

Messenger and Visitor.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER
VOLUME XLVII.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE MARITIME BAPTIST PUBLISHING COMPANY.

THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR
VOLUME XLVII.

Vol. X., No. 28.

SAINT JOHN, N. B., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 1894.

Printed by G. W. DAY, North Side, King St.

— THE recent death of Prof. W. D. Whitney, of Yale College, removes a scholar who had achieved a more than national reputation. He was eminent as an instructor, and his text books and treatises on language have made his name familiar to all students in that department. He was especially well versed in the Sanskrit and kindred languages, and ranked among the leading philologists of his time. Prof. Whitney was also widely known as the superintending editor of the Century Dictionary. His age was sixty-seven.

— OUR readers will, we suppose, be pleased to have some brief account, which we endeavor to give elsewhere, of the doings of the Presbyterian General Assembly, now in session in St. John. It is not every year, of course, that this august and influential body honors us with its presence, and we have been glad to avail ourselves of the opportunity of watching some of its proceedings. It should not be without interest and value to Baptists to observe how Presbyterians transact business. We desire to add our word of welcome to the many such words which have been addressed to the Assembly and to wish the Presbyterian church in Canada good speed in its large and successful endeavors in the cause of Christ.

— 1492 and 1892—The World's Political, Intellectual and Religious Struggle for 400 years, is the title of a booklet of 24 pages by Rev. J. E. Hopper, D. D., of St. John. The contents of them, were given as an address delivered before the Baptist Minister's Institute of the Maritime Provinces last August. The address was received with so much favor by the Institute that it was placed in the hands of a committee that it might be published. This has been done, and no doubt many, both those who heard it delivered and those who did not, will be glad to have the opportunity of reading Dr. Hopper's interesting and valuable paper in its present form. The subject is so large that within the limits imposed a cursory treatment of it, in our course, all that was possible. But a bird's-eye view of the progress of the world during these four centuries along the lines indicated is afforded, and much interesting and valuable information is presented. The booklet may be obtained at the Baptist Book Room, Halifax. Price 10 cents per copy, or \$1 per dozen.

— THERE has been during recent years among the Baptists of the Northern United States a growing conviction that the connection between their great general societies and the churches is not sufficiently close and vital, that the discussion and management of the great interests committed to the trust of these societies are practically in the hands of a few men while the main business of the churches is to provide the means for their support. It is complained that the anniversaries, instead of affording opportunity for practical discussions—in which many might participate—of the interests represented, have become for the most part opportunities for grand speeches, making and oratorical displays, and that the custom has been too much to call to the platform from year to year a few prominent men to the exclusion of others of equal ability and equal right to be heard. In discussing this matter the New York Examiner says:

"It is a matter of common knowledge that something is much needed to bring our great missionary societies and the churches closer together. Theoretically these societies are the agents of the churches, and the churches, through their delegates, not only elect the officers and managers, but shape and control the business of these organizations. Practically the societies are independent corporations that control their own affairs, and the only part of the churches in the matter is to foot the bills. The missionary contributions of the churches do not keep pace with Baptist growth in numbers, intelligence and wealth. Why? One great reason, as we hold, is this widening gap between the churches and the societies. The theory on which our missionary organizations are conducted must be made a fact. The anniversaries must cease to be the mass-meetings of a junketing crowd intent on having a good time, and become the gathering of delegates who come to do business. Incidental speech-making and social enjoyment will be both inevitable and unobjectionable, but these should not be the main features of the meetings."

— A Dominion Prohibition Convention, called by the Dominion Alliance, is to be held in the city of Montreal on July 3rd and 4th. The purpose of the convention is stated to be to consider the present position of the prohibition cause and to plan for further general united action for the securing of national legislation for the suppression of

