

THE HUMANITARIAN.

VOL. I.

NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1892.

No. 2.

OFFICE OF PUBLICATION, 20 VESEY STREET.

Published simultaneously in London.

EDITOR:

MRS. VICTORIA WOODHULL MARTIN.

ASSOCIATE EDITOR:

MRS. ZULA MAUD WOODHULL.

All communications should be addressed to

The Editor, HUMANITARIAN,

142 West 70th Street,

New York, U. S. A.

or, 17 Hyde Park Gate,

London, England.

[Entered as Second Class matter at the Post Office in New York.]

EFFICACY OF PUNISHMENTS.

BY THE EDITOR.

What is that part of an individual which is held responsible for his or her actions? Idealists would call this responsible agent the soul; realists would call it the power we have to control our actions, the responsible agent, the higher controlling power of the cerebral cortex. All souls are not alike; we have big-souled and little-souled persons. We are puzzled to know whence the difference arises. Why should one person be endowed with a noble, generous, sensitive soul and another with a contemptible, or mean, or criminal soul, if the soul is independent of the body? We do not punish juvenile delinquents with the same severity or in the same manner as those who have attained maturity. Why do we make this distinction? Is it not because even idealists recognize that the mind or soul has to develop or mature to attain full responsibility, as well as the body to attain its full stature? Anatomy of the brain shows that the cortex of a child is imperfectly developed, and so it is with imbeciles or idiots; they have not the higher controlling planes fully and perfectly developed. Disease, drink, opiates, or any chemicals which attack the higher nervous centres and vitiate the brain, destroy the soul. Disease or an accident may so affect a particular group of cells in a growing individual as to arrest their further development altogether; and this individual on reaching maturity, apparently a man or woman, may still be as irresponsible as the child. The study of the efficiency of punishments, legal or otherwise, is highly instructive. The importance of this study as a preparation to the better

comprehension of our fellow creatures cannot be better illustrated than by quoting from Montesquieu's Spirit of Laws: "In the ancient French laws we find the true spirit of monarchy. In cases of pecuniary mulcts, the common people are less severely punished than the nobility. But in criminal cases it is quite the reverse; the nobleman loses his honor and his voice in court, while the peasant *who has no honor to lose*, undergoes corporal punishment." What were the physiological conditions which made it possible that the peasant had no honor to lose? Was it not that, being overworked and underfed, his capital of potential energy was at so low an ebb that slight stimuli had no effect on consciousness? The peasant had not the higher nervous centres sufficiently developed to appreciate the pleasures and pains of the intellect. The corporal punishment administered to the peasant is analogous to the necessarily slight corporal punishment of very young children who have not as yet their higher nervous centres developed which would enable them to reason whether an act is right or wrong.

We punish imbeciles as we punish children. It would be useless to reason with them, because their brains are in a stage of arrested development. It would be ridiculous to talk of the honor or dishonor of an imbecile, because we know the person is incapable of appreciating the one or the other. And not less ridiculous is it to speak of the honor or dishonor of moral imbeciles; they have not their higher faculties fully developed. What is remorse? Is it not the reflection which comes after a deed is done? It is the bringing into relation the performance of a deed and its consequences, and the fact that the consequences might have been avoided. Consequences are the check to a repetition of the act. If an act is condoned, and the consequences are slight, in all probability the act will be repeated. Experience not only associates pleasure and pain with an act, but it enables us to say that the consequences of an act will be so and so. It comprises not only the actual state, but the sequences of that state. Consequences which act as a check to the highly organized man may be purely psychical; consequences to the less highly developed must be physical pain. Those individuals who have not the power to reflect will not suffer remorse. If reflection is impossible, remorse is impossible.

Copyright, 1892, by VICTORIA WOODHULL MARTIN.

certain actions will vary in intensity with the age of the individual. The keenness of the pleasure or pain is dependent upon the intensity of the stimulus. We recall a particular circumstance which gave us pleasure, even to all its details, because the feeling aroused in us at the time was intense, and therefore vividly impressed itself on consciousness. A hundred circumstances have occurred to us since, to give us pleasure, but they are forgotten because the emotion at the time was not of sufficient intensity to leave any great impression, and fades into the many minor impressions of every day life. The more intense the feeling, the greater is the amount of energy used up. With increasing age the sensations of pleasure and of pain are not so keen. Moreover, the little things which caused intense suffering in the child are disregarded in the man or woman. The pleasure of love, and the pains of unrequited love, are most intense at a certain age. The doubts and hopes that rack the mind at one period of our life, we may be indifferent to at another. It is because the intensity of reaction to particular stimuli varies with the condition of the central nervous system, and the organs through which the impression is received.

Disease attacking the auditory centres would cause increasing deafness, and therefore would diminish the pleasure experienced by the performance of beautiful music, or the pain of hearing discords; and total deafness would make an individual oblivious to either. The failure to feel pleasure upon the playing of harmonious, soul-inspiring music is not attributable to the music, but to the conditions of the organs of the individual through which the sensations of sound are received. Degeneration of the optic nerves will diminish the power of seeing beautiful landscapes; and total blindness will make the person insensible to the exquisite pleasures experienced at the sight of beautiful objects, and to intense pain when brought into contact with ugly and repulsive ones, in fact, to all the emotions aroused by the sight of familiar objects. With deafness, the individual becomes insensible to the emotions aroused by familiar music, or the enthusiasm aroused on hearing patriotic airs, the sadness experienced on hearing funeral marches, and the joy and exhilaration on hearing bright dance music or favorite melodies. A good or bad action, and the intensity of pleasure associated with either, do not depend upon the action itself, but upon the nervous organization of the individual, and the manner in which it has been taught to re-act to these impressions.

The intensity of the sensation of pain is augmented by the attention being directed to it. If we become absorbed in something else, we may forget a pain,

or become indifferent to it. As, for instance, the intense pain endured under a terrible excitement, of injuries received in an accident will often go unnoticed, or unheeded, till the excitement is over, and then a gash or fracture will be discovered. A patient is often oblivious of pain while undergoing an operation; but when the excitement is all over, and attention is directed to the wound, the pain is intense. In the heat of battle soldiers have been known to continue fighting, oblivious of pain, though dangerously wounded, where, wrought up to a certain pitch, we become indifferent to pain. Notable instances of this are seen in religious ecstasies, when all the energy is concentrated upon one object. Religious fanatics who mutilate themselves, walk on live coals and the like, and yet seem unconscious of that which, in another, would cause extreme agony. If the extra amount of energy which attention directs to an organ is directed elsewhere, it correspondingly diminishes the energy of the organ affected. But when we become morbid, that state incapacitates us to direct attention elsewhere.

