen, useful for general writing, per gross, 1s. 6d. The Author's Pen, specially adapted for rapid writing, per box of three dozen, 1s.

**MOFFATT'S PREPARED EXAMINATION PAPERS.** Per packet of 50, 1s. 6d. post free.

THE  
RELIGIOUS VIEWS OF CHARLES DARWIN.

By EDWARD B. AVELING, D.Sc.,

Since the death of our great teacher, the clergy, who denounced him a lifetime with that vehemence of which long practice in the art of vituperation has made them consummate masters, have claimed the illustrious dead as one of their flock. Not content with burying in Westminster Abbey the man whom they had all reviled and maligned, the man at whose great discoveries they had sneered, they have had the audacity to say that the teaching of Evolution is wholly in accord with that of the Church and of the Bible. Only the two truly religious bodies have remained faithful to ignorance. The Roman Catholic Church and the Salvation Army alone have clung to god, and been deaf to the voice of science, dumb she never so wisely. The Roman Catholic Bishop of Salford is of opinion that Charles Darwin is even now suffering the tortures of the damned. Mr. Booth, the demoraliser of the uncultured folk, no more believes in Evolution than he understands the principle of Natural Selection. But those who are trying to effect a compromise between the irreconcilables, religion and scientific thought, from the Archbishop of Canterbury upwards, are asserting as that the great truths of Evolution are all in harmony with the Bible, and have been this long time embodied in more or less hidden guise in the teaching of the Church—that, in short, the discoveries of to-day are a godsend to religion, whilst less versatile thinkers had regarded them the rather as a god's evil. All this might have been passed by with pity and a sigh for something more novel. But when these same persons tell us that Charles Darwin was a religious man and a Christian, a feeling other than one of pity is born. An indignation that is, we hope, righteous takes possession of us. They slandered him when living, not without protest from us; and now that he is dead and evil is spoken of him, our voices must be raised again.

It is in consequence of the statements that Darwin was a Christian, and in consequence of the suppression by our English newspapers of his remarkable letter on religion, that I now write an account of a visit paid by two Atheists to Down in the year 1881. One of the Atheists was Dr. Ludwig Büchner, of Darmstadt, President in 1881 of the Congress of the International Federation of Freethinkers, and one of the distinguished popularizers of Darwinism in its second home, Germany. The other was the present writer. Dr. Büchner had been in correspondence with our English philosophers, and had in his remarkable works, and especially in "*Die Darwinische Theorie*," "*Der Mensch und seine Stellung in der Natur*," thrown light upon the great principles enunciated by Darwin and extended their application. Between the author of the "*Origin of Species*" and myself several letters had passed. I was grateful then, and am more gratefully grateful now, for the generous readiness with which all help and information were given me when I was attempting to prepare an epitome of his works. A list of his books, with their dates of publication in his handwriting, and his letters of explanation and of encouragement, are now very precious relics to me.

The International Federation of Freethinkers held its Congress in London on the Sunday, Monday and Tuesday, September 26th, 28th, 29th of 1881. Dr. Büchner, its President, was very anxious to see Darwin, and had only the Wednesday of that same week disengaged. On Tuesday, therefore, I telegraphed to Mr. Darwin the wish of the German thinker, and had a telegram in return asking us to lunch with him on the following day. Hence it fell out that on a day that summer seemed to have left behind it as forgotten in its flight northwards, we were driving from the white, sleepy station of Uxbridge, through English lanes, a long four miles to Down. As we passed by the house of Sir John Lubbock, student of insects and flowers, as the great thinker by my side spoke in his gentle fashion of variation and heredity and Evolution, as I remembered to what English home we were moving, the world of living things making gay the aftermath of summer in the September sunshine had a deeper meaning to me than ever.

