

NEW YORK HERALD

BROADWAY AND ANN STREET.

JAMES GORDON BENNETT, PROPRIETOR.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.—On and after January 1, 1875, the daily and weekly editions of the New York Herald will be sent free of postage.

THE DAILY HERALD, published every day in the year. Four cents per copy. Annual subscription price \$12.

All business or news letters and telegraphic despatches must be addressed New York Herald.

Rejected communications will not be returned.

Letters and packages should be properly sealed.

LONDON OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK HERALD.—NO. 46 FLEET STREET.

PARIS OFFICE.—NO. 3 RUE SCRIBE.

Subscriptions and advertisements will be received and forwarded on the same terms as in New York.

VOLUME XL.....NO. 123

AMUSEMENTS THIS AFTERNOON AND EVENING.

BAN FRANCISCO MINSTRELS, Broadway, corner of Twenty-ninth street.—NEBO MINSTRELS, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10 P. M.

JIVOLI THEATRE, Fifth street, between Second and Third avenues.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10 P. M.

WALLACE THEATRE, Broadway.—ROAD TO RUIN, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:40 P. M. Mr. Montague, Miss Jeffrey-Lewis.

BOWERY OPERA HOUSE, No. 201 Bowery.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.

WOODS MUSEUM, Broadway, corner of Third street.—ON HAND, at 10:45 P. M.; closes at 12 P. M. Mattie at 12 P. M.

THEATRE COMIQUE, No. 24 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M. Mattie at 12 P. M.

GERMANIA THEATRE, Metropolitan Museum of Art.—FALSCHER BILDELMANN, at 8 P. M.

METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART, West Fourteenth street.—OPEN FROM 10 A. M. TO 5 P. M.

BROOKLYN PARK THEATRE, Fulton avenue.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M.

OLYMPIC THEATRE, No. 414 Broadway.—VARIETY, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:45 P. M. Mattie at 12 P. M.

FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE, Twenty-eighth street and Broadway.—THE BIG RONANZA, at 8 P. M.; closes at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davidson, Mrs. Gilbert.

METROPOLITAN THEATRE, No. 26 Broadway.—THE QUIET FAMILY, at 8 P. M.

ROBINSON HALL, No. 25 Broadway.—THE QUIET FAMILY, at 8 P. M.

BOOTH'S THEATRE, corner of Twenty-third street and Sixth avenue.—AMY SOBARSAT, at 8 P. M.; closes at 11 P. M. Miss Neilson.

LYCEUM THEATRE, Fourteenth street near Sixth avenue.—MARIE ANFOINETTE, at 8 P. M. Mme. Ristori.

TRIPLE SHEET.

NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 1875.

From our reports this morning the probabilities are that the weather to-day will be warmer and partly cloudy.

WALL STREET YESTERDAY.—Stocks were dull and irregular. Railroad bonds were moderately active. Gold closed at 115½. Money was in larger demand, and on call loans rated at 4¼ per cent.

A WORTHLESS FELLOW yesterday swallowed a diamond ring, and nobody would value him at a thousand dollars. This is one way of becoming a valuable member of society.

KING ALONSO has professed his gratitude and affection to the Holy Father. The boy is so young and the Pope so old that Holy Grandfather might have been a more appropriate title.

THE ELECTION of officers of the Chamber of Commerce occurs to-day, and the canvass has been unusually exciting. We print the opposing tickets elsewhere, with an explanation of the dissatisfaction of a portion of the members.

THE FUNERAL of the four children of Captain Costa, who were drowned by the East River collision, will take place to-day. The condition of the other members of this unhappy family calls for the prompt attention of the charitable community.

THE CARLIST CASE IN ENGLAND.—The effort has been abandoned in Parliament to induce Great Britain to recognize the belligerent rights of the Carlists in Spain. The government announced yesterday that the policy of non-interference would be continued.

THE CAUSE AND EFFECT.—There was an attempt to shoot Deputy Comptroller Earle yesterday by a city creditor who claimed an old bill. It is rumored that Mr. Green on hearing of this went straight off and paid the wages of a scrubbing woman who was lying in wait for him with a broom.

BELGIUM AND GERMANY.—The substance of the Belgian reply to the German note is given in our cable despatches. It is dignified and courteous, but affirms the determination of Belgium to fulfil the duties of a neutral State. After the note had been read in the Chamber of Representatives yesterday the Minister of Foreign Affairs, M. Assomont, appealed to the patriotism of all parties to support the government in its course.

