THE BRADLAUGH CASE.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Charles Bradlaugh and Annie Besant surrendered to their recognisances on Monday morning in the Queen's Bench Division, before the Lord Chief Justice and a special Jury, to answer a charge of having published an obscene book. The Solicitor-General, Mr. Straight, and Mr. Mead appeared for the prosecution; Mr. Bradlaugh conducted his defence, and that of his co-defendants in person. The Solicitor-General said the two defendants were Indicted for having published an obscene book under statute, which prohibited the publication of matter calculated to corrupt and destroy the morals of the people. The work in question was published In the first Instance in Bristol by a Mr. Watts, and the defendants, wishing to test the legality of the publication, sent a notification to the clerk of the Guildhall Police-court sod to certain of the police authorities that they would attend at an address to Stonecutter-street to publish the work. The question to be decided was whether the defendants were entitled to sell for the sum of 6d the book referred to every person to whom It might occur that It was interesting or exciting to a morbid appetite, was whether the question was whether the book was an obscene publication—The case for the prosecution having closed, Mrs. Bisant addressed the jury. She said her intention to the publication was not to corrupt but to cure disease. It was a pamphlet written by a duly qualified medical man, a man who lived a thoroughly blameless life, and who had the greatest sympathy with the poor; and all the work did was to circulate useful and necessary information, which ought to be within the reach of all persons.

The trial was resumed oil Tuesday, when Mrs. Besant continued her address, arguing that as the natural checks on population—war, famine, and disease were in a great measure removed, It was necessary that scientific checks should be substituted, She proceeded next to treat of the Darwinian doctrine, of the survival of the fittest.—The Lord Chief Justice: It may be well worthy of Mr. Darwin's consideration whether the result of a struggle for existence may not be twofold—namely, that beneath the small numbers of a highly gifted race a deteriorated mass may not be found.—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 evil of 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 percussion of such subjects to magazines, and the use of physiological works in girls' schools, but she argued that a physical truth could not be morally evil.

On Wednesday Mr. Bradlaugh addressed the jury. He submitted that the essay was an essay on the population, that the question was lawful to be discussed, and that over-population was a fruitful wares of poverty, Ignorance, crime, and misery, and that therefore the advocacy of prudential checks, to population was not merely lawful, but highly moral.—Witnesses were called to give their opinion that there was nothing prurient in the book.

THE VERDICT.

On Thursday, the jury retired at a quarter to one o'clock, and returning Into Court at twenty minutes past two o'clock, the jury said: We are of opinion that the book is calculated to deprave public moral, but we entirely exonerate the defendants from any corrupt motive in publishing it.

The Lord Chief Justice: I must direct you upon that to find a verdict against the defendants.

The jury then returned a verdict of guilty.

A verdict of guilty having been entered against both defendants, they were allowed to go at large upon their own recognisance, until this day week, when they will be called upon to receive sentence in this court.