

THE BARBARISMS OF CIVILIZATION.

GUIZOT attempted to fix the meaning of the word Civilization by an elaborate induction, and concluded that its essential meaning is Progress. But to many minds progress will appear harder to define than civilization; such a definition is certainly *obscurum per obscurius*. Far more obvious it is to look to the history of the word Civilization. It is a modern development out of the verb Civilize, which, of course, meant nothing but to *make civil*. Thus we are thrown back on to the adjective Civil, Latin *Civilis*. If we can rightly expound this, we can hardly fail to interpret Civilize aright.

Notoriously a *Civilis animus* is the opposite of a *Regius animus*, which to the Latins suggested the claim of lordship and privilege, nay, a spirit haughty and high-handed. On the contrary, he who was *Civilis* had the qualities of a *Civis*, the virtues of a citizen: especially, he treated other men as his equals, his peers, and claimed no superiority; hence the popular English idea of Civility. Not only so, but he was a good citizen in a larger sense; ready to sustain the public welfare by wisdom and energy at the expense of personal sacrifices. Surely we need not hesitate to accept as a true interpretation, that to be "civilized" means to become thus *fit for citizenship*. If we try to step further back, and ask, What was the primitive idea of the word *Civis* with the Romans? our ignorance of early Latin embarrasses us. Yet in other cases also (whatever be the cause) the Welsh or the Irish language gives indirect suggestion. Here we find that the Welsh *Cyf* (sounded *Kiv*) is comparable to Greek *συν* and Latin *Con, Cum*. Words beginning with *Cyf* occupy twenty columns of Richards's Welsh Dictionary. *Cyfalle* means *conjux*, husband or wife, a partner, a fit match. *Cyfail* means a friend, a comrade, *alter idem*. This reminds us that those who were full Spartan citizens were called *οἱ ὅμοιοι*, the equals, *the peers*. By

such analogies the present writer is persuaded that the idea of CIVIS among the Sabines, from whom it probably came into Latin, was Partners and Equals in the community. Out of this the sense of the adjective Civilis flows naturally, and comprises the notions of "fraternal, just, and courteous."

Now, if the attainment of such qualities be (as the writer believes) Civilization, it is only in *spurious* civilization that barbarity can inhere; and in this sense must the motto at the head of this article be interpreted. It is not here denied that there has been Progress (in the high and true sense) accompanying the national changes both in England and in all Europe; indeed, when there is occasion for it (as in a certain controversy there is), to recount the marks of such progress is easy enough. Yet, wherever a national history lies open to us, it is a familiar fact that its earlier barbarism had its own virtues as well as its vices, and that in its later stage new vices came in, or even the old ones under new pretences; so that at last, in spite of the progress of which it might justly boast, the *Civitas* broke in pieces mainly through the failure of the *Civilis animus*. From no other cause does the vain talk of Socialism now gain plausibility and influence than from a perception, an inward sense, that such is our present danger. If we will not look honestly into the face of facts, a fundamental discontent, not the less formidable because its claims are vague, may gain great and dangerous prevalence.

But in speaking of our barbarisms the argument must be confined to this United Kingdom, and nearly to matters which public opinion either does not censure or has even approved by law and established as systematic. Unless we thus limited ourselves it might seem doubtful where we should stop and whence we could hope for a remedy. Unhappily the range of facts to be considered is far too ample, even when limited as above. From what point shall we begin on a wide and varied topic? Perhaps from our *neglects*.

While population is scant over an area of which few know the limits, lawless freedom can do no harm against the force of Nature. If a stream be polluted by wanderers, the pollution is quickly carried away, and the evil is transitory. If trees be lavishly cut for firewood, the forest does not miss them. If their trunks impede a water-way, a new channel is presently opened. If large game be killed, and much of the carcase left to putrefy, the poisoned air does not reach far. Man is not yet powerful enough to improve the country; therefore neither to mar or ruin it. But when population increases, new dangers arise—not those of which alone Malthus and the spurious followers of Malthus talk, but—danger lest *one* spoil the air, the water, and the land for *another*; danger also lest one seize for himself more land than he can use, to the damage of many others. Even very rude tribes soon discern these dangers; our earliest common law denounced the practices which involved them; but local mischiefs can only be averted or redressed by locally vigilant authority; central power has plenty besides to do.

Among ourselves there has been, and there is, manifold and barbarous neglect.

It is not at all rare to find the side of a mountain or high hill thickly timbered as you traverse a road, until of a sudden the timber fails, and you see only thin rocky soil with tufts of gorse and grass. On examining, you discover the ground to be just as poor even where trees and bushes grow thick; but a wall encloses them. The difference is only that within the wall the land is private property, outside it is common. The law, as administered by the rich, has not defended the woods which belonged to the *public*, but has permitted each greedy individual to despoil them. In consequence the natural wood long ago disappeared, except where defended as private property. Continental countries have defenders of the public forests. We might have had defenders, appointed not by any central power, but by each parish, if our originally well-planned local institutions had been cherished and developed. Every wardmote, holden in the common interests of the people, might have been a public school and fountain of local sentiment. With little or no expense the people themselves would have restrained the offences of their own order: but there is now little to preserve; commons have been swept away, and public footpaths too, under cover of new laws, the rich rivalling and surpassing by far the encroachments of the poor.