Punishment may take the form of depriving the individual of something to which he or she has been accustomed; as, when the body has been deprived of food, the pangs of hunger may become so intense as to make all other pains insignificant. Pain conveys no meaning except the contrast which has been drawn between it and pleasure, or a neutral state—the greater the transition, the greater the one or the other. The representation of these two sensations will be vivid or the reverse, according to the impression made on the individual mind. The deprivation of liberty to the nomad or wild animal, induces much keener suffering than it would to the civilized man or the domesticated animal. The deprivation of drink to the drunkard, causes much keener suffering than to the moderate drinker. The loss of a sum of money to a miser gives rise to much keener suffering than the man, who is not a miser, is capable of experiencing from the same cause. A plate of food given to a man, who has just eaten, will produce a different effect than will food given to a man who has been fasting from want for the previous twenty-four hours. Imprisonment has one effect on the man transferred from a comfortable home to a prison and another on the man who was homeless. When liberty signifies nothing to those deprived of it, when liberty means no home, no chance of getting an honest living, and the being shunned as a pariah, the deprivation of liberty as a mode of punishment is useless, and only puts a tax on the community. The pleasure or pain varies in intensity with the suddenness or greatness of the change. The prison may

afford pleasure to the man who has eaten nothing for the previous forty-eight hours. Whereas, with another man, it may have the effect of making him incapable of eating for the following forty-eight hours, that is, until the horror and shame has worn away.

Better conditions of life develop in human beings the faculty of feeling, the pleasures of being praised by our fellow creatures, and the pain of being blamed. Those who are born and reared in low conditions, cannot experience the grief which high life individuals would experience on losing social caste.

Right or refined conduct has no meaning by itself; it acquires its significance only by being compared with actions which are not good or refined. Those individuals who have been unfortunate enough from childhood to be environed by evil associations, and never have had these associations contrasted with better conditions, have no conception of the moral ought. It is the contrast between the two which teaches the morality. We know night, by having day,—we know right only by having wrong made perceptible to us as a contrast. Those children who are taught to lie, beg, or steal for the benefit of their parents, grow up with the idea that evil is good. And after attaining manhood and womanhood, they carry into practice the training of their youth, and are punished accordingly. The slum child and the child nurtured in refined surroundings, and trained to high conceptions of human conduct, will have quite a different code of morality. The one will be almost incapable of experiencing the exquisite shades of feeling, painful and pleasurable, accompanying a more highly developed nervous organization. It will be interesting to cite instances in proof of this. A lady friend of mine, who had a sewing class in a very poor district, was very much surprised when one of the girls brought a baby to the class. My friend said, turning to the girls, "You know it is forbidden to bring babies to these classes; whose baby is it?" "P—'s" was the answer. My friend with horror and astonishment said, "But P— is not married." My friend was shocked because she had been brought up to look on such a fact with horror. But the girl felt no shame in bringing the baby among a lot of girls whose ages ranged from fifteen to twenty, laughing and joking about the mishap. Her training in morality was different, that was all. Pity being felt for the mother of the child, who was only seventeen, occasion was taken to visit her at her lodgings, and the question was asked, "Are you not going to marry the father of your child?" With a shrug she answered, "Indeed not, I hope to do better than that." The baby was simply an incident. How

will legal punishment operate taken in connection with perfect callousness of prisoners to shame?

Another case was when, on a round of visits in the country, a woman holding a baby was asked whose baby she was holding, said that it was her daughter's. Some one remarked to her that her daughter was not married. "No," she answered, without the least feeling of shame, "what a pity we couldn't catch her man, and I have to support the brat." There was no comprehension that she had failed to teach her girl what perils beset her path, and guided and reasoned with her. The only suggestion which aroused any emotion in her was that the man could not be made to pay for the keep of the child. We cannot blame her, we must go back of her and blame the system which produces these ignorant mothers. It is only by such examples as these that we can be made to realize the great disparity between individuals, and that there must be something radically wrong in our present social relations. It is important to study the conditions of life which have helped to form the moral character of a given individual, and then we can pass judgment accordingly. It is the contrast made between two opposed states of feeling which gives to each its vivid unconsciousness. A certain degree of cold has a different effect on a woman who has been out walking and on another woman who has just come out of a warm room. And so it is with all conceptions of human conduct, our actions and judgments are the outcome of individual experience and education.

Dangerous classes will continue to be bred, as long as the conditions of their environment are such as to destroy moral refinement. An individual feels no shame on the performance of particular acts, because no grief, pain, or horror is associated with these acts. The very term dishonored is only applicable to someone who has been honored in some way. The individual who has no honor to lose cannot feel the shame of dishonor. We take pleasure in beautiful surroundings, and feel the anguish of being thrust into base, low, ugly surroundings in proportion as the æsthetic faculty is developed in us, and we are capable of appreciating the beautiful. We feel pain at the sight of immoral conduct, and pleasure in seeing or hearing of great and noble deeds, in proportion as the moral faculty is developed in us. All men's faculties of perception are not equal. In trying the effects of sounds in a public hall, in the presence of a large number of persons, it has been proven that the audience were not all affected alike. As the experimenter increased the speed of the vibrations, and the sound became higher, some of audience remained tranquil,

as if deaf, while it gave others the most excruciating agony. Many persons are incapable of hearing very high sounds. Is it not because there are no corresponding filaments in the cochlea of the ear to correspond to the vibrations produced? And with the intellect, there are some brains so highly organized, sensitized, that every new idea, every æsthetic blending of colors, or noble example, will set some fibres of those millions of the brain quivering in response, and consequently make itself cognizable. The whole universe, as comprehended by us, is only real according to the degree of perception possessed by us. The gamut of the scale of feeling is larger, and more finely strung, in some individuals.

If the æsthetic and moral faculties are not developed in an individual, the individual is not capable of experiencing the pleasures and pains appertaining to æsthetics and morals. And to punish that individual, we must affect the physical man. We have to employ coarse and brutal methods of punishment to deal with coarse and brutal persons. If we deplore these methods of punishment, and the large number of the unfit, we must eradicate the conditions which produce them. When human beings are devitalized, their power to resist temptation or pernicious influences is weakened.

The punishments and rewards of religion are ideal, and appeal entirely to the intelligence. The conception of heaven and hell is based on the principles of rewards and punishments—if you act right, if you are righteous, you will be praised, you will be rewarded by going to heaven; if you sin you will be punished by going to hell or purgatory. The hope of reward or fear of punishment inculcated by religion is not real, it is purely ideal. It is not what is but what ought to be. And this thought becomes the actual when the sight of wrong conduct, evil actions, give rise to pain in the human mind, and the opposite gives pleasure. How will those modern biologists who do not admit the Lamarckian theory of use-inheritance account for the fact that many of the ideals of antiquity have become the real of to-day. It is ridiculous to say that those individuals who survived were a happy variation in the direction of morality. It was real in the history of each race to give full vent to animal instincts, and ideal to place any restraint on them. The human in us is the power to check or restrain that which is a natural tendency. And the ideal rewards and punishments, the contrasting of good and evil of religion, have had their influence in developing the human in us.

From the simplest misdemeanor to the most terrible crime there are certain associations attached to each and every one—the pleasurable emotions aroused by good conduct, and painful emotions

associated with bad conduct. The word sin conveys to the mind, several varieties of evil actions and there may be different ways of punishing each, but as the individuals of a particular race are punished, what they are accustomed to associate with the action will be recalled when the particular form of sin is named.

