

THE FUTURE OF THE HUMAN RACE.

SOME OF THE LATEST

FRUITS OF DARWINISM

THE SUBJECTS ASSOCIATED THEREWITH

TREATED FROM A

SOCIAL, LOGICAL, POLITICAL AND SATIRICAL

POINT OF VIEW

WITH

NOTES AND REFERENCES.

BY

JOHN FRANCIS FISHER

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & CO.

LIVERPOOL: EDWARD HOWELL.

1880.

THE FUTURE OF THE HUMAN RACE.

SOME OF THE LATEST

FRUITS OF DARWINISM

THE SUBJECTS ASSOCIATED THEREWITH

TREATED FROM A

SOCIAL, LOGICAL, POLITICAL AND SATIRICAL

POINT OF VIEW

WITH

NOTES AND REFERENCES.

BY

JOHN FRANCIS FISHER

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & CO.

LIVERPOOL: EDWARD HOWELL.

1880.

“If there be no surer token of a right practice than its
“tendency to promote the common good, can we but judge
“that to be a right opinion which has undeniably, in an
“eminent degree, such a tendency?”—DEAN BOLTON'S *Essays*.

“The wisest know so little, that humanity must be
“content to gather information from every possible source,
“and leave no set of ascertained facts out of view in
“attempting to arrive at generalizations.”—PROF. CLELAND'S
Address to the British Association.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.	PAGE.
A GLIMPSE INTO THE STATE OF THE SOIL WHICH PRODUCED THE FRUIT	5—10
CHAPTER II.	
ONE VERY NATURAL RESULT ; OR, "FRUIT" OF DARWINISM. A CONGRESS OF ANIMALS AND THE "SPEECH FROM THE CHAIR"	11—21
CHAPTER III.	
THE SPEECH FROM THE STABLE AND THE "FIRST RESOLU- TION"	22—29
CHAPTER IV.	
THE SPEECH FROM THE DOG KENNEL	30—41
CHAPTER V.	
ANOTHER THEORY OF THE CAUSE OF "MAN'S SUPREMACY"	42—48
CHAPTER VI.	
A SHEEP'S-EYE VIEW OF THE SITUATION	49—51

CHAPTER VII.

PAGE.

THE DARK SHADOW OF DISUNION COMES OVER THE CON-
GRESS—THE “ OPPOSITION ” MOVE AN “ AMENDMENT ” 52—56

CHAPTER VIII.

ANOTHER THEORY 57—66

CHAPTER IX.

A SEARCH FOR PRECEDENTS... .. 67—83

CHAPTER X.

A PROPOSAL FROM THE CHAIR AND ABRUPT “ PROROGATION ”
OF THE CONGRESS 84—88

CHAPTER XI.

THE FRUITS OF DARWINISM AS GATHERED FROM POLITICAL
SOILS 89—100

CHAPTER XII.

THE FRUITS OF DARWINISM VIEWED FROM THE SOCIAL
ASPECT 101—119

CONCLUSION.

120—131

INTRODUCTION.

THE origin and design of the present unpretentious work may be briefly stated.

Few readers at the present day will be disposed to combat the doctrine that natural laws exist. They cannot be infringed to the extent of a hair's breadth—with impunity. The evils of life are the punishments of those infringements, applicable as equally to the moral as to the physical nature of man.

Starting from this position as a central point, without being endowed with any extraordinary percipient power, the writer—for some time previous to entertaining any thought of rushing into print—had observed what doubtless others in the course of any lengthy experience will have observed: that whenever one individual commits an act of injustice upon another, say, does him a wrong—whether it squares with that first individual's views of wrong, or does not—in a variety of instances he encounters at some period of his life the suffering proportioned to that the wrong or injustice has inflicted. Later experience, however, proves that this is so universally.

In no instance is there any exception to this rule : the difficulty lies in this—the proof is only too often concealed.

The logical completeness of this doctrine may, and probably will, be disputed : be this as it may, doubt, disputation, or disbelief in no way affect either natural laws or facts.

Here then, if we suppose this point established, is the evidence and form (which it may be thought requires confirmation,) of an invisible, impalpable—Something ! for I am not competent to give it a name ; I can only draw attention to the fact—presenting itself, if not directly to the senses, indirectly to the imagination ; seeable to the mind, that is, and offering itself as a legitimate subject for investigation. Apparently reigning paramount over *human* affairs—for it did not until very recently occur to me to extend the scope and function of this unknown but observed phenomenon into the realm of the *Animal Kingdom universally*—with some claim to an affinity with the Nemesis of ancient mythology—the critical observers or disciples of which in assigning to *it* an impersonation, or providing it with a habitat, must evidently have long perceived an operator, instrument, or unerring force of some kind—it has received from all historic time some dim, hazy,

undefined, but almost universal recognition from all with any pretension to be classed as the "human races." This feature may have had its origin in an excess of the emotional element, said to be a constituent in the nature of man, to which the designation of *religion* has been given; but the operation of this something—phenomenon, nemesis, force, or whatever it may be—*outside* its own pale or exclusive section, "humanity" has up to this day very generally denied, or else cast contemptuously aside as a subject altogether unworthy of any consideration.

Notwithstanding this popular, pleasant, plausible and almost universal verdict, it will be the purpose of this work not only to show the existence of this force by furnishing some illustrations of the order or method of its working, but to prove that there is really *no department of animal life exempt from this condition, that is, beyond the dominion of moral law.*

Hitherto all the evidences of title to the assumed position which man is said to occupy in the great commonwealth of sentient life are, as far as is known, derived from a witness not entirely free from taint, that is himself, certainly not wholly free from the bias of self-interest. Now, as it is likely there will be in these pages many blunders or mistakes, until better informed minds shall correct or repair them,

this work by placing an infinite variety of human experiences in a new—and as it is believed—their *true light*, aims to be the organ or mouthpiece of those dumb subject races unrepresented as they are—otherwise than by some society for the prevention of cruelty, and having no voice in the matter of their title to existence—but over whom man holds, as he says, and seems to believe, *irresponsible sway*; a delusion it is humbly hoped these pages by referring him to his true “place in Nature,” but higher destiny, will have a tendency to dispel; to which end their patient unprejudiced perusal is all that is asked by

THE AUTHOR.

CHAPTER I.

THE ORIGIN OF THE FRUITS OF DARWINISM.

A GLIMPSE INTO THE STATE OF THE SOIL WHICH PRODUCED THE FRUIT.

BEFORE opening up the ground upon this domain, the subject to which we would in the first instance invite attention is—"Epidemics."

There are many reasons for believing that neither the character nor the frequency of epidemics is sufficiently recognized, probably because—such is our ignorance on most subjects if we would only confess it—they are as yet but imperfectly understood. It may be here observed, that by *epidemics*, it is not meant to confine that term to the long and dreary catalogue of *diseases* placed often under that generic head, such for instance as small pox, or typhoid, or other infection after their kind, any one of which at some time may, as it would seem, be often found insidiously plotting how to make animal life, especially the life of the human animal, as intolerable as possible for a season (though any of these really subserve a very different purpose); but something of a much wider grasp and more general application. The peculiar feature of the force, it may be called, here alluded to can only be described as something for which at some definite period there is quite a mania, something which is all the rage at the time, or by which large bodies of a community are abnormally affected, they know not why; and how this "force" is generated or put in motion, no one hitherto, as far as I am aware, has been able to satisfactorily explain.⁽¹⁾ Thus it may appear in boating or bicycling, in rinking or walking at one time; in cricket or climbing, in croquet or crinolene at another. Polo or poker, prayer or pro-

toplasm may be only a mild form of attack; pugilism or pigeon shooting, wife kicking, ⁽²⁾ or criminal conversation, a more virulent. Ritualism or rationalism, prerogative or prudery, may sometimes indicate a merely chronic stage of the infection; while Fenianism or Nihilism, strikes or ship-scuttlings, demonstrations or demi-monde, at others, a more aggravated or more acute. Now antiquarianism or mediaevalism, obelisks or monoliths, present symptoms of a harmless or incipient stage, now restoration, experimentation or exploration, effigies, ogres, or abortions, whether in bronze or marble, a more mischievous or more fully developed. Or, lastly, railway or steamboat accidents, iron-clad flounderings, or commercial "frauds" or "depressions," while they may be thought an absurdly ridiculous, are none the less a certain indication of an abnormal condition, just as rapes, robberies and murders, ⁽³⁾ gunpowder, dynamite, or fire-damp explosions, ⁽⁴⁾ with which probably may be added cyclones, volcanoes, and earthquakes are a manifestation of symptoms of a "disorder"—somewhere! the most terrible and disastrous. The catalogue may seem a long one and rather diffuse, but in each and all of these and many other forms, there is beyond dispute a state of *disorder*, and this disorder is for the time either contagious, or an epidemic. As regards its effects, much will depend upon the constitution of the patient, for every thing organic, and it is even thought inorganic matter may at some time absorb the unhealthy germ or *virus*. We make no attempt to explain this phenomenon, we only point to the fact.

One of the most recent, and as regards some of its phases, probably the most remarkable instance of a liability in the world of life to be acted upon by this subtle "force," will be found in an affection to which, for the want of a better, the term Congress ⁽⁵⁾ has been given, and which as it threatens to become widespread, it will only be proper to give to the uninitiated, or to such as have any uneasiness at its approach, or alarm at prospective contact, due warning or a prognosis, with a *diagnosis* or

brief notice of some of the most generally observed accompanying symptoms.

A Congress, then, as every one I imagine knows, is an association, meeting, or assembling together of individuals of life forms often for the discussion of a certain speciality of topics or matters at issue, generally believed to affect somehow certain strata of Society: and it will no doubt at first glance appear difficult to such as have not studied the nature of these phenomena, to conceive how an assembling, meeting, or associating together of matter in any form should become epidemic. Such, however, is the apparent fact which, as before stated, we make no attempt to explain; but for the proof we have only to refer the sceptical to the daily or weekly prints, the records or journals of current events in all countries where this feature it will be found is, at certain stated periods, almost the most prominent one of the age, for it is at that time in nearly every mouth, though in no way resembling "the foot and mouth epidemic," and it may be said often to have affected almost the whole of the human family, wherein from the Vienna Congress, Geneva Congress, Berlin Congress, Paris, International, Church, Social Science, or Trades' Union Congress, down (or up, as the case may appear to some) to the "Amalgamated Chimney Sweepers' Union," the "Affiliated Branches of the Costermongers' Association," or the "Universal Corporation of Cadgers," traces of this "epidemic wave" are, I think, unmistakeably visible.

Thus much as to its existence: now in order to pave the way for what is to follow, we wish to add a few words upon the *diagnosis* of this singular infection.

It may then be observed that upon this head one very marked—and, as doubtless it will be regarded by not a few—awkward feature, inseparably associated with the diffusion of the "Congress" epidemic is—intelligence! This, it may be said, is always one premonitory symptom. By numberless careful investigations, "Scientific Research" has found that the absence of almost any ordinary or

useful knowledge, or a state of profound intellectual blank is, in every instance, the only known safe-guard against an attack of this often unwelcome visitor. Even in the lower orders (of the human family) wherever there is any exhibition of only some slight symptoms of exaltation over the average standard of ignorance (in that family) especially if accompanied by a "quick" or "full" pulse (for hunting out grievances) or, an eager or "feverish" tongue, indicating a restiveness under restraint arbitrarily imposed, or a disposition to "throw off" used up "tissue" or institutions, or addictedness to a habit of denouncing them when they become offensive or corrupt, and a general tendency in the system often amounting almost to a "craving" for reform, or change of some kind, it may safely be predicted that Society in that region is shortly going to be visited by an epidemic of the congress type. Such probably was the origin of the "Workingman's Association" when first formed, and such may have been the nature of the soil which has produced other growths ⁽⁶⁾ whose origin is often perplexing to the naturalist and statesman, whose researches upon these domains, in the midst of the overgrowths of unreason in which they are *said* to have been enveloped, have produced very meagre results, but which, however, we hope in some measure to supplement.

Now if amidst the still visible traces of the "education" mania we call in imagination to our aid, and picture to ourselves that "epidemic condition of the atmosphere," of which the congress wave is only a type, permeating a grade, lower down, or say, into that stratum of "Society" in natural history known as "the more intelligent members of the brute creation," what can we suppose but "that a meeting will be held" of some kind? A "Congress of Animals" must be the inevitable result.

In anticipation of that event, and as "priority of intelligence" is always one of its most valuable features, we propose in the next place to give publicity to the

doings and sayings of the "Congress of Animals" that is to be, and to which we may have to devote several chapters. ⁽⁷⁾

A vivid imagination might enable us to give a minute detail of the manner, place, conduct, or objects of the Congress. Shorn of that endowment, or never having possessed it, we will now only briefly say or suppose, that in consideration of innumerable posters and placards, an equally innumerable assembly of animals has congregated somewhere, and on account of the very high estimation in which the Donkey family has been universally held, and the very general satisfaction members of that family have invariably given when called upon to "assist" at demonstrations triumphal or administrative as recorded in history, a worshipful individual of that family has been voted to the Presidential Chair by acclamation, and who—after as it seems a rather prolonged or preliminary clearing of the throat—addresses the assembled multitude as follows:—which, however, must form the subject of another chapter.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I.

NOTE 1.—This is about the only one we have seen. "That *epidemic condition* of the atmosphere which, since the time of Sydenham, has been noticed but never explained, in which diseases of a spreading type extend uncontrolled when once they are started."

The above extract is from "*Nature*," by the pen of a gentleman to whose utterances we shall again have to refer. But may not emotion, habit, thought, &c., to which we have alluded, extend also "uncontrolled," or until their force is somehow exhausted, and this, we think, is the explanation of the *infectious character* of those phenomena.

NOTE 2.—This *disease* is not confined to England where the mortality from this epidemic in our large towns is often "high," but it has broken out elsewhere, as we shall show.

NOTE 3.—At the time when brigandage—Italian and Greek—was making a very considerable sensation in England, a London journal in a leader says:—“Or else treat it (Greek brigandage) as a social evil of which the country, from *the nature of things*, produces an annual amount, just as Mr. Buckle supposed that England produces its annual crop of robbery and murder by *an organic law of nature*.”

Whatever may be the *nature* of the “law,” in obedience to which crimes against Society in England are perpetrated, if they (crimes) are not epidemic in that country at least, the blackest of them—as Shakespeare says of sorrows—“Come not single spies, but in batallions.” We shall have occasion in these pages to recur to this subject again.

NOTE 4.—I am informed that these phenomena in a measure appear to conform to some law of periodicity. Explosions in mines are more numerous about the periods of the equinoxes.

NOTE 5.—A London journal expects that “there will be many congresses held this winter.” Similar observations have been made on the plentiful prospect of “hawthorn berries” though we don’t suppose there is any connection between them.

NOTE 6.—The present “Land League” for instance—“monstrous abortion”—as it may appear—is a perfectly “natural growth,” and perplexing as it may be to many really well-meaning minds, is the result of a process as *purely chemical* as that which under certain conditions produces sugar from a bamboo stuck in the ground or—as a figure of speech with which we are all more familiar—the thistle from the seed!

NOTE 7.—The model of Æsop may to some seem an anachronism to-day. When, however, it is taken into consideration that “public opinion” upon the subject of any “rights” possessed by animals *has advanced scarcely a step since his day*, as in the Introduction we have endeavoured to shew, and that *their* turn, in common with the turn of every thing with unredressed wrongs, *must* come—it matters little who is the “agitator” nor what is the agent or process by which those wrongs are exposed; and a Congress of Animals, not being a secret meeting or treasonable—is selected as being in accord with the “spirit of the age.”

CHAPTER II.

ONE VERY NATURAL RESULT ; OR, "FRUIT" OF DARWINISM.

A CONGRESS OF ANIMALS

AND THE "SPEECH FROM THE CHAIR."

The Donkey on being voted into the Presidential Chair, as related in the previous chapter, on "rising," said :—

*"Fellow Herbivores, Omnivores, Vertebrates and
Cosmopolites,*

As you have been pleased to invest me with the honourable distinction of presiding over this brutal and intellectual assembly, I need scarcely assure you how deeply I feel impressed with the weight of the honour you have thus conferred, nor how earnestly it shall be my purpose to acquit myself to the satisfaction of this gathering in the discharge of a duty so onerous, but so suddenly devolved—I might almost say, thrust upon me. Met together as we now are, over all the face of the earth, for the discussion of subjects of the very last importance to the future well-being of the whole animal world, I shall at once proceed to the business for which this Congress has been convened." (A letter of apology from the "Goose" was here read, stating that her absence was unavoidable, having been *nailed to a board by the feet*, as it was said to induce plethora, repletion, fat or otherwise "assist" in the cause of "scientific research;" but how, that is, in what branch was not stated.⁽¹⁾ There was also a "Halfpenny Post-Card" from a party of the name of "Renard," or something of the kind, desiring to be excused because the "Hounds met"—somewhere; whatever that meant the President or Chairman did not explain.) He then proceeded :—"The very unequal—he might, he thought without any impropriety of speech call it *unfair*—

distribution of good and evil among all forms and grades of life where all are said to be 'born equal,' was a subject which he doubted not had at some time attracted their attention ; but alas ! only to perplex their brutal instincts. To consider this subject with a view to the introduction of some remedial measure was, as he believed, the first object of this Congress. Whenever one of his own family, a patient—or as he is not seldom styled—'obstinate ass,' or beucolic horse, or comtemplative ox, or meditative sheep, or jocund calf, or sportive dog, or festive pig, or other animal of whose services that other animal—man, has gratuitously availed himself, changes from any of these phases or tokens of a normal condition, experience, he had no doubt, taught them to attribute such change to an endeavour to solve this unequal distribution in the 'good of life' problem ; an aim, or he might call it an ambition which, however heretofore unsuccessful, he was now sanguine enough to feel himself in a position to tell them a few gleams of something very like hope, are now visible in the not distant future of the animal economy—without the aid of a microscope.

But before he pursued this phase of a 'very complex subject' any further, or called upon some one else better able than himself to do so, it might not be out of place here to give a glance at the relative positions of the human and animal races, as distinguished from all historic time by those appellations, that thence possibly some faint idea may be formed of that 'even handed' measure of *justice* we hear of so much but see so seldom, or some clew may be gathered up of the *causes* which in their accumulation have resulted in this Congress as their effect. ⁽²⁾

From the earliest historic human records (of course), which go far away into the impenetrable past, until those of yesterday, as one may say, we gather the fact—or rather the *assertion*, not exactly the same thing, he would observe—that however divergent these records are upon some points, upon one, as it is said, they all agree ; the organism called 'man' has always had dominion over all other organisms or races, and there is a balance of opinion in favour of the

theory that it was always 'intended' this should be so; but how, or why, or from whom this intention emanated, the evidence is too conflicting to enable one even to guess with any hope of approximating the truth. Under this truly sublime and delightful illusion, he (man) has claimed, possessed and exercised—no one knows how long—*unrestricted right* of life or death over every other organism. Whom he would, he spared or preserved, fondled or cherished; whom he would, he slew or ate, tortured or destroyed, as lust or love, caprice or hate tempted or prompted. But as more light glimmered upon this mysterious being it occurred to him, but only very recently, or perhaps he had better say to a few⁽³⁾ of the more sagacious of the species—for the representative human animal is, as they well knew, sometimes only a shade higher than a brute!—of the first order—sometimes, indeed at some points, even more than a shade lower than a brute of any order;⁽⁴⁾ that another record existed of a very different character to that in general use,⁽⁵⁾ and was in point of fact the only one entitled to implicit trust. This record though at first rather difficult to decipher, having passed through various manipulations, is now printed in characters speaking even more plainly than language, and proves conclusively that in no particular does this animal (man) differ from some of the organisms over whom he has thus long tyrannized and usurped dominion—except in degree! There was certainly a slight difference in one respect, for he was about the *last* of nature's inventions in the region of species; but it only amounted to this; he was of the same form and structure, but of a 'higher type:' might it not then be within the bounds of possibility that a relationship existed⁽⁶⁾ between them? If so, where did it begin, or where cease? If the figurative gulf which, until very recently, was thought to be an insuperable obstacle in the way of union or 'identity' between blackskin and whiteskin, was found on more careful exploration in that region to have no existence; might not the chasm supposed to lay directly between *Bimana* and *Quadrumana* be as equally impalpable, or as easily bridged over? Might it not

be even practicable and easy to knock down at one fell swoop all partition—that is, if any existed except in imagination—that separated *Bimana* from *Animalia*, and would it not be more honest and straight-forward, as well as appear more magnanimous to do so at once, and acknowledge the universal tie of brotherhood and sisterhood with as good a grace as possible, than be ultimately *compelled to do so*; as he (man) has aforetime been compelled to ‘eat humble pie’—that is ‘grass’—to make humiliating concessions, he meant, by the force of circumstances, to wit, the current of public thought, which *when the conditions become favourable will become epidemic in that region also*.

The metaphorical ‘oil,’ or lode of discovery having once been struck, thought gradually expanded, or rather ‘advanced’ until it was found there remained one, and but one, legitimate conclusion. In fulfilment of what ‘was once a matter of speculation and argument, but has now become a matter of fact and history,’⁽⁷⁾ the highest and the lowest organisms have, by the process of evolution, one common origin or parentage; consequently there is a (distant) relationship between all forms and grades of life,⁽⁸⁾ by ignoring of which fact has grown up evil! whose blossoms and seeds having been everywhere strewn broadcast, have developed the crop which is attaining that deplorable luxuriance it is now the object of *this* Congress (in common with the efforts of other Congresses,) seriously to consider, with a view to check, thin, or if possible quite mow down or root up.

After some slight sensation, the expression of these startling facts had produced, had abated, the Chairman continued:—Another very natural question, and one he thought pertinent to the present subject, followed upon this discovery. Was the ‘physical superiority,’ as it is called—power of endurance, that is—which in some individuals of the human race is undeniable, and the extraordinary mental exaltation which in others seems bounded by no limitation, designed or capable of no higher development than that which heretofore had found expression only in tyranny and

cruelty, aggressiveness and destructiveness? In time the general (human) mind became leavened with subjects of this kind. (He mentioned this parenthetically for their encouragement, as shewing the field there was open for operations whatever form they may hereafter assume.) Thought, which had for some time hovered over, now seemed to have swooped down or settled upon this and kindred questions; or, more correctly speaking, 'became drenched and saturated with the spirit of the nineteenth century,'⁽⁹⁾ which ere long became infectious. The 'female man,' as it has been called, as being the nearest in contact, was almost the first to take the infection, and at one time the loudest in asking for some enfranchisement or disenthralment; and though some small and trifling concessions have been made on that domain,⁽¹⁰⁾ and other objects which have assisted in raising the outcry are said to be 'under consideration,' the epidemic has by no means run its course; from which very significant fact it may be inferred there is still a wrongness in that department of organisms—if the naked truth could be only known in all their relations with the lords of creation—offering the greatest number of victims to vivisection—though on all hands admittedly the most engaging, attractive, and demanding on many accounts the greatest consideration—of all other life forms.

The 'inferior animal world,' as it is called, by inhaling the infected atmosphere, or 'germs,' caught the *contagium virum*, or rather *contagium animatum*, and became infected. Then in connection with this phase of the subject appears a very beautiful and pointed illustration of the constancy and persistency of 'heredity.' Scientific research in an illegal pursuit of a legitimate object⁽¹¹⁾ has been of late necessarily thrown much into the society, as 'subjects' for experimentation of not only the lower, but many of the higher forms of animal life; some of them quite upon a level in point of intelligence with human!—of a certain type. These forms, by picking up such crumbs of knowledge as have from time to time fallen from their teacher's (demonstrator's) tables, or (torture) troughs, or while under-

going some of those sublime and beautifully touching and instructive operations, found in their full bloom and flavour nowhere out of hell—since the abolition of the Inquisition—but in the laboratory! have very naturally bequeathed the knowledge so acquired to us, their descendants; thus aptly, though unintentionally, fulfilling the assertions often made in relation to this branch of science, that the ‘advantages’ resulting from the practice of vivisection are shared by every form of life!

Now from the very great interest which has been felt in the character, conduct, and general bearing of animals under trying, he might say often under painfully distressing circumstances, it may be safely assumed that interest will not flag under this, if not the most trying, certainly the most eventful, and he hoped he might call it the most auspicious phase in life any of them had as yet entered upon; and therefore he had presumed to draw their attention to the necessity of much circumspection, lest enthusiasm, engendered of the new aspect affairs had taken in the animal world, should outstrip discretion. They were now, he might say, ‘put upon their trial,’ or adopting the language of a leader of human power and opinion in a bye-gone age, he would say, ‘Brutes! in the glorious enterprise you have undertaken, the eyes of (more than) sixty centuries (of wrong and injustice) are looking down upon you.’

Historical instances of colloquial effort to settle vexed questions between human and animal are, as they would be aware, rare; being confined to the one solitary instance in which a member of the family of their present Chairman took a distinguished part; ⁽¹²⁾ so that they were not without ‘a precedent’ which ought to afford them hope. But even were it not so, it must be seen by every impartial observer that the present *status quo* cannot be maintained; things cannot remain or go on for ever thus; for though not gifted with speech in the conventional application of that term, every organism whenever it desires to utter a protest, has a way of making itself heard with wondrous potency and distinctness; though not often intelligible to man. When

the state of society is 'ripe' for the change, a remedy for any and every evil, or call it *disease*, is always at hand;⁽¹³⁾ and thence it may be called nature's own remedy; and a voice, not in the wilderness nor in the desert, but conspicuous by its shrillness from every department of animal life, was never louder nor more unanimous in its claim for 'equal rights,' bestowed by nature on all forms of animal life, than at the present; and he might tell them that if this cry is stilled by force, the very 'stones out of the wall would take it up, and the beams of the floor would answer them.' He feared however he was overstraining their powers of endurance: he should therefore call upon his friend and neighbour *Equus* (Horse) to address the Congress, and propose the first resolution, which will form the subject of another chapter.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II.

NOTE 1.—A friend, whom I might with truth describe as being "religiously disposed," to whom this work in a manuscript form was lent, told me on returning it that he could very well remember that his mother, the wife of a country farmer, *always* did this when he was a boy, when she fattened geese for market and—*never thought it cruel!* Yet in his experience of many years, he had not met with any one in whose life he saw so much to admire; or, to use his own words, "so much that was lovely and of good report" as in that mother's life. The anomaly thus presented reveals the results of "education" (for to nothing else can it be attributed) in its broadest sense. Can we then be surprised when we contemplate that insensibility to animal suffering in man, which in towns finds illustration in crates crammed with geese, ducks, fowls, etc., piled upon carts on their road to market? We should suppose that none but the survivors of Calcutta or other "black-hole" can realize the sensations of those unfortunate animals thus cooped up—merely to gratify the *lust for flesh*, or "dainty fare" in man. The problem here offered for solution is: *Do these sufferings end with the lives of the animals thus immolated?* A problem this work will attempt to solve.

NOTE 2.—“It has long ceased,” says the writer in a leading journal, “to be possible to keep any account of congresses. When first the term was used to mean a gathering of specialists and not Sovereigns, there was some attempt to provide a multiplicity of subjects as well as visitors. Every fresh congress, however, has taken to itself a narrower field; and there is now no reason why there should not be a congress to discuss the watering of roads or the lighting of street lamps.” We await with some expectation the popular verdict on the Congress of Animals.

NOTE 3.—Mr. Darwin, from the great celebrity his name and works have gained, is here placed in the front rank; though, doubtless, M. Wallace in England, Haeckel in Germany, and Lamarck in France, are each entitled to a share in the honour of the discovery of the “origin of species” as applied to man as well as animals. The contemplated revolution in the lower animal world, of which this congress is the anticipation, is, therefore, a ‘Fruit’ of that discovery.