He met us in the hall of his home with the kindest, the most genial of greetings. Any embarrassment that might have been felt by the youngest present in coming thus face to face with him, and in witnessing the first encounter between two men so material as these, vanished in a moment under the spell of the frankest and the kindest eyes that ever looked into mine. He was tall, and built on powerful lines; yet with a suggestion of fragility running through the massive frame. In his carriage, in the serenity and strength of his face, in the honored head white with age, and in the calm, steady, self-contained voice, there

was a quiet majesty, very impressive. One felt that one was in the presence of a king among men, whose manner was so courtierly gentle, so unassuming, so frank, so graceful with an unstudied ease, that he almost made men forget how far above them all his intellect ranged. A man intensely human, whose being near you made your own life more intense. One of those rare natures whose increasing to the chamber of a convalescent is like a breath of strengthening air from the sea or the mountain, and begets a swifter striding towards health.

In the drawing-room, where we were introduced to wife and daughter and to Francis Darwin, co-worker with his father, and at luncheon in the bright airy room looking out upon the classic ground of the Kentish garden, in which so many notable experiments have been conducted, our talk was on what is strangely called physical or natural science. These adjectives seem more than usually out of place when our topic is the man who, more than any other, has served his fellows in breaking down the artificial barrier erected in man's salad days between the knowledge of matter and motion and the knowledge of mental phenomena. At the luncheon table three generations were gathered together. Mrs. Darwin was at the head, nearest the window that gave upon the garden. Charles Darwin sat, with Dr. Huxner on his right and myself on his left, on the right-hand side. His son Francis faced the mother, and opposite to us were little children. Between myself and Mrs. Darwin sat a clergyman of the English Church.

The talk ran, as I have said, mainly upon what are generally known as scientific subjects. Especially, I remember, there was discussion as to instinct. Ludwig Buchner's "*Gestalteten der Thiere*," familiar to English readers through Annie Semon's translation, was in some sense our text. It is well known that Buchner, in that remarkable volume, adduces incontrovertible evidence against the old idea of instinct as a blind, unreasoning faculty, implanted in certain animals by a creator, and deeming them, as it were, to perform certain definite acts in a rigidly monotonous, uniform, unintellectual fashion. He shows us that much—in some cases all—of such so-called instinctive acts is due to education by parents. Whilst the German thinker never ignores heredity, in his anxiety to demonstrate clearly the inaccuracy of the old notions as to instinct, he lays stress mainly on the education-factor, and his great English brother was questioning, in his gentle, thoughtful manner, whether the relative amount of effect of the two factors, education and heredity, was yet recognised or even recognisable. He quoted Douglas Spalding's experiments, as showing that whilst education at the parents' hands has much to do with the performance of certain acts on the part of the offspring, heredity comes also largely into play, and that tendencies and aptitudes are both



transmitted. He told us of his book on "Vegetable Mould and Worms." It was published but a week or two after that memorable visit, and has to all men a melancholy interest added to all its other charms, in that it is the last of his written utterances to us. In my youthfulness I expressed a foolish surprise that he who had written the "Origin of Species" should deal with a subject so insignificant as worms. I see his face now, as he turned it on mine and said quietly: "I have been studying their habits for forty years." I might have remembered better his own persistent teaching, that in Nature no agency can be regarded as insignificant, that the most stupendous effects have been produced by the ceaselessly repeated action of small forces. Forty years he studies the habits of worms, and then he thinks it is time to write a book upon the subject. This is the very nature of the man. And some of us, as soon as we have borrowed an idea from someone else, see for printing it in pamphlet form incontinently.

In talk such as this the luncheon-time passed swiftly. That meal over, the four whose interest in science at least placed them upon a common ground, though at such different levels, passed to his study, and there, amidst the smokes of cigarettes, with his books looking down upon us, his plants for experiments laid by, we fell to talking, on his own suggestion, about religion.

