

G5620

COMBINATIONS AND STRIKES

FROM

THE TEACHER'S POINT OF VIEW.

BY

WILLIAM ELLIS.

(Reprinted from "The Museum and English Journal of Education.")

LONDON:

THOMAS NELSON AND SONS, PATERNOSTER ROW;

AND EDINBURGH.

MDCCCLXV.

COMBINATIONS AND STRIKES FROM THE TEACHER'S POINT OF VIEW.

IN a journal not devoted to education, some apology might be required for introducing a subject so hackneyed as "Combinations and Strikes." This subject, like that of education itself, has become distasteful to the general reader, on account of the flood of vague and irrelevant matter with which our periodical literature has been deluged, both directly from the pen, and indirectly from speeches at public meetings, where these subjects have been treated of.

The subject of Combinations and Strikes cannot, however, have become distasteful to teachers as teachers, because it has seldom found its way into schools. And our purpose now is to invite them to consider whether this subject do not deserve some of their attention, and whether the judicious treatment of it in schools will not shield it from some of that ill-treatment outside which it has met with so undeservedly.

If we can show teachers that correct views upon the probable influence of Combinations and Strikes will materially affect the future well-being of their pupils, and also that it is quite within the scope of school instruction that correct views shall be formed by the pupils in their schools, we feel quite sure of obtaining their attention; and if we cannot do thus much, none of their attention ought to be bestowed upon us, due as it may be, nevertheless, to the matter which we shall have failed in elucidating.

As for the importance to the young of correct views upon the probable effect of Combinations and Strikes, we need do little more than state what that effect is expected to be, viz., increased wages, or, which is the same thing, less work with undiminished wages. Few teachers can contemplate the present state and future prospects of adults now at work, without desiring for their pupils better prospective wages than those which widely prevail, however well they may be reconciled to the modicum reasonably to be expected at starting. Neither can teachers consider this thought to be otherwise than a wholesome one for their pupils to carry into industrial life:—"By

what means may we hope to become entitled to and possessed of, such wages as will enable us, at least, to live decently and comfortably?"

How far it is possible to qualify the young while yet in our schools, to judge of the means likely to be accessible to them for obtaining satisfactory wages, or for obtaining an increase of the unsatisfactory wages which they may be compelled to put up with for a time, is a matter to which a little space and attention must be devoted before we can ask teachers to agree or to discuss with us. We must bespeak, at the same time, a certain amount of indulgence, if our attempted exposition should be more elementary and elaborate than might appear called for between teachers and teachers. They will kindly bear in mind that we are addressing the parents of the children in their schools as well as themselves. We can hardly hope to escape mystification, confusion, and obscurity, except by avoiding to use many of the general terms in common use, or by deferring their use until we have established the existence, and obtained a firm hold of the ideas, for which those terms are the names. To this precaution against admissions not warranted by experience under cover of vague and ambiguous language, may be added another against the unguarded introduction into schools of subjects that are beyond the comprehension of the children to be instructed in them. Such subjects might be overlooked in a crowd. To secure inspection, therefore, we will enumerate, one by one, some of the subjects which, in our judgment, are at once important to be known, and teachable to the young. Attention will thus be fixed upon each separately, and whatever is deemed inadmissible can easily be objected to at once.

Assuming it to be desirable that all the young should take from school as correct and vivid an impression as is possible at their age, of the nature of the life which awaits them, we will proceed, briefly and succinctly, to place before our readers some of the matters important to be understood, on which the young may be brought to observe, and judge correctly, and feel strongly, if

they be but under the direction of teachers capable of supporting and guiding them.

1. They and all their fellow-creatures are subsisting upon the produce of past labour—partly even of the labour of some of the men who lived many ages ago. If the produce of past labour were suddenly destroyed, all men would perish, with the exception of a few here and there in the warmer climates, who might subsist upon the spontaneous products of the earth.

2. They and their fellow-creatures are day by day consuming the produce of past labour—some things rapidly, as articles of food; others more slowly, as articles of clothing, and furniture, and dwellings. If, then, men are to continue to live as comfortably, and in as large numbers, as at present, the produce of past labour must be replaced as fast as it is consumed. If they are to live more comfortably, and in larger numbers, the produce consumed must be more than replaced. No portion of the labour, and of the knowledge and skill to assist it, which were at work in the past, can be spared in the present and future, if society is not to deteriorate. More of each must be brought to bear upon production, if society is to be improved.