ATHLETIC EXERCISES IN THE PARK.—The summer garden of the metropolis is admirably adapted for all health-giving sports and recreations, and the Commissioners owe it as a duty to the public to make liberal provisions for the same. The lake might be profitably used in encouraging aquatic contests, and an occasional boat race on it would increase its attractiveness considerably. Then athletic games, similar to those of the Caledonian Club and other organizations, would be quite in accordance with the spirit that suggested the formation of our beautiful Park and would add much to its usefulness. Whatever is calculated to contribute to the health and enjoyment of the numerous visitors to the Park cannot be ignored by the Commissioners without rendering themselves liable to a charge of dereliction of duty.

Rapid Transit an Immediate Duty.

So long as rapid transit was a struggle between the projectors of rival railroad schemes nothing was easier than for interested parties to interfere and paralyze any successful effort by arraying one enterprise against another. In the old days it was always safe for the patrons of one scheme to throw upon the others the stigma of corruption. The barter and sale of legislative franchise had become a recognized industry in Albany, and members, emulating the pernicious but dazzling example of men like Tweed, were only too anxious to combine into rings to insure the success of their own measures or dictate the defeat of those to which they were opposed. If the true history of the passage of the Tweed charter, the Erie Classification bill, and, in fact, every measure affecting any of our great railroads, could be known, it would be easily seen how so long as any one powerful interest was arrayed against rapid transit as a general measure of public welfare it would be impossible to induce the Legislature to adopt it.

Happily, however, or perhaps we should say, to be accurate, unhappily, considering the condition in which New York is to-day, rapid transit is no longer a question of schemes and plans. The issue is no longer whether we shall have an elevated, or a surface, or an arcade, or an underground railroad. People are no longer divided into partisans, one class demanding a railroad on the east side, another insisting that there should be one on the west. It is not a question of tunnelling, or of bridging, or of excavations to build an arcade. The general public sense of New York is that we need rapid transit, no matter in what shape it comes. The problem to be solved is, how to go from the Battery to the Harlem River in the shortest space of time. We are forced into a solution of this problem by the fact that, while New York has been retrograding for the last ten years, the cities surrounding it have been advancing in prodigious strides. We see that Brooklyn and Jersey City and Williamsburg, the towns on the Erie and the Pennsylvania railroads, as well as those lying beyond the East River, have entered upon a career of unexampled prosperity. Their prosperity represents the atrophy of New York, the paralysis of its growth, the fact that, notwithstanding the ferries and the obstacles of the Hudson and East rivers, the people prefer to find homes in other States and other counties than to live in the city of their choice, where they transact their business, where they earn their money, where, if they were permitted, they would make their homes.

This sentiment has grown slowly but steadily. We do not underrate the magnitude of the interests opposed to rapid transit. At the same time we think that the gentlemen in charge of these interests, as has been so often the case, fail to read the situation truly. There is this general belief that the owners of the surface lines running along our main avenues regard rapid transit as virtually the death of their franchise. They fear that in the event of a steam line running, either on the east or west side, from the Battery to the Harlem River, there would be a lessening of their revenue. Now, we think this is a fear and not a demonstration. The addition of rapid transit to the present facilities of communication would be to increase the bulk of travel and not materially decrease the revenues of any of the companies. The fact is that none of these roads is competent to transact the business that has been forced upon it. Take the Third Avenue line, which is now our main artery to Harlem. This is a prosperous, shrewdly managed, advantageous road, but for years it has failed to answer the wants of the people. In the morning and evening, when the tide of business either goes up or down, the Third Avenue cars are unable to accommodate their passengers. A journey from Harlem to New York in the morning, or from New York to Harlem in the evening, is a most disagreeable undertaking, and it is because the travel has outgrown the accommodation. Now, if we had a steam line from the City Hall to Harlem there would probably not be as many passengers at certain hours of the day on the Third Avenue line; but that line would still have its local traffic. It would still be able to pay good dividends on its capital stock. Instead of transporting ladies and gentlemen very much as cattle are carried on cattle trains from the West it would have the opportunity of accommodating them as ladies and gentlemen, in proper cars, at good rates of speed, and without any of the annoyances that now attend a trip to Harlem at certain hours of the day.

