

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री प्रशासन अकादमी
Lal Bahadur Shastri Academy of Administration

मसूरी
MUSSOORIE

पुस्तकालय
LIBRARY

अवाप्ति संख्या

Accession No. ~~1515~~ 100392

वर्ग संख्या

Class No. 155-332

पुस्तक संख्या

Book No. Lud.

GL 155.332

LUD



100392
LBSNAA

MAN: AN INDICTMENT

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

WOMAN :
A VINDICATION

Daily Mail : "A strange wild work, attacking all the conventions of daily life—iconoclastic, and not written for babes and sucklings. . . . His book will certainly provoke fierce controversy. It is one of the most notable that have appeared for many months, whether the reader agrees or disagrees with it."

Truth : "What Newton's *Principia* did for the Solar System, that Ludovici's *Woman : a Vindication* has done for the Eternal Feminine. We know now why Woman does all the baffling things she does as surely as we know why the apple falls downwards."

MAN: AN INDICTMENT

by

ANTHONY M.^o LUDOVICI

LONDON

CONSTABLE & CO LTD

1927

Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London

PREFACE

IN the present treatise I propose to deal with that aspect of the Sex problem not already dealt with in either my *Woman: A Vindication*, or *Lysistrata*. Following the method adopted in the former of these two volumes, I shall first discuss the subject in its general bearings, and shall then proceed to examine in detail those features of it which are confined more particularly to Great Britain, and to those countries where British influence has created conditions similar to those prevailing in these islands.

As man in his sexual rôle and adaptations has not been discussed nearly as often as woman, and his psychological idiosyncrasies have not been as widely popularized as those of his mate in the sexual union, the present work perhaps calls for a less elaborate apology than would otherwise have been necessary. Nevertheless, I crave the reader's forgiveness for having presumed to compose what I hope will prove a readable discourse on a subject which hitherto has suffered so much neglect, and can only trust that this neglect in itself has been due less to the intrinsic dullness of the male sex than to the preponderating fascination exercised by woman.

In both *Woman: A Vindication* and *Lysistrata* much was necessarily said about man and particularly about the modern Englishman. But the compass of these works, not allowing for a complete picture of the human male as a mate, a father, a bachelor, a widower, and (in his purely British rôle) as an Empire builder and director, I trust that those who know my two works on woman, may find the following pages a useful and essential completion of them.

What is true of my two books on woman, however, is also true of this book on man ; for, while in the former I found it necessary to say much concerning the opposite sex—man, so, in this work, which deals specially with man, I have been compelled to say much concerning his mate.

ANTHONY M. LUDOVICI.

CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
PREFACE	v
INTRODUCTION	ix

Book I

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

I THE INEQUALITY OF THE SEXES—Part I	3
II THE INEQUALITY OF THE SEXES—Part II	15
III THE MATRIARCHAL MYTH—Part I	49
IV THE MATRIARCHAL MYTH—Part II	78

Book II

THE INDICTMENT

V THE DEGENERACY OF MODERN MAN—Part I	111
VI THE DEGENERACY OF MODERN MAN—Part II	139
VII THE DEGENERACY OF MODERN MAN—Part III (The Proofs of Progressive Physical Deterioration)	180
VIII THE DEGENERACY OF MODERN MAN—Part IV (The Degen- eration of Mind and Character)	203
IX THE DEGENERACY OF MODERN MAN—Part V (The Degen- eration of Mind and Character) <i>continued</i>	232

Book III

THE CAUSES OF DEGENERATION AND THE REMEDY

X THE MORE REMOTE CAUSES OF DEGENERACY—Part I	271
XI THE MORE REMOTE CAUSES OF DEGENERACY—Part II	304
XII THE REMEDY	333

APPENDIX: RECENT RECRUITING STATISTICS OF THE ARMY, NAVY AND AIR FORCE	361
---	-----

INTRODUCTION

BRIEFLY, the problems I have set myself to investigate, and if possible to solve in the present work are these: How are we to account for the fact that among the most highly civilized peoples of the modern world, man, as the human male, with all his physical and other advantages, has contrived, both in the home and in public life, to descend to his present position of apparent equality with, or subordination to woman? And, where he is not yet either the equal or subordinate of woman, why are the privileges, or rather responsibilities (political, professional, economic or other), which have hitherto fallen to his lot, now being claimed and steadily appropriated or shared by his womenfolk? ¹

More narrowly described, my problem is to explain how and why the modern Englishman, with the magnificent heritage he has received from his forefathers in the form of that great Empire on which the sun never sets, has become the kind of male who, not only in his sexual, but also in his administrative and Imperial relations, seems no longer able to maintain his supremacy.

¹ Lest the reader should not be satisfied that this is a fair statement of Feminist aims, let me quote Miss Rose Macaulay's own definition of Feminism. In the *Morning Post* of July 7, 1925, Miss Macaulay wrote: "Let us then be more precise, and define feminism as 'attempts of women to possess privileges (political, professional, economic or other) which have been previously denied to them on account of sex.' This should be exact enough to afford Lord Ampthill [Miss Macaulay's opponent in the controversy on Feminism] and myself a common basis for dispute." The fact that there was no demur, but only applause, from the Feminists on this point, proves that Miss Macaulay satisfied them with her statement of their position.

England and the Empire she has built up has, in more than one sense, made the Englishman the leading male of five continents. Owing to his material success and the enormous prestige it has conferred upon him, he has been widely imitated. What he believes to be right and proper to-day, the whole world thinks right and proper to-morrow. This has been true of his political institutions, his industrial organization, his commercial methods, his pastimes, and to some extent even of his choice in clothes.

But it is also true of those vices in his philosophy and art of life, which have contributed and are still contributing to his decline. It is true, for instance, of his false doctrine of equality, self-determination, democracy, and industrial socialism.¹ It is true of his misunderstanding and corruption of women, of his inadequate conception of true manliness, of his failure to rule urban populations, and his inability to found anything permanent and sound in social architecture and national character.

Thus while five continents have been copying his methods for achieving material prosperity, they have also—more often than not quite unwittingly—been adopting the opinions by which he rules his actions, the prejudices and prepossessions which govern the direction, or rather the drift, of his life; and, in this way, the civilized male population of the globe has become either English, or else more or less infected with English ideas.

In framing a treatise on the modern human male, in which—as it will appear to some—I give an undue prominence to the Englishman, I shall not therefore have sinned as gravely as might be supposed against the scientific requirements of my thesis; for, in the first place, he is certainly the most important male figure of

¹ The reader is reminded that Karl Marx, the founder of modern Socialism and Bolshevism, thought and wrote with English social and industrial conditions as his data.

modern times, and secondly, owing to his temporal power and prestige, he has done most to mould his fellow-men all over the world.

Consequently if I carry the day with my Indictment of modern man, it will be because I have successfully made out my case against the modern Englishman, including all his imitators, whether in Germany, France, America, or the Republic of China. And, if I can show that the Englishman is wrong, and, by continuing in his present downward direction, cannot escape further deterioration, it will mean, not only that this country is in dire need of reform, but that the whole world is plodding steadily towards disaster, and that the time has come to cry a halt and to plot out a fresh itinerary.

For, if we exclude the vast body of the Englishman's imitators, there remain in the British Empire alone, a territory and organization so vast and so powerful,¹ and therefore an instrument so effective for securing the good of an appreciable portion of the world's inhabitants, and supplying an example and an ideal to the remainder, that, at the present day, there can be no more constructive and creative work at hand than the conscientious criticism and stimulation of the people of these islands, in their rôle of hereditary custodians and organizers of the greatest Mission, the greatest means for Good, the greatest Cause, the world has ever seen.

If, by allowing male degeneracy to continue one hour longer, we suffer this Mission, this vast means for Good, this Cause, to slip from our grasp, to fall into other hands, or otherwise to perish, before the great objects which it places within our reach have been attained, the British Empire will have been great merely as a preparation, a pioneer effort, a *tour de force* in conquest and appropriation, without the fulfilment, the

¹ In 1923, of the total area of the five continents, which was 55,500,000 sq. miles, the British Empire represented 14,220,000 sq. miles, and of the total population of the globe which was 1,656,000,000, British subjects numbered 436,752,000.

subsequent creation, and the beneficent justification, which might have made the name of Britain sacred to posterity.

For, although we may concede to the Socialists, Bolshevists and other detractors of the British Imperial power, that the Empire was built up by the un-Christian use of might,¹ we claim that the best way to repair that iniquity is not to allow the Empire to perish when all the wrongs to which its creation led are no longer retrievable, but to use it and its vast machinery in such a way as to prove it an ultimate blessing rather than a curse to humanity. This will be its most handsome vindication, and it is this thought that ought to give us hope and make us patriots. Nowhere else do we see the chance of linking up our energies with such a vast concern, the course of which can at will be so effectively deflected towards the salvation of humanity. In this sense only do I undertake to criticize the present development of British manhood, because all those who cherish any

¹ As this aspect of the matter is frequently overlooked, particularly by those people who are either unacquainted with history or (what amounts to the same thing) acquainted only with those facts that are to be culled from popular and school histories, perhaps it may be interesting to quote the words of a great British soldier, who can be suspected neither of lack of patriotism nor of ignorance, concerning that portion of the Empire of which he speaks. In *The Story of a Soldier's Life* (Vol. I, p. 256) Field-Marshal Viscount Wolseley, G.C.M.G., etc., wrote as follows: "We won India by the sword, and whilst humanity and a Christian spirit incite us at all times to do what we can to make the Sepoy and the people generally happy and contented, that sword must be always kept sharp and ready for use at any moment." Concerning other parts of the Empire much the same could be said. The histories of the New Netherland Colony in the U.S.A., of Acadia, of the Province of Quebec, of Zululand, of the Ashantee kingdom, and of the partition of Africa in 1885-1895, all bear witness to the unscrupulous violence of our Empire politics; while the early histories of Australia, Tasmania and New Zealand probably constitute the worst reading of all for a patriot who wishes to think well of England. The cruelties committed by the Spaniards in America and elsewhere pale into insignificance beside the atrocities perpetrated by the early English settlers in Australia and Tasmania only a little more than a hundred years ago.

good will to humanity must wish to see the power of England preserved and her blood-stained sword converted into an aspergill.

Now a vast Empire can be efficiently administered neither by women, nor by men who have delivered themselves up into the hands of their womenfolk, or ceased to lead and inspire them. It is therefore no mere coincidence that precisely at this juncture in our Imperial affairs, when in more than one of our dependencies the cry is beginning to be raised against British rule and suzerainty, and the former docile non-British subjects of the Empire are increasing their impudent demands for independence, our womenfolk at home should be claiming an alleged equality with men, which extends beyond political privileges, and should at the same time be manifesting both discontentment and disdain towards their men whether as leaders, husbands, fathers or brothers.

To blame the women for their attitude of revolt, to exhort them to adopt a meeker and more subordinate rôle, to apply to them such injurious epithets as "tribads," "Lesbians" or "women in trousers," or to accuse them of being unnatural or unsexed, is not only unfair, it is also unscientific. All life is a striving after power, and power extends only so far as the point where it meets with effective resistance. The extension of woman's power in recent years, therefore, must be commensurate with our own weakness, or our failure to resist (which amounts to the same thing), and if we blame anyone it must be ourselves.

If we came across a school full of children who had successfully defied the authority of their elders, and were directing their studies and defining their hours of work and play themselves, we should not suspect that there was anything wrong with the children—on the contrary, we should immediately turn our eyes on the elders themselves, to discover what was lacking in them, where they had failed, and by what derelictions from duty

and adult standards of quality they had forfeited the prestige and the advantages of their position, and lost those powers of mind and character which spontaneously evoke the confidence, respect and love of juniors and dependents.

It cannot be repeated too often that respect, love, confidence and admiration, are spontaneous reactions; they are the natural and almost involuntary adaptation of human nature (and sometimes even of animal nature) to the creature who inspires them. There is perhaps no greater error in psychology, no more shallow misunderstanding of humanity, than that which is embodied in the command, "Love thy neighbour." Love and respect, like confidence, like admiration, like attachment, cannot be created in this way by a word of command. A spontaneous reaction depends for its manifestation just as much upon a proper and adequate stimulus as water depends on heat in order to boil. And in the case of love and respect, that proper and adequate stimulus is not a copy-book maxim, or a moral principle however frequently reiterated, but the possession of certain unmistakable qualities in a fellow-creature, which, when recognized, promptly provoke the inevitable response. Only an undiscerning man or woman will love a neighbour who is not lovable.¹

If, therefore, the modern generation of men, particularly in England, have forfeited the respect, confidence and admiration of their womenfolk, they merely display their shallowness and ignorance of psychology, when they take to blaming the women themselves for what they (the men) fail to make the women feel. Nay more, they waste their time when they try to restore women to their former attitude of mind by exhortations and sermons.

¹ When I pointed this out five years ago in my *False Assumptions of Democracy* (pp. 175-6) critics were more concerned about the implied attack which my argument made upon a certain great religion's doctrines than about the truth of my contention.

At the outset many readers will be inclined to protest that they know of thousands of women, particularly since the Great War, who, far from having lost their respect and admiration of men, take great pains to proclaim both as often as possible. But the crucial test of a woman's deepest convictions is not to be sought in her deliberate utterances, particularly about the Great War. It is in her deeds, in the principles upon which she models her whole attitude towards men, and in the share she desires them to take in the guidance and direction of her life, that her true feelings are most clearly revealed.

Admitting, then, that woman's struggle for independence, for a hand in the government and administration of the country, and for greater power in all spheres, points to a loss of the confidence she once felt in her menfolk—and it is difficult to see what else it can indicate—men cannot mend matters by deploring her lack of propriety, or her deficient sense of fitness, or her loss of “true womanliness.” They can begin to mend matters only if they turn their eyes upon themselves and ask what can have happened, *what change can have come over them*, that they should no longer be able to stimulate those spontaneous reactions known as respect, confidence, and attachment, all of which derive from the devoted love of individual women for individual men, and which formerly left women content to rely on the male sex for their domestic and public weal.

Regarded in this way, Feminism and all those ends to which it aspires, constitutes a tacit or avowed condemnation of the male population of the country in which it flourishes. Although sex hostility may be entirely absent (which it never is) from the programme of the Feminists, the fact that a Feminist movement forms, is in itself sufficient evidence of the degeneration of the men among whom it forms; and, since this degeneration must lead to other and more serious consequences than the mere self-assertion of the female, it behoves all the men of a

country tending to feministic development, to take stock of themselves, and to proceed with energy to arrest the dry-rot before it spreads too far.

Those who, like John Stuart Mill, are prepared to reply to this reading of the situation, that the beginning and end of the Feminist Movement are quite independent of man's state of degeneracy or regeneracy; that, on the contrary, they are the direct and inevitable outcome of the evolution of woman herself, of a development which has freed her from a traditional subjection and made her more intellectual, more self-reliant, more capable of responsibility and better able to take her place beside her mate or brother, in all those functions which were once exclusively male, are not only historically unsound, but can know little either about modern woman or the woman of former ages.¹ For even if this alleged subjection were a fact, which it is not, the freedom from subjection would not necessarily have led to a *volte-face* so complete that men should no longer be relied upon, respected, trusted or looked up to. To return to our analogy of the child, the offspring of good parents who finds himself emancipated in late adolescence, does not necessarily cease from looking up to his elders, or from respecting or trusting them.

All those men who, like Mill, argue that Feminism is not simply an automatic reaction to man's degeneracy, but a positive movement created by the intrinsic superiority of modern woman over her forbears, thus merely promote the many evils to which they stubbornly blind themselves. And Mill himself, who should have been ashamed of his subserviency to his womenfolk (wife and stepdaughter) in the sixties of the last century, and who failed to perceive that a nation of Mills would have landed us in total disintegration and dissolution long before the dawn of the twentieth century, was the very

¹ For a historical refutation of Mill's dishonest arguments in support of the myth of a male subjection of women in the last two thousand years in Europe, see Chapter X of my *Woman: A Vindication*.

kind of degenerate male¹ who does most to belittle, besmirch and generally to undermine the fair fame of man in women's eyes and to create the discontent and exasperation towards the male, which supply the energy of all Feminist agitations.

Those men, however, who are brave enough to face unpleasant truths, and who, from their observation both of their own and other men's lives, have learnt that Feministic tendencies are not prone to manifest themselves, and never do manifest themselves in households or circles where the menfolk inspire the traditional female reactions of respect, confidence and devoted love, will not be satisfied with this reply of the Feminists, even when one among the latter enjoys the reputation of John Stuart Mill.

For it is not sufficiently understood that, at any rate in England, Feminism began in the home. The home is the one place in which the women of the country enjoy the most constant and most favourable opportunities for observing their men at close quarters. It is in the fierce light of intimate home life that a man's intelligence, capacity, acumen, mastery of life, general reliability, powers of giving sound guidance and direction, powers of inspiring respect and confidence, are most persistently and accurately measured, by a mate who can never relax her vigilance, because she is always seeking in him precisely those qualities which have been enumerated.

And it was in the home that the women of England first learnt how many of these qualities were frequently lacking in their menfolk. It was in their own homes that the daughters of a former generation learnt to regard men as pleasant, useful, but uninspiring, grown-up school-boys. It was in the extended circles of their friends and acquaintances that they found their home observations confirmed. And, whereas their instinct for safety made

¹ It is said that, sexually, he was of little more than infantile development.

them acknowledge that their menfolk were generally "safe" and therefore desirable on an inferior scale of passionate experience, they also discovered that this breed of safe, wholly amenable and sequacious males, were in the long run tiresome, incapable of firm leadership, and unable to make the masculine elements in their mates recessive and unobtrusive.

All those who have a wide knowledge of the private homes of the eighties and nineties of last century and after, must be aware of how often and easily the alleged "manly" English type of male became subordinated to his womenfolk, how seldom he retained all directive and initiatory powers, and with what frequency he was treated with ill-concealed contempt by a wife and daughters, who were given every opportunity of asserting and developing the least feminine and least docile elements in their natures.

By the end of the nineteenth century, the price was beginning to be paid for this steady inculcation of the contempt of man upon the womenfolk of the country, and during the reign of Edward VII this contempt was translated openly into words and deeds.

Without any hesitation, and following very naturally the line of interpretation most flattering to themselves, the females of the country soon explained man's backward movement as their own advance, as their own positive development. Women who could not hold a candle to their grandmothers and great-grandmothers, for serenity, for charm, for sound instinct and intelligence, for contentment, health and lack of "nerves," began to argue plausibly enough that they were entitled to increased responsibilities and powers, not because their men had proved incapable of both or had abdicated them out of sheer incapacity, but because they, the women, were now better able to undertake them. And since most of the men with whom they came into contact, confirmed rather than shook their conviction regarding the striking equality of the sexes in all those spheres

where reproduction alone played no part, they boldly asserted their extravagant claims and felt, sometimes quite justifiably, that there was nothing extravagant in them whatsoever.

Those men who recognize the element of truth in this brief sketch of the hidden and recent development of the Feminist atmosphere and mentality in this country, will therefore not make the mistake of imagining that it is due either to the perversity or to the wanton arrogance of modern woman. But, seeking in themselves and in their fathers and brothers not only the causes of Feminism, but also the causes of those other signs of national chaos and decay, of which, in recent years, so much evidence has been adduced, they will feel that the attempt to understand the whole evil of present conditions, and also to arrive at some cure and correction of the nation's many diseases, must begin with an indictment of modern man himself, and end in a drastic reform of his nature, and the ideals which have been responsible for its creation.

With regard to the general indictment of modern man which is the subject of this book, however, I should like it to be understood by those readers who may be too ready to assume the contrary, that I in no way exclude either myself or those who agree with me, from the various charges I make. From experience gathered at the many public debates which I have attended on the subject of masculine degeneracy, I have come to the conclusion that people are inclined to suppose that the publicist or public speaker, who concentrates on this topic, necessarily considers himself above, or free from, the stigmata at which he points an accusing finger. And the natural consequence is that certain feelings of resentment are aroused, which make audiences and readers lose patience with one, who, although he is admittedly a child of the degenerate Age under discussion, seems to speak as if he were superior to it.

This hasty, and in the present case, unjust conclusion,

probably arises from the fact that the majority of people use the word "degenerate" (like the technical word "complex" taken from the scientific terminology of the Freudian school) merely as a epithet of abuse, which they hurl at anything and everything that displeases and annoys them, or of which they disapprove, and always on the understanding that they—*they* who make the charge—are free from the characteristics which provoked it. Thus "degenerate," in popular phraseology, becomes merely a word to designate some trait, or thought, or action, of which the speaker regards himself as innocent, and which he wishes to condemn.

So prevalent is this attitude, that it has now become necessary to protest against the mere suspicion of belonging to such self-complacent critics of modernity. Because, whereas one might perhaps face and survive the charge of self-complacency alone, one could hardly shield one's work from the prejudice which would certainly be created if people really believed that one was so foolish as to make a claim, which, in these degenerate days, could hardly be sustained by any civilized man.

I therefore take this opportunity of making it quite clear that I in no way exclude myself from the general indictment which I bring against my contemporaries, and am quite prepared to recognize where, and to what extent, the indictment fits my own particular case. I know that, like other modern men, I am badly co-ordinated and that this condition has had grave consequences both in regard to my use of self and possibly also in regard to my thoughts. I know that, like my contemporaries, I respond too quickly to environmental stimuli, and that my resistance is therefore feeble. I am also fully aware of the customary euphemisms with which these defects are covered up, and interpreted as advantages. I moreover appreciate the extent to which unreliable emotional and instinctive reactions in myself too frequently take the place, as they do in all modern people, of intellectual processes; and it is because I

know the difficulty of rectifying these shortcomings in the individual, and the danger of leaving them unrectified, that I recommend caution and serious safeguard regarding their unrestricted development in a nation. Concerning these modern features of degeneracy enough will be found in the chapters that follow to enable the reader to understand the importance of this aspect of the subject, and it is hoped that the correctives outlined (particularly that dealing with the need of re-education in the use of self) may prove as valuable to the reader as they have proved to me.

Book I

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

To the Book Lover and Book Buyer.

A PRIVATE LIBRARY OF YOUR OWN.

COPIES of this book will eventually become surplus to requirement in our library, and will be offered for sale at very low prices. If you are anxious to add this to your collection, please fill in the form below, carefully detach from the volume, and hand to the Librarian, or post direct to the **Head Librarian, Boots Book-lovers' Library, Stamford Street, S.E.1.** ☐ Copies will be reported to you immediately the book is available.

BOOTS BOOK-LOVERS' LIBRARY.

To the **HEAD LIBRARIAN,**
STAMFORD STREET, S.E.1.

Please report to me when a copy of the following work is withdrawn from circulation and available for sale.

Title

Author.....

Please use { *Name*
block letters { *Address*

Date.....192... ..

CHAPTER I

The Inequality of the Sexes—Part I

NO scientist can say how long the mammalian female has been in possession of the structures on which her functions depend. It is, however, generally supposed that both the structures and their accompanying functions must have characterized her for many millions of years. The male, on the other hand, has been in possession of his structures, or of structures very similar to them, and of the instincts, emotions and mental powers that accompany them for probably very much longer. This is not usually remembered in discussions upon sex. Whereas lactation and later parturition are comparatively recent functions in one of the sexes, that is to say, whereas their successive appearance marks the origin of the mammalian order, and therefore coincides with the appearance of the structures which chiefly characterize the mammalian female, the function of fertilization in the male, far from being comparatively recent, is certainly as old as sexual dimorphism itself.¹ While the male structures undoubtedly have suffered modifications and transformations which began long before the mammalian order originated, and continued long after it, the fact remains that the male sex with the instincts and mental powers associated with its function have probably suffered very much less radical

¹ At all events the change in the structures in the male from the reptilian to the mammalian type is very far from being as complete as that of the female.

change than, for instance, that which took place in the female during her gradual evolution from an oviparous into a viviparous creature.

In this sense the mammalian female's rôle, with a great part of what it now signifies, is probably younger, more recent, more lately evolved than the male's. To put it in a nutshell, whereas the male function has been the fertilization of the female for say ten million, the female has been bringing forth her young alive and suckling them only for two million years.¹

Thus the male is probably the senior of the highest order of living creatures—a conclusion strangely anticipated by the account of the creation in Genesis.

But the consequences of this difference are more interesting than the difference itself. For, in the first place, it means that the female's sex-adaptation to the male alone is incalculably older than her extended sex-adaptation to her live progeny. And, if we attempt to trace the changes that came over her life through the modifications in her structure and functions which constituted her a member of the mammalian order, we shall see that they were not only far-reaching but also differentiated her very much more than she had been differentiated theretofore, from the male of her species.

During the existence of the reptilian and reptiloid quadrupeds which inhabited the earth in the Palæozoic and Mesozoic ages, the egg-laying female led a life which, for independence of action and freedom from bodily constraints, was presumably very much more like that of her male partner than it became after the appearance of the Triassic, Jurassic and Cretaceous mammals. She probably left her eggs to be hatched by the sun, and, caring no more about them, shared her partner's wanderings and other adventures, almost like another

¹ These figures bear no relation whatsoever to facts, they are simply chosen arbitrarily to give a graphic idea of the seniority of the male sex concentration.

male at his side. Gradually she must have developed a greater interest in her hatched young, however, for as time goes on, she not only attends to them after they are hatched, but, with the appearance of the Theriodonts (belonging to the extinct Permian and Triassic group of the Theromorpha) reveals certain marked changes which profoundly alter her own position and her attitude to her progeny. Probably beginning with the suckling of her young, which still continued to be hatched from eggs, her relationship to her progeny gradually grew more complicated until, by slow degrees, she developed from an oviparous reptilian (through the stage of an oviparous though suckling mother) to the perfect viviparous mammal with which we are familiar to-day. These changes may have taken millions of years, but they probably followed this order.

Now what did this transformation mean? It meant not only a greater differentiation from the male in structure, function and life-habits, than had hitherto existed in the reptilian and reptiloid species, but also a change for the worse in comparison with her former greater parity with him, through the gradually increasing drain which these modifications imposed upon her system. Once almost as free and unconstrained as the male; once subjected to sexual exertions only slightly, if at all, heavier than his own, she first suffers the constraints and the toll on her physical resources, which suckling involves, and finally is subjected to the further constraints and heavier toll which placental gestation brought in its train.

Thus the greater differentiation between male and female which appeared with the advent of the first mammals, was not only one of structure and function, but also of life-habits, and consisted chiefly of greater disabilities for the female and greater strains upon her strength and physical resources. It is important to remember this, for we shall see that it is a tendency in evolution which manifests itself by a

further burden upon the female of the human species later on.

It is not improbable, indeed, that the mammalian female has never been able to recover the ground that was lost when first lactation and then placental gestation imposed these strains upon her remote ancestors in the course of evolution; and the fact that, generally speaking, the female of the mammalia is more like the young of her species than the male—a peculiarity which can and has been explained as the result of arrested development—may be due to the heavy toll upon her physical resources which the preparation for these extra burdens first demanded of her reptiloid forerunners.¹

Meanwhile not only had the male to suffer no extra

¹ There is some evidence for this view, though the effects of sexual selection have blurred the facts to some extent. The comparative anatomy of the male and female in the lower animals has apparently not been studied with nearly the same care as that of the human species or the apes. In the latter the adult female, as all authorities seem to agree, is nearer to the young in bodily form and in the shape of the skull than the adult male; and, when we come to discuss the secondary sexual characteristics of the adult human female we shall find a large number of facts pointing to the same approximation of her form to the child's. At all events, it seems clear that generally speaking, there is less differentiation between the male and female of fishes, reptiles and saurians, than there commonly is in the mammalia. There are, for instance, no well-marked differences between male and female tortoises and turtles. This appears to be true also of the crocodiles. The differences increase among many of the birds, but they are confined chiefly to plumage and size, and anatomical differences do not appear to have been the object of very much study. The precocity and early arrestation of growth which have been observed among some of the females of the mammalia (*vide* Darwin on the precocity of marsupials, bitches and the quadrumana, *Descent of Man*, Ed. 1883, pp. 515, 517, 558, also Brehm on the precocity of the female mandrill, *Works*, Ed. 1876, Vol. I, p. 171) may possibly afford evidence in favour of the view that development is arrested sooner in the female than the male mammal. It is also interesting to bear in mind, in this connection, that Darwin suggested that "the great waste of vital power" which would have attended the development of horns in female deer, and tusks in female elephants, may have tended to their being eliminated in the female through natural selection, provided, of course, they were of no use to her. (*Op. cit.*, p. 603.)

toll upon his system, but the radical bodily changes which transformed his reptiloid mate into a mammal, left his own sex-life and adaptations almost unaltered. He was still able to attain to his full development, unhampered by the insistent claims of prolonged gestation and lactation, and his adaptation in sex continued to be the female alone, and was not extended or distributed as his mate's was over mate and progeny.

Like the differences established between the various species by unlike life-habits and functions, the differences established between the sexes by unlike conditions are as follows :

(a) Differentiation of the two organisms, male and female : the possession by each of a particular and suitable physical form,¹ and the resulting experiencing by each of a particular kind of existence. This is exemplified by the characteristics external and internal which distinguish the sexes in mammals, and by the different habits of life which their specialized functions impose upon them.

(b) The necessity that each sex is under to select and

¹ Subsequently, and apparently through heredity, there occurs a certain amount of exchange between male and female, of their distinguishing bodily structures, and each may acquire a number of the other's secondary or primary sex-characteristics in a more or less rudimentary form. Thus extinct species of giraffes reveal the fact that the female originally had no horns, whereas, in existing species, the female has horns like the male. This has occurred with other male characteristics. The males of all mammals, on the other hand, reveal, among other female structures, rudimentary dugs, a fact which led Darwin to suggest (*Descent of Man*, 2nd Ed., p. 163) that long after the progenitor of the whole mammalian class had ceased to be androgynous, both sexes may have yielded milk and nourished their young. But, among the other difficulties besetting this hypothesis, it may be asked why, if the disuse of the super-numerary dugs in the later ancestors of *Homo sapiens* caused these dugs to disappear in the female, disuse has not done the same by man's two mammæ. Does not this seem to point to some influence other than the original use of lactiferous mammæ being responsible for the presence of two rudimentary mammæ on the male breast? The maximum of exchange of structure is revealed in the hermaphrodite. But this is a rare and morbid phenomenon, and, as a rule, the exchanges do not interfere with survival,

reject only in its own way—that is to say, only in that manner which harmonizes with its own sex-adaptation. In each the specialized functioning, resulting from different structures, becomes a need, and, while health and vigour last, a need so pressing that everything possible is done to meet it. These fundamental facts lead to the conclusion :

(c) That the instincts, emotions and mental powers of each sex bear a close relationship to the kind of need it feels, or, in other words, these instincts, emotions and mental powers will be associated with the life-function. Thus, while the male, as the active participator in coition, will require to be the wooer, the capturer and the initiator, and will develop the qualities of mind and disposition compatible with these three rôles, the female will develop the complementary traits—initial coy resistance or *prudery*, inclination to surrender and yield, or *abandonment*, and readiness to subject herself to the active initiation of the male and to receive his contribution to procreation, or *sequaciousness* and *receptivity*. (It should be noted that these traits in each sex which arise from the relationship of male and female alone, are much older than the mammalia themselves, and have therefore a far deeper hold upon the natures of male and female than those arising out of the presence of progeny.) While the male will develop no instinct to suckle, succour and tend the young, the female, on the contrary, will feel the need, and will possess the instinct to do so. Whereas the male will not necessarily feel any emotions at the sight of the young, the female will respond to their presence instantly, with the emotions that her rôle as their custodian, nurse and educator stimulates. Whereas the male will not necessarily concern himself about their safety, the female will display her greatest bravery, not in protecting herself, but precisely in protecting them. Whereas the active rôle of the male in procreation will lead him into rivalry with other males, and the law of battle will ensue, the

female will bear only a sexual relation to the male, and will be either hostile or indifferent to him, when once her sex needs are met. Thus the male will develop courage and the powers of the fighter in proportion to the need he is under of contesting his rights with other males. And so on.

(d) The finding of pleasure in the consequences of the concentration.

In the sex-life we behold male and female each pursuing happiness, or, to state it biologically—adaptation, not by breaking the bounds of his or her rôle, but by trying to fulfil the specialized functions that derive from it, by trying to select and reject in the preordained way, and by exercising those instincts and mental powers, and experiencing those emotions which harmonize with the part which each plays. If the object be to make either sex miserable, this cannot be more speedily and effectively achieved than by compelling it to break bounds, that is to say, by thwarting the rooted instincts and emotions of its own adaptation. It is only in fantasy or romantic fiction that we find this denial associated with happiness.¹ Desire itself thus becomes the need to perform a specialized function, the pleasure that is anticipated by endeavouring to live in harmony with the demands of a particular living destiny. And, since the preservation of the species depends upon the two sexes and their union, and it was of the utmost importance for survival that the need for this union should lay a fast hold upon animals, we may, to speak teleologically for a moment, say that Nature deliberately made the sex functions exquisitely pleasurable, in order that there might be no attempt, no possibility of an attempt (except in aberrant individuals), to break bounds, or to depart from the limitations that each sex imposes. Thus

¹ An elementary and convincing example of this law is to be found in La Fontaine's fable of the fox and the stork, in which, with his un-failing realism, La Fontaine makes the incompatibility of the couple end in unhappiness to each.

specialized sex functioning became a pressing need and a pleasure. As long as health and vigour endures, therefore, the animal pursues happiness by submitting to the consequences of its particular sex-rôle.

If we examine the lives of living creatures for a moment, we can judge how much happiness they associate with remaining within the bounds of their sex-rôle from their determination to fulfil their specialized function.

Thus most male animals are ready to incur considerable risk in the pursuit and apprehension of the female, and when she is seized, menaces and buffets and blows, which at other times would cause both sexes to turn tail and flee, are endured with heroic equanimity. The back legs of frogs and toads in the act of coition have been amputated without disturbing them, or diverting them from the vital act. It is related of the foxes in Egypt that they run great risks when copulating, and sometimes allow man to approach so close that they fall a prey to him. The same phenomenon has been seen in Europe though less often.¹ Some male spiders face death every time they approach the female with the intention of fertilizing her, but this does not deter them, while the mole when he is moved by sexual ardour, performs feats in his subterranean pursuit of the female, which for their magnitude are almost incredible. When they are in season, female animals also display much "restless activity"² and show great eagerness and "desire for the male."² If the wooing has been successful—that is to say, in most cases, if the unfamiliarity of the male's presence is overcome—they will offer themselves to him again and again, assuming suitable and frequently quite uncustomary attitudes (i.e. attitudes never assumed except when they are in season) and practising all the arts of exhibitionism and allurements. They will find pleasure in their adaptation just as he

¹ A. C. Brehm, *Thierleben* (Ed. 1876, Vol. I, p. 662).

² F. H. A. Marshall, Sc.D., D.Sc., F.R.S., *The Physiology of Reproduction*, pp. 31 and 57.

does in his, and the fact that they must enjoy the passive endurance of his violence (frequently quite marked) just as he enjoys the active exercise of it, is proved by their readiness to experience it again and again. This can be observed in most mammals, and, in the cats—from the lioness to the domestic variety—is a typical feature of the sex relationship. Indeed, so highly sexed are the cats, that a female of the domestic variety will copulate almost continuously for three or four days. Brehm says of the puma that, at the zenith of its ardour, it will copulate on an average once every five minutes,¹ and he reports a case of a lion and lioness at the Zoological Gardens of Dresden that copulated three hundred and sixty times in a week.² It is said of mandrills that occasionally they literally die of love, and will show eagerness some time before they are mature.

Moreover, the attachment between male and female is sometimes so great that it seems to equal if not to excel the love of human beings. Male moles have been found dead beside the traps in which their mates were caught. Female bears have been known to allow their young to die, if their mates were taken from them. A wild male monkey is said to have come quite close up to a traveller's tent, howling and moaning, after his female had been shot, and to have refused to go away until her dead body was given to him. Thus he overcame his fear of the strangers in order to recover his mate, and bore her sorrowing away when her body was handed out of the tent. We have only to read the works of Büchner,³ Boelsche⁴ and Romanes,⁵ to learn how widespread this

¹ Op. cit., p. 383.

² Op. cit., p. 370.

³ *Liebe und Liebesleben in der Thierwelt* (a book full of interesting facts and well written).

⁴ *Das Liebesleben in der Natur* (also interesting, but exasperatingly prolix and discursive).

⁵ *Animal Intelligence*, which is full of instances of devotion between the sexes. See also Remy de Gourmont's *Physique de l'amour*; but this book contains many inaccuracies and is at times a little fantastic.

sexual devotion is in the animal world, and the above few examples must suffice here.

If we leave aside the remote androgynous ancestors of the mammalia, the instincts which draw male to female and female to male are the oldest of the instincts associated with the sex functions. The emotions that accompany their operation are likewise among the oldest consequences of the sex-life—incalculably older, as we have seen, than maternal and paternal affection. And that is perhaps why both these instincts and emotions have such a fast and deep hold upon the two forms whose destiny they sway. Compared with them, the claims of mammalian maternity are not only an innovation, but, in a sense, a disturbance of the single-minded pre-occupation of male by female and female by male.

Far from there being any inclination on the part of either male or female to break bounds in the sex-adaptation, both, as we have seen, show the greatest eagerness to abide by the limitations their particular structure and its accompanying functions impose. In both the sex relationship is a need and a source of pleasure, and the happiness thus achieved appears to be so great that, certainly among the males, death is frequently faced in the attempt to experience it.

With regard to the female mammal's further extension and distribution of the sex instincts and emotions, in her relationship to the young which she bears and suckles, everybody knows that her devotion and eagerness to fulfil her functions amount to a proverb. The performance of a vital function is a need. When the structures on which the function depends are sound, vigorous and normal, this need is pressing, and the meeting of it brings so much happiness, that it is an object worth fighting for, and worth running great risks for. The process of lactation, with the whole of the duties it involves, besides being a physiological need and pleasure to the female, is also a function rooted in the instincts, emotions and mental powers resulting from her particular sex-rôle,

and thus most female mammals are prepared to lose their lives for their offspring during the suckling period. As the dugs get dry and the young increase in size, the interest in them wanes,¹ and it is noticeable also that where the milk supply is poor, there is less maternal attachment than when it is copious.²

It is not denied that in some species, particularly in the apes, the monkeys and the cats, there is a period subsequent to lactation, during which the young are fed and cared for. There is also no doubt about the fact that the mere fondling and caressing of the young, apart from feeding them, affords great pleasure to the female and sometimes even the male. And here we behold the beginnings of that devotion to and pride in offspring which among civilized human beings extends over the whole lifetime of the parent and may be said to die only with his or her death. Generally speaking, however, Brehm's words are true, and as fast as the young grow up the colder becomes the relationship between mother and child.

Again, in this consequence of the female mammal's sex-rôle, there is no attempt on the part of the animal to break bounds—on the contrary, the determination to remain within bounds is often fought for at great risk to the creature's life, and as long as health and vigour

¹ Brehm, *Op. cit.*, p. 34. "Je mehr das junge heranwächst, um so kälter wird das Verhältnis zwischen Mutter und Kind." Even among some members of the human species and by no means the most savage, interest in the offspring dies when lactation ceases. (See Capt. Sir Richard Burton, *A Mission to Gelele, King of Dahome*, Ed. 1893, Vol. II, p. 126.)

² According to my experience—and I have bred cats continuously for six years—there is less attachment to the young among large-headed females of male appearance, and it is in these females, as a rule, that the milk supply is poor. They tend to neglect their litters, even when these are artificially reduced, and leave the basket for long prowls many days before a good milker can be tempted to do so. Apparently similar traits have been observed in large-headed cows, with high back-bones, drawn up bellies, and small udders and teats. (See Jouatt's *Cattle*, p. 244, and Wedge's *Cheshire*, p. 251.)

endure, happiness is sought by the female in selecting and rejecting in her particular way.

That the males among some of the higher mammals sometimes develop very genuine paternal feelings has often been observed, and there is much evidence to show that, particularly among the larger cats and the primates, these feelings lead to acts of great devotion and solicitude. The lion, for instance, protects and helps to feed the brood. The gorilla, the chimpanzee and the orang-utang protect their mate and young, and, like many of the monkeys, fight for them when they are in danger. The male magot, or barbary macaque, has been observed throughout a whole summer helping to carry his young about, and disciplining them long after the weaning.

There is, however, another aspect of this pleasing relationship of the adult male and the young. For, just as the stag or buffalo, which is the leader and master of the herd, resents the younger males interfering with his harem, and only yields up his position of sire when he is too feeble or too aged any longer to be able to overcome a younger rival, so among the apes and many of the monkeys, there appears to be a great jealousy between the leading males and the males of a younger generation. If the latter persist in their attentions to the females before they are able to hold their own against the tyrant, they are not infrequently killed by him, and it is only when he grows decrepit or is removed by accident or by sickness, that they come into their own. The preponderance of females resulting from this kind of persecution of youthful males has been noticed by many travellers.¹

¹ For general information about paternal duties and feelings in the apes and monkeys, and about their protection of their families see Brehm, or Lyddeker (the latter in the *Royal Natural History*, Ed. 1893-94, Vol. I, gives, however, less exhaustive details than Brehm, and Brehm actually kept monkeys).

CHAPTER II

The Inequality of the Sexes—Part II

NOW, turning to the human species, we find that there is nothing that has been said about the sex-rôle of the great order of the mammalia to which man and woman belong, which does not also apply to them. And the only differences to be found are those which consist of accretions and additions to the original stock of instincts, emotions and mental powers, which have come to mankind in their ascent from their lowly ancestors.

Like the sex-rôles in the rest of the mammalia, they have led to

(a) Differentiation of the two organisms, male and female, and the possession by each of a particular and suitable physical form, and the resulting experience of a different existence.

(b) The necessity that each is under to select and reject only in the manner which harmonizes with a particular destiny, and, in each, the specialized functioning, resulting from different structures, which, as long as health and vigour last, constitutes a need that is met with great eagerness and determination.

(c) Each sex has the instincts, emotions and mental powers related to the kind of life that it will have to lead, and the corresponding limitation in selecting and rejecting. For instance, the male as the active participator in coition is the wooer and initiator; he has to awaken desire for himself in the female, and finds his pleasure in these rôles. The female finds pleasure in

being captivated, in surrendering herself, in yielding to initiation, provided that she approves of the male. In his rôle of initiator, man develops boldness, leadership, the habit of dominance, responsibility, originality, independence. In her rôle of passive participator, woman develops shyness, prudery and coyness, sequaciousness, irresponsibility, imitativeness, dependence. (These are the oldest psychical consequences of sexual dimorphism, and probably antecede by millions of years the qualities of mind which are associated with parenthood.) The active rôle in procreation leads to the rivalry of other males, and develops courage, fighting powers, and a marked tendency to violent jealousy in the male, particularly when he is old. But the female, finding her sex-adaptations normally arranged for her, will not need to fight, nor will she develop courage and jealousy to the same extent as the male at this stage.

Happiness will be pursued by each sex in trying to fulfil the specialized functions that derive from its own rôle. And, if the object be to make either sex miserable, this will be best achieved by compelling them to break bounds. Sexual desire is thus the need to perform a specialized function, and love for the opposite sex is attachment to the sexual object which makes this performance possible. Happiness comes with performance.

Each sex will find pleasure in the adaptations peculiar to its own rôle, and will pursue happiness by seeking those adaptations. The female will find pleasure in exhibitionism, while the male will find pleasure in *voyeurism*, or, to put it plainly, in feasting his eyes.¹

¹ The abnormal manifestation of these instincts should not blind us to the fact that they have a natural and normal basis. Only when the expression of sex is fixed at one of these preliminaries to the coitus (i.e. when morbid fixation has occurred in development) are they abnormal. The fact that a sort of modified exhibitionism has long characterized woman's ordinary dress, and is regarded as quite natural in civilized countries, should not be overlooked in judging of the deep-rooted origins of female exhibitionism and male *voyeurism*. (See p. 10, *ante*, for mention of female exhibitionism in the mammalia.)

If the wooing has been successful, that is to say, if the female has been captivated, each sex will display its instincts to the full. There will be increased preliminary exhibitionism on the part of the female, and a corresponding increase of pleasure for her. In the same way there will be increased male voyeurism, and a like increase of pleasure for him. There will be a short period of increasing familiarity—the play of the sexes—which may be confined merely to secondary sexual characteristics. This will all be natural and clean. It has its basis deep down in the ancestors of the mammalia, and we cannot now eradicate the instincts that urge us to it. And during this time, while eagerness and pleasure will increase for both, barriers will break down.¹ Each will then find further and greater joy in his or her particular part in the consummation. The passive, yielding rôle, if it is ably directed by the male, will be enjoyed by the female; while the violent active rôle, if he is versed in the arts of life, will be enjoyed by the male, and each will be grateful and proud.

The original picture of this relationship, in broad and rude outline, is to be found at almost every stage of our pre-mammalian and mammalian ancestry. It is as much part of ourselves as is the instinct to eat or to move. To attempt to break bounds here, to attempt by Puritanical and prurient interference with sacred things, to cut out any of the natural preliminaries to the coitus which we have so briefly described, is merely to suppress or repress a need, the violence of which will recoil against the nervous equipment of the individual.²

¹ Again, here, we get abnormalities only in cases of morbid fixation. The natural place of the preliminaries, however, is not the end, but the means to the end—the path thither. The moment they become an end in themselves they cease to be desirable or normal.

² A large amount of female neurasthenia is due to the fact that the coitus is not *normally* approached in Puritanical countries, and that many of the essential preliminary stages, which are necessary for a full sex-expression, are either deliberately cut out, or left out through ignorance or timidity on the part of the male.

If, however, everything be allowed to proceed normally, the original attachment of the man to the woman, and *vice versâ*, will, after consummation, suddenly leap up mountains high. Each will see and feel life afresh, according to the new perspective that comes with the expression of each sex-concentration. There will follow that period of ardent discipleship when the sequaciousness of the female reaches its zenith, and when the male, who has successfully and artistically performed his rôle of initiator and leader, in one of the deepest and oldest acts connected with sexual dimorphism, will, if he be adequately equipped mentally, proceed to initiate and to lead in everything.

History, science, fiction, the lives of all great peoples, the experience of every one of us—evidence of every kind and from every corner of the compass—tells us convincingly how fundamental and how wonderful this relationship is. Some of the greatest and noblest acts of heroism have been performed precisely for the sake of this love which unites two people of different sexes, and examples could be multiplied *ad infinitum*, to show the extremes of devotion, fidelity and happiness which it inspires.

If we leave aside our androgynous ancestors, this relationship is probably the oldest and most profound of the consequences of sex-dimorphism. It is incalculably older than parenthood, and the relationship of either sex to offspring. And if, for a moment, we divest ourselves of the preconceived and habitual notions of latter-day conditions, and pause for a moment to take a realistic view of the history we have outlined, we are bound to admit that offspring tend rather to disturb and to deflect the current of sexual love, than to intensify it.¹ Possibly that is why, in spite of all that is now

¹ The extent to which we are still unadapted to this disturbance which offspring bring into our lives, and the degree of original sexual love which continues to enter into, and to fortify even parental and filial love, has been sufficiently proved by the wonderful contribution that

said and done about the child, the unreasonable accent that is placed over its life,¹ and the exorbitant fuss that is created around the persons of all human young, the deepest thrills and the deepest interests still continue to centre round the love-relations of adults—the primordial and pre-mammalian relationship of male and female. In our poetry, in our fiction and in our drama, we insist on finding the portrayal of the sentiments and situations that arise out of this love of the sexes, and even the most stubborn and resolute child-loving spinster expects in the artistic productions that entertain her, not the panorama of parental or filial affections, nor yet an epic of unisexual adventure and effort, but always the clash and the harmony of the sexes in the prime of their vigour and beauty.

We have now to consider woman's further extension and distribution of the sex instincts and emotions in her relationship to the young which she bears and suckles. Like her mammalian ancestors in the lower animals, she has suitable and elaborate structures, differentiating her sharply from man, by means of which she bears her young alive and suckles them for some time after birth. And the exercise of the specialized functions associated with these structures, constitutes just as urgent a need to her as it does to her more lowly sisters. She pursues happiness—or in biological terms—adaptation, in seeking the means whereby she can perform these specialized functions, and, as long as health and vigour endure, she will only encounter unhappiness by breaking bounds.

psycho-analysis has made to the understanding of human psychology. Thus even in the relationship of child and parent, and parent and child, the oldest source of love is tapped to strengthen and solidify the bond.

¹ In my *Woman: A Vindication*, Chapter VIII, I dealt with the social aspects of this unreasonable accent, but I had no space to show, as I have shown here, the biological ground for its absurdity. Incidentally, the gross exaggeration of the child's importance is, as we know, leading at the present day to an enormous amount of child idolization and consequently to lack of discipline among children. But this is not the place to discuss this unexpected result of the morbid hatred of sex.

This remains true in spite of the misery which recent man and recent medicine have made of the function of parturition in the human female,¹ and since the instincts and emotions associated with both lactation and child-bearing are almost as old as the mammalian order itself (as we have seen, probably the former, alone, is as old as the mammalian order), the human female cannot consummate her destiny, cannot display the full gamut of her endowments, unless she experiences motherhood, and the whole of the normal relationship between mother and child.

The devotion of which the best mothers are capable, the joy they find in tending and feeding the young of their own flesh and blood, and the enduring attachment that follows, afford sufficient testimony for the fact that woman finds happiness in this unique relationship; and even if there can be no doubt that this extended and distributed form of sexual passion inevitably mars her relationship to her children's father,² that is an aspect of human life which we can no more change or readjust than we can change or readjust the position of the sun. The fact that the male, as father, is usually the principal sufferer in this domestic triangle, can no more alter the natural course of things than any other form of suffering can; and the most we can do is to recognize it as a

¹ For a more elaborate treatment of this aspect of sexual life see my *Lysistrata* (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1924).

² Stated in the most moderate terms, it cannot leave her original fund of ardour and capacity for attachment unaffected; for, by being divided over two or more objects, it must surrender some of its intensity towards one of those objects. The reply to this usually is that the love for spouse is "different" from the love for offspring. But this will hardly do; for, quite apart from the evidence supplied by psycho-analysis, if we conceive a creature's capacity for warmth of feeling and devotion as a unit—and this we can hardly avoid—that unit cannot fail to be reduced in one direction if it have to meet urgent claims in another. A woman who has become a mother would need to be in a position to draw reinforcements from infinity, in order to retain towards a first object of affection that same energy and depth of feeling, which she felt before other claims came to be made on her heart.

factor in our social life. That it is already visible in animal life may be seen in various species where the male continues to remain with the female after the advent of young. Who has not seen the angry stabs of his beak which a drake will sometimes distribute over the girdle of downy ducklings that separate him from his spouse? And the pinching and tormenting of baby monkeys by their fathers has been noted both by Brehm and Lyddeker. Probably the popular tradition that the male will destroy the young, if he is allowed to get at them—a tradition, which according to my experience with cats and mice is by-the-by quite unfounded—has arisen from some such observations as these. It is not impossible, however, that the multiplication of wives is an essential counterpart of mammalian maternity in mankind, both from the purely physical and emotional standpoints.¹

We now have to consider the evidence that has been collected to support the view that woman shows in her development, (*a*) more infantile characters than man, and, like the females of the quadrumana, greater resemblances to the young of the species than her mate; and (*b*) that her growth, like that of many of her own more lowly ancestors and fellow female mammals, ceases earlier and is more precocious than that of the male of the species.

For, although, as Lipschütz points out,² “it is illegitimate to explain all differences in body shape between man and woman, by the woman remaining always in an infantile stage, or by the growth of the woman’s body stopping earlier than that of man’s, it seems certain . . . that the body shape in the woman is nearer to the infantile form than that of the man.” But it is the infantile form of woman, and the infantile character of many of her organs, considered in conjunction with other facts—with the fact, for instance, of her precocity, of the heavy claims upon her physical resources, and of the antagonism

¹ The physical standpoint will be found discussed in Chapter VII, pp. 162–8, of *Woman: A Vindication*.

² *The Internal Secretions of the Sex Gland* (1914), p. 17.

between genesis and development—that lead one to the inevitable conclusion that, although much in her anatomy and form has to be regarded as no more than her physical adaptation to the mammalian female's rôle, there is much which does not appear to be part of that adaptation, and which is nevertheless infantile; and, therefore, that in association with her precocity, and the heavy claims upon her strength, her infantile form points to an earlier arrestation of growth than in man.¹

We have to remember that the asexual embryonic soma, with its sexual equipotentiality, recapitulates in mammals and birds “a phylogenetic phase in which sexual differentiation related only to the generative cells.”² In plain English, we have to remember that the unsexed body of the embryo in mammals and birds, with its equal capacity for becoming either male or female, points to a stage in their evolution when the only sexual differences resided in the generative cells. This stage which, as we have already hinted, probably covers the period of the reptiloid precursors of the mammals, in which male and female were more alike than they are now, leads us to ask what influences, other than the increasing stress imposed on the female by mammalian motherhood, could have operated to cause the greater differentiation between male and female which we now observe. We must, in this respect, remember the precocity of other mammals already referred to,³ and

¹ Dr. Schütze, in *Das Weib in Anthropologischer und Sozialer beziehung* (Leipzig, 1920), says: “How is it that woman in her build approximates so much more to the child than to man? The explanation is to be found in the unequal claims which the organs of reproduction and the preservation of the species have laid upon her for thousands of years.”

² Lipschütz, *Op. cit.*, p. 460.

³ See p. 6, *ante*. In order to make quite sure of the modern expert's opinion on this point, I wrote to Professor Frederick Hobday, C.M.G., F.R.C.V.S., the well-known veterinary specialist, and asked him for his views. On October 13, 1925, he answered me as follows: “I think that any veterinary surgeon will tell you that he has met with precocity of the female in all species of animals, in fact it is so generally recognized that beyond making a passing remark upon it, we make no further comment.”

the fact that they more closely resemble the young of the species than does the male; and we ought also to bear in mind the interesting suggestion of Lipschütz that, while male and female castrates tend to show the symptoms of a prolonged prepuberal stage [a stage when they approximate to a common asexual type] and show less sexual divergence than normal individuals, both also tend to be more like the male than the female form externally.¹ This seems to point to the fact that the male type is probably the adult norm for both sexes, but that the female falls short of that norm through the claims which the mammalian sex adaptations imposed upon her. Otherwise, why should not castrates of both sexes tend to resemble the female form more than the male?

There is also this further fact to be considered: as foreshadowed on page 6, *ante*, a third additional stress has been placed on the female human being's system, which female mammals lower down in the scale are spared. Whereas the latter differ in their sex-concentration from their reptiloid ancestors in nourishing their young with lactiferous mammae, and bearing them alive after carrying them as parasites in their own bodies until they are able to lead a separate existence, the human female differs from her reptiloid ancestors not only in suckling her young, and in placental gestation, *but also in the menstrual discharge*. This periodical function which imposes an additional stress on her system, and which she endures in common with various female monkeys, baboons and higher apes,² may prove another factor in arresting her growth and precipitating precocious and imperfect

¹ Op. cit., pp. 17, 46, 492.

² For details about the menstrual process in the quadrumana see F. H. A. Marshall (Op. cit., pp. 56-59, 84-91). In the species *Macacus Rhesus*, for instance, the menstrual discharge has been found to last "from three to five days" (p. 58). According to Professor W. Kohler (*The Mentality of Apes*, p. 315) the female chimpanzee definitely menstruates at intervals of thirty to thirty one days, and always for a period of between three to six days.

maturity, so that we might expect more infantile characters in the human female and the females of the quadrumana than in the lower mammals. Dr. Schültze declares that these characters actually occur, and from our point of view it is interesting that he should have arrived at this conclusion, because he does so without our *a priori* grounds for anticipating it, and apparently, without our biological grounds for assuming it.

He writes,¹ "in the mammals, as far as we have been able to observe, the secondary sex characteristics, in so far as they are confined to differences of muscle development and strength, are not so much pronounced, in fact, are not nearly so much pronounced, as in the human species. . . . The menstrual process, which for thousands of years has been working its effects upon the young and not yet fully grown body of woman, has accentuated the secondary sexual characteristics. Thus, in my opinion, the menstrual process is one essential cause the more, accounting for the fact that woman, above all in the development of her muscles and strength, is not equal to man, and that her organs have for the most part remained closer to the infantile type."

Thus, in the female human being's sex rôle, we have to reckon with three tolls on her system, two of which are more recent than her reptiloid ancestors, and one of which is more recent than the ancestors of the quadrumana. All three of them, however, in the opinion of so great an authority as Dr. Schültze, account for her approximation to the infantile type and for the apparent arrestation of development that occurs in her at an earlier age than in man.

But these influences may also account for the widely recognized female possession of a lesser variational tendency; for, if by remaining at a more infantile, or more potential stage of development, the marked accentuation of character that comes with ripe adulthood is indefinitely postponed in woman, her lesser variational

¹ Op. cit., p. 51.

tendency, which includes her lesser tendency to manifest genius, would be more or less intelligible.¹

What is the alternative? The alternative is to suppose that the three extra tolls above mentioned have, in the course of evolution, had no effect upon the female since she departed in form and function from her reptiloid ancestors—that is to say, we are to suppose that there is no necessary relation between development and expenditure, or between development and sexual genesis,² and that an unequal expenditure of energy, like that to be observed in man and woman, or in the female reptile and the female human being, does not necessarily lead to any difference in bodily development. The absurdity and untenability of this view, however, is obvious; and we are therefore forced to the conclusion that the three tolls in question have exercised a strain on the physical resources of the female, that they have been balanced, and that this balance probably consists in an earlier arrestation of development, and, therefore, in the retention of more infantile characters.

Now what is the evidence that the female form is more infantile than the male?

Dr. Oskar Schültze who, in a recent work,³ conveniently and impartially sums up the knowledge available on this vexed question up to the present day, and who confirms most of the facts previously recorded by investigators like Daffner⁴ and Ellis,⁵ produces overwhelm-

¹ See Havelock Ellis, *Man and Woman* (1904), p. 420. "We must regard genius as an organic congenital abnormality . . . and in nearly every department it is undeniably of more frequent occurrence among men than among women: . . . Genius is more common among men by virtue of the same general tendency by which idiocy is more common among men. The two facts are but two aspects of a larger zoological fact—the greater variability of the male."

² For interesting information on these relations see Herbert Spencer, *Principles of Biology*, sections 182-6.

³ Already quoted above.

⁴ Dr. Franz Daffner, *Das Wachstum des Menschen* (Leipzig, 1897).

⁵ *Op. cit.*

ing evidence in favour of the view that woman's form and general anatomy more closely resemble the child than does that of man. Briefly summarizing his conclusions, in so far as they concern those parts of the human body not directly connected with reproduction (for about such parts as are directly connected with reproduction—the larger and flatter pelvis of the woman, the development of her mammary glands, and the copulatory and genital apparatus in either sex, there is no dispute) they may be stated as follows :

“Woman's bony structure is on the whole smaller and weaker than man's, for the individual bones are, generally speaking, smaller and weaker. They are also smoother, because woman's muscles require fewer rough surfaces for their origin and development.¹ . . . Her muscles are also less highly developed. They are moreover paler and softer than man's, a condition probably due to their larger content of water. In all these respects she is more like the child than man is. Woman, like the child, also develops much more fatty tissue than man.² . . . In her skin, finger nails, and hairiness woman is also nearer than man to the child.³ . . . In her proportions, i.e. in her shorter legs and her longer and larger belly, she is again nearer than man to the child.⁴ . . . The bones of her thorax are disposed more in the form of a tub than man's, and are narrower than his. In man the breadth of the thorax is greater than the depth. Woman's sternum is shorter and more vertical than man's, and in section his thorax appears to be more oval than hers, which is more circular in form. Here again woman is the more infantile of the two.⁵ . . . Woman's skull stands half way in development between man's and the child's.⁶ . . . Woman's blood, like the child's, is more watery than man's. . . . Her liver, like the child's, is proportionately larger than man's.⁷ . . . In view of her slightly larger lungs woman

¹ Op. cit., p. 5.

² P. 6.

³ P. 8.

⁴ Pp. 9 and 20.

⁵ P. 11.

⁶ P. 27.

⁷ P. 27.

is more childlike than man.¹ . . . Her blood temperature and pulse, like the child's, are higher than man's.² . . . Woman's stomach is more childlike than man's.³ . . . Her voice and larynx remain childlike.⁴ . . . Her whole type is more childlike than man's. It is precisely woman's more childlike character that makes her more beautiful and more captivating."⁵

Finally, Dr. Schültze emphasizes the fact that women mature more quickly and sooner than men,⁶ and, what is more important still, that they have a smaller variational tendency than men.⁷

These are the facts. The next question is, how are we to interpret them? There are various alternatives. We may conclude that, as the cumulative result of the extra tolls on the female body since its differentiation from the mammalia's reptiloid ancestors, an arrest of growth and a consequent greater likeness to the child has become a permanent characteristic of the female sex-concentration. Or we may argue that these characteristics, consisting of arrested development and of greater similarity to the child, are simply feminine, and that the infantile nature of the female is only a coin-

¹ P. 38. ² P. 37. ³ P. 43. ⁴ P. 38. ⁵ P. 48.

⁶ P. 22. Daffner (Op. cit., p. 89) states that men reach maturity between the ages of 23 and 27, while women do so between the ages of 19 and 23. Ellis (Op. cit., p. 39) says: "A woman may be said to have reached her full development at the age of twenty; a man continues to show a fair degree of development for some years after this age." See also Marshall (Op. cit., p. 713): "In women puberty occurs at a slightly earlier age than in the male sex. The constitutional changes characterizing this period take place more suddenly in the female, the girl almost at once becoming a woman, whereas the boy is several years before he develops into a man, complete maturity not being reached until the 25th year." The precocity of certain lower mammals and of certain species of the quadrumana has already been mentioned. See pp. 6 and 22, *ante*.

⁷ Op. cit., p. 37: "*Eine geringere Variabilitätsbreite.*" This is confirmed by numerous investigators, including Darwin (Op. cit., p. 224) and Ellis, as already mentioned, but see especially Chapter XVI, *Man and Woman*.

vidence. Or, arguing teleologically, with Havelock Ellis, we may say that woman "retains her youthfulness for the sake of possible offspring," and that "Nature has made women more like children in order that they may better understand and care for children."¹

Dismissing the second alternative as too improbable to be entertained seriously, we will turn our attention to Havelock Ellis's view. And, first of all, we would point out that we fail to see the necessity for these teleological aids to explanation. They strike us as a little far-fetched, and they also seem to contain very serious *non-sequiturs*. There is nothing to show that it is necessary to be like a thing to understand it (unless objective study must always be inferior to subjective initiation).² There is also nothing to show that women display any understanding of children whatsoever. They may, and undoubtedly do, find great pleasure in children's company; they may, and unquestionably do, amuse children by amusing themselves with children; but some of the grossest errors concerning child psychology are of woman's creation. Indeed for consistent misunderstandings of children, in all their different aspects, it would be impossible to beat either the average spinster or the average married woman. They are both alike in this. No mother understands her child in the sense that she can explain his mental processes, the mechanism of his psycho-physical motivation. All this understanding of the child has been man's work, as has also been the recent research work regarding child welfare and the successful artificial feeding of infants. Again, there is nothing to show that the retention of youthfulness (I suppose by this Ellis means infantile characters) is necessary for the sake

¹ Op. cit., p. 450.

² To understand a creature absolutely it is certainly necessary to include (that is to say to comprehend it); but that is not necessarily to be like it. Man understands woman and the child because he includes (comprehends them) and this explains why women and children do not understand him.

of possible offspring.¹ When we remember the relation of genesis to development, or of the claims of reproduction to growth, and bear in mind "the great inequality in the cost of reproduction to the two sexes," what need have we of teleological arguments, more or less speculative and fantastic, and based moreover upon guesswork, to account for the phenomenon of woman's infantile characters? Is it not more likely that her precocity, her arrestation of growth, and her resulting infantile characters, are the inevitable reaction to this inequality of cost, the disadvantages of which happen to fall to her sex? Besides there is a *suggestio falsi* in Ellis's reasoning. To suggest that woman has been made more childlike in form and anatomical details because Nature wished her to retain her youthfulness for the sake of possible offspring, implies that the retention of infantile character preserves the individual female from the ordinary ravages of age. Thus two different principles are confused: you are first invited to picture infantile characters as the natural possession of females even of adult years, by which you are led to visualize them as what they are, i.e., more like children than man is; and then, through the inevitable association of infantile conditions with youthfulness, you are led to infer that age and time cannot affect women as much as men, because infantile characters are connected with infants, who are obviously not old. But against this we may point out that, as every one knows, women age just as quickly as men, if not more quickly, and that a man of thirty frequently looks younger and less worn by life than either his sister or his wife, and that this alleged retention of youthfulness is an invention of Mr. Ellis's.

What happens is this. Women grow old just as fast, if not faster, than men, but they start growing old at a

¹ Many animals, the mare, the cow, and carnivore for instance, can go on breeding almost until their death. There appears to be no climacteric in the horse, ruminant or carnivore. See Major-General Sir F. Smith, K.C.M.G., C.B., *A Manual of Veterinary Physiology* (1921), p. 757.

different stage in development. To put it in the form of a simile, if we can imagine the whole gamut of human development to consist of twenty-six stages, each bearing the name of a letter of the alphabet, we must think of women starting to age at R or S, without ever having attained to T,U,V,W,X,Y,Z; whereas men start aging from Z onwards. Therefore it is not consistent with the facts to imply, because woman never gets beyond R or S, that she retains her youthfulness.

Arguing from the superiority of the infant ape over the adult ape, in the line of evolution, because the infant ape is very much nearer man than the adult ape,¹ Ellis claims (apparently on the line of analogy alone) that the human infant is also higher in the line of evolution than the man. "The human infant," he says, "bears the same relation to his species as the simian infant does to his," . . . i.e. he is higher in the line of evolution than the adults, particularly the male adult. And, as woman resembles the child, she too, therefore, stands higher in the line of evolution than man.

But, surely, this is to question one of the most important principles upon which the hypothesis of evolution relies. According to the evolutionary hypothesis, the individual, in his development, retraces the course his ancestors have followed in their evolution. Haeckel, who gave great publicity to this doctrine, called it the biogenetic law, and formulated it in the terms that ontogeny, or the development of the individual, is a repetition of phylogeny, or the evolution of the race.

If, however, this principle is true, how can the infantile stage show a higher degree in evolution than the adult stage? It can do so only if and when there has been in the whole species a degradation from a higher type in evolution. Thus, if modern man had descended from

¹ Op. cit., p. 445. It should be pointed out to those readers who are not aware of the facts, that the infant ape's head—for instance, the infant orang-outang's head—is nearer the human type than is that of the adult ape, and the same is true of the infant gorilla.

a higher type—an angelic or super-human race—it would be conceivable that the child, as recording that higher stage in man's development, must be superior in the line of evolution to the adult being. But Mr. Ellis does not say this. Merely on the analogy of the relation of the young ape to the adult male ape, he argues that the human child is higher in the line of evolution than the man.

But it may be possible—in fact, it has actually been maintained—that the existing apes have descended from a higher type, which was the common progenitor of both modern man and the orang-outang and the gorilla. What then becomes of the analogy? Mr. Ellis foresees this objection and in a footnote he says: "It may be argued in explanation of the phenomena, that the ape has descended from a more human ancestor, but there is no ground for this assumption."¹

No ground? But is this not precisely what Dr. Hermann Klaatsch set himself to prove?² He not only maintains that the existing higher apes are degenerates and have descended from a more manlike ancestor, but shows that fossil apes of two million years ago had better skulls than their descendants of to-day.³

Even if these conclusions be disputed, however, it can hardly be denied by the most ardent advocate of Mr. Ellis's view, that the higher apes both in the length of their arms and particularly in the degeneration of their thumbs, show specializations constituting a departure from the progenitors of both the apes and man. How then can it be so boldly maintained that "there is no ground" for the assumption that the apes have descended from a more human ancestor?

¹ Op. cit., p. 446.

² See his *Evolution and Progress of Mankind*, pp. 70-71, in fact, the whole of Chapter III.

³ See also p. 584 of the Vol. *Mammalia* in the *Cambridge Natural History*, where, speaking of the fossil ape's skull found in Java, the author says its cranial capacity is 400 cm. greater than that of any anthropoid ape.