3. Maintenance of the stores of produce, and encouragement of future production, are indispensable for the continued subsistence of society as it is. Other efforts must be added to these, in order to bring about an improved state of society. Side by side with these truths, it has become known to us that some men will not work to produce, and will spoil and waste as well as consume. Not only do they fail to replace what they consume, but they would, if not prevented, destroy the produce of other men's labour, and thereby discourage their efforts to produce and save for the future.

4. A consciousness of the existence of such ill-disposed persons interspersed among the other members of society, fear of their increase, and alarm lest the industry, knowledge, skill, and economy upon which the subsistence and improvement of society depend, should decline or perish under their assaults, have led to efforts to resist, and, if possible, to overcome them. Combinations and contrivances for these purposes fall within the province of what goes by the name of government, and must ever be the work of those who desire to defend the happiness and progress of society against those who are indifferent or averse to that which is indispensable for the general welfare.

5. The conclusion arrived at, and acted upon, by those who have been accepted as most com-

petent to organize and administer the powers of government, is, that their efforts must be directed,

First, To securing to each member of society the undisturbed enjoyment of the produce of his industry: implying liberty to exchange, to buy and sell, to lend and borrow, to give, and also to appoint, subject to some few restrictions, who, at his death, shall succeed to his possessions. The powers thus enjoyed under the protection of government constitute the "rights of property." The declarations of these rights by government, are a portion of the laws under which we enjoy property. The products of industry being called "wealth," property consists of wealth, and those titles to wealth recognised by law. The penalties by which rights are protected against those who would invade them, are another portion of laws.

Second, To securing, chiefly through the promotion of the teaching and training of the young, that knowledge, skill, and good habits—the human agents in the production, preservation, and enjoyment of wealth—shall as nearly as possible be co-extensive with life itself.

6. A very cursory survey of society enables us to recognise who are the principal possessors of wealth, as we see them around us, and as they have grown up under the protection of our laws, and also who are those that possess little or no wealth. The former are the elders, the inheritors of wealth, and the more capable, that is, the more intelligent, industrious, economical, and trustworthy. The latter are the younger, and the less capable, that is, the uninstructed, the indolent, the dissipated, and the untrustworthy. It cannot be questioned that the former are much better fitted than the latter to hold and dispose of that wealth, the replacement of which, as fast as it is consumed, is so essential to the welfare of society. To entrust it to the latter is impossible, and would be fatal were it possible. Nevertheless, no human being, whatever his disqualifications, can be entirely shut out from access to some portion of wealth. To shut him out, would be to sentence him to death by starvation. It remains to be shewn how the "rights of property" may be maintained while the "duties to humanity" are performed.

7. The difficulty in the way of performing each of these duties, without neglecting the other, although by no means overcome, is seen to be greatly diminished when once attention is directed to the practice prevailing among a large portion of the possessors of wealth, and a still larger portion of the wealthless; the first, devoting some of that wealth which they reserve as a provision against future want, to the purchase of labour wherewith to acquire more; the second, selling

their labour for some of that wealth, without which they could neither work nor live. The readiness, on one side, to part with present wealth in order to obtain increased wealth in the future, and on the other, to surrender the direction and produce of one's own labour to obtain the produce of past labour, has been accompanied and followed by a succession of contrivances, in the form of machinery and other instruments of production, by which the labour purchased is made to accomplish results otherwise unattainable, and to bring about the continually increasing accumulations of wealth everywhere observable. It must be evident that the duties to property and to humanity will be performed together more and more in harmony, progressively as the wealthy become less wasteful, and the wealthless less incapable.

8. This practice of applying wealth to the purpose of procuring more wealth in the future, has given rise to a number of arrangements and bargains to suit the convenience and circumstances of the various persons disposed to apply a portion of their wealth to this purpose.

