

the sword, the pestilence, or the famine, may break down the barriers so laboriously constructed against wrong, and show us scenes of injustice, violence, cruelty, in the most civilised communities of the world.

These considerations are not directed against education—far from it. They do not even afford an argument against public instruction, which is only the first starting-point for education. What they do suggest is that we should not overrate this means of reducing human vice and misery, or set it up as a cure for all the evils of modern society. The most frequent criminals are probably the ignorant; the greatest criminals are generally those who have had their intelligence sharpened by some exercise. There is no panacea for human ills; certainly not this—the favourite one with modern theorists.

The second point established by the foregoing argument is this: that if we make haste with our instruction we are sure, not only to spoil it, but to destroy the education which it ought to convey; moreover, we create a new crop of physical and mental evils to take the place of those we are striving to remove. Take the clearest case. Is it a good bargain to have a

boy or a girl highly instructed and eminently successful in the competition of life, but shattered in health, and resulting in a splendid failure? Let it be remembered that there may be innumerable cases not so signal, and yet of the same kind—young people damaged in sight, still more damaged in insight, entering the world weary and dull of mind, with all their vigour and elasticity gone. They may get their school scholarships at fourteen, their college scholarships at nineteen, a brilliant degree at twenty-two; and then they sink into the rank of some profession, having gained no useful habit but to drudge at books.

Is this the way to build up the great English race, called to direct the fortunes of a world-empire? Is this the way to preserve that splendid type which foreigners criticise and ridicule, only because they envy it? Or do we indeed desire the next generation to pose as second-hand Germans? God forbid! We all think ourselves very jealous of our liberty; are we not in real danger of losing it? Is it not being filched away from year to year by those pestilent theorists who are enslaving our youth under the false pretence of intellectual discipline?—*The Nineteenth Century.*

A FOOT MEASURE.

IT is a noteworthy fact that the foot is a unit of measure in all countries of the civilized world. It is the human foot that is thus recognized as a standard of measurement, and it is claimed in some countries that it was the actual foot of the reigning sovereign which was originally taken as a definite standard for all time. But inasmuch as the foot measure is known as a standard in countries differing as widely as China, Russia, and Turkey, from France, Spain, and England,—

always the same in name, and yet varying considerably in length,—it is obvious that it is the foot of man as man, and not of any one man as above all men, which is organized as a unit of measurement among men everywhere.

It is common to think of the human face and the human hand as indicative of personal character, but it is not so common to think of the human foot as thus indicative. Yet the foot is more truly the measure of the man