The punishments and rewards of society exert a powerful influence in determining conduct. The influence of public opinion has been very potent in developing character. What people will think, has a great influence on conduct. Public opinion ratifies or augments legal punishments by making the culprit feel all the terrors of social ostracism. Its power is direct and certain, therefore more deterring than all the imaginable possible punishments of the other world combined. It inspires human beings with a desire to do good and noble deeds by rewarding them with praise, love, respect. It trusts a man or woman who is known for honesty and probity, and distrusts them when the contrary, thereby adding to public security. It inspires individuals to emulate anything noble or courageous. It stimulates just and courageous actions. For example, a man or woman who risks his or her life to save that of another, is given a medal for brave conduct. The mere gift of a medal has little value, nor is the value in the medal itself, but public opinion gives the value by honoring the receiver. And so it is with all decorations and rewards of merit, public opinion has the power to ratify and give the value to a public gift. It stimulates the desire to acquire knowledge and position by giving these homage. Kindness is repaid by love, cruelty by hate. A man or woman does not like to be called a fool, a good for nothing, selfish, or any other opprobrious epithet; therefore, he or she avoids doing anything which may call such forth. Thus it places a restraint or checks that which may be a natural tendency.

An action is judged in its relations to its antecedents and to its consequents. A man commits a murder in order to rob his victim; he is a criminal, and is regarded with horror. Another man murders a man who has alienated his wife's affections to defend his honor, and he is not regarded with the same degree of horror as the first would be. The latter might not even be called a criminal, the antecedents of the same act "murder," are different, therefore, the judgment of the act varies. Knowledge of the antecedents influence our judgments on a course of conduct adopted by an individual, so will increased knowledge of the influences of environment, and education in forming the character of the individuals, influence our judgments on the course of conduct adopted by those individuals.

Why do we imagine that the penalty of one, two,

or three months, or so many years of imprisonment, will reform the criminal and repress crime? Primitive communities did not have the gradation of penalties. Sir Henry Maine tells us "in the almost inconceivable case of disobedience to the award of the village council, the sole punishment, or the sole certain punishment, would be universal disapprobation." In Rome, at one time, we learn that the citizens were so far developed that it was only necessary to point out the right way and the citizens would follow it, or the punishment was sufficient if a man was reported dishonest. We cannot afford to have in any community individuals who have no honor to lose. It is not reformation of the criminal we want. We do not want the formation of criminals.

In archaic communities there were no lawyers, and there was no expensive judicial machinery. It is only when society becomes so intricate and complex as it is to-day, that we need these institutions. In primitive societies custom was the lawgiver. The whole community met and decided the merits of the case. It is only as societies become more differentiated that we find written laws, and as these societies advanced, revision of the laws has been necessary. All individuals, unfortunately, do not move in the direction of progress. Individuals are apt to revert through disease or abnormal conditions to some primitive type, which would be suited or adapted to some archaic community, and we administer to them our later day code of morals, and punish them by law, which is incongruous.

And this leads us to the question, What right have we to inflict penalties on our fellow creatures? The answer might be—It is the same right which all social groups of animals take upon themselves who associate together for mutual benefit, to excommunicate or kill the one who by its inability, disability, or refusal to conform to the code of that group, makes itself obnoxious to the rest of the community. And this was the view evidently taken by primitive groups of human beings who associated together for mutual benefit in the early tribal communities and later village communities. Each group had its own social code, and when this code was violated, the offender was outlawed. Social groups of to-day act similarly. If a man or woman shocks, very badly, the community, he or she is shunned, ostracized, excommunicated from society. Early social groups cut off the offender from all communication with the group, and as Sir Henry Maine has already said, "All communities who can at once place its malefactors outside its bounds have little need of an elaborate criminal jurisprudence." But to-day, the offender is still part of that village or town, and even if isolated for a time, returns to become part of the

community. If excommunicated from one class the influence on another for evil is still present, and if exiled, will still have influence on another nation. And as surely will the excommunicated from the societies of to-day, the homeless, the outcasts, exert their influence on the community in which they live.

PHILOSOPHICAL NOTES AND COMMENTS

"As we pity the blind and the lame, so those who are blinded and maimed in the faculties which are supreme, should be pitied."

* *

"Things that will wear are not to be had cheap, whether it be a fabric or a principle; if it is to endure, it must cost something."

* *

"The bitterest prejudices are those which are founded on ignorance. Many a war would have been prevented if the heads of great states could have met and talked the matter over."

* *

"If one could weigh the motive power that affects the mind, it would be found that one ounce of responsibility laid upon a man has more effect in determining his conduct, and even his character, than tons of good advice, lay or clerical, or hundred-weights even of good example."

* *

"The air we breathe, the temperature in which we live, and the objects with which we are surrounded, acting from day to day upon body and mind, necessarily produce an effect upon the organs of utterance, and mould them for harsh or for softer expression."

* *

Richter gives it as an excellent antidote against moral depression to call up in our darkest moments, the memory of our brightest; so, in the dusty struggle and often tainted atmosphere of daily business, it is well to carry about with us a high ideal of human conduct, fervidly and powerfully expressed.—*John Stuart Blackie.*

* *

Genius rushes like a whirlwind—talent marches like a cavalcade of heavy men and heavy horses—cleverness skims like a swallow in the summer evening, with a sharp, shrill note and a sudden turning. The man of genius dwells with men and with nature; the man of talent in his study, but the clever man dances here, there, and everywhere, like a butterfly in a hurricane, striking everything and enjoying nothing, but too light to be dashed to pieces.—*Hazlitt.*

HORTICULTURE.

Beautifully colored and symmetrically arranged flowers are the result of careful selection and painstaking cultivation. The relationship of the domesticated plant with that of its wild ancestor is, in many cases, very difficult to trace, hybridism being an important factor in determining the qualities and peculiarities. Florists who want to develop characteristics which would make the plant valuable, take great care with crossing, and even then they meet with many failures, for without any apparent cause an obnoxious color or malformation springs up from crosses considered pure. But these are set aside by the careful florist, who, by perseverance and selection will bring out the qualities desired, so subservient are plants to training, until he has a fixity. There are even then occasional exceptions, for no matter how true a plant may be in yielding the qualities of more immediate parentage, there very often crops up some backward deviations due to reversion to some remote ancestry. Cultivation may go on for years during which time the flower may become richer in color, stronger in texture and more double, all of which qualities become to be inherited. The leaves can likewise be trained, and quite often a plant of straggling, careless habit can be made into a more defined shape.

It occurs, however, that, while many of the seeds of a well cultivated plant come true, there are usually a few having all the characteristics of the wild species. The more careful the selection the better, for good seeds from good varieties naturally give good results, but notwithstanding, the tendency to revert to the primitive forms is ever present. The many varieties of the common pansy can be identified with the wild *viola*, and every gardener knows how prone they are to change their form and color. Even the wild forms are so erratic that some of them are not easy to distinguish so like do they become to one another. If carefully watched and noted, it will be found, considering conditions of domestication, that there can be seen a direct tendency to revert to one or other of the wild forms, more particularly to *viola tricolor* or *viola grandiflora*. A well cultivated and constant-growing plant—one that retains its form, color, etc., from year to year—may produce a bud which varies in character from its fellows and which gardeners call "Sports". Such a modification may be cultivated independently, forming a new variety, and transmitting its new characters from year to year. "The white moss-rose was produced in 1788, by an offshoot from the common red moss-rose; it was at first pale blush-col-

ored, but became white by continued budding."