This we might say of the other lines, though perhaps not in so large a degree. The general fact we present is this:—That rapid transit does not necessarily mean destruction of our surface lines. Therefore, when the owners of these franchises spend money at Albany to arrest rapid transit they do not gain any material advantage, because rapid transit must come, sooner or later. The longer it is postponed and the more impatient the people become for the proper measure the less disposition there will be to consider the just rights of these railways. The people feel, and justly, that they have given the owners of these roads a certain valuable franchise. They respect the enterprise which built these lines in the beginning. They do not feel that they have outgrown their usefulness. They do say that New York has gone beyond their grasp. It is, therefore, as foolish to expect to confine New York to these slowly creeping, inconvenient railway lines as it would be to insist upon running stage coaches to Philadelphia in place of the Pennsylvania Central cars. Therefore, when we find the street railway interests arrayed against rapid transit we feel that they should be dealt with as bodies who care nothing for the common welfare of the people, but insist upon sacrificing it for their own gain. They are but postponing a day that must come. They are but anticipating a fear that can never be realized. They should accept the fact that New York is no longer within their reach and that it must have a new method of communication to enable New York to maintain its metropolitan greatness.

Therefore rapid transit has become the duty of the hour. We have said again and again, and we cannot be too emphatic in the assertion, that a failure to give New York rapid

transit now is a confession on the part of those who rule this city and State that they are unfit for their government. It will not do to postpone this matter. Such an act cannot be explained. It will be looked upon by New York as a wanton ignoring of its just demands. The people will feel that they have again been sacrificed, either to corruption or imbecility; they will ask properly why it is that, with the democratic party in power, with its leadership in the hands of Governor Tilden, Mayor Wickham and Mr. Kelly, it is impossible to give us this measure of necessary relief. Public opinion has reached the point that to postpone or defeat rapid transit is to aim a blow at the prosperity of New York. Every citizen who suffers from the want of swift communication; every business man who is compelled to waste one or two hours a day in slow and tedious means of travel; every laboring man who is doomed to live in the unwholesome purlieus of the city because he cannot reach the open country grounds and fields and the fresh air and sunshine, regards the failure to pass rapid transit as a personal wrong to him. There is no reason why we should not celebrate the centennial year of our independence by the achievement of a swift and proper rapid transit line. Already we have steam communication from the Battery to Thirty-fourth street and from Forty-second street to the Harlem River. It is only necessary to bridge the little gap to enable us to attain at once this necessary result. Now that we have all agreed upon the measure the general demand of the people is that the bill now before the Legislature at Albany, giving the Mayor the power to deal with this work, should be promptly passed. The Assembly yesterday took an important step to this end. The three bills pending—the Prince bill, the Hess bill and the Common Council bill—were taken up and discussed, and all were passed to a third reading. The matter is thus referred to the Senate, which should lose no time in making a satisfactory decision. The duty is immediate, the issue is plain, the ways and means are, simple and clear. Now let us see who will dare to go upon the record as opposing a measure so vital to the prosperity and comfort of New York.

International Conference.

A recent despatch from London informed us that the Russian government was earnestly striving to induce England to take part in the "International Code Conference" to be held at St. Petersburg. Our readers will remember that some time since there was a Conference of this character held in Brussels and an effort made to reconstruct the laws of war. Delegates attended from all the great Powers, the English government only consenting to be represented at the last moment and under reserve. When the delegates came to discuss the questions submitted to them by the Russian government, under whose direct auspices the Conference had been summoned, there was found to be radical difference of opinion upon almost every question of international law so far as it concerned military and naval operations. The Germans, for instance, were anxious to have a law passed forbidding citizens of any country to take up arms unless they were regularly in the army. The effect of this measure would be to give additional power to the standing armies of Europe, because it would subject the inhabitants of an invaded country to treatment as marauders and spies if they attempted to defend their homes. France and England contended that the right of self-defence, in other words the right of the inhabitants of a town to suddenly rush to arms and defend it from an invading party, was sacred, and that those who did such an act of patriotism without happening to be in the regular service of the country could not be dealt with as marauders. The effect of such a law would have been to largely strengthen the power of Germany, especially in dealing with a country like France. Another objection was in reference to the rights of maritime nations. The Russian government proposed a law in reference to the rights of neutrals on the sea, and limiting the scope of naval operations in the pursuit of maritime war. England, whose strength is largely naval, objected to any enactment that would injure the usefulness of that arm of her service. Upon these two points the Conference broke down, and Russia retired from it chagrined, but at the same time made an effort to summon a new one.

