

in by only a select few who are usually athletes to begin with, and who are much more likely to reap serious and permanent injury from over-exertion than benefit from healthful exercise, while many share only in the baneful excitements. The whole system must tend to degrade the ideals of college life, and to distract attention from that earnest pursuit of knowledge and truth which should be its prime characteristic.

THOSE who have been at any time students of the ancient philosophies will remember the strange doctrine of Heraclitus, the foundation principle of which was embodied in his aphorism, "War is the father and king of all things." This old law has now been, so to speak, rediscovered, and elevated to a high place among scientific generalizations, by no less an authority than Sir William Grove. To Sir William, it will be remembered, Modern Science is indebted for the phrase "convertibility of forces," which it has of late years put to so good service. At a recent meeting of the Royal Institution in London he supplemented the expression with another which, there is good reason to believe, will become equally useful in the scientific vocabulary, as crystallizing into a law another set of phenomena much more easily observed and equally universal. The new word is "Antagonism." In the course of a very learned address Sir William traced the operation of this principle or law through all the kingdoms of the natural world, not as the baneful thing which many deem it, but as a necessity of existence and of the organism of the universe, and as a tendency which is productive of at least as much good as evil. He pointed out how, in the solar system and the stellar universe, each sun or planet is kept in its place and orbit by the antagonistic forces operating upon it; how light is affected by antagonism through the troubling of the so-called ether, how antagonism reigns in the neutralization of chemical affinity, in the blades of grass which rob each other of nutriment, in the animals which prey upon each other, in the battles in the blood between the white corpuscles and the unwholesome bacteria, in the competitions, games, feuds, and terrible wars of human beings, and finally in the collisions which are so potent a means of regenerating life and heat in the regions of space, by replenishing suns, etc., with nebulous matter. No doubt the word will take its place in the language of science, and we shall hear much of the great principle of "antagonism" in philosophical discussions for some time to come.

THE progress of the anti-slavery movement in Brazil seems to be becoming accelerated by the rapid growth of hostile public sentiment. The scheme of gradual manumission adopted by that country carefully guards the rights of the slaveowners. All children of slaves born since 1871 are free by law. No date is fixed for the final emancipation of the others, but the owners have an indefinite time within which to take advantage of certain provisions. Some provinces have entirely abolished slavery within their limits, and very large numbers of slaves have been set free by individuals and families. Recent advices from Rio Janeiro and other places give accounts of the frequent mobbing and maltreating of slave-catchers while seeking to seize runaways. The result will probably be the development of a state of feeling which will before long compel definite action to complete the work of manumission either at once or at a fixed date in the early future.

In the May number of the *North American Review* Mr. Gladstone, with his well-known versatility, turns aside from the labours and trials of Parliamentary life to enter the field of religious controversy as an opponent of Col. Ingersoll's Agnosticism. No one can read Mr. Gladstone's article without admiration of its sustained courtesy, as well as of its profound ability. Col. Ingersoll, notwithstanding the keenness of his thrusts and the exceeding brilliancy of his rhetorical fencing, exposes himself at many points to the deadly strokes of a logical adversary. Mr. Gladstone uses his advantage unsparingly. By a series of carefully selected instances, he convicts his opponent of glaring misquotations, of gratuitous assumptions, of philosophical inconsistencies, and of astounding recklessness and dogmatism in assertion. His paper, apart altogether from its immediate object, affords an excellent study of logical methods in controversy, and an excellent example of the skilful combination of telling argument and keen irony with perfect candour and unflinching courtesy.