Reversion is not only to be observed in the crosses, but as often happens by budding. Thus in *dianthus caryophyllus* (carnation), it not unfrequently occurs that a flower may show itself of different tint, even when great care has been taken to have the plant come true, and no other reason can be assigned than that of the tendency to come back to the original species. One very good example was a subvariety of the weeping-willow. The leaves of this tree rolled up into a spiral coil. For twenty-five years it kept true, "then threw out a single upright shoot bearing flat leaves."

It appears to be the case that with budding as with crossing, there is the inclination to come back to ancestral characters, such characters lying latent during a long period of cultivation.

GOVERNMENT.

Government is the people it represents.

Government is national existence organized.

Government is the representative of civilization and the principal means of its diffusion.

Government is the highest form of applied knowledge because it has the greatest influence in civilizing and educating the people.

Government in the individual sense is the control over our own actions; in the political sense, it is the agreement of the individual governors to a stated law for the benefit of the whole.

Government is the truthful reflection of the governed, when considered as a whole, and all changes and modifications that occur therein result from the growth of the governed.

Vernet, the great French painter, was coming from Versailles to Paris in the train. In the same compartment with him were two ladies whom he had never seen before but who were evidently acquainted with him. They examined him very minutely, and commented upon him quite freely—upon his martial bearing, his hale old age, his military pantaloons, etc. The painter was annoyed, and determined to put an end to the persecution. As the train passed through the tunnel of St. Cloud, the three travelers were wrapped in complete darkness. Vernet raised the back of his hand to his mouth and kissed it twice violently. On emerging from the obscurity, he found that the ladies had withdrawn their attention from him, and were accusing each other of having been kissed by a man in the dark. Presently they arrived at Paris, and Vernet, on leaving them, said: "Ladies, I shall be puzzled all my life by the inquiry, 'Which of these two ladies was it that kissed me?'"

PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT, OR ATHLETICS.

In athletic training the care and development of the visceral organs are of more importance than the development of the muscles. A good trainer is generally very careful to have his pupil in the best of health before beginning the muscular exercises, and there is probably no better way of attaining this end than by dietetic attention. This treatment, however, is too slow for many trainers, who resort to purgative and sudatory medicines. This drastic method of preparation is more harmful than beneficial, for a trainer who resorts to such means generally goes further, and instead of placing his "man" in condition, usually overtrains him. The muscles are forced too much without a corresponding action of the vital organs.

It is necessary for the production of muscular tissue (quality and quantity) to have assimilation as near perfect as possible, plus purity of repair. The tissues depend upon the blood for nutrition, and to make the blood as rich as possible there must be thorough healthfulness of the circulatory system. When all the organs of this system are in good working order, the pupil has proceeded a long way in his training. Again, the oxygenation of the blood is of great importance, probably of paramount importance, in the development of quality of tissue, and in seeking this end endurance is promoted. The effect of pure air can be seen in people whose business calls them to live in the mountains, shepherds and such. They are large lunged, therefore broad chested, and large and firm of limb.

The aspirant to athletic pre-eminence, of whatever class, not only looks to his physical structure, but must also train his intellectual capabilities, which is no very difficult matter to one in such a state of health. But one man may have keener acumen than another, and this goes a long way in competition. Indeed, the strongest and swiftest are not always the prize-takers. The man who can focus his strength, combined with "knack" (a very suggestive word) and trained endurance, likewise a determined *will* to be foremost, may not be so strong physically as the man who lacks the "knack" or endurance or will, each or combined, yet the former is far and away the better man. Will power, if properly used in athletics, is of great value in getting the muscles in condition. It is rather underestimated in this respect. Apropos of this—the writer was privileged to see a man who could, at will, dislocate almost all his joints. One can readily understand to what perfection of training he had brought his muscles to when he could, without any

apparent extra effort, dislocate his shoulder or hip joints, knowing the strength of the muscles in those parts, and without any outward pressure. Moreover he could retain the limb in its dislocated state and reduce it at will, the articulating surfaces, when the muscles were put upon the proper stretch, coming into place with the characteristic "whack" familiar to surgeons. This is certainly an extreme case of will training, but it can be done in due moderation.

The ordinary "all-round" athlete who counteracts the effects of his labor by reverse action, and who simply seeks health and enjoyment, can be stimulated by the record-breaking attainments of the professional. Purely amateur, he need not carry his pastime to such excess, but go on in the even tenor of his way, establishing for himself a vigorous manhood.

ABUSE OF THE BICYCLE.

The use of the cycle is a form of bodily recreation, in itself, doubtless wholesome; none the less is it open to the mischievous effects of undue indulgence. Everyone finds he can do something with it, and considerations of weather, constitution, age and health are apt to be dismissed with summary imprudence.

One fruitful source of injury is competition. In this matter not even the strongest rider can afford to ignore his limit of endurance. The record-breaker who sinks exhausted at his journey's end has gone a point beyond this. The septuagenarian who tries to rival his juniors by doing or repeating his twenty or thirty miles perhaps against time, is even less wise.

Lady cyclists, too, may bear in mind that their sex is somewhat the weaker. So, likewise, among men the power of endurance varies greatly, and it is better for some to admit this and be moderate than to labor after the achievements of far more muscular neighbours.

In short, whenever prostration beyond mere fatigue follows the exercise, or when digestion suffers, and weight is markedly lessened, and a pastime becomes an anxious labor, we may be sure that it is being overdone—*Lancet*.

A good story is told in the *Gaulois* of Bosco, the famous conjuror, who was giving an exhibition of his skill at a *café* in the provinces. Among other tricks, he took ten five-franc pieces out of the pocket of a very shabby man, who for years had probably never had so much money in his possession. "Wonderful!" said the stranger, "I could never have believed it." "Keep them," said Bosco. The shabby one took the coins, felt them, and putting five in his pocket replied, as he handed back the remainder, "I admire your skill so much that I make you a present of half the sum you stole from my person."

PEDIGREE FARMING.

Breeders of stock are often confronted with peculiarities which seem to be foreign to the parentage. But when they trace back the pedigree it is found that nature has repeated itself, and that the strange offspring is but a reversion to some remote parent. Many examples may be given. Darwin mentions not a few—"a pointer bitch produced seven puppies; four were marked with blue and white, which is so unusual a color with pointers that she was thought to have played false with one of the greyhounds, and the whole litter was condemned; but the gamekeeper was permitted to save one as a curiosity. Two years afterwards a friend of the owners saw the young dog, and declared he was the image of his old pointer bitch Sappho, the only blue and white pointer of pure descent which he had ever seen. This led to close inquiry and it was proved that he was the great-great-grandson of Sappho; so that according to the common expression he had only 1-16th of her blood in his veins." Another case: "A Mr. R. Walker bought a black bull, the son of a black cow with white legs, white belly and part of the tail white; and in 1870 a calf, the gr-gr-gr-grandchild of this cow was born colored in the same peculiar manner; all the intermediate offspring having been black."