And there are other investigators, besides Dr. Klaatsch, who seem to think that the apes are specialized descendants of the common ancestor of man and his simian relatives. In explaining the wide differentiation of man and the gorilla, Mr. G. Elliot Smith says: "Long ages ago, possibly in the Miocene, the ancestors common to man, gorilla and chimpanzee, became separated into groups. The different conditions to which they were exposed after they parted company were in the main responsible for the contrasts in their fate."¹

It may be replied to Mr. Ellis, therefore, that there is no ground for the assumption that, because the infant ape happens to be more human than his male parent, that, therefore, the human child stands higher in the line of evolution than his father; and, in taking exception to his claim that women and babies in the matter of hairiness bear the special characteristics of humanity in a higher degree than man,² I would point out that this is not necessarily a sign of superiority, and that in this they were anticipated, as Mr. Elliot Smith has pointed out (see footnote below), by races which are generally acknowledged as inferior to the modern European (for instance, the negroes and Mongolians, who are believed to have shot off from the main stem of the Caucasian race by earlier specializations).

To argue further, as Mr. Ellis does, that growth in man from about the third year onwards is to some extent growth in degeneration and senility,³ because,

¹ *The Evolution of Man*, p. 38. See also p. 34. "In many respects man retains more of the primitive characteristics—for example in his hands—than his nearest simian relatives, and in the supreme race of mankind many traits, such as abundance of hair, persist to suggest pithecoid affinities, which have been lost by the more specialized negro and other races. Those anthropologists who use the retention of primitive features in the European as an argument to exalt the negro to equality with him are neglecting the near teaching of comparative anatomy, that the persistence of primitive traits is often a sign of strength rather than of weakness."

² *Op. cit.*, p. 447.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 447

apparently, he develops many primitive characteristics to which woman (owing to her arrested development) does not attain, is again quite invalid. Mr. Elliot Smith has already supplied me with a refutation of that standpoint (see footnote, p. 32, already referred to); but let me quote a further passage from his illuminating work, *The Evolution of Man*, to show how unwarranted is Mr. Ellis's conclusion.

Mr. Elliot Smith says: "It is important then to bear in mind the fact that the retention of primitive characters is often to be looked upon as a token that their possessor has not been compelled to turn aside from the straight path to adopt protective specializations, but has been able to preserve some of the plasticity associated with his primitiveness, precisely because he has not succumbed or fallen away in the struggle for supremacy. It is the wider triumph of the individual who specializes late, after benefiting by the many-sided experiences of early life, over him who in youth becomes tied to a narrow calling."¹

Thus we find it impossible to accept Mr. Ellis's interpretation of the facts, and incline to Dr. Schültze's conclusion that the differences between man and woman, which make woman approximate more than man does to the infantile type, are the outcome of the great inequality in the cost of reproduction to the two sexes. According to this view, the greater toll on woman's physical resources has to be compensated, and this compensation takes the form of preventing her from attaining to the full development of man.²

To be reminded that, in mammals and birds, the sexually differentiated type originates from an asexual

¹ Op. cit., p. 447.

² Mr. Ellis admits the fact of woman's arrested development (Op. cit., p. 54), but does not appear to admit any connection between it and the greater cost of reproduction which falls to her, and prefers to abide by teleological speculations about Nature and the latter's alleged desire to keep woman youthful. . .

embryonic soma through the action of what are known as sex hormones (the secretions of the sexual glands) does not invalidate this conclusion, because we know that these sex hormones act both by "furtherance" and "inhibition" of the characters.¹

The precise way in which these formative influences of the sex glands operate, is not known, but the fact that they promote growth here and arrest it there is well established. We may therefore suppose that in some obscure way they memorize for the organism the experiences of its past in the line of evolution, and prepare it for its reproductive rôle; and, by preventing in the female the expenditure of energy on full development, enable her the better to meet the heavy claims that begin to come with puberty.

At all events, since the argumentation based upon those anatomical differences between the two sexes, which are not directly connected with the copulating and genital apparatus, or with the sexual auxiliary apparatus, must still depend a good deal upon conjecture, we have no wish to press it too far. And, if we conclude that woman is more infantile than man in these somatic characters which are not directly connected with reproduction, and account for this by pointing to her precocious and earlier arrest of development, owing to the heavier claims which reproduction makes upon her physical resources, we state no more than what is consistent with our present knowledge of the facts, and a fair interpretation of them.

Nevertheless, it should not be forgotten that this infantile character of woman is intimately bound up with her smaller variational tendency, and consequently with her inferiority to man in the attainment of genius in all fields, and, as such, is very important in estimating the ultimate insuperable differences in the achievements of the two sexes.

If, however, we turn from those somatic characters

¹ Lipschütz, *Op. cit.*, p. 468.

not directly concerned with reproduction, to those which have reproduction for their subject, we are no longer in the domain of conjecture; we are confronted by differences the consequences of which are indisputable, which, as we have seen, have a great bearing upon the ultimate differentiation of the two sexes, both in their life-habits and their psyche. And we may attempt broad generalizations, which, while they are beyond dispute, may serve as a basis for an appreciation of each sex.

The primary fact that emerges from our inquiry is the great inequality in the cost of reproduction to the two sexes. This may be subdivided as follows:

A. *Physical consequences of the inequality of the cost to women.*

(1) The three great tolls on her physical resources—menstruation, parturition and lactation, which in their cumulative result through the ages, has led to the early arrest of her development. It should be borne in mind that the first toll at any rate, cannot be escaped.

(2) The longer sexual cycle which, including gestation and lactation, may last eighteen months or more after the fertilizing coitus. This means that while man is ready for a fresh sexual experience as soon as he has recovered from the coitus, woman is only ready for a fresh coitus provided the first has not effected fertilization. If fertilization has been effected by the first coitus, both for the sake of the coming child and herself, she is best left alone. When once the child has come she is happiest left alone.¹

(3) The loss of freedom due to the presence of the beloved parasite, and the need to spend a good deal of her lifetime with it.

(4) The inferior wieldiness of her body through her broader pelvis, larger abdomen, and shorter legs. We

¹ Among many savage peoples this desirable segregation of the gravid and nursing female from the male is frequently enforced by tribal law. For a full discussion of this aspect of the sex relation and its bearing on monogamy see *Woman: A Vindication*, pp. 162-7. See also G. Pitt-Rivers (*Psyche*, January issue, 1926), for attitude of Maoris to this question.

might add through her smaller sustaining power and weaker muscles.

(5) The earlier ageing of women, which is probably due to the consequences of their faster and greater expenditure.

B. The physical consequences of the inequality in the cost to the man.

(1) Fewer tolls on his physical resources. No ineluctable loss like that of menstruation. Higher and longer development.

(2) A very much shorter sexual cycle, consequently, if it is desirable for the sake of the coming generation that he should not approach his mate after fertilization, a great intolerance of monogamy.¹

(3) Greater freedom. Man is not tied down to the beloved parasite, and need not spend much of his lifetime in associating with it.

(4) Greater agility and wieldiness of body, owing to narrower pelvis, shorter trunk, longer legs. We might add, greater sustaining power, and stronger muscles. (The greater bodily agility, like all bodily qualities, finds its counterpart in greater agility of mind.) It is interesting to note in this respect that only once in its history has the Derby been won by a mare. At least, so I have been informed.

(5) Slower and later ageing, which leaves a longer freshness of mind and body and enabled some men, like Goethe, Gladstone, Bismarck, Bernadotte, Cardinal Fleury, Dufaure, Thiers, Rémusat, Guizot, Titian, Corot, Bonnat, Cervantes, etc., only to abdicate with their life their freshness and combativeness.²

¹ The Feminists who are anxious to forestall the argument for polygamy that can be based on this contention, deny that monogamy necessarily involves this insuperable difficulty. And they prefer to see an unfortunate sister produce a child a year than to admit that because interference with a gestating or nursing mother is deleterious to both mother and child, monogamy must lead to degeneration.

² Bernadotte, when 80 years of age, with mental powers still intact, presided at his Council of Ministers. Guizot at the age of 83 wrote the

C. *The mental consequences of the inequality in the cost to the woman.*

(1) The earlier arrest and precocity of development have, as we have seen, limited the female's variational tendency so that, in no sphere, does that sex produce the extremes that the male sex produces. Thus genius in all fields is rarely if ever a female phenomenon.

(2) The drains on her energies, by lessening her powers of endurance, make woman weaker in application, concentration and sustained mental effort than man. To condense into a short statement what is meant by this, we may quote Edmund Gosse's remark about women in poetry: "In order to succeed in Poetry," says Edmund Gosse, "women must be brief, personal and concentrated."¹ Why?—They must be brief because their inspiration is not powerful enough to endure a prolonged

first four volumes of his remarkable *Histoire de France Racontée à mes Petits Enfants*. Dufaure at 78 was President of the Council. The great chemist Berthelot, who died at 80 worked right up to the end of his life. Titian at the age of 95 completed his *Christ crowned with Thorns*. Herbert Spencer was over 70 when he wrote some of his best essays, and revised his *Synthetic Philosophy*. Corot, when 77, painted *Le Village du Sin-le-Noble*, one of his best pictures, and when almost 89, *L'Intérieure de la Cathédrale de Sens*, which is a chef-d'œuvre. Bonnat was 87 when he exhibited at the salon of 1919 portraits which showed that this grand artist had lost nothing of his talent. Finally Cervantes was 55 when he published the first part of *Don Quixote*. Regarding the procreative ability of old men, it is notorious that it may last until extreme old age. To mention extreme instances, Jacob was probably over 90 when he begat Joseph and Benjamin; Cato, the Censor, was 80 when he married and had a son. Dr. Défournelle of Barjac was 102 when he married a girl of 26 "by whom he had children." Baron Baravicini de Capelli died at 104, leaving his fourth wife enceinte with his eighth child. In 1860 Mr. Tyler, a President of the United States, married at 75 and became the father of a girl. Lakanal was married and had a son when 77. The Duc de Bouillon, when 66 years old, had a son. Prof. Lacassagne, in his interesting work *A Green Old Age*, from which most of the above details have been culled (London, 1923), states (p. 49) that Dr. Duplay examined the testicles of fifty-one old men over 70 years of age, and in twenty-seven of the subjects found that they were in every respect similar to those of men in middle life.

¹ *Century Magazine*, June, 1923. Article: "Christina Rossetti."

struggle with the difficulties of form ; personal, because intimate knowledge supplies the most vivid kind of refreshment to the idea, as fast as the checks of form cause it to languish ; and " concentrated," because concentration (in the sense of condensation) enables the obstacles to be overcome with greatest possible speed.

(3) The limitations imposed by the beloved parasite on woman's freedom (and it should always be remembered that woman without the beloved parasite is not sexually adapted) prevent that persevering and continuous pre-occupation with a subject or with a problem which conduces to mastery.

(4) The fact that woman does not attain to man's degree of development, makes man for ever a mystery, a misunderstood creature to her. She never *includes* man, and therefore cannot *comprehend* him. That is why among other facts that could be adduced in support of this view, women can never paint good portraits of men. No such achievement is known. To express adequately one must understand. As for the literary portraits, they are only the expression of the wish-thought. They are portrayals of what the racial tradition in woman regards as the desirable sexual mate—hence such characters as Heathcliff (the finest of all male characters created by a woman), whose complete absorption in one sexual adaptation is the one grandiose though unrealistic trait in his character. Thus man always eludes woman's grasp, and idealization and romantic fiction, whether unduly laudatory or depreciatory, take the place of a realistic representation of his nature. By cunning women, desirous of deceiving credulous and simple men, this truth is usually inverted, and the dictum is spread that woman always eludes man's grasp.

D. *The mental consequences of the inequality in the cost to men.*

(1) The possibility of attaining to genius, as also to the lowest depths of depravity and stupidity. (Idiots are more common in men than women.)

(2 and 3) The freedom to apply all available energy to one task, to one cause, and one object. Greater powers of application, concentration, and endurance than woman. Thus, in art, greater success in maintaining the strength of the inspiration against the obstructive difficulties of form. In science, as in all effort, greater success in surviving long periods of no apparent or no appreciable success.

(4) The inclusion and comprehension of woman (except among effeminate or degenerate men) which, with the understanding of his fellow-men, leads man to a greater capacity for realistic conceptions about man, woman, the child and life. Romanticism and idealization, in so far as they are distortions either of man's or woman's nature, are a sign that the male who is guilty of them approximates to the sick or degenerate type.

E. *The mental consequences of the functional differences of sex to woman.*

These are all dealt with in detail in *Woman: A Vindication*.¹ For the mental consequences of the difference in her rôle on copulation see above, pp. 15, 16. (*It should never be forgotten that the mental qualities reared through the ages by woman's part in the coitus, are probably among the oldest that characterize her; they are much older than those mental qualities which have been reared in her during the existence of the mammalian order.*)

F. *The mental consequences of the functional differences to men.*

(1) For the mental consequences of the difference in his rôle in copulation see above, pp. 15, 16. (As the coitus constitutes man's only part in reproduction, and this part has probably not changed very materially in the male since the time of the warm-blooded ancestors of the mammalia, man is, in the mental consequences of his rôle in reproduction, much less differentiated from his earlier ancestors among sexually dimorphic animals

¹ See particularly the Chapters on Marriage and Chapter X: "The Virtues and Vices of Women,"

than is the mammalian female, woman. Thus he is essentially the senior of the two.)

(2) The mental consequences of the part of protector and ruler of the family or horde—a part which we already see played by the male monkeys and the male apes—are: combativeness, bravery, heroism in battle,¹ intolerance of other males and particularly a tendency to be jealous of younger males.² (We have seen that in the monkeys this jealousy of younger males is a salient characteristic of the older members of the same sex, and in man it is just as pronounced, although man successfully conceals it, at least in civilized communities, where it usually manifests itself in the form of Puritanical constraints upon the young.) Again here, as under (1) above, leadership, with all that it means in responsibility, in a fondness for exercising protective rights, and in the habit of expecting and commanding obedience, becomes a prominent characteristic.

(3) The mental consequences of the very much shorter sexual cycle in man, with its smaller drains upon his physical resources, has, as we have seen, consisted in giving him greater freedom thoroughly to acquire expertness and mastery in almost any undertaking. The absence of the beloved parasite from man's life (except as an indirect burden), added to the fact of his higher development, thus gives him an advantage, to which his unquestionably greater achievements in every field must be ascribed.

(4) The mental consequences of the greater freedom resulting from man's functional difference also manifests itself in his nature as independence and self-reliance, and endows him with that pioneer spirit, which, both in the sciences, the arts, and the task of world-mastery, exploration and exploitation, causes him to be an innovator, a discoverer and inventor.

¹ See a particularly fine case of this reported by Lyddeker, Vol. I, pp. 72-73, in reference to the leader of a monkey horde of the Langur species.

² See last section Chapter X for more exhaustive treatment of this subject,

(5) Finally, owing to man's ability to turn away both from woman and child, and to concentrate all his power on contemplation and meditation, and all his genius on searching the meaning of the mysteries that surround him, he is not only the truly artistic and scientific sex, but also the sex from which all religiousness and religions ultimately derive. The pursuit of science issued from man's stubborn endeavour to solve the mystery of his environment, and though much can be conceded to woman in the nature of magical and divinatory powers, not only is she surpassed in both these fields by man, but she is also nowhere on a level of equality with him in religion.¹

* * * * *

Now, briefly summing up, what is the conclusion at which we have arrived ?

In the first place, we have devoted much labour and space simply to the object of establishing what must surely appear to be no more than the obvious truth that *specialized functions associated with structural differences between organisms are, and always must be, accompanied by special instincts, emotions and mental powers.*²

Tracing this law throughout animal species, we find it operating also in that differentiation within species which we have termed the sex-rôles ; and, finally, we found it determining those distinctions between the human male and female which, from time immemorial,

¹ See p. 262, *Early Civilization*, by A. A. Goldenweiser, where the author, who is, if anything, inclined to be feministic in his bias, concludes that "in religion woman is scarcely anywhere on a level of equality with man." See also W. H. Rivers, *History of Civilization*, p. 148: "A rule of wide application is that occupations involving ritual, i.e. involving knowledge of manual or verbal rites implying appeal to higher powers, are practised by men, while occupations devoid of this sacred aspect are open to women."

² It is the popular denial of this law to-day which makes it necessary to devote so much labour and space to the demonstration of what ought generally to be regarded as a truism.

have been recognized with more or less certainty by the bulk of mankind.

Secondly, therefore, we have shown man and woman to be essentially unlike each other, unequal and incapable of equality, and we have demonstrated this essential dissimilarity of the sexes, not only in those bodily characteristics which are directly concerned with reproduction, but also in those other physiological features which, sometimes called secondary, do not directly co-operate in the functions of multiplication.

Finally, we have endeavoured to bring out clearly all those mental characters, instincts and emotions, which are associated with the structural and functional differences that have been noticed, in order to show, not only that there is a necessary psychical differentiation associated with the different rôles of male and female, but also that this psychical differentiation accounts for and harmonizes with mankind's general experiences and knowledge concerning the marked disparities between male and female achievement.

Thus the second important fact that emerges with overwhelming force from our inquiry is the immense advantage with which man starts as a performer in all fields of human endeavour not directly connected with the bearing and rearing of children.

We have seen that he is the senior of the two sexes,¹ inasmuch as he is probably more like the remote adult ancestor of the race than the female, and retains an equipment of instincts, emotions and mental powers which for millions of years has been much less modified than hers by the changes which produced placental mammals.

We have also seen that, owing to the changes which have affected the female of all mammalian species, since

¹ No attempt will be made in the following catalogue of man's advantages to enumerate all the peculiarities and possibilities of the masculine body and mind, but only those which most sharply distinguish the human male from the human female, and are easily traced to the different rôles of each sex in reproduction,

they branched off from their reptiloid ancestors, there is a much greater drain upon her physical resources in reproduction than there is upon the male's, and, therefore, that he is able to attain to his full development unhampered by arresting claims. In the human species this is probably one of the causes of genius in the male.

Furthermore we have given the scientific authority for regarding man as capable of greater variability than woman—the second probable contributory cause of genius in the male.

And we have also called attention to :

(a) His freedom from the beloved parasite, with all that this means in a capacity for concentration, application, independence, and thoroughness, in all that he undertakes—hence his greater ability in science, art and all effort.

(b) His freedom from the physical stresses occasioned by the beloved parasite, with its resulting greater sustaining power, greater enduring power, and greater energy.

(c) His rôle in copulation, which imparts to his psychical character that quality of leadership, initiation, responsibility, boldness, originality, independence, the habit of dominance. And, since this is the oldest part of the sex-relationship both in him and woman, the qualities arising from the respective rôles of the sexes in copulation must be considered as much more deeply rooted in both of them than the qualities connected with parenthood.

(d) His greater bodily agility, with a corresponding greater agility of mind.

(e) His slower and later aging.

(f) His inclusion and comprehension of woman.

(g) His combativeness, bravery, heroism in battle, self-reliance, and independence, as the outcome of his rôle of protector and ruler of the family or horde, and again here his training in leadership, implanting in him the pioneer spirit for all undertakings.

(b) His shorter sexual cycle.

(i) His greater powers of concentration, contemplation and meditation make him not only the truly artistic and scientific sex, but also the sex from which all religiousness and religions ultimately derive.

These are indeed immense advantages, and their derivation from the structural and functional peculiarities *differentiating man from woman, make them permanent advantages as long as the sex-rôles remain as they are.*

But, if we accept these advantages as proved, if, in the light of what physiology, psychology, and above all history tell us, we recognize that they are definitely associated with maleness in humanity, then we are forced to acknowledge that the human male enters life with such a paramount superiority for successful achievement, with such a formidable bias in his favour, that it is inconceivable that he can ever allow himself to sink either to equality with, or subordination to, the female, without making such a renunciation of his heritage, such a surrender of his endowments and traditional distinctions, as to have become almost a different creature, a member of a new and hitherto unclassified sex.

For what order of being, gifted as he is gifted, and liberated as he has been liberated from the heavy handicap imposed on woman, could have failed to establish his supremacy in every field when in competition with the other sex? Even admitting that the two sexes started millions of years ago in pre-reptiloid days with the same equipment, the same opportunities, and the same adaptations—which is obviously untrue—man, with all the positive and negative advantages which the male sex has acquired through the ages, must inevitably have won in the competition for achievement, however soon or however late that may have started.

When, therefore, we find chiefly the names of men in all the records of human greatness; when in some fields, such as the arts of architecture, sculpture, music, and the highest of all arts—legislation, we find almost the only names worth considering those of men both young

and old,¹ the phenomenon, far from surprising us, should strike us as the least possible product of the chances involved, the minimum rather than the maximum of what, from our data, we should feel entitled to expect ; and, in view of what we know of man's endowments and privileged position, we should marvel if historical and contemporary facts revealed a record one whit less glorious, one whit less creditable.

To talk of a natural equality between man and woman, therefore, is obvious nonsense. To talk of an equality that can be acquired or imposed by law, is not less absurd. But to suppose, as many at present do suppose, that the equality that clearly is not and never can be present, can be secured either by educating or in some mysterious way, transforming the female, is to contemplate the possibility, not only of removing woman's life handicap, but also of endowing her with those qualities of mind and body which, deriving directly from man's specialized functions, she never has possessed and can never possess as he possesses them.

And yet there is a large body of people to-day, who not only question this fundamental inequality of the sexes, but who, with a stubborn refusal to look at the record of history, are prepared to go to extreme lengths to defend the opposite doctrine and to make it the leading principle of their lives. When forced to recognize the overwhelming evidence which the records of the past and present afford of the absurdity of their position, they reply that hitherto woman has been suppressed, or repressed, or violently subjugated into relative inferiority.* When confronted with the physiological and functional differences of the sexes, and asked to acknowledge that these differences must be associated with a corresponding

¹ And this despite the exorbitant sentimental fuss which it has been customary to create about any female achievements, however mediocre.

* This position, which was assumed by John Stuart Mill, and has since been adopted by all Feminists, will be found adequately dealt with on historical lines and refuted in Chapter X of my *Woman: A Vindication*.

differentiation in instincts, emotions and mental powers, they point to those imperfect and abnormal examples of both sexes, who manifest no truly unisexual preponderance, and who in their freakishness exhibit bisexual characters. When driven to their last defence, and invited to admit that where there is a preponderance of one sex in a creature (which is the normal phenomenon) that creature will exhibit the qualities associated with the preponderating influence of one sex-concentration, they deny that sex is a reality, and claim that the terms man and woman are anachronisms !

It is owing to the increasing prevalence of such singular people, that it has become necessary to restate the more or less obvious truths that have been the subject of these first two chapters ; for, although their attitude argues very profound and wilful prejudice and a degree of unenlightenment almost incredible at this late stage of European culture and learning, we have to accept the fact that the world has grown both foolish and credulous, and we have to deal with it on that basis. Another alternative would have been to regard these sex-egalitarians as less honest than they are obtuse, less irrational than they are deliberately deceptive. This may be so. But in that case we have only to convince their ignorant followers of the fraudulent nature of their claims in order to defeat their disingenuous tactics.

At all events we have very reluctantly indeed thought it necessary to restate with some elaborateness the case for sexual inequality. And, although we have not yet finished with the sex-egalitarians, we challenge them to prove satisfactorily to all concerned that the differences between the sexes which we have enumerated are not differences, that in fact specialized functions do not involve corresponding instincts, emotions, and mental powers, and that the records of history are mythical and unreliable.

But we who are satisfied that there is still some meaning in the words man and woman, and that they still connote, and will continue to connote very definite attributes

and ideas, refuse to effect any compromise with the sex egalitarians. Regarding the sexes as fundamentally different and therefore unequal, we cannot help classing as disingenuous any attempt that is made to support a claim so fantastic as sexual equality; and let it be remembered that we adopt this position with no feelings of hostility to women, but rather with a tender solicitude for those precious aspects of female life and happiness, which the sex-egalitarians are doing their utmost to destroy.

Not only can a woman not see or feel a thing as a man sees and feels it, but even when he and she appear to do the same thing, that thing is not done and cannot be done in the same way. The approach and adaptation of each to the world is, and cannot help being, utterly and unalterably different.

There is indeed a method by which the human male and female can be made to appear equal in all fields of achievement; there are even means by which the former may be reduced to a position of inferiority in all such fields—a method and a means which modern mankind, particularly in Western Europe and America are, and have for some time been steadily pursuing as if intent upon altering and reversing the relationship of the sexes.

That method and those means, as we shall see, have consisted in dwarfing, limiting and reducing man's claims and prerogatives, in truncating and extirpating his hereditary gifts, in making him timid and hesitating where he should be most intrepid, in sentimentalizing, cowering and debilitating him, and above all in besotting and impoverishing his intellect and his body. This method and these means have been man's own invention, man's own deliberate choice. He himself has been directly responsible for their adoption and for their continued operation. And, now that they have begun to produce their direst consequences, now that, partly emasculated, effeminized and despirited, he finds himself no longer the creature he was, he is confronted by a condition of affairs which he does not understand, which he cannot

master, and which he utterly fails to interpret correctly.

His mate, woman, on the other hand, arguing as if man's stubborn and self-sought retrogression were really *her own advance*, her increased endowment, and as if his scandalous abandonment of his great heritage were really an inevitable evolutionary phase, by which she herself has come to assume greater importance and higher powers, is now interpreting as natural and desirable an apparent equality between the sexes in achievement, and, in the ultimate extreme, an inferiority of the male, which, far from being an inevitable evolutionary phase, by which "she has come into her own," is merely the latest symptom of man's deliberate dissipation of his spiritual and physical patrimony.

An ignominious and voluntary retreat is thus, as is customary in warfare, interpreted by the opposing horde as a successful and irresistible forward movement on their own part.

The cry and the claim of sexual equality are therefore merely symptoms of male degeneracy, they are the by-products, as it were, of the disintegration of the manly character, and it may be taken for granted that the gradual crescendo of the soprano voice in all civilized communities is the signal of their decline. It was so in Greece, as we shall show in Chapter III, and it was also the case in Rome, and in France before the Revolution.

That is why I call this work, in which I propose to analyse the causes of the current cry, and the current partial fact, of the Equality of the Sexes, not the Defence of Man, or his Vindication, but his *Indictment*; for it is with him, and with him alone, that all the responsibility lies for every phase and every step of the present triumphant movement known all over Western civilization as Feminism and Sex Warfare. And it is because I believe that this movement in recent times has spread from England, and through the paramount influence of Anglo-Saxon ideology, that I shall in these pages pay particular attention to the Englishman and the factors which in England have led to the degeneration of the male.

CHAPTER III

The Matriarchal Myth—Part I

IN settling the question of the relative fitness of the sexes for achievement in life, there are apparently two alternatives. And these alternatives depend, not upon two different sets of facts, but upon two different interpretations of the same facts.

Let us look at the facts first, leaving out of account those already considered in the two previous chapters.

The facts which are historical and beyond dispute are openly admitted by both sides.

Confronted by the evidence of history and the records of primitive as well as of highly civilized societies, everybody, feminist or anti-feminist, is bound to acknowledge that, whatever the explanation may be, man has played a more leading, a vastly more distinguished, rôle than woman in the whole of that arduous and glorious struggle which has led humanity up from its more lowly ancestors to its present lofty station. And, in this matter, it is well to remember that the conclusion to be derived from the records of recent historical times among civilized people is in no way different from that which can be drawn from the picture of prehistoric times which we are able to reconstruct, more or less perfectly, by means of our study of primitive societies now existing, or only lately become extinct.

Thus, whether we choose to compare a catalogue of the outstanding male creators of European culture, from Hesiod or Thales to Kant, Darwin or Einstein, with a list of those females who, however grossly and sentimentally

the importance of their work may have been exaggerated, are said to have contributed in some way to that same culture ; or whether we compare the respective influence of males and females in existing primitive societies, with the idea of obtaining a fair picture of the relative rôles of the sexes in prehistoric times, we are compelled, by the nature of the evidence and the overwhelming array of facts, to place man first in all those fields of achievement in which something beyond the reproductive functions come into play.

To dwell on the recent historical period alone, let the reader, without any special study, just try to recall the names of those whom he associates with outstanding mastery, whether in political leadership, philosophy, science, architecture, music, the graphic arts, poetry, belles-lettres, or mechanical inventions during the last three thousand years in Europe alone. What will be the result ? The result will necessarily be a long and closely packed list of men, beside which the small, insignificant contingent of women will appear almost pitiable. And this result will be obtained, not because the reader has displayed bias and deliberately omitted, or unintentionally forgotten, certain women's names, but because he will be quite unable to think of any substantial number of distinguished women even with very considerable effort.

Now, in order to form a picture of prehistoric cultures, and of the rôle of the male in societies of which we have no record, let him examine the life of those existing tribes or groups of savages which, from the accounts of travellers and field ethnographers, he may assume to present a fairly accurate picture of what we ourselves probably were, long before the dawn of the Egyptian, Babylonian or Hindu cultures. What will he find ? Without exception, he will see man either as the leader, the director, the executive power, or (rarely) at least the adviser of the horde.

These facts cannot be disputed ; but, as I have already said, they may be differently interpreted.

We can take up the Feminist attitude and argue that the marked disparity between man's and woman's achievements hitherto has been due to artificial constraints imposed upon the female—whether owing to the wanton bias or brutality of man, or to the foolish lethargy of woman herself—and that when once these constraints have been removed, the visible disparity, now perforce acknowledged, however reluctantly, will tend to vanish. Or we can argue that the difference we behold throughout the historical and prehistorical period between man's and woman's place and achievements in society—a difference which places man very much higher than woman in general capacity, except in the one department immediately dependent upon her reproductive structures and their functions—is due to a natural and insuperable distinction between them, which, while it accounts for the preponderating influence and efficiency of the male, explains that influence and efficiency by directing attention to (*a*) woman's original handicap, as discussed in the last chapters, and all that it means in the concentration of power and time on the beloved parasite both in the physiological and psychological sense; and (*b*) the multitude of her physical divergences from the male, many of which, quite apart from the presence of the beloved parasite, but derived from the functions connected with it, tend to make her unable to surpass, or in the aggregate to equal man in all those fields where the opportunities of the two are equal.

If we wish to support the Feminist view, we are faced by many difficulties which the Feminist can hardly be said to have met.

The greatest of these difficulties is this: if, among the most primitive human hordes it was a matter of indifference which sex was put to achieve a certain important object, or to perform a certain lofty function, how can we explain the preponderating influence and power of man in all societies, or almost all societies, that have ever existed?

Primitive men, like the animals and like the masses of modern civilized communities, are not moved by useless and unserviceable fancies. Sooner or later the struggle for existence imposes the stern utilitarian law upon all, that exceptional gifts, whether of mind or body, establish the claim to leadership. It is not a question of the leader asking to be elected, or demanding of voters that they should seek his advice or instruction before embarking upon any undertaking. Those who look up to him and follow his counsel do not do so out of altruism, or charity, or benevolence, or some abstract tenet of justice. The recognition of his superior ability, when the latter is profitable to his group, constitutes him the leader or director, whether he wishes to lead or direct, or not.

Where the struggle for existence is keenest and hardest, this law will prevail over all others, and according to the usefulness of the superior man to his group in the hour of need, so that group will honour and if necessary humour him. That creature, therefore, man or woman, who sees a way out of a difficulty, who can shoot straighter than the rest, who can track an enemy or make a weapon better than the rest, or who is able to read from obscure signs on the ground or elsewhere all kinds of useful information, is of the utmost value to the group among which he or she happens to be born. Nothing, no empty prejudice, can prevent that group from recognizing the signal ability he or she exhibits in any field, or from perceiving its utility.

Take, for instance, the power of tracking an enemy or a quarry, in which the Australian bushmen are said to display such marvellous talent that they can tell by looking at the entrance of a burrow whether the animal using it is at home or abroad. Referring to this power, to its importance to the tribe, and to the varying degrees in which it is exhibited by different men, Sir W. Baldwin Spencer and F. L. Gillen write as follows : " The difference is so marked that while an ordinary good tracker

will have difficulty in following them [the tracks] while he is on foot, and so can see them close to, a really good one will unerringly follow them up on a horse or camel back." ¹

Now here is obviously an example of the difference between mere talent or practical ability and genius. Can it be supposed that, where such genius manifests itself in a tribe, its utilitarian value could fail to be noticed or used, no matter in which sex it appeared ?

Any quality that is of paramount importance to a primitive group or tribe, constitutes the creature who has it a coveted possession. And, in mankind's long and arduous struggle up from the beast to the philosophic type of recent history, all outstanding qualities of group value must necessarily have made their possessors important and directive spirits in the community. Here it is not even reasonable to plead artificial restraints. Men in a savage state know just as well as we do what suits their purpose best. And it is inconceivable that, if outstanding ability in all fields of human achievement had been habitually exhibited by the female, that the savage could have afforded to overlook it any more than modern society could afford to do so.

The theory that differences of rank and social distinction began with those slight or marked differences in ability which may be discerned between the members of any group in any clime is now generally accepted, and thus the office of chieftain is supposed to have evolved out of that early differentiation which superiority in any sphere establishes between an individual and his group, or between an individual and a group strange to him (the case of a chief or ruler who is an adventurer from a strange land).² Judging the matter merely from the

¹ *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 35.

² This is usually the origin of the chiefs among the Khonds and among most of the Highland tribes of Central Asia, and it probably accounts for the traditions of Bochica among the Chilchos, Amulivaca among the Tamanacs, and Quetzalcoatl among the Mexicans.

standpoint of probability, therefore, it seems unlikely that the universal existence of male leadership at all times should have been the outcome of a deliberate suppression or repression of the female by the stronger and brutal male ; for we may feel fairly certain that if outstanding ability of any kind, quite apart from physical strength, had been more repeatedly displayed by the female than by the male, the former's would have been regarded as the superior sex just as the male's has been.

It is a mistake to suppose that mere physical strength is any more the sole criterion of superiority in primitive societies than it is in our own.¹ It is also a mistake to believe that in savage tribes mere physical strength is used more often than it is in modern society to suppress other kinds of superiority. The savage is perfectly well aware of how dependent he is upon superior gifts unconnected with brute strength, and it is probable that in the majority of human societies, from the moment man became a weapon-making and weapon-using animal, from the moment the rudiments of science began to be developed—whether in the chase, in battle, in navigation, shelter construction, healing, or the making of seacraft—the possessors of physical strength alone became the servants and protectors, rather than the oppressors, of men showing peculiar abilities, whether such men were or were not vigorously endowed on the physical side.

This being so—and the records of ethnographers lead us to believe that it is so—it is inaccurate to suppose that the preponderating power of the male sex, the universal possession by the male sex of the executive in primitive and civilized societies, can be ascribed to the abuse of their physical strength at the cost of latent

¹ See Sir James Frazer, *The Magical Origin of Kings*, p. 86 : "The idea that the first king was simply the strongest and bravest of his tribe is one of those facile theories which the arm-chair philosopher concocts with his feet on the fender without taking the trouble to consult the facts." Sir James then proceeds to say that strength as the origin of temporal power is the exception rather than the rule,

ability of a higher and more useful order in the weaker sex. For, if it is admitted that the power of male chiefs, priests, sorcerers and magic workers is acquired and maintained by other means than physical superiority alone, there can be no doubt whatsoever that similar power could have been acquired and maintained by females, despite their physical inferiority, if the experience of all societies had led mankind in all parts of the inhabited globe to recognize the utilitarian value of such an elevation of the female above the other sex.

The fact that the kings and royal lines of many primitive societies have sprung from the ranks of the sorcerers and medicine men, ought to put us on our guard against assuming too readily that the genesis of social power is to be sought in the mere assertion of physical superiority.¹ And seeing that, at this stage of evolution, keenness of intelligence and the ability to use hitherto unknown weapons, devices, or stratagems, are likely to baffle very much more than the familiar display of muscular efficiency²—hence the belief in a large number of communities both savage and civilized in America, Africa and elsewhere, that the first European invaders with their firearms, etc., were gods—it seems fairly certain that no relative weakness of body can bar the way to power, if other outstanding qualities are exhibited.

For it must be remembered that by sorcerers, magic-workers, and medicine men in primitive societies, we are not to understand simply unashamed tricksters, who exploit for their own advantage the credulity of their fellows. The whole of primitive society, its order, its *joie de vivre*, its trust in the future, its most cherished traditions, are the particular care of this body of men.

¹ Sir James Frazer (Op. cit., p. 87) emphatically states that "the public profession of magic has been one of the roads by which the ablest men have passed to the supreme power."

² Cf. Sir James Frazer (Op. cit., p. 83): "At this stage of evolution the supreme power tends to fall into the hands of men of the keenest intelligence and the most unscrupulous character."

The life-preserving pursuits of the community find their experts and authorities precisely among this class so much discredited by ignorant European observers.¹

As Captain Pitt-Rivers says : " Generally speaking, magic and sorcery are in primitive societies the coercive and inhibiting agencies that support the power of the chiefs, enforce observance of tribal taboos, and maintain social and family relationships in accordance with traditional usage. This does not mean that magic supplies a coercive element for forcing men unwillingly into ways abhorrent to them. On the contrary, it supplies the necessary stimulus which naturally indolent humanity needs to induce it to act with vigour, enthusiasm, and unanimity in the direction it thoroughly approves of." ²

All those facile explanations of male supremacy, therefore, which concentrate upon the brutal and bullying side of man's nature, hardly accord with the facts ; for although it is an easy matter to collect, as Herbert Spencer has done, much evidence to support the view that man in the primitive state uses his superior strength to exploit woman very much as more advanced societies

¹ Cf. Captain George Pitt-Rivers (*Problems in Mental Anthropology* : Presidential address to Section F (*Anthropology*) Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, pp. 506-7) : " The idea that magic and sorcery can possibly perform a necessary social function seldom seems to occur to the white man, who, equipped with a very imperfect and superficial knowledge of the origin, development, and evolution of European culture, and with a host of preconceived notions, sits down in the midst of a native community for the purpose of 'protecting' it, giving it 'good laws,' or of 'teaching it morality.' Magic and sorcery are inextricably related to chieftainship, the power of the latter depending in a great measure upon the former." See also Captain Sir Richard Burton, *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 99 : "Fetish is throughout the dark continent the strongest engine of government—a moral policeman whose sudden removal would break up society."

² *Op. cit.*, p. 507. Elsewhere (p. 504) Pitt-Rivers says : " Tribal law and tribal morality is unwritten, and needs no police force or established Church to enforce it ; yet it is more efficient and infinitely less often transgressed than European morality and laws are by Europeans."

exploit their own slave class, this does not mean that in behaving in this way, man deliberately overlooks higher qualities in woman which he is foolhardy enough to sacrifice for the joy of bullying her. And it remains true that if women as a whole had displayed qualities so superior that the utilitarian ends of the tribe would best have been met by elevating them to a position of power and influence, the error of not so elevating them would very soon have been discovered and corrected.

Thus, if we examine the government and social organization of those societies, past and present, which exhibit a primitive state of development, we find that the chief, headman, sorcerer, magic-worker or priest, or the individual in whom all these men's offices are combined, is a man of special knowledge, experience and ability. Even when he cannot command obedience he commands respect because of his ability to advise and to direct his less gifted or less knowledgeable fellows in the routine of their lives. His knowledge may be agricultural, or it may be warlike. He may be the best builder of a hut, of a canoe, or a weapon, or he may be the best judge of the weather, or of the soil. He may know the best time to go out fishing, and the best conditions under which a successful haul may be expected. Speaking of the sorcerers and magic-workers, who display these various forms of ability, Sir James Frazer says: "They were the direct predecessors, not merely of our physicians and surgeons, but of our navigators and discoverers in every branch of science."¹

And, since the profession of sorcerer or magic-maker, at least in the higher stages of savagery, relieved those who were engaged in it from the need of earning their livelihood by hard manual toil, and gave them other coveted privileges, it was "one of the roads by which the ablest men have passed to the supreme power."²

We must conceive the public profession of magic, therefore, as a means whereby the ablest men of the

¹ Op. cit., p. 92.

² Frazer, Op. cit., p. 87.

community acquired the control of affairs,¹ and seeing that we have no reason to suppose that if outstanding ability had been displayed by women, they too would not have been able to occupy the highest positions in the executive—for they were always allowed to perform the minor offices of the sorcerers or medicine-men and therefore had ample opportunity of rising, if they had been adequately gifted—we must conclude that primitive man remained unconvinced of women's adequacy for the higher posts. The alternative view—that man deliberately wasted woman's great latent gifts and sacrificed their utilitarian value for the sake of the joy of oppressing her—we have already rejected as untenable.

Now let us briefly pass in review some of the most characteristic of the tribal headsmen or chiefs and examine their functions.

Among the Eskimo, where there is no chief in the strict sense of the term, there is a sort of head-man called a "pimain" who, although his authority is limited, is generally consulted on all matters. He decides the proper time to shift the huts, and he may ask some men to go sealing and others to go deer-hunting. His name "pimain" means simply that he is the man "who knows everything best."²

Speaking of the Iroquois, L. H. Morgan says:³ "The celebrated orators, wise men, and military leaders of the Ho-de'-no-sau-nee are all to be found in the class of chiefs. One reason for this may exist in the organic provision which confined the duties of the sachems exclusively to the affairs of peace; and another may be that the office of chief was bestowed in reward of public services, thus casting it by necessity upon the men highest in capacity among them. In the life of those chiefs

¹ See Sir James Frazer (Op. cit., p. 89): "So far as the public profession of magic affected the constitution of savage society it tended to place the control of affairs in the hands of the ablest men."

² See Keane, *Man Past and Present* (1900), p. 361.

³ *League of the Ho-De'-No-Sau-Neé or Iroquois* (1851), p. 101.

who have earned a place upon the historic page, as well as in the 'unwritten remembrance,' of their tribe and race, might be enumerated many who have left behind them a reputation which will not soon fade from the minds of men."

Among the Mafulu Mountain people of British New Guinea, the predominance of a clan is due to the fact that its chief displays "superior ability, or courage, or force of character," or perhaps an exceptional "capacity for palavering" and presumably he is elected chief on the score of these gifts.¹

Major A. G. Leonard, speaking of the Kimaians of the Lower Niger, says: "The bulk of the people have their thinking done for them by their priests, doctors and diviners, who are *de facto* the active thinkers and thought-leaders of their communities." Speaking of the election of a chief among these people, Major Leonard says: "I believe that Gabia's chief distinction was that he was the most successful hunter of wild pigs in the neighbourhood."²

Among the Masai, the chieftain (*ol oiboni*) ruled by virtue of his prophetic gifts and his supernatural capacity for magic.³ It is said by one of the acutest observers of these people that Mbatyans, the great father of the present ruling chiefs, not only effected real cures among his subjects, but that he also discovered a vaccine by which he cured a plague among their cattle.⁴

Among the Mekeo Tribe of the St. Joseph River district, Pitt-Rivers tells us⁵ that, in addition to the two chiefs, (the head chief, *lofia fāa*, and the war chief, *io lofia*, or chief of spears), there were a number of departmental magical experts who superintended the arts of hunting, agriculture, building or war.

The Iroquois warrior chiefs, on the other hand, must

¹ Robert W. Williamson, *The Mafulu Mutu People*, p. 88.

² *The Lower Niger and its Tribes*, pp. 59 and 111.

³ M. Merker, *Die Masai*, p. 18. See also A. C. Hollis, *The Masai*, Introduction by Sir Charles Eliot, p. xviii.

⁴ Merker, *Op. cit.*, pp. 20-21.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 508.

show military powers,¹ while among the Central Australian tribes there seems to be no true chieftainship, and society is controlled by a sort of gerontocracy, or by the old men of the tribes, whose greater experience constitutes them the wisest of the community.²

Among the Maoris of New Zealand the native priest or Tohunga "was ever an important personage in a village community, and his influence was a far reaching activity."³ His authority might be exercised in every department of the community's life, according to his particular knowledge or skill, and the word Tohunga denotes simply an expert, a skilled person, and not necessarily an expert or minister of any religion in our sense. "Thus every expert, such as an artisan, might be termed a tohunga."⁴

Occasionally a woman acted as a tohunga, but never in the higher branches of the profession.⁵

Herbert Spencer, who collected many facts of a similar kind, may conveniently be quoted here. After referring to the various tribes where no proper chieftainship is found, he points out that even where there is no organized government by authority, age and capacity or some recognized superiority in an individual will usually constitute him a person having more than the common share in forming the resolutions finally acted upon. Thus, in the Central American tribes, where frequent reunions are held in the council-house at night, "the people listen respectfully to the observations and decisions

¹ See A. A. Goldenweiser (who lived among them), *Early Civilization*, p. 79.

² See Sir W. Baldwin Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *Op. cit.* This is also true of a large number of other tribes—of the Bushmen of Africa, the Fuegians, the Rock Veddahs, the Dyaks of North Borneo, and many others.

³ Bulletin No. 10 of the Dominion Museum (New Zealand), Section I, p. 163.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.* This agrees with Goldenweiser's conclusion (*Op. cit.*, p. 262) that "in religion woman is scarcely anywhere on a level with men."

of the *ahuales*—men over forty who have occupied public positions or distinguished themselves in some way.”¹

Where chiefs exist, the most varied criteria of eligibility may be found, thus a Chinook chief depends for his position upon his ability to render service to his neighbours and the popularity which follows it.² The Ostyaks, on the other hand, expect their chief to be both wise and valiant.³ With the Bedouins it is the fiercest, strongest and craftiest who obtains the mastery over his fellows,⁴ while in some tribes, it is the bully who becomes chief.⁵ The chief acknowledged by the Creeks is eminent only for his superior talents and political abilities, as is also the chief of the Comanches.⁶

But there is no need to multiply examples. Enough has been said to dispose of the idea that no other qualities than physical strength can be the means of elevating either an individual or a group of men to administrative power in primitive societies, and when once this is acknowledged it is no longer possible to deny that if women had as often as, or more often than, men displayed gifts which elevated them above the rest of their group they could, despite their relative physical weakness, have occupied the position held by men in civilized or semi-civilized communities.

If this conclusion is wrong, then we have to suppose that, despite the obvious superiority of woman for the position of chieftain, ruler or head in all societies, or despite the equality of her endowments with those of men, the majority, or, as we shall show, the total number of known societies, civilized or uncivilized, have, in spite of the heavy pressure of the struggle for existence, deliberately sacrificed utility and expediency for some

¹ *Principles of Sociology*, Ed. 1882, Vol. II, p. 313.

² *Ibid.*, p. 320. According to Mr. Mitchell-Hedges, whom I consulted personally on this point, this is also the criterion of eligibility among the Chucunaque.

³ Spencer, *Op. cit.*, p. 320.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 333.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 334.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 334.

fanciful and unfounded predilection in favour of masculine dominance, and have taken advantage of women's physical weakness to realize their whim.

Those who accept this fantastic conclusion are invited to examine it in the light of biology, anthropology, and sociology, and to decide how far they may be justified, in view of recent discoveries and the greater exactness and method of recent students of anthropology, in continuing to hold it.

Those who accept the evidence as it stands, however, will recognize that if it is possible for old men (the gerontocracy, experts in experience), magic-workers in all departments of human life (experts in agriculture, hunting, building, war, etc.), and born geniuses (experts in all problems demanding outstanding intellectual gifts) to rise to positions of power without the exercise of physical strength—and old men certainly cannot be regarded as the strongest of a community—and if it is true that the majority of chieftainships and kingships have developed out of the profession of magic, to which the best men of the tribe are drawn,¹ then the proof of the eligibility for administrative power must be the capacity of being useful to the community, the display of some efficiency or gift which commands respect and awe, and could not therefore have been associated with the male sex alone unless that sex had repeatedly given such proof. Those who arrive at this conclusion will therefore see that some factor other than physical strength, used for the repression of woman, has operated in man's favour, and that this other factor has been nothing else than the use and development of those advantages, physical² and spiritual which we found in

¹ Cf. Frazer (*Op. cit.*, p. 82): "The profession . . . draws into its ranks some of the ablest and most ambitious men of the tribe because it holds out to them a prospect of honour, wealth, power, such as hardly any other career could offer."

² There is no contradiction here, because to use and develop a physical advantage does not necessarily mean that the object of such use and development is to achieve the repression or subjection of the weaker sex.

the last chapter were normally enjoyed by the male sex, and which, all things being equal, must continue to place woman at a disadvantage as long as no degeneracy overtakes the masculine elements of a community.

So far as primitive societies are concerned, therefore, it would be quite inaccurate to conclude that, because men are everywhere seen in the executive posts of tribal government, that therefore there has occurred a universal suppression or subjection of the weaker sex despite the latter's eminent qualifications for leadership and direction. And, since the conditions existing in primitive societies shed much useful light on our own past history, we are entitled to assume that no such suppression or subjection of women occurred among the remote ancestors of modern civilized peoples.

Regarding the historical period of civilized societies exactly the same may be said, and in my *Woman: A Vindication* (Chapter X) I have given the historical evidence which disposes of the view that there has been any such thing as a subjection of women, at least in England and France, from the very earliest times up to the present day.¹ I have no intention of repeating here what I have already said with sufficient elaboration elsewhere; but one or two further points, which have occurred to me since, may well be mentioned now, and considered as additional to the arguments and facts advanced in the tenth chapter of my *Vindication*.

The reply usually made by the beminists, when confronted with the great disparity between the achievements of man and woman throughout the historical period, is that, owing to the subjection of women, the latter have never had the same opportunities as men.

When once this alleged subjection of women was shown to be illusory, and merely the creation of John Stuart Mill's imagination, the reply became worthless as a defence of woman, and an explanation of her relative incapacity. And as, in my previous work, I showed that

¹ See particularly pp. 280-296.

this alleged subjection of women was a piece of fiction, I considered that I was not compelled to discuss the further charge that women and men had not had the same opportunities. Nevertheless, I took up this further charge and examined it, and found it as completely unfounded as was the charge of subjection itself.¹ I went further and showed that in those departments of human life where there could be no question even of inequality of opportunity, because women had had them all to themselves—I referred to cooking, child care, and clothing—women had displayed such ineptitude, such inability to improve, and such gross and stubborn stupidity, that only when men took over these departments of knowledge, as special branches of study, was there any sign, any hope, any certainty of progress and perfection of method.²

This should have been conclusive enough. But there is another department of life, where not only have the opportunities been equal, but where the conditions have been identical, and here the evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of man's greater capacity. It occurred to me, after writing *Woman : a Vindication*, that in that department of mediæval life concerned with the production of illuminated manuscripts, in which both men and women worked under conditions of perfect equality, evidence might be found of that disparity in achievement, which I consider has characterized the sexes from the very dawn of human life.

Now I discovered that from the female religious bodies

¹ See my references to women doctors, women scholars, women rulers of monasteries, women voters, women writers, business women and women administrators, throughout the Middle Ages and the fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Chapter X, *Woman : A Vindication*).

² Where cooking is still chiefly in the hands of women, and has been for centuries—in England, not only is it execrably bad, but there is also the most universal use of poor food substitutes, cheap and nasty ready-prepared sauces, soups and pastry mixtures, all of which pander to woman's natural indolence, her lack of initiative, and her complete absence of resource.

or lay illuminators of female sex, we have nothing that can in any way compare with the work produced by the male religious bodies and the lay illuminators of the male sex. This fact in itself is sufficiently instructive, and, as far as I am aware, has not hitherto been given any prominence in the sex controversy and its relation to art. In his *Dictionary of Miniaturists, Illuminators, Calligraphers and Copyists* (Vol. II.), J. W. Bradley refers to Harlinde and her sister Renilde, who in 714 "left their native province to found a monastery on the banks of the Meuse, among the meadows of Alden-Eyck and Maes-Eyck," and he tells us that they "consecrated their lives to the praise of God and the transcription of books, adorning them with precious pictures."¹ They illuminated an Evangeliary that was discovered in the Sacristry of the Church of Maes-Eyck. But, speaking of the miniatures themselves, Bradley says: "Of course the drawing is very defective, the action unnatural, and the drapery heavy, and having large parallel folds."² He then adds: "No doubt the origins of the art of this venerable MS. are to be found in the Irish and Lindisfarne gospels."³

Mr. J. H. Middleton, in his *Illuminated MS. in Classical and Mediæval Times*,⁴ mentions Cornelia, wife of Gerard David of Bruges, as an able and famous illuminatress;⁵ but Bradley, while he acknowledges that three examples of her work which we possess are very fine, adds that the figures in them are probably from designs by her husband.⁶

Mr. Henry Martin, in his *Les Peintres de Manuscrits et la Miniature en France*⁷ also mentions Bourgot, who, with her father, Jean le Noir, entered the service of the French King in 1358 as an "enlumineuse," but in another volume, *Les Miniaturistes Français*,⁸ when speaking of Jean le Noir and his daughter, he says: "*Mais il nous est resté aucune œuvre qui puisse leur être attribuée avec certitude.*"⁹

There are, of course, many references to minor women

¹ Bradley, Op. cit., p. 87.

² *Ibid.*, p. 87.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

⁴ Cambridge, 1892.

⁵ P. 218.

⁶ Op. cit., Vol. I, p. 277.

⁷ Paris, 1909.

⁸ Paris, 1906.

⁹ Op. cit., p. 72.

workers in this art, but those I have mentioned are the most important, and beside the men their performances are insignificant. A glance at Bradley's *Dictionary* is enough to set all doubts at rest on this point. In view, therefore, of the nature of the work, and the similarity of the lives led by monks and nuns in the Middle Ages, we are forced to conclude that the poor record shown by the female workers in the art of illuminating must be due to something more radical than inequality of opportunity. In fact, the few data I have collected above suffice to show that at least in this branch of mediæval life—and the study of other phases of mediæval life will lead to the same conclusion—there is no evidence either of the alleged subjection of women, or of any inequality of opportunity for the sexes.¹

Neither can it be said that the enormous amount of freedom enjoyed by the women of Greece and Rome, when their civilizations were declining, produced any female work of outstanding merit. For we hear of nothing remarkable either from Athens or Sparta (even Sappho, who belonged to another culture, cannot be said to have exerted a great influence on the world), and as for Rome, although many Roman women devoted themselves to philosophy and literature, there is no proof

¹ The same is true of the history of portrait miniatures. Although we know that women have studied and practised this art ever since the sixteenth century, when we attempt to form a list of the outstanding masters in this branch of painting, we are compelled to pass over the women in order to record the achievements of such performers as Hans Holbein, Nicholas and Lawrence Hilliard, Isaac and Peter Oliver, John Hoskins, Samuel Cooper, Nicholas Dixon, Cosway, Andrew and Nathaniel Plimer, George Engleheart, John Smart, Ozias Humphrey, William Hood, etc. Lecky (*History of European Morals*, Vol. II, p. 358) also called attention to music, as being one of those departments of human activity in which women have failed to obtain the first position, "for the cultivation of which their circumstances would appear most propitious." A. Huth, in *The Employment of Women* (London 1882), also writes (p. 28): "More women are educated for music than are men, yet there is no instance of a grand composer amongst women, much less a precocious untaught child like Mozart."

that any one of them produced a great work. Only one literary production of a Roman woman has come down to us, and that is the Satire of Sulpicia who flourished towards the close of the first century. From a literary point of view, however, it is generally admitted to be weak, pointless and destitute of spirit.

Besides there is this to be remembered by those who are prone to argue that the disparity between the achievements of the sexes is due to the subjection and repression of the female, and that is, the circumstances in which most of the outstanding feats of genius have been performed in this world. A review of the lives of great men would, I think, demonstrate to the most stubborn Feminist that the frequency with which greatness has been achieved in defiance of the most adverse circumstances, makes it impossible any longer to explain non-achievement or failure to the power of unfavourable ambient conditions. The proportion of men who have achieved greatness in spite of almost crushing initial difficulties, so far outnumbers the men who, like Darwin, Goethe, and Gibbon, had only the problems of their art of science to contend with, that to explain inferiority in performance by directing attention to the crushing weight of adverse external circumstances—even if we admit that they always existed—is to appeal only to the ignorant.

On the other hand, what we may undoubtedly gather from the records of the historical period is that, whenever and wherever there has occurred the decline of a civilization, through the degeneration of its male population, not only have women always been in the ascendant, but there has also occurred *pari-passu* with the gradual deterioration of the males, a corresponding increasing assertion of female influence, and a tendency to regard the sexes as equal.

It is as if the swan song of great civilizations were always intoned by soprano voices, and the gradual crescendo of these voices in our midst should, like the shriek of the locomotive entering a tunnel, warn us that there is probably a long and gloomy period of darkness

before us during which it will be idle to hope either for illumination or for pure air.

At the dawn of ancient Greek civilization, the inferiority of women was strongly asserted, and the existence of concubinage on a large scale shows the small amount of influence that even the best of the Homeric women could have had. Penelope, for instance, takes no exception to the fact that her husband Odysseus is the accepted lover of Calypso and Circe ; illicit unions with women were not held to be dishonouring to either party. Women captives, even when they were of the royal line, were, moreover, treated with scanty consideration.¹ A woman was purchased from her father by her lover, and in Hesiod, who probably gives a truer picture of the position of women in the earliest days of Greece, a woman is counted with a horse or an ox.²

Later on, in the historical period, better class virtuous women lived a life of perfect seclusion and accepted the common inferiority of womankind as part of the law of life. There was no social intercourse with men, and the women lived in a separate part of the house ; but wives sat at their husband's boards and met their husband's friends. The class of women, however, that became more and more emancipated as time went on, were the *hetairæ* or courtesans, who, as their name implies, were much more the companions of men than were the respectable matrons. Some of these women lived in great splendour, and towards the end of Greek greatness, were the friends and equals of the philosophers. Socrates associated on equal terms with the courtesan Diotima, and Epicurus, over a hundred years later, had the courtesan Leontium among his most ardent disciples.

It was, therefore, in this class, that Greek Feminism took its root, and although we may gather from the marked difference between Xenophon's and Plutarch's description of the Greek wife, how much freer even the

¹ See, for instance, the treatment extended to Cassandra or Andromache.

² See *Works and Days*, 373-5, 405, and 695-705.

married woman had become at the end of Greece's glory, we must look to the *hetairæ* for a movement which can with any justice be called feminist.

It is quite evident that, by the time Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusæ* and *Ecclesiazusæ* were written, a woman question must already have arisen in ancient Greece, and that it was exercising the minds of the people. And seeing that, according to our most reliable information concerning the *hetairæ*, they bear the closest resemblance to the women who, in Euripides and Aristophanes, are represented as the leaders of the woman movement, we are led to believe that emancipation started with them.

The fact that they were the more educated class among the women is shown by Socrates' hint to Aristobulos that Aspasia will explain to him how to educate his young wife,¹ while in the *Menexenus*, Socrates again refers to the *hetairæ* as educators.

Ivo Bruns, who has produced an interesting treatise on the woman movement in Athens,² is of opinion that, while the *hetairæ* appear to have started and led the feminist agitation in Athens, it could hardly have progressed as triumphantly as it did, had not the men of the period co-operated with the courtesans in its promotion, and he reminds us of how eager the Athenians of the latter half of the fifth century were for any new theory or innovation. According to his view, the extremes to which the movement led are to be accounted for in this way. In the *Ecclesiazusæ* the family is dissolved and free love is instituted; and the fact that Plato, with his principle of the equality of the sexes, and his abolition of the family among his guardians, ultimately gave these ideas a philosophic form, shows that the philosophers were in this more the followers of their age than its leaders.³

¹ See Xenophon, *Oikonomikos*, III, 14.

² See his *Frauenemancipation in Athen*, pp. 20-21.

³ Ivo Bruns (*Op. cit.*, p. 22) says that the date of *Lysistrata* (411 B.C.) makes it impossible for Plato to have been first, and Dr. J. Donaldson

At all events, it is interesting to ascertain, in the first place, that it was among a large class of educated women, *who were not breeders*, that the woman movement began in Athens ; and secondly, that the success of the movement was due largely to the active help of the degenerate men of the age.

For the fact that at the time when the power of the *hetairæ* was at its zenith, Hellenic civilization was proceeding headlong towards ruin is a matter of history. Quite apart from the evidence of this decline which we can find in the literature of the period, we can discern it in every feature of Athenian public life—from the Peloponnesian War to the rule of the demagogues.

There is, in any case, a curious line in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, where Lysistrata, addressing the Athenian, says : " I'm of myself not badly off for brains, and often listening to my father's words and old men's talk, I've not been badly schooled,"¹—which seems to show that the younger men of Lysistrata's generation (*circa* 411 B.C.) were at least sufficiently degenerate no longer to be capable of guiding or instructing their womenfolk. And when we behold the state of Athens of that day, with the demagogue Cleon only recently dead, with its State doles, its war profiteers, its rabid democracy, and its disastrous expedition to Sicily just fresh in the minds of all, we require no further proof of the degeneracy of the male population, and are not surprised to find that a woman movement was in full swing, and that the doctrine of the equality of the sexes was beginning to be taught as a principle of almost obvious validity.

The rest is well known. A brief period of anarchy preceded the ultimate fall of Athens in 404 B.C. ; Sparta, in his *Woman, Her Position and Influence in Ancient Greece and Rome and Among the Early Christians*, says that " it is probable that the *Ecclesiastusæ*, or Parliament of Women, was exhibited before Plato's *Republic* was written." Plato changed his mind in later years about the community of wives, but he still insisted on women being soldiers.

¹ Translation by Benjamin Bickley Rogers (Loeb Classical Library), 1125-1127.

for a while, was then supreme in Greece; Thebes followed, and finally, with the arrival of Philip, ancient Greece became no more than a memory.

In Sparta, which was organized entirely on military lines and for military purposes, women were from the first regarded as essential contributors to the national stamina and martial spirit, and were therefore subjected to much the same discipline as the men. The girls, in common with the boys, underwent an arduous gymnastic training, and as the sexes practised gymnastics together, and the young women were allowed to appear almost nude, there naturally arose a freedom between the sexes which was in marked contrast to the seclusion of the Athenian women. And yet Spartan women were said to have had a high repute for chastity, and it would be a mistake to conclude, because Sparta was a large camp, in which the women co-operated with the men in realizing the national ideal, that therefore they were, at least in the heyday of Spartan prosperity, as emancipated as many have supposed. Although, as a nation of warriors, the men were necessarily bound to leave much of their home concerns in the hands of their women, there does not appear to have been a woman's movement in Sparta until complete degeneracy had set in, that is to say, in the third century B.C., and in Plutarch's life of Agis much light is thrown upon this latest development of Spartan life. It is true that, like all purely military States, Sparta probably suffered as much as we are suffering from a too narrowly limited ideal of manliness, and there can also be no doubt that Aristotle was right when he declared that the heavy losses in men and the consequent necessity of leaving property to women (because they were so often the sole heirs¹) ultimately led to a good deal of power being transferred to the female population. In the fourth century B.C., for instance, nearly half the land in Laconia was already owned by women. But the executive remained until the end in male hands. That

¹ *Politics*, 1270a,

the male population degenerated may be concluded from the facts I have elsewhere adduced in regard to the decline of the ruling caste; ¹ while we are also led to believe that, at the time Aristotle was writing, life had become dissolute and luxurious in Lacedæmon. When, therefore, we learn that, at this period and after, women probably reached the zenith of their power in Sparta—that is to say, just before and after Sparta's fall—it need not surprise us. ²

Far be it from me to suggest that the influence of women necessarily had any connection with the ultimate downfall of Greece. All I am intent upon showing is that the woman's movement, the increase of female power, and the rise of the doctrine of sex equality, coincided with the downfall of Athens and Sparta. This is enough for my purpose, as I am not nearly so certain about the lethal effect of female dominance as I am about the inevitable concurrence of such dominance with male degeneracy.

In Rome the history of women followed very much the same course as in Greece, except that in the Roman civilization the courtesan class did not play the same rôle as it did in the woman movement of Athens. From being wholly subjected to the authority of the head of the family, Roman women, whether they were wives or daughters, gradually acquired an independence, the growth of which followed closely upon the general decline in public discipline and virtue, till the repeated modification of the laws concerning their status and rights ended in their complete emancipation.

At first the daughter of the house was reckoned as no

¹ See my *Defence of Aristocracy*, p. 323. See also J. Donaldson (*Op. cit.*, pp. 34, 35).

² An interesting story is told by Dr. J. Donaldson which entirely discredits the idea that Spartan women were always emancipated. "A person," writes the learned doctor, "was sent to try to persuade a Lacedæmonian woman to aid in some civil practice. 'When I was a girl,' she said, 'I was taught to obey my father, and I obeyed him, and when I became a wife, I obeyed my husband; if, therefore, you have anything just to urge, make it known to me first.'" (*Op. cit.*, p. 32.)

more than her father's slave; and the wife *in manu*, who had the same rank as the daughter, was likewise powerless to resist the will of her lord and master. Thus, wives, children and slaves were equally subject to the power of the *paterfamilias*. The father could dispose absolutely of his daughter's hand, and, if he chose, even break off a marriage that had already been contracted. If the girl were married by being placed "in the hand" of her husband, her father then relinquished his power over her, and she fell under the absolute authority of her husband. If, however, despite her marriage, she remained in the family of her father, her husband did not become her guardian, and her father's original authority could be asserted over her at any time.

At the time when Roman women were subject to this protection and custody, manners and morals were severe in the State. But it must not be supposed on that account that the women ever led the life of absolute seclusion which was the lot of Athenian wives. They appear, on the contrary, to have been very much more the companions of their husbands in public, and, in spite of this, for a very long period, to have maintained their reputation for virtue.

During the era of the Punic Wars and after, however (*circa* 264 to 146 B.C.), a marked change took place in the morals and manners of the Roman people. The old rigidity was relaxed, domestic ties were loosened, the old authority of the head of the family was undermined both by legislative and popular influence; and, by the time the Empire was established, Roman society was almost completely degraded. *Pari passu* with these changes, the former tutelage and dependence of the women had gradually vanished, and with the advent of the first Emperors, female emancipation had become an accepted fact.¹

¹ See Edouard Laboulaye, *Recherches sur la Condition Civile et Politique des Femmes*, p. 68: "Dès le règne d'Auguste, les femmes et les fils en puissance furent-ils favorisés par la législation, et ces grandes lois Julia et Papia,

There can, however, be little doubt that the power and influence of Roman women had been developing, and had even asserted itself long before the advent of Augustus ; for, during the consulship of Cato the Censor and Valerius Flaccus, an incident occurred which can leave no doubt in anybody's mind about feminine ascendancy during the latter days of the Republic.

It will be remembered that, at the height of the Second Punic War (215 B.C.), a law had been passed to restrict the extravagance of women and to limit their jewellery and wardrobes. And in 195 B.C., just before Cato set sail for his appointed province in Spain, it was proposed that this measure, known as the Oppian Law, should be abolished. Cato stoutly resisted the proposal and appears to have made an ungallant speech in defence of the law.¹ Now, during the negotiations which took place to decide this important issue, an extraordinary scene occurred in ancient Rome. The Roman matrons sallied forth *en masse* into the streets of the city, deliberately caused obstructions in every avenue leading to the Forum, and fiercely importuned their husbands, as they

qui fondèrent la monarchie dans les mœurs, furent en même temps celles qui agrandirent la capacité civile des enfants et des femmes aux dépens de l'antique constitution de la famille."

¹ According to Livy's account of Cato's speech, on this occasion, the latter is supposed to have uttered among other sentiments, the following significant words : " If, Romans, every individual among us had made it a rule to maintain the prerogative and authority of a husband with respect to his own wife, we should have less trouble with the whole sex. But now our privileges, overpowered at home by female contumacy, are, even here in the Forum, spurned and trodden underfoot ; and because we are unable to withstand each separately, we now dread their collective body. . . . Our ancestors thought it not proper that women should perform any, even private business, without a director ; but that they should ever be under the control of parents, brothers, or husbands. We, it seems, suffer them now to interfere in the management of State affairs, and to introduce themselves into the Forum, into general assemblies, and into assemblies of electors." (Book XXXIV, 2. Translation by Cyrus Edmunds. Bohn.) Even if this argument be one which would have been used only in Livy's day (59 B.C. to A.D. 17) it is interesting as a comment on the relation of the sexes in the Rome of that period,

made their way thither, imploring them to give them back their vanities. For a little while the city was a babel of female voices and the scene of the utmost confusion. It is said that the irate females even accosted the prætors, consuls and other magistrates as fast as they appeared. Finally the bold and determined matrons carried the day. The tribunes, M. Brutus and L. Brutus, worn out by their appeals, withdrew their opposition, the hated law was abolished, and the women displayed their enthusiasm by marching in procession through the streets and the Forum, decked out with the ornaments and finery which they could now flaunt with impunity. The pre-war suffragettes could not have made a more triumphant display.¹

This picture of Roman life, about two hundred and fifty years before the advent of the first Emperor, is interesting as showing the immense power and independence enjoyed by Roman women before the final downfall of the Republic, and it should not surprise us, therefore, to hear that, by the time the Empire was established, their freedom was practically won.