the traffic in intoxicating drink. The plebiscites taken in four of the provinces of the Dominion and the action of the New Brunswick legislature in memorializing the Dominion government in the matter indicate a very strong public sentiment throughout Canada favorable to a prohibitory liquor law, and the subject is therefore receiving from politicians more respectful consideration than ever before. A Dominion election is expected to take place next year, and it is believed to be important in the interests of the temperance reform that there should be no delay in forming plans for such concurrent action in all parts of the Dominion as shall ensure the return at the next general election of a House of Commons definitely committed to the prohibition of the liquor traffic. The convention is expected to be large and widely representative. Besides Canadian prohibition leaders, Hon. Neal Dow, Lady Henry Somerset and Miss Frances Willard are mentioned among those who are expected to be present from abroad. Arrangements have been made by which delegates and visitors to the convention may go to Montreal and return for a single first-class fare one way. Provision is also being made for the entertainment at reasonable rates of those attending the convention. Delegates may be sent by county, city and district prohibition alliances, leagues or central committees, municipal or ward committees, branches of the W. C. T. U., divisions of the Sons of Temperance, lodges of the I. O. G. T. and any other prohibition or temperance organization; also church congregations, Y. M. C. Associations, S. A. corps, Christian Endeavor and other young people's societies of a similar character.

— LORD ROSEBERY is said to have cherished three grand ambitions—to marry the richest heiress in England, to be Prime Minister and to win the Derby. All these ambitions he has achieved. His famous horse, Ladak, having been the winner at this year's races. Whether this achievement appears to be of so illustrious a character as it did in anticipation we cannot say, but it is evident that Lord Rosebery will find that his two latter ambitions are not quite compatible. There is in the Liberal party of Great Britain a pretty large, and influential element which has no taste for a horse-racing Prime Minister, and the notes of disapproval which have been uttered have not been soft and uncertain. Lord Rosebery can scarcely afford to treat this sentiment lightly by saying, as he is reported to have done in a recent speech, that he does not "feel one vestige of shame at possessing a good horse that can win races." Of course no one will object to his Lordship having as many good horses as he pleases, if only he employs them for good and legitimate purposes, and does not make them a means of corrupting the public morals. Horse-racing is no doubt a somewhat more "respectable" thing in England than on this side the Atlantic, but it is pretty generally regarded and denounced by at least the Nonconformist pulpit and religious press as a grand means for the promotion of gambling, and accordingly one of the most moralizing corrupting customs of the day. Lord Rosebery, if he wishes to continue to administer the public affairs of Great Britain, can scarcely afford to fling defiance in the face of the people who hold these sentiments, and it is therefore probable that prudence, if not virtue, will decide his lordship to abandon the turf.

— Rev. E. K. Ganong entered upon his work as pastor of the tabernacle church, St. John, on the first Sunday in June. We trust that pastor and church may be abundantly blessed in their work. We are glad to report that Rev. G. B. White is slowly recovering from his illness, and reasonable hopes are entertained that in time he may be restored to his usual health. His recovery must be far from rapid. To lay aside work and care, and to rest awhile is all that can be done at present. Many prayers are being offered that our brother and his wife may find all needed support in this hour of severe trial.

— In the House of Commons Wednesday, Arthur F. Jeffreys and other members complained that quantities of Canadian grain and forage were used in the army. W. Woodall, financial secretary to the war office, replied, saying that the amount of last year compelled the war office to purchase 25,000 sterling worth of additional forage abroad. He added that the forage brought from Canada proved to be of excellent quality.

Evolution by Blind Force and Evolution by Intelligence.

Graduating Essay of Mr. W. C. Vincent, Acadia.

The scientific doctrine of evolution is defined by Le Conte as "a continuous, progressive change, according to certain laws, and by resident forces"; and by Herbert Spencer as "an advance from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, from the undetermined arrangement to the determined, and from confusion to order." Although these definitions seem clear and simple, yet evolutionists are by no means unanimous in their interpretation. The cause of division among them is that mysterious something called "resident forces." Out of the explanation of this point have grown up two prominent theories which we may with precision enough name Evolution by Blind Force and Evolution by Intelligence.

The first theory maintains that the power which moves the universe is blind force working by necessity; and it proceeds, without the aid of a god of any description, to evolve a cosmos. Haeckel terms this "The non-miraculous development of the universe." We are to look upon the world as no longer the result of a creator working according to a plan, but as caused by forces inherent in the chemical combination of matter itself. Through the blind play of these forces the primitive chaos has been shaped by a purely mechanical process into central bodies with their planets; planets with their moons, and so on in ever-widening circles till the completed cosmos at last emerges full of order, beauty and life.

To the method, assumptions and partial nature of this hypothesis the human mind, as at present constituted, must ever object.

