

physical force, but holds that it needs 'guidance.' ”

“ On all sides we hear the echo of Professor Le Conte's words : ‘ Vital force may now be regarded as so much force withdrawn from the general fund of chemical and physical forces.’ ”

Very well then, here is no conflict on a matter of opinion or philosophic speculation, but divergence on a downright question of scientific fact (let it be noted that I do not wish to hold Professor Haeckel responsible for these utterances of his disciple : he must surely know better), and I wish to oppose the fallacy in the strongest terms.

If it were true that vital energy turned into or was anyhow convertible into inorganic energy, if it were true that a dead body had more inorganic energy than a live one, if it were true that “ these inorganic energies ” always or ever “ reappear on the dissolution of life,” then undoubtedly *cadit quæstio* ; life would immediately be proved to be a form of energy, and would enter into the scheme of physics. But inasmuch as all this is untrue—the direct contrary of