

and longer than the sphinx to perplex and baffle humanity. The adolescent mind is confident; for it has never been beaten, since it has never been engaged in any real fighting. It proudly believes in its own success, and is but too apt to look disdainfully on great thinkers, because they left more to be thought. It glories in generalizations, and is gladly indifferent to the harassing details and preliminaries, with which, if it continues active, it will afterwards be chiefly and sensibly occupied.

The *young man* is often a would-be revolutionist. He is surprised that older and wiser and better men are so benighted. Let us not be misunderstood. The young man we are characterizing is the one in whom the faults his years are prone to are strongly accented. We have no intention of wholesale condemnation towards a class to which we have belonged, and therefore may be supposed to think of respectfully. If the unfortunate individual or type we are discussing betakes himself to science, he may do useful and praiseworthy work, but he is pretty sure to injure its meritorious part by adjuncts of misshapen generalization, and of criticisms very bad in taste and unjust in substance. His pages show a saddening spectacle of overgrown self-confidence, betrayed by the tone of expression, by the ill-repressed laudation of his own theories, and the bad-mannered fault-finding with others, perhaps merely because their observations, without which the young man could have done nothing, were not exhaustive of the field. Next follows pitiless criticism; the pedestal of flimsy logic is dashed away; the victim falls from his eminence. The specious argumentation is reft, and the man's ignorance is exposed nakedly. Last comes the cruel abasement, all the worse to bear because it is the public sequel of elation. And still the young man must be grateful if the late lesson can be learned by his aching and repentant mind. Would that the fire of the soul always purified, and never consumed!

PROHIBITION.

INTERFERENCE with the voluntary actions of people is to be deprecated, except when such actions trespass on the rights of other members of the community.

A chemical factory, emitting noisome fumes, must not be established in the midst of a town or city, or measures must be enforced against it to prevent the contamination of the surrounding air; a boiler-factory, with its din of rivet-hammering, must not be suffered to disturb the peace of a residential neighborhood; a gunpowder-factory must

not be allowed to endanger other properties by its proximity; a graveyard must be kept away from centres of living population. These interferences with the voluntary actions of factory and graveyard owners are justified by the fact that the interdicted operations are trespasses on the rights, because baneful to the health or comfort, of the community.

Is there any similar justification for the prohibition of the manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors?

We know that use is very apt to degenerate into abuse of such commodities; and we know that more than half of the immorality that afflicts society, and of the crime that fills our prisons, is directly traceable to the abuse of alcoholic liquors. We know also that the heaviest portion of the burdens on tax-payers—the cost of protective, detective, judicial, reformatory, and punitive establishments—is largely owing to the same cause. Everybody admits, therefore, that society would be justified in doing whatever is requisite to protect itself from the gigantic evils which spring from the liquor traffic.

Here, however, the policy now widely advocated diverges from the line of justifiable interference. Prohibition of manufacture or sale is not the proper protective policy. This interferes with the voluntary action equally of those who innocently use as of those who criminally abuse. No notice need be taken of the bigot theory, that innocent use of alcoholic liquors is impossible. Let us grant a place in the world for every thing to be found in it, and for every production of man's hands. Use and abuse are possible for all things.

What, then, is the proper line of social action?

Society does not, and can not, prevent the playing of games of chance by those who choose to waste their time and means in such demoralizing pursuits; but society does interfere with the business of the gambler, the card-sharper, the lottery-ticket seller, etc. Society does not seek to stop, by futile prohibitory measures, the prevalence of other forms of 'social evil,' but society does prevent the flaunting of immorality before the public eye, and the use of the streets for its advertising purposes.

So in reference to the liquor traffic. No attempt need be made, or should be made, to interfere with manufacture or sale; but the most absolute prohibition should be laid on the *business* of selling liquor 'to be drunk on the premises.' Saloons and bar-rooms are evil, and only evil, and that continually.

If a man wants beer or brandy, let him buy it as he does beef or bread, and by due measure of

pint or gallon, as he does solid provisions by ounce or pound. And let his purchases of liquor be delivered at his home, as openly as his meat and vegetables are. What would be thought of the man who should pack his fill of beefsteak and oysters within his own waistcoat, and leave his family to dine, as best they could, on bare potatoes? If the beer is good for the husband, a little of it would be equally good for the wife?

