THE END OF DARWINISM

Not Change but Persistence is Characteristic of Life
Every Change is Essentially a Persistence;
Only what Persists can Change.

AN ESSAY

—BY—

ALFRED P. SCHULTZ, M. D.
Author of "Race or Mongrel," "The Children of Everybody," Etc.

Published by
ALFRED P. SCHULTZ,
Monticello, Sullivan Co., New York.

THE END OF DARWINISM

I have before me an article in which I read:—"With different modifications the theory of evolution is now accepted by every competent mind in the civilized world. What does that mean? It means that since the far off beginning—I say beginning, because I do not know how else to express my thoughts, for we can conceive of no beginning—there has been gradual growth, from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher, from the poorer to the relatively better."

The theory of evolution is not accepted by every competent mind, and it is not accepted for compelling reasons. The truth is, that not one *fact* has been discovered which substantiates the theory, and many facts which prove it to be erroneous, not only erroneous but impossible. It is a conception of nature, which is not at all the last thought of science but on the contrary the simplest and crudest of explanations. It is as plausible and as apparently self evident a truth, as the truth that the earth is a stationary plate in the centre of the universe around which the river Oceanus flows and the sun and stars revolve. Buechner praises the Indian for his lack of prejudice in calling the wolf his brother. No savage doubts the evolution of one species into another. Every Hottentot believes in spontaneous generation. The Babylonians and Egyptians of old held the same notions concerning life. Some of the Greek philosophers preached this doctrine. Aristotle held it. Anaximander forbids the eating of fish for the reason that 'fish is father and mother of man.' Kant

said, 'the assumption of a spontaneous generation followed by an evolution into more perfect forms lies so close and is apparently so self evident a truth that there are probably but few naturalists, even among the most clearsighted and ingenious, who have not at some time cherished an hypothesis of that sort'. It is not held, that the highly organized living beings owe their existence to spontaneous generation. In 1675 Anton van Leeuwenhoek discovered the bacteria, and immediately the question arose do these generate spontaneously, or are they the descendants of beings of the same kind? In 1749 Needham held that the bacteria developed spontaneously. Spallanzani 1769 drew attention to the laxity of Needham's methods. Schulze, Dusch, Schwann, Schroeder, Hoffmann, Pasteur, Tyndall proved by the convincing nature of their experiments that the presence of living organisms is due always to the preexistence of similar living forms. Cohn of Breslau demonstrated that some bacteria have the ability of passing into the spore stage, in the course of their life, in which stage they are more able to resist deleterious influences. This discovery was the death blow to the doctrine of spontaneous generation; and we now know that nothing is more certain than the truth of Harvey's law "Omne vivum ex vivo". The bacteria have no chlorophyll, and are therefore unable to obtain nitrogen and carbon from such simple bodies as Carbon dioxide and ammonia, they must get their carbon and their nitrogen as such from organic matter. The bacteria are as active in their life cycle as the so called higher organisms. They cause profound changes in the organic matter on which they live. Developing in the living body, the parasitic bacteria cause disease and death. The saprophytic bacteria cause decomposition, putrefaction, and fermentation, and thus they resolve the tissues of dead organisms into the simpler compounds carbonic acid, water and ammonia, in which form they serve as nutrition for the more highly organized members of the vegetable world, without which simpler compounds these plants cannot live. They

cannot get their carbon and nitrogen from the complicated substances which are the foodstuff for bacteria, the bacteria furnish the green plants with the simple compounds which these can use, the plants that possess chlorophyll having the power in the presence of sunlight to break up these compounds into their constituents. Were it not for the activity of the bacteria, which furnishes food to the plants, there could be no plant life, and as all animal life is dependent directly or indirectly on the vegetable world, there could be no life at all upon earth. The socalled "low" and the socalled "high" forms of life are interdependent, they necessitate and presuppose one another; without the "higher" forms of life, no "lower" forms are possible and without the "lower" forms there can be no "higher" forms. Every living being depends on every other living being.