NOTE 4.—Fact! as some crimes against society, not only in ancient but quite modern times will sufficiently attest.

NOTE 5.—Geology seems to be here meant by the Chairman; and thence the light which the theory of evolution derived therefrom sheds upon species or race.

NOTE 6.—Upon this subject the wonderfully endowed author of the *Vestiges of Creation* says:—“We cannot but regard with profound interest the question respecting our own immediate ancestry. The mind immediately refers to the simial family, whose form, size of brain, and general characters make so manifest an approach to our own. Yet it may be doubted if the particular species whence the human family was derived, has ever come under the attention of naturalists. . . . It may here be observed that of all the reptilian orders, the batrachian is that which has best pretensions to a place in the origin of the Primates. “It is singular,” says Dr. Roget, “that the frog, though so low in the scale of vertebrated animals, should bear a striking resemblance to the human conformation in its organs of progressive motion. It is the only animal besides man with a calf to its leg. *It evidently is making an approximation to the higher orders of mammalia.*” In these things the superficial thinker will only see matter of ridicule: the large-hearted and truly devout man, who puts nothing of nature away from him, will, on the contrary, discover in them interesting traces of the ways of God to man, and a deeper breathing of the

lesson that *whatever lives is to him kindred.*—*Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation.*

NOTE 7.—American Addresses by Thomas Huxley. London: Macmillan and Co., 1877.

NOTE 8.—“*It is almost an axiom with evolutionists that identity of structure is, without exception, an indication of descent from a common parent.*”

The above paragraph is in italics in the *Nineteenth Century* where it appeared under the head of “Animals and their Native Countries,” by A. R. Wallace, in justice to whom, however, it must be said *he* does not agree with the “axiom,” if such it is. Employing it, however, as a working hypothesis, it may be said that looking at the hog family, and noting the identity of structure therein with the human, “an indication of descent from a common parent” with that family may be often easily detected; being probably a removal of not more than some half million or so of years. And the “working power” of this hypothesis gains very material support from the fact of the still powerful and visible forces in active operation, not seldom impelling amiable and respectable members of the latter “higher” family to “revert” to the lower or semi-hog condition of a prior, but not altogether uncongenial state. Hence the common but significant expression of “their piggish habits.”

NOTE 9.—In the *Popular Science Monthly* there is the following: “The innovations made by Science upon other modes of thought and study within the last half century are without a parallel in the history of human progress. It has swept away many of our most cherished convictions, hoary with the dust of ages, and left others in their places entirely irreconcilable with them. Marching on with the might and majesty of a conqueror it has spread dismay in the ranks of opposing forces, and caused a complete abdication in its favour of many who were most hostile to it. Nor has it taken the field in an aggressive or bellicose spirit. On the contrary, almost all its conquests have been made without any design of inspiring opposition or terror, and while engaged in pursuits that of all others require for their prosecution the most pacific and philanthropic temper.” To this innovating but “pacific” temper it is more than probable we shall, ere long, be indebted for the complete recast in the many pleasant theories we have formed of our own “descent” and status in nature,

NOTE 10.—The introduction of the “Bill for the Protection of the Property of Married Women” is here alluded to ; by which a worthless man, or loafer, will no longer be “legally competent” to make ducks and drakes of his industrious and more frugal wife’s earnings. “Man,” says Mr. Darwin, “is more powerful in body and mind than woman, and in the *savage* state he keeps her in a far more abject state of bondage than does the male of any other animal.”—*Descent of Man*, page 597. Will it be thought impertinent if we ask : How many degrees removed from savagery or advanced in civilization, can any race be which has on its “Statute Book” a law such as this measure repeals?

NOTE 11.—Knowledge is here meant which is a legitimate pursuit ; but not when its “researches” are carried to the extent they are in some laboratories.

NOTE 12.—The celebrated historical case, when “Balaam the son of Beor” went to the wall (literally) in the debate.

NOTE 13.—A neighbour, with whom I have for some time been on intimate terms, has of late years confided to me an article of his faith—as I may call it, which is this:—“After you have entered upon a house, if afterwards, anything in the way of house-fittings gets wrong, if endurable, endure it—rather than the other alternative of calling in mechanics or artizans for repairs.”

It seems that each member of this “horrid fraternity is imbued with the idea, that the more *he destroys* in your house the better it will be for the “trade”—if not in his—in some other department. Thus the “gas-fitter,” if your eye is taken away from him, will be found standing on your drawing-room table, in preference to the “step-ladder” you have given him, in his boots armed with dreadful nails, when doing any repairs to your gaselier when it leaks—as most likely it soon will, because—he thus “plays into the hand” of his friend the French-polisher, and so on through the whole series of tradesmen, artificers, or mechanics of all kinds : each doing all he can to put the householder to expense to “help trade.”

I don’t know that I can solve this difficulty, or throw any light on this seemingly dark feature in the “lower orders” of humanity *to-day* ; but Blackstone, in his “Commentaries,” has the following—“On Manors” ;—

“A villein could acquire no property either in lands or goods ; but if he purchased either, the lord might enter upon them, *oust the villein and seize them to his own use*, unless he contrived to dispose of them again before the lord had seized them ; for the lord had then lost his opportunity.”

“In many places also, *a fine was payable to the lord if the villein presumed to marry his daughter to anyone without leave from the lord* ; and by the common law the lord might also bring an action against the husband for damage for thus *purlaining his property*. For the children of the villeins were also in the same state of bondage with their parents, whence they were called in Latin *nativi*, which gave rise to the female appellation of a villein who was called a *neife*. . . . The law protected the persons of villeins, as the king’s subjects, against atrocious injuries of the lord ; for he might not kill or maim his *villein* ; *though he might beat him with impunity since the villein had no action or remedy at law*, but in case the murder of the murder of his ancestor, or the main of his own person—Neifsindeed had also an appeal of rape in case the lord violated them by force.”

Now if speculating upon this elysæan existance of “villeinage,” it is not necessary to master all the subtleties of metaphysics or logic before giving an answer, would it be taking too great a license with those branches to put the question : May there not exist *some* connection between the villainious household desecration “epidemic,” I may call it, the gall and wormwood in the cup of my typical friend and neighbour to-day, so to speak, or the “spiriting of servant galism,” a form of rabies almost equally virulent just now, and the passages in Blackstone, here quoted and specially dignified with italics ? In other words—Is there not here manifested an attempt of nature to remedy a “disordered condition” of a very old standing ? If that is so, notwithstanding, however, much *pater* and *mater familias* may plume themselves on their never ceasing kindness to all their employées and domestics—in the face of, it may be, “the blackest ingratitude,” these “disturbing forces” (vindictive operatives, or spirited housemaids) are the *inevitable result of inexorable law*—the transformed shapes of villeins, neifes or daughters of fedual times, as we may presently attempt—even though we may not succeed—to prove.

CHAPTER III.

THE SPEECH FROM THE STABLE, AND THE "FIRST RESOLUTION."

Upon the call which was made by the Chairman, as related in the last chapter, the Horse "rose," and—with that graceful inclination of the head, which has probably been induced by "champing the bit"—said:—

"Mr. Chairman, and Fellow Brutes,

The resolution I have to propose is:—"That this meeting views with pain and alarm the great augmentation in the amount of evil, to which, since only a comparatively recent period, many of the 'inferior'—and one pitiable section of the 'superior'—races of life forms have become subjected, and which appears to be on an increase in a ratio totally disproportionate to the growth of culture and civilization, and quite unprecedented in any former age in the history of this planet."

He then proceeded to say that:—"In thanking them for having been saddled with the honour of proposing the first resolution to that brutal and intellectual assembly—the largest probably, most earnest, and if rather noisy, certainly the most orderly, as it was also the most important of any former gathering of life forms recorded in history, it would be his endeavour to convey to them as briefly as possible his sentiments, with a view to trace out this subject of Evil, from its source if practicable, and this, in so far as it effected his own race, he thought he should be able to do, and thereby to prove conclusively to whom he individually—but as representing his race—was indebted for the loads of it he had often to carry, or the waggons full he had often to draw,

a work of supererogation and an encumbrance against which he lifted up his voice in protest."

After a pause as if to see whither he had driven, he proceeded:—"He would next assume that the state or rank in the social scale by which their Chairman, himself, and the representatives of some other races he saw before him were known—in the human family—was by the expressive and beautifully suggestive epithet of a 'beast of burden;' and he would draw their attention to the fact, that the only plea that was set up for assuming that title was their quiet, harmless, peaceful lives. He would also shew them from whence that epithet was derived. Pictures have indeed been found of scenes of a past age, and legendary traditions have descended down to the present era of chariots, instead of being drawn by the Equine family, playful carnivora of the first order were substituted; but as these were supposed to be yoked to the chariot of the 'god of Wine,' if they are not pure fictions or myths, the animals so substituted must have been first 'overcome' with—Wine! or probably, and what is quite as natural, they were who constructed both legends and pictures: for, if things have not greatly changed since, nothing more unserviceable than a member of this family could now be found as a substitute for the beast of burden proper. (Here some growling noise interrupted the speaker, which was found to proceed from a rather pugnacious Panther who seemed to think this part of the speech reflected upon him personally, or some of his family connections. On denying any intentional personality, the speaker proceeded). Now, though the gentleman who has just 'risen,' and who seems so indignant that it should be even hinted that he or any of his species might not be able to draw a cart or even a chariot creditably or properly, might feel aggrieved at what he considered proof of a want of discernment in a 'stupid race,' his feelings and sentiments might undergo a change if the Congress would allow him to relate for their information the different stages, representing the various

phases of indignities endured by his ancestors, by which *he* has arrived at the climax or beast of burden stage, which under the hand of man he had become."

[Here the speaker read over some extracts from the Lectures of Professors Huxley and Marsh, which in a curtailed form we give in a note ⁽¹⁾ wherein he endeavours to shew that originally a "four-toed" animal, from being employed to drag loads on the ground for the convenience of man he had gradually, as the loads were increased, and as his capabilities enlarged, become the "one-toed" impersonation of nature's intention in thus equipping him for the use and service of his present master, who seems never tired in thus proving him "designed by providence" for his especial use—probably the only instance in which he (man) can detect the designs of Providence in anything. (After the sensation consequent upon the universal feeling of injustice had subsided, he proceeded.)

"Now, he put it to the lowest reasoning organism to say, if it can believe that life in the shafts or saddle or harness⁽²⁾ such, alas, as that of too many of his race; or, such as that of too many of other races out of harness, saddle or shafts, and death, such as he would only hint at, for it would be too horrible to describe—is consistent or in harmony with a system which not merely professes to be founded upon a basis of—but contains so many features standing out like landmarks or beacons, all conducive to—faith in—'beneficence of design.' For his part, he could not, and therefore he sought for some casuistry, no matter from whence derived, that can reconcile a theory of intentional good or UNIVERSAL HAPPINESS to all life forms, with the practical continuance of *unmixed evil to almost every form of life.*⁽³⁾ He believed he had in his own experience described the dilemma in which this meeting found itself—a not uncommon situation for other meetings—and out of which he hoped some one would be able to drag it, a labour for which he was quiet unequal." (Here the speaker turned round appealingly, as he is sometimes observed to do when whipped unmercifully, or as if he was

now thinking of the probable fate that awaited him when the rather active part he was taking in this Congress should become known.) "As he had come there upon the spur of the moment and without the knowledge of his master, who, he feared, might miss him, and unprovided with a 'seconder,' he would beg of the Chairman to call upon someone to second the resolution."

Amidst congratulations and applause the speaker withdrew, and the Chairman, thus appealed to, asked if there was any one who would second the resolution of his "noble friend." Hereupon a very strange-looking, but colossal figure was seen slowly approaching the chair, on reaching which, and presenting his card, he was introduced to the meeting as the "Dinothere" (*Dinotherium giganteum*) of the *Miocene* period, supposed to have been long "extinct," but as the Chairman explained, though not habited in the dress usually worn when presented (to the naturalist) at levees, transformed or evolved into a form more fashionable, or at least more congruous, or in keeping with the altered state of his means or circumstances. He (the Chairman) would call upon the Dinothere to second the resolution.

This singular individual commenced in a low dreamy monotone, more like soliloquy than as addressing "a crowded intellectual audience," by reverting to the very great changes he—as a representative of the "ancient and noble" family of Pachyderms—had witnessed on this planet. "He had thought," he said, "to have retired altogether from taking any active part or interest in public affairs; to have expended the remainder of his declining years in a warm, oozy, slimy, voluptuous senility; to have lain him down and wallowed out life in soft, delicious, mephitic delirium; or to have abandoned himself to the enchanting ravishment of an atmosphere redolent of moisture and miasma, or rich in stupifying carbonic acid, an atmosphere impervious to almost all other forms of warm-blooded life. These had been his day-dreams; but if they were dreams, out of them he had been ruthlessly and remorselessly disturbed. Man, one of the latest inventions of nature—one, that is, of the latest

products of evolution he meant—had penetrated to and discovered his retreat; and the deadly bullet was the inevitable carollary of that ill-boding discovery. ⁽⁴⁾ He had crawled there in the name of the insulted majesty of Right, to protest against the encroachments of this innovating usurper. He could, he assured them, remember the time when this animal whose ‘steady progress’ as it is called, he had carefully watched, stood both in a very different garb as well as relationship to other organisms from that he wears to-day. He would inform them that the ratio of man’s ‘profit’ by civilization is exactly indicated by the ‘loss’ sustained by all inferior organisms in the transformation. ⁽⁵⁾ Oh! would that he (the speaker) could be carried back in reality and not in retrospect to those halycon days, when his (man’s) amusement or ‘business’ consisted in nothing more harmful to other races than climbing a tree, as was his wont, to rob it of its fruit or nuts, and when the capacity for climbing, or robbing, or eating no longer remained, swinging by the tail,—which it will be seen had not then become ‘functionally useless’—from some inviting branch to aid digestion or give fresh stimulus to appetite.” Here the speaker as if carried back into an almost forgotten or obliterated era—if it was not altogether an imaginary one—relapsed into the transcendental, when the Chairman ‘rose’ and apologized for the last speaker by saying: “He hoped they would all make due allowance for age, infirmity, and the retrospect of better days. They would consider the resolution ‘carried’ which saves time, you know;” an advantage to which the meeting seemed to give its cordial agreement.

Our bulky *Miocene* era friend seemed now slowly to dissolve or fade away. When he had altogether disappeared, the Chairman said, “He should now call upon his friend ‘Canis Minor’ (little dog) to move the next resolution.

As the intimacy between this individual and the “scientific world,” and his familiarity with many of the delightful laboratory secrets and experiments were generally known, the appearance of the small but intelligent mover of ‘the next resolution’ was followed by a general murmur of

approbation, especially from the more intellectual classes of brutes. Looking himself very wise, and having thus excited expectation on tiptoe in others, he thus commenced with what we shall call the "Speech from the Kennel," but which we must reserve for another chapter.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III.

NOTE 1.—The following is the extract to which reference has been made. "In the lowest part of the *Eocene* basin of Green River is found the earliest known animal which is clearly referable to the horse family, viz.—*Eohippus* of Marsh. This animal had three toes on the hind foot, and four perfect serviceable toes on the fore-foot; but, in addition, on the fore-foot an imperfect fifth metacarpal (splint) and possibly a corresponding rudimentary fifth toe (the thumb) like a dew-claw. Also, the two bones of the leg and fore-arm were yet entirely distinct. This animal was no larger than a fox. Next in the Middle *Eocene* (Bridger Beds), came the *Orohippus* of Marsh, an animal of similar size and having similar structure, except that the rudimentary thumb or dew-claw is dropped, leaving only four toes on the fore-foot. Next came in the Lower *Miocene*, the *Mesohippus*, in which the fourth toe has become a rudimentary and useless splint. Next came, still in the *Miocene*, the *Miohippus* of the United States and nearly allied *Anchithere* of Europe, more horse-like than the preceding. The rudimentary fourth splint is now almost gone, and the middle hoof has become larger; nevertheless, the two side hoofs are still serviceable. The two bones of the leg have also become united, though still quite distinct. This animal was about the size of a sheep. Next came in the Upper *Miocene* and Lower *Pliocene*, the *Protohippus* of the United States and allied *Hipparion* of Europe, an animal still more horse-like than the preceding, both in structure and size. Every remnant of the fourth splint is now gone; the middle hoof has become still larger, and the two side-hoofs smaller and shorter, and no longer serviceable except in marshy ground. Next came in the *Pliocene*, the *Pliohippus*, almost a complete horse. The hoofs are reduced to one, but the splints of the two side-toes remain to attest the line of descent. It differs from the true horse in the skull, shape of the hoof, the less length of the molars, and some other less

important details. Last comes in the *Quarternary* the modern horse—*Equus*. The hoof becomes rounder, the splint bones shorter, the molars longer, the second bone of the leg more rudimentary, and the evolutionary change is complete.”

There is just one unfortunate hitch in the very plausible theory our “noble friend”—as we suppose we must call him—has elaborated from these geological revelations. At the periods of the changes in the foot or molars of the present *Equus*, so far from the animal called “man” converting or educating him out of *Eohippus*, or being qualified for such an undertaking, he (man) was himself passing through those chrysalis like stages of his own existence out of which he has emerged—as the seconder of his own resolution has just testified—and arrived at the dignity of man contemporaneously, or nearly so, with our noble friend’s becoming “horse,” viz.—some time in the *Quarternary Period*. The causes, or rather laws, by whose operations four-toed *Eohippus* has become modern one-toed *Equus*, are nearly identical with those by which man has become *Biped*, viz.—“natural selection” and the action of his “environment.”

We are sorry to rob our noble friend of his grievance, if such it is; but truth, wherever ascertainable, must be adhered to in these pages.

NOTE 2.—It has been stated on a high authority “that the actual suffering of the inferior animals bears no comparison with that which is borne by the human family.” However much this may seem like a plea for “reversion” as being preferable to, or, a remedy for this suffering, we are not now going to dispute this astonishing statement, though we may have a doubt about its literal accuracy. We shall, however, presently endeavour to show a “cause” for a state of things so discreditable to the “human family,” and if unable to restore health, prescribe that which will certainly act as an amodyne in this direful emergency.

NOTE 3.—Sad as it is to contemplate this fact, it still remains the fact. Hence, probably, the difficulty found in many minds by the exertion of thought necessary to realize a picture of the time when “the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose:” and when “the wolf and the lamb shall feed together,” between which and the present, wide as may seem the interval in point of time, *inflexible but unmistakable laws are narrowing the distance*.

“I am quite sure the time will come when people will read of the wanton cruelties which we now inflict in sport or otherwise with the same wonder and the same abhorrence with which we now read of the bloody orgies of savage tribes and of the cruel scenes of the

Roman Amphitheatre.”—*Speech of Mr. John Morley at the 51st Anniversary Meeting of the R.S.P.C.A.*

NOTE 4.—See an “Account of Sports in South Africa,” by Gordon Cumming the “Lion Slayer,” where between knife and bullet he bathed—literally “bathed” in hippopotamus’ blood.

NOTE 5.—This is it must be observed is from a pachyderm’s view. Man, as we have seen, denies the possession of any advantage over brutes, so far as immunity from physical suffering is concerned. But while upon this subject we may state that, from our point of view, the last stages in the life of the Horse is one of those perplexing problems, which every one who makes use of that animal in ever so remote a degree would do well to consider. The spring, summer, and autumn of life to it is often not enviable. Opinions differ here; but the winter is beyond all dispute so bitter that it baffles any mental effort to realize. The best of its years having been spent in the service of one master, it is usually sold to another, often unfortunately—poorer! As it becomes less useful, its share of whipping, starving and general ill-usage is increased; until often society steps in and thinks it is doing a virtuous act when it procures its sentence to be slaughtered, because—‘there’s an end of it’—as it is generally *thought*. But until that time arrives, what calculating machine can count up the sum of its misery. Now as it is on all hands admitted this animal (in common with all other lower animals) *has no future state of being*—no better life to live hereafter, and as we wish to be clear wherever clearness is practicable; with all reverence we ask:—What becomes of all this misery of a life-time? Does *it* also cease with the dissolution of life? The misery—with its dissipation? The agony of years—with death? Even if these questions cannot be satisfactorily answered, there is no irreverence in approaching them openly, and in so doing we state as our belief it does not! It would be utterly irreconcilable with any theories we can form of a Being—*one* of whose attributes is said to be “inflexible justice”—presiding over the government of the world, if it did. Can there be a doubt in any candid mind that this misery—these life long agonies, *react* in obedience to natural laws—and react it may be long after their last operation has ceased? And every contributor in every case—whether to the agonies of his fellow man, or fellow animal—will at some time be the victim of a reaction, *exactly proportioned to his share in the contribution*.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SPEECH FROM THE DOG KENNEL.

As soon as some degree of silence had been restored, Canis, Minor, "rose" and said:—

"Mr. Chairman, and Brother Brutes,

The resolution I am now called upon to move is:—"That in the midst of the complications and anomalies which everywhere exist in almost every grade and department of life, this Congress desires the influence of the race called *Man*, especially that part of it inhabiting the space under the sway of the British Sceptre, to be employed with a view to the early and effectual developement of Liberty of which that race has proudly made itself the Champion, together with equal rights to all weaker races, by putting an end for ever to the ban of inferiority with which they are now branded, and which, to many of them, has become a source of unmitigated suffering and wrong."

"They had not yet," he said, "in the Lower Animal School, he might call it, even with all the advantages the operative and experimental departments of the laboratory afforded, arrived at that stage of perfection in (canine) education when they could altogether dispense with many of the records and references from that kind of knowledge the human race, in its largeness of heart, had handed over to them; therefore he would, whenever necessary, make such extracts as may from time to time be expedient or, by way of illustration, or for the furtherance of the great objects of the meeting."

"There was one habit—he might call it, axiom—of the laboratory, which was this:—of 'believing nothing—unless there is evidence for it; and Scientists have a way

of looking upon belief which is not based upon evidence, not only as illogical but as immoral.'"⁽¹⁾ Now he thought he need scarcely point out to them that from a scientific stand-point, this habit or axiom struck at the very root of the theory of nature's intention in providing us brutes and all other lower terrestrial organisms with a lord and master, such as he who now laid claim to that title and dignity. A "claimant" to title, and certain fiefs and emoluments thereto attached, had been of late years so rife and nauseating, that but for the skill displayed in "stamping it out," *it* also, might have become epidemic something like that with which all animal life becomes infected at some time: but where he would ask, is there any evidence of nature's intention in providing such a claimant as the one now before them—metaphorically speaking in this Congress, and with such a title as universal sovereignty embraces? Where, but in sheer "brute force" as it is very significantly called. He (man) possesses the power, or force, or cunning necessary for the performance of certain acts; he performs them: therefore, it was always *intended* this should be so! But is *that* evidence enough? It might have been ample ten or twenty thousand years ago, or about the time this theory of intention on the part of Nature may be supposed to have originated, or in those elysian periods alluded to by the last speaker, when, as we must suppose, man's claim to civilization, much less to sovereignty was not very pronounced before he had unfolded, or evolved into the glorious being ⁽²⁾ he now is: but will that evidence suffice for the civilization of to-day? There is however a kind of evidence with which we are furnished and it will be well just to look at it, for it is that of himself. Let us put him (in imagination) into the witness box, and see what is the product of his examination. I may tell you this has been done over and over again, and with results so strikingly similar that I have been able to reduce the result of that practice to a system, of which the following may be supposed to form a sample or formula. ⁽³⁾I say to him (Me)—"Will you kindly allow

me to ask, by what grant or charter from nature you hold this privilege or title of *right* of life, or death, or subjugation of inferior or weaker animal life of the lower form?" (Him)—"Certainly. What else is it sent for?" (Me)—"That is not information exactly, nor the point upon which it is sought. I merely wished to *see* your charter, grant, act of parliament, or whatever it is, by virtue of which you claim the *right* to take or spare the life of all inferior animals or organisms or—to know where it is to be found." (Him)—"Know where it is to be found? Why doesn't it say so?" (Me)—"Say what?" (Him)—"Say what? Why say—have dominion over the beasts of the field, and over everything that breathes." It is to be here observed, that he (man) seldom—I might say never, quotes the passage containing this injunction, correctly: but so much as he is capable of quoting in a parrot-like fashion as an article of faith, he generally regards as an extinguisher. However, I proceed (Me)—"Who says that?" (Him)—"Who says that? Why—*somebody*, I suppose." Here is a difficulty he had not foreseen, so he repeats the question by way of gaining time for the consideration of whom it could be who employed those sweeping words. His memory refreshed, he bursts out triumphantly with—"Moses said it!" as if further question was purely an absurdity. However, I think otherwise, and proceed again (Me)—"May I be permitted to ask, who gave Moses authority thus so summarily to dispose of the inferior animal races?" (Him)—After some consideration, and not without appearances of slight misgivings, "Who gave Moses authority? Why, God to be sure?" (Me)—"Did God ever tell *you* this, that you say, he told Moses?" (Him)—"Tell me this? Why, no! But we are to believe it." (Me)—"Do you believe all that it is said in those works attributed to Moses, God said to him?" (Him)—"Believe all? Why, no, I rather think not." (Me)—"How much may I ask?" (Him)—"How much? Well, I can't say." (Me)—"When you say you don't *know* how much you believe of those works attributed to Moses, do you believe everything said in

Genesis or his (Moses's) version of "First beginnings?" (Him)—"Well, I think not." (Me)—"You *think* you don't believe in the accuracy or trustworthiness of everything contained in the Book of Genesis?" (Him—"Certainly not!" (Me)—"That will do." ⁽⁴⁾

There is another axiom, I may call it, not of the laboratory, but of the legal (canine) mind, which is this:—That the manner of witnesses under examination affords the court an almost certain indication as to whether or not they are telling the truth. In the present instance a gauge, meter, or index is unnecessary. Whenever it is the witness's 'manner' persistently to repeat the questions put to him to answer, the gnomon of evidential value, invariably stands at zero or nothing. In the one here formulated the only answer savouring of truthfulness is the last, expressing disbelief in almost everything in general, or what otherwise is supposed to be a racial creed or article of faith. Analyzed—man's own evidence to title is this: a work attributed to Moses or somebody, authorises him to take the life of inferior animals or reduce them to a state of bondage without distinction of condition; but neither Moses nor anybody had *power* to grant such authority. This then we may call the negative evidence to title.

Now the positive evidence to title must be sought out with origin, or in other words: Is there anything so mysterious about the *origin* of this being, that it is thence indubitably the patent of prerogative? An answer is found ready from that intellectual giant ⁽⁵⁾ of the laboratory who, after asking "does man originate in a different way from a dog, bird, frog, or fish?" Says, "the reply is not doubtful for a moment: without question, the mode of origin and the early stages in the development of man, are identical with those of the animals immediately below him in the scale: without a doubt in these respects, *he is far nearer to apes than apes are to the dog.*" Keeping the laboratory axiom in view, I think you will thus have a very fair gauge of the depth of immorality in permitting witness-box evidence of the sort selected for

illustration to influence belief, and herein is the gist of the resolution.

As far as we can see, this seems to be the situation. This organism (man) has 'unfolded' or 'developed' into something generally — but by no means universally — *superior* to other races. But this development is the result of "accident," or rather a combination of circumstances better known as "good luck," or *favourable conditions*. The organism—speaking more accurately—has been in harmony with its "environment" to a greater extent than less favoured life forms. Had this not been the case, it also might have remained at a lower stage; say at an ape, or a marsupial, or a newt, or a shark, or a seal, or an ascidian, or even an 'autogenous protoplasm,' or, at any intervening or intercalary stages. Having, however, arrived at the dignity of man—by what means it is not now necessary to trace—it neither follows as a consequence that it will remain there for ever fixed, nor go on ascending, nor, does it exclude the possibility, he might say, the strong probability that some lower form will some day—*though it may be a distant one*—outstrip it!⁽⁶⁾ Hence we get a view of the vitiating tendency of that ban of inferiority, the stigma upon us brutes as being of an inferior creation which, in the resolution he had denounced as entailing much suffering and wrong.