Is modern science about entering on a new phase, having nearly reached the limit of its resources in the attempt to explain natural phenomena on a basis of purely physical conceptions? The question is suggested by the Duke of Argyll's trenchant critique in the *Nineteenth Century* of a couple of articles by Mr. Herbert Spencer in previous numbers of that review. The paper is, in the main, an attempt, and it must be admitted a pretty

successful attempt, to evolve the gist of what the critic styles "a great confession," contained in the articles referred to. The critic first emphasizes the truth of Mr. Herbert Spencer's demonstration of the unsuitableness of Mr. Darwin's famous phrase "natural selection," to describe the processes of organic evolution, as conceived on a basis of purely physical causation, inasmuch as "the words 'natural selection' do not express a cause in the physical sense," but are a "mere convenient figure of speech," and contain, moreover, teleological "implications" which are "misleading." He further elaborates Mr. Herbert Spencer's own confession that the phrase, "survival of the fittest," which he himself invented as a supplement, if not a substitute for Mr. Darwin's phrase, is found, on close analysis, to be open to kindred objections, since these words vaguely, and the last clearly, calls up an idea which must be admitted to be "anthropocentric," the very thing which it is essential to the system to avoid. But the strength of the Duke of Argyll's criticism is concentrated in an attempt to show that Mr. Herbert Spencer's most strenuous efforts to avoid this fatal philosophical defect in the use of terms—efforts which result in such lucid sentences as the following: "So that while the composite atoms of which organic tissues are built up possess that low molecular mobility fitting them for plastic purposes, it results from the extreme molecular mobilities of their constituents, that the waste products of vital activity escape as fast as they are formed"—are unavailing, inasmuch as these sentences are "charged with teleological phraseology," as illustrated by such words as "built up," "purposes," etc., in the sentence quoted. The whole article is in the Duke of Argyll's most vigorous vein, and the question raised is one worthy of the closest attention on the part of the student of modern science generally, and of the Spencerian philosophy in particular.

## IRELAND AND THE VATICAN.

*Roma locuta est: causa finita est.* Will this decision be accepted? If it is not accepted in the condemnation of the Plan of Campaign it is difficult to see how any theory of papal supremacy can be worked. If the Pope has jurisdiction in matters affecting faith and morals, then he has authority in this case. The dictum of the great O'Connell, and so often quoted by the not so great Dr. McGlynn, "As much religion as you like from Rome, but no politics," is here inapplicable. It is misleading to represent the question as political. It is distinctly moral; and in saying this we are not prejudging the case. In saying, for example, that Socialism involves moral as well as political considerations, we do not condemn Socialism. On the contrary, we might start from such a statement and land in the conclusion of Proudhon, that "property is theft." Certainly, either property is theft, or else the invasion of the rights of property is robbery. These are the two alternatives; there is no third judgment conceivable. The law of excluded middle is absolute.

To us the wonder is that any one should wonder at the papal condemnation of the Plan of Campaign. It is all very well to say that the action of the Pope has been brought about by the influence of the Duke of Norfolk. It is quite possible that the Roman Catholic Duke obtained an earlier consideration of the question than would otherwise have been accorded. It is not improbable that the papal utterances might have been for a season deferred. We can even imagine that from ignorance of the facts the Pope should never have spoken at all. It is well known that the papal claim to infallibility does not extend to the knowledge of facts. Indeed, it is on the ground of imperfect or erroneous information that the advocates of papal infallibility rebut some of the objections to that doctrine which are drawn from certain papal judgments in the past. It is quite true, they say, that the Pope gave a wrong decision (the case of Honorius is an example), but the Pope himself was right enough; it was his information that was wrong.

On these principles we can quite see that the Pope might have abstained from interference, simply because he was not satisfied that there was a sufficient reason; but it is entirely out of the question that he should have given a different decision when the facts were before him. And there was really no difficulty about the facts. They had not to be gathered from the accusations of the adversary, or from the witnesses for the prosecution: the accused themselves had published them openly, fully, boldly. The Plan of Campaign and the Boycott were the chief points in the programme of the Home Rule party.

It is reported that Mr. Gladstone is preparing a criticism of the papal decree; and it will be interesting to know what the great Sophist has to say on this subject. It will not be the first time that he has appeared as the opponent of papal doctrines. In former times, he protested against theories which involved all modern society and government in condemnation. If he now assails the papal decree, he will be attacking the very