

THE ORIGIN OF MAN AND THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN SPECIES.

(Continued.)

HAVING examined the anatomical difference between men, the monkeys, and other animals, let us now compare the psychological phenomena of man and animals. "The difference in mind between man and the higher animals, great as it is," says Mr. Darwin, "is certainly one of degree, and not of kind."—(Charles Darwin's "The Descent of Man," p. 105.) Is Mr. Darwin justified to speak with so much confidence? Are we, then, to believe with Dr. Bérard, that man is "a mammiferous-monodelphio bimana," differing in mind, as Mr. Darwin explains it, "in degree but certainly not in kind from other animals." [Mr. Darwin says explicitly "that man is here, not to prepare himself for a better world . . . but simply to be here—one might add, to be happy and comfortable here." He does not believe in Christianity. "Christianity must be destroyed," he says, "the civilised world has out-grown that religion."—"Hints and Facts," by Plus Melia, D.D.: chap. II.] Are we to believe in "L'homme Machine" of Julian Offray de la Mettrie? or with Aristotle, Plato, Boetius, Buffon, Linne, Lawrence Jussieu, and the most eminent philosophers of ancient and modern times? Are we to consider human reason as a special prerogative of man, distinguishing him, not in degree only, but in kind, from all animals? This, I shall have you to decide when you have heard my observations on the subject in question. I grant that the instinct of animals is most wonderful. [Mr. Darwin mentions a monkey able to crack a walnut with a stone; another who could open the lid of a large box with a stick. He also mentions baboons fighting one another with stones.—"The Descent of Man"; vol. 1, chap II Mr. E. L. Layard, of the British consulate, Noumea, relates an interesting anecdote about a cat which pulled the wire of a bell, when out at night in the cold in order to be let in.—"Knowledge"; Jan. 6, 1882.] They can communicate their emotions to each other by particular sounds; yet they can never learn languages, express their sentiments by articulate sounds;—in one word, they are unable to speak. The language of animals, if we may dignify it with such a name, is invariably the same in the same species. Dogs bark, horses neigh, oxen low, blackbirds whistle, and eagles scream, but they cannot speak. The parrot and a few other birds may repeat short words, imitate certain sounds, but they can never realise their meaning, or be taught to make use of them to express their wants. Let Mr. Darwin, Hæckel, Lyell, or Huxley, train a young monkey, and, under the most experienced masters, teach it to speak Greek, Latin, Hebrew, French, German, English, Italian, &c., then let this new philologist come and vindicate his rights to our kindred; willingly shall we listen to him; until then, let our friends the evolutionists permit us to believe that the difference between man and the higher animals is certainly one of kind and not of degree. [Trained animals show the skill of the man who has taught them; they act only by the impression conveyed to their senses. A dog may be taught to arrange numbers written on a square black; a donkey to beat the ground with its right leg as many times as there are shillings in a coin; a pig to point out a card chosen by a person. But the master indicates to them by a sign to do those things, which they have practised before. They are therefore acts of instinct, not of reason.—See "Hints and Facts," chap. XI.] Man, also, is the only being in this world capable of stereotyping his ideas by means of writing, and of appropriating to himself the ideas of others by reading. No monkey, if it were kept in the best school for twenty years could ever learn to read or write. Arts and sciences are also the special prerogative of man. I should like very much to see some mandrill, marmoset, chimpanzee, orang-outang, or gorilla—our would-be venerable progenitors—able to play on the violin, the guitar, the harmonium or piano. I should be delighted to hear from their lips a lecture on botany, geology, astronomy, chemistry and other sciences. Until these things come to pass, Mr. Darwin and his learned friends, by showing the affinities of animated creation from the protozoa, infusoria, spongiae, rhizopods, entozoa, echino dermata, vermes, molusca, fishes, birds and mammalia, and even man, may indeed thereby display their erudition, and show their own spirit, but surely not that of beasts. Mr. William Denton, in his book on the origin of man, says that "it is most reasonable to suppose that all forms of life, including man, have come into existence by natural process" (Wm. Denton's "Is Darwin Right," p. 16): and explaining this natural process, he tells us that, "from invisible gelatinous globules, that floated in the primal seas, life has advanced to crawling worm, balancing fish, hopping batrachian, tree-climbing marsupial, mimicking ape, to the man and woman of this age."—(Ib., p. 103.) The same Mr. Denton, in order to demonstrate that the brute is the father of man, shows that all animals are alike to the eye when in their primitive egg state, and because the human "ovum" is like that of the fish, of the bird, and of the brute, he concludes therefrom that "the brute is the father of the man." But Mr. Denton is mistaken; although apparently alike, the various "ova" must differ essentially, since the creatures they produce are invariably different, and neither Mr. Denton nor any of his learned friends will be able to show that at any time of the world's history the egg of a fish has produced anything but a fish, and the egg of a bird anything but a bird. No conclusion, therefore, can be drawn against primitive creation from the facts related by Mr. Denton in his chapter on metamorphosis of animals. "But," continues Mr. Denton, "if man did not come into existence as a metamorphosis of some pre-existing and inferior beings, how was it done?" We are told that man was made by God. There is no objection to this, if a rational idea goes with the word. "If by God is meant nature, then man was doubtless made by God, and made out of dust, but it passed through myriads of forms to arrive at the man."—(William Denton's "Is Darwin Right," p. 98.) In order to deny creation by God, as related by Moses, Mr. Denton admits of millions upon millions of miracles, each more incredible than the Mosaic cosmogony. For instance, he says: "We live in a world teeming with life." But he does not even attempt to tell us how this world came into existence; who gave it its vitality, its modifications, its

