

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF

EUGENICS

EUGENICS— . . . the doctrine of progress or evolution, especially in the human race, through improved conditions in the relations of the sexes.

—THE CENTURY DICTIONARY.

NOVEMBER, 1907.

In This Number:

EUGENICS: THE FUTURE OF MAN C. W. SALEEBY, M. D.
SEX IN SOCIAL EVOLUTION. II. PAUL TYNER
TOWARD THE PURPLE MOUNTAINS . . LILLIAN BROWNE-THAYER
THE SEX PROBLEM HENRIETTA FUERTH
MARRIAGE-LAW REFORM GEORGE BEDBOROUGH
TWO TALES HUGH MANN

EDITORIAL: The Opponents of Eugenics.
Editorial Comment.

THE PERSONAL PROBLEM LENA BELFORT
Concerning Morals. "Lending Our Minds Out."

CULTURE: Physical, Mental, Moral M. FLORENCE JOHNSON
The White Slave.

VARIOUS VOICES.

Sex and the Administrative Process. Does Obscene Literature Tend to Moral and Physical Injury of the Young? Obscenity Laws. To What Extent Can We Select and Predetermine the Characteristics of Unborn Children?

BOOKS RECEIVED.

AT THE DESK.

THE YOUNG PEOPLE.

M. HARMAN:

500 FULTON STREET, CHICAGO.

Application made for entry at Chicago (Ill.) postoffice as second-class matter.

Price 10 Cents

Vol. I. No. 5.

\$1 a Year

ANCIENT SOCIETY:

OR, RESEARCHES IN THE LINES OF HUMAN PROGRESS; FROM SAVAGERY THROUGH BARBARISM TO CIVILIZATION. BY LEWIS H. MORGAN, LL. D. CLOTH, \$1.50.

There is one American, and one only, whose name is known in every great European center of learning as one of the world's greatest scientists, and that man is Lewis H. Morgan. What Darwin's "Origin of Species" is to biology, what Marx's "Capital" is to economics, that Morgan's "Ancient Society" is to anthropology. Every textbook on the history of institutions which has been written during the last generation is based upon this great work. Yet, because this logic is destructive of the existing order, his work has been ignored and belittled even by those who have built upon the foundation it laid. Marx was one of the first to recognize its merits, and Engels thought it of so great value that he popularized some of its principal positions in his "Origin of the Family." It is a fundamental part of the Marxian system, applying to the prehistoric period the same principles which Marx applied to the stage of capitalism. Morgan shows that the evolution of society in the pre-capitalistic stage obeys the same laws as in the present society. The first division of the book shows how the social stages may be classified by the form of production employed, and his classification remains the base of all subsequent ones. The second part deals with the "Arts of Subsistence," and traces the development of the powers of production until the stage of a possible surplus is reached. Man, unlike any other animal, finally reaches that control over his environment which the possession of such a surplus implies, and this fact determines many social institutions.

The second part traces the "Growth of the Idea of Government," which he shows to have originated in the sex relation. It is this portion, tracing the evolution of the gens, tribe, and phratry into the beginnings of modern government, that constitutes the most famous portion of the work. Morgan had lived for many years as an adopted member of the Iroquois tribe of Indians, and it was the knowledge which he thus gained that gave him the clew to the laws of institutional evolution. He further elaborates the facts thus gained in the third part, on the "Growth of the Idea of the Family," a portion of the work which rivals the second part in its epoch-making character. Since it was written, no discussion of the family has ever appeared which is not founded upon it. The fourth part, the "Growth of the Idea of Property," is more directly connected with the Socialist philosophy, although it is really but the logical conclusion of the book. Here is traced the relation of property to different industrial stages, and to other social institutions, especially the marriage relation.

Hitherto this work has been sold only at a price which made it practically inaccessible to the working-class reader. This largely accounts for the unfamiliarity of most Socialists with its contents, save as they have gained them indirectly. This edition for the first time places this work within the reach of every student of Socialism and makes possible a wide diffusion of its contents.

If you want literature on Eugenics, Freethought, Economics, or any other advanced subject, I should be pleased to receive your order.

L. HARMAN, 500 FULTON ST., CHICAGO, ILL.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS

SUCCESSOR TO LUCIFER THE LIGHT-BEARER

Published Monthly at 500 Fulton Street, Chicago, Ill.

Subscription Rates—United States: One year, \$1; six months, 50 cents; three months, 25 cents.

Foreign and Canada: One year, \$1.25.

M. Harman, Editor and Publisher.

Vol. I. No. 5.

NOVEMBER, 1907.

Whole No. 1098

Eugenics: The Future of Man.

BY C. W. SALEEBY, M. D.

[From Dr. C. W. Saleeby's *Evolution the Master-Key*. Copyright, 1905, by Harper & Brothers.]

[Republished by special permission of Harper & Brothers.]

If this present generation suddenly became self-conscious as a whole, and asked itself how it came to be, the answer would refer its genesis to the marriage of *certain* members of the last generation. Now, among our predecessors were numbered men of character and men of none, saints and criminals, athletes and weaklings, lovers of beauty and Philistines, Cornelias and Messalinas. Of these our *amour propre* would lead us to choose some rather than others, could we decide; and this inclination may surely be regarded as evidence of a popular, if not an explicit, belief in *heredity*. We feel that we are not to be regarded as entirely independent of our ancestry. Similarly, if heredity be a fact, it is evident that all future history, that human destiny on this not yet moribund earth, is bound up with the *selection*, conscious or other, of present individuals whose blood shall visit men's sad or happy hearts in all time coming.

Now, this chapter is written with the object of introducing, to the grave consideration of such persons as can induce that mental state, the study which concerns itself with all the influences that can improve the inborn qualities, physical, intellectual, and moral, of our own or any race. But before outlining the recent history of this study, which its author, Mr. Francis Galton, has called eugenics—surely a happy term—let us inquire whether any influences are already extant which tend to such improvement. For it is now accepted by thinkers of all schools that the great thesis implicit in the masterpiece of Mr. Galton's illustrious cousin, Charles Darwin, is a proved truth. The human race, as we know it, is the contemporary product of æons of improvement. To this our brains, our backbones, our thumbs, our religions, our symphonies, our manners, bear

witness. Now, while biologists still discuss among themselves the relative importance of the factors in organic evolution, they have ceased to question the enormous influence of that factor which Darwin discovered and named natural selection. Indeed, the current question is whether natural selection is the only factor, as Weismann asserts, or merely the principal factor, as Darwin himself maintained. In brief, we may take it that, of any generation, whether of mosses or mice or men, the fittest tend to be more largely represented than the less fit in the succeeding generation. The fittest, however—as no amount of didactics will make the many understand—are not necessarily the *best*, but are merely those best adapted to the conditions of the environment. These conditions, however, owing to the appearance of man's moral sense and higher intellectual faculties, have made the survival of the fittest to coincide with the survival of what we are pleased to consider the best. In other words, there is already at work a most potent force that has long made and is still making for the improvement of the human breed—which, indeed, owes to that force its very origin. Now, by means of eugenics, as I understand it, Mr. Galton merely proposes to enlist man's conscious coöperation with and encouragement of the factor which Darwin and Wallace discovered. It is not unfitting that this great biologist should be the prophet to the twentieth century of the application of that principle which his cousin, the greatest biologist of any age, constituted the chief revelation of the nineteenth century.

We may observe the operation of the eugenic principle at this hour by studying the "expectation of life" among married and unmarried persons. As every one knows, the married live longer than the unmarried, a fact which was accepted as proving that marriage is conducive to long life, until Spencer analyzed it in his *Study of Sociology*, and showed that the married are already the selected of their generation. On the average, the married man was fated to marry because of certain characters—such as physical beauty, efficiency, "attractiveness," love of domesticity, fondness for children—which make him more valuable to the race than his less fortunate fellows. Certain it is that, whether or not Mr. Galton has his way, and despite the witty and worthless criticism of the popular critics, the eugenic principle cannot be excluded from its benevolent rôle in human affairs.

But it is evident that I have hitherto begged the fundamental question, a fault of which Mr. Galton himself has been accused by certain distinguished medical critics, such as Dr. Henry Maudsley and Dr. Charles Mercier. What is the use, they say in effect, of proposing to improve the human breed by invoking the principle of heredity when our Shakespeare, for instance, was the son of undistinguished parents, and had five utterly commonplace brothers? Now, of all the men to face with such a question,

surely Mr. Galton was the last. If the critics would inquire, they would discover that his proposals are the logical outcome, in this his ninth decade, of all his previous life-work. Is not he the author of *Hereditary Genius*, who has proved up to the hilt that intellect is transmissible and is transmitted? Is not Mr. Galton himself a member of a family which would prove his case if it stood alone, as it does not? His relatives number Josiah Wedgwood; Erasmus Darwin, the forerunner of evolution; Charles Darwin, and Professor George Darwin, the president of the British Association for 1905, one of three brothers, sons of the great Charles, all of whom are fellows of the Royal Society on their own merits. After this there is little need to refer to Thomas and Matthew Arnold, the Bach family, or the hundreds of instances which might be quoted.

But let us, in this connection, glance at the recent history of the subject. It had its beginning in Mr. Galton's mind decades ago—doubtless under the influence of Plato's discussion of the subject in the *Republic*. Mr. Galton first invented the term stirpiculture, now popular in America. But latterly the inchoate idea has developed in Mr. Galton's mind, and was the subject of his Huxley Memorial Lecture, delivered before the Anthropological Institute, London, three years ago [1902]. Now, Mr. Galton is not only the student of finger-prints whose work is now invaluable to the police, not only the author of *Hereditary Genius*, but he is the first to apply mathematics to biology, the first *exact* student of heredity. This new study his disciple, Professor Karl Pearson, has called biometrics, and it was fitting that Mr. Galton's Huxley Lecture should be followed by Professor Pearson's, which proved, by the use of the Galtonian method, that mental and moral characters are *as surely transmitted by heredity as are the physical*. But this is not all my answer to those who declare that heredity is incalculable and that we had better let well alone. Since Mr. Galton was drawn from his retirement by the Sociological Society in the summer of 1904, and read his initial paper on eugenics, he has instituted an inquiry of the utmost interest among the fellows of the Royal Society.* Mr. Galton addressed to every fellow of the society a form containing queries concerning his relatives, which the fellow addressed was to fill in with the details requested. The inquiry has produced a mass of results, which have been subjected to strict mathematical analysis, and which conclusively prove that there exist, in this country at the present day, certain families the individuals of which are of priceless value to the community and to the race at large. Even this limited inquiry has revealed the exist-

* Mr. Galton's paper on eugenics, together with a discussion to which the leading biologists and psychologists of the day contributed, and his paper on the results of this inquiry, are to be found in *Sociological Papers*, a volume recently published by Messrs. Macmillan for the Sociological Society.

ence of at least nine families of the very first distinction, besides a large number of almost equal value, among fellows of the Royal Society alone.

Having done this piece of work, Mr. Galton saw that the time for further action had come. He therefore presented to the University of London an initial sum of £1,500, to be spent within three years, for the establishment of the "Francis Galton Research Fellowship in National Eugenics." The first election to this fellowship has now taken place, and the honor has been awarded to Mr. Edgar Schuster, M. A., F. Z. S., late holder of a science scholarship at New College, Oxford. Mr. Schuster has already contributed important papers to *Biometrika*, and has studied such subjects as heredity in mice and the characters of the ancient British skulls in the Oxford collection. He is now well established in University College, with the engaging legend "Eugenic Record Office" inscribed over his door. Mr. Galton, the University of London, and the eugenic cause are to be congratulated on obtaining the services of a student so enthusiastic and skilled. Perhaps Mr. Schuster, to whom I am personally unknown, will forgive me for instancing him, as I have already instanced Mr. Galton, in illustration of the contention that heredity is a fact not only in matters of cranial form, let us say, but also in matters of intra-cranial product. He is a nephew of Professor Arthur Schuster, of Manchester, and Mr. Felix Schuster; son of a distinguished specialist in international law, Dr. Ernest Schuster; and grandson of Sir Hermann Weber, M. D. Like Mr. Galton himself, he has every reason to believe in eugenics.

It is stated by the university, in preliminary terms, that "Mr. Schuster will, in particular, carry out investigations into the history of classes and families, and deliver lectures and publish memoirs on the subject of his investigations." Let me here briefly indicate what Mr. Galton conceives to be the most immediate demands which eugenics makes of this, its first authorized student. We want a biographical index of gifted families, modern and recent—an Occidental and scientific adaptation of the Golden Book of the Chinese. This index, together with the biographies of capable, though hardly gifted, families, may be published. Not for publication will be a collection of biographies of families distinctly below the average in health, mind, or physique. To this end the records of asylums, hospitals, and prisons must be consulted. Then we must utilize all the invaluable aid to be afforded by the data of insurance offices. Most important, also, is it to study what I may call the *social circulation*. We must know the birth-rates of every class in the community, and must determine how far each class is derived from and contributes to its own and the other classes. It is known, in general, that society is an organism which perpetually renews itself *from below*, but the particular strata which are foremost in reproduction are not known. The highest and lowest strata are constantly re-

plenished from some intermediate levels. Further, Mr. Schuster will endeavor to collect and catalogue the enormous amount of literature already extant which bears on the subject of eugenics, not forgetting to avail himself of the experience of horticulturists and breeders of stock.

Then, again, there is almost endless work yet to be done in the field of heredity. Notably do we want to know the effect on the offspring of differences in the parental qualities. Mr. Galton also considers desirable a study of Eurasians (the descendants of English and Hindu parents), both as a topic of national importance to Britons and in relation to the theory of heredity which we owe to the long-neglected work of the Austrian abbot, Gregor Mendel.

The eugenic proposal is that it will be well if the best of each generation contribute more—much more—than their share to the making of the next. It is obvious that there are positive and negative aspects to this intention. Let us for a moment look at the latter.

Objectors declare that love, which notoriously “makes the world go round,” will laugh at eugenics as at locksmiths; we need not fancy that people will tolerate any interference with their matrimonial intentions. Mr. Galton has made an extended answer to this objection in a recent paper which must be summarized here. Already we know that, in our own day, public opinion is a potent restriction upon marriages between, for instance, first cousins, and persons very disparate in social status. If it can control these, why not also the marriage of the epileptic, the “borderland” insane, the consumptive, and the criminal? But Mr. Galton has invoked history and anthropology in this paper, most inappropriately read before the Sociological Society on St. Valentine’s day. Already man, who is not a monogamous animal by nature, has submitted to the monogamic restriction. The Greeks, the Romans, and the modern Hindu have submitted to the custom of endogamy, which forbids marriage outside the caste or tribe or the patrician or Hellenic group. Endogamy has been sanctioned by religion and enforced by law in all ages and in all parts of the world. Similarly exogamy—the duty enforced by custom, religion, and law of marrying *outside* one’s own tribe—is, or has been, as widely spread as the opposite rule of endogamy. The primitive Australian, again, submits to marriage restrictions still more grievous. The tyranny of taboo need only be mentioned. Then, again, every one, in all times, has submitted to the restriction of prohibited degrees in matrimony. The Roman Catholic may not even marry a third cousin, and marriages of first cousins are discouraged, though the evidence that they tend to racial deterioration is practically *nil*. Custom, also, is the main factor in producing our objection to incest. In truth, this supposed irresistible, incoercible, all-devouring passion of love can scarcely arise when religion or

custom or law, or all three combined, tend to render its consummation by marriage impracticable. Lastly, we have the dictates of religion as to celibacy. When eugenics is incorporated into the national conscience and has become, as well it may, an integral part of our religion, the duty of celibacy may well be enforced upon those whose progeny are palpably likely to be a burden to themselves and the community.

At any rate, if ever an objection was widely and finally disposed of, it is so with the objection that eugenics is impracticable because no one will tolerate any interference with his or her matrimonial intentions. Mr. Galton has conclusively disintegrated that criticism by his brief discussion of the facts of monogamy, endogamy, exogamy, Australian marriages, taboo, prohibited degrees, and celibacy. Persons, as he says, who are born under these various rules live under them without any objection; they are unconscious of their restrictions as we are unaware of the atmospheric pressure.

We may observe, then, that the negative part of Mr. Galton's proposals is one which has long been bruited, is unquestionably practicable, and, in the case of the insane, is applauded by all. In this, its struggling infancy, eugenics does not propose to tamper with marriage, nor to outrage public sentiment, both of which its protagonists respect. Nor do I for one moment believe that when eugenics is everywhere recognized, and its name is as familiar as, let us say, politics, it will propose any injury to or detraction from the dignity of the central and fundamental institution of society; on the contrary.

Surely even less objection than to the negative part of the eugenic proposals can be taken to the positive. These will readily suggest themselves to all who appreciate the eugenic idea; and when, haply, the object of ennobling our race is enthroned among men's ambitions, the positive proposals of eugenics will need no enumeration or academic support. It used to be stated that each man's duty to the state included the begetting and upbringing of as many children as possible. If this were so, the current fall in the birth-rate, common to us with all other civilized countries save Russia, would attest to a grave and widespread dereliction of civic duty. But the somewhat uncritical advice of President Roosevelt is sublimated and exalted when the eugenic idea is applied to it. As Sir Francis Younghusband said at Mr. Mackinder's lecture in London on "Man-Power as a Source of National Strength":

For the maintenance of empire we want not merely large numbers of men, but men of character and ability—we want not only quantity, but quality . . . What we have to do as a people is to try and maintain the high qualities of our race. Had Sir Francis said "maintain and enhance," he would have precisely expressed the eugenic ideal. When this is common property, and when

we have a national roll of distinguished families, men will be as proud of being inscribed and of having their children inscribed on that roll as of having had an ancestor, probably worthless, who came over with the Conqueror. The man who is conscious of worth of any kind will make many personal sacrifices in order that he may leave as many children as possible to perpetuate it. In seeking a partner, he will learn to attach a greater value than heretofore to fine qualities, moral or intellectual, in the woman of his choice; for he desires to be written in the Golden Book, and he knows that his children will be the more likely to earn enrolment there if their mother be "a perfect woman, nobly planned." Similarly your true altruist, conscious of some grave physical flaw likely to be perpetuated, will renounce any possibility of satisfying even the noble desire of parenthood.

Certain objectors seem to imagine, despite the unequivocal language of Mr. Galton, that he wishes to turn out all men on one pattern; in short, that this foremost student of heredity does not know the value of variation! Further, they say that no one is agreed as to what is best; some would wish all men to be scientists, others long for an elevation of æsthetic culture alone. Mr. Wells objects that the average criminal is probably superior in racially valuable qualities to the average judge; and since no one is agreed as to what we want, we need waste no time in trying to obtain it.

But hear Mr. Galton:

Postulating existing social groups [artist, financier, biologist, journalist, and what not], and existing moral criteria, eugenics aims at the reproduction of the best specimens of individuals—in *each* of those groups in which the characteristic activity is not demonstrably antisocial, as in criminals.

We want as much variety as ever, but we want the best possible of each variety. The practice of eugenics would thus raise the average quality of a nation to that of its better moiety of the present day: men of an order of ability (in a thousand spheres) which is now rare would become more frequent, because the level out of which they rose would itself have risen. We should still have demagogues, no doubt, and a gallery for them to play to; but the gallery would be a whit more discerning than the many-headed of today.

The first great need is that the thinker and the student shall accept eugenics as a study worthy of prosecution. Thereafter we must work at it with diligence and patience; and then, but not till then, it must be "introduced into the national conscience, like a new religion."

To oppose eugenics with success, it must first be demonstrated that the alleged facts of heredity are not facts. If, however, they be admitted, it inevitably follows that an improvement of the human race, in accordance

with certain ideals which we all accept, is theoretically possible. Here other objectors may add, "but, as a matter of fact, impracticable." But no one will say, however high he rate the potency of love and its refusal to brook interference, that the marriage of the insane and the criminal cannot be prevented; yet this would palpably be a eugenic measure. Nor do I, for one, think so poorly of my fellows as to disbelieve that no small number of them, when the eugenic ideal has been fairly presented, will be willing even to "strive and agonize" for an object the superior or the peer of which has yet to be named—the intellectual and moral ennoblement of our kind.

Sex in Social Evolution.

BY PAUL TYNER.

[An address at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Life, New York.]

[Concluded.]