Under English notions of freedom the same mischief has for a long time been going on in English colonies, or colonies so called—as, for instance, the Mauritius. This island was captured by the British in 1810. Since its sugar has been admitted into England on equality with West Indian sugar the blind eagerness of trade has done its worst to deform a beautiful spot. Nature is still too powerful for man; yet an old resident thus writes: “Fruit, once abundant, is now scarce and high-priced. The beautiful woods, rich in a tangle of gay flowering trees and gigantic *lianes*, are now to be seen only in a few of the more rocky places. Naked stumps and rows of stiff cane replace them. Even the prettily-wooded environs of the country-houses are too often sacrificed for the universal cane. There is not a Creole in the island but will shake his head mournfully, and tell you that his *petit pays* is but a shadow of its former beautiful self.” Far worse than this—that is, worse than the disappearance of rice, arrowroot, manioc, yams, potatoes, cotton, indigo, most of the fruit and much of the beauty of the island—is the terrible fact, that eagerness to raise sugar led to a large importation of “coolies” (ignorant, helpless men, who often came under a misunderstanding of the contract which virtually enslaved them); and no provision being made for cleanliness in a tropical climate, this island, formerly noted for salubrity, is permanently stricken with malarious fever. A lagoon many miles in extent, on one side of the principal town, is now described as a bare expanse of fetid mud, when the tide recedes.

The same may be said of many English sea-side resorts. Offensive details might easily be here put together. But to return to the destruction of timber. A Continental statesman of some eminence recently uttered the assertion: "The universal curse of old civilization is the wide destruction of the natural forests." He had Italy especially in view. But in Canada and the United States already the mischief is felt. One may presume that the steeper the hills the more rapid is the devastation. Often the rainfall is lessened. Also the forest which acted as a sponge no longer holds up the water, which runs off in flood instead of sustaining full streams all through the year. It is well if these floods do not carry off the soil from the surface, leaving bare rock, upon which no human repentance can renew the original timber. The modern English philosophy, too often preached by Radicals and practised by Conservatives, is: "Let the State give to every enterprising individual free leave to use up the natural products of the soil, vegetable or mineral, leaving posterity and the future to shift for themselves."

Poisoning of the natural streams is a still worse offence perpetrated by the cupidity of trade. This was severely forbidden by our common law, yet constantly committed, simply because we have no official public prosecutors. The same cause makes laws against polluting the air by smoke ineffective. Neighbours may be annoyed, yet do not like the odium of prosecuting; in manufacturing towns all the rich have interest in impunity, and shelter one another; much less is an individual likely to take the expense and risk of lawsuits, especially against an opulent company. Hence, long before the invention of gas polluted the Thames, foul water in plenty gushed into it against common law from the Fleet Ditch. But the main stream and upper water remained comparatively pure; for salmon came up with the tide beyond Richmond in the memory of men not yet decrepit. After the gas companies had made the water unfit for use no scruple was felt against increasing the pollution. No powerful corporation bestirred itself to prosecute, and neglect might seem already to have inflicted on the noble river the worst which it could suffer.

But theory, pedantry, and pretentious sanitation proved still more efficacious for evil than any mere neglect. A number of active-minded men, physicians, surgeons, and physicists, were shocked at the high death-rate of towns and their evident insalubrity. In order to improve the atmosphere they invented the bright idea of commanding the pollution of rivers. In the years 1844-48 it was in vain that any unpretending citizen argued with the eager sanitarians who assumed the direction of Parliament against the odious offence of poisoning the natural streams. In vain did one remind them that this was the specific iniquity, the detestable crime peculiarly forbidden (according to Greek belief) by "that voice of many peoples which is truly a voice of God." They derided opposition as the outcry of ignorant conservatism, and cajoled

Parliament (1848) into making that pollution of rivers to be compulsory, which from time immemorial had been penal. Before many years were past Parliament, in consequence, found itself half-poisoned by the pestiferous stench of the Thames. Then counter-legislation began. But the mischief had been made universal by fatuous law of which the sanitarian philosophers had been the originators, the Parliament the tool, and the helpless nation the victims. After this very grave blunder, to purify the polluted streams and get rid of noxious matters was easier to command than to effect. The evil which ought to have been removed by calling for the execution of the good old common law had been multiplied a hundredfold by the energy of would-be scientific statute law; it still distresses most and crushes many.

London, a very wealthy metropolis, has been relieved at the expense of many millions sterling; but it is only a relief, not a cure, which her vast constructions have achieved. The newer science has gone back to the wisdom of Moses, and teaches that earth is the rightful purifier of refuse that else will be dangerous; that no accumulation of material, noxious out of place, ought to be allowed to putrefy by long time; that it is a very evil thing to rob the head streams of rivers for the convenience of huge towns, first stinting the rivers of their natural supply, next pouring back into them the waters detestably polluted, to the misery of villagers. The marvel is, how any men, pretending to science can have devised such plans. That they succeeded in winning over Parliament is, of course, to be accounted for by the over-occupation of that august body, and by the wretched misarrangement which permits laws (of perhaps vital importance) to be passed in thin and wearied Houses after midnight. A solemn condemnation of all this false sanitation is recorded in the Social Science Transactions of 1868—that is, in the able Address of Dr. Henry W. Rumsey on “Health.” Most reluctantly, no doubt, does he sum up against the deplorable errors of his predecessors in science. A short extract from his Address may here be appropriate (p. 93):—

“So eager were most of the earlier sanitarians to get rid, at any cost, of human refuse that, without due consideration of the possible results of the measures adopted on the future water-supply of the people, they advised the pouring of abominations of all kinds into the nearest water-courses; having first rendered subsequent measures for the recovery of what was truly valuable in this (so-called) refuse almost impracticable by diluting it with floods of water, both that which had been artificially stored at enormous expense for town distribution and the natural rainfall.