symmetry; how elements are directed in their natural selections; by what mysterious agency the metamorphosis of animals, he so much magnifies, is accomplished. He affirms that the cosmogonic history of Moses is "a Lilliputian chronology, insisted upon only by antiquated theologians." He adds, with an air of triumph, "that the young but lusty science of geology has made great havoc with this venerable idea of creation, and torn down the curtain our ignorance had woven."—(William Denton's "Is Darwin Right," p. 77.) Indeed, the ignorance of all past generations must have been very great, for (1st) all nations of the world attributed creation to a supreme god. Zeus, according to the Greeks, is the first of all the gods, the principle of all things, and the ruler of all.—(Plutarque "Opin.," Phil. iv.) Socrates, in "Xenophon," says that a supreme being made all things from the beginning.—("Xenoph. Mem. Soc.," I, c. iv.) According to the Egyptians, the first of the gods is the principle of all things and the father of all men.—("Jamblicus De Myst. Egypt.") The Persians believed in one supreme god, called Ormusda, by whom all things were made. The Penjangan, the most ancient religious book of the Indians, distinctly affirms there is a god who made all things. The Chinese, with Confucius, believe that Jai-ki or You-ki whom they style the Great Spirit, who has neither shape nor figure, was the creator of all things.—("Rech sur les Liv. Sac. de L'ori.," 1843, p. 14.) [Voltaire himself confessed that learned Chinese are deists, believing in one God and in Providence.] Before the arriving of the Incas in Peru, the ancient inhabitants believed in a supreme being, called Pacha-chamack (the creator), who gave life to all things. 2nd.—For the creation of man in a perfect state, we could quote numberless authorities; let a few suffice: Confucius said that the Great Spirit created man and woman.—("M.C. "Les Chinois," ix) According to the Arabs, God created mankind out of the earth.—(Herbelot Biblioth., p. 231.) Brama is said by the Indians to have made the first man. The traditions of the Scandinavians, the Greeks, and the Romans confirm this truth. [At Alba Julia, in Transylvania the following ancient Roman inscriptions have been found:—"Deo magno aeterno": "To the great, eternal God." "Jovi optimo, maximo servatori, conservatori": "To the most excellent and great Jupiter, the regulator, and preserver of the universe."—One of the finest geniuses of ancient Rome, Horace, speaks of the Deity in the following terms:—

"Unde nil majus generatur ipso;
Nec viget quidquam simile, aut secundum":

"Nothing greater than Him was ever produced; He has no equal, He has none like to Him."—Saadi, a Bactrian poet, has the following passage on God:—

"The child He sketches in its mother's womb,
From east to west His hand transports the sun.
The massy mountains He with rubies sows," &c.

Here is a Bramin prayer: "I adore that Being, the origin and cause of all other beings, that supports the universe."—Phil. Cate. I, 155, 156.] This universal testimony—concerning the origin of man—is a very strong argument against evolutionists. When men living at different times, inhabiting different countries, speaking different languages, are agreed about any fact, this fact should be considered as historically true. Evolutionists are quite mistaken in saying that man in the early stage of his existence had all the brutal characteristics of his savage origin. History shows, on the contrary, primitive men were quite as intelligent as those of the present time. It is not quite clear that men before the flood did not surpass in knowledge our greatest scientists. Botany, astronomy, agriculture, architecture flourished thousand of years before the Christian era. In poetry, music, and many other things, our ancestors were likewise very advanced. Who could form an idea of the beauty of Babylon, and its suspended gardens, of Nineveh, of the temple of Diana of Ephesus, of the pyramids of Egypt, of the paintings and statues of Herculaneum and Pompeii? [In the Mesopotamian Valley most beautiful antiquities have been excavated; sculptured slabs, statues, fragments of terra cotta, &c., also inscriptions in cuneiform characters. These wonderful discoveries show that it is not an invariable rule that the greater the antiquity of relics of the past, the greater the inferiority of execution they present.—"Knowledge," Jan. 27, 1882, p. 268, 269. We find in all the pyramids of Egypt the evidence of an astronomical plan carried out with great skill—in accordance with astronomical observations of great accuracy.—"Knowledge," Jan. 6, 1882, p. 193. The eminent Egyptologist, Mr. Chabas has published an essay to prove that the ancient Egyptians were acquainted with the movement of the earth round the sun.—"Knowledge," March 3, 1882, p. 379.] Although our ancestors had no railway, no electric telegraph, no telephone, were they not, on the whole, as perfect and intelligent as we? Away, then, with the theory of our sialian origin. No, man is not a brute. If I read history attentively everywhere I see man, by his genius and reason, ruling over all animated creation; nowhere do I perceive the brute of Darwin or of Denton.

(Concluded in our next.)

The French Minister of the Interior and Public Worship, *Le petit Goblet*, resigned two weeks ago, the Ministry having been defeated in the Chambers in its policy in regard to the municipality of Paris. It is a very strange coincidence that barely two weeks before, this same Goblet handed over as far as he could, to the tender mercies of the present municipality of Paris, the National Basilica of the Sacred Heart at Montmartre. Three million Frenchmen subscribed to that magnificent temple, as an act of National homage to the Sacred Heart. Now the Deputies of France have voted to practically suppress it. The wretched Goblet pretended to oppose the radical motion by saying that it was not the right of the Government to appropriate the Church—that was the right of the municipality of Paris! "The National Basilica will disappear," says a famous writer in the *Pays*. "Montmartre, after a century will again become Mount Marat. The Phrygian Cap will replace the Cross of Jesus, and God once more will be driven from His own Household."—*Catholic Review*.