The relation of sex to social evolution was sharply emphasized in its economic bearings by the Rev. Thomas R. Malthus in his *Essay on Population*, published in 1806. This English country parson produced a book which first called public attention on a large scale to what is, after all, the vital problem in human society. It is not too much to say that to Malthus' *Essay on Population* we owe it that the needs and importance of some understanding of the union of the sexes, as an essential of modern political science, began to be realized. Very briefly, Mr. Malthus argued that "increase of population tends to outrun that of subsistence." That sums it up: increase of population being in geometrical ratio and subsistence increasing only in arithmetical ratio, the world is becoming overpopulated and there is not bread enough to go around; so the population must be kept down by conscious control of reproduction, or "nature" will reduce it by plague and famine, war and pestilence.

As you well know, this fundamental premise of the Malthusian theory has been denied. It is insisted by certain writers that the means of subsistence cannot be said to increase only in arithmetical ratio; but, on the contrary, that man's increasing power over the forces of nature makes the increase in the means of subsistence practically illimitable. But, so far, the Malthusian premise has not been disproved. If it be true, then, that in our present state of society population increases at a rate far outrunning the increase in the means of subsistence, the problem of a self-conscious regu-

lation of births presses for solution. As a remedy for this overpopulation Malthus found that there are what he calls "two kinds of checks"—the positive and the preventive. By the operation of the first, the surplus is killed off through infanticide, war, famine, pestilence, and like causes. The second, or preventive, check is brought to bear by the limitation of offspring, to be effected by abstention from marriage or by control after marriage. To avoid the evil of the first class of checks, his deduction is that we must adopt the second. Malthusianism, as the theory has come to be known, has been much discussed, giving rise to a voluminous literature. At this day there is in England a Malthusian Society actively engaged in the propaganda of his ideas.

Malthus himself advised against early marriages, and counseled "prudence after marriage"; but the Malthusian Society developed his doctrine and came to the conclusion that he was wrong on this point. It is shown that the postponement of marriage—celibacy—was productive of much vice and crime, and that it was altogether a disease that was worse than the remedy; while early marriages, under certain circumstances, might increase domestic happiness and content, and with this the public welfare.

As a result of scientific investigation, nearly half a century after Malthus' *Essay* appeared, Darwin and Spencer accepted his main position, which I think is testimony of a remarkable kind to Malthus' judgment. Darwin based upon it his doctrine of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest, leading to the theory of evolution. His deduction as to the practical action called for is summed up in the phrase, *laissez faire*; that is, let it alone, do nothing!

Spencer follows Darwin in his conclusions, although he points out, as a result of his observations, covering a number of years, that the rate of multiplication in the number of species investigated varies inversely as to the degree of individuation.

Thus we come back to the development of the individual as the hope of the race. Mr. Spencer's law of individuation is illustrated in familiar examples of the marvelously prolific in the lower forms of life; some of the worms and other insects increase from a single pair to millions in the course of four or five days; some to millions in the course of four or five hours. The rate of increase lessens all the way up to the elephant. It would seem natural (and many have drawn this very conclusion from these observations of Mr. Spencer) that the practical solution of our problem is to develop individuality through education. But Mr. Spencer himself does not agree with that conclusion; in fact, there are very practical objections to it; development through education would be a matter, not of days or weeks, but of centuries, while overpopulation is a present and pressing condition.

The authors of *The Evolution of Sex*, after a calm review of the arguments of the Neo-Malthusians, suggest the possibility of a danger lest, in removing one of its consequences, sexual intemperance become increasingly organic; and they urge the necessity of an ethical rather than a mechanical "prudence after marriage"—of a temperance recognized to be as binding on husband and wife as chastity on the unmarried.

I was in London in 1877, when there was a great agitation over the publication of a book by Charles Bradlaugh and Annie Besant, called *Fruits of Philosophy*, which urged the carrying out of Malthus' "preventive checks" by practical methods of preventing conception. The authors were arrested, and contested the matter vigorously in the courts. I met Mrs. Besant a few years ago in Denver, and she told me she had suppressed the book wherever she could find it; that she no longer endorsed the "preventive check" as a remedy for overpopulation; and that her conclusions had developed in quite another direction.

Definite response to stimulus is more active and pronounced in the generative nature than in any other department of woman's life, so that immense possibilities of service are opened up to woman in this respect through improvement of environment during gestation. It is certain that the great need is a new ethic of the sexes. Limitation of population is permanently to be reached, not simply by individual restraint, but by a reorganization of our social life. In such reorganization Love must lead, and women will give themselves more and more to the cultivation and development of sympathetic helpful intercourse, the improvement of environment, and the bearing of one another's burdens during the sensitive time of the child's coming. It should be impossible in this great city—impossible in all the land—for a mother to come to the hour of trial and of blessing lacking any care, comfort, or provision that her motherhood requires. We need not be afraid of encouraging a more rapid multiplication of the unfit. With the education of mutual love and sympathy between mothers, rich and poor, we shall have fewer children and better children.

Don't be alarmed by the reports of lower birth-rates in France and in Switzerland, and in other countries, nor by our President's "race suicide" scare. Alarmist newspaper-writers are in the habit of pointing out that these figures mean disintegration and weakness for the nation concerned. They mean nothing of the kind. Naturalists scoff at the efforts of statisticians to predict the survival or extinction of populations from their number and rate of reproduction alone. These prophets forget that "the thicker the grass, the easier it is mown." As Geddes says, "It is the most individuated type that prevails in spite, nay, in another sense, positively because of its slower increase." This is the answer to what is known as the "yellow scare": the fear that our civilization may be swamped by the

mere weight of the Asiatic populations—that we may be overrun and subjugated by the six hundred millions of Chinese.

It is the most individuated type that prevails. You find that the case all through. It is true in all forms of life below man; it is true in the evolution of human function and expression in art, in literature, and even in business. It is the most individuated type, not the heaviest artillery, that finds God on its side; that makes "God and one a majority."

I hope that the necessarily dry side of the statements of fact I have felt called upon to present will give none of you the idea that, after all, this study of life is a "brown study." It is a serious matter, and has to do with earnest, even intense, application to the mastery of facts and figures. But that is a very small part of it. That is only the skeleton, so to speak, upon which the real body is built. There is an intimate relation between the beautiful and the biological, between the plastic and the creative. In the categories of beauty, we begin with the beautiful in form, which is the groundwork of sculpture; this is the beginning of the sense of pleasure in *form*, the beginning of what we call the art instinct. Next comes beauty in *color*, which lies at the basis of painting. Then there is the beautiful in *expression*—the beauty, as Bacon has it, of "the sweet and graceful motion which no picture can express," and which verges more upon the ideal than does either form or color. Lastly, we have the beautiful in *individuation*, which is still subtler and more ethereal than beauty of expression. This brings us to a realizing sense of what this rhythmical impulse at the basis of all life, carried to its fullest development, really means. It is the impulse by which life grows from worm to God, characterizing every effort to embody—to give outer expression to—our inner sense of the ideal.

Individuation—beauty of character—is clearly the highest form of beauty, the form to which all lesser forms lead. It cannot be attained through overlooking, ignoring, or suppressing the lower forms of beauty. I think we should not be unmindful of the truth that the greater contains the less; that the higher is always grown from the lower; that, if we are going to have the perfect individual,—if the development of the perfect individual through the most perfect society is our end and aim,—then that perfect individual will not necessarily be uncomely in form, in color, or in movement. He must not neglect the proper care of the body, physical exercises, bathing, diet, rest and recreation. And he must be encouraged to express his nature freely.

I think that there is an implication here that will give to us all something of which to think. And it is this: If we find, as we do find every day, this higher beauty of individuation in men and women who are nevertheless suffering and distorted in the physical body, or whose lives are

not as pleasant and peaceful as they should be, then there is something lacking in realization—a wrong that may be righted. How? First, by seeing that the beauty of character thus distinctly recognized, being the greater, holds earnest and assurance of our power to complete the categories of beauty, so to speak. To call forth the beauty of form and color and motion that properly belong to beauty of character, or individuation, as its truly inseparable although subordinate parts, is then not merely possible, but it will be the certain result of thought and action intelligently directed to that end. Women, especially American women,—inheritors of the New England conscience and of all the old Puritanical tradition that has so largely influenced our thought and our habits,—are called upon to give themselves freely and grandly to the work of counteracting the old idea that associated sickness of body with beauty of soul, long faces with piety, sourness and severity of countenance with virtue and high character. Rather, with the old Greeks, let us understand that we want and may have sound minds in healthy bodies, and inner beauty manifested in outer beauty. Shall we not see at last that

“Soul needs sense not less than sense needs soul”?

Toward the Purple Mountains.

BY LILLIAN BROWNE-THAYER.

Straight toward the purple mountains we walk
Hand in hand.
Cities and conventions are left far behind.
We breathe the intoxicating breath of freedom.
The wonder of infinite space possesses our souls.
I feel I should never tire walking thus with you.
I loosen from my spirit all ties—they are phantoms, miasma,
You are now my only reality—you and these sun-kissed mountains.

The Sex Problem.

BY HENRIETTA FUERTH,
GERMANY.

Translated from Mutterschutz for THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS by A. Isaak.

I.

Nothing is more conservative than mankind. It erects altars to the eternal Yesterday, treats with enmity the Present, and persecutes the prophets of Tomorrow with murder and fire. It vindicates its intolerant rigidity with proofs of love and the weapons of wisdom: That which is old is sacred! The older the more sacred! That which is, is wise!

Even before Hegel coined these words, and since then, it is always the same: that which prevails assumes possession—all rights—and is therefore the bitterest, the most merciless enemy of that which is approaching.

This we can observe in all spheres of life—in our social life and in politics, in trade and industry, and especially in the domain of morality. Only the sciences of natural history and their related departments make an exception today. According to Lessing, it is more delicious to strive after the truth than to possess it; we actually enjoy questioning any new truth achieved, to ascend from the truth just proved to a hypothesis still to be proved, to use the achievements for a spring-board to refute and vanquish ourselves.

But otherwise the eternal Yesterday triumphs everywhere. Every step forward, every advance on the road of knowledge, every act which attempts to apply this knowledge to life, is made at the expense of blood and innumerable wounds.

Everything is put on the Procrustean bed of tradition, no matter whether these customs are still in accordance with life or hostile to real life, or even contradictory to it.

The reverence for prevailing things, the beliefs in authority, the ghost of sin! These threatening shadows have darkened our life, and not many have had the strength and courage to take up life's battle with their surroundings. This can be observed most plainly in the domain of sexual morality. As far as we are able to trace it, such zealous morality has divided the world into two camps: hither man! thither woman! To man all the rights, to the woman all the wrongs. And how illogical it all is! On the one side the woman during long centuries was degraded to a sexual being *sans phrase* (and how many are there today to whom woman is anything else?). On the other hand, it was declared, on the ground of alleged irrefutable scientific proofs, that woman is sexually more indifferent than

man, and therefore the double standard of sex morality was quite proper; that woman is committing a wrong in yielding where man simply follows a natural instinct.

If one deliberates upon these things calmly and without prejudice, one must come to the conclusion that there is a logical break somewhere. Woman, it is asserted, is sexually naturally more blunt and more indifferent. And the proof? Well, the prostitute on the one side, and the non-craving chaste woman on the other, and finally the alleged sexual indifference of the married woman.

To be sure, that which is, is reasonable; that which one is anxious to vindicate and to prove, can be easily proved. But just for such reasons should awakened womanhood put the proofs to a test by example, and thus transplant the problem under consideration from the moldy narrowness of sentiment to the broad battle-ground of knowledge and scientific proof.

Several years ago I attempted to take up the sex problem from this standpoint. (See *Deutschland*, Vol. III, October, 1904, "The Sexual Problem and Modern Morality.") But as I cannot assume that this work is known to all my present readers, I shall here give the gist of my treatise. I started from the question: "Are these views, which dominate the judiciary, morality, and politics,—that woman's sexual activity is of an inferior quality, and hence she has less sexual wants,—founded on biological facts?" And further: "Does the history of natural development or that of social life point to a period in which the sex problem was thus construed and thus reflected in social institutions?"

Both of these questions must be answered in the negative. At the cradle of organic life there is the sexless cell which multiplies itself. Only when we come to the multicellular organisms can we speak about sexuality, and the division of cells into different sexes has no other meaning than the division of labor and an increased differentiation. Even among the higher animals no fundamental difference of the sexual instinct is traceable. This is also true of some people in a state of nature, from whom we can learn much—that not all our peculiarities of civilization indicate a higher development. There is much less difference in the bodies of man and woman among the uncivilized than among civilized people. Especially the secondary sexual characteristics differ less in their development. The woman is as strong as the man. Even such telling incidents as childbirth do not affect her seriously.

Certain it is, however, that the customary sex relations, as reflected in the mirror of peoples and times, give us no reason to assume that in the beginning there existed differences in sexual desire between man and woman. We find there the same usages of matching—of a tighter or looser, lasting or temporary, kind—as exist among animals and birds. In

the course of time we find woman appreciated for her capacity as a working power far more than as a sexual mate. But in no period and in no time can traces be found which would indicate that there ever existed a perceptible difference between man and woman in their sexual feelings and desires.

Such differences appear first when, through the property and marriage institutions, a fundamental transformation of social life has been consummated. Men invented methods and means to increase production and to accumulate such products beyond the necessities of their natural existence. He who prior to this time had lived from hand to mouth became the possessor of wealth, which made him independent of the change of seasons, and in the course of time became the lord of contemporaries who were not his equals in power and capacity. The slave became the instrument of labor, and the necessary number of actual producers decreased as the means of production were perfected.

Thus also a part of womankind was deposed. Women were not needed any longer as laborers to the same extent as before, and the fulfilment of sexual requirements was assigned to those who had found a place in marriage, founded on property and paternal rights.

The rest of them, who could be neither laborers nor married women, became, last but not least,—for the reason that strict monogamy, sanctified by the church, had robbed them of their natural sexual right,—free game, prostitutes. Through the habit of associating with prostitutes, these drew out the greater passion and exaggerated the sexual passion of man, which matter-of-fact existence today they attempt to explain on biological and social grounds. This is done with as much or as little right as when the sexual apathy of the prostitute, caused by professional practice and degradation, or the real or pretended passivity of the honorable woman, caused by hypocritical morality, is taken as proof of woman's sexual indifference.

But such cogent arguments I hold to be decidedly negative. Yet that by no means signifies that we intend to establish for woman the possession of unbridled and hypertrophical sexuality. On the contrary, on the basis of original sexual equality—*i. e.*, the parity of inclinations of both sexes—the ethically and mentally matured, true and sentient woman is to wield her influence in order to revert man gradually to sexual harmony, through which a higher development of mankind is to be achieved.

II.

"In woman there will be forthcoming nothing greater and nothing smaller than—man. But this man in his full vigor will today study the stars, tomorrow give birth to a child, without disturbing the one or the other," says Boelsche. Such, then, are the prospects that the scientist

discloses for woman in the future, after he has deduced the fact from natural science that in the animal kingdom the female originally was the strongest. "In innumerable cases she carries the entire burden of existence, exactly like the male, and has to take all the duties of motherhood into the bargain. If I were to form a general tenet from the facts on hand, it could be only this: Nature has endowed woman—to enforce her duties of motherhood—with one and one-half vigor." (Boelsche.)

Thus speaks the naturalist. And the sociologist can easily complete the picture thus portrayed, by pointing out the many thousands of women who even today, under much more unfavorable bodily conditions, are compelled to carry the double burden of motherhood and provider of the family. There are the illegitimate mothers, there are the widows, there are thousands and thousands to whom the husband gives nothing or only a small share of his earnings: all the heroines of every-day life, who even today must exert one-and-a-half vigor or must be endowed with double energy in order to comply with the requirements of life.

And in what station in life is she of whom Boelsche says she will some day represent *man*, placed as a compensation for all the burden?

Let us see what Helene Boehlaw, in her classical novel, *The Right of the Mother*, puts into the mouth of her heroine, Christine:

"We, who give birth to mankind, are slaves! We are in a world of ignominy, in which not only I, but thousands and thousands, walk along, stooped and disgraced: all—even if they are content and do not feel it. The blow which struck my face not only struck me—it struck the woman, the child-bearer of mankind. It is horrible that men descend from slaves—from domesticated animals.

"What monstrous burden of contempt, injustice, and license rests upon all of us!

"Not to think, not to speak, not to act, not to will, not to dare—to be unable!—that is woman!"

And what makes this terrible truth still more horrifying: in its last analysis, the determining sphere is suicidal. Neither the selfishness and arbitrariness of man, nor injustice and unfavorable external conditions, have hurt woman as much as she hurts herself. Nobody is more inclined to submit to that which prevails rather than to strive for something better, more reasonable. And nobody is more intolerant and ruthless than woman is against her own sex if she trespasses upon that which the centuries have proclaimed as "divine" and "natural." With hatred and resentment woman defends the strongholds that are in the way of her liberation, especially in the sphere of sexual morality. Woe to the woman who happens to be the offender against the statute law of so-called morality! And three times woe if women sit in judgment of her!

How is such inconsistency still possible today, when evolution is shaking the barriers of tradition more forcibly than ever, and has assigned to woman a different place in economical life? Let us look around. Millions

of women have taken up the struggle for existence and are coming off with credit: those who, by hard, honorable, and joyful labor, or in patient service, maintain themselves; the host of married women who maintain their children; the host of daughters who support their parents; or the hosts of sisters who exhaust themselves in order to prepare or lighten the path of life for their brothers.

So many economically independent women, and yet so few who are free, either mentally or morally! Economically depending upon themselves, they remain in traditional slavery and dependence.

If we trace the vestige of such disparity we knock against school and church. Here are the perpetuators of Eternal Yesterday, the conspiring enemies of progressive consciousness, which just the same acknowledge to man more mental power as well as more rights and pretensions to life. The wrong committed by the church is recorded in history, but neither is the school of today doing justice to its high task of education and preparing mankind for life as it should be. It is not the school and a great part of its representatives that is responsible for such state of affairs, but the spirit and the system that is forced upon the institutions of education, which thwarts the most unprejudiced intentions and aspirations.

Not words, only deeds, can help in these matters. But by what deeds is the remedy to be achieved?

Nature knows no suddenness and no leaps. Even the natural events which we are prone to look upon as abrupt happenings prove to be the effect of a long chain of development. Thus internal, *i. e.*, true freedom, will not be achieved between today and tomorrow, but will be the work of many thousands and of many generations. But its path is already marked out, leading to economical freedom of woman, and we are already in the midst of it.

The acquired physical strength of man gave him once the position of an absolute ruler in the family. Today the struggle for existence has been shifted from the physical to the intellectual domain also in the industrial field, and in this sphere woman performs her task honorably alongside of man. For, as we have already shown, her physical inferiority was not originally natural, but merely an artificial product, and very often only imaginary. The wife of a savage is not in the least disturbed in her daily duties and obligations during pregnancy or even childbirth. Even in our civilization the cases are much more numerous than is generally known where woman performs all her duties till the last hour of pregnancy, and takes up her work very soon—often immediately after confinement. And who is to speak about woman's physical or mental inferiority in face of the twofold burden of motherhood and breadwinner carried by so many women?

No, we need not worry: thousandfold has woman already shown that she

is capable of taking up the struggle for existence. And all appearances indicate that material self-maintenance will be joined by mental independence; that the woman who has learned to rely upon her own strength as regards the fate of her life will also learn to draw her spiritual and ethical judgment from her inner self and her liberated consciousness, and not from customs and traditions.

In spite of the fact that millions of women are today engaged in gainful vocations, this is in the eyes of many an undesirable, exceptional phenomenon, enforced by necessity as a transitional period to marriage, etc. But when some day every girl and every woman will have prepared herself for a profession and fills such vocation, things will assume a different aspect. Marriage and motherhood will only be periodical interruptions in her professional work of life. Many women will raise an outcry against such a perspective of the future, and much will be said regarding menaced motherliness, the destruction of family life, and the degenerated and neglected youth.

What folly! Because those things they fear are a concomitance of today's professional life of woman, they transfer such phenomena also to the future, without bearing in mind that the coöperation of all means lessening the work for all participants, not to speak of the steady improvements of the facilities of production, the possibilities of which we can hardly surmise today, which will furnish us with incomparably better and healthier methods of work. It will mean, in short, moderate work for all and enough leisure for both sexes for the raising of a vigorous race, and to enjoy life with their children in common.

