In regard to contemplated institutions for the treatment of confirmed drink cravers of the lower classes, of course, government could not be expected to do more at first, at least, than sanction tentatively some reformatory accommodation on a small scale, and at the public expense; but to meet the wants of the other grades of society we would confidently look to the efforts of associations, and to private enterprise. Respecting sanataria for the upper classes, Dr. Bucknill has thrown out an insinuation that "gold dust"—the expectation that the "rich man's captivity made profitable"—lies at the bottom of the present movement to obtain a permissive law; and he has endeavoured to torture this conclusion out of what I said as to the various arrangements—even luxuries to the rich man—which he has a right to expect—necessary to make such establishments successful. The sole motive thus assigned is so vulgar, and the objection so absurd and equally applicable to every private asylum for the insane, that I shall not condescend to discuss the matter. I do not hesitate, however, to say that should power be granted to control confirmed drunkards, the founding of establishments to meet the requirements of the upper classes would be a perfectly legitimate investment of money, energy, and medical skill; and, further, I believe that any man undertaking such a responsibility, and bringing mental power, and moral and religious worth to bear on his work, would assuredly make the enterprise profitable to himself, while he would be conferring a great blessing on individuals and the public.

In conclusion, I must thank Dr. Bucknill for the opportunity given by his letter of enforcing anew the obligations of humanity and the law of love in connection with this disputed question. The quotations, too, at pages 429, 30, and 31, answer my purpose excellently; for that evidence being hidden in a blue book is not readily accessible to many; and while the alleged "torment" by the Select Committee of the House of Commons may be seen to have been agreeably mild, I do not apprehend any serious consequences to myself or the important psychological and social question at issue from the torment attempted on my letter of the 21st July, or in any remarks which may hereafter be made. However, considering the strong animus which has been shewn by Dr. Bucknill, and the uncourteous—I may say virulent—strain of attack on myself, I must view him—so far as I am concerned—beyond the pale of professional fraternity, and decline replying to any further communication he may chose to make in your Journal.

I am, Sirs,
Your obedient servant,
A. PEDDIE.

15, Rutland Street, Edinburgh,
4th November, 1876.

JOHN HOWARD.

To the Editors of THE JOURNAL OF MENTAL SCIENCE.

SIRS,—I believe that I am not altogether out of order in asking you to allow me space for a few remarks provoked by the exceptional manner of your publication of my paper on John Howard in your issue of July, 1876.

In the first place, allow me to correct two printer's errors. At page 184, line 10, for "there alone," read "the real ones;" and at page 196, last line, after the word "more" insert "good."

I scarcely complain of the "comments" of the gentleman (or lady) whom you consider "singularly qualified, by study of Howard's life and character, to give a just opinion concerning both;" as they are so evidently, not only one-sided, but also hasty, that I imagine that they are rather calculated to create an impression in my favour from their very unceremonious severity. Scarcely one of them can be called justifiable.

With respect to his qualifications for the task he undertook, I have one remark to make. It appears most extraordinary that so qualified a critic should have been wholly ignorant of the particulars of Howard's remarkable

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.22.100.659 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interviews with the Emperor of Austria, at Vienna, which are related as characteristic of him in his life, by Dixon, at page 354-360. Yet, he says, in his third note (page 188) upon my statement that Howard kept Emperors "standing for hours in deference to his unbending humour." "This is new to me!" I propose to give other examples to shew that his study of Howard's life and character seems rather to have had the effect of incapacitating him from giving a just opinion of what I wrote, or from giving it even ordinary or necessary attention.

His first note (page 182) is one example. My remark to which it refers, plainly related to prisoners *in general*. The *particular* prisoners with whom he suffered in France, he would have been a very chief butler to forget. But the fact alleged makes it all the more remarkable that his interest in prisoners in general was not excited till 18 years after. I am conscious of no oversight.

The 2nd note, on the same page, is equally pointless, or misdirected. Though his general reforms quite early included the prevention of gaol diseases, his attention was not devoted to other diseases till near the end of his career.

The note on page 183 shews entire inattention to the text. I had stated that no expense was spared on Howard's education; and in the sentence criticised, I remarked upon the effect of *unwonted* (not unexpected) wealth on—*not* an *individual*, but—a *family*. It is not those who become wealthy so much as their children, who become liable to mental aberration. (See Maudsley's "Phys. and Pathy. of the Mind," 1st Ed., p. 206.)