The Darwinists suppose, they claim it as a dogma, that in primeval times, infinitesimal particles of primeval dust coalesced into an infinitesimal primeval Darwin-Haeckel; it was the beginning of life, no other life existed. This living thing, which Darwinists say was simple, must at the same time have been able to perform what it takes bacteria, chlorophyll plant and animal life in conjunction to perform. The assumption is an absurdity. How could this living thing live in isolation? And the more simple this living thing is supposed to have been the more absurd is the supposition that it could live in isolation; if on the other hand this living thing was the wonder that could perform what it takes all living beings in conjunction to do, then it was not simple, but the most complex, the most compound, the most highly organized being that ever existed in fact or in imagination. In either case the Darwinistic theory is proved an untenable assumption. We know that not only every living being is the product of another living being, but that every living being is the product of a living being of the same kind and type, a chromogenic bacteria is the product of a chromogenic bacteria, a photogenic bacteria of a photogenic bacteria, a nitri-

fying bacteria of a nitrifying bacteria, a diphtheria producing bacteria of a diphtheria producing bacteria and not of a tuberculosis producing bacteria and so forth. Were this not the case we could have no science of bacteriology. This means that persistence is the essence of life and not change as the Darwinists hold.

The simple cell is an essential part of the Darwinistic Credo. It is its cornerstone. Twenty-five years ago it was ignorance to speak of the simple cell, today it is conscious fraud. The more perfect our microscopic lenses become, the more clearly do we recognize that "simple cell" is a contradiction in terms. We now know that the infusoria have many interdependent parts, each organized to perform its function. They have a circulatory system and organs of digestion, assimilation and reproduction. Hermann Nikolaus Maier has shown that they have organs of special sense. Other scientists point to the amoeba as the simple cell. Professor M. Foster in his "Textbook of Physiology" says "The amoeba is a simple being; it renews its substance, replenishes its store of energy and sets free energy now in one form, now in another, and yet the amoeba may be said to have no tissues and no organs * * *. Using the more familiar amoeba as a type and leaving on one side the nucleus" (Why? Is the nucleus not an organ belonging to the amoeba?) "we may say that its body is homogeneous. * * *. Now the great characteristic of the typical amoeba, leaving out the nucleus" (With what right? Have I the right to say that the great characteristic of man, leaving out the internal organs, is that he is bone covered by muscle?) "is that as far as we can ascertain all the physiological units are alike, they all do the same things. Each and every part of the body receives food more or less raw and builds it up into its own living substance; each and every part of the body may be at one time quiescent and at another time in motion, each and every part is sensitive and responds by movement or otherwise to various changes in its surroundings. * * * The

body of the amoeba is frequently spoken of as consisting of protoplasm". This protoplasm is evidently a wonder, not at all simple, but from Prof. Foster's description most complex. Professor Foster continues: "The body of man in its first stages, while it is yet an ovum if we leave aside the nucleus and neglect differences caused by the unequal distribution of food material or yolk, may also be said to be composed of like parts or like physiological units". This is a remarkable sentence, it is absurd. If the parts were homogeneous, how could the different parts develope so differently? Because we do not see the differences in the first stages, does that justify Prof. Foster in saying that there are none? He continues "By the act of segmentation however the ovum is divided into parts or cells which early show differences from each other and these differences rapidly increase as development proceeds. Some cells put on certain characters and others other characters". Mark this "The cells put on character" and "the differences rapidly increase". According to this scientist the physiological units were at first homogeneous, the putting on of this or that character on the part of the cells and the rapid increase of the differences between them, therefore means the growth of something out of nothing. Prof. Foster states further "Each physiological unit of the amoeba while it is engaged in setting free energy so as to move itself, and by reason of its sensitiveness so directing that energy as to produce a movement suitable to the conditions of its surroundings, has at the same time to bear the labor of taking in raw food, of selecting that part of the raw food which is useful and rejecting that which is useless, and of working up the accepted part through a variety of stages into its own living substance, that is to say has at the same time that it is feeling and moving to carry on the work of digesting and assimilating. It has moreover at the same time to throw out the waste matter arising from the changes taking place in its substance having first brought these waste matters into a condition suitable for being thrown

out". Mark, that this is said not of the amoeba as a whole, but of each and every particle of the amoeba. And is it simple? No, it is the most complex tissue imaginable, the wonder of wonders. We now know that this wonder of wonders does not exist. The amoeba has a contractile vacuole which means a circulatory apparatus, the processes in multiplying are very complex and indicate internal organs. "The amoeba", says Prof. Foster, "may be said to have no tissues and no organs, at all events this is true of closely allied but not so well known simple beings". Prof. Foster probably refers to the myxamoeba which are said to be so "low" that it is difficult to classify them. De Bary, Cienkowski and others studied them under the microscope on culture media. Instead of being simple they found the myxamoeba and its life cycle very complex. The myxamoeba is at first aquatic and moves about by means of a flagellum, this it loses as the tadpole its tail and it becomes terrestrial. Now many individual myxamoebas coalesce and form colonies, these colonies undergo profound changes. Variously marked and variously colored spore capsules are formed containing spores; capillary vessels (capillitium) with complicated arrangements for the protection and spreading of the spores are noticed. Under certain conditions the colonies break up again into their individual components. The sporangias, the spores and the complicated frame of the capillitii permit a classification into groups, genera and species. (v. Houston Stewart Chamberlain "Immanuel Kant"). This "simple" living being is not at all simple. It is as complex as man himself.