“In vain did physiologists and scientific agriculturists protest, for various reasons, against this rash dilution and wrong disposal of organic matter. The skill and enterprise of our great civil engineers, supported by the energy of leading sanitary reformers, were triumphant. The effete products of manufactures and trades, the animal and vegetable *débris* of towns, mineral detritus, &c., were all to be got rid of by water-carriage. The result was, that communities have had to encounter a more serious difficulty than at the very beginning of sanitary reform. There were fish in the rivers, good for food; they all perished. There were human communities down the stream, suffering from an increase of sickness and

mortality, and crying out for drinkable water. Well, they were advised to filter the river water, or to boil and then aerate it; or if all this were too troublesome and expensive, they might sink wells, or tunnel the nearest hills, for a *safer* supply. No substantial relief or help was afforded them."

Dr. Rumsey goes on to quote figures which seem to confirm the belief emphatically preached by Dr. Budd of Bristol, that watercourses, when defiled by the products of disease, are very efficient diffusers of baneful malaria. Without adopting any germ theory, any novel or contested opinion, the repugnance of common sense to sending in every direction that which tends to poison the air might seem a sufficient reason for condemning and rejecting water-carriage of such materials. But we are not yet at the bottom of our difficulty. In all our towns it is both the fashion and the compulsory law to have tightly-closed drains; open sewers are forbidden. Good! right! we at first say. But, alas! the gases which are formed inside the drains will blow them up if some vent be not allowed; therefore at fixed distances vent holes are periodically opened, whence foul blasts are liable to assail one or other of the luckless neighbouring houses. But now we are taken aback by a new development. It is asserted that the drains need more ventilation than had been supposed. Orders from central authority in London insist that the vents shall be placed at shorter distances; and so great is central power that, in the town where the present writer resides, members of the ruling commission have made the ominous remark, that we seem now to be forced back in the direction of open drains! With an unsound basis you cannot attain consistency and stability. Surely this is a condemnation of water-carriage, even if we had, ready-made, a double set of natural channels and a double supply of water.

In all this discussion it has been overlooked that, instead of going to the root of the mischief, artifice has been applied to sustain historical wrongs which we ought to outgrow and remove. Dr. Rumsey justly insists on the essential want of ozone, and excess of carbonic acid, in the atmosphere of large towns. Large towns are in themselves a monstrous evil—an evil continually growing through wrongful laws or customs of land; and this system of drainage has, by affecting to induce salubrity, aided to blind the public and sustain the evil. A town of twenty thousand inhabitants is large enough for every good and desirable object. Even when this number is not exceeded careful regulation is needful to secure healthful air and water without unreasonable expense. One sentence suffices to express the cardinal condition which supersedes water-carriage of refuse, and ensures normal salubrity—*viz.*, every block of houses should have side by side a proportionate space of land suitable to periodical and rapid crops, on which the whole refuse should be expended. It is not parks and gardens that we want in the middle of a town to serve merely as lungs, but rustic fields, to be manured and cropped at short intervals, under public and compulsory rules. To

enact such rules prospectively concerning towns not yet built involves no intrinsic difficulty even in the United Kingdom, and might almost be called easy in our newer colonies—say, Australia and New Zealand especially. But a Parliament so overworked as ours can never look forward, and is driven on to work chiefly by public disasters, for which (it might seem) it waits, except when intriguers manage and master it by a cunning study of its forms and rules. Empty fields and huge densely-packed towns denote in past history the era of decay, especially when the towns have to be fed from abroad. No large population ought now to live on a narrow area. In the ruder ages, before cannon and bomb-shells were invented, swarms of people huddled thick together in order to gain protection by a city wall. Military necessity then overpowered all scruples concerning health. But in the modern stage of the military art, an enemy who commands the field is formidable to a town in proportion as its population is dense, which is so much the more exposed to the horrors of famine and of bombardment. We have no longer excuse for any towns with closely-packed inhabitants; much less was there ever valid reason for cities so large that the children by scores of myriads are unable to walk into the country. The old accounts of Nineveh and imperial Babylon represent those capitals as having within the fortifications wide areas of cultivated land, making them, not cities, but fortified provinces, with rural districts enclosed. If thirty-five years ago our sanitarians had held the doctrine to which their sad failure points us—which, indeed, Dr. Rumsey maintains—that water-carriage of offensive matter is fundamentally wrong, their action would have been directed to control the growth of towns, and permit it only under severe conditions. But as things are now managed the land on the edge of every town is the property of an individual, and if built upon, its money value is multiplied manifold. Therefore private cupidity, not the public welfare, prescribes when and where new houses shall be built, and how tightly the inhabitants shall be packed. To the poor this is a terrible calamity. The poor cannot select where they will live; they have to lodge where they can find shelter, not too distant from their work. The wild savage not only lives in pure air, but is fastidious in choosing the atmosphere in which he will sleep; but a poor family in a country which vaunts its civilization, too often, in spite of industrious virtue and immense efforts, sink down into misery, the health first of one, then another member breaking down under the insalubrity of a district. What avails it to talk of drains when the drainage from the higher grounds defiles houses that are lower, and perhaps a poisoned river adds its fatal exhalations? A family, packed into two, or say three, rooms can scarcely avoid contagion when a single member falls sick. Now also, the drains being out of sight, it is morally certain that defects will exist, or be caused by wear and tear, unseen. In one place evil liquids and gases will percolate; in another evil accumulations will putrefy. Instead of blending small portions of needful manure quickly with small portions of

the earth that needs it, we secure in the drains a slow putrefaction, and a permanent source of pestilence; we relieve a town by imposing a grave vexation and danger on the whole neighbourhood where its drains have exit; we make the mouth of every tide-river a harbour and store-house of pollution; and after thus wasting an agricultural treasure, we send across the Atlantic ships for a very foul commerce in material destined to replace it. Is there here any lack of eloquent facts to rebuke our "barbarism?"