This new body is to meet in St. Petersburg, and it will continue the discussions of the Congress at Brussels. The purpose which the Czar professes is to amend the international laws so as to assuage the horrors of war. England has thus far declined to take part in the deliberations. The English statesmen feel, no doubt, that they can have no interest in common with the interests of the Continent on these matters. In England the standing army forms but a small portion of the people and there is a large volunteer service. The policy of England is to depend upon a small army but upon a large navy, and to trust its defence, should ever the invader come, to the patriotism of the people at large. The policy of the great Powers of the Continent is to recognize the army as supreme, to compel every able-bodied citizen to do military service, to deprecate any policy that does not strengthen the military spirit. As our correspondent telegraphed us, the refusal of England to take part in this Conference will probably lead to its complete abandonment. There could, of course, be no conference of a practical nature which did not bind England, and England can have no common ground with the other nations. The attempt of the Czar of Russia to settle by congress these questions in dispute recalls the attempt of the late Emperor of the French, before the Danish war, to summon a European Congress for the settlement of all the questions then disturbing European diplomacy. England refused to take part in that Congress and thus destroyed the imperial dream. She also now refuses to take part in the present and destroys another imperial dream. It is just possible that England may not have forgotten that the last Congress held in Europe was summoned by Prussia for the purpose of enabling Russia to abrogate the Black Sea Treaty and destroy all the results of the Crimean war. Remembrance of this would justify even a less prudent statesman than Lord Derby in declining to have further relations with the Russian diplomatists.

Governor Graham on the Mecklenburg Declaration.

We present at great length this morning the argument of Governor Graham, of North Carolina, in behalf of the authenticity of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence. Governor Graham is among the most eminent of our citizens. He was not only the Chief Magistrate of his native State but a Senator in Congress, the Secretary of the Navy under President Fillmore, and the wigm candidate for Vice President on the ticket with General Scott. Alike by eminent services and distinguished descent, being the son of General Graham, of Revolutionary fame, he is qualified to speak of the attitude of North Carolina in the struggle for independence, and his words on behalf of the Mecklenburg Declaration will have great weight, even if they fail to convince those who refuse to put their trust in that document. The original of that paper was in the hands of John McKnitt Alexander, the Secretary of the assumed Convention of May 20, 1775, and was destroyed by fire when his house was burned in 1800. Mr. Alexander had previously given copies to different persons, among them General Davie, of North Carolina. This copy came into the possession of Governor Graham, and was published among the State papers of North Carolina. This may be accepted as the authentic version, and all that Governor Graham has to say about it and its history receives additional interest from the fact that he was in part instrumental in its preservation.

In the present state of the controversy it is impossible to accept anything as proved. All that we can do just now is to consider some of the isolated issues which spring out of the argument, leaving the main question to be determined after the whole case is heard. One of these side issues is incidentally raised by Governor Graham in his efforts to sustain the genuineness of the document. This point is that either the McKnitt Alexander paper is a forgery or that Jefferson drew from it the ideas and even some of the phrases of the immortal Declaration of 1776. If it was not a forgery Jefferson must have seen it, for it is distinctly avowed as part of the case that it was sent to the Continental Congress at Philadelphia, of which Jefferson was a member. If this Mecklenburg claim can be sustained Jefferson almost inevitably must have been guilty of prevarication as well as plagiarism. As Governor Graham shows us, the memory of the Mecklenburg Declaration had been allowed to fall into oblivion. It was not revived until 1819, when Joseph McKnitt Alexander renewed the claim by the publication of the paper in the Raleigh Register. It was copied into the Essex Register in Massachusetts, and so came under the notice of John Adams, by whom it was sent to Jefferson. Both of these eminent men denied any knowledge of its existence, and from the lively interest which Adams evinced in the discovery it is evident it was a thing he would not readily have overlooked or forgotten. Jefferson had even stronger reasons for remembering it. The language of the resolution under which he acted was either copied from it or it was copied from the Declaration of Independence, and Jefferson not only incorporated all this remarkable phraseology into his immortal State paper, but added to it that even more remarkable phrase, to be found also in the Mecklenburg Declaration, which is its concluding sentence. The charge of plagiarism against Jefferson can only be based on the use of this last phrase, and he could readily have defended himself against it when Adams seemed to imply it, because the use which Congress had already made of the Mecklenburg Declaration would have fully justified him in adopting and using the other phrase. It is plain that neither Adams nor Jefferson were ever aware of this Mecklenburg document, and it is inconceivable that they should not have been aware of it in view of the liberal use which Congress has made of its peculiar forms of expression and the efforts which Governor Graham would have us imply were made to suppress the document by the very body which afterwards adopted it, both in spirit and phraseology.