What these arrangements and bargains are, ought to be understood; but it would be tedious to describe them without using the terms in general use; and it is dangerous to use these terms without making sure of the things which the terms are the names of. Let us, therefore, rapidly run over these things, and mention the names which have been given to them.

a. Wealth applied to the purpose of obtaining increase is called *capital*. Originally, capital can have been little more than wealth, destined by its owners for the purchase of labour. Progressively, larger and larger portions of capital have assumed the form of instruments of production, among the latest developments of which may be named railways and their appendages, agricultural, mining and manufacturing machinery, ships, docks, harbours, and canals.

b. Wealth obtained by sale of labour is called *wages*. The portion of capital set apart for this purpose is spoken of as a wages-fund, to distinguish it from other portions of capital evidently no longer available for purchasing labour.

c. The increase of wealth, looked forward to from the application of wealth as capital, is called *profit*.

d. Many owners of capital are not administrators of capital; some administer the capital of others as well as their own. Where they are not, as in the case of those who prefer to work for wages, of professional men, and of men conscious of incapacity for directing labour, they lend their capitals, surrendering their title to the larger but

uncertain return called profit, and bargaining with the borrower for a smaller but certain stipulated return. This smaller and stipulated return is called *interest*.

e. Besides these arrangements for facilitating the co-operation of capital and labour in the work of production, there are various forms of partnership and joint-stock association, admitting, according to the tastes, capabilities, and means of each, the separation, partial or complete, of the elements of the total future profit expected; these elements being, remuneration for the superintendence, for the risk, and for the *use, without risk*, of the capital. The latter of these elements, as before stated, is called interest.

f. Wealth, capital, wages, profit, and interest, are more frequently than otherwise measured in *money*, and distributed with the aid of money. They are also, spoken of, and written about, as money. But each of them is a thing of itself, independently of money. And money is another thing.

With the assistance of these terms, bearing in mind that they are familiar to thousands who attach no definite meanings to them, and keeping on our guard, so as not to be entrapped into using them, sometimes in one sense, sometimes in another, quite unconscious that the matters denoted by them have been shifted, let us proceed further to indicate what the pupils in our schools can be led to deduce for themselves from what they have already observed and thought over.

9. The tendency of administrators of capital or employers, is for them to distribute the wages-fund at their command among the labourers whom they employ, according to the estimate which they form of the producing powers of each. Making use of the term "labourers" in its widest signification, employers will give to some, £5000 a-year; to some, £10 a-week; to some, 3s. a-day; and to others they will refuse wages or employment altogether.

10. The total capital, and hence the total wages-fund, is a limited quantity. If it were distributed among labourers in equal portions to each, the portion of each could not be more than the quotient of the whole wages-fund divided by the number of labourers. If this portion or wage were considered insufficient, its increase could only be procured by increasing the total wages-fund, or by diminishing the number of labourers. The latter mode of increasing average wages does not require to be considered, and the former can only be brought about at some future time, near or distant, rapidly or slowly, according to opportunities and the means resorted to.

11. Increase of wages to all is no more possible

at once, because the wages-fund is distributed among labourers according to their respective producing powers, than if it were distributed among them equally and irrespectively of their comparative producing powers. If more than the average share be given to some, there must remain less than the average share for others. But there are two compensating circumstances attached to the apportionment of wages according to producing powers. Greater future wealth is produced, and as the wages fall into the possession of more capable men, they are more likely to be well used, and to be partly added to capital forthwith.

12. Employers and employed,—they who have bought and they who have sold labour,—it will be observed, are two classes much more distinguishable than capitalists and labourers. In every country where the industrial virtues flourish, and in proportion as they flourish, labourers, excepting the youngest, whose power of earning and hence of saving is as yet undeveloped, are capitalists. They lend their capitals because they can earn more through wages and interest than they see their way to earn by administering their own capitals, either separately or in co-operation with other capitalists. The savings banks alone, with their deposits of more than £40,000,000, are proofs apparent to everybody, and many more might be produced, of the extent to which, in a community still deplorably afflicted with ignorance and misconduct, labourers are capitalists.

The chart of life, and the sailing directions which the young will take out of schools where they receive this kind of instruction, point to wealth as the reward of intelligence and good conduct,—wages small at first, because producing power is small, but growing with the growth of the estimate formed of producing power. The capable labourer does no damage to his less capable fellow-labourer. He assists in the increase, so urgently required, of future capital. If he save, a portion of his wages becomes capital at once, wherewith employers distribute more wages. The incapable, he assists to support. Lessons easy and pleasant to learn in schools become difficult and painful if deferred till those who never learned such lessons begin to suffer from their ignorance. To children who leave school with correct chart and good sailing directions, with capacity for using them and resolution to act upon them, the world opens not as a scene of storm and tempest, in which shipwreck can with difficulty be escaped, but as an arena for the exercise of industry, intelligence, and the other social

virtues, with probable success in the future, and certain satisfaction from the performance of duty in the present. Little comfort can be derived by the victims of ignorance and vice from the knowledge, if communicable to them, that their destitution and suffering are the consequences of previous mistaken conduct. In the presence of misery, it would be brutal, if possible, to trace to the sufferers the causes, no longer removable, of their sufferings.