He (*Canis Minor*) feared he was becoming tedious, but having placed "man" and "brute" before them in such a light that he hoped their relative positions would be better understood, if it was not too great a trespass upon their indulgence, he would ask for a patient hearing only for a short time, until he disclosed what until recently were some of the secrets of the laboratory, and this part of the subject so far as the revelation he would make, they would perceive was the question of questions to every man and beast inhabiting this planet.

He would then bring to their notice the doctrine of "Force."⁽⁷⁾ Not exactly the "brute force" so frequently

mentioned, though probably often imperfectly understood, but physical force; moral force, may then receive some consideration, since the two often, and ought always to run parallel, or be in harmony with each other.

There was, then—as some quite as familiar with the laboratory as himself were aware—no such thing as dead or *inert* matter or force. No molecule or atom of any element existed without force in itself, or was so interwoven with its minutest imaginable essence or condition as, not alone to enable, but *compel* it to act and to be acted upon by internal forces of other particles. Force then was inseparable from matter and immanent in it. They were “correlatives.” Matter existed and was endowed with force, which was inherent and indestructible. Force could not exist and be sensibly active without matter; matter could not exist, nor be in any way active without force; neither could it exist and still be *in-active* or dead. Force therefore, like matter, was *permanent and indestructible*. The *form* changed, but the *quantity* never. The apparent destruction of a force, therefore, like the apparent destruction of a particle of matter, is only *its transformation into another force*—like the transformation into another particle of matter—which is correlative to it. Thus motion, for instance, when lost, is again detected in the new form of heat, and heat, in that of light; and the special object in introducing this triumph of the laboratory was with the view of showing that, not mere hypothetical traces, but *actual and palpable evidences* of this same correlation of force exist, and may be detected pervading and ramifying through the whole *moral nature* of both man and beast. Now he had no doubt there were many in that Congress quite as capable as himself of applying this wonderful doctrine as a key to some of those difficult problems, found not only in the laboratory, but out of it, and straightway they are unlocked! He should indeed feel very much disappointed after all the sacrifices he had made in the cause of science, if this would not be the “open sesame” to every moral, political or social puzzle or paradox. Having,

therefore, pointed out the orifice and provided them with a key, he should leave them to insert it at their leisure or in their necessity, and pass on to another theory—he would call it—for the subject is hardly accessible to experimental or demonstrative proof like the last one; but it is at least in harmony with evolution and the method of nature as hitherto known—of “a struggle for existence” said to be within the limits of a single organism between the various tissues and organs, and which if proved, running as it does in a kind of parallelism, or on the same line with title of race or species, may have a very close bearing upon the objects of this Congress. “The existence of an organism is not only dependent on the external existence of others, and is the outcome of a struggle; but, also, on the internal conditions which co-operate in the formation of its structure, this structure being the outcome of a struggle.”⁽⁸⁾ The conditions of the external struggle are, first a potential indefiniteness of multiplication; secondly, a limited supply of food; and lastly, the competition of rivals all seeking this supply. There is said to be a similar state of things within the organism. The different tissues entering into the several organs, have a potential growth of unlimited extent; they are said to be hindered from growing beyond certain limits by the limitation of the supply of pabulum and by the competition of other tissues. What gives the advantage in this internal struggle, or is there any? Does the heart, for instance in mammalia, grasp and appropriate an undue, unfair, or unhealthy share of fibrous pabulum, leaving the liver lean, flabby, hobnailed, or atrophied? Or do the kidneys by rapacious greed become surfeited, plethoric, or too excitable at the expense of the weak, cavernous and incapable lung? Or does the brain engross so much “grey matter” pabulum, that the cranium massive, bulged out or disproportioned explains the limp, thready or attenuated spinal chord? If these occur, the organism cannot choose than do other than soon quit a life of necessity anything but desirable. But is this so? Rather is not the reverse of this the case? For does not each organ, nerve, tissue or viscus

seek only, when not intermeddled with, its fair and equally proportioned share of "building material;" and thus the whole organism becomes structurally firm, perfect, and under ordinary conditions, enduring? If, then, every organism is thus built up and supported by a system of general contribution, each part being supplied with that share exactly proportioned to its requirements, thus forming a perfect organism or being, ought not the universal body of terrestrial life-forms *of every grade* to exist in a state of pure and perfect harmony⁽⁹⁾ by the same system? Here then from observing the forms and directions of the forces in primal or protoplasmic economies up to the highest organisms from a structural aspect, we get an illustration of what *ought to be* the path of duty of the highest intellectual life-forms.

What then, he would ask, is the moral? Those "imaginings of the rude inhabitants of Syria,"⁽¹⁰⁾ the "cosmogony of the semi-barbarous Hebrew," the records of whom it had become the fashion in the present day to disparage because of some supposed anachronism, or a "conflict" of some kind with something not very definite, will be found somehow to contain, not only the oldest memories, the earliest records of the animal races—though not troubling themselves or others with such details as the chemical processes by which these races have been evolved out of dust, water and heat!—but something of a far higher import in the immeasurable beyond to which we can attach credence, when we find them forecasting *a future to both man and animals* science is unable to fashion into any form beyond the present—a future not a trace of which is now visible, but in so far as it can be brought within the focus, this Congress will circumscribe, and, in fact, is intended to *adjust*, which will, and must, pave the way for future accomplishment.⁽¹¹⁾ Whatever strength is still left in the "worn old bottles of Judaism," one thing is pretty certain: the "complications" to which allusion had been often made, would never have existed had they been taken as the only *safe moral guides*; and they (complications) will never cease, until—as the old Jewish records, the contents of the worn old bottles, insist—man

shall set an example of justice, moderation and generosity commensurate with his lofty title to prerogative, and as we of this Congress insist—commence it at once by a return to his primæval herbivorous diet. Life will then cease to be the continual fever or conflict, or say *battle* which proverbially it is ; but *why* it should be so, no one seems very clearly to comprehend. ⁽¹²⁾ He begged to move the resolution.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV.

NOTE 1.—Professor Huxley's " American Addresses."

NOTE 2.—Whatever may have been the instrument employed by our little " friend " and laboratory pupil, as the measuring-rod or standard of human civilization " ten or twenty thousand years ago," his opinions with regard to its extent or capacity in that " glorious structure " representing it *to-day*, might undergo some modification if he would only use a more modern instrument ; say, for instance, a bird's-eye view of that representative as he appears in a crowd or at an election ; or in any other violent agitation ; or, better still, where great accuracy is required, some terrible " steamboat catastrophe " with men, women, and children all struggling together for life. " Primitive instincts "—with but a few exceptions—he would see were terribly in the ascendant. Indeed, we may say with a learned counsel, he would " be surprised to find " how very little the " unfolding process " has as yet accomplished, even admitting the " wearing down of the tail " into the list of facts accomplished.

NOTE 3.—Though this is put down as the evidence of " representative man," which will of course embrace both the glutton and the sensualist, it is sad to have to make the confession that it is also applicable to the most exemplary and abstemious of the race, or those who would be thought so, as the following extract will have a tendency to prove :—

" He had no objection to be loved by a dolphin, or any other member of what is called the ' poor, dumb animal world,' called ' poor,' probably, not because it is thought to be naturally in evil case, which would be a wrong thought altogether ; but because it—the poor, dumb animal world—is sometimes taken unfair advantage of by the human world ; and *not only eaten, which is fair play, not*

only driven and ridden, which is fair play too, not only milked and chained, which is also fair play, not netted and menageried and exhibited, which I am inclined to think is perfectly legitimate on broad grounds; but because it is sometimes needlessly beaten, cruelly over-driven, mercilessly stinted in the matter of food, and generally taken advantage of, because it cannot call a public meeting (the present Congress of Animals was evidently unheard of when this was penned) to consider and pass resolutions and to influence the legislature."—*Sunday at Home*, January, 1872. "Morals and Mottoes," by the Rev. S. B. James, M.A.

Wherever it is the case in any member of the human race—no matter whether the blackest of "niggers" or the fairest of men or women—being not only eaten, but driven, ridden, milked, chained, netted, menageried, or exhibited, that "fair play" to it (?) is thus exercised, as that phenomenon is defined by the reverend author of "Morals and Mottoes"—from our (Darwinian theory) view—*there* also, fair play to a poor, dumb animal under *similar conditions* is exercised; but—and it is the chief object of the "Fruits of Darwinism" to prove, and from which proof there is no logical escape—not otherwise! It is simply upon this basis that "brilliant theory," like the simpler but no less beautiful theories of Isaiah and others, must stand or fall!

NOTE 4.—The only variation of this argument that in a multitude of instances the author has encountered is in relation to the fallibility or otherwise of the Book of Genesis. Some, as in the case of the present example, do not attach credence to the divine ordination contained in that version; while others again are quite prepared to go to the stake for the Genesis injunction to kill and eat *some* kind of animals, or, on the other hand, suffer martyrdom rather than undergo a course of "blood pudding."

NOTE 5.—"Man's Place in Nature," Professor Huxley, page 65.

NOTE 6.—Any one familiar with the theory of evolution will be able easily to appreciate the weight of this argument. The difficulty is in conceiving of the unimaginable ages of time required for the change. Macaulay's New Zealander delivering an archæological lecture upon the ruins of St. Paul's, while it illustrates the constancy of transformation in animate nature, and notwithstanding, however, much appearances may be against the realization of such a picture, is not an impossibility so long as one pair of that race is left.—(See Note 6, Chapter 2.)

NOTE 7.—The author of “Mechanism of Man,” in Chapter 4 on the “Method of Study” asks: “What is Force? It is so necessary to have in the mind a clear and definite conception of what we intend by the term “a Force,” that it will be desirable for the student at the very beginning of his inquiry to make himself familiar with it.”

“Force is that which causes motion.” True; but what is the *thing* you so call that produces the motion? Is a Force an actual *something*, or merely a condition or quality of something? If that cannot be, Force is not an abstraction but a substance, meaning by this term something that has shape, that is composed of some material and exists in a definite portion of space. By “action at a distance” let us understand an influence exercised by one body over another body without actual contact or without an intermediate agent. Does the magnet act from afar by a species of moral influence existing within itself, and by the example and presence of which a sympathetic influence is set up in the steel, inducing it to leap to the magnet? This cannot be the explanation, although squaring in all respects with the phenomenon, for the sufficient reason that such an action implies *intelligence* in both magnet and steel. In such case metals must have mind. But if not this, what is the influence that exercises a *force*, and what are the materials the force employs? Something must pass from one to the other by which the attracted body is seized and drawn as by a cord. We are ignorant of what this intermediate something is. But it must be a very *refined* something, for it passes through the hand, or through glass, or through wood when interposed, and *when it penetrates our own structure its passage is attended with no pain nor even with consciousness*. And thus also, is it with the force known as “moral force.”

NOTE 8.—“The Physical Basis of Mind,” with illustrations, by George Henry Lewes. London: Trübner and Co.

NOTE 9.—Although it might probably be more in accord with accuracy to call this condition a state of involuntary or unconscious equilibrium, upon this point there cannot remain any doubt; because whether voluntary or involuntary, wherever the normal condition in nature is disturbed or disorder introduced, it matters not how, when the time favourable for its enforcement arrives, an equilibrium is enforced—or, as it seems to be more usually designated, “restored” by the operation of natural law. Thus the destruction

of the mighty empires of antiquity was as much in obedience to natural law as was the earthquake which destroyed Lisbon or New Granada ; and the decline of the British Empire, or if that is a contingency too remote for ordinary optics, as something more seeable some Sepoy Mutiny, Cetewayo disturbance, or Afghan complication, will each and all be re-enacted as soon as the conditions for their enactment become “favourable,” just as fever, or say disease, will become rife, or strikes, demonstrations, leagues, meetings—which are each minor forms of the same type—take place; whenever the social atmosphere becomes loaded with “inciting causes” in obedience to organic laws.

NOTE 10.—Professor Huxley’s “American Addresses.”

NOTE 11.—Science aims only to arrive at Truth, and this is what she says of the future of man :—“The economy of nature, beautifully arranged and vast in its extent as it is, does not satisfy even man’s idea of what might be ; he feels that, if this multiplicity of theatres for the exemplification of such phenomena as we see on earth were to go on for ever unchanged, it would not be worthy of the Being capable of creating it. An endless monotony of human generations, with their humble thinkings and doings, even though liable to certain improvement, seems an object beneath that august Being. *But the mundane economy might be very well as a portion of some greater phenomenon, the rest of which was yet to be evolved.* Our system, therefore, though it may at first appear at issue with other doctrines in esteem amongst mankind, tends to come into harmony with them and even to give them support.—“Vestiges of Creation.”

NOTE 12.—That ‘this’ (or that) has always been *thus*, is, to some minds, reason sufficient that this or that should so remain ; a position—from the character of the internal forces constantly at work in every particle of matter each productive of change—and notwithstanding every human effort employed to preserve the *status quo ante*—simply impossible !

CHAPTER V.

ANOTHER THEORY OF THE CAUSE OF "MAN'S SUPREMACY."

THE Chimpanzee having "caught the Chairman's eye," now rose to second the resolution:—He said: "He very much regretted he could not bring with him such an admirable temper as that of which the last speaker, the mover of the resolution was the impersonation, especially as he (the dog) had the greatest cause to feel aggrieved upon the subject of inferiority. He must, therefore, cast himself upon their forbearance, if, in the course of his remarks, he should feel an emotion too powerful to be kept in due restraint. He believed they would all endorse the spirit of the resolution. Degradation, suffering and misery were, as they knew, referable to this 'badge of inferiority' which, like the chain or strap round their loins, many of them, under certain conditions, were compelled to wear. That in itself was an evil, he might call it an indignity of no small magnitude, but it became intensified beyond all simian endurance, when it developed the partiality or favoritism which it was known to many of them, extensively prevailed among what were considered the 'higher forms.' What, he would ask, could they think of a case like that he should now bring to their notice? There was, as some of them knew, a 'species' only recently discovered, which, while it has greatly interested, has also not a little 'perplexed' the medical, judicial, theological, and scientific mind each in turn, and sometimes all of them together, and is making a sensation in the natural, or, as some think it upon that domain, *unnatural*, history of the age.⁽¹⁾ Distinct alike from the human and the brute—that is to say, partaking of the nature, and, when not otherwise prostrated, to which there is a proneness, erect bearing of the former, but several degrees below the level of habits and demeanour of the latter—this "specimen" was for a

long time supposed to be a hybrid, or a kind of *lusus naturee*; but expert naturalists are now compelled to admit that it is a good and true species—of a case of 'reversion' to a former semi-human condition; though he thought it not improbable that the antagonism which, from the first, it encountered in any overtures for admission into the ranks of other species may have exerted pressure enough to extort this admission. The most singularly interesting feature—though it has also been designated "a very alarming characteristic"—of this species is this: that so far from suffering from any stigma or opprobrium affixed to all 'low characters' or organisms, this 'profits by its own wrong-doing,' triumphs by the very outrages in which it riots! Where, he asked them, was this lord of creation now, to permit this partiality; where this paragon of animals to encourage favouritism and wink at the triumph of wrong?" (Here the voice of the speaker became husky, almost inarticulate, being, in fact, more like "croaking" than speaking, or an intellectual harangue. When he had cooled down somewhat, which the reduction of his cheeks may have assisted, probably from being the receptacle of an electuary or lozenge affected by some public speakers, he proceeded:)—He hoped he was not offensive, but he had just a word or two more to say in relation to this latest discovered organism, because it corroborated what the Chairman had said of the law of 'heredity.' What, then, it has been frequently asked, has produced this abortion, this monstrosity? *And the laboratory makes no sign.* Everyone is at liberty to adopt his own theory. That which he entertains, though it may not be the most scientific, he adheres to, because from *his* point of view it is the most feasible. It is this:—For a long period much of the (mental) diet of some low organisms of the human form has consisted largely—he might say, almost exclusively—of garbage,⁽²⁾ in which the pictorial element preponderated; and it included, along with other combinations, such phenomena as bull-dogs, instigated by human forms of some sort to worry women, or female forms; or an individual of that unhappy sex having her head hacked off,

or her shoulders and body 'all skimped up' by lighted paraffine, or other painfully interesting experiments, or outbursts of otherwise pent-up muscular energy, such as only the male organism—whether to prevent a more disastrous explosion, as is thought by some, or by way of mere 'playful recreative indulgence' by others—is in the habit of periodically 'setting free.'⁽³⁾ Then, as interaction between organism and environment through countless ages in the past has resulted in the paragon of animals, so this species of (mental) nutriment, combined with certain favourable atmospheric or domiciliary surroundings, which, though they may never have been accurately analyzed, we can well believe to be fully charged with corresponding elements, has developed—something else—the modern 'Wife-kicker Fiend,' the most startling paradox against which this nineteenth century, or any former, has ever struck its head." (Although this speaker continued his harangue—if such it could be called—for some time longer, and without being called to order, it was utterly impossible for "our reporter" to catch with accuracy either his expressions or their meaning. He was, however, understood to say, as near as it was possible to detect, out of the succession of unutterable croaks, the semblance of the vernacular, that any superiority man possessed over the Simian family was through him (man) accidentally discovering how to make a fire, by which he obtained one overwhelming advantage, namely, that of freeing himself from "Acari,"—whatever that may be—whenever they become intolerable, by singeing himself, and sometimes, when this had been "overdone,"⁽⁴⁾ the skin peeled off, as well as hair, thus satisfactorily accounting—to himself—for any superiority the subsequent whiteness or appearance of the skin lent to man's personal dignity.)

The absence of all demonstration among members of the Congress when this speaker "sat down" seemed to indicate that his theory had not made a very favourable impression, and the Chairman, who seemed, from some not quite explicable cause, anxious to lose no time, said "he supposed they might consider the resolution carried. He

would therefore call upon some of the *Ruminant* family to propose the next resolution," with which we shall commence another chapter.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V.

NOTE 1.—Some time since, when Mr. Gough, the great advocate of "Total Abstinence," was lecturing in England upon the subject of "Temperance," and the evils in connection therewith—so suicidal did he seem to think a dose of alcoholic liquor in ever so small a quantity to be—I dropped him a note through a friend, wherein I endeavoured to bring to his notice the theory I am in these pages trying to establish, and its bearing upon what is generally styled or denounced as the "curse of the human race," civilised and savage. "Might not language," I endeavoured to show, "even in its most eloquent form,"—and that of Mr. Gough is, as is generally thought, of a very high order—"be a work of supererogation, in so far as it can ever become an effectual agent in quenching the thirst and craving after stimulants and intoxicants, when by far the greater number of the sufferers from this affection or epidemic, or, call it, disease, are quite unconsciously dieting upon that which may be remotely the cause of this thirst or craving?" Or, regarding it from the point of view in which it is the more immediate object of these pages to place it, "Will not the murder and slaughter of such innocent creatures as it has long been the custom to murder or slaughter as food for man be as certainly succeeded by its correlative in some form—the aforesaid 'curse' being only *one* form—as day will be succeeded by night?"

What Mr. Gough thought of this view of the curse of the human race I never knew: whether he put this theory down in the same category with mesmerism, spiritualism, hocus-pocus, or other "new-fangled" and quickly exploded/"fancies" with which the human mind is often pregnant, I am as equally in the dark; but, if it received timely acknowledgment, acceptance or adoption, I fear it would be followed by consequences as fatal to him as a professional Total Abstinence lecturer as it would be to another much-tabooed class (public-house keepers) which the age has produced, against whom the picture-galleries and art collections are, as I am told, just now going to be pitted, as a last forlorn-hope, or

attempt to remove a blot—under the present semi-carnivorous dietary—as hopelessly fixed, ingrained, systematic, or, I may call it, “national,” as are the tendencies of the parasitic mistletoe or the daughters of the horse-leech. Still, if lecturing is his forte, he might in that case take up his parable with effect upon butchers, or against slaughterers—for anything we know, the insidious allies of publicans and other miserable sinners against society. When the whole confraternity have become “extinct species” the chronic and corroding state of perplexity on this score, as indicated from press, platform, pulpit and bench, by our monkey Mentor, as well as every temperance lecturer, may meet with some alleviation—if not entirely cease.

NOTE 2.—The “Police News” of London and New York, the centres of civilization and savagery, attested by the Press of each.

NOTE 3.—Allusion to the “female man,” in any shape, may to the hypercritical seem in bad taste, or out of place in these pages. But whilst meekly deferring to those who thus think, the Author nevertheless asserts, without fear of contradiction, that in this Nineteenth century, of steam and electricity, rams and big guns, torpedoes, infernal machines, Christianity, civilization, or anything else of which it may vaunt itself, whatever she may be theoretically, woman is practically treated as an individual of an inferior race by much more than one-half the male (human) inhabitants of this little planet; and in this enumeration the civilized portion differs in but little respect but the name from the savage. In deference, therefore to that half—or, it may be, a larger proportion—we allow her to have a logical claim to have her rights (if she has any) canvassed, or her wrongs (of which it may appear she has *some*) exposed in this Congress, with those of all other “inferior races.” What *truth* may be contained in our assertion the following extracts will probably have a tendency to show :—

“One way or another, it is unfortunately the fact that wife-murder is so common in England that *an ordinary case of it excites no particular interest*, and that it requires the introduction of an exceptional monetary or social element, as in the Tourville case, or of circumstances of peculiar brutality, as in the Penge case (which, by the voice of the noisy British public, it appears, *does not amount to murder*) to stimulate the languid curiosity of a generation well

nigh sated with stories of battle, murder and sudden death, to attract crowds to the Old Bailey, or promote the publication of newspapers at midnight.”—*Saturday Review*, Sept., 1877.

Or this,—

“Probably ever since marriage was instituted as a civilized institution, men have considered that the ceremony made them, to all intents, the master of the woman (the ‘love, honour and obey’ of the marriage ceremony involving a contradiction and impossibility) not only physically, but that it gave them an absolute ownership of not the person only of the wife, but of her life even. Bow and beg and plead before marriage ; but brutality, oppression, neglect, abuse, afterwards ; and when these cease to give the *brute* (man is here meant, be it observed) sufficient employment and satisfaction, then the bludgeon, the knife, the pistol, come into use, and the life of the woman he has sworn to protect becomes his victim and is shot or cut down as if she were merely an obnoxious weed in his garden. Such seems the condition of only too many married lives. Lately, the act of murdering wives has become so common as to alarm the thoughtful. Within a few weeks the journals have given a large number of such outrages. But two days ago, in this city, one of this class of creatures not only deliberately shot his wife unto death (her offence, positive refusal to leave service in a private family and exchange it for his society and treatment), but subsequently said that ‘she was his wife, and therefore that he had a right to kill her.’ Is it not possible for our courts to give an interpretation to the marriage contract that will throw some protection around the poor woman, through the fear of punishment, if not because of love and affection?”—*Daily Alta California*, June, 1879.

Or, lastly, Legouve says—“The protracted subjection of woman proves but one thing—that the world, so far, has had more need of the dominant qualities of man, and that her hour is not yet come. *We have no reason to conclude from this fact that it will not come.*” And he fortifies his position by the following striking illustration :—“How many centuries did it take to produce the simple maxim of common sense—‘All men are equal before the law?’ The tardy advent of an idea, so far from proving its uselessness or fallacy, is often an argument in favour of its grandeur. The principles of liberty, charity, fraternity, are all *modern* principles.”

The above extracts, like some panorama, represent but too

faithfully the position of the Female Man, of typical woman, of the *mother of the human family*, at this present day of “sweetness and light,” in the great commonwealth, or jumble of mongrel breeds and races of men, “destined,” as it is said, “to carry the torch of civilization (whatever that may mean) over the habitable globe ;” and our argument is, that where the life of woman is held so cheaply, or where there exist such singular views of equality, she cannot be the *equal* of man : *ergo*, she *is* of an inferior race—
Q. E. D.

NOTE 4.—“Oversinged,” we suspect, was his meaning here.

CHAPTER VI.

A SHEEP'S-EYE VIEW OF THE SITUATION.

A WHITE, graceful, and as it might by some be styled, "showily-dressed" wether—but "whether young or old, it would be difficult to judge from personal appearance," as the police reports put it—accepted the invitation given in the preceding chapter, and in a soft, quivering bleat, not without some pathos, said,—“The resolution he had to propose to the Congress was embodied in a very old adage used among a very ancient people, which might be called a proverb, which he was anxious to see revived, for somehow it had been allowed almost to die out. It was this,—“Whatever you wish others to do to you, do the same to them.”⁽¹⁾ This supersedes all law; and from ignoring its obligations, and the dead certainty that it is the basis and fundamental principle upon which all animal intercommunication ought to be built, have arisen all those complications and that wrongness in the world of life it is the object of this Congress to remove or put right.

“He was not going to trespass upon the indulgence or time of that assembly; but he had just a word or two to say by way of illustration of the principle of the resolution. A practice, as he had been informed, had obtained among some exceedingly low forms of the ‘highest race’—such is even the diversity in character among races—of decoying young and well-dressed, but innocent children into lonely places, and divesting them of their garments—in other words, plundering them of their clothing and leaving them in a state of nudity; and this practice had, very inconsistently, as it appeared to him, been denounced, not as ‘brutal,’ but as ‘most inhuman.’ Now, he entirely differed from that opinion. He thought that stripping off clothing from such

as were powerless to resist such spoliation was perfectly ‘human;’⁽²⁾ at least it was well known what the practice was with regard to the clothing of his own race, who might, in comparison with the human, be called children, often very harmless, weak and timid children too. Yet the periodical theft of their clothing—albeit old-looking, or beginning to have a seedy, tattered appearance—by their natural protectors, or rather, lords and masters, was not only not denounced, but organised and practised as a legitimate trade; and though he might be taking an extreme view of the situation,⁽³⁾ it seemed to him that if they (sheep) should take counsel and agree to stop the supply of this trade, by growing no more wool, the dominant race must soon die out. Whereas, on the other hand, were the resolution adopted in all its entirety, without any trimming, or cutting, or paring to meet what are by an euphemism termed ‘the wants of modern requirements,’ not only would the robbers, or traders (to whichever class they belong) be ‘warmed and cheered,’ while gracefully acknowledging the debt,⁽⁴⁾ but it would inaugurate an era, or, he might say, set an example which, if followed, would be conducive to the happiness and well-being of *every form of life*. He moved that the resolution be carried.”

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI.

NOTE 1.—Or, as a Roman might have put it, “*Ab alio expectes alteri quod feceris;*” which being rendered “Expect from one person that which you have done to another,” is an indication that the law of correlation of physical force, and its transformability into moral, was not unknown in Roman history, when our great grandfathers of many descents, the savages of Britain, had *no* history!

NOTE 2.—Or stripping off or ‘lifting’ anything not otherwise too hot or too heavy for the operation. How else has it become idiomatic in the English language, and the expression “fleeced,” have reference to a human transaction, not to that of a sheep?

NOTE 3.—It is taking an extreme view, but not an original one. The author of the “Descent of Man,” says, “Although the gradual

decrease and ultimate extinction of the races of man is a highly complex problem depending upon many causes which differ in different places and at different times ; it is the same problem as that presented by the extinction of one of the higher animals—of the fossil horse, for instance, which disappeared from South America, soon afterwards to be replaced within the same districts by countless troops of Spanish horses. . . . Though the difficulty is great to our imagination, and really great if we wish to ascertain the precise causes and their manner of action, it ought not to be so to our reason as long as we keep steadily in mind that the increase of each species and each race is constantly checked in various ways ; so that if any new check, even a slight one, be superadded the race will surely decrease in number (and what more likely to add to that check than no wool, except no food?) and decreasing numbers will sooner or later lead to extinction.”—“Descent of Man,” page 192. See also *Examiner* of October 20, 1877. Article “A National Danger.”

