which has been revealed by longer and closer study of the problem is that many inebriates are really mental defectives, as already noted in connexion with insanity. Such cases constantly reappear in the police courts after discharge.

*Heredity.—*It has long been generally assumed that the children of alcoholics suffer in body and mind for the sins of their parents, that they are weak, diseased and defective; and it is very often assumed that they inherit an alcoholic craving. The latter assumption is not admitted by scientific students of the question, but the former has been generally held, though without any proof. It has been made the subject of a statistical investigation (1910) in the Eugenics laboratory of London University by Miss E. Μ. Elderton and Professor Karl Pearson. The object was to “measure the effect of alcoholism in the parents on the health, physique and intelligence of their offspring, ” whether by toxic or environ­mental influence, but not by the transmission of original defective characters, which is omitted from the inquiry. The material used is a report by the Edinburgh Charity Organization Society on the children in one of the Edinburgh schools and one by Miss Mary Dendy on those in the special schools of Manchester. The number of children is not stated, but so far as can be gathered from the tables the Edinburgh inquiry covered about 1000 and the Man­chester inquiry about 2000. The ages were from 5 to 14 (Edin­burgh report), and both sexes are included in approximately equal numbers. The general conclusion reached is that “ no *marked* relation has been found between the intelligence, physique or disease of the offspring and parental alcoholism in any of the categories investigated. ” The principal particular conclusions reached are as follows:—Higher death-rate in alcoholic than in sober families, more marked in. the case of mother than of father, but alcoholic parents more fertile, and therefore nett family about equal: height and weight of. alcoholic children slightly greater, but when corrected for age slightly less; general health of alcoholic children slightly better, markedly so in regard to tuberculosis and epilepsy ; parental alcoholism not the source of mental defect in children; no per­ceptible relation between parental alcoholism and filial intelligence.

These conclusions, which run counter to current opinions, have been much criticized, and it is true that the scope of the inquiry is inadequate to establish them as general propositions. Moreover, the chronological relation of parental intemperance to the birth of the children is not stated. But so far as it goes the investigation is sound and it is the first attempt to treat the subject in a scientific way. Nor is there anything in the conclusions to surprise careful and unbiassed observers. The existence of a broad relation between superior vigour and an inclination for alcoholic drinks was pointed out years ago by the writer; drinking peoples are noticeably more energetic and progressive than non-drinking ones. It is the uni­versal experience of shipmasters that British seamen, whose (in­temperance causes trouble and therefore induces a preference for more sober foreigners, exhibit an energy and endurance in emergency of which the latter are incapable. Similar testimony has repeatedly been borne by engineers and contractors engaged in large works in the south of Europe. And that acute observer, Miss Loane, has related a particular and striking case in regard to offspring from her own experience, which is curiously in keeping with the conclusions of the Eugenics laboratory. The question, however, needs much more elucidation.

The whole subject has, in truth, got somewhat out of perspective. The tendency of the statistical and experimental investigations, summarized above into the relations of alcohol with crime, mortality, disease, &c., has been to obliterate the distinction be­tween the use and abuse of alcohol, between moderate and excessive drinking, and to bring into relief all the evils associated with excess, while ignoring the other side of the question. It is legitimate and desirable to emphasize the evils, but not by the one-sided and fallacious handling of facts. Alcoholic excess produces the evils alleged, though not to the extent alleged, but there is no evidence to show that its moderate use produces any of them. Yet they are all put down to “ alcohol,” and the inference is freely drawn that its abolition would practically put an end to crime, vice, poverty and disease without any counterbalancing loss whatever. The facts do not warrant that inference, nor has mankind at large ever accepted it. Both the statistical and experimental evidence is full of fallacies, and especially the latter. The pathological investiga­tions on the action of. alcohol referred to above elucidate the organic changes which the. tissues undergo in the chronic inebriate who is saturated with spirit, but to draw the inference that alcoholic liquors taken in moderation and consumed in the body have any such action is wholly fallacious. In point of fact we know that they have not. But there is more than that. These experiments only take cognizance of alcohol; they ignore the other substances actually consumed along with it. Some of these, and notably sugar, are recognized foods; the balance of opinion on the vexed question whether alcohol itself is a food—which really depends on what is meant by. a food—is now on the side of alcohol. But in addition to the principal constituents, easily separable by analysis, are many other substances of which science takes no cognizance at all; they are not identified. They may be in minute quantities yet extremely powerful, as are many other vegetable extractives. We know that they exist by their taste and their effect; they make the difference between port and sherry, between claret and Burgundy, between one vintage and another, between brandy and whisky, differences unknown to chemistry—which only recognizes alcohol, and knows very little about that—but vastly important to the human organism. Another group of experiments arc equally fallacious in a different way. The effect of alcohol in mental operations is tested by the comparative speed and ease with which work is done after a dose and without it. The effect has been found to be diminished speed and ease; but these experimenters do not apply the same test to a good meal or a sound sleep or hard exercise. The writer finds in concentrated mental work that the immediate effect of even a small dose of alcohol is to impair efficiency, but the other three do so in a much higher degree. The inference is not that these are injurious, but that the proper time for each is not just before work; after work he finds them all, alcohol in­cluded, beneficial. The mortality statistics are treated in a similar one-sided way. They clearly show the injury done by the abuse of alcohol, but what of its moderate use? Agricultural labourers are the most typical moderate drinking class, and they are one of the healthiest in spite of exposure, bad housing and poverty. If all the unhealthiness of those who drink hard is referred to their drink, then the healthiness of those who drink moderately should be referred to it too.