I believe I am speaking for Dr. Stuckner as well as myself when I say that there was no intention on the part of the visitors to Down to touch upon the question of religion. We knew that we could not leave the choice of subjects for converse in better hands than those of our host, and the selection of religion as matter for discussion was his, not ours. When once we were within the walls of his study, and he was sitting in most unconventional fashion in the large, well-worn easy chair, almost the first thing he said was, "Why do you call yourselves Atheists?" And here I have to record a fact that will seem strange to those who fail to keep in mind two things. One of these is the wide extent of the popular error as to the meaning of the name so dear to us. The other is that, as far as I know, Charles Darwin had given but little attention to the great conflict raging between the religious and the scientific folk. Of the latter fact we had evidence in more than one remark made at that memorable interview. That the misunderstanding of the word *Atheist* is far-reaching is shown by the fact that even he held the opinion that the *Atheist* was a *denier of god*. And his holding this opinion is in turn evidence bearing upon the second of the two statements just made.

Very respectfully the explanation was given, that we were *Atheists* because there was no evidence of deity, because the invention of a name was not an explanation of phenomena, because the whole of man's knowledge was of a natural order,

and only when ignorance closed in his onward path was the supernatural invoked. It was pointed out that the Greek *ε* was positive, not negative; that whilst we did not account the folly of god-denial, we avoided with equal care the folly of god-assertion: that as god was not proven, we were without god (*ἀθεοι*) and by consequence were with hope in this world, and in this world alone. As we spoke, it was evident from the change of light in the eyes that always met ours so frankly, that a new conception was arising in his mind. He had imagined until then that we were deniers of god, and he found the order of thought that was ours differing in no essential from his own. For with point after point of our argument he agreed; statement on statement that was made he endorsed, saying finally: "I am with you in thought, but I should prefer the word *Agnostic* to the word *Atheist*."

Upon this the suggestion was made that, after all, "*Agnostic*" was but "*Atheist*" writ respectable, and "*Atheist*" was only "*Agnostic*" writ aggressive. To say that one did not know was the verbal equivalent of saying that one was destitute of the god-idea, whilst at the same time a step was thrown to the Caribbees of society by the adoption of a name less determined and uncompromising. At this he smiled and asked: "Why should you be so aggressive? Is anything gained by trying to force these new ideas upon the mass of mankind? It is all very well for educated, cultured, thoughtful people; but are the masses yet ripe for it?" Then we asked him whether the same questions he now asked of us had not been addressed to him about the years 1859-60, when his immortal "*Origin of Species*" first saw the light. Many at that time had thought a greater wisdom would have been shown in only enunciating the revolutionary truths of Natural and Sexual Selection to the judicious few. Many had, as of old, dreaded the open declaration of truth to the multitudes. New ideas are always at first regarded as only for the study. Danger is feared if they are proclaimed abroad on the house-tops, and discussed in market-places and homes. But he, happily for humanity, had by the gentle, irresistible power of reason, forced his new ideas upon the mass of the people. And the masses had been found ripe for it. Had he kept silence, the tremendous strides taken by human thought during the last twenty-one years would have been shorn of their fair proportions, perhaps had hardly been made at all. His own illustrious example was encouragement, was for a command to every thinker to make known to all his fellows that which he believed to be the truth.

Then the talk fell upon Christianity, and those remarkable words were uttered: "I never gave up Christianity until I was forty years of age." I commend these words to the careful consideration of all and sundry who claimed the great naturalist

as an orthodox Christian. The unscrupulous will probably quote this remark hereafter with a designed omission of the last seven words. But by a similar device, the Bible can be made to say that "there is no god."

I confess that a great joy took possession of me as I heard a statement by its implication so encouraging. I, like the rest of the outside world, was not sure as to his position in regard to religion. Now, from his own lips, I knew that before I was born this, my master, had cast aside the reigning faith. The step taken by so many of us had been taken by him long ago. What a strength and hope are in the thought that the first thinker of our age had abandoned Christianity!

