

In section 419 it is stated that "the habitual moderate drinker finds it necessary to increase the dose, in order to obtain the same effects as were produced by the original smaller quantity." Anstie, in his great work on "Stimulants and Narcotics," denies this, and says that within the bounds of strict moderation there is no necessity of increasing the dose, to produce the same effects, and that the craving for a larger amount, as well as the so-called "reaction," is the direct result of an immoderate or narcotic quantity. This deliberate confounding of the effects of the use with those of the abuse of alcoholic beverages occurs in almost every paragraph, and is in itself enough to condemn the article as unfair and misleading. Thus, section 492 says that the habitual beer drinker is usually short-lived. If this seeks to convey the impression—as it seems to do—that the habitual moderate drinker of beer is short-lived, it is untrue, for, according to the most recent European statistics, the average longevity of brewers, bakers, and butchers is fifty-four years: this is next to the highest among craftsmen,—gardeners and fishermen leading with an average longevity of fifty-eight years. The United States statistics are still more favourable—placing the average longevity of brewers' employes at fifty-seven years. Brewers certainly drink more beer and drink it more constantly than any other class of people, and yet they live longer and preserve their physical energies better than the average workingman of the United States.

Dr. B. W. Richardson, who is so largely quoted, has little claim to speak with authority, and the vein of prejudice is so apparent in his writings on the alcohol question that he cannot be accepted as a safe guide, no matter how honest his intent may be. Many of his views are opposed to those of such men as Anstie, Garrod, Parkes, Lauder Brunton, Pavy, Farquharson, and others of great eminence. The only physiologist of distinction who has supported them is Dr. W. B. Carpenter, and it is a well-known fact that this eminent man very materially altered his teetotal views in his latter years, and was a moderate drinker for some years before his death. He highly recommends malt liquors in cases in which the stomach labours under permanent deficiency of digestive powers, and says that "an alcoholic stimulus affords the only means of procuring digestion of the amount of food that the system really requires" in such cases. Section 503 objects to alcohol because it coagulates albumen, and hardens the living tissue, but it does not tell us that tea has a similar action. Alcohol certainly should not be taken in its purity, but diluted, as *e.g.*, in beer and the lighter wines, it has no more effect in hardening tissue than the ordinary cup of tea. If the natural condition of the tissues is impaired by "puckering of the mouth," the teetotaler ought to give up many articles of his dietary.

The disingenuous confounding of the effects of the use with those of the abuse of alcoholic stimulants, already referred to, is again manifest in section 505, where it is stated that "repeated and long continued use of alcoholic stimulants finally brings about an unnatural condition and impaired function, which may be seen in the glazed and fissured tongue of the habitual drinker of ardent spirits."

The experience of millions has demonstrated the falsity of this: it is the long-continued abuse, not the use, that does all the harm, and the glazed and fissured tongue belongs to the habitual drunkard, not the habitual drinker. With regard to the action of alcohol on digestion, let us examine the views of some of the ablest physicians. Dr. Garrod, one of the greatest authorities on Therapeutics, says: "Though in its concentrated form it arrests digestion, by altering the character of the pepsin, when diluted it helps digestion. The majority of adults can take a moderate quantity, not only with impunity, but often with advantage. To many it is a source of much enjoyment, and, as discomfort springs from its discontinuance, it is difficult to say why it should be discontinued under ordinary circumstances. Among the nations who do not use alcoholic drinks the use of opium and Indian hemp is extremely common. There are no statistics to show that abstinence from the moderate use of alcohol is attended with unusual length of life, or improvement of health. Many, when they have ceased to take it for a time, exhibit symptoms which show that the nutrition of the system is not fully kept up, and many are unable to abstain, on account of their health failing under the trial."

Dr. J. Lauder Brunton, the eminent physiologist, highly recommends its use in cases where the stomach is temporarily or permanently below par; for convalescents, anæmic persons, and especially for the tired brain-worker in cities, who returns home in the evening worn out by a long day's work, a glass of ale or sherry with his dinner will, he says, enable him to take a hearty meal, ensure its digestion, and give him a sense of well-being and comfort for the whole evening. Dr. James Risdon Bennett, a president of the Royal College of Physicians, writes as follows: "The stomach of one man is offended and irritated by wine, whilst the appetite of another is improved and his digestion facilitated. I believe alcohol to be among the gifts of God, accorded to man for therapeutic as well as other beneficial purposes."

Section 513 quotes Hammond as having proved that alcohol has a special affinity for nerve tissue and nerve centres. If the writer had any affinity for honest statement of facts, he would add that the same Hammond (for I presume it is the celebrated New York neurologist he quotes) is an earnest believer in its great food value, and that, when he was rapidly losing weight on an insufficient diet, the addition of a small quantity of alcohol, without any increase in the amount of other foods, not only stopped the loss of weight but converted it into an actual gain. R. B. Carter, the famous London oculist, made three distinct and prolonged attempts at total abstinence, but at each attempt was forced to abandon it because his health failed. He says: "I believe the dietetic use of alcohol to be one which is simply indispensable for the whole of that large class of persons, who, while they are subject to large expenditures of nerve force, are unable to digest more than a very moderate quantity of the dietetic equivalents of alcohol in the forms of fat and sugar."