NOTE 4.—There cannot be a doubt that a “strike among sheep” would cause some consternation in the human mind ; and if backed by the hints here given, the stoppage in the “wool supply,” no doubt the masters would have to submit to the terms of the strikers, as they have *invariably* submitted to every demand where reason and humanity have been umpires. And even at this day, a “strike among sheep” cannot be catalogued among “safe impossibilities.” Moral—Breed sheep—but only for wool : and there will never be a strike amongst them.

CHAPTER VII.

THE DARK SHADOW OF DISUNION COMES OVER THE CONGRESS.

THE "OPPOSITION" MOVE AN AMENDMENT.

UPON a hint from the Chairman, who appeared to exercise a sort of freemasonry over herbivores, a member of the bovine family now rose, apparently to second the resolution ; but, as he did so, a roar, which vibrated upon the air in such a manner that even the ground whereon the Congress "sat" seemed to have lost some of its stability, made him pause, fall back a few paces, and then retreat to where we shall not just now follow him : when a fine, sleek, adult, genteel-looking party, a member, as it was said, of the 'feline aristocracy,' stepped forward and said, he "moved an amendment to the last resolution."

The Chair having been appealed to on a point of 'order' by some of the winged members of the Congress—almost all others having suddenly and in a most mysterious manner "dissolved into thin air"—without waiting to hear the Chairman's decision, the carnivore—for such it was—proceeded to say,—“One motive he had in moving an amendment to the last resolution was because he saw Man was not represented in that—Congress, he supposed they called it. Though he was not generally regarded in that light, Man was his esteemed friend, nay, he might almost say, near relative—'cousin german,' he believed it was, or even a relationship less removed. To be sure, there had arisen a sort of coldness at one time, grown, as it often does, of the division of some landed property ; but setting aside that, there always appeared to him to be a hitch somewhere in any theory of the 'descent of Man,' when he found his own family tree left out in the cold, as it were, in tracing his

(man's) pedigree; especially when there was such a strong family likeness, or, as the Chairman would call it, 'persistency of heredity;' the same insatiable appetite for outrage and destruction;⁽¹⁾ the same love of slaughter, of riotous killing and ravening for killing's and ravening's sakes; the same soft and gentle manners, that oft conceal the most implacable hatred or 'splendid villany': with these mutual and conspicuous emblems of 'nobility,' he felt instinctively the tie of *blue* blood, and his heart warm by intuition towards a nature so lovely and so congenial to his own. Well, that was one reason. Another was, that he had strolled there without *any* purpose whatever in view; but he soon found it took a strong effort to master his impatience as he listened to the absurd doctrines—he had almost said, idiotic or maniacal ravings—promulgated at that Congress. Some of these doctrines, he confessed, might sound plausible enough to certain organisms he saw before him; but probably their education had been neglected, or they might not have studied political economy, or the laws of population, or they would not quarrel with their fates as they now do. He would just take the trouble to ask all malcontents to the present delightful and (from the carnivore's aspect) equitable condition,—what would be the consequences of 'unlimited reproduction?' Let them answer that question, or, as he had spoken of education, go to school until they could; for it admitted of but one. They would die miserably by that most agonising of all exterminating processes—famine—which they must perceive was now becoming as prevalent as were plagues in the Middle Ages: proving conclusively either that the sun is beginning to feel some degree of exhaustion, in the increasing pull upon it for 'energy,' to grow grass or food enough for the out of all proportionate degree number of the graminivorous races this earth has now to support; or, the need of more carnivora, to keep down population within the limits of the sun's ability to feed them, which was, in fact, the cause of their (carnivora) invention in the first instance. The wrongness of which they complain was their own wrongness. He had spoken

of school, as an experiment, or rather, as a machine through which some of them might be passed with advantage to themselves and the world. Let them try it. School themselves into *habits of abstemiousness*, and they would soon find a remedy for all the wrongness complained of; for the present condition, as it is a consequence of a former, must be the fittest. It would modify and adjust itself, not to what were, but what ought to be their requirements, exactly in the ratio of their conquest over self, which was the duty, and ought to be the object, of everyone in that Congress. He treated with disdain any idea or attempt at 'reform,' with the view of building any improvement upon the present orthodox and nearly perfect system. Originally introduced as an 'experiment,' or as a field for the recreation of atoms and molecules in their gregarious or nebular movements and habits, this globe had at length caught the general predisposition to 'epidemic influence,' and gradually developed into something little short of a 'trades union,' and all outside that union, as a matter of course, felt themselves wronged or aggrieved. But he begged to inform them that *he* was a member of that union. He should therefore move, that the present *status quo* be maintained in all its integrity; and he should firmly and unhesitatingly place his paw upon any pragmatic attempts at manipulation, alteration, or change."

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII.

NOTE 1.—If there is one thing in Mr. Darwin's theory which more than another is calculated to shock the sensibilities of the amateur student of that theory, it is the cool, deliberate, matter-of-fact manner he sometimes disposes of some difficulty, or explains certain phenomena, upon the assumption of the wholesale commission of crimes the most revolting to civilized or modern society. And yet, sad to say, the explanations in these cases are the only ones admissible: hence, true ones. And the fatal havoc they make

with the reputation of the ‘lord of creation’ receives a tremendous impetus from newspaper accounts, not only of “crimes and misdemeanours,” and of “bags” that are made of grouse, partridges, pheasants, deer, elephants, hippopotami, gorilla, and, shall we add, occasionally “higher game,” in ignorance, forgetfulness, or in disdain of the system of “constant compensation” pervading the universe, but also in the singular views held by the Press as to *what constitutes cruelty*; and this is what *it* says:—“
 “It is curious to observe how widely apart are the notions of different people as to *what* constitutes cruelty. Mary the cook-maid, while in the act of skinning a live eel, scolds John the footman for his ‘brutality’ in pulling the cat’s tail; and it is not her plebeian lack of culture which makes her so illogical and inconsistent, for Lady Mary, who weeps in sympathy when her pet dog is accidentally trodden upon, feels no qualms of conscience when going across country after a fox, or watching tame pigeons shot down, one by one, as they are released from a box. The word ‘sport’ seems to have a magic influence which sanctifies conduct which would otherwise be universally condemned as barbarous and inhuman, and which cannot be defended upon any known principle of justice or morality. Self-preservation—that ‘first law of nature,’ *may fairly be pleaded in defence of our wholesale slaughter of animals for food*, and for the never-ceasing war of extermination which we carry on against ‘noxious vermin’ of all kinds; but it can be no excuse for the prolonged torture inflicted upon some of these, which, in plain language, is but the gratification of one of the lowest and most brutal elements in our nature.”—*Graphic*.

Without pausing here to inquire what is the result of this experiment—for, “the lowest and most brutal elements in our nature,” under that condition known as *being gratified*, will be productive of *some* ‘result’—or to ask, is this condition a normal or abnormal one—the author laments in having it to say, that he has experienced more difficulty in “educating” a single cultured or religious individual of either sex—such probably is the force of educational habit—into seeing the fallacy of this *Graphic’s* theory, I will call it, than in any number of totally uneducated slaughterers engaged in killing and skinning cattle from morn until midnight *every day of the week*. “We know it’s wrong,” say the slaughterers, “cruel, and makes you unhuman; but we’ve got no other way to live, and—there’s money in it.” “Despatch them by giving them

as little pain as possible,” says the cultured or religious man, for whom happy hunting grounds are somehow reserved for the future, “and there’s an end of them,” oblivious to the truth that, as says the author of the “*Vestiges* :” “There is really no *great* and *small* in nature. Such only appears when we thrust *ourselves* in as a point from which to start in judging.” It seems also probable that though there may be an *end* of them at death, the *effects* of their agonies outlive them.

CHAPTER VIII.

ANOTHER THEORY.

THE consternation attendant upon the advent of the last speaker, but more especially the emphasis with which he signified adherence to the (to him) blissful, but rather chaotic state (to others) of animal life, was a trifle overpowering; it almost "took the wind out of Congress," so to speak. All self-control, however, was not lost among some of the members; but it was some time before they got over their agitation, and smoothed down their feathers. When the Chairman—who had no feathers to smooth, and whose ears, it was noticed by the critical, were not quite so erect and perky as he had before worn them—asked if any one felt disposed to second the resolution, or "amendment," a rather dull and stupid-looking party, calling himself (Mr.) Bovis—for he carried no card with him, and who seemed to have fixed his eyes on vacancy as if his subject lay there as well—said he "should like to offer a few remarks." "There was not a doubt," he said, "that selfishness existed in the 'animal republic,' he would call it, to a very great extent, even as unfortunately it did in many other republics of which he had heard, and it was equally certain it was the cause of *all, or nearly all the evil and misery that existed*, for if it was only possible once in any case to get hold of the clew, we may feel assured to that labyrinthine recess it would inevitably lead us. It was, however, as it seemed to him, a better way of putting it to call it a 'misdirection of energy,' from which the world suffered. There were, he believed, in almost every organism evidences of this, although the quantity differed greatly; being found the least in the lowest order of life forms, gradually increasing in proportion to the ratio of exaltation, until it is found greatest in the

highest, which is diametrically opposed to all expectation from reason and analogy! Now, he must say he thought the Chairman had accurately described the situation when he said that in no respect did the highest forms of life differ from the lowest, except in degree. It had also been said, though he could not just at the moment give the name of its author, that 'there is no reason why we should not regard the *human* body as merely an exceedingly complicated machine which is wound up by putting food into the mouth.'⁽¹⁾ Now, as one who had assisted in this process of winding, or contributed probably as much material as any one for mending or rebuilding the machine or organism here named, he would ask, might not the 'key' of which their little (dog) friend had spoken be used with immense advantage here? If applied to the keyhole of this 'machine,' is it not exceedingly probable that it would unlock some of the (otherwise) inscrutable secrets, or solve some of the difficult problems, or what have always hitherto been thought such, in connection with this wonderfully endowed organism? For instance, may not that which it has become the habit to regard as an 'evil,' be only a consequence of inadequate or too liberal a system of winding: faulty or diseased 'cellular tissue,' a direct result from cannibalism, from devouring distantly connected relatives; deranged mental or mis-directed muscular energy, a product or growth from cogs or spindles metaphorically lubricated with brothers' and sisters' blood? 'The organism being perpetually disintegrated by slow degrees; as its de-energised constituents are cast off and excreted, requires to be supplied with fresh integrable energy-yielding matter.'⁽²⁾ But he (the speaker) could not somehow be brought to see the justice in bringing that supply through a source which required murder, slaughter, and the disintegration of other bleeding life-forms: and upon the theory of our little laboratory 'pupil teacher,' there is little, he might say, *no* doubt, the 'correlatives' of such murder, slaughter, and concomitants of that species of 'energy-yielding' matter, will be found in the shape of almost *every variety of evil* under which the wheels of the 'machine'

now groan; pang answering to pang, throe to throe, anguish to anguish, mental and physical, through every form of sanguiferous life. 'The lifting of the life,' says the foremost man of all this (scientific) world, ⁽³⁾ 'is the principal thing, and so long as *dogmatism, fanaticism, and intolerance* are kept out, various modes of leverage may be employed to raise life to a higher level.' He hoped he should not be thought dogmatic if he asserted that murder—destroying life can never be one of them. On the contrary, if 'vice and virtue' are material substances like 'vinegar or treacle'—a decision now generally arrived at in certain circles as a correct 'definition' of those phenomena—it is scarcely possible by any known experiment to extract the 'secretion' known as 'purity,' or 'loveliness of life,' out of tissue assimilated from blood or life of relatives—albeit somewhat far removed—or a higher, more fluent, or sublimed a phase than that it is now the fashion to live, from injustice, suffering, and murder—even though '730 doctors, headed by the *Lancet*' ⁽⁴⁾ think it a part of their duty to tell the world, 'there is no medical evidence of murder' in the cases of all the distant relatives too multitudinous to enumerate. Thus then, as an answer to the question, said by our gentle friend who moved the second resolution to be continually in the mouth of man: 'What else are they (domestic animals) for but to be eaten?' He would answer, Do you see that individual? Well, he is a doctor! and he and his drugs, his blister and blue-pill, his saw and his scalpel, his trochar and his trephine, are the 'correlatives' of—lives taken; blood spilled; agonies endured; and all this to gratify an appetite vitiated and depraved by long indulgence, but still capable in an 'age of progress' of being weaned from its detestable cannibalism, and carnivorous, mediæval, or semi-savage propensities. He should support the resolution from a belief that herein (viz., the subject of food and assimilation) lies the pith of the matter; for while on the one hand you are actively engaged devouring others, it is often the last wish of your heart that somebody would perform the same kind

office for you on the other, where, they would perceive, *the resolution left them no choice in the matter*; and since by the laws of assimilation—having regard also to the automatic aspect of the human machine—every particle of energy-yielding matter, whether beef, pork, mutton, flesh, fish, fowl, used in the process of winding, must—since it enters into the structure—affect to a very great extent the moral⁽⁵⁾—supposing there is such—as well as the physical part of the machine, it is perhaps not overstating the position to assert that wherever the sanguiferous element preponderates, or even is used as a handle in the smallest degree (say one mouthful of steak, chop, fish or fowl) it will *reappear in its correlative* in the form of ‘work performed’ by the machine⁽⁶⁾ often under the conditions presupposed, such that it will not often bear close inspection—not infrequently will not even endure the light of day. It is but to say, in other words, that as ‘Nature is the greatest of economists and never works imperfectly,’ the *torture and anguish*, mental⁽⁷⁾ and physical, dissipated in the transformation of these substances out of life forms, and conversion into integrable energy-yielding matter, are neither *lost nor annihilated*, but will reappear in their correlatives, the causes and purposes which have called into existence and frequently into active operation the offices of the doctor,⁽⁸⁾ the lawyer, the judge, the parson, and confessor, and hangman, and other salutary, often necessary, always expensive luxuries (or remedies,) for which he believed there would always be a ‘steady demand,’ until, as it has been suggested, man ‘acts justly,’ loves and shows mercy, and, as his first step on the road to these attainments, returns to his primæval vegetable and farinaceous diet, the which it might have saved a universe of groans and oceans of tears never to have forsaken.”⁽⁹⁾

NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII.

NOTE 1.—We think we can help Mr. Bovis. It was Professor Clifford in the *Fortnightly*.

NOTE 2.—Herbert Spencer’s “Principles of Psychology, page 16.

NOTE 3.—Professor Tyndall's "Belfast Address."

NOTE 4.—The medical publication of that name, probably so called because of its incisiveness.—(See Penge Murder Case.) From what has been, or is still to be said in these pages, it may be thought we are prejudiced against the medical profession. Nothing of the kind. We only know that the "medical man," like the missionary or philanthropist, the burglar or baby farmer, Colorado beetle, girl of the period, phylloxera, lawyer, prostitute, or Mr. Parnell, is "a product of the age," or speaking with greater accuracy, is the joint product of *this* and a *former* age, and for which both are somehow responsible. So far from prejudice, we know there are in the profession as honourable, high-minded, estimable gentlemen as there are—out of it at all events! and we might say, as in any class that exists, and he was from that class who communicated to us his firm conviction that "they who die from eating outnumber them who die from drinking." But then we also meet with a multitude in the profession who insist on the necessity of animal food *sometimes*, as diet, at others as a medicine, when it is often given in exceedingly large doses (a case is on record where a male patient cost the hospital in which he died over £80 in six months for animal food upon which he almost exclusively lived, and upon which, it may be said, *he died*) not in obedience to law or ethics, but appetite, consequently the emotion of a brute. But though unprejudiced, we take the opportunity of protesting against the display of weight, or force of medical opinion incidentally alluded to in the text; (because it was there employed to illustrate a principle thence it was appropriate), as it was in direct opposition to the clear and dispassionate "summing-up" and lucid explanation of what is the law of the land by a legal dignitary—as distinguished from the law of the land by medical evidence—whose very office has become proverbial for exceptional impartiality: a display the more unseemly when it is remembered that though we cannot detect any chemical affinity, or rather 'repulsion,' between the medical profession and the legal, it is rather unfortunate for the credit of that profession, whatever it may be for its evidence, that from among its members, data or statistics have been furnished showing a per centage of cases wherein it and the last grim officiating dignitary of the law have stood in a tragically intimate relationship, and higher than its education might anticipate; though that does not in the least invalidate the claim of medical evidence to due consideration.

We don't want to be hanged, neither do we wish to see justice defrauded and its ends defeated; but either of these hap-hazard disasters is liable to occur, if the judge is to be subordinated by a battalion of medical men.

NOTE 5.—The question has been raised: Upon what principle is it that we so frequently see virtuous and exemplary heads of families blessed with children, or at least with one boy, the torment of schoolmasters, and a nuisance to the town or village where they are? “Five hundred pounds per annum was once offered to the director of a school in Germany to take charge of an English boy, but he refused.”—(“German Letters on Education,” by Dr. L. Weise. London: W. Collins, Son and Co.) Now, if this boy's parents were not incorrigible—and there is no evidence of that condition—might not his diet, or more especially that of his mother at a certain period of his history have something to do with the development of this young fiend? And this, as it seems to us, is the theory Mr. Bovis is trying to establish. Now this is Mr. Alexander Pope's view:—

“Now hear what blessings temperance can bring.

(Thus said our friend, and what he said I sing).

First health: the stomach (cramm'd from every dish,

A tomb of boil'd and roast and flesh and fish,

Where bile, and wind and phlegm, and acid jar,

And all the man is one intestine war)

Remembers oft the schoolboy's simple fare,

The temp'rate sleeps and spirits light as air.”—Pope's Satires.

NOTE 6.—Mr. Darwin in his “Descent of Man,” says:—
“Sympathy beyond the confines of man, that is, humanity to the lower animals, seems to be one of the *latest* moral acquisitions. It is apparently unfelt by savages, except towards their pets. How little the old Romans knew of it is shown by their abhorrent gladiatorial exhibitions. The very idea of humanity, as far as I could observe, was new to most of the Gauchos of the Pampas. This virtue, *one of the noblest with which man is endowed*, seems to have arisen *accidentally* from our sympathies becoming more tender and more widely diffused until they are extended to all sentient beings. As soon as this virtue is honoured and practised by *some few men*, *it spreads through instruction and example to the young*, and eventually becomes incorporated in public opinion.”—(“Descent of Man,” chapter 4, page 123.)

This may be very true: though we yet confess to some ignorance as to the manner in which our sympathies “accidentally” become more tender. Now between the announcement of Professor Clifford and the theory Mr. Bovis has constructed therefrom, we may see something congruous, tangible, we might say logical, in referring *humanity* (to the lower animals), or its *opposite* to winding or food. Why does a bread and milk diet, or barley cake, etc., induce such honourable and gentlemanly conduct in the domestic dog, while that of himself in a wild state, or that of his cousins the wolf and jackal, while purveyors of carrion, is so reprehensible and offensive, if there is not something in the theory of Mr. Bovis, or if you will, give Professor Clifford the credit of it?

NOTE 7.—An apostle has said, “Fear hath torment.” Probably no one of an observant nature can see animals going to be slaughtered, and not be struck with the evidences of horror depicted in their countenances up to the fatal moment: and the question here raised is: Does this affect the “cellular” or fibro-nervous tissue? If so, in what way? And may not it (cellular tissue, or ‘integrable energy yielding matter,’ or in plain English, beef, pork, veal, or mutton)—when thus acted upon by the fear of which this horror is the token and measure, act prejudicially when—as Shakespeare puts it—“performing a process through the guts of a beggar,” or, “assimilated”—as we put it.

NOTE 8.—In the *Fortnightly Review* in an article headed “Chapters on Socialism,” by J. S. Mill; there is incidentally among pages of extracts from “*Destinée Sociale par V. Considerant*” the following:—“Here then, again, is one of the innumerable vicious circles of civilization. . . for there are a thousand facts which prove cumulatively that in our existing social system the introduction of any good brings always along with it some evil. In short, if we go lower down and come to vulgar details, we find that it is the interest of the tailor, the shoemaker, and the hatter, that coats, shoes and hats should be soon worn out; that the glazier profits by the hailstones which break windows; that the mason and the architect profit by fires; the lawyer is enriched by lawsuits; the doctor by diseases; the wineseller by drunkards; the prostitute by debauchery. And what a *disaster* would it be for the judges, the police, and the gaolers, as well as the barristers and the solicitors, and all the lawyers’ clerks, *if crimes, offences, and lawsuits were to come to an end.*”

This lamentable fact is indisputable—under the present “existing social system!”—and at first glance does seem to many perplexing. Doubtless, the consequences of a widespread epidemic of honesty or integrity in a race might be a “disaster” to some of its members, who escaped its ravages, and the condition of those whose daily bread supply would be suddenly cut off by any solar or atmospheric disturbance which swept “crimes, offences, and lawsuits” from off the face of the earth, would be truly deplorable to them; for it would be the precursor of their extinction; an indication that a condition had arrived when they—like the long since discarded human “tail”—had become “functionally useless.” Now, though we have already touched lightly upon “vulgar details” on this domain—(See Note 13, Chapter 2)—suppose we here put the question. Why in our existing social system the introduction of any good brings always along with it some evil: what would be the answer? Is it not that our views and ideas of this same social system which has fostered “innumerable vicious circles of civilization” are probably *altogether erroneous*, certainly far too contracted? Take the following as an illustration. If one robs, or in any way directly injures—in mind, body, or estate—a fellow creature of one’s own type, society, justly—as it is thought—punishes the offender wherever practicable; but if, on the other hand, one robs a fellow creature of another, because lower type—the calf, say, though almost any other animal will serve as well—that animal, like the villein, neife, or daughter, of feudal times, or say the “nigger” of but *yesterday*, but—by no means of *to-day*! which is significant—if not terribly confirmatory of our theory—has “no remedy or action at law,” as Blackstone puts it in relation to those bygone individuals; nor does society make any sign. But, notwithstanding this exclusion from the pale of all human sympathies, this ignoring of any right of action or otherwise of the calf by the human race,—something! whether coming under the designation of nemesis or nature, God or ‘force,’ drops down, or steps into the vicious circle, and in this and every other instance extorts from robber or injurer of calf or other animal (which sounds very like a synonym for existing human society universally) ‘the very last (metaphorical) farthing;’ of which it is even more than probable the doctor or police, judge or prostitute, barrister or wineseller, lawyer, gaoler, and an endless variety of others are the ever active, efficient, and inexorable collectors.

NOTE 9.—“Professor Möbius proved that a pike requires three months to establish an association of ideas between particular kinds of prey and the fact of their being protected by an invisible wall. This fact was proved by the pike repeatedly dashing its nose against a glass partition in its tank, in fruitless efforts to catch minnows, which were confined on the other side of the partition. At the end of three months, however, the requisite association was established, and the pike, having learned that its efforts were of no use, ceased to continue them. The sheet of glass was then removed, but the now firmly established association of ideas never seems to have become disestablished, for the pike never afterwards attacked the minnows, though it fed voraciously on all other kinds of fish : from which we see that a pike is very slow in forming his ideas, and no less slow in again unforming them—thus resembling many respectable members of a higher community, who spend one half of their lives in assimilating the obsolete ideas of their forefathers, and through the other half of their lives *stick to these ideas as to the only possible truths*. They can never learn when the hand of science has removed a glass partition.”—(Lecture on “Animal Intelligence,” delivered before the Royal Association, at Dublin, August, 1878 ; by G. J. Romanes.)

Now, though no one more than I can admire the beauty or triteness of the figure employed, I should still further have admired the skill of the lecturer—supposing its employment here had not been an incongruity or *mesalliance*—if, seeing this subject from my point of view, he had also detected its capacity for very considerable prolongation. Thus, “the pike,” he might have said, in more senses than the one he is here chosen to illustrate, “resembles many respectable members of a higher community,” for they also “feed voraciously,” not only on almost “all kinds of fish,” but on flesh, fowl, farinaceous diet (and, metaphorically speaking, upon each other), when not separated by “an invisible wall.” Disease, however, is very often that invisible wall, against which they—again like the pike—keep dashing their noses in frantic or spasmodic efforts to gratify sensual appetites. In one respect it may be said they differ from the pike ; for not after three months, nor yet three years, but after almost a lifetime, or so long as there is vitality enough for the act, *very* respectable members of the highest community will persist in dashing their noses against glass partitions, if that expression may be used to indicate a positive

refusal to learn when they may or may not gobble up all the “good things in this life ;” an invisible wall, as we have shewn, in their case, as in that of their congener the pike, being often placed as a stern prohibition.

CHAPTER IX.

A SEARCH FOR PRECEDENTS.

As this was the final resolution, before putting it to the meeting the Chairman asked if any other "honourable member" of that Congress wished to make any observation: when the Elephant got up and without further preamble said:—

"He had listened with some satisfaction to the speeches that had been made at that Congress, especially the last, which, from a herbivorous point of view, he thought was well worthy of something more than a casual notice. But the most remarkable phase of the subject, to his mind, was when viewed from the 'assimilation' theory aspect, he might call it. It was a matter of surprise to him to find that so large a variety of facts had been 'eliminated,' so to speak, from thistles, and compact logical deductions sublimed, or precipitated, or evolved from a compound vegetable or mucilaginous aliment.⁽¹⁾ He trusted this surprise would find an echo in other quarters, and add weight to and facilitate the promulgation of doctrines, the which, when they become known, the whole family of sentient races upon earth will hereafter regard as benefactions to life forms.

"It had been stated that wherever truth was required to clear up some mystery, or unravel some apparent paradox where the human animal was involved, the most approved plan was to put that individual into the witness box, and after allowing him to tell his version of a story, cross-examine him. Now he thought, that if he made some extracts from a work upon human 'travels,'⁽²⁾ wherein certain phases of slaughter are made to exhibit points of resemblance to 'murder,' the murderer himself being both witness and judge, that would be equivalent to the process to which he

had alluded. In a description of something vastly like the 'massacre of the innocents,' the author and murderer says:—

'The terrified animals (elephants) finding themselves surrounded on all sides, crowded together right in front of us, screaming and trumpeting in a pitiful manner, with their trunks elevated straight in the air. Our breech-loading rifles enabled us to fire very rapidly, and in a few minutes the big male and two others were on the ground. The herd, now terrified to the verge of madness, made a sudden rush and broke away; but as they passed the Rajah cruelly fired at the little calf and brought it down. I shall never forget the scene that followed. The dam rushed about frantically, making the ground tremble with her great weight, and in her wild excitement tearing down great branches from the trees. Her screaming was dreadful, and the caresses she bestowed upon the dying calf (for it was not killed outright) heartrending. Suddenly she seemed to remember from whence the fatal shot had proceeded, and made a desperate charge towards us. It was well for the Rajah and myself that the firing of Mr. Grant and Captain Lacy diverted her attention. One bullet struck her tusk and broke it off about six inches from the root. *I was almost as much horrified as if I had witnessed the murder of a human being,*⁽³⁾ and had not our lives been in actual danger I would not have lifted my rifle against her. Three or four more shots brought her to the earth; but even in her death agony she stretched her trunk towards the body of her now dead calf.'