At the time of Gaius, in the second century A.D., the tutelage of women was only an empty form,² and though vestiges of it are found under Diocletian towards the end of the third century, after that all trace of it entirely disappears.

True, female emancipation never advanced to the stage of giving women civic or political powers. This is also true of Greece. Short of that, however, woman certainly acquired absolute legal independence, and a

¹ A similar demonstration occurred later, under the triumvirate of Octavianus, Anthony and Lepidus (*circa* 40 B.C.), when the triumvirs passed a decree that 1,400 of the richest women in Rome should make an exact return of their means, so that a portion thereof might be used to defray the expenses of the war then going on. But the women, after energetic and persevering efforts in back-stair intrigue, finally approached the tribunal of the triumvirs, and succeeded in being let off with a comparatively small sum.

² Laboulaye, *Op. cit.*, p. 69.

good deal of political influence,¹ just about the time when the Roman world had definitely begun to decline; and we have only to remember the activities of a man like Musonius Rufus, who in Nero's day was teaching the equality of the sexes, we have only to think of such viragos as Amæsia or Mæsta of Sentinum, surnamed Androgyne for her masculine mind, of Afrania and Carfania, and of the *Conventus Matrorum*, a regular assembly of women under the Empire, in order to find ourselves again confronted by the strange phenomenon of the degeneration of a male culture coinciding with the steady increase of female freedom and assertiveness.

Turning now to France, we find the century which brought an end to the monarchy and culminated in the horrors of the Revolution was a century not only of feminine emancipation, but also of feminine rule. As early as 1723 Madame Palatine, writing to her son Philippe d'Orleans, said: "I have resolved not to interfere. Between ourselves France has, to her detriment, been too long governed by women [Madame de Maintenon was meant]. I wish my example to be useful to my son, that he may let no woman lead him."

But the century continued as it had begun. As de Goncourt said, "in the eighteenth-century woman is the principle that governs, the reason that directs, the voice that commands,"² and the power fell into the hands of one woman after another. First it was the Marquise de Prie, then it was Madame de Vintemille, followed by the Duchesse de Châteauroux, Madame de Pompadour, Madame du Barry, and finally Marie Antoinette. By the end of the century nemesis came, and when the confusion was at its highest, it was again the women who did most to accentuate its horrors. Even Mirabeau, who believed in sex equality, was revolted by

¹ For the political influence of Roman women just before the Empire and after, see J. Donaldson (Op. cit., pp. 122-4). Also Mommsen, *History of Rome*, English Translation, Vol. III, p. 122, and Vol. V, pp. 392-3.

² *La Femme au XVIII Siècle*, p. 372.

what he saw; but it did not prevent Condorcet, the fanatic of democracy, from recommending votes for women.¹

As Ostrogorski says,² "having flung themselves into the Revolution with an ardour and an enthusiasm not devoid of grandeur at the outset, they [the women] soon lost all balance, intellectual and moral. The Feminists themselves were disgusted in the end, if not by their excesses, at least by the habit into which they fell, of exciting the people, of remonstrating with the men in office, and of promoting disorder in the streets."

At last the Convention decreed (1793) the suppression of all female clubs and societies; subsequently it prohibited any public assembly of women; the female politician completely disappeared, and with the advent of Napoleon a fresh manly era was inaugurated.

The important conclusions to be drawn from the above facts are—first, that there appears to be a close relation between the emancipation of, or the increase of power among, women, and the decline of a civilization; and, secondly, that the rise of female power does nothing and can do nothing to check or cure the vices in a civilization which are contributing to its downfall. Least of all can the rise of female power lead to the production of anything great by women, or bring about the only condition which can restore health to a people's institutions, namely, a regeneration of its manhood. Greece and Rome never recovered, and France had the good fortune to be saved by a genius, who was a stranger in the nation, and whose virile lead alone restored the vigour of her male population.

¹ See his *Lettres d'un Bourgeois de New Haven à un Citoyen de Virginie*. (*Œuvres*. Paris, 1804, Vol. XII, Letter II, p. 20.) "*N'est-ce pas en qualité d'êtres capables de raison, ayant des idées morales, que les hommes ont des droits? Les femmes doivent donc avoir absolument les mêmes, et cependant jamais, dans aucune constitution appelée libre, les femmes n'ont exercé le droit de citoyens.*" He then proceeds to plead what the suffragettes pleaded so earnestly, that there should be no payment of taxes without the right of voting.

² *The Rights of Women*, p. 29.

CHAPTER IV

The Matriarchal Myth—Part II

NOW, in spite of the conclusions arrived at in the three previous chapters, and the overwhelming force of the evidence on which they are based—which evidence, by the by, as the reader must have observed, is accessible to all and requires no arduous research for its collection, since most of the facts composing it are common knowledge—a large body of people still continue to rely upon a pseudo-science, of which there has been too voluminous a supply of late, and also upon the thoughtlessness and ignorance of the masses, in order to spread the belief that the disparity, which has always been noticed between the achievements of the sexes, is really an artificial thing, that it is not rooted in any natural difference between man and woman, and that, indeed, there was a time—the matriarchal period—when woman exercised the fullest authority over the world, both for the good of man and herself.

According to this theory, which has met with the widest acceptance in recent years, particularly among prejudiced and ill-informed people, matriarchy was the original and most primitive form of government; during its supposed existence humanity lived in a golden age of archaic feministic bliss, and it is only through the brutality of man that it ultimately passed away among the ancestors of most civilized races, leaving behind but faint traces of its original prevalence in the marriage and other social customs of existing primitive societies.

The history of how this belief came to be so widely

spread would take too long to tell. But that it dates from the latter half of the last century, and that it emanated from Germany in the form of a bulky anthropological treatise, are facts that can be verified by anyone who takes the pains to investigate the matter for himself.

So many learned treatises have contained doctrines which, in their ultimate popularization, have led to misunderstandings of natural facts in the minds of the unscientific public, that it will surprise no one to hear that, over this matter of the relative capacity for dominance in man and woman, in which so much heated prejudice and emotional reaction are involved, the grossest errors of interpretation have come to be accepted as scientific fact.

Everybody knows, for instance, that Spencer's phrase "the survival of the fittest," has popularly been thought to mean the survival of the strongest, and that not only members of the general public, but trained thinkers as well can still be found who are guilty of this misunderstanding. In his own lifetime Spencer had to combat this erroneous view among the learned,¹ and it still holds a firm position in the popular mind, where the doctrine of organic evolution is supposed to postulate a principle of general amelioration, because of the identification of the survival of the fittest with the supposed survival of what, humanly speaking, is the most desirable.

What happened with this essential law of evolution has also happened with Darwin's doctrine of human descent. Millions of unscientific Europeans to-day continue to believe that, according to Darwin, man has descended from the kind of monkeys which they occasionally behold in their zoological collections; and it will take generations of re-education to eliminate this belief from their minds.

Now, about sixty-five years ago, a book was published

¹ See his controversy with Mr. Martineau, *The Contemporary Review*, June, 1872.

in Germany, under the title of *Das Mutterrecht*, in which its author, Bachofen by name, enunciated a doctrine so strange to the scientific and general public of the period, and at the same time so misleading in its terminology, that the popular errors to which it gave rise have survived to this day, not only in the minds of the uneducated, but also in the mind of many a scholar and student.

Briefly stated, Bachofen's doctrine amounted to this : the ideas about the beginnings of human society which, probably through the influence of the patriarchal organization of the ancient Israelites, led most people in Western Civilization to suppose that in primitive mankind, descent, kinship and inheritance were always traced, as they are among ourselves, through the male line, were largely unfounded and mistaken ; because it might be demonstrated without much difficulty that, not only among many primitive societies, but also among the early ancestors of certain civilized peoples, both descent, inheritance and family name and traditions were traced through the female line.

This conclusion led Bachofen to call his book *Das Mutterrecht* (Mother-Right) and in its pages to speak of a certain gynæcocratic family right whenever he found the phenomenon of kinship or inheritance traced through the female line. And, as he advanced an enormous amount of evidence to demonstrate the prevalence of this alleged gynæcocratic family-right, the implication was that human society in its beginnings must, with but few exceptions, have been gynæcocratic and not patriarchal. He knew how novel this doctrine was, and, in his lengthy introduction, he pointed out that matriarchy would sound to his contemporaries as strange as it would have sounded to the men of antiquity.¹

As is usual in the case of a scientific theory of startling novelty, this doctrine of the matriarchal beginnings of

¹ *Fremdartig steht das gynäkokratische Familienrecht nicht nur unsern, sondern schon dem antiken Bewusstsein gegenüber."*

certain human societies became widely spread among the reading public. But, whereas the scientific world, while admitting and even adding to the many instances of mother-right among existing native tribes, which Bachofen had collected, were careful to avoid the inaccurate conclusions to which his misleading use of the word "gynæcocratic" led, the public and the ill-informed among the thinkers retained the impression that it had now been scientifically proved that human society had once been under the dominion of women. And, to this day, there are thousands of people—and not by any means the most uneducated—who still imagine that primitive human groups were all, or almost all, ruled by women.

Like the mistake about the survival of the "fittest," the error arose through the use of misleading terminology. But whereas in Spencer's case, the use of the word *fittest* was justified, carefully thought over, and only decided upon when its precise connotation had been clearly stated; in Bachofen's case, the word "gynæcocratic," as applied to the phenomena the author was discussing, was carelessly and thoughtlessly chosen and yet its meaning was so obvious to anyone with a knowledge of etymology, that misconception was inevitable.

Thus, while the phenomena that Bachofen was discussing consisted chiefly of those derivatives of the institution of Mother-Right in many primitive and civilized societies, which arise from various causes unconnected with the supposed dominance of women, Mother-Right was widely understood to mean Mother-Rule; and matriarchy, or the dominion of women, of which in its pure form no trace has ever been known, was believed to have been either universal, or almost so, in the beginning of human history.

Let us examine how the confusion arose. Various phenomena, most of them irregularly correlated, cluster round the institution of mother kinship in primitive societies. But, the important principle behind them all,

is the fact that descent, in mother-right communities, is traced through the female and not through the male.

The causes which led to tracing descent through the female are more or less thoroughly understood. This much, however, is certain, that, just as in animals, the mother relation is always clearly established, whereas the father may be doubtful or, in some cases, quite unknown, so at given levels of human development a similar uncertainty regarding paternity is likely to exist.¹ It has been suggested that this uncertainty may arise either through the sexual ignorance of savages² and their failure to associate copulation with procreation, or through the promiscuity of sexual relations, whereby the identity of the male procreator cannot be determined. A third ingenious suggestion recently made by an eminent psycho-analyst is to the effect that mother-right is an institution deliberately created by man to ward off from savage societies the direst effects of the Œdipus Complex.³ "The motive, according to this view, in both cases [i.e., in the case of sexual ignorance and the institution of mother-right] is to deflect the hatred towards his father felt by the growing boy."⁴

Whichever of these explanations of the genesis of mother-right, in the sense of mother-kinship, may be the right one, does not really concern us much here ; because we are interested not with the etiology of mother-right as a fact, but rather with the nature of its working.

¹ See Ed. Sydney Hartland, *Primitive Society*, p. 159: "Speaking of mankind generally, it seems clear, from all that we know, that the earliest kinship to be recognized was that of mother and child. The corporal relation between mother and offspring is patent from the first, while the recognition of that between father and child depends upon physiological knowledge and reasoning, which are even yet not achieved by some of the lowest races." (Hartland's whole discussion of this question is thoroughly worthy of attention, and is most illuminating.)

² This is in fact Hartland's conclusion.

³ See "Mother-Right and the Sexual Ignorance of Savages," by Dr. Ernest Jones (*The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, Vol. VI, Part VI, 1925).

⁴ See p. 12 of the reprint of Dr. Jones' paper.

In any event, however, in an ultimate analysis of the early influences governing kinship, it seems so clear that the relationship to the mother, where other ties are loose, must be the strongest and the most obvious one, that there appears to be little difficulty in assigning either this or that additional cause for its adoption in determining descent. Even in our own civilization—whether in France, Germany or England—mother kinship still prevails in the case of illegitimate children; and, in view of the preference that male children all over the world commonly evince for their female parent, whether the father happens to be known or not, it does not seem improbable that, where passions are fiercer and less tamed, as they presumably are in the savage breast, this additional cause alone might have been adequate in turning the balance in favour of mother-kinship, at least for the male sex, whereupon the female sex might have fallen into line.

Be this as it may—and, as I have already said, the origin of mother-right does not concern us deeply here—the characteristic features of those societies in which mother-right prevails (and such societies are very numerous) are very briefly as follows:

(a) That descent is traced through the female line, i.e., matrilineally.

(b) That succession of rank (chieftainship, rulership, etc.) may, and usually does, pass from a man to his sister's son, not to his wife's son—i.e., it is often transmitted through the female instead of through the male. This rule is sometimes broken, and in societies where matrilineal descent prevails, succession may be patrilineal.

(c) That property is inherited through the female. It may actually be held by the female, but this is rare. As a rule it is transmitted to the sister's son, although there are instances in matrilineal societies of property inherited from the father.

There is no hard and fast rule about (b) or (c).

(d) That residence may be with the wife's people,

in which case the union of man and wife is termed "matrilocal." When this happens the husband is usually subject to the head of the wife's household—her brother or her uncle.

(e) That authority usually resides not in the person of the husband, but in some male relative of the wife, usually her brother, and the children thus fall under the rule of their maternal uncle. It is very rare indeed that authority, even in the households of people having matrilineal and matrilocal institutions, is wielded by the mother; and thus "matriarchy, or a gynæocratic organization of society, is hardly found, despite the prevalence of mother-kinship."

Now it is simple to see how the misrepresentations of mother kinship have occurred; for, if we bear in mind the tendency of early travellers, and of early students of ethnography—encouraged no doubt by an emotional bias against masculine dominance—to read matriarchy into purely matrilineal and matrilocal customs, we immediately understand the gross perversion of facts that cannot fail to arise.

For if, without inquiry into the sex of the ruling executive of matrilineal societies, which is invariably male, we assume that, wherever descent or property passes down the female line, authority is vested in the females, we are likely to obtain an absolutely distorted picture of the actual facts.

Rule by women, however, even in mother-right societies is almost unknown.¹ It is so seldom encountered that W. H. Rivers could only discover three examples of it²—among the Iroquois, the Seri Indians, and the Khasis. And yet all that this alleged "matriarchy" amounted to among the Iroquois was that the women participated in the election of the *male* chiefs. "Once

¹ See Hartland, *Op. cit.*, p. 33. "The rule by women, however, is a rare form of organization. More usually the clan and the family are ruled by men, descendants of the women through whom kinship is traced."

² *Op. cit.*

in a while," says Goldenweiser, who lived among them,¹ "a woman who had gained the grateful recognition of her people by acts of unusual heroism or patriotism, was made a chief; but in such a case it was an honorary chieftainship, a so-called Pine-Tree chieftainship."

Among the Seri Indians, the women do indeed sometimes put their decisions into execution themselves; but usually their brothers constitute the executive of the power; while with the Khasis of Assam, although property is transmitted through women and held by women alone, political power is transmitted indeed through women, but is held by men. "In other words," says Sir James Frazer,² "the Khasi tribes are, with a single exception, governed by Kings, not by Queens. And even in the one tribe which is nominally ruled by women, the real power is delegated by the reigning Queen or High Priestess to her son, her nephew, or a more distant male relation."³

Of course, where, owing to what cause soever, matrilineal or matrilocal conditions prevail, and where property and rank are inherited through the female, it follows that, in the event of any elevation in the general level of the community, women may come to be considered very much more highly than where other institutions prevail. For instance, a man, by marrying a particular woman, may avail himself of the only access there is to a certain position, either of property or of power. This, however, does not mean that the woman he marries

¹ Op. cit., p. 80.

² *Adonis, Ottis, Osiris*, Vol. II, p. 210.

³ In another respect the alleged approximation to matriarchy among the Khasis seems to be very remote, for we read in Major P. R. T. Gurdon's account of them (*The Khasis*. London, 1907, pp. 80, 81): "The rule of monogamy is not so strict for the husband as it is for the wife, he can contract an informal alliance with another woman, the only prohibition being that she must not belong to the original wife's village. Such a wife is called *Ka Tynga Tuh*, literally, stolen wife, in contradistinction to the legally married wife *Ka Tynga Trai*." The children, however, of the stolen wife "cannot claim ancestral property except in the War country."

will either have the disposal of the property, or wield the power of the office, which is acquired through her person. And thus again misunderstandings on the part of mere visitors to the country where such customs prevail, often lead to matriarchy being falsely read into the institutions of the people.

Ancient Egypt was certainly an example of a community which, originally matrilineal and matrilocal, rose to a high level of civilization, without abandoning its early institutions. But in Egypt the executive of government always remained in the hands of the men, and even if the Pharaoh acquired his throne through marrying his sister, it was he not she who exercised authority in the land.¹ Although Egyptian women had full powers of inheritance, they had no power of dealing with their property.²

Again, among the Papuasians, we find what appear to be very substantial female privileges. But when we inquire closely into them we discover, as a matter of fact, that they were non-existent. Speaking of these people, A. H. Keane says: "Mother-right is prevalent, descent and inheritance being counted on the mother's side, while a man's property descends to his sister's children. At the same time the mother is in no sense the head of the family; the house is the father's, the garden may be his, the rule and government are his, though the maternal uncle sometimes has more authority than the father."³

Thus, although, through the misrepresentation of matrilineal, matrilocal, and other mother-right customs among primitive and other societies, numbers of careful investigators have undoubtedly been led to infer that

¹ See A. Géraud-Teulon: *Les Origines du Mariage et de la Famille*, Paris, 1884, p. 244: "*Elle [la reine en Egypte] ne conduit qu'exceptionnellement le gouvernement, mais on dirait que le roi ne peut exercer le pouvoir suprême que sous les auspices de la reine.*" On this point see also Sir James Frazer, *Adonis, Ottis, Osiris*, Vol. II.

² See Francis Llewelyn Griffiths, M.A., Ph.D. (*Encyclopædia Britannica*, Article "Egypt").

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 144.

matriarchy was a widespread institution of mankind, it cannot be said that this belief any longer prevails in enlightened circles. But it has remained fixed in the public mind, and there are thousands of people to-day, who imagine that they are stating what is scientifically true, when they say that matriarchal government is among the earliest and most widespread of human institutions.

An interesting problem arises, and that is to determine how, in those communities where matrilineal customs have led to a certain modicum of female dominance, this dominance has come into being. I have already alluded to two possible sources of it—the increase of prestige among women in an ascending culture, where property or rank descends through them (Egypt), and the tendency in all societies, whether matrilineal or patriarchal, for women to gain the ascendancy as fast as their menfolk degenerate (ancient Greece and Rome, France in the eighteenth century). These influences may operate together, or separately; but I have not yet made it clear how the second influence, the degeneracy of men, reacts on the women so as to bring about the change in the position of the latter.

The history of most cultures seems to teach the following moral: *that the relation of the sexes is always a fluctuating balance of male and female elements*, and that at every stage in social development, the bisexual components of each man and each woman tend to assert themselves to the utmost of their capacity, within the limits allowed by the values and the customs of the people. The check upon the expression by the male of his latent femininity thus consists of (a) virile values, (b) masculine pursuits, (c) the single-minded preoccupation with male problems, and (d) the process of selection, which, operating through the taste imposed by the values, tends to keep down the proportion of males with prominent feminine characteristics. Thus the femininity of the male, where such checks exist, becomes what psychologists term *recessive*, and may remain latent for centuries.

The check upon the expression by the female of her latent masculinity consists of (*a*) her male environment, (*b*) the feminine pursuits, (*c*) the single-minded pre-occupation with female problems, and (*d*) the process of selection, which, operating through the taste imposed by values, keeps down the proportion of females with pronounced masculine characteristics. Thus the masculinity of the female, where such checks exist, also becomes *recessive*, and may remain latent for centuries.

Surrounded by males who maintain masculine standards, and who are capable of giving the highest expression to masculine ability and taste, the male elements in women tend to grow furtive, timid, and averse from expression. A woman then knows that she only makes herself ridiculous by trying to measure her rudimentary maleness against masculinity of the full-fledged brand. In an environment of masculine men, therefore, her femininity tends to be expressed with boldness, and selection operates in favour of females with only latent masculinity.¹

The moment, however, she finds, as she does in periods of male degeneracy, that the expression of her latent masculinity does not make her appear ridiculous—that is to say, *that the amount of her masculinity can without appearing absurd by comparison, be measured against the*

¹ For an example of the manner in which, in declining societies, selection operates in favour of masculine females and feminine males, the following passage from Mommsen about the women of Rome under Cæsar, is exceedingly instructive. Speaking of the fashionable season at Baiæ and Puteoli, Mommsen, says: "There the ladies held absolute sway; but they were by no means content with this domain which rightfully belonged to them, they also acted as politicians, appeared in party conferences, and took part with their money and their intrigues in the wild coterie doings of the time. Anyone who beheld these female statesmen performing on the stage of Scipio and Cato and saw at their side the young fop—as, with smooth chin, delicate voice, and mincing gait, with headdress and neckerchiefs, frilled robe and women's sandals, he copied the loose courtesans—might well have a horror of the unnatural world in which the sexes seemed as though they wished to change parts" (Op cit., pp. 392-3).

masculinity of her menfolk, there is no longer anything to make her male elements recessive, and her maleness is likely to become developed at the cost of her femaleness, while the process of selection will operate in favour of a multiplication of females with excessive masculinity, and *vice-versa*.¹

This does not mean that the female with strong male elements is necessarily to be deprecated. For, provided her male environment is always sufficiently beyond her in masculinity to make her male side recessive, no harm is likely to arise, and the multiplication of malish women then contributes without evil results to the cultivation of a virile people. This happened in Sparta, and was successful from the ninth to the fourth century B.C., without the appearance of a woman's movement, because until the fourth century there was no marked degeneration of the male. It also happened in England. And the presence of a large proportion of masculine women in our midst to-day is not in itself a proof of the degeneracy of our men. For, as a virile culture, we required masculine women, who would not introduce too much of the feminine element into our stock. It is the present unadaptedness of these women, their present free expression of their maleness at the cost of their femaleness, which is a sign of male degeneracy, because it means that their menfolk have not remained sufficiently beyond them in male characters, to make their masculinity recessive.

The question, therefore, is whether there are always signs of masculine degeneracy, accompanied by female virility, in societies where women tend to dominate. The test is, whether the male elements in the woman are being freely expressed. That there were such signs in ancient Athens, Rome, and eighteenth-century France, I have already shown. The fact that the *hetairæ* of Athens consorted with the philosophers, and instructed so famous a man as Socrates, is a comment

¹ For a treatment of this question in relation to modern marriage, see my *Woman: A Vindication*, Chapter VII, pp. 160-2.

at once upon the Socratic philosophy¹ and upon the *hetairæ*; while the historical proofs we have of the wanton cruelty of Roman matrons in the period of the decline,² and of the viragoes that Rome produced during the Empire, leave us in no doubt that the male elements in the Roman women of the first century A.D. had long ceased to be recessive. Cruelty in woman, which is the morbid expression of that part of her male elements that includes sadism, is always a sign of unrestrained bisexuality, and although it is by no means the only sign, it occurs again and again in periods of masculine decline. The diabolical cruelty of the women of the French Revolution revolted even the male Terrorists themselves; and we must not forget that since extravagant and maudlin humanitarianism is only an inverted

¹ For a ruthless and penetrating analysis of Socrates and his philosophy see Nietzsche, *The Twilight of the Idols* (English translation by A. M. L., 1911), pp. 9-16. See also that profound thinker and sage, de Quincey (Vol. X of the Complete Works, A. C. Black & Co., pp. 180-1): "Confining our notice to people of celebrity, we may say that the house of Socrates (*Domus Socratica* is the expression of Horace) were those who next attempted to popularize Greek prose—viz., the old gentleman himself, the founder of the concern, and his two apprentices Plato and Xenophon. We acknowledge a sneaking hatred towards the whole household, founded chiefly on the intense feeling we entertain that all three were humbugs." For vulgarities of Plato's style, see same essay, p. 188; and for critical condemnation of Plato see de Quincey's Essay on Plato's *Republic*.

² At this period Roman mistresses inflicted the cruellest punishments on their female servants for the most trifling offences, such, for instance, as the misplacing of a single lock of hair in their elaborate coiffures. The female slave attendants on a Roman lady during her early morning toilet were, in fact, expected to appear stripped to the waist, so as to enable her, if she wished, or if she were annoyed at anything, to stick pins into their arms and breasts, or to beat them while they performed their duties. Apparently flogging a slave was also a source of entertainment to these women. For a detailed account of the most horrible scenes between exalted Roman ladies of the first and second centuries A.D. and their female slaves see *Sabina*, by C. A. Boettiger (Leipzig, 1806), Vol. I, pp. 285-326, and Vol. II, pp. 173-8. For confirmation see Juvenal's 6th Satire, 475-496, and Ovid, *Ars Amatoria*, III, 235-243, *Amores*, I, xiv, 15-18; Martial, II, 66.

and socially permitted form of sadism,¹ the display of excessive humanitarianism in modern England, is really as suspicious as was the cruelty of the later Roman matrons.

I have said that not more than three races have been found in which an approach to true *matriarchy* has been noticed—the Iroquois and the Seri Indians, and the Khasis of Assam. But, truth to tell, the prominence of women exists in other American tribes—the Hurons and the Chucunaque, for instance. While reminding the reader, therefore, that even among the Iroquois, the Seri Indians, and the Khasis, the executive remained in male hands, although the female population had a share in electing those who wielded it (among the Seri Indians the women sometimes put their decisions into execution themselves), let us endeavour to discover the reason for the development among these peoples, and among the Hurons and Chucunaque, of a certain amount of feminine authority. As we have already ascertained that female authority is by no means essentially connected with matrilineal and other mother-right customs, it will serve no purpose to point to the fact that the Chucunaque, or the Iroquois, or the Seri Indians, are matrilineal in their descent and inheritance, or matrilocal in marriage, as the case may be. We must seek other reasons.

Speaking of the Chucunaque, Lady Brown says :² “Undoubtedly the woman rules the man and is leader. Outside the contoolie, chief, or headmen, her word is law throughout Chucunaque. It matters not whether it is a question of building a new dwelling, getting food, going into the bush for wood, or any other such domestic detail, the man never dreams of making a move unless told to do so by the woman.”

Now the picture Lady Brown gives of the Chucunaque Indians depicts them not only as a people whose cultural

¹ On this point see my *Woman: A Vindication*, Chapter “The Old Maid.”

² *Unknown Tribes, Uncharted Seas* (Duckworth, 1924), p. 155.

development is pre-Stone and Iron,¹ but whose menfolk also are exceptionally degenerate. A passage referring to their sexual relations² is significant in this respect. But, in order to make quite sure about the matter, I availed myself of Mr. Mitchell-Hedges' kind interest in my work, in order to consult him and Lady Brown on this very point, and I may say that the impressions I had gathered from Lady Brown's work were abundantly confirmed.

Both Lady Brown and Mr. Mitchell-Hedges assured me that the Chucunaque menfolk were hopelessly degenerate, and furthermore that they were almost impotent. Apparently they display a listlessness in all the deepest concerns of life which can be ascribed only to their condition of acute physical decay, and this is accentuated by the many diseases that were found playing havoc among the whole of the population.

It would, of course, be inaccurate to argue that the condition in which Lady Brown and Mr. Mitchell-Hedges found the Chucunaque menfolk is essential to a certain degree of female dominance; for we have no reason to believe that the Iroquois Indians can be compared to the Chucunaque in the matter of sexual impotence and extreme degeneration. But, on the other hand, it is quite obvious that the influence of women, though appreciable, among the Iroquois has been grossly exaggerated. And we have only to read L. H. Morgan's *League of the Ho-de'-no-sau-nee*, to conclude instantly that these people are as far from even a modified matriarchy as were the early Greeks.

Speaking of the lack of the love-passion among the Iroquois, Morgan says :³ " A solution of this singular problem is, in part, to be found in the absence of equality in the sexes. The Indians regard women as the inferior, the dependent, and the servant of man, and from custom and habit, she actually considered herself so."

The ritual of male degradation among the Iroquois

¹ Op. cit., p. 257.

² Op. cit., p. 156.

³ Op. cit., p. 323.

was the putting on of the Gā-kā'-ah, or the skirt of the female, and this was done to the Delawares after they were subdued.¹ Moreover, adultery by the man was not punished, but the adulteress was given a whipping. She alone was supposed to be the offender.²

All this seems strangely unlike even a modified matriarchy, and how W. H. R. Rivers came to the conclusion that the Iroquois came nearest, with the Seri Indians and the Khasis, to a true matriarchy, is a mystery.

Nevertheless, that a certain amount of male degeneracy may be suspected among the North American Indians, where female prominence is frequently encountered, may be gathered from the fact that the women are so often found to be exceptionally cruel and sadistic.

I have already explained the relationship between female sadism and the free expression of bisexuality in woman, and it is so constantly met with—as among the Amazons of Dahomey for instance³—in conjunction with sexual maladaptation and inadequate mates or an absence of mates,⁴ that whenever female cruelty appears accompanied by a certain modicum of female dominance, it is legitimate to suspect sexual or other degeneracy among the men.

From the accounts of travellers, it is perfectly evident that an enormous amount of cruelty is exhibited by the women of the native tribes of America. Let me quote, for instance, Mrs. Mary Eastman, who cannot, I presume, be suspected of any sexual prejudice in the matter.

¹ Op. cit., p. 338. ² Op. cit., p. 331. See also p. 85, *ante*.

³ See on this point Capt. Sir Richard Burton, Op. cit., Vol. I, p. 112, and Vol. II, p. 49; see also E. Chaudouin, *Trois Mois de Captivité au Dahomey*, pp. 286, 352. Chaudouin gives a picture even more revolting than Burton of the bestial cruelty of these women.

⁴ The Amazons of Dahomey were all strictly celibate. So although there was apparently no degeneracy among their menfolk, and no female dominance in Dahomey, these spinster soldiers are only an example of the cultivation of sadism in a body of women doomed to be unmated, and at the same time, through their occupation being allowed full scope for the expression of their bisexuality. On their virginity, see Burton, Op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 46-9, and 260, and Chaudouin, Op. cit., pp. 322-325.

Speaking of a woman of the Dahcotah, she says : " This old woman was a fearful virago. . . . In her time she had cut off the hands and feet of some little Chippeway children, and strung them and worn them as a necklace. And she feasted yet at the pleasant recollections the honourable exploit induced." ¹

Referring to the Athapuscow Indians, Hearne describes how one woman, without any motive, killed the child of another, and, in a footnote, he adds : " It is too common a case with most of the tribes of Southern Indians for the women to desire their husbands or friends, when going to war, to bring them a slave, that they may have the pleasure of killing it ; and some of these inhuman women will accompany their husbands, and murder the women and children as fast as their husbands do the men." ²

Among the Iroquois, it is the women who take hold of the whips and lash the prisoners of war, and as a proof that the whipping is no child's play, the unfortunate victims frequently succumb exhausted at the women's feet, as they run the gauntlet between two rows of these female sadists.

Speaking of this practice, Morgan writes : " They [the prisoners of war] were taken to the head of this long line of whips, and were compelled, one after another, to run through it for their lives, and for the entertainment of the surrounding throng, exposed at every step, undefended, and with naked backs, to the merciless inflictions of the whip. Those who fell from exhaustion were immediately dispatched as unworthy to be saved." ³

Morgan then proceeds to explain that the rejected prisoners of war were " led away to the torture and death," ⁴ but he refrains from giving details of the torture, because, apparently, they are too horrible. It is a pity that he stops at this point, for the suspicion is

¹ *Dahcotah* (1849), pp. 44-7.

² *A Journey to the Northern Ocean*, p. 266. In another footnote on the same page he mentions the case of a girl of sixteen who had this bloodthirsty propensity.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 342-3.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 344.

that just as the women inflicted the thrashing, so they also inflict the torture. This would only be in keeping with the general picture we have of North American native women. But as Morgan does not state it as a fact, we refrain from assuming it, and are content, for our purpose, with the custom of the whipping carried out by the females of the community.

My comment on this and similar instances of extreme and morbid cruelty among women, as also upon the extreme and morbid humanitarianism which in civilized communities is but an inverted form of this cruelty, is either that the mates of such women are inadequate and insufficiently masculine to make the male elements in their womenfolk recessive, or else that such women are compulsory celibates; and in all cases of partial or complete female dominance (the latter, however, is never found) it would be interesting to discover whether this element of morbid cruelty, morbid humanitarianism, or other assertion of latent masculine characters, were not noticeable among the women; because, if it were, we might reasonably conclude, without further inquiry that the ascendancy of the female had occurred through male degeneracy.

At all events, we have now arrived at very significant conclusions, and it will be an advantage to state them as briefly as possible. They are as follows:

(a) That matriarchy, or female rule, is so rare, and, even when it is found, it exists in so modified a form (always a male executive) that as an order of social organization it is negligible.¹

(b) That matrilineal descent and inheritance, and matrilineal marriage customs, are not to be confused with *matriarchy*, and that the former are very much more often found divorced from partial female dominance than in association with it.

(c) That where partial female dominance is found, the

¹ Cf. Sir James Frazer, *Adonis, Ottis, Osiris*, Vol. II, p. 211: "The theory of gynæcocracy is in truth a dream of visionaries and pedants."

menfolk are in some way degenerate and inadequate mates, and selection operates in favour of masculine women and feminine men.

(d) That the cruelty, or self-assertiveness, or masculine pursuits of the female, or all three together, whether in ancient Athens, ancient Rome, France of the eighteenth century, or many tribes of America,¹ is a sign that the male elements of the women have not been made recessive; *ergo* that they are not adequately mated, and that their males are in some way below a desirable male standard.

It now only remains to sum up, and I cannot do this better than by making two quotations—the one from W. H. R. Rivers' article on *Mother-Right*, already referred to, and the other from Sir James Frazer's *Golden Bough*.

Rivers says : "Mother-right has often been supposed to imply mother-rule, but in the great majority of the societies which furnish us with examples of mother-right, authority is definitely vested in the male—in the father or oldest male as the head of the household, and in the chief or head of the tribe or corresponding social group."

Sir James Frazer writes as follows : ² "But in order to dissipate misapprehensions which appear to be rife on this subject, it may be well to remind or inform the reader that the ancient and widespread custom of tracing descent and inheriting property through the mother alone does not by any means imply that the government of

¹ In Stephen Powers' *Tribes of California* (Contributions to North American Ethnology, Washington, 1877), Vol. III, Chap. XVII, there is a curious account of the difficulty experienced by the men of the Pomo tribe in ruling their women folk. On p. 158 the author says : "All the devices that savage cunning can invent, all the mysterious and masquerading horrors of devil-raising, all the secret sorceries, the frightful apparitions and bugbears which can be supposed effectual in terrifying the women into virtue and preventing smock-treason, are resorted to by the Pomo Leaders."—It almost makes one wonder whether there is not perhaps something in the climate of America that is fatal to high male standards being maintained ; because it is notorious that modern Americans, who have no blood kinship with the native tribes, are utterly incapable of establishing a proper male attitude to the female.

² *Adonis, Ottis, Osiris*, Vol. II, pp. 208-9.

the tribes which observe the custom is in the hands of women ; in short, it should always be borne in mind that mother-kin does not mean mother-rule. On the contrary, the practice of mother-kin prevails most extensively amongst the lowest savages, with whom woman, instead of being the ruler of man, is always his drudge and often little better than his slave. Indeed, so far is the system from implying any social superiority of women that it probably took its rise from what we should regard as their deepest degradation, to wit, from the state of society in which the relations of the sexes were so loose and vague that children could not be fathered on any particular man. When we pass from the purely savage state to that higher plane of culture in which the accumulation of property, and especially of landed property, has become a powerful instrument of social and political influence, we naturally find that whenever the ancient preference for the female line of descent has been retained, it tends to increase the importance and enhance the dignity of woman ; and her aggrandizement is most marked in princely families, where she either herself holds royal authority as well as private property, or at least transmits them both to her consort or her children. But this social advance of women has never been carried so far as to place men as a whole in a position of political subordination to them. Even where the system of mother-kin in regard to descent and property has prevailed most fully, the actual government has generally, if not invariably, remained in the hands of men. Exceptions have no doubt occurred ; women have occasionally arisen who, by sheer force of character, have swayed for a time the destinies of their people. But such exceptions are rare and their effects transitory ; they do not affect the truth of the general rule that human society has been governed in the past and, human nature remaining the same, is likely to be governed in the future, mainly by masculine force and masculine intelligence.”

* * * * *

This chapter would hardly be complete unless it contained some reference to an alleged scientific work which appeared two or three years ago, and had a very great vogue among all classes of the community in Europe. It was translated into various languages, and, what is even more surprising, was treated seriously by many men of repute in the scientific world.

It is with some reluctance that I refer to this work, because I think it is unworthy of serious consideration. As, however, my omission, if I fail to notice it, is likely in these days to be interpreted as a sign of my disinclination to engage with a successful opponent, I feel bound to discuss it, in the briefest possible way, particularly as it sets in doubt the conclusions arrived at above. And, since better authorities than myself—Julian Huxley, for one—contrived to give it serious attention, if I sin in mentioning it in these pages, it cannot be said that I do not sin in good company.

In *The Dominant Sex*,¹ the authors, Mathilde and Mathias Vaerting, advance arguments which all tend to the following conclusion: that when once one of the sexes, whether male or female, becomes dominant and determines conditions of existence for the other, it is the attitude and habit of subjection in the subordinate sex which then proceeds, quite irrespective of innate tendencies, to develop that sex's characteristic virtues and vices. The obvious inference is that, whichever sex happens to become dominant, the other subordinate sex, whether male or female, will develop the virtues and vices which are associated with subordination; and that, therefore, if we admit that men are now the dominant sex—say, in modern Europe—the virtues and vices of women, far from constituting essentially feminine traits, are merely the features invariably developed by subordinates, whether men or women.

“It is erroneous, therefore,” say the Vaertings, “to do what is usually done at the present time, and to

¹ English Translation by Eden and Cedar Paul. London, 1923.

ascribe the differences in question without further consideration as sexual characters.”¹

And they proceed: “The error presumably arises from a not unnatural identification of the male sex with dominance and of the female sex with subordination. The respective associations have been regarded as inseparable. The extant inequality in the position of men and women has consequently been looked upon as itself an expression of sex differentiation, and a search for additional factors of the inequality has been superfluous. Yet the steady advance of the female sex towards the attainment of equal rights has been enough to show that the foregoing assumption is invalid.”²

Now, quite apart from the difficulty of reconciling such a theory as this with the teaching of both anthropology and history, from which we learn that the disparity between the social positions of male and female in all communities is due in the first place to the unlikeness of their functions in life,³ and secondly to their different capacity for achievement—a difference which is not overcome but only modified, in favour of the female, by male degeneracy—there are the following further objections to it: that a true matriarchy, or woman-ruled community has, as we have seen, not yet been found, and that even the few approximations to such a state, which have been discovered, exhibit pronounced patriarchal or man-ruling characteristics; that to place the whole onus of sexual character-differentiations upon environmental conditions is to forget those instincts, emotions and mental powers (examined in the previous chapters) which arise from special structures and their corresponding specialized functions; and that the prevalence of matrilineal descent and inheritance, as we

¹ Op. cit., p. 17.

² Op. cit., p. 17.

³ See Spencer, Op. cit., Vol. II, p. 289: “Men and women, being by the unlikeness of their function in life, exposed to unlike influences, begin from the first to assume unlike positions in the community as they do in the family.”

have shown, in no way argues a corresponding prevalence of woman rule.

But the Vaertings, as may be seen from every page of their book, repeatedly make the assumption, fatal to their hypothesis, that evidence of matrilineal customs is evidence of matriarchy; they also frequently adduce Bachofen in support of their argument, although they are fully aware of what we have claimed, namely, that Bachofen uses the word mother-right in the erroneous sense of female rule;¹ and they themselves often use the word "matriarchy" when they are speaking of merely matrilineal customs,² as if a sufficiently constant repetition of an error must make it ultimately acceptable and right.

No amount of juggling with terms and with the facts of ethnography can establish a plausible case for woman dominance. As we have seen, it occurs only exceptionally. There is in fact no perfect example of it. To proceed to derive other conclusions from it, therefore, such as the cultivation in dominant women of every masculine quality that has ever existed,³ can only be accomplished by imposing on the credulity of the reader.

Furthermore the Vaertings never seem to feel it incumbent upon them to inquire whether the claim of sexual equality in itself is not, as I have attempted to show, perhaps a symptom of something very different from the alleged advance of the female; and, presumably, in inquiring into the customs of the Chucunaque (which, by the by, they were not in a position to discuss), they would have assumed at once from Lady Brown's account not only that the Chucunaque were an instance of female dominance, of true matriarchy, but that there was not

¹ Op. cit., p. 19.

² In speaking of the Garos, for instance (p. 25), they say: "Among the Garos, women were dominant, and family groups were of the matriarchal type, tracing their descent through the mother."

³ Vaertings (Op. cit., p. 21): "We shall show that there is not a single 'masculine quality,' which cannot be paralleled as a 'feminine quality' in the history of one race or another." It need hardly be said that they do not show any such thing.

necessarily any male degeneration in these people, to account for the approach of sexual equality among them.

A last and more grave objection to the book, which makes it all the more surprising that it should have met with serious consideration, is the manner in which the Vaertings produce and marshal the evidence in support of their supposed discovery.

The book is so full of unwarranted assumptions and misleading inferences that it will be quite impossible for me to deal with it as a whole. But I will give a few instances, taken at random, of the kind of *suggestio falsi* I am referring to, and from these the reader will be able to draw his own conclusions.

On p. 24 the Vaertings say: “By the laws of Manu, a girl is allowed the choice of her husband;” and they adduce this as evidence of the fact that among the ancient Hindus women were dominant.

Now what are the facts?

First of all the Book of Manu lays it down as a principle that, “Day and night women must be kept in dependence by the males of their families . . . her father protects her in childhood, her husband protects her in youth, and her sons protect her in old age; a woman is never fit for independence.”¹

Secondly we find in Manu a long list of rules to be observed by a young man in the choice of his mate. “Let him avoid that family (in selecting a wife),” says Manu, “which neglects the sacred rites, one in which no male children (are born), one in which the Veda is not studied, one (the members of) which have thick hair on the body, those which are subject to hæmorrhoids. Let him wed a female free from bodily defects who has an agreeable name, the (graceful) gait of a Hamsa, etc.”²

Apparently, then, it is the man who must choose!

Again we find Manu saying: “To a distinguished, handsome suitor (of) equal (caste) should (a father) give his daughter in accordance with the prescribed rule,

¹ *Book of Manu*, Chapter IX, verses 2 and 3.

² *Ibid.*, III, 7-10.

though she have not yet attained (the proper age). (But) the maiden, though marriageable, should rather stop in (the father's) house until death, than that he should ever give her to a man destitute of good qualities."¹

Now come two verses which certainly give the daughter the right to choose, but only under certain conditions—that is to say, if her father has failed to find a husband for her.

“Three years let a damsel wait,” says Manu, “though she be marriageable; but after that time let her choose for herself a bridegroom of equal caste.”² (A very wise measure if we take into account the frequency of jealousy of young men in fathers of daughters!)

“If, being not given in marriage,” says Manu, “she herself seeks a husband, she incurs no guilt, nor (does) he whom she weds.

“A maiden who chooses for herself shall not take with her any ornaments given by her father or her mother, or her brothers; if she carries them away, it will be theft.”³

So what it amounts to is this: if her male parent fail in his duty by her, and at the end of a three years' wait have not found her a husband, then she has the right to go out and find one for herself. Even then, however, she is penalized to the extent of being unable to carry with her any ornaments given her by her family, under pain of being accused of theft.

This is very different from the bald statement that “By the laws of Manu a girl is allowed the choice of her husband.” But, for the Vaertings' purpose, of course, the bald statement was much more useful, and incidentally much more misleading. The authority they adduce for the bald statement is, by the by, V. Jaeckel's *Studien zur vergleichenden Völkerkunde* (p. 65). But as the *Laws of Manu* are accessible to all why give a second-hand source?

About the Egyptians, the Vaertings' conclusions are even more astonishing. In the first place they interpret

¹ *Book of Manu*, IX, 88, 89. ² *Ibid.*, IX, 90. ³ *Op. cit.*, IX, 91-2.

the affair of Joseph with Potiphar's wife as a proof of the alleged fact that women did the wooing in Egypt, and add: "Joseph indignantly repudiates the attempt to seduce him. As a last resort he runs away in order to preserve his virtue."¹—As if the fact that a married woman sometimes importunes a young man with her attentions were peculiar to countries where women dominate, and as if the only reason that the young man could have for running away in such circumstances was his anxiety to save his virtue!

Then, as a further proof of the dominance of women in Egypt, they quote Diodorus as saying that the man among the Egyptians obeys the woman; ² but they make no mention of those passages in Diodorus, which would have helped them to correct the impression that the historian gives of these ancient people. For instance, they do not quote Diodorus when he says: ³ "A woman who committed adultery was sentenced to lose her nose, upon the principle that, being the most conspicuous feature and the chief, or at least an indispensable ornament of the face, its loss would be most severely felt, and be the greatest detriment to her personal charm. The man received a bastinado of 1,000 blows. Some of their laws regarding the female sex were cruel and unjustifiable. Women were bastinadoed by a man."

The Vaertings also say of the Egyptians: "But although monogamy prevailed, women had more sexual freedom than men. . . ." ⁴

Diodorus, on the other hand, informs us that the Egyptians were not restricted to any number of wives but that every one married as many as he chose, with the exception of the priesthood.⁵

Wilkinson, in his history of the Egyptians,⁶ tells us that "although the Egyptians generally confined themselves to one wife, they, like the Jews and other Eastern nations,

¹ Op. cit., p. 26.

² Op. cit., p. 28.

³ I. 78.

⁴ Op. cit., p. 37.

⁵ I. 80.

⁶ *The Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians*, Vol. I, p. 319.

both of ancient and modern times, scrupled not to admit other inmates to their harem, most of whom appear to have been foreigners, either taken in war, or brought to Egypt to be sold as slaves."

As a confirmation of the view that women had more sexual freedom than men, the Vaertings add : "In Egypt no stigma attached to the mother of an illegitimate child."

Diodorus gives another interpretation of this attitude towards the mother of a child born out of wedlock in Egypt. He says :¹ "No child is regarded as illegitimate, even when it is born of a slave concubine ; for according to the popular belief, the father was the unique cause of generation, the mother only supplied it with food and shelter. . . . Thus they gave to the fruit-bearing trees the title male and female to the non-fruit-bearing."

We leave it to the Vaertings to reconcile their own authorities with the view that women dominated in ancient Egypt.

Speaking of the Chippewayans, the Vaertings say :² "Waitz relates that among the Chippewas the women took part in the wars, the councils, and the 'Grand Medicine Festivals,' it is evident, therefore, that the sexes had absolutely equal rights." Then, later on, they add : "In the case of the following peoples, Women's states without exception, we are told that the supreme power was wielded by a woman chief : the Creeks, the Dyaks, the Linggans, the Winnebogos, the Bolonda, the Angolans, the Chippewas."³

It is a pity the Vaertings are so fond of second-hand sources. Why quote Waitz, when we have original descriptions of the Chippewayans ? I looked through Waitz, but utterly failed to find any evidence of female dominance, or a Woman state, among the Chippewayans. I will not say that the passage the Vaertings seem to refer to above does not exist in Waitz ; all I submit is that I could not find it. On the other hand, I did find the following in Waitz. Speaking of the Chippewayans,

¹ I. 80.

² Op. cit., p. 25.

³ Op. cit., p. 159.

he says, "Their treatment of women is most brutal and often truly cruel;"¹ but he certainly adds, "In spite of their subordinate position, the women sometimes exercise a good deal of influence . . . particularly in all commercial matters."²

So much for Waitz as a supporter of the plea that women are dominant among the Chippewayans. Now let us turn to the original sources. Mrs. May Eastman, who, if she had been able to anticipate the Vaertings' thesis, would surely not have wished to refute it out of malice prepense, says, in a passage about the Chippewayans: "Early in the morning the Chippeways encamped near St. Anthony's falls; the women took upon themselves all the fatigue and labour of the journey, the men carrying only the implements of war and hunting. The Chippeway chief was the husband of three wives."³ Speaking of the wives, she says: "He was fond of them, but if they irritated him, by disputing among themselves, or respecting anything which he found necessary to his comfort, he was very violent. Blows were the only arguments he used on such occasions."⁴

Referring to the loss of a Chippewayan chief's youngest wife, Mrs. Eastman says: ⁵ "When the old man heard that Red Stone had gone too, his rage knew no bounds. He beat his two wives almost to death, and would have given his handsomest pipestem to have the faithless one again. His wives moaned all through the night, bruised and bleeding, for the fault of their rival."

Another independent witness, William H. Keating, writing of the Chippewayans, says: "Polygamy is held to be agreeable in the eyes of the Great Spirit, as he that has most children is held in highest estimation; some of the chiefs had nine wives."⁶

¹ Dr. Theodor Waitz, *Anthropologie der Naturvölker* (Leipzig, 1862), Vol. III, p. 101.

² *Ibid.*, p. 101. ³ *Op. cit.*, p. 97. ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 195. ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

⁶ *Narrative of an Expedition to the Source of St. Peter's River, etc.* (1824), Vol. II, p. 155.

Later on, the same author says: "Chastity is a virtue in high repute among the Chippewas, and without which no woman could expect to be taken as a wife by a warrior. . . . The character of a good woman rests merely in the observance of chastity, of obedience to her husband, and of affection to her children."¹

Thus there is little first-hand evidence of female dominance among the Chippewayans, and no evidence at all that I could find of this alleged woman chief who wields the supreme power.²

Of course it is impossible to check everything the Vaertings say in this detailed manner. It would take a volume three times the size of their own to do so adequately. I must, therefore, let the above suffice. From the passages already given, the reader will be able to form his own opinion concerning the reliability of the evidence the authors adduce in support of their thesis. But, before I leave the subject, I must just give this

¹ Op. cit., pp. 169-170.

² In attempting to demonstrate female dominance among another North American tribe, the Iroquois, the Vaertings say: "In the case of the Iroquois, polyandry was permissible to women, but polygamy was forbidden to men (Westermarck)." (Op. cit., p. 20.) Now, if the reader will look at pp. 92, 93, *ante*, he will see Morgan's own flat contradiction of this statement (Morgan being one of our greatest authorities on the Iroquois), and will also observe how far from female *dominance* the Iroquois actually were. If, however, in spite of the absence of any mention of the volume or page against Westermarck's name in the Vaertings' book, the reader will take the trouble to discover the passage to which the authors refer, he will find in Vol. III, p. 108, of the *History of Human Marriage* that the alleged sanction of polyandry, and prohibition of polygamy, refers only to the Seneca branch of the Iroquois, and it is reported by a man who is obviously misusing the word gynæcocracy (Father Lafitau); and on p. 196 he will see that Westermarck accepts the evidence of the phenomenon with caution and says, "it may, however, be only Lafitau's own inference." But to ordinary readers, the name of Westermarck against the statement seems sufficient authority for it, and unless their suspicions have already been aroused by other passages in the book, they are likely to pass on, secure in their belief that Westermarck's scholarship is a sufficient guarantee of the reliability of this fresh fact in favour of the Vaertings' thesis.

final gem of unfortunate incompatibility between an authoritative source and their own statement about a certain female corporation.

Referring to the warrior women of Dahomey, the Vaertings say,¹ "These warrior women regarded men as cowards and weaklings. When reproaching one another for cowardice or weakness they would say: 'You are a man!'"

There is no authority given for this statement, so we presume that the Vaertings were "told" about it, or that they found it in Waitz, or perhaps in Jaeckel. It is a pity, however, that they do not say where they found it, for one of our greatest authorities on Dahomey tells us exactly the reverse.

"The King [of Dahomey]," says Capt. Sir Richard Burton, "has repeatedly said to me that a woman is still a woman. And when the Amazons boast that they are not women but men, they stand self-corrected of the fact that, however near to equality, etc."²

If the warrior women of Dahomey boasted that they were not women but men, they could hardly have used the word "man" as a term of abuse. From my study of first-hand sources relating to Dahomey, I am led very much to doubt the Vaertings' statement about the Amazons, and, in view of the nature of the rest of their evidence, am inclined to reject it without further ado.³

I could go on for a good while longer taking exception

¹ Op. cit., p. 175.

² Op. cit., Vol. II, p. 48.

³ Take, for instance, the Vaertings' insistence on the fact that the ancient Teutons were "matriarchal." On what do they chiefly base their conclusion? They say (Op. cit., p. 25): "Lamprecht has positively proved that matriarchy existed among the early Teutons," and mention certain facts about the women wooing the men, etc. But who is Lamprecht, and what does it matter that he too should misuse the word matriarchy? Listen to what our best authority on the ancient Teutons says of their women: "Adulteries were very few for the number of the people. Punishment is prompt and is the husband's prerogative: her hair close-cropped, stripped of her clothes, her husband drives her from his house in presence of his relatives and pursues her with blows through the length of the village. For prostituted chastity there is no

to the Vaertings' method of reasoning, and to their manipulation of their facts; but as this necessary, though tiresome, examination of their book has already taken up too much of my space, I must now leave it. Perhaps the most extraordinary feature about the Vaertings' treatise was the reception it was given by the press. Almost every paper gave it a special article. *The Spectator* had it reviewed by Julian Huxley,¹ *The Eugenic Review* had it read by Havelock Ellis, well-known doctors quoted whole passages from it without questioning its reliability, and so on. And perhaps no better proof could be given of the profound feminist bias both of the Press and the public of the present day, than the respectful attention which it provoked. A book advancing the other point of view, even if it had been supported by more reliable evidence than that offered by *The Dominant Sex*, would either have been cut to pieces or entirely ignored.

In a communication to *The Spectator* on the subject, I wrote: "The general tendency to-day is to try at all costs to achieve, and to believe in, the equality of the sexes. If, therefore, the virtues and vices hitherto associated with both sexes respectively may be shown to be purely adventitious and not essential to their physiological functions and the instincts and desires which arise out of them . . . one more obstacle in the path of perfect sex equality is removed. The Vaertings come along and conveniently offer to remove that obstacle with their work, *The Dominant Sex*, and we have no doubt that they will get a wide and sympathetic hearing."²

pardon; beauty nor youth nor wealth will find her a husband." (Tacitus, *Germania*, C. 18, Loeb Classical Library.) Those who know the Vaertings' thesis will perceive how hopelessly this passage conflicts with their claim that the early Teutons were matriarchal.

¹ It is only fair to Prof. Julian Huxley to say that, although he gave *The Dominant Sex* his serious attention, his review of the book was far from favourable, and that he did his best, in the space at his disposal, to question its main conclusions. (See *The Spectator*, Sept. 15, 1923.)

² *The Spectator*, September 29, 1923.

Book II
THE INDICTMENT

CHAPTER V

The Degeneracy of Modern Man— Part I

IN the preceding chapters I have been concerned with demonstrating what to many of my readers will, I hope, appear to be the obvious ; but, since to demonstrate the obvious is always a thankless task, they will probably not be too thankful for the time and space I have taken up in doing it. Nevertheless, it is precisely in times like the present, when all kinds of extravagant notions are being circulated and accepted as truths among the masses of the population, that it becomes an urgent duty to restate the obvious in uncompromising terms ; and this must be my excuse for having so long postponed the consideration of my main theme.

Even for those who did not require to be confirmed in the principles established in the preceding pages, however, certain useful conclusions have been reached without which it would have been difficult for them to follow me in the further elaboration of my thesis ; and it may be as well, therefore, to recapitulate these conclusions in the order in which they were reached.

In the first place, we have seen that the correlation of certain instincts, emotions and mental powers, with special structures and their associated specialized functions, is a very definite biological phenomenon, which leads throughout the organic world to differentiation between species and likewise between the sexes.

This led to the conclusion that there can be no equality between the sexes.

Secondly, we have seen that our mental and physical adaptations to sexual dimorphism are probably much older than our adaptations to the mammalian form of life; that, indeed, the former probably account for some of the oldest instincts and general characters we possess, if we exclude the instincts connected with alimentation and movement.

This led to the conclusion that the characteristics arising out of sexual dimorphism are very deeply imbedded in our natures, and cannot therefore be altered in a day, in a generation, or even in a century. Apparent modifications of these characteristics, which alter the relations of the sexes, are, therefore, more likely to be morbid and transient than normal and permanent.

Thirdly, we have seen that in the differentiation of the sexes through specialization of function, the female has steadily been subjected to ever greater physical stresses, until in the order of the *Quadrumana* and in the genus *Homo sapiens*, the toll on her physical resources is out of all proportion greater than the male's.

This led us to account for her greater similarity to her young, for her arrested development, and for her precocity, by showing them to be Nature's compensations for the burdens placed on her constitution; and from the freedom from these burdens we deduced man's more complete development, his capacity for genius, his greater vigour, etc.

Fourthly, we have seen that the mammalian functions of the female naturally limit her freedom, besides naturally straining her physical resources, and that the most recent of these functions is ineluctable. Seeing, however, that she is abnormal if she be not reproductive, the more normal she is, the more she must submit to the natural limitation of her freedom and the natural drain on her physical resources (The Beloved Parasite.)

This led to the conclusion that man starts life with

a number of advantages over the female, which make him easily superior to her in achievement; and we proceeded to account for the historical record of his superior achievements as the outcome of his being free from woman's heavy handicap, and also as the result of his capacity for genius, which we have seen is the outcome of his more complete development.

A further conclusion we drew was, that where man loses ground, and, by falling back, gives the impression to woman that she is advancing, he has failed to make full use of his advantages, he has failed either through indolence or degeneracy to maintain his standard. This may temporarily give the impression of sex-equality.

Fifthly, we have seen that in the genesis of social superiority mere brute force does not necessarily play a very important part; that very early in the life of primitive races the struggle for existence compels them to attach importance to other more spiritual endowments, and that frequently it is the oldest (therefore the weakest physically) of the menfolk of the community who acquire social power, or it is the magic-workers in all departments (not only in the use of warlike weapons), or the most intellectual.

This led us to conclude that there was no reason to assume that if woman had displayed gifts of a higher order, which were likely to have been recognized as of utilitarian value to primitive man, she would, owing to her weakness alone, have been denied a leading place in human society; and we inferred from this that the absence of women as leaders in primitive or civilized communities, confirmed, from a different angle, our earliest conclusion that they were less gifted than men for successful achievement.

Sixthly, we exposed the idea that there had been any deliberate stultification of women's higher powers by men, first of all by demonstrating, as above, that mere physical weakness is not oppressed when its possessor offers other advantages to the community, and secondly

by showing that in those periods in history when women have been absolutely free to develop capacity in any field side by side with man, their productions have always been inferior.¹ We also called attention to the fact that, in view of the great number of distinguished men in all fields who achieved their greatness in defiance of the most adverse circumstances, it is not reasonable to argue that the absence of great achievement among women could have been due only to unfavourable ambient conditions.

This led to the conclusion that the alleged subjection of women, which has been postulated to account for woman's acknowledged inferiority in achievement, is a myth, and a pure invention on the part of those who are not honest enough to admit disconcerting truths.

Seventhly, we have seen that the steady emancipation of women in older civilizations has been accompanied by a gradual degeneracy of those civilizations and of their menfolk; in fact, that the first phenomenon was always a symptom of the latter, and we instanced Greece, Rome, and eighteenth-century France as examples of this rule.

This led us to conclude that the emancipation of woman and her invasion of male spheres of interest and power, is a sign that her bisexuality has ceased to be controlled, that her male elements are no longer recessive; therefore that her male entourage cannot be sufficiently male to make them recessive, therefore that this male entourage must be degenerate, and that in this male degeneracy must be sought the common cause for both the emancipation of the female and the decline of the civilization in which she becomes emancipated.

Eighthly, we have seen that the idea that *matriarchy* was once a prevalent type of social organizations on earth is a pure myth, and we adduced much evidence, as well as the opinions of such high authorities as W. H. K. Rivers and Sir James Frazer, to show that it could no longer be entertained by anybody.

¹ Part of this historical demonstration is to be found in my *Woman: a Vindication*, Chapter X.

This led us, in the course of our examination of the facts, to conclude that where, as in some American tribes, the Khaxis and the Chucunaque, women³ acquire a certain modicum of power, we may always be sure to find certain signs of male degeneracy, such as sexual impotence, for instance (the Chucunaque), or inability to make the male elements of the female recessive, and thus frequently the display of cruelty among the females (the Dhacotah, the Iroquois, the Athapuscow Indians). The Amazons of Dahomey are another example of this, but in their case the free expression of their bisexuality was the result of (a) their celibacy and (b) their peculiar calling.

* * * * *

Now, turning our attention at last to conditions in modern England, and viewing these conditions in the light of the principles at which we have arrived above, our problem will be to discover whether in view of the situation of the sexes in this country, we may justly charge England's manhood with degeneracy.

In present-day society in this country we certainly find the significant doctrine of the equality of the sexes well established, and, if we date the Woman's Movement from the time when Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women* was published, which was the year 1792, the whole agitation which has finally culminated, among other things, in the granting of the suffrage to women, is over a hundred years old.¹ During the whole

¹ Truth to tell, there were earlier works than this one. In 1767 there appeared *A Dialogue concerning the Subjection of Women to their Husbands*, and in 1780 *Female Restoration by a Moral and Physical Vindication of Female Talents*; but they cannot compare with Mary Wollstonecraft's work, any more than can a later work published in 1796 entitled *Robert and Adela, or the Rights of Women*. In France, however, the Feminist movement started much earlier. And the fact that it has come to nothing, and has produced none of the expected great women which its promoters foretold, is surely significant. François Poutain de la Barre, one of the most notable Feminists, published his *De l'Egalité des deux Sexes* in Paris in 1673. In it he claimed that "brains have no sex," and that the whole of women's apparent inferiority to men is due to their defective education. This was followed up in 1674 by his *Education de Dames*,

of the nineteenth century it gathered strength, and with the publication of Mill's *Subjection of Women* (1869) may be said to have entered its final, most active period, ending in the passing of the famous Representation of the People Act in 1918.

The success of the Woman's Movement has meant that in Politics, Science, Local Government, and administrative functions of all kinds, women now figure almost as prominently as men; in fact, that there no longer remains any statutory or conventional obstacle to prevent them from occupying the highest positions in the land. And, if the conclusions we have arrived at above are valid, this change in our social organization, quite apart from any other evidence we may adduce, presupposes a certain degree of degeneracy among our menfolk.

Even if it be not the only sign of this degeneracy, it is at least an important one. It means that men are no longer maintaining their standard; it means that their retrogression and their failure to profit from their immense advantages is leading to that appearance of equality between the sexes which is only to be met with in periods of cultural decline; and it means that the bisexuality of the female in our midst is obtaining free expression, that there is little or no recession of the male component in her nature, and that selection is operating in the direction of a multiplication of women whose masculine elements are being developed at the cost of their female elements. In fact, it means that everything to-day contributes to the establishment of

and in 1675 by his *De l'Excellence des Hommes contre l'Egalité des Sexes*. But Poutain himself was preceded by Mlle. de Gournay in 1626 with her treatise on *l'Egalité des Hommes et des Femmes*, and by Maria von Schurman, whose Dutch essay was translated into French and appeared under the title of *Question Célèbre, S'il est Nécessaire ou Non que les Filles soient Sçavantes*. Other French publicists in favour of Feminism were Jacques du Bosc with *l'Honneste Femme* (1632), Louis Machon with *Discours ou Sermon Apologétique en Faveur des Femmes* (1641), Jacqueline Guillaume (1665), D. J. B. Decruet (1687), G. S. Aristophile (1694) and C. M. D. Noel (1698).

conditions in which the woman whose femaleness is recessive, flourishes best.

Furthermore, the success of the Woman's Movement means that the muddle which generations of inferior male administration have made of the national life, has become obvious to the meanest intelligence, that man's present ineptitude calls urgently for a corrective; otherwise it is difficult to account for the fact that women should have found a plausible pretext for agitating so feverishly to take charge, or to help in directing the nation's future destiny.

The fact that we do not believe that the advent of women at our council board is a sign that things are mending, has nothing whatever to do with the complex causes which brought them there. We may be convinced that Feminism is a quack cure, a pseudo-remedy for our present alarming ills, an emergency measure, which, far from giving us any hope, merely makes us fear that the only profitable and genuine remedy, a regeneration of men, will not be adopted; but this does not mean that we deny that the women who led Feminism recognized a good additional reason for their movement in the alarming pass to which incompetent and decadent men were bringing their country.¹

For it must not be supposed that it was necessarily the least desirable or least intelligent women of the nation who have led and formed the body of the Woman's Movement. This is very far from being the truth. To meet some of them, as I did at the time of their greatest activity, was immediately to dismiss such a suspicion from one's mind. Besides, most of these women had fathers whom they knew, brothers with whom they were brought up, husbands whose guidance or support they had, in the intimacy of the home, learnt to value at its precise worth. Is it conceivable that they could have felt justified in clamouring to play a part in national

¹ See on this point my reply to Lady Frances Balfour's *Anti-Feminist Folly*, in the *English Review* of March, 1924.

affairs, if their native acumen, their judgment, and their sensibilities had not told them that men were no longer to be relied upon? Had the menfolk nearest and dearest to them impressed them with the essential superiority of masculine minds and understanding, is it likely that the thought of supplementing the male power in the nation, or of collaborating with it, would ever have occurred to them? Even if some of us may suppose that there is possibly a psycho-analytical explanation of Feminist agitation, we must surely concur in attributing to women sufficient shrewdness to have lighted on a plausible pretext for expressing their complexes. Where would have been the plausibility, however, in an agitation for a share in the nation's direction, if its actual directors appeared completely adequate? ¹

To reply that the condition of the nation, that the failures of male administration, had nothing to do with the determining influences of Feminism, is to forget the whole element of contempt for the male, which plays such a significant part in modern Feminism (as it did also in ancient Feminism) and is to be found on almost every page of the literature of the movement.²

To say that this contempt of the male is to be traced

¹ Truth to tell this argument was used again and again by women speakers in favour of the vote.

² For typical examples see *Marriage as a Trade*, by Cicely Hamilton (pp. 259, 265); *Julia France and Her Times*, by Gertrude Atherton; *Mere Man, or Great Thoughts on a Small Subject*, by Honor Bright (pp. 13, 18, 26, 51, 53); *Mere Man*, by Margaret Dalham (pp. 38, 75: "That woman with her powers of maternity should be under the control and at the mercy of another being, and her inferior at that, is altogether degrading"; p. 120: "Men are becoming more an adjunct of the house, not the prime factor"); *Imprisoned Souls*, by Violet Ashmole (pp. 11, 18, 20, 91); and *Woman's Franchise, The Need of the Hour*, by Mrs. Wolstenholme Elmy. Among the earlier writers, Jacqueline Guillaume, the author of *Les Danses Illustres* (1665), is quite as emphatic in her contempt of men. "Le Sexe Féminin," she says, "surpasse en toute sorte de genres le Sexe Masculin," and "les ouvrages les plus merveilleux que Dieu a faits icy-bas ont toujours été exécutés par des femmes." Later on, addressing men, she writes: "Venez, petits Pigmées," etc.

only in a few viragoes, tribads, or Lesbians, whose anxiety to figure in exalted positions causes them to seize upon any argument that suits their purpose, is also neither fair nor true. I have met a large number of desirable and quite normal women, who, out of principle and taste, remained stalwart anti-Feminists, but who nevertheless shared with the majority of active Feminists that contempt for the modern male which is the outcome of experience rather than of prejudice, of ordinary vision and judgment rather than of bitterness or a warped mentality.

No, contempt of the male is not only a deeply rooted sentiment in most women to-day, but it is also one of which thousands would give anything to be rid. It is an ache, a consuming fire, rekindled by almost every man they learn to know intimately; and, as I hinted in my Introduction, it is in their homes that the women of England first learnt the contempt I speak of.¹ The fathers, uncles, brothers, and especially husbands, of Englishwomen, for the last century, have been the principal inspirers and inculcators of this contempt for the male; and the ardent conviction behind the Woman's Movement, the momentum behind the plea for sex equality, was certainly furnished by the accumulated experience of everyday life in the home.

