

millionaire at his own game. Col. Watterson would doubtless found colleges and libraries, would build hospitals and museums. All this is very well, but it is beyond the mental range of the "smart set." They are earnestly doing the very best they know how. What more can Col. Watterson ask?

Then, too, the charge that Newport is haughtily exclusive and refuses to recognize anything except money, is wholly groundless. Never was there a society more eager to welcome what it regards as brains. It is only a year or so ago that a young champagne agent acquired a reputation for the easy wit and repartee that everywhere marks the commercial drummer; and instantly all doors were open to a man who, in the set in which he now moves, is held to be a miracle of cleverness. There is not the slightest question that Newport would be equally hospitable to authors, artists, and such intellectual fry if they would consent. The trouble is not that the "smart set" is exclusive, but that other people are.

We trust that these few words will clear up the misunderstanding in the minds of Col. Watterson and other harsh critics of Newport; and that we shall have proved that the simple and guileless children of wealth who try to be happy at Newport deserve from the rest of the country not blame, but sympathy and pity.

#### SCIENCE AND THE COMMON WEAL.

One of the most striking features of the nineteenth century was the rapid increase of population, especially in the most highly civilized countries. From 1801 to 1900 the population of the earth grew from 900 or 950 to 1,558 millions, or considerably more than 50 per cent.; but this increase was due mainly to the growth of the population during the same period from 170 to 510 millions in Europe, America, Australia, and other lands settled chiefly by Europeans. At the time of William the Conqueror, in 1086, the population of England and Wales was 2,150,000; six centuries later it was 5,500,520, and in 1800 only 8,500,520; but from 1801 to 1901 it rose to 32,500,000. In Germany the increase was from 24,800,000 in 1816 to 56,300,000 in 1900; and in France, where the growth of population is relatively slow, it was from 27,300,000 in 1801 to 38,400,000 in 1900. Ireland is the only part of Europe that shows an actual diminution of population during the same period. This decline began in 1851, in consequence of unfavorable political and economical conditions, famine, and emigration.

A little more than a century ago Malthus published his 'Essay on the Principles of Population,' in which he asserted that the increase of population tends to overpass the means of

subsistence, and that this disproportion necessarily leads to general destitution and starvation, unless counterbalanced and corrected by the devastations of pestilence and war; the only other remedy of the evil being the voluntary or coercive restriction of propagation. From his point of view, the material welfare of the people ought to have been much greater when the population was small than it is at present, but statistics show the reverse of this to be true. In an address entitled "Volkswohlstand und Wissenschaft," recently delivered by Professor Brentano, Rector of the University of Munich, on the four hundred and thirtieth anniversary of the founding of this institution—the university was founded at Ingolstadt in 1472, transferred to Landshut in 1800, and to Munich in 1826—the eminent political economist examines the Malthusian theory, and explains why its pessimistic predictions concerning the future of mankind have not been verified.

In 1794 more than 6 per cent. of the men over twenty-one years of age in Bavaria were beggars. The peasants were virtually serfs, and it was forbidden by law to pay a laborer more than fifteen kreuzers (about ten cents) a day. Whoever offered more than this sum rendered himself liable to a fine of ten thalers (\$7.15); and the workman who demanded or accepted such high wages was condemned to eight days' imprisonment at hard labor and on bread and water, and to receive each day twelve stripes with the scourge. It is no wonder, as the Bavarian historian Westenrieder remarks, that "the jails were crowded with culprits, and the highways adorned with gallowses instead of fruit-trees." Since that "good old time" the population of Bavaria has doubled, while the condition of the individual has constantly improved. Still more conclusive is the refutation of Malthusianism furnished by England, where the increase of population, accompanied by a corresponding increase of prosperity, has been greater than in any other country of Europe. According to the statistics tabulated by Sir Robert Giffen, the wealth of Great Britain and Ireland amounted in 1812 to 160 pounds sterling per head, and in 1885 to 270 pounds sterling per head. That this advance was not due to the enrichment of the rich, attended by the impoverishment of the poor, but benefited all classes, is evident from the fact that from 1840 to 1900 the average wages of the common workman rose from 43 to 100, or about 133 per cent. The fact that compassion for poverty finds stronger and more frequent expression with us than with our ancestors, and that more persistent and systematic efforts are made to relieve it, is not due to its greater prevalence, but to the clearer perception of its evils, the prevalence of a higher standard of living, a more correct conception of what

is necessary to human comfort, and stronger sympathy with all forms of suffering.