He was asked, with all deference, the reason of the long delay. With a charming frankness, he made answer that he had not had time to think about it. His time had been so occupied by his scientific work, that he had none to spare for the careful study of theological questions. Nor must this want of time be urged as an objection to his conclusions. For, in the first place, a like want of time to devote to the subject is never urged on the opposite side. Sudden conversions were and are quoted as strongest of evidence on behalf of religion. The testimony of the last few minutes of a long, mis-spent life is taken as in favor of Christianity. A dying thief, the legends have it, purchased Paradise by the compassion of a few moments after years of wrong-doing. Men, women, even children, often of the lowest intellectual order, bringing to bear on this subject brains infinitely inferior to his, both by birth and by training, declare on the side of religion, and their witness is accepted. I would weigh the witness of this one man against that of the whole of the Salvation Army. And in the second place, he had given attention to the matter. For, on further inquiry, he told us that he had, when of mature years, investigated the claims of Christianity. Asked why he had abandoned it, the reply, simple and all-sufficient, was: "It is not supported by evidence." And this came from the most careful and unbiased weigher of evidence the generations have known. Those who remember his painstaking in regard to all evidence bearing on scientific points, who remember his scrupulous fairness, his honest statement of both sides of a question, the labor devoted to the right balancing of adverse claims, will grasp the immense significance of that answer: "It is not supported by evidence."

Not, perhaps, without something of presumption, warranted, let us hope, by the momentous, fateful nature of the subject under discussion, his attention was called to the well-known passage in his "*Origin of Species*," wherein the phrase is used that the Creator breathed into one or more primordial forms the breath of life. This phrase is constantly quoted by Christian-evidence persons who, rejecting the teaching of Darwin as every

other point, with an inconsequence that would be strange were it not theirs, suddenly adopt it on this one point. They will have none of him as long as he teaches Natural Selection, Evolution, the origin of man from lower forms; they reject, in a word, the whole of his teaching on subjects whose observation is possible, and then accept as true the one statement not founded on observation. He was asked whether, in using the phrase quoted above, he had not gone beyond the bounds of scientific statement, whether the strictly logical method he had used throughout all the rest of his argument had not, at this point, been abandoned. As he had explained so much for us, without the hypothesis of supernatural intervention, was it philosophical to invoke it as essential to the origin of life? And at these questions, urged, let us hope, very gently, very respectfully, he was silent and thoughtful for a space.

A little later he admitted that there was an enormous waste of energy in respect to the supernatural generally, and to the god-idea particularly. Man had so much time, so much strength at his disposal. Whilst work was to be done on earth and for humanity, whilst Nature had so many of her secrets, so many of her methods still hidden in her maternal bosom, even from the children that nestle there, half terrified but all loving, so long the time, money, strength, the individual lives, the organization devoted to aims other than natural, were wasted.

Francis Darwin, sitting all this time silent by the window, chimed in with but one remark, that showed how closely and critically he had followed the line of talk. It was as to the non-provenceness of duty, and the utilisable energy wasted in the senseless and hapless seeking after god.

In all this is a beautifully welcome confirmation of the ideas of Charles Darwin as enunciated in the letter to Baron Moeggen, and in the letter to a Dutch student in 1879, that was published, I believe, for the first time in England, in the *National Reformer* of October 1st, 1882. The explanations of his irreligious views, so due to age and weakness, vanish, if they ever had any tangible existence, at the sound of those memorable words: "I never gave up Christianity until I was forty years of age." The Roman Catholic *Tribune* hails the famous letter as the utterance of the arch-heretic. It recognizes the true glory of that letter and of its writer. The *War Cry*, if its writers read decent literature, would quote the words written to the young student of Jena in triumph. But the religious writers and speakers that are temporizers, the Messrs. Facing-both-Ways, would have stifled it, had the power been theirs; and now, with a sense of shame and impotence gnawing at their hearts, tell you it is nothing, and bid one another be of good cheer, whilst their faces are white with dread.