On a smaller scale we have like noxious deeds, not in dense populations, but in places essentially rural. These words do not allude to the hideous deforming of scenes naturally beautiful, say in Yorkshire, Lancashire, Derbyshire, or Wales, by the smoke of chimneys for manufactures or mining; pollution of the rivers is still pointed at. As isolated instances of a common fact, we may here state, that into the beautiful Ulleswater a fresh bubbling stream ran from Greenside, until in the mountain a mine was opened, which poured its refuse lead into the "beck," turning its colour to that of dirty milk. Hereby every wanderer gets warning not to drink. The peasants close by have become accustomed to get drinking water from other and smaller rills, and, if asked whether the loss of the beck is not an infliction, they reply: "Well, the good folk at the mines *give us work*." Thus, for a consideration, they become willing partners in the poisoning of the stream. But this is not all. The stream poisons the lake, at least where first it enters; no doubt much of the lead is quickly deposited in the deep bottom. But after copious rain, the lake overflows on the pastures. Some years back the writer knew a case, not likely to be isolated. A pony ate grass over which the water had flowed, and was killed by its poison. The company which worked the mines immediately paid the price of the poor animal, thus averting a lawsuit and a disgraceful exposure. But is this state of things not barbarous, and worse than barbarism? Again, at Aberystwith, where two streams meet, one of them is poisoned by refuse from a mine, but the colour of the water does not show it. The writer knows of two tourists, who, being thirsty with walking, tried to drink, and were foiled only by the steepness of the bank and want of a cup. They afterwards learned what danger they had escaped.

At the moment of writing, a notice turns up concerning the state of the Scotch rivers—viz., in the *Daily News* of May 5th. For drinking or for washing the water in many streams gives the people much anxiety. Creosote is used in sheep-washing. A tank of creosote was kept near to a small river of Kinross-shire named the Devon, in which the trout still retained a home. But the tank leaked, the stream became muddy with it, the trout sickened, died, and floated on the top; the neighbours dreaded to use the water. "Meanwhile," says the Editor of the *Daily News*, "the Tweed salmon are dying of the disease which has done so much mischief in the Eden; which, as *Science has probably caused it*, Science may be asked to cure." Is science in sheep-washing intended?

or science of health? or science of national economy? It was quite notorious forty years ago that the refuse of the animal was the food of the vegetable, and ought to be saved for use, not wasted in poisoning the waters. How could well-informed men delude themselves into an approval of this course? Only one explanation occurs: *they despaired of returning to Nature.* They assumed that we must live by artifice, and they entitled artifice "*Science.*"

When once manufacturers have been accustomed to use a river as a drain it is necessarily hard upon them to forbid the practice; yet even here we have encouragement in returning to the only natural and right path. The greatest manufacturers of alum, perhaps in all the world, have their works in Manchester, and when forbidden to continue throwing their refuse into the adjoining stream, a tributary of the Mersey, were at first stunned by perplexity; but they called in the aid of science, in a right, not in the wrong way. They propounded to skilful chemists the problem how to dispose of their refuse, and before long (to use the phrase of one of the partners) they discovered that they had been throwing away gold. Modes were suggested of turning it to service, by which an actual gain was achieved, where they had expected heavy loss. The same gentleman attested that he had heard similar results to neighbours whose trade was of a different character from his.

It is evident that the avarice of trade needs many checks, both from political enactment and from moral teaching; yet neither check is duly applied. The wastefulness of military action is proverbial, yet the trader, who aims only at his own immediate enrichment, is as reckless of the future as the soldier, who plans only for victory. How painful is the record of successive destruction or extermination of animal races. If a huge creature like the elephant can only exist by occupying large areas of forest and plain which are needed for human habitation, no doubt the brute, however generous, must at length give place to the man. We do not know certainly how the elephant was exterminated from Northern Africa, but the eager demand for *ivory* under the Roman emperors is the probable cause. The entire race was driven out of existence for the pride or fantasy of rich men, whose money the hunters coveted. It is believed that in India also this noble animal, under English rule, is rapidly diminishing, and likely soon to vanish, though there exist jungles innumerable in which men cannot live and elephants might multiply. In Africa, south of the equator, the elephant is still found, but the pursuit of him for his tusks is incessant; chiefly to satisfy the craving of the civilized!* Much the same may be said of the American bison, who is sometimes slaughtered for his *tongue* alone, which is easier to carry off than his hide or his horns. In like manner the beavers have

* An enterprising American, who bought up from President Lincoln's Government the carcasses of all horses slain in battle, found that the shankbone of a good horse is so dense as to furnish no bad substitute for ivory. Are such bones duly esteemed and economized?

been hunted away, perhaps extirpated; not because their works are noxious to the streams, but simply because their furs fetch a steady price in our markets. The destruction of salmon and other fish by avaricious and reckless fishing has never been quite overlooked, and of late has been more seriously provided against by preventive legislation. The seals, walruses, and whales have not (we may presume) in any case wholly perished under the attacks of our pitiless hunters; but these innocent, kind-hearted animals—some of them very intelligent—have been largely driven away from the habitats most suited to their comfort; and probably the young ones perish through want of the fostering care of parents. To pass from the great to the little: it is reported that the exquisitely beautiful humming birds are disappearing at an alarming rate, owing to a new fashion which decks ladies' bonnets or heads with their feathers.