It will be observed that Governor Graham takes up all the points and establishes or answers them to his own satisfaction and that of the people of his State, if not to the acceptance of historical critics generally. The claim is a simple but glorious one—namely, that to Mecklenburg is due the first open declaration of the necessity of separation from Great Britain. This claim is the proudest boast of the people of North Carolina, and they have frequently commemorated it by appropriate celebrations and sought to preserve the memory of the event by legislative provision. The historians and scholars of the State have endeavored to fortify the claim by all the aids of learning and literature, and they have succeeded not only in rescuing it from oblivion, but in strengthening it so that it is not easier to overthrow it than to overcome a veritable "hornet's nest." Governor Graham reproduces all the arguments, telling its very interesting history over again, and showing not only how the Mecklenburg Declaration was preserved, but why there is no Congressional record of its existence, and why its authenticity was not discussed previous to 1819. He makes out a very fair case, but there is still ground for controversy. Many things may be urged against the genuineness of the document, and there are reasons for questioning whether there ever was a Mecklenburg Declaration at all. Either way there are difficulties; but the document was either a shrewd forgery or else the first American Declaration of Independence was allowed to fall into almost complete oblivion for nearly fifty years. In any case the discussion is an interesting one, and the decision, whether it is in favor of or adverse to the Mecklenburg claim, can only be productive of good in turning the thoughts of the people toward the consideration of the principles of liberty and free government.

THE CANADIAN CANALS.—The Canadian government is moving in the work of improving the Welland and other canals in the province. The locks are to be enlarged and deepened, and other important improvements are to be made. The activity of our neighbors should remind our State Legislature of the necessity of some action looking to the thorough reform of our canal policy. The foundation should be laid this session for the final disposition of the lateral canal question, either by the formation of a special committee or by instructions to the Canal Board.

Mrs. Tilton's Letter.

All right-feeling people will approve Judge Neilson's considerate treatment of this afflicted and most unfortunate woman. In any ordinary case such an irregular attempt would have been regarded as an impertinence deserving judicial rebuke. But in every point of view poor Mrs. Tilton has a strong claim to indulgence. If she is innocent few persons of her sex were ever so cruelly wronged. Even if she be guilty great allowance should be made for the kind of temptation to which she yielded. She was described in the well known letter of contrition as "that poor child lying there with clasped hands, sinned against, bearing the transgression of another;" and supposing the worst to be true which has been alleged in this shocking scandal, she fell after long resistance and was the victim of a deliberate seducer, who took advantage not merely of feminine weakness, but of the trust of confiding friendship, the veneration felt for a religious teacher and the admiration of an appreciative mind for splendid intellectual abilities. When "Satan is transformed into an angel of light" it is in accordance with Scripture that he may "deceive the very elect." Whatever may be the truth as to the great point in litigation it would not be humane to pass a harsh judgment on Mrs. Tilton, and we are glad that Judge Neilson, though refusing her request, returned it to her with a respectful reply. While discharging his duty as a magistrate he has evinced the instincts of a gentleman and the spirit of a Christian. It is not Judge Neilson who excludes Mrs. Tilton's testimony; it is the law that excludes it. So long as the counsel for the defence do not choose to call her the Judge cannot even consider the question of her admissibility.