No articles of consumption are so tampered with by deleterious adulterations as the staples of the bar-room. No articles are sold at such a disproportion between the wholesale cost and the retail price. Nothing measured by the yard or weighed by the pound is so vague in quantity as the saloon 'glass.' People sneak behind the lattice-screen, and submit to the extortionate dishonesty for the sake of the privacy of their selfish indulgence. In the higher order of such places the patrons are further attracted by objects of luxury and sensuality. Gas, gilding, mirrors, statuary, and paintings are lavished on the surroundings. The wretched tippler's home is, of course, dull in comparison with this brilliant vestibule to the temple of vice.

Prohibition and local option are the measures most widely recommended for the cure of the drink-habit. But the true remedy has not been thought of by the advocates of these worse than ineffective panaceas. The social curse can only be stopped by stopping the liquor-supply at the point where alone it is capable of legislative control. Shut the saloons. Allow no liquor to be sold anywhere to be drunk on the premises. This is the grand summary of a grand revolution.

This 'prohibition' leaves to every man the due exercise of his personal freedom: it prohibits only the manufacture of drunkards, paupers, tramps, and criminals.

The spiders who fatten on the weak frequenters of their glittering nets of doom would have to turn to other employments. *They* would not be the liquor-sellers of the future. These would be of the class of ordinary honest tradesmen who put a fair price per definite quantity on a definite quality of their wares. Purchasers would be protected as to quality by certified inspection, and as to quantity by the compulsory use of measures in selling. Cut away by these provisions, the source of dishonest profits from the business of the bar-room, and even the proprietors of such establishments would speedily relinquish the traffic.

Prohibition of the *use* of alcoholic liquors has never succeeded — never can succeed; for it is a tyranny from which every independent mind revolts. If a man will play the fool with his brains

and his means, society cannot stop him; but it ought not through its licensed agents to facilitate the process. It should, moreover, provide an easy means of family protection from the consequences of drunkenness. Legislation can accomplish this, and nothing more would be necessary.

To stop the sale of alcoholic liquors for consumption on the premises would inconvenience nobody. Phials of any capacity might be obtained for use at home. And the gilding and glitter of the saloon might still be available to render attractive the tea-room, coffee-room, and reading-room, where families as well as individuals might resort for the cup 'which cheers but not inebriates.'

B.

PETER'S ATTACK ON PASTEUR.

THE discussion in the Paris academy of medicine, which originated in Professor Peter's recent paper on death by hydrophobia after preventive inoculation, was concluded at the last meeting (Jan. 18). Professor Peter spoke again upon the subject, but in much milder language, and his remarks may be summarized as follows:—

When death takes place after preventive inoculation, the defenders of Pasteurism recur to an alibi or to extenuating circumstances instead of confessing the truth. For instance, they argue that death was due to some other cause, such as uraemia, meningitis, or albuminuria, but not to hydrophobia. In other cases they admit that hydrophobia is the cause of death, but they explain it by stating that the patient did not apply for treatment until it was too late. M. Peter does not accept these excuses, and bluntly says, that, if patients die after having submitted to preventive inoculation, their death is due to the inoculation, entirely ignoring the effects of the rabid animal's bite. Pasteur's method, according to M. Peter, is an ingenious one; but it should not be applied to man, especially the more recent method of intensive inoculation. The old method, he admits, is harmless though useless; the new method, he claims, is harmful, even murderous. To it and not to the bites of the rabid animals, he attributes the recent death of patients with hydrophobic symptoms, after preventive inoculation.

M. Brouardel, in a short matter-of-fact address, said that M. Peter's arguments were utterly illogical, and concluded by giving the statistics of results already achieved at Odessa, as follows: out of 101 cases treated by the ordinary method, there were 7 deaths; out of 35 cases treated by the mixed method, 1 death; out of 140 cases treated by the intensive method, *not one death*. This disposed of the charge that the latter method is mur-