Nowhere has a trace of the Darwinistic "simple" living being or of the "simple" cell been found. Every day we recognize more clearly that many differentiated elements constitute the cell, and nowhere has a sign of the evolution of one being into another been found. Like produces like; that is true not only of the cell as a whole, but also of the individual components, parts, organs which constitute the cell. No nucleus without a

previous nucleus, no nucleolus without a previous nucleolus, no centrosome without a previous centrosome, no chromation without previous chromation, and so forth. The "simplest" cell consists of parts which are interdependent and presuppose and necessitate each other. Life is organization.

Does the science of palaeontology (the science of the ancient life of the earth or of its fossil remains) substantiate the theory of evolution? In the lowest strata of the fossiliferous rocks that contain the earliest forms of life are found the evidences, that the fauna then was just as rich and just as highly organized as the fauna that exists on the bottom of the ocean today. Prof. Brooks of John Hopkins University, a Darwinist, finds that the forms there found, very far from being the simple unspecialized ancestors of the present fauna are zoologically speaking intensely modern and belong to the same order of nature as the fauna of today. Neither present nor early times justify us in accepting the Darwinian dogma.

The study of man does not substantiate Darwinism. It flatters us to believe that in comparison with us our grandfathers were dull and stupid, we alone are great, greater than any generation that preceded us; progress, progress, this century, this generation produced more greatness than all the others combined. History does not substantiate this belief. There is no essential progress, which justifies the acceptance of the theory of the evolution of man. Not one new sense has been added to the senses of man. He has no more today than in the grey dawn of history. Has his mind evolved from a lower to a higher sphere, so that we overtower the ancients in ability, intelligence, morals? History says "No". In literature the Greeks produced Homer and Sophokles. The last two thousand years produced two men only as incommensurable as these—Shakespeare in England and Goethe in Germany. How does our epic poetry compare with the old Teutonic sagas, The Volsungen sagas—in essence if not in workmanship as great as the Homeric poems?

And have the Hindoos not produced Kalidasa, the poets of the Vedas, of the Mahabharata, of the Ramayana? Where is evolution in literature? Where is our architecture that merits comparison with Gothic or Hellenic architecture? We have some fine buildings, such as the capitol in Washington, but these are imitation from cellar to roof. We are proud of the republican form of government, as if this were something new and essentially American. History teaches that all forms of government known to man existed at all times. Absolute democracies, absolute monarchies, constitutional republics, constitutional monarchies, socialistic communities and communistic societies. The wise king knew that there was nothing new under the sun. The form of government is in itself of no importance. That form is best which assures the greatest amount of self government, and this is as often found in a constitutional monarchy as in a republic. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty no matter what the form of government is. Where vigilance abates a despotic oligarchy rules. No one will affirm that we have a higher conception of freedom than our Teutonic ancestors had or that we love freedom better.

Our morals are not better essentially than those of our ancestors, in some respects worse. Never before was there a time in which brewers drowned the world in beer as they do now. No narcotic was ever as widely used as the narcotic "alcohol" today is used. We are content with a double morality, our ancestors demanded chastity in men as well as in women. Where is there an evolution?