The assumptions are many and false by defect. Add to them what is lacking, and no such system of evolution can be drawn from them. The theory assumes at the start, certain forces, materials, or both, as a sort of stock-in-trade with which to begin the process. Prof. Winchell calls this primitive somewhat "world-stuff or cosmic dust." Haeckel terms it "gaseouschaos." But Mr. Spencer, who seems content with less than some others, assures us that if we will grant him the single indubitable fact of force and its persistence, he will show us how "nebulae, sun, rocks, brutes and men have been necessarily evolved."

We must grant the mental necessity that compels this assumption and if Mr. Spencer would make it persistent will-force, we might go with him. For how do we know anything of force or its persistence? Only through the exercise of will. Our senses perceive change, but do not see power. We only infer force from change because conscious of power exerted by our own wills. We might gaze forever on the rolling waves and listen to howling wind but never would connect one with the other as cause and effect if we were not conscious of exerting will-power and seeing physical results. Persistence of force then is persistence of will. Hence we ask Mr. Spencer to enlarge this fundamental assumption and build hereafter on the broader truth that the ultimate basis of all things is an infinite source of energy whose nature is conscious intelligence and will. And as we must grant the freedom of the will or abandon science and philosophy, this destroys forever any system of evolution by blind force.

But if we grant thus much, we are immediately asked to postulate for this theory the assumption that force can be differentiated into forces without implying a will or design. Now, this persistent, homogeneous somewhat ought to be beyond antitheses and distinctions of every kind; for in so far as it has oppositions of any sort, it is not homogeneous. But under the magic hand of Mr. Spencer, this force is soon converted into forces of attraction; and, marvellously enough, repulsion too; and these are so wonderfully adapted to each other as to produce matter and motion with all the aforementioned wonders of the universe. Yet how these primal differentiations were reached, he never condescends to inform us. He talks of a principle which he calls the instability of the homogeneous; but as a matter of fact, the homogeneous is the only stable thing. In a perfectly homogeneous material, there could be neither motion, nor change, but everlasting inertia.

But when we have liberally conceded this, too, and even admitted that matter and motion are produced by blind force, a third demand is made on our good

nature. We are assured that we shall receive in return a completed cosmos if we grant but one thing further, viz., that by some unaccountable necessity all the changes in things take place mainly in one direction; from the lower to the higher, from the less to the greater. At first sight this seems to agree with observation. Are not all things thus tending? But as Calderwood remarks, "we are too ready to speak of the lower producing the higher, tending to overlook the fact that only the mature life produces the germ, organic life thus testifying that the greater produces the less." In this, he agrees with Sir William Dawson, when he says, "The complex resolves itself into the simple germ and finally into its constituent elements, and what we see is not evolution, but revolution."

But not only are the assumptions many and false; the hypothesis is also of too partial a nature. This will be apparent when it is learned that after all these undemonstrated and indemonstrable postulates have been granted, there yet remains several great gaps to be filled up. The theory does not account for the beginning of anything. It exhibits story after story of the superstructure rising in majesty and grandeur, but contains no record of the foundation stones; still less of the quarry whence they were digged.

It falls also to explain to us how that which is living was derived from the non-living. It is easy to fill up this gap with protoplasm, which includes both dead and living matter and thus ignores the distinction as does Haeckel. We may foist on humanity some sea slime with a technical name, "the original nitrogen holding carbon compound, the seat and agent of all life," after the fashion of Mr. Huxley. But the truth still remains; the mechanical theory of the origin of life has not a shadow of proof. Dr. A. M. Homes says, "To the delight of many and the regret of a few, scientific authorities are everywhere unanimous on this point: omne vivum ex vivo—all life comes from life." While Mr. Huxley assures us that "at the present moment there is not a single proof of abiogenesis." And Dr. Beal of London asserts that "physics and chemistry have not accounted for one vital action." But the proof will be forthcoming, it is asserted. "Life is the undiscovered correlative of force." This "undiscovered" is the unknown god to which these philosophers build altars and chant for the encouragement of their disciples. "The vital correlative is not yet obtained from heat, light or electricity; but be not faithless only believe. It will surely be found." But Haeckel informs us that where "faith begins science ends." Yet the advocates of this theory build everything on the truth of this prophecy. And these who are gifted with the prophetic spirit continue to evolve fancies and to expound the discoveries of their prolific imaginations.