And yet it seems incongruous that the one person who knows the whole truth cannot be permitted to tell it. Whether the alleged criminal conversation ever took place is, indeed, as well known to Mr. Beecher as it is to her; but on the supposition of his innocence his knowledge of the fabrication of the charges is very slight as compared with hers. Tilton swears that she made to him an oral confession in the early part of the summer of 1870, five or six months before Mr. Beecher knew that she had accused him at all. Mrs. Tilton knows what did take place between herself and her husband on that occasion, when he testifies that she made a confession of adultery and specified the times and places of the first two acts. She is the only possible person who can contradict Mr. Tilton's testimony as to the fact or the substance of that oral confession. She also is the only person in the world besides her husband who knows the precise contents of the written confession made near the end of the following December. Mr. Beecher never saw it, nor even the copy of it, which Mr. Tilton says he held in his hand and tore up in the memorable interview at Moulton's house. Mrs. Tilton is the only person that could be called for the defence who knows what the written confession did really contain—whether it was a confession of adultery, as Tilton swears, or only an accusation that Mr. Beecher had made improper proposals. It would be easy to mention other points in respect to which she would be an invaluable witness if she were permitted to go upon the stand and could be relied on to tell the exact truth. The legal objection was waived by the plaintiff, and had the counsel for the defendant seen fit to call her she would doubtless have been permitted to testify. As she cannot tell what she knows in court it only remains to consider the effect of her offer on the public judgment.

With the discriminating part of the public it cannot be favorable. It proves, in the first place, that she does not share the opinion of Mr. Beecher's counsel that he has made out a clear defence by the testimony already in. When Mr. Beech arose in court and consented to the introduction of Mrs. Tilton as a witness Mr. Evaris said that "the defence believe that their case needs no more testimony," and professed his belief that there is no weakness in his client's case which required to be supplied by further testimony. "Fortunately," he said, "we have not been wrought by any doubt or hesitation as to the force of our defence into that great moral question." Mrs. Tilton is as intelligent as an ordinary juror. She has followed this case and listened to the testimony as closely as the jury who are trying it; and she is clearly of the opinion that the defence has not made out a clear case or she would not think her testimony necessary to her own vindication. If the jury declares Mr. Beecher innocent that of course clears her; for if he did not commit adultery with her nobody is very likely to believe that she did with him. Her letter is, therefore, a virtual declaration of her belief that the testimony for the defence has not fulfilled the promises of Mr. Tracy's confident opening. According to that opening speech the evidence for the defendant was to be so crushing, so overwhelming, that the plaintiff would deserve to be hooted out of court. And now, when this formidable and crushing evidence is all in, Mrs. Tilton publicly gives her opinion of its insufficiency in a pathetic appeal to the Court to be permitted to go upon the stand and supplement it as a means of rescuing her reputation and the pride of her children from irretrievable ruin. Unless the jury thinks better of the testimony for the defence than Mrs. Tilton does the most that a disbeliever can expect is a disagreement, and a disagreement would be as fatal to him as Mrs. Tilton declares it would be for herself and her children. "My soul cries out before you," she says, "and the gentlemen of the jury, that they beware how, by a divided verdict, they consign to my children a false and irrevocable stain upon their mother." This surely is in a very different strain from the air of triumph put on by Plymouth church in view of the testimony, and very different from the confidence in its sufficiency expressed by Mr. Evaris. Here is a person who has listened to it all, a person as intelligent as the jury, a person who has a deeper interest in an acquittal than Plymouth church itself, thrusting herself irregularly upon the Court with a pathetic and petitioning cry which would be quite superfluous if the evidence strikes her as the Plymouth party are so forward to profess that it does them. There are other suggestive points in connection with this singular letter which we must omit at present.

Is the Brain the Sole Organ of the Mind?