We are proud of our mechanical inventions and with justice. The prehistoric man, however, who first controlled fire instead of being controlled by it, who rendered fire useful to man, the men who discovered navigation, were men of as great genius as the greatest inventor of historic times. The man who made the first stone axe was as great a benefactor as the man who made the first steam engine. The alphabet, the art of writing, were

given us by prehistoric men. Think how little science we could have without the socalled Arabic notation of numbers. The man who invented the symbol " 0 " was a very deep thinker. The zero is no number, but a philosophical-metaphysical conception. It signifies the absence of all things, it is the point where the positive and the negative intersect. It has become so much a part of ourselves that we can no longer think without it. Figure out what 6 per cent. of " M " dollars are and you cannot do it, because consciously or unconsciously our mind translates the " M " into 1000. We owe this symbol to a great Hindoo thinker, who is unknown to history. Where is that evolution of the mind, where that progress that we are so proud of? We have more things, we know more than our ancestors, because we profited by their experience, because we are the descendants and the heirs of men as great and as good as we are and not the children of semi-apes. Was the prehistoric man in physique a semi-monkey? Some of the oldest prehistoric skulls are more roomy than the skull of the average white man of today. The more roomy skull had a bigger brain, and undoubtedly a greater intelligence. Johannes Ranke and Broca find that some of the races of the stone age were of the highest and noblest human development.

Evolution, however, must be and so the Darwinists close their eyes tightly in order not to see the facts. None are as blind as those who will not see. On the other hand Darwinists see things which do not exist, the " simple " cell is one of them; the original monkey is another. At first Darwinists held that man was the son of the ape. This was quickly seen to be impossible for anatomical reasons, and they promptly invented the original monkey of whom man and ape were the descendants. Gegenbauer writes ' no relation can be established between reptiles and mammals'. That troubles him little. ' We must', he says, ' assume that there was an original reptile that had the characteristics of both, mammals and reptiles'. These wild phantastic speculations are called biological science. On similar delusions

Prof. Haeckel bases his " biogenetic fundamental law ", which alleges that the individual in his development repeats the history of the race. Haeckel was not the first scholiast who preached this dogma. Bonnet declared it in 1768. Diderot in " Pensees sur l'interpretation de la Nature", 1754 delivered the whole theory of evolution. (v. Chamberlain, Immanuel Kant.) Ernst von Baer discovered the facts which the speculating Haeckel remolded in order to get his so called " law ". From Louis Agassiz, Haeckel took the palaeontological facts and thoughts. Both men protested against Haeckel's abuse of their work, pointed out the monstrosity of his hypothesis and showed that Haeckel thoroughly and radically, though perhaps unconsciously (being hypnotized by his own nightmare), forged the facts everywhere in order to make them agree with his theory. Agassiz in his " Essay on Classification " pointed out Haeckel's suppression of some facts and his falsification of others in establishing his genealogical trees. Milne Edwards in " Introduction a la Zoologic generale " laid bare the frivolity with which Haeckel twisted the truth. The whole of Haeckel's structure rests on contortions of truth. Houston Stewart Chamberlain and the Kepler League demanded him to rectify his falsification of facts, and to explain the changing and miscorrecting of embryonic plates, which made them suit his theory. The sixth edition of his " Anthropogenie " neither explains nor corrects these malcorrections. It is evident that Haeckel does not seek truth but notoriety.

It has been shown that spontaneous generation exists nowhere, that everything organized is the product of something organized. The Darwinists assume (it is nothing but a wild assumption) that in primeval times dead matter gave birth to life. All forces of nature are antagonistic to life as Edward Drinker Cope pointed out; the assumption that matter and energy produced life is a nonsensical conception. Mr. Cope says " It is more probable that death is a consequence of life, rather than that the living is the product of the non-living". It is a tale sim-

ilar to that of Baron Muenchhausen, who riding over a fen sank with his horse and when he was submerged to his belt thought of his queue, took hold of it and pulled himself and his horse out of the mire; so dead matter took hold of its Darwinistic pigtail and lifted itself into life. Prof. Gegenbaur writes "Let us imagine a simple organism". How can we know what that is? Prof. Gegenbaur tells us how this "simple" organism (the product of a diseased imagination) developed, and how by degrees it became perfectly organized and its parts adjusted. How this first organism that was no organism could live a second if it was not perfectly organized we are not told. David Hume asks "I would fain know how an animal could subsist unless its parts were so adjusted". We are told that an organizing principle arose (How? From what? Another instance of the growth of something out of nothing.) and developed the living thing into an organism. Prof. Ludwig Plate writes "The essence of selection consists in the separation of bodies fit for existence from those that are not fit for existence, and thus progress and perfection are produced". Dr. Savage writes "There has been a gradual growth from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher, from the poorer to the better." Literally a continuous creation of more out of less, of something out of nothing. No wonder that Kant calls the theory of evolution, which is the scientific credo of today "the common, superficial conception". Prof. Gegenbaur further states that 'due to an inherent variability' (another wild assumption) 'the organism changed and adapted itself." The inherent variability makes change possible, it is not the cause of the change or adaptation of the organism. What is the cause? Prof. Gegenbaur says "The cause of the adaptation is the advantage which accrues to the organism from the change". The advantage as a consequence of the adaptation gives sense, but as the cause of the adaptation it is nonsense (v. Chamberlain "Immanuel Kant"). The scientific scholiasts

of the nineteenth century do not at all favorably compare with the theological scholiasts of the Middle Ages.