Divines and moralists have very little busied themselves with inquiries into the duties of men to other animals, and the limits to man's right over the various animal races. Hitherto, if in the recklessness of trade any animal be extirpated—say a beaver or a species of seal—it is lamented, not because the animal had any right to live, but because posterity will be poorer for his destruction; just as, if we deplore the using up of our coal-mines, which does but enrich one class of richer men, we deplore it not because the coal has a right to exist, but because the coming generations will have to go deeper and search further for their coal—perhaps may find it too dear to use. Yet is there not another side to this question? When the extreme case is put—"Shall man die, or shall animals die, that man may live?" there is no difference of judgment among men; but only in the exceptional case, only where wild game is essential for human food, is the absolute right of man over the life of gentle and harmless brutes universally conceded. A strong distinction is maintained by some between the wild animals which owe nothing whatever to mankind and the half-domesticated which men feed and protect from their natural enemies, so that in some sense we cause them to exist. Suppose it to be conceded that the fowls which we have defended and nourished may be claimed as lives over which we have discretionary control, surely with much less plausibility can we claim the like control over wild animals. The English law which pronounces those that we feed and protect to be private property, while it refuses all right of property in the wild animal, was based upon a sense of the sharp distinction. There is, apart from the moral question, an underlying economical one, in the fact that the grazier who rears cattle for the butcher's knife is never likely to exterminate the race; on the contrary, he seeks to multiply it, though by his artificial treatment he propagates a far weaker and more fragile breed. Still, he has demonstrably *some* right in his cattle, and a farmer in his fowls; but a hunter has absolutely none in the wild animals he pursues; unless might be right. To kill some, to mangle more, to cause numbers of young to perish, to drive

whole flocks from their natural abodes, perhaps to extirpate entire species for no other reason but pecuniary gain, is apt to be an injury to the human race on the one hand, and on the other is hard to justify by any moral reasoning if a court be held where an advocate is heard on the side of the brute. This is a topic which will be more fully discussed in the near future.

In considering our national state, the character of our laws, and the temper of our immediate rulers, it is often hard to judge what is the ideal at which legislators aim. Perhaps we must conclude that there are half a dozen different ideals alternately in the ascendant. Very careless we have been, and are, as to the extirpation of wild animals and of savage tribes; but how about the British and Irish races? Do we wish them to multiply or to dwindle, or do we think their present number precisely the right thing? Early in this century if a nobleman chose to unpeople his estate few voices were raised to censure it, and those were not heard in Parliament. Nearly the same state of things still exists. Where a faint defence was regarded as necessary by some professed economist, it was thought a good argument to insist that the population was still in existence, indeed was probably better housed than before, being now in some fishing town or some great metropolis. If population multiply in some rural area, the economists call it a *warren*, comparing men to the rabbits, whom farmers style "vermin;" but if they multiply in the slums of a town, where they are sure to grow up largely deficient in vital force, and perhaps with inferior moral character, this is approved of, as a sufficient compensation for driving them out from the fields and mountains where they were vigorous parents of a vigorous posterity. Barbarians know how to value a tall, muscular, and active population: have we entirely lost pride in the *rusticorum mascula militum proles*, whose large extermination in imperial Italy the poet Horace deplored? So it might seem; for the condition imposed on the old English baron of maintaining soldiers for the king's service has been for ages set at nought with impunity. Œdipus in Sophocles avows that neither towers nor ships are of avail if they are not well manned. Do we now really think that industrious slaves, paying rich tribute to the exchequer, sustain a nation in strength and honour without stalwart peasants? Or, when other nations compute their population at eighty millions or forty millions, *ever increasing*, that we can long continue in rival equality if our millions cease to multiply? During the advance of national greatness the increase of population is coveted and applauded; barrenness of women is esteemed a curse of God; blessing and joy attend every increase of families. When misanthropy and avarice deprecate increase, Nature is dethroned: the nation must decay if this be acquiesced in, and we may generally infer that its institutions are unjust. Certainly every nation has an intrinsic right to increase its numbers; a right earlier than, and more sacred than, any right which an individual can have to the luxury of romantic solitudes. To forbid such increase is a deeper

barbarism than that of savages. Institutions and laws, if they hinder it, need to be severely reformed. As the elephant or the wild Indian must give way to the pressure of human population, so must the rich proprietor; and if we value the English race as not inferior to any human family and superior to most, it is inevitable for us to desire not to be outnumbered by others, on whom perhaps we look down. The talk about superfluous population is about as gratuitous as that about the lost ten tribes. The ten tribes are no more lost than the two tribes; Ephraim and Judah have for near two millenniums been inextricably mingled; no one tribe is lost more than another, unless you go back to Simeon or Dan. So too, no one has ever yet shown that we have any superfluity of population. We have great superfluity of vice, great superfluity of bad law: remove evil habits and evil institutions, and it will presently appear that never was it easier for a people to feed and support itself. Too many political economists (unhappily) have to learn that vice is of all things most wasteful. Only a *vicious* population ought to be regarded as superfluous. Institutions which forbid industrious men to raise food out of the soil are something worse than superfluous. At the close of the American civil war, when freedom had been proclaimed to the slaves, those red men who live in the Indian territory—who, in imitation of the Southerners, had introduced a system of slavery—concluded that they must now reverse their course. *They*, too, proclaimed freedom to their slaves. But they did not scold at them as vermin, or as a superfluous population; no, but they re-divided their own lands, and gave to the freed men portions equal to their own. Which doctrine or practice is more barbarous—that of English land-tenure and population-fearing economists, or that of these American children of Nature?