The chief cause of the increase of population has been the decrease of mortality. From 1810 to 1820 the death-rate in Europe was 31.5 per thousand, while from 1886 to 1890 it was only 27.3 per thousand; in western Europe, where the progress of civilization was most rapid, the death-rate diminished during the same period from 28 to 23.4 per thousand. In Germany it sank from 28.8 in 1870-1880 to 23.5 in 1891-1900. Malthus maintained that every improvement in the conditions of human existence would be followed by a multiplication of marriages, and consequently of the human species by natural generation. This anticipation, however, has not been realized. The enormous increase of wealth during the latter half of the nineteenth century has not resulted in an increase of marriages. In England the number was 8.5 from 1851 to 1860, 7.5 from 1881 to 1890, and 7.9 from 1890 to 1900. In other parts of Europe this fluctuation is still more marked; but, on the whole, the number of marriages in proportion to the population, and also the average number of births to each marriage, have greatly diminished during the last decades of the nineteenth century. This is true not only of France, where the ideal of the family is to be attained by not having more than two children, but also of lands inhabited by more prolific races, as, for example, England, where the number of births to a marriage has fallen from 4.36 in 1884 to 3.63 in 1900. Taking these factors into consideration, the extraordinary increase in population in recent times must be ascribed to the diminution of the death-rate, and especially of infant mortality.

The question now arises why the principle enunciated by Malthus and accepted by the most prominent political economists of his day should have been so greatly qualified by subsequent events; the increase of population, so far from producing general distress, having been attended by a still greater increase of human welfare, the people being better provided with the means of subsistence at the present time than they were a century ago. This favorable result we owe to what Malthus could not foresee, namely, the evolution of modern science, and its practical application for the relief of human wants, especially in the production of food. We need only mention the progress of agriculture, to which organic chemistry and physics have so largely contributed; the social amelioration attending technical and industrial development, and commercial expansion by the aid of forces such as steam and electricity, which make the remotest regions of North and South America and Australia convenient market-places for supplying the daily needs of the densely populated cities of Europe; and the effi-

ciency of medical science, jurisprudence, and ethics in promoting longevity by sanitary regulations, inculcating justice and equity, and elevating the standard of morals, thus leading to the relative decrease of crime.

It is only to countries unaffected by the progress of science that the Malthusian theory may be said to apply. Outside of Europe and nations of European origin or under European influence, like British India and Japan, the population, according to the statistics of Sir Robert Giffen, remains very nearly stationary. In British India the number of inhabitants has increased during the last century from 150 to 294 millions, and in Japan, since 1870, from 31 to 45 millions.

#### LATE SPANISH OPINIONS ON BULL-FIGHTING.

MALAGA, September 1, 1902.

The first opinion I shall mention was that of a Spanish gentleman who took me up into a high mountain back of this place, not to show me the kingdoms of the earth, and the glory thereof, but to show me a small country-house he had to rent there. It was a pleasant, rural house enough, but with the radical objection that it could be reached only by the dried bed of a torrent after a long ride on donkey back. The August Festejos, or summer carnival, were on just then. Every Spanish town is especially lively in August, and as 20,000 people or more come to Malaga for the sea-bathing, something unusual has to be done for their benefit. The gayeties were thinly spread out over a fortnight: one day a battle of flowers, another an evening concert, and so on, and especially the bull-fights. My companion spoke of staying a few days quietly at his country-house. "But you will be coming down for the great bull-fight on Sunday, of course?" I said. "Not I," he replied, and, waving his forefinger with disgust and emphasis, "á mi no me gustan los toros" ("Bulls are not to my taste").

Another typical opinion was that of the lady who was our hostess during our stay in the city. She was an elderly person, a good housekeeper, sympathetic in time of sickness, a sterling and attractive character. We used to call her, among ourselves, "Doña Perfecta"—not that she had any disagreeable trait whatever; but a look of severity that would occasionally cross the prevailing amiability of her smile, recalled the impression produced by Pérez Galdós's fictitious personage. We were going to the bull-fight one day, as strangers go "just for once" to what is curious in foreign countries, and we asked our Doña Perfecta if she were. "I have never seen one in all my life," she replied vigorously, "nor do I ever think of going." A handsome young widow, a guest from Granada, whom in like manner we had slyly dubbed 'Pepita Ximenez'—though I found, in passing, that she herself had never heard of 'Pepita Ximenez,' nor of its author, Juan Valera—then spoke out plainly against the cruelty and even against the monotonous tameness of the national diversion.

So here are three different opinions, taken quite at random, which clearly indicate the

existence of a body of enlightened sentiment on the subject. But far more important was the appearance of an article in the leading newspaper, the *Union Mercantil*, of Malaga, headed, "Sin Picadores" ("Without Picadors," the mounted men in the fight). It consisted of a scathing denunciation of the whole wretched sport to which the unfortunate country is addicted.

"If we should put on savage war-paint and feathers," it said in part, "and dance hand in hand, as do the red Indians of the West about their prey, we should only be in keeping with our true position when attending these bloody spectacles. What an odious piece of hypocrisy, too, to lecture children for tormenting birds and insects, when the same people go perhaps from that very lecture to feast upon the magnified horrors of the bull-ring!"