"Next in utility to the witness-box style of evidence is that of its counterpart, where sometimes by 'Our own Correspondent,' at others in our 'London Letter,' a general view of the state of human affairs within some given area is spread out as in a map or panorama, and wherever this is the case the observant herbivore who has studied those doctrines so simply but tritely explained by their little (dog) friend, will find himself greatly assisted in the manner and application of the 'key' before mentioned, by reference to these human diagrams, toward the solution of what would otherwise without them be often a serious social, moral, or

political puzzle. Let us take the following from one of the 'magazine family':—

'As a preface to my observations I may briefly mention that the horrible massacre of the Uxbridge family has filled our hearts with grief, and sensible, thoughtful men are asking each other if there is murder in the air, so numerous and so terrible are these slaughter stories of late.'⁽⁴⁾

"Here it will be observed 'our own correspondent' by the report of questionings as to the existence of 'murder in the air,' though he may have taken his cue from Macbeth, is very near tripping over the discovery, he would call it, of their laboratory friend. To return to our 'London Letter.' 'I have seen the great cattle market at Islington at early morn when it was crowded with broad-backed oxen and lowing calves, bleating sheep and playful lambs,⁽⁵⁾ all unconscious⁽⁶⁾ of their quickly coming fate; suggestive to some of the beautiful pastures of rural Britain, while to others more prosaic they present the idea of mountains of beef, piles of veal and mutton, sirloins and saddles, succulent and smoking.' And to others less 'prosaic' but more imaginative—though perhaps no one was ever heard to exclaim, 'by what horrible conjunction or chain of circumstances has such wholesale butchery as this become—not necessary but so customary as to be thought so?'—they present according to the theory of our little friend, in their yet undeveloped correlatives—whatever horrible or fantastic forms these may assume, or however long may be the delay in their re-appearance—forms of forces as fixed and certain in their operation as those which uphold this sphere in its orbit,⁽⁷⁾ and differing from those forces in nothing but volume or degree.

"Let us proceed a little further with our 'London Letter.' 'To-day we have a new sensation on an old subject, and the news of the Fenian raid in Canada, and the capture of General O'Neil, satisfies us that the rebels are a set of stupid idiots, badly led or worse advised.' Here a question arises, what 'force' has made or converted out of a mere set of stupid idiots, 'rebels?' Or we may go a step further and inquire,

Of what is 'Fenianism' the correlative? Our laboratory friend will tell us that it is impossible to extract this force, or essence, or spirit, or secretion out of—nothing! It is not itself a 'first principle,' not an elementary substance, but probably a compound of many ingredients, and may be thought difficult of analysis. Philosophers, statesmen, journalists, and others have ere this each tried their hands at manipulation, and often been censured for issuing, as it was thought at the time, a false analysis. Here is one, whether false or true he did not pretend to determine, he only knew it was from no mean demonstrator.⁽⁸⁾ 'The Fenian plot is the joint product of chronic disaffection in Ireland, and the American war. . . . The political discontent in Ireland rises from *complicated causes* which the enemies of the ruling power arbitrarily describe as wilful misgovernment. There have been many mistakes even in modern times, but for *forty years* there has been no political oppression.⁽⁹⁾ The Fenian conspiracy is not the gradual growth of discontent, but the recognition of an opportunity. The plot furnishes no reason for refusing to consider any legitimate demand for the removal of grievances; but it will not be affected by remedial legislation, or by any agency except the judicious use of superior force.'

"This can scarcely be called an analysis: it is more like the prescription for a remedy—that remedy, 'superior force.' Or take another which, while it does not profess to be an analysis of the institution of Fenianism, or to trace cause and effect, professes to expound its mission: "I am convinced that these painful and horrible manifestations of Fenianism may, in the manifest designs of Providence, have been *intended* to arouse the British nation to a greater search of its own heart and spirit and conscience with reference to the condition of Ireland."⁽¹⁰⁾ Probably the following will be more like the genuine 'key' of our little friend (*canis minor*) which, if it will not unlock *all* 'Irish difficulties,' may greatly aid the subsequent accomplishment of that feat, by partially exposing to view the wards, or 'complications,' or combinations constituting some of the

forces generally believed to be hermetically sealed up in that 'inexplicable puzzle.' During the suppression of the rebellion in '98 (more than forty years ago) the then Viceroy says he 'put an end to free quarters, which comprehended *universal rape and robbery throughout the kingdom.*'^[11] Or this: "It was boasted by officers of rank that within certain large districts *no home had been left undefiled.*"^[12] We do meet with organisms expressing surprise at the *unreason* developed in the experiment of Fenianism, probably because they are unable to trace the line of life backward for a longer period than 'forty years,' or a lifetime. There may also be others so stolid as to be incapable of receiving any impression from what is contained in those two short but wonderfully suggestive paragraphs he had quoted, whose correlatives, or rather the correlatives of the deeds they darkly portray, *must reappear*, according to the theory of our little friend, *at some time, somewhere, and in some form*, and it is probably premature, if not impossible, to say in what form; but there is nothing unscientific, nor opposed to the doctrine of Conservation of Energy^[13] in the belief that Fenianism may be *one form*, or correlative. Returning to 'our London Letter.' 'Flowers and leaves and bright sunshine and the sweet carolling of birds, fresh and balmy air and happy faces! If these don't make a Paradise, what can? And we have them in perfection and abundance now.' He would pass over a period of rather less than *ten* short years and we find our same correspondent on December, 1878, from London, confessing that 'the times seem to be completely out of joint. Here we are within two or three weeks of the festive season, yet everybody appears dull and despondent. *We are all going to the dogs, is the universal cry.* Perhaps the gloomy character of the weather may have something to do with this most uncomfortable and dispiriting impression.^[14] A few moments of sunshine are becoming exceeding rare. . . . Professor Stanley Jevons has been endeavouring to prove the existence of some kind of connexion between sun spots—one of the alleged causes of atmospheric phenomena—and periods of commercial depression

and although his labours have exposed him to a considerable amount of ridicule, there are not wanting numerous believers in his ingenious hypothesis.' ^[15] It may be said, that it is equally likely that, a considerable amount of ridicule will—*though only for a time*—result to the propounder of the doctrine of correlation of physical force as applicable to the nature of man ; but ridicule is about the last thing to affect this force, or change or postpone its operation, or the accomplishment of the work given it to perform.

“He would now briefly touch upon the subject of food. What, it had been asked, ought to be human food? Which, as the last speaker observed, was the “pith of the matter.” He must again have recourse to what he had styled the “witness box” class of evidence. Now let them “look upon this picture.” In an account of “Morocco and the Moors,” speaking of a people who owed a nominal allegiance to the Sultan, it is said :—“their powers of endurance are described as wonderful ; on one occasion, Mr. Drake was accompanied by two of them on foot during a hard ride of forty miles over a rough mountain track which took ten hours to accomplish. *They ate nothing but a few oranges and a bit of bread, and at the end of their journey were perfectly fresh.*” ⁽¹⁶⁾ “And upon this:”—An undertaking in which a great nation took much interest—he would not say failed, because he for one thought it a great success—but did not give to the unreasonable and unthinking—unfortunately figuring as a large per centage of the human race, often composed in a great measure of those who bless the God who makes them so comfortable by their firesides, and this is in a great measure the extent of their experience—the satisfaction that—a portion of the North Pole!—brought away like an obelisk in the hold of one of the vessels might be expected to produce. “Uneatable minced collops,” like some of the many “slight checks” which in their accumulation ultimately extinguish races or peoples, may have operated as a check upon this expedition ; but could those hardy and adventurous explorers have been supplied with *ever so little* of the same diet which supported the Moors in the other picture ^[17]—

even with that ever to be lamented minced collop catastrophe, and beef, pork, mutton, fat, blubber, carbon, “heat-supporters,” or “flesh-formers” in any or no quantity, for he believed the effect would be much the same—who can foresee what might not have been the result of that expedition? But some fractional part of the spindle upon which it may be the earth rotates, starting up out of the “Thames Embankment,” and adding its quatum to the chapter of general incongruities of which that spot seems destined to become the focus of the future, is one of the least “advantages” that species of outfit would have insured.

“He would not, in conclusion, attempt any recapitulation of the subjects ventilated in the Congress. That duty he should leave to the Chairman, who he felt assured was much better qualified for the task than himself. But before he “sat down” he wished to give the “highest organism,” if represented here, a parting warning as well as a word of advice upon a subject which *he* thought to be a vital one. He would place the last first. Let his race, then, cease from forming habits which supply the place of reasonings, and from the performance of actions which are their own judge and executioner. Next. Sink, if they will, for the sake of experiment that island for an hour (the favourably regarded prescription of not a few) where the atrocities to which he had alluded had occurred, or *any island*, or even continent ^[18] that had been the scene of outrages as foul, unnatural, and unhuman as these he had described—sink them to the bottomless depths of ocean—and Fenianism or Ribbonism, Socialism or Chartism, Communism, Internationalism, or some other “ism,” the correlative of the foulest stain, the most loathsome ulcer laid at humanity’s door, would—like the fabled goddess—start up into life from the Foam of the Sea!”

NOTES TO CHAPTER IX.

NOTE 1.—The following is from the *Examiner* :—

“It would scarcely be imagined that the most passionate productions of George Sand in her earlier days were the result of

milk fresh from the cow. Alfred de Musset says that during their stay together in Venice, George Sand required a quart of milk for every chapter, whilst he indulged in stronger drink, which as he grew older became stronger and stronger, till he finished with absinthe; while George Sand, according to her medical adviser, died of strong coffee."

As we have always believed the conductors of this publication possessed the analytic and synthetic knowledge to bring them abreast of the "requirements of the age"—of journalism—we hope it will not be deemed impertinent if we ask—why "it would scarcely be believed" that passionate literary productions from George Sand, or any one, should be the result of milk? Unless upon the assumption that diet, or "winding," as Professor Clifford would call it, has *everything to do in producing the actions* which regulate—or *disturb*, as the case may be—our lives, and thus give direct support to our theory.

NOTE 2.—"Travels and Sports in the Malay Peninsula," by J. Bradley. London: Samuel Tinsley.

NOTE 3.—We think we can match, if not out-Bradley, Mr. Bradley in our own experience.

During the Bengal Mutiny, the firm known as the "Borneo Company" (Limited) shipped to Calcutta a large quantity of machinery, for one purpose, among others, of manufacturing jute and other fibres into fabrics, and which the present writer is happy in having it in his power to say has been a great success. Upon some ground some six or eight miles from Calcutta, selected as the site of the new buildings it was the intention of the Company to erect, stood an old, disused sugar factory, which—since the reinvigorating process the West India colonies have undergone after the temporary collapse caused by "abolition of slavery"—had been allowed to fall into partial decay. The engineers, machinists, spinners, &c., to the number of about twenty, attached to the enterprise and imported with the machinery for the purpose of setting it going, were located for the time, and until more suitable quarters (that is, their present luxuriously arranged apartments) could be prepared, in what had been the dwelling-house of the former manager or proprietor of the works. This also, though in a very fair condition, had been long untenanted, and at some time previous to that event of which I am going to speak, a "society" of staid, orderly, well-conducted (probably, from their surroundings,

archæological) baboons—each, when standing erect, which they had a habit of doing, as tall as a man—had pitched upon this house, in lieu of the wood, about half a mile distant, where the troop were located, as a sort of rendezvous, or suitable place, in the companionship of jackals and pariah dogs, to hold their meetings. One day, a couple of these monkeys (probably the President and Secretary), in ignorance of the new occupants, and during their temporary absence, entered one of the long, rambling, spacious rooms of the many which composed the building, and which, in the cause of truth, and notwithstanding any strong ties of friendship, or even *relationship*, and the esteem in which we hold the ‘monkey family’ generally, we are compelled to admit, had been temporarily converted into a—‘store’-room!—and therefore one which from its associations has unfortunately a tendency to upset any former pleasant theories of archaic preferences over other more grovelling proclivities in the visitors, and to substitute another and more prosaic, viz., that of their being a mere band of marauders, of which this couple were the pickets, or skirmishers, or Uhlans of the camp entrenched—in the trees!—only half a mile off!

Which of these theories is the correct one will probably never be known or even investigated; but, shortly after the occurrence just related—and at that critical epoch in Indian History when in almost every “bungalow,” dining tables and dressing tables were daily and nightly covered with rifles, pistols, muskets, cutlasses, boar spears, and when even every pillow, as if unmindful often of the sex of the soft, delicate, probably lovely face reposing upon it, had a revolver or so under it, and the dwellings of former peaceful years—when no such reaction could ever have been contemplated—were converted into arsenals or fortresses, often with a couple of bloodthirsty looking, but alas—*totally unloadable* howitzers at the entrance, as it was frequently explained to my inquiring look, to “give the beggars a warm reception, you see!”—a couple of the machinists entered the invaded apartment. The archæological, or scientific, or predatory intruders—as the case may have been, for there was really no evidence, circumstantial or otherwise, to decide either way—were perceived! Here was a “splendid opportunity” for testing the effects of their Whitworth’s or Chassepots on mutinous or murdering Sepoys. Those instruments were but too fatally ready. One of the monkeys escaped; the other fell mortally wounded. The report of firearms brought manager,

superintendents, and nearly everybody else to the bloody scene, and I shall never forget the horror described to me, a short time after the event—when I was almost daily a guest or visitor, or the recipient of some kindness, hospitality or courtesy at the hand of every one in that enterprise—as being the feeling with which each individual contemplated the dying look and agony of the victim. These machinists, spinners, etc., were all men of excellent character, selected in Scotland with much care; and should this meet the eye of any of them still living, it will bear witness of my desire to do them justice; believing that at any other time than at that critical period and for that particular purpose, such an act as that I have just related, would have met with their severe reprehension. But each, and especially he who had fired the fatal shot—and who in consequence felt very much as if he was standing in the shoes of a murderer—declared “*it was just like shooting a human being!*” The only consolatory or redeeming feature in the case, if by any stretch of fancy it can be called such, was founded upon the hypothesis that “burglary”—and not science was the object of the visitors, when “justifiable monkeycide” would be a legitimate verdict, even though according to the requirements of a late Chief Justice, the burglars in this case “had *not* all the instruments of their avocation visible upon them.”

NOTE 4.—Not a doubt of it, and this, viz.—that murder may often be epidemic, we have in the outset stated as our impression.—See Chapter I.

NOTE 5.—Many years ago, a nautical friend engaged at that time in the China trade, in whose disposition the metaphorical “skim-milk” of human kindness predominated, and of such a consistency that it might have been no infringement of the “Adulteration of Foods’ Act” to call it “cream,” related to me the following incident:—Going out to China at the season of the year when that route is taken technically known as the “Eastern Passage,” when in Dampier’s Straits, formed by New Guinea on the one hand, and the island Wagiau, as I believe, on the other, some canoes came off to his vessel—a not unusual occurrence—with certain articles, chiefly fruit or other edibles, which the canoe men are willing—often, as in this case—desirous to barter for European commodities in almost every form and manner. In fact, the extreme “liberalism,” of opinion, as I shall show, of these “benighted heathen” with regard to the “unfettered” condition of trade whatever form

its development might assume, would make the most enthusiastic free trader “wear them to his heart,” if it were possible “with strings of steel.”

Included among my friend’s passengers, was a young clergyman of the Establishment going out as a missionary, either to the Chinese or more favoured races, accompanied by the regulation wife and child, without which no enterprise of this nature seems complete, and also by a Chinese female servant, rendered in some measure necessary, I imagine, by the extreme youth of the child. With no more experience of human nature, or of the outer world, as I believe, than that which had been learned from books, probably of a missionary or religious flavour, this young enthusiast was imbued with implicit faith in the doctrine that in the ‘human form’ he beheld the image and indelible stamp of the Supreme, its maker; and this image pervaded all races. To be sure, it had got a trifle tarnished in some instances; the stamp a little defaced in others; oxides had accumulated generally; but a little rubbing up or burnishing with such chamois skin as leaves out of the Bible afforded would bring out the original impression in its full lustre and effulgence. This doctrine my nautical friend—in that quiet, amiable, unpretentious manner with which I have prepared the reader to expect—combated, but without dogmatism as stoutly as if he had been a student of Mr. Darwin’s all his life, though the celebrated works which have made that name a household word were then still in an embryo stage.

Trade in the unfettered condition I have described it to have existed among Papuans or Wagiouians was rather brisk, and in a short time, to such an extent had it flourished, that the only article which had not “changed hands” was a large turtle—which by some unaccountable perversity of judgment or taste is seldom, if ever, viewed by a marine population through that focus or halo of gastronomic glory which it presents to the Aldermanic or Guildhall banqueter mind.

As a matter of course, as well as of fact, every “transaction” in this instance was effected by signs. The canoe men in all likelihood understood each other by some monkey-like chatter, but it would be perfectly unintelligible to an European, and probably not half so eloquent as the gesticular “vernacular” hitherto adopted with so much mutual advantage and success. While this unfortunate turtle wasthus “hanging heavy on holder’s hands”—commercially speaking

—upon his back in the bottom of the boat, no one seemingly inclined to go up to the exorbitant figure—of pea coat, guernsey frock, flannel, red or blue, dungaree, knives, nails, hoop-iron, tobacco,—and shall we add rum, gunpowder, or musket? or whatever the “currency” which the force of circumstances demanded; or had for the time converted into “legal tender”—an event occurred which not only complicated “commercial relations” with these islanders, but completely changed the social (human) aspect of the “operation.” Our missionary looked over the ship’s side with his child in his arms—as it was supposed either to give it the advantage of seeing a sample of its future, that is, supposing it to tread in its parent’s footsteps, a piece of wisdom parents seem never tired of instilling into the minds of their offspring, or what is equally probable, to divert it with the novelty these black images of its maker presented—when lo! an “advance” in the “turtle market.” Or, perhaps, I should have said, the views of “holders” underwent a change. That mercenary job of flesh inside the nether millstone like compound—the turtle merchant—relaxed, softened, was desirous to trade, and he forthwith signified in language unmistakable to my nautical friend, though not so quickly spelled by our missionary, that—though it was simply the most ruinous speculation in which he had ever embarked—he would let the turtle go, or, he might say, throw it away; in fact, “swop it” for that white, delicate-looking, sucking child! He (the missionary) on this being interpreted to him, went immediately with his child to his room; was silent, dejected, and thoughtful for many days; and, as I was assured—all subsequent faith in the untutored—if “noble savage,” was from that time forward on that passage, and, probably, ever after—“scattered to the winds!”

Now, though my only object in relating this little incident—however thrilling it may have appeared from a dramatical aspect to other parties—is, as it affords a commentary to the “lowing calves, bleating sheep”—which it is not surprising to learn from history has before this grated upon sensitive tympani—and “playful lambs, etc.” which they who choose, or who can perceive its point, may reflect upon at leisure, it may also further illustrate our theory.

Mention has been made of the stimulus given to trade by the appearance of the young child *in* the market—as it appeared to one of the parties to this transaction, *upon the scene* of the market to the other. Now, unless they have since succeeded in mastering the

doctrine of Correlation of force, as it has been so charmingly set forth by Mr. Justice Grove, I think it improbable that these interesting, if “unschooled” cannibals here mentioned, will have been able to determine with any degree of certainty of what the avalanche!—compounded of coal (in “excess,” as being probably the most portable) hot or greasy water, holystones, brickbats, and sundry other improvised missiles, which somehow like a trigger belonging to some “infernal machine,” when suddenly pulled “negociations” in connexion with this child shot down upon them—was the correlative.

NOTE 6.—We are not so sure of that. They may be “unconscious”—what! but they certainly fear—that, some fatal tragedy is awaiting them, and in that fear, to their naturally timid dispositions, lies their agonizing thoughts.

NOTE 7.—A great master of science has told us:—“Another (theory) of still wider grasp and more radical significance, is the doctrine of the Conservation of Energy, the ultimate philosophical issues of which are as yet but dimly seen—that doctrine which binds nature fast in fate to an extent not hitherto recognized, exacting from every antecedent its equivalent consequent, from every consequent its equivalent antecedent, and bringing *vital* as well as physical phenomena under the dominion of that law of casual connexion which, as far as the human understanding has yet pierced, asserts itself everywhere in nature.”—Professor Tyn-dall’s Address at Belfast, August 19, 1874. See also “The Reign of Law,” by the Duke of Argyle.

NOTE 8.—*Saturday Review*, Jan. 1868 (Article “Fenianism.”)

NOTE 9.—The views of the present age are opposed to penance in any form, whether building a church, endowing a charity, or walking with peas in the shoes: believing any of these inefficacious to rub off the sins of an evil life. On the same principle, the *absence* of any oppression—political or otherwise—of a race, for “forty years,” can scarcely possess potency enough to undo the “mistakes”—which seems a mild form of saying the *injustice*—of centuries!

NOTE 10.—Mr. Gladstone’s speech in Parliament on the “Fenian Plots,” 1868.

NOTE 11.—“Correspondence of Lord Cornwallis,” vol. 3, pp. 74-89.

NOTE 12.—“Plowden,” p. 702. The atrocities here alluded to

may have been forgotten by the Irish people, or—and this is quite probable—*not even known* to any of the present members of the Fenian brotherhood. But that does not, as it seems, in any way affect the existence or action of those malignant forces, *then* put in motion, and it is *certain* their correlatives will appear at some time, it may be now, or it may be centuries hence.

NOTE 13.—It will, we have no doubt, have been perceived that this doctrine is the basis upon which the “Fruits of Darwinism,” as a superstructure, is erected.

NOTE 14.—“Legs and shoulders, saddles and sirloins, succulent and smoking,”—nothing? But even setting aside, for the present at least, the threatened or impending journey “to the dogs,”—wherever that may be—as *inexplicable*, it will be no easy task to escape from off the horns of the logical dilemma upon which the middle passage—since the opening of the “oversea cattle trade”—places us: and this view *to us is perfectly explicable*. A hundred or so head of cattle—or say, of our distant and “poor relations”—drowned, trampled to death, as they often are, or “happen to die,” in legal phraseology, at our instigation and to gratify a mere lust after flesh, though it may not affect our lachrymal glands in the least, is nevertheless regarded as a pecuniary misfortune from a carnivore’s aspect. But does our bereavement end here? Do we hear of this again? Is there anything ever happens after? Or is this “the last of them” that we have heard, or seen, or—*felt*? So far, however, from this being the case, from our view, we believe at the least, one Akbar or Yaoub Khan, Sheer Ali, Yeah, Quan, Ashantee, Sandilli, Cetewayo, or any of the innumerable hosts we beefeaters have been for almost centuries alternately civilizing or slaughtering, Christianising or bombarding, colonizing, annexing, or—annihilating!—in a time otherwise of peace the most profound—will barely correlate the horrors and sufferings of that middle passage, leaving the final and more emphatically murderous catastrophe still to be accounted for, or correlated somehow—carnivores may still have to learn how!

NOTE 15.—The Government astronomer at Madras is a strong advocate for the theory propounded at the beginning of the century by Sir W. Herschell that some correspondence exists between the phases of solar maculation and terrestrial phenomena, such as rainfall, &c., and the same view is taken by the Government astronomer at the Mauritius; and the fact of cyclones being

especially prevalent at the maximum period of sunspots, and especially rare at the minimum, is now fully recognised.”—*Examiner*.

NOTE 16.—“The Literary Remains of Charles Tyrwhitt Drake, F. R. G. S.: edited, with a memoir, by Walter Besant. London: Bentley, 1877.”

NOTE 17.—Although the last “Arctic Expedition” has been the subject of much controversy, both from a scientific and political aspect, the latter not without some acrimony, as we might expect, yet it certainly adds its quatum to the already overwhelming evidence that human life *cannot* be supported without a certain proportion of “vegetable matter” (as food) in some form—though it is equally certain it *can* be supported without “animal matter” as food in any form, and where it is necessary to minimise fruit takes the precedence.

The only real disaster which befel that expedition originated in consequence of omitting to take “limejuice,” as a part of the equipment of “the sledging parties,” whereby it is certain two lives were sacrificed, and those of many more greatly imperilled, and from which they were delivered only through the daring hardihood and great exertions of one of the officers and two seamen, who made their way to the ship, and thus by procuring help from that quarter, saved the expedition from utter break down.

Ten gallons of this “rot-gut stuff,” as I have heard it styled—as it was then no doubt, and probably by many is yet considered—if it does not contain the “nutritious principle” contained therein, would have been more efficacious and health-giving than droves of “musk oxen,” herds of rein-deer, or preserves of hares, animals sought often with much avidity, and—though not in any very great numbers—shot, because supposed on all sides to be so *necessary* and *useful* to human life. The *exact opposite* being the *exact state* of the case.

Or take another illustration:—After the British Government had seized upon Aden as a preparatory step to the “overland route” to our East Indian Empire—when all Sheik, or Native, or Afghan “disturbances” were to cease, such would be the facilities for placing our Government at home “in direct communication with that in India” (though I do not remember that Irish disturbances were included) among the 150 men composing the rank and file of the force, it was found necessary to station there for its protection—whose rations, consisting of *fresh* beef, flour, biscuit,

etc., in the usual quantities, *were without vegetables of any kind*, which at that time (1839) were very difficult to procure, there being none but such as were brought from the Malabar Coast—four or five cases of “sea scurvy”—the same disease that had decimated Anson’s, and twice annihilated Hozier’s crews—appeared in the first six months of *that* dietary; but vanished, as soon as vegetables were procured, the only medicine the system needs, as it is also the only one of the slightest avail in checking the disease, or restoring health.

In addition to these facts, I was informed by one of H.M.’s Consuls abroad that whenever “scurvy” makes its appearance on board a British Merchant Vessel, as it is a preventable disease, the commander is liable—not exactly to a criminal prosecution, but—to the decision of a “Naval Court of Inquiry,” from which there is no appeal, and by whose decision he may be visited by a heavy fine. To any one who has read the case of the “West End Physican” to whom £16,000 was awarded as damages for “pain and injury” sustained while travelling by the London and North Western Line, *his income being over £5000 per annum for a series of years*, the question may occur:—How comes it that this sum, *minus* £1000 awarded as compensation for actual “pain,” instead of being paid to him, did not go to the State Exchequer in the shape of “fines” levied upon his patients—as in the case of the Merchant Navy Commander—for allowing the appearance of “preventable disorders,” of which, no doubt, this sum in nearly every case represented the *cost of cure*, the path of duty being their prevention. If scurvy at sea is preventable, and *all* preventable diseases are made penal, it seems probable the “vegetarian” would soon be the only individual undeserving of punishment.

Lastly, I am informed by the courteous Naturalist of the Royal Aquarium, Mr. John T. Carrington, that “all anthropoid apes are naturally vegetarians, or more correctly *fruit* eaters:” and speaking of the Ourang at that Institution, he says, “An unarmed person would have little chance in single combat with so strong and wild an opponent.”

After these it is almost unnecessary to say that the human animal can “support life” without a *necessity* for destroying that of another’s—for food, (for as Professor Huxley observes:—“Every body has heard of the pitiless microscopist who ruined the peace of mind of one of those mild (Hindoo) enthusiasts by showing him the

animals moving in a drop of the water with which, in the innocency of his heart, he was wont to slake his thirst.”—I must be included, and being moreover a water-drinker, may have performed (unwittingly) the same outrage—only it was always some solace to me in my case to know they were *cannibals to a man!*—that is, to an *Infusorium*—who were thus swallowed when I slaked my thirst”) and enjoy that of his own (life) at a maximum in the companionship of uninterrupted good health! without which it is scarcely worth having; and if he commences this early, before disease has been dug into the system by a semi-carnivorous diet, *thus elude doctors*; but quickly succumbs in the face of all the medicos in existence to back him—*on any diet without vegetables in some form!*

NOTE 19.—Australia, for instance, and Van Dieman’s Land, where a voice will at some future time be heard—even if there are not some mutterings of that voice now—asking the colonist, or the mother of the colonist, or both for the “aboriginee”—when he is extinguished; and the correlative of his non-production or extinction with compound interest for all “arrearages!” is what each must be prepared to discharge as it becomes due; and *one*, even if in the mean time some cataclysm has wiped out that continent or island from the map of the world.

CHAPTER X.

A PROPOSAL FROM THE CHAIR, AND ABRUPT "PROROGATION" OF THE CONGRESS.