This hypothesis proves itself partial also in that it fails to show us how the sentiment and conscious being sprang out of that which has no sensation.

Nor yet is it able to inform us how the rational is derived from the non-rational. "In the field of comparative research," says Calderwood, "the rational nature of man is the outstanding event for which there is no adequate scientific explanation." An attempt is made to account for thought by making it a thing of physical energy. Now, physical force can be measured. Are we in future then to say that a weighty thought is so many pounds avoirdupois? Yet wherein is the absurdity if the psychical and physical, are mutually correlative? We ought in time to be able to tell, if this be true, into what physical force the brain of the dying Newton or Shakespeare was converted. But the truth is, it is impossible to account for the power of thinking by any combinations or vibrations of physical atoms. Thought may be inseparably connected with the physical organism, but this does not prove identity. The organism can produce his exquisite harmonies only by touching the keys of the instrument. Must we, therefore, infer that instrument and organism are one? Biology then is demonstrably insufficient and this proves this phase of evolution insufficient too.

When we enter the moral realm, the system is still more helpless. "The soul of man as of all animals," remarks Haeckel, "is the sum of the molecular phenomena of motion in the particles of the brain."

The soul, then, is simply matter and free-will, an absurdity, as Mr. Huxley consistently teaches. This leaves us in

a worse state than Ulysses' Companions for Circe's Cup only turned men into swine: this makes their machines without will, without soul, without responsibility.

Still remaining, are the gaps that separate the species, the animal from the vegetable, and man from both, all to be filled up with material soon to be discovered, it is asserted. Yet Mr. Darwin with candor admits that the more distinct the forms, the more the arguments fall away in force. But we naturally recognize decreasing probability to be overbalanced by increasing weight of evidence. The reverse is the case. And the links in the chain are weakest just where the greatest stress falls on it.

As to man, he is sui generis, without a connecting link. Of the ape-like man or man-like ape, the missing link, we are compelled to say, "non est inventus." He is an adumbration of the dream of unity. "Wide, very wide, anatomically and physiologically" says Aaa Gray, "is the gap which separates the highest quadrumanus from man." "Where," he asks, "is the slightest evidence of a common progenitor?" Aid even Mivart asserts that there is "no one family of apes to which man is allied." The most that is found is analogy and often of a very superficial kind. One eminent naturalist soberly infers that man did not come from the orthodox monkey but from the lemur, because forsooth the tubercles on the teeth of many people resemble more the lemurs than those of the monkey. "According to this reasoning," says Virchow, "we are bound to believe that because the negro has wool like a sheep, the lineal descendant of the sheep is the negro." We see, then, that these men have searched the "wide world over" for proof of their folly. For as Prof. Gray has said, "The utility of every hypothesis for deviation can be made apparent or unmeasurable objections raised against."

Once more, the method by which this hypothesis is supported is not in harmony with the scientific spirit of the age. Bacon taught the world that the true method is facts first, then explanations. We are to reason from effects to causes. But this system violates this dictum of science. It attempts to deduce a universe from an assumed something by necessary laws. Now, Tait, a greater than Spencer, says, "no priori reasoning can conduct us demonstrably to a single physical truth." The method then is wrong even if the principles were right. It is a purely a priori scheme.

Another unscientific thing about the method is its constant appeal to authority. After wading through the heap of supercilious remarks on religious dogma, one is amazed to find Humboldt, Haeckel, Lyell, and others supporting some of their most important principles by quotations from men and even heathen divinities. Humboldt says, "Laplace has combined the results of the highest astronomical and mathematical bodies and has presented them to his readers free from all processes of demonstration; yet no one has ever accused his work of incompleteness or want of profundity." Undemonstrated profundity! Such scientists need not be astonished if the common sense of mankind revolt against their fanciful theories, and accuse them of constructing a cosmos by methods that would baffle omnipotence itself, because absurd. One is not surprised to find such crutches in the old poetry and philosophy of the day. Democritus, when "men with crude efforts endeavored to grasp the system of nature;" but that in our day a theory supported only by vague analogy and bald assertion should find able adherents, who endeavor to string on its thread of assumptions the accumulated facts of modern science, leads one to question even the advance of human intelligence.