The physicians and physiologists who had so cleverly persuaded Parliament in 1848 to make the pollution of rivers compulsory were so elated with their success that very soon their ambition assumed new audacity. Sir Robert Peel died in 1850 by a fall from his horse; but they had already beset him with the project of making vaccination compulsory: a thing which he protested the English public would never endure. He did not know how cleverly a devoted clique would manage the midnight hours of a wearied Parliament, nor what energy a united faculty could put forth when it had attained permanent office for ambitious schemers. The analogy was so beautiful between defiling the natural streams with a view to the public health and defiling the blood in the arteries with a view to the health of the individual, that those who had been bitten and infected with rabies for the one scheme took naturally and kindly to the other. No public debate took place on the topic, even among medical men; much less was any notoriety given to the debates in Parliament, if there were any, concerning compulsory vaccination. Apparently the thing was managed in the mode now esteemed orthodox. Various esteemed medical men talked over the editors of London "Dailies:" it would seem that a "conspiracy of

silence" was achieved in that early day; and, to use a very modern phrase, the whole thing "was sprung upon us" unawares, in 1853, just when our heads were getting full of Menchikoff and the Sultan, of Hungary and Austria, and much beside of foreign affairs. The Crimean War came, and was fought out, and departed, without one man in a hundred, out of those who were too old to have infant children, being aware of any change concerning vaccination. But in the medical profession itself there had always been avowed and pertinacious enemies of the practice. A small section of the nation knew and abhorred the law of compulsion. Out of this small but resolute school came stern remonstrances and solemn warning to the medical officials that vaccination, especially from arm to arm, was apt to convey any or every blood disease. But the officials spurned them as mere "quacks." Within twenty years, however, the confessions of able pro-vaccinators were overpowering. Mr. Simon, medical officer to the Privy Council, could not deny the fact, but alleged that the operator *must have* dipped his lancet too deep, and taken a drop of blood. He did not, and does not, guarantee any one against a like misadventure in the future. The pro-vaccinators have not learned to blush at their persistent and rude denial of what is now a confessed danger. Sir Thomas Watson, an aged and leading physician, only last year (June No. of the *Nineteenth Century*) calls the chance of foul disease from the vaccination now orthodox "a ghastly risk," and praises the father who will go to prison rather than permit it. Yet Sir Thomas Watson so hugs vaccination that he advocates the infusion of disease into calves in order to get cow-pox *at first hand*.

This is no place for nice medical argument, if the writer had tenfold knowledge: but many broad facts glare upon every one who has open eyes. In history, in theology, and equally in medicine, we have often to remember that there are some assertions, some doctrines, so paradoxical, so opposed to common sense, that when it is asked, what sort of evidence would avail to prove them? we are driven to reply, that we cannot imagine any: they are intrinsically incredible. Such to us is the doctrine that the Supreme God became a bull and a swan, and much beside which might be named. It generally happens that precisely those doctrines which thus startle us as incredible are eminently devoid of any proof that deserves regard. Just so is it here. *A priori*,—that is, from all the light of received physiology and ordinary common information,—we believe that the stronger is vitality, the sturdier is the resistance to contagion; and the purer the blood, the stronger is vitality. That corruption infused into the blood can secure us from contagion is certainly most unplausible,—scarcely credible,—a doctrine not to be received without overwhelming proof. Yet no proof from science is even pretended, but only a proof from perfectly ridiculous statistics,—ridiculous, because ill imagined from the beginning, and variously self-refuting. As an eminent Austrian physician has lately argued:—If tables were now drawn up to show how many of the vaccinated, and

how many of the unvaccinated, die of *diphtheria*, the figures, if applied with the most perfect skill and fairness imaginable, must end in making out either the one side or other to have more deaths : thus (if the logic used concerning small-pox be admitted) it will be made out that either vaccination or non-vaccination tends to secure from diphtheria. Of course that would be nonsense ; and why not equal nonsense to infer from statistics that vaccination saves from small-pox ? Meanwhile, the awful fact on a great scale confronts us, that small-pox has become more and more prevalent, more and more fatal, since vaccination has been made compulsory. Now at last the cause comes out without a blush of shame from our orthodox school. The Government vaccinators have for many years obtained a large part of what they call *lymph* (a fraudulent name—*pus*, or matter, is the only right word) by inoculating calves or bullocks with *small-pox*. The result in the animals they are pleased to call *cow-pox*, and when the poisonous matter is transferred back to human infants they assume that it will *not* reproduce small-pox !! But while this doctrine is orthodox in London, the Local Government Board in Dublin allows no such dealing ; for on February 10th last it warned all vaccinators that such proceeding spreads small-pox by inoculation, and is a crime against the law. Another broad fact is, the widespread suffering, disease, and death which vaccination causes in infants. A third is, the utter failure of vaccination to prevent small-pox, and the zeal of doctors for re-vaccination. Numbers of the re-vaccinated have caught small-pox within *a year* or *a month* after. The medical men who pretend (to the vulgar and to the ignorant) that vaccination is “ a real and easy preventive ” of small-pox often reply, when confronted with the fact of failure, either that the vaccination *cannot have been* (!) well performed ; others pretend (without a particle of proof) that the force of vaccination lasts for seven years only ; a figment which, if true, would not be to the purpose, would not relieve the facts. Finally (what to the present writer is by itself decisive), unless the *causes* of small-pox be removed (generally some impurity in the air or in the food), those causes will work mischief somehow. To throw an eruptive disease back into the system is proverbially dangerous. If vaccination had this tendency, so much the more dangerous must it be ; for it cannot remove the causes of small-pox. Moreover, what right has any physician to neglect the cures of small-pox, by which herbalists, hydropaths, and Turkish bath-keepers find it a most tractable disease ? Some barbarians bastinado an unfortunate patient when he is seized by ague : is it less barbarous to infuse corruption into the blood of a healthy man, as precaution against a disease which may not occur at all ? The last sentence touches on a great and critical fact. No doctor, no legislator has any right to assault the body of a *healthy* child or man under pretence of providing for the public health. A medical man, whatever his celebrity, proclaims his own folly when he entitles a healthy child a fountain of disease. These doctors,