<sup>7</sup> Thousands are glad that he, being dead, yet speaketh on

this tremendous matter. We know that he had, consciously or unconsciously, been undermining religious belief his long and honorable life through. His eyes, at work within study and garden, closely bent on the search for truth, had hardly seen, as had eyes less keen but looking farther a-field, the whole consequences of his great generalisations. But to his lesser fellows, who, studying his teachings from without, recognised their bearing upon the fading belief in the supernatural, possibly even more fully than he, it is a joy that our Master had cast off the old bonds, and was walking in the large freedom that he has given to so many of his brothers and sisters.

When the estimate of his majestic work is made by minds more capable of judging than are ours, more capable in that they will have the light of future centuries beaming upon them, it is more than possible that highest of all the results of his vast generalisations will rank the fatal blow thus dealt at the very foundations of all belief in the supernatural.

PRICE ONE PENNY.













and several have already in other similar cases. The great numbers of persons engaged in this occupation, that they are not only laborers, but also, in some instances, are engaged in the business of buying and selling, and are thus the means of the circulation of the money of the country. It is, therefore, of great importance that the law should be so framed as to secure to them the full enjoyment of their property, and to prevent any interference with their business, or any other act which would be likely to injure their interests, or to deprive them of the full enjoyment of their property.

It is, therefore, of great importance that the law should be so framed as to secure to them the full enjoyment of their property, and to prevent any interference with their business, or any other act which would be likely to injure their interests, or to deprive them of the full enjoyment of their property. It is, therefore, of great importance that the law should be so framed as to secure to them the full enjoyment of their property, and to prevent any interference with their business, or any other act which would be likely to injure their interests, or to deprive them of the full enjoyment of their property.

It is, therefore, of great importance that the law should be so framed as to secure to them the full enjoyment of their property, and to prevent any interference with their business, or any other act which would be likely to injure their interests, or to deprive them of the full enjoyment of their property. It is, therefore, of great importance that the law should be so framed as to secure to them the full enjoyment of their property, and to prevent any interference with their business, or any other act which would be likely to injure their interests, or to deprive them of the full enjoyment of their property.

In the Convention of Syracuse, Nov. 8, M. Mann, of Rochester, read a paper on "The Relations of Religion to the State," which the Syracuse Standard reported in part as follows:—

The subject of the relations of religion to the State, is one of the most important and interesting questions which have of late years attracted the attention of the public mind. It is a question which has of late years attracted the attention of the public mind. It is a question which has of late years attracted the attention of the public mind. It is a question which has of late years attracted the attention of the public mind.

The subject of the relations of religion to the State, is one of the most important and interesting questions which have of late years attracted the attention of the public mind. It is a question which has of late years attracted the attention of the public mind. It is a question which has of late years attracted the attention of the public mind. It is a question which has of late years attracted the attention of the public mind.

The subject of the relations of religion to the State, is one of the most important and interesting questions which have of late years attracted the attention of the public mind. It is a question which has of late years attracted the attention of the public mind. It is a question which has of late years attracted the attention of the public mind. It is a question which has of late years attracted the attention of the public mind.

The subject of the relations of religion to the State, is one of the most important and interesting questions which have of late years attracted the attention of the public mind. It is a question which has of late years attracted the attention of the public mind. It is a question which has of late years attracted the attention of the public mind. It is a question which has of late years attracted the attention of the public mind.

The subject of the relations of religion to the State, is one of the most important and interesting questions which have of late years attracted the attention of the public mind. It is a question which has of late years attracted the attention of the public mind. It is a question which has of late years attracted the attention of the public mind. It is a question which has of late years attracted the attention of the public mind.

Another paper discussed at Syracuse was

"The Relations of Free Religion to Specific Religions." This was read by H. E. C. Towns, and the following extracts from the Standard's report give a partial list of his ideas:—

Free religion is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination.

Free religion is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination.

Free religion is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination.

Free religion is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination.

Free religion is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination.

Free religion is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination.

Free religion is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination.

Free religion is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination.

Free religion is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination.

Free religion is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination.

Free religion is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination.

Free religion is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination.

Free religion is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination.

Free religion is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination.

