

the 15th of May, 1891; and in that Encyclical Pope Pius XI could have found page after page of reasoned condemnation of Socialism as a policy—condemnation as direct and emphatic as his own of a later day. Leo XIII, like Pius XI, strongly asserted the God-given rights of all toilers; but he said that if Socialistic principles were carried into effect, 'the working man himself would be the first to suffer'; and he added—'They are, moreover, emphatically unjust, because they would rob the lawful possessor, bring State action into a sphere not within its competence, and create utter confusion in the community.' Mr. Austen Chamberlain cannot feel obliged to the correspondent and newspaper who presented him to England as an inspirer of Papal Allocutions in great social questions. He does not look or behave like a man endowed with a keen sense of the ridiculous; but he must have intelligence enough to know that his most ardent admirer would laugh if such a claim were put forward on his behalf."

Evolution Cranks

The theory of evolution forms the base of many impossible schemes of social reform advocated by people whose pride in their scientific pose is equalled only by their ignorance of scientific subjects. Modern Communism has its roots bedded deeply in the theory, and this enables it to sneer at morals and the idea of God as "Capitalist dope for job-conscious workers." Cranks of another type look to evolution to abolish gaols in favor of hospitals in which those afflicted with the disease that manifests itself in theft and murder shall be nursed back to health on beef-tea and jellies. It is not a case of honest conviction with many of these people. In order to be convinced of a thing one must know something about it; but many of the advocates of evolution not only know nothing about evolution, but they are not in a position either to obtain any first-hand knowledge of importance on the subject or to test the findings of those who are. A few weeks ago we quoted Sir Bertram Windle's opinion of the mass of rubbish written about pre-historic man. Sir Bertram, who is an authority of note, showed how impossible it is to determine from a skull the period or state of civilisation in which the person lived who owned the skull; and in addition he referred to several amusing cases in which the so-called scientists allowed their enthusiasm and credulity to cover them with confusion. Last week we learned from a London cable that a fossil skull, representing something between a man and an ape, was found at Taungs. The Anglican Bishop of London jumped for joy at the news. He felt that he had discovered an ancestor much more to his liking than the commonplace Adam of Christianity. The skull proved, to his satisfaction at all events, that the gaps between man and his ape-like ancestors were being bridged. One naturally asks what degree of training in anthropology has the Bishop of London experienced that warrants him opening his mouth about a subject upon which only specialists can speak with authority, and upon which experts are sharply divided.

Evolution and the Mind

Father Rickaby warns us to distrust all philosophies which lead up to an absurdity. Professor McBride, a well-known biologist, said that "if the doctrine of evolution be true, then sin consists of nothing but the tendencies which man has inherited from his ancestors." "A world without ethics of any kind," says Sir Bertram Windle, "is surely the champion absurdity." Sir Bertram then goes on to affirm that God breathed the breath of life into man, and man became a living soul. He then shows that evolutionists fail to account for the supremacy of man over the animal kingdom. What makes man master of the lower animals? Not his strength nor his swiftness nor any other physical attribute. Then what? Obviously his wits, his mental characteristics, his power to think. As we live to-day we are much more at the mercy of the wild beast in man which exists, and may be terrible when not curbed by the higher side of his nature, than we are at the mercy of the wild beast in the jungle. Yet even primitive man, without weapons to speak of had to face his wild beast antagonists to secure food. He triumphed, and why? Solely because he had the wits that other things had not, the wits and something else in him that gave him domination over every beast of the field. And now, mark again, he had this from the very beginning of our knowledge of him. If he had not had it from the very beginning he would never have survived to produce a second generation, but would have been exterminated by the wild things around him. The question, then, is: How did he get that way? Evolutionists reply by pointing to the growth of that part of his brain which is thought to be concerned with the intellectual character. But what made this part of the brain grow? Some evolutionists suggest that it grew because man wanted to think and must have something to think with. It is a complete fallacy, however, to say that a function can create an organ. One must first have the organ before it can function. You cannot have bile before you have a liver of some sort. No reasons are advanced as to why man's brain began to increase in size. One authority says that man began to walk upright (reason for his doing so unexplained) and in consequence his brain began to grow larger (nexus also unexplained). Another view is that as man's brain began to grow larger (reason for such growth unexplained) he assumed the erect position (nexus again unexplained). Father Ronald Knox says that the most startling discovery which Adam and Eve made in the Garden of Eden was when they discovered themselves, a thing that no lower creature ever has or ever will discover. Professor Sidgwick, a very distinguished non-Catholic biologist, says that we cannot explain man by anatomy. He proceeds:—"If psychical characters were taken into account in zoology the whole of classification would be thrown into confusion, and in the case of man how should we assign the position to be assigned to him? For what a piece of work is man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel!

in apprehension how like a god! And again: 'Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels and hast crowned him with glory and honor!' Evolutionists, however, are blind to the spiritual in man, and in this they show no higher conception than "Topsy" who believed that she just "grewed."

The Right to Slave

America has been devoting some attention to a question which must frequently intrude itself into industrial affairs. Our contemporary asks: Has not the worker a right to contract for long hours, even for twelve or fourteen hours a day, carried over a seven-day week? And then it proceeds to answer its own question. If a man wishes to work, why may he not put his wish into effect? His right to do so has been defended by many writers. Whatever may be said for the legal value of their argument, which is certainly slight, it shows no realisation either of the good of society itself or of the worker's religious and social needs and duties. No State can properly function when impeded by a large body of workers who are mere parts of a huge industrial machine rather than men and citizens. Should these workers marry they would lack the leisure to perform the sacred duties incumbent upon them as heads of families, and with the collapse of the family the State is marked for destruction. No man may enter into a contract which imperils the duties which, as a human being, he owes to the State, to his fellows, or to his God, and an enlightened State will not tolerate any industrial system which demands or permits a contract of this unlawful nature. "No man may with impunity outrage that human dignity which God Himself treats with reverence," teaches Leo XIII, "nor stand in the way of that higher life which is the preparation for the eternal life of Heaven." As to the alleged right of the worker himself in this respect the Pontiff speaks in eloquent language: "No man has in this matter power over himself. To consent to any treatment which is calculated to defeat the end and purpose of his being is beyond his right. He cannot give up his soul to servitude; for it is not man's own rights which are here in question, but the rights of God, the most sacred and inviolable of rights." Again, in opening his discussion of the living wage, the Pontiff returns to this subject: "In all agreements between masters and workpeople, there is always the condition, expressed or understood, that there should be allowed proper rest for soul and body. To agree in any other sense would be against what is right and just; for it can never be just or right to require on the one side, or to promise on the other, the giving up of those duties which a man owes to his God and to himself." If the systems of industry which necessitate excessive hours of work daily and the seven-day week can be abolished or reformed by private initiative, much will be gained. But when capital cannot be induced to acknowledge the evil of an industrial and economic plan which is a menace to the worker, to the home, to the State, and to religion, then, as Pope Leo has counselled, "recourse should be had, in due measure and degree, to the intervention of the law and of State authority."

Les Goodall

HIGH-CLASS FRUITERER and CONFECTIONER.

TRAFALGAR STREET
(Next Masonic Hotel),

Nelson

Any Taste and Purse Catered for in Confectionery.

Get your Supplies of Fruit and Vegetables here.