Where the mind resides in the body has been the subject of investigation long before Dr. Hammond delivered his interesting lecture on the subject before the Neurological Society. Some of the ancients imagined it to be seated in the stomach, and the old theory that the heart is the home of tender emotions has been impressed upon language, and upon poetic literature especially. Bowels of compassion was once more than a figurative expression. But modern science has always regarded the brain as the organ of the mind, and the other portions of the body as the instruments of the brain, possessing automatic motion, as the heart, but incapable of conscious action. The interesting question is now presented by Dr. Hammond as to whether the brain is exclusively the organ of the mind, and he is of opinion that it is not. Experiments upon lower forms of animals have been made by removing the brain, and yet sensation and thought seem to have survived the operation. Shakespeare puts into Macbeth's mouth the scientific remark that "the times have been that when the brains were out the man would die;" but this is not the case with frogs. A frog deprived of his brain will swim, scratch himself when tickled, will turn over when placed upon its back; the headless rattlesnake will coil and strike when it is annoyed; the decapitated alligator will show similar signs of consciousness. Hence Dr. Hammond argues that wherever there is life there is gray nerve tissue there is also mind. Children born without brains sometimes act like other children, and breathe, cry, suck and eat. This is certainly evidence in favor of the theory that "the spinal cord is something more than a mere centre for reflex action and a conductor of impressions to and from the brain," and is a centre of perception and volition. We cannot altogether agree, however, that other instances of unconscious action quoted by Dr. Hammond must be referred to the spinal cord. It is true that persons playing on the piano and conversing are unconscious of the movements of their hands, just as it is true that in the action of writing the brain seems to give no direction to the pen. The mind of the astronomer may be wandering in the zodiac while his hand unconsciously records his thoughts. But too little is known of the brain to say absolutely that these strange manifestations are outside of cerebral consciousness. There are depths of consciousness which we seldom sound and others which are actually inaccessible to the reasoning powers. They are so infinitely remote from the ordinary processes of thought that they cannot be examined. It seems arbitrary to say that these fathomless gulfs of mental consciousness reside only in the spinal cord. The memory of the brain is still a mystery. No complexity, probably, is so great as the web of associations into which memory is woven and through which it acts so swiftly that no man can detect the process by which he remembers even the slightest action. We need not accept the theories of phrenology to believe that each of the great divisions of the brain has a memory of its own, and that these memories are rarely, and perhaps never, united in one instant flash of consciousness. Our criticism upon Dr. Hammond's theory, if we should presume to criticize it, would be that he makes his division between the organs too absolute, that he defines too narrowly the separate functions of the brain and spinal cord. The dark abysses of conscious thought and of automatic action of the mind will probably baffle experiment forever as they have forever defied introspection.

Yet the conclusion of Dr. Hammond that "perception and volition are seated in the spinal cord as well as in the central ganglia" seems to be justified by innumerable experiments of his own and other eminent scientists, and if this be true of the lower animals it is probably true of man. We must then give our backbones a higher place than they have held in our esteem, when the cranium was considered the sole seat of the mind. It is an interesting question, and one of which we should like much to know the opinion of the Darwinians, for it has certainly profound relations with their theory. They once examined the origin of language in reference to the light it throws upon the origin of species, and may now find the "missing link" in investigating the organs of the mind from the lowest to the highest forms of life.

PERSONAL INTELLIGENCE.

Mr. Joshua G. Beale, of Boston, has apartments at the Everett House.  
Brevet Major General George A. Custer, United States Army, is at the Fifth Avenue Hotel.  
Judge Teacher, Commissioner of Patents, has left Washington, to be absent a few weeks.  
Inspector General Randolph B. Marcy, United States Army, is quartered at the New York Hotel.  
Mr. B. C. Johnson, United States Commissioner of Customs, is registered at the Grand Central Hotel.  
Engineer-in-Chief William W. Wood, of the Navy Department, has arrived at the Union Square Hotel.  
Judge Alexander S. Johnson, late of the New York Court of Appeals, is residing at the Fifth Avenue Hotel.  
Mr. John Knapp, of St. Louis, arrived in this city yesterday and took up his residence at the Fifth Avenue Hotel.  
Judge Furman, the new Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, qualified and entered upon his duties yesterday.  
Mr. Nathaniel G. White, President of the Boston and Maine Railroad Company, is stopping at the St. Nicholas Hotel.  
The man who bolted a diamond ring yesterday is likely to prove that one swallow does not make a summer—in prison.  
General B. E. Cowen, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, arrived from Washington yesterday at the Fifth Avenue Hotel.  
Mr. John King, Jr., Vice President of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company, is sojourning at the Fifth Avenue Hotel.  
Mrs. Bostou writes that the escape of her husband and other Communists from New Caledonia was provoked by ill treatment.  
General and Mrs. Hudson are in Washington. The President and Mrs. Grant gave a large dinner party in their honor last evening.  
Hon. D. D. Pratt, ex-United States Senator, has accepted the position of Commissioner of Internal Revenue, tendered him by President Grant.  
Senator Spencer, of Alabama, who recently had a congestive chill and was dangerously ill, is rapidly recovering, and was able to sit up yesterday.  
General Cowen, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and Commissioner Smith, of the Indian Bureau, are now in this city for the purpose of assisting in the opening of bids for Indian supplies.