THE Chairman after stating that he thought they might consider the resolutions "carried," said:—"He never once, on consenting to take the chair at that Congress, for one moment contemplated the elaborate illustrations, forcible deductions, logical conclusions, or portentous significance of which, by the way certain subjects had been handled, that meeting had been the outcome. He saw before him, in his mind's eye, a multitudinous array of suitors, as he doubted not attended by, or within call of an almost interminable string of injustice, suffering, and wrong, the (illegitimate) offspring of the highest intellectual race: but, as it appeared to him, if they must admit all organisms who have a grievance of this kind, it would be likely to prolong that Congress to the 'crack of doom,' and then not be finally completed. Speaking not so much as their Chairman but as a private individual, he thought the subject of evil had been sufficiently discussed, and that the resolutions (which appear to have been carried with great unanimity) embodied all that was really requisite to give PEACE on EARTH and GOOD-WILL throughout the whole circumference of animal life; for whatever may be the nature of the renovating process here necessary, it must begin at the highest organism. Nothing, he might tell them, could be clearer than that. Now, his next object would be to remind them to whom they were remotely indebted for the seeds of that prospective happiness, which the resolutions, if only adopted, would plant, water, cultivate, and as he doubted not hasten on to a maturity so prolific, that it would bless alike the giver and

receiver: and though gratitude in man was said to be a plant of exceedingly rare and slow growth, he trusted by the alacrity they would show—in presenting some graceful acknowledgment of their debt to the wonderfully endowed organism⁽¹⁾ the discoverer of Origin of Species, and consequent close relationship between all grades of warm-blooded life—that in any drawback to its exuberance, it was the nature of the soil and not the plant that was at fault; and that in strata such as that he saw before him, and of which he might say the Congress was in a great measure composed, the perennial luxuriance of this plant was the best testimony to the truth of his assertion. Now, upon the subject of a ‘testimonial,’⁽²⁾ he would very much like to have the sense of the meeting, say as to the most suitable, and he would beg of some of the ‘skilled artificers,’ of which he saw several before him, to send in ‘tenders of designs,’ or if actual ‘specimens’ were obtainable, he should”—&c.

Thus far every thing had gone on rather ‘swimmingly’—if we except just the little *contre-temps* about the “amendment,” which, if only as an illustration of how difficult it must ever be to bring the animal world to think alike on all subjects untainted by interest, untinged by predelictions, may not have been an unmixed evil. But just at this stage, when all seemed so placid and tranquil, “like bride and groom divesting,” &c.—a solitary individual of that race of organisms, against whose usurped dominion the Congress had been convened for the express purpose of protesting—appeared on the scene, and who—after the surprise which beamed from his “noble mein,” probably at the novelty of the sight before him—forthwith proceeded to “hobble” the Chairman: to saddle, bridle, or harness the mover of the first resolution; make a fruitless cut or two with a whip at the mover of the second; and as the mover of the third had already absconded—a piece of strategy very generally adopted—to chase to the four winds of heaven the promiscuous herd of flesh and fowl;⁽³⁾ thus, while disposing of them, terminating the “First Congress of Animals”—as ever was!

.

It is just permissible here to ask—was, then, the object of that Congress altogether frustrated—all that tumid eloquence wasted—all those incisory or cauterising prescriptions wasted, shelved, or lost? Scarcely that. On the contrary, we believe with Draper and Hitchcock, that the hieroglyphics of our (imaginary) reporter, by which these sayings and doings are now being made known to the highest earthly intelligences, will be indelibly impressed upon the elements when they shall be forming combinations in the economy of other worlds, when this—like the candle it may now be to some of them—has been for ever snuffed out!

NOTES TO CHAPTER X.

NOTE 1.—It has been before stated Mr. Darwin is placed in the front rank of discoverers, who, however, throughout his works loses no opportunity to acknowledge the assistance he has received from others.

NOTE 2.—It would be some months—at the least six or seven—after this was written that a number of *Nature* was put into the hand of the writer, wherein is the following:—

TESTIMONIAL TO MR. DARWIN.

“Mr. Darwin has received as a testimonial, on the occasion of his sixty-ninth birthday an album, a magnificent folio, bound in velvet and silver containing the photographs of 154 men of Science in Germany. The list contains some of the best known and most honoured names in Europe. He has likewise received on the same occasion from Holland an album with the photographs of 217 distinguished professors and lovers of science in that country. These gifts are not only honourable to Mr. Darwin, but also to the senders, as a proof of their generous sympathy with a foreigner; and they further show how widely the great principle of Evolution is now accepted by naturalists.”

A subsequent number contains Mr. Darwin's reply, which, though we may feel assured is characteristic of that great naturalist, we shall not insert.

NOTE 3.—In an article in the “Contemporary Review” on the

“Study of Natural History,” by Professor St. George Mivart, there is the following:—“When we study the laws of growth, as in the creeping lichen or gigantic eucalyptus, or the actions of roots or leaves, when we follow the course of the spore dropped from a fern frond, or when we investigate the meaning and action of flowers of whatever kind, *we come upon processes which the human body is destined to perform.* But the animal world especially concerns man, since, *being an animal himself,* he shares the pleasures, pains, appetites, desires, and emotions of the sentient myriads which people earth, air and water. His fame, like theirs, thrills responsively to the ceaseless throbbings of that plexus of ever active agencies, lifeless as well as living which we call the cosmos, etc.”

Doubtless, to whom this vegetable sort of growth in man is not generally known, it will appear wonderful—if not a trifle staggering, or, we might call it—humiliating! But this being so—with an origin—from the “laws of growth” point of view—so earthy, or so identical with a “cabbage,” or—if you will—an oak, with apparently nothing but what an animal if the matter was referred to it would call “superior mental force” to substantiate the claim, upon what principle, we ask, is it, that a little further on we are told—“Man, as lord over all other organisms, *rightfully disposes of them for his profit or pleasure?*”

Of course we feel that it is very stupid in us failing to perceive what must be so clear to St. George Mivart: but we also feel that if this is from our stupidity, and though it may be very wrong or vulgar in us to make the confession, it is an emotion to which we do confess with pride rather than regret or sorrow: especially as we think this expression of St. George Mivart’s is capable of the construction being put upon it, that *his* view of the right of “man as lord over all other organisms” seems to come within the same focus as that of the “lord”—mentioned by Blackstone, to whom allusion has been made—of such singular and interesting characteristics and proclivities, who—if a Conservative, a not unlikely phenomenon—would be disposed to pronounce as his candid opinion that liberty, or say, justice, to the “lower orders”—of the human family in that day, like justice to the “inferior animal” family in this, had been sketched to its utmost limit, verge or confine; or, notwithstanding any dissentient voice of those human forms known as villeins, neifs or sons and daughters of villeins and neifs, incapable of any further

extension; an opinion, as it would seem, not strictly confined to Conservative Lords to-day.

As a commentary to the views held by St. George Mivart we give those of an anonymous writer more than a quarter of a century before him. "A deep moral principle seems involved in the history of the origin of man. He is the undoubted *chief* of all creatures, and as such may well have a character and destiny in some respects peculiar and far exalted above the rest; but it appears that *his relation to them is, after all, one of kindred.*

"Along with his authority over them, he bears from Nature an obligation to abstain from wantonly injuring them, and as far as possible, to cherish and protect them. Good men feel this duty, as if it were a command from *a source above themselves.* It seems to them that if the helplessness of childhood calls for kind and gentle treatment, much more does the essentially weaker character of the dumb creature. . . . It is common under the influence of prejudice to do gross injustice to the characters of these denizens of Nature's common. . . . Yet we must go to the dog for a type of the virtue of fidelity, and to the bee for that of industry. The parental affection of many animals is not below, if it is not considerably above that of human mothers. Man nowhere exemplifies the virtue of patience in the practical perfection in which we see it in the horse, and many other creatures which become the slaves of his convenience. Nowhere does he display the perfect moderation in wants. Alas for man's boasted superiority—in how many respects does it fail beside the unassuming merits of the mere commonality of nature!"—(Vestiges of Creation).

CHAPTER XI.

THE FRUITS OF DARWINISM GATHERED FROM POLITICAL SOILS.

THE services of our 'special reporter' being no longer necessary, we put him and his animal puppets on one side, and proceed, in the next place, to consider the 'Fruits of Darwinism' on political grounds.

In the series of Macaulay's Essays which appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* between the years 1825 and 1840, there is one on "Machiavelli," wherein Cæsar Borgia is incidentally introduced.

"On two important occasions," says the essayist, "Machiavelli was admitted to his society: once at the moment when Cæsar's splendid villany achieved its most signal triumph, when he caught in one snare and crushed at one blow all his most formidable rivals; and again when exhausted by disease and overwhelmed by misfortunes, *which no human prudence could have averted*, he was the prisoner of the deadliest enemy of his house."

Here one is tempted to ask, upon what theory is explicable the fact that, after Cæsar has crushed all his rivals (by the most atrocious means), he is ultimately overtaken by misfortunes which no amount of "human prudence could have averted," except that of the theory of our laboratory friend, of correlation of physical force—in the present instance, transformed into moral. Had he possessed the "prudence" to cling most tenaciously to the "last resolution" adopted at the Congress of Animals recently *prorogued*—for we feel sure we have not heard or seen the last of it—it is scarcely possible that he would have become "the prisoner of the deadliest enemy of his house." In his case, disease and captivity are the natural and necessary 'correlatives' of his debaucheries, villanies, assassinations, fratricides, &c. They

are the *result of law*. Had he, after the commission of these, lived happily, and died otherwise than amidst universal execration, "natural laws" would indeed have been suspended; a "miracle," in that case, would most certainly have occurred.

Now, if it be indeed true that, as it happens to individuals, so does it to nations, how stands the case with Great Britain? Is there here any analogy between this singular individual and that great nation—between the merciless robber and purloiner of petty dukedoms or principalities, and the no less rapacious grasper and unscrupulous and wholesale annexer of kingdoms and empires?

In the almanack of the Financial Reform Association, published in 1878, after a list of officers, with their salaries, there is also the following:—

"These numbers are only an approximation, the officers of various grades being so distributed in the Navy that it is next to impossible to ascertain what their number really is. So far as the numbers stated go, it appears that we have an admiral for each of the 297 in commission, with 35 to spare for receiving, store, training and surveying ships, despatch boats, and tug-vessels, yachts, &c.
 . . . There is a similar glut of officers with regard to the Army. Of generals, counting those on the active list only, there is one for every two of the 151 regiments, with 20 to spare. There is a lieutenant-general for each of them with three over; and for every regiment there are three major-generals with 18 over; 6 colonels with 12 over; 15 lieutenant colonels, with 44 over; and 9 majors, with 116 to spare. Proportionately, therefore, if not actually, we are more abundantly supplied with officers than even the great military powers of the Continent. Of regular troops we have 151 regiments, of Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers 488, making a total of 639 regiments, to say nothing of Pensioners and Reserves. We have also a sea force more powerful than any two other Naval powers, and the advantage of an insular position instead of an open frontier. Yet, notwithstanding all this, there are persons amongst us who believe, or affect

to believe that, *there is nothing to prevent the landing of a hostile force of 100,000 men upon our shores in a single night, and that there will be no safety for us until every able-bodied man amongst us is trained to arms.*"

Many who have read the "Odyssey," (as translated by Pope) have no doubt been carried away or fascinated by the wonderful picture of—the Last Supper, we may call it—of Polyphemus, and its still more thrilling accompaniments. The artistic, as well as gastronomic gout, or relish with which that interesting individual despatches the ever-memorable meal composed of two of Ulysses' stewed and baked companions—as a basis, exclusive of entrées—a feat which satisfies that hero that a condition has arrived when the "struggle for existence" has assumed a more than ordinary degree of ominous importance,^[1] can scarce have its counterpart poetically; though, unfortunately, it is not unlikely it is being re-enacted figuratively or politically, and on a grand scale, before our eyes.⁽²⁾ They will, moreover, have been reminded of the fact that to devour a brace of Greeks at a meal infers a state of fairly robust health and tolerably good digestion in the devourer. Yet, Homer informs us that the possessor of this health, appetite and stomach came to grief—not, however, from indigestion—as some metaphorical "Brazil nuts" (political complications with the country of that name, the result of a hasty seizure of some merchant vessels under that flag) were said to have "disagreed" with a certain Cabinet Minister, when he was adjudged to have acted *wrongfully* by the seizure—but, by the law of correlation of force, which he himself had put in motion by the base promptings of an *ill-regulated appetite*, which, while it affords an illustration of a tendency "in individuals of a species to revert to a former lower organism"—is a phenomenon not *altogether unknown* in the present Victorian era.

The fear or anticipation of invasion in the face of the list of admirals and generals, captains and colonels, fleets and armies, indicated in the Almanack of the Financial Reform Association before alluded to, is the *correlative of something!*—it may be murder, outrage, robbery, licentious-

ness, or something on which we cannot place our finger—figuratively speaking, on which of Borgia's villanies, or which of Polyphemus's suppers. In all certainty it is the correlative of some physical force *unjustly employed*, the result it may be of a bellicose, pugnacious disposition, and since which unjust employment, years, ages, or centuries may have intervened. ⁽³⁾

The thirty-nine or so British colonies or dependencies upon which the grandiloquent minister, club, guild, or civic banqueter expatiates as the "empire upon which the sun never sets"—*ad nauseam*—may to others, neither ministers nor banqueters, but who have made subjects of this kind at times their study, represent the counterparts of Polyphemus's suppers, or afford some analogy to Borgia's splendid villanies, succeeded (as were theirs in a fatal degree), namely after each fresh "annexation," by an attack of national "epistaxis" in a compound form (the blood and treasure poured out now at Oude, now at Cabul, now at the Transvaal, or somewhere else) denoting impaired national vitality, which is yearly, almost daily becoming more manifest: and this "bleeding from the nose," it may safely be predicted, will shortly defy the "tonics" it has become the fashion of the collective wisdom to prescribe. in seeking to restore—not health, for that is beyond recall—but some intermission of the acuter paroxysms, the more serious but unfailing presentiments of penultimate decay, where the exhibition of nothing short of (Parliamentary) "alteratives," or the most drastic political purgatives,^[4] is so unmistakably indicated in the treatment of this overgorged Polyphemus, a piece of information we commend to the notice of those political empirics to whose keeping the national health for a long time has been entrusted, as the only certain alternative between a miracle—in which the age has not much faith—and the fate of the disease-exhausted, misfortune-overwhelmed Borgia, and—with the odium attached to that name in perpetual historical entail.

Stating our belief that, whatever the amount of 'cerebral excitement' produced by the "Roast beef of Old England,"

or, however soothing or emollient the action on the brain—that air, when played, as it often is, at public dinners, may be, upon the favoured guests seated at the “groaning table,” or “hospitable board,” the nutrient or assimilative properties of the viand do not appear to produce results such as one might expect from the laudation it receives, or favourable to the development of health, happiness, or a high degree of contentment among the human races.^[5]

We close the chapter by introducing a political creed which, if adopted would not only secure a “scientific frontier,” but make manifest the unerring operation of those beneficent laws to which Combe, in his essay on the “Constitution of Man,” has in an especial manner directed attention.

“And so when one nation commits an aggression on the property or rights of another, or even pursues towards it a sordid or ungracious policy, the effects are sure to be redoubled evil from the offended party. All of these things are under laws which make the effects on a large scale *absolutely certain*; and an individual, a party, a people can no more act unjustly with safety than I could with safety place my leg in the track of a coming wain, or attempt to fast thirty days.”

NOTES TO CHAPTER XI.

NOTE 1.—Somebody might say here. “Where would Ulysses have been had he not anticipated this objectionable, unneighbourly propensity of Polyphemus? Now in the face of such evidence as this in defence of a “scientific frontier,” what becomes of all your *pacifist policy theories*?”

Well, somebody else might say, had Ulysses not joined *his* “contingent” on to the Greek, a measure every Trojan would deprecate, his bones—both before and after that event—so far as the teeth of Polyphemus would be concerned in picking them, or “sucking the marrow” out of them—were comparatively safe.

NOTE 2.—We don’t suppose that Ayooob Khan ever heard of the “wanderings of Ulysses;” but no one conversant with

them, can fail to observe a striking parallelism between the step taken by that hero to avoid the fate of his companions, to which allusion has been made, and that of the warlike tribes of Afghanistan threatened with a similar fate: that is to say, that of being swallowed up in our Eastern Empire; to which, like the sensible people they are (or “treacherous villains” as from an imperial or “special correspondent” aspect they may appear), they will not, as it would seem, tamely submit.

On the other hand, it seems probable, we may say *certain*, that without being conscious of it, every aggressive movement of British troops, and every day spent upon a war in that country, which, by no twisting or perversion of language can be construed into a defence of “British hearths and homes”—an expression which possessed some force *once* it may be—is only so many *steps of retrogression*, or so much time *lost*—before arrival at that goal toward which (not alone the Anglo-Saxon but) *all* the human races, but for these deviations would and *must* advance.

“The transformation of modern peoples from warriors and conquerors into manufacturers and traders” says the President of a neighbouring Republic “has perhaps done more for the peace and liberty of the world than the combined efforts of politics and philosophy,” a sentiment which notwithstanding Great Britain’s “Scientific Frontier” system, brings a “millennial period” into an imaginable, if not a seeable distance, where, probably no one but Dr. Cumming, a quarter of a century back, could see the slightest trace.

NOTE 3.—Perhaps the following extract from the *Observer* will be a solution of the difficulty.

“In the face of the views enunciated the other day by Mr. Bright on the subject of India, it may be well to assert our conviction that these views—whether just or unjust in the abstract—are not those of the British nation. It would be easy to make out an elaborate justification for the dominion we exercise over foreign countries. *But even if the justification should be shown to be logically incomplete* the people of Great Britain would not be a whit more disposed on that account to forego the Imperial mastery. They have got it and they mean to keep it; and when all is said and done that is the one plea on which our Empire, in common with every other Empire the

world has known, can successfully be defended.” But to a person of an observant nature, by a singular coincidence, there will appear in this “plea” of the people of Great Britain, or at all events of their press representative, a rather ominous identity with the theory or view of proprietary rights held by a certain (representative) Mr. William—or as he is more commonly designated Bill—Sykes, made probably in a momentary spasm of cool reflection or, on a return of the better impulses of his nature, when it is not unlikely he has just successfully completed the “gutting” of your house. ‘After all is said and done, it is the one plea on which the “swag” of every “cracksman” the world has known can be defended. Are we then so much alike: an Indian Empire to a cracksman? Let us reflect.’

NOTE 4.—Can any conception be formed of the consternation which would overwhelm the House of Commons, were some one of its honourable members—while moving for the abolition of the Army and Navy, in the course of the speech he might make for the furtherance of that mighty movement—to use language after that of Mr. Morley’s (see Note 3, Chap. 3) at the meeting of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. “I am quite sure the time will arrive when the names of the inventors of ironclads, torpedoes, explosive bullets, Enfields, etc., and of those who introduced them into warfare among communities otherwise deriving some advantage from a certain amount of civilization, will be held up by a not distant posterity to the same amount of execration, as will their names to deserved honour, veneration, he might almost say apotheosis, *who first resorted to arbitration as a settlement for national disputes.*”

Here probably, if the “war party” were in a majority, the hooting, yelling, crowing, barking, etc., or other dulcet sounds often successfully employed by that party for putting down an obnoxious member, or objectionable truth, would become so universal that he would get no further. Yet, notwithstanding this infatuation of “a party” *the days of armies and navies are numbered!* (See the debate upon Mr. Richard’s motion on International Arbitration, July 8th, 1873).

NOTE 5.—A short time after the Royal Commission to inquire into the practice of Vivisection had published its report, there appeared in *Nature* a series of articles (eight in number) under the head of “Abstract report to *Nature* on the Experimentation of

Animals for the advancement of practical medicine," by Dr. Benjamin W. Richardson (author of "A City of Health.") Of these articles it may be said, they afford an illustration of a remarkable but by no means rare or singular phenomenon; viz., the manner in which a mind endowed with the highest attainments, and imbued with the loftiest principles, may, even in the cause of humanity, be hoodwinked by a crotchet or blinded by a temporary but illusive success, until it is led to advocate courses totally irreconcilable with justice or morality; a sort of mental mirage with which some seem at times to be afflicted, leads them to conjure up phantom images, and clothe them with a reality healthier optics fail to perceive. We will make one or two extracts from them and give some of our ideas thereupon.

After stating that his views had been already expressed before a large meeting of the "Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals" on two occasions, Dr. Richardson says:—"In what I am now about to record I shall merely bear witness of what I know without prejudice to either side. I state this at once because I feel morally sure that if I had not been a physician, and if I had not from that circumstance studied the question in connection with human suffering in its most poignant aspects, I should have been one of the strongest partizans amongst those who are most strongly opposed to experimentation. I differ indeed only from them, in that I have been obliged to consider the pains of men, women, and children in my daily labours, and have been forced to the conviction that *the actual suffering of the inferior animals bears no comparison with that which is borne by the human family; that the mental sufferings alone of man exceed the physical pains of the lower creatures; and that his physical pain is greater in amount, in intensity, and in appreciation.*"

Before we offer any remark upon this startling and painfully humiliating assertion, we should first like to ask: how does Dr. Richardson arrive at what *he* may consider an accurate estimate of the sufferings in man, relatively to that endured by the inferiors of animals? Does he draw his conclusions merely from his experience gained in Great Britian; or, has he collected them from observations made in other countries as well? If he has, does the evidence of one continuous series of fractures from root to extremity of the tail of the ordinary "hackery" buffalo of India, inflicted by its despairing driver when all other stimuli (except food) to induce

it to proceed have been tried and failed, lead him to cherish the convictions to which allusion has been made? Or, does the “hump” of that unfortunate animal, as also the “back” of the horse, ass, mule, bullock, llama, or any other beast of burden in almost every part of the globe except Europe and the United States (where the lives of animals are not enviable), upon which the tender heart of Sir C. Bell might without the inconvenience or severity of personal operation or removal of integument, leisurely explore, if not the “roots of the nerves” parts in their near vicinity—on which darling experiment that heart deterred from motives of humanity had, for so long a time been fixed—lead him to the conclusion stated above? Or, does the certainty that not only these unfortunate brutes, compelled to carry unheard of burdens on backs thus maimed and wounded through their half-starved lives, but almost all others of burden, *die under their loads*, as their only means of exit from this world, force upon him his convictions? Yet these evidences and a multitude of others too numerous as well as too horrible to catalogue, imply a profundity of physical suffering in animals, which none but those who have witnessed these sights—and thence are often soon impervious to pity—or, who have felt the *extremity of exhaustion*, or are endowed with more sensibility than the inhabitants of all countries but those we have excluded—can appreciate. And that man positively dives to depths of agony more profound (which in the riotous and demoniacal frenzy of battle can alone, one would imagine, be possible), implies a condition in a rational being so wretched and unnatural, and is an assertion so staggering and gratuitous that, either we must claim to be excused if we cannot fall in with Dr. Richardson’s singular views of this part of his subject, or else adopt the theory that the “suffering” borne by the one, is the “correlative” of that inflicted on the other.

Still we believe Dr. Richardson to be sincere in *his* convictions; therefore, taking them at their sterling value as facts, we are tempted to put the question:—since no event can by any possibility happen without *a cause*, to what cause can be attributed the lamentable fact, that with his godlike reason to direct him, “the mental sufferings alone of man exceeds the physical pains of the lower creatures?”

To account in some measure for this apparent anomaly it may be observed, that the more highly organized or delicately strung

fibre which in the highest life form we call the nervous system, while it may form an inlet to enjoyment which the lower cannot by any possibility appreciate, may also by its susceptibility be acted upon by pain-producing influences (the mental sufferings of man in this case for instance) in the one case, to which the grosser nature is impervious, in the other; but on this supposition, by the laws of compensation the just and natural results of the diverse natures would be kept somehow in a state of equilibrium. Thus, if the brute suffered less, it had also fewer consolations; if the human suffered more, life, to it, had more solace.

But take the case of pain in the abstract, or, call it *evil* in any form. Whence did it arise? Many amiable and well intentioned people are still content with what Professor Huxley would call the “Miltonic theory,” of the origin of evil; but not Dr. Richardson. He is a Scientist; a F.R.S., as well as a philanthropist, and this view of the origin of *anything* will fail to satisfy his astute mind. Now we ask again, by what chain of causation—for that is the exact expression, and a very long chain it often is—has this phenomenon come into being? Is it not a result sometimes, directly and immediately, at others, more indirectly and remotely of infraction of law in every case? By this I mean, is not human suffering in all cases, mental or physical, the aggregate action and product of disobedience to many natural, and in numberless instances, known laws? Are not the startling figures at which it is in contemplation in the future “City of Hygeia” to reduce the present death-rate, myths, or chimeras, if not “loud tongued denunciators” of a systematic and disdainful trampling upon natural laws—and which we define the murder or slaughter of animals, for any purpose but self-preservation from their attacks, to be—obedience to which, not alone the reduced death-rate, but every form of blessedness, is the reward.

After relating the way in which the operation of “ovariotomy” was performed upon 18 animals for surgical learning, Dr. Richardson says:—“From that time of probationary learning on to this time of matured experience, Mr. Wells has performed the great operation with which his name is for ever identified 770 times. In every instance the patients who have come under his care for operation would presumably, from past experience, have died from the disease. Of his patients operated on, an average of three out of four have recovered. *He has, therefore, by his own hand saved*

between five and six hundred women from one form of certain and lingering death. But when it is remembered that his teaching and example have been followed wherever surgery is practised, the numbers of women saved from death and suffering during the last fifteen years in consequence of what was learnt by sacrificing some eighteen dogs, rabbits and guinea pigs, it is obvious that those who estimate human life at its real value, and observe human suffering in its most distressing forms, are compelled, however distressing to their own feelings, to think and act first for the best interests of the human family."

What we have to ask at the hands of Dr. Richardson is—are these thoughts and acts for "the best interests of the human family?" We have not a doubt Dr. Richardson believes them to be so. But is it *absolutely certain* that numbers of women have been saved from suffering and death by operations learnt by experimentation upon animals? Are not ovarian tumours in these and every other case the natural but "equivalent consequents" of some *non-natural* "antecedents?" Or, we may ask, do not suffering and death come in some other, and probably, for anything that is known to the contrary, more agonising, form? Assure us that this is not the case, and that the consequences of infraction of natural laws may be expiated vicariously by some wretched inferior animal, with rights to life as just and sacred as any that man can claim: then, however much might be our detestation of that person who sought so base a refuge, a bridle should be put upon our tongue or pen, but—not until then!

From our view of this subject, not a doubt can be entertained that the "City of Hygeia" of Dr. Richardson, could it be practically adopted, would be an immense triumph in many ways. But with his familiarity with those laws which control the affairs of men, upon obedience to which this triumph must depend, we should think Dr. Richardson would be the last who cannot fail to perceive that no good ever did or by any possibility can result to one race from torture inflicted by it upon another—for any purpose; because such torture, unless a voluntary sacrifice—a merit to which we think these can have no claim—is diametrically opposed both to the spirit and the letter of those very laws—(*vide* the last resolution at the Congress of Animals) upon which he has to depend for the firmness of the ground upon which to erect his model town, city, or—system.

NOTE 6.—No “gentleman” would now wish to appear in public with a black eye, because it presupposes a pugilistic encounter, or quarrel, or something that would disgrace him. Thus, “single combat,” it will be seen, is regarded as disgraceful in a certain stratum of society. Combat, to be justifiable, must be upon the wholesale and murderous scale adopted in “civilized warfare,” (as distinguished from that of savages). Were the “House” (of Commons or Lords) to “divide” upon the subject we have quoted, it is even more than probable the supporters of the author of the “Vestiges” would be in a minority. Yet how seldom is it the minority is wrong—how *almost invariably* is it found afterwards that the majority has been so ?