This does not mean, however, that the mentally, morally, and economically independent woman will necessarily renounce marriage. It does not follow that such new sex morality, as proclaimed here, must alter the present form of sexual relationship as now expressed in marriage. The old form is only to be given a new purport—a purport which will recognize true monogamy where free people are held together, temporarily or for life, by nothing else but their own sweet will.

III.

Marriage contains the germ of such individualized sexual relations as alone are worthy of man: the germ of a strong and enduring love between two individuals of different sexes.* This form of marriage exists among some chosen ones, while millions of others are pushed astray in their conventional marriages or are living in concubinage by virtue of circumstances or

*German writers on sex reform rarely dare to attack monogamy *per se*. Only some of the playwrights so far have ventured to ridicule monogamy, championing complete freedom in love matters.—TRANSLATOR.

their own erroneous idea of the meaning and value of sexual relations.

The more the female sex will achieve economic independence, which is very essential for the development of character, the less will such erroneous by-paths be entered upon.

True, the foundation of character, *i. e.*, the singularities which just this and no other person exhibits, can be laid in youth. But unfoldment and ripeness can be reached only in the torrents of the world and in the struggle which every man who is responsible for himself has to go through. Thus it happens that people who have had no life-struggles are void of character. Metal is tempered in the fire, and struggle alone stamps the individualities of men. Only those who strive for an ideal can gain one, and only his or her own experience can give him or her the courage to live the ideal. Therefore the preparatory and transition period to individuality for women means struggle: first, the struggle for her daily bread; and then the other—a much harder struggle—for mental fortitude.

Conditions, partly economic changes, have enforced upon woman new positions and services in the economic field, with or without her own help, or with or against her own will. If she wants to reap the fruits of these changes in full, then she must hail them with her will and comprehension, not only in the field of labor, but foremost in the intellectual and moral domain.

Woman must free herself! She must emancipate herself from the manifold bonds and obstacles of tradition and customs in which she has been strangled. I will mention only incidentally the self-conceited women, the useless drones who look down upon the diligent working-bees, and call attention to one point where preposterous conservatism, bare stupidity, and sanctimonious hypocrisy play their game.

In the light of nature, what are the sexual sphere and sexual morality which are today more than ever the arena of dissolute passions? Sexuality is a natural function, and sexual love is a means by which nature fulfills its best purpose. Now, if a criterion regarding our sexual life is to be established, it can only be this: How do men in general conduct themselves in complying with the inherent object of nature? Certainly only an exceedingly small percentage of marriages have been concluded in agreement with the laws of nature, based entirely on mutual love, without having been influenced by social and economic considerations. And still more deplorable conditions are evidenced in so-called irregular sexual association. Women must learn to understand and appreciate this if they are again to be the custodians of the sacred fireplace.

Let us make radical changes! Even in the domain of sexual morality there is only one basic truth: Remain true to the laws and demands of your own nature. Be true to yourselves. Act so that you need not blush before

yourselves. You cannot violate the needs of your nature with impunity, no matter what your lot may be.

We must not only judge ourselves before this court, but we must learn also to understand the souls of others in this light. From this point of view so many marriages weigh but little indeed, while the scales sink down deeply in favor of those whom the world condemns, ostracizes, but who have remained true to themselves!

How differently will we look upon prostitution—not the degrading and shameful profession, but the prostitute—when we once are able to understand the motives which led her on. How different will our attitude be toward those giddy, flirting children of the sun whose natural impulse is turned toward inconstancy and fickleness! To comprehend everything means to forgive everything. And woman must come to this if she wants to reach clearness and rest and ripeness in the domain of sexual life and sexual morality.

Everybody lives his own life and is responsible only to himself. One is monogamically inclined, and I repeat that the future, with its freer conditions of life, economic independence, and greater freedom of conduct for both sexes, will develop such inclination more and more, for it is here that the intense heartfelt harmony of life, tranquillity, and mental ripeness find expression. Another is polygamic; the third one is monogamic only for a limited period.

But we must reach the stage where we will concede to every one the right of the various possible emotions in sexuality, according to his natural desires. The sexual sphere of every one must be inviolable, his own private affair,—even if he is not exactly a Goethe,—which finds restriction and limitation in the equally self-evident right of another.

With this is plainly set forth that our elaboration does not aim at sexual Anarchy. On the contrary, the right of each to himself as his natural and therefore necessary development demands the protection of the rights of all. We will never be able or desire to dispense with a class of laws and regulations which undertake a certain protection against unsanitary dangers, or which insure the protection and security of children, etc.

But this has nothing to do with the moral condemnation of those who differ from us in thought and action. Nobody can look into the soul of another. How dare we be so presumptuous as to pass judgment upon men and conditions of which we know only the surface, but nothing of the determining inner structure?

Whosoever feels himself free from guilt, let him cast the first stone! Why is it these words of Christ are constantly trampled upon—and mostly by those who forever carry their Savior on their tongues?

We ought to relearn much! Learn—all of you women—you, first of

all! And when you have achieved economic, mental, and also moral independence, then will the sex problem of today have vanished like the fog before the conquering rays of the sun. Then there will be no "honorable" and "depraved," but only "man"—men and women—who will live according to their inclinations and obey only their own inner laws.

And when woman, the free woman, will have begun to esteem in her sister the fellow-being who is responsible only to herself in her sexual conduct, one who must be free to determine her own fate,—which man has achieved long ago,—then man will follow suit. He will change his opinion and demands of woman accordingly.

To the world everybody is exactly what he makes of himself. Woman should remember this.

Today woman is still the worst enemy of woman. If we succeed in cutting the very ground from under this animosity, through knowledge and self-consciousness; and, moreover, if we succeed in making the sex problem understood in its true and pure form, especially among women—then will the problem cease to exist. What we shall be then, we can only hope for—anticipate—but we do not know.—

Perhaps the Messianic time in which free, erect, and high-spirited people will meet in an alliance of love "to create that which is better than those who created it"—

That would be the solution of the sex problem, after which the dawn of a highly well-disposed mankind will rise, to forecast the bright day of fulfilment.

Marriage-Law Reform.

BY GEORGE BEDBOROUGH.

Happy England! Its marriage laws have been reformed at last! After more than forty years' agitation the British Marriage Law Reform Association is able to dissolve: its warfare is accomplished; its ideal is realized; and amidst banquets and congratulations its members meet once more, to part for ever. Aside it lays its weapons; and the old warriors' sons will tell their grandchildren how, in spite of priests and nobles, the democracy of England bravely faced the awful consequences of reform. And what is this sex-revolution which England is celebrating? Nothing less than this: On January 1, 1908, a full-blown adult man will be permitted to legally marry the sister of his deceased wife. Such a luxury has hitherto been unattainable. Even now a woman will not be allowed to marry her dead husband's brother; but one must not expect too much—a little reform goes

a long way in these matters. Of course, marriages with a deceased wife's sister have been by no means unknown in our time. British churches have celebrated them, registry offices have connived at them, and even the Pope at Rome has overridden church sentiment, tradition and law by sanctioning such marriages. Even so, the unions have been adulterous in the eyes of the law, the children have been bastards, and the parties themselves have only been saved from inconvenience or worse by the fact that scarcely one layman in a million ever considered the law as just or even sane. With the exception of a numerically insignificant rump of churchmen in the House of Commons, and the bench of bishops in the Lords, the legislature was unanimous in approving this trifling reform. It is an open secret that several wealthy and noble families in England are likely to be affected by the new law, which has had the advantage of the advocacy and support of the aristocracy as a whole, otherwise the clergy would have been able to prevent its passage for another forty years owing to the difficulty of passing opposed measures through the British Lower House. Except for government measures, the laws of procedure enable a handful of opponents to strangle all attempts at legislation, even when, as in the case of votes of women, the House of Commons has expressed a favorable opinion by overwhelming majorities. The Deceased Wife's Sister bill was passed by the House of Lords years before the House of Commons could be brought to deal with the measure. The time and money spent on this *mus ridiculus* ought to warn all reformers in every country of the folly of waiting on parliaments for this particular kind of remedy. Marriage reform has never owed anything to law except the gradual disuse of legal penalties against nonconformity. The British law just altered has, like other sex laws, very little concern for any but the propertied classes. In the case in point, probably only estates subject to the law of primogeniture (an evil survival of one of the worst abuses of property) are in any essential affected. Even a millionaire illegally married to his deceased wife's sister could have devised by will that all his property should be inherited by the lady he had married or by her heirs, thus effectively legitimatizing the illegitimate. But omitting this property consideration, which affects a few only, most of whom are easily able to evade the troubles arising from their legal disabilities, what is left? Public sentiment having long ago countenanced these unions, what do the contracting parties gain by the royal assent to the act of Parliament giving them legality? In Ireland at present effective public sentiment is opposed to the "loyalist" payer of rack-rents. Law is on the side of the landlord's friend, but public sentiment in its most dramatic form shows how little assistance law gives against such a force even where property is at stake. On moral questions public opinion is both stronger and weaker. It is omnipotent when it is tolerant, it is strong

when opposed to anything but principle, it is weak as water in the presence of one who cares nothing for its smile or its frown.

The student of eugenics will aim rather at educating public sentiment than praying for legislative assistance. Every individual influenced in our direction is a stepping-stone towards a healthier public opinion, besides a source of light to lead others aright. We need more of those who, seeing as we do, will not fear to speak and act in private and in public as though freedom were already an accomplished fact, instead of an ideal to agitate for. We do not want others boycotted in our interest, but we want to be allowed to live our own life as we think fit, so long as we do not invade the liberties of others. It must seem almost like an insult to those who have lived their life thus and survived animosity and criticism, only now to be told that their conduct is at length worthy of legalization.

Meanwhile imagine the intellectual type embodied in the person who regards the legalization of marriage with a deceased wife's sister as the beginning and end of marriage-law reform.

London, England.

Two Tales.

BY HUGH MANN.

He—See, even the moon feels the magnetism of your charm; he beams upon you with affection and love, and sends his rays down through the leaves to greet and kiss and caress you.

She—Heine has said: "The moon is a fool."

He—No! at this moment he proves he has wisdom; he knows beauty when he sees it. The beams of his light are gamboling upon your rosy cheeks—they dance with happiness around your ruby lips.

She—You speak like a poet—

He—No; only like one, my words are uttered from a feeling and painful heart—my darling, I love you, I love you very dearly, I adore—

She—Hush! do not give voice to such idle and empty talk—go to my mother—your words may give her pleasure and make her happy. She will then advise you what to do, and I trust you may abide by her advice.

He—Come, let us go at once—

She—Wait! this recalls to my memory a story I once heard—

He—If it has any relation to the subject we are speaking of, relate it.

She—Yes, it has. This occurred in the garden of Eden—before the guardian angels with the sharp swords were placed on watch at the entrance—Adam was still the occupant—

He—Did this take place before he ate the apple from the tree of knowledge?

She—No, it happened after he ate it——

He—And he was not yet driven from the garden for his sin?

She—No; let us assume God is all-forgiving, and he has called a session of his cabinet to try Adam; and the counsel for the defendant is making his plea for his mortal client, pleading temptation as a defense and begging forgiveness for him.

He—All right, let us take this supposition.

She—Do not interrupt—Adam is walking to and fro, in a thoughtful and pensive mood; and while strolling on one of the numerous paths, his glance fell upon a very beauteous and delicious apple hanging from one of the trees. Its beauty aroused a strong desire in him to become the possessor of it.

He—Did he pick it from the tree?

She—No, he did not touch it. Before Adam was driven from the garden of Eden, he knew naught of theft and robbery——

He—Did he get it through artifice and stealth?

She—No; then man had no knowledge of craft and cunning—you must remember this occurred in the garden of Eden——

He—Then how did he get it? What did he do after he had eaten from the tree of knowledge, and had not become versed in deceit and theft?

She—He pleaded; like a man with the highest moral ethics, he went over to the tree, bowed very politely, and said: "Beautiful and honored tree, if you believe me worthy, if you think well of me, and if I appear honorable and sincere in your eyes, give me the fruit of your tree—your fine apple; I will absorb its exquisite fragrance and aroma; I will eat of its wholesome meat and become stronger and healthier——"

He—What did the tree reply?

She—The tree did not refuse; she offered her fruit upon one condition only.

He—And what was the restriction she imposed?

She—"Without my aid you cannot get the apple; hence you must take me—you must eat it together with myself, my leaves, my branches, my twigs, my roots, even with the earth wherein my roots are inbedded—you must eat everything——"

He—Ha, ha, ha! ho, ho, ho!

She—Like you, Adam also laughed; how can he eat the whole tree? The tree only replied: "You need not eat me at one time nor at once—you can eat me all of your life, every year of your life, every day of the year, every hour of the day, every minute of the hour—you must eat of me constantly and without cessation."

He—Did Adam agree to this?

She—You ask this question, after I had told you he had tasted the fruit of the tree of knowledge?

* * * * *

He—Come, let us go now—

She—Wait! I have yet another story that your words recall to me—

He—Relate it; I am listening.

She—This did not take place in the garden of Eden, but in a place scenically similar to the garden,—in an immense wood inhabited by primitive man, living only by the hunt. This occurred to one of them armed with bow and arrow—

He—Has this any relation to our conversation?

She—Yes, without doubt. This primordial man, armed with his implements of the hunt, wore a headgear composed of numerous feathers of various hues and sizes. While walking through the dense forest he observed a large bird with a golden plume in its tail—a feather that appeared very attractive and lovely in the rays of the morning sun. The apple also possessed the same attractive charm and magnetism—

He—Yes, so it had!

She—The hunter was fascinated, and a passionate craving for it was aroused in him to get it as an addition to the other plumage—

He—Did he aim his arrow at the bird?

She—No, the flight of the bird was too swift and at too great a height for his arrows to reach it.

He—Did he get the ornament by craft and cajolery?

She—No; primeval man was aught but cunning and wily. He lifted his head to the bird with an entreaty—

He—And what was his request?

She—“Come down, nearer to me,” he begged; “do not fly so swiftly and high; allow me to kill you; I will take your beautiful golden feather and will then throw your carcass away.”

He—And the bird?

She—It gave no answer, but flew away more swiftly and still higher.
 . . . Good-night.

Editorial.

THE OPPONENTS OF EUGENICS.

[The writer of the following somewhat iconoclastic article is not unknown to the readers of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS. He has contributed several articles to its columns since change of name, and was also for many years a regular contributor to the columns of our "Son of the Morning." He does not often hide behind a *nom de plume*; but for this time, and for reasons of his own, he prefers that his personality shall remain *incog*. The article came into my possession some weeks ago and has been held in abeyance until now. After reading and rereading more than once, I have at length decided that, notwithstanding its many imperfections, it contains sufficient merit to justify giving it a place in our young yet old magazine, and therefore send it to the office, with the request that it appear, if possible, in the forthcoming November number. M. HARMAN.]

What are the forces most to be feared that are now arrayed against eugenics—against the success of the gospel of right generation of human beings?

First in the list should perhaps be named the popularity-seeking clergyman,—the power-loving, the conservative, the creed-bound, the reactionary priest and clergyman; and with them all who accept the dicta of Saul of Tarsus, commonly called "Saint" Paul, in regard to the status of woman before the law, ecclesiastic and civil: "Wives, submit yourself unto your own husbands in all things"; "Man is the head of woman, even as Christ is the head of the church," etc., etc. Also all who accept as the infallible word of God the sentence pronounced upon woman, recorded in the book called "Genesis"—*the beginning*—"Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."

The first commandment of the gospel of eugenics,—first requirement,—is the emancipation of motherhood through and by the self-ownership of womanhood—the practicalization of the right of every woman to decide whether she will become a mother or not; and the further right to demand and command the best possible conditions, environments,—economic, climatic, political, social, artistic, sexual—including best possible fatherhood,—as preliminaries to the production by her of the best possible human beings.

Naturally enough, the conservative, the creed-bound clergyman objects to all this, for the simple reason that children born of self-owning, self-reliant womanhood would not be content to swallow without question the dogmas of Moses and of Paul in regard to the status of woman, as quoted above; neither would they submit without question to the government of man by the twin rulers, church and state, as voiced by such oracular utterances as: "The powers that be are ordained of God. Whoso resisteth the

power shall receive unto himself damnation." "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake," etc., etc. (I quote from memory.)

Such children would be very apt to ask questions, in meetin' and out of meetin', not easy for the priest or clergyman to answer; and if denied the right to ask questions in church they would soon refuse to attend church at all, in a land where attendance at church is not compulsory. The children of self-owning mothers would go to meetings where their questions would be answered, thus curtailing the revenues of the clergyman and diminishing his power and influence as a social factor, including his authority over the most important of all human relations—the marital, the conjugal, the family relations of women and men.

No wonder, then, that the conservative, the time-serving clergyman denounces as impious, heretical, blasphemous, and wicked the new gospel called eugenics. "Self-preservation is the first law of nature." Self-preservation leaves him no choice. It is either destroy the new gospel or be destroyed by it. It is a fight to the death, and since "all is fair in love and war" the creed-bound clergyman does not hesitate to adopt the usual tactics of war,—among which are strategy, deception, misrepresentation, calumny, and personal abuse,—in his fight against woman's rebellion, against woman's demand for self-ownership, and against the practicalization of the right of the child to be born well if born at all.

Yes, of all the opponents of eugenics, we naturally expect to find the conservative priest or clergyman the most insistent and consistent, most persistent and uncompromising; and yet no one who understands what eugenics means, and what would be the result of the complete triumph of its principles, can blame the priest for his opposition. With like heredity, like training, and like social position, all of us would do and say just as he does and says.

It took the writer of these lines fifty years to evolute out of the superstitions that dominate and terrorize the masses of people in regard to sex and reproduction. Even now, after all these years of investigation, all these years of conflict with foes within and foes without, he does not claim to be wholly emancipated from his hereditary chains, and therefore he entertains no thought of hostility or hate towards the defenders of Pauline Christianity; that is, towards the opponents of eugenics—the natural, the inevitable outcome of woman's emancipation from sex slavery.

Next to the conservative priest and clergyman, the most determined foe to eugenics is perhaps the professional lawyer and politician,—of course including the legislator, the judge, the sheriff, the jailor, the hangman, and the electrocutor. The most necessary requirement for the success of each and all of these parasites is an unfailing supply of voters who cannot do their own thinking; a perennial supply of the badly generated, the badly

born,—such as have not sense enough or will-power enough to keep within their own sphere of rights and to keep from getting into trouble with their neighbors, and who thus find themselves in need of a lawyer to help them out of trouble; a never-ending supply of weak-minded, unreasoning retainers, unquestioning followers, who can be easily hoodwinked or cajoled into voting for a *party name*, a *party fetish*, long after the party bearing the name has ceased to represent the principles of justice and humanity for the promotion of which it was once organized.

Quantity rather than *quality* is the main requirement of the Napoleons, the Cæsars, and the Roosevelts of all time; and it matters little what name is applied to the political aggregation ruled by the “strenuous” and selfishly ambitious men who urge mothers to give birth to as many children as possible. A republic, so called, may be even better adapted to exploitation by the cunning and capable minority than is the average monarchy or aristocracy, because the monarch or aristocrat is held personally responsible by public opinion,—when things go wrong,—for the shortcomings of the “administration,” whereas in a republic the blame is charged up to the voting “sovereigns,” the almighty “majority,” who nominate and elect the rulers; and thus, while the masses are kept quiet by the comforting fiction that through “manhood suffrage” they are self-governing it is ever so much easier for the power-loving politician and the self-loving lawyer to get in their schemes for self-aggrandizement than it would be under a monarchy or an avowed aristocracy.

Yes, whether called a monarchy, aristocracy, or republic, the despotic, the power-loving politician finds his chief support in the sex-enslavement of woman and in the denial of the right of the masses to be born well through free and self-owning mothers.

Another class of natural opponents of eugenics is the newspaper men, the owners of daily newspapers and of the sensational weeklies and monthlies,—especially in a so-called republic, where public opinion is supposed to rule in every department of life. A very large portion of the power and revenue of these journals is derived from publishing sensational reports,—often manufactured to suit the morbid appetites of the readers,—of divorce trials and tribulations, such as those of the Vanderbilt and Gould families, and in describing the weddings (“swell” weddings!) of “society” people, such as that of Alice Roosevelt to Nicholas Longworth. If eugenics should once prevail as a national cult, there would, of course, be neither marriages nor divorces as spectacular social events. Mating of women and men would then be a strictly private and personal affair, with which the general public would have nothing whatever to do; and separation of conjugal partners would also be private and personal, the details of which would never become public property.