At page 186 my critic twice complains of my omission to notice particularly the motives that Howard alleged for his conduct. My reasons for generally rejecting all reasons alleged by anyone for his own acts, applied of course particularly to Howard, or they would have been irrelevant. For obvious reasons, I thought it unwise, as well as superfluous, to touch more on the subject of his religion than I did at page 193, lines 21 to 29, which evoked no remark from my critic.

The note at page 187 scarcely touches my position.

On page 188, the first note shews the animus and the hastiness of my critic. My statement that Howard was far from impoverishing himself, is strictly accurate, and can scarcely have received proper attention. He was—if his biographies are at all accurate—wealthy—not poor at his death. He may have been less wealthy than formerly, but he certainly had not reduced himself to poverty, which would have to have been the case for my statement to be inexact.

The second note (page 188) is worse. I deny the alleged inconsistency with any previous statement, and I say that such an allegation should have been more specific. I had said (page 181) that the severity with which he had been charged (and which was direct and personal) could scarcely have permanently affected his son's mental constitution. I had said that perhaps over-care in expenditure and selection of guardians may have had a bad, instead of a good effect on his son. But I had not anywhere excused him for the continued personal neglect—by absence—to which I alluded at page 188. It was none the less neglect, because his personal care would perhaps have been more mischievous.

The third note (page 188) as before observed, admits incapacitating ignorance of some of the most remarkable incidents of Howard's life.

The fourth note on this page is entirely incorrect, if Dixon's life of Howard is to be depended upon (see pages 390-4) with which my statement of the circumstances is in strict conformity. I appeal also to the inscription on his statue.

The first note (page 191) is either the expression of an extraordinary misconception, or is inexcusable after the grounds of my assertion had been given at page 186. Had those grounds not been given, I should have guarded against being supposed to mean that all men desire to do good, without expecting to benefit or please themselves. But I had, surely, sufficiently explained (page 186) that "all men desire good by whatever means they propose to attain to it."

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.22.100.659 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Good, of course, for themselves. If they err, they err in judgment, not from a desire for evil *per se*.

The second note here shews animus to an extraordinary degree. I never questioned that Howard did good to others than prisoners. In the same paragraph I had mentioned examples. But I challenge all impartial, and even most partial persons to shew how my penultimate sentence in it is not strictly accurate (page 191).

The note on page 192 is very inconsiderate and unfair. No one can possibly be in a position to say that Popham would not have succeeded in completing what he had well begun, had Howard never lived. But I recognised the possibility that Popham might not have succeeded nearly so soon. My critic assumes that Popham failed because he had not already done what he had just begun. He forgets that Howard likewise had not then succeeded in doing it. But did I depreciate him for that? My critic here objects to my application of the term *enthusiasm* to Howard's work. He may perhaps know the meaning of the word enthusiasm better than anyone else, but when he writes for others to read, he should use words in the sense in which they are generally understood, if he wishes for attention or comprehension. Did he never see a book called, "Ecce Homo?" From it he may, at least, learn what enthusiasm means.

In his next note (page 194) my critic rudely says "obviously untrue." Is he prepared to deny that poverty is one cause of crime? Yet, that is the basis of my statement. He can scarcely think that "*they*" (line 1) refers to the children. But if he can, let him ask the opinion of some one who understands English.

In the next note (page 194) he says "some proof of this" (the larger propagation of the unfittest) "ought to have been given." This is done—I think sufficiently—in the remainder of the paragraph. Proof is not exactly the word, but no more proof than reasons should have been demanded.

In the first note on page 195, I am accused—if serious—of inconsistency. This remark indicates an inadequate grasp of the subject. The reason I urge for the extermination, "with tenderness and humanity," of the mindless, and of infecters with poisonous diseases, is the promotion of a higher social and moral feeling than now anywhere subsists; a superior regard to larger and ultimate, rather than immediate good.

As to the second note on the same page, I admit that, strictly speaking, all action in nature is equally natural, and that in subdividing nature into—artificial, or a class of facts influenced by civilised man, and natural or a class of facts not so influenced by civilised man, another term, than the general one, which includes both, should have been used to connote the latter. But not even my critic could misunderstand me, for it is notoriously customary to use the terms natural and artificial in the same manner contradistinctively. And, is it not a fact, that the natural law of the survival of the fittest fails solely when artificially interfered with by man? Ask Mr. W. R. Greg.