That, *servicing a person in military uniform* with “refreshments” would injure the reputation of even a “liquor-seller” is, however, a hopeful as well as a healthy sign.

CHAPTER XII.

THE FRUITS OF DARWINISM VIEWED FROM THE SOCIAL ASPECT.

EXCLUSIVELY of those at St. Stephen's, for which there is often not much to show, the number of "meetings" of one kind or another that are yearly held, the number of audiences that are yearly addressed, the number of "resolutions" that are yearly carried, will naturally impress the casual but dispassionate observer with the fact that, in the social human intercourse, and in the human economy of the world, there has been something radically *wrong in principle*,^[1] especially when after all this moving of heaven and earth, as we may say, further account is taken of the existence still of an enormous amount of misery—if only the half of what is said upon this subject be true—in every country on the face of the earth, in every city, in every town, village, hamlet, street, house, and almost in every member of it. Very naturally, in the mind of the dispassionate or casual observer of this phenomenon is apt to start up the question: Why should this be so? Can we find no satisfactory explanation of this perplexing difficulty?

Many good, well-meaning, virtuous people are continually in the habit—we will not say of inflicting pain, for that is furthest from their thoughts—but of doing that which is the remote cause of pain, of inflicting terrible sufferings upon animals, where it would require no excessive exercise of abstemiousness to refrain from, simply for the want of some consideration; and this is often an objectionable feature in the sex, called from its associations "the softer sex." One instance only—albeit so well-known as to be a stereotype—is needed to remind them of the evil of this habit, which unfortunately has very extensive ramifications.⁽²⁾

Thus : “the tender and delicate woman,” who would scarcely adventure to put her beautifully formed “foot to the ground for delicateness and tenderness,” physically she—as one of the sex and from her peculiar delicate circumstances one the most liable to experience the agony induced from slow exhaustion—or rapid, as it may sometimes be—the most agonizing probably of all the various forms of anguish with which humanity is afflicted, intensified, as it often is in her case, by its sad surroundings until released only by death, and which, we would remind her, gave an early and direct impulse to the practice of vivisection ^[3]—she, of all others might, one would think, be concerned enough, or expected to possess that tenderness of heart, if not to prevent, not deliberately to consign the wretched calf to meet a similar death (that is, in its present horrible form) for the sake of *the appearance its flesh presents at table*, and upon which she has set an otherwise tender heart to produce. And yet she—as the primal instigator of this horrible practice—which being nobody’s business, and no one seeming to care about it, however much it may be denied, is practised still—to this charge will for ever have to plead guilty. Now, looking at this phase of the subject from our point of view, as the whole consists of parts, than which it is greater, and as each individual pang is a part of that sum of misery in the aggregate to which allusion has been made; and further, as in a multitude of cases a person is master or mistress of his or her own actions to the extent that they (actions) may or may not do that which gives pain to another, but *as that person chooses*; if the one example we have here selected may be taken as an illustration of many, where can we seek, better than to *thoughtlessness and indifference*, and to them alone, for an explanation of the ramifications of misery in our very midst, which oft appalls us by its magnitude and tortuosity; and thoughtlessness and indifference react in cases of this kind, oft with fearful consequences.

It may not be out of place to state that we do not, here or any where, attempt to introduce anything new, or elaborate, or unknown among the forces of nature to

help out our theory. Neither have we started with some recondite principle, and then made facts succumb to its requirements: nor, though we endeavour to be logical and to exclude the "vicious" form of argument, do we aim at any exact coherence in all the parts which, as a whole, and under more skilful manipulation, we doubt not will in due time be placed beyond the region of hypothesis. "The history of Science," says the author of the "Mechanism of Man," "has been an almost continuous narrative of things pronounced by the philosophers to be impossible and afterwards proved to be true." Now from what has been said in these pages of "Correlation of Physical Force" and its transformability into "Moral" we think the theory we have aimed to construct from materials selected or to hand—viz., the evidences of some of the most illustrious of the race—quite able to stand upon its merit, for some merit few will deny it. The only misfortune to *it* is, that for its construction and diffusion it has not fallen into abler hands. The "force" which all through these pages is paramount, and its operation which is in "obedience to law," are each certainly "in harmony with the method of nature as hitherto known." It seems, from our standpoint, to pervade all grades, not only of human, but of lower animal life, and to operate from birth to death, from the cradle to the tomb, in one unbroken series of consistent uniformities. This being the case, and as the organism called man, *at some period of his history*, differs in no respect but degree ⁽⁴⁾ from the organism called ape, or dog, or seal, lizard, newt, tadpole, or other lower organism—and from the very lowest of which, there is scarcely a doubt remaining, the admission will be universally made he has sprung—it scarcely need excite any exclamation of surprise when we say, we hope, as we fully believe, the day is not far distant when slaughtered animals' flesh hanging up for sale in shops or markets in the very heart of civilization—as human food! will strike the civilized (that is, as he ought to be—refined) beholder thereof with the same horror as slaughtered human flesh would do, as it

may *now* be seen hanging up in human “shambles”—to wit, under trees or in the shade or wherever it will “keep” best—in the heart of a not excessively high degree of savagery! ⁽⁵⁾

Or, to put it in another form: two individuals shall respectively represent civilization and savagery. They are physically and organically alike: appearing to be of the same species or even the same race; presenting the same outward appearance and both said to be “human.” There may be, as it has been before stated, a tremendous difference between them inwardly, that is mentally and morally; but it is not outwardly visible to the eye, and whatever social difference does exist, it is only one of “degree.” But the number of degrees of difference between the most exalted representative of human intelligence, and that of the lowest representative of savagery, is far in excess of the degrees of difference between the same lowest savage, and the most intellectual ape. In any estimate of character the moral part in their natures presents the widest divergence, and to it the emotional in each will correspond: and on this hypothesis is rendered in some measure explicable the perfect *indifference*, with which a certain Dahomey Prince, with whom we may ere long have disagreeably “intimate relations,” regards the nude “uniform” of a regiment of Amazons, his female body-guard, and the *horror* with which a Sovereign Lady ruling within a thousand miles of Westminster, would contemplate her male attendants or “household troops”—in the same uniform (no) attire; and the indifference at seeing human flesh as “food” in the one case, and animal in the other, is only a parallel case—a *guage of civilization*, as we may call it, capable of some exaltation in each!

As one reason for this assertion, we may state that the motives which are generally urged in extenuation of flesh-eating, ^[6] that is to say, in support of *the divine right of all organisms to devour each other*, or assigned by the highest of them in excuse of a practice which a not very great length of time, and one particular branch of education *alone*, are

needed to associate with all that is horrible, unnatural and loathsome in any rational being, are identical with those we should be prepared to encounter in a lower, or even the lowest life forms, were *they* capable of giving a reason for a habit so inveterate as this seems to be. “If we are no longer to eat animal food, what is to become of all the sheep and oxen and the cattle upon a thousand hills and plains which Providence has sent into the world in such abundance, expressly—as we are told—to be eaten?” says the lord of creation, the highest intellectual life-form. “What am I to do with all my captives, taken in the future burnings and sackings of the villages of my enemies,” says a man with some small pretention to be thought a casuist, and a brother of a slightly inferior intellectual type, but still, a lord—of creation, as is his more cultured relative—“if they are not sent me to be eaten?” “How will all the small fry be disposed of,” says a carnivore of a lower form, the “pike” for instance, of such interesting proclivities to which allusion has been made—“if I am now to be shorn of the time-honoured and thence immemorially-*legalized* privilege of devouring minnows?” No doubt existing in his mind—as none is said to exist in the highest organism—as to the purposes such “small fry” were intended by Providence to subserve. And, doubtless, upon the announcement of the deliberations of the First Congress of Animals, each family of carnivorous organisms, down to the very lowest “protozoa”—if that is tainted with this tendency—will each echo the same wail of despair, (or yell of defiance,) without ever once considering—supposing each family of forms gifted with that endowment—the miracle!—for such it would seem,^[7] though only the result of *obedience to law*—the prospective change in diet and otherwise will effect upon the condition of each individual, nor the happiness and contentment which—by the altered relations in the whole animal world this Congress is intended to inaugurate—that change will, as it is expected, be the inception.

In one of those interesting sketches from “our own correspondent,” one peruses often with so much satisfaction,

there is the following, which we insert, as it has a strong tendency to show how the nearly universal belief of modern civilization that “some animals are sent to be eaten” is purely a result of habit, or speaking more correctly—of “education,” and with which we close the chapter.

“Thanks to the exertions of merchants and missionaries, the taste for human flesh has lately been considerably on the decrease, and even tall hats and swallow-tails have been adopted by some of the principal oil merchants up-country. But diet as well as dress on the Gold Coast is, sad to say, rather a fashion easily capable of change than a principle which has any root in the native mind. A conservative reaction may at any time discard the dress coat for the simpler fringe, while, however much cannibalism may die out in time of peace, eating captives in Bonny is one of the evils of war which seems almost inseparable from it.” To which we might add—but which we in more radical or reforming Great Britain have probably outlived.

NOTES TO CHAPTER XII.

NOTE 1.—The paternity of a saying to the effect that “the only difference between the devil and a deacon is that if you resist the one he will fly from you, but if you resist the other he will fly at you”—has been ascribed to a Minister of the Christian religion. Though not incompatible with a ‘Swift,’ any legitimate affiliation of this character in more recent times may be doubted. But notwithstanding any doubt as to its ‘origin’ in this case, and as there must be a cause for every effect, it may safely be used as a safety-lamp whereby some rays of light may be thrown upon one force which has caused splits, differences, secessions, schisms, where alone of all other places one expects to meet with union and harmony. What then can one expect in those dark places of the earth said to be “the habitation of cruelty?” What, for instance, where there are no “deacons?”

NOTE 2.—As a verification of the above statement and further illustration of the operation of the law of Correlation of Force, I have inserted the following, apologising for its great length by the

momentous importance, the subject of which it treats is to the human family in every-day life.

Within almost a stone's throw of the humble dwelling in rural England where I spent many happy—and some unhappy—days, as it may be well believed, of my early life, stood a farm-house, whose occupants, associations and surroundings, had for me a fascination I was at that early age powerless to resist. Fronted by a paddock and separated from it by a paling enclosing a small garden—outside of this garden and paling was a footpath, unfortunately for my peace of mind, from time immemorial the public “right of way.” Scarcely a day passed that I did not find occasion to traverse this footpath, and on many occasions when I did so, I found it the resort of a being for whom it must have possessed some attraction, loafing listlessly on the grass, without apparently any other occupation than what he could casually pick up, or such as examining his clothes, probably for vermin, afforded—sometimes indeed of two, the latter being a female with whom I supposed he cohabited, and on some occasions, of some half-dozen of the children of this disreputable pair; though as they never molested me much that I can remember, it is of the “head” of this family, as he appeared to be that I need now speak—whose bleared, bloodshot, and not unfrequently blackened eyes—the badge of the blackguard that he was—as he looked out of them at me as I walked past him, now I think of it at this distance of time, I can see still, regarding me with a look of unutterable hatred, the more remarkable—as it was to me the more oppressive, that, beyond being better dressed, or in darker clothes, or that I did not wear “fustian,” I had never, up to that period at least, knowingly injured him—nor even then until an open, I might call it, “official,” declaration of hostilities on his part. The doctrine of “Correlation of physical force” and its transformability into moral, unfortunately for my peace of mind, had not then been broached; thence it may easily be inferred my mind was as much in a state of blank, or ignorance of its existence and *unerring* operation, as seem to be the minds of some Prime Ministers whose days, and probably nights, are haunted by spectres of “Russian aggression” or other bugbear, as mine were by this loafer—by no means a bugbear or spectre, but a horrid and tangible reality, as I had often experienced. It is only now that I have become familiarised with a full conception of this truly wonderful doctrine, and can calmly look at things through it, that I can perceive its force and

application. Now, I can see that the embitterer of my life—like the oppressor everywhere, then as now—must in turn bite the dust. Those unjust and cruel quarrels often fastened upon me—like unjust personal and *national* quarrels fastened upon others—must be correlated somehow, and at some time, *my* day must come. And so, it came to pass—that at or about the first Martinmas (of rural England the Lady-day of legal phraseology) that I can well remember, that Gander belonging to this farm-house, to whom as my earliest and most rancorous enemy I have been alluding—and probably it would not be exceeding the truth if I added, the most formidable one, relatively speaking, I ever had—was “plucked” (I don’t use that expression here technically, or as denoting sometimes an abnormal condition after “examination,” but literally) upon the lap of the farmer’s wife or that of some Sukey or Becky, for the sake of the feathers, some of which it must be admitted were dropping off, but many of which it was certain would—but for the vigorous and rather indiscriminate plucking at the hands of these Abigails—remain, if not an adornment, a dress which, having done good service through an English winter—such is the prevalence of epidemic influence or “force of law”—must be thrown aside like the winter goods of a haberdasher, to make room for “spring fashions,” just as it is often done among geese—that is, bipeds of an higher organization, often with even more disastrous consequences.

The result of the operation of “being plucked,” whether of feathers or of prospective “honours” are various ; varying with the several or peculiar idiosyncracies of the different biped organisms ; but in the one under notice, such was the change it wrought, that though before the operation I have described, this gander would probably have disputed the right of way with a lion !—for a short time only, as it may be supposed—if that animal chanced to claim it when he was standing on one leg on that footpath smoothing his feathers—after that operation, so effectually was all the fight plucked out of him, that at the least some weeks elapsed—probably five or six—before he again disputed the right of way with *me*, and I could in the meantime pass him, unattacked !

At this length of time I can scarcely restrain a feeling of some slight indignation at my own meanness, as it seems to me now, in the pitiless manner on these occasions, I rode roughshod over my completely prostrate foe ; and can only reconcile myself to actions displaying something so much

like cowardice, or wanting in magnanimity, by the thought that this process might have been somehow—"a result of law!" For instance it may in some way—for anything I know to the contrary—have "correlated" the bruises, or traces of physical force on my arms, ribs and legs often a source of much perplexity to my mother when performing the generally *indispensible* duty of washing me—for bed, and of whose origin from the wings and bill of this fiend, fears for an embargo being placed upon my personal liberty or movements kept me strictly from divulging; being in fact generally the effects of forgetfulness, or when remembered, adventuring that footpath or right of way unattended—by "nobble" or other stick, with which I was more than a match for him, and his female 'friend' to help him; but it is now only that we approach the "ramification" domain, the outworks of complications, political, probably as well as domestic, as we shall be likely to find, though it is with the latter we are now more immediately concerned.

As a boy, or before I attained my tenth birthday, I sometimes suffered from rheumatism in my legs and shoulders, especially in summer, which a certain "Bessy" or faithful domestic in the family—for as the correlatives of villeins, neifs and daughters of feudal times and Blackstone had not arrived, "faithful domestics" had not become the nearly extinct races (in families) they now are—to whom I alone confided it, attributed with all the force of the oracle she thought herself upon such matters to—the "softness of the bed" on which I reposed! I shall show the truth or fallacy of that theory presently; of course any suggestion of this kind would be derided now probably upon scientific ground. It is, however, one of the objects of these pages to give to even objects of derision, or what to some minds are considered such, due consideration. That bed was certainly a miracle for softness. The way in which it would sink in was wonderful. I remember well to have heard it said it contained more than "eight stone" of feathers, a fact I should not now mention here, but as it will be cited presently to further illustrate my theory or rather the doctrine of correlation of force; though even if only on historic ground that antique "four poster," being a heirloom of many descents, was certainly entitled to something more than the passing notice a more modern erection would call forth.

Now though the rheumatism of boyhood may in part have been attributable to the softness of featherbed in which I slept, it

may also, as I have since boyhood thought, be as equally attributable to the many casualties—"the moving accidents by flood or field"—chiefly the former in my case—through which I passed about this time and in which it frequently happened I got wet to the skin, or into some dyke! and as certainly left my clothes to dry on me; and this theory of the origin of those early rheumatic pains gains support from the fact—even in the face of Bessy's theory of which there is yet something to be said—that since I have "educated" myself into a habit of changing my clothes as often as they get wet upon me, a by no means rare occurrence, rheumatism, whether as an affliction or as a casual visitor is now to me unknown. "But then," some Bessy may retort, "you have ceased now to sleep in that featherbed," which, alas! is only too true; and so she carries off the featherbed (origin) *theory* of pain or rheumatism triumphant, a position some may think untenable. Can we really interpose in a way effectually to check her? Have we any better theory? Let us try this.

The unsophisticated mind of Bessy, although it may have been "the organized register of infinitely numerous experiences received during the evolution of life," and capable of tracing cause and effect to some extent—though it must have been actual "experiment" which in her case connected rheumatism somehow with featherbeds which sink in—had not, it may well be imagined, pierced through the "tick" or into the "fluff" of which it was the covering only; nor had it done so, would it have been able to detect—woven as it may have been into its very texture, or buried somewhere in the down—the *pangs and anguish of pluckings and murders*, the portals or avenues through which those unconscious feathers had reached their sleep seductive but fallacious form, or "had arrived at the dignity" or final goal of "bed."

But this process though not visible to the eye of Bessy or any one not tainted with ultra materialistic views, is seeable to the mind of any one not weighted with more than the average amount of obliquity of mental vision with which the race is usually endowed. For have not featherbeds been discarded as an institution or as a rule? If so, why? Is it not because of some physical unhealthiness or unwholesomeness said to be somehow "mixed up" or associated with feathers in the gross? Not a doubt about it, and herein lies the essence of the theory; for, admitting that featherbeds are unhealthy, pain or rheumatism inductive, or unproductive of rest

in many cases—doubtless the experience of Bessy and a host of other “experimentalists”—is this phenomenon a natural result of close contact with ordinary feathers—insufficiently stoved, it may be in some cases—or, is it not the consequence of their “abnormal” condition, that condition being the correlative of the pluckings, robberies, and “violence to the persons” of the bipeds who furnished the feathers in every case, and which even a certain degree of heat to which they have been exposed in the process of “stoving” has not—like the less foul crimes done in the days of nature by Hamlet’s father’s ghost—“burnt and purged away!”

As a very natural difficulty may exist in some minds in reconciling the statement—*with truth*—that a boy of six or seven years slept in a bed large enough for Og, or Anak—and capable, as it was of accommodating either or both of these worthies at once, if so disposed to rest themselves without resorting to the “diagonal,” or uncomfortable geometric curve, I may as well clear that up as it will further illustrate the “ramification” problem.

Being the youngest of a family of three boys, up to the time I was seven years old, for about nine happy months of each year, I was allowed to roam about at home almost as I liked, and with whomsoever I chose: and even the first week or two after the return of my brothers from school for the holidays, things went on passing well. Affection seemed to “well up”—naturally enough, as it should do, rather than “gush” spasmodically—between me and my newly found and amiable relatives from school: but shortly after that length of time, either this well could not from the first have been very deep, or the fountain from whence it received its supply was soon exhausted, for if all traces of affection were not exactly obliterated, there arose with them, I can scarcely call it a little “trickle” for somehow it more resembled a “torrent” or passion for the display of their genius in attempts to frighten me, wherein they sometimes achieved very considerable success.

Though I am not aware of any historical instance where it has been asserted or even suspected by others, if the naked truth must be told, I have ever since that period, *known myself* to be one of the biggest of cowards—though sprung from a stock disdaining, as I can see, and almost impervious to fear in any form; and my condition the most pitiable and abject that can possibly be imagined, I refer to those early displays of fraternal proclivities at my expense. At one time in winter

we all slept in the same room, and in the course of the evening, that is before we went to bed, generally the “Arabian Nights,” often other delightfully entertaining sources of horror, would be rummaged up by them for some “precedent” or new character in which to excite mine. I knew of all their plots beforehand, overheard their secret whisperings, saw them at their “secret meetings,” as did also my father to whom my fears somehow seemed always an enigma, so strange is this. I even saw often the “properties” or scenery to be employed in the amusement—or catastrophe it is a wonder it was not—when we went to bed. But in possession of some of these weak points of the enemy, when the crash, *denouement*, or climax came, as it always did when least expected, I was utterly prostrated, and I have since wondered that I was not bereft of my reason altogether, which some may think—to some extent—I am. Appeal to my parents was next to useless. They merely ridiculed my fears, or told me *not to be* frightened. “Take no notice of them,” has been said to me scores of times; excellent advice, but totally impracticable. Our fathers were probably not “wise at all hours.” A horsewhip vigorously employed is what I should prescribe now, and had it been applied then, what a world of misery would it have saved me, and what a service to my brothers! However, at length, beginning I suppose to see some of the mischief that was being done under their very eyes, coupled also with the fact that those habits of my brothers were becoming “second nature,” as it is called, or too powerful to be resisted whenever there was an opening, a sort of domestic “coercion bill,” I may call it, was passed, and “repressive measures” introduced, and to facilitate the more effectual “working” of this bill, I was separated from them at night, and consigned from that time forward—when there were no visitors—to the “best bed”—as a *sine qua non*, I think it must have been, for I certainly now, remember no other room at that time at least—a structure or erection of Queen Anne’s time, if not before it, with a pair of stairs on each side with, I forget how many steps to ascend up to it—though as there was plenty of space in that room, a “run and jump” was generally my tentative mode of ascent—with all other appendages in that room to match.

But now, so fraught with “complications” is this life, and so many “ramifications” invest this subject, that no sooner is escape

made from one difficulty, or it is explained away, than another confronts us ; and so here is one hatched as it is, in this case of the last view taken of a former subject ; and it seems to resolve itself into this question. “Since upon your theory these cruelties practiced upon you, must have been the correlatives of some other antecedent actions, cruel or otherwise, how do you account for this apparent incongruity, when as it seems these occurred when you were still, as one must suppose, innocent of any pre-eminence in crime ? ”

Stop a bit now, and I think, difficult as may appear the task, I shall be able to put this matter right, or in accord with the doctrine, which all this rigmarole, if it only succeeds in still further illustrating, as I think it will, will have done good service. It has been said, I was left for about nine happy months out of the twelve, to roam at large almost at my own sweet will, or as I pleased. But unfortunately for *others*, my ideals of pleasure did not always, I might say often, harmonise with *theirs* ; thence, even at that early age, like many of my adult but excellent fellow-creatures of to-day, I fear I often carried sorrow into the bosoms of many otherwise happy families, or desolation—unknown but for this of my bringing, into the most loving, united, contented, quietest, snuggest, happiest of “hearths and homes ;” for while on the one hand, a paternal ukase protected swallows who built in barns, and martins under the eaves, as well as robins, wrens, and other enumerated species—though even an ukase unsupported by a proper degree of “force” is apt to merge into a “dead letter”—on the other a species of “outlawry,” to the extent of a price being set upon the heads of sparrows had gone forth in consequence of being addicted, as they are, or were at the time of issuing this ukase, along with other mis-demeanours, to burrowing in the “thatch” of which the roofs of most of the houses in those parts are, or where constructed, and which price was in no way affected by the victim of it being a “fledgeling” and not an “adult” bird ; thence a “chirrup,” which continuing long after dark, I knew to be the voice of despair, the wail of some broken heart—just as I knew the noisy, hopping about jocund chirrup in the morning to be the token of sparrow mirth, or festivity, or the more vital and stirring events of the coming day, so easy is the “language” of these “dumb animals” to be learnt—often followed me to my chamber with its reproaches which, not even the thickest of curtains closely drawn could exclude. Indeed

I should be only doing bare justice to truth, as well as to Sultans, Sinbads, genii, gnomes, ghowls, demons, or other of the usual impersonators of characters invoked to be my tormentors, if I stated as one article of my faith, that—any of these individualities must indeed have attained a proficiency in mischief, if it can successfully rival the capacity for *torture*—usually encased in the skin of a human imp, when not more than seven or eight years old. The energetic exercise of this capacity or “endowment” *must* be correlated somehow and at some time, and these fraternal exercises *may* have been that correlative in my case.

NOTE 3.—Draper informs us that “vivisection” was practiced as far back as the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who towards the close of his life was haunted by an intolerable fear of death. (History of the Conflict between Religion and Science by J. W. Draper, M. D., LL.D.)

This it must be observed was upon criminals under sentence of death. It remained, however, for comparatively modern civilization to rescue it from the oblivion into which it had fallen, and restore it to its place among the fine arts or a “branch of Science,” as it is sometimes called. Its more legitimate employment—if anything so abhorrent to the feelings of any thinking being can ever be thought legitimate—in more recent times, and before it became epidemic, or called loudly for “Government interference”—originated in a desire in the obstetrician to save the patient in cases of flooding by “transfusion ;” a desire, which however laudable has not been crowned with success. But though in our endeavour to prove the “epidemic” as well as Procrustean nature of that modern disorder known as “experimentation upon animals” we may incur the charge of prolixity, there is just one other view in which we wish to place it, by way of contrasting its modern antecedents in post Ptolemaic times, with its pretentious, we might say, bombastic claims.

In the early part of the nineteenth century (1829) and before the origin of “limited liability,” the “firm” known as Burke, Hare, McDougall, & Co., carried on, if not an unlimited, certainly an extensive and lucrative, though rather “risky” business in the City of Edinburgh. There were, it is true, suspicious cynical people in those days, even as unfortunately there are in these, and especially among the customers of the firm, who doubted the “legitimate character” of some of its “transactions.” But then

there have always been dubious people, so the doubts of these ones were pooh-poohed—for a time, and “business,” flowed in pretty briskly until—the rather startling discovery was made that an Italian organ grinder, who somehow had managed to become a sort of “institution” in Edinburgh, thence not unlikely to upset any pleasant theories of “mistaken identity,” and some fifteen or twenty other individuals, all of the human family—had been strangled and their bodies sold to certain doctors, or professors of anatomy who, it was said then, as now, were “humane men,” who detected in these transactions “some good to the human race.” After this disclosure, confidence was much shaken in this firm. Indeed it collapsed, or came to grief, and—the gallows! and strangely enough as it was then and has since been thought—*unaccompanied* by any of its constituents, the professors and humane people before mentioned, who it was naturally thought, had an equal title to that bad eminence; but who eluded that well earned elevation by what is technically called a “fluke,” or because the law which makes the “receiver” a principal had not then come into operation.

Whether, after this, the air of Edinburgh, often murky, became insalubrious—when inhaled by the lungs of these professors—and so they removed to London for change of air or scene, is not known, nor is it material. Epidemic influences, too, at that time were probably but very imperfectly understood. Be these as they may, a very short time after the wreck of the first firm in this “interest,” of which mention has just been made, another firm—that of Messrs. Williams & Bishop—commenced in the same line, or rather, art, and soon became “eminent” in that city. Such, however, is the lack of appreciative talent in the more stupid, or “clamorous section” of the human race that, notwithstanding the alacrity shown during the short, daring, brilliant, though rather lurid career of the firm, to meet a public want, or, as it was styled, “necessity,” public confidence, as well as patronage, took another direction, and a failure as gigantic and tragical as that which had overwhelmed its predecessors brought it to be a partaker in the benefit of the same (hangman’s) Act.