In order to escape the doctrine of spontaneous generation Haeckel endowed matter with some degree of life, going back to the hylozoism of the ancients. This means that matter is not inert. The conception that matter is inert is the basis and foundation of all physical science. Let the notion that matter is not inert creep in even by the smallest loophole and we can have no science. Thus Haeckel-Herostratus deprives us not only of our science but of the very possibility of science. If man is nothing but developed matter, specialized into man by the blind working natural selection, it follows that man is not a free moral agent, and that is the Darwinian-Haeckelian conclusion. In other words man is an automaton; what meaning can God, duty, morals, love, sympathy, charity have for an automaton? None whatsoever. Thus the Herostrati deprive us not only of our science but of the best we have, of our personality.

In the science and art of medicine the evolutionary hypothesis has been and still is practically applied; it has led to the theory of rudimentary organs. These are organs, the Darwinists say, which in the supposed animal existence were of use to our ancestors, but are now discarded; they testify to some previous stage in our development. Prof. Wiedersheim in his Darwinistic intoxication has found 107 rudimentary organs in man. Mr. Houston Stewart Chamberlain says it is about time to write a book on the Human Body as Nature's Junkshop for Defunct Organs, and wonders whether the human brain is not the one hundred and eighth rudimentary organ. In medicine the Darwinian disease led to deplorable consequences. As these organs were declared to be useless, they were cut out for trivial reasons. The thyroid gland is a rudimentary organ, "Cut it out," and it was cut out. Many of the victims died from the effects of the operation, all the others developed myxedema (a form of cretinism). This rudimentary (!) organ was found to have an import-

ant function. The Darwinian construction of "rudimentary organs" is utterly untenable. There are no rudimentary organs, the functions of the organs so called are gradually being discovered. The two rudimentary (!) organs which are still being abused are the tonsils and the appendix. The tonsils have probably a protective function, the active phagocytosis going on in them destroying parasites, and because of this function at the most exposed part of the alimentary tract, they frequently become inflamed; they do not become inflamed because they are rudimentary (?) organs which the surgeon wants to excise. Many scalpel wielders (I do not say every surgeon), still consider themselves justified in exsecting every appendix that comes across their way. We do not yet know the purpose of the appendix, but it is very certain that it is not placed in the human body for the purpose of giving surgeons the opportunity to show their skill. In medicine the Darwinian mode of thinking has done and is still doing harm. The Darwinian theory muddled the brain of anatomists, physiologists and surgeons; it confused the unsuspecting public. The great sale of Haeckel's works speaks well neither for Haeckel nor for the public. The theory of evolution is a consequence, a symptom, and a cause of the materialism which is rampant; a materialism as crude and as superficial as that which infested imperial Rome.

Mr. Reader, lay aside for a moment the Darwinistic blinders and open your eyes. Do you see a change in living beings? Yes, of course,—but—you see a change only in beings *which persist.* You and I change between today and tomorrow, yet we persist. If we did not, we would not know ourselves. It is the nature of life to be elastic and its elasticity enables it to resist the antagonistic forces of nature. The essential thing is the persistence not the change. The phenomenon of regeneration proves the truly wonderful pertinacity of this persistence. "Only what persists can change." (H. St. Chamberlain). Every change is a persistence. Darwinism makes change the essence of life. It

is a revival of the doctrine of Heraclitus "Everything is in a flux, nothing persists, no one can step into the same river twice." Plato's answer to Heraclitus answers the Darwinian hypothesis. "If as Heraclitus maintains all things are in a flux and nothing persists, no knowledge is possible, for knowledge must necessarily connect a persisting object with a persisting subject. If everything is in a flux there can be neither a knowing subject nor a knowable object, and it is impossible to hold that there can be a knowledge of anything". As Darwin attempts to prove that everything is in the process of evolving into something else, Chamberlain thinks that the title of his famous book ought to read "The Origin of Species, which do not exist".