On the last page my critic remarks—upon my statement that the non-survival of the fittest is a great and increasing fact—that Howard did largely save the healthy and moral from disease and degeneracy. That I never questioned. But he did not do all he might have done to save his son from either. My contention, however, is that he did importantly more towards the non-survival of the fittest—physically, morally, and intellectually.

His last note is not quite intelligible. But if he meant that Howard did not, as I affirm, *principally* work to improve the condition of criminals or prisoners, the world is at issue with him as much as I am.

I can only say that these notes impress me strongly with the incompetency of the writer to deal in any way with the subject. They are inconsiderate, inexact; and apparent haste seems their only excuse.

The principal defect of which I am aware in my paper is unnoticed by my critic. The proof is inadequate that Howard should be held responsible for the irrational, immoral, and fatal sentimentality, in deprecation of which my paper was written. In fact the action of Mr. Popham and of the Committee of

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.22.100.659 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1701-2 might be taken as evidence that it was strong, and perhaps excessive before Howard's time. This view would, of course, detract from Howard's originality and precedence, which might not suit such a blind admirer of him as my critic. But, in any case, I maintain that my general contention is just and true. I am, Sir, yours &c.,

HOKOR,

Melbourne, 4th October, 1870. Author of the paper on John Howard.

The author of the short foot notes appended to the "Essay on John Howard," printed in the "Journal of Mental Science," July 1876, p. 189, has forwarded to us the following explanation and remarks:—

In the first place, he wishes it to be distinctly understood that his notes were written as a short running commentary on the original MS.; that they were not intended for publication; that he did not see them again till the essay appeared in print; and that, consequently, he had neither the advantage of seeing his notes in type, with the text to which they referred, nor the opportunity of modifying or correcting them. (For two of the foot notes the Editor is responsible.)

A running commentary, made under these circumstances, cannot need any apology; and, on referring to the notes in detail, their author finds little to alter or to add. He cannot even take blame to himself for misunderstanding the words at p. 188.—"Emperors he kept standing for hours in deference to his unbending humour;"—for he failed to recognise in them Hepworth Dixon's account of the "singular interview" between Howard and the Emperor Joseph II. at Vienna. The facts, as recorded by Dixon, are these—Prince Kaunitz, having arranged that an interview should take place at nine o'clock on the morning of Christmas day, Howard kept his appointment with his usual punctuality. But he had peremptorily refused to be bound by the "servile etiquette" then enforced at the Austrian Court of approaching the Emperor on bended knee. This appears to have been the only difficulty Howard raised. The arrangement that the interview should take place standing, seems to have been entirely due to the Emperor himself; and, though obviously made out of consideration for Howard, does not appear to have been at his instigation. It was, therefore, in an indirect, not in a direct sense, that Howard kept an Emperor (not Emperors) standing for hours (two hours, the length of the interview), and his refusal to conform to an objectionable piece of Court etiquette, is surely not rightly designated as an "unbending humour." A conscientious feeling led him to decline the invitation of an Empress (the infamous Catherine of Russia); a like feeling forbade him to take part in a Court ceremonial which implied a degree of reverence due to no human being, but only to his God.

There is one point on which the Author of the notes desires to say a few words. Hokor speaks of *the survival of the fittest* as a *natural law*. If for *fittest* we substitute *strongest*, we give expression to the only natural law which has really been established. The application of that law to human beings in the modified form of the survival of the *fittest* is rendered difficult, if not objectionable, by the obvious necessity of defining the word *fitness*. The laggard in a herd of antelopes is the fit prey and food of the lion. Here the natural law applies itself. In the case of man living in a state of civilization the work of destruction would be found to be surrounded by very serious difficulties.

THE TRAINING OF ASYLUM ATTENDANTS.

To the Editors of the JOURNAL OF MENTAL SCIENCE.

GENTLEMEN,—The emphatic and eloquent Paper by Dr. Clouston, in the July number of your Journal, on "Getting, Training, and Retaining the Services of Good Asylum Attendants," must have called forth a response and an aspiration

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.22.100.659 Published online by Cambridge University Press