It went on to speak of the work of the picadors as being the most brutal part of the exhibition, as it is, and called for the abolition of that feature as a preliminary to further reform. The poor horses, as we know, are spurred blindfolded upon the horns of the bull for the express purpose of being ripped open, and they are often seen going about treading on their own entrails.

"What a premium and final reward is this," exclaims the *Union*, "for the patient labors of this faithful servant of man! Such baseness and treachery, such a cowardly vileness, enter into this conduct, that few actions can be more degrading to human nature. If a cry of horrified protest does not arise from all the spectators—a cry which would do them honor—it is because their finer feelings have been calloused by familiarity with the sight from childhood; such a vicious education makes the devotee of the bull-fight himself a brute beast and nothing less."

This is as strong language as the most humane foreigner could desire. To give to its suggestions a practical effect, this paper proposes that the different local societies for the Protection of Animals and Plants, which exist throughout Spain, should meet in a congress and endeavor to obtain the proper legislation from the national Government. An active propaganda should also be begun through the teachers of the public schools, who should be induced, by money rewards and otherwise, to include, as a part of the regular moral lessons they give, abhorrence of the bull-fight.

The article in question drew out hearty approval from many in the succeeding numbers, and found favor in other journals. Señor García de Toledo wrote. He had already worked much for the cause, and it came out that a large meeting had been held, and numerous signatures to a petition obtained, at Barcelona in 1901, but the movement died a natural death. This writer wants the agitation to be entirely Spanish and without the coöperation of foreigners. If the sport is called "national," then let the protest against it be thoroughly national, too. The journalist, Alfredo Calderon, known on a wider than the local field, says:

"Apart from the horses, the bull is the only one who is in the right of it; the animal conducts himself like a man, but the man like a brute animal. Our national diversion is the Waterloo of reason and the Austerlitz of instinct. A crowd of people gather to these villainous shows, some to massacre helpless beasts, the rest to delight in the carnage. They tell us that this should prove a stimulus to Spanish spirit and valor. Precisely the opposite is true;

this is the apotheosis of cowardice; true courage is generous and merciful, only wretched cowardice is mean and cruel."

All this was very encouraging as to the future of Spain, and it was the pleasanter to read after coming again fresh from the bull-fight. For surely, as a game, apart from the cruelty, it is very dull indeed; the bull is so unfailingly simple and stupid; he turns away every time from the man to dive idly at the flaunting cape; the men are never in danger, at least from intent of the bull, and cannot come to harm except by accident. There is nothing of it, then, except the cruelty. But, on the other hand, friends who know the country longer, point out to me that Spanish newspapers are fond of dealing in fine sentiments, and Spain generally abounds in good intentions which amount to little.

On the other hand, too, the new young King, who was brought up by his careful mother to know better, has been induced to attend the bull-fights, to cultivate popularity with the mob. And, on the other hand, again, a new and more brutal form of bull-fight has come in. A law on the statute-book, the Ugarte Law, endeavors to infuse a certain amount of decency into the thing, by restraints as to times and places, combats with too tender animals and by inexperienced performers, and so forth. This law is evaded or openly defied. The *Heraldo* of Madrid stated a day or two ago, that the numerous country fairs all over Spain have come to be only an excuse for bull-baiting of the most barbarous sort. These fairs consist now of one day of market and two of torturing animals to death. It cites, in passing, the case of one worthy citizen who spends his time going from one to another of these shows, and has jotted down in a notebook a record of some two thousand.

For lack of better opportunity, the denizens of the market village or hamlet will buy some poor animal of the bovine race in common, some inferior bull or a bull calf, or a frisky cow. "I will put in five reals," says one, "and I seven," says another. They massacre the victim in common, and divide up the meat afterwards. If the authorities do not apply the Ugarte Law, through fear of losing their votes or fear of riot and personal injury, they do this in the open plaza; otherwise, in the yard or even the court of some private house. Each one appears with such a weapon as he may have—this with a dagger, that with a sword-cane, the other with a sharpened table-knife—and they set to work like demons; they stab and hack their helpless prey to death, but by slow stages, that the pleasure may last the longer. If death does not come the first day, the animal is brought out again a second, and even a third day. *Vaya!* (Go to!) exclaims the *Heraldo*, here is a fine, magnanimous people! And it continues:

"Bulls and bulls only are what the country is clamoring for from one end of the land to the other; it is a veritable madness; the Spanish nation will not see or hear of any other form of diversion. Where blood does not flow, there is deemed to be no festivity, no amusement. Thus in bloodshed we are reared, and in blood we live and have our being."

If the *Heraldo* be right, the good *Union Mercantil* of Malaga has a slow and toilsome campaign before it.

WILLIAM HENRY BISHOP.