Taking our leave of school days, we will accompany the young as they leave the schools in which they had received instruction such as we have faintly sketched. Four out of every five of them will be more or less dependent for subsistence upon the sale of their labour. They will rejoice rather than complain that there are employers to be found able and willing to buy their labour, and able and willing to afford them opportunities of increasing their powers of usefulness. They may regret, if service satisfactory to themselves and their friends is not easy to be found, that capital and employers are not more abundant. They will surely not murmur if employers, with capital at command, are so much in want of labour that, not waiting to be sought, they apply at the schools to obtain recruits likely to be made efficient labourers and deserving of wages.

They have entered upon their industrial career. With the assistance of their friends they have sought the best service accessible, in the estimate of which neither prospective nor present advantages will have been overlooked. Some will be less successful than others in the selection of the employments offered to them. Employers also will not always find the services which they have hired worth the wages which they have bargained to pay. Shiftings and re-engagements will be of frequent occurrence. But in subsequent, as well as in original engagements, there will be one thought prevailing among employers and labourers. Each will wish to do the best for themselves; and if their efforts in this direction are made intelligently, they will also do the best for one another, the employers seeking labourers whose labour will produce most in proportion to the wages paid, and the labourers seeking employers whose service is most likely to lead to those industrial rewards of which immediate wages are but a part.

There is an incessant and, we may say, a healthy activity of thought and effort for individual and general advancement. It is felt that there is room for improvement. There is no denying that a very large number of people are inadequately fed, clothed, and lodged; that

they have no capital; and that, thrown entirely upon the wages-fund for support, they obtain wages insufficient for decent and wholesome living. It would be a sadder spectacle to see this state of things contentedly and inertly put up with, than even to be compelled to acknowledge that efforts at amelioration were taking a wrong direction. In this country, happily, there is no danger of such passive submission, on the part either of the immediate sufferers, or of society in general. But efforts at amelioration will probably be not wholly either in the right or in the wrong direction; susceptible, therefore, of better direction. And it is desirable that the young should be prepared to form a correct judgment upon the plans submitted to them for obtaining increase of wages, and for bettering their condition in other respects.

We may now ask the specific question which we had in our thoughts at starting: How should the young, instructed as we say they ought to be, deal with proposals to them to unite in combinations and strikes?

We mention combinations and strikes together because they are so commonly brought to our notice together. But we may dismiss "strikes" in a few words, and without much ceremony. Strikes are acknowledged by everybody to be evils, and they are resorted to only, as many other evils are, to avert greater—as the destruction of buildings to check the spread of conflagration, as a jettison to preserve from foundering, or as amputation to save life. Because strikes bring to our notice the existence of combinations, it must not be forgotten that many combinations exist keeping clear of strikes. And it is contended that all might be so managed as to keep clear of strikes.

We may be quite sure that when combinations are formed, the prevailing wish must be to keep clear of strikes. Strikes are no more intended by labourers who combine, than indignations by the hungry who eat. Proposals, accordingly, will be made to the young to unite in a combination by itself, and not in conjunction with a strike invidiously tacked to it. But before they could accede to any such proposal, they would wish to understand what advantages might be reasonably expected by them and their fellows, and what ought not to be expected, if they would escape disappointment.

They might begin by considering the probable effect of a combination upon wages. It would not increase the wages-fund. It could not, therefore, increase general wages. If it were to alter the distribution of the wages-fund, it would only

do so by interfering with the efforts of employers to distribute the wages-fund among labourers according to their several producing powers. But that would be to diminish future wealth, and hence to check the growth of the future wages-fund.

But might it not maintain a high level of wages in particular branches of business, or raise the level of wages previously felt to be too low? It could only do this by excluding additional labourers from access to those branches, or by bringing additional capital into them. But additional capital cannot be attracted into a business except by the prospect of profit equal to or greater than that seen to be obtainable elsewhere. And with this prospect, capital would flow in, not in consequence, but in spite of a combination which prevents labourers from following or accompanying the capital to share in the advantages offered by it. The forcible exclusion of labourers from particular branches of business can only mean condemnation of the labourers excluded, to lower wages, in order to maintain or to raise the wages of those in possession.