When once this contempt came into the open, it naturally expressed itself academically and in euphemisms. It clothed itself in terms which were conceived to be as free as possible from the emotional component of long-pent-up disdain and boredom. It assumed the majesty of a legal claim, of a political grievance, of a public demand for "justice." But those that had ears to hear could hardly fail to discern beneath the public and clamorous demand for Women's Rights, the muffled and secret

¹ Thackeray was one of the greatest nineteenth-century writers who recognized this. See the profound passage in *Henry Esmond*, Chapter XI, which begins: "Much of the quarrels and hatred which arise between married people——" and ends with the words, "beyond the power of his muddled brains,"

cry of women disillusioned and exasperated by their male associates, outraged by the inadequacy of their men.

The absurdity of supposing that, at the end of the nineteenth century, with the principle of democracy utterly discredited as it was, the immense energy and determination of the Woman's Movement could have been generated by a desire for the vote alone, in each militant female's breast, is surely too glaring to be demonstrated.

Psycho-analysts would now probably interpret the whole of the fight for the vote as an unconscious struggle for a symbol of male sexuality, on the part of women suffering acute feelings of inferiority through the castration complex.¹

But this is only putting my claim in different words. For I should point out to the psycho-analysts that women are only likely to suffer acutely from the castration complex in the first place, when their latent maleness is allowed free expression (i.e. in an environment of inferior males); and secondly, when the constant exhibition of male inadequacy makes the traditional inferiority of the female intolerable. If one is conventionally held to be inferior to an inferior, one suffers a daily affront to one's dignity. Social, or any other kind of inferiority, is only tolerable when it is the natural relation to something superior. Then nobody minds.

The psycho-analyst would reply, probably, that since

¹ This complex is explained by Dr. Helene Deutsch (a pupil of Freud's) in her excellent *Psychoanalyse der Weiblichen sexual Funktionen*, edited by Freud (Vienna, 1925), Chapter III, as the repression in early childhood by little girls of their disappointment and indignation at finding themselves deprived of the male generative organs. She gives three types of women: (1) those who become reconciled to their loss of the male generative organ, by regarding it as a punishment, and seeking compensation in feminine joys (normal); (2) those who never become reconciled and who wish to avenge themselves on the world, and particularly on men, for their grievance; and (3) those who remain until the end stubbornly unconvinced that they are completely deprived, and who therefore shun all experiences which may disabuse them of this idea (these are the so-called frigid women, who decline sex experiences).

the whole of the castration complex is formed in early childhood, my argument is beside the point. For an infant is not in a position to assess the value of the menfolk of her circle.

True. But complexes, like all other traits of character, *acquire their adaptation*, not in childhood, but in adult life. It is as adults that we find that our complexes are either satisfactorily organized with our lives, or else giving rise to abnormal symptoms. Now it is precisely in the attempted adaptation of their infantile castration complex that growing girls and young women may find that the distressing mediocrity of modern men forces them to abnormal adjustments and compensations.

Observe how quickly in a room of men, those of inferior intellect or inferior physique, will cheerfully recognize their superior, and proceed to convert their initial distress into pleasure by rapidly calling to their aid the pleasurable adaptation known as "hero-worship." Now in connection with this idea, let the reader bear in mind how loathsome it was to many of the excellent regular non-commissioned officers during the late war, to find themselves placed in subordinate positions under temporary officers of the New Army, who often did not know as much as they did even about the King's English—not to mention King's Regulations.

I would not venture to deny that the castration complex may have played a powerful hidden part in the Woman's Movement, and is doing so still, by giving a strong unconscious impetus to its leaders. But this is only a psycho-analytical way of expressing what I am trying to show—namely, that one must first despise one's alleged superior in one's heart, before one's position of inferiority to him can appear ignominious.

Respecting the question, how Englishmen have earned the secret and avowed contempt of their womenfolk, and how, therefore, they have gradually made the traditional division of labour between the sexes appear as intolerable to women, will be revealed on every

subsequent page of this book, and the reader will frequently be left to draw his own conclusions. Nevertheless, where the particular form of male inferiority which I happen to be examining is one that is likely to be felt acutely by women, I shall not fail to emphasize the fact. For the moment, however, two or three other problems must be dealt with, and the first of these is the part played by certain men in supporting the claims of Feminism. The fact that a large number of men have associated themselves with the efforts of the Woman's Movement in England is known to everybody who watched the Female Suffrage campaign in the early years of the century.¹ Indeed, from the very inception of its more intensive activities in the sixties of last century, the Woman's Movement may be said to owe so much to its male supporters, that it could hardly have succeeded, as it has done, without this element among its champions.

It is not unusual, however, in a revolutionary movement, to find among the revolutionary party people who by virtue of their position seem to have no business there. But this does not mean that their support is any the less useful. On the contrary, the very fact that they are seen among the subverters seems to lend a peculiar sanction to the latter's aims. We have only to think of men like the Vicomte de Noailles, the Comte de Mirabeau, the Duc d'Aiguillon, the Duc du Châtelet, the Marquis de Blacons, and such other democratic noblemen as Montmorency, Castellanes, Liancourt, Laroche foucauld, Virieu, Lally-Tollendal, and Clermont-Tonnerre, during the French Revolution, in order to understand not only the phenomenon of incongruous elements in a revolutionary movement, but also the fate of such incongruous elements.

Indeed, we might go further and say that, quite

¹ As we have seen, men have also associated themselves with Feminism in France. But they have not done so there nearly to the same extent as in England, and certainly far fewer among the masses in France have shown Feminist sympathies.

apart from such official male supporters of the Woman's Movement, there was in the whole of the United Kingdom, at the time of the Suffragette outrages, a vast additional, but quite unconscious body of male supporters, without whom it would have been quite impossible for the suffragettes to have succeeded. I refer to those perfectly passive male adherents to the Woman's Movement, who manifested their sympathy with the leaders, not by open and articulated expression, but by the maudlin sentimentality with which they suffered themselves to be influenced by the hunger-strikers, the blood-epistolists of Holloway Gaol, and all the other artifices of sensational martyrdom on which the newspapers flourished twelve or more years ago.

It should not be forgotten, however, that such men would make a success of any agitation, no matter what its object might be. For, to them, it is not a question of ascertaining the intrinsic merits of a proposed measure of reform, but merely of deciding how long they will be able to endure the spectacle of its "suffering" supporters. Given a large number of people—particularly if they happen to be chiefly women—who are prepared to break the law and then to hunger-strike and write letters with their own blood after they have been apprehended, and their cause will be sure to succeed, provided that you have two additional factors—a sensational Press and a sickly sentimental public.¹

Now the public chiefly concerned with the final efforts of the Woman's Movement was obviously the manhood of the nation. It was they who were in a position permanently to resist, or ultimately to grant, the suffragettes' claims. It was therefore fatal to the cause of the resisters that there should have been among the men of the nation, not only a handful who were active supporters

¹ Quite recently the Home Secretary has been heard complaining about the crowds who always pity, and petition for the release of, murderers (see Daily Press, February 9, 1926). These agitations emanate from the same sentimental elements in the population.

of the Woman's Movement, but also a great multitude outside who, when confronted with anarchy posing as martyrdom, got a lump in their throats and yielded.

And thus, although the statute which allowed women to be enrolled as voters was not passed before the war, there can be little doubt that the valuable preparation made in the hearts of the more maudlin males by the behaviour of the suffragettes at the time of their great offensive, had sufficiently broken the back of the country's resistance, to make the ultimate measure of 1918 if not a popular, at least a tolerable reform, unlikely to arouse much indignation. Truth to tell, except in the hearts of the few, it roused no sign even of protest.

When such sentimentalists as Bishop Welldon, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Lloyd George and scores of others, said that women had earned the vote by their wonderful work in the war, they merely expressed what thousands of other men doubtless felt, who remembered the "heart-rending" scenes that had been enacted at Holloway years before. And, although the Woman's Cause was won in this way, it was only won as any other cause might be won to-day—however bad or however absurd—thanks to anarchy and the pose of martyrdom on the one hand, and sentimentality on the other.

This, however, does not explain the position of those men who actively collaborated with the female leaders of the movement, in order to help them to realize their aims. Neither does it explain the mentality of such people as Condorcet, John Stuart Mill, Ruskin, Buckle and Ibsen, and the body of other men, who must remain unnamed, who worked side by side with the suffragettes in the domestic tumult that preceded the international upheaval of the Great War.

We have seen that sentimentality played a very great part among the thinking and unthinking supporters of Feminism, and perhaps it would be as well to explain this before proceeding to our analysis of those other

characteristics in modern men, which, in our opinion, proclaim their degeneracy.

The maudlin attitude of man towards the female—by which I mean that attitude of turgid emotionalism which is founded on an imaginary conception of her as a pathetic and heroic performer in life's drama—arises as a rule from three causes: (1) the belief that the whole of motherhood and wifehood is one long self-sacrificing martyrdom; (2) the belief that woman is the more moral of the two sexes and constitutes the moralizing influence on earth; and (3) the partial or complete impotence of the particular male who assumes the maudlin attitude.

Let us examine these separately.

(1) As I have pointed out elsewhere, it suits women to give men a guilty conscience about the alleged unfair apportionment of pleasure and pain between the sexes in life. It is a matter of elementary experience that men with guilty consciences are more easily ruled than other men, and the Church having acted on this principle for centuries, and having flourished on it, it is not surprising that women out for power should ultimately have heeded the valuable hint. The consequence was, the pains and difficulties of pregnancy, childbirth and child-rearing were grossly exaggerated, not only by the women themselves, but also by their adoring mates. Owing largely to the ignorance and indolence of the medical profession, on the one hand, and to unhygienic conditions among numbers of women, on the other, pregnancy and parturition have, it is true, become more of a disease than a natural function.¹ But, bad as things are,² these functions, with the majority of healthy

¹ See my more exhaustive discussion of this in *Lysistrata*, Chapter II.

² They must be pretty bad for two eminent doctors to feel that it is necessary to state the truism that pregnancy is not a disease, as if they were imparting useful information to the lay world! See *Health Problems of the Empire*, by Drs. Andrew Balfour and H. H. Scott (London, 1924), p. 327: "Pregnancy is physiological, not pathological, it is a natural condition not a disease, though circumstances of modern life tend to make it so or lead to its being regarded as such among western peoples."

women, leading rational lives, are still very much more pleasurable than most of them care to admit, and it is always a sign of a certain lack of shrewdness and normal alertness in a man, if he feels guilty—i.e. heavy about the conscience—regarding the child-bearing and child-rearing functions of his womenfolk. For even if they have endured the tortures of the damned in performing these functions (which is always a sign of bad management, irrational living, or malformation) he can feel guilt only as a man who has either displayed atrocious taste in the selection of his mate, or else who has no mastery over life's problems, but certainly not as a being implicated in the supposed unjust apportionment of pleasure and pain, because of the act of procreation he has performed. To feel guilt as man *per se*, because one's own self-seeking appetite has led to so much distress, is a sign of a condition bordering almost on idiocy. And yet it is surprising how many thousands of men, influenced by sick values, feel this heavy conscience, and it is still more surprising to see how their womenfolk exploit them by playing upon their feelings in this matter.

To respect a man who thus allows himself to be imposed upon must be exceedingly difficult. How can such gullibility fail to provoke disdain ?

The literature of the nineteenth century is full of the sickly sentimentality arising from this extraordinary load of guilt,¹ which Englishmen, in particular, have

¹ It would be impossible to give all the examples of it that I have found, but the following instance taken from a great writer, who must be reckoned among our most masculine English authors, shows how widely spread is this attitude. In the *Story of the Gadsbys*, Captain Gadsby, who is represented to be a big muscular man, persistently calls his wife, a smaller creature, "poor little woman," for no apparent reason. Then all of a sudden, after a piece of confidential information from her, he exclaims: "Oh! I'm a brute—a pig—a bully, and a blackguard. My poor, poor darling!" Why? Simply because Mrs. Gadsby has told him that a few months hence she will perform the natural function of presenting him with a child.

cheerfully helped to heap upon their own heads; and the fact that it has greatly increased their docility and humility towards Woman, may be tested by anyone who attempts to discuss the relation of the sexes with the average man.

(2) The belief that woman is more moral than man, and is the moralizing influence on earth, is partly a derivative of the former attitude, because not only is the creature who has been given a guilty conscience prone to believe that those towards whom he feels guilty are better than he is (the simple man imagines that even the clergyman or priest must be a better man than he is), but also because it is always assumed that the greater sufferer from the sexual relations must expiate by her suffering whatever amount of sin is associated with the sexual act (and in Christian countries the sexual act is never quite free from associations of sinfulness) whereas the party who is free from suffering and who only derives pleasure from the relation, remains saddled with sin.¹

But there is another root to the belief that women are the moralizing influence on earth, and that is the gross misunderstanding of the sexual experience in each sex. Man, being normally the initiator and the active agent in the sexual relation, is assumed by unthinking and prurient people to be more sensual and therefore more sinful than his mate. As if Nature—to speak teleologically for a moment—could in this instance have departed

¹ So that this may not appear fantastic, and pending my more exhaustive examination of this point, let me quote Lecky's view of the sexual act (*History of European Morals*, Vol. I, p. 104): "All that is known under the names of decency and indecency, concur in proving that we have an innate, instinctive perception that there is something degrading in the sensual part of our natures, something to which a feeling of shame is naturally attached, something that jars with our conception of perfect purity." The preposterous assurance with which he writes this revolting nonsense in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and the fact that he is writing as an historian of morals, shows, I think, that he knew he was not expressing a view that would be likely to startle or displease his readers.

so fundamentally from her usual method, as to have made the creature who has to perform the greater and more elaborate part in the sexual life, less eager about the gratification of her double-barrelled, trebly endowed appetites, than the creature who performs but one, and that the shortest of the sexual functions! I pointed this out in my *Woman: a Vindication*, but although I was not thanked for doing so, I have been gratified since to find myself supported by a learned German physician, Dr. Groddeck, who refutes the erroneous principle almost in the same words as I have.¹

For we must understand that "moralizing," in the sense of the modern world, means "tending to turn away from bodily pleasures." It has little meaning besides this, for no one in his senses, not even Lecky or Miss Christabel Pankhurst, would claim that women are less inclined than men are to deceive, or to lie, or to deal dishonestly. The belief, therefore, amounts to this, that women are supposed to be the moralizing influence, because they tend to turn away from bodily pleasures themselves, and to lead others away from them. Those who have a clear perception of woman's rôle in life will see at once the absurdity of this belief on the sexual side; while those who have an intimate knowledge of any woman of what class, race or nationality soever, will also be able to refute it on the alimentary side, for the woman who does not love food has yet to be found. All this, however, does not condemn woman, in the Pagan sense. It is only Puritans, Americans, and Englishmen who fancy that they enhance the value of woman by stripping her of her natural "immorality." To say that woman is and must be more sensual than man, is simply to draw rational conclusions, not only from the world we know, but also from the necessary association between pleasure and healthy functioning discussed in the first chapter. And, seeing how much of woman's life is taken up with sexual functions, unless

¹ See *Das Buch Vom Es* (Leipzig, 1923), p. 110.

we can suppose that Nature has made an exception in the case of the human female, and made her normal functioning unpleasant, we are bound to conclude that she is more sensual than her mate—ergo, more "immoral" in the Christian sense, not more "moral" as Lecky argued.¹

Another root to the belief that women are the moralizing influence in life—and this root women have tended to nourish with the devotion of the most enthusiastic husbandry—is the superstition connected with the idea of selfishness and unselfishness. It is assumed that because woman gives her life-blood and ultimately the secretion of her mammary glands to the beloved parasite, she stands for the "unselfish" principle in life, and Herbert Spencer, in his philosophy, argued in support of this view.

To argue in this way, however, is to remove every trace of moral value from the idea of selfishness and unselfishness. Because according to the moralists, that act which is unselfish must be performed without any view to self-interest. But in that sense no normal bodily function, such as digesting, gestating, sweating, breathing, growing, secreting fluids, can be called truly unselfish in the moralists' sense, because it is in the pursuit of self-interests that they are performed.

We can see no meaning whatever in the words "selfish" or "unselfish," but, at all events, to ascribe unselfishness to a woman, because in pursuit of her own happiness, her own self-realization, her own full life, she happens to fall in love, marry, and bring forth children and secrete milk for their sustenance in infancy, is surely to make the word unselfishness quite valueless as a moral epithet of praise or blame, even for those who do believe that "selfish" and "unselfish" have a meaning. First prove that woman is actuated solely by feelings of duty to the State or nation in falling in love, and that she continues to be actuated by purely patriotic motives in the arms

¹ Op. cit., Vol. II, p. 359.

of her lover, in the marriage-bed, in child-bed, and in association with her infant child, and you will have come appreciably near to proving that she is constitutionally unselfish in the sense in which the word is popularly used. But as it is impossible to prove this, and as furthermore, it is impossible to contend that parturition and lactation do not gratify a natural appetite, the association of unselfishness (if the word means anything at all) with woman more than with man is simply bluff.

And yet there can be no question that this bluff partly accounts for the modern Englishman's belief in woman's moralizing influence, as also in the superiority of her moral nature, which can be read, not only in Lecky, but in almost every page of prose and poetry that has been written for the last hundred years.

It is no doubt difficult to respect men who allow themselves to be imposed upon by such palpably false valuations. But if men are more easily governed by women who give themselves airs and who pose as self-sacrificing altruists when all the time they are only performing natural functions and gratifying natural appetites, it is hardly to be wondered at that such methods of coercion are widely adopted.¹ This much, however, may be laid to the credit of Englishwomen, that, when surrounded by masculine dupes of this kind, they have never even pretended to respect them.

(3) We now come to that root of the maudlin attitude towards the female, which consists in the partial or complete impotence of the male. This is very common. But it must not be imagined that the impotence is always absolute or anatomically determined, or that in its partial manifestation it is incompatible with procreation. Tolstoi, for instance, was one of these partially

¹ For instances of the manner in which women use the words "selfish" and "unselfish" in order to get their own way with men who believe that these words have a meaning, see my *Woman: a Vindication*, p. 197.

impotent men, but he had children by his marriage.¹ The two commonest examples of relative impotence are those of the repulsive man, on the one hand, and of the old man, on the other. Both of these, by finding access to the willing female difficult, tend to idealize and exalt the object of their desire, which happens to be out of reach. Their impotence is not constitutional; it is imposed by circumstances. They are chaste *malgré eux*. It is their repulsiveness or their senility that causes the female cold shoulder. And what they covet and cannot obtain, they paint in all the wondrous colours of the rainbow, and elevate to the level of that natural phenomenon—somewhere near heaven. They can persuade a woman to have them only by wealth or some other substantial inducement. They are always compelled to *marry* the woman they desire, and often have to put up with a third- or fourth-rate woman at that. But they are extremely grateful notwithstanding, and always speak about woman with a lump in their throats.

A less common, but more powerfully maudlin rhapsodist about woman, is the man who is sexually either below standard or else whose genital apparatus is incapable of functioning. Such a man was, of course, John Stuart Mill, whose reproductive organs remained rudimentary in adult life.² As, however, I have dealt with his utterances and his markedly maudlin attitude towards woman in my *Woman: A Vindication*, I need only remind the reader here of the wild and fantastic nature of his work *The Subjection of Women*, in which the argumentation alone (apart from the falsification of history) is so obviously unworthy of a reputable thinker, much less, therefore, of a logician, that an intelligent

¹ See the interesting arguments advanced by Dr. Victor von Gyurkovechky to prove the sexual impotence of Tolstoi in *Warum Tolstoi Liebe Verachtet und Aerzte Hasst?* Tolstoi, of course, meets the advanced Feminists in his loathing of heterosexual relations.

² See Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, Vol. VI, p. 174.

schoolboy could easily point out the errors in his reasoning.¹ When, however, we know him as impotent, we understand his trend to rhapsodic fictions about women, and make allowances for it. Unfortunately, however, it is not every reader of the *Subjection* who is aware of its physiological causation.

With regard to Condorcet, Buckle and Ibsen, we must bear in mind that, although we may have very cogent reasons for suspecting their sexual potency, it is very often extremely difficult to find, either in biographies or autobiographies, any reference to this side of a man's life, and therefore not easy to establish the facts. It is usually the one aspect of a man's life that his friendly biographer tries most to conceal.

I think careful investigation of Condorcet's case, despite the fact that he married, might possibly show that he was one of those partially impotent men of whom I have already spoken. For we must not forget that he was primarily a mathematician, and that mathematicians have not infrequently been regarded as subnormal in sex.² With regard to Buckle, the problem of deciding to what extent he was sexually below standard, is equally difficult to solve, although there is much which, from a prejudiced standpoint, might be used as evidence against him. His family was Puritanical, he was con-

¹ See *Woman : A Vindication*, Chapter X, for a refutation of the reasoning and historical support of his theories.

² See Dr. Leonard Casper, *Impotentia et Sterilitas Virilis* (Munich, 1890), p. 25, where the author makes this claim, and mentions Isaac Newton as an example of the alleged association. Grimaud des Ceaux and Martin Saint-Ange (*Histoire de la Génération de l'Homme*, p. 294) recommend mathematical studies as an anaphrodisiac; and Broussais (*Cours de Phrénologie*, p. 183), in his lectures before the Medical Faculty of Paris, not only declared that sexual potency was impaired by mathematical studies, but also enumerated a large number of mathematicians who had been unmarried. It is not unlikely that the facts may be interpreted otherwise, and that instead of mathematical studies being regarded as the cause of sexual subnormality, it may be found that only men who are already below standard in passion, turn with interest to the arid field of mathematics for their life's work.

stitutionally delicate, had fainting fits as a young man, at the age of twenty-two had rheumatic fever, never, as far as anyone knew, experienced sexual intercourse, and died at the age of forty-one. He is said, moreover, to have had a weak heart and to have been a heavy smoker; indeed, abstinence from smoking, it is stated, would incapacitate him from reading, writing, or talking.¹ He was a great admirer of John Stuart Mill, and he wrote that little monograph of fulsome praise of women known as *The Influence of Woman on the Progress of Knowledge*,² a fantastic effusion without any attempt at a scientific substantiation of the thesis it puts forward. Like Mill, therefore, he went far astray from his customary scientific method when he wrote about women, possibly an indication of the deep and unexpressed emotional riches the idea of the female stirred in his breast.

Ibsen, as his works reveal, was a Puritan, and although he married and had a son, it seems not unlikely that he was below normal capacity in sex, because of the way in which he allowed his Puritanical Scotch ancestry to influence his work. His friendly biographer, Henrik Jaeger, certainly acknowledges this trait in him,³ but his whole life confirms what his works reveal.

But the classic instance of the maudlin attitude towards woman, and the consequent falsification of her psychology and nature, arising out of male impotence, is to be found in John Ruskin.⁴ His history is well known. He married

¹ See the *Life and Writings of H. T. Buckle*, by A. H. Huth, Vol. I, p. 45.

² Read before the Royal Institute on March 19, 1858, and published in *Frazer's Magazine* in the following April.

³ *Henrick Ibsen* (English Translation, Chicago, 1901), p. 15: "One comes almost involuntarily to think of the Puritanism and idealism that have played so essential a part in Scotch history, and made such an impression upon Scotch philosophy, when dealing with this man . . . whose outlook on the world is as sombre as that of the Puritan." For an analysis of the relation between Puritanism and Feminism see also my *Lysistrata*.

⁴ Thomas Carlyle, although also impotent, was probably only saved from Feminism by his hatred of modern democracy. (See *Thos. Carlyle*,

a beautiful woman, who did not discover his condition until too late, and who was obliged to resort to public proceedings in order to be rid of him. Subsequently she married John Everett Millais, and her whilom bridegroom wrote, among other things, rhapsodies about women. He thought so much of woman that he wanted man to obey her, to be subject to her, to worship her, to be advised by her, and to be ruled by her. He believed in woman's infinite goodness, unselfishness, capacity for self-renunciation—in fact all the nonsense of latter-day maudlin puerile ignorance of the sexual relation.

“In all Christian ages, which have been remarkable for their purity or progress,” says Ruskin, “there has been absolute yielding of obedient devotion by the lover to his mistress. I say *obedient*—not merely enthusiastic and worshipping in imagination, but entirely subject, receiving from the beloved woman, however young, not only the encouragement, the praise, and the reward of all toil, but so far as any choice is open, or any question difficult of decision, the *direction* of this toil.”¹

One can feel the lump in his throat as he writes.

“Chivalry, I say,” he goes on, “in its very conception of honourable life, assumes the subjection of the young knight to the command—should it even be the command in caprice—of his lady.”²

We shall deal with chivalry ourselves later on.

“It ought to be impossible for every noble youth—it *is* impossible for every one rightly trained—to love anyone whose gentle counsel he cannot trust, or whose prayerful command he can hesitate to obey.”³

Counsel on what? Counsel for what? About by Froude, Vol. II, p. 421, also “Shooting Niagara and After” in *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays*, by Thos. Carlyle, Vol. V, pp. 7 and 8.) As a matter of fact, Carlyle's loathing of democracy is clear proof of his total muddle-headedness, for his attitude to the Grand Rebellion and to the French Revolution brands him as an admirer of democratic ideals.

¹ *Sesame and Lilies*, Lecture II,

² *Ibid.*,

³ *Op. cit.*,

domestic medicine, I presume? How did such great bachelors as Michael Angelo, Newton, Locke, Leibnitz, Hobbes, Hume, Beethoven, Sargent, Balzac, Pascal, Pheidias, Gibbon, Adam Smith, Kant, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Spencer, Pope, Plato, Goethe, Van Gogh, Descartes, Galileo, Rabelais, etc., manage to dispense with this counsel and direction?

“The woman’s power is for rule not for battle, and her intellect is not for invention or creation—but for sweet ordering, arrangement and decision. She sees the quality of things, their claims, and their plans.”¹

That is why, I suppose, an age in which women dominate, always ceases to be aristocratic, always becomes plutocratic, and always grows tasteless! The perception of quality is an aristocratic trait, it is incompatible with an age in which wealth is the highest value; it is incompatible with tastelessness. Behold Imperial Rome and modern English society! Women acquire the upper hand in both. Hence, I suppose, the evidences of aristocratic value that are everywhere visible, of taste, and of the values higher than wealth in each of them!

This only shows the extremes of silliness to which a poor impotent man can go. It is, if anything, worse than Mill’s *Subjection*, because it was done without a woman’s influence or help, whereas the *Subjection* was written by Mill with two women holding and directing his hand. And, when one remembers that *Sesame and Lilies* is a favourite prize in girls’ schools and has been presented as such ever since the year 1866, can it be wondered at that the atmosphere in England is what it is?

But all impotent, or semi-impotent men (and the latter owing to excessive smoking,² Puritanical inhibitions, excessive sports, and the comparative rarity of physiological impotence, are very much more numerous than

¹ *Ibid.*

² For evidence that tobacco smoke causes a diminution of sexual potency, see my *Defence of Aristocracy*, pp. 225–26, and Ivan Bloch, *The Sexual Life of our Times*, p. 444.

the former in England) are not as articulate as Ruskin and Mill. As a rule they stand in silence, ruminating over their profoundly religious emotions for women, and with difficulty swallowing the poetical feelings these emotions stimulate. When, however, anything happens in the outside world, which rouses them from their beatific lethargy, and causes them to express their opinion either for or against female ascendancy, then observe the stampede they make to range themselves on the side of the ladies!

The psycho-analyst's explanation of the mental attitude described above, and of the whole phenomenon of Feministic bias in impotent or semi-impotent men, would probably be the following: The impotent or semi-impotent man feels like the eunuch—the castrated man. His self-esteem derives no support, no tribute from the virile side of his nature. He, therefore, finds himself in perfect sympathy precisely with that section of the female world which is most irate and resentful as the result of the castration complex,¹ and, seeing himself ranged by nature among those women who are in revolt over precisely what harasses him—the absence of any evidence of the male generating organs—he instinctively adopts their attitude as against that other hated section of the world, the men in complete possession of their potency and of the organs which represent it.

But whether you adopt the psycho-analyst's interpretation of Mill's, Ruskin's, Ibsen's, Buckle's or Condorcet's views or not, it does not signify. For in the end it comes to the same thing, and what is important for our thesis is simply the fact that impotence or semi-impotence in the male is almost always found accompanied by a grossly maudlin attitude towards the female.

Thus there is nothing so potent as male impotence as a magnifier of female value, and yet there is nothing more heartily contemned by women.

But, in any case, it is very difficult not to feel con-

¹ See p. 120, *ante*.

tempt for anybody who grossly overrates one's powers and merits; for the natural conclusion is, if he cannot see how falsely he is judging me, what an ass he must be! Woman, therefore, though she may avail herself of the fulsome falsities poured out by these eunuchoid men, does not respect them for their pains. She points to their maudlin ravings as a justification for her overweening claims; but in her heart of hearts despises them for their full-throated stupidity.

Thus we have examined the three causes from which we claim that the maudlin attitude towards woman arises: (1) The belief that the whole of wifehood and motherhood is a long self-sacrificing martyrdom; (2) The belief that woman is more moral than man and is in fact the moralizing influence on earth; and (3) The partial or complete impotence¹ of the particular male who assumes the maudlin attitude.

Those who know anything of England, and of countries like England, will not need to be told that these three causes, operating singly or together in each individual, account for a very large contingent among the male population who are maudlin in their feelings towards the female; and when the women's struggle for their alleged "Rights" was at its zenith in this country, it was among these males, who were articulate, that the most active supporters of the Feminist side were to be found. The remainder of them, who were not articulate, merely acquiesced in silence. But, if in private they were called upon² to express an opinion, they would speak of justice and taxes, and allude to the hackneyed anomaly of Marie Corelli and her gardener—the one being denied and the other being allowed the vote—in much the same strain as that which Condorcet adopted over a hundred years previously.

In addition to the fact, therefore, that the claims of the Feminist leaders and their followers had to be

¹ I shall deal again with the phenomenon of partial and relative impotence of the modern male in a later chapter.

acquiesced in by men not participating in the movement before these claims could succeed in England, there was in this country a very large body of men who were either active or passive supporters of the Woman's Movement, and to this circumstance, far more than to the merits of the Feminist cause, the triumph of Feminism has been due.

Those women who are prone to declare that Feminism was won by women for women, forget this essential factor in their success—to wit, the large body of men whose motivation we have just examined. For, to this body and to the apathy and indolence of the remainder of the male population (who were at heart opposed to Feministic reforms) established and statutory Feminism owes its existence.

CHAPTER VI

The Degeneracy of Modern Man— Part II

WE now propose to proceed with our charge of degeneracy against the modern man, after having, in the previous chapter, called attention only to those characteristics of a certain section of the male population (loss of native shrewdness, alertness, and virility) which directly affected the struggle of official Feminism for statutory recognition. But, in order the more methodically to substantiate our charge, we must now decide what we mean by degeneracy, and how we intend to demonstrate its existence.

There are two possible ways of proving its existence. It may be demonstrated inferentially, by enumerating the phenomena which argue its probable existence, such as the industrial system, the inflated urban communities, the political chaos, the rise of socialistic as opposed to individualistic and self-reliant conceptions of the national weal, and Feminism (this last phenomenon has already been dealt with in the previous chapters¹);

¹ I fear, however, that in the eyes of a large number of people in this country, it will not appear sufficient evidence of degeneracy, if it is not supported by other facts. This does not mean that it does not appear sufficient to myself and others who sympathize with my view, and who are aware of the historical and anthropological data on which the inference is based; for to us, as I have plainly shown in the previous chapters, the phenomenon of Feminism is in itself adequate demonstration of male degeneracy. It simply means that my knowledge of the modern mind makes me doubt whether the existence of Feminism in our midst would ever lead the average person, man or woman, to suspect male degeneracy in conjunction with it alone.

or it may be demonstrated by a direct examination of modern man himself, his physical and mental equipment, in comparison with the man of former ages.

Owing to the paucity of the data about the man of former ages, the latter line of proof is admittedly more difficult, but I do not intend to shirk it on that account, as so many other writers on the subject have done.

My first duty, however, is to make quite plain what is meant in this book by the word "degeneracy"; and, as there appears to be a good deal of misapprehension rife concerning the nature of the condition the word implies, it may be as well to devote a little attention to this matter, before proceeding any further.

To the man in the street, degeneracy implies merely a visible manifestation of something which inconveniences him, or of which he does not approve. Just as he uses the psycho-analytical word "complex," so much abused to-day, in order to stigmatize any mental trait in an acquaintance which happens to annoy him, so he flings his epithet "degenerate" at anything and everything which to him personally is objectionable. To the average woman "degeneracy" may mean simply that which jeopardizes her smug security. Thus an enhancement of vitality or vigorous sexuality may be "degenerate." I have heard Oxford trousers thoughtlessly called "degenerate," and I have also heard English and Scotch matrons hurl the same epithet at a youth whose wanton and overflowing health and spirits constituted him a formidable menace to their grown-up daughters. On the other hand, I have heard some men say that flesh-coloured silk stockings for women were "degenerate," and I have heard not a few Englishmen and women charge the whole male population of Italy, Spain and Southern France with "degeneracy" on no grounds whatsoever, except presumably because they used olive oil in cooking, or could not speak English, or wore peculiar clothes,

It is obvious, therefore, that the word "degenerate," in the mouths of most people, means nothing at all. Like the word "complex" snatched from the technical phraseology of the Freudians, it has come to mean no more than a vulgar term of abuse. At all events it is only a means of dismissing a creature, or group of creatures, who are unlike ourselves. The tacit assumption being always that I—I, who make the charge—*am not* degenerate.

It is impossible, however, to investigate all the popular abuses of the word "degenerate." Nor can we waste our time over those people who insist at all costs in maintaining their own complete freedom from any share in the universal degeneracy of the Age.¹

With the view, therefore, from the outset, of meeting the charge of looseness on the one hand, and of Pharisaism

¹ It should always be remembered that the resistance to the charge of national degeneracy (and there is a very great resistance thereto) arises on the one hand from the vanity of the bulk of the population, which urges them to believe that they must belong to the best and most desirable people on earth, and to the best period of this people's history; and on the other to the resolute and plodding refusal of most Feminist women to acknowledge too frankly that men are degenerate, lest they may be led to infer that the present ascendancy of the female, instead of denoting a positive and absolute female advance, is only a relative advance, due to the regression of the male. Such women are quite ready to despise men as they are, but they would maintain that there is no change, that men have always been despicable. To admit that modern men are degenerate, would make female ascendancy appear purely adventitious, which it is, and contingent upon male weakness, which it also is. But this would be distasteful to the Feminists; therefore, while they claim the right to despise modern men, they will generally be found greatly to resent the claim that modern men are degenerate. A third section of the modern world, who are also powerful and are generally found bitterly to resent the claim that modern men are degenerate, are the members of the medical profession. The charge of degeneracy seems to set *their* achievements in doubt. It seems to reflect unfavourably upon *their* triumphs in prophylaxis and cure; and in view of their very lively consciousness of the so-called "strides" of their science, the idea that modern men are degenerate is intolerable and must be resisted at all costs.

on the other, I may as well protest at once that, when I use the word "degenerate," it has a very definite and intelligible meaning, and that when I apply it to the men of my generation, I do not by any means exclude myself or my sympathizers from the charge. Indeed, I might say, as Nietzsche said before me, that much that I have discovered about modern degeneracy is entirely due to the fact that I am as much the outcome of this Age as any other man, and that I have never failed, if I required information otherwise inaccessible, to turn my eyes inwards and to study the working of my own mind and body. Let me also add that I have endeavoured always to be harder in my analysis of self than in my analysis of my neighbour. There is, however, all the difference between being sick and knowing it, and being sick and not knowing it; and, at the risk of sounding Pharisaical, I think I may claim that in being sick and knowing it, I belong to-day to a small minority. The majority of men do not know, have not an inkling, of the condition they are in.

I have no sympathy with the man who, because he has false teeth, resents the idea that false teeth are to be strongly deprecated. One ought to have the courage of admitting one's failings while at the same time deploring them as phenomena. But, nowadays, so deficient is the crowd in intellectual honesty, that, arguing from their own inner consciousness and motivation, they suspect every one who makes a general charge of necessarily conceiving himself above its incidence. Only a man with a complete set of teeth, for instance, is expected to argue that dental caries and pyorrhœa are degenerate; because he alone can feel himself proof against the charge he is making. Therefore, if we follow this principle logically, on the subject of the stigmata we all reveal, the most complete silence must be observed. But this is feminine and cowardly. Never to be able to make a charge against humanity, in which you yourself are involved, is tantamount to being insufficiently courageous

to acknowledge that you yourself may also be second- or third-rate.

When I make the charge of degeneracy against my generation, therefore, I mean it to be understood that I regard it as impossible that I, being a child of the Age, should be free from one or more of the prevailing stigmata of this condition. It may not manifest itself in me in the same way as in Tom, Dick or Harry, but the fact that I must be infected by it naturally emerges from the fact that I am here.

As to what I mean when I say that *we* men are degenerate, I shall now proceed to define.

Degeneracy, in the sense in which I propose to use the word, means either a loss of one or more of the higher characteristics once acquired by a people, or else the occurrence of those characteristics only in a feeble or moribund form.¹ In this sense it may mean either a return to a more primitive stage in the evolutionary ladder, or it may mean a state of individual or national disintegration which interferes with a healthy life or with a full life. Thus a civilized man may be called degenerate, who exhibits barbarian or foetal characteristics; or he may be called degenerate if his bodily co-ordination or equipment falls below the standard which enables him to look or to function (within the limits of his class) like the cultivated type to which he belongs. Thus harelip, cleft-palate, cryptorchidism and supernumerary mammæ are degenerate traits, because they are the signs of arrested development denoting that the individual exhibiting them has reached far back along the evolutionary scale. Pre-senile decay, or congenital and chronic physiological disorders, may

¹ Since writing the above, I have come across this very useful and correct definition of degeneracy, by Dr. David F. Harris, M.D., C.M., B.Sc. (Lond.), in *National Degeneration* (p. 7): "Degeneration, or, as some call it, decadence, whether of the individual or the nation, may be defined as the receding from a previously higher or better state, physically, intellectually, æsthetically and morally." This is just as good as mine, and I am quite ready to accept it.

also be degenerate traits, because they are signs of retrogression, not along evolutionary lines, but from racial standards already achieved. Thus the prevalence of dental caries in youth (i.e. dying and decomposing in the mouth long before the grave is reached) is failure to achieve a racial standard already achieved by the race.

But these are not degenerate traits confined to one people. They would be degenerate in the savage, in the lowest of mankind. There is, on the other hand, a degeneracy which must be peculiar to a group or a people, in the sense that they alone may have achieved the standard from which this particular retrogression is possible. Such standards are chiefly concerned with national or tribal beauty, intelligence, stature, colouring, or other characteristics which constitute a people's pride and possibly its chief weapon in success. In this sense degeneracy means loss of characters, not common to mankind, but common only to a certain group. For instance, Gibbon speaks of the degeneracy of the ancient Romans in the period A.D. 98-180, meaning that they had lost their manly spirit of freedom and their disciplined courage—both qualities which, as a people, they had once developed to a high degree.¹ In the same manner, when Otto Sieck speaks of the degeneracy of ancient Athens, he means that, owing to miscegenation, the old Athenians had lost, or diluted, those characteristics which had made for the unique greatness of their city state.²

Thus there are three kinds of degeneracy, according to the definition I have given. There is the degeneracy which is arrested development, or a retrogression along the evolutionary ladder. This we shall call *atavistic degeneracy*. There is also the degeneracy which is the failure to achieve a physical standard once achieved by

¹ *Decline and Fall*, Chapter II.

² *Geschichte des Untergangs der Antiken Welt* (1895), Vol. I, Chapter IV.

the human race as a whole, this we shall call *racial degeneracy*. And there is the degeneracy which must be confined to one people, or limited group. This we shall call *national degeneracy*.

Although there is a large amount of atavistic degeneracy among the population of the British Isles, and its stigmata almost always indicate the presence of racial or national degeneracy in the individual, I have been unable to collect any statistics of it, except, strange to say, in the case of one example of it—cryptorchidism. And here I find the incidence is about $\frac{1}{5}$ per cent. of the males.¹ As, however, the stigmata of atavistic degeneracy are usually only extreme and definite indications of the two other forms, and need not always be recognized, where the latter are manifest, the fact that exact data are unobtainable does not matter to any great extent.

Throughout, therefore, we shall be more closely concerned with racial and national degeneracy, than with degeneracy of the first kind.

Now, whenever before audiences in England I have spoken about the degeneracy of modern men, I have always been met by the following indignant and frequently angry replies :

That, far from seeing any signs of degeneracy the objectors in the audience (usually an old man or a woman) declares that ever since the magnificent performance of "our men" in the Great War, he or she has ceased to be able to listen with patience to this charge of degeneracy. Indeed, it is inconceivable that a nation whose manhood was really degenerate, could have achieved what raw English recruits of all ages achieved between the autumn of 1914 and the autumn of 1918.

Among those who listen to this sort of vindication of England's manhood, there are usually not a few married women who are inclined to curl their lips in an expression of faint scepticism. And those who behave in this way

¹ See *Cryptorchidism in Animals and Man*, by Frederick Hobday, C.M.G., F.R.C.V.S., etc., p. 12.

are by no means necessarily Feministic in their point of view. Why do they do this? Obviously because if military prowess is the ultimate proof of regenerate English manhood, then what has become not only of other equally fundamental male traits, but also of those higher male characteristics that have been cultivated in the centuries that separate us from barbarism? What has become of will power, determination, higher intelligence, the capacity for self and neighbour discipline, the capacity to lead and to inspire that complete trust which resides in vigorous and reliable judgment, the richness of endowment which constitutes versatility and catholicity of tastes, and makes the range of interests wide (wider than the female's within the limits of a class)? Male cats and male monkeys are good and brave fighters. Some male savages are just as capable of heroism as was the stoutest male heart of the whole of the fighting armies on both fronts in the late war. How then does the possession of such a primitive quality as valour exonerate a man from the charge of degeneracy, if it can be shown that he has lost other traits which his ancestors once cultivated with success?

In speaking of valour and liberality, Gibbon says: "The first of these merits is often lodged in the most savage breasts."¹ Precisely! And if that is admitted, how can it be claimed that the valour exhibited by our manhood in the late war necessarily argued against their degeneracy?

As we have seen, however, the word "degeneracy" may mean so little, or so much, in the popular mind, that it is not surprising that in public debates and newspaper articles I should constantly be confronted with this same reply.²

The other stock reply, which most people make, is more or less as follows:

¹ Op. cit., Chapter VII.

² See, for instance, my article and letters in the *Daily Express* and *Daily Mail* respectively, and the reply from a woman in the *Daily Mail* of September 5, 1925.

“The facts about our ancestors are vague and largely imaginary, but in view of the obvious decline of such national scourges as small-pox, bubonic plague, typhoid and other ailments, in view of the greater longevity of the population as a whole, and moreover of the evidence adduced by the examination of old armour, according to which it is proved beyond a doubt that modern man is bigger than was his ancestor of former centuries, how can it be pretended for a moment that we of this generation are degenerate ?”

Now the errors contained in this objection are so complex and manifold, that the people who are in the habit of advancing it against the charge I make, can hardly move left or right, backwards or forwards, without improving their position. They cannot stir but they will mend.

In the first place, we may pursue our previous line of argument, and inquire whether the fact that men lower in the evolutionary scale are also free from the scourges of small-pox, typhoid, and plague, does not invalidate the claim that the decline of these diseases amongst ourselves necessarily argues anything for or against our degeneracy ?

Secondly, we may point out that, as we have eliminated, or almost eliminated, these diseases, *not by achieving natural or individual immunity*, but (as in the case of small-pox and typhoid at least) by artificial immunization (inoculation) and in the case of other diseases (malaria, plague, etc.) chiefly by sanitation and disinfection, we might ask whether the decline of these scourges really argues anything at all from the standpoint of our constitutions.¹ If it does not, how can the more extensive

¹ In *Health Problems of the Empire* (p. 21) Drs. Andrew Balfour and Henry H. Scott say: “In London from 1660 to 1780, Farr estimated that small-pox caused upwards of 4,000 deaths, per 1,000,000. In England and Wales in 1832-42 the rate was 575, and in 1886-90 it had fallen to 14 per 1,000,000.” The authors then ask “Why ?” And their reply is: “Because of vaccination.” They also point out that while in the South African War the British Army had 58,000 casualties from

ravages of these diseases in the past signify a condition indicating an absence of degeneracy to-day? Does it even signify that constitutions have remained the same, *plus* sanitation and prevention?

Thirdly, we might ask whether it would not be possible to have lost a whole series of characteristics which once elevated us to our present position in the world—I am thinking not only of stamina and endurance, but also of self-reliance, the love of independence, etc.—and yet to be artificially immunized by modern science against epidemics?

Furthermore, we might ask, if the objector insists on pursuing his line of argument, whether modern plagues like cancer, lunacy, general debility, bad teeth, constipation, nervous diseases, etc., do not account for the same, if not a greater proportion of casualties, than did the plagues of bygone days, and whether prevention itself (inoculation and disinfection) has not introduced new scourges? ¹

typhoid out of a total force of 208,000 men, in the European War, when the total force was over 1,000,000, there were only 7,500 casualties from typhoid, thanks to inoculation. The fact that between the Boer and the Great War the national physique did not improve, I shall show later.

¹ Dr. Leonard Williams, in an admirable book entitled *The Science and Art of Living* (p. 38), mentions “pyorrhœa” as having been unknown “before the use of antiseptics” and declares (p. 40) that “such diseases as rickets, adenoids, and appendicitis (to mention but a few of those which take a heavy toll of life and efficiency) were unknown to medicine before the microbe, the kettle, and the crucible, came to constitute a creed.” On p. 45 he also speaks of that “major malady of civilization called constipation.” In this respect we should also remember that one of our great wise men of the nineteenth century, Herbert Spencer, did not rule out the possibility that vaccination in itself might be a part cause of modern degeneracy (see *Education*, Chapter IV), and in this view he is supported by a body of modern doctors, who are admittedly not the most popular men in their profession. It is true that in the form in which Spencer made it, his objection to vaccination no longer applies; but in *Facts and Comments* he states the case against vaccination broadly enough to include modern improvements in his indictment. He says: “You cannot change the constitution in relation to one invading agent and

Finally, the objector might be asked to make sure about the precise relation between immunity and degeneration. Are not thousands of degenerates (crippled and mentally defective children, as well as adults) now being kept in modern sanitary institutions, quite able, owing to the scientific precautions taken with their food and drink, and with the air they breathe, to live to a great age? But does their artificially secured immunity make them any the less degenerate? The question resolves itself into this—does our present-day artificial immunization constitute us superior as organisms, to the people who lived in a less-protected age? If it does, then the introduction of the subject of national scourges, such as small-pox, into the discussion has some relevance. If it does not, then let us cease from attaching too much significance to the almost total elimination of these scourges.

And the same may be said of the alleged greater longevity of modern people. Before we can decide whether this is a sign of an improved stock, we must discover whether it is due to greater stamina or to greater protection, to greater vitality or to readier acquiescence in semi-vital vegetation.¹ And, seeing that

leave it unchanged with regard to all other invading agents . . . the assumption that vaccination changes the constitution in relation to small-pox and does not otherwise change it is sheer folly." See also Appendix XXIX and the memorial of the *Anti-Vaccination League*, sent to the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration (1904).

¹ See Laurence Housman, *The New Humanism* (p. 9), where, speaking of the common objections raised to the charge of degeneracy, he says: "Of course when you say that to your . . . advocates, they will produce their athletes and their sportsmen, and all those fine specimens of humanity which are published and made prominent in our midst. They may point to the decreasing death-rate in our great cities, due mainly to the increased power of medical science to secure long life for the unfit; it has very little to do with healthy production. . . . They will show you all these; but they will cover up, in splendid institutions, the disease, the lunacy, the deformity and the suffering which are the price of civilization in its present form. If that side of life could be paraded to you in the streets, only in dummy form, you would be aghast."

not only is the increase of cancer ascribed by most medical men¹ precisely to the greater longevity of modern people, but also that in the hot-house protection of modern science lunatics and incurables of all kinds frequently attain to a very great age,² it is extremely doubtful whether this greater longevity can usefully be opposed to the charge of degeneracy.

Now let us turn to that part of the objector's reply in which he adduces the evidence from old armour in order to rebut the charge of degeneracy.

He says that old armour shows that the stature of Englishmen has increased since the days of chivalry to the present time.

On what does he base this conclusion ?

The reply is—chiefly on inexpert and irresponsible hearsay. But, at any rate, we may contest his conclusion on the following grounds :

There is no single suit of armour in existence dating before the middle of the fifteenth century.³ We know from the chronicles, and from the effigies of warriors that complete armour was worn long before this period, but the English climate, the civil and other wars,⁴ and various other adverse circumstances, have accounted

¹ See, for instance, Sir Arthur Newsholme's *Vital Statistics*.

² For instance, three lunatics in the North Wales Counties Lunatic Asylum (Denbigh), alone, in 1903, died at over 80.

³ See a *Record of European Armour and Arms*, by Sir Guy Francis Laking, Bart. (1920), Vol. I, p. xxxix, where, speaking of the great quantity of armour and weapons used, spoilt and lost during the wars of the Middle Ages, Baron de Cosson says : "But of all these but little remains to us anterior to the middle of the fifteenth century, indeed not a single complete suit of armour dating from before that epoch is in existence." Speaking of the fourteenth century (p. 145) the author says : "We are handicapped . . . by the entire non-existence, as we believe, of any actual body armour of this period." See also p. 161 of the same volume.

⁴ Laking (Op. cit., Vol. V., p. 113). But peace was almost if not quite as disastrous as war, where armour was concerned, because in peace time it was constantly being remade, refitted, or otherwise used up or destroyed. See Charles Ffoulkes, *The Armourer and His Craft*, p. 19, and *Armour and Weapons*, by the same author, p. 13.

for the disappearance of all complete armour of the fourteenth, almost all of the fifteenth, and a good deal of that of the sixteenth century that was of insular production, and a great quantity besides, which was made for Englishmen abroad. Even of the English-made mail suits, which must have been common in the early years of the sixteenth century, not a single harness is in existence to-day.¹

Neither can the extant examples of mid and late fifteenth-century complete armour supply a basis for comparison between modern and ancient stature; because only a very few such suits are known, and they are chiefly of foreign make, designed for foreign princes and noblemen.²

So we are reduced to the complete harnesses, made and worn during the sixteenth century. Of these there are indeed a number of examples. But before we venture to base any arguments on them, we should consider, in the first place, that the fully armed man was not nearly such a common figure in war as the fanciful modern pictures of those times lead us to suppose; ³ secondly, that the rich alone could afford such equipment; thirdly, that even the country gentlemen and yeoman farmers, who went to war as light horsemen and mounted archers, had to be content with a quilted pack or brigandine, and a basinet or salet (a light globular headpiece of metal); and fourthly, that ancient wills and inventories, except those of great folk or military adventurers, "have scanty reference to complete harnesses."⁴

Now, before the end of the sixteenth century, the full suit of armour had become an antique survival, and long before 1660 the art of the armourer had begun to deteriorate.⁵ This was not due, as might be supposed,

¹ Laking (Op. cit., Vol. I, p. 219).

² *Ibid.*, pp. 164, 176, 178, 200.

³ *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Article: "Arms and Armour."

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Laking (Op. cit., Vol. V, p. 1).

only to the universal use of gunpowder;¹ for, until the rifle appeared, plate armour continued to be made shot-proof. But it was due chiefly to the new strategy, which necessitated rapid military evolutions, and induced men to prefer the risk of being shot before the handicap of heavy defensive metal.²

Complete suits of armour continued to be made for great folk right up to the Grand Rebellion and even after, but their use was being limited more and more to pageantry, and they ceased to be a feature in war after the Commonwealth.

It is true that during the Grand Rebellion, there is mention of a regiment of 500 horse under Sir Arthur Haslerig, which, owing to the fact that the troopers were completely armed, were called "Haslerig's Lobsters"; but their appearance was sufficiently odd to provoke comment—a circumstance which seems to prove that such complete armour, particularly for ordinary fighting men, was in those days regarded as exceptional.³

The common archer had always had to content himself with a metal cap or helmet and perhaps a good hide or quilted coat for his protection; while in later days, the pikemen wore a "pott-helmet" and bullet-proof breast- and back-plates. Now, although very many

¹ Gunpowder contributed to the disuse of armour, by increasing the toughness of the suits to such an extent, owing to the need of making them shot-proof, that their weight became intolerable.

² See Ffoulkes, *The Armourer and his Craft*, pp. 68 and 115: "From the sixteenth century and even earlier we have records of the discarding of armour because it hampered the wearer or for some equally cogent reason. . . . It would be superfluous to mention the different occasions on which unhorsed knights were captured and killed through their inability to remount in battle."

³ See Clarendon, *History of the Grand Rebellion*, Book VII, para. 104 (June, 1643): "Sir William Waller having received from London a fresh regiment of 500 horse, under the command of Sir Arthur Haslerigge, which were so prodigiously armed that they were called by the other side the regiment of lobsters, because of their bright new shells, with which they were covered."

genuine pikemen suits of the Commonwealth period are in existence, they tell us nothing about stature.

So it amounts to this: we have for our basis of comparison of present-day with bygone stature, not by any means all the complete suits of armour of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, but only a very small proportion of them. We know that all those we do possess probably belonged only to one class in the community, and are therefore evidence of stature only among a small percentage of a small portion of the population. Of the stature of the country gentlemen, of the yeomen farmers, and of the common people, surviving suits of armour tell us nothing.

It is obvious, therefore, that even if a relatively smaller stature could be demonstrated for the wearers of this armour (which it cannot, as I shall show), there would not be much in the argument as applying to the English people as a whole, the less so, as those who advance the argument never seem to take the pains to specify to which section of the nation their claim of greater present stature is supposed to apply.

If, however, we leave the direct evidence of surviving harness aside for the moment, and turn to such evidence as can be gathered from the weight of the fully armed warrior's equipment, then it is surely even less possible to argue that the men of the period mentioned above (sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries), whether they were bigger or not than modern men, compare unfavourably with the latter in physical vigour.¹ Stating the matter in the most moderate terms, it is at least inaccurate to advance the converse view.

We know, for instance, that the hauberk of mail worn by the Norman knights at the Conquest must have been exceedingly heavy, for William's men are depicted walking two by two bearing a hauberk slung upon a pole thrust through the sleeves. And, when we come

¹ The kind of statement that is glibly repeated is that the armour of former ages can be fitted only on boys of the present day.

to the plate armour of later periods, we find that a tilting suit weighed 100 lb.¹ A suit of armour made for Henry VIII when he was 25 years of age weighed 94 lb., and Sir Guy Laking points out that it is "in striking evidence of King Henry's athletic figure at the age of 25."² Major Ffoulkes mentions another suit made for Henry VIII for fighting on foot in the lists, which weighed 93 lb.³ But this is not all. The knight or nobleman who wore a suit of this kind bore a lance when jousting which was of enormous proportions. In the second half of the fifteenth century, the girth and weight of these lances were terrific. They were like small trees cut down and roughly trimmed. Some had a diameter of five inches.⁴

These heavy jousting lances and suits were certainly not used in battle, but from the weights given by Major Ffoulkes the average weight of fighting armour must have been at least 60 lb.,⁵ and this does not include either undergarments, weapons or other equipment.

So that we find that at least the argument from armour can substantiate no satisfactory claim regarding the relative stature of modern and bygone generations of men, and is, therefore, quite irrelevant. On the other hand, we have seen that the small class of men that did wear armour must have been a vigorous and sturdy body of men; for, apart from the inferences to be drawn from the weight of the complete harness and weapons that survive, we are assured by experts who have handled a great deal of armour, *that they were always struck by the*

¹ Laking (Op. cit., Vol. II, p. 136).

² *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 224.

³ *Armour and Weapons*, p. 60.

⁴ Laking (Op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 83-4): "So great indeed was their weight that in Germany it was often found necessary for the mounted varlets, riding in advance of their knights, to bear the weight of the spear upon their left shoulders, only abandoning it the instant before the jousters came to the cope."

⁵ See *The Armourer and his Craft*, p. 119, where weights varying from 103 to 56½ lb. are given for seven suits of armour.

considerable breadth of the shoulders and depth of chest which may be inferred from the dimensions of the harnesses they have examined.

The next question is, can we find by actual measurement any truth whatsoever in the statement that the suits of armour actually surviving indicate among the small class who wore them a smaller stature than that of the average modern Englishmen ?

The answer is, No ; and for the following reasons : ¹

(1) It is particularly difficult to estimate the height of complete harnesses, although their breadth is obvious, because, except in the later seventeenth century suits, the armour of the body and hips is unconnected with that of the thighs and legs, and it is not easy to tell how much the original wearer allowed the tesses (overlapping plates from the cuirass) to overlap the cuisses (armour for the thighs).

(2) It is quite clear that the statement (widely circulated by people who have taken no steps to confirm it) that the men who wore armour were of smaller stature than those of to-day, is largely based on the fact that in few armouries are the suits really well set up, and the upper parts are frequently allowed to overlap the lower parts to an exaggerated extent.

(3) Every existing suit has been releathered, i.e. the straps to which overlapping plates are riveted have been renewed, with the consequent possibility of shortening, or lengthening their combined extent through the work of an ignorant repairer. Thus bad leathering and riveting have frequently completely altered the proportions and character of a suit.

(4) Another fact that may have helped the circulation of the statement about stature in its relation to old armour is that, as a rule, the circumference of the greaves is small, and that a man of to-day—unless he were an habitual polo-player and hunter—would often fail to

¹ The information that follows was kindly supplied to me by Mr. G. F. Mann of the Wallace Collection on December 11, 1925.

get into the leg-armour of a suit, otherwise quite large enough for him, owing to the dimensions of his calves. The original wearer of the suit would have been used to constant riding and so have had what is known by hunting-bootmakers to-day as "a good leg for a boot"—in other words, the thin leg commonly seen on lifelong hunting men and jockeys to-day.

(5) Finally, a number of suits of armour of exceptionally large proportions are still existing. There is the early sixteenth-century suit of the Ffoulkes Inventory, II, 22, of the Tower of London, which, when mounted on a dummy, measures 6 ft. 10 $\frac{7}{8}$ in. There is the Turin suit of the Armeria Reale, Angelucci Cat. B. 44, which measures 6 ft. 7 in. There is the suit in the Vienna, K.K. Museum (Cat. 68); and in Paris, in the Musée de l'Armée, there are several large pieces of the end of the fifteenth century. Among armour recently sold in London, was a very large early sixteenth-century suit in the Morgan Williams sale (1921), and a seventeenth-century one in the Lamb sale (1923), now No. 29 in the catalogue of Mr. R. L. Scott's collection. There is also the black Bavarian suit at the Wallace Collection (No. 851, dated 1532), which is for a man of unusually large proportions.

As we have seen, therefore, it is impossible to substantiate the objection to the charge of degeneracy, which may be based on surviving armour, and this objection consequently falls to the ground. We thought it worth while, however, to devote a good deal of space to the refuting of it, because we have so often heard it made, particularly by members of the medical profession.

Let us now turn to the positive evidence of modern degeneracy we possess, and since we have been dealing with the so-called "physical" or "bodily" aspect of the matter, let us continue to investigate it from that standpoint. It does not seem either philosophically or scientifically sound, in the present state of our knowledge, thus to divide man into "physical" and "mental"

elements ; because both philosophy and science, in their more recent discoveries, appear to be approaching ever nearer and nearer to the point when no such division of parts will be recognized. Such division represents an old theological survival in modern thought (like the belief in the necessity of pain in childbirth¹) which cannot be justified on any grounds whatsoever save those of superstition. Nevertheless, since the belief still prevails in many, even scientific, circles, that man is a compound of psychic and physical elements, and not a psychophysical whole, we can very conveniently proceed with our argument along so-called bodily or physical lines, provided the reader understands from the start that we regard the two, body and psyche, as so essentially one and interdependent, that no such division really exists in our minds, and that if we postulate decay or degeneracy of his body, we necessarily implicate the mind or psyche of the modern man into the bargain.

Now, confining ourselves for the moment, simply to the inferences which may be drawn from a cursory examination of our fellow-men, and with our knowledge of history to help us, what can we see about us to-day which points to the probability of physical degeneration having occurred ?

In the first place, we know that within a little over a century a number of entirely novel conditions have been imposed upon the people of this country, which, even if they were alone among the evil influences of modernity, would be likely to induce a state of physical decay. There are, for instance, the recent commercialization and adulteration of food, with all that this means in the tinning, excessive handling, freezing, drying and universal devitalizing of such pabulum as the masses, and even the well to do, can and do buy in large quantities at their grocer's and elsewhere. In my *Defence of Aristocracy*,

¹ The belief in specifics for disease and illness is also a theological survival, reminiscent of the age when "devils" had to be driven out, and there are many other instances of atavistic thought in medicine.

I showed how the machinery which, in the Middle Ages, existed for the supervision of the sale and distribution of sound food was broken down, and how adulteration was allowed to become part of the food and drink industries of England. All historical authorities concur in this, that the food of rich and poor alike, throughout the epoch preceding the middle of the seventeenth century and especially the Industrial Revolution in England, was wholesome and sound. One writer of the fifteenth century actually declared that the common people of this land were the best fed in Christendom. And he was a traveller.¹

At all events, we know positively that the chemical information and the industrial plant possessed by our ancestors were not extensive enough to allow them to indulge in food adulteration and commercialization on a large scale, and therefore, that their staple articles of diet, though simple, were at least genuine of their kind. It is possibly true that, in the winter months and in times of famine, too much salted fish may have been eaten; but, apart from this one article of diet, it would not be historically accurate to argue that the food of our ancestors was not very much more sound, and above all, more vital, than that which the bulk of the population habitually consume at the present time.

It was, moreover, all home-grown or home-made. The idea of obtaining large quantities of foodstuffs from all the corners of the earth, or ready prepared in tins from the grocer's, had not occurred to Englishmen before the Industrial Revolution; ² and had it occurred to them, they could not have found the means of realizing it. Stale, excessively handled, or commercialized foodstuffs,

¹ See *Social England* by A. Abram, p. 159, also *English Life and Manners in the Later Middle Ages*, by the same author, Chapter "The Public Health."

² In 1760 England and Wales, in one season, grew enough corn to feed their total population for four years. It was precisely this year, however, that marked the beginning of the new era, *our* era.

as we know them to-day, were unknown.¹ The fact that when hops were first introduced as a preservative for old English ale, they were regarded as a vicious adulterant, and created a commotion in the land,² is sufficient evidence of the state of public opinion in the matter of food purity.

Here then it would seem that we are concerned with conditions, recently established, which might not only lead us to expect physical deterioration, but from which, according to many scientific and experienced observers, physical deterioration has already occurred.

Secondly, there is humanitarianism, which until quite recently—that is to say, before the early days of Dickens—had not begun to reach the ridiculous extremes which we find it reaching at the present day. Now, owing to the enormous number of women, chiefly unattached, who have nothing besides philanthropy to occupy their time, and who, in this age of female emancipation, and

¹ In the evidence given before the *Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration* in 1904, this alleged degradation of the people's foodstuffs through commercialization was fully borne out. (See particularly pp. 40-3, 51 of the *Report*.) On p. 43, we read: "There is no doubt that the opportunities offered to the adulterator by the change from the home production of many articles of food and supply through the channels of trade has had a deleterious effect on public health." The excessive use of tinned foods, even in rural districts, is mentioned on p. 42. And on p. 40 a hint is given regarding one of the chief causes of food deterioration (already mentioned in my *Lysistrata*, but probably disbelieved by the reader who found it there). It is to the effect that "a large proportion of British housewives are tainted with incurable laziness and distaste for the obligations of domestic life," and this causes them to "have recourse to such expedients in providing food for their families as involve them in least trouble." See also evidence of Dr. Young, Dr. Robert Hutchinson, and Dr. Purdon, quoted by Dr. Young, in regard to excessive use of tea, bought jams and white bread among the poor. The fact that the deterioration of the population, even in rural districts, is to be ascribed to changed food conditions, was also borne out by such witnesses as Mr. Harry James Wilson (p. 80), the Hon. Sir John Gorst (p. 432), Mrs. Close (p. 118), Mr. S. H. Fosbroke (p. 261), Sir Lauder Brunton (p. 83), and Mr. V. A. Dolamore (p. 83), who spoke on behalf of dentists.

² See my *Defence of Aristocracy*, Chapter V.

particularly of repressed female sadism, have an itch for what is known as "doing good" (in plain English—to exercise power in an approved manner), humanitarianism is so much an obsession, that the only deep emotion which the majority of modern people seem to be capable of, is pity. And, mark you, this pity of the moderns is not provoked, as the farmer's pity is provoked, by the sight of the superior vegetation being stifled or overgrown by weeds. On the contrary, it is provoked by weeds themselves.

Throughout the Middle Ages, when English people were chiefly agricultural, and therefore knew the laws of sound and desirable life in the cultivated fields round their homes, it was a recognized thing that in times of epidemics and famines, the sound came first. When there was anything to be sacrificed, if sacrifice were imperative, the unsound, the rubbish and weeds of humanity, were the victims chosen. (This, of course, which is an elementary law of healthy life, makes the unconscious female sadists, the morbid humanitarians of to-day, shudder with horror.) The populace in periods of distress, resulting from epidemics, would, for instance, clamour for the slaughter of the lepers, the cretins, and the idiots of the community.¹ It is true that they often did this from the wrong motive, that is to say, they ascribed the distress itself to the presence of the physiologically botched in their midst; but, as a proof that there was method in their madness, and that they were not quite so blindly superstitious as some would make out, we must remember, first, that one of the acknowledged perquisites of the almoner at a coronation or other feast, was the satisfaction of burning a leper who had misbehaved himself at the receipt of alms; ² and, secondly, that when meat was condemned by the market inspectors it was usually given to the

¹ See Paul Lacroix, *Science et Lettres au Moyen Age et à l'Époque de la Renaissance* (Paris, 1877), p. 178.

² Mary Bateson, *Mediæval England*, p. 143.

hospitals. There is a Scottish Act of Parliament of the year 1386, in which we find the following passage: "Gif ony man brings to the market corrupt swine or salmond to be sould, they sall be taken by the bailie, and incontinent, without any question sall be sent to the lepper folke, and, gif there be no lepper folke, they sall be destroyed all utterlie." There was a similar regulation at Oxford in the fifteenth century.¹ No wonder that although there were still a few cases of leprosy in the fifteenth century, lepers had by that time almost died out!²

But what a difference! Now, the best goes to the undesirable and the weeds. If anybody has to be deprived or penalized, it is the sound and the desirable.

I mention these facts in order to call attention to the change that has occurred in our whole attitude to the laws of healthy life, in so far as they relate to humanity. They show that the kind of maudlin humanitarianism which, with our old-woman and old-maid philanthropy to-day, penalizes and sacrifices the sound for the sake of thousands upon thousands of the unsound, did not exist in the days of our ancestors. We may, therefore, rightly assume that it was more difficult, very much more difficult, for the physiologically botched, for human rubbish, to survive and to multiply, then, than it is to-day. Now, not only is everything done to encourage the least desirable in the community to survive, and if possible to breed, but the sound and the hearty are penalized by a kind of legally enforced charity, to enable the worthless elements of the population to live as if they had no disabilities. Thus in the Middle Ages, and until comparatively recently a more rational, a more aristocratic tone prevailed. The decadent principle accepted by

¹ *Chaucer and his England*, by G. S. Coulton, p. 132.

² *English Life and Manners in the Later Middle Ages*, by A. Abram, p. 191. Even the methods of securing the segregation of lepers in the Middle Ages were what we should consider cruel. But they were eminently successful in extirpating the disease.

modernity—that it is noble, right and justifiable to sacrifice the greater to the less, the best for the worst, had not yet been completely absorbed; and, as it had not yet been completely absorbed, we may with perfect justice assume that one of the most potent contributory causes of degeneration was less active in the world at that time than it is to-day.

Again, in the field of medicine, all authorities agree in assuring us that in the Middle Ages, and even up to Smollet's time and a little later, it was in the most rudimentary state.¹ Whether the medical men, previous to our era, actually achieved fewer cures than modern doctors do, may be doubted, but at least they were not such past masters as the latter are in patching up and prolonging the lives of sub-normal people, and in rescuing semi and demi-semi-vital children and adults from death, only to enable them to live and multiply and perpetuate their debile stocks. In this sense, the contribution of modern expert medicine to human life has again a degenerative tendency. For the Christian principle, according to which all human life is protected as a sort of "mysterious sanctity"² finds itself best supported, not by an inexpert science, like that of bygone ages, which, while it cured very little, also rescued few of the constitutionally unsound from their natural fate in extinction; but by an expert science which, while it also cures very little, has nevertheless developed a marvellous and most elaborate technique for supplementing failing nature by means of artificial aids, and thus for maintaining a vast multitude of sub-normal and undesirable people alive. I do not mean that it thereby endows them with a fresh *joie-de-vivre*, or with a capacity for leading full lives, but it enables them to keep going, and therefore to multiply and to perpetuate decadent

¹ See, for instance, Lacroix (Op. cit., p. 156 *et seq.*), Bateson (Op. cit., pp. 76, 240, 303). See also *Roderick Random*, which was written by a man who had an inside knowledge of the medical profession of his time.