when they consent to stick by their own logic, avow, that as fast as a man or child throws off the effects of cow-pox, he becomes liable to small-pox, and *therefore* ought to be cow-poxed again. (It is not really cow-pox, but it is certainly disease.) Thus they confess that *they dread perfect health*: (must we add, of course a healthy person pays them no fees?) they want to keep us in permanent cow-pox: yes, and they know not what more beside they may infuse into the blood. But, what is here urged mainly, a *legislator* usurps, if he *forbid perfect health*; he might as well command vice. Legislators who do not despise the physician who weeps over healthy children as dangerous have less good sense than most barbarians.

Is the sum of our barbarisms as yet completed in this rapid sketch? By no means. The same medical clique, which has installed itself in power, and has got the ear of over-worked legislators, became more audacious still after the Prince Consort's death. They resumed an old plot, which had been all but "sprung upon" the nation under Lord Melbourne, but had been defeated by the Queen's accession. Lord Melbourne declared it impossible to ask the signature of a virgin Queen to such a law. Whether there was any real connection between the death of the Prince and the resuming of this plot is not certain; however, about a year after his death they did resume the scheme of providing safe harlots for profligate men. Once more we find the same fatuous logic, *which seeks for health through artificial impurity*, and with brazen front avows that marriage is inconvenient to many men, and chastity is unhealthful. The laws were made and carried stealthily, in thin Houses and at midnight; penal legislation was passed without public notice or discussion; the common rights of the female sex were ruthlessly sacrificed, and an iniquitous system chained on to the neck of extensive districts, with an ingenious cruelty to girls and poor women which may seem a mongrel between the Paris police and the Spanish Inquisition. The first step to civilization, according to the ancients, was to enact, to honour, to uphold marriage: of all steps back into barbarism none is more marked than that of maintaining State slaves as harlots. This foul and disgusting despotism must soon be swept away by public indignation, unless family life and youthful purity are to be undermined, and a secret police in plain clothes, responsible to a central functionary, is to trample us down permanently. Moral despair of virtue and a resolve to indulge the profligacy of idle and drunken soldiers lie at the bottom of this odious and disgraceful legislation. Stop the soldiers' drink, and you will stop nine-tenths both of their unchastity and of their other offences.

The medical faculty (not all, for there are glorious exceptions—yet only too many) have been the upholders of artificial factitious remedies of ill-health, real or pretended. It is pleasant to be able to say that, however monstrous have been the cruelties of the faculty towards animals in some other countries, the horrors of vivisection here found their earliest

and most active advocates, not among actual practitioners of medicine, but among theorists, "biologists," and professors. It would be better still if we could avoid adding, that, as months and years go on, medical students, with the approbation or connivance of professors, more and more display zeal on the side of animal torture. In slight illness we do not need any very refined medical science: in dangerous and severe cases medical treatment is not so splendidly successful (if we may believe the testimony of a whole chorus of eminent practitioners and professors) that it can vaunt very high of the advantages it has obtained from the prolonged agonies of dogs, cats, and rabbits. Whether by such horrible cruelties human physiology has obtained, as a theory, any important enlargement, physiologists and students of the history may discuss. But the vivisectors are obstinately silent on the question whence they get a right to torture a *dog* any more than to torture a *man*. Some of them are avowed Atheists; and of them it has been remarked that having cast off reverence for a superior, they with it have lost mercy for an inferior. But if any profess to obey a moral law, they have to explain how they justify *animal* torture without justifying *human* torture, especially when the latter would much better promote science. The ground of condemning the torture of men is not because the man is intelligent, because he is religious, because he has a soul, because he is immortal; but because he has a sensitive nervous system. If a dog, a horse, a rabbit—as most vertebrated animals—have a body equally susceptible of pain, the moral offence of torturing it merely to increase our knowledge is identical with that of torturing a man for the same purpose. As one class of doctors insolently tell ladies that they invade the rights of poor women in order to save innocent wives from pollution by profligate husbands, so do vivisectionists insolently declare that we, the public, desire to get the advantage of medical treatment, while we censure the only means of attaining it. In each case, ladies not a few reply that they would scorn to accept such an advantage, whatever its amount, if bought at such a price. The whole matter is, not barbarous, but ghastly; and we have a new portentous example of imbecile legislation. A law was made nominally to restrict this torture of animals, but practically it has for the first time legalized it. The torturers are triumphant. The names of those who have licences to torture are carefully concealed, so that no torturer can be prosecuted, for it is always uncertain whether he may not have a secret licence. When law is thus perverted how can reverence for it be sustained? Dr. Charles Bell Taylor of Nottingham, in a meeting of a local society, after recounting a number of dreadful heartrending facts, remarks: "No man can do such things without suppressing his conscience, and the man who habitually suppresses his conscience is on the way to become a devil. . . . Young men are necessarily demoralized and spoiled by such an education."