Combinations among labourers, so far as they can influence wages, can only do so by preventing that distribution of the wages-fund which would be made by employers left uncontrolled in their efforts to employ their capitals to the greatest advantage. Combinations among labourers can scarcely, then, be said to be so much against employers as against other labourers, since they can only control employers by withholding from labourers permission to be employed. If decrease of production be the consequence, future wages will decrease also.

It will not be lost sight of that employers strive to distribute the wages-fund among labourers according to their respective producing powers, *i. e.* according to the estimate formed of their respective industrial virtues. If the authority of employers be superseded by that of a combination of labourers, will they also wish to distribute the wages-fund so as to reward and encourage the industrial virtues? If so, which of the two, the employers or the labourers, are, from their experience and position, more likely to form a correct estimate of industrial merits? If not, the development of those qualities upon which the happiness and progress of communities depend would scarcely be promoted by combinations among labourers.

One can conceive of a combination among labourers in which attempts to encroach upon the prerogative of employers should neither be made nor contemplated. Its object might be to dis-

countenance ill conduct, to contribute out of their wages towards the maintenance of those temporarily incapacitated, to introduce promising recruits, to find other employment for supernumeraries, to form their capitals into a joint stock, or to add them to a joint stock already formed. A combination of labourers thus directed would be a co-operation of labourers with capitalists, and also of capitalists with one another.

Combinations have been formed, we are not sure that some are not in existence still, to exclude machinery, or new contrivances for making labour more effective, from particular branches of business. Our intelligent young people could not possibly enter into a combination for such a purpose. They would not be misled by the complaint, that it was wished to supersede labour by machinery. Their intellectual exercises will have brought to their notice, that language may be used to conceal a fallacy, as well as to express a truth. The spade, the plough, and the thrashing-machine make labour more effective, they do not supersede it. And the pumping-engine which drains a mine, which, without it, must remain submerged, makes labour possible where it was previously impossible. To obstruct employers in their efforts to make the labour which they purchase as remunerative as possible, is to obstruct the growth of the wages-fund, from which alone general improvement in wages is to be expected.

There are, and will continue to be, epochs in most branches of industry, when, from the flow of capital faster than that of labourers into them, wages will rise; and also when, from the flow of capital faster than that of labourers out of them, wages will fall. If combinations, by spreading information and organising facilities, could expedite the influx and efflux of labourers, to make them correspond with the movements of capital, they would unquestionably be useful, by assisting to diffuse the benefits anticipated from the altered applications of capital, and to diminish the suffering of those who were about to be abandoned by the capital upon which they depend for wages. But if combinations attempt to make labourers refuse to accommodate themselves to the movements of capital, they can only succeed by excluding some from opportunities for bettering their condition, and by condemning others to look on and clamour for undiminished wages, and, perhaps, pine in want, while the tide of capital is flowing towards other parts, to confer increased wages upon those who choose to accompany it. When the workmen of employers who remain to the last in a declining branch of business, or who persist in conducting it by means since surpassed

by others, are compelled to submit to lower wages, can it be said with propriety that capital has "triumphed"?

If combinations be so much less capable than they have been imagined to be, of improving the condition of under-paid and over-worked labourers, is there, it may be asked, no escape for them from their misery in the present, and no hope of redress in the future? Before attempting to answer that appeal, it may be observed that there are few instances of misery so sad that they might not be made much sadder, and few lots so dark that they might not be made darker; and combinations would rather work in those directions or encourage hopes doomed to disappointment.

There are expressions familiar to us all, which, whether manufactured on purpose, or diverted from former uses, have helped to blind us to our follies and mistakes.* Restrictions on trade were recommended to us under the name of "protection." Persistence in error so long as our neighbours chose to go wrong, was advised under the name of "reciprocity." The free circulation of capital between borrowers and lenders was long prevented through fear of the "extortions of usurers." And now, combinations among workmen are recommended as bulwarks against the "tyranny of capitalists."