² See de Quincey, *Essay on Greece under the Romans*.

stocks. In this respect again, therefore, a degenerative influence exists to-day, which we are justified in regarding as a recent and characteristically modern innovation.

The effect of science and commerce on the production of the people's food, in recent times, has already been referred to, but one important aspect of it, which deserves our special attention, is the artificial feeding of infants. Now we are quite sure that in the past, not all women were able to suckle their young, but from the difficulties that faced them if they could not, we may feel quite certain that they made every effort to succeed with natural methods if they possibly could. For what was the alternative?—only a foster-mother until about the sixteenth century, and, thereafter, until the nineteenth century, only cow's, ass's or goat's milk.¹

At the present day, however, every facility is provided for artificial feeding, and, moreover, with the commercialization and emancipation of women, every inducement. It is probably true that, even in the Middle Ages, it was unusual for mothers in high life to suckle their own children;² but they constituted only a negligible minority. Now, there is no class where the opportunity and inducement to feed artificially cannot be found. And, since the means to hand, by which natural feeding may be dispensed with, are both numerous and cheap, and since most of them consist of devitalized pabulum, which is easily prepared and easily obtained, we are justified in saying that, here again, a difference exists between this and former ages, which, if we did not already see degeneration about us to-day, would lead us to expect it. And above all, let us not forget that, as I pointed out in my *Lysistrata*³ the effect of artificial feeding is twofold, it impairs not only the child's body but probably its mind as well; for the natural maternal secretion in humans contains elements for the nourishment of the large and rapidly growing brain of the infant, which any

¹ See my *Lysistrata* (p. 73) for particulars of first artificial feeders.

² See G. S. Coulton, M.A., *A Mediæval Garner*, p. 58. ³ Pp. 71-2.

lactic product other than human milk does not provide in the same quantities.

The alarming decrease in breast-feeding has been noticed by various medical authorities, and its influence in deteriorating at least the physique of recent generations, is generally admitted.¹ We are not, therefore, on the ground of conjecture here, but on that of established fact. And, in view of the difficulty of obtaining precise statistics showing the number of artificially fed babies in our population in each year, the reader who wishes to form some idea of the extent of this evil, is invited to inquire into the magnitude and number of commercial enterprises whose sole business it is to make and distribute artificial food for new-born infants.²

Connected with the above, and with other aspects of physical deterioration, is the great change that came over the occupations of the British people with, and after, the Industrial Revolution. The account of the enormous increase in factories, from about the middle of the eighteenth to the end of the nineteenth century, can be read in every history of British Industry; but a few figures will help to give some idea of the extent of

¹ See, among others, Dr. G. von Bunge, *Die Zunehmende Unfähigkeit der Frauen, ihre Kinder zu Stillen*, and Dr. A. Stayt Dutton, *The National Physique* (1908), pp. 74-7. Both writers allude to the evil effects of artificial feeding on the teeth of the child. See also report of *Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration* (1904), p. 50, also the evidence of Dr. Hope, Medical Officer of Health for Liverpool, to the effect that, for every death from diarrhoea among breast-fed infants under six months, there were fifteen among those partly breast-fed, and twenty-two among those fed entirely on artificial food. Dr. Jones (p. 51) before the same Committee declared that only one in eight infants born in Sheffield was brought up on the breast. Dr. Eustace Smith (p. 318) offered similar evidence for the East End of London, and Drs. Collie, Rob. Hutchinson (pp. 363-8), Lewis A. Hawkes, William McAdam, Ralph Vincent and Arch. Kerr Chalmers (pp. 474, 391, 442) unanimously agreed that breast-feeding was declining.

² Among the poorer classes this artificial food is in most cases tinned milk (for evidence on this point see p. 51 of *Inter-Departmental Report* (1904), already quoted).

this expansion. Our exports at the end of the seventeenth century were to the value of £6,709,881; in 1728 they had risen to only £7,891,739. In 1760, however, they shot up to £14,693,270; in 1805 they totalled £30,000,000; by 1831 they stood at £37,164,372; in 1841, at £51,634,623; in 1871, at over £283,000,000; and in 1924, exclusive of colonial and other foreign produce exported, British produce alone amounted to £795,364,581. When it is remembered that the bulk of this (allowing for a steady rise in coal exports from £250,000 in 1837 to £78,313,000 in 1924) was accounted for by manufactures alone, some idea is obtained of the vast growth of factories in these islands between 1760 and the present day.

With every increase in the population in the last hundred and more years, there has not occurred anything like an even distribution of adult males between urban and rural occupations. On the contrary, there has been almost exclusive concentration upon either mining or manufactures. Between 1800 and 1921, the population of England and Wales rose from 8,892,536 to 37,885,242; but the total of adult males employed in agriculture during that interval shows hardly any increase whatsoever. In 1831, for instance, the total for the British Isles was 1,252,751, and in 1921 the total for England and Wales was only 1,171,298. On the other hand, the number of males employed in mining or manufactures of some kind in 1921, totalled 5,189,370—almost the total of adults, male and female, for the year 1800.

This employment of the bulk of the adult male population (to which should be added 1,667,329 women and girls) in occupations chiefly carried on in surroundings which are admittedly unfavourable to health and vigour, has, together with the other factors already enumerated, increasingly contributed very seriously to a deterioration in the national health, and we have only to glance at such treatises as Dr. Oliver's *Diseases of Occupation*,¹

¹ Methuen & Co., 1908.

and Drs. G. M. Kober and W. C. Hanson's *Diseases of Occupation and Vocational Hygiene*,¹ in order to convince ourselves of the havoc played by a very large number of modern industries with the physical condition of the workers.

The tables given in these works with the object of showing the relative incidence of different diseases in various occupations will leave the reader in no doubt whatsoever concerning the immense advantages, from the standpoint of health, enjoyed by men employed in agriculture, gardening, and work other than factory and sedentary work, over men employed in manufacture and trade; and the vast changes that have occurred in England since this country supplied not only her own needs in corn, but also exported her surplus to the continent, can be appreciated in the five volumes mentioned, through the help of graphic and frequently distressing statistics.

"Taking 1,000 to represent the mortality of all males at these ages [25-65] in England and Wales," say Drs. Parker and Kenwood,² "the comparative mortality figure for all occupied males was 953, and while it was 687 in agricultural districts, it reached to 1,248 in industrial districts."³

"Of all occupations," says Sir Thomas Oliver, "that of the farmer is the healthiest."⁴

¹ London, 1918. See also *Hygiene and Public Health*, by Drs. L. C. Parkes and H. R. Kenwood (London, 1923), Dr. Oliver's *Occupations* (Cambridge, 1916), and Drs. Collis and Greenwood's *The Health of the Industrial Worker*.

² *Hygiene and Public Health*, p. 678.

³ And the same applies to the children. In 1873 Dr. Bridges and Mr. Holmes examined and measured 10,000 children, and noted the principal indications of degeneracy in them. They established for the limited area covered that the children of factory parents (urban or suburban) compared unfavourably with the children in non-factory districts (urban and rural).

⁴ *Occupations*, p. 57. But the reader should specially note the table given on p. 170 of Drs. Collis and Greenwood's book, showing the increase of cancer in ten years in thirty-three occupations.

There could be no more convincing evidence of the evils resulting from modern conditions than the data collected in this depressing but illuminating pentateuch of modern industrialism. It should, however, be remembered that the medical men responsible for it, deal almost exclusively with those industries and occupations to which definite diseases can be traced. Very naturally, they could not concern themselves statistically with those manifold but very distressing disorders, which, while vague in their manifestations, and obscure in their etiology, come under the head of acute or chronic debility, and occur so frequently among all those whose work deprives them of fresh air, and condemns them to a sedentary, monotonous, besotting, and not unusually sexless existence.

Chronic indigestion, sleeplessness, and nervous diseases of all kinds,¹ whether slight or severe, are affections about which it is not only difficult, but almost impossible to collect accurate data. And yet we know positively that with over two million of the nation's menfolk engaged outside industry, as office hermits, clerks, warehousemen, packers, storekeepers, and indoor servants,² the incidence of these affections must be, and actually is, very high. The enormous profits, and the vast advertising efforts, made by firms purveying proprietary drugs for aiding normal functioning in debilitated sedentary workers in England and Wales, and the number of these firms, are sufficient evidence in

¹ For comparative tables of nervous disorders in various occupations, where the labourer in agricultural districts as usual has the best record, see Drs. Parker and Kenwood (*Op. cit.*, p. 671). But presumably the statistics were obtained from severe cases, and do not include all those slight and yet distressing nervous disorders, which never reach either the hospital or the asylum.

² The precise figures for 1921 in England and Wales were : Commercial, Financial and Insurance Occupations, 1,063,120 ; clerks, draughtsmen and typists, 568,034 ; warehousemen, storekeepers, packers, 222,269 ; public offices, 442,325 ; and personal service, including institutions, clubs, hotels, etc., 339,944.

proof of the very great demand that exists for such artificial aids among the population ;¹ and, seeing, that the cumulative effect of resorting to such unnatural corrections must be severe as time goes on, in the absence of precise data, we are entitled to conclude from the immense increase of patent and proprietary medicines in recent years, that the debility we speak of, which for obvious reasons is not recorded statistically, is a serious contributory cause of physical deterioration.

But it is not alone on the physical side that the vast expansion of industry and commerce in England and Wales has contributed to degeneracy, for we must not forget the besotting and stultifying effect upon the mind of the worker which characterizes many of the occupations that the modern factory system, and modern commercial methods, have introduced. Machinery has replaced skilled labour in hundreds of trades. Often the machine hand is no more than an automaton who from year's end to year's end only turns a handle or a lever from left to right. Even in the sphere of transport, the tram-driver, who manipulates a lever, is less skilled than the driver of a coach and four. But the men performing these duties have children, and grandchildren, who are doomed to perform duties no less emasculating and besotting. Thus, as generation follows generation, there is not that garnering of ability and native aptitude which in former times used to be the natural guerdon of skilled labour. On the contrary, there is but one family heirloom, which gets more and more polished as time goes on, and that is stupidity.

And the same may be said of the thousands of clerks, typists, storekeepers, etc., whose natural versatility and general aptitudes, however modest, are daily stifled and

¹ See Dr. Leonard Williams (Op. cit., pp. 85 and 88) : "Civilized man spends half his life in cultivating constipation, and the other half in campaigning against it. Unfortunately he resorts to the wrong weapons. . . . There are more constipated people in the world than know themselves to be constipated."

cramped, by their being forced to concentrate on highly specialized routine work, requiring less than average intelligence, no initiative, and little character.

This twofold source of mental degeneracy, with all the depression and despair that it involves, must be taken into account in measuring the full consequences of our present trend, and in view of the fact that spiritual depression may also react on physical conditions, and *vice versâ*, we have in our industrial and commercial expansion, a vicious circle in which both mind and body seem doomed to inevitable destruction.

Here once more, therefore, in the disproportionate growth of industrial, commercial and clerical, as compared with agricultural and craftsman's callings, we are in the presence of conditions which, while recently established, would incline us to expect physical deterioration in the population, if it had not already occurred. And, in view of the many scientific records we possess, of the evil influence of these conditions upon the health of the nation, there can be no doubt that the effects which might have been anticipated by any wise and far-sighted body of rulers, at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, are already, and have been for a long time, visible in our midst.

As an inevitable consequence of the Industrial Revolution, there occurred in England and Wales an inflation of urban and a depletion of rural populations, which continues to this day, and is among the most serious of the many causes contributing to physical deterioration. In 1801, for instance, out of a population of 8,892,536, almost 6,000,000, or two-thirds, were entirely rural; while in 1921, out of a population of 37,885,242, only 7,850,857, or about one-fifth, were rural, and the remainder, 30,034,385, were collected in towns. The relative decrease in rural populations was steady throughout the nineteenth century. In 1850, the country and town folk were about equally divided, in 1851 the rural represented 49.8 per cent. of the total; in 1861,

45.4 per cent.; in 1871, 38.2 per cent.; in 1881, 32.1 per cent.; in 1891, 28 per cent.; in 1901, 23 per cent.; in 1911, 21.9 per cent.; and in 1921, 20.7 per cent.¹

The grave results of this urbanization are known to all those who have made an investigation of the health of modern people. In spite of the fact that, owing to commercial enterprise, food products have been largely standardized all over the country, and that people in rural districts no longer enjoy the dietetic advantages which might once have been claimed for them,² and although death-rates in the country are largely increased by sick and feeble people going into the country to die,³ the death-rate in rural districts is still very much lower than in urban districts,⁴ while the incidence of such affections as cancer, phthisis and heart disease is lower.⁵

Dr. Newsholme gives a table showing the greater expectation of life in both sexes in rural districts, and shows that the male expectation of life at 25 in country boroughs is 37.80, and in rural districts, 42.89.⁶ He goes on to say⁷ "that one of the greatest influences militating

¹ See *Vital Statistics*, by Sir Arthur Newsholme, K.C.B., M.D. See also *Physical Deterioration*, by A. Watt Smyth (1904), p. 51.

² See the evidence of Sir John Gorst before the *Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration* (1904), p. 432: "If you investigated the country children they are nearly, if not quite as badly fed as the town children." See also evidence of Mrs. Close (p. 118), where she attributes the ill-health of rural children "entirely to the change in the food habits and cooking of the parents." See also Mr. Henry James Wilson's evidence (p. 89): "The quality of the food is changing [in rural districts], I believe, as it has changed in the towns." See also evidence of Mr. G. H. Fosbroke, D.Ph. (p. 261), where he ascribes the deterioration of rural women to their inferior food.

³ See *Vital Statistics*, p. 278, and *Report of Inter-Departmental Committee* (1904), p. 84.

⁴ See Watt Smyth, *Op. cit.*, p. 29, also Drs. Parker and Kenwood, *Op. cit.*, pp. 671, 675.

⁵ See Drs. Collis and Greenwood, *Op. cit.*, pp. 131 and 135, for Phthisis Tables in 1911, and p. 170 for Cancer Tables 1900-2. For standardized death-rate from valvular disease of the heart in country boroughs and rural districts see *Vital Statistics*, p. 283.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 257.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 318.

against health in the last century has been the increasing gravitation of the population into crowded cities," and, quoting Dr. Brownlee's report, adds,¹ "it has been rendered probable that the inhabitant of the country is at the ages 55-56 biologically about 6-7 years younger than the inhabitant of the town." Furthermore, he says,² "Premature ageing of tissues may be regarded as an important factor in the earlier age at death in the towns," and, in a table of occupational experience,³ he shows that the expected death from all causes at ages 25-65 (per cent. of number if experience had been same as all males) is for gardeners 58·1, for agricultural labourers 59, for clergy 59·7, for coalminers 91·2, for butchers 110·5, for brewers 129·5, for waiters 133·8, for men-servants 157·2, for inn and hotel keepers 160.

Another medical man, Dr. A. Stayt Dutton, who went to the pains of travelling the country, very much as Cobbett did a hundred years ago, but for a different purpose, found in every urban centre he visited,⁴ that the inhabitants suffered from anæmia, that they also revealed a high incidence of dental caries (particularly factory workers), and that their food conditions were on the whole defective. He made blood tests in various representative districts in England, and formed the opinion that the main cause of physical deterioration is to be found in the defective quality of the individual's blood,⁵ as the result of faulty nutrition, inadequate oxidation, and generally of urbanization. Even of districts such as Brighton, Eastbourne, Seaford and Newhaven, he writes,⁶ "this part of the country cannot be described as anything but one of the best from a health point of view. . . . In this district anæmic conditions are prevalent to a considerable extent, and but for this everything would tend to healthy physical development."

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 283.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 284.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 318.

⁴ See *The National Physique* (1908).

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

In London his tests showed that only 19 per cent. of boys between 7 and 14 had blood approaching that of normal health,¹ in girls of the same ages that quality was defective in still larger numbers. He suggested that the anæmia in children all over the country may be largely due to the elementary and other schools.²

Mr. Harry Roberts, quoting Mr. H. S. Wilson, Superintending Inspector of Factories in Scotland, publishes a table³ recording results of the medical examination of recruits, together with other statistics collected by himself, which shows differences of height and weight between working men of agricultural origin and craftsmen and labourers born and bred in industrial towns. It is as follows :

Class examined	Average height ⁴		Average weight ⁴	
	ft.	in.	st.	lb.
Country-bred men	5	9	12	4
Public-school men	5	9	11	11
Sheffield grinders	5	4½	9	10
Birmingham brass-founders	5	6½	9	8
Glasgow labourers	5	2	8	12

But there is, as a matter of fact, no lack of data. Space does not allow me to quote all the figures I have found to support the allegation that the excessive urbanization of the last hundred years has been deleterious to public health. In the literature I have quoted—and it was impossible to quote all the works I have examined—the reader will be able to find abundant confirmation of my standpoint, if he wish to do so. At all events in the excessive urbanization of the people of this country, we have a further recent change which

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 65.

² *Ibid.*, p. 86. More will be said on this point in the next chapter. See p. 187 ahead.

³ See *A National Policy*, p. 48.

⁴ According to the Report of the Anthropometric Committee of the British Association, in 1883, the weight and height of artisan town children was less than that of children of all classes and localities in the kingdom.

would lead us to expect physical deterioration if it had not already occurred. And, seeing that the effects of this deterioration are cumulative and that urbanization is still increasing, the outlook does not appear to be very hopeful.

It should also be remembered that the moral effect of urbanization is almost as serious as the physical. To mention only one of these effects, let it be noted that these vast hordes who live in large cities and know nothing of rural conditions, who never see food being produced, or witness the labour and care that its production entails, who buy all they need at their local butcher's and baker's, but particularly at their grocer's, cease in the end from being able to hold a single realistic view either about life or its necessities. To them food is something that is found in a shop, of which the source, though obscure, appears inexhaustible, and for which one need have no special reverence. From this attitude to habits of wastefulness and improvidence is but a step, and he who observes with horror the amount of bread that is thrown away daily by poor children in our public parks during the summer months, knows one of the least pleasant of the moral results of urbanization.¹ There is also the influence of the exciting life, of the false, sentimental and romantic values, inculcated not only by the artificial existence itself, but also by the way in which these urban hordes spend their leisure. But, above all, there is the nervous irritability induced by the incessant

¹ Their elders are, however, no better in this respect. The wastefulness, in matters of food alone, of the English masses, horrifies every foreigner who comes to live in this country. And, during the war, when in the course of the Somme battles, I had, as billeting officer and Mess Secretary of my battery, to deal with the mayors and other officials of various villages and towns in N. E. France, I always had to listen to long and astonished harangues about the appalling waste of food perpetrated by the British troops that had previously occupied the areas into which we came. This sort of thing can be the outcome only of long severance from the land, and of ignorance of the toil and anxiety involved in the production of food.

and futile appeals to the individual's attention, which urban attractions, urban noise, urban bustle, and urban advertisements make every moment of the day.

In the density of the population alone, however, there lurk evils both for the mind and the body of the people, to which many trained observers have called attention. For, apart from the overcrowding, which necessarily followed from densely populated areas, we have to reckon with the harassing effect of an increased struggle for existence, a greater pollution of the atmosphere, and a tendency to impair food-products owing to (a) the need of procuring them from a distance, (b) the delay incurred in distributing them, and (c) the temptation to commercialize preserved forms of foods. We must also take into account the nervous exhaustion daily occasioned by battling and competing with large numbers of people in even so simple a matter as getting about, and obtaining transport and breathing space. And, when Dr. Wiglesworth, before the 1904 Committee already quoted so often, declared that he thought insanity was increasing owing to "the density of population and the environment it connotes,"¹ he stated a truth to which much too little attention has hitherto been called.

The steady increase from 152 people to the square mile in 1801 to 649 to the square mile in 1921, has been allowed to go on, without anybody, except private individuals and societies attempting to face and to solve the problems of over-population. And yet the unhappiness and physical and mental stress which such over-population causes must be manifest to all. The fact is we are still sadly old-fashioned in our views on this point, and, in spite of the pains that many writers have taken² to explode the old and fallacious teaching that nothing need be done "as there is room in the world for every-

¹ See *Report*, pp. 78-9. See also the evidence on overcrowding in this report.

² See particularly Mr. Harold Cox's *The Problem of Population* and my review of this book in the *Fortnightly Review* of April, 1923.

body," there are still a large number of people who refuse to face the problem because of their blind attachment to this doctrine. Even a Government measure to secure at least this boon, that, *if we are to be over-populated, let the population at all events be qualitatively desirable*, has not yet been framed, and, with the advent of sentimental Labour legislation, the prospect of such a measure coming into being becomes every day more remote.

At present, therefore, we not only suffer from all the worst evils of over-population, but a high percentage of our excessive numbers are merely waste human material, idiots, defectives, lunatics, incurables, cripples, and people physiologically botched in every conceivable way, who are a heavy burden upon, and constitute a gratuitous penalization of, the remainder—that is to say, who impose a useless, intolerable, and often cruel limitation upon sound life, for no other than sentimental reasons.¹

For instance, in 1921, in England and Wales, we had 177,366 pauper lunatics, including mental defectives under care (an increase of 4,670 on the year 1920), and the average cost of maintaining them was 32s. 8d. per week per head. In addition there are about 70,000 people either blind, deaf, or dumb, or suffering from different combinations of these afflictions.

In 1924,² the defective children alone amounted to 170,167, besides 900 feeble-minded, 1,273 imbeciles,

¹ Mr. Geoffrey Drage, a high authority in these matters, estimated in an article in the *Spectator* of February 3, 1923, that £225,000,000 were now spent on public assistance alone. This money has to be earned by the willing and the sound, to support what, in a large measure, is a useless burden of physical wreckage. According to a communication kindly made to me by the Eugenic Society, "the normal and fit must pay for the feeding, clothing, housing and special education of the unfit £46,500,000 annually. And this bill does not include the cost of hospitals, prisons, and special schools. The cost is steadily rising."

² The bulk of these figures and those that follow have been obtained from the *Annual Reports of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education*, and from the *London County Council's Reports of the School Medical Officer*.

180 idiots, 4,448 epileptics, for all of whom special school and other arrangements had to be made.

In July, 1925, there were 360 day and 184 residential schools in England and Wales, with accommodation for 43,361 abnormal children, and the cost per head was £30 per annum for day schools and £90 per annum for residential schools.

In 1924, spectacles were prescribed for 138,064 children. This, of course, is only the figure for the year, and takes no account of the children already wearing spectacles.

In London, alone, in 1924, 35,827 defective children had to be accommodated in various special homes and schools. 323 were totally blind, 946 were partially blind, 719 were totally deaf, 144 were partially deaf, 7,367 were mentally defective, 890 were epileptic, 3,577 were tuberculous, 14,111 were delicate, and 7,750 were crippled.

Among the so-called *undefective* children in London elementary schools in 1924, out of a total average roll of 675,078 in 1924, 192,885 were treated after routine examination, and 226,368 were classed as special cases, i.e. they had either eye trouble (32,747)¹ or teeth trouble (99,045),² or ear, nose or throat trouble (12,980), or other ailments (81,596). Now when it is remembered that the older children must already have been examined and prescribed for in previous years, as the system has been working since 1908, we must assume that these numbers—at

¹ Sir William Hamer says that in the London schools in 1924 53·1 per cent. of 8-year-old boys and 56·2 per cent. of 8-year-old girls failed to pass the test for normal vision.

² Of 10,517 children (boys and girls) of an average age of 12 years, examined at the beginning of the century in English and Scotch schools by dentist practitioners approved by the British Medical Association, only 1,508, i.e. 14·2 per cent., had sets of teeth free from decay. Of the number there were 19,096 permanent teeth that required either extracting or filling, and teeth already extracted numbered 2,175. (From *Report of Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration, 1904*, p. 98, Appendix.)

least as far as eye trouble is concerned—were made up chiefly by entrants for the year.¹ Thus in 1924 alone, 23,338 cases in London schools had spectacles prescribed for them.²

In the whole of England and Wales in 1922, 42 per cent. of elementary school children were suffering from some defect mental or physical. In 1924 the figure was 48·6 per cent.

Meanwhile the increase in medical expenditure alone for discovering and recording these cases, quite apart from the cost of maintaining institutions, etc., rose from £285,993 in 1913 to £1,220,268 in 1924.

These facts speak for themselves, and they are only what we might expect from the conditions we have enumerated, *plus* the dysgenic influence of Christian teaching, and morbid humanitarianism.

But we have made no mention of homes for incurables, homes for cripples and private asylums, and we have not referred to the physiological botchedness among the wealthy and the well-to-do—the cretins, cripples, semi-imbeciles, mental defectives, deaf, dumb and blind, who are kept at home in the houses of people sufficiently affluent to preserve their secret from prying Government officials. We have also made no mention of defective eyesight, defective teeth and defective noses, ears and throats among the children of these classes. To be led by class pride to suppose that the well-to-do and their children are to-day any better than the poor, would be not only foolish but grossly inaccurate. Statistics of

¹ This is borne out by the Annual Report of the *Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education* (1923), where the figure given for defective entrants in London elementary schools is 35 per cent. for 1923, and 38·6 per cent. for 1924.

² See figure for England and Wales on previous page. See also *National Degeneration*, by Dr. D. F. Harris, p. 35, where the author quotes Dr. J. R. Kaye as having said at the Leeds Health Congress in 1909, that “at the present time, there were 4,800,000 children unsound in body and mind.” This does not seem unlikely if we examine the annual figures given in the reports quoted above.

defects among well-to-do people and their children are naturally not obtainable, and are, as a matter of fact, not compiled for very obvious reasons ; but where comparative tables have been made, the disadvantage would, strange to say, appear to be entirely on the side of the well-to-do.¹

If, however, we look about us, and observe the enormous multitude of people to-day, who *although reckoned as among the sound and the healthy*, make daily use of some kind of artificial aid to normal functioning—whether it be spectacles, false teeth, aperients, sedatives, tonics, or what not—and remember that their number has to be added to the gross total of acknowledged invalids and defectives, both among the poor and the well-to-do, before our estimate of modern physical deterioration can be regarded as complete, we have a picture of our times which, far from being edifying, is probably the most depressing that it is possible to behold, and to those who can appreciate its significance, it is full of the most alarming features.

The facts, as we have said, speak for themselves. It is not even necessary to give a full account of them. The fragmentary sketch here attempted is disconcerting enough.

¹ For instance, in a table showing the army recruits for 1900, arranged according to classes, the rejections per 1,000 among the professional and student class were higher (266·02) than the rejections in the mechanic class (260·96) consisting of smiths, carpenters, masons, bricklayers, etc. See p. 95 (Appendix) of *Report of Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration*. Also, in a comparative record of poor and well-to-do children in Edinburgh, it was found that the ratio of defective teeth per 100 children was 158·2 in the school for the children of well-to-do working people, and 273·9 in that for children of a better class, professional men and merchants. See *Report* (1904), Vol. II, p. 280. See also table in *Vital Statistics*, p. 321, where upper and middle classes show worse records for phthisis, liver troubles and cancer, than miners, agricultural labourers, and (in the case of liver trouble) than textile workers and unskilled workmen. See also opinion expressed by Committee on Physical Deterioration (1904) Report, p. 5, to the effect that dental caries is certainly not peculiar to any particular class.

We know too well, however, the nature of the stubborn and resolute optimist to suppose that we can leave the subject here. We know how easily he retreats behind his screen of blue romantic steam, and declares that we have not yet—not yet with all our figures—demonstrated the fact of degeneration. To do this, he says, we must prove that there has been progressive physical deterioration. Having met his arguments based on armour and the late war, he is the more determined to make our task of demonstration particularly difficult.

Very well, we accept his challenge. *We believe that progressive physical deterioration can be proved.* We have already seen a few figures above which afford some evidence of progressive physical deterioration. But in the next chapter we shall confine ourselves to such figures.

CHAPTER VII

The Degeneracy of Modern Man— Part III

The Proofs of Progressive Physical Degeneration

AS we have suggested, it is not enough for some people that we should be grossly overburdened with the human wreckage of our excessive population (devoid of qualitative values) and with the visible signs all about us of a marked decline in health, beauty, normal functioning, and vigour, even among the so-called "fit." It is not enough to be able to show masses of figures proving a high incidence of lunacy, dental caries, myopia, or other defects of the eyes, crippledom, mental inferiority, blindness, etc., etc., among our population. Such people will continue to maintain that it is still incumbent upon us to prove *progressive deterioration* more completely than we already have done.

I have already mentioned, I believe, that there are three powerful bodies of people in these islands, who are stubbornly disinclined to admit that the modern Englishman is degenerating.

On the one hand there are the ignorant but conceited masses who wish to believe that they not only belong to the best people on earth, but also to the best period in that best people's history. They, therefore, stoutly deny national or racial degeneracy, for fear lest their self-esteem might suffer.

Then there are the so-called "advanced" or "new" women, who are shrewd enough to perceive that if they

admit the possibility of male degeneracy, they forfeit their claim of an evolutionary necessity for women's recent strides. For, if men have declined, then obviously woman's recently acquired privileges cease to denote a positive advance, but only a relative advance, contingent upon man's recession, or inability any longer to maintain his ascendancy.

Finally there are the doctors, who regard the charge of national degeneracy as one directly impugning their own particular sphere of power. "If this alleged physical degeneracy is a fact," they say, "then we doctors have done no good, we have failed in our mission of healing and physical salvation." It is this implication which must be avoided at all costs; it is this damaging consequence of the first proposition, which doctors wish to forestall, and if possible to invalidate, by flatly denying that degeneracy is a fact. And this explains the uncontrollable fury with which most of them will retort to the charge I am making. They will record facts and data about the incidence of disease and the relief which their services have supplied. But only the fewest among them will cheerfully draw the proper conclusions from these data.

I remember, not long ago, at the house of a friend, I almost caused an unpleasant scene at table, by maintaining to my *vis-à-vis*, who happened to be a very sickly and anæmic-looking doctor, that modern Englishmen were degenerating. It was partly this experience that first led me to suspect the hostility which the professional pride of doctors causes many of them to feel towards my present line of argument.

Now it must be obvious to every one that these three groups—the ignorant and conceited masses, the advanced women, and the medical profession—form a very powerful body of opinion in the nation, hence, I believe, the difficulty in getting the country to regard the fact of racial and national degeneracy seriously, and the reason why no drastic steps are taken to arrest the tendency to decline,

There is, perhaps, one further contributory factor in the formation of this strong body of opinion against the charge of degeneracy, and that is the trait common to all unthinking and smug people—whether ignorant or well informed—to prefer to listen to optimistic utterances, however deceptive, before facing unpleasant truths.

To convince the three stubborn groups above described, and the unscrupulous optimists just mentioned, it is therefore necessary to use methods which, with less biased and more observant people, might be discarded. And, for the sake of those, therefore, for whom the spectacle of modern mankind is not enough, and for whom even the signs to be observed in themselves and among their own circle of friends and acquaintances are insufficiently enlightening, I shall now proceed to deal with those further proofs I have collected of *progressive physical deterioration* in England.

I do not deny that the task of collecting these proofs has been an arduous one. The data are sparse, and systematic methods of registering differences in health, stature, statistics of disease, crippledom, eye trouble, etc., from decade to decade, have hardly been attempted. The consequence is that, from the very start, those who wish to prove progressive physical deterioration by means of figures are faced with a very difficult undertaking. If, therefore, the data I now propose to reveal seem small and trifling, let it not be supposed that they are exhaustive. They represent only a portion of the whole picture. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to underrate the significance of even the small array of figures that I am giving. For, seeing that progressive physical deterioration proved in any one organ or function can—if we regard the human organism as a psychophysical whole—hardly be classed as a unique phenomenon, unaccompanied by collateral progressive deterioration elsewhere, I regard it as of the utmost value to my case, that I have been able to prove pro-

gressive deterioration in at least one function. This achievement (apart from any other facts I adduce), measured in conjunction with a due regard to the difficulty of collecting evidence, supplies as convincing a proof of my charge as I could wish to obtain.

Beginning, then, with the function of suckling, and reiterating my former allegation regarding the decline of breast-feeding,¹ whether from morbid incapacity, disinclination, or inability (in the case of mothers obliged to go out to work), there can be no doubt that this evil is increasing. And, in view of the unabated multiplication of incentives for not performing the function of lactation, and the probable result, which will consist of a gradual decline in the capacity to suckle, the situation is serious. Dr. Janet E. Lane-Clayton has maintained ² that a morbid incapacity to suckle is so rare that "with few exceptions lactation can be induced in every woman." But, in saying this, it would appear that she hardly reckons with the many causes which to-day conspire to prevent women from nursing their infant children, and with the danger which our race thus incurs of losing the power to function normally in this respect. Dr. J. P. Crozer Griffiths, in a paper on *The Establishment and Maintenance of Breast-Feeding*, makes this point very clear. He says: "It seems probable that a line of mothers, who, though able, practise a voluntary refusal to suckle their offspring, finally develops an acquired characteristic which can be transmitted, resulting in an inability in the mothers of the younger generations to perform the natural function of nursing." And this fear seems to be warranted by the fact that morbid incapacity for lactation frequently runs in families.

Now the morbidity of bottle-fed infants is well established. It has been asserted that for every death from diarrhœa occurring among breast-fed infants under

¹ The reader is requested to refer to the evidence clearly adduced regarding this decline, p. 164, *ante*.

² *Milk and its Hygienic Relations*, pp. 147-9.

six months, there were eighteen among those partly breast-fed, and twenty-two among those fed entirely on artificial food. And Dr. H. M. McClanahan has shown not only "that breast-fed infants have a better immunity and furthermore more prompt defence when invasion occurs," . . . but also that "intestinal infections are, without doubt, more rare in the breast-fed."¹

Thus, although infant mortality from other causes may have been successfully combated in recent years, we should expect to find, if there has really been a decline in breast-feeding, an increased mortality from disorders affecting the digestive tract. And the tables on the opposite page confirm this expectation.

These figures are instructive. Bearing in mind the proportion of deaths to the number of births in each category, it is quite clear that the number of deaths among infants from diseases of the digestive system increased alarmingly in the thirty years between 1873 and 1902, both in urban and rural districts. The figures for pneumonia, which cannot be held independent of digestive conditions, also show an increase. While it is interesting to note, from the standpoint of the condition of the adult woman, that premature births also became more frequent in the period taken.

In view of the precautions now taken to save infant life, it is difficult to account for this increase in lethal digestive troubles except on the score of a steady decline in breast-feeding. And, if we remember that these tables record only the fatal cases, and that thousands of infants must survive each year, who through artificial feeding have their digestions impaired,² we are bound

¹ *The Relative Morbidity of Breast-fed Infants*. Dr. Lane-Clayton is of the same opinion (Op. cit., p. 147).

² Dr. V. B. Green-Armytage, in a paper on *Some Common Ailments of Children, Their Identification and Treatment* (1924), writes as follows: "Remember that patent milk foods unintelligently used are among the curses of modern civilization, and undoubtedly become a boomerang for evil from infancy to youth, and from youth to adolescence, for I need not remind you that that immense group of symptoms which are generic-

INFANT MORTALITY

185

I

DEATHS OF INFANTS IN URBAN DISTRICTS IN ENGLAND IN TWO PERIODS OF FIVE YEARS

Cause.	1873-1877.		1898-1902.	
	Males. Total Births, 1,197,072.	Females. Total Births, 1,155,722.	Males. Total Births, 1,392,156.	Females. Total Births, 1,297,246.
Diarrhœa ; Dysentery ;				
Cholera	24,876	20,616	34,481	29,892
Pneumonia	11,740	8,832	18,579	13,954
Enteritis ; Gastro-Enteritis	1,626	1,130	14,664	12,275
Stomach Diseases	841	679	3,731	3,110
Premature Births	16,953	13,438	29,878	23,230
Stomatitis	252	201	526	474

II

DEATHS OF INFANTS IN RURAL DISTRICTS IN ENGLAND IN TWO PERIODS OF FIVE YEARS

Cause.	1873-1877.		1898-1902.	
	Males. Total Births, 333,956.	Females. Total Births, 319,778.	Males. Total Births, 279,687.	Females. Total Births, 268,966.
Diarrhœa ; Dysentery ;				
Cholera	3,392	2,746	3,340	2,556
Pneumonia	2,400	1,657	2,631	1,858
Enteritis ; Gastro-Enteritis	319	240	1,836	1,416
Stomach Diseases	218	175	591	461
Premature Births	4,224	3,203	5,786	4,485
Stomatitis	53	52	98	79

to acknowledge that a degenerative tendency, arising in the decline of breast-feeding is already established in this country.¹

Turning now to children—according to the Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education for 1923, there has been a very great increase, both absolutely and relatively, in the number of children absent from school owing to rheumatic conditions (including chronic heart disease). In the three years 1919–22 this increase amounts to 9·1 per cent.

In his report for 1924, he also records an increase in unhealthy throat conditions : 1·83 per cent. more children being referred for treatment of tonsils and adenoids than in 1923.

Speaking of physical deterioration among rural children, Sir George Newman writes : “ In his report on the physical condition of rural children in certain districts of Devonshire in 1924, Dr. Corkery found evidence of decadence. He has been officially responsible for the medical examination of school children in the same district for many years, and as the result of careful personal study and long experience, he formed the considered opinion that the physical condition of the children in certain of

ally classified under the heading ‘ spasmophilia ’ are to a very great extent due to gastro-intestinal disturbances which have had their origin in patent rather than natural food during babyhood.” Later on in the same paper Dr. Green-Armytage prophesies, “ that, as a result of the Great War with its effect on infant dietetics, and the modern tendency of all classes of society to rely upon patent baby foods, obstetric difficulties and anomalies will increase.”

¹ It should also not be forgotten that the infants who survive artificial feeding also probably suffer mentally from the process, as shown in my *Lysistrata*, Chapter III. In view of the large number of feeble-minded and mentally defective children that are dealt with every year, this is an important consideration ; while in addition there are the mentally backward children who, as Mr. Cyril Burt (the L.C.C. Psychologist) has pointed out, may be assessed at 10 per cent. of the non-adult population. In the County of London in 1918 they numbered 50,000, which would give 600,000 for England and Wales. See 1923 Report of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education.

DECADENCE OF RURAL CHILDREN 187

his rural schools was *definitely decadent*,¹ and was worse in 1924-5, than it was in similar groups of children examined in 1910 and subsequent pre-war years."

Then Sir G. Newman adds: "Having inquired locally and observed his method of examination and comparison, I am satisfied as to the validity of the evidence."

Similar trustworthy evidence comes from Anglesey, Lincolnshire, Yorkshire and Northumberland.²

Furthermore, according to the L.C.C. Report of the School Medical Officer for 1924, there has been an increase of 3.02 per cent. in scholars requiring treatment at elementary schools in twelve years. The figures are :

1912.		1924.	
Total Elementary Scholars Examined.	Percentage Requiring Treatment.	Total Elementary Scholars Examined.	Percentage Requiring Treatment.
240,764.	35.52	192,885	38.5

In 1923 the percentage requiring treatment was 36.7, while the defective entrants rose from 35 per cent. in 1913 to 38.6 in 1924.

According to the 1924 Report of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education, the physique of a number of children degenerates *while they are at school*, and Sir G. Newman's comment on this fact, is as follows: "It would seem that there must be conditions in the school as in our educational system, which are favourable to, or perhaps even produce, some of the physical effects which are found."

¹ The italics are mine.—A. M. L.

² Dr. Luston of Newcastle, in his evidence before the Committee on Physical Deterioration (1904), said: "There is undoubtedly great deterioration in the physique of our city population, and this is attributable to two chief causes, first a decadence of home life, which entails improper food and clothing, irregular habits, and absence of order and thrift. . . . There is an undoubted falling off in the physical conditions of the infants vaccinated, and young persons presented for employment during the last quarter of a century, and this is due to the fact that they are the offspring of town-bred parents who produce *sui generis* (p. 22, Vol. I).

Turning now to adults, we have Sir Arthur Newsholme's authority for stating that, on the average, from 1913 to 1921, 14,476,000 weeks' work were lost every year through sickness, or 278,000 years, or in other words the equivalent of the annual work of 278,000 persons.

But in 1924, this figure had risen to 23,500,000, or a period of 447,115 years. "That is to say," we read in the Annual Report of the Chief Officer of the Ministry of Health, "in England and Wales, there was lost to the nation in the year among the insured population only, and excluding the loss due to sickness, for which sickness or disablement benefit is not payable, the equivalent of 12 months' work of 447,115 persons. Moreover, it must be remembered that it is not only the working equivalent of 447,115 persons that was lost, but also the labour and expense involved in their care during their incapacitation."¹

With regard to teeth and their defects, there seems to be no doubt whatsoever that degeneration is already advanced.

In his evidence before the Committee on Physical Deterioration in 1904, Mr. W. H. Dolamore, Secretary to the British Dental Association, who is a qualified medical man, spoke of the visible changes that have occurred in the teeth and jaws of the people of England, compared with the teeth and jaws that can be seen in old and ancient skulls. He deprecated the suggestion that the signs of caries sometimes found in the teeth of the older inhabitants of these islands, was anything like as serious as the caries occurring to-day, and declared that there was overwhelming evidence of degeneration in this respect.²

For the purposes of the same committee, an examination was made of 181 jaws at University College, London, which had been found in Whitechapel, presumably in one of the plague pits (*circa* 1665). From

¹ See the section *Sickness and Invalidity* (IV), p. 16.

² See p. 278, Vol. II of the Report.

the number of teeth missing it was clear that dental caries was more common at that time than in early British times, although not nearly to the same extent as at the present day.¹

The Committee of the British Dental Association also sent a circular letter to certain dental practitioners who were able to speak from an experience extending over 50 years. All agreed that dental caries had increased.²

Furthermore, it was stated that hospital statistics show that a largely increasing number of patients require to be referred to the dental department, and that there is also a largely increasing number of patients suffering from diseases of the stomach and from other indirect affections due to bad teeth.³ While, with regard to children, dental caries had increased to such an extent as to be found in 86 per cent. of their total number.⁴

Professor Cunningham, in his evidence before the same Committee, spoke as follows: "It is an obvious fact that the teeth of the people of the present time cannot stand comparison in point of durability with those of the earlier inhabitants of Britain. . . . I take it that the real cause of this degeneration is the striking change which has taken place in the character of the food."⁵

An examination of the recruiting statistics for the Army for the years 1891-1902 shows a progressive increase in the numbers of men rejected for loss or decay of teeth. The figures are 10.88 per 1,000 in 1891, rising to 26 per 1,000 in 1898, 42.26 per 1,000 in 1902.⁶

It must be remembered, however, in examining these figures, that the men accepted were not necessarily in possession of a complete dentition of sound teeth, but that they had either the minimum or more than the

¹ *Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration (1904) Report*, p. 99, Appendix.

² Report (1904) quoted above.

³ *Ibid.* ⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 8. See also confirmatory evidence of Sir Lauder Brunton, Vol. II, p. 110.

⁶ *Ibid.*

STATISTICS OF REJECTIONS AMONG APPLICANTS FOR ARMY DURING 12 YEARS¹

Cause of Rejection.	Ratio per 1,000 Rejected.												
	1891.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.	1900.	1901.	1902.	
Under Chest-measure-													
ment	93·03	95·90	108·55	110·27	126·38	139·64	89·44	73·88	65·84	59·84	49·88	56·72	
Defective Vision	40·35	42·35	41·51	42·90	39·88	40·72	41·15	42·64	41·99	36·42	35·84	39·23	
Under Weight	32·47	27·62	39·99	39·61	36·58	35·95	45·58	34·82	33·84	28·52	25·15	21·72	
Under Height	26·76	32·71	33·24	28·67	28·72	28·77	24·86	21·79	20·21	15·18	13·56	11·59	
Imperfect Constitution													
and Debility	18·40	9·87	9·47	5·00	3·57	4·44	4·45	5·49	5·82	4·94	3·36	3·91	
Diseases of Veins	16·39	16·24	17·11	15·84	15·85	15·72	15·42	15·74	14·22	11·69	13·98	12·30	
Diseases of Heart	16·06	13·87	17·74	19·62	20·71	18·76	17·67	17·26	15·69	13·15	16·74	17·33	
Defects of Lower Ex-													
trimities	15·57	17·09	14·40	17·44	18·16	18·14	18·12	17·72	13·98	10·53	10·35	12·27	
Varicocle	12·93	11·85	12·85	14·25	12·28	13·07	13·07	12·29	12·16	11·21	13·89	12·59	
Flat Feet	11·04	9·83	12·45	14·71	13·16	17·81	16·79	12·24	12·31	9·02	11·66	12·44	
Loss or Decay of Teeth .	10·88	14·56	15·33	16·26	17·95	19·75	24·16	26·34	25·29	20·02	26·70	49·26	

¹ Taken from the Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration (1904), Appendix.

minimum allowed. In the Navy, for instance, in 1902 men were rejected if, when they were under 17 years of age, they had more than seven teeth deficient or decayed, and when they were over 17 years of age, if they had more than ten teeth deficient or decayed. Now in 1902 the Army requirements were less exacting in this respect than the Navy.

There is a suspicion of degeneration also in the following facts :

In 1902, of 6,169 lads who offered themselves at the Royal Marine Recruiting Offices for the Royal Navy and Royal Marines, 1,686, or 27·3 per cent., were rejected as unfit. Of the lads, however, who desired to enter Greenwich Hospital and join the Navy, just under 33 per cent. were rejected. Now the extraordinary feature of these last rejections is that the lads admitted to Greenwich Hospital *must be the sons of former seamen*; which seems to point to the conclusion that the lads were not the men that their fathers were.¹ And the First Lord of the Admiralty observed that the statistics were far from including all those who applied, "as a very large percentage were turned away by the recruiting sergeants for some physical deformity, such as defective teeth, without being brought before the medical officers at all."²

In the *Contemporary Review* of January, 1902, Sir Frederick Maurice stated that out of 5 men who wished to enlist, 2 ultimately remained in the Army as effective soldiers, and that it followed from this that 60 per cent. of men wishing to be soldiers were unfit for military service. Again, however, this 60 per cent. did not represent the total number of rejections, as thousands were turned away by the recruiting sergeants before coming in front of the medical inspectors. And in 1902 the Inspector-General of Recruiting reported that, "the one subject that causes anxiety as regards recruiting,

¹ See A. W. Smyth, *Op. cit.*, p. 20.

² *Ibid.*, p. 20.

is the gradual deterioration of the physique of the working classes from which the bulk of the recruits must always be drawn.”¹

In the Director-General's Memorandum sent to the Committee on Physical Deterioration, there is an interesting table, giving the causes for rejection of applicants for the Army during 12 years, 1892-1902. (See table, p. 190.) But in examining it the reader should note not only the steady increase of certain defects, but, where there is an apparent decrease, he should bear in mind that the standard has probably been lowered. For instance, in 1895 the standard height was 5 ft. 6 in. This was lowered to 5 ft. 3 in. in 1883, and 5 feet in 1900.

In 1901 no fewer than 593·4 per 1,000 were under the old standard height of 5 ft. 6 in., and 511·8 were under the chest measurement of 34 inches, which was the minimum in 1883.²

In 1871, 159·4 per 1,000 were under 8 stone 8 lb.

In 1901, 325 per 1,000 were under 8 stone 8 lb.³

According to Sir Arthur Newsholme, there was an increase in the number of rejections between 1860 and 1886. The figures he gives are :

1860-64 (inclusive), of 32,324 recruits 371·7 per 1,000 were rejected.

1882-86 (inclusive), of 132,563 recruits 415·6 per 1,000 were rejected.⁴

And Sir Arthur Newsholme quotes the late Director-General of the Army Medical Department, as having said : “ The masses, from whom the army recruits are chiefly taken, are of an inferior physique to what they were 25 years ago.”

Everything possible was said and done by the optimists, when these facts and figures first began to cause concern in 1902, in order to allay anxiety and to make it appear

¹ *Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration*, Appendix, p. 96.

² A. W. Smyth, *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Vital Statistics*, p. 552.

that while things were undoubtedly bad, there was no cause for alarm, so long as *progressive physical deterioration* could still by hook or by crook be shown to be a matter of doubt. And the consequence was, nothing was done.

Finally, the Great War came, and the recruiting statistics of only one portion of the large Army that was mustered, revealed that the physique of the nation had gone from bad to worse.

Far from Sir Frederick Maurice's estimate of 60 per cent. of unfitness in the nation being an exaggeration, it was now found that 64-65 per cent. was the actual figure, and those who in 1902 had found reasons to cast doubt upon Sir Frederick Maurice's so-called "alarmist" conclusions, were brought face to face with facts they could no longer deny.

The Report issued by the Ministry of Health refers to the physical condition of 2,425,184 men of military age who were examined as possible recruits for the Army during one of the last years of the war, and it gives the result of the examination as follows :

871,769 were placed in Grade I.

546,276 were placed in Grade II.

756,859 were placed in Grade III.

250,280 were placed in Grade IV.

Thus 36 per cent., or, approximately, only one in three, attained the normal standard. The remaining 64-65 per cent. failed to do so.

Between 22 and 23 per cent. were placed in Grade II.

Between 31 and 32 per cent. were placed in Grade III. (These may be regarded as the C3 men of the Army nomenclature.)

And a little more than 10 per cent. were graded permanently unfit.

Furthermore, in order to meet the kind of objection which the optimists had advanced against previous records of a less alarming kind, the Report contains the following significant passage : " It seems probable that

the men examined during the year under review may be regarded in the aggregate as fairly representing the manhood of military age of the country in the early part of the twentieth century, from the standpoint of health and physique, and that deductions, founded upon the observations made at the medical examinations of these men, *may be legitimately looked upon as a trustworthy criterion of the national health of the period.*"¹

Thus in recruiting from the whole nation, 64-65 per cent. were found inferior to standard. And, when Sir Frederick Maurice, sixteen years previously, had declared that 60 per cent. of the men presenting themselves for admission into the Army had to be rejected, the optimists, among whom were many medical men, had replied that his figures only represented one section of the nation, and that probably the worst; for "it was the men of unskilled labourer class who could not find work, who chiefly offered themselves as recruits."²

But the worst aspect of these figures can be revealed not only by the pages of the Report itself, but by men like myself who had to deal with the recruits *who were found fit for service*. I challenge any officer who was on the Western Front, whether in the artillery or infantry, to deny that the men we used to get as reinforcements, even as early as the autumn of 1916, were often among the poorest specimens of manhood we had ever seen—dull-witted, delicate, toothless, and often rheumatismal. Thousands of these men are taking war-disability pensions to-day, who ought never to have crossed the water, who only crossed it in order to be invalided home again, and their number should be added to the number given for total rejections. This would increase the percentage of unfitness far beyond 65 per cent., but it would give a much truer picture of the nation's health at the time of the war.

Mr. Lloyd George, in a speech at Manchester on

¹ The italics are mine.—A. M. L.

² For more recent recruiting statistics, see Appendix.

September 12, 1918, said he hardly dared to tell his audience what the figures were, and added that "the number of Grade II and Grade III men throughout the country was prodigious."¹ He characterized the revelations he was making as "appalling"; and, indeed, he was not exaggerating.

At last, it seemed as if the nation were to be made aware of the price it was paying in bodily vigour and beauty, for its industrialism, its excessive urbanization,² its false values, and its lethal humanitarianism. But once more, nothing radical was done. The multiplication of medical services could not be expected to improve matters, as long as medicine remained what it was, and the chief causes of degeneration were left unmodified. And the consequence is, every possible source of mischief is just as flourishing as it always was before the war, and everything points to further physical deterioration.

Stopping and filling the teeth of school children, distributing spectacles among them, and providing the optimum of conditions for the defectives, the cripples and the insane, does not even approach the root of the trouble, nor does the steadily increasing supply of artificial aids—whether purgatives,³ spectacles, false teeth, surgical appliances or what not—to adults, represent any improvement in our means of combating the ills which these aids are supposed to relieve. And until the problem of progressive physical deterioration is faced more or less in the way outlined in the last section of this book, no improvement can be expected. But deeply rooted evils require drastic remedies, applied perseveringly over

¹ See *The Times*, September 13, 1918.

² For a searching inquiry into the changes which originally brought about our present condition, and the metamorphosis of the Englishman, from a healthy, vigorous, intelligent being, into a creature seriously below standard, see my *Defence of Aristocracy*.

³ See Sir Arthur Keith in the *Lancet* of November 21, 1925 (p. 1,048): "We have only to consult the pages of the medical Press, to listen to the tales which reach our ears daily, to note the ever-growing demand for patent purgatives."

long periods of time, and it is extremely doubtful whether the nation can now be brought to that attitude of courage and determination, which will enable it to adopt some of the necessary but unpleasant measures of reform dictated by the extreme danger in which it stands.

Meanwhile the casualties from cancer, insanity, diseases of the circulatory system, and diabetes continue to increase every year. And here alone, quite apart from the facts adduced above, we find further proof of progressive physical deterioration.

Even allowing for greater accuracy in diagnosis, and the fact that longevity is increasing, and therefore multiplying the numbers of those susceptible to the disease, the figures for cancer reveal a very substantial absolute increase, the gravity of which seems to be generally recognized.

There is a steady rise in the toll per million living, from 313 in 1853 to 1,267 in 1923, and the period from 1900 to 1923 alone shows an increase of 436 per million. Occasionally, as in 1919 and 1920, there is a slight improvement, amounting to a reduction of about 50 per million; but on the whole the rise is a steady one, unrelieved by any mitigating figure.

The increase in idiocy and lunacy has likewise been steady, and in 66 years has amounted to 15.42 per 1,000 living. In 1859 we had 18.53 per 10,000 of our population suffering from some kind of lunacy, idiocy or mental unsoundness, and in 1925 we had 33.95. In very few of the years in this interval is any improvement to be seen, and in some years the figure rises, as in 1913, 1914 and 1915, to 37.21, 37.35, and 37.69 respectively.

As usual, much has been said and done to mitigate the gravity of these figures and to try to prove that the increase is only relative. It has been pointed out that lunatics live a long time, and therefore that the statistics must show an increase as the years go on. It has also been pointed out that better means of diagnosing mental trouble has swelled the numbers of those placed under

care. There are many doctors, however, whose experience has associated them chiefly with asylums for the insane, who are emphatic in the belief that the increase of insanity is absolute, and not accounted for by the causes given above, and among these medical men I would mention Dr. Richard Legge, Dr. W. F. Farquharson, Dr. P. W. Macdonal, Dr. J. Ireland, and Dr. Robert Jones, whose evidence before the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration is well worth examining.

The diseases of the circulatory system, again, show an increase from 769 per million in 1853 to 1,926 per million in 1924, with a steady rise all through that interval. And these figures which I obtained from the Parliamentary Papers containing the Reports of the Registrar-General for Births, Deaths and Marriages, are more or less confirmed by Sir Arthur Newsholme.¹

Sir Arthur Newsholme also gives the following interesting table, showing the increase in diabetes per million living,² and although I have not yet been able to confirm his figures from the original records, his general accuracy is a sufficient guarantee of their trustworthiness :

DIABETES PER MILLION OF POPULATION.						
	1861-70.	1871-80.	1881-90.	1891-1900.	1901-10.	1911-20.
Males . . .	43	54	74	90	104	135
Females . . .	21	28	46	64	84	117

There is a mass of other evidence, which I should like to quote. But I think for the purposes of my claim, I have made an adequate display of facts. It is interesting, for instance, to hear a careful observer, like Mr. Fosbroke, the Medical Officer of Health to the Worcestershire County Council, when speaking of the deterioration of rural populations, declare that "30 years ago it was the commonest thing for a labourer to carry

¹ See *Vital Statistics*, p. 372, where diseases of the blood-vessels are given as 874 per million in 1906 and 1,097 per million in 1920.

² *Ibid.*, p. 373.

two and a quarter cwt. of corn up a ladder," and that "now you very seldom see it"—a fact, apparently, which is confirmed by farmers.

A good deal of evidence of this kind might be advanced ; but, in the end, it would only constitute repetitive confirmation of the main facts I have established, and it would in no way alter my conclusion. For, however much I might be able to multiply the testimony of individuals in support of my claim regarding progressive physical deterioration, such is the prejudice aroused among the optimists by the mere mention of such a claim, that statistical data alone will convince them.

But these statistical data I think I have given, and I shall now leave the subject and proceed to the discussion of those other forms of degeneracy which, though inseparable from physical degeneracy, are usually considered apart.

Before doing this, however, there is just one individual authority whom I should like to quote in my support—an authority whose prestige is sufficiently great to command universal respect, and with whose words I may very well conclude the evidence given in this chapter. I refer to Sir Arthur Keith, F.R.S., who, in an address *On the Nature of Man's Structural Imperfections*, delivered at the Royal Society of Medicine, November 16, 1925, referred to many questions already touched upon, and to one question to which I shall allude later. Among other things Sir Arthur said :

"Seven years ago I made an elaborate comparison between 50 of these ancient skulls, 25 of which were adjudged to be those of men and 25 of women, with equal numbers of individuals who had lived in England during the last two centuries. In only three of the 50 ancient skulls did the upper and lower teeth fail to meet in an edge-to-edge bite ; in all of the 50 modern skulls the bite was of the overlapping or scissors type. Our teeth are in an abiotrophic state ; the failure of the wisdom teeth or third molars to form, or to erupt

if they are formed, is but one symptom of this abiotrophic change; it affects crown, cusp, and root development. In the 50 ancient skulls, instead of 100 upper wisdom teeth, there were only 82, 13 being absent from non-development and 5 from non-eruption. In the 50 modern skulls, instead of 100 upper wisdom teeth, there were only 59; 30 of these were absent from non-development and 11 from non-eruption. Such evidence shows that although abiotrophic changes had overtaken the dental system of the Western European as early as the Neolithic period, yet these changes have been accelerated during the more recent centuries. Dental abscesses were nearly as common in the ancient skulls as in the modern; carious teeth, on the other hand, were three times more frequent in modern skulls than in the ancient.¹

“In not one of the 50 ancient skulls was the palate contracted, whereas in the 50 modern skulls there were 13 in which this condition was present to a recognizable degree—in more than half of them to a marked degree. No matter which stratum of our population we make observations on, we shall find that every fourth or fifth child or adult we examine possesses a palate which, compared with the older type, may be described as both deformed in shape and reduced in size. I have never seen this defect and irregularity of palatal growth except in skulls from cemeteries of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It may be thought that this irregular growth with reduction in the size of the palate, and the defects in the formation of the jaws and face which usually accompany them, are merely the results of the soft and highly prepared kinds of foods we eat; with such a dietary the teeth, jaws and chewing muscles are deprived of the work which fell to them in more primitive times. That this is not the true explanation is proved by this fact. When children are fed, clothed and exercised exactly alike all are not affected; only some of them

¹ *The Lancet*, November 21, 1925, p. 1,050.

develop irregularities of the palate and jaws. There is a special susceptibility to these imperfections in certain races and in certain families. ¹

“Amongst modern British people are to be seen various facial characters, particularly in the orbits, in the cheek-bones, and in the bony supports of the nose, which are never to be noted in the facial framework of people who lived in Britain during the pre-Norman period. When a continental cartoonist seeks to represent John Bull he always emphasizes these new facial characteristics. Such changes in the form of the facial bones, like contraction of the palate, which they usually accompany, are not the result of a nasal obstruction such as might be caused by enlarged adenoids or tonsils; the cause lies deeper. The incidence of irregularities in the growth of the face follow the same laws as hold for all abiotrophic structures such as the appendix, the sclerotic coat of the eye, the thymus, and the tonsil. Further research will likely prove that the disorders of growth which overtake all these structures are linked to a disturbed action of lymphocytes and of all the constituent elements of the lymphoid tissues.” ²

“I have touched only on the fringe of a great subject; I have left undiscussed the numerous imperfections and disharmonies which civilization has made manifest in structures concerned in the maintenance of posture, and in those which are concerned with the circulation of the blood and with the duties of respiration. I have said enough, I believe, to convince you that Metchnikoff was right when he declared that civilization had launched man on a great experiment.” ³

I shall refer again later on to Sir Arthur Keith's remarks about posture. For the present, however, I must pursue the subject of degeneration in the sphere of mind and character, and this I shall do in the next chapter.

Nevertheless, before closing this chapter, there remains

¹ *Lancet*, p. 1,050. ² *Ibid.*, pp. 1,050-51. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 1,051.

one question to be answered, and that is : how I propose to make good my implied claim, that whereas men have degenerated, women have so far managed to escape the worst consequences of this degeneration.

I do not deny that women must have degenerated *pari passu* with the degeneration of men. By means of masses of figures, which I have not quoted, I could easily show that male and female physical degeneration have been, as they might well have been expected to be, almost parallel. Besides, we have to remember that, apart from the suffrage movement, which was only an indirect and semi-conscious revolt against modern men as men, there has been no open revolt of women against their degenerate manhood. Now if women had not degenerated more or less equally with men, they would have found modern men so intolerable that they would have been forced openly to revolt against modern conditions, and against the men that modern conditions gave them. The fact that they have not done this, and have expressed their mild intolerance of modern men only by themselves insisting upon being granted so degenerate a privilege as the modern democratic vote, is sufficient evidence in itself of their degeneracy.

There are, however, one or two influences which have enabled women, so far, to escape some of the worst consequences of modern conditions which have overtaken men, and they are :

(a) The fact that men develop longer than women (*vide* opening chapters) and therefore bring the seeds of degeneration within them to greater maturity than women do.

(b) The fact that men have specialized in routine industrial and commercial duties longer than women, and have therefore undergone a longer schooling in besotment and physical depression than women have.

(c) The fact that, owing to man's rôle being the active one in sex, he is more adversely influenced than woman is by the power of Puritanical and Christian

values, based on sex-phobia,¹ and therefore that he has lost more of his wanton spirit and fire in sex than woman has.

(d) And, finally, that in a culture whose values and daily life are becoming more and more adapted to the requirements of one sex, the sex which is not favoured by the social trend must suffer more than the sex that is so favoured. The trend to-day is to approximate more and more to an emasculate or at least effeminate character, in occupation, values and tastes;² hence masculine men are either unadapted or eliminated, while women flourish.

But in this reply to an anticipated objection, I have forestalled some of the arguments that are to follow. I only made the reply with the view of temporarily allaying the reader's anxiety concerning a matter which I felt sure must be agitating him.

¹ The term "sex-phobia," here used by me for the first time to express that attitude of guilt, shame and condemnation towards the whole of the sex life, which is implicit in Christian teaching, is borrowed from the terminology of Captain George Pitt-Rivers. It will occur often again in this book as I find it a much too useful and comprehensive term to be dispensed with in referring to precisely that kind of morbid hostility to sex, which characterises those who have been reared in the Manichæan atmosphere of modern England and America.

² Sir Arthur Keith in *The Lancet* (November 21, 1925) remarks: "Modern civilization, so far as temperature is concerned, tends to make the human body a hot-house plant." (He might have added, "as far also as occupations are concerned.")

CHAPTER VIII

The Degeneracy of Modern Man— Part IV

The Degeneration of Mind and Character

IN the last chapter I advanced what evidence I have been able to find in support of a claim fiercely contested in certain quarters—the claim that progressive deterioration is a fact, and therefore that degeneration may be alleged of the population of England and Wales. The data dealt with, however, related chiefly to racial degeneration in the sense in which this is defined in Chapter VI.

We shall now be concerned with degeneration in a more narrow sense, that is to say, with that form of it which is confined more or less to one people, and what we propose to discuss, therefore, is the national degeneration of Englishmen in accordance with the definition already given.

Truth to tell, there is no such thing as national degeneration, or degeneration of a particular nation's mind and character, independent of racial degeneration or the degeneration of men's bodies from a standardized norm. If man is, as we believe, a psycho-physical whole, degeneration cannot display itself in his constitution and his functions, without also manifesting itself in his way of thinking, judging and feeling. In order, however, to pursue a method to which, though quite fashionable and unscientific, we have in Chapters VI and VII already committed ourselves, we shall now continue the examina-

tion of the degeneracy of the modern man as if it were possible to divide man into two parts—mind and body ; and, having dealt with the physical aspects of the problem, shall now, therefore, occupy ourselves with those evidences of national degeneracy which, because necessarily associated with mind and character, the modern world, under the influence of theological dualism, falsely distinguishes as “ psychological.”

The convenience of the distinction “ mind ” and “ body ” is readily admitted, not only for practical purposes, but also because of its deep hold upon modern thought. I should, however, like to emphasize my profound objection to the scientific validity of this accepted dichotomy, while pursuing the present investigation as if it were a reality. Nevertheless, the method will be seen to break down—that is to say, the frequency with which we shall be compelled to speak of psychological degeneracy in terms of the physical, will become sufficiently evident as the chapter advances, and I hope in the end to be able to show that any remedial measures I may recommend, must give equal attention to the body and psyche of man, and thus be directed at a psychophysical entity.

I propose to deal with the degeneration of the modern Englishman’s character and mind under the following aspects : (1) His attitude to religion, (2) his attitude to politics, (3) his attitude to art, (4) his attitude to sex, (5) his attitude to woman, and (6) his attitude to the child.

(1) The attitude of the modern Englishman to religion is the outcome of two influences, both of which are more or less recent. They are : (a) The decline of his positive self-feeling (to use an expression of Professor McDougall’s), which is displayed by a diminished feeling of inner riches and an actual diminution in the depth and plenitude of his self-confidence, resulting from an impoverished physique ; and (b) the tendency to reduce all religious questions to ethical or moral considerations. We shall consider these two influences together.

The profound and cultivated man of wanton spirits, whose sense of self is the outcome of healthy impulses springing from the abundant energy and serenity of his being, not only affirms his own self and the universe with every breath he takes, but, by the intimate knowledge he acquires of life through the intensity of his own vitality, he feels deeply at one with everything else that lives. The intensity of his feeling of life helps him to perceive, behind the external differences of living phenomena, that quality and power which unites him to them. The luxuriant profligacy of nature finds a reflection in his soul, but it also finds an answering note in his feelings. Profound enough not to be deceived by surfaces, he feels the dark mystery behind himself and the rest of life, and, what is more important, guesses at the truth that he himself cannot, any more than the daisy or the antelope, stand alone, or dispense with the power which is enveloped in that dark mystery. In fact he laughs to think that it can be possible for a man to be so foolish as to suppose that he stands "alone." If the daisy could think, it would know that it did not stand "alone." It would *know* how much it owed to the power behind phenomena. One must be very sick indeed, very remote from life, not to know this.

But the dark mystery behind himself and that life of which he is a part, challenges him to be its interpreter. Why?

Obviously because, to interpret it is to obtain a working hypothesis concerning his relation to it. And it is of the utmost importance for his orientation to obtain as correct an interpretation as possible. The Power behind life obviously must have a trend, an invisible trend that must be divined—felt. Falsely to interpret this Power, therefore, or not to interpret it at all, might be like spitting against the wind. One's contempt might simply get flung back in one's face.

He feels like a creature in mid-air, flying on the bosom of the clouds. About him there is an invisible force—

the wind, which, if he is a wise aviator, he will endeavour to associate with his effort. He recognizes that it can be his friend or his foe, according to how he understands or interprets it. If he knows its trend, it can be his staunch ally. If he knows not its trend, it can retard his progress, arrest him altogether, or shatter him in the abyss.

Having, with that portion of the mysterious power which he, as a living being, necessarily possesses, interpreted it and begun to understand it, he will, if he is sufficiently profound, feel the most solemn reverence for it. And, the more his experience confirms his first tentative interpretation, the more will his faith and his reverence increase. He will thus come to feel a personal relationship towards the invisible and mysterious power. If he has interpreted it correctly and experienced the help which it gives when it is properly understood, he will regard it as his secret ally, his strongest ally, his patron—nay, if he completely understands it, he will regard it, just as the daisy would regard it, as an indispensable associate in every act of life.

This is the root of true religious feeling. And to the extent to which such a man shares his interpretation with a group of his fellows, he belongs to a religion. He can hold his interpretation individually, or rather, he may think he holds it individually; but he becomes the member of a religion the moment many join him in reverencing the same invisible power, or, better still, the same invisible power as defined, or interpreted, by himself.