The absolute condemnation of alcoholic drinks has never been endorsed by . public opinion or by the medical profession, because it is contradicted by their general experience. That many persons are better without any alcohol, and that many more would be better if they took less than they do is undeniable; but it is equally undeniable that many derive benefit from a moderate amount of it. Sir James Paget, than whom no man was more completely master of his appetites or better qualified to judge, drank port wine himself because he found that it did him good. He represents the attitude of the medical profession as a whole and of temperate men in general. Attempts to support the case for abolishing the use of alcoholic liquors by. denying them any value and by attributing to them effects which spring from many other causes, do not carry conviction or advance the cause of temperance. A much stronger argument lies in the difficulty of drawing a definite line between use and abuse ; they tend to merge into one another, and it may be urged that the evils of the latter are sufficiently great to justify the abandon­ment of the former. But the use of most things is open to the same objection., and mankind at large has never consented to forego the gratification of a natural appetite because it is liable to abuse. Nor is there any sign of an intention to make an exception in favour of alcohol. On the other hand, moderation is attainable by every sane individual. It is in fact observed by the great majority and to an increasing extent. There *is* a line between use and abuse, and every one really knows where it is in his own case. If he cannot draw it let him abstain, as Dr Johnson did for that reason. But society can do much to assist the individual by inculcating moderation, setting a standard, promoting its main­tenance by helpful environment, discouraging excess and diminish­ing temptation. All the evidence points to those means as the effective agents in securing the improvement which has taken place in Great Britain.

This article should be read in conjunction with that on Liquor Laws, and it will therefore be in place here to give some additional information regarding the latter. The policy of prohibition has recently gained ground in several countries. In 1910 nine American states had adopted it—namely: Maine, Kansas, N. Dakota, Georgia, Oklahoma, Alabama, Mississippi, N. Carolina and Tennessee; and it was estimated that nearly half the popula­tion of the United States were living under state or local prohibition. In Canada the province of Prince Edward Island has adopted complete prohibition. In 1908 Iceland by a popular vote resolved to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquor. In Norway nearly half the towns have adopted prohibition under the law of 1906. In Belgium and Switzerland the manu­facture, importation and sale of absinthe was forbidden in 1908. In New Zealand the principle of prohibition has gained ground, and in 1910 was in force over one-seventh of the colony.

Authorities.—Licensing Statistics Home Office (annual); Statistical Tables of Alcoholic Beverages, Board of Trade, 1905; Report of Inspector under Inebriates Acts (annual); judicial Statistics (annual); Registrar-General's Annual Report; Statistics of Cities, United States Census Bureau; *Alliance Year Book;* Church of England Temperance Society Annual Report; *American Prohibition Year Book; Brewers' Almanack; New Encyclopaedia of Social Reform;* “The Drink Problem" *(New Library of Medi­cine);* Eugenics Laboratory Memoirs; Morrison, *Crime and its Causes;* Pratt, *Licensing and Temperance in Sweden, Norway and Denmark;* Rowntree and Sherwell, *The Temperance Problem and Social Reform;* A. Shadwell, *Drink, Temperance and Legislation.*
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**TEMPEST, MARIE** (1866- ), the stage name of the

English actress, *née* Marie Susan Etherington, who in 1898 married Cosmo Gordon-Lennox ("Cosmo Stuart ”), a grandson