

My idea is that the human conscience is of a much higher order than the animal conscience—a conscience which approves a man when he does right because it is right, and disapproves him when he does wrong because it is wrong. And here I would most respectfully ask, would it not be better if our moral teachers would appeal a little more frequently to our human nature? that we should hear a little more of humanity, uprightness, integrity, justice, benevolence, of the doing by others as we would that others do by us, a little encouragement to do right because it is right, and for the scientific reason that every good act a man does the act itself produces a good physical change in a man's mental organization, as by every evil act he does he produces an evil physical change in his mental organization,—the terms good and evil being understood to mean the fulfilling or breaking of a natural law of our being.

I said every man, in virtue of his human nature, had a free will—this requires no proof, every man knows of himself that his will is free, no power can bind a man's free will, but we must draw the distinction between a man's human free will and his animal desire, which he has in common with all other animals: human free will and animal desire are two very distinct things, a fact which, if generally known, is very frequently lost sight of by law-makers and judges, aye, and by teachers of the moral law, all of whom—law makers, judges and teachers—speak and act as if, because a man has a free will, he is necessarily a free agent, ignorant of the fact that a man by his free will cannot always control his animal desires, which are the outcome of his mental organization, leading to deeds.

He is a fortunate man whose animal organization is in accord with or in subjection to his human free will. He is a man of an extraordinary physical formation who can bring his animal desires into subjection to his human free will. We hear men talk very flippantly of will-power, and give examples of what men have done by force of will in overcoming animal desire; but perhaps if we knew all the particulars of these cases we would find that animal desire had ceased because of physical change in the animal organization, when indeed it would be very easy to submit to the will,—something like the lady of doubtful character who gave up the world when the world had given her up, or, like those very good old men who write doleful letters to the chums of their youth, regretting

their youthful follies, "although they were pleasant times," but who would not, if they could, return to them again. Of course they would not, but why? Simply because youthful animal desire has been subdued by the physical change in their emotional organization by time, so that they are not what they were. It would be rather a ludicrous affair to see an old man scrambling over a fence to rob an orchard, which perhaps was the strongest desire of his youth.

If we would prove will-power let us take cases where the animal desire and human will are in strong opposition, for example, that of the conscientious man, the man who knows right from wrong in the abstract, and has an honest abhorrence of what is wrong, but is the slave of strong animal sexual desire, or a strong animal desire for drink, either of which desires is his hereditarily. And look at the everlasting struggle between human free will and animal desire, a struggle that tears its victim to pieces, in some cases driving the victim to suicide, in others into a lunatic asylum. Never, indeed, is human free will victorious till a physical change takes place in the man's mental organization—for in all such cases the mental organization is either hereditarily abnormal or diseased from some cause. It is a fearful sight to see the human free will thus struggling with animal disease. Our own sweet poet, JOHN READE," well describes it in the following lines :

" 'Tis easy to cry Raca from within
 " Cold passionless morality's strong tower
 " To those who struggle fiercely hour by hour
 " 'Gainst grim Goliaths of unconquered sin."

and "SHAKSPEARE" seems to have well understood the importance of the subject when he put the following words into the mouth of the unhappy "HAMLET":

" And blest art those
 " Whose blood and judgment art so well co-mingled
 " That they are not a pipe for fortune's fingers
 " To sound what stop she pleases: Give me that man
 " That is not Pasion's SLAVE, and I will wear him
 " In my heart's core, aye in my heart of heart,
 " As I do thee."

You see I differ entirely from Dr. Maudsley, who makes will and desire one and the same thing. I maintain that they are separate and distinct, and come from different sources, desire being derivable from our animal organization, and will from our human nature. If the matter be normal, the desires