Free religion is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination. It is a religion which is not the creature of any particular sect or denomination.

and to be done by men who must in fact and want have-faith also.

We have translated a whole address by sage and so forth, writing first in time for our meetings; then spoken each an hour; then walked on to the nearest hotel, called up a morning shower from his back to the barroom, was close by to a chamberlain, chamber, great supporter, sometimes cold, but, more early in the morning, breakfast in the morning and retired at the moment grocery, expending not a dime more, and then pushed forward to our next engagement, by each one's way to defend. Some times a friend would not do so, we would not say that we could reach a stage, when we had money to pay for, and frequently we went on that, sometimes even to several cold and warm.

We were young and strong then; and he had been too kindly in nature. We had abandoned the Congressional military, when we evidently had the progress of success in it (Mr. Foster present), and we had no idea of throwing the lines and went away to our new calling.

To us, slavery seemed the National sin, shame and crime; and we determined to see its overthrow, or die in the struggle. We were then more than thirty. More than now, I think, our meetings were broken up, or nearly so, few there in one month; the most not unprofitably because directly to the pulpit of the places where they occurred, and always to some "evangelical" cause!

And that was the way much of New England was made acquainted with the anti-slavery cause, and with its dignities and responsibilities toward the subject.

You will not wonder that, Mr. Mann, that the witness have now for me some years. I have dated them through more than thirty of your volume, most of the time in New England, but now, as last year, have retired to "white quarters" in Salem, Ohio, as you suggested in Ten Years' study.

Coming up to Toledo and Clyde from the winter climate of Charleston, and almost at the very moment when the House of Representatives was divided with respect to the war, the wind descended with uncommon fury, the wind was that I survived. It was indeed recovering now, and hope to give good account of myself in the coming season. My plain better appreciation good, earnest work than before.

And I probably have every reason to be proud of the results of my intense campaign in Michigan, Indiana, Illinois and Ohio. And one of the most cheering reflections was that, wherever I went, I was invited to repeat my visit and remain longer if possible.

There are several men and women in almost every considerable town in the West, who were indignantly for the just the gospel which you preaching in Ten Years, and which I also endeavor to carry in my humble way into whatever place I visit.

Call Hamilton, by the article "The Cause" in the N. Y. Independent, shows that she has been reading certain lectures on Christian Propaganda. She does not spin like to suggest it, but it is clear she wants to know more about religion than the "Baptist" state. She has certainly a half-conviction that the whole truth has not been told. That this explains is not true, she will



and the maintenance of all the other's of law. The great question of justice requires that the law should be administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner.

The law is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner.

The law is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner.

In the Convention at Syracuse, Nov. 5, Mr. Mason, of Rochester, read a paper on "The Abolition of Slavery in the States," which the *Syracuse Standard* required to print as follows:

The abolition of the four States the legislative power of the United States. The States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, have each passed a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner.

The States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, have each passed a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner.

The States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, have each passed a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner.

The States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, have each passed a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner.

The States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, have each passed a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner.

The States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, have each passed a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner.

"The Abolition of Four States to Abolish Slavery." This was read by Mr. R. C. Taylor, and the following extracts from the Standard's report, give a partial list of his address:

This paper is intended to call the attention of the people to the fact that the States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, have each passed a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner.

The States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, have each passed a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner.

The States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, have each passed a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner.

The States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, have each passed a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner.

The States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, have each passed a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner.

The States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, have each passed a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner. It is not possible to have a law which is not administered in the same manner.

Since my last report, my work has been done mainly in Cincinnati, Toledo, and Clyde, all in your State. The latter place was wholly new and for our good, but not in the least prejudicial. The weather was tolerable, but both my business were well attended and heard with profound interest. The new Hall was finely opened by the Association for the first, and the Colonization meetings here for the other.

Mr. Cowles and Mr. Morse attended our most useful lectures; and Mr. and Mrs. Whipple also attended our very useful lectures, to our all the many witnesses an account of the meeting history of the weather, of which I have not a great deal to say much for my health or comfort.