More important still: if the gospel of eugenics should ever triumph in the matter of creating human beings, the newspaper man would be deprived of the pleasure and the profit of reporting such trials as that of Thaw in New York, and that of Judge Loving in West Virginia—trials that grow out of ignorance of sex and of its legitimate uses and functions, and out of the superstitious belief, the religious tradition, that the body of woman is never her own, that it belongs always to husband, father, brother, or to “society,” to the priest (the church) or the judge (the state), and that whenever the rights of the husband, the lover, the father or brother—the right of control over the body of woman—is interfered with by another man the injury to the said owner can only be wiped out by the murder of the alleged offender.

Still more important, if possible, because more inclusive: under the reign of eugenics the news-caterer would be robbed of the pleasure and the shekels that come to him for reporting such trials as that in which the wholesale murderer, Harry Orchard, was principal witness, and in which the only man convicted of crime—self-convicted—was the chief witness for the prosecution,—unless, forsooth, it be admitted that *every* man concerned in the kidnaping, imprisonment, and prosecution of Haywood, Moyer and Pettibone is a criminal. For while, in the present formative stage of the science of eugenics, it is difficult if not impossible to get at the exact facts in all cases, enough is demonstrated, beyond the possibility of doubt, to justify the conclusion that bad heredity,—including bad prenatal impressions,—enters as a principal factor (or cause) into the commission of all or nearly all *real* crimes in the long calendar of crime.

Still other classes of people might be mentioned as the natural, the logical foes to eugenics, but, knowing full well that short articles and many of them are preferred by both editor and reader, I close; but before closing desire to say that I have many friends among the clergy, also among the “legal” fraternity, also among politicians and government officials and newspaper men, and therefore desire to have it distinctly understood that *no censure of persons* is intended in the foregoing remarks. What I have said is the result of long reflection and of extended observation upon the working of our basic institution—the marital, the conjugal,—and upon the causes of the indisposition of the rulers of human society to give a patient hearing to those who dare to suggest that this basic institution could be and should be mended.

INVESTIGATOR.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

MUCH material for thoughtful consideration is afforded in the article on "The Sex Problem," written by Henrietta Fuerth, of Germany, a translation of which is printed in this issue of EUGENICS. It appeared originally in *Mutterschutz*, a magazine, published in Germany, which is devoted principally to the discussion of eugenics. The translation was made by a staunch friend of EUGENICS, A. Isaak, of New York, who was editor and publisher of the now discontinued *Free Society*.

It will be noticed that Mrs. Fuerth does not agree with those who assert that economic freedom will solve the sex problem. "So many economically independent women, and yet so few who are either mentally or morally free!" she says. "Economically depending upon themselves, they remain in traditional slavery and dependence."

Although personally she believes "heartfelt harmony of life" will be developed most completely through monogamy, she is brave enough and considerate enough of those holding a different opinion to say: "But this has nothing to do with the moral condemnation of those who differ from us in thought and action." This fairness of spirit, unfortunately, is rare among those who discuss ethical questions.

A MAN who believed his wife had received improper attentions from another man shot the supposed offender dead in Chicago several months ago. The slayer was tried last month and found guilty of manslaughter, but the jurors did something never heard of before in the history of the Cook County courts. All of them signed a petition to the state board of pardons recommending the minimum punishment for the convicted man, intimating strongly that they believed the killing was justifiable. In fact, one of the jurors was quoted by a newspaper after the trial as saying: "Harris got what he deserved." The action of the jury was spoken of by the press as a recognition, if not a vindication, of the "unwritten law." Had the jury asked for clemency for the convicted man on the ground that he acted in the heat of passion, or in a fit of insanity caused by the belief that his sacred property right in another human being—his wife—had been invaded by the man he shot, I would consider it far more sane and reasonable. It is hardly creditable to the intelligence of a body of twelve men in this stage of human progress to justify vengeance as a basis for a plea for clemency.

A FEW weeks ago a girl of fifteen years died in one of Chicago's suburbs immediately after giving birth to a child. The girl's father was arrested on the charge of being the father of her child. Cases of this kind, fortunately, are rare, but can any one doubt that they would be rarer still if

custom and statute law did not hamper the discussion of sexual problems? The object of eugenics is to promote the propagation of a better quality of children through the study of sexual science and the discovery of the cause of the production of degenerate offspring. Statute laws never can extirpate sexual perversion. It can only be eliminated through heredity and the lifting of sex discussion out of the filth to which it has been consigned by morbid prudes and placing it on a plane with the study of physiology and the other natural sciences. It would be a valuable experiment if some well-to-do sociologist would adopt the baby referred to in this paragraph, give it the best opportunity for development, and study carefully the psychical or physiological effect of its irregular parentage, if any such effects should develop. Even in cases so revolting as this to the sentiments of most persons, it is far better to study it carefully and get the facts than to dismiss it through moral prejudice as too horrible for consideration. The time has come when morality must seek and find a basis on facts if it would endure.

IF eugenics is to develop into a science it must fearlessly accept all facts which have a bearing on the improvement of the quality of human reproduction. For this reason this magazine offers a free forum for the discussion of both sides of all questions pertaining to the sexual relations. Facts, however, instead of mere sentiment, should be presented in support of any view held by writers who submit articles for publication.

IF you are forcibly impressed by any of the able articles published from time to time in *EUGENICS*, show it to your acquaintances and urge them to read the magazine regularly. Ask your news-dealer if he keeps the magazine for sale. If he does not, a little talk may convince him that he should do so.

DR. C. W. SALREBY, whose article on "Eugenics" appears in this issue, is perhaps the most noted popular writer on scientific subjects at the present time. His views, therefore, are worthy of consideration. His style of presenting them is forceful and interesting.

THE editor of *EUGENICS* assumes no responsibility for the views expressed in any article published in this magazine except those bearing his own signature.

M. C.

The Personal Problem.

Since man came into existence he hath had too little joy. This alone, my brethren, is our original sin. And when we learn how to have more joy we best get disaccustomed to cause pain and to invent pain unto others.—*Nietzsche*.

CONDUCTED BY LENA BELFORT.

CONCERNING MORALS.

The greatest social achievement of modern times is the abolition of conscience. It would be too much to say that this abolition is already accomplished, but it is on the way. It has been shown to be possible. Some have achieved it, and yet the foundations of social peace and harmony are not undermined; rather are they strengthened. The assertion of the good, "Thus says my conscience," is no longer a finality. It no longer explains; it merely removes the explanation one step. For we have learned that conscience itself is a thing to be explained, and we can no longer take refuge from our reason in its convenient fastnesses.

"Good and evil," "right and wrong," are only technical terms of relation to accepted authority. To be in accord with accepted authority is to "be good"; to ignore or defy it is to "be bad." This is absolutely all there is to "right and wrong." The authority may be civil, ecclesiastical, traditional; but ever conformity is to be imputed to a man for righteousness, and nonconformity for sin. When the seat of authority was ostensibly changed from the external to the internal authority the nature of it was in nowise changed. The moral man is ever the slave of established authority. Being a slave, he does not reason for himself, he does not take the responsibilities of his own acts; he obeys. The utmost exercise he can make of his faculty of judgment is in determining what are the demands of authority. In this exercise he takes great pride, and it seems to him of great importance; but of things in themselves he takes small account. Thus

it is of great moment to determine whether a statement which it may seem desirable to make can be regarded as a "white lie," or a "falsehood," or whether it must be unequivocally regarded as a plain, unvarnished lie. But it never occurs to the moral man to balance the advantages to be gained with the disadvantages to be sustained; to consider future claims to credibility, the effect on his own character, the possible help or harm to others. The man who does take these things into consideration shows thereby that he is on the road to the abolition of his conscience, that he will one day be free from the last of the Bugaboos.

This abolition of the Bugaboos is a shocking and a painful thing to most of us. It is as hard as losing our Santa Claus! And next to absolution from the Pope or immunity under the Law, conscience is the most convenient substitute for responsibility. It takes a hardy soul to stand face to face with life with nothing at his back! To meet each event as an original problem in the conduct of life, and not as another case of applying Rule I or Rule VII or Rule IX, requires courage, and confidence, and perseverance, and quick and ready reason, all one's faculties alive and alert. That makes it hard, but oh! it makes it worth while! And through requiring these qualities it develops them. One becomes capable at last, learns to live, finds himself and fullness of life.

But the mistakes we shall make! Bless us! that is the best of it all. We made mistakes under the old régime. We called them "sins," and they required an agony of repentance, of self-

abasement, of atonement and forgiveness and redemption, to escape from their shadow. A mistake to the free man is a changed condition which demands of him a greater output of energy, and creates a deeper understanding and a fuller power.

For the abolition of conscience in no-wise leads to haphazard conduct. Let no man think he will escape effort and self-direction thereby. The powers that pass judgment upon him are the implacable laws of life,—not a jury to be cajoled, a judge to be influenced; not a Fate to be propitiated, a Deity to be entreated. Freed from the obscurations of traditional morality, he finds himself environed by the inexorable facts of life. There is nothing between him and the realities. Is this a thing to make men careless? Is this encouragement to the reckless, the frivolous?

Furthermore, the abolition of conscience does not make of man's life a thing of mathematics and logic. It develops his reason, but not as an end; rather as a means, for the free life is essentially the life of the heart. "We live as we love" in the land of Reality. It is our loves that make us what we are, that show what we stand for. Greater than all "rights and duties" together is desire. Preachments, principles, and precepts can but little avail us until we love that to which they would point us. That a thing be "right" or "wrong" is not half so potent as that it be desirable or undesirable. We reverse the order of nature when we imagine that a thing is desirable because it is right. Nature knows only advantage and disadvantage. That which is advantageous persists, while the disadvantageous is weeded out ruthlessly. Her stamp of disapproval is sterility and annihilation. The fundamental activity of life is to follow desire. Experience and reason establish relations between varying desires, and gradually ideals are formed, as certain achievements and satisfactions appear preëminent in de-

sirability. These ideals must be in their very nature inconstant, varying with time and place and personality, and growing with the development of experience. Hence the attempt to formulate them into precepts of morality, at once stultifies growth, estops reason, renders experience barren, and results in moral decay. The formulation of a moral code results in the atrophy of ideals; and an individual or a race as it becomes moral becomes stagnant, forgets the upward look, contents itself more and more with sordid and selfish things. And the breaking up of the established moral code, while it may be attended by confusion, sets in motion psychic forces which, allowed freedom of activity, will produce an upward and onward current of life, and lead toward purer ideals. Not the moral code but the personal desire, not the outward compulsion of moral authorities, but the inward compulsion of living Ideals, shall open the door to Wisdom and the pathway of Human Joy. For the outward compulsion can exact but a slavish obedience; it is the inward compulsion that produces a living power.

There is a common belief that it is the moral code which welds society together; that without it we should be as beasts, devouring one another. But even the beasts do not devour their own kind. We are bound together in a social whole because we are a gregarious species, and furthermore, because our social development has made us utterly interdependent. We have derived our very manhood from the prehistoric fact of association. Let no man think to alienate himself from his fellows. He may destroy his own joy in the common life; he may make of himself a hermit and shun the faces of men, but his own annihilation begins therewith. If he would still be man he must live mind to mind and heart to heart with his kind. He is not man apart from them. Out of the self-protective drawing together of some prehistoric species grew the

mental interchange and stimulation that made man possible; out of that dim beginning swelled the genetic forces of the human race; out of common fears and needs and desires have grown the great race-ideals, stimulating men to exert their powers until from out the striving mass arise individualities, "simple, separate persons," drawing their every sustenance from the vast heredity of common race-life, and yet appearing as distinct, and often seemingly finding themselves in opposition to their kind. Such men become the martyrs of great causes, the leaders of great hopes, the dreamers and prophets of the beyond-life. And ever their number grows, and ever more and more units find themselves and stand out, until one day, after fruitless endeavors to stand alone, after failure has made them tolerant, after pain has made them kind, after sorrow has given them sympathy, after love and joy have illumined their lives, they find the great whole and become one with it in consciousness. Such as these are the wise ones, the joy-bringers of earth. They feel the needs of all in their own hearts, they pulse with the great longings of the greater race, they thrill to the deeper joys of the social attainments. They dream the wondrous dream of a great race of more than brothers: of individuals separate and distinct, yet socially conscious, each one living the life of all, growing, loving, enjoying with the full tide of the life of his race.

Let no man say this is a mad ideal until he has felt within his own soul the pulse of solidarity; until he has tossed and agonized with the great unrest of the race; until he has thrilled to the fuller consciousness of human happiness: then no man can say this is a mad Ideal, for he will be striving and dreaming to make it Real!

The greatest achievement of modern times is the superseding of the moral code by the personal Ideal, and the freeing of the individual from the pet-

tinesses of institutionalism to the larger perceptions of those great social Realities to know which is the fullness of life.

"LENDING OUR MINDS OUT."

Address all correspondence for this department in care of this magazine. Letters inclosing stamp will be answered, either in the magazine or personally.

Comrades: Next month I hope to have some interesting letters from correspondents. This time I will take a text from the newspapers and make a little preachment about "How Not to Do It." Doubtless you are all, like me, utterly weary of the case of Artist Earle, and the nauseating stuff the newspapers have been pouring out with regard to it. But the whole matter is significant of the hypocrisy of the general attitude toward the relations of the sexes.

If the said Earle had discovered that his wife had an "affinity," and had promptly killed them both, no one would have rolled him in the mud. They would have talked of "unwritten law." Perhaps they would have given him an ovation as a defender of purity! But he and his wife discover that they have outlived the joy of their union, and he meets another woman with whom he thinks to find happiness and harmony, and they all agree to do the sensible thing and dissolve the legal semblance of a tie that is dead, and presto! the neighbors take a hand in the matter and express their purity in the very appropriate manner chronicled by the newspapers. Tar and feathers and ancient eggs are suitable expressions, certainly, of the vulgar ideas of love and sex. The whole affair would be laughable were it not sickening.

It is never safe to judge a man upon newspaper evidence, but, assuming that the reports are mainly true, we find that Earle has committed no antisocial act, has injured no one. For wife and child he has amply provided, and they have agreed to separate. Clearly he is not injuring her, as he certainly would

if he continued to live with her under pretense of a feeling that no longer exists. However, if he had done so, and had furnished a suite in the city for his "affinity," and had contrived to deceive both women, even though the facts became an open secret among his neighbors, it is not at all likely they would have interfered with him. It is

ever so. A sinner and a hypocrite is tolerated. His neighbors can look upon him with a fine sense of their own virtue. But a man who declares his nonconformity to be a higher virtue than their own startles them out of their smug self-complacency, and they must assert their superiority and vindicate their virtue.

L. B.

Culture: Physical, Mental, Emotional. For Man, Woman and Child.

CONDUCTED BY M. FLORENCE JOHNSON.

Whatever may appear in this department will doubtless belong to the literature of the "crank." If there is anything marked in my heredity it is the joy of unpopularity. As far back as we have any record, my ancestors, both maternal and paternal, were taking up some new work religiously or rebelling against governmental encroachments and tyrannies. On both sides they fought for the abolition of negro slavery—fought almost to martyrdom. Accompanying the belief in freedom for the black man, was a desire for mental freedom for all, and my parents stepped from the Adventist Church, with its limitations, into the broader religion of Spiritualism, with its religious toleration, its recognition of woman as man's equal, and its helpfulness to children, giving them a chance for expression and growth not then known in other denominations.

I was about seven years old when my parents escaped from the slavery of the church. What a change it brought to my sisters and myself! The fear that our souls might be lost through sin had caused us to suffer severe punishment for trifles. A five-year-old child questioning the efficacy of baptism had brought father to his knees to inter-

cede for its soul's salvation. I used to watch the clouds, with expectation and fear, for the coming of Christ; and the vague notions of what I heard preached and prayed and sung made childhood full of terrors. But with Christianity gone, we could be happy every day. There was no hateful "Sabbath." We could play *every day*. "Wait until the Sabbath is passed," was the command that had ruined one-seventh of what happiness is allowed the children of those who enforce worship from fear. Now we were supplied with all the games, and taught to play them, and the stern father became the most gentle companion and playfellow; and from that time on, no children of whom we had any knowledge were so free and happy as we.

What has all this to do with eugenics? Much. When father Moses Hull escaped from church he began to study life, and in a short time wrote a pamphlet entitled *That Terrible Question*. It was a discussion of the marriage institution. I have not seen the book since I was old enough and interested enough to read it, but I know it was considered radical for that time, and kept him in discussions for years, until he wrote other things more radical. As far back in

childhood as I heard discussions, this subject has held a prominent place in memory; a subject most interesting in trying to solve life's problems for myself, and in observing the methods and lives of friends, it has been most important and interesting; and in the every-day reading of the papers, it is impossible to eliminate it. And what would literature be, were love, hatred, and marriage left out? Ever since skepticism entered the family, and I was taught to think for myself, authority, whether in the realm of intellect or in morals, has meant nothing to me. Authority needed to prove its superiority to my own view, or it was not accepted. And naturally I expect no one to accept my view as a guide. I write my thought that it may be considered as the idea of one woman who has looked at life without the colored glasses of church, state, or custom. Let us exchange views on the subjects of interest to mankind.

THE WHITE SLAVE.

An article by Ella Wheeler Wilcox which had appeared in the *Hearst papers* was printed in the August number of *EUGENICS*, with the "hope" that I would say something on the subject. For years Mrs. Wilcox has written on all sides of all subjects. As her articles are usually short, she can express one idea one day, and within a week another idea that is almost wholly contradictory of the first; and as each reads well by itself, her followers, as incoherent in thought as she, do not criticise or even notice her inconsistency. Now she writes rhetorically of prostitution, and the women engaged in it, euphoniously called "white slaves." She says:

The heart of the world must bleed for the mothers of the unfortunate girls who have become enmeshed in the so-called "white slave" traffic in Chicago. All the world thinks of the mother first, when a tragedy happens to a child, especially a woman child.

Certainly the heart bleeds in sympathy for the mother, but few point out the

fact that a *slave mother* is often in as sad a plight as her daughter. She has been the slave of *one* man, and had not the privilege of leaving her master if she had wished to do so, as the "white slave" can if she deems it best. The mother is not known as a slave, so *society* does not abuse her; but the daughter is recognized as a "white slave," and is abused. If the hearts that are "bleeding" for the mother of the unfortunate girl were beating under practical thinking heads, the sympathetic voice would say: "Your daughter has made a mistake; the life she is living is not conducive to health; we will try to show her wherein it is dangerous, and she will then change to a more simple, natural life."

I believe many girls become "white slaves" to escape the fate of their mother. A woman who is unhappily married to a poor man, who cannot give her the comforts of life, might say: "If I must be the slave of a man who is distasteful to me, why not be the slave of a master who can supply me with food, shelter, and clothing?" If the mother has the courage to resist this thought and live "true to her husband," and rear daughters, the daughters can and do ask the question, and sometimes get even a worse fate by trying to escape what they know the mother endures. "No slave is a good messenger," and while all the "historical ideas concerning the sacredness of motherhood" are being taught the young, and while those who try to instruct us on the subject are believers in the present slave mother and father system, we will have the "white slave." The girls are born slaves.

The mother who keeps her little girl from all knowledge of the great facts of sex relations and their sacredness is not a good mother.