But we must not too hastily condemn a doctrine so acceptable to the scientific world. Another theory of evolution is proposed which accounts for all the facts of science, satisfies reason, and is reconcilable with revealed religion. This is designated, "Evolution by intelligence." This theory accepts mechanism as a principle of method; for as such, it is a demand of intelligence. The mind requires order in the system. But it posits at the beginning a free and intelligent spirit. And as it is of the nature of spirit to reveal itself, the universe is considered the self-revelation of this Infinite Spirit who is immanent in nature and yet transcendent. The forces in the cosmos are the outgoings of this Supreme Will. Na-

tural law are his ordinary modes of activity; and the so-called supernatural manifestations, his extraordinary ways from our point of view. "What Agassiz says of each species is thus true of all nature—"It is an embodied thought of God." The universal law of gravitation is His mode of sustaining the cosmos, and the universal law of evolution, His method of creating it. This view satisfies a demand of the human reason that the other did not. The mind finds no rest in the assumption that the Infinite is blind force acting by necessity. Prof. Gray utters the sentiments of a majority of thinkers when he says: "To us a fortuitous cosmos is inconceivable—the only other is a designed one." This theory encounters just the same difficulties in the physical world that the doctrine of providence does in the moral, not more. Some things do seem to happen by chance. It is easy to conclude that all do. But such a conclusion is superficial; for as Agassiz affirms, "The universe exhibits thought." And even Mr. Huxley declares that "the materialistic position that there is nothing in the world but matter, force, and necessity is as utterly void of justification as the most baseless theological dogmas."

This theory also satisfies the demands of modern scientific research. The revelations of science are forcing men to one of two conclusions—either God is far more closely related with nature than we are accustomed to think, or else nature operates itself and needs no God. The re-action from the first system is leading men to view God as more immanent in His world than even Christians at times believe; but not more immanent than the Old Testament representation. A. R. Wallace, co-originator of Darwinism, says, "It does not seem an improbable conclusion that all force is will-force; and that thus the whole universe is not merely dependent on, but actually is, the will of higher intelligences or of one supreme intelligence." Dr. Schurman of Cornell University, is even more decided, and declares that we can no longer think of God as separate from His creation. This theory satisfies this demand and at the same time avoids the absurdities of the former. It provides in itself an intelligible source of nature. It does not require us to bridge all the gaps between the several grades of being. It solves the problems of life, of mind, and of spirit.

But without this assumption of a free and intelligent Spirit, all the great principles of evolution are either incredible or irrational. The rotation of the nebulae with no impact from without; the heat producing condensation of the diffused mass in spite of repulsive forces; the origin of the varieties which natural selection finds ready to its hand, the fit of which survive; the progress of the race along a line of development instead of deterioration, which even Mr. Darwin admits to be equally possible according to his theory; and the final triumph of moral sentiments or sexual—all these and many more are explicable only on the supposition that a thinking mind and a loving heart superintend the forces of nature and direct them to the accomplishment of a plan of far-reaching wisdom and benevolence.

W. B. N. U.

MOTTO FOR THE YEAR:

"Lord what will Thou have me to do." Contributors to this column will please address Mrs. Baker, 341 Franklin Street, St. John, N. E.

PRAYER TOPIC FOR JULY

For our million workers who toil hard abroad, To Secretaries of Aid Societies and Missions, Bands in N. S.

By the end of this month, June, the blank forms will be in the hands of the secretary of our Aid Societies and Mission Bands.

Will these officers please note: 1st. Wherever there is a county secretary these blanks are sent to her, and by her sent to each local secretary, who, after filling them out, returns to the county secretary, who returns them with her own report to the provincial secretary.

2nd. These blank forms having been pointed before our Union made home missions a department of our work, there is no claim for that object. But will each secretary please state how much has been raised for home and how much for foreign before putting the sum total.

3rd. Please be very careful to put Mrs. or Mrs. before the names of presidents and secretaries.

4th. Give P. O. address and name of county in full.

5th. When at all possible give the number of resident female members of your church. 6th. Give name of church or branch of church. A. E. JOHNSTON, Prov. Sec. N. S. W. B. N. U.