

passed current, their truth never was questioned, and upon just such statements the public judgment was formed as to how the trotter should be bred. In remarking upon this paragraph we exercised great courtesy, but we wanted to know by whom this horse was bred, when and under what name he ran his mile at Lexington in 1:44, through what hands he had passed to his present owner, and who that owner was, &c. These questions were pointed directly at the editor of the *Record*, a man of very wide intelligence in running-horse matters, and was or had been secretary of the Lexington course, where this performance was said to have been made. His reply was personally bitter, complaining that we had singled him out for committing an offense that was common to all editors, and confessing that he knew nothing about the horse nor his reputed performance, and that the paragraph had "crept in" without his knowledge. This was the first bubble of the kind that it became our duty to prick, and the pricking of it brought an angry retort that may be classed as the first fight against the MONTHLY. The whole paragraph, with all its circumstances, was untrue.

After exploding a few scores of these bubbles, by a single question or a single fact, every one of which made us an enemy, our contemporaries began to become more careful in their statements, and, in the last few years, not one of them has had the temerity to talk about a horse running in 1:44 and then trotting below 2:30. The arguments advanced about running blood in the trotter may depend upon this as though it were true, but however little brains an editor may have, he will not take the risk of being ridiculed the world over by making any such preposterous statement as a fact. He may not refrain, wholly, from fear of being exposed, but if he has the brains of an oyster he knows that nobody will believe it. One of the earliest and most important achievements of the MONTHLY, then, has been the improvement of the morals of many of its contemporaries. Their arguments may be just as baseless and as truthless as the bald statement about Ben Starr. But not one can be found who will utter such a statement to-day.

Closely allied with this improvement of morals is the growth of intelligence. Nine years ago such stories as that of Ben Starr were not only put in circulation by editors and reporters, but they were believed and accepted as true by the great body of readers. To-day nine hundred and ninety-nine men out of a thousand would reject them as untrue on the simple reason that all the experiences of all the years have never shown a horse that could do both things. There is no record or evidence extant that goes to show that any running-bred horse ever

trotted a mile in three minutes. This fact, that the running-bred horse never has been able to show any speed at the trot, is now universally known and accepted among all horsemen. This is a primary truth, a starting-point in all our knowledge of trotting affairs. If there is any fact among horsemen upon which all can now stand and agree, it is the fact that the running horse cannot trot fast, and cannot be trained to trot fast. Nine years ago the common belief was that all he lacked was training and opportunity on the trotting turf. The diffusion of practical knowledge on this initial truth, and the confirming of the public judgment in the belief that the running horse is not a trotter, we may designate as the second point that has been accomplished by the MONTHLY.

The revolution wrought in the philosophy of breeding the trotter is, perhaps, the most marked achievement of these nine years of labor. This revolution seems all the more stupendous when we reflect upon the years of labor and study before we were able to achieve our own personal emancipation from the traditions and teachings of all the writers on the subject, both English and American. The theory was inwrought in our very nature that the great trotter must, of necessity, be of the same blood as the great runner, because, as we then supposed, the running horse was superior to all other horses in any service or habit of action that might be required of him. This was the theory held and taught by everybody in all the past, and we would have been advocating it to-day if we had not found it necessary to try to strengthen the theory by trying to reconcile it with some facts that developed themselves in our researches. The mental process of emancipation was very simple, and we will outline it in a few words. With all the facts and experiences of the past tabulated and spread before the eye, we found as follows:—(1.) No running-bred horse had ever trotted. (2.) Animals with fifty per cent. running blood had generally failed as trotters, and all the exceptions to this conclusion could be counted on the fingers of one hand. (3.) Animals with twenty-five per cent. of running blood had a good many distinguished representatives. (4.) Animals with only twelve and a half per cent. running blood had a still greater number. (5.) Many of our greatest trotters had no running blood at all. Next we took up the tables of long distance races, and there we found that strong infusions of running blood had no advantage in either will or wind, over any distance of ground, from two to twenty miles. The greatest performers at all distances were really those farthest removed from running blood. With these facts, gathered from all past experiences, plainly and honestly spread out before us, how could we do otherwise