Some of the statistics quoted in section 515 are so manifestly ridiculous, that it is a wonder any one can be found credulous enough to quote them. Those physicians who informed Dr. Hitchcock that 50 per cent. of deaths in adults under their observation during a recent year were directly due to alcohol, either made extremely limited observations, or were more attached to teetotalism than to honesty of statement. It is admitted that extremely few females die from alcoholic excesses, so it follows that nearly every male who died under the observations of these Michigan luminaries must have been a victim to drunkenness. Even the average given, 13½ per cent., is absurdly high, as any physician can prove for himself by referring to his case-book for any year he has been in practice. Dr. Hitchcock must have obtained his statistics from physicians to inebriate asylums. The writer of this article has not had a single death in his practice attributable to alcohol for over four years. There is abundance of room for sound temperance instruction, without distorting the medical evidence, or striking at the fundamental principles of liberty and Christian morality.

T. M.

GARDINER'S CIVIL WAR.

IN Mr. Gardiner's new volume [London: Longmans] dealing with England under Charles I., we pass from the political history to the events of the Civil War. Mr. Gardiner is the very opposite of the sensational historian, of whom Mr. Froude is the sinister type: he combines with the strictest and most conscientious accuracy the most judicial impartiality. The second quality is eminently valuable in treating a period of history so stormy and so provocative of party passion as the reign of the first two Stuarts. Instead of being in the regions of romance, we are, while we read Mr. Gardiner, always on the solid ground of fact. What he lacks is life, with which we cannot altogether dispense. We feel the want of it particularly in the volume which he has just published, and which embraces the first portion of the Civil War. Not the Annual Register itself is more authentic or, we might almost add, less thrilling. There ought surely to have been some military account of the troops, their arms, their tactics, and their modes of warfare, to help our imaginations in forming a picture of a battle, or a siege. It is possible to be dispassionate and just without being entirely colourless. Still dispassionateness and justice are great qualities in the historian of a Civil War, whose tread is on ashes beneath which the fires of more recent politics have hardly ceased to glow. Hitherto all writers, all historians of the English Revolution, from Clarendon to John Forster, have been partisan. If Mr. Gardiner betrays any sympathy, it is with the Parliamentary side: at least he does not love Charles, and he seems to feel that the king's success would have quenched the real life of the nation. But his tendency throughout is to minimise the differences between the parties, and instead of painting one side black and the other white, like his predecessors, to paint both sides gray. We cannot help thinking that he carries this too far, and that he leaves these men, who were not likely to plunge into a civil war about nothing, almost without an intelligible cause for drawing their swords. The struggle in England was a portion of a great European struggle, in which the powers of absolutism and reaction on one side were arrayed against those of liberty and progress on the other. By the quarrel of Henry VIII. with the Pope, the English Monarchy had been severed from the Roman Catholic league, yet the Stuarts and their party belonged essentially to the Catholic reaction. James I. had been bred a Presbyterian and, to the last, was a Calvinist, but his absolutist bias drew him to the Spanish connection. His queen was a convert to Roman Catholicism. Charles I. seems to have been steadfast in his Anglicanism; but there can be no doubt to which of the two great parties his ecclesiastical advisers belonged. Charles II. was a Roman Catholic, and was working in the interest of Roman Catholicism throughout his reign, though he declared himself only on his death-bed. In his brother's attack on liberty and Protestantism the political and religious tendencies of the dynasty stood confessed. That there were many shades of opinion in England, and that many drew the sword only because they could not remain neutral, is very true, but it is not less true that the issue at Marston and Newbury was whether England should cast in her lot with Holland and Protestant Germany, or with France and Spain. Criticism of a military narrative we must leave to military men. In dealing with the tangled web of the political movements and negotiations which were going on at the same time with the fighting, Mr. Gardiner shows the qualities which have already given him a very high place among historians. We should have been glad to know his opinion as to the aim of Pym, Hampden, and the other leaders. An aim they must have had, and they can hardly, after showing such absolute mistrust of Charles's good faith, have intended again to set him on his throne. They must have known that he would never forgive them. It seems more likely that they contemplated a change of dynasty such as that to which recourse was had in 1688; and Charles Lewis, the Elector Palatine, and the grandson of James I. by the Queen of Bohemia, so dear to all Protestant hearts, presented himself as a natural candidate. Civil war is always cruel, especially when religious are added to political passions; yet we are confirmed by Mr. Gardiner's history in the belief that it was incomparably less cruel in England than it had been in France. The ordinary course of life also appears to have remained, to a remarkable degree, undisturbed. Horace Walpole has a story that a squire going out with his hounds crossed the field of Edgehill on the morning of the battle. This is not true: but it is true, as Mr. Gardiner tells us, that the King on his march to Edgehill found a country gentleman, Shuckburgh by name, going out with his hounds, and induced him to join the Royal Standard. A striking anecdote is unusually fortunate in having so respectable a foundation.