To show reversion to more primitive ancestry: Darwin "reared several birds from the white Silk hen by the Spanish cock—one of them . . . closely resembled the wild *Gallus bankiva*, but with red feathers rather darker. On close comparison one considerable difference presented itself, namely, that the primary and secondary wing feathers were edged with greenish black, instead of being edged as in *Gallus bankiva*, with fulvous and red tints . . . in all other respects, even in trifling details of plumage, there was the closest accordance. . . . This case of reversion is the more extraordinary, as the Spanish breed has long been known to breed true, and no instance is on record of its throwing a single red feather. The silk hen likewise breeds true," etc.

In illustration of latency the same author says:

"In every female all the secondary male characters, and in every male all the secondary female characters, apparently exist in a latent state, ready to be evolved under certain conditions. It is well known that a large number of female birds, such as fowls, various pheasants, partridges, peahens, ducks, etc., when old or diseased, or when operated on, assume many or all of the secondary male characters of their species. In the case of the hen-pheasant this has been observed to occur far more frequently dur-

ing certain years than during others. A duck ten years old has been known to assume both the winter and the summer plumage of the drake. Waterton gives a curious case of a hen which had ceased laying, and had assumed the plumage, voice, spurs, and warlike disposition of the cock; when opposed to an enemy she would erect her hackles and show fight. Thus every character, even to the instinct and manner of fighting, must have lain dormant in this hen as long as her ovaria continued to act. The females of two kinds of deer, when old, have been known to acquire horns; and as Hunter has remarked, we see something of an analogy in the human species.

"On the other hand, with male animals, it is notorious that the secondary sexual characters are more or less completely lost when they are subjected to castration. Thus, if the operation be performed on a young cock, he never, as Garrell states, crows again; the combs, wattles, and spurs do not grow to their full size, and the hackles assume an intermediate appearance between true hackles and the feathers of the hen. Cases are recorded of confinement, which often affects the reproductive system causing analogous results. But characters properly confined to the female are likewise acquired by the male; the capon takes to sitting on eggs, and will bring up chickens. . . . I will add a somewhat different case, as it connects in a striking manner latent characters of two classes. Mr. Hewitt possessed an excellent Sebright gold-laced bantam hen, which as she became old, grew diseased in her ovaria, and assumed male characters.

"In this breed, the males resemble the females in all respects except in their combs, wattles, spurs, and instincts, hence it might have been expected that the diseased hen would have assumed only those masculine characters which are proper to the breed, but she acquired in addition, well-arched tail, sickle-feathers quite a foot in length, saddle-feathers on the loins, and hackles on the neck, ornaments which, as Mr. Hewitt remarks, would be held as abominable in this breed. The Sebright bantam is known to have originated about the year 1800, from a cross between a common bantam and a Polish fowl, recessed by a hen-tailed bantam, and carefully selected; hence there can hardly be any doubt that the sickle-feathers and hackles which appeared in the old hen were derived from the Polish fowl or common bantam; and we thus see not only certain masculine characters proper to the Sebright bantam, but other masculine characters derived from the first progenitors of the breed, removed by a period of above sixty years, were lying latent in this hen bird, ready to be evolved as soon as her ovaria became diseased."

CHILD CULTURE.

Children are at all times most observable and quick to detect any deception or double-dealing in their elders. They mentally note such vagaries, for they can do nothing else. They can tell by the expression the particular mood of a person with whom they are occasionally brought into contact, and soon learn to discern whether the words belie the meaning. They are very prone to note slovenly habits, such as carelessness of gait, irregularity in attention to duties or derangement of toilet, and a teacher regardless of such does much to inculcate into their young minds a certain non-chalancy which in any sphere of life is to be avoided. There is as much in the actions and ways of living of a teacher, which goes far to mould the after life of his or her scholars, than there is in the ordinary lesson routine. The latter is probably of secondary importance, for if methodical habits have been implanted much has been done to simplify the task.

The infant impressions are not easily eradicated, and it is the duty of a teacher to make those imprints clear and legible and blotless. What man or woman cannot recall how important he or she felt when placed in a school for the first time and the impressions then made? The faculties were then fresh, acute, flexible. The whole system unimpregnated with anything appertaining to hypocrisy or evil in any form. No polish—nothing but naturalness. How easy it is in this state to imbue right or wrong! The methods need never be driven in with the hammer of harshness, but can be moulded into consistency by gentle dealing and kindness. Occasionally there may be a fractious urchin on whom great care must be exercised, and it is for the teacher to exercise some tact in the "breaking" of such a child. It is no test of the proficiency of a teacher to bring up to a standard of goodness, in education or discipline, a hundred *good* children. The merit is in the results achieved in treatment of the few refractory ones. Gentle firmness and example, combined with tact as individual cases require, are necessary to secure good results in the child, who, if well directed, will grow up to be a useful member of the community.

Many a young fop imagines that a girl takes an interest in his *welfare*; when, in truth she is eager only for his *farewell*.

AT THE LIBRARY.—Lady: "I am tired of modern fiction; can't you recommend me a good exciting standard work?" Librarian: "Have you read *The Last Days of Pompeii*?" Lady: "No, I believe not. Can you tell me what he died of?" Librarian: "An eruption, I believe."

CRÆSUS AND CYRUS.

Cræsus, the last King of Lydia, B. C. 560-546, was famed for his power and wealth which drew to his court at Sardis, all the wise men of Greece, and among them the sage Solon, whose interview with the King was celebrated in antiquity. In reply to the question who was the happiest man he had ever seen, the sage replied that no man should be deemed happy till he had finished his life in a happy way. Alarmed at the growing power of the Persians, Cræsus sent to consult the oracle of Apollo, at Delphi, whether he should march against the Persians. The oracle having replied that if he marched against the Persians, he would overthrow a great empire, he collected a vast army and marched against Cyrus, little dreaming that it was his own empire which he would overthrow. He was defeated, retreated to Sardis with the remains of his army, and after a siege of 14 days the city was stormed and Cræsus, being taken prisoner, was condemned to be burnt to death. As he stood before the pyre, the warning of Solon came to his mind, and he thrice uttered the sage's name, Solon! Solon! Solon! Cyrus, who was present, inquired upon whom it was that Cræsus called, and upon hearing the story, repented of his purpose, and not only spared the life of Cræsus, but made him his friend.

On observing the great liberality of Cyrus, Cræsus remonstrated with him on the lavish distribution of his wealth. Cyrus then asked him thus: "What sums do you think I should now have in possession if I had been hoarding up gold ever since I came to power?" Cræsus, in reply, named some immense sum, and Cyrus said to him, "Well, Cræsus, do you send with Hystaspes here, some person in whom you have perfect confidence, and do you, Hystaspes, go about to my friends, tell them that I am in want of money for a certain affair (and in reality, I am in want of it), and bid them furnish me with as much as they are each of them able to do, and writing it down and signing it, ask them to deliver the letter to Cræsus' officer to bring to me." They departed on their mission, and, on their return, Cræsus found that the friends of Cyrus, who had been enriched by his liberality, were willing most gladly to give the King far more than the sum which Cræsus had said the King might have saved by a less generous course of action.

When it appeared to be thus, Cyrus is reported to have said to him, "You see, Cræsus, that I too, have my treasures; you bid me hoard them up, but it would be to be envied and hated for them. I make my friends rich, and reckon them to be my treasures. I am rich by possessing their love."

THE FRENCH WORKMEN'S SANITARY CONGRESS.

