

ults has been a liberal sale for thoroughbred stock to farmers through the state, and a perceptible raising of the farm and market value of common poultry has been conceded as the result.

The poultry show enables fanciers of thoroughbred stock to place the superior merits of their birds before the public in such plain and convincing terms that the temptation is inspired to own a few thoroughbreds themselves, and the influence of one intelligent fancier upon his neighborhood is sure to spread abroad the popular desire for better poultry; as "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," so the display of choice bred poultry at our great fairs and mid-winter shows works upon the public mind with ceaseless activity and convincing power, until, in the process of time, the thoroughbred will come into fullness of his inheritance, and the scrub hen will have gone to join the silent procession receding into the shadows of oblivion; while the show room and the score card will have endowed the earth with stately thoroughbreds and mankind shall revel in unlimited fresh eggs and an infinitude of tender spring chicken.

#### JUDGING.

*By L. P. Harris.*

It is said that philosophy deals with laws, principles and reasons; and with the application of rules, regardless of the underlying principles. The philosophy of judging fowls is an explanation why certain cuts are made for defects. Art judging is applying Standard rules of perfection. A judge must have a thorough knowledge of the art and also of the philosophy. As a judge on the bench considers the statute laws, so a poultry judge should consider the Standard and its application. He should be perfectly unbiased, free from fear or favor, just and impartial, knowing neither friend nor foe. He must not only have a thorough understanding of the art, but must have a perfect knowledge of the principles upon which the Standard is based. These principles are not made but discovered. To detect true principles one must go to nature; must consult her in her various developments. Whenever one deserts nature there is danger of violating principles, of becoming arbitrary and unreasonable and extremely absurd. In watching and studying nature, one should seek only for the best, not the worst, or even the ordinary developments. Only the best of nature will suffice for the harmonious blending into one symmetrical whole. Hence the most accurate standard is made from the blending of the most perfect sections discovered in nature, and to judge fowls one must not only have a thorough knowledge of the application of the rules laid down in the Standard, but must be perfectly conversant with all true principals of nature. His first concern is: What is the meaning of the

Standard? This he is to gather from the language of its description, from the definition of its technical terms and from the known intent of its maker. It sometimes happens that the intent is so obscure as to lend considerable force to the observation of the judge.

In laying down some of the Standard rules the makers have had no intent or knowledge. In such cases their meaning must be obtained by its own terms and by the common understanding of such terms. Another thing must be taken into consideration; that is: whether these terms conflict with nature and therefore render them void. The Standard should be upheld and given the benefit of every doubt. But after giving it due deliberation, there is no possible way to harmonize the two, then ought not the judge to uphold the law of nature rather than the unnatural requirements of an unreasonable maker? That differences of opinion do exist is well known. The poultry papers are filled with complaints of this nature, and the artists by their illustrations give additional evidence upon this point. We see by comparing the cuts of the many artists that they differ very much in the style and symmetry of the same fowl; and this difference is traceable to the fact that they are or have been breeders or fanciers of a certain type or breed of fowls. To illustrate, Erdman was a great admirer of Dorking's and in every cut that he made you can see the distinct outlines of the noble Dorking, no matter what breed it was to represent. This is more or less true of all artists and can be applied, to some extent, to judges as well. If a judge breeds Brahmas and is an ardent fancier of this useful breed, when he comes to the show room he looks for every fowl to be more or less Brahma shaped, and because they are not they get cut this ideal defect. Our illustrations of poultry to-day are therefore ideal. They should be the fruits of free imagination, and founded upon nature; they should be accurate, and accuracy can only be attained by the closest study of all the details of the natural fowl, and as I have stated before, our ideals and our standard must be governed by nature and not by the whimsical ideals of others. We should not be influenced by ideal cuts that fill every paper of to-day for an ideal that is twenty-five per cent. better than nature is a fraud and a delusion. If cuts are accurately made from nature, they are of great value to the judge and the fancier in helping to form a better understanding of the true shape and symmetry of fowls.

Symmetry is an important element of beauty. All parts that are perfect form, perfectly united produce perfection of symmetry. It has nothing to do with color, but depends upon form alone. Much confusion has arisen from this term "symmetry." The earliest Standard and score card