Twenty years ago, I could lecture every evening and sometimes two or three days on Sunday, from first of September till last of March, sleeping all weeks, all winters. But I can no longer experience what was in earlier life.

In the winter of 1846, my friend Stephen S. Foster, now of Worcester, Massachusetts, commenced our winter night all-day system of the Southern States. We travelled together much of the time for a year or two, but always on well-stocked the New England wherry, was always able to "make two ocean spans," if even we had plenty of more inland passages. And, although within the discipline when I was very full, "without any storm, or money in the pocket," we had but previous trials, money, and our own personal resources only. I have not, however, been so much of this world's best and best and religious teaching and preaching

would be done by men who read or had and were best-fitted men.

We have travelled a whole afternoon by stage and on foot, writing just in time for our meetings; then spoken such as hours, then walked on to the nearest hotel, called up a morning leader from his bunk in the bar-room, then dined by him in a cheerful chamber, good supper, sometimes cold, or hot, then early in the morning, breakfast on a cracker and milk at the nearest grocery, repeating on a time such, and then pushed forward to our next engagement, by such courtesies as offered. Sometimes a friend would cut us on our way; now and then we could catch a stage, when we had money to pay for it, and frequently we went on foot, sometimes even in snowy cold and storm.

We were young and strong then; and health was mostly in excess. We had abandoned the Congressional military, when we certainly had fair prospect of success in it (Mr. Foster personally), and we had no idea of cherishing our lives and work away in our new calling.

To us, Slavery seemed the National sin, shame and crime; and we determined to see by ourselves, or die in the struggle. We were then most nearly married. More than two years ago, I think, our meetings very broken up, or nearly so, for there is no one who can not so adequately transmit directly to the pulpits of the places where they occurred, and always to some "respectable" arena!

And that was the way much of New England was made acquainted with the anti-slavery cause, and with its obligations and responsibilities toward the colored.

—My old war-wounded friend, Mr. Wilson, after the victory here over the sea was over. I have dined there through more than thirty of his winters, most of the time in New England; but now, as last year, have retired to "winter quarters" in Salem, Ohio, as you suggested in *The Liberty Bell*.

Coming up to Toledo and Clyde from the winter climate of Cincinnati, and about at the very moment when the Snow-Storms were descending with uncommon fury, the weather was that I survived. It was indeed so "with the tide of my coat." But I am recovering now, and hope to give good account of myself in the coming months. My place here appears good, except work that I have.

And I certainly have every reason to rejoice at the results of my arduous campaign in Michigan, Indiana, Illinois and Ohio. And one of the most cheering indications was that, wherever I went, I was invited to repeat my visit and remain longer if possible.

There are several good and warm in almost every comfortable town in the West, who wait impatiently for just the paper which you publish in New York, and which I feel confident to carry in my travelling way like whatever else I can.

That Southern, in the article "The Clergy" in the N. Y. Independent, shows that she has been reading certain lessons on Christian Prerequisites. She does not appear to be able to do it, but it is clear she wants to know more about ministers than the "Reports" can do. She has certainly a half-suspicion that the whole work has not been told. That she suspends is not because, she will



























An excellent edition of a new edition of the book of the...

The only way in which...

A letter was received...

Advertisement for 'The Index'...

**The Index Association.**

Address: No. 7 Nassau Place, London.

**THE INDEX.**

Published weekly, containing...

**ADVERTISING RATES.**

Table with 4 columns: Line, Day, Week, Month. Contains advertising rates.

**CONTENTS FOR FEBRUARY.**

The Index Association, London, No. 7 Nassau Place, London.

**THE INDEX.**

A Weekly Paper devoted to the...

Published by the Index Association...

Subscription rates...

Advertisements...

Editorial notes...

Correspondence...

Publications...

Religious Association...

Free Religion...

Index Association...

Publications...

Religious Association...

Free Religion...