The profound man, the cultivated healthy man of to-day, still sees religion in this light. To him it is an attitude of mind which involves the reverence, worship, solicitation by prayer and thanking, of an invisible almighty power.

But—and this is the most important thing of all—it is only the profound man, with vigorous religious equipment, who can feel sufficiently vehemently, sufficiently dynamically, to move this invisible power, to set

it in motion, either by his worship or his supplication. It is as if he alone had the requisite originating force for his wishes or supplications to cause a perturbation on the immense surface of the great power's sensorium. For the mechanism of the successful prayer is the postulating of a possible desired development—a first premiss—vehemently and urgently before the invisible power; and, the invisible power being entirely deductive in its reasoning, then proceeds to complete the proposition, by adding the final premisses of the syllogism. This is fulfilment.¹

Confirmatory religious experience, therefore, can only be the privilege of the few in times of low physical tone, because the necessary dynamic force behind successful worship and prayer in such times is generally lacking.

But, in the absence of confirmatory experience, the shallow man abandons religion—hence the decline of religion in all decadent periods.

It is not everybody who *can* pray. And those who think they can but cannot, begin to doubt the existence of the invisible power. *N'est pas vigoureux qui veut*—therefore, *n'est pas religieux qui veut*.

The truly religious man conceives the performance of religion first of all as worship and then as prayer. And since experience constantly confirms him in his interpretation of the invisible power, he continues worshipping and praying all his days. Conduct, though important, is a secondary consideration in his religious outlook. It is felt as derivate and subsidiary. It has merely the relation to religion which steering has to direction. The more important element is obviously the knowledge of the direction.

Thus the advent of a new religion cannot multiply the number of people who can enjoy religious experiences. It does not necessarily swell the ranks of those who

¹ As this paragraph is most important for the understanding of what follows, and of religion in general, the reader is invited to look at it again if it gives him any difficulty.

can pray. It can only achieve these ends on a soil which consists of vigorously endowed, and profound personalities—creatures rejoicing in a strong physical basis to their lives, which lends them the essential dynamic power to be truly religious, and to move the unknown.

Thus, Christianity, by influencing the world dysgenically, and thereby multiplying the number of the physiologically botched, has done more to kill true religious feeling than to foster it. And modern disbelief, modern atheism, and modern religious indifference, which is not even found among savages, is really the result of the degeneration which the dysgenic values of Christianity, with its contempt for the body, have created.

We have said that religion is chiefly worship and prayer—worship and prayer performed with the conviction that there is such a thing as a personal relationship to the invisible power. Conduct is secondary.

Now what do we see about us in England to-day? Not only millions who are quite irreligious, or who feel no impulse to religion, but by their side millions of professing religionists, who nevertheless regard *conduct* as the chief consideration of the religious man.¹

Leaving aside the millions who are irreligious, and dismissing them with this conviction in our minds, that they are irreligious because they have not the physical stamina to be anything else, and certainly not the dynamic power to experience successful worship or prayer, let us now concentrate upon the so-called religious.

These, in this country, apart from 1,930,000 Catholics,²

¹ Nietzsche, who came from a long line of Protestant parsons, also believed, as an atheist, that conduct was the most important consideration of all.

² I exclude the Catholics, because there does not appear to be the same tendency among them to let the religious life degenerate into a mere concern about conduct. The number of Catholics given is taken from the *Statesman's Year-Book* for 1925, but the Authorized Catholic Directory estimates the number at 2,042,630, a difference of about 100,000 to the good for the Holy Catholic Church.

belong to the Church of England, to the Dissenters, or to that anomaly and foolish self-contradiction in terms, the Anglo-Catholics. Now the peculiarities of the Church of England, from my point of view, are, in the first place, that she is the part parent of Puritanism (the alleged "religion" which knows only conduct and morality—the religion for tradesmen, who must be kept from tampering with their scales); secondly, that her service consists much more of hymn-singing and sermonizing than does the Catholic Mass, and thirdly, that the spirit she has spread in the country is one which is prone to let questions of conduct loom too largely among religious ideas.

Let it be remembered that, not being a Christian myself, I cannot be suspected of being a partisan in discussing religious sects, and therefore beg the reader to believe that I speak quite objectively.

In the Church of England alone, I believe, has it been possible for certain congregations to have clamoured for, and to have been given "brighter services"—by brighter, meaning more entertaining, more snappy, more time-killing; and in the Church of England alone has interpretation of the invisible power fallen into a state of such chaos, owing to the wide disagreement of bishops and theologians, that really the only certain ground left is that dealing with morality or conduct.

It is possibly through the competition or influence of Nonconformity that the idea of the "bright service" has taken such a hold upon the Church of England—one hears of it not only in London but in almost every rural village—and the frequency with which one hears of churches filling when the singing is good and the vicar or rector is an interesting preacher, and of churches emptying when the service is dull and the preaching is tedious, points to the conclusion that true religious feeling, as I have defined it above, must fast be dying out. For, if the need to worship and to pray formed the main-spring of the attitude of these congregations, we should

never be told of the "bright service," nor should we overhear any disappointed complaints when the sermon had failed to "entertain."

In the Nonconformist communities, of course, things are even worse. There, in many cases the congregation cannot even endure set prayers—as if the form matters when the heart is full!¹—but prefer the excitement of listening while their spiritual leader performs ever greater feats of extempore supplication each Sunday. In Nonconformist communities, moreover, congregational singing and the sermon loom even more largely in the service than in the Church of England, and one frequently hears people expressing a preference for the Nonconformist service because of its excellent last item—the sermon. In particular churches and temples in the country, matters have progressed so far, that well-known people have been invited to speak from the pulpit in order, presumably, "to draw people to church"; and there has even been mention of dramatic and cinema performances.

Now it must be quite obvious that the spirit behind this development in our religious bodies is utterly irreligious, it is utterly foreign to religion as defined above. But it is only one of the many signs of the times, which point to the decay of religious feeling.

One more point must be mentioned about the Nonconformists, however, and that is the lack of reverence which characterizes their attitude to the invisible power, and which in itself is a conclusive proof of one of two things: either that they have not a true interpretation, or else that they are not sufficiently profound to understand it after having obtained it. This irreverence is shown in the pressing and vulgar familiarity of most Nonconformists towards their deity. They hobnob with him. They rub shoulders with him. They make one feel

¹ An example of this is the conventional "good morning" which can be uttered every day with complete fullness of heart by a loving child to its mother and *vice versa*.

they are breathing in his face. This refrain taken from a Nonconformist hymn-book is typical of the attitude :

“Tell mother I’ll be there,
Heaven’s joys with her to share,
This message, Darling Saviour, to her bear.”

—Jesus as messenger, as a darling bearer of private domestic communications.¹

The most convincing sign, however, of the decay of religious feeling is certainly the tendency on the part of the great majority to understand by religion a system of ethics. And the Ethical Society, whose services most of us know, is but an extreme development of this tendency.

The best proof we can get of the prevalence of this misunderstanding, and therefore absence, of religion, is to ask the average so-called religious Englishman what he understands by religion. He will immediately begin to recite a list of rules concerning one’s duty to one’s neighbour, to one’s children, to one’s charwoman, and to one’s tradespeople,² and probably conclude with the tag : “If one does one’s best to act fairly to all men—that is the best religion.”

One may acknowledge the nobility of the sentiment, without, however, committing the error of regarding a catalogue of such sentiments, however long and noble, as an adequate equipment for a truly religious mind. And yet, if you examine the average adult, even of the cultured class, in this country, on the nature of religion, this is the sort of thing you will be certain to hear.³

¹ See also the *Positive Methodist Hymnal*, no. 39 ; *The Methodist Hymn Book*, no. 166 ; *The Methodist Free Church Hymns*, no. 359. Also *A Complete Compendium of Revival Hymns*, no. 91 and *Salvation Army Music*, nos. 5 and 25.

² An excellent demonstration of this occurred not long ago when the *Daily Express* invited a number of English celebrities to contribute articles about their religion. More than three-quarters of the contributors were almost wholly concerned with moral precepts.

³ For instance, most readers will recall Matthew Arnold’s well-known lines in Chapter I, Part I, of *Literature and Dogma* : “And so, when we are asked, what is the object of religion ?—let us reply : *Conduct*. And

As I have already hinted, the Puritans are largely responsible for the prevalence of this development of the part at the expense of the whole, of ethics at the cost of religion, which is far more widespread than many might suppose. The Puritans, in their stupidity, and probably general grossness as well, were incapable of religious feeling. It was they, therefore, who very naturally were the first to introduce sermons lasting from one to three hours;¹ it was they who identified religion with a code of morality, and who failed to seize one single truth about genuine religious feeling.

But the chief cause of this degeneration of religious feeling into Church entertainment on the one hand, and ethical preoccupations on the other, must be sought in the physical decline which preceded and accompanied it. *For degenerate people, not having the dynamic force to experience contact with the invisible power either in worship or prayer, must in the end become either unbelievers and abandon religion altogether, or else display that misunderstanding of religion which makes them gravitate towards quasi-religious observances in the sense of ethics, entertainment, comfort, or a means of safety.* Some of the more shallow of the anti-Bolshevists of to-day even conceive Christianity as merely a useful weapon against anarchy.²

The decline of religion in England, therefore, must not be measured only by the number of those who now profess no religious beliefs whatsoever, and by the prevalence of that attitude towards the Church service which is common both among the Church of England

when we are asked further, what is conduct?—let us answer: Three-fourths of life." There are few Nonconformist or even Church of England divines who would take exception to this statement, while to the majority of laymen it seems to be the most profound wisdom.

¹ See on this point my *Defence of Aristocracy*, Chapter V.

² I say "the more shallow of the anti-Bolshevists" advisedly, because Bolshevism is the outcome of Christian values, the true descendant of Christian tradition in Europe. For a demonstration of this contention see my *False Assumptions of Democracy*, and also the next section on politics in this chapter.

and the Nonconformist congregations, but also by the increasing tendency observable among all classes and persuasions, to conceive religion as no more than a system of morals. And since the decline of religious feeling denotes, as I have shown, a loss of native strength, both of character and physique, the present state of religion in England is one of the most alarming signs of the times.

A counterpart to the loss of religious feeling is probably the equally widespread insistence upon "humour" in everything and in everybody. The characteristics of the religious—not the sanctimonious man—are, as I have said, that he is profound and dynamic. He takes life and himself seriously. Serious things are not the constant occasion for humorous allusions with him. He feels that while humour destroys the seriousness of a problem or a situation, it also defeats those who would earnestly try to face it. All great men have been serious in this way, and have taken themselves seriously. Had a modern English humorist been at Napoleon's, or Cæsar's, or Luther's elbow, all through the days of these men's hardest struggles, I have no doubt that he would have urged them not to take life or themselves "so seriously"; and by so doing he would, probably without knowing it, have tried to destroy their power. For to-day, the great crime, whether in society or in thought, is precisely to "take things and one's self too seriously." This plea for humour, which is on every one's lips, however, and is simply a confession of weakness, and of the conscious incapacity to do any good, no matter how seriously one may face the problem, is the antithesis of profundity and dynamic power. For humour masters a situation by turning it off into a laugh—that is to say, by leaving it alone and cracking a joke about it; whereas serious profundity does not leave a situation alone until it has mastered it. The combination in modern English life, of overmuch humour—humour everywhere—and overmuch muddle and lack of mastery everywhere, is sig-

nificant ; and it is not impossible that this latest and foolish craze in favour of humour is connected with the rarity of the religious man.

Not only he who insists on humour in serious things, but he also who is always humorous about serious things, is strongly to be suspected. For the man who comes forward with intricate and pressing problems and jokes about them, is at heart a coward, a man devoid of passion and passionate interests, who fears to be laughed at, if he reveal the seriousness say of a John the Baptist or a Savonarola, and therefore forestalls hilarity deliberately. There is not a joke in the whole of the New Testament. But Christ was a passionate and earnest thinker, and took his problem seriously.

Whether there is the relation which I suspect, between the loss of religious feeling and this ridiculous insistence upon humour on all occasions in modern England, it is not possible to decide ; but very passionate people certainly take themselves and life very seriously, and probably the popularity of humour may be due as much to the loss of passion as to the loss of religion. At all events, the loss of religious feeling, whatever may be its associations, is in itself a sufficiently grave matter from the point of view of the future. For no people ever did very great things, who was not religious, and no very great things have ever been possible without religion.

(2) The attitude of the modern Englishman to politics is the outcome of various influences : (a) A decline in the national character, through which it appears to be losing its traditional spirit of self-reliance and independence ; (b) A decline in culture, by which Englishmen are losing confidence in the desirability of their self-assertion ; (c) The spread of Bolshevistic or levelling ideas, based upon values which have been wrenched from Christian doctrine, and thereby divorced from their associated ideas in that religion ; (d) The subordination of the intellectual to the emotional appeal ; and (e) The decline of liberty through the inevitable des-

potism of majorities, which results from the democratic régime.¹

We will discuss the influences separately.

(a) The decline in the national character is probably due, in the first place, to the general decline in health and vitality. The robust ancestor of the modern Englishman, who was feared all over the Continent as a bowman, a pioneer, and a statesman, was bred in an atmosphere which Henri de Tourville has termed "particularist," by which he meant that individual, as distinct from corporate, enterprise was the rule.² This spirit of individual enterprise, which was necessarily also a spirit of self-reliance, led to the system of independent estates, and is traceable still in the small self-contained houses, with their small patches of private garden, that can be seen all over England. It is also traceable in many of the traits of the modern English, particularly their readiness to retort "Mind your own business," if you invade their private sphere either with sympathy or with meddlesomeness. It is a spirit which made every one able and anxious to manage his own affairs, and led to the development of robust and self-helping natures. Under its influence, personal liberty was associated with the minimum amount of dependence on and interference with one's neighbour.

It is this spirit of "particularism," or self-reliance, which made the first members of Parliament reluctant to assemble, and caused the constituencies of many districts to display marked apathy or hostility towards the notion of sending a member to the House. To speak of England as the "Mother of Parliaments" is to be guilty of the grossest injustice towards the true spirit of the Anglo-Saxon peoples. The idea of a Parliament was essentially a foreign one, introduced

¹ The degeneration which is the inevitable outcome of democratic institutions I have dealt with in great detail in my *Defence of Aristocracy*.

² For a searching analysis of the origin of this spirit among the early English, see the excellent book *The Mastery of Life*, by Dr. G. T. Wrench.

from a foreign land by a man of foreign blood.¹ The very word betrays the foreignness of the idea it represents. It meant corporate action on the largest possible scale, and was moreover opposed to the Anglo-Saxon genius, because it involved what the spirit of enterprise can least abide—centralization, central control, and an infringement, through taxation, of the liberty of the subject, for the purposes of a central, interfering and co-ordinating power.

Speaking of the early Parliaments, before the fifteenth century, Mr. Edward Jenks, says :² “ The counties hated it, because they had to pay the wage of their members. The clergy hated it, because they did not want to acknowledge the secular authority. The boroughs hated it, because the parliamentary boroughs had a higher scale of taxation than their humbler sisters. And all hated it, because a Parliament invariably meant taxation. The members themselves disliked the odium of consenting to taxes, which their constituents would have to pay. Only by the most stringent pressure of the Crown were Parliaments maintained during the first century of their existence. . . . The notion that Parliaments were the result of a spontaneous democratic movement can be held only by one who has not studied, ever so slightly, the facts of history.”

This spirit of self-reliance and particularism also accounts for the extraordinary feats of arms performed by small English armies on the Continent—Crécy, Poitiers and Agincourt, where the English were respectively one to four, one to six, and one to fifteen of the enemy. And the battles of the Peninsular War revealed the same characteristics in Wellington and his army hundreds of years later. It is this spirit which accounts for the ability the best Englishman of all classes have

¹ Simon de Montfort, who called the first Parliament in 1265, was a Frenchman, son of Simon IV of Montfort d’Amaury (Normandy) and Alice of Montmorency.

² *A History of Politics*, p. 127.

shown to stand alone against great odds, and to use their own judgment in a moment of crisis and to act upon it. The English pioneers who founded and kept our colonies were of the same fibre with that great man who, in the thrill of the battle of Copenhagen, deliberately put his glass to his blind eye, in order that he might not read the signal of his commanding officer, Admiral Sir Hyde Parker, to "leave off action"!

It is this spirit of particularism and individual enterprise that may be said to have made the British Empire, and although it fell into disrepute after the Industrial Revolution, owing to the brutal cruelties to which this Revolution led,¹ it still remains the noblest of manly qualities, and the attribute of the noblest of animals.

But, obviously, the essential prerequisite for the maintenance of such an independent spirit is a sound and robust constitution. A sick lion cannot feel confidently self-reliant, a debilitated lion cannot embark alone upon a perilous enterprise. And that is why—although we may deeply deplore the many changes that have come over the English people of late, so that they seem from year to year to clamour for ever more and more corporate action, more and more linking of arms, mutual assistance, mutual dependence, greater centralization, and less and less distributed and decentralized power—that is why we need not altogether despair; because it is just possible that, in these changes, we are confronted only by such modifications of character as inevitably follow lowered vitality and debilitated health, and not by a permanent loss of quality resulting from a complete metamorphosis of the Englishman's nature. At least this is a possible explanation of the unpleasant phenomena witnessed during the last fifty or more years, and one that, in any case, offers a small ray of hope for the future.

¹ It should always be borne in mind that the worst aspects of the Industrial Revolution were no more essential to the spirit of self-reliance than gas warfare is essential to international strife.

But there are, alas, other influences, besides those of ill-health and physical deterioration, which have been conspiring to undermine the character of the English people, and not the least of these is probably miscegenation.

It has often been said that the people who lost Rome were not the same as those who built up her greatness. Owing to the extensive mixture of Roman blood with that of Orientals and aliens of all kinds, investigators like Otto Sieck, for instance, declare that the Romans were ultimately completely transformed, no longer the same race, and that it was a rabble of mongrels who witnessed the Decline and Fall of their Great Empire. In this way they are supposed to have been punished for the enslavement of their fellow-men from all over the world, because, owing to the manumission of imported slaves, these ultimately bred extensively with the Roman people.

But to-day we have no slavery—at least none of the kind that the Romans had. We have, however, open doors. And the fact that thousands of foreigners from all nations have for centuries been allowed to settle in this country and to inter-marry with its people; the fact, moreover, that through democratic influences, inter-class, inter-trade, and inter-tradition marriages occur almost habitually throughout the nation, may have, and undoubtedly has done, a great deal to modify the native character. Whether the effects of this influence are so far-reaching as to justify us in interpreting such phenomena as the unemployment dole, and the rise of socialism, as the outcome of miscegenation, may, however, be questioned; for the English people have hitherto shown a remarkable capacity for assimilation, and it is probable that even now, if health and vigour were restored to them, that their native self-reliance would recover its strength. Nevertheless, it is possible that miscegenation has played a part in their metamorphosis, and to this extent it ought to be suspected and guarded against in the future.

Other influences are, of course, the lowering of intelligence and high spirits, through the besotting drudgery of industrialism and the cultivation of pack and gregarious qualities through the exorbitant development of towns.

(b) The decline in culture which has robbed Englishmen of the confidence they once had in the desirability of their own self-assertion, must be obvious to all. In view of the impossibility of demonstrating or upholding the proposition that all men are equal, and the need therefore of admitting that there must be varying degrees of desirability between races and peoples, it is plain that in a limited area, like the terrestrial globe, a superior race or people must have the uncontested right of spreading at the cost of an inferior race or people. This right was assumed and acted upon by the English, as by many another European people, and there is undoubtedly an enormous amount to be said in favour of it, despite all that sentimentalists and humanitarians may argue to the contrary. When the first colonies were founded, however, and even as late as Charles II, we still had a magnificent culture, a splendid character and a glorious spirit to give to the world. Men were still robust and vigorous. They still believed in themselves and were capable of profound feelings. Shakespeare had been dead hardly forty years; Charles I hardly twenty. Seers like Hobbes and Shaftesbury, and artists like Inigo Jones and Milton, had only just produced their masterpieces. The craftsmanship that we know of the period—no matter in what department—displays taste, conscientiousness, quality, lasting power. Charles I himself, as I have already shown,¹ foresaw the worst evils to which we were then tending, and lost his life through doing his utmost to direct the nation along another path. An Englishman could then hold his head high, and feel that in spreading his culture he was spreading something wholly worthy of acceptance.

¹ See my *Defence of Aristocracy*.

But now, where is the Englishman of gentle susceptibilities who can feel that he is conferring anything but a bane, even on totally uncivilized nations, by introducing among them our culture of factory chimneys, mass production, inflated urban populations, non-qualitative valuations, and lowered vitality? He has only to look about him in order to feel those same doubts and qualms which have given rise within the Empire itself to the associations and movements whose one aim it is to protect the savage from the influence of modern civilization. He has only to read the records of the last hundred years, to be found among our Parliamentary papers, in order to question whether he any longer has the right to impose his mark on one more square inch of the world's territory.¹

Justified as his doubts may be to-day, however, they could not always have been so justified; for the highest warrant that men can have for wars of aggression and for schemes of Empire, is precisely the superior culture which by these means can be conferred upon peoples whose culture is still brutal or barbarian.

Now it is unquestionably the loss of this highest warrant that has robbed England of her former confidence in her right to self-assertion; and the result is seen not only in the Little Englander spirit, but also in that attitude of mind, largely socialistic and democratic,

¹ Curious confirmation of this view has come to hand in the report of an address delivered by Sir W. Arbuthnot Lane to the London Clinical Society on February 18, 1926. Dealing with the question, *Has Civilization Failed?* Sir William said: "This is a question which always arises when one sees the disastrous effect that association with the white race has upon communities that have for hundreds of centuries had a happy, vigorous life. Can anyone feel that we have conferred the slightest physical benefit on any native race to which we have first sent our merchant seamen and later our missionaries? The former have taught them to drink to excess and have decimated them with diseases, while the latter have altered their habits, teaching them a moral code, which invariably results in their degeneration and degradation." Much more follows in a similar vein, but unfortunately it cannot all be quoted here. (See *Daily Press*, February 19, 1926.)

which wishes for nothing more urgently than the disintegration of the British Empire, and never loses an opportunity of exposing the injustices, the crimes, and the violent beginnings of this Empire, whenever it is a question of providing for its consolidation and prosperity.

(c) The spread of Bolshevistic or levelling ideas, which is the last product of communistic and socialistic teaching, follows naturally from the tendency, in both believers and unbelievers, to regard the morality taught by Christianity as something which may be separated from the rest of the creed, and used as a weapon in a class struggle. The ideas so deeply embedded in Christian teaching—the equality of all men, liberty of conscience, the desirability of “unselfishness,” the undesirability of riches, the notion that there is such a thing as a universal and imminent justice, which is violated when one child is born in a slum and another in Park Lane; the idea that it is noble and virtuous to sacrifice the greater for the less, and the belief that it is our duty to do unto others as we would that they should do unto us (a credo for busybodies who wish to use violence in order to interfere with their neighbour)¹—all enable the Bolshevik, who may disbelieve utterly in Christian dogma and the rest of the teaching of the Church, to confront his fellows with lofty and moral reason for appropriating their property. He uses moral arguments, which he knows that they, through their traditional Christianity, must believe in as wholly as he does; and he would defeat them in a trice, were it not for the fact that self-interest arms them against him. As Mr. Arthur Ponsonby says, because bishops refuse to exhort their wealthy colleagues in the House of Lords to sell all they have and give to the poor, that is no reason why laymen should not be more logical.²

¹ For a refutation of these principles see my *False Assumptions of Democracy*.

² See *Religion and Politics*, where the author identifies Socialism with Christianity.

Because the Bolshevists in Russia persecuted the Church and molested priests—just as the French Revolutionaries did before them—a large number of the more naïf anti-Bolshevists in England, including Mrs. Nesta Webster, hastily concluded that they could not be animated by Christian principles. But, because one uses traditional and useful elements of Christian morality in a fierce class struggle, one is not necessarily committed to the Thirty-nine Articles, or to a belief in the Virgin Birth. In fact, one might be an atheist, and still use the cry of equality and immanent justice, in order to stir up class strife. If it is right to do unto others as you would that they should do unto you, why should we not regard it as our loftiest duty to relieve the rich man of those riches which will make it difficult for him to enter the Kingdom of Heaven? ¹ If God “hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise . . . and the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and the base things of the world, and things which are despised . . . to bring to nought things that are,” ² why should it not be my holy duty, says the Bolshevist, to be one of the instruments in the realization of this plan?

The fact that Bolshevism, like Communism and Socialism, is essentially the offspring of Christian teaching, is surely the most obvious of truths. It is demonstrated by the history of the early Christians themselves, who, before the establishment of the Church's power, were communistic and anti-social. And the difference between the revolutionary of ancient Athens and the revolutionary of to-day is precisely this, that the former was a plain honest coveter of his neighbour's goods, whose

¹ It is all very well for Christian divines to argue that the words do not warrant this extreme application; but who is to say what they really mean, when once the morality of Christianity has been divorced from the remainder of the Church's teaching? Besides are there not a few eminent Church of England divines who acknowledge the close relationship of their religion to Socialism?

² 1 Corinthians i. 27, 28.

acquisitiveness was gratified by force, while the latter is a moralist who comes forward with lofty reasons for robbing us, and who harangues us about the equality of men, eternal justice, the duties of "unselfishness," and our brotherhood in Christ, before he relieves us of our savings. Now these arguments are both persuasive and insidious, because if we believe in the morality he preaches—and most of us have been taught it all our lives—we are threatened with defeat at the first encounter, and can only fall back upon the primitive instinct of self-preservation (self-interest) to resist him.

In this sense Bolshevism is Christianity carried into politics, and we have only to read the history of early uprisings, like that organized by John Ball, the famous English priest of the fourteenth century, who led the great peasant insurrection and preached equality on Christian grounds, in order to see the connection.¹

Thus, in combination with the loss of self-reliance, the influence of Christian morality gives us Bolshevism, and leads to the desire to live corporately, or by "unselfish" mutual support and dependence, instead of by the old virile qualities of self-help and individual enterprise.

Coupled with Christian teaching as a whole, I do not deny that the morality of Christianity, even with its exaltation of "unselfishness," may be maintained in a subordinate and orderly position. But when once it becomes divorced, as it has done, either through the work of non-professing Christians, or fanatics, from the dogma and the Church discipline, it merely supplies dangerous devices for revolutionary banners, and is the more difficult to confront because those who oppose it are already believers in its truth.

Again here, therefore, we find that the loss of true religion, and the fastening of attention upon the morality

¹ It was John Ball who composed the couplet :
When Adam delved and Eve span
Who was then the gentleman ?

of the Christian religion, through loss in stamina and profundity, give us elements in the population which, politically, are difficult to deal with ; and as the only remedy is the refutation of the morality itself—which no official politician dares to undertake—the position is a hopeless one.

The tenets of Communism and Socialism, like much of the morality of Christianity, are easily refuted, and their foolishness is almost transparent.¹ As long, however, as the masses consist of people whose general intelligence has been lowered through generations of besotting drudgery, it is not likely that they will be able to detect the gross errors in the socialistic proposals of reform, particularly as these happen to appeal to their acquisitiveness, their indolence, and their earliest notions concerning divine morality.

What makes matters worse is that we no longer possess a body of men in the nation, who are sufficiently profound and intellectual to present a programme of ideas and reform, which can hope for long to resist the school of thought in which the masses are now reared. The Conservative Party, in fact, is as bankrupt in the matter of ideas as the Royalist Party was in France in 1793. The men constituting this party have suffered almost as much as the masses from the evil conditions of the last two centuries. For whereas they may have escaped some of the more besotting occupations of the proletariat, their long specialization in routine pursuits, their ill-health, their Puritanism, and their exclusive devotion to sport and unintellectual exercises, have so lowered their stamina and intelligence, that England now looks round her Empire in vain for the great leader, the great ruler-genius, who will give her vast organization a new mission, a new unity.

I shall deal later with the influences that have operated more especially in reducing the intelligence of the

¹ See my refutation of them in various of my works, but particularly in *The False Assumptions of Democracy*.

governing classes ;¹ but for the moment, all that is necessary is to point out that the unfortunate coincidence of an absence of great men on the one hand, and the conditions analysed above on the other, have made us politically weaker and more unstable than we have ever been before. Muddle is multiplied everywhere. Incapacity and its fruits are apparent at every turn, and so bad have things become that the masculine sex has long lost its prestige and its ascendancy. Our womenfolk who despise us for our incompetence, imagine that, because we are failing and have failed, they have automatically acquired the ability and genius that we have lost. But this too is an illusion. And the advent of women into the governing spheres of the nation will only increase the chaos already created by masculine degeneracy. If, however, during the next hundred years, efforts are not made to restore some of its old physical and intellectual vitality to the English people, both above and below, nothing but disaster may be expected.

(d) The subordination of the intellectual to the emotional appeal arises from two causes—the effeminacy of men, and their increasing besotment. The most impartial observers of human nature, hitherto, and even thinkers as friendly to women as Thomas Henry Buckle,² and Herbert Spencer,³ have expressed the view that the emotional reaction in women is more potent in determining their judgment than the exercise of the intellect—that is to say, that the subconscious or conscious wish colours the judgment of women, very much more than

¹ One acute and thoroughly expert thinker on this question, Disraeli, knew what was at the root of the decline of the governing classes. In *Sybil, or The Two Nations* (Longmans, Green & Co., 1889), p. 123, he says: "There is no longer, in fact, an aristocracy in England, for the superiority of the animal man is an essential quality of aristocracy." See also p. 327-32.

² See his *Influence of Women on the Progress of Knowledge*.

³ See his *Principles of Psychology*, 3rd Edition, Vol. II, para. 493, pp. 535-6.

it does in men. In my *Woman : A Vindication*, I gave as an instance of this the experience I once had in a debate, in which I was opposed by a number of ardent female Feminists. It was quite impossible for me to make them admit that Dame Ethel Smythe's music was in any way inferior to that of Beethoven or Bach. Their wish to think the female artist as great as, if not greater than, the best men, completely deprived their intellect of any chance of co-operating in forming their judgment. Their emotions alone prevailed.

It would, however, no longer be correct to say that this trait was now confined to women ; for to anyone with any experience of male audiences and male debaters, it must be quite obvious that men have become just as emotional in their judgments as women were held to be sixty years ago. Select any phrase or sentence which, while it has no very precise meaning, nevertheless makes a strong emotional appeal, and shout it loudly enough before a male audience to-day—such a phrase as “the brotherhood of mankind,” or “the equality of men through their common form, their common fate in birth and death, and their common spark of divine fire,” or “the noble fight put up to make the world safe for Democracy,” or anything else equally undefinable, vague, or incapable of translation into an intellectual form—and the chances are that the applause will be both deafening and prolonged. On the other hand, state a profound truth in terms which make a purely intellectual appeal, and nine times out of ten your effort will be unnoticed, even if it has been understood. As I have tried both, and have some experience of public speaking, I presume I am entitled to speak with some authority on this subject.

Now, obviously, the danger of this emotional susceptibility at the cost of intellectual alertness among the manhood of the nation, is that it exposes them to the trickery and charlatanism of any actor, mountebank, demagogue, or political humbug who cares to exploit

their weakness. It is, therefore, a psychological infirmity in the male, that not only causes the modern newspaper to thrive, but also paves the way for the political and social anarchist; for where masses can be moved by empty slogans, society is at an end. It makes a sound political policy under a democratic régime quite impossible, and no amount of learning or education can remove it as a defect so long as the deeper causes of its existence remain unmodified. For, if education could remove it, then it would be characteristic of one class only—the class of the uneducated male. But this is not so. Emotionalism as the leading determining factor in judgment is now everywhere, in every class. It is by no means peculiar to working men. And the reason of this is as follows :

It is too often forgotten that emotional thinking, or thinking carried on without the co-operation of the intellect, is regressive thinking—that is to say, the thinking that characterizes primitive or uncivilized man. It may be easy and pleasant, because all regressive acts, by taking us back along the ladder of evolution, bring us to what we have practised longest, and to what we are therefore most accustomed to. As man has advanced, however, his thinking has become more and more intellectual, and consequently more and more difficult. But the whole of England is degenerate to-day—that is to say, has gone backwards along the ladder of evolution. To suppose that degeneracy is only to be found among the working classes is pure snobbery. We moderns are, therefore, all inclined to be regressive thinkers—to believe that which pleases us, and to doubt that which annoys us—and we are, therefore, all equally at the mercy of catch phrases, decoy words, and theatrical display, and all equally remain unmoved by a purely intellectual appeal.

But the extent to which regressive or emotional thinking is spreading, is the measure of our political instability; and our womenfolk, who recognize their

own minds and their own habits of thought in our present psychological decay, naturally imagine that they are becoming more and more like men, or, in other words, more and more equal to us every day.

(e) The decline of liberty through the inevitable despotism of minorities or majorities in a democratic country, and owing to the abuses which any powerful group or combination behind the Government can perpetrate in the name of the "People," was a result which might have been, and was, in fact, anticipated by the first body of men who were opposed to centralized and democratic control. It has often been said that an individual tyrant can be got rid of, but that a tyrannical majority or minority cannot, and indeed, there is much truth in this statement.

England, chiefly owing to the spirit that once reigned within her shores, still enjoys on the Continent the reputation of being the country of the free. And, indeed, when the King, the Lords and the Commons, contrived to run the country, the idea of liberty was so much bound up with the relation which each class in the nation bore to the other, that it would have been impossible for a commoner—say of the fourteenth century—to regard his overlords as in any way the enemies or destroyers of his liberty. On the contrary, he knew perfectly well that his overlords secured his liberty, and that the King watched impartially over the whole.¹

The rule, or rather the tyranny, of minorities and majorities may roughly be said to have begun with the

¹ Even as late as the reign of Charles I it was considered the glory of the crown, according to the view of the Lord Keeper Coventry, "to maintain the right of the weak against the strong," and Charles I in commenting on the Petition of Right is alleged to have said: "The King's prerogative is to defend the people's libertie." See also Disraeli (*Op. cit.*, p. 488): "In the selfish style of factions, two great existences have been blotted out of the history of England, the monarchy and the multitude: as the power of the Crown has diminished, the privileges of the People have disappeared: till at length the sceptre has become a pageant, and its subject has degenerated again into a serf."

Puritan Rebellion.¹ It was then that portions of the nation started to tyrannize over and to interfere with their fellow-countrymen, and since 1649, with but few intervals of comparatively undisturbed liberty, the tendency for minorities or majorities to tyrannize has been steadily increasing. The gradual ascendancy of Parliament made this inevitable. But what has aggravated and accelerated the progress of sectional tyranny has undoubtedly been the loss by the masses of the nation of that ardent love of liberty, for which they were once notorious, and their meek submission to statute after statute that has limited their freedom of choice and action.

It is possible to distinguish between alleged "political liberty" and "personal liberty"; but the latter is rapidly disappearing. Even a hundred years ago Heinrich Heine was shrewd enough to point out, with some astonishment, that what seemed to satisfy the Englishman was a form of liberty quite inadequate for the taste of the foreigner.

To-day, the Englishman imagines he is free, because he has a vote, and because he can say more or less what he likes in the Press about his rulers and their public behaviour.² But, meanwhile, his personal liberty is

¹ Speaking of Charles I's fight with Parliament, the Right Hon. J. M. Robertson says: "It is idle to keep up the pretence that what was at stake was the principle of freedom." *An Introduction to English Politics*, p. 441. See also my *Defence of Aristocracy* for a full description of what was lost to England with Charles I.

² See *The Enemies of Liberty*, by A. S. P. Haynes (London, 1923), p. 138. "We have no individual liberty except in regard to political discussion, and even this liberty is a fraud because it gives us no participation in the government of the country." The whole of Mr. Haynes' book is well worth studying, as is also his excellent previous treatise on the *Decline of Liberty in England* (London, 1916). In this work he describes with much penetration the steady inroads that have been made on individual liberty since the Reformation, and deals in detail with the increase of bureaucratic tyranny since 1895; the powers of the Caucus as opposed to the illusory powers of government by representation; the recent interferences with private life; the lack of

encroached upon more and more, and, with the example of America before us, it looks as if soon he might lose every scrap of freedom he ever possessed. To read about the forefathers of the English nation, even as late as the eighteenth century, is to be amazed at the amount of personal freedom they were allowed. And yet the increasing bondage has taken place under the pretence that it constituted in reality a steady progress in liberty. And no one, or very few, protest.

The very rise of Socialism is, in itself, the best proof of the loss of the spirit which once made England renowned as the land of freedom. For it must be quite obvious, even to the most ardent supporters of Socialism, that personal liberty will vanish under it.

The unfortunate correlative of this decline in personal liberty and in the determination to secure it, is that the sense of responsibility is also on the wane. Only where there is personal liberty can the individual feel, or wish to be, responsible for himself and his actions. And the loss of the feeling of responsibility is probably one of the most serious consequences of our present trend. Again, here, we have not only an inevitable development of democratic government, but also a demonstration of a change in the character of the people, which can certainly not be regarded without concern. For, although we must make allowances for the fact that democratic tyranny, being the most formidable and most irresistible of its kind, and allowing of no appeal and no quarter, is the most difficult to oppose—for a majority or ruling minority has no intelligence and no mercy—yet, if the old spirit of liberty had survived in the nation, liberty in the family; the limitations imposed on free discussion in religion and morals, and the constraints imposed on social freedom. "There is no doubt," says Mr. Haynes (pp. 14, 15), "that for the last forty years the whole tendency of British politics has been hostile to individual liberty." And on p. 16, he adds: "In all democratic countries the executive, and usually the legislative, powers ultimately fall into the hands of groups who exploit what they choose to call the popular will for their own purposes."

this latest and most insidious form of tyranny could never have survived as long as it has done.

There can be no doubt that this loss of the old spirit is also to be traced to the decline in vigour and stamina, which physical deterioration, and possibly miscegenation have brought in their train. But how far it is possible to restore to the constitution those guarantees against sectional tyranny, which recent reformers have so unwisely removed, it is difficult to say. For, even if we can envisage so desirable an unravelment as the recovery by the English people of their stamina, their health, and therefore their spirit, it is questionable whether the havoc that degeneration has wrought in our political machinery could ever be repaired.

Let it, however, not be forgotten that to be a revolutionary to-day, to be an innovator and a herald of salvation, means precisely that one is in favour of this decentralization of power, this redistribution of power over other bodies than the House of Commons. Socialism and Communism are already *vieux jeu*—antiquated and discredited. To be modern in the best sense to-day, is to see the eternal sameness of human nature so long as it remains in health, to interpret man's periods of flatness, slavery and muddle, as periods of bodily and mental decline, and, therefore, to wish to restore those institutions which man invented in the fulness of his power. This is not reaction, in the ignominious sense, but creation. For it depends on the creation of a new manhood, and of a new national spirit, devoid of decadent and effeminate elements.

CHAPTER IX

The Degeneracy of Modern Man— Part V

The Degeneration of Mind and Character— continued

(3) **T**HE attitude of the modern man towards Art must be dealt with briefly, as other more pressing considerations demand our attention.

In a nutshell it is this : that, owing to the prevalence of sickness, debility and nervous exhaustion, there is no longer any lofty criterion concerning what is, and what is not, necessary, inevitable and desirable in art production. Irascibility, as I pointed out fifteen years ago,¹ but which only recently I have learnt to ascribe to faulty bodily co-ordination, by giving the modern generation a vague sense of injury and a general lack of well-being, causes every one to feel that he has “ something to express.” That which distinguishes the average artist from the rest of mankind is thus simply his greater lack of self-control. Particularly is this so in music, painting and literature. But to mistake the bulk of the “ expressive ” or “ protesting ” output in the sphere of art as a good sign, or as a proof of national riches, instead of as a sign of ex-

¹ See my *Nietzsche and Art*, where I point to those traits in the modern artist, which, while being interpreted by himself and others as “ artistic,” are chiefly the result of deficient self-discipline plus a certain manual training. Thus the inability to resist the appeal of a “ splash of colour,” whether in a sunset or a field of poppies, is not nearly so often due to a creative impulse as to a pathological lack of self-discipline.

haustion and nervous fatigue, is the repeated error of modern criticism as also of modern public opinion. We should require almost a century of silence to recover from all this "expression of selves," and to begin again to produce a desirable Art. Because Art is essentially the product of inner harmony, inner serenity, and the discipline of inner riches, and it can only be travestied by creatures whose natures only too accurately reflect the chaos and exhaustion that surrounds them.

To-day, however, the only distinctions drawn are those between moral and unmoral art, or between that which pleases the chaotically conditioned public and that which displeases them, and no one reckons other differences. What is stigmatized as pornographic, whether it be a sculpture, a picture, or a book, is alone condemned, no matter whence it springs. No one dreams of inquiring whether exhaustion or mastered plenitude has operated in its production. But any other sort of crime against good taste, healthy values, and style is allowed to pass unchallenged. The bulk of novel writers, for instance, are not even yet aware that they themselves, and the people they depict, are degenerate; and would indignantly repudiate the suggestion if it were made to them.

But how can a degenerate age judge of what is exhaustion and chaos, and what is plenitude and mastery in Art? Criteria even of Art, therefore, must vanish in periods of low psycho-physical standards.

(4) The modern man's attitude towards sex is composed of several elements, each of which has its complex of causes and derivations. The remoter and deeper causes I shall deal with in a later chapter; ¹ at present I shall merely describe the attitude, and its more immediate causes.

If the fame of modern England's achievements in other spheres were ever to perish, and be utterly forgotten, there would nevertheless be one fact about the English of to-day which would be certain to survive and be

¹ See pp. 271-303 ahead.

remembered by posterity, if only because it has caused so much suffering and unhappiness among English women. I refer to the modern Englishman's radical inability to master sex, to face its problems, and to deal with them as part of a necessary art of life.

The modern Englishman stands before the fact of sex like a timid amateur, half guilty, half afraid, and no longer possessed even of the sound instincts which would prompt him to deal with it even as the healthy animal does. The key-note of his attitude was struck by that very English, but very thoughtful man, George Gissing, who, when he spoke of the new element that enters a man's life at puberty, referred to it as "the curse of sex."¹ Like Lecky, whom I have quoted, and who was in many ways also a typical Englishman, the average man to-day feels that "there is something degrading in the sensual part of our natures, something to which a feeling of shame is naturally attached,"² and this feeling of shame, of which he is never able to rid himself, cools the source of his passion, and paralyses his natural spontaneity. At least, this is true of the majority of men of the wealthy, well-to-do, and comfortable classes in this country, and it is one of the worst blights that have overtaken English social life. It makes the sensual experiences of the women of the classes mentioned inadequate, constrained, and lacking in innocent voluptuousness, and is, therefore, a potent cause of nervous disorders among them. And, since they are frequently either too moral, or too timid to seek consolation elsewhere, or are prevented from doing so by the dearth of unconstrained and skilful lovers, they are either doomed to a life of resigned but aching discontent, or else forced to give vent to their pent-up feelings in Movements, Causes, or Welfare Work, and thus to find oblivion even if they cannot secure happiness.

¹ See Morley Roberts, *The History of Henry Maitland*, which is based on Gissing's life.

² See p. 127, *ante*.

This accounts for the numbers of married women who concern themselves with outside affairs—affairs outside the home, I mean—to which the spinster's relation has some *raison d'être* and necessity.

Sometimes the modern man's shame is so great, and his body so atonic through physical degeneration, that he does not possess sufficient native vigour to react in any way whatsoever to a woman, even when he is married to her, owing to the superior power of his traditional inhibitions. But at all events, even when he possesses the stamina to overcome these inhibitions, and in spite of his moral scruples, to react normally to women, his timidity, his lack of knowledge, and his clumsy inexperience, make him a poor, an inferior, and exasperatingly inadequate initiator. How far, how unconscionably far he is from that art, regarded as the bare minimum by Sheik Nefzaiu, in his wonderful chapter on the essential preliminaries to sexual congress! ¹ It is too often forgotten that the act of initiation in love involves not only a knowledge of the crude elements of sex, but also an understanding of those arts preliminary to sexual congress, which are perfectly natural, which can be observed in a rudimentary form in the animal kingdom, and without which the female's requisite psycho-physical excitement cannot be generated. These arts are pleasant, form an indispensable part of a genuine love experience, and what is more, should come quite instinctively to a man, unless he has had his mind poisoned and his natural impulses arrested by the sex-phobia of Christian and Puritanical values.

Proud of his knowledge of his car, and glad to be able to explain every detail of it to a patient listener, as a rule, however, he knows nothing about the mechanism, the working and the needs of a woman's body. Indeed,

¹ See the delightful and scientifically sound work *Le Livre d'Amour de l'Orient* by Sheik Nefzaiu (French translation, Paris, 1922), Chapter V, 2nd part, pp. 75-8, which deals with the preliminaries to human sexual congress.

he does not think that the man who knows much about such matters can be altogether "nice"; and the young women of his circle, who do not as yet dream of the torture of being linked to a man like him for life, are inclined to agree with him. His "breezy," fatuous ignorance about sex and about them, strikes them as one of his most fascinating attributes. He is inclined to leave these things to "chance," and in his heart of hearts he will be found to cherish the secret belief that there is something in the attitude of Puritanism which is fundamentally "sound" and "gentlemanly."¹

A further potent cause of timidity and incompetence in sex-initiation is, of course, the absurd reverence which the average Englishman feels for the moral elevation and purity of his bride. Radically misunderstanding her, and the large area covered in her mind and body by sex-instincts, he feels that he would be guilty almost of desecration in letting himself go naturally and unconstrainedly with such a creature. Not having a notion of the desires that agitate her, of her eagerness and her curiosity, he is so deeply obsessed by his belief in his own moral turpitude and her freedom from any sensual velleity, that nothing but the straightforward act of procreation, divested of all preliminary and subsequent arts, ever strikes him as permissible. She is too much of a "lady" for anything else. Thus the whole relationship is vitiated. A sound physical basis to marriage becomes impossible, and nothing but the most resolute patience and forbearance on the woman's part (usually

¹ If this is considered as exaggerated, let the reader peruse Marie Stopes' *Married Love*—a book that has sold in so many thousands of copies, that it must be assumed that it meets an urgent and widespread need in the population. There he will find ample confirmation of what I maintain above. On p. 32, for instance, this authoress says: "About the much more fundamental and vital problems of sex, there is a lack of knowledge so abysmal and so universal that its mists and shadowy darkness have affected even the few who lead us." The bulk of her teaching amounts to an attempt to make good the ignorance and stupidity of the natural initiator in sex—the male partner.

supported by her ignorance concerning ideal sex relations) can enable the couple to live together in peace.

It is this factor, this compound of Puritanism and a misunderstanding of woman's nature, that has done most to poison the relations of the sexes in England. And nothing will ever restore happiness to those relations, if the chief obstacles to a sound physical basis in marriage are not in the first place removed.

All the innocent, the maddening joy of sex, therefore, hardly ever comes the way of the English married couple. But since physical disabilities of all sorts, from false teeth to impure breath, greatly impair those close, those intimate and fusing relations, which complete sexual spontaneity insists upon, it is perhaps as well that Puritanical traditions keep a large number of unsavoury people from too ardent an expression of their passions.

Abstinence in sex, therefore, is a much more common occurrence among men, even of mature years, than seems to be generally recognized ; and while it aggravates among them those serious disorders which, in any event, would proceed from their faulty co-ordination and their debility, it renders them, when they ultimately indulge, very inferior sexual partners. Lord Dawson of Penn has recently expressed the view that in England more harm is caused to young men by sexual abstinence than by indulgence ; but very few people know the extent of that abstinence. It is not at all an uncommon thing to find men over thirty in this country who have never had any knowledge of woman, and the astonishing feature of this phenomenon is that both they themselves, and those about them, think that it is a very desirable—because moral—state of affairs. The fact that they may in the end have one or two children, means that, if acquired characteristics are transmitted, a progressive atrophy or diminution of sexual passion must inevitably occur in the race ; and to judge from the tale that most young wives have to tell, and from the number of semi-eunuchs one encounters among the present generation

of young men, it would appear as if this kind of degeneration were already in full progress.

The essentially masculine rôle in sex—initiation—is therefore more often dreaded than coveted by men of almost all classes in England to-day—hence possibly the enormous increase in divorces and prostitution, and the persistent high figure maintained in the statistics of widows who remarry, despite the increase in surplus women. Timidity, incompetence, ignorance, and above all shame, naturally lead men to shun the uninitiated girl, and to select the initiated woman, whether she is actually married, or a widow, or a prostitute; because anything is better than the ignominy of a bungled or unconsummated initiation. But divorces, prostitution, and the neglect of young girls for widows—all these things are better in the eyes of the Puritan and the ignorant interfering spinster, than young men knowledgeable and artistic in sex matters; hence we may expect an increase of the tendency already established. Indeed this increase seems already to be perceptible.

Although each year the surplusage of women over men increases in England and Wales, which means that the number of eligible spinsters is very much more than adequate, the statistics show that the percentage of widows who remarry, instead of depreciating, remains more or less stationary. In the years of the war, in spite of the large disproportion of the sexes, the remarriages of widows increased far beyond any preceding figure, and in the decade 1914 to 1923, there were 9 per cent. more marriages of bachelors with widows than in the decade 1851-60.¹

True, widows increased appreciably during the years 1914-18 owing to the casualties. But so also did the

¹ The number of widows remarried in recent years is as follows : 1918 : 30,469 ; 1919 : 40,229 ; 1920 : 29,141 ; 1922 : 23,778 ; 1923 : 20,778.

This gives a total of 144,414 widows remarried in five years, when there were about 2,000,000 surplus women in the country.

number of surplus eligible young women, and for the same reason.

With regard to divorces, the increase is notorious. They rose from an average of 277 for the years 1876-80, to an average of 1,509.6 for the years 1916-20, and in 1921 they reached the high figure of 3,522. This points not only to a possible increase of unhappiness in marriage, but also to a possible and probable increase in the fascination of the initiated woman for emasculate men, who fear the duty of sex-initiation.¹ This last fact, if it is a fact, would seem to argue progressive sexual degeneration in the male; while, in any case, his loss of mastery and of art in the sex relation, about which there appears to be no doubt in any knowledgeable person's mind, points to a decay of a natural instinct, through the stultifying influence of negative values, acting upon a widespread decline in stamina.

Why may we feel so certain that this ultimate victory of negative values over a natural and instinctive reaction points to a decline in stamina? Because the negative values have been the same for centuries, and the ignorance and loss of mastery in sex, about which such a writer as Marie Stopes, for instance, very rightly inveighs, is a modern and comparatively recent development. It is not therefore the values that have changed, but the native stamina, which hitherto enabled men to act naturally in spite of the values.

Now there is no feature about modern man which is more potent in provoking contempt in the female than precisely this loss of mastery in sex. Consciously or unconsciously, modern woman feels it as his most serious challenge to her esteem; for it must be remembered that as we pointed out in the first chapters, this sex relation belongs to the oldest and most respectable elements in

¹ I am not aware of having seen this possible explanation of the increase of divorces advanced before; but I think it is worth considering. Of course, the increase is not all due to the infidelity of wives; but, as I have shown in *Woman: A Vindication*, the bulk of it certainly is.

our being—it is probably much older than the parental relation—and for millions of years woman, or the female in our line of evolution, has been accustomed to the very mastery and art in sex initiation, which the male in England, and countries like England, has lost. Whatever her Puritanical prejudices and upbringing may have been, therefore, she cannot deny this oldest element in her nature ; and when, as too frequently happens, she finds her mate deficient and not true to type in this respect, although she may not know the ultimate cause of her contempt for him, she cannot help feeling contempt. She may clothe it in language or in ideas that are as remote from sex as possible ; but its deepest root will be the fact that the male has failed in his traditional pre-mammalian rôle, and has to that extent forfeited a measure of his oldest claim to masculinity.

The best proof of this is to compare the attitude of women in non-Puritanical countries with that of women in Puritanical countries. Owing to the Pagan tolerance of the Holy Catholic Church, almost the whole of Southern Europe, including a large part of France, is more or less free from the blight of sex-phobia and Puritanical values ; whereas Northern Europe, with England and North America, is wholly a prey to these very influences. In the former area, there is no such thing as the uncontrollable and deep-rooted contempt of the male, which is to be found in the latter area ; while the look of the men themselves differs as widely as does the attitude of their womenfolk. Examine an American or an English male tourist of mature years as he stands surrounded by natives either in Venice or Rome, in Madrid or in the Basque territory of North-eastern Spain. Compared with the southerner, he looks ascetic, pinched, oppressed and still boyish despite his adulthood—in fact, rather like a monk in mufti ; while the woman at his side may be seen to look restlessly about as if animated by a vague yearning for something the nature of which she is probably not even conscious of.

The natives themselves ascribe these characteristics of northerners, which they cannot help noticing, to the lack of sunshine and good wine and olive oil. They seldom guess that a deeper cause than the absence of good living and blue skies is at work in producing the effect they observe. And in Venice I once heard the impression made by American and English visitors summed up graphically enough, though without any indication of its cause, as "grey misery."

"Grey misery" it is indeed. Because, quite apart from the amount of joy that is lost as the result of this shelving and ignoring of sex, and this loss of innocence and serenity in the exercise of the sex functions, it should not be forgotten that the systematic dwarfing and impoverishment of the sex passions and instincts in both sexes, leads to an ultimate heavy loss in other very desirable qualities in the nation. For I am by no means alone in believing that among highly sexed people, some of the most desirable citizens on earth are to be found.¹

(5) The Englishman's attitude to woman has already been partly discussed in Chapter V. Here it will be necessary to deal only with those influences determining his attitude which have not yet been mentioned. They are (a) his insistence upon a humourous relation, (b) his lack of catholicity and versatility, (c) his reverence for chivalry, (d) his lack of penetration and psychological insight, and (e) his lack of will power.

(a) I have already discussed the insistence on humour and its relation to passion and religion. But it is important to notice that it not only has a bearing upon the sex-life, through the association of humour with a lack of passion, as already pointed out above, but that it also influences the rest of the relationship of man and woman. It colours the whole of their outlook, in this

¹ At a debate I attended in the Essex Hall a year or two ago, which was held under the auspices of a Birth Control society, the senior gynæcologist of Guy's Hospital, Mr. Harold Chapple expressed this view, and I know that the eminent gynæcologist Mr. Norman Haire also holds it.

sense, that the passionate relationship is forced into the background. The severest charge that history will be able to bring against Anglo-Saxon culture is that it led Anglo-Saxon women to seek the passionate relationship elsewhere than in their association with man and the child. To have brought things to such pass that we now have half our womenfolk, even the married ones, not only declaring that the joys of the sex-relationship are grossly overrated, but also pursuing with passionate attachment callings which release them from their natural calling, their only true calling, means that we have "made a hash" of the sexual side of women's lives. We have sickened and wearied them of a relationship which ought to be their greatest joy and preoccupation. We have actually extirpated in them the impulse which springs from their strongest and deepest instinct. By losing the art of love, by reducing the sexual life of woman chiefly to painful child-bearing, we have neglected that oldest part of her nature, which was formed during the long ages before the mammalia existed and before child-bearing had become a female function, and in this sense we have wounded and goaded an old instinct into a state of cynical revolt.

We have treated woman as a playmate, as a companion, as a fellow-golfer and tennis-player. We have expected her to be all these things and to roam the country with us on far too long rambles and to admire the view. We have called "jolly" the girls who could associate with us in this way without reminding us of sex or of the fact that they were fully-equipped females. The girl who could spend weeks and months with us in this way we have spoken of as one that "had no nonsense about her," meaning no passion so irrepressible as to be inconvenient. Thus we have forced even the girls "with nonsense about them" to behave like neuters, and the rest to look and act as if they had hardly any of the woman about them. These girls are humorous like ourselves, their stifled passions have been deflected

or atrophied, and they have become that horrible product of tepid temperaments and damp finger-tips known as the "pal." How can we wonder that they turn their back with ease on a life for which they are equipped to the teeth? How can we wonder that they express their passion in Causes, Movements, Callings and bread-winning? But it was our incompetence and our failure to understand them, our fear of love and our dread or our ignorance of its arts, that made us prefer the girl who had "no nonsense about her." The Anglo-Saxon has a deal to answer for. He has transformed his woman and himself, and he would have transformed the whole world to match his woman and himself if his power had not begun to decline through the decadence brought on by his various transformations.

(b) The Englishman's lack of catholicity in tastes and of versatility in gifts makes him frequently look up to his mate as a prodigy of both general knowledge and general acumen. Women, owing to the fact that until quite lately they have escaped most of the specialist and routine tasks of bread-winning, have retained more of their pristine catholicity of interests. While, therefore, they bewilder man with the range and glamour of their mental activities, they feel his limitations as tiresome and even exasperating. To find a complete male environment, therefore, they would be forced to have about them many males of various callings. The modern specialist and specialized male no longer fills their lives—can no longer, in fact, give them a full life. Moreover, he is aware of his limited range. He becomes, through repeated humiliations, subjected by the broader scope of his mate's adaptations. He may feel no interest, or very little, in poetry, in human nature, in art. His speciality, and the specializing above all of his ancestors, may have forced him to concentrate on one point of existence, to the exclusion of all else. He may love this narrow specialization. This, however, only makes him the more helpless before the nimble versatility of

his mate's mind, and, what is more important, makes it difficult for him to take the lead. When an occasion arises that seems to invite him to take the lead, he finds that the past history of his life with her, with all its repeated little triumphs of intellect on her side, has robbed him of the requisite ascendancy and prestige. She may be nervous, exhausted, and reduced, owing to the need that has thus arisen for her to act and to make weighty decisions in a crisis. She may despise him while enjoying and suffering from the power his latter-day mediocrity has given her. But, meanwhile, he is inclined to think that men are superior to women only in physical strength. (He does not like to be told that this is true only of a country in which the men have lost their intellectual superiority through narrow specialization, and intellectual decay.) And, when he contemplates the work of the Feminists, and the alleged "advance of women," he fancies he sees in these phenomena only the inevitable march of progress and the results of the higher evolution of his species.

(c) The Englishman's reverence for the modern notion of chivalry which is summed up by the tag "play the game," is inculcated upon him at school, and it makes him an easy victim of his female circle. There is nothing more admirable than a chivalrous spirit—that spirit which arose in Europe in feudal times, and which makes it incumbent upon the superior and the stronger to protect the weaker from all molestation and assault, and to meet for him or her all the difficulties with which the weaker cannot reasonably be expected to cope. And it would be an excellent thing if chivalry in this sense were more widely practised. Perhaps the finest exponents of chivalry in the whole world were the old Maoris of New Zealand, who would never continue a fight if their opponent were at the slightest disadvantage from the lack of food or water, or from inability through lack of time to collect and tend their wounded. How this chivalry on the part of the Maoris was exploited by English

settlers does not constitute the finest page in the history of the Empire. But this is another matter. Suffice it to say that the tradition of chivalry exists wherever Feudalism once prevailed, and its very essence is to thwart and resist that bullying propensity in the powerful which tends to victimize individuals or groups who have momentarily no means of protection, or who are in any way at a disadvantage. In war it has long since been dead. The spirit which caused Pope Innocent VI in the reign of Stephen to prohibit the use of the arbalest "as a barbarous weapon unfit for Christian warfare," which led Charles V in 1376 to celebrate the memory of the Black Prince in a solemn service, although the latter was his bitter and successful enemy, and which made Robert of Normandy refuse to besiege one castle when the besieged were waterless, and another when Henry I's queen was in childbed inside it—this spirit may be said to be quite extinct. For many years now European nations have thought nothing of slaughtering with all the terrible weapons of modern warfare, savages, who were armed only with spears and bows and arrows; and no civilized nation, during the last hundred years at least, has scrupled to take advantage of an opponent's momentary bad fortune, or disadvantage in the matter of munitions, or water, or food, in order to crush him. And the same is true, more or less, of social life within the various states. To be undefended, is, as a rule, to be victimized. Think, for instance, of the treatment of the women and children in the early days of the nineteenth century in the mines and mills of the north of England! While publicly England fought for the emancipation of the slaves in America, her own women and children were working in chains underground. In social life, too, therefore, we may say that the spirit of chivalry is dead. The exploitation of the weak (I do not mean the sick—that is another matter) goes on uninterruptedly day after day.¹

¹ In his *Decline of Liberty in England* Mr. Haynes gives many examples of this.

There is, however, a curious survival of the idea of chivalry, which is at once a distortion and a travesty of its original character, and that is the belief which prevails in certain classes that it is not "chivalrous" for a man to have his way with a woman. Truth to tell, however, if a man is to hold himself responsible for the woman who is his mate, he must at times "have his way"; for a man cannot be held responsible for some one whom he cannot guide—that is elementary. The Alpine guide soon points out to a recalcitrant tourist that only if he falls in with the rest of the party, and does not stray—that is to say, *only if he follows the guide*, can the latter be responsible for him. And the same holds good all through life.

Now it is obviously the chivalrous thing for a man to hold himself responsible for his womenfolk. To decline responsibility here is to do precisely what the knight of old least wished to do. Chivalry was the responsible side of Feudalism. But how can a man make himself responsible without occasionally—at least on matters where his responsibility is likely to be called to account—having his way?

There is thus an apparent contradiction between ideal or practical chivalry—the only chivalry that matters and which is the willingness to be held responsible for some one weaker or more dependent than oneself, and that other idea of chivalry, which is modern, false and sentimental, and which practically amounts to a renunciation of any right to prevail over a woman whether or not she be one's spouse.

How does the Englishman extricate himself from this dilemma? Very simply. He maintains his sentimental notion, that it is not chivalrous, or "the game," to prevail over a woman, and is therefore committed to the necessary corollary of giving up responsibility. This is being done more and more, and even the law is being altered to make the change more complete and more effectual.

Thus we have on the one hand, in the average married

couple of the cultivated classes, a creature who eschews coming to grips, who renounces his right to have his way, because, through some foolish misunderstanding of chivalry, he feels it would not be "playing the game" to have his way with a woman; and on the other, we have another creature, woman, who, not being expected to be "chivalrous" or "to play the game," repeatedly gains the victory over her mate through the permanent advantage she possesses of being able to break rules that her mate feels bound to observe.

She, moreover, knows that, just as he likes to be thought humorous, he also wishes to be considered what is vulgarly called a "sport." And, if ever he ventures to thwart her, he is quickly brought to heel, by being menaced with the immediate loss of his reputation for "sportiness." When women want their way—and they usually will have it, if they are allowed—they are little concerned about "playing the game." In fact they are not, as I say, expected to play it. Consequently, when they are confronted by a man whose pride lies in his "chivalry," their victory is always assured. When, in addition, we remember that almost the whole of popular and learned opinion in England supports this insensate interpretation of "chivalry," and that the woman feels this background of sympathy behind her, we cannot be surprised that guidance, responsibility and authority in the home, if not also everywhere else, has passed almost entirely into the hands of women.

Frequently it happens (Gissing mentions an instance, doubtless drawn from life) that a woman may crave to be mastered; when, in the midst of a storm of tears, stamping of angry feet, and offensive remarks, she may wonder why her man does not at last impose his will with violence, and half wishes he would.¹

¹ Even Charles I, whose character as a gentleman no one, not even Macaulay, has ever questioned, found it necessary on one occasion to use violence with Queen Mary. The incident occurred at Whitehall, in the summer of 1626, when the Queen's French retinue were expelled

When, however, one's vanity lies in one's good name for "chivalry," one is induced to sustain it even at the cost of ignominious defeat, and thus too often a scene which, if energetically handled, might consolidate the love of a couple, ends in building a barrier of strangeness between them. For the woman, dissatisfied with and contemptuous of her alleged "chivalrous" partner, does not forgive him for his lack of ordinary human skill in managing her, and, his "chivalry" having tamed him, she dreams of the sheikh who is still untamed. Hence the enormous popularity in England of all that class of fiction which depicts amorous commerce between Arab sheikhs and white women.¹

This so-called "chivalry," too, is a sign of mental softening; for the man of strong character not only insists upon being chivalrous in the right sense—that is to say, responsible for his dependants, but he also wishes the essential correlative to that condition, which is the right to guide and to have his way where his responsibility is likely to be called to account.

(d) The Englishman's lack of penetration and of psychological insight, by which he repeatedly misunderstands the motivation and general background of his mate's behaviour—her complaints, her moods, her hints, her rebukes, and her provocative moments, arises from the fact that generations of routine work, routine games, and routine interests, have robbed him of normal alertness and awareness. The discussion of psychological problems, like too keen an interest in humanity in general,

by the King's orders. Queen Mary was so much enraged that she broke a window, and Charles "was obliged to use all his masculine strength to control his incensed partner, by grasping her wrists in each hand." (See Strickland, *Queens of England*, Ed. 1865, Vol. IV, p. 169.) And yet Charles and Mary, as every historian knows, were a devoted couple until the end, and Charles was a model husband. We must remember, however, that this happened in the seventeenth century.

¹ I have attempted to work out the general problem of physical mastery in the male in my novel *French Beans*, published in 1923.

is never encouraged in England.¹ A humorous remark that makes every one laugh is very much more welcome at a dinner table, or anywhere else for that matter, than a penetrating explanation based on skilful analysis. The Englishman, therefore, is, more often than not, out of touch with problems of human character and motivation. He hardly understands his own sex, and cannot therefore be expected to understand his wife's. In addition, his abysmal ignorance of the question of sex itself, makes him inclined to take so many of his mate's remarks and actions at their face value, without first interpreting them, that he is usually entirely at sea about her. It is he who keeps alive the absurd belief that no one can ever understand a woman. And, since women do not respect men who do not understand their hidden motivation, although they may say they dislike the men who do, the Englishman has great difficulty in keeping the respect of his womenfolk. As I have already said, it is to the credit of the average Englishwoman that she never pretends to respect her man;² but this does not exonerate the Englishman from blame for having forfeited her respect.

Clearly, it must be most difficult to respect anyone who, at every moment of the day, misunderstands one's least cryptic allusion, believes one's most palpable lie, and accepts one's moral indignation at its face value. (Moral indignation ought always to be regarded as a suspicious manifestation in anybody, but in a woman, it is doubly so.) But all these things the average Englishman will do with unfailing regularity, until his wife, if she wishes to be understood, is forced to plain-speaking and truth—*truth!* By that time, however, a doctor is usually in attendance, and a holiday may be prescribed

¹ J. S. Mill, probably as the result of introspection, readily acknowledged this. In his *Subjection of Women* (Chapter III, Section 14) he wrote: "An Englishman is ignorant respecting human nature."

² I can imagine the indignant protests that the average managing matron will make on reading this sentence. But by their works, not by their words, should these women be judged. What does their behaviour imply—respect or disrespect? That is the question.

—a holiday away from the need of truth and away from him who needs it; and there may be temporary relief.

(e) The best Englishmen, as a rule, have displayed no lack of will. In their dealings with men, indeed, they have shown a surprising amount of it. The word of command that does not necessarily wound or frighten, but at once secures obedience, is essentially an English characteristic. Nevertheless, I do not think it can be doubted that the will power, at least of the governing classes, is declining, because there has been such a relaxation of discipline all through the nation in recent years, that it is impossible not to suspect a serious loss of will in the ranks of those who set the tone and the example to the rest of the community. What is perfectly certain, however, is the fact that in their relationship with women, the Englishmen of to-day have to all intents and purposes relinquished the power of will entirely. Whether they still possess that power as their ancestors did and voluntarily abjure its use, however, or whether they no longer possess it in the same degree, may be a debatable point; but certain it is that one might have to travel far nowadays before coming across a man like Matthew Bramble in *Humphrey Clinker* who could, when provoked, round on a cantankerous, vain, and tyrannical old spinster like Tabitha Bramble, and secure her prompt obedience. In spite of the advantage which the majority of men have enjoyed until quite recently, and which millions still enjoy, of being the sole economic support in their own household, it is comparatively rare to find that they also succeed in exercising any authority over those who are dependent on them. And it is one of the strange anomalies of English life that direction and the power of having their own way in all things, has passed almost entirely into the hands of the female section of the married community. Not that we wish to imply by authority an arbitrary exercise of power that overrules all reasonable objection. Authority in the home is something very different. When it is right

it is simply the use of directing power, in regard to a partner and other dependents, who, inspired by devotion, love, and above all confidence—that confidence which comes of experience, and of the recognition of superiority—voluntarily accept the leadership of one who they know is worthy of guiding them.