The ignorant mother whose sex relations have been such that she feels ashamed to have her daughters know of sex relations is not a good mother. She is to be pitied; and should be taught that her condition is unfortunate, that

she has been cheated in life, and that a sex life lived in love and desire is not a life that she would be ashamed to mention. The woman who teaches the "sacredness" of sex has put sex out of the realm of natural study and investigation. Teach your daughters and sons that sex is physical and has its natural rewards, consequences, and responsibilities; that sex is most persistent and exacting in its demands; that it gives the most exquisite pleasure and happiness, when naturally lived, but that the consequences are the most severe if carelessness leads to disease. Teach them that natural sex life brings physical joy and peace, which is the foundation of mental and emotional joy. (Or, if you are metaphysical, you may say mental and spiritual development.) Teach them that if the laws of health are not observed, the diseases resulting are as distressing as it is possible to imagine, and the evil effects may be lifelong; that these diseases are transmissible from one to another; and that it is necessary to know well the life of those with whom we associate, to avoid such contamination. Tell your daughters that many a beautiful girl has gone to her death through disease brought to her by her husband when he supposed himself cured, and that the same men and diseases will kill *unmarried* women if the women become their associates. Tell them that the diseased married woman has the sympathy of society, because she is "sanctified in marriage," and if she dies she will have eulogies, cut flowers, and monuments; but if the unmarried woman becomes ill from such a cause she is an unsanctified outcast, and is supposed to deserve death and burial as a pauper. Also tell the girls *and boys* that any sexual relation is likely to bring a child, and that the responsibility should be well considered. Do they want a child, and what can they do for it? Do they understand all the sacrifices to be made in the rearing of children? Give them the knowledge of everything resulting

physically from sexual union, and the word "sacred" need never be uttered.

Nobody can blame a mother for not *knowing* the way to make her child such a close confidante and friend that it would be impossible for her to be led astray. The only people who should be blamed in these matters are the reformers and philanthropists, who blindly pursue the same old roads to the same old goal of nowhere, and refuse to listen to the voice of progress.

Why should the philanthropists be blamed more than the mothers? Some philanthropists are mothers. Enlightenment is what is needed, and mothers who have the personal welfare of their children at heart can be enlightened as easily as philanthropists who have a desire to do something—they hardly know what.

Confederation and smelting of all the philanthropic reformatory societies of America into a great scientific association, with Luther Burbank and Elmer Gates as directors, and the billions of money America can produce at short notice to back it, would in two generations do away with the . . . weak and misguided and vicious men and women in the land.

We might mention many other impossible things that, if done, would work wonders. But with all respect to Luther Burbank and Elmer Gates, I can imagine nothing meant to be beneficial that could be more unfortunate than to put the *world* under two men. The amount of good these men are doing is inestimable; but to think of putting them over the world of philanthropy, and to think of knowing beforehand that they would be successful world-reformers, is the incoherent thought of emotional self-elected instructors, who pride themselves upon their ability to analyze and fix the boundaries of the "sacred" affairs of the world.

Get rid of slave parents; give each individual a chance to live a sex life that is as beneficial and beautiful as any form of physical perfection; treat the girls who are "white slaves" as you treat one who earns her living by selling herself to any occupation that leads to disease or death,—and then you may do away with white slavery.

M. F. J.

Various Voices.

SEX AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS.

BY EDWIN C. WALKER.

It is somewhat disquieting to find a defender of "the unwritten law" among the readers of *EUGENICS*, for, of course, "the unwritten law" is only the law of private vengeance, the administrative process, as it were, of individuals acting unofficially. In all such adjudications, the aggrieved person, or another assuming to represent the aggrieved person or the person said, by him or herself or others, to be aggrieved, takes upon himself all the authority of judge, jury, and executioner, condemning and destroying without a hearing, without opportunity given to the accused for the production of witnesses in his own behalf, for the cross-examination of the prosecution's witnesses, for the services of counsel, for a statement before trial of the charges preferred, for trial by jury, for change of venue, for appeal. The whole procedure is *ex parte*, arbitrary, lacking every element of judicial calm and fairness. It is of the age of the vendetta, antedating all conceptions of equitable investigation, relegating reason to the rear, and making passion supreme arbiter of life and death.

This is why I say that it is disquieting to find a reader of *EUGENICS* among the champions of this custom of pre-civilization, for *EUGENICS* stands for the principle of inquiry, for the hearing of both sides before reaching a verdict. If all-sided investigation is important in a matter of abstract opinion or in the field of social experimentation, where haste is not necessarily fatal and irrevocable in its effects, of how much more immediate importance it is where irreversible action is threatened, where life may be sacrificed in one mad instant!

To talk of "gentlemen" and "brutes" is not germane to the issue.

The question is whether *any* person accused of crime is to be condemned unheard. No matter what the crime alleged, no matter what the reputation of the victim or of the reputed aggressor, there should be adjudication by those not immediately involved, if reason and not irresponsible passion and brute force is to determine action in such momentous events. This adjudication may be legal or it may be through some form of arbitration outside the state.

It was *not* true, in the Virginia case, that there was a question of "gentleman" vs. "brute," that the murderer was undeniably the "gentleman" and his victim as undeniably the "brute," and that the guilt of the "brute" was established by independent witnesses. On the contrary, the father who committed the murder often had been, if he was not at that time, under the influence of intoxicants, and it is admitted that he made no inquiry whatever when the story was brought to him. There was no evidence that the man slaughtered was a "brute." The jury could do nothing but acquit, under the instructions of the court, which were that the father was under no obligation to make inquiry, to give the accused a chance to speak in his own behalf, but might kill first and let the farcical investigation come afterward. This ruling was a flat denial of all civil rights to persons charged with any offense in this class, a subversion of all that the race has struggled and sacrificed for through thousands of years. Would Doctor Kuznik hold that this sweeping away of all the rights of the accused should be permitted where other classes of crimes are concerned? Why should this most unjust and demoralizing procedure be peculiar to cases where sex is involved? It is here that it should *not* be indulged, even if allowed elsewhere, for ~~there~~ is

so much unregulated emotion, so much jealous and angry passion, so much superstition, so much false sentiment, associated with whatever pertains to sex that an accusation of sexual wrong-doing requires the most careful and painstaking inquiry before any punitive action is taken, even before any fixed opinion is formed.

The very fact that a charge of sexual misconduct carries with it conviction to the minds of a great majority of those who hear of it, is a constant and oftentimes irresistible temptation to make the charge when no foundation for it exists. Envy, malice, desire for revenge, slighted vanity, unreciprocated love, find this a ready and effective weapon. Then hysteria and imitative delusion play their parts in the bloody drama. During the prevalence of the recent "crime wave" in New York City, there were scores of accusations that had no basis in fact. Some rumor would start, and a mob would form at once to execute "the unwritten law." Sometimes the reputed victim would tell a most circumstantial story of outrage or attempted outrage, only to have it wholly disproved upon investigation. Probably most of these cases belonged in the class of imitative delusions, for the storytellers usually were quite young girls, whose imaginations had been inflamed and confused by the prevailing excitement. The records of the courts in all times and countries, and our own knowledge gathered through years of observation, tell us that no other kind of accusation requires the careful sifting and unquestionable corroboration that are demanded when offenses against woman's sex are presented. Blackmail has no richer quarrying ground than this; out of the readiness of the public to believe and condemn before inquiring, comes the success of the "badger game" and like methods of reaping where one has not sown.

"Gentlemen" will, of course, characterize these statements of indisputable

facts as "insults" to women, and so continue to advocate "trial" off-hand with knife, shot-gun, and revolver, but just ordinary common-sense men and women, who have at least a little self-control in discussing sex-problems, will continue to insist that every person charged with crime shall have a fair trial, shall have the benefit of that patient inquiry before conviction which is the most precious right won by the men of the past for the men and women of the present and future.

Cannot the excitable protagonists of "the unwritten law" see that while, on the one hand, the ravisher or alleged ravisher is destroyed by their summary method, on the other hand the same fate is meted out to the accepted lover or friend of the murderer's wife, mother, sister, daughter, or other woman chattel, who is not supposed or permitted to have a mind of her own? If, in the first instance, "the unwritten law" operates for the protection of women, does it do so in the second instance, does it help to make her an independent, self-poised, self-directing woman? Naturally, in those parts of the country where there are many gentlemen and relatively few men, this question would be answered emphatically in a manner most satisfactory to reactionists, but hardly, I should suppose, in a way to please any one progressive enough to read EUGENICS. In those parts of the country, it would be admitted cheerfully that the real beauty of "the unwritten law" was in its fine applicability to the uses of sexual orthodoxy, for there it is the first social as well as religious tenet that wives shall submit themselves to their husbands in all things. It is rank heresy to say that woman should be mistress of her own mind and body and commander of her own actions. She easily will find a gentlemanly father, brother, uncle, son, husband, cousin, or grandfather to murder any one she likes, or is suspected of liking, in an unconventional way, but mighty few men can

she discover manly enough and clear-thinking enough to defend her right to think and act for herself in all the concerns of her life as woman, neighbor, and citizen. There a belated "chivalry" is far more popular than is modern justice. There, likewise, the study of eugenics is not overly popular.

**DOES OBSCENE LITERATURE TEND
TO MORAL AND PHYSICAL IN-
JURY OF THE YOUNG?**

BY WILLIAM J. ROBINSON, M. D.,
New York.

Editor "Critic and Guide," "Aitruia," etc.

I am much interested in THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS, and the July and August issues were read by me as soon as received. An overwhelming amount of work, however, prevented me from looking into the September number until now. Mr. Schroeder's article, "Why Do Purists Object to Sex Discussions?" is the most amusing thing that I have read in a long, long time. That there are purists who object to sex discussions is true; but when Mr. Schroeder includes the writer of these lines among those who object to sex discussions, he tells something which is distinctly and palpably untrue. Mr. Schroeder knows perfectly well that I do not object to sex discussions. He knows that a great deal of space in *The Critic and Guide* is devoted just to that very subject. He knows that for years I have been demanding the right to teach the people how to limit their offspring; in other words, how to prevent conception. In fact, so free am I in discussing the various phases of the sex question, so insistent have I been in the advocacy of the right of people to say when they should and when they should not have children, that a great part even of the medical profession is shocked and horrified at my teachings. If, knowing all this, Mr. Schroeder still classes me among the purists or pruders or Comstockians, or what not, he is perfectly welcome to do so. In my opinion, however, it merely shows

a perverted mind—a mind that will not recognize the *essential* difference between true literature, which is meant to inform and elevate the people, and the filthy pornographic sheets and pictures which conscienceless wretches and degenerates issue for the exclusive purpose of making money by preying upon the weaknesses and vices of immature youths and degenerate old roués.

Mr. Schroeder spends a page or two in a pathetic plea for the freedom of "the most objectionable word in the English language." Isn't the thing indescribably silly? One would think that that word was a necessity in our language, that the entire nation or at least a great part of it were suffering agonies on account of the prohibition to use that word in print, and that letting down the bars, permitting that word in print, would make millions happy, would be a real contribution to the freedom of the press. Again I ask, isn't all this indescribably silly?

Suppose even (which I do not admit for a moment) that the whole subject of obscenity resided merely in the literary form. *If we have a right to forbid people to commit vulgar, offensive acts in the streets, why haven't we the same right to forbid them to use filthy, offensive language in print?* Will Mr. Schroeder please answer this? I asked him that question in a private letter, gave him some examples of the printed and pictorial "literature" which is circulated by certain human harpies, and asked him if he would permit or forbid these. I demanded a categorical answer, yes or no. But I regret to say that with all his courage Mr. Schroeder did not have the courage to commit himself in this instance. He simply would not answer yes or no.

All this is, however, preliminary. My real objection to pornographic filth, printed or pictorial, is that it injures, that it *ruins* the young. This Mr. Schroeder denies. He says:

I never have met a purist nor any one

else who would admit that his own sex morality had ever been impaired as the result of reading obscene books.

Mr. Schroeder might as well deny the existence of the pyramids because he hasn't seen them. It merely goes to show, what I have been suspecting for some time, that Mr. Schroeder's knowledge of the subjects on which he writes with such aplomb is purely academic and is not based upon facts of life. Mr. Schroeder has not met anybody who has been injured by the reading of obscene books or the contemplation of obscene pictures. How should he meet such people? Is he a physician? But if he hasn't, I have, and so has every physician who has a more or less extensive practice in treating venereal and sexual diseases. I keep notes of every case I treat, and I make it a point to trace, if possible, the circumstances which led up to the contraction of venereal disease or to the formation of some abnormal habit. I have the reports of dozens and dozens of such cases. Within less than three months I have seen three patients whose miserable condition, they told me, was caused directly by obscene leaflets and vile pictures. One, a strong, beautiful boy of fifteen, contracted a filthy, debilitating habit through the contemplation of a photograph picturing that habit in all its vulgarity. The other two were the victims of venereal disease contracted as the result of reading illustrated pornographic literature, loaned them by a friend. Of course, the sophist would say that if not this time, those patients would have contracted their troubles some other time. They might and they mightn't. The fact remains that in those three cases the direct exciting cause was nasty pornographic literature, which I would forbid most decidedly, but for which Mr. Schroeder pleads with such earnestness and zeal—earnestness and zeal worthy of a better cause.

When you come to think of it, it seems awfully silly to attempt to deny

that vile literature and pictures can work real injury. It seems to me that only a eunuch or one suffering from complete *impotentia sexualis* can enter such a denial. No sane person will deny that a beautiful nude woman will generally excite the sexual passions in a man. So why cannot a lascivious pictorial representation do the same thing?

And it does. And not only in weaklings and degenerates, but in perfectly normal, healthy men also. The trouble with Mr. Schroeder is that, having taken an untenable position, it does not pay him to recede from it; and he will not, in spite of arguments which he is utterly unable to answer, admit that there is a difference between decent discussions of the sex question—questions dealing with the physiology of the sex function, the prevention of venereal disease, the prevention of conception, etc.—and the filthy, smutty stories and pictures of brothel scenes which degenerates get out with the sole purpose of making money by debauching the young and fanning the dying passion-embers of the old.

It is such pornographic filth only that the writer objects to. It is such pornographic filth that gives the *raison d'être* to Comstockery. Without that filth, the occupation of Comstock would be gone. The writer of these lines considers himself a thorough radical; he likes to call himself and to be called a sane radical. To me the ignorant obscurantism of Anthony Comstock and the intemperate zeal of Theodore Schroeder, who will not recognize the line of demarcation between literature and filth, are alike obnoxious. He is disgusted with the one; he is amused and sometimes nauseated at the other.

P. S.—As I finished this communication a book came in to *Altruria*, a passage of which seems very *à propos* to the subject under discussion. The book is entitled *Woman and the Race*, and is from the Ariel Press. The author of the book is anything but a prude, demands

perfect freedom of discussions of the sexual question, and nevertheless I find in its pages the following passage:

A damnable trade in the innocence of our young men is prosecuted in secret; printed and typewritten books are disseminated among schoolboys that are calculated to do untold harm. . . . A typewritten manuscript which was handed to the writer a few months ago had been taken from a lad of seventeen. It was the most thoroughly demoralizing and seductive matter that can be imagined. It would be impossible for any young man to read such pages and to retain his virtue. It had been written, evidently, by a man of experience and power of expression; it was not crude, nor vulgar, in the sense of being repulsive; therein lay its awful attractiveness to the emotional nature of the young; and the scenes that it depicted were intentional exaggerations of possible intimacies calculated to rouse, in the ignorant and easily stimulated imagination of youth, passions that must find an outlet in some form of sexual sin.

Comment is unnecessary.

OBSCENITY LAWS.

BY M. KUHN.

Theodore Schroeder's appeal for advice upon the subject of present and possible laws regarding obscenity is timely; and the response thereto, if of value, is of public interest. For this reason I desire to offer him, in a public way, a few suggestions.

When the word "obscene" presents itself to your eye, what is the character of its influence upon your thought? If the fabric of your thought is the product of the loom of Heredity, it may have any one of a million kinds of influences; but if your thought is emancipated from heredity to any measurable degree, that influence is a suggestion of impurity.

In itself the word "obscene" has no meaning—it only has the power of suggestion. This being true, "the uncertainty of the statute," of which Mr. Schroeder complains, is inevitable; and no "test" can be written into a statute of which the word "obscene" is the subject.

When we pause to remember that the controlling thought of 99 per cent of our lawmakers, both legislative and judi-

cial, is hereditary and not emancipated, we can account for the continued use of a word which no legislator or jurist can define, and for the remaining content to "leave it to the whim or caprice of juries or judges to determine guilt by personally created and *ex post facto* standards."

The word "impure" has an intrinsic meaning; its suggestion is the same to all rational minds. A legislator writing it into a statute would be conscious of its meaning, the jurist would be conscious of the legislator's will, and the "ordinary man knows just what he must not do."

An impure thing is a thing once pure and now mixed or impregnated with foul or extraneous substance. Illustrations: To mix sand with sugar; to state a truth mixed with falsehood—such as that all sex-relations are pure except the human, and that is made pure only by church-sanction; to make a representation of a natural thing in an unnatural form—such as the painting of a picture, either in colors or words, of a woman with the face of a Madonna and the body of a serpent, or one sitting "upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns." Many quotations of impure word-pictures might be made from a book found in almost every home, but to print them here would make this article "obscene," under the statute, to a hereditary thinker.

But all impurities are not harmful—and only those that are should be made the subject of legislation. As now drafted and interpreted, most of our obscenity laws are directed against that which is pure. For illustration, a beautiful picture of a nude woman would be declared obscene. It might be perfectly natural—unmixed with foul or extraneous substance—but that is what makes it obscene to the hereditary thinker. The reason for this is that for thousands of years we have been taught that a woman is impure by nature, and that to

hide her impurity we must clothe her. It is not contended that she can be made pure, but only that her natural impurity may be partly concealed. Of course, just the reverse is true—but the legislator and the jurist has that plain and simple truth yet to learn. This same conception of purity in nature is applied to art and literature.

After all is said, the thing attempted to be done by our obscenity laws is to prevent a shock to the normal mind by an uncommon suggestion. Taken by itself, the intention is good; the harm in it lies in this fact: No regard is taken of the truth or error of the suggestion.

There can no harm come to the normal mind by the suggestion of truth, no matter how severe the shock, in nature, art, or literature; but immeasurable harm does come by the suppression of truth, in whatever form it may be submitted, by such devices as "obscenity" laws and postal censorship.

I know of no way to make a law better that is wrong in principle, and I do not think Mr. Schroeder, though he be an able lawyer, will find one. There are two things which may be attempted, however: First, to have the word "impure" substituted for the word "obscene" in the statutes; second, to emancipate the minds of jurists and legislators from the influences of the Dark Ages—which seem to extend up to the present moment.

If the first were accomplished—ye gods! what a wriggling of dry-bones there would be! I should like to be the judge to try the first offender. I would make a precedent for all courts to follow. Judgment would not be left to my whim or caprice—but to a jury of the defendant's peers; and the honorable prosecuting attorney would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the work of art was impure—was not a likeness of the subject; or that the published language was untrue and false—and that the suggestion of impurity or falsity was

such as to cause a harmful shock to the normal mind.

And if the second thing were accomplished—well, the law would indeed be "a rule of action," not because the court enforced it, but because it needed not to be enforced.

Lock Box 722, Milwaukee, Wis.

TO WHAT EXTENT CAN WE SELECT AND PREDETERMINE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF UNBORN CHILDREN?

BY FRANKLIN THEODORE ALLEN.

To what extent are parents the creators of their children?

To what degree may it be possible for a prospective mother to choose and predetermine the characteristics of her unborn or even her (as yet) unconceived child?

Presumably all observing, reasoning people are agreed that a mentally and physically enslaved woman, or one whose associations and environments are of a low and vulgar order, cannot normally give birth to a very highly refined order of progeny. There is at least the relation of association or affinity between the environments, prenatal conditions, etc., and the characteristics of the child which may be conceived and born therein. But what actual data is there by which it may be demonstrated that such association is either entirely or in part the relationship of cause and effect?

But even though we may conclude that the conscious and purposeful choice of the mother may combine with heredity and environment (such would become in part both hereditary and environmental) to predicate the mental and physical qualities of the child, it will require but very little thoughtful observation and reasoning to enable any fair-minded person to agree that such are not the only, and possibly not even the chief, causative factors which conspire or combine to predestine the newborn babe to those peculiarities of mind and body which predispose him to acts,

habits, preferences, tastes and affinities that ultimately cause him to be readily distinguished from his own brothers, who may have had as nearly as possible the same environments. What is it that appears so often to arbitrarily select one child from a numerous family of average children and causes him to become distinguished from all his kin and companions?

As a student and exponent of astrology, I have had an extensive experience in giving character delineations of children, and in so doing I have found ample evidence to convince me that the child's disposition is largely, if not entirely, a sort of a composite photograph of the mental states of the parents at the moment of the conception. I do not dogmatically declare this to be so, but I have very often astonished parents by venturing to describe their mental states at the time of the conception of the child whose birth-data they had submitted to me for analysis. Of course, I cannot always do this successfully, but my failures are readily traceable to my lack of experience and ability rather than to any flaw in this theory.