This brings us back to the original question—Who is a good citizen?

in other words, What is it to be civilized? Let those believe, who can, that the habit of inflicting prolonged agony on innocent animals does not harden the heart, does not make a man a worse citizen. Yet no one, not even a drunkard, will deny that a sot is a bad citizen. A bad man, says Aristotle, is more dangerous than a wild beast; a man without a conscience is unfit for human society; and when drink disorders the brain, a man has no conscience, and differs little from a lunatic. Precisely because a beast cannot be a citizen of a human community, drunkenness, which makes a man more dangerous than a beast, suspends his rights as a citizen. The same infatuation which acquiesces in chronic pauperism, and does not know that it is a plague spot, complacently endures an army of drunkards counted by myriads, with orphanhood, disease, insanity, and pauperism marching in its wake. Nothing could be a milder punishment, if not rather called *remedy*, for drunkenness, than when once a person had been convicted of it, to forbid others in future to sell or give to him any intoxicating liquor. Our ancestors long ago saw that the trade in such drink must be kept under special restrictions. The kings, the parliaments, the ministries, the magistrates, have long since claimed, used, and acknowledged the right and duty of repressing a trade which thrives most when it does most vital mischief to the community. Therefore, for centuries back local magistrates received the power of severely cutting down the trade to its narrowest limits. When merchandise became more enterprising and capital increased, during the long reign of Elizabeth, this trade (here, as everywhere else) became dangerous and mischievous in proportion to its increased energy. Hence, under the two first Stuarts the ministers of the Crown were active and severe against it: the Parliament also was indignant at the ever-increasing vice. But against the attempted despotism of the first James and Charles, freedom and the Parliament triumphed. Under the second Charles,—a man not more drunken than his grandfather,—things turned for the worse, and the English nation became more and more despicably sottish, until the great religious revival under Wesley, Whitfield, and the Evangelicals made a change for the better. It is thought that we are not at present in quite so bad a state as in the reigns of the early Georges, down to the close of our American War. But how is it that the successive ministries, ever since Charles II., have shown none of the zeal against drunkenness which was so active before the Commonwealth? How is it that since Lord Grey's Reform Act a series of ministries, Whig and Tory, have been callous, cold, and practically unconcerned at the steady and formidable increase of an evil which a Parliamentary Committee of 1834 denounced in terms of burning indignation; and that, while unable to deny the enormous magnitude of the mischief,—while perfectly aware that the magistrates in nearly every great town scandalously neglected the duty of repressing the dangerous trade,—yet not on one occasion for two hundred years past has a Lord Chancellor been known to

reprove a magistrate for this neglect of duty, much less to displace, or threaten to displace him? Why did the ministries under James I. and Charles I. show a spirit so different from that of later ministries? Is there possibly any connection between this notable fact and another notorious fact, namely, that under Charles II. the Parliament gave to the king's Exchequer a new revenue from the Excise, which became more and more profitable, as did the duties on wine which are called Customs? So great has this source of revenue become, that it now exceeds thirty-three millions sterling in the year. But we are suddenly checked: we are reprovèd. No one ought to impute motives! It is outrageous to suggest that ministries connive at drunkenness in order to get revenue! Well; no doubt, to impute bad motives *gratuitously* is very wrong; yet if we may not speculate on motives, there can be no moral criticism. We are told that we ought to be charitable; but blindness is not charity. The charity here entreated or required of us is unhappily superfluous; for the ministries, and Parliament too, knew officially, from about 1826 onward, that, by the unlawful connivance of our Indian authorities, opium was smuggled into China for the sake of revenue to the Company. The ministries also connived, and hereby implicated themselves in war with China. Three wars with that injured country they fought, caused mainly by this opium traffic, which by dint of war they have compelled the Emperor of China to legalize. When challenged in Parliament by Sir Wilfrid Lawson, the late ministry did not dare to defend the morality of the opium traffic: all they could say for it amounted to this, that they could not afford to lose the revenue from it! Moreover, spirit shops have been introduced into India, to the disgust of Moslems and Gentoos, for no possible reason but to swell the revenue. It is therefore not charity, but mere simplicity, to doubt that from desire of revenue the successive ministers for two centuries back have connived at the magistrates' neglect of duty. If a Lord Chancellor were now as energetic as a Lord Keeper under Charles I.,—if he were to threaten whole benches of magistrates with removal unless scandalous drunkenness vanished,—we should need no new legislation; the existing laws are quite severe enough, if only there were the heart to execute them. No barbarism in England has been longer assailed than this uncivilizing vice. None has been cherished more obstinately by those whose duty was to control it. Unless the English nation brace up serious determination to extirpate both this and our other deadly barbarisms, good intentions and pious wishes will be unavailing to avert the natural results of vice in the people and folly in the governors.

FRANCIS W. NEWMAN.