It is difficult to account for this paralysis of masculine will in the presence of women. Is it possibly the outcome of the romantic view of women, discussed in the fifth chapter, where I showed how the alleged greater morality, purity and “unselfishness” of women, cowed the morally oppressed man, and made him feel inferior? ¹ Or is it merely the result of the false interpretation of chivalry discussed in the last section, coupled with the loss of prestige which has come with man’s intellectual and physical decline?—I am inclined to believe that all these factors have operated in bringing it about, but I am also persuaded that there has been, in any case, an absolute loss of will-power among the men of the nation,

¹ The fact that this supposed superior morality of women is influencing our lives very much more than we know, is shown by the turn legislation is taking. It is always presumed that woman has to be protected against man’s wickedness and never that man has to be protected against woman’s wickedness. Thus, while women are dealt with extremely leniently by the courts, and it is almost impossible for a man to win a case against a woman, even when he is 100 per cent. right, the legislature itself is reflecting this absurd misunderstanding of woman’s moral nature by framing laws that always give women an unfair advantage against men. This was recognized by Mr. H. C. A. Bingley, the Marylebone magistrate, as recently as February 21, 1926, when, dealing with a male applicant who asked for his advice concerning the impossible behaviour of his wife, Mr. Bingley said: “This is another instance of legislation which is all in favour of the woman and disregards the rights of the man.” After consulting the new “Summary Jurisdiction Act, 1925,” he declared that, just as in the “Guardianship of Infants Act,” the woman’s powers had been increased, and the man had been left with nothing. “It seems hard,” said the magistrate, “but I have no power to help you. . . . It is always ‘Heads I win, tails you lose’ for the woman nowadays.” But how can anything else be expected when the popular and the learned minds believe in the absurd myth about the moral superiority of women? (See Daily Press, February 19–22, 1926.)

through the decline in stamina. Will-power, which is the attribute of strong natures that have undergone stern discipline, must necessarily decline in periods of physical debility, physical impoverishment, and relaxed discipline ; and when, in addition to this, man's normal sexual relationship to woman is disturbed by Puritanical inhibitions and his own sexual feebleness, and his prestige is destroyed by his inadequate intellectual breadth and attainments, it is obvious that the men of to-day must find it difficult, if not impossible, to assert their will against woman's.

Nothing, at all events, is more pathetic than an attempt at a display of volition which fails through lack of those essential accompaniments, prestige, superior wisdom, proved reliability, sexual mastery and vigour, and strength of character ; and a man who, as often happens nowadays, feels that he has to look up to his female partner, owing to his consciousness of the many humiliations or defeats he has suffered in her presence in the sphere of intellect, wise judgment, taste, sexual experience, or what-not, had far better abstain from any such attempt at self-assertion.

On the whole, then, as we have seen, the modern man's attitude to woman is of a kind that places him at a constant and very serious disadvantage ; but there is little hope of improving the situation until his physical condition is improved, his moral superstitions are destroyed, his notions of chivalry are corrected, and his sexual powers and arts are greatly enhanced ; for of all men who wish to have their way in their own homes, that man will succeed least who, while possessing every other gift, yet lacks the oldest and most impressive of masculine claims to authority—sexual vigour and mastery. Whatever prudish women may say, there is nothing which more utterly destroys a woman's faith and trust in man than precisely deficiency in this department ; and that is one of the reasons why Puritanism, and the systematic reduction of man's sexuality, as I show in my *Lysistrata*, were bound to lead to Feminism.

(6) The Englishman's attitude to the child, like his attitude to woman, is largely determined by his moral superstitions and sex-phobia. As a father, however, we must add to these influences the power of vanity.

Dealing with the moral superstitions first, it must be clear to every one that, in England and countries like England, where a good deal of shame and guilt attaches to the sex-impulses, the child enjoys an astonishing amount of false and quite unnecessary prestige, owing to the fact that it is supposed to be "innocent," or rather, not yet polluted by the sex life. Thus we should expect to find, what we actually see to-day—a degree of reverence shown to the child, which is as absurd as it is ruinous of proper discipline. This attitude, which is adopted with more than customary ferocity by the spinster, amounts in certain cases almost to child-worship. The alleged "purity" of children, which is of course all nonsense, is entirely based upon this shame and guilt of the adult in regard to sex functions, and leads to an enormous amount of harmful adulation and corruption of children.

The moral adult's will becomes paralysed in the presence of the child's supposed "moral superiority," just as the moral man's will becomes paralysed before the alleged "moral superiority" of woman; and much is done and said by adults before children which goes a long way towards destroying the natural order of rank separating maturity from immaturity. Children are now very largely undisciplined, impudent and exacting, not only in the presence of adults, but in all circumstances, because they feel the intense admiration, tacit or avowed, which colours every one of the adult's relations to them.¹

¹ See Arthur Ponsonby, *The Decline of Aristocracy*, p. 90, where, speaking of the Victorian aristocrats, the author says: "In the middle of the nineteenth century, they still ruled their children with the method of stern, if not tyrannical discipline. Time has still to show whether the reverse plan of giving the first place to children is going to be more successful." And on p. 170 the author adds: "Speaking more generally, there is undoubtedly a widespread tendency to avoid responsibility, or to misuse or to renounce the particular authority which parents alone can wield."

An influence which greatly aggravates this condition is the tendency in countries oppressed by sex-phobia to exalt the final stage and result of the sexual life, at the cost of its "less decent" beginnings. The child, the baby, which is the end result, is thus given exorbitant value and importance, because of the need which is felt of obliterating if possible all memory and thought of its procreation. This act of obliteration is accomplished in theatrical style by turning the maximum amount of available limelight on the child, and the maximum amount of black shadow over its hateful beginnings.

In a word, the nursery is exalted at the expense of the bedroom, and this spirit colours the whole of the world's subsequent attitude to the child. It is a spirit which is encouraged by the body of public opinion represented by masses of spinsters, masses of married Puritans, male and female, and by every Christian sect, from the Church of England to the most obscure one-chapelled subdivision of Nonconformity. It is a spirit wholly supported by the Judicial Bench and by every official act and utterance in the country, and it has received its classical poetical form in Wordsworth's famous Ode, *Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood*. In this poem, Wordsworth depicts the child as "trailing clouds of glory" from its original habitat—"God, who is our home." He also assures us that "Heaven lies about us in our infancy," and that as we grow up this "heavenliness," this "purity" gradually departs until "at length the Man perceives it die away, and fade into the light of common day!" The whole of the fifth stanza of this Ode, in fact, is worth reading for the light it sheds on Wordsworth's own psychology and sex-phobia; and there is probably a no more monumental record of the Anglo-Saxon misunderstanding of childhood than these nineteen lines of English verse.

How refreshing it is, therefore, after reading the *Intimations of Immortality*, to come across Robert Browning's much more profound interpretation of the

same phenomenon—childhood, and to see how very much more realistically he understood it.

Addressing Luitolfo in *A Soul's Tragedy*, Ogniben says: "There I will tell everybody; and you only do right to believe you must get better as you get older. All men do so; they are worst in childhood, improve in manhood, and get ready in old age for another world. Youth, with its beauty and grace, would seem bestowed on us for some such reason as to make us partly endurable till we have time for really becoming so of ourselves, without their aid, when they leave us. The sweetest child we all smile on for his pleasant want of the whole world to break up, or suck in his mouth, seeing no other good in it—would be rudely handled by that world's inhabitants if he retained those angelic infantile desires when he had grown six feet high, black and bearded."

This seems somewhat to redeem Wordsworth, and, incidentally, to vindicate the reputation of Englishmen for profundity and vision. But how many know, love and can quote the fifth stanza of Wordsworth's Ode, for every one or two who read, understand and appreciate the truth of Ogniben's last speech in *A Soul's Tragedy*?

Again here, therefore, we encounter not only a lack of ordinary human instinct and shrewdness, even among cultivated men, but also a decay of common sanity, which we must reckon with in any attempt to account for the faults and failures of our education of children, and any reduction of discipline in the junior members both of the poorer and the well-to-do classes. And, seeing that this reduction in discipline is felt throughout life, and leads to a good deal of the disorder of modern adult life, we must not imagine that its evils are confined to childhood.

Regarding the second component in the modern Englishman's attitude towards children, it is a little more difficult to speak without giving offence, for it relates to one of the most secret and most prevalent of the results of diminished sexual vigour.

We must recall all that has been said concerning the large order of relatively impotent men, who, particularly in the middle and wealthy classes, and owing to their lack of native vigour, experience the greatest difficulty in overcoming their Puritanical inhibitions and fears in connection with sexual congress. And, at the same time, we must bear in mind that, while their upbringing, their values, and their impoverished physique, make them timid and uncertain about the procreative act, the oldest part of them—the emotions and desires associated with the traditional rôle of the male in the coitus—causes them to feel that the strongest support they can have for their self-esteem resides precisely in the act which they most apprehend.

This conflict leads to the following curious results—that, while they are not in the least comfortable about the whole of the sex life, feel no mastery in it, and would not be greatly inconvenienced if they never experienced it, they nevertheless covet that positive proof of manhood and vitality which the procreation of a child enables them to give to the world at large. And it is their very doubt about themselves and their manhood that makes them so strongly covet this positive proof. To this large and ever increasing body of young men in the modern world, the child is thus not a chance or happy result of a passionate love relation, but a deliberately sought tangible certificate of potency, which frequently they can ill afford, which they parade before their friends at every conceivable opportunity, and which among the poorer classes greatly complicates their own and their wife's difficulties in a modest and often ill-provided household. This is the meaning of an otherwise inexplicable phenomenon—the large number of quite passionless and even seriously debilitated people who are to be seen pressing their offspring upon the notice of their friends and acquaintances, and often upon strangers, with every sign of intense personal satisfaction in the display. It should never be forgotten that they

are exhibiting to a sceptical world their diploma of potency.¹

These people who quite dispassionately add to our present excessive population could, on temperamental, eugenic and frequently also on economic grounds, quite easily refrain from perpetuating their stock or continuing their utterly undesirable conditions. And, as one looks into their faces, one frequently wonders what could possibly have induced them, when passion drove so little, to burden themselves at the present day, with such unwelcome extra claims upon their meagre physiques and often equally meagre resources. When, however, their offspring is seen in the light of a necessary buttress to their self-esteem, a buttress which mere marriage does not provide with nearly the same sensational conviction, the anomaly is explained, and the multiplication of the "many-too-many" in these passionless days, receives a new and entirely modern sanction.

Such men always retain a distorted relationship to the child; because it has brought them such exaggerated, such unexpected satisfaction and assurance. The more noble among them, who have that rare quality gratitude, never forget either what they owe to the child, or their duty to repay, and the consequence is, the body of Wordsworthians is swelled by recruits who, while they end in the same follies as Wordsworth, approach the Wordsworthian position from a different direction.

The above three influences leading to exorbitant child-worship were bound to arise with sex-phobia and depreciated vitality, and we find the former, at least, all over Europe. Schiller wrote an essay about its existence in Germany over a hundred years ago,² and showed with

¹ In certain sections of the labouring classes, which I have had opportunities of studying, it is by no means uncommon for a thrifty but sensitive man to be driven to fatherhood before he is prepared to meet its obligations, merely because of the chaff he gets from friends and relatives.

² *Ueber Naïve und Sentimentalische Dichtung*. (The essay was first published in 1795-6.)

remarkable clarity how the excessive reverence for Nature, like the excessive reverence for children, arises from a moral and not from an æsthetic or intelligent understanding of either.

I am tempted to speak of many other evidences of the degeneration of mind and character in modern man, but must now draw this section rapidly to a close for want of space. For instance, I might expatiate on the following :

(1) The lack of solidarity among men, which makes it impossible to maintain a friendship with a man, when his wife has some reason for disliking one ; whereas, when it is merely the husband who has some reasons for disliking one, the friendship with the wife may continue uninterruptedly with the husband's concurrence.¹ The lack of solidarity among men is also displayed by the inability men show to keep each other's confidences secret. This is now almost universal.

(2) The too rapid reactions of modern men, and their lack of control. This trait which is largely the result of nervous exhaustion, is frequently interpreted as intellectuality or artistic sensitiveness. It manifests itself in restless interest, incapacity for silence and meditation, quick undignified bodily movements, and an increasing weakness of character through a too rapid response to environment.

(3) The too speedy absorptivity of modern men, so that they too readily assimilate strange thought and opinion. This is coupled with a lack of resistance both physiological and psychological, and with a so-called "thirst for knowledge." Imitativeness, feminine receptivity, and sequaciousness are the result, and leadership becomes impossible. This is so un-English that its prevalence points to a serious decline in the English character.

¹ This is not, as might be supposed, entirely due to the wife's domestic power over the xenial side of Friendship, but also to her ability in modern homes to select her own and her husband's friends.

(4) The increasing vanity of modern men. The recent multiplication of honours and orders is a proof of this,¹ as is also the stampede after publicity. It is an effeminate trait, and is incompatible with independence, and a strong, passionate nature. (For the mutual antagonism of passion and vanity, see my *Woman: A Vindication*.)

(5) The increasing tendency to obtain vivid experiences at second-hand, either through literature or the stage. This denotes a decline of appetite and vitality, when it is not merely a sign of repression and the desire for catharsis.

(6) The tendency to identify pleasant statements with true statements. This is also a feminine trait, but it is becoming more and more common among men. It makes the smooth-tongued demagogue powerful with the crowd, and makes it difficult for a man to move a body of his fellows if he is truthful.

(7) The tendency to accept praise or blame from women in regard to artistic or other performances, and to regard such praise or blame as a reliable estimate of one's worth. The personal and sexual factor in all women's judgments of men's performances is thus overlooked, and a man who speaks, writes or paints, however insignificantly, thus often lays to the credit of his wit and intelligence what he ought really to lay merely to the credit of his sexual attraction. The modern world is full of such men, who have a completely distorted notion of their worth, owing to having repeatedly entered to³ the credit of the wrong account adulation received from their womenfolk. To scorn the judgment of women, however, no matter how adulatory it is, proves, I admit, dangerous nowadays, because women have become very powerful. But they have only become powerful through the suffrages of those men who accept

¹ Only within the last forty years seven new orders, two new decorations, and several new medals (not war medals) have been instituted. (See Arthur Ponsonby, *The Decline of Aristocracy*, p. 124.)

their praise or blame as estimates of worth in other departments than sex-potency.

(8) The inability to make a damaging admission about oneself. This is also a feminine trait, but it is becoming ever more and more characteristic of the male sex also. It explains why most men and women among the audiences I have addressed on the subject of degeneration, have always taken it for granted that I must be excluding myself from the general charge. Until I told them I was not excluding myself—a piece of information that invariably astonished them—they naturally thought, being modern, that I would not make a charge so humiliating to modern pride, without regarding myself as unimplicated in it.

(9) The tendency is also increasing to judge men, not on their merits, but according to how far one can purr and feel comfortable and pleased with oneself in their presence. This is also a feminine trait that has now become very common among men. No woman can think well of a man who has snubbed her, however great he may be (example : Madame de Staël and Napoleon). Such an attitude is, however, unpardonable in a man, who ought to discount vanity from his judgment. A man should be rigid and settled enough in his judgments to exclude his personal reaction from his estimate of another's character and merits. He should, for instance, be able to despise a man who has done him only kindnesses, and admire a man who has done him only unkindnesses, if disdain and admiration were deserved by each respectively, apart from his own experience at their hands. But this hardly ever occurs to-day. Every man, like every woman, asks himself, consciously or unconsciously : "What is my relation to this man ? How has he treated me ?" And, according to whether the answer is favourable or unfavourable, he admires or despises him. This is, however, the slave's attitude, and the woman's attitude. But it is quite unworthy of man.

As an illustration of what I mean, I might perhaps quote the following personal experience. I happened one day soon after the war to be talking to a group of people, when the conversation turned upon the subject of a particular lady, whom, for private reasons, I never wished to meet again. The company knew that I never wished to meet this lady again, and that my reason was that she had wronged some one very dear to me.

I could not, however, refrain from paying a high tribute to her gifts, and spoke very enthusiastically of her versatility and brilliance. Now the reader will, I hope, believe me when I add, that the whole of the company present, both men and women, immediately concluded, from the way I had praised her attainments and gifts, that I must be wishing to become reconciled to her, although I had not the slightest intention of doing so, and have never done so to this day.

Nobody in the relation of an enemy can, according to the slave or to woman, possess any desirable quality, hence the unfounded expectations of the company on the occasion I speak of. They thought I could no longer be regarding the lady as an enemy because I spoke highly of her. It was excusable in the women, but quite inexcusable in the men.

(10) Finally, I would refer to the decline in intelligence, which I think can be shown to have occurred in all classes of the community. This is generally denied with great heat, even by those who are willing to acknowledge that so-called "physical degeneration," as apart from "mental degeneration" is a well-established fact; and in this way the modern world seeks to justify and vindicate its right to esteem. For it argues that, although our bodies may be in a sad plight, our minds have never been more brilliant and more fertile.

Nevertheless, there is much evidence pointing to the conclusion that intelligence is really declining, and such works as Mr. Lothrop Stoddard's *Revolt Against Civilization* and Mr. Arthur Ponsonby's *The Decline of*

*Aristocracy*¹ furnish us with many alarming facts about this phenomenon.

One does not require to be pessimistically inclined in order to see in the increasing power of the demagogue and of the press, a substantial falling off of vigorous and independent thought among the masses, while in the lack of leading personalities among the governing sections of the community, and of constructive ideas in modern politics, adequate demonstration is to be found of a similar condition among the more cultivated classes.

One of the most convincing proofs of intellectual deterioration, however, is the remarkable standardization of opinion and taste that has been made possible within recent years. This would not be so bad, if those who were affected by it were aware of it. But what increases the suspicion that a process of general besotment is in progress, is the fact that the very people whose thoughts and opinions on almost all subjects have been standardized are not in the least aware that they are not exercising the right of private judgment with complete originality and independence.

Any kind of false conclusion, whether scientific or artistic, if it be sufficiently widely circulated and advertised, will quickly become public opinion to-day, without any attempt on the part of the public to apply realistic tests of its validity before accepting it. Reputations are made, commercial products are bought in enormous quantities, and false values about life and culture are assimilated, by the mere repetition and emphatic restate-

¹ For the decline in intelligence among the masses, see the whole of the former work, and for the decline of intelligence among the governing classes see the latter work, especially pp. 23, 128, 135, 139 and 141. "Even in fighting the battle to retain their ascendancy," says Mr. Ponsoby, "the nobility and aristocracy showed themselves as a body, with a very few individual exceptions, poorly equipped intellectually, blind, and ill-informed." (Op. cit., p. 135.) Another useful work that should be consulted by the reader, on the subject of physical and mental decay, is R. Austin Freeman's *Social Decay and Regeneration* (Constable & Co., 1921).

ment of their alleged merits in a press wholly devoted to "stunting"; and there is no effort on the part of the majority to escape from this intellectual enslavement.

Thus the right of private judgment, which is inherent not only in Protestantism, but also in the genuine particularist character of the Anglo-Saxon, is now no more than a myth. We have mass-thought and opinion imposed on the population, in the same way as are their standardized manufactured boots, and any attempt at raising them from their hypnotic condition, by stating truths that are incompatible with their standardized intellectual pabulum, is to earn the reputation of insanity or crankiness. The immense power of advertisement at the present day is only made possible through the servile suggestibility and absence of independent judgment among the masses, and the magic of a name sufficiently often repeated reveals the hypnotic nature of this power.

Let any reader try such experiments as I have tried. Let him make it a rule for six months to ask, wherever he may happen to be, in high society or low, the opinion of some representative personality on say—(a) the value of humour, or (b) the extent to which the late war disproved and invalidated the charge of degeneracy made against modern man, or (c) the question whether modern man, though perhaps possessing less animal stamina than his ancestor, is not growing every year more intellectual, or (d) whether old armour does not show that we of modern England are bigger and finer men than our ancestors were, etc. If he does not find an extraordinary amount of unanimous though false opinion on all these questions shared equally by high and low (among the lower strata, of course, he is not likely to hear anything at all about armour, because they have never heard of it), he will need to congratulate himself on frequenting the most exceptional and most self-determined individuals of his age.

There is some reason to believe that, at least among the masses, elementary education is responsible for a

good deal of the decay of intelligence ; because, while it fills their minds with an enormous amount of ridiculous and useless facts, it also fails to give them the necessary safeguards against an abuse of the one powerful weapon which it places in their hands—the ability to read their own language. And thus in later life they become exposed to all the nonsense that commercialized fourth and fifth-rate literature takes good care to supply them with. But there can also be little doubt that low physical health is an important contributory factor in producing dull and stupid children. Indeed Dr. Clarke of Cornwall, after examining some 4,000 local children, who had been found to be backward, discovered that their condition was most closely connected with the following attributes : enlarged tonsils and nasal obstruction, squint, defective hearing, diseases of the circulatory system, and defective vision,¹ and there is a good deal of other evidence to the same effect.² The 1920 report of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education contains the following significant remarks : “The educational organization discovers the backward child as a serious factor in national life. . . . We cannot afford to neglect a problem which adds to the industrial problem some 50,000 to 60,000 children per annum—recruits to an army unprepared by mental ineptitude to meet effectively the intellectual demands of a full life.”

With regard to the wealthier classes, the same causes are no doubt operating with the same effect, and some of the figures given by Mr. Ponsonby in his *Decline of Aristocracy*, regarding the reduction in the successful entrants to the Civil Service from the families of the governing classes, are significant in this respect. Naturally

¹ See *Report of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education, 1920.*

² See *Reports of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education for 1921, 1922, and 1923.* Some of the data have already been given in a previous chapter.

there are no such official records of dullness and stupidity among the children of the rich as we find regarding the children of the poor, but the general tone and achievements of these classes, the way they spend their leisure and their wealth, the way they face current problems, and the way in which they too, as we have already seen, submit to the standardization of opinion and taste, can leave us in no doubt as to their low intellectual condition.¹

* * * * *

This concludes my indictment of modern man, but let it not be supposed that, because I have drawn my examples chiefly from England—the country I know best—that I therefore imagine there is any other civilized country better, or less degenerate, than England; because I do not. Here and there you may find signs of what appears to be a superior condition, as for instance, in the greater rural life of France, in the contemptuous rejection by the French populace of the many attempts which have been made (and which have been successful in Germany and England) to introduce the Servile State, and the virile execration with which a recent endeavour on the part of the French Government to register and to insure the artisan as a separate category of citizens, was received by the whole of the French nation.² But I have no doubt that if one took the trouble one could find certain other and inferior features in France, which would destroy this apparent superiority over England and Germany, and in the end the difference would not be very great. I have travelled Western Europe pretty thoroughly, and am convinced that the racial degeneracy of modern man is just as acute on the Continent (especially in the industrial parts of Germany, France, Belgium and Italy) as it is here. The national degeneracy is more or less different in each country,

¹ For an incomplete but fairly extensive enumeration of the blunders and incompetencies of this class during the nineteenth century see my *Defence of Aristocracy*.

² See E. S. P. Haynes, *The Decline of Liberty in England*, p. 26.

because the qualities that are being lost are not the same in each nation. But that degeneracy, whether atavistic, racial or national is pretty general wherever Western civilization has spread, is, I think, an indisputable fact, which only the lack of space prevents me from being able to demonstrate.

Now it must be perfectly obvious that no such substantial deterioration in the mind and body of man as I have described, could possibly have occurred, without greatly disturbing the normal balance of the sexes, even if woman had degenerated equally with man in mind and body. Seeing, however, that for the reasons already given at the end of Chapter VII, and in view of other reasons to be discussed later, woman has not degenerated equally with man, or has at least escaped some of the worst consequences of modern degeneration ; and, seeing moreover, that the kind of degeneration which has occurred in man, particularly that of his sexual vigour, sexual instincts, character and intellect, is of a nature specially to provoke the contempt and ridicule of the other sex, we are justified, I think, in assuming that the present attitude of woman both to the sex question, to the status of her sex, and to man in general, is largely, if not wholly, due to man's own very definite loss of ground, both in the physical and the mental sphere ; and that no alteration in the sex war, and no enhancement, above all, in the authority, prestige and dignity of man, can possibly be expected until some headway has been made in the regeneration of mankind as a whole and of the male sex in particular.

Woman's respect for man, like her trust in him, has gone and we have seen that there is ample justification for this phenomenon. If, however, our thesis is sound, and we are right in believing that it is quite impossible to run the world successfully and desirably, except under the guidance of first-class male material, let us be quite sure that we thoroughly understand our present position.

While regarding the present contempt of our women-

folk as well deserved, and interpreting their clamorous demands for power, and their strides towards power merely as the expression of that contempt and the natural reaction to our own failure and incompetence, let us not beguile ourselves with the thought that Feminism is either a necessary evolutionary development or a guarantee of any hope for the future. Let us see it as it is—that is to say, merely as the inevitable reflection of our own decline, and not by any means as a remedy for any of the ills, political, physical, intellectual or religious which we may see about us to-day. For these ills are the direct result of a serious deterioration in male efficiency, male vigour, and male character. They cannot be corrected, except by restoring to man his proper quota of health, intelligence, sound instinct and capacity; they cannot be corrected within a nation, without restoring to the male members of that nation the full vigour of their peculiar virtues and character; and the first step to be contemplated, therefore, the only step which can possibly give any hope for the future, is the regeneration of man himself, and the recovery of a high standard in the measurement of his physical and mental desirability. This alone can bring about the urgent subsequent reforms that are needed in every department of modern life, in order to restore humanity and society to a sane and healthy condition; and those who see in other directions, away from this Masculine Renaissance, a remedy for any modern evil, however slight, however tolerable, ought to be regarded as the enemies not only of Progress, but of all mankind as well.

It now only remains to deal with those causes of modern degeneration which I have not yet discussed, and then to turn to the more pleasant but more difficult task of enumerating those measures which, according to my view, and the view of many men very much more qualified than myself to speak with authority on the question, may help us to achieve our regeneration even at this late stage in our history.

Book III

THE CAUSES OF DEGENERATION AND THE REMEDY

CHAPTER X

The More Remote Causes of Modern Male Degeneracy—Part I

IN the course of the previous chapters I have hinted at many of the more proximate and particular causes of the degeneration I have described. In the present chapter I propose to examine the more remote and more general causes of the same phenomenon.

The causes of degeneration which are constantly active, which have long been established among us, and which affect both male and female are :

- (1) The dysgenic influence of Christianity.
- (2) The hostility of Christianity to sex, and to the joys of the body (Puritanism).
- (3) The influence of the democratic contempt of blood and family (miscegenation).
- (4) The faulty co-ordination of our bodies.
- (5) The false conceptions of modern medicine.
- (6) The selection of type which operates in commercial and industrial conditions.

The causes of degeneration which, while constantly active, affect especially the male, are :

- (7) Sport.
- (8) Specialization in occupation.
- (9) Selection operating under too limited an idea of true manliness.

These causes will now be discussed in the order in which they have been enumerated.

- (1) The dysgenic influence of Christianity may con-

veniently be treated under three heads : (a) The exaltation of the soul above the body, and the destruction of sound taste in selection ; (b) The false and unsocial teaching of pity ; (c) The exaltation of moral above æsthetic values.

(a) The exaltation of the soul above the body, to the extent of making soul attributes the principal criterion of human worth, is of the very essence of Christianity. It permeates all the values, and therefore all the civilizations that Christianity has created, and is the chief feature distinguishing that religion from Paganism, Judaism, and most of the heathen cults of savage races. The idea of soul-value, as opposed to body-value, is said to have arisen out of the dualistic view of the universe—the well-known dichotomy of spirit and matter—which, according to some authorities,¹ seems, in its ascetic form, to have characterized the philosophic speculations of oriental peoples and of Greece at the moment of their decline. In India, for instance, the origin of this dualistic view is ascribed to the settled despondency that appears to have come over the people through their subjugation by powerful invaders of a mental calibre lower than their own. And in Greece, where it may, or may not, have had an independent origin, its appearance is also connected with the beginning of Hellenic decadence.

The ascetic idea of dualism does indeed savour of depression and despondency ; because, by depreciating matter in favour of spirit, it suggests the need of a flight from the world and its material concerns. Thus, the early ascetics of India, who were the protagonists of ascetic dualism, regarded matter as corrupt and the work, in whole or in part, of a being other than the creator of the soul, while they regarded spirit as incorrupt and as divine in origin. In this view of life, the soul of man was held to be the higher part of him, imprisoned in corrupt matter—his body, and purity or holiness was

¹ See, for instance, the authors of the articles on "Asceticism" in Hastings' *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*.

conceived as a denial of this bodily prison in favour of its inmate the soul. Every desire of the material shell was, therefore, to be stifled and mortified, so that the soul might attain to ever greater independence and beauty; and the holy life was tantamount to the complete liberation of the soul from bodily desires, appetites and joys.

This ascetic ideal was widely disseminated long before the appearance of Jesus Christ in Palestine; and both Brahminism and Buddhism in India, but particularly the latter, six hundred years before our era, set up a severe ascetic ideal for the achievement of holiness.

Whereas, however—and this is the important distinction—in Brahminism and Buddhism, asceticism, while remaining a strict discipline in bodily mortification for the priesthood, was never upheld as an idea for the lay world, it also never led to the neglect of bodily demands, or to a disregard of the essentials for healthy breeding. Roughly speaking, therefore, we may say of India, that despite the priestly valuation of the body as corrupt, this remained an esoteric doctrine, which never operated as a dysgenic influence among the lay population. It never led to the neglect of primary bodily considerations, even in that part of the priestly code which was directed at regulating lay life, and thus the masses continued to be safeguarded against the worst evils of body contempt, although body contempt was implicit in the national philosophy.

Thus, in the Laws of Manu, which constitute the holy book of the Brahmins, not only are the dysgenic effects of miscegenation carefully guarded against, but very stringent rules are laid down to prevent marriages between people of unsound constitutions. A young Hindu may not marry a girl whose family has thick hair on the body, or is subject to hæmorrhoids, phthisis, weakness of digestion, epilepsy, or white or black leprosy. He may not marry a maiden who has a redundant member, or who is sickly, or has red eyes (presumably conjunctivitis). He has to marry a girl who is free from all bodily

defects.¹ There is no suggestion that bodily defects may be overlooked, or are compensated, if the soul of the person displaying them is sufficiently pure.

In Buddhism, while there is a distinct relaxation of the Hindu regulations against miscegenation,² the provisions against deterioration of stock by neglect of the bodily defects in marriage, continue to be enforced. A man must marry a girl whose parents are not afflicted with any hereditary disease, such as leprosy, madness, cancer, syphilis, etc.,³ and those children of a marriage, moreover, who are defective or of equivocal sex are not allowed to benefit fully under the will of their father.⁴

Likewise in Plato, whereas the dichotomy, soul and body, and the superiority of the former are fully admitted,⁵ we read in the *Republic* of all kinds of regulations for securing sound human stock. No children bearing the stigmata of degeneration are to be reared, and only sound people are to be mated.

Thus among three peoples, the Hindus, the Buddhists, and the later Greeks, the condemnation and contempt of matter and the body were never allowed to lead to a frivolous neglect of bodily concerns, and the sound and realistic view of the essentials of healthy physical mating was never superseded by the romantic and sentimental notion of the union of two souls.

The Egyptians and the Israelites need not be reckoned with, because with them asceticism played no part. The very notion that the body must at all costs be preserved

¹ See Book III of the *Laws of Manu*.

² See *Notes on Buddhist Law, II Marriage*, by Sir J. Jardine (Rangoon, September 14, 1882), p. 2.

³ In *Notes on Buddhist Law, III Marriage*, by Sir J. Jardine (Rangoon, December 12, 1882), pp. xii and xiv. See also p. 23 of the former publication (Rangoon, September 14, 1882).

⁴ See *Notes on Buddhist Law, V Inheritance*, by Sir J. Jardine (Rangoon, March 15, 1883), p. 3.

⁵ No such feelings existed in Greek life before the age of Hesiod, and asceticism is supposed to have sprung from a pessimistic outlook upon earthly existence in the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.

for the use of the spirit, the "Ka," in after life, absolves the Egyptians of any charge of body contempt or hostility to the physical side of life, while their stringent regulations against miscegenation also sufficiently reveal their realistic acceptance of sound concepts regarding the body. To the Jews, as to the Mohammedans in after years, asceticism as a ruling idea was entirely foreign, and the many regulations to be found in Jewish law concerning the care of the body, the dangers of miscegenation, the distinction between cleanliness and uncleanness, and the magnificent condemnation of physiological defects in their priesthood,¹ show how far they were from the unhealthy attitude, which, starting with the vilification of the body and matter, ends in making it a virtue to neglect the whole of the physical side of life.

Now, through the influence both of the oriental and late Greek thought, the whole of the Near East had, in pre-Christian days, probably become familiar with asceticism, and the Essenes and the Therapeutæ, both ascetic sects, were probably the extreme expression of this widespread cult of other or super-worldliness.

Certain it is that, from the very first, Christianity embodied the ideas and ideals of the ascetics, and there is no doubt that John the Baptist, for instance, was a thoroughgoing example of the oriental ascetic type.

The New Testament is full of references to the castigation and crucifixion of the body for the attainment of virtue and holiness, and throughout its various books emphasis is repeatedly laid on the vileness of this world and the flesh, and the superiority of the soul. Indeed, the consequences of the lengths to which the early Christians went in accepting this view of life, greatly embarrassed the early Church, and it might even be said that, certainly in the first four centuries of its existence, the Church was faced by the following extraordinary dilemma—was it to expire through the ascetic

¹ See Lev. xxi. 16-23.

zeal of its adherents, whose denial of the body and all physical joys made a Christian future impossible ? or, was it to combat too extreme an application of asceticism in daily life by relaxing the stringency of its teaching on this matter ? Apparently the instinct of self-preservation in the captains of religion in those days decided in favour of the second alternative. But this did not prevent asceticism from remaining the ideal both of the lay and the clerical world, *and there was never in Christianity that sharp differentiation between these two worlds as regards the way to virtue and holiness, that we find in Brahminism and Buddhism.* On the contrary, the contempt of the body and its joys and needs, became the very kernel of the faith for both the priesthood and the populace, and it was unfortunately not balanced by any of those sound eugenic safeguards which we find alike in Brahministic doctrine, in Buddhism and in late Greek philosophy.

In spite of the fact that the Old Testament remained part of the Christian's Holy Book, its more sound teaching regarding the body was unable to prevail against the lethal asceticism of such men as Paul and the early Fathers ; and the consequence was that in Christianity Europe embraced a religion which, while it possessed the most unhealthy elements of oriental philosophy—the vilification of the body and of matter as corrupt—it entirely lacked the wise corrections of Hindu, Buddhistic and Platonic teaching.

“ Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world.”¹ (I remind the reader that this is not an exhortation directed at an ascetic priesthood alone, but at the whole body of believers.)

“ Flesh is death, Spirit is life and peace. The body is dead because of sin ; but the Spirit is life because of

¹ 1 John ii. 15-16.

righteousness. If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die ; but if ye through the spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.”¹ (The same remark as above also applies here.)

This last jewel of ascetic negativism comes from Paul, the most venomous of body-haters that has ever existed.

“And they that are Christ,” he says on another occasion, “have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.”² And so on *ad infinitum*. Paul would like us to believe that the Almighty could have had no part in the creation of man’s body—precisely the teaching of the Indian ascetics, but how very much more dangerous now it was divorced from the rest of the Laws of Manu !

There is much more in the same strain in the New Testament, and the upshot of it all is that the soul is exalted at the expense of the body, and body contempt becomes the main pillar of the creed.

We are not so much concerned here, however, with the absurdity of this theological reasoning about the soul and body, and with the still less savoury conclusions drawn from it by Paul and the early Church Fathers, as we are with investigating its consequences ; and these, it cannot be denied, have been quite as disastrous as we might have expected them to be.

The inevitable result of exalting the soul to this extent, and of despising and condemning the body, was obviously to pave the way for the ultimate neglect of all physical concerns. Care about food, about sound mating, sound selection, and caution in all physical matters, naturally went by the board the moment soul values became the only criterion of worth. A hunchback, an epileptic, a congenital deaf-mute, could, provided they were loved by the Lord and believed in Him, regard themselves, and, what is more, be regarded, as quite as desirable as any other men ; for that part of them which had value—their soul—was approved of by the Church. And seeing that in Christian tradition

¹ Rom. viii. 6-13.

² Gal. v. 24. See also Col. iii. 5.

and doctrine, and certainly in the books composing the New Testament, there are no regulations, like those to be found in the law-books of the Brahmins or Buddhists, prohibiting the mating of unsound people, it was a foregone conclusion that dysgenic mating should become a common and perfectly legitimate practice under the patronage of the Church.

Not only that, but it was also inevitable that through the reiteration of the importance of soul values, and of the unimportance of body values, a generation of men should have been born, who like ourselves, have not only lost all sound taste where human stock is concerned, but who have also lost all shame about our own and other people's bodily defects. With soul values as the only important values, why should a man feel ashamed of artificial aids like false teeth, spectacles, aperients? The Church encourages shame in regard to impurity of the soul. Does it ever mention shame about impurity of breath?

Every day we can see marriages consummated by Christian communities, which on every conceivable physical ground ought to be forbidden—the marriage of cripples, blind people, deaf and dumb people—in fact, the physiologically bungled and botched of every description.¹

Is there anything in the Christian faith or doctrine to forbid or prevent this evil?—We know there is nothing. On the contrary, every tenet of the creed makes physiological considerations quite superfluous. It is no longer

¹ See R. Austin Freeman (Op. cit., p. 244): "Lunatics are permitted to marry and do marry. Thus out of the total of 117,274 lunatics in the United Kingdom shown by the Census returns of 1901, no less than 46,800 were married or widowed. . . . And not only are there no impediments, in many cases degenerate persons are encouraged to marry. A clergyman connected with an institution for deaf-mutes mentioned to me the number of happy marriages that had been arranged by him between the inmates; and among the feeble-minded marriage is often encouraged on 'moral' grounds." Mr. Freeman might also have referred to the congenitally blind who are also allowed to marry.

necessary to be able to walk upright to the altar to be married. One is allowed a bath-chair.

That is why Christianity is dysgenic in its influence. By opposing no moral or religious barrier to dysgenic mating, but rather by encouraging such mating through its exaltation of soul above body values, it has been in the past, and is still, one of the most potent causes of degeneration. And the Eugenic Society may last a very long while and yet fail to make any appreciable headway, so long as it remains so far from recognizing this primary fact as to include upon its council an avowed and official Christian like Dean Inge.¹

Of course everybody will appreciate how difficult it is nowadays to come out into the open with an attack upon Christianity on its moral and non-dogmatic side.² And the kind of treatment I have received both at the hands of the Press and the Public for my consistent exposure of the evils of Christian morality (which almost every modern person is taught to regard as the most creditable aspect of the religion) is not of the kind that would encourage others to follow my lead.³ Nevertheless, the fact remains that all the eugenic legislation in

¹ Dean Inge is well aware that his position as a eugenicist may provoke astonishment, hence his eager but very feeble efforts in *Outspoken Essays* to prove that Christianity is not dysgenic in its influence. But let him look about him! *Qui s'excuse s'accuse!*

² The difficulty Huxley and the Darwinians had in fighting the dogma is as nothing compared with the difficulty of fighting the values of Christianity.

³ It is interesting to note in this respect that, as far as I have been able to discover, such works as Mr. Freeman's *Social Decay and Regeneration*, Mr. Stoddart's *Revolt Against Civilization* and the other books on physical deterioration already quoted, never draw the logical conclusion that Christian values are equally responsible with the more commonly described influences of Industrialism and Urbanization for our degeneration. Mr. Freeman (*Op. cit.*, pp. 275-6) does indeed get very near to an open admission of this fact; but he is still too cautious to do more than leave the reader to draw his own inferences, and he nowhere dares to state definitely how and why Christianity must be dysgenic.

the world can achieve but little, as long as the contempt of body values remains as an active moral element in our midst. And that is why, if Eugenists really meant business, they would learn to know where their most insidious enemy was to be found, and they would, at all costs, openly attack him.

(b) In its false and unsocial teaching of pity Christianity also exercises a powerful dysgenic influence.

Pity should be a means of increasing or preserving the strength of a human group or community. It is the emotion which is provoked by a member of a group falling, collapsing, or otherwise failing in the fulfilment of his social function. And the group, by feeling pity and by being provoked to help him up and to restore him to a sound and upright position, adds to, or rather preserves, its own strength. In this sense pity is a vital emotion, a useful emotion, a social need.

It is easy to see, however, that if pity be perverted into a mere reflex action of sympathy at the sight of all suffering, it may become a very noxious influence in society and one which may even require disciplinary removal.

To adopt for the moment the analogy of the human body to the body politic, it is obvious that, so long as a man feels he can save or restore to serviceableness a particular member or part of his body that has become diseased, his compassion for that part and for himself, may induce him to take very expensive and drastic measures to procure a remedy. The moment, however, there is no hope of healing, and the health of the body demands that the part should either be healed or removed, then, the wise man, who wishes to survive, naturally decides to have the diseased part of his body removed. In the language of the emotions, he ceases to feel any pity for the diseased part or member, because his attachment to the healthy remainder is greater than it is to the unhealthy part. Therefore to spare the remainder he sacrifices the diseased part.

If, however, he is so corrupt and so imbecile as to continue to feel pity for the diseased member, after he knows that it cannot be healed and that it imperils the rest of his body, then he perishes ; and after all one feels that he deserves to do so.

Now what Christianity has done is practically to impose pity, in the sense of an irrational reflex at the sight of suffering, upon the whole of civilized mankind as a moral duty. Pity must be forthcoming whether its expression promotes or hinders the welfare of society. And, since the active expression of pity is to succour, Christian pity means in practice that every kind of human wreckage, no matter whether it is the wreckage of congenital rot, or of useful service, no matter whether its continued existence endangers or does not endanger the health or welfare of the remainder, must be succoured, tended and salved. This, however, is to make pity a source of weakness to the community instead of a source of strength.

It is conceivable and arguable that society has a duty to those of its members who, having in the fulfilment of a useful purpose become wreckage, are nevertheless beyond the power of healing, and can never be restored to the strength of the community. Pity appears to lose its sanction here, but it does not really do so. Because, although the human wreckage in this case may never be restored to the strength of the group, to neglect to tend and care for it might deter others from working for the group, for fear lest a similar fate might overtake them.

It is inconceivable, however, except on Christian grounds, that society has a duty to those of its members, who, having at birth shown themselves to be wreckage and beyond the power of healing, can not only never be restored to the strength of the community, but can also only burden it uselessly as long as they survive. For while society may owe them protection, it can only do so to the extent to which it does not cease to protect

itself. And it may be reasonably argued that, quite apart from the danger of their transmitting their defects if they survive puberty, the multiplication of these hopeless cases impairs the welfare of the healthy remainder by imposing upon them burdens, financial and otherwise, which limit their freedom, reduce their powers of survival, and prevent them from procuring for themselves and their children an optimum of conditions within their means.

But at this point the doctrine of irrational pity (as an automatic reflex) receives support from the further Christian doctrine that it is noble and desirable to sacrifice the greater to the less. Thus, according to Christian ethics, it cannot be wrong to penalize and jeopardize the lives of the sound, the promising and the better stocks, for the support of the unsound, the unpromising and the decadent ; and the whole of the rational attitude towards sacrifice is reversed. If sacrifice there must be—and society cannot survive without it—the act of sacrifice, again, should be a source of strength to the community and not a source of weakness. With the doctrine of irrational pity, however, it is always the more desirable and sounder elements that are sacrificed for the less desirable and less sound, and the consequence is that sacrifice where it is practised, becomes a further source of weakness to the group.

The farmer, when contemplating his crops, endeavours to spare the more valuable plants, and to protect them from the weeds and the parasites. When he sees a crop of wheat overrun with dodder or any other weed, his pity goes out to the wheat. And when he thinks of sacrifice, it is to the dodder that he turns his attention. He does not think it a shame that the wheat is not allowing more sunlight to reach the dodder ; he thinks it a shame that the dodder is hindering the healthy growth of the wheat.

A Christian community, however, confronted by a similar spectacle in the human world feels no pity for

the diminishing number of the sound and the better stocks among human beings, when their existence and welfare is being threatened by the inroads of the degenerate ; because its pity, being an irrational reflex, is not provoked by a noble and sound minority struggling hard to perpetuate human desirability on earth. No matter how great the numbers of the degenerate and the botched may be, and no matter how seriously they may threaten the survival of the dwindling minority composed of the sound and desirable, Christian irrational pity continues to express itself in the succour of the less desirable elements of society at the cost of the more desirable ; and, what is more, on the principle that it is noble to sacrifice the greater to the less, finds every justification for pursuing this policy.

The rise of the power of women, who very quickly and by nature came to regard Christian irrational pity as the loftiest emotion, has, of course, done a good deal in recent years to promote the kind of unthinking humanitarianism which is destroying the nation's stamina and health. But even the males in a Christian community must, in their attitude to pity and sacrifice, act in a manner which is destructive of their fellows' ultimate welfare ; and in this sense, the Feminist power has only aggravated an influence which would in any case have caused havoc among mankind.

In its inculcation upon all of the duty of pity as an irrational reflex, and as a source of weakness instead of a source of strength to the community, Christianity is once more, therefore, shown to constitute a dysgenic influence ; and when it is remembered that its distortion of pity is coupled with an utterly dysgenic view of sacrifice, it must be obvious that no headway can possibly be made against the forces of degeneration, so long as there is no frontal attack on Christian values.

(c) In its exaltation of moral over æsthetic values, to the extent of utterly ignoring the latter, Christianity also exercises a further dysgenic influence on society,

because it sets a value to a human being even when the latter's conformity with the Christian moral code is the outcome of negative rather than positive qualities.

The mere inability or disinclination to act is thus set higher than the inevitable overflow of wanton strength and spirits, and the same valuation applies to man and woman. The girl of passion and beauty is placed lower than the passionless and ugly girl, if it can be shown that the latter leads a pure negative life, while the former perseveringly seeks the environment in which her passion can find expression.

This does not mean that in a society free from Christian values, anarchy in the relations of the sexes would necessarily prevail; for we have only to study anthropology to discover innumerable societies where there has been and is still perfect order in the sex relations, without any of that disdain for æsthetic values which characterizes Christianity.

It simply means that, where moral values alone are considered in estimating human value, as they have been in Christianity, the æsthetic aspects of human beings are not only neglected, but are also frequently regarded as obstacles to "holiness" and "purity," and thus tend to become eliminated.

When Prynne wrote: "Man's perfect Beautie consists in the inward Endowments, Ornaments, Trappings, Virtues, and the Graces of the Mind and Soul. . . . This is the only Comeliness and Beautie, which makes us Amiable and Beautiful in the sight of God,"¹ he spoke not only as a Puritan but as a Christian.

Again, when he wrote: "A Studious, Curious, Inordinate and Eager Affection of Beautie must needs be sinful and Abominable,"² he voiced not a personal sentiment, but the sentiment of a great and powerful religion.

¹ *The Unloveliness of Lovelocks* (1628), p. 51.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 55, 56.

The danger of thus favouring moral to the extent of condemning æsthetic values, however, was that by so doing, every species of human repulsiveness might justify its existence (as it does to-day) to the exclusion of creatures fair to look upon. But for the stubborn persistence, here and there, of Pagan values, bodily beauty would by now, therefore, be almost completely eliminated, for it has no proper status, and can make no claim against alleged moral perfection.

In ugliness and repulsiveness, however, many of the principal signs of degeneracy are frequently proclaimed. Facial asymmetry, for instance, which is a universal sign of degeneracy, is generally one of the most potent causes of personal ugliness. According to strict Christian teaching, however, such ugliness does not in the least detract from a man's value, because, since it cannot be traced to any individual moral trespass, it is beyond the scope of Christian criticism. The whole of the critical apparatus of Christianity is concerned with man's moral value ; it pays no heed to his body and his face, let them be ever so revolting.

There is, moreover, this fatal consequence of favouring moral at the cost of æsthetic values, and that is that each individual with his own judgment values himself only according to moral values. Thus while shame is felt about moral depravity, as I pointed out in my *Lysistrata*, no shame is felt about physiological depravity. A man or woman, morally depraved, may not only feel prevented from gaining access to certain social circles, but if he or she invaded such circles uninvited, the latter would quickly rectify the act of intrusion by a rigid ban amounting to ostracism or exile.

Is there any such barrier against a man or a woman physiologically depraved ? May not he or she go anywhere, be seen anywhere, and be welcomed anywhere ? Does a man with false teeth or any other socially accepted physiological depravity, feel any compunction in declaring his love to a girl who is free from such stigmata of

degeneration ? ¹ And, conversely, would any girl with degenerate traits decline an offer of marriage with some man better than herself on the score of her degeneracy alone ? She would be expected to decline an offer of marriage if it were known to all except her lover that she was morally depraved, or at least she would be expected to confess her immoral past before accepting him. And if she failed to decline his offer or to confess, there would be scores of people ready to prevent the match from being consummated. Would scores come forward to prevent the match if she were merely physiologically depraved ?

Thus in favouring moral at the cost of æsthetic values, Christianity has given us a conscience only for moral depravity.

In this way the first natural checks to degenerative mating, which would be applied instinctively by a group of healthy men and women—the taste which recoils from ugliness, deformity, physical inferiority, bodily defects, etc., and the standards which would cause healthy people to feel nausea rather than love in the presence of false teeth, glasses, impure breath, nervous debility, etc.—have all been broken down, and the values behind them transvalued. Here again, therefore, Christianity is seen to exercise a dysgenic influence, and one of the essential prerequisites to any eugenic reform would have to be the reinstatement of æsthetic considerations in the estimation of human beings, and the refutation of the position assumed by Christianity in regard to moral and æsthetic value.

(2) Christianity's hostility to sex and to the joys of the body is so well known, and so easily read from the Church's doctrine and the Scriptures upon which it is

¹ To argue that physiological depravity is condoned because it cannot be helped, and that moral depravity is not condoned because it can be helped, is, in the light of modern knowledge, no longer possible. The very nature of this plea reveals how much more rigidly we are ruled by moral than by æsthetic values.

based, that it need only be briefly referred to here. Seeing, however, that in countries like England and America, where the ascetic side of Christianity has been taken very much to heart, the sex-phobia of Christianity is the cause of most of the sex misery that prevails, and is an additional cause of degeneration; beyond those already given; *in view, moreover, of the fact that Christians are prone stoutly to deny that Christianity is necessarily hostile to sex and to the joys of the body*, it will be necessary to state the evidence of Christianity's sex-phobia very precisely.

As a rule Christians reply to the charge of sex-phobia that their religion should not be confounded with Puritanism, and that there is nothing in Christianity to justify the extremes to which the Puritans go. This, however, is hardly candid, and it is a rejoinder that can easily be refuted.

We have already pointed out that Oriental asceticism was adopted by Christianity without any of the eugenic safeguards which prevented the contempt of the body from leading to degeneration. It will now be our object to show that precisely the same influence of asceticism occurred in the domain of sex and bodily joys without, in Christianity, being saved from absurdity by the wise differentiation between priests and laity which characterised Brahminism and Buddhism.

True, the ascetic Brahmin priest was forbidden any sort of sexual experience and to him the body of woman was pronounced impure. To the lay world, however, the joys of the body were recommended as an essential experience, plurality of wives was allowed, and that man alone was pronounced perfect who had wife and children. To the layman, moreover, the mouth and body of woman was pronounced pure, and woman herself was condemned if she remained unmated.

"To be mothers were women created," says the Holy Book of the Hindus, addressing the laity, "and to

be fathers men.”¹ “Reprehensible is the father who giveth not his daughter in marriage at the proper time.”²

“He only is a perfect man who consists of three persons united, his wife, himself, and his offspring.”³

“The mouth of a woman is always pure.”⁴ “Pure is the mouth of a goat and of a horse, pure is the back of a cow, pure are the feet of a Brahmana ; but women are pure in all parts.”⁵

And finally, there is this jewel of friendliness to human love : “A woman is not defiled by a lover.”⁶

In Buddhism, which admittedly carried asceticism much further than did Brahminism, there is the same careful doctrinal differentiation between the laity and the priesthood in the matter of sex.

“Although like St. Paul,” says Sir J. Jardine, “Gautama felt that celibacy was alone consistent with his spiritual vocation, and made that state the rule for the religious, there is nothing to show that he ever treated marriages among the laity with disrespect ;”⁷ and although the command, “Thou shalt not be unchaste,” meant for the priests and nuns celibacy, for the lay world it was only a prohibition of adultery.⁸

In an extract from the Marriage Feast at Jambunada there is a passage which gives a very good idea of Gautama’s ruling on this question in so far as he addressed himself to the laity.⁹

“The greatest happiness which a mortal man can imagine,” he is said to have declared on this occasion, “is the bond of marriage that ties together two loving hearts.”

Thus, although for the bhikkhu (the Buddhist priest) the observance of complete chastity is essential, the

¹ *Laws of Manu*, IX, 96.

² *Ibid.*, IX, 4.

³ *Ibid.*, IX, 45.

⁴ *Ibid.*, V, 130. (See also *Institutes of Vishnu*, XXIII, 49.)

⁵ *Vasishtha*, XXVIII, 9.

⁶ *Ibid.*, XXVIII, 1.

⁷ *Op. cit.* (September 14, 1882), p. 7, Introduction.

⁸ Hastings’ *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*.

⁹ *Gospel of Buddha* (LXXXI), by P. Carus, 1917.

ordinary man, in yielding to his natural impulses, commits no wrong, so long as he thereby does not harm or injure anyone.¹ And be it noted that, even for the priest sexual intercourse is not considered wrong or sinful in the sense that bodily pleasure is wrong or sinful, but because sexual indulgence is the strongest expression of the will to live, and hence diametrically opposed to the goal of the bhikkhu.²

How different from this is the atmosphere of Christianity! For, in the religion of revelation, not only is sexual intercourse sin, and all bodily pleasures so much devilry, but there is also no attempt to differentiate between the laity and the priesthood in the ban that is placed on the so-called carnal lusts.

When Paul said, "It is good for a man not to touch a woman,"³ he was not addressing priests or probationers alone, but the world at large. And this is true also of his advice to the unmarried and widows, to the effect that it is good for them to remain, like himself, a total sex-abstainer.⁴ He maintained that it was good for a man to remain a virgin,⁵ and for this reason, that he who is unmarried "careth for the things that belong to the Lord; but he that is married careth for the things that are of the world. . . . The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy in body and in spirit, but she that is married careth for the things of the world."⁶

Speaking of the virgin, Paul said: "He that giveth her in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better."⁷

The Essenes had said these things already, and had practised the principles on which they were based, and Christianity has on that account been regarded by some

¹ See *A Buddhist Catechism*, by Subhadra Bhikshu (approved by the Venerable the High Priest of Buddhism), p. 75, note.

² *A Buddhist Catechism*.

³ I Cor. vii. 1.

⁴ I Cor. vii. 8.

⁵ I Cor. vii. 26.

⁶ Cor. vii. 32, 33, 34.

⁷ I Cor. vii. 38.

as Essenism popularized.¹ But a very high sanction seems to have been given to the sex-phobia by the Founder of Christianity himself, when he declared that "there be eunuchs which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake."² He could hardly have admitted the possibility of men emasculating themselves for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake, if there had been no possible connection in his mind between the two ideas.

Scores of early Christians took this passage very seriously, and proceeded without delay to carry it into practice, and among the leaders of the early Church, Origen (A.D. 185-253) was the first to castrate himself for the faith. It is said that he regretted it afterwards, but when the matter came to the ears of his Bishop, Demetrius, so far from inflicting any punishment, this prelate urged him still more to devote himself to the work of Christian instruction.³ Seeing, however, that Origen was to become the Father of the Church's Science, and the founder of the theology which was to be perfected in the fourth and fifth centuries, the fact that he emasculated himself when he was still a layman shows to what extent the slander of the body and of the sexual life had been carried by the early Christians, and how convinced they must have been of the correctness of the Christian attitude.

Truth to tell, the school of Origen flourished unchallenged till the end of the third century, and sexual abstinence and the slander of the sexual life were regarded by it as the great original contribution of Christianity to ethics. Thus the state of virginity came to be exalted above every other state, and there was a general stampede into monastic and celibate institutions. Hermit settlements were founded in Egypt in the third and fourth centuries, where people who had renounced all carnal pleasures, adopted voluntary exile and seclusion

¹ *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th Edition, Article "Essenes and Therapeutæ."

² Matt. xix. 12.

³ *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

from the world ; while in Rome, and elsewhere, wives left their families and husbands abandoned their homes, in order to adopt a life of "purity" and "holiness."¹

According to the Christian Fathers, original sin was nothing more or less than concupiscence, or the sexual passion, and thus to function sexually amounted simply to perpetuating sin on earth. Methodus of Olympus, who came after Origen, taught that the cunning serpent had excited us to the sin of concupiscence, to which we had become a prey. He gives no other explanation of original sin.²

But had not Paul himself said : "To be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace" ?³ Had he not also said : "They that are in the flesh cannot please God" ?⁴

How else could the Early Fathers and their followers interpret these passages except as a general defamation of the bodily and particularly of the sexual side of life ?

Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Pacian of Barcelona, all regarded this attitude as essential to a Christian life ; and as, among these leaders of the Church, there were not a few who, like Jerome, appear to have been acquainted with Buddhism,⁵ the influence of asceticism

¹ See Lecky (Op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 105-7) : "Towards the close of the fourth century, the monastic population in a great part of Egypt was nearly equal to the population of the cities. Egypt was the parent of Monachism, and it was there that it attained both its extreme development and its most austere severity ; but there was very soon scarcely any Christian country in which a similar movement was not ardently propagated. . . . There is, perhaps, no phase in the moral history of mankind of a deeper and more painful interest than this ascetic epidemic. A hideous, sordid, and emaciated maniac, without knowledge, without patriotism, without natural affection, passing his life in a long routine of useless and atrocious self-torture, and quailing before the ghastly phantoms of his delirious brain, had become the ideal of the nations which had known the writings of Plato and Cicero, and the lives of Socrates and Cato."

² See Otten, *Manual of the History of the Dogmas*, Vol. I, p. 360.

³ Rom. viii. 6.

⁴ Rom. viii. 8.

⁵ See Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy*, p. 34.

upon early Christianity was extremely powerful. Sextus Philosophus, an ascetic author of the third century, under the sway of the prevailing mood, did not hesitate openly to recommend castration to everybody, and although his arguments were regarded as heretical by the Church, they were no more than the logical outcome of Christian doctrine. In fact, the number of prohibitions of the practice of self-mutilation for holy ends that appear in the canons of the third century seems to point to the conclusion that the Church had come to be faced by a situation which was in every sense alarming. So many were accepting her teaching with enthusiasm, that, for fear lest she might lose her followers through their renunciation of life and its carnal joys, she suddenly found it necessary to forbid too literal an interpretation of her doctrine, at least as far as the laity were concerned.¹

Augustine was of opinion that original sin must consist in concupiscence. "This concupiscence (especially sexual passion)," he said, "is an evil with which every man is born." And Augustine's teaching was restated in practically the same terms by Pope Gregory I, and thenceforth it was universally accepted and defended by Western theologians until the end of the eleventh century.

So profoundly imbedded in Christian doctrine is this condemnation of the body and the sexual life, that even the custom of eating fish on fast days, which is almost universal in Christian communities, is based upon the fact that, since fish do not copulate, they are supposed to be free from the taint which pollutes all animals *quæ copulatione generantur*.

Anselm in the eleventh century slightly modified Augustine's doctrine of original sin, and gave it a less

¹ As late as the twelfth century, however, Clement III relaxed the canons against self-mutilation in favour of a priest of Ravenna, who had followed the example of Origen, and in the sixteenth century, a Dominican friar, Ambrosio Morales, is said to have taken Origen's effectual means of extinguishing his passions.

Puritanical turn; but the theologians of the twelfth century paid little attention to Anselm, and Robert Pulleyn, Peter Lombard, and Pope Innocent III followed Augustine in holding that concupiscence was the root of all evil. A good deal of discussion followed. Alexander of Hales, Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas each attempted to settle the matter, and finally Thomas arrived at the conclusion that, while original sin consisted in its material elements in concupiscence, in its formal element it is the privation of original justice. What this precisely means nobody has ever yet been able to discover; but, at all events, his principles were adopted by the Council of Trent and were thus made the official teaching of the Church for all time.

It is interesting to point out, however, that whatever Thomas may have meant about the nature of original sin, he certainly maintained that matrimony is *essentially complete without the act of procreation*¹ (presumably this is the origin of the famous nonsense about the union of two souls, which has done so much havoc to matrimony in Western civilization); and in the Council of Trent, which is based upon his principles, virginity is held to be higher than the state of matrimony.

Thus Canon X of the Council of Trent is as follows: "If anyone saith that the marriage state is to be placed above the state of virginity or of celibacy, and that it is not better and more blessed to remain in virginity or in celibacy than to be united in matrimony, let him be anathema."

Nor must the importance of the Council of Trent be underrated. Its labours in dogma and ecclesiastical law conditioned the whole of the future of the Holy Catholic Church, and the above canon may be regarded as the ultimate and existing ruling of the Church on the relative value of the virginal and the matrimonial state.

Protestantism did not alter this position; in fact it intensified it; for, in addition to abandoning many of

¹ Otten, Op. cit., Vol. II (*Mediæval Theology*).

the Pagan elements in Catholicism, which saved the latter from extreme asceticism, its insistence on a return to Holy Scripture as the one and only authority, rather led it back to the rigorously negative attitude of the early Christians, and thence to what is historically known as Puritanism.

Wickliffe (1320-84), who may be regarded as a pioneer Reformer, upheld the superiority of virginity over marriage, even to the extent of suggesting the fanciful etymology of *cœlibates* from the state of the *beati in cœlo*; ¹ and the Lollards, and later the Hussites, who were the precursors of the Reformation, professed the same ascetic principles. John Huss was indeed a disciple of Wickliffe, while the Lollards supplied Wickliffe with the majority of his followers.

In view of the above facts, it is idle to maintain that Puritanism, or hostility to sexual intercourse and to the joys of the body, is something foreign to Christianity, or that it is a recent and heretical development of the original credo. And, when it is said that Christianity has for the last two thousand years in Europe taught sex-phobia to its followers, it is not possible to refute that statement.

Only the enormous age and vigour of the sex instinct in man could have resisted the lethal influence of this teaching all this time; but there are signs which seem to show that the values are at last taking deeper effect than merely to constrain and limit indulgence—these signs have already been discussed in a previous chapter.

But in order further to convince ourselves of the sex-phobia at the root of Christian doctrine, we have only to think of the numerous sects which, consisting of poor deluded believers in the Scriptures, who were logical enough to act up to their beliefs, have been formed in Europe during the last thousand years, with the object of practising total sexual abstinence.

The Priscillianists in Spain in the fourth century

¹ See his *Trialogues*, chapter on "Sensibility and Chastity."

regarded marriage as a deadly sin. The Cathars of the tenth and fourteenth centuries believed in complete chastity. A husband, on initiation into the Cathars, left his wife and *vice versâ*, and the whole sect believed that "the begetting of children was evil," and that a man's relations with his own wife were merely fornication. The Bagonids or Paulinians in Bulgaria, known in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as Bulgari, were strictly ascetic; and, among the Albigenses, who regarded marriage as a mortal sin, wives left their husbands and *vice versâ*, and bound themselves by a vow of chastity in order to join the sect.

It is all very well for Catholic and Church of England divines to point out that these sects were regarded as heretical by orthodoxy. So they were, but such defenders of Christianity know perfectly well that the exaltation of asexuality and virgin purity by the Scriptures and the Church made the Church itself and not these so-called heretics appear illogical when it became necessary to check their multiplication. We must remember to what odious extremes Paul himself was driven when he cast about him for an excuse for matrimony. He could only think of this, that "it is better to marry than to burn."¹ "If they cannot contain," he said, "let them marry."¹ In other words, marriage was only to be a last shift for those unfortunate people who were impure enough to be troubled by their sex.

After all, there were only two possible rejoinders to the Church. Either one resented bitterly this slander and befoulment of the most basic, most sacred, most beautiful and most pleasurable of life's functions, and boldly resisted the whole of Christianity's prurient attack on the body and on sex, or else one accepted its principles and proceeded to carry them to their logical conclusion. The fact that this last alternative led to race extermination was not the fault of the believers but of the Christian doctrine, and the Church's attempt to compromise

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 9.

with her own teaching in order to save her adherents from extinction, proved how preposterous was her doctrine. In this sense the burning of Priscillian, of Lollard, and of Huss, were acts of gross injustice. These men were burnt for the crime of taking the Scriptures seriously.

But the list of ascetic sects is not finished. There were the Petrobrusians of Brittany and Belgium in the first half of the twelfth century, who rejected marriage. There were the Waldenses of Lyons in 1181, who strongly recommended complete sexual abstinence. There were the Fraticelli of Italy in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, who abhorred sexual intercourse as much as Paul did, and finally there were the Puritans, who with very solemn reluctance acquiesced in God's method of propagating the human kind, only on condition that it was confined to the married state, and that it was not pursued for pleasure.

Later on came the Chlysty and Skoptzy in Russia. The former vowed never to commit carnal sin, which meant that they must never marry ; they were founded by a peasant and carried on by Iwan Saslow, somewhere between 1645 and 1649.¹ The latter, taking Matthew xix. 12 and Romans, xiii. 14 quite literally practised castration, and their name is derived from the Russian *Skopets*, which is a eunuch. Founded in 1772 by two self-mutilated peasants, who persuaded others to abjure all sexual pleasure, they were soon joined by nobles, soldiers, naval officers, civil servants, and merchants from all parts of the country ; and in 1874 the sect numbered at least 5,444, including 1,465 women, and of these 703 men and 160 women had mutilated themselves. Some of the sect migrated to Roumania, and there became known as the Liporans. In 1835, 163 men and 13 women were sent to Siberia for having practised castration,² but in 1911 Skoptzysm still held its own in

¹ *Symbolik oder Christliche Konfessionskunde*, by Fried. Looss, Leipzig, 1902, p. 180.

² *Ibid.*, p. 181.

Russia. where it was a secret sect, although it is said that latterly it only imposed chastity and not castration upon its members.

To argue that these unfortunate and deluded people entirely misunderstood Christianity is to proclaim oneself singularly ignorant not only of the whole of the early history of the Church, but also of the attitude of the Scriptures and of orthodoxy itself, both towards the body and sexual intercourse ; and that is why any attempt at drawing a sharp distinction between Christianity and Puritanism is wholly unscientific and disingenuous.

The effect of thus poisoning the very springs of life, however, has been so disastrous to human health and happiness that, where the more Pagan elements of European tradition have been lost, as in England, northern Europe and North America, the abnormality of the sexual life and the misery and misunderstanding of woman have led to every species of social and political enormity. The innocence of sexual relations having vanished from Western civilization, the prevailing culture has become one of repressions and nervous morbidity, in which the relations of the sexes have been strained almost to snapping point, and in which a degeneration of the sexual instinct—its atrophy—has been pursued with fixed determination. The men of this civilization, particularly those belonging to the areas where Christianity has been most fiercely enforced, have not only ceased to attain to the normal standard in sexual potency, and lost all knowledge of the sexual arts and of female psychology, but they have also, on that very account, become effeminate and despised, and are now leading their women to a general revolt against every condition of the modern world.

We should also not forget the effect that Christianity has had upon human selection. For, where shame and guilt are associated with the sex function, there is likely to be a marked reluctance and timidity about selecting the type who bears the stamp of wanton spirits

and rugged animal stamina, while the ideal type will tend to become negative and as remotely reminiscent as possible of the *joie de vivre*. Beauty in a shame and repression culture no longer implies, as Stendhal said it should, "*une promesse de bonheur*," and young men and women who give an impression of asexuality gain the ascendancy over those who are plainly endowed for a happy and normal sexual life. We can see this method of selection operating now, and young men in their choice of wives are astonishingly prone to adopt it. "There was a look of immaculate sexless purity about Gerda," says Rose Macaulay, in describing a heroine of one of her novels,¹ "she might have stood for the angel Gabriel, wide eyed and young and grave."

Thus the taste of the age is directed to a type lacking in vitality, and degeneration occurs through the influence of a consistent bias in favour of abnormality. This bias can be traced in the history of the pictorial arts, and I have myself been responsible for an outline of it.² But it is now so well established in our popular values, that people stare in astonishment when one denies that their selected beauties make any claim upon our admiration from the standpoint of voluptuousness or vitality, and this attitude is reflected even on the stage.

It may be asked why, if the Puritanism of Christianity is so hostile to the deepest instincts of humanity, and to their enjoyment of life, it has flourished so long and has continued to maintain its sway. I suggest two possible causes of this phenomenon.