The young should leave our schools qualified not only to use language to express their own thoughts appropriately, but to detect the misuse of language by which they might otherwise be confounded and misled. A tyrant, they know, is supposed to be an oppressor. When they make

* For specimens of this use of language see letters from Mr Fawcett in the *Times* of 17th and 22d March 1865. Some matters are referred to by Mr Fawcett upon which, although beyond the scope of our text, we would gladly have a little more information. Mr Fawcett, speaking of the labourer of the present times, says:—

"He hears our statesmen eloquently describing the vast increase in the nation's wealth, and he does not find that his own lot is perceptibly improved; mechanical inventions have caused untold wealth to be created, and yet his hours of toil have not been materially shortened; he hears glowing descriptions of the growth of this mighty metropolis, and at the same time he knows that the home of the London working man is not more comfortable, because, as new streets are opened and other improvements are introduced, places where the labourers can dwell are more and more restricted."

Is it true that labourers have not been benefited by "the vast increase in the nation's wealth," and are less comfortably lodged in this metropolis? If these statements cannot be made with truth of labourers in general, to which in particular will they apply? and why have some been excluded from participation in the blessings enjoyed by others? If he will tell us what becomes of the labourers who are refused admittance to, or dismissed from, the establishments of such employers as Sir Francis Crossley, and thriving co-operative societies, and why they, in common with the crowds at our dock gates, are thus unfortunately situated, he will assist us, and perhaps himself also, to the information of which we are in search.

their first attempts to sell their labour, they scarcely believe themselves to be on the look out for tyrants. When they obtain an advance of wages, they do not become conscious of any tyranny. When some new employer, hearing of their efficiency, offers them better wages than their former employers can afford to give, they do not suspect the tyrant. When employers attract labourers from districts where they are earning ten shillings a-week by the promise of twenty shillings; or when enterprising labourers, unsolicited by others, quit places where they were earning ten shillings and apply for employment at twenty shillings, the acceptance of their services will not appear tyrannical to them, unwelcome and tyrannical as it may appear to other labourers in the receipt of thirty shillings.

We have no thought of escaping criticism or refutation by affirming, that the expositions which we have attempted are consistent with "the principles of political economy," or are correct applications of those principles. Principles of political economy, in common with all other principles, are liable to be misinterpreted and misapplied, and we do not seek shelter, accordingly, behind them. Nor shall we be greatly alarmed by those who do no more than assert that we have sinned against political economy. Calculations can be verified, and the analysis of a compound can be tested by experiment, without ostentatiously appealing to "the principles of arithmetic or chemistry." We beg that our estimate of the probable influence of combinations upon wages and well-being may be examined by similar methods. We doubt whether any political economist, master of his subject, would find much to dissent from in what we have written. If he would not, he certainly ought to refrain from the use of such expressions as "antagonism between capital and labour," the effect of which must be to make truth and sound doctrine unpalatable.

We were told, on one occasion, when commenting, perhaps a little warmly, upon this mischievous trifling with matters of life and death, that such "*bosh*" did not deserve our attention. To this

we replied, it may be very well for you to despise "*bosh*," but those who listen to *bosh* as if it were sense may rush to their ruin, and those who talk *bosh* will never know nor talk sense till they can see through their own *bosh*.

The expression, "antagonism between capital and labour," must have been invented to foster a prejudice rather than to recommend a truth. We might as well talk of the antagonism between food and appetite, or between the shivering body and clothes. Passing from capital and labour to capitalists and labourers, they seem to us to be more attracted towards, than repelled from, each other. Their respective wants and means of supplying wants draw them together. Apart they are powerless. Buyers and sellers, borrowers and lenders, are similarly drawn towards each other. The antagonism, if there be any, is between capitalists and capitalists, labourers and labourers, buyers and buyers, sellers and sellers, borrowers and borrowers, lenders and lenders, each contending for a common object, and appearing to frustrate those against whom they contend.

We will not close this paper without reminding teachers, that the subjects which we have been urging upon their attention cannot be left unheeded by their pupils. They, at the close of school-life, will be compelled to act. The alternative before them is not action or inaction, but judicious or injudicious action, the one leading towards well-being, the other away from it. Surely there is misery enough caused by wilful misconduct, and by "the ills which flesh is heir to." Its increase through ignorance is a reproach to those by whom the ignorance might have been prevented. It is more in sorrow than in anger that we blame the courageous, enduring, and energetic men, who are adding misery to misery by their mistaken efforts to obtain relief. But we cannot suppress our anger at the apathy of those instructors of youth, who persist in a course of instruction, the end of which is to leave their pupils in ignorance upon matters, a knowledge of which is indispensable to good self-guidance and well-being.