PHILOSOPHY AND MR. DAWSON.*

In the current number of the *Contemporary Review*, Sir Alexander Grant, the distinguished editor, has briefly discussed the relations between Mr. Darwin's theories and Psychology. He supplies, to my most vulgata point, as all his critics allow, on the whole, the philosophy is a fine one, an expression in the commencement which, we think, is not fair, because, although the author claimed it not, it seems to us to be a philosophy which attributes to Mr. Darwin a theological position which, whether he accepts it or not, is, we believe, essentially Darwinian.

The following is the sentence to which we refer:—

"In his present work, Mr. Darwin boldly applied the theory of the "human species, and maintains that...

"... man, so far as he is 'the Master' in his bodily frame "the indelible stamp of his lowly origin. We object strongly to the words we have ourselves in the next line and this view..." and Mr. Darwin's present condition after a thousand million years of "... evolution, or that he sprang into being as a perfect being, has been a... special flat of Divine volition. We are sure Sir A. Grant will allow this. We only desire to protest against unguarded expressions which might be unfairly used by those who are bitten, as Sir A. Grant is not, by the odious theological aspect which is quite natural when he affirms that Mr. Darwin's theory tends to substitute a different conception of the idea of the invention of the world, and, as we have already remarked in former notices, if there is in man to-day, as soon as a thing was... unnatural and supernatural set in a framework of Nature, then, so far as that element is concerned, we can say that Mr. Darwin's philosophy is in itself, or that which needs another Organon for its solution.

When Sir A. Grant's assertion of Sir A. Grant's, we think, involves an inaccuracy of a different kind. He remarks that "the sympathy of the physical and... with which Philosophy can hardly deal."

If Philosophy is proper is not to decide in a case of this sort, what is to be done in a case in which inductive philosophy, with all its logical apparatus, is put to its severest strain, and the solution can be arrived at only through some such drill as the study of Baconism and Mr. Lecky's History of Switzerland in the Form of "leaders"... proper"—will scarcely marshal his facts in such a way that any person was able to

The truth is, Sir Alexander, strange to say, identifies Philosophy proper with one small de...

The House adjourned at a quarter to two o'clock.

The House adjourned at half-past one o'clock.

The Speaker was on the point to rise, when Mr. Coveney again rose, and asked if the question had not been adjourned to a later day. The Speaker informed him that the question had been carried against the Government by 197 to 97. The House then went into Committee of the Whole House, on the motion of Mr. Coveney, and the House adjourned to the House not to pass the resolution. It was then carried against the Government by 197 to 97.

The Speaker again called on Mr. Coveney to resume his seat, and Mr. Gladstone was then called upon to say a few words in answer to the observations which had been made by Mr. Coveney, and which he could not resist the temptation of entering upon. He stated that he was not disposed to enter into a discussion of the question as it stood, but rather intended to speak of the general position which the House had taken up in this matter, and which he hoped would prove satisfactory to the House. He stated that the House had, as a body, adopted the resolution which had been moved by Mr. Coveney, and which had been carried by a large majority.

Mr. Gladstone then said that he would not attempt to argue the question, but merely to state his opinion on the subject. He thought that the position which the House had taken up was the correct one, and that the House was justified in so doing. He stated that the House had, in his opinion, done a public service in thus indicating a wish to go on with the work of the House, and that he trusted that the House would continue to do so in the future.

The House adjourned at twelve o'clock.
condition to accepting or rejecting the Darwinian hypothesis.

The reason assigned for this singular conclusion is thus stated:

"...the theory is, that the human mind, with all its capacities and characteristics, is the result of the development, within a breed, of the different and specifically phylogenetic predispositions which it implies—that intelligence is absolutely hereditary, but only in degree, between the extremes of the elementary mental and the completely developed, elementary sensuous perception. Such a hypothesis cannot be held, so long as the question of moral and religious development, so long as the work of moral and religious education, is not considered as coming to a similarly unbroken development in the mental sphere, are totally different questions. The theory of Darwin, then, if natural history, must be carried many stages forward, in order to get the problems, of which it may be even granted that they are not less difficult in kind as well as in degree, between say the sense-perception of a mollusc and the understanding and application of a natural fact, that a process of evolution may conduct us from one to the other. Not of course without a break. But it is possible to suppose a sequence of breaks—metaphysical and physical—with their dependence, interdependence, or independence, a similarity to the sequence of breaks which a natural historian must necessarily stop short at savage life. There he leaves humanity fixed, rigid, immovable. In a word he is compelled to shout that above all it is 'a new and self—a step not contemplated in Mr. Darwin or any other system of nature—philosophy. From Morality and Religion it is simply human. The first is not more than it is Divine, and cannot be completed without Divine intervention from outside. While it is possible to call such a view 'another place.' Yet here, if any place which is to be the basis of any reverence, the science must yet find some way of bringing its theories of evolution up to this better elevation above all the trivialities of the world, and if the sense of deficiency has been forced upon us, he himself and his Psychology must bear the blame.

...Mr. Helps' life of Cortez.

A life-history which in all the elements of interest, the best social and intellectual dissertations of men, as rises a most important and suggestive piece of history, could not have been treated with more felicity and more effect. Its effect is due to the grandeur of the life of Cortez. Of course the groundwork of the book is to be found in the author's "History of the Sea," but it has been carefully revised, some additions, relating principally to the private life of Cortez, have been inserted. The whole admirable monograph. It is no easy task to tell over all the facts which have been so often told before, but Mr. Helps has succeeded in accomplishing it.

The object of this, so much of the marvelous, that it is no wonder it has been a favorite with a large number of friends, and more especially those who are interested in the history of science, are probably to think that there is nothing more left to learn about it. But Mr. Helps' mode of treating the subject is such that if a single page is soon dispelled. In intellectual and moral qualities alike, he is thoroughly fitted for his task. He is not too partial to Cortez in his account of him, he tells him, "We also think that whatever a man does, he should take great pains in the study of his work, and that he should not be afraid of his success, if he is not as great, or as much, or as2, or as
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