(As a matter of justice I must state that my attention was first drawn to this matter in Butler's delineation of the "polarities" in his *Solar Biology*, a work which is very far from being accurate, consistent, or scientific, but which in this one respect at least is suggestive of a tremendously important truth.)

The average types of character among all classes are readily traced to heritage, but extraordinary characters often happen in the most unexpected places and come up out of seemingly the most unlikely environments,—as Harry Orchard of Quaker parentage and Abraham Lincoln of very inferior stock, by way of two contrasted examples.

While years of patient study, experiment, practice, and observation have produced in me the conviction that the positions and aspects of the planets at the time of birth do furnish a remarkable

index to the characteristics and tendencies of the individual, I am by no means convinced that the force or influence which either emanates from, or is associated and possible only coincident with, the heavenly bodies, is of itself the actual cause of the qualities we find them to persistently synchronize with.

There are two most vitally important matters to be understood before we can hope to make any satisfactory progress in the art of consciously and purposely selecting and determining any of the characteristics of our unborn children. The first is to learn where and when the Life, the Ego, or individualized Soul, of the child actually originates. The second is to become familiar with the quality and modes of all the factors that may have a part in shaping its character and destiny. If we overlook, neglect, or misinterpret any one of these, it may be that the influence left out of our calculations will operate to negative all of our efforts, making them abortive, and the resultant child a victim of our presumptive meddling with the creative forces and elements.

Is it reasonable to suppose that the Life, Ego, Soul, Spirit, or whatever you may choose to call that intangible "Something" which lives within and uses our bodies as its instrument, has its first individual beginning in the embryo of that body? Or may the births we observe be but one of a long series of births or incarnations? I am not a member of any sect or cult and have no desire to introduce any religious discussion in the columns of this magazine, but I declare this to be far more of a scientific than a religious or theological question.

As "Like attracts like," it follows that we attract or beget children whose qualities accord with our own conditions at the time when the contact or conception takes place. This being the case, it must follow that if we but learn to, *and do*, live in closest possible harmony with nature's laws at *all times* we cannot

then, at *any time*, attract to ourselves or be attracted to any relationships that are crude, vulgar, or antagonistic to us.

The "borning of better babies" is certainly a noble ambition; but as "the stream can never rise higher than its source," it must be that if our children are to excel us that such excellence as they may be blessed with must find us its ready and willing instrument, rather than its author or creator. The simple and spontaneous child of nature is far more likely to be selected for the mothering of a sweet and lovely child than the woman whose mind and will are at a tension in an effort to conform to ideals or to maintain, or attain, ideal conditions. As a parent, as well as a scientific student, I have had some personal experiences along these lines, the details of which I do not now care to reveal or discuss, because others who were involved with me are unwilling to coöperate with me in a frank expression of experiences.

It is well known that the tastes, habits, desires and actions of women during pregnancy usually differ very far from the normal, and I have been informed of cases where there have been very noticeable differences in the tastes, desires, etc., of the same woman when pregnant with different ones of her children. May it not be that these variations and changes are due to the dominating influence of the Ego that is beginning a new incarnation in the womb of the pregnant woman? If the whole truth were actually known we might find that the life and character of parents are quite as much affected by the children that are attracted to them as that of the children is influenced by the parents.

If such conclusions as I have hinted at should be found to be correct, how would such a knowledge affect the work and aims of those interested in and devoted to the aims for which *THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS* has been founded?

I believe that the principal effect would be to turn our attention from

projects and efforts calculated to determine and influence the life, character, and actions of others, whether infant or adult, born or to be born; because, realizing that it is what we intrinsically *are*, rather than what we aspire to be and do, that influences others, we will therefore devote ourselves to the task of gaining a fuller understanding of the subtle laws and influences that surround and affect us, sexually, morally, socially, and every other way, being content to grow into a conscious understanding of the mysterious forces within ourselves, ever enjoying more and more of the pleasure of living in harmony with nature's laws.

I once heard a radical, or "New Thought," preacher say, "Get yourself right and the world will be right." But no one can travel far on that road before he learns something of the unity and interdependence of all life, the realization of which will lead to a willingness or desire to do all that may be possible to assist others to reach the same goal—not by dictating their actions or beliefs, or by any show of authority or superiority, but by a friendly interest and candid disposition to compare and discuss mutual experiences, to the end that all may profit by the experiences of each. And what better medium can we conceive of for such comparison and discussion of experiences in the field of eugenics than such a journal as this?

I have been moved to write this article because I have perceived in the speech and writings of some few of the most devoted and sincere friends of the cause so dear to the Harmans a tendency to erect standards that might easily develop into tyrannical codes, as also here and there a desire to have the findings of the advanced thinkers along these lines crystallized into laws and regulations, or a desire to enforce the practice of such methods as experience and observation may prove to be a necessary prelude to the borning and rearing of better babies—harmony in sexual relationships,

etc. I am well aware that refined environments, spontaneous love between the parents, freedom from all sense of obligation on the part of the mother, etc., all exert or at least form a very essential part of the influences connected with the birth of ideal children, but in all cases that I have known where such ideal conditions were approximated they came about without any predetermined plan or purpose to effect it! When you produce such conditions, or rather the appearance of such conditions, by force of mind and will, you are introducing a something incompatible with freedom of heart and spirit, which normally act without premeditation and conscious direction, and you are pretty certain to find the resultant child vastly different, if not what may be designated inferior, to the child conceived and born amid similar ideal conditions that simply transpired without the intervention of the human will and intellect.

I am satisfied that all true and lasting ideals result from spontaneous growth, or natural evolution. The human mind may love, admire, and aspire after the ideal, but when it attempts to create it the result is like wax flowers and fruit—marvelously like the ideal in appearance, perhaps, but lifeless and barren. The kingdom of harmony comes not by force of will or by the might of human intellect. "Except ye become as [grow or evolve—not force yourself into a semblance of] a little child [spontaneous, free, natural] ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Berlin, N. J.

While one may not be disposed to berate Dr. Robinson for his views, as he anticipates, one can but feel that he draws curiously unfair inferences from his facts. He says that among the poor and excitable French working folk, whose circumstances make it impossible for them to assume regular family ties and the support of offspring, there are frequent quarrels and murders. In this

country of our own—where the frank love affairs of the Latin Quarter would be most offensive to our more refined moral sense—are not the greater part of the arrests for disorderly conduct made among the poorer and more illiterate of our population? Animals are not forever quarreling about their mates, although there is no legal bond; why is it that some writers are forever insisting that if we did away with formal marriages in the human family, everything would go to the demnition bows and we should "degenerate to the level of the animals"? This is a part of the eternal and amazing conceit of man; the other animals can teach us many things, even in relation to our family affairs.

Suppose every civil tie in this country were dissolved tomorrow, would the majority of our families remain together? If there is any real bond, it would hold; and if there is not, there is something wrong about our laws. Our best reform schools are so managed that it is impossible to get the boys and girls to run away!

Byron for two years was more happy with the Countess Guiccioli than he had ever been with the woman to whom the state had "married" him; Voltaire and Madame du Châtelet did not make each other miserable; Shelley did not quarrel with Mary Wollstonecraft before it became possible for him to marry her; and I dare say that Pericles and Aspasia did not indulge in brawls! On the other hand, vulgar folk will quarrel, whether the state has given them a marriage license or has not.

As for the fact that Dr. Robinson found people living happily under our present social laws, "many men have many minds." Some men and women are very constant in their ordinary friendships, others not. One person lives contentedly upon a farm; another must needs set out to see the world. One man follows an occupation all his life; other men can do several things.

Michelangelo could use the painter's brush and model a statue as well as design cathedral domes. Furthermore, there are probably many discontented married people who do not confide their real sentiments even to the family guide to health, to say nothing of the community at large.

The principal point in Dr. Robinson's article [pp. 208-210] seems to be the one that, were marriages less closely regulated by the state, they might be entered into by those of too great consanguinity. This, however, has less weight than the objections—such as constant preservation and continuation of the unfit—which may be urged against the present system. The fact that Leonardo di Vinci might possibly marry his first cousin would scarcely justify us in determining that there should not be a Leonardo born at all. However, I am decidedly inclined to believe that if women, as well as men, had some occupation or profession to engage their energies and even cause some separations from their households (shades of those who tell us about "woman's sphere!"), thus remedying the monotony of too constant association; and could we rid ourselves of the absurd idea that married folk should never dine or walk or talk alone with persons of the other sex under grievous penalties of shootings, divorces, and the like,—we should then be in a much better position to ascertain whether or not monogamy is acceptable to the Anglo-Saxon race.

L. H. DANA.

I have just received a copy of October EUGENICS, and can hardly wait to read it right through. What impels me to write is that I was so surprised to receive this copy, and will say by the way that an invitation to a theater party which came in the same mail did not make me as happy as the anticipation of reading this excellent little book. Did I send you any money for this copy? If so, I am not aware of it. Please

let me know, as if I am not entitled to the next number I want to become a regular subscriber.

You will find enclosed some stamps for *Lucifer*, which I am anxious to receive. I think, if I had the opportunity of belonging to clubs or attending lectures for the "cause," I would stand up and devote an evening talking about the merits of EUGENICS and its grand editor.

Trusting that you will believe me to be truly elated over this little journal and its greatly commendable work, believe me, most sincerely yours, SADIE L.

New York City.

I don't think the "dress" of the magazine could be improved. It is dignified and attractive, and gives a forecast of its excellent contents. I have shown it to several to whom I would hardly have ventured to show our dear *Lucifer*, and the verdict is always that such a magazine is much needed. Yours,

BOLTON HALL.

I cannot express to you the satisfaction I feel over the publication of your excellent AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS, introduced to us through Mr. Schroeder's kindness. I only wish its circulation may be many times multiplied. Please find enclosed check for \$6. Will you send the magazine, beginning with the first number, to the enclosed names, and to yours truly,

GWYNETH K. ROE.

Have received your sample of EUGENICS; read it carefully; still, it does not take hold. Once in a while I enjoy reading a good love story written by an artist, still I cannot develop the least interest in your EUGENICS. Am I in the same position regarding your book as the professional musician who goes to listen to a concert? Am I too positive? For instance: "The Question of Population," by C. Gonnard, a weaver: from his standpoint I understand the man perfectly; from my stand-

point I have only contempt for him. I do not think he could ever look into the muzzle of another man's gun and draw his own: he is a coward. The following illustrates: Says he: "If man wishes to escape the abominable obligation of destroying his fellow-men, he must be prudent and"—kill his own children. It does not take much courage to kill his own children.

An old German proverb says: "Dogs which bark do not bite." There is much truth in it. Most people who practice free love do not talk about it, and those who always talk about it do not practice it.

As long as I do not take any more interest in EUGENICS, I will not subscribe. Truly yours, A. PIETZOLD.

Portland, Ore.

Your favor of Aug. 19 was duly received; also the copies of your JOURNAL OF EUGENICS, which were placed on the counter and were sold before I got an opportunity to examine them and see the nature of their contents. I think I can sell EUGENICS regularly, and after I see the magazine I will be able to tell how many will be required.

W. H. EVANS.

357 1-2 Yonge St., Toronto.

My Dear Mr. Harman: The book *Strike of a Sex* has reached me. I am a kindergartner, who for some years past has done mission work on the East Side. The great problems of life confront one there, and the cry of the slave women who are doomed to a life of misery and ignorance makes one hail a man like you, who is trying to help through educating people—the only way. My grandfather was a godly man and my people are old-fashioned Christians, who look with fear upon my "advanced notions" and cannot understand my departing from my old traditions. So it is a pleasure to write to one who is in sympathy with the best—who knows what real happiness in the married life means and who is spreading the good news.

My especial interest has been with the mothers' instruction of their children. The impurity, the low ideas in little children, who in many cases could tell me—a woman of thirty-five—things that were too dreadful to think of, is so appalling that it behooves good men and women to stop and think where it is all to lead to and how they can and ought to help. That the holiest, most sacred things in life should be dragged in the mire in the eyes of the little children—what can we expect of them in after life! You have the assurance that God will bless the fruits of your labor. So you take courage and go on. Yours in sympathy,

G. L.

Glen Ridge, N. J.

Dear Lillian: Received your child clothed in its brand new dress—THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS. It's very becoming, to say the least. It was born through severe struggles, suffering imprisonment and all sorts of ignorant

UNCOOKED FOODS

AND HOW TO USE THEM.

IS THE AUTHOR CRAZY?

The LONDON MAIL says:

"No! The author of 'Uncooked Foods' is not crazy—he is just 100 years ahead of his age. His book 'Uncooked Foods' can be disputed, but it cannot be answered."

The NEW YORK HERALD says:

"'Uncooked Foods' is a book every advanced thinker ought to read."

Sent Postpaid Upon Receipt of \$1

ADDRESS THE AUTHOR:

EUGENE CHRISTIAN,
Room 45, No. 7 East 41st Street,
New York City.

persecution. I know that every stitch taken (labor of hand and heart) in its development, increasing its interest and value, is due to your dear father and yourself. Your attention has been divided between it and your dear babies. It is through the agency of yourselves and other creative workers that it has been able to live, which entitles you to the appreciation of its every reader. So here's my hand with vigorous greetings. Success, and \$1 on which to feed the new child.

Home, Wash. GERTIE VOSE.

Dear Lillian Harman: The first number of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS came duly to hand, and is very interesting and instructive. I am glad to know that Moses Harman is continuing an uncompromising battle with ignorance, superstition, bigotry, blind prejudice, and their allies. He certainly will win out in the end, and we will all lend a helping hand—all we who have learned to think and act for ourselves. Sincerely yours,

Elkins, W. Va. VALDEMAR BLAD.

Dear Sir: Although I do some magazine-subscription work and am a member of the National Association of Magazine Agents, still I have special subjects that I am personally interested in, and one of these is the "new science of eugenics," which thusly first came

under my eyes last fall or winter in *Ridgway's*. I gave three cheers. The world moves. When we give as much attention to ourselves as we have been putting upon horses, dogs, potatoes and pigs, then we will move onward and upward. The name is the best that could be devised,—name of science, I mean. I am foolish enough to believe that at least a partially open door to our juveniles, so they may know as much about themselves as they do about fishes, would produce no worse condition, either physically or morally, than now we have.

W. H. DAVIS.

Dear Friends: Have received the August number of your magazine and like it even better than the first issue. It was the name *Lucifer* which attracted my attention to your paper years ago and led me to send for a copy. Of course I love the old name, but for good reasons the change is desirable.

Concerning *The Blossoming of Tansy*. I have often thought that the writers of such stories are compelled to conclude somewhat in accordance with conventional morals and thus avoid too adverse criticism and possible suppression. They leave the rational ending to the conception of the thoughtful reader.

I could use some of those "stickers." This is a good town for propaganda work, especially in the winter season, when there are crowds of visitors, many hungry for something to read.

A. A. COWLES.

Box 82, Hot Springs, Ark.

BOOKS AND PERIODICALS FOR THINKERS AND DOERS. SCARCE WORKS FOUND.

Special Attention Given to Old and New Publications in the Field of Freethought, Secularism, Evolutionary Science, Economics, Ethics, Sex, Sociology, and Free Press. Old Works on Slavery Constitute a Leading Line. Also, Radical Fiction. What do you offer me in rare works in these departments? What do you want me to find for you?

If in your reading, you come across a rational, progressive book, new or old, let me know about it. Many a good work lies hidden for years in the enormous mass of rubbish.

Send for lists and circulars.

EDWIN C. WALKER,
244 W. 143d St., Manhattan, New York City

The man
Of virtuous soul commands not, nor
obeys.

Power, like a desolating pestilence,
Pollutes whate'er it touches; and obedience,

Bane of all genius, virtue, freedom,
truth,

Makes slaves of men, and, of the human
frame,

A mechanized automaton.

—Shelley.

Books Received.

Angels' Diary, and Celestial Study of Man.
By Mrs. Effie M. Shirey and her brother, Charles Samson—from the Celestial Sphere. Inscribed to their mother, Mrs. J. A. S. Samson-Leuder.

So long as "human love kisses the clammy lips of death," just so long will the question of continued conscious existence after the breath of life leaves the physical body be one of absorbing interest to the average human being.

All my life I have been a reader of books that treat of what is now popularly called "psychic science,"—science of *soul*,—and have spent much time and some money attending "seances," or *sittings*, for development of psychic powers and for communication with the so-called "dead," with the result that, with such investigators as Alfred Russell Wallace, Professor Crookes, Astronomer Flammarion, and many more whose names are familiar to all who care to know what is going on in the world of scientific investigation,—in common with these leaders of modern thought I have reached this conclusion:

After making due allowance for hallucinations, for fraud, for "fakes" and "fakers," such as we may reasonably expect to find in this commercial age, I am fairly well convinced that there remains a large *residuum* of fact, of truth,—of honest, intelligible, rational and helpful philosophy of science (knowledge),—to be found in the books and other literature of spiritualists and theosophists, reincarnationists, etc.

One of these books entitled as above was handed to me soon after my arrival in Los Angeles, with request that I read and tell the publisher, Mrs. Leuder, what I think of it. Together with many others this handsomely bound and well-printed volume has not received the attention I have much desired to give it. Of all cities I have ever known, Los Angeles is the least suited to routine editorial

work. Never before have such persistent and continuous demands been made upon my time and strength as since my arrival here in January last.

As the name indicates, this book purports to be an account of the experiences in spirit life of Mrs. Leuder's two children, Effie and Charles. Here are a few of the chapter headings, or subjects:

Chapter I. TRANSITION. The Contrast—Reminiscences—"The Beautiful Country"—Sensations at Death—Spiritual Embodiment—Floating, Buoyancy, Health—Angel Throng—The Barren Section—The World of Beauty—Two Roads—Heaven's Gateway—The Spheres—"No Night There"—The Home and "Dear Brother"—How Books Are Made.

Chapter VII, Part 2. A TRIP THROUGH SPACE. Beyond the Spiritual Ether—New Planetary Systems—Mars and Venus—The Martians—Stars in Process of Formation—Comets and Flying Stars—Mercury's Blue Vibrations—Some Planets Have No Light of Their Own.

There are thirty-one chapters in all, with similar array of subjects. A few sentences selected almost at random will give the reader an idea of the style and trend of thought of the book. On page 156 we read:

In passing through the different centers of transfiguration, the spiritual form becomes each time more ethereal and beautiful. But it never loses its individuality or identity. One may become more spiritual and beautiful and yet there is always something about him that belongs distinctly to himself, and which one may see. The spiritual form, as it passes through the first center of life, is electrical. The force which is generated from it is electrical. It is this form of spiritual substance that is best known to the physical. But the force surrounding it is not so high as that in the centers above, since as one continues to pass onward he draws nearer to the God-center. The force that prevails in the second center of life is Argaon [meaning a higher form of atmosphere]. They who pass through it take on a higher state of being; that is, more beautiful and ethereal.

The impressions, the suggestions, received from reading this book are all cheerful, optimistic and hopeful, and whatever we may think of the origin, or method by which the story was received

by the writer, the amanuensis thereof, the tendency of such books is in the direction of mental sanity, of human brotherhood, of peace, joy, and goodwill among men.

No price is named, but presumably \$1 would bring a copy if addressed to Mrs. J. A. S. S. Leuder, Los Angeles, Calif., care Mrs. Howell, Burbank building.

M. H.

In the Fire of the Heart, by Ralph Waldo Trine. McClure, Phillips & Co. Handsomely printed and bound in green and gold; \$1 net. Contents:

- I. With the People: A Revelation.
- II. The Conditions That Hold Among Us.
- III. As Time Deals with Nations.
- IV. As to Government.
- V. A Great People's Movement.
- VI. Public Utilities for the Public Good.
- VII. Labor and Its Uniting Power.
- VIII. Agencies Whereby We Shall Secure the People's Greatest Good.
- IX. The Great Nation.
- X. The Life of the Higher Beauty and Power.

The Confessions of a Monopolist, by Frederick C. Howe, Ph.D. The Public Publishing Co., Chicago. \$1 net. Dedicated "to those to whom justice is the law of life, monopoly the creature of legislation, poverty the product of privilege, and liberty a living inspiration." This narrative is, the author tells us, "the story of something for nothing—of making the other fellow pay. This

making the other fellow pay, of getting something for nothing, explains the lust for franchises, mining rights, tariff privileges, railway control, tax evasions. All these things mean monopoly, and all monopoly is bottomed on legislation."

