THE trial of Mr. BRADLAUGH and Mrs. BESANT for publishing an obscene book was commenced on Monday, in the Queen’s Bench. The SOLICITOR-GENERAL, Mr. DOUGLAS STRAIGHT, and Mr. MRAD prosecuted. A preliminary application to quash the indictment was refused, the point being reserved. The SOLICITOR-GENERAL then opened the case. He referred to the case of the “Confessional Unmasked” to show that it was not necessary that there should be an intention to vitiate public morals. The point was the general effect of the book. His LORDSHIP said in that case they would be criminally liable. Formal evidence of the publication having been given, Mrs. BESANT addressed the Court for the defence, leaving it to Mr. BRADLAUGH to establish that similar ground had been taken by a large number of eminent writers. She denied that the work was obscene, argued that the information it conveyed was useful and necessary, and that opinions honestly expressed should not be put down because some police agents did not agree with it. She denounced the prosecution as a disgrace to English justice. Mrs. BESANT had not concluded when the Court rose. On Tuesday Mrs. BESANT continued her address, arguing that as the natural checks on population, war, famine, and disease were removed it was necessary that scientific checks should be substituted. She was proceeding to treat of the Darwinian doctrine of the survival of the fittest, when the LORD CHIEF JUSTICE remarked it was well worthy of Dr. DARWIN’s consideration whether in the struggle for existence a still higher and more gifted race might not come from the smaller number, and yet the effect upon the masons be deteriorating. Mrs. BESANT observed that Mr. DARWIN’s theory could only apply to man on the supposition that the weakly, the aged, and the starving were allowed to die without assistance. She proceeded to point out the evils resulting from delaying marriage, and contended that celibacy on the one hand and profligacy on the other were far more productive of evil than early marriages. She deprecated the discussion of such subjects in magazines, and the use of physiological works in girls’ schools, but she argued that a physical truth could not be morally evil. Mr. BRADLAUGH then commenced his address, and continued until the Court rose. On Wednesday Mr. BRADLAUGH continued his address, arguing that not one sentence in the pamphlet was directed against marriage, and that the subjects in question were discussed quite as fully and less delicately in “Carpenter’s Physiology,” a book placed in the hands of boys and girls, and which the Recorder who charged the Grand Jury against him had presented as a prize. The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE interposed, observing that the SOLICITOR-GENERAL’S contention was that details essential in a medical book were unnecessary in a book for the public, and might have an evil tendency. Mr. BRADLAUGH said the contention amounted to this, that a rich lady might obtain from her physician knowledge which it was criminal to communicate to the poor, to whom it was more essential. Miss ALICE VICARY, examined by Mrs. BESANT, deposed that she had examined the book, and considered it fit for general circulation. Dr. DRYSDALE said he did not consider there was anything prurient in the work. Mr. BOHN, publisher of “Carpenter’s Physiology” and other medical books, stated he had never restricted their circulation. On Thursday Mr. BRADLAUGH having summed up for the defence, and the SOLICITOR-GENERAL having briefly replied, the LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said a more ill-advised, to judicious prosecution was never brought into a Court of Justice. When the SOLICITOR-GENERAL said the authorities were compelled to prosecute he should like to know who the authorities were? The policeman seemed to be the prosecutor. So long as the Government thought fit to leave the administration of justice without a public prosecutor so long every individual, however ill-advised, had a right to put the law in motion. He put it to the jury, Was the purpose advocated in the work, and the purpose for which the details were given, inconsistent: with public morals? If the jury considered the offence made out, no conviction that defendants had acted from a sense of public duty, and a desire to do a public good, could justify that which was wrong. The jury, after an absence of an hour and thirty-five minutes, returned, and the foreman said, “The jury are of opinion that the book in calculated to deprave public morals, but we entirely exonerate the defendants from any corrupt motive in publishing it.” The LORD CHIEF JUSTICE said: I am afraid gentlemen I must direct you on that to find against them. Your exoneration of any corrupt intention will be taken into consideration, but I must direct you on the special verdict to find against the defendants. The jury accordingly found a verdict of guilty. THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE, under the circumstances, said he would not pass sentence at present. The defendants were released on their own recognisances to come up for judgment next Thursday.