The French Workmen's Congress of Hygiene met on July 3rd and terminated its labors on July 10th. It is organized by the Possibilist Party, the most influential of the various factions in which the Labor Party of France is divided. This party has determined that it will try and effect some immediate improvement in the condition of the working classes and for once leave abstract theories of social justice aside, so as to secure for the living generation practical advantages. No legislative or political question offered a better field for such action than the broad issues raised by sanitary reformers. The Sanitary Workmen's Congress was preceded by a series of six lectures, the first being delivered by Dr. Dujardin-Beaumetz on Food. The five other lectures have also been delivered and proved most successful. They were each attended by more than a thousand workmen, all representative men, who listened with such rapt attention, and showed such enthusiastic appreciation of what was taught by the eminent lecturers, that some of the lectures were prolonged for more than two hours. What is more remarkable is the fact that the more scientific the lecture became the more it was appreciated. When dealing with more purely workmen's questions, such as factory legislation, the attention was not so marked, but it became intense when the lecturers described the chemistry of food, the circumstances that affected the quality of mother's milk, and the vital statistics that demonstrated the fatal consequences of bad sanitation. These lectures are being published in the cheapest form, so as to be accessible to the working classes, and the most scientific lectures command the best sale. This is a fact well worth noting, for it shows the determination of the more intelligent working men to acquire a scientific basis for their opinions. A large number of the workmen who attended these lectures have also visited the municipal laboratory, where methods of detecting the adulteration of food were shown. The question of adulteration proved very interesting, and fraudulent practices in providing alimentary supplies would be suppressed with no light hand if the working classes alone had to decide such questions. The disinfecting station, the sewers, the sewage farm and other places of interest as bearing on public health have been visited by hundreds of workmen during the last few weeks. They were always accompanied by engineers or others who could give full explanations.

Now that the period of instruction is nearly completed, the workmen who have followed these lec-

tures and these investigations are discussing in their respective societies how the knowledge they have acquired can be practically applied. The various trades unions, and other workmen's societies belonging to the Possibilist Party are busy drawing up reports and proposals which they will present at the forth-coming Congress. A Commission on each subject will be appointed to study these reports and proposals, take the best points out of them and combine them all in one single report and one set of resolutions. Then discussions will follow and we shall see to what extent the labor organizations of Paris have profited by the lessons they have had and how they propose to deal with those sanitary problems which in France at least have in the main been discussed only by experts. Apparently the workmen are well satisfied with what scientific men have told them. They do not wish to go any further; they accept what they have been taught, they only demand that the moral of the lesson should be enforced by suitable legislative enactments. The approach of this original style of congress—for I am not aware that in any country workmen have held a sanitary congress—has attracted a great deal of public attention. The French press has given it wide publicity and in the country several municipalities have decided to encourage this effort. The Municipalities of Lilles, Blois, Angers, Tours and Chatellereault have voted subventions to enable the workmen of these towns to send delegates to the Congress. From abroad, also, expressions of sympathy and interest have been received. Though the Congress was purely a national gathering, foreign representatives were welcomed with great cordiality as honored guests. There is no doubt that a large number of trade unionists would have been present but for the general elections which took place in England just at the time the Congress met in Paris.—*The Lancet*.

Laissez faire.—As an instance of the difficulty of moving the bucolic mind, I may mention an incident which occurred to a friend of mine in Sussex.

He had purchased a house, the garden of which at one time had been overlooked from the back windows of an adjacent cottage; but the previous owner of the property had bricked up the said windows in order that he might enjoy the privacy of his garden. My friend, however, was of a far more generous spirit; it would be no pleasure to him to reflect that his comfort had been procured at the cost of his poor neighbor. So he asked me to go with him to the tenant of the cottage to say that he purposed to reopen the windows that had been bricked up, and thus give more light and ventilation to the cottage.

His benevolence was not appreciated; it elicited only a piteous lamentation. "We be very well, sir, we be. Let we 'uns alone, please."

PHILANTHROPY AND ECONOMICS.

"Evil is wrought by want of thought
As well as want of heart."

Hood—*The Lady's Dream*.

The terms "charity" and "benevolence" are unknown in the vocabulary of the orthodox political economist. They do not form the subject of discussion, hardly of reference, in the works of Adam Smith, Ricardo, or John Stuart Mill: it has been made a reproach to the consistency of the first named writer, that, whereas he made sympathy the main-spring of the moral nature of man, his doctrine of the acquisition and distribution of wealth rests on the assumption that the actions of mankind are directed solely by selfishness. Equally remote from the scope of a consistent scheme of socialism must be the conception of any motives of benevolence. In as far as it deals with community of goods, socialism cannot logically stop short of extreme views. If it be granted that the poor have a claim to be relieved out of the abundance of the rich, that all have, even in the very birth and production of wealth, a right to share in its distribution, there can, *ex hypothesi*, be no room for any arbitrary apportionment at the suggestion of sentiments of pity or of sympathy. On the other hand, we have the poor always with us; we have deeply rooted in our nature the instincts of sympathy and compassion; the most austere economist would probably find it hard to say, with truth, that never in his life had he allowed the stern teaching of his professions to give way before an appeal to his unphilosophic sentiments of benevolence.

These amiable impulses, whether they be regarded as inherent in our very nature, or whether they be considered as acquired (since they are absent, or present within the narrowest limits, among the lower animals), have been fostered by the ethical and religious teaching of all ages and of every creed. In the Old Testament the command is absolute—"If thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen in decay with thee, then thou shalt relieve him" (Lev. XXV, 35); and again "When ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest. And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather every grape of thy vineyard; thou shalt leave them for the poor and stranger" (Lev. XIX, 9-10).

Turning to the New Testament, the injunction is not less stringent. The Pharisee, trained in the strict letter of the old law, is made to say to the Propounder of the new, "I give tithes of all that I possess" (Luke XVIII, 12). In the next chapter Zacchæus, the chief among the publicans of Jericho, imputes it to himself for righteousness that "the half of my goods I give to the poor" (Luke XIX, 8). Interposed between these two examples, the direct injunction of the Master occurs, who, to a certain ruler seeking the way of eternal life, replied, "Sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the

poor" (Luke XVIII, 22). The founders of the Christian Church appear to have attempted to carry these precepts into practice—"All that believed were together, and had all things in common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need." (Acts. II, 44-45). The duty of active benevolence has from that time forth been conspicuous in the doctrine of Christianity of every shade.

It is unnecessary to say that on this point the Christian Church can claim no monopoly of teaching; from all time, in all parts of the world where religious teaching has emerged from the stage of fetichism or devil worship, the practice of benevolence and almsgiving has been assiduously inculcated. The founders of the great religions of China, and of India, arose in times of oppression and violence, when the insecurity of property, and the precarious tenure of wealth under arbitrary government, inclined the philosopher to teach renunciation of worldly possessions as the first step toward the enjoyment of tranquility. Abnegation and poverty were of the very essence of Buddhism; mendicancy was the outcome of its pessimism; as a necessary corollary, those who renounced the world in favor of the better way were constrained to exist on the alms of those who were outside the pale of perfect initiation.

The teaching of Islam has not in this point of doctrine lagged behind that of the religions which have preceded it: the true believer is constantly reminded by the five pointed emblem of the mystic hand, that the cardinal points of his religion are faith, prayer, fasting, pilgrimage and almsgiving.