The Kingdom of Love, by Henry Frank. R. F. Fenno & Co., New York. \$1. The trend of this work is indicated by the author in his "Foreword":

To those whose souls are strained in life's hard struggle; to those who bear the noise of traffic and feel the cruel pressure of commercial strife; to those whose feet have trodden stony paths, whose hearts are sore with pain and disappointment—'tis hoped these pages may become an inspiration and encouragement, and gladden with a note of joy.

To those whose skies are clear, whom favoring winds have guided to safe and happy ports, whose lives are redolent of happiness and hope, the words within may bring a touch of sympathy with those who are in want, a sense of human solidarity essential to social progress and individual unfoldment.

Woman and the Race, by Gordon Hart. The Ariel Press, Westwood, Mass. \$1, postpaid.

Mother Bickerdyke as I Knew Her, by Florence Shaw Kellogg. With an introduction by Jenkin Lloyd Jones. Unity Publishing Company, Chicago. 75c. A story full of "human interest" incidents in the life of a woman impulsive and strong in her desire to alleviate suffering.

William Godwin and Mary Wollstonecraft. By Victor Robinson. 25c. The Altrurian, 12 Mount Morris Park West, New York City.

These books will be reviewed in future issues of *EUGENICS*, as time and space permit.

Where is much desire to learn, there of necessity will be much arguing, much writing, many opinions; for opinion is but knowledge in the making.—*Milton*.

NATURE IS HARMONIOUS

in the combination of matter, as well as in its dissolution. Man, although he is but a small part of the whole of her great system, is the only one who breaks her laws and destroys his own existence. His ignorance of what constitutes marital harmony results in divorce.

KNOWLEDGE IS POWER

ABOLISH DIVORCE COURTS. READ

- "BOUND AND FREE," by Hugh Mann...\$.50
 "NEW LIGHTS," by Hugh Mann..... 1.00
 "FREEDOM," by Alice Groff..... 1.00

To readers of *EUGENICS* the three books will be sent postpaid for \$2.25.

SAMUEL A. BLOCH,
 Box A, 670 N. Oakley Av., Chicago.

At the Desk.

The subscription price of *EUGENICS* will be raised to \$1.50 a year on Jan. 1. When we changed form and name we hoped to be able to continue at the old price; but changed conditions soon made it apparent that at the nominal price of \$1 a year the average net price of subscriptions would be less than 70 cents a year. Many of our subscriptions—a constantly increasing percentage—now come through agents to whom a very liberal commission is given; also in connection with premiums and clubbing rates with other journals, by which means the subscription list is rapidly growing. Under its old form, nearly all subscriptions were direct, at full price, and the expense of production was scarcely 25 per cent of the present necessary cost. I wish, however, to ask as a special favor that all who feel that the extra 50 cents is more than they can afford to pay will inform us of the fact.

Mr. R. B. Kerr wrote a criticism of some of the sentiments expressed by Professor Larkin and the editor, and sent it to the latter at San Diego. The criticism and replies thereto, composing a sort of symposium, were to appear in this number of *EUGENICS*, but the editor's part came too late. A constitutional and family failing is thus manifested. The editor begins his work in ample time, usually; but as he never feels satisfied that it is as well done as it should be, will not send it in until the last possible minute. Then if delays occur, it is too late. This tendency is mine, also—by inheritance or otherwise. I always have much in mind which I wish to write for each issue, but as I put off writing till the last available moment, the work remains undone. The law of compensation is ef-

fective here as elsewhere, however, and this habit of procrastination prevents my using space which is needed for the constantly increasing supply of good things which come our way.

The December number will complete Volume I. of *THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS*. A few volumes, probably not to exceed a hundred, will be handsomely bound in brown cloth with gold lettering. The price will be \$1.75. Those who have sets which they wish to have bound can have the work done here at a cost of \$1 a volume.

Did you receive your September *EUGENICS*? We have had complaints of non-receipt from some of our subscribers, and if any others failed to receive that or any other number we will supply it. *EUGENICS* should reach subscribers soon after the 20th of the month preceding date of issue.

We can now supply on application neat little slips with subscription blank on one side, and on the reverse a statement to be signed by the person sending it out. This can be inclosed in letters to liberal-minded friends. We

THE FREE SPEECH LEAGUE.

Invites correspondence, co-operation, and membership of all who claim rights, and dare maintain them.

Join us. Help us.

Get our list of books.

Read them—pass them on.

Liberty tracts by Ingersoll, Wakeman, Walker, Pentecost, Darrow, Post, and Schroeder. Read *Our Vanishing Liberty of Press*, 5c, and *Do You Want Free Speech?* 10c, and so learn why you should act with us.

FREE SPEECH LEAGUE,
120 LEXINGTON AV., NEW YORK.

will allow a liberal commission to all who secure subscriptions in this way.

In a quotation from Theodore Roosevelt in September *EUGENICS* the printer credited him with saying that "if wives refuse to have children . . . then they are animals." Mr. Roosevelt's criticism was not so mild. His real assertion was that such women are "criminals."

Is this a promise or a threat?

Last number of *EUGENICS* is fine, but your announcement of lukewarmness in the future leads me to feel the necessity for another and more radical publication to take its place.

Why to "take the place" of *EUGENICS*? I have always believed that, instead of supplying a demand and thereby crowding out the old, each new radical publication helps to create a demand for such literature, and so I welcome

PERSONAL MAGNETISM.

Why Not Become Attractive and Influential?

Some people possess a silent and unseen power which attracts others, who in turn find pleasure in conferring their confidence, good will and patronage.

That silent power we term Personal Magnetism. It can be acquired through cultivation.

LEROY BERRIER'S

Cultivation of Personal Magnetism

is a book that tells just how to acquire this desirable power. This book is guaranteed to give satisfaction. Price: Cloth, \$1.00; paper, 50c.

JUST OUT:

"The Power of Self-Formation."

By Same Author.

Price in cloth, gilt top, 80 cts.; in paper, 50 cts.

This book presents the Human Culturists' methods of utilizing **AUTO-SUGGESTION** in **SELF-FORMATION**. One man after reading it wrote and told the author: "You have done more good than any man that ever lived."

FREE On request, an eight-page folder describing **THE MASTERSHIP COURSE**.

Address **LEROY BERRIER**,
2301 Farnam St. DAVENPORT, IOWA.

FREE! Interesting literature concerning the science of Astrology and its coincident philosophy will be mailed on receipt of 2c stamp to pay postage. Dr. J. H. Tilden, editor of "Stuffed Club," wrote to the author of this literature: "I have always enjoyed what I have received from you—you are the only man in the line that you are representing that has ever interested me." Ad., Frank Theodore Allen, Box 680, Berlin, N. J.

every such effort. This correspondent is amply able, financially, to maintain a creditable publication, and I would be pleased to see him do so. It is a very interesting way in which to spend money. But I have promised no "lukewarmness" either in the columns of *EUGENICS* or elsewhere.

The "Secretary of the Altrurians" in a postscript to a business letter gives me this information:

Dr. Robinson received two communications this morning in which it was stated that his was the only "sane and wholesome" article that has appeared in *THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS* since its foundation.

I am glad to know that Dr. Robinson's correspondents are so well pleased. If they have read everything which has appeared in all the numbers of *EUGENICS* their patience certainly deserves to be rewarded. I presume there are several people in the world who would not be able to find even one "sane and wholesome" article in *EUGENICS*.

Here is a New York physician, for

DR. MORRIS LYCHENHEIM, OSTEOPATH.

39 STATE STREET,

Suite 507 Burton Bldg., Chicago.

TELEPHONE: CENTRAL 3670.

Osteopathic Treatment, inclusive of the Electric Sun-Bath, the Horizontal Jet (External Water) Douche Baths, Healing (Medical) Exercise, Vibratory Treatment, Dietetics, Respiration, and Hygiene.

J. RUSSELL PRICE, M. D.,

1637 Indiana Avenue, Chicago.

Phone: Calumet 734.

J. H. GREER, M. D.,

52 DEARBORN STREET, CHICAGO.

Telephone: Market 1344.

OFFICE HOURS: 9 a. m. to 6 p. m.; Wednesdays and Saturdays till 8; Sundays, 9 to 12.

DR. OGILVIE RICE,
DENTIST.

1556 Milwaukee avenue, near Western, Chicago.

instance, who was not able, in a fifteen minutes' examination, to find anything deserving his attention:

I thank you for sending me a copy of THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS. I read it for a quarter of an hour, and do not care to read much more. A second number will not see my eyes. In Emile Zola's novels I was interested for a few days, but I have nothing but aversion to such literature. It is in all large cities. I am glad that the department in medicine gives me no opportunity, but aversion. Please do not send me the Journal. I have no time [even] for my journals for eye and for ear. Yours truly, Dr. H. KNAPP.

The news items which are sent to the daily press and not published are usually of more importance than those which do appear, though not so sensational. As we have friends on several of the great dailies, we see and hear of much such matter. In the Earle case, for example,

C. J. ZEITINGER,

Water-Power Expert, River Improvement Engineer, Promoter of All Public Utilities, and Real-Estate and Business Broker. Investigation and reports for financial institutions and municipalities. Public utilities improved and made valuable by judicious and energetic management.

NO. 40 BENTON PLACE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

GOLD. SILVER. COPPER.

CHARLES FRANCIS BLACKBURN,
MINING GEOLOGIST.

Mines and Mining; 33 years' experience. Can make big money for you on mining investments.

Victorville, San Bernardino Co., Cal.

WALTER BREEN, RENTALS AND REAL ESTATE.

Rents Collected and Property Cared For.
613 BEE BUILDING, OMAHA, NEBR.

PHILIP G. PEABODY,

Attorney and Counsellor at Law.

15 COURT SQUARE, ROOM 61, BOSTON, MASS.

CHOICE 6% MORTGAGES TO SELL.

FRANK WELLER, Mitchell, S. D.

L. N. SCHMIDT & SON, Undertakers and Embalmers. CARRIAGES.

1519 MILWAUKEE AVENUE, CHICAGO.
Telephone Humboldt 2116.

interviews with the principals and their neighbors giving reasonable views and explanations were considered unavailable. Here is a portion of an interview which was not sufficiently sensational for publication:

Mr. Wack owns the estate adjoining that of the Earles in Monroe and has known the family for years. Mr. Wack stated that it was arranged that Mrs. Earle should have for life the income of a portion of

SENSIBLE, USEFUL GIFTS for the HOLIDAYS

Attractively Packed in Handsome Single Pair Boxes

They contain more and better rubber than any other make, have gold-plated non-rusting metal parts and strong cord ends that cannot wear through. The new back free action permits ease and comfort no matter what position the body may assume.

THEY OUTFEAT THREE ORDINARY KINDS, WHICH MEANS THREE TIMES THE SERVICE OF USUAL 50 CENT SOLETS

The MOST COMFORTABLE suspender made for man, youth or boy

In Light, Heavy or Extra Heavy Weights, Extra Long (No Extra Cost)

They make inexpensive gifts every man, youth or boy will gladly receive

HEWES & POTTER, Dept. 933, 87 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.

Our Buckle Dog Suspenders Down and Out mailed for 10c. postage. Instruction booklet, Style, or How to Dress Correctly, free if you mention this publication

50¢

her husband's estate, worth over \$200,000.

"So far as Mrs. Earle's divorce plans in France are concerned, I have no knowledge of them, nor of the grounds upon which a divorce is to be sought," said Mr. Wack.

"I have known the Earles for years, and my connection with the case is that of a neighbor who has been sought by both parties as their attorney in the matter of certain financial and property settlements between them. My family knew the Earles and liked them for many fine qualities, besides their exceptional talents.

"Both are persons of much force of character and each desires to live a life unextinguished by the other. Their separation is a matter of mutual desire and was settled upon long before Mr. Earle met the woman who has been exploited as his next wife.

"While my province in this affair has been limited to that of arranging financial

affairs between Earle and his wife, I have observed nothing but generosity on Mr. Earle's part and satisfaction on that of Mrs. Earle.

"Earle has been condemned because he broke the laws of conventionality," continued Mr. Wack, "but he really has accomplished openly what hundreds of people do secretly and retain the respect of their fellow-citizens. Mrs. Earle has clamored for a separation for a long time, and she wanted it perhaps more than the husband did. The birth of the child made the separation hard, but it was mutually agreed to.

"Earle is a man of exceptional versatility. Few people know that he is a splendid musician. He is also an athlete. He is not only morally courageous, but can defend his convictions with his fists if it is necessary."

LILLIAN.

WAR!

The Elgin and Waltham Watch Companies have indirectly declared war on John C. Dueber, of the Hampton Watch Co., and small competitors. By continually reducing prices they hope to drive out competitors or force them into a Trust. John C., many times a millionaire, but who employs Union Labor only, will not join them in their nefarious scheme. He promptly meets all reductions made by the older companies, until now watches are actually sold far below value. Note the latest quotations:

23-jeweled "Special Railway" - - -	\$26.00
"New Railway," 23 jewels - - - -	20.00
"John Hancock," 21 jewels - - - -	16.50
"Dueber Watch Co.," 21 jewels, only -	15.00

All above in silverine screw case, prepaid.

In 20-year gold-filled case, \$3 more.

Every watch new from factory and guaranteed to pass Railway Inspectors.

The 17-jeweled Hampton, adjusted - -	\$8.00
--------------------------------------	--------

17-jeweled, not adjusted - - - - -	7.00
------------------------------------	------

15-jeweled - - - - -	6.00
----------------------	------

7-jeweled - - - - -	4.50
---------------------	------

In 20-year gold-filled case, \$3 more. All prepaid, with guaranty. **Buy now!** When this war is over you will pay 30 per cent more.

OTTO WETTSTEIN,

The Liberal Mail-Order Jeweler.

LA GRANGE, COOK COUNTY, ILL.,

can save you 20 per cent on Watches, Diamonds or anything in the Jeweler's Line.

Write me and receive prices, and my great little tract, "**Theism in the Crucible**," free.

CHILD-BUILDING, SOCIALISM, SPIRITUALISM AND CHRISTIANITY, from an Angel's Viewpoint, through mediumship of Dr. ROBERT GREEN, 409 N. Fourth av., Maywood, Ill. Angel claims Hungarian birth and known as LOUIS KOSSUTH. Price 25c.

DIET VS. DRUGS.—"The Dietetic Way to Health and Beauty," 5c. "A Nut and Fruit Dietary for Brain-Workers," 5c. "Sexuality and Vitality"; the average person sacrifices his vital powers on the altar of his passions; cause and cure given; 10c. J. B. BARNHILL, Xenia, Ill.

YOUR ATTENTION

IS CALLED TO

THE STELLAR RAY

A magazine of universal thought for thinking people. It is seeking for its readers those who are in pursuit of

Twentieth Century Thought Currents

Currents of thought that do not flow between stone walls of prejudice, but are free to search through all scientific methods for solutions of life's meaning.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: In the United States, Mexico, Cuba and Island possessions of the United States, \$1.00. Foreign, except as noted above (six shillings), \$1.50.

ASTRO PUBLISHING COMPANY

HODGES BLDG.

DETROIT, MICH.

CORRESPONDENCE CLUB Each member has a number. Letters forwarded through this office. None need disclose identity until they choose. For further particulars enclose stamp. Also give brief personal.

C. A. KIRK, Mitchell, S. D.

ARE YOU EVER LONELY? Join the Happy Thought Club, organized to create congenial friendships by correspondence. Membership \$1 per year. Correspondents harmoniously assigned. Describe self and correspondent desired. Kindly enclose stamp. Address Mehtatable Hanford, Mgr., 2707 N. Robey St., Chicago.

The Young People.

"What will become of the children?"

CONDUCTED BY WINIFRED.

THE VISION OF SIR LAUNFAL.

PRELUDE I.

The preludes of the *Vision of Sir Launfal* form fitting backgrounds for the body of the poem. The first, a summer scene, tells of an ideal June day. Birds singing and flowers blooming—what more is needed for a perfect day? What matter it if the winter winds have brought sufferings? As Lowell says,

No matter how barren the past may have been,
'Tis enough for us now that the leaves are green.

Our hearts cannot help but be cheerful and happy in harmony with those rare and beautiful days of June.

PART I.

Sir Launfal was setting out on his quest for the Holy Grail. He ordered his servants and lackeys to bring him his richest mail in preparation for the morrow.

Sir Launfal was young, handsome, strong, and brave, with a purity of heart which he believed qualified him for the search; but there was lacking in him that element of humility, of brotherly love, without which he could never find the sacred cup. He was proud, very proud, and his castle was open only to the highest noblemen and women.

He sank on a bed of rushes and soon "into his soul a vision flew." He thought that he was passing out of the gates of his castle to begin his search, when he saw, seated by the wall, a poor, moaning leper. As Sir Launfal passed him, he shrank back with disgust from the loathsome creature and scornfully cast him a piece of gold. The leper did not take up the gold, but said that any gift, given with pity, however poor,

was welcome to him; but it was worthless gold that was given from a sense of duty.

PRELUDE II.

The second, a winter scene, forms a sharp and bitter, but fitting, contrast to the first prelude.

It forms the setting of a picture, as the first does, but with such a difference!

The wind,—not now a mild summer one, but a cold winter one,—sweeps down the mountainside. It was snowing, and covered everything with a white blanket. The little brook, which had laughed along so merrily in summer, had now frozen up, and was covered with a frost-work of ice. No birds were singing, no flowers were growing; all was covered with the drear gloom of winter, and through Sir Launfal's gray hair the wind seemed to sing, "Shelterless! Shelterless! Shelterless!"

PART II.

Many years after, Sir Launfal, now an old man, came back from his search, which had been in vain. But not all in vain, for he, by his sufferings, had gained what he never had had before—that feeling of sympathy which can come to the proud only through many and bitter trials. He came back to the castle, ready to be received with open arms by his former friends; but the castle was in another's hands, and he was turned from his own gates into the bitter cold into which he had turned so many in former years.

As Sir Launfal turned sadly away, his eyes encountered an object outside the wall. It was the same leper to whom he had tossed the gold that bright June morning so many years ago. But there were different feelings in Sir Launfal's heart now, and as he gazed on the

leper a great wave of compassion swept over him.

He broke the ice of the little brook and gathered some water in a cup. Holding this and a crust of bread toward the leper, he bade him share his food. The leper accepted, and together they ate. The bread was the coarsest, but to the leper it was made of fine wheaten flour, and the water became the richest wine.

As the leper held the cup, Sir Launfal looked, and lo! before his eyes the leper was transformed into the Christ and the cup into the Holy Grail!

Sir Launfal bowed his head and the vision told him that for many years he had searched in foreign lands without avail, but through that one act of charity, his first one, was the Holy Grail found.

The vision vanished and Sir Launfal awoke, but ever after that he led a life of charity, and his castle was always open to the poor and sick.

PHILIP HALLIDAY.

Dear Winifred: I am reading your department with much interest, and I am glad that you have started it. I am sure that many young people will contribute to it.

I am fourteen years old and in my first year in high school. We are studying Lowell's *Vision of Sir Launfal*. I am sending you a review of it which my teacher marked excellent. Hoping that your department will be a success, I am, yours truly,

PHILIP HALLIDAY.

My Dear Winifred: I am glad you are going to have a "Children's Department." I will like to read the letters and stories.

I am ten years old, and live with my papa and mama in a mining camp. We came here from Colorado. We are seven-

SCENE NEAR ROUND MOUNTAIN, NEV.



The boy playing by the side of the rushing stream is Richard Williams.

ty-five miles from a railroad. My mama will have to teach me this year.

We live in a pretty canyon with trees and flowers, and water running by our door. I go wading and fishing.

I hope a lot of boys and girls will write to your column.

RICHARD WILLIAMS.

Round Mount, Nevada.

OLD PEOPLE'S HOME (chartered) wants help, bequests and joiners; also Institute of Honor and Peace Society, petitioning Congress for peace laws and disarmament of nations. Send names, or for petition. Am poor; please help expense to Congress. Institute grants certificate; send proof of honor and \$1. Help published in *EUGENICS*. Literature for postage. DR. WILLIAMS, Pres., Cherryvale, Kan.