Index Association...

Publications...

Religious Association...

Free Religion...

Index Association...

Publications...

Religious Association...

Advertisement for 'The Index'...

Advertisement for 'The Index'...

Advertisement for 'The Index'...

Advertisement for 'The Index'...

**THE INDEX.**

Address: No. 7 Nassau Place, London.

**INDEX TRACTS.**

No. 1. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 2. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 3. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 4. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 5. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 6. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 7. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 8. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 9. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 10. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 11. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 12. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 13. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 14. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 15. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 16. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 17. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 18. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 19. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 20. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 21. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 22. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 23. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 24. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 25. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 26. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 27. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 28. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 29. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 30. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 31. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 32. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

No. 33. 'Tracts for the Times, by F. D....

1 8 7 4

**THE INDEX.**

A Weekly Journal

DEVOTED TO

**FREE RELIGION.**

PUBLISHED BY THE

**INDEX ASSOCIATION,**

No. 7 Nassau Place, London.

PLACES ILLUSTRATED BY

JOSIAH GAYNE

WALTER WATSON

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

G. E. BENTLEY, Newcastle.

W. J. GAYNE, London.

G. E. BENTLEY, Newcastle.

W. J. GAYNE, London.

G. E. BENTLEY, Newcastle.

W. J. GAYNE, London.

G. E. BENTLEY, Newcastle.

**PUBLICATIONS**

**FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION.**

Reports of the Association and other...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...

Proceedings of the Annual Meeting...





From C. Darwin to W. Graham.

Down, Booterham, Kent  
Aug. 6, 1881. (Railway Station  
Orpington. S.E.R.)

Dear Sir

I thank you for your long and interesting letter. I am not a quick thinker or a good talker, and you would learn nothing from me on the many important subjects which you have discussed. Moreover I labour under a great disadvantage (the effects of many years ill-health) that I am not able to talk long with anyone. It would therefore by no means be worth your while to come all this distance to see me for an hour. I should however, much regret not to make your personal acquaintance, and as I am sure to be in London in the autumn, I will then ask you to lunch with me, should this plan prove convenient to you.

I hope that your book may be largely read, but it is very difficult to get a hearing, so tremendous is the rush of new ideas and of new works of all sorts.

I remain Dear Sir

Yours faithfully

Charles Darwin.

W. Graham

(3)

Dear Mr. Barwin

The enclosed letters I intended to have sent you some time ago but have been prevented from illness and want of energy consequent thereon until now. I hope it is not too late. I send them all (four) although I think only one of them is of importance. That namely which is dated July 3/1881 and which consists of two sheets.

The reason I think this letter important is because it contains the clearest statement I know of of his attitude to the most central philosophical and religious questions. It is very clearly and pointedly expressed and with all the candour and at the same time want of dogmatism which distinguish your father's writings. The position laid down by your father approximately as regards philosophical and religious problems is what is now called resignation or agnosticism; though where he expresses his "inward conviction" that the Universe is not the result of chance he leaves that position a little, as the true Agnostic (a horrid word by the bye) has no inward conviction on any such question. Nevertheless it is well known that a

conviction that the world was the upshot of chance en-  
 dured for ages, and your father that it was not and  
 neither opinion is that of our positivists and agnostics gene-  
 rally. As regards Evolution and the progress of our  
 species the words of your father in the letter referred to  
 are optimistic as they are in his books and it is a good  
 thing to find a robust and cheerful optimist in these  
 days like your father and Herbert Spencer. Both go  
 a little beyond my views but I like to see men try to  
 pierce that veil of things. I hope you may find the  
 letter of some use and that I have not inflicted my  
 opinions on you. I hope also that you and all your  
 family are well especially Mrs Darwin to whom the  
 change of residence is a more serious thing. I was  
 greatly pleased, <sup>at the time</sup> to hear that your brother George had  
 been appointed Professor. Please remember me kindly to  
 him.

Sincerely yours  
 W. Graham

view