"O ye faithful, give alms of that which ye gain, and of that which is yielded from the bosom of the earth..... To give alms in public is good, but to give them in secret is better..... The blessings you bestow upon the poor will be paid back to you again."

(KORAN, Ch. II.)

The most cursory survey of the social conditions of the world around us, will satisfy the observer that the combined action of the promptings of the benevolent instinct, and the teachings of religion, have not produced a result in any way satisfactory. In England a system of poor-law relief is in force that should, in theory, render it as superfluous in the individual to give as to solicit alms. This state system is supplemented by institutions endowed or supported by wealth almost fabulous in its total. But all this does not avail to free the public from the solicitation of the most abject form of beggary, from the genteel begging-letter writer, from the all-devouring soup-kitchen, or from the nineteenth century representative of the mendicant orders—these last named ragged brethren being replaced in our day by neatly costumed sisters, and the greasy wallet by a well appointed spring van. In Italy, in Spain, and in Russia, wherever the older regime prevails (and the teachings of religion are powerful in proportion as the voice of the economist is unheard), human misery, if not more intense than among ourselves, is more obviously in evidence. Outside the Christian pale this

is still more emphatically the case. The maimed, the halt, and the blind, who infest the gates and the streets of Mohammedan cities, display to the passer-by withered limbs, wounds, and sores, that rouse in an unaccustomed spectator feelings in which pity is almost overpowered by horror and disgust. Still farther afield, China affords an instance of the *reductio ad absurdum* of the mendicant art. In that country state relief and benevolent institutions and asylums exist in a lamentable state of inefficiency, but beggary is reduced to a system. The streets of Chinese towns swarm with casual mendicants, but in addition to these, there are mendicant societies or guilds, presided over by presidents, and placed under the superintendence of a magistrate. They have their rules, to which they swear obedience; their entrance fee of upwards of four dollars; their periodical feasts; their annual celebrations. So great is their power that it is found expedient to place the streets under watchmen who are usually the heads of a begging guild. They make their quest organized system, and having taken toll of a house, give in acknowledgment a ticket which releases the householder from further importunity for a certain period. It need hardly be said that all citizens find it easier to pay toll at once than to submit long to the disagreeable consequences of a refusal.

If this system is really organized with the thoroughness described, it must amount in practice to much the same thing as a poor rate.

Turn, then, which way we may, whether to the cases where philanthropic efforts owe their origin to the teachings of religion, or to those where they have been set in action by the instinctive promptings of human nature, it must be allowed, that, while relief has been afforded to individuals (sometimes indeed to the most deserving and necessitous, but too often to the most importunate, or those who, by some happy accident are most favored), no serious impression has been made on the aggregate mass of human misery and destitution. Must, then, religion itself be held in fault, in that the exhortation to charity has always had for its aim the elevating effect of the virtue on the giver, in disregard of the degradation, and that to a greater degree economically, of the receiver of alms? It may be deemed a distortion of Scripture to read into the text, "it is more blessed to give than to receive" (Acts XX, 35), a suggestion of the demoralizing effect of alms on the recipient; yet it would be easy, as has been seen, to multiply instances of exhortation to charitable acts on the ground of their subjective effect for good on the giver. But, if it be a laudable virtue that we exercise in turning the cheek to the smiter, in yielding the coat also to the plunderer of our cloak, in going two miles when we reluctantly go one only, have we not, in exercising that virtue, assisted in developing in an antagonist the vice of violence, of rapacity, of tyranny, which he will certainly impart in his turn to others, and so help to fill the world with violence? If we give all we have to the

poor, and take no thought for the morrow, are we not adding ourselves and our families to the ranks of pauperism, and swelling the number of those in that great army, who are only too ready to learn the lesson that sustenance is not only their due, but theirs to be enforced as a right? In short, are we not tending to involve society in a common vortex of hopeless and irredeemable destitution?

There is not much to be gained in the way of practical guidance by reference to the works of accepted text-writers. It is in the "Introductory Discourse and Notes" of McCulloch, rather than in the body of Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations," that there will be found any discussion of the theory of the relief of distress. Admitting that the really necessitous poor should not be allowed to die in the streets, and that it would be abhorrent to all the feelings of humanity to allow paupers to suffer the extreme of want, and also that unless the burden of relief be equitably distributed by a compulsory rate, mendicancy must be permitted; he holds it to be "pretty clear" that the duty should be performed equally by all classes, in proportion to their means. Mill follows in much the same strain, and, subject to necessary restrictions, conceives it "to be highly desirable that the certainty of subsistence should be held out by law to the destitute able-bodied, rather than that their relief should depend on voluntary charity." At the same time, Mill leaves to private charity the drawing of distinction between the deserving and the ill-conducted, a discrimination which it is not in the province of the state to exercise, the duty of the latter not being "to do more for anybody than that minimum which is due even to the worst."

In strong contrast to these cold and dispassionate views are those of Malthus: premising that the test of utility must be applied to the promptings of impulse as the surest criterion of all morality, he denounces as mis-called charity the immense sums distributed to the poor by the parochial laws (which it must be admitted were at their worst point of administration in his day), and, quoting from Mr. Townsend's Essay on the Poor Laws, draws in animated words the contrast between the grudging dole, thanklessly received at the parish pay-table, and the mild complacency of wealthy benevolence hastening to the humble cottage to relieve the wants of industry and virtue.

Mr. Herbert Spencer denounces in still more vigorous terms the law enforced plans of relief that, instead of blessing both him that gives and him that takes, are a curse on both, and contrasts the cold, hard, lifeless mechanism, managed by boards, clerks, and collectors, with the gentle softening influence that should be habitually taking place between the rich and the poor. The keynote, according to Mr. Spencer, is Sympathy, "the faculty which distinguishes the social man from the savage—the faculty which originates the idea of justice. In deciding how misery is best alleviated, we have to consider, not only what is done for the afflicted, but

what is the reactive effect upon those who do it. Charity is in its nature essentially civilizing: the emotions which accompany every generous act add an atom to the fabric of the ideal man. But a poor-law is the direct opposite, and all defenders of a poor-law must be ranked as spurious philanthropists."

Whichever way, then, we turn when an appeal is made to our benevolence, we are confronted with a dilemma. If we refuse to listen, and shelter ourselves behind the plea that relief is the duty of the state, we must place ourselves in antagonism to all the precepts of religious teaching; we must divest ourselves of that prerogative which separates civilized man from the savage, and the savage himself from the lower animals; we must act with the indifference with which nature relentlessly works for the survival of the fittest; driving out, like a herd of deer, the sick and wounded from our midst, to perish alone of wounds or want. If, on the other hand, we open our hearts and our purse-strings, we have to consider whether our motive is any higher than that which actuated the founders of many an alms-house and refuge in days gone by; whether by indulging the emotions that accompany the generous act, we are, in Mr. Herbert Spencer's phrase, adding "an atom to the fabric of the ideal man;" or whether we are gratifying our moral sense with the indulgence of an act of bastard philanthropy, and simply seeking to "make our souls" in a somewhat more plausible guise than did the pious founders of the middle-ages. At the same time, we have to take into account the effect of our benevolence, not only on the recipient, but on the community, and to satisfy ourselves that we are not only, by an act of apparent philanthropy, degrading the individual, and spreading the very evils that we fain would alleviate, but also defrauding the more industrious and more provident members of society. For if, in Herbert Spencer's phrase, destitution be only the measure of the difference between the sum total of the supply of the means of subsistence, and of the demand, any misappropriation of the general stock cannot but increase the amount of the deficit on the one hand, and the number, on the other, of those for whom no means of subsistence exist.