The buoyancy and elasticity of commerce is, however, proverbial. It may sometimes suffer a paralysis of its members, but can never be entirely swamped; and so other enterprising firms, with various changes and modifications in their prospectuses,

followed, tentatively, as it were, and with the same objects as their predecessors—to meet “public requirements.” One practice was introduced about this time into this ‘industry’ which was thought to be a decided advantage, and consisted in this: instead of rushing or forcing the life out of the future subject as heretofore, they patiently waited for the operation of Death in the first instance, when, after that “demonstrator,” the brilliancy of their genius came forth as “resurrectionists,” often developing a series of successful exhumations, and meriting so well all that gratitude, admiration, and something more “sterling,” none better than the physiologist knows when and where to bestow. Yet even after thus, in a way, doing the greatest violence to their feelings and patience, and making such large concessions to “a mere whim,” or “popular prejudice,” the “trade” somehow fell into disfavour with the clamorous herd (or punctilious people), and some of its members not seldom into trouble—sometimes, indeed, into a gaol; but never without loud-tongued denunciations from medical journals, one of which now in existence—and probably the loudest—not only organised a subscription to defray the legal expenses and, unfortunately, the “fine,” (amounting altogether to over £800) levied upon a too enthusiastic professor or demonstrator of that epoch, who was thereby enabled to support life *outside* the walls of a gaol, but repeatedly asserted that if this key to knowledge was withheld (or branch of commerce prohibited) the surgeon might as well throw up his sponge and scalpel at once, and betake himself to some occupation of a character less scrupulous than that which his—if this state of things is to continue—must inevitably become.

Now, not alone the uncompromising believer in “germs” or equally emphatic disciple of “secretions,” but every one of ordinary observation, cannot fail to detect here an overwhelming argument *against* “spontaneous generation.” The ovum—or as we do not wish to appear as partisans to either school of theorists—the embryo of the institution of Ptolemy mentioned by Draper, after remaining in a state of torpor, or comparative inactivity until resuscitated in more modern times—when hatched, develops the “burking and body-snatching epidemic” of 1830. This again runs its course in obedience to the “law of epidemics.” Some residual part (whether germ or secretion we do not pretend to say) after lurking about in

laboratory, coal-cellar, or other dark abyss for another half-century, after fertilization again re-appears in the new form of “experimentation upon animals.” Indeed, if we merely substitute the “dog or cat stealer” for the defunct burker or body-snatcher, we remove every appreciable distinction between the two *diseases* or—“phenomena!”

NOTE 4.—Upon this point Mr. Darwin says,—“There can be no doubt that the difference between the mind of the lowest man and that of the highest animal is immense. An anthropomorphous ape, if he could take a dispassionate view of his own case, would admit that though he could form an artful plan to plunder a garden—though he could use stones for fighting or for breaking open nuts, yet that the thought of fashioning a stone into a tool was quite beyond his scope. Still less, as he would admit, could he follow out a train of metaphysical reasoning, or solve a mathematical problem, or reflect on God, or admire a grand natural scene. . . . They (apes) might insist that they were ready to aid their fellow apes of the same troupe in many ways, to risk their lives for them, and to take charge of their orphans; but they would be forced to acknowledge that *disinterested love for all living creatures*, the most noble attribute of man, was quite beyond their comprehension.—(“Descent of Man,” Chap. 4 p. 125).

Admirable as is the distinction here drawn between man and ape, perhaps even Mr. Darwin would also admit that “to follow out a train of metaphysical reasoning, or solve a mathematical problem or, reflect on God,” or admire anything in particular from which he derived no benefit was quite beyond “the scope,” probably ‘comprehension,’ certainly practice of many organisms classed far higher than “lowest man;” while we question whether “disinterested love for all living creatures” can with any appearance of truthfulness be called an “attribute of man,” noble or otherwise; and this conclusion we have arrived at from our experience of the difficulty—we might almost with propriety call it *impossibility*—of “educating” a single specimen of that estimable family into seeing the right of any organism inferior to itself (sometimes indeed that hedge does not prevent incursions)—to exist!—much less an object to be loved—whenever it happens to will it otherwise.—(See Note 3, Chap. 4, also Note 3 Chap. 10).

NOTE 5.—“Dr. Schweinfurth has arrived fresh from the canni-

bals of Monbuttoo with human skulls and bones almost warm from the saucepans of the savages. He can even describe the sauces which these gourmands use in their dainty dishes. Mushrooms and capsicums form a "*sauce piquant aux champignons*," and are the literal civilized adjuncts for a dish of *stewed baby only two days old* It may be asked, "How did Dr. Schweinfurth escape?" but it must be remembered that the Monbuttoo do not eat men of science, who are generally very lean. A fat missionary with a family fresh from Exeter Hall, may meet with immediate attention." *Nature*, No. 227 vol. 9. Article "Sweinfurth's Heart of Africa."

NOTE 6.—One instance we have before us we will give; and which coming as it does from a very Goliath, or, we might say "Ulysses" of Scientists, will afford a better illustration of the singularity of view and consistency of opinion held by some individuals in connexion with this subject, than any we can furnish.

"Against this proof of the benefits of vivisection it has been urged that man has no right to inflict pain on animals. The same argument has been urged against the destruction of the life of animals at all, and the adoption of a vegetarian diet has been the result. It is surely not needful to answer the last argument here, but in a degree the answer is the same against giving pain to animals; if we take animal life for the purpose of food, *it is only taking the life we have given us for the purpose of our existence; and in giving a minimum of pain to animals we give it for the higher purposes of securing human life and freedom from pain*"

Anything "given us" no matter what, nor for what purpose, implies a "Giver." To the Editor of *Nature*, or author of the article from whence the extract is taken (of Jan. 8th 1874), we put the question of the mover of the "second resolution," and ask who is here the *Giver*; or, where is there any evidence of the *gift* of such a terrible power to man?

As there may be some simple-minded people who, in the innocency of their hearts, believe that the expression we have placed in Italics represents the true cause or motive for the practice of Vivisection, let them refer to the same journal of May 25th, 1876, Article "Lord Carnarvon's Vivisection Bill," where they will find the following:—

"It is but natural to suppose that concomitantly with the rapid advances which have, within the last century or so, been made in our knowledge of scientific method, similar progress has

occurred in the theory of legislation. And yet our leading politicians, in introducing the above quoted Bill, are bold enough to advance, as a motive for the legal machinery they are endeavouring to enforce, the idea that there is any real substantiality in the notion that *the lengthening of human life and the alleviation of human suffering can from any direct stimulation to physiological work.* In so doing they show how *little* they are capable of appreciating the spirit of the higher philosopher, whose thoughts and temptations to investigate, *however much they may be disguised by secondary motives, are but the involuntary secretion as it may be termed of his individual brain.* They do not even seem to know that one of the most fundamental of the data of scientific method precludes the possibility of preconceived ideas of any kind forming part of a correctly stated problem."

This seems to indicate a need for *official* interference and "restriction" of a kind very different from that included in Lord Carnarvon's Bill.

NOTE 7.—It would scarcely be imagined that a statesman—whose "ministerial whitebait dinner" utterances, and "Guildhall banquet" revelations have ever formed central or conspicuous figures on which, as it is said, the political eyes of Europe, in search of the future "foreign policy" of Lord Beaconsfield have been unwinkingly fixed—should in his cast of author, put into the mouth of one of the most admirable as well as original heroines which either the genius of the novelist or the reality of the world ever produced, a sentiment so much in accord with the opinions here enunciated and with so deep a meaning as the following :—

"I am a great foe to dinners, and indeed to all meals. I think when the good time comes we shall give up eating in public, except perhaps *fruit* on a green bank with music."—"Lothair."

Now what are we to understand from this, but that a time—designated here "the good time"—will arrive when Society will look on the "dinner party" community as on a class infected with a tendency to revert to a former lower form or condition? And it is more than a little remarkable that the Earl of Beaconsfield—after what has been said of the conditions under which his future policy has been often divulged—like some of those ancient patriarchs or seers of his race—should thus dimly, and in all unconsciousness foreshadow—we might almost say, predict—a doctrine and a habit which only a very few centuries, *may see universal in all "civilized communities."* Be the first Prince or Prophet of Vegetarianism.

CONCLUSION.

THE preceding pages, whether the pliant yielding vehicles for the invention of purely inane fictions, or the sterner and more resolute exigesis of strange, but natural, harsh, but intelligible facts—whether the outcome of dreams, myths, absurdities, or chimeras, to which like many modern phantasies it would be the height of credulity to give so much as a hearing, or presentments of phenomena coming into daily, almost hourly contact with every day human life—whether abstractions, or realities,^[1] notwithstanding any uncertain sound they may trumpet, are, if taken as a whole—and notwithstanding their many imperfections—in our estimation deserving something more than a passing notice, not merely on account of the tremendous consequences they involve—supposing the subjects of which they treat to have any foundation in fact; but also, in extenuation of the audaciousness of the theory they propound; the moral they may withal be calculated to point, and the “tale”—of suffering and wrong, they certainly will not “adorn,” but which it is one of their objects to bring more prominently before the world in a newer form, habited in a dress more attractive than that in which it usually appears in public, one in which none but the very grossest of natures may be uninclined to embrace it, when, from the more usual and customary association in the old, threadbare, unattractive garment, the gaze turns away as from the sores of a beggar, or the gorge rises with feelings of loathing and disgust.

But do the subjects of these pages trumpet an uncertain sound? Briefly to review them, we gather albeit in a fragmentary form, if not the fact, the assumption—of it, that—whether under the designation and control of a nemesis of ancient mythology, the Supreme Being of more modern theism, or the Force of the scientist, human actions are kept in

a state of equilibrium, unimpeachable evidence, or sufficient to convince any but the most sceptical is here adduced of the presence of *some* retributive justice—and were it not from the impossibility of tracing and unravelling the often knotted and tangled skein of human actions through a lifetime, it would perhaps be not overstating the situation if we said—*exact* retributive justice in this life.⁽²⁾ In fact it may be stated as a proposition capable of demonstration that *retributive justice is always a condition of life incapable of separation from it.* This, in so far as it is the experience of every thoughtful mind, will, we imagine, be found only to corroborate what the Jewish scriptures over and over again affirm. *As we do to others, so it is done to us.* This position we unhesitatingly assert to be unassailable. But unfortunately, as Draper says, “for objects to present themselves under identical relations to different persons, they must be seen from the same point of view.”⁽³⁾ Now herein lies the magnitude of the difficulty: for an individual deficient in conscientiousness will probably never be brought to see the correlative of any short-comings—peculations, as we will suppose, when he comes to grief, as come he will—through the same focal medium as another endowed with a conformation demanding a high standard of moral principle. Still less will it be practicable to explain to a being human in form but animal in everything else, that the exquisite titillation his palate derives from a pig “whipped to death”⁽⁴⁾ or a goose “roasted alive” is but the precursor of corresponding torments to himself: and it would be altogether a work of supererogation to attempt to convert an apostle of scientific research to the doctrine, that such delightfully interesting and amusing experiments as scooping the brain out of the living frog—by way of proving to sceptical natures that that animal will act as rationally without, as with that organ—will be correlated at some time by the exact counterpart of that “experiment,” and thus form an integral part of the excess of suffering endured by man over the inferior animals which it is said to be one of the objects of vivisection to reduce or equalise (See Note 4, Chapter 11) while

that interesting individual is led apparently blindfold by an imperious fatalism into a forgetfulness of the plainest fact, that, *the greater sufferer* is such only through being *the greater wrong-doer*, or that *like* invariably begets *like*.

In the next place, the apex to the pyramid of organisms which man now forms, Mr. Darwin and other great naturalists inform us is the result of natural selection, and the survival of the fittest to cope with their environments; consequently, is one of the triumphs of brute force over mere organic matter. We see also that from the time that slavery, serfdom, vassallage, villeinage, or any of those delightful human institutions mentioned by Blackstone—to some of which allusion has been made—were regarded as national and normal human conditions, down to the present day when wealth is still invested with the power of armour, every equalizing boon or concession has ever been made by the dominant party *through a necessity having all the force of law*. Now a writer in the *Popular Science Monthly* says: that “the tendency to connect the facts of history with the overruling operations of law is fast breaking down the barriers which separate our views of the government of the material world from those we hold concerning the affairs of man; so that it is safe to predict that the time is not far distant when, in a philosophical point of view, *no very perceptible difference will be seen between the forces which control the conduct or career of nations and those which preside over the movements and revolutions of planets.*”

Subject to these conditions and from this standpoint of our present knowledge the reader is invited to take a glance at the situation. He will probably be struck by the fact that the attitude which man assumes towards the inferior animals finds an apt parallel on that very ground upon which the favoured “people of God” took *their* stand in their relation to the rest of the human races; and that the proceedings of him who first made the attempt to disabuse them of that illusion, and who was nearly pulled to pieces for his pains, affords only another illustration of the very slow growth of liberal opinion. In this, the

Nineteenth century, he will find plenty on this domain who, in relation to the treatment of animals, are quite prepared to take their stand on the same platform with the Philippian scribe, and with him ask, "Doth God take care for oxen?"

It is the object of science to reject the anthropomorphic element everywhere, and we think this question has been sufficiently answered. The nature of the laws which control alike the conduct or career of nations or planets are sufficiently known to assure us they exclude *nothing* from the sphere of their operations. If in any degree they control men, in an equal degree they will control every department of animal life; and there is nowhere any reason for believing they *exclude* the moral where they *include* the physical element within the sphere of those operations.

We have stated our belief that civilization is yet capable of considerable exaltation even amongst organisms of the highest type. We might go even a step further, and say that, few can read modern history thoughtfully, or take a dispassionate view of human events as they occur, and not feel disposed to subscribe, if need be, to the miserable and humiliating confession that, as yet, we in Great Britain, who profess to stand in its front ranks, or as the patrons of all that is good, and noble, and virtuous, and elevating, are but upon the threshold. "Man," says Mr. Darwin, "with all his exalted powers, still bears in his bodily frame the indelible stamp of his lowly origin:" and this unpleasant resemblance to the features of his unsavoury but remote ancestors in the modern Anglo-Saxon, is continually thrusting itself into unfavourable notice as a speciality of the type, in the insolent ignoring of any rights in others who may be too feeble to resist his aggressive spirit. Here we have the phenomenon of muscle, still unsubdued by mind—brute force, as yet, by the higher intellect. It scarcely needs prophetic vision to see which must ultimately be in the ascendant; but it will be the work of time—we might say, much time.

Now that in which we, whether as a race or nation, to our view are signally deficient is—*refinement!* Not to be

misunderstood, we do not mean effeminacy, nor anything detracting from manliness. What we *do* mean by refinement is, bringing the quality of gentleness—not gentility—to enter more into the every day duties of life; that capacity which will not only reconcile one to bear some of the burdens of another, but will enable one person to put himself, mentally, into the position of another: that instinct which will educate one into feeling exactly the effect of our words, but especially of our actions upon another, whether that other is of the same race or another is all the same; and this acquirement is, as we think, more readily attainable through a full knowledge and appreciation of Mr. Darwin's theory than any thing we know of—next to the teachings of Christianity, which we by no means wish it to be inferred has lost any of its force or efficacy, though there are not wanting those who speak of it as if it was in its decline.⁽⁶⁾ This feeling we do not in the smallest degree share. But we assert our belief that human nature, even in its highest types, oft requires something!—though we may not know what—outside those teachings to stimulate it up to the standard the enthusiasm of self-sacrifice upon which those teachings are based, demands: or, as Professor Tyndall puts it, “to whip it into action;” and here we think is that stimulant or “whip,” in a mild and easily administered form, least excoriating description of knout or bull's-hide, free alike from the consequences of after soreness, or, the more enervating effects of re-action, and just ready to human nature's hand.

If we have not exhausted our subject, before putting down the goose's quill, for which no other “return” than this may have been made that biped, we have only to add in conclusion:

There are Statiticians who will tell us that a fractional part of a pound avoirdupois of “flesh” per individual, per diem consumed, say in London, in excess of that consumed at, say Paris or Naples, represents so much muscular “power,” developed from that species of energy yielding matter in the one place, over or in excess of that developed in the other; and for anything we know to the contrary they may be

right. They may also point to the stability of the one government where this excess in flesh is consumed as food in the one case, and the quicksand-like fabric erected upon onions, cabbage, chesnuts, grapes, oil, garlic, sour wine, maccaroni and other luxuries proverbially supposed to be the material employed to build up the human edifice in the other. But then, there are those also, who will remind us of the fact that, if the attainment of happiness is the end of *human existence* (and if of human, why not of all ?) or say, multiplying pleasure, mitigating pain,⁽⁷⁾ a community, race, people or nation uninfected with an abnormal condition to which we apply the name of "disorder"—infected with or "predisposed" to order, love, peace or goodwill to all grades or forms of life—"the most noble attribute of man," as Mr. Darwin terms it—may also be happy with *no* Imperial Government or Policy, Revenue or Customs, with no armies, no fleets, no police, *with the negatives of coercion in every form*, the positives of which these collective physical or brute—perhaps we might often say with strict adherence to truth—brutal forces represent; and this (normal) condition is equally likely to occur in a community where diet or the "belly" as Paul terms it, is not the chief, or only object of existence in the human animal, whatever it may be in the pig!—through which from the strong "family likeness" in some types, the former higher organism—as we have previously endeavoured to shew—may have "evolved," and—as Tyndall asserts, "you ought to know the environment which with or without your consent is rapidly surrounding you, and in relation to which some adjustment on your part may be necessary"—the diet—from our point of view, which can be instrumental in inducing an epidemic upon this domain, or contentedness with life as life thus "adjusted" would then become—is to be preferred.

Sprung from a race of carnivorous organisms, shall then this lord of Creation remain duller than the Pike in some respects, or little above the level of the Pig in others: be indifferent to learn when to desist from dashing his nose against an invisible pane or equally invisible force: throw

reason overboard because "ancestral experiences" and predilections would seek to bind him down to an undignified subservience to precedent, custom, or appetite: be still a cannibal because it was the misfortune of his forefathers to be cannibals before him?

On the contrary is there not here a strong temptation to prolong the view thus placed figuratively before us, beyond the boundary of the "known," or into the region of the "unascertained," and he who does this may see in every otherwise inexplicable event of his life, the correlative of some act performed by him, either to a fellow creature of his own race, or to some lower animal form. And this—the fruits of Mr. Darwin's labours, when accomplished, as when the age becomes fully ripe it will be—is the triumph of the spiritual in man's nature over the intellectual. Such then are some of the latest fruits to be derived from Mr. Darwin's theory.

Now, in connection with men of Mr. Darwin's calibre, Herbert Spencer has said: "The origin of the great man is natural; and immediately he is thus recognised, he must be classed with all other phenomena in the society that gave him birth as a product of its antecedents If it be a fact that the great man may modify his nation in its structure and actions, it is also a fact that there must have been those antecedent modifications constituting national progress before he could be envolved." The truth of this proposition, though self evident, will probably not be very generally assimilated until that time arrives when, the human conscience has triumphed over the human appetite, or, when the love of justice is in excess of the love of Butcher's meat; then—in a world so brave and beautiful as this may become—under a Supreme Ruler so beneficent as He who constructed this — "vanity and vexation of spirit" shall no longer be the normal condition of all animal life upon it.

NOTES TO CONCLUSION.

NOTE 1.—At the forty-eighth meeting of the British Association held at Dublin, the President elect, Mr. William Spottiswoode, concluded his inaugural address as follows :—

“In proportion as method is better than impulse, deliberate purpose than erratic action, the clear glow of sunshine than irregular reflection, and definite utterances than an uncertain sound—in proportion as knowledge is better than surmise, proof than opinion—in that proportion will the mathematician value a discrimination between the certain and the uncertain, and a just estimate of the issues which depend upon one motive power or the other. While on the one hand he accords to his neighbours full liberty to regard the unknown in whatever way they are led by the noblest powers they possess ; so on the other he claims an equal right to draw a clear line of demarcation between that which is a matter of knowledge and that which is at all events something else, and to treat the one category as fairly claiming our assent, the other as open to further evidence. And yet, when he sees around him those whose aspirations are so fair, whose impulses so strong, whose receptive faculties so sensitive as to give objective reality to what is often but a reflex from themselves, or a projected image of their own experience, he will be willing to admit that *there are influences which he cannot as yet either fathom or measure but whose operation he must recognize among the facts of our existence.*”

NOTE 2.—Victor Hugo must have written “The History of a Crime,” for the express purpose of illustrating this principle, if the following can be taken as a specimen.

“It was done from above, with the terrible authority of Destiny. It seemed as though they had come there *purposely*, those to kill, the others to die. A valley for a mortar, the German Army for a pestle, such is the battle of Sedan. I gazed, powerless to avert my eyes, at this field of disasters, at this undulating country which had proved no protection to our regiments, at this ravine where all our cavalry were demolished, at all this amphitheatre where the catastrophe was spread out, at the gloomy escarpments of La Morphée, those thickets, those declivities, those precipices, filled with ambushes, and in this terrible shadow, O Thou the Invisible ! I saw Thee.”

NOTE 3.—Some time since, I arrived—in the company of a friend with whom I was staying—at the Broad-street station, in London, during that daily tide of human life which ‘makes’ until about 10 a.m., and shortly after met with the following experience illustrative of Draper’s position. I may observe, first, that one of my friend’s peculiar idiosyncracies was always to take the shortest “cut” to any place: another he possessed in common with many Londoners—of walking as if for a wager. By the combined action of these—foibles, I may call them, where, as in the present instance a high rate of speed was not necessary—I, an indifferent pedestrian, found myself some five or six paces behind him—when, jostling up against people marketing, or bargaining for fowls, or game, or some other edible in Leadenhall Market—through which we defiled, “as it cuts off a good distance, don’t you see?”—to get to some street we wanted; but which, however, gave me the advantage alluded to. My attention, instead of being directed solely to locomotion, was attracted towards a rather full-busted, plethoric, red-faced female vendor of poultry, as she appeared to be, who was instructing a man as to the disposal of some infirm and sickly-looking fowls he might have assorted, for anything I know, from farm-yards full of healthy ones; telling him to put them into some empty crates, or pens, assigning as a reason for that act—unconscious, probably, that I was within earshot—“them’ll do to send on board ships.” Interested as I knew my friend to be in ships and steamboats and maritime subjects, I caught up with him and enquired, if he had heard the expression just mentioned, which—remembering also his relish for “statistics”—might, I thought, be invaluable to him as affording a sort of ‘key’ to the problem, the extraordinary high ‘death rate’ which, by keen observers, it is said, is found among poultry when taken on oversea voyages for purposes of food? Replying in the negative, I communicated it to him, when the exclamation which fell upon my ears could, I fear, be interpreted in no other way than as it would lead to the conclusion that the “point of view” from which this expression of the vendor of poultry hit the retina of my friend, was identical with that of a defrauded carnivore. “What a villainous old creature!” was his observation. Although my own (view) may have been not a whit higher, it was like an antipodes to it. A long vista of feminine diseases—probably from having been long in the habit of taking *this view* of these subjects—passed in review before my mental

vision, and various were the conjectures ventured as *which* might be formed into an “equivalent consequent” to this “antecedent”—cruelty, or, “correlate” the inhumanity—as it appeared from my “point of view”—in sending aged, infirm, or sick folk, albeit of a family with no higher pretensions than the gallinaceous in the social scale, to “one form of a certain, lingering death,” as Dr. Richardson would say.

Not being on terms of intimacy with those phenomena, “ovarian tumours”—may not have put in an appearance at that review; but in case of any short-comings on that domain, there is very little doubt in my mind that something—would be found to correlate that death sentence of the red faced female, and thus help to justify the assertion that “the actual suffering of the inferior animals bears no comparison with that which is borne by the human family” by showing *how*, and *why*!

NOTE 4.—It is not likely, indeed scarcely possible the atrocities to which allusion is here made are practiced in Britain now. That they once were there cannot be a doubt and without any suspicion on the parts of their perpetrators that they were delving to any profundity of cruelty. In one of Pope’s letters to the Duke of Buckingham describing the house of that name, in speaking of the kitchen he says:—“The horror of this place has made such an impression on the country people that they believe the witches keep their Sabbath here; and that once a year the devil treats them with infernal venison, *a roasted tyger stuffed with tenpenny nails.*”

NOTE 5.—This question has been before answered in Note 8, Chapter 8, where we have shewn some “thought” is taken for calves. A conversation the author once had with an old lady, the wife, mother, and grandmother of a butcher may further illustrate our meaning.

“You find nothing wrong in eating meat?” “No.” “Nor, I suppose, in drinking milk?” “Certainly not. And what’s more, I’ll always have ’em as long as I live.” “Well, now you’ve lived a long time, and have seen a good deal both of years and events, have you had a very pleasant time of it all through your life?” “Nay, I’ve had *more nor a bushel o’trouble in my time.*” “Well, *I* can understand *that*, and can only say that if you haven’t, you ought.” “I ought?” says the old lady firing up. “What do yer mean?” “Well, that *you* ought. That is, if you have ‘set the sum’ accurately.” “Set the sum? What are you

talking about?" "The 'Rule of Three' sum. You have stated you have always eaten meat, which *implies being accessory to murder*, and you have always used milk which implies robbery and *something else*—the cruelty of those 'milk cart boys.' Now if you work this sum out correctly according to the 'rule' laid down in all arithmetical questions of this nature *more*, and much more than 'a bushel of trouble,' will be found to be the 'result' or *as the share coming to you.*" Here the old lady looked at me as a person in training for Colney Hatch, therefore to be shunned: but she is almost a perfect sample of the race, and each member of it says, *it has "trouble" and "oughtn't."*

NOTE 6.—The religious world, or they who pin their faith upon the Mosaic injunction to kill, and eat, and employ animals, though generally silent upon what is said of muzzling the ox when thrashing corn for the use of man, are able in their self-defence to expatiate upon what is merely presumed, viz.:—that Christianity in no wise *altered* the relative position: that it abrogated nothing, nor introduced any new, or more stringent code than was already in force, on this debateable ground.

Allowing that this is so, it is easily explained by the fact that the simple, but indisputable truths of Christianity have been found a food far too "strong" for the world's humanitarian assimilative organs. So true is this, that now, a minister of the Christian religion, a follower of him who nineteen hundred years ago laid down the injunction to "resist not evil," to this day *asks God to bless arms* (or the force contained in them) just going to be plunged into a "brother's blood." What wonder then, that to a race with whom this fetish or Obyism is the standard of its progress in two millenia, any mixing up of inferior animals "rights" would be esteemed altogether supererogatory.

NOTE 7.—In a review in the *Examiner* of a work on "Pessimism" by J. Sully, (A History and Criticism. London: H. S. King and Co.) there is the following:— "Schopenhauer and Hartman prescribe the renunciation of the will to live as the only remedy for the malady of the universe. Since the first dawns of social life the world has gone on exactly the opposite principle. Existence has been *complicated* and intensified with the undeniable result of *multiplying pleasures*, and mitigating pains. The pessimists doctrine may therefore be affirmed to be contrary to experience."

Without attempting to define what is meant by the "malady of

the universe," we may observe, that members of the Infusoria, who are said to pass all their time in mutually devouring each other, "intensify existence," or even "multiply pleasures" to some individual cannibals, just as it is done among cannibals, often of a higher social type. But this seems to be exactly what Schopenhauer and Hartman condemn, apparently on account of its being the *cause* of this malady.

If with Solomon we say "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter," this probably might describe the situation in the fewest words:—

Those "children of nature"—as we have heard them styled—these said *Infusoria*—who are often held up to the gaze of human forms, but whether as patterns to be followed or examples to be shunned is not always very clear—made a grand mistake when, "in seasons of scarcity"—as we must suppose it was, and probably some time prior to the "first drawings of social life"—they first hit upon the brilliant idea of cannibalism as an alternative. Higher organisms in succeeding ages have had ample leisure and scope for considering in all its bearings the problem that first grand mistake involved: but, *the wisdom of its discontinuance as the only solution of that problem*, and the adoption of measures less in accord with Infusorial predilections, more with the vaunted march of progress, or advance in thought, the peculiar epidemic of the age, has not yet, like a mantle, descended upon modern Elishas or highest organisms, it may well be imagined because of some ancestral distortion, misshape, unripeness or unfitness in those organisms, for the dignity and grace that mantle will not fail to confer on whom it does descend.

EDWARD HOWELL, PRINTER, CHURCH STREET, LIVERPOOL.