The Darwinian theory makes the world nothing but a retort, differing from the ordinary chemical retort in size only. Alfred Wallace says—"There is in all this (life) something quite beyond and apart from chemical changes." Otto Weininger holds that 'chemistry can get at the excrements of life only, not at life'. Hans Driesch writes: "The common chemico-physical interpretation of life is a phrase, it is more easy to make phrases than it is to think". To deduct life from matter and energy is, according to Prof. Tait, simply unscientific.

The time is ripe for a sane interpretation of nature; and it will read something like this. Matter is inertia, energy is mutability, life is neither matter nor energy nor a combination of these, but a third principle. Life is organization, which implies elastic persistence. Just as science substantiates conservation of matter and conservation of energy, so science substantiates conservation of life. The total quantity of life does not change. A change in one group conditions and corresponds to a change in another group. The creation of something out of nothing is in the domain of life as preposterous a thought as in the domains of matter and energy. Every living being depends on, presupposes and necessitates every other living being. An isolated living being is a Darwinistic nightmare, a preposterous thought.

Types persist there is no evolution of one into the other; in the case of man this means that racial types persist no matter what the environment is; the negro remains a negro in America as well as in Africa, the Jew a Jew under every sky, the Teuton a Teuton, and so forth. The changes these undergo under different enviroments are due to the elasticity of life, and are for the purpose of enabling the type to persist. Every change is essentially a persistence. The crossing of types that are not closely related (promiscuous crossing) leads to mongrelization, which is followed by deterioration and death. (The Greeks of Hellas, the Romans, the Aryan Hindoos) v. Chamberlain "Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts", A. P. Schultz "Race or Mongrel".

The origin of life we cannot explain. We have to agree with Svante Arrhenius that the question how did life originate is similar to the question how did matter or energy originate. We will have to accustom ourselves to the thought that Life has no origin in time. The Darwinists attempt to demonstrate how life became organized. It is as senseless an attempt as if they attempted to demonstrate how matter gradually became inert or energy mutable. The very thought is preposterous. Goethe said "Lebhafte Frage nach der Ursache ist von grosser Schaedlichkeit". (Anxious questioning as to the cause is pernicious), and Roger Bacon said "Causas non oportet investigare". (v. H. St. Chamberlain "Immanuel Kant"). We have to be content with "God created".

Prof. Joseph Jastrow in an article entitled "Malicious Animal Magnetism" (Hampton's Mag. Oct. 1910) writes "Science builds slowly but safely. It is very very careful about the foundations. When men tried to build too fast and trusted more to imagination than to brick and mortar they produced pseudoscience, false and hollow which soon tottered and had to be pulled down. When they neglected the foundation they built up superstitions in commonplace affairs, and what may be called

pseudo-philosophy in more ambitious ones. The system of ideas back of Christian Science is a very crude form of philosophy". Put the word "Darwinism" in place of the words "Christian Science" and these sentences remain true. It is high time that this "English Disease" as Friedrich Dreyer calls it be shaken off. In the hullabaloo that Darwin-Haeckel and his followers set up, the voices of the great naturalists Immanuel Kant, Karl Ernst von Baer, Milne Edwards, Louis Agassiz, Richard Owen, Houston St. Chamberlain and others are not heard. The Haeckelian papism in philosophy is a danger to our culture. A sane interpretation of nature leads not to monism but to dualism. Every monism is a fraud, and pernicious in its effects. We must be free moral agents or have no moral laws, we must conceive nature a mechanism or have no science. The mechanical conception of nature is the necessary method for obtaining science. We have moral laws and we have science. Man is both free and bound. The Darwinistic interpretation of nature pretends to explain everything and to give the cause of everything; it is arrogant, presumptuous and suffers from theophobia. A sane conception of nature is modest, it knows that the sum total of all we know is to the sum total of all we do not know as a drop is to the ocean. Darwinists either tear their eyes open and say they see everything, there are no wonders, or they shut their eyes tightly and say they see nothing, there are no mysteries. How mistaken they are. Is the growth of a blade of grass, is the growth of a powerful tree from a little seed, is the starry sky not a wonder and a mystery. In fact everything is wonderful and mysterious. We study to *comprehend* things, *explain* them we cannot. The depth of the human mind, the infinity and mystery of the starry heavens impelled Kant to kneel down and worship. A sane interpretation of nature will not be without Kant's modesty. It will not be materialism. Present day materialism declares reason, thinking, life the product of not reasoning, not living matter. It makes mind a function, a secretion of the body.