The problem is one that presents itself in its most perplexing form in a great metropolis. Here we have not only the official form of state relief provided by the poor rate, the contributions extorted from the reluctant rate-payer and grudgingly received by the ungrateful pauper; and on the other, the glowing emotions of my Lady Bountiful, visiting as some heaven-sent messenger, the humble roof of appreciative virtue in distress, as depicted in the pages of Malthus and of Mr. Herbert Spencer; but we have also the vast organization, if it may be so called, of institutions originating in private endowment, or supported by voluntary contributions. No one who has, or enjoys the reputation of having, any superfluity of this world's goods needs to be reminded of their infinite variety, or of

the persistency with which, each for itself, advocates the claims of the particular form of distress with which it is intended to cope.

These voluntary alms have created a new danger. The parochial relieving officers have at least in view that their means are to a certain extent limited,—the rate at so much in the pound can but realize so much, which must be made to go as far as may be among a number of paupers, which must be kept down as much as possible. But no such obligation lies on the administration of voluntary charity; so much more raised this year than last, so many more cases relieved, so many more widows pensioned or housed, so many more children placed at school or in service; all this is testimony to the zeal of the administration in meeting the needs which it was instituted to supply. It would be surprising if under these conditions, while the fountains of benevolence are apparently inexhaustible, the requirements to which they minister should fail to be perennial, until it has grown to be a question whether the inscription that decorates many an imposing façade, "Supported by voluntary contributions," is one that is a credit, or the reverse, to the community; and we may be driven to recognize that in matters of charitable relief, not merely "*uno avulso non deficit alter*," but that there never was a charitable institution started, the need for which was not thereby at once created.

The foregoing considerations show how closely allied to the province of religion and of ethics is the domain of economics; in the discussion of the subject under present review the three are well-nigh inseparable. In the matter of the giving and the receiving of charitable benevolence of any kind, the subjective effect on the character of the individual may perhaps be left to the religious teacher, the moralist, or even the casuist. But as regards society as a whole, the economist is directly interested in the conditions under which it seems fated that the industrious and effective portion of the community is to be taxed in perpetuity for the support of the other portion, which, either from incompetency, idleness, or misfortune, is simply non-effective. From the economic point of view, it is immaterial whether this tax be voluntary and self-imposed, or whether it be compulsory and raised by the state. The only difference between the two cases will be in the incidence of the tax; in the former it falls on a mere fraction of the small class of the opulent and well-to-do: in the latter it will be levied on the much larger proportion of the community, who are able by their own exertions to earn somewhat more than sufficient to defray the bare cost of subsistence.

Is there any method whereby the present most unsatisfactory condition of things can be remedied? Is there any hope that in the future the mass of pauperism and indigence that now weighs like an incubus on every civilized community can be at least diminished in volume, if it cannot be entirely removed?

To adopt the heroic remedy is here clearly out of the question. In a civilized community will it be permitted to allow even the most improvident or indolent to starve? and it may well be doubted whether such an experiment, were it actually put in practice, would prove successful. It is even probable that the moral fibre (defect in which allows an individual to sink below the level that separates independence from pauperism), would still be wanting in the residuum of society, and that the prospect of starvation might to such be as little deterrent as is now the prospect of the almshouse. Will society, then, ever be saved or raised to a higher level by an abundance of the means of relieving destitution? The first effect of a recent crusade directed, under the auspices of a powerful propaganda, against vice and destitution, and toward the attainment of a terrestrial millenium has been to crowd with tramps the highways leading to London, and to raise the average number of the occupants of the metropolitan casual wards.

Discrimination must be the key-note of relief; it is evident that there must always be cases where sickness, accident, misfortune, the failure, through diversion of trade, change of fashion or improvement in machinery, of a craft which has been laboriously acquired and long industriously pursued, may bring a man or woman to undeserved want, in declining years, or even in middle life. It is clearly wrong to place such cases as these on an exact equality with that of the constitutionally, perhaps congenitally, vicious and idle. It is at least a principle to admit that the unfortunate shall not be ranked as the vicious or the criminal. To carry out this principle presents many difficulties. Discrimination can be exercised only by establishing some measure of contact, direct or indirect, between giver and receiver; any scheme of centralization, whether under the direction of the state or of private organization, must be antagonistic to the attainment of the end in view. It is practically essential that the occupants of a poorhouse, or of a hospital, under the present conditions of management of such institutions, shall be placed in a position of equality, no less than the guests in an hotel. To open the door to even the suspicion of favoritism might lead to evils even worse than those that it is sought to avoid. But an accurate knowledge of the causes that have brought this or that individual to a condition of dependence might make it possible to secure, for the merely unfortunate, a scale of treatment more liberal than that minimum to which Mill holds that the worst are entitled. Such knowledge can scarcely be arrived at otherwise than by individual effort; decentralization,

rather than centralization, must be the watch-word, always bearing in mind that in this matter subdivision of labor, if carried too far, must lead to dissipation of energy. It is obvious that in a small or comparatively isolated community the needs and claims of each individual are far better known, or can be much more readily ascertained, than in the case of a large population aggregated in a populous city. The difficulties in the latter case are great, yet, even so, much has been done by individual effort and unobtrusive organization. But, though much has been done, much yet remains to be done, and no better work could be ready to the hand of those who are in a position to undertake it. It is not a little singular that in the present day, when social distinctions are constantly tending to effacement, and when the community is becoming more and more homogeneous, the fallacy that the rich are growing richer and the poor poorer, finds more vigorous expression. No less fallacious is the cry that the rich care naught for the poor; at no previous period was there probably a larger proportion of society anxious to devote time and energy to improving the conditions of those who are in need or distress.

The economic effects of discrimination in bringing help to the indigent would be far-reaching: poor-law relief as at present administered cannot but be pauperizing, and must lead to obliterate that sense of responsibility in the community, which is indispensable to the general welfare. A pauper class looking to the state for the means of supporting a merely animal existence, will continue to perpetuate itself after its kind. For such as these there is no hope; they must be eliminated from the body politic if the aim be, not exact quality in the appropriation of wealth, but such an apportionment that each shall have sufficient for his own needs, and that no individual or class be taxed for the maintenance of another. If the sentiment of society does not permit us to stamp out the Rougon-Macquart family, it may yet be possible to crowd it out by the slow process of elevating and imbuing with a sense of responsibility, those whose degradation is not complete and irremediable.

"Self-knowledge, self-reliance, and self control,
These three alone lead life to sovereign power."

To the general recognition of this maxim, and the cultivation of these qualities, society must look for its emancipation from the incubus of pauperism that hangs as a mill-stone round its neck, and hinders the march of free economic development.

JOHN BIDDULPH MARTIN.