OLLIE M. STEDMAN,

600 FULTON STREET, CHICAGO, ILL.

Piano, Harmony, Mandolin.

Special Attention Given to Beginners.

**PRINTING OF ALL KINDS.
GOOD WORK.**

J. B. CALDWELL, 79 5th Av., Chicago.

Reasonable Prices. Phone: Market 1170.

"MEATLESS DISHES" A COPY FREE!

A unique Cook-Book, giving tested recipes for healthful and appetizing dishes without meats or animal fats. Sent Free, postpaid, as a premium to new subscribers only who remit 25c for three months' subscription to the

VEGETARIAN MAGAZINE.

The only publication of its kind in America. Official Organ of the Vegetarian Society of America and all its branches. Read it and learn how to become stronger, healthier, brainer, happier. Worth many times its cost to any one wanting to better his or her condition in life.

Get the Magazine for 3 months on trial (25c) and "Meatless Dishes" thrown in.

Or, if preferred, a copy of "Cleanliness the First Principle of Hygiene," free with 3 months' subscription.

Or Adelaide Johnson's great book, "Harmony: The Real Secret of Health, Happiness and Success," free with 6 months' subscription (50c).

Or all three of the above Books sent Free upon receipt of \$1.00 for a year's subscription.

These premium offers good for a limited time only. Better remit today. You won't regret it!

VEGETARIAN MAGAZINE,
80 DEARBORN STREET, CHICAGO.
(SAMPLE COPY FREE.)

ESSENOLOGY

If you want to know how to use the powers of your mind in Prevision, Telepathy, Self-Healing, Weather Forecasting, and Mineral Divination, send for pamphlet.

COUGHER MENTAL TRAINING SCHOOL,
Simpson Block, Kansas City, Kans.

Our Course of Six Lessons in FUNDAMENTAL THINKING,

Commencing with "The Origin of Thought," and ending with "The Limitation of Thought," "How to Know Truth," and "The Power of Generalization," will cause every real Educator and Psychologist in the world to sit up and take notice.

The Fake Psychologists will not dare go through this course or mention it to others, because it will put them out of business.

Every One Needs It—

There Are No Exceptions.

THE COURSE IS WORTH \$1,000.
IT COSTS \$5.00.

To-Morrow School of Clear Thinking,
2238 Calumet Av., Chicago, Ill.

REFERENCE—Any Professor of Mental Science in the World.

THERE ARE ALL KINDS OF CURES,
and There Is Good in All, but

A STUFFED CLUB

Is Unique in Teaching Rational Thinking
on These Lines.

PRICE \$1.00 PER YEAR.

Send 10c for sample copy to
A STUFFED CLUB, DENVER, COLO.

YOUR OPPORTUNITY IS NOW.

THE
SWASTIKA



The Ancient Symbol of
Good Fortune.

TO BE GIVEN AWAY FREE:

50,000 Lovely Gifts. A Beautiful Solid Silver Swastika Pin free to each yearly subscriber to

THE SWASTIKA

"A Magazine of Triumph." (Published monthly.) Edited by Dr. Alexander J. McIvor-Tyndall. Devoted to the Message of Truth and Individuality.

Special features are Health Hints, Personal Problems, Psychological Experiences, Metaphysical Healing. New Thought, Psychic Science, and some well-known writers, among whom are: Yono Simada, Japanese philosopher; Grant Wallace, Grace M. Brown, Dr. George W. Carey, George Edwin Burnell, Margaret McIvor-Tyndall; Baba Bhareti, the Hindu sage, and others.

\$1.00 PER YEAR. 10c A COPY.

Trial Subscription Four Months, 35c.

SEND FOR THE SWASTIKA SERIES OF BOOKS BY DR. McIVOR-TYNDALL.

Ghosts: A Message from the Illuminati, 35c; How Thought Can Kill, 25c; How to Reap Thought, 12c; Proofs of Immortality, 12c. Send your order NOW. Address

THE SWASTIKA, Dept. E., Wahlgreen Pub. Co., 1742-48 Stout St., Denver, Colo.

IS WOMAN DOOMED

By Mother Nature to suffer all her days for fulfilling the mission to which Nature calls her? The answer is that most of woman's suffering is unnatural and therefore unnecessary.

"The Abuse of the Marriage Relation"

Is the work of a physician of wide knowledge and experience. The woman who reads this book and follows it can avoid most of the chronic diseases that wreck so many wives and mothers.

It is a book for every married person who wants to enjoy the life of home and family.

The book is sent postpaid on receipt of
25 CENTS IN STAMPS OR COIN.

B. LUST, N. D.,
Dep. Nat., 125 East 59th St.,
New York City.

LOVE:

The World's Highest Thought, Word,
Motive, Action, Life, God.

JAS. T. L. MacDONALD, Editor and Publisher

THE CAXTON PRESS,
1023 East 49th St., Los Angeles, Cal.

10 CENTS A COPY. \$1.00 A YEAR.

BABA BHARATI, Editor of *The Light of India*, Los Angeles, Cal.: "Your little magazine of Love I read with the deepest interest, for its messages sink into my heart and fill my soul, making it all the richer for it. It is an unusually happy conception, your little magazine, big with the deepest meaning of life."

REYNOLD E. BLIGHT, in the *Los Angeles Fellowship*: "Every word is an inspiration, and no one could have been omitted without loss. This little monthly will not follow the usual direction of periodicals into the waste-paper basket; but, by reason of its great words, and attractive appearance, will remain on the study table, to be taken up at odd moments when one wants a breath from the spiritual heights."

BENJAMIN FAY MILLS, Pastor of the Fellowship Church, Los Angeles, Cal.: "I thank you for the copies of your beautiful little magazine. I need not say that both the contents of the magazine and its form are exceedingly attractive and along the lines with which I am in the heartiest sympathy."

500 PARCELS OF MAIL FREE TO YOU

No 2 aike. Address **THE MAIL,**
Dept. 3, Kennedy, N. Y.

THE MOUNTAIN PINE

COLORADO'S MAGAZINE.

Published Under the Shadow of Pike's Peak.

Devoted to pushing on the car of human progress. An exponent of the principles of Practical Socialism. Spiritualistic in religion, and always full of the best New Thought.

If you want the best there is in its lines, send 10 cents for a sample copy, or \$1 for a year's subscription.

THE MOUNTAIN PINE,
Crystola, Green Mountain Falls, Colo.

IF You Are Not Hide-Bound in Your THINKING APPARATUS

You ought to subscribe for that peculiar magazine published twelve times a year by the Chief of the Tribe. The little Brown Book is called "**The Ghourki**" and will be sent you twelve times for **25c.** You may not like it, but it will do you good nevertheless. There are several thousand members of the Tribe now. Why not send 25c and join this growing organization, and get *The Ghourki* a year at the same time? Address

THE CHIEF OF THE TRIBE,
Morgantown, W. Va.

THE SOCIALIST WOMAN.

Are you interested in the woman question? Read **THE SOCIALIST WOMAN**, a staunch champion of the rights of women of all lands. Published monthly. 35 cents a year; foreign, 50 cents.

THE SOCIALIST WOMAN,
619 East 55th Street, Chicago.

SPECIAL OFFER, \$1.20.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF

EUGENICS

AND

TO-MORROW MAGAZINE,
BOTH FOR ONE YEAR, \$1.20

William Godwin and Mary Wollstonecraft.

By VICTOR ROBINSON,

The Solitary Sentinel of Altruria.

WILLIAM GODWIN was the Father of Philosophic Radicalism in England. His wife, MARY WOLLSTONECRAFT, was the Pioneer of the Woman Suffrage Movement. Yet the present generation of reformers knows little about these glorious Liberals. This booklet tells of Godwin's early life, of his development from orthodoxy to the championship of rationalism, of his epoch-making "Political Justice," of his narrow escape from imprisonment on the charge of high treason, of his first meeting and dislike of Mary Wollstonecraft, of his later love and marriage with her, of her former marriage and attempt at suicide, of their views on the marriage relation, of the storm which Mary Wollstonecraft caused by writing "A Vindication of the Rights of Women," of her lamented death, of her talented daughter who eloped with Shelley, of Godwin's subsequent love affairs, of his philosophy, of his old age, etc.

This booklet is splendidly bound in substantial covers and artistically printed on special paper. It is illustrated with rare and excellent portraits of Godwin and Wollstonecraft. PRICE, PREPAID, 25 CENTS.

THE ALTRURIANS,

12 MOUNT MORRIS PARK WEST, NEW YORK CITY.

EVERGREEN EUGENICS.

There is no other publication, except THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS, that gives as much consideration to the Problems of Sex as

SOUNDVIEW,

Exponent of the Society of Evergreens, composed of Men-Not-Afraid-of-an-Idea (and Women). A special feature of this magazine of sound views is

A SEX SYMPOSIUM,

being a discussion of this basic question by some of the deepest thinkers and best writers of the present time. The series began in January, 1905, and will continue during 1907 and 1908.

A FEW COMPLETE SETS

containing this interesting discussion can be had for \$3, including a 1907 subscription and a copy of "Wildwood Philosophy" (a cloth-bound book by one of the "Simple Lifers"). Regular price \$1 per year, 10 cents the copy. On sale at news stands.

"What Is Purity? A Study of Sex Overvaluation," by Theodore Schroeder, is one of the many grand articles in this series. No Eugenic reader should fail to read this epoch-making article.

Special to Students of Eugenics.

For 50 cents we will send Soundview the balance of 1907 and a copy of Mr. Schroeder's article, just issued in book form. We want to get you into the "Evergreen Habit."

The Evergreens, Olalla, Wash., U. S. A.

ARE YOU INTERESTED IN TELEPATHY?

Of course you are. Every one is interested today and most folk will be using it tomorrow. Would you like to be one of these?

Here is your chance. We are making a great experiment in Telepathy for the purpose of collecting data for scientific generalization and to prove the scientific basis of Telepathic Absent Treatment, and we want receivers in every part of the world to get messages from this center every week (over 500 enrolled Sept. 3). Every one of these receivers will get a complete course of instruction and training in the theory and practice of Telepathy, consisting of monthly lessons, special instructions when needed, and actual practice in receiving a message every week. This is the most complete and practical course ever offered to the public, and it is given free to every one who helps with this experiment. Write your full name and address on a postal and send it for enrollment, or ask for fuller information.

This is straight and practical. Address WELTMER'S MAGAZINE, NEVADA, MO.



An Indian Secret OBJECTIONABLE Hair Removed

without injury; quickly, permanently SEE-HAIR-GO. A perfumed powder.

One application often sufficient.

Sample for mere cost of mailing.

Did you ever see an Indian with hair on his face? The reason for the lack of hair, it is said, lies in the fact that the ingredients in the paints used for centuries on the faces of American Indians have removed all hirute growth. Send 4 cents in stamps for trial package and many letters from those who have used it, or if you have faith that our preparation will do all we claim under our guarantee, send \$1.00 for generous carton. Money returned if dissatisfied. ME-DA-WIN MFG. CO., Dept. 5, 155 Washington St., Chicago

HOW TO HAVE PRIZE BABIES.

A SHORT TALK TO SENSIBLE PEOPLE, ADULTS OF BOTH SEXES.

Some folks do not favor plain talk; they would prudishly prefer our headline to read: "How to Be Prudent Parents and Produce Praiseworthy Progeny."

Herbert Spencer wrote: "For the due discharge of parental functions, the proper guidance is to be found in science."

Amen, say we; just so; that's it; and after learning how to live right for your own sake, nothing can be more important than knowing how "to have and to hold" prize babies.

If "race suicide" is deplorable, then race improvement (stirpiculture, or scientific propagation) is very desirable, and, in short, plain talk, that simply means knowing how to mate and breed.

To wed or not to wed—when and whom to wed,—these are questions that most normal men and women must decide some time.

To breed or not to breed—who may and who ought not to—are some more questions that occur to thoughtful persons with due sense of responsibility for their acts.

Reckless, thoughtless, and ignorant people are overtaxing all public institutions with foundlings, feeble-minded, crippled, and incorrigible children.

To ruin yourself by ignorant misuse of mind or body, and have "hell to pay," is sorrowful enough, but

To pass on your blights, defects and diseases to innocent babes becomes a crime grievous in proportion as we come to know better.

At marriage ceremonies we are generally reminded that "marriage is ordained of God," and scripture teaches that "male and female created He them."

Then true reverence for Divine wisdom requires us to study the natural relations of the sexes, and learn all we can of harmonious marriage and wise parentage.

Newspapers are overloaded with sickening details of mismatched couples, marital murder trials, divorce suits, deserted infants, and no end of the mutual miseries of marriage.

"Is marriage a failure?" is becoming a general cry, since many fools rush in where wise ones fear to tread.

Ellis Wheeler Willcox, in the *New York Journal*, rightly says: "Who is to blame but the fathers and mothers of both bride and groom? *It is upon the fathers and mothers of the land that nine-tenths of the blame for all unhappy marriages of the world rests. It is the ridiculous false modesty of parents and their shameful indifference to a subject which is the root of all existence.*"

An editorial in the *Minneapolis Tribune*, a conservative daily, well says: "After all, we are not very wise in dealing with obscure but vital questions that underlie the very foundations of civilized society. . . . We pour out money like water to endow colleges to teach everything, from Sanscrit to making mud pies, excepting the laws and conditions of that on which the vitality and perpetuity of the race depends. *We teach sons and daughters everything on earth except how to be fathers and mothers.*"

Parents should read up and do their duty, and when they fail, young folks should instruct themselves by the aid of good books. Therefore we say to them: "Look before you leap," be careful, go slow, study up, and prepare for the most important steps in life!

Those who agree with us so far will be glad to learn further of a book which essays to cover all these points, and which has been happily named Dr. Foote's "**HOME CYCLOPEDIA of Popular Medical, Social, and Sexual Science**"—largely devoted to the consideration of **Love, Marriage, and Parentage**, and all most pressing problems of family life. This is **THE BOOK** for every one who is married or expects to be. About half of it is "plain home talk" about the sexual relations, marriage, its history in all countries, curious varieties and experiments, mistakes, reforms and possible improvements. All who hesitate to consult home physicians about delicate questions will find them plainly answered in this great work of 1,200 pages, by an authority of fifty years' experience. By mail to any address for only \$2.00.

This Coupon Is Worth 50 Cents to the Buyer of DR. FOOTE'S HOME CYCLOPEDIA.

This great \$2.00 book (as large as many sold at \$5.00) sent on receipt of \$1.50 with this coupon; "money back" if not suited.

MURRAY HILL PUBLISHING CO.

129 East 28th St., New York.



SEE RAILROAD LIFE AS IT IS!

Vigorous editorials, romance, poetry, prose and fiction, perfectly illustrated, all go to make up a rattling good publication called THE IRON TRAIL MAGAZINE.

"It is to the railroad world what Scribner's or McClure's is to the general reading public." YOU WILL LIKE IT. Send fifty cents now for a trip of six months. \$1.00 a year. Agents wanted.

THE IRON TRAIL MAGAZINE

247 Hennepin Ave., Minneapolis, Minn. U. S. A.

Please say you saw it in Eugenics when answering ads.

The Most Interesting Books for Americans of Today

The story, told simply and directly and without argument, of how the masses work without getting, while the few get without working; and how America can become really free. **Free America**, by Bolton Hall. With illustrations by Dan Beard. Cloth, 75 cents, postpaid. Paper, 25 cents, postpaid.

A stirring, fascinating novel of political and business life in New York, containing the romance of a young lawyer of high and strong character, who enters politics and attacks special privilege. **The Romance of John Bainbridge**, by Henry George, Jr. Cloth, gilt top, \$1.50, postpaid.

The realistic life-story of a typical, successful business man of the present time, showing his business and political methods and how he becomes the manager of his party in a great State, and finally a member of the United States Senate. **The Confessions of a Monopolist**, by Frederic C. Howe. Cloth, \$1.00, postpaid.

A fearless dissection of recent social, business, and political developments, with an eloquent warning that there is a moral law which will exact swift and fearful retribution from those who transgress it. **The Cost of Something for Nothing**, by John B. Altgeld. Cloth, gilt top, \$1.00, postpaid.

The most practical instructor in the means to a long, healthy and happy life; the famous work of the great Venetian centenarian, Louis Cornaro, who fathomed the secret of longevity more effectually probably than any other person, retaining his complete mental and bodily power until his death at the age of 103. **The Art of Living Long**, by Louis Cornaro; translated and edited by Wm. F. Butler. Cloth, gilt top, illustrated, \$1.50, postpaid.

A vivid and unsparing picture of American life to-day, showing how our princes live, their amusements and dissipations, and the physical, mental and moral deterioration of the masses; with fearless treatment of the most vital questions before the American citizen, showing how simple the troubles really are and how easily they can be cured. **The Menace of Privilege**, by Henry George, Jr. Cloth, \$1.50, postpaid.

A delightful, inspiring statement of the noble ideals of genuine democracy, and of the moral law as applied to government; with a clear and simple explanation of many complicated problems of present life, such as trusts, competition, socialism, imperialism, patriotism, etc. **Ethics of Democracy** [in a fundamental, not partisan, sense], by Louis F. Post. Silk cloth, gilt top, large 12mo, \$2.00, postpaid.

The People's Book Club

Lock Box 1051, Chicago, Ill.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS

The Pioneer Magazine in the English Language Devoted to Prenatal Culture and the Right of Every Child to Be Well Born.

It Treats of Sexual Science

In a Sane, Intelligent, and Inoffensive manner. It points out the vital necessity for a broader knowledge of Sexual Hygiene. Hence it opposes any attempt to restrict Instruction in Sexual Science.

Reproduction of the Human Race

Is discussed by men and women who have made a special study of the Sexual Relations, and who realize that Quality is of more importance than Numbers.

It Insists on the Freedom of Men and Women

From Sexual Slavery. It insists on the Right of Every Woman to the Control of Her Own Person. It insists that Woman alone shall be the one to decide When and Under What Conditions she will bring a New Human Being into Existence.

Following are some of the articles which have appeared in previous issues of the Magazine:

JULY.

Opposition to Freedom of the Press.....	
Theodore Schroeder, Attorney for the Free Speech League.....	
Paternal Impressions.....	Dr. E. B. Foote, Jr.
Reproduction of the Unfit.....	J. M. Crane
Marriage as a Business Proposition.....	Edwin C. Walker
The Scientific Method and Eugenics.....	M. Florence Johnson
Medical Interest in Eugenics.....	Hulda L. Potter-Loomis

AUGUST.

A Study in Social Psychology.....	Rev. Sidney Holmes
Relative Sex-Morality.....	James Armstrong
The Question of Population.....	C. Gonnard
The Song of Maternity (Poem).....	Lillian Browne-Thayer
The Fruit of the Spirit.....	Lillian Harman
Culture.....	M. Florence Johnson
The Kingdom of the Soul.....	Mrs. D. Steele
Life, Health, and Longevity.....	M. Harman

SEPTEMBER.

Slaughter of Babies in Chicago.....	Raymond Parnell, M. D.
Why Do Purists Object to Sex-Discussion?.....	Theodore Schroeder
"The Unwritten Law".....	E. C. Walker
"Votes for Women".....	George Bedborough
Climatology and Eugenics.....	Joseph Steiner, Ph. D.
Right Marital Relations.....	F. A. Binney
Sanity, Ceremony, and Love.....	James Armstrong
Marriage.....	Moses Harman

OCTOBER.

Dr. Saleeby on "Ideal Marriage".....	Raymond Parnell, M. D.
Fallacies of Puritanism.....	R. B. Kerr
Stirpiculture.....	R. W. Shufeldt, M. D.
Sex in Social Evolution.....	Paul Tyner
Remarks on Monogamic Marriage.....	William J. Robinson, Ph. G., M. D.
An Almost Forgotten Reformer.....	John A. Lant
A New Public Guardian.....	Edw. D. White
The Personal Problem.....	Leta Stetter Belfort

Back numbers, with the exception of the July number, can be had for 10 cents each. Our supply of the July number is limited, and will be sent only to those who subscribe for EUGENICS for one year, beginning with that number.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

Because of the heavy expense of publishing a high-class magazine on superior paper, the subscription price of EUGENICS will be increased to \$1.50 a year on January 1, 1908. Prior to that date subscriptions will be received for one or more years at the present low rate of ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS, 500 FULTON STREET, CHICAGO

Ask your news-dealer for The American Journal of Eugenics.