The contrary is true; it is not the eyes that see or the ears that hear, it is I who sees and hears by means of my eyes and ears. Not my brain thinks, I think by means of my brain. The whole body is the organ of the soul. Man is an intelligence served by it. It is the I, the soul, that builds the body. Materialism declares man to be nothing but a combination of chemicals in the big retort called the world; and life the accident or fact of their combination. In truth man is not only a chemical-physical substance but also a metaphysical, a spaceless, timeless and therefore eternal being. His life not a mere fact or an accident, but a problem and a duty. "The essence of life," says Kant, "is of immaterial nature". In a purely material world ruled by necessity, there can be no morals. Materialism is therefore the chief enemy of humanity and of all culture. Time is money preaches materialism; it is in fact our chance to make ourselves, and to do good. The struggle for existence being a means and not an end does not prove untrue the words "God saw everything that he had made and behold it was very good". "Man," the Darwinists say, "is an animal, more highly endowed than the beasts of the field but differing from them in degree only". Man is an animal endowed with reason; but the true man, the moral, metaphysical, transcendental man is no animal at all. He is a spirit, an eternal being, the image of God. "Life," says Kant, "is the commercio of the soul and of the body. Birth is the beginning, not of the life of the soul, but the beginning of this commercio. Death is the end, not of the life of the soul, but the end of this commercio. Birth, life and death are but conditions of the soul. The substance persists, though the body vanishes."

Men of such convictions feel God in them, they know that they have nothing to fear but doing wrong, they are of good cheer knowing that nothing can happen to them but what God permits, they hold a hand that guides them, they fear no evil though they walk through the valley of the shadow of death. A little less materialism, a little less greed for material things and pleasures and everybody is better and happier.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbot "Principles of Bacteriology."
Agassiz "Essay on Classification."
Arrhenius "Die Umschau 6-13-03."
Brooks "The Foundation of Zoology."
Burkhardt "Zur Geschichte der biologischen Systematik."
Chamberlain "Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts."
"Immanuel Kant."
Claus "Zoologie."
Cope "Origin of the fittest."
"The Primary Factors of Organic Evolution."
DeBary "Vergleichende Morphologie und Biologie der Pilze."
Dreyer "Peneroplis, eine Sutdie zur biologischen Morphologie und zur Speciesfrage."
Driesch "Die Biologie als selbstandige Grundwissenschaft."
Edwards "Introduction a la Zoologie generale."
Foster "A Text Book of Physiology."
Gobineau "Essai sur l' inegalite des races humaines."
Kant "Metaphysische Anfangsgrunde der Naturwissenschaft."
"Psychologische Vortrage."
"Kritiken der Vernunft und Urteilskraft."
"Einzelne Betrachtungen und Ephorismen uber Naturwissenschaft im Allgemeinen."
"Traume eines Geistersehers."
Maier H. N. "Uuer den feineren Bau der Wimperaparate der Infusorien.
Mayer R. "Die organische Bewegung in ihrem Zusammenhange mit dem Stoffwechsel.
Neumeister "Betrachtungen uber das Wesen der Lebenserscheinungen, ein Beitrag zum Begriffe des Protoplasmas."
Plate "Uber die Bedeutung des Darwinschen Selektions rinzips."
Ranke "Der Mensch."
Schemann-Gobineas "Die Ungleichheit der Menschenrassen."
Schneider "Histologie."
Schultz, A. P. "Race or Mongrel."

Uexkull "Im Kampf um die Tierseele."
Von Baer "Uber Darwin's Lehre."
Von Haustein "Das Protoplasma."
Wallace "Darwinism."
Weininger "Geschlecht und Charakter."
Wiedersheim "Der Bau des Menschen als Zeugniss fur seine Vergangenheit.
Wiesner "Die Elementarstrukter und das Wachstum der lebenden Substanz."

OTHER PUBLICATIONS BY DR. ALFRED P. SCHULTZ:

"Race or Mongrel," with bibliography, appendix, statistical charts, etc., 8 vo., cloth, 352 pages,	$2.50 (p'st'ge 12 cts)	
"The End of Darwinism"	.50	
"The Children of Everybody"	.50	
"Braganza" A Satire	.50	
"Muttersprache, Volkstum und Menschenwert"	.50)	.75
"Die Kinder der Menschen vov Ueberallher"	.50)	
"Das Deutschtum in Amerika"	.50	