In the first place, it should never be forgotten that, although the dogma and metaphysical side of Christianity are no longer accepted by the majority of intelligent mankind, the morality of Christianity, its method of valuing, which, apart from Nietzsche's work, has so far

¹ *Dangerous Ages*, p. 8. Scores of other examples might be taken from modern fiction. But there is no point in emphasizing a fact that must be obvious to everyone.

² See my *Nietzsche and Art*.

met with no powerful attacks, still maintains a fast hold not only on the masses but also on large sections of the governing classes all over Europe.¹

Now this morality, as I have shown, is Puritanical in its foundation. And as long as civilized men continue consciously or unconsciously, and whether as atheists or agnostics, to adhere to the ethical side of the religion of revelation, they will persist in their Puritanism.

The second cause is, I suggest, the power and influence of old people. Owing to delicate scruples based on courtesy and considerations of politeness, much too little has been said and written hitherto about the influence of the old upon conventions and legislation; and yet, the whole of a very large volume might be filled with this subject alone, and the historical and anthropological instances that might be adduced to illustrate it. The truth is, the subject is unpleasant and unflattering to the old. And, as the old are very powerful, it has not yet been ventilated.

The old people of each generation, however, like the rest of mankind, will always be found to exercise their power in gratifying their strongest impulses, whether conscious or unconscious. And since, *vis-à-vis* of youth and wanton spirits, particularly of joyful sexuality, the old are secretly, and frequently, quite unbeknown to their conscious minds, extremely jealous, it would amount to a piece of psychological shallowness to suppose that this jealousy does not motivate them in exercising whatever power they possess. Particularly is this true of old men. And, in estimating the causes of the continuation of Puritanism, despite the decline in the power of Christian dogma and metaphysics, we must reckon,

¹ For instance, an intellectual man like Lecky does not hesitate to endorse Christianity's defamation of the body and sex, as if it represented an obvious and generally accepted point of view. He says (Op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 107-8): "In its central conception that the purely animal side of our being is a *low and degraded side*, it reflects, I believe with perfect fidelity, the feelings of our nature." (The italics are mine. Lecky forgets that "our nature" is the product of two thousand years of Christian teaching.)

especially in the case of Mrs. Grundy legislation, with the rancorous jealousy of old men and men beyond middle age.

I have called attention to the treatment by mature and old monkeys of the younger males who venture to enjoy any sexual intercourse before their senior is deposed, and I have spoken of the difficulty experienced by young monkeys in procuring young or even old females at any time.

The toothsome, appetizing young virgin is a source of great attraction to the old male of the quadrumana, and he will, if he can, monopolize all the young females of his horde and deprive the young male of a mate as long as possible. When the monkey merges into the man, however, we find that the same love of youthful womanhood, and the same bitter jealousy of the young male, causes among old savages exactly similar restrictions and harsh suppression in regard to their junior rivals, as we find among monkeys, and the monopolization of the young females of a tribe by the older men has repeatedly been noticed by travellers.

Writing about a number of tribes in Australia, among which the principal are the Deiri, the South Central Tribes, the Wolfal and the Geawe, Dr. B. Malinowski says : ¹ " In Australia old men secure the young females for themselves . . . and young men obtain for wives some old repudiated wife of one of the old men."

This is also true of the Angas, among whom the old men get the youngest and comeliest women, whilst old and haggard females are left to the young men.² The tribe of the Euahlayi and the tribes near Victoria River Downs observe the same customs ; while " in the tribes of King George Sound, the old men seem partly to monopolize the young females."³

Innumerable other instances might be given of this jealous appropriation by old men of the young females

¹ See his *The Family Among the Australian Aborigines*, pp. 260-1.

² *Ibid.*, p. 261.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 202. See also Sir Walter Baldwin Spencer and F. S. Gillen (Op. cit.).

of the community, but no purpose can be served by multiplying examples, and Dr. Malinowski's reliability as an anthropologist is sufficiently well established to enable me to depend on his evidence alone.

Now what are we to gather from this greedy monopolization of the younger females by the old men in so many savage communities? Are we to be so simple as to suppose that because man has become civilized that he has therefore lost his deep-rooted and long-practised tendency to endeavour in his maturity and old age to snatch the youngest and comeliest women from his juniors and to enjoy them himself? And are we to suppose that, when the conventions of his society prevent him from indulging his desires, like the old monkeys and the savages, that he therefore cheerfully resigns himself to the situation—that is to say to his middle-aged or aged wife? Does he feel no bitter jealousy of youth? Has all that gone? And since his hands are now tied, does he feel no wish to retaliate for his lost privileges?

To reply in the negative to these questions may be pleasant and acceptable at a dinner-table, but it would hardly be profound. For, truth to tell, old men, however much they may try to conceal or to misinterpret their secret emotions, feel to-day very much as they have always felt about the fresh virgin, and there can be no doubt therefore that they are racked by the most acute jealousy of all junior males. But—and this is the important point—as this jealousy may no longer manifest itself unsocially in deeds of violence, suppression, constraint, or in the appropriation of the comely virgin, it takes advantage of the sex-phobia of Christianity in order to express itself in every kind of Puritanical restriction, whether legislative or merely conventional.

This hostility and jealousy, which the old feel towards the young, may not be obvious to all, but there are many signs, quite apart from Puritanical legislative measures, which, if they were generally observed, would convince the most stubborn disbelievers of its existence.

Take, for instance, the attitude of old people during the war. Is it too much to say that they enjoyed it? I myself saw a septuagenarian go livid with rage when it was suggested to him, after the Somme battles, that the war should in some way be stopped. Let those who imagine that a septuagenarian goes livid with rage out of offended patriotism continue to cherish their pretty illusions!

Turn now to the columns of *The Times* and read the letters that poured into them from sexagenarians, septuagenarians, and octogenarians, imploring the authorities to continue the war at all costs, when there was some talk of peace at the end of 1916. These people were exhilarated and uplifted by the war, chiefly because, for a brief space, their secret and mortal jealousy of youth was receiving its most gratifying relief. At last the order of decess was for a while reversed. They who had hitherto been in the front rank on the edge of the grave, were watching their juniors being brought from the rear and tumbled into the darkness, long before the appointed time. It is a mistake to suppose that bitter spinsters were the only people who read the Roll of Honour at their breakfast tables with feelings of secret triumph.¹

All this probably sounds very hard and unkind, particularly to people who are wont to sentimentalize over grey locks and wrinkled faces; but sentimentality is hardly ever a suitable pathway to truth.

The best proof, however, if any were needed, of this jealousy of youth felt by old people, and of the resulting exhilarating effect of the war on everybody over military age in England, is a comment made by the Registrar-

¹ Mr. E. S. P. Haynes, in the *Enemies of Liberty*, p. 143, notes the attitude of the spinster, but is not so clear about old people, and he never refers to the possible influence of senile jealousy on legislation. He says, for instance: "Election agents tell me that nothing appeals to the spinster voter so forcibly as conscription of the men who have remained indifferent to her charms." But in the *Decline of Liberty* (pp. 133 and 135), when he points to Puritanism as to a great extent created by jealousy, he makes no special allusion to the influence of senile jealousy.

General in his report for the year 1918. (It must not be supposed that the Registrar-General has any theories about old people's jealousy of youth, or about the consequent uplifting effect the war had upon the aged. But this makes his impartial comment all the more interesting.) He says :

“The sudden increase in the mortality of old age at the commencement of the war, and its complete disappearance before the war was over, form a curious incident in the history of our time. If altered conditions of physical life had been the cause, the increase of mortality should have been progressive, attaining its maximum, instead of disappearing in 1918, when shortages were at their maximum. It seems reasonable, therefore, to regard the growth and decline of this mortality as of mental rather than physical origin, though the explanation of the cause remains obscure.”

Conflicting views may be held about the explanation of this strange disappearance of the increase in the mortality of old age during the war. But I think the Registrar-General is right in arguing that the cause was probably mental rather than physical, and I have hinted at its possible nature above.

Whatever may be the truth about this matter, however, it seems clear that old people's profound jealousy of youth, and particularly their jealousy of the sexual joys of youth (the most secret part of senile rancour), has not yet been sufficiently appreciated in accounting not only for the long survival of Puritanism, but also for most Puritanical legislation. And now that old women have been added to the legislature, so that our gerontocracy is reinforced by a graocracy of middle-aged and old women like Lady Rhondda, Lady Astor, Lady Frances Balfour, and Mrs. Bertrand Russell, the advent of increased restraints upon the young of both sexes is a certainty. Indeed, during the last few years, as I point out in my *Lysistrata*, the legislation influenced or brought in by old women has been entirely Puritanical.

CHAPTER XI

The More Remote Causes of Modern Male Degeneracy—Part II

(3) **T**HE influence of the democratic contempt of blood and family, which is based upon the belief in equality, and leads to miscegenation on a universal scale, must also be reckoned among the remoter and deeper causes of modern degeneration.

Science is approaching ever nearer to the standpoint that inbreeding, where stocks are sound, is better for character, enduring power and beauty, than cross-breeding, and the future is probably to the race which, through the observance of some law or tradition, will have been most careful to maintain itself pure.

The old prejudices against inbreeding, which began with the theological and Puritanical bias against incest, is being discredited more and more every day, and science is now faced with a new era, in which she will have to restore man to his old faith in close inbreeding and, if necessary, in incest.

Too long has Western humanity overlooked the fact that mixed breeding does not destroy or eliminate disease or degeneracy, but only covers it up, and that inbreeding does not create or introduce disease or degeneracy, but only brings it out. By labouring under the belief that inbreeding creates or introduces disease or degeneracy, and that cross-breeding eliminates or prevents both, mankind (except in the breeding of animals) has for hundreds of years, but particularly latterly, been prac-

tising miscegenation on such a systematic and determined scale, that character and innate virtue (virtue = capacity) has been almost completely dissipated.¹ The examples that Puritans and democrats usually select for refuting the claim of inbreeders, do not really affect the argument one way or another. For inbreeders admit that if the tainted stocks are crossed, the inbreeding will intensify—that is, bring out, the taint. What the inbreeders claim, however, is that after the crossing of two untainted stocks, and the formation of a closely inbred family, when once that family becomes what is known as homozygous—that is to say, consists of individuals which breed true and in whom like characters are joined together—no ill effects can arise from inbreeding; on the contrary, the two streams of health and character that are joined up with such mating, only increase and stabilize the qualities of the family line. When a stock is cross-bred, however, exactly the reverse takes place, character is dissipated, unlike qualities get joined in each individual, and disharmony, amounting frequently to serious physiological and nervous trouble, arise as the result of conflicting tendencies;² while there is also this serious complication, that taints tend to become concealed and latent.

“If evil is brought to light by inbreeding,” say the authors of a recent scientific work, “inbreeding is no more to be blamed than the detective who unearths a

¹ The prejudice against inbreeding is such nowadays that even the retention of skilled trades or professions in families or groups by the marriage of young men and women whose fathers have the same or similar occupations (which was more or less the rule in the Middle Ages in Europe, and which led to a great accumulation of capacity in one line), is now frustrated by a complete mixture of trades, professions and classes; and thus there is no possibility of garnering quality or virtue in particular lines.

² For Sir Arthur Keith's references to disorders of growth, and irregularities in the growth of face in modern English people, which, I venture to suggest, may be due largely to excessive miscegenation, see p. 200, *ante*.

crime. Instead of being condemned it should be commended.”¹

“Continual cross-breeding only tends to hide internal defects,” says another author on the same subject, “not to exterminate them. We may not, therefore, lightly ascribe to inbreeding or intermarriage the creation of bad racial traits, but only their manifestation. . . . The animal breeder is, therefore, amply justified in doing what human society at present is probably not warranted in doing—viz. : in practising close inbreeding in building up families of superior excellence and then keeping them pure. . . . If sufficient vigour is retained after a fully homozygous state has been reached, then the closest inbreeding (or even self-fertilization when this is possible) should cause no further loss of vigour.”²

It is impossible for me to describe all the results that have recently been obtained both by commercial breeders and scientific investigators to establish the truth of the above, but I have lectured on the subject sufficiently often in the presence of scientific critics to know that the facts are well established, and my belief is that we are entering upon an era in which miscegenation for human society will be discredited and inbreeding and possibly even incest adopted in its stead.

The decline of character and of beauty, as well as the decline in harmonious physiological co-ordination, are all probably due in a large measure to the absurd extremes to which miscegenation has been carried by modern man under the influence of dysgenic Christianity; and before dismissing the subject I would strongly urge the reader to consult such works on the subject as I have already quoted, together with Reibmayr's profound and erudite work *Inzucht und Vermischung*, and the more practical statements of commercial

¹ *Inbreeding and Outbreeding*, by E. M. East and Donald F. Jones, p. 139.

² *Genetics and Eugenics*, by Prof. W. E. Castle.

breeders, such as Mr. C. A. House's pamphlet on *Inbreeding*, Mr. J. B. Robertson's *The Principles of Heredity Applied to the Racehorse*, and the recent accounts given in history of incest and inbreeding among the Incas, the ancient Britons, the Egyptians, the Israelites, and the Greeks.¹

To refer to the degeneration of inbred families known to history is no argument against the plea for inbreeding, for, as every stock-breeder knows, the essential prerequisite for successful inbreeding, as recently practised by Dr. King in America, for instance (who bred brother and sister repeatedly for twenty-five generations in rats without any harmful results), is (a) that the founders of the family line should be free from taint, and (b) that when once a homozygous strain has been formed it should be vigilantly watched and all aberrations from type carefully eliminated. When have these conditions been fulfilled by families usually referred to by the opponents of inbreeding?

To proceed as we are doing in Europe, however, and to cover up our tainted strains by ever more intensified miscegenation, is simply to pollute the whole of living mankind with degeneration, and it is only to delay the ultimate crash by making it universal instead of local and partial. It means that, while we insist on diluting our own cancer strain with somebody else's phthisis or diabetes strain, we do not eliminate our taint, but merely strike a fifty-fifty balance against total corruption by means of one disease.

It is certainly true that if the conventions and laws

¹ A good deal of the historical evidence on this subject will be found in my *Defence of Aristocracy*. In fact, the whole of Chapter VII in this last-named work will be found helpful in understanding the necessarily too brief statement of the question given above. For writers on the evils of miscegenation in modern countries other than Europe, see Louis Agassiz, *A Journey in Brazil* (1868), and Cyaria-Calderon, *Latin America: Its Rise and Progress*, in both of which books the reader will find data about the disastrous consequences of cross-breeding among a young and healthy people.

against inbreeding and incest were relaxed to-morrow, hundreds of thousands would be wiped out in two or three generations (through the detective "Inbreeding" unearthing the various taints), but those that survived would be magnificent creatures from whom we might hope to rear a regenerated people; and degeneration, in so far as it is the product of miscegenation, would have been largely eliminated.

I do not pretend to have dealt adequately with this subject, there is not the space. But with my remarks in his mind, I most earnestly invite the reader to study the literature I have recommended, although it only fringes the subject, and he will see the vast importance of this aspect of the problem of degeneration.

The present power and ascendancy of the Jews is no accident, neither is it any indication that in an ultimate analysis the Jews would be found to be superior to the Gentiles in ability and gifts. Their momentary superiority is more probably due to the effect of their close inbreeding in the past; and that is why we cannot do the Jews a greater disservice than to increase our friendliness to them to the extent of breaking down the racial barrier that now separates them from our degenerate miscegenated stocks.

The fact that the superiority attained through inbreeding is not confined to mental qualities and character is proved by the great endurance of the racehorse (one of the most closely inbred of all animals) and the great milking capacity of highly inbred cows; while statistics recently obtained by Dr. Hall about the health of Jewish and Gentile children seem to point to a similar physical superiority in the more closely bred Jew.

Dr. Hall examined 2,704 Gentile and Jewish Board School children from 6 to 13 years of age, and found that the poor Jew is 3 lb. heavier and 2 inches taller than the poor Gentile at 8 years of age; 6¼ lb. heavier and 2¾ inches taller at 10 years of age, and 7 lb. heavier and 2¾ inches taller at 12 years of age.

In a classified list he gives the statistics of rickets and bad teeth in four different schools, two of which are Jewish, and it will be seen that in each case the Jews show marked physical superiority.

	Rickets. Per cent.	Bad and Defective Teeth. Per cent.
1. Good District Gentile School . . .	8	38
2. Poor District Gentile School . . .	50	60
3. Good District Jewish School . . .	5	11
4. Poor District Jewish School . . .	7	25 ¹

This remarkable difference between Jewish and Gentile children, residing in a similar urban environment may possibly be due to some extent to the more rational feeding of the Jews; but this can hardly account for the whole of the difference between, for instance, the 25 per cent. and 60 per cent. of bad teeth in classes 4 and 2; and from our knowledge of other data relating to miscegenation and inbreeding, we are inclined to ascribe a good deal of the superiority to the inbreeding of the Jews in the past. That our kindness and familiarity are causing the Jews to relax their rules about cross-breeding with Gentiles in this country is perhaps the cruellest scourge that has ever been imposed upon the Jewish race in the whole of their history.

(4) The faulty co-ordination of our bodies is probably the least obvious, the least known, and yet one of the most potent causes of modern disease, modern abnormality, modern nervous debility and exhaustion, and modern madness; and for my text in discussing this cause of modern degeneration, I shall use the two well-known books of Mr. F. M. Alexander,² who is undoubtedly

¹ A. W. Smyth (Op. cit., pp. 304-5). See also the evidence given before the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration (1904) on the physical superiority of the Jews by General Sir Frederick Maurice, K.C.B.; the Rt. Hon. Charles Booth, F.R.S., Mrs. Close, and many others.

² *Man's Supreme Inheritance* (Methuen, 1910) and *Constructive Conscious Control of the Individual* (Methuen, 1924).

the pioneer and most genial discoverer in the whole of this field of latter-day diagnostics.

Briefly stated, Mr. Alexander's diagnosis is as follows : He says, and has, moreover, proved, that owing to the repeated extensive disturbances of the harmony between man and his environment, which have been brought about by the too rapid changes of civilization, probably from the time of the first application of fire to metals down to the present day, man's equipment in instincts has been unable to deal adequately with the daily aggravated problem of adaptation, and the grievous result has been that his instinctive reactions are no longer reliable and lead to a harmful use of himself in almost everything he does.

Mr. Alexander, therefore, asks these searching and disconcerting questions : Are our instinctive reactions to environment any longer reliable ? And, if they are not, have we any other means of reacting to environment ?

He answers the first question with a flat negative. The modern man standing on the pavement of his streets, and about to walk ; or reclining in an easy chair and about to get up ; or using a tennis racquet or a golf stick, still depends on his old instinctive mechanisms and muscular sense to perform the actions that are required of him. Although he has not had time to re-educate his instincts correctly, to perform the many complicated actions demanded of him by civilization, and to modify his primitive form of reacting so that it may be suited to the new requirements—for the development of a new instinct is a long and laborious process, and requires a stable environment for its fulfilment—he has no choice but to react and to react quickly to his present circumstances ; for life is action. And, since he has to fall back upon instinctive reflexes which were cultivated in him for a different and more simple purpose—a purpose long ago buried with his vanished ancestors—he reacts wrongly, cannot well help reacting wrongly, and by so doing proceeds to a faulty use of himself.

By a faulty use of himself, Mr. Alexander understands a use which causes unnecessary strain, constant constriction, absence of proper co-ordination, maladjustment, pressure, irritation, and deforming habits.

Under the constant influence of this faulty use, his thoracic capacity, for instance, becomes unduly and perniciously limited, his heart becomes harmfully hemmed in, his spine becomes distorted, his muscular co-ordination is seriously impaired, and violence is repeatedly done to a complicated and delicate structure, which, though it possesses wonderful recuperative power, must ultimately suffer from such continued ill usage. Truth to tell, in time, this ill usage and the disorders in the functioning of his body to which they give rise cannot help manifesting themselves in the form of diseases; and since the true cause of these diseases—wrong functioning as the result of the faulty use of self—is not known, the diseases are treated specifically and separately, as if they were independent disturbances of a part which bore no relation to the rest of the system.

The faulty use, according to Mr. Alexander, now begins in early childhood. Indeed, through this faulty use having been practised by modern man's forbears, children are actually born with the inherited results of their parents' ignorance, and one of these inherited disadvantages, long recognized but unexplained by modern medicine, is what is known as a *low respiratory need*—that is to say, an inadequate breathing capacity, which in itself alone is responsible for all the evil consequences of an imperfect oxidation of the blood.

It is difficult, without having had visual demonstration and personal experience of the nature of this faulty use, to grasp the gravity of the conditions it creates, and the extent of their complicated ramifications; for one of its most serious consequences is the perversion of consciousness, the debauching of the muscular sense, or sensory appreciation of the individual, so that he no longer knows that he is wrong, so that he no longer feels his wrongness,

and requires a long period of time to become convinced of it. Even when he has studied Mr. Alexander's works, he may remain unaware, as I did, for instance, of their application to his own life ; and it is only when he has been shown this application by a few simple tests carried out upon his own person by Mr. Alexander himself, that he begins to understand not only the extreme unreliability of his instinctive reactions, but also the extent to which this unreliability forces him to a constantly harmful expression of his vital energy.

Professor John Dewey, the distinguished American philosopher, writing on this question of the perversion of individual consciousness and sensory appreciation, says : "It is precisely this perverted consciousness which we bring with us to the reading and comprehension of Mr. Alexander's pages, and which makes it hard for us to realize his statements as to its existence, causes and effects. We have become so used to it that we take it for granted. It forms, as he has so clearly shown, our standard of rightness. It influences our every observation, interpretation and judgment. It is the one factor which enters into our every act and thought." ¹

To the modern world, with its sophisticated belief in the desirability of a "return to Nature," it seems odd that our instincts should be declared no longer reliable, and that they should have ceased to guide us correctly in our daily movements and thoughts. But if we attempt to examine the question more narrowly, we come to the conclusion that it would surely be very much more odd if, despite the extreme complication, rapid changes and artificiality of our lives, they had remained as trustworthy as they once undoubtedly were. What modern man would maintain that he has a reliable instinct, or that modern man in general has a reliable instinct, regarding the choice of foods, regarding the simple correctives for transient disturbances of his system, regarding

¹ See Introduction to *Constructive Conscious Control of the Individual*, p. xxii,

threatened changes in the weather, or regarding the reading of any other obscure sign which the animals and the savage read with ease? If, however, he acknowledges the unreliability of his instinct in these matters, and ascribes it to the fact that he has not had time to re-educate himself to correct instinctive reaction in a complex and too rapidly changing environment, why should he suppose that his instincts are reliable in any other respect? Why, for instance, should they have remained reliable in the matter of the use of his body as a mechanical contrivance, for which there is only one right method and an infinite number of wrong methods of use?

But, fortunately, Mr. Alexander does not rely on dialectics for carrying his point. He has demonstrated, and is prepared to demonstrate again, to hundreds of people who imagine themselves quite well and properly controlled, the fact that they are not only using themselves wrongly, but also that the consequences of their wrong use are already apparent upon them, and cannot fail, sooner or later, to lead to distressing results. And, since the consequences of wrong use, in addition to leading to organic diseases and lowered vitality, may also mean the advent of those more obscure afflictions of modern times which are loosely classed under such different heads as neurasthenia, nervous debility, morbid and free automatisms, insomnia, premature senility, etc., the first demonstration a man is given of his own wrong use of himself is probably the most startling revelation it is possible for him to experience at the present day. As I am one of those fortunate people who have enjoyed the privilege of having, in good time, experienced such a dramatic demonstration, conducted by Mr. Alexander on myself, I presume that I am qualified to speak with some authority on this matter, and I may say that I could never have imagined its apocalyptic effect. It left me convinced that the claim made by Mr. Alexander, that an enormous amount of our present degeneration is due

to a perfectly unconscious, but very wrong, use of self, by every individual, probably constituted one of the most constructive pieces of diagnosis and criticism that has been given to the world for many scores of years.

This may sound an extravagant statement, particularly as it comes from a layman, not qualified to speak with authority on a matter so important and so far reaching. But fortunately I am not alone in claiming what I do claim about Mr. Alexander's diagnosis. There are now grouped around him many eminent medical men and scientists who are prepared to vindicate his claim, and what is more, to help in achieving its ultimate acceptance by the world at large. And when I add that Mr. Alexander's discoveries, although quite original, have in part been scientifically and independently made by such distinguished investigators as Professor R. Magnus¹ and Sir Charles Sherrington,² I need say no more about their importance.

Mr. Alexander, however, does not stop at his profound analysis of modern degeneration, he has developed an educational technique by means of which he can not only rectify our faulty use of ourselves and chasten our corrupted sensory appreciation, but also restore to us the lost key to correct reaction to environment, which consists in the recovery of a central control of all our actions.³ But I am anticipating. This part of Mr. Alexander's work properly belongs to the next chapter.

The special importance of Mr. Alexander's contribution to modern diagnostics is this, that our age is one in which

¹ See *Körperstellung* (Julius Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1924).

² See *The Integrative Action of the Nervous System*, 1916.

³ Speaking of Mr. Alexander's discovery for restoring the central control to man, Dr. Peter Macdonald writes: "I regard Mr. Alexander's work as quite the biggest thing in the evolution of medicine since the days of Pasteur. . . . For while Pasteur's work aimed at the prevention of access to the individual of the infection of germ-conveyed disease, Alexander's aims include the building-up of a physique which will make the body of the individual resistant to disease, both infectious and non-infectious."

the physical deterioration of humanity is a fact well known to all, and the consequence is that a big movement is on foot to attempt to correct by every conceivable means the disordered functioning that plagues and burdens human life at every turn. Now among the most universally recommended means of recovering efficient bodily functioning, the most popular are those which consist in directing modern man to the adoption of all kinds of exercises, out of door gymnastics, strenuous games, deep breathing etc.—pastimes which, because they are redolent of a “return to Nature,” seem to be obviously right and promising.

But, if the whole of our urban populations, who are already using themselves wrongly, are driven in despair to exercises, sports and games, without first having been taught a correct use of themselves, what will be the result? What cannot help being the result? By an intensification of their output of energy in a wrong way, they will simply aggravate troubles which, with less exercise and less sport, would take longer to break them up. Indeed this is exactly what is happening already; and the statistics of heart trouble, which now heads all other diseases in the casualties it claims, show that Mr. Alexander's diagnosis is correct.¹ It is the heart that chiefly suffers from ill-usage, and to recommend sport, games and exercises to people whose wrong functioning requires correcting, when all the time that wrong functioning has been brought about by a faulty use of themselves, is not very far removed from recommending universal suicide.

(5) The false conceptions of modern medicine are so numerous that it will be quite impossible to describe them all; but those which particularly aggravate modern degeneration may be divided into two classes—theological and barbarian.

¹ See *Vital Statistics*, p. 368. Of a list of thirteen causes of death, including cancer which accounts for 9·4 per cent. of deaths, tuberculosis which accounts for 9·1 per cent. and pneumonia 8 per cent., heart disease stands highest with 11·4 per cent of total mortality from all causes.

The theological errors of modern medicine, or those which derive from theology are : (a) The belief in dualism, so that there is a department of psychology and a department of physiology in scientific medicine (this error is too complex to be investigated here) ; (b) The belief in the necessity of suffering in child-labour—a belief which has practically arrested all research in the direction of securing *pleasant and natural* parturition, and has led doctors along a downward path to the present alarming situation, in which pregnancy and parturition have been allowed to become almost diseases ;¹ and (c) The belief in the existence of a specific for every ailment, which is merely a modern and scientific elaboration of the belief in casting out devils by means of talismans, charmed food, or “the hair of the dog that bit you.” The therapeutic system based upon this belief has led to such enormous confusion and distress, that probably the greater part of the discredit which in recent years has fallen upon the medical profession, is due to this cause alone. “By no known means,” says Sir William Arbuthnot Lane, “can we cure any chronic disease,” and Sir James Mackenzie, shortly before his death, wrote that it was difficult to perceive the progress made in the cure of disease during his forty-five years of service. A writer in *Truth*, calling himself a student in Homeopathy,² declares that “at present therapeutics cannot be classed as an art or a science, it can only be classed as a confusion ;” and the immense progress of so-called “quack medicine” in recent years, the enormous field now occupied by patent drugs and proprietary medicines, and the popularity of all forms of healing (Christian Science, Faith Healing, or what not) other than orthodox medicine, are sufficient proof of the failure of modern medicine to satisfy the public’s needs and to secure its confidence.³

¹ For a discussion of this error see my *Lysistrata*.

² See the issue of December 13, 1926.

³ It should always be remembered that coupled with the belief in scientific drugs for specific diseases, is the unwarranted belief that a disease

The barbarian conceptions of modern medicine are briefly: (a) The belief that a disease can be satisfactorily treated by suppressing or removing its symptoms or end products; (b) The bacteriological bias; and (c) The belief that the perfection and multiplication of artificial aids is one of the directions in which medical science can improve.

(a) The first abets degeneration, because it arrests inquiry and research into the true nature or cause of disease. To remove the tonsils from a child with tonsillitis amounts only to suppressing the last symptom of a constitutional trouble that probably has a very ancient and very complicated history. To remove the last symptom, however, though it gives immediate temporary relief, has no effect upon the complex influences in the system which originally led to the disorder. So the child is left as it was—that is to say, with the morbid conditions which gave rise to the tonsillitis—but it is *minus* its tonsils. That, in fact, is all that has happened. And as the morbid constitutional conditions which led to the tonsillitis are unaffected by the operation, they remain to bring about a different trouble in later years. Similarly, the removal of gall-stones, though it constitutes the suppression of an end symptom of disease, leaves untouched the conditions that led to gall-stones being formed; and thus the diseased condition remains unaltered by the alleged “cure.”

But the very principle of attacking a diseased part in this way—whether it be the tonsils or the liver—as if, in a highly organized psycho-physical whole like the human body, one part could go wrong independently of the rest, involves such a gross misunderstanding of

can be treated apart from the idiosyncrasies of the individual suffering from it. This leads to an absurd standardization of alleged cures, which really amounts to an academic treatment of an artificially determined unit that has no real existence: for instance, gentian for loss of appetite, digitalis for heart faintness, salicylate of soda for rheumatism, and so on.

the nature of disease as almost to disqualify those who are guilty of it of any right to approach the problem.

“The true cause of disease,” says the intelligent student of Homeopathy already quoted, “expresses itself first by some wrong functioning, and until a system is evolved to correct wrong functioning on biological lines, we are only tinkering with the problem.”¹

But modern medicine never does and never can correct wrong functioning if it remains hypnotized by final symptoms; and, what is more, it can never understand the nature of disease as long as it makes no endeavour to discover how wrong functioning—not merely of a part, but of the whole organism—arises. This discovery, which will soon be published to the world in a scientific form, by a medical man of note, was made by a layman, and it will at one stroke make all modern medicine antiquated and out of date.

Because medical men have not concentrated on the true cause and nature of disease, they have, in spite of all their boasts of progress, allowed the whole of humanity to go wrong precisely through persistent faulty functioning; that is why degeneration has occurred in spite of the alleged “wonderful” strides of medicine. It is probably true that wonderful results have been achieved in the successful removal of end-symptoms by surgery. But no progress whatever has been made in discovering how faulty functioning, and therefore disease, arises; and that is the only direction in which an enlightened medicine could have sought for fruitful and far-reaching results.

The object of medical research should have been to make medicine unnecessary; and the fact that as doctors have multiplied in number and increased in power medical aid has become every day more necessary for the performance of the most simple function, is a sufficient proof of the utter failure of modern medical science.

¹ See *Truth*, December 30, 1925.

(b) The bacteriological bias is another barrier to progress; because as long as a microbe or germ can be regarded as the cause of disease, it is obvious that we are on the wrong track. The mere fact that out of a hundred people, bred and living in the same area and circumstances, only nine die of tuberculosis, is enough to show that tubercle bacilli cannot be the cause of tubercular disease. The true cause must lie in the characteristics which originally differentiated the nine who die from the ninety-one who do not die. The ninety-one who remain immune have presumably been exposed to the same amount of invisible bacilli; therefore the true cause must antecede the infection. The same is true of diphtheria, and all other so-called "germ diseases." The stage in a "germ disease" when a successful invasion has been made, therefore, presents only a final symptom of a condition that may have been endured from infancy; and it is that condition, not the ravages or poisonous secretions of the germ, which is interesting as shedding light on the cause and nature of disease. To call this condition "a predisposition" is only to give it a name. We ought to be able to define this predisposing condition more narrowly. The whole of this inquiry, however, has been side-tracked, because of the concentration upon a late symptom—the nature and activities of a germ. Foolishness could not go very much further. And yet it is not only possible, but in the light of certain discoveries, highly probable, that if we understood the condition which antecedes successful germ invasion, and makes the latter lethal, we should know, not only the cause and nature of disease, but also the cause and nature of degeneration. And I suspect once more, therefore, that the apparent anomaly of our present situation, in which we have a powerful and elaborately equipped medical profession, and nevertheless continue to degenerate, is explained partly on the ground that so far medicine has not approached the root of its own problem.

(c) The belief that the perfection and multiplication

of artificial aids is one of the directions in which medicine can improve, is obviously the outcome of the commercialization of medical services. For what the public obviously like is quick results. What they do not and cannot understand is that artificial aids, such as aperients, spectacles and tooth-stopping, etc. do nothing and can never do anything to remedy the conditions which created their need. They allay a symptom without arresting the process by which the symptom arose. The consequence is that glasses and aperients have periodically to be strengthened, and more teeth have to be stopped. Even admitting that in the production of artificial aids, medical science has displayed great ingenuity, we still cannot see how mankind can indolently resign itself to an elaboration of this means of relieving abnormality, because it obviously offers no hope. Let artificial aids become by 50 per cent better than they are—should we be any better off? What we want is a method of relief that dispenses with artificial aids. And I believe, and moreover know, that a new era is opening in medicine, when artificial aids will become more and more discredited. They will be regarded as a remnant of barbarism. But both medical men and the public will require a good deal of re-educating before they can perceive that this is not only an urgent necessity, but also a possibility; and yet nothing short of a condemnation of artificial aids can ever be tolerated by a school which proceeds to eliminate degeneration and to correct bodily vices by correcting faulty functioning. All that spectacles do, for instance, is to alter the image so that it reaches the abnormal eye in a form in which the abnormal eye can deal with it. It is like perpetually modifying the food of a patient to meet the demands of his badly functioning stomach. The proper procedure would obviously be to dispense with glasses and artificial aids in general, and to re-educate the faulty organ—whether it was an eye or a kidney or a heart—to function correctly. The fact that medicine has so far failed to

recognize this truth is in a large measure responsible for our progressive physical deterioration.

(6) The selection of type which operates in commercial and industrial conditions is probably among the most potent influences contributing to degeneration. The extent to which modern conditions select, both in the male and female sexes, types which are not by any means the most desirable, is far from being adequately appreciated, and as this is a tendency that shows no signs of abating, its gravity cannot be sufficiently emphasized.

As regards the male sex, it is pretty obvious—the war has proved it—that the bulk of occupations, particularly in the middle and lower middle classes, demand no special qualification whatsoever, or at any rate none that are essentially manly. The fact that when 5,000,000 men were out of the country the majority of their places were easily filled by women, is a sufficient proof that most men, particularly of the clerk, cashier, conductor, attendant and menial type, are not employed in work in which peculiarly masculine qualities are needed. But what does this mean?—It means that survival can now be achieved by hundreds of thousands of men, who have no reason whatsoever for attaining to a high or even to a moderate male standard, either in physical or mental qualities; and seeing that docility, patience, love of safety, and the ability to be satisfied with a life of uneventful drudgery, are the best qualifications for a large number of callings now open to men in commercial and industrial centres, it follows that a large army of men are being cultivated, who can have no reasonable grounds (except anatomical) for regarding themselves as in any way different from women. If they were all to be removed by death to-morrow, women could easily take their places. I know that there is a good deal of controversy on this subject, and that there are some who say that even in “clerking” women cannot attain to men’s standards. This may be so; but if it is so, it is difficult to understand the ever increasing demand for

women in occupations which forty years ago were restricted to men. At all events, the late Sir Edward Holden, who was Chairman of the London, City and Midland Bank, certainly assured me that he liked to employ women in the many branches of his bank, and he always declared that he found them most efficient.

In addition to the absence of any special male qualification in the hundreds of thousands of men of the middle and lower middle classes now earning their living in commerce and industry, there is, however, this further selective principle at work : in those occupations where staffs are mixed, *it is an advantage not to be too highly susceptible to the stimulus of sex* ; it is better to be below standard in this respect. And that man is likely to achieve much quicker and greater promotion, and therefore more successful survival, who is capable of remaining unaffected by the presence of young members of the opposite sex about him. (This is also true of the girls working with epicene staffs.)

So that we have two influences at work selecting men who do not require to be in any respect specially masculine ; (a) the low grade work (both from the physical and mental standpoint) demanded of hundreds of thousands of clerks and other commercial and industrial workers, and (b) the low sexual inflammability (meaning, all too frequently, not control—for who knows control nowadays ?—but subnormality) which secures success, or at least an absence of “ indiscretions ” in a business career.

The types which are too robust, too adventurous to endure the drudgery of thus earning a living instead of living a life, and those who are too vigorously endowed sexually to be able to survive a feminine entourage without succumbing, either go abroad (when they are lost to this country) or fail, or else go to swell the criminal classes :—*hence the danger of classing all habitual criminals, as most criminologists, psychologists and sociologists too hastily do, among the degenerates.*

In regard to the women and girls, the process of selection acts more or less on the same lines, except that whereas, in a commercial and industrial world, men tend to become emasculate, meek and asexual, the women, through their environment failing to make their male elements subordinate, tend to become masculine. Most artistic and great civilizations hitherto have endeavoured to secure the harmony of the sexes by making the slice of maleness in the woman recessive, that is to say, sink into rudimentary insignificance. But the environment of a female breadwinner in the modern world does exactly the reverse, with the result that, while at the present day the intermediate, or markedly male, type of woman finds complete adaptation, the more feminine woman is converted into the intermediate type by having all her male elements forced to the front and her feminine elements stunted.

Thus there is continuous selection of effeminate and asexual men and of unfeminine asexual women ; and as this tendency is encouraged by the values of the age and by the Puritanism of Christianity, nobody is in the least alarmed by what is happening.¹ The whole of society is now inclined to class highly temperamental and adventurous individuals of both sexes among the criminal classes, no matter whether they ultimately gravitate there or not ; and thus, among smug and "safety first" people, the term "degenerate" instead of being applied to the type commerce and industry are breeding, is constantly applied to people who are either too virile and robust to endure the air that is breathed in offices and warehouses, or else too passionate to survive daily contact with the opposite sex without expressing themselves sexually.

Thus do false values do violence to the meaning of ordinary words.

¹ For the curious coincidence of aims between Commercial and Industrial demands and Puritanical tastes in men and women, see my *Defence of Aristocracy*.

We shall now turn to the remote causes of degeneration which affect only the male sex :

The first of them is sport.

(7) It is not generally known that sport and a good many out-of-door games and exercises, like the English working week, are really an importation from France,¹ and that in the sixteenth century English travellers on the Continent used to comment with surprise on the number of French people they saw with either a ball or a racquet in their hand. In those days, the English people were not nearly so much addicted to these pastimes as their neighbours across the Channel, and as late as the seventeenth century, the English standing on the banks of the Thames looked on with horrified astonishment while the Duchess of Chevreuse, a lady in Queen Mary's suite, swam across the river and back again. Bathing would appear to have been an innovation regarded with very strong disapproval by the English at that time. Even the English game of football, which is probably the oldest of the games played in these islands, was hardly ever indulged in by the people before the eighteenth century, because it was repeatedly prohibited by law. Royal edicts for its suppression were issued successively by Edward III, Henry IV and Henry VIII, and it was forbidden under Queen Elizabeth on pain of imprisonment. In Scotland an act was passed in 1457 to discontinue both football and golf, as they threatened to supersede archery, and there is no doubt that the English prohibitions were dictated by the same fear.

Thus for many years England was spared one of the most dangerous games, in so far as the wrong use of self is intensified by violent movement ; and that is probably

¹ It was first put into practice by the Parisian trades in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It then passed over to England where it was retained, and whence it was ultimately restored to France in recent years. The same thing happened to the word "sport" (Fr. *desport*, *desporter* = to exercise) and the game of tennis (Fr. *tenez*). Both were importations from France in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and subsequently restored to her in an English form.

why her people maintained a very good physique for very much longer than would have been possible had football been played throughout the Middle Ages and subsequently as extensively as it is played now.

The extreme popularity of sport and out-of-door games in England at the present day is no doubt due, in the first place, to the dullness, sedentariness and lack of air, which characterize the work of the greater part of the population, and secondly to the increasing belief that something must be done to correct the prevailing debility and improve the health of the nation. But the extreme indulgence in sport and violent out-of-door games is not on that account a good sign, and the benefits supposed to be derived from it are much more probably due to the open air than to the sports and games themselves. In any case these benefits are more than balanced by the harm that results, particularly in violent games (like football for men, and hockey, lacrosse and net-ball for women) from the players' wrong use of themselves during the most active movements throughout the duration of the play; and what is true of sports and games is also true of gymnastics and exercises of all kinds. Even lawn tennis is very bad from this point of view, and unless by a fluke or else by knowledge, the tennis player uses himself properly during the game, there can be no doubt that his pastime is a frequent source of heart and other troubles, which are commonly ascribed by medical men to the "speeding up of city life," to "overwork," or else to "nervous strain."

Hitherto the wrong use of self, together with faulty co-ordination in sport and games, has affected chiefly men, because it is only recently that girls and women have been encouraged to engage in out-of-door exercise, and this is probably one of the reasons why degeneracy has become very much more noticeable among men than among women. It is proverbial that athletes and champions in violent games to-day are usually very nervous and strained men for their age; heart disease

is common amongst them, and the increase of heart trouble in recent years is no doubt due partly to the fact that sport, games and exercises—particularly drilling in school—as a compensation for an unhealthy life, are being indulged in more and more.

With the prevalent wrong use of self, accompanied by faulty co-ordination, however, games and exercises are no correction either of the consequences of an unhealthy life, or of an unhealthy condition of the body. Apart from the good derived from being in the open air, they do but aggravate these conditions, and that explains the strange anomaly that, although English people are probably at the present time, and have been for many years, the most enthusiastic lovers of all open-air games and sports, their health record, as the war showed, was worse than that of any of the Allied nations. Had it been only just as bad as that of other nations, the fact would still have appeared surprising—because games and sport are supposed to be “so good for you”—and it is curious that the above argument, based upon Mr. Alexander’s masterly diagnosis, is probably the first attempt at accounting on physiological grounds for the apparent anomaly.

It would, of course, be very much better for us if our civilization were such that no correction of unhealthy conditions were needed, and if the daily life of the people and their breadwinning occupations secured them the necessary amount of health and fresh air. And that is why the Egyptians wisely forbade every form of gymnastics, because they believed that where supplementary exercises were necessary the ordinary life of the people must be wrong, and, therefore, that the proper step to take was to correct their life. But, seeing that our civilization does impose an unhealthy existence upon the bulk of the people, and that there is little hope of its being corrected, it is a thousand pities that the correctives employed, in the form of games, sports and exercises, should in themselves be a means of aggra-

vating the vices they are meant to correct, and should even create new troubles which may be regarded as essentially modern and the outcome of violent out-of-door exercise.

But there is another effect of sport and games upon the manhood of the nation. I can never forget M. Briand's remark to Mr. Lloyd George, when the latter tried to interest him in golf. "*Mais c'est un jeu d'écolier!*"¹ exclaimed the French statesman; and, indeed, he described it precisely.² This concentration by adult Englishmen, for the alleged purposes of health, upon games of skill which consist chiefly in hitting, throwing, or kicking a ball in various directions, are so ingeniously calculated to keep intellectual co-operation in the background, that, particularly in the governing classes, it has done an enormous amount of harm. It is a curious coincidence, if it is a coincidence, that the most genial and gifted statesman of modern times, Joseph Chamberlain, whose idea of the Federation of Empire, although it was never carried out, was probably the most constructive political proposal of this century, never played an out-of-door game of skill.³ And it is also strange that our greatest modern writer and dramatist, Bernard Shaw, is a man who also eschews every kind of sport. I do not mean by this that all games and all sports are therefore to be eschewed. All I mean is that too narrow a concentration upon them is certainly deleterious to thought and intellect,⁴ while their intensive

¹ "But this is a schoolboy's game!"

² I shall be told that my favourite monarch, Charles I, was a golf player. This is perfectly true. And, as a relaxation for a man engaged in heavy brain work, golf may be exceedingly valuable. But to make it the chief hobby or pastime of men whose daily work in itself never occupies them above their eyes, may be a means of confirming their besotment.

³ On the other hand, Lord Balfour and Mr. Lloyd George, who have not been responsible for much constructive work in politics, are both devoted to out-of-door games, and are probably much better at golf than at statesmanship.

⁴ Apparently Dr. D'Arcy Power has taken the trouble to collect data which bear out this conclusion, but as his paper on the subject was published in California I have been unable to obtain a copy,

pursuit by the majority of modern men, most of whom use themselves wrongly, makes games and sport an additional cause of degeneration instead of a source of recuperation and vigour.

(8) Specialization in daily occupation, which has characterized the work of men for a very much longer period than it has the work of women, must here be understood in its modern sense, and in relation to our increasing tendency to divide labour upon the same task. Thus we must conceive it as a tendency which, through the ages, has whittled down capacity and catholicity of interests as much in the higher as in the lower spheres of life. And, just as we see it operating in the ruler, and reducing him from a patriarch who once had to judge his people, conduct their religious devotions, lead them in war, and guide them in their daily lives, into a man of the governing classes who now undertakes but one, or a portion of one of these responsibilities, so we see it operating in the subject, and reducing the blacksmith, for instance, from a man who understood all kinds of work in iron and steel, to a man who now hardly does more than the shoeing of horses. If we were to examine the history of the carpenter, the mason, the plumber, the weaver and the string-maker, we should find the same reduction in the range of their interests and skill, while in those trades which have been almost entirely superseded by machinery, such as the old mystery of book-making and book-binding, we should find the workers reduced to mere machine-minders, wielding starting- and stopping-levers instead of tools.

Indeed, skill of the hands, which involved the finest discipline for the brain and muscles of men, and the constant exercise of which brings to the individual and his stock, the greatest rewards in character and self-control, is now fast dying out, and even where it survives in its highest form, in the arts, those who display it no longer cover the field that their ancestors did. The versatility of a man like da Vinci is extinct ; while if only

in the department of preparing their own mediums, the painters of our Age are much inferior in capacity to their predecessors even of the generation of my grandfather, who, as an artist, could make his own pastels and chinks, and prepare his own colours.

It is no doubt true that the increasing struggle for existence in the last two hundred years, and the general speeding up of life, has made catholicity and versatility almost impossible except for the dilettante and the man of means ; but this does not alter the fact that the necessity felt by the majority of modern men deliberately to limit their scope and intensify concentration at one point (quite apart from the additional influence of machinery) has substantially reduced the individual man's pristine endowment of variegated interests and capacities ; while the loss of the discipline which results from skilled handwork, with other influences already mentioned, has promoted the general decline in character.

By narrowing man's interests, modern conditions have impaired his intelligence and made him like a child in regard to all those questions in which he has not specialized ; and, seeing that, until lately, the intelligence of woman had not suffered this cramping influence, and the majority of women, even to-day, still escape it and therefore retain their pristine catholicity and versatility, it is not surprising that in a large number of cases, they find their mates tiresomely limited, puerile, and unresponsive. When Wolfe declared that he would have preferred to write Gray's *Elegy* to taking Quebec, it was not because he feared the enterprise ; for his subsequent conduct proved that he was fearless. It was because he still retained some of that catholicity of interests which, though more common in his day than it is at present, was even then fast dying out. Now, who has time for poetry, if he is not a poet ? Who has time for the study of human nature, if he is not a psychologist ? But women have retained much of their primitive interest in the whole range of human capacity

and human expression ; and, in this sense, though they probably do not grasp it in this way, the constant companionship of one modern man can hardly give them a full life.

(9) Lastly, I suggest as one of the remote causes of men's degeneracy, the tendency in England during the last five or six generations to describe too narrow limits to the notion of manliness. This deliberate restriction of the demands made upon a full masculine equipment by national opinion, operating in the sphere of selection, has undoubtedly led to a serious reduction in men with the full endowment of male qualities, and it has, therefore, been largely responsible for Feminism. For although women, through their proneness to accept ruling and popular valuations as right and proper, are the first to apply this limited standard of manliness in estimating their menfolk, it is a standard which leaves out of account so many essentially masculine qualities, that he who comes up to it without surpassing it, cannot fail ultimately to earn their contempt.

It is doubtless the outcome of two influences—the atmosphere of the public school playground on the one hand, and on the other the enormous successes obtained by England's fighting men ever since the days of the mediæval bowmen. But, whatever the influences may be which have led to this limited standard, its fallacy consists in this, that it tends to regard as sufficiently manly those men and youths who are good horsemen, proficient at out-of-door games and sports, possessed of the bravery of the efficient soldier, endowed with the kind of chivalry that has been criticized in Chapter IX, and with the kind of manners that reveal the utmost subserviency to the female sex.¹

¹ Although most women ultimately weary of the man whose masculinity is limited to these qualities, and despise his inadequate equipment, it should not be forgotten that he is essentially the "safe" type, with whom they "know where they are," and on that account the less passionate incline to him.

Now it is perfectly obvious, and no one would dream of denying it, that the first three qualities represented by the above standard are all very desirable and praiseworthy. What one may reasonably question, however, is whether they are sufficient in themselves to constitute an adequate standard of manliness; for I think it can be cogently maintained that it is precisely because they have for a very long while constituted an adequate standard of manliness in this country, that certain other equally essential manly qualities have tended to decline and disappear.

If, however, the reader doubts the accuracy of my statement that this limited standard of manliness is universally applied to-day, in estimating the value of men, let him by way of experiment question the manliness of a certain fellow in his circle, whom he knows only as a good sportsman. He will find that he will be immediately met with a howl of indignant protest from his listeners. And if he chooses to press his point, and proceeds to explain that in his opinion a manly man, in addition to being a good sportsman, should also bear a correct and normal relation to the opposite sex, should show will power, character, and lucidity and precision in thought, and that, moreover, he should most emphatically prefer the intellectual before the emotional appeal in all serious questions, while displaying a sufficient mastery of those problems which, as a citizen and a member of a democratic state, it is his duty to understand—if, I say, he should explain his view in such wise, his answer from his listeners would most probably be to the effect that they did not think these additional qualities had anything to do with manliness. To them—for such is the valuation of the Age—it would be enough that the young man could ride well, play a good game, display bravery in war, and behave for all the world like a lackey whenever a lady appeared.

Now it is precisely this attitude of mind, this dangerous limitation of the idea of manliness, which, during the

last hundred and fifty years, has done most to breed the incomplete, the poorly equipped man in our midst; and it is a vice of judgment which seems peculiar to nations rejoicing in a tradition of military success. The fact that women find the standard in some respects a useful one for their purpose (for, as Aristotle pointed out, it makes for a class of men easily ruled by the female) and therefore help to uphold it, should not blind us to the fact that it supplies but a mean and inadequate estimate of what a man should be; and, seeing that, in close contact with those men who come up to it, women are exasperated despite the power it gives them, its abandonment would be not only an unsuspected boon to the female sex, but also a very great blessing to the nation as a whole, and to its future.

It is so prevalent, however, that it will take a good deal of living down, and those who will be most anxious to retain it, will be the Feminists themselves who, aware of the kind of docile and rather dull-witted man it produces, and therefore, of the power it gives them, will only very reluctantly acknowledge that it represents but a truncated and deformed ideal of true manliness.

CHAPTER XII

The Remedy

THE modern world sees a number of changes taking place, and it imagines that these changes are conditioned by the evolutionary march of events towards a better and happier future. To look closely at these changes, however, and to examine them in the light which the preceding pages have shed upon the problem of degeneration, is to recognize immediately that little or nothing is being done to get to the root of the trouble. Mankind goes on daily altering or abolishing its most hoary institutions, without once even attempting to inquire whether the fact that they no longer work may or may not be due to the degeneration of those who are now running them. The innocence with which modern man always finds fault with his institutions, as if he must necessarily be better and healthier than the generations that created them, is in itself a sufficient proof that he is as far away as he can be from a proper grasp of his problem. If for one moment, for instance, the house-breakers now engaged on demolishing the whole of established society could pause to ask themselves whether it was perhaps they themselves, and not their institutions, that were wrong, the problem would immediately receive more serious and more adequate treatment. But there is no such pause. With blind assurance the destroyers continue their work, like monkeys breaking up a complicated mechanism, which they do not understand how to keep in motion. Sweeping changes, therefore, in so far as they mean the modification or abolition of ancient institutions, offer no hope.

In regard to changes of detail, such as an increase in the efficiency of mechanical and scientific appliances, or a development of productivity, they also can offer no hope as long as they pass over the main problem, which is to increase the efficiency of man himself. Some may think that this is actually being done. To improve our mechanical equipment, however, or the scientific way of treating the mentally defective—to mention only one superficial change—obviously does not amount to much ; because, unless reform goes deeper, it fails to alter by one iota the conditions which are producing our inferior stocks. In the same way, little is to be expected from the extended use of the ultra-violet ray, or of sunlight. These remedial measures are but surface palliatives, and the best scientists engaged in applying them, know that they are but surface palliatives.

If the values which guide a people's taste and choice of ways continue to be unhealthy, and to direct them into dysgenic methods of living and mating, no amount of subsequent correction can remove the causes of degeneracy at their source.

In the sphere of mind and character, education, however much it is improved, can do little to regenerate a nation, if its mental powers are declining through lack of vitality, morbid hereditary taints and absence of severe discipline ; and, just as out-of-door exercise and games only aggravate diseased conditions, if the people who indulge in them do not use themselves correctly, so improved education (in the sense of mere knowledge) only increases perversity, when instincts and character are wrong through the cumulative effort of long neglect and corruption.

In State management and politics, it is surely obvious, in the light of all that has been argued here, that if men, despite their many peculiar advantages, have failed as the result of their loss in ability and native genius, women, with all their natural disadvantages are hardly likely to succeed. History alone, apart from what science

teaches us on the subject, is sufficient to settle this question for us ; and we must therefore regard Feminism, and all that it means, simply as a quack cure, a bogus remedy, for all the ills of the time. It is merely a red herring drawn across the path by those who are seeking after a genuine remedy for the modern world's sickness. But it really only deludes those who are in the habit of being drawn off the scent by red herrings, and its vogue cannot therefore last. The very fact that the majority of those who support this movement are abnormal, neurotic and physiologically disappointed creatures, is enough to prove that it can endure only so long as the present Age's ill health incapacitates it for adopting a more reasonable cure.

Socialism and Communism, likewise, offer no hope for the future. For, what human life has demonstrated conclusively hitherto is that every elevation of mankind has been the work of superior individuals, or groups of superior individuals ; never of mediocre people, no matter how numerous. The aim of Socialism and Communism, is, however, to bring about the reign of the mediocre ; and, this being so, it must end in disaster. Sooner or later the misguided and suffering masses will clamour for the genial leader, the artist ruler, who will give them what the inhabitants of suburban villas cannot possibly vote for. The contempt of suburbanites for each other must ultimately kill all forms of Socialism and Communism, just as it is killing democracy.

There remains one suggestion that is worth considering, and that is the proposal put forward by Mr. Austin Freeman in his book *Social Decay and Regeneration*, to the effect that, since the segregation and elimination of the so-called "unfit"¹ presents many difficulties, the next best solution is the *voluntary segregation of the "fit"*—that is to say, the voluntary withdrawal of the "fit"

¹ I do not approve of the term myself, because it is bad biology ; but it has popular currency and Mr. Freeman uses it. Presumably he means the "undesirable."

from the rest of the community for the purpose of living their own life, and breeding only with their like in constitutional and mental healthiness.

The idea is ingenious and Mr. Freeman is to be congratulated for the way in which he defends it; but one insuperable difficulty in the way of its realization is the problem of getting people to acknowledge, with our present standards as they are, that they do not belong to the order of the so-called "fit." I come across so many people who, while they do not share my standards of human desirability, regard themselves as among the "fit," when all the time they frequently do not reach my own level of physical efficiency (I, be it remembered, not being in the least satisfied that I am "fit") that I despair of being able to carry out Mr. Freeman's suggestion.

It seems to me that before Mr. Freeman's idea could take effect, we should have to alter our whole standard of value. Otherwise we should find thousands of our fellow-men demanding admission into the compound of the segregated "fit," when all the while their claim to enter it would be about as valid as that of Hephæstos, Caliban, Quilp, or Tom Thumb.

Moreover, among those who voluntarily segregated themselves, whose claim to "fitness" was valid, how many would take with them into the compound the *unhealthy values* of the world they had quitted? How many would bring with them the ignorance of the proper use of self, which, while it might by a fluke have left them unharmed, would remain to harm their friends and descendants? How many would bring with them false notions about religion, about sex, about sacrifice and about children, by which a fresh degenerative tendency would be started in spite of the sound physical and mental conditions prevailing?

I think Mr. Freeman's idea a good one, but its success is contingent upon so many preliminary safeguards, that to advance it without insisting upon these safeguards

is only a little more helpful than Dean Inge's advocacy of Eugenics when all the while he adheres to Christianity.

It must be obvious, that, if there is any validity in the various claims advanced in the preceding chapters, the most important object to be striven after, with all possible energy and expedition, is first and foremost the reform of man himself, particularly his way of thinking and valuing. Unless all that I have attempted to prove is historically, biologically and physiologically unsound, it must be quite plain that there can be no possible hope for any aspect of modern life, no chance of any progress, as long as the true leader, the born leader, the only builder and creator of everything in the past that has had any value and enduring power—man himself—remains in his present deplorable state of mental and physical subnormality. And all those, therefore, who are in earnest about this question of degeneracy, and who, moreover, are locally interested in its particular effect upon the British Empire, will sooner or later be bound to perceive that nothing less prodigious, less unfeminine and less unpopular than a *Masculine Renaissance* can possibly effect any desirable change in our condition.

No amount of mediocre epicene deliberation, no amount of mixed bathing by second-rate swimmers in the waters of politics and science, can possibly help us, as long as we remain as we are, not only in possession of our unhealthy values, but of our inherited taints both of character and mind. And since great men are the only people who can be saviours in this world, it behoves us to see that they are bred.

Our problem in a nutshell, therefore, is how we are to set about preparing the way for a *Masculine Renaissance*.

I venture to make the following suggestions in regard to this problem :

Although the need for it is urgent, it is idle to recommend a revival of true religion. For, in view of the fact that the sort of debasement of true religious feeling, which we find about us to-day, is largely the outcome of

the impoverishment of man as a deep-thinking and deep-feeling creature, to recommend a revival of true religion to the present generation would be as sensible as to recommend a feat of giant weight-lifting to a cripple.

What is needed, indeed, is a new religion, based upon a keen intellectual perception of the power behind phenomena, and a deep emotional relationship to that power, freed from all notions of ethics and entertainment, especially of Christian ethics and Protestant notions of church and chapel entertainment. For, just as no man devoid of true religious perceptions and emotions can be either a great worker, a good citizen, a staunch friend, or a profound thinker, so a nation that is devoid of true religiousness can never accomplish anything lasting either in social organization or in culture. But for the accomplishment of such a task as the creation of a new and true religion in this sense, a new order of men is necessary, and all that we can do is to prepare the way for it. We cannot create what we have not the strength to create. We can, however, build up our strength, in order that a generation may come that will be capable of this great task. Religion must follow, it cannot precede a Masculine Renaissance.

The future, therefore, depends upon the extent to which we are willing to alter our present trend and to recast our lives. And the first step in this direction must consist in a reform of our present values.

It is our values that direct our choice, not only of roads, ways and means, but also of things. It is our values that govern not only our criticism of our neighbour, but, what is more important, our criticism of ourselves. If, therefore, we have become degenerate, our standard of values must have been faulty, unhealthy and unreliable. Now here is a task for which our strength is still adequate. We can alter our values—not, however, in the spirit of mere iconoclasts, but in the spirit of workers who have found their old tools no longer serviceable.

A man who attacks the valuations of this Age is only an anarchist if he also disbelieves in all valuations of what kind soever. We, however, do not come forward in this spirit. All we say is that our present valuations must be wrong, for we know now whither they have led us. We must, therefore, have other valuations.

First of all we must abandon the ascetic values about the body, and cease to despise that side of our natures and the functions that depend upon it. The value according to which the body is reckoned the lowest side of us must be abolished. Realizing that we are all psycho-physical wholes, we must learn afresh the science of the interdependence of mind and body, and cease to think it possible that a botched or inferior body can contain a pure and desirable soul. We must cease to condone ugliness, physiological depravity, in ourselves as in others. A new emotion must be created—the emotion of shame for all bodily defects. This will teach us not only to place ourselves in the scale of desirability, but also to place others. No eugenic legislation can possibly effect valuable reforms until a new taste is created in man—a taste which will cause him to regard as unclean and nauseating bodily defects which to-day we cheerfully overlook in human beings although we still loathe them in animals.

This new taste will preserve us against dysgenic mating much more efficiently than new and drastic laws. But it means the overthrow of old and long-reverenced values; and there is much in ourselves and others that will resist this change, despite the fact that we may not be consciously Christian. The despised of this earth, the people who will be *declassés* and who will be avoided, will then consist of the physiologically depraved—that is to say, those whose bodies, being defective, cannot be expected to have desirable sentiments and beliefs. But before this stage is reached, much that is in us will have to be chastened, hardened and purified.

In the first place, we shall have to alter our concept

of pity, and instead of retaining it as a mere uncontrolled reflex in the presence of all suffering and physical deformity, which merely weakens the social body, we shall transform it into an emotion that strengthens us and society. Our pity will go out to the soldier of life who drops, or who is wounded, in the fray. It will go out to the noble and desirable human plants the moment we see their existence jeopardized or limited by contact with the ignoble, or by encroachments of the latter. It will cease to go out to the lowly evolved, to the degenerate and the physiologically botched who have never, and can never, contribute anything but misery and undesirable taints to society. These we shall regard with enmity as undesirable parasites, threatening and limiting the lives of the more valuable social elements. We shall imitate the farmer with his crops. But, since it is woman's natural part in life to feel for the helpless (*no matter what their worth may be*) we shall not expect woman's co-operation in this reform. On the contrary, we shall expect women to oppose it.¹ Only by the control of women can this false pity as a social vice be eradicated. No woman, if she remains a desirable member of her sex, would ever destroy, or wish to see destroyed, her defective child. She can only be made to acquiesce in such a step through her devotion to a tasteful mate who demands the sacrifice. That is the reason why, when the proper relationship of the sexes is destroyed, many other things of price must go wrong on earth.

We must also recast our values about sacrifice. The teaching of Christianity that it is noble, desirable, and virtuous to sacrifice the greater for the less, the god for the mob, must be transformed into the value: it is noble, desirable and virtuous to sacrifice the less to the greater. No institution, however small or however large, no army, however powerful or well-disciplined, could possibly succeed if those who led it made it a rule

¹ For a more detailed explanation of this point, see my *Woman: A Vindication*, on the biological necessity of bad taste in women.

always to sacrifice the greater for the less, instead of the less for the greater. We must learn to regard this value as Bolshevistic—which it is—and as the canker that is destroying everything great and valuable in our civilization. So long as it is possible, however, for the life of one desirable and fragrant family to be penalized even to the extent of sixpence a year, in order to maintain human rubbish in existence, we are obeying the value which demands, when sacrifice is necessary, that the greater should be offered up for the less. We have obeyed this value too long, and it has necessarily landed us in disaster.

Instead, therefore, of honouring those who fling their accumulated wealth to the least desirable human beings, so that they may batten and multiply, we shall honour those who select the finest and the best for their charity. How many desirable working-class families in the country have not sunk to a low level, through the impossibility of obtaining substantial help in a crisis, while thousands of pounds were being given to cripples, incurables and defectives of all kinds? This, our modern values, directed by Christianity, approve. We must cease to approve of it. Honour must no longer be paid to anyone who does not practise tasteful and constructive charity.

We must also alter our valuations regarding men and women. We must abandon the Pauline and Christian doctrine concerning the superiority of virginity over matrimony, and cease to regard as normal, either the non-reproductive woman, however sound she may be, or the intermediate female who is happy unmated. Instead of being so imbecile as to regard such creatures, as we do to-day, as representatives of their sex, and as able to voice the sentiments and wishes of their sex, we should consider them as one with the harmlessly insane—unreliable and suspect in all their judgments. Just as we would instinctively look at our watch if a lunatic told us the time, we ought instinctively to take pains to verify, before accepting it, every word that proceeds

from the mouth of the woman who is not leading a normal sexual life.

The crass imbecility that has come over England and America to-day, which enables these countries to listen with respect to a crowd of abnormal, unmated or badly mated, viragoes, is perhaps the most hopeless sign of the times. It shows how utterly at sea we have become concerning the valuation of human beings. Here it is that Pauline and Christian influence has done most to pervert our pristine wisdom—for savages apparently know better.

With regard to man, we must make our demands more searching and our standards higher. We must no longer be satisfied with the whittled-down standard of manliness, which is based upon the qualities of a good horseman, a good cricketer and a good soldier. We must learn to expect of the manly man, not only courage and proficiency in games and sport, but also will-power, leadership, mastery over the mysteries of life, and not Puritanical funk in their presence, intelligence sufficient to overshadow any female brain that is placed alongside of him (within his class), and clarity and decision regarding every problem which it behoves him to understand—in fact, everything that goes to make a man, in whose presence the mere claim of sex equality appears utterly ridiculous.

Only by the return of such a man to all classes of the nation can women be made to feel happy and content ; only by his presence can the woman be brought out in woman, and the male in her nature made recessive. And if any further proof were needed of women's inability to institute any great and lasting reforms, it would be the fact that the most prominent members of the Woman's Movement have so far failed to perceive that the only fruitful reform is the regeneration of man.

Nothing less should satisfy us, because nothing less can possibly do any good. Every other remedy is quackery, and a mere headline for a penny paper.

Before leaving the question of values and their reform,

I would remind the reader of what I have already said regarding chivalry, responsibility, the idea of freedom and the idea of independence.

The man to whom we aspire must be chivalrous, but only in the sense that he understands chivalry as responsibility. The absurd misunderstanding of chivalry to-day, which amounts to a social convention that no gander may say "boo" to his goose, is about as fatuous as anything modern could be. We have eviscerated most things, but nothing more heartlessly than chivalry. We must restore to chivalry its central idea of responsibility—the willingness to answer for dependents, for creatures weaker than ourselves, always with the understanding that such responsibility must mean guidance. One cannot be responsible for a creature that one cannot command—that is a plain truism. But to retain a travesty of chivalry, and to call him who practises it a gentleman, is one of the most ridiculous farces of this burlesque of a world. It multiplies lackeys—that is the only result.

The man to whom we aspire must also understand freedom, and wish to be free. But here again, he must desire the consequences of his demand. To be free is to be self-reliant and strong. Freedom and dependence are antitheses. The man who wants freedom, therefore, must be prepared for the consequences of standing alone. And, since these consequences may be fatal, he must be brave and resourceful. Freedom is expiring to-day, because, as I have shown, modern man has abandoned or forgotten the inevitable relation of freedom to self-reliance. The modern man wants it both ways. He will have a centralized power able to force the whole nation to support him if he fails, or cannot support himself, and yet he demands freedom of action. But if the central power relieves him of the need of self-reliance, it must limit his freedom. Hence the decline of freedom to-day. If our aim is the self-reliant man, we must decentralize power and destroy the present system of supplementing

self-help by governmental interference. *But is the aim of modern England really and truly the self-reliant man?* It is doubtful. No other man, however, is worth striving after, no other man is any good. And he used to be the typical Anglo-Saxon.

In the realm of sex we must destroy the values which made Lecky feel and say that this side of our lives is degraded and impure, and, recognizing these values as the outcome of Christianity's defamation and slander of the sex function, and our own feelings regarding the matter merely as the result of our incorporation of these values through two thousand years of Christian teaching, we must rescue sex from the ignominy into which it has been made to fall. Our object should be to elevate the sexual relation to the high plane which it deserves, both from the standpoint of the sacred part it plays in the preservation of our kind, and from that of the joys, lofty emotions and unique relationship it creates for adult man and woman; and we should learn to regard with contempt and loathing all those who speak slightly or indignantly about this deepest and most voluptuous of the passions. In the slanderer of sex, and of the primary sex function, we should learn to recognize the *jealous, the botched, the bitterly disappointed, or the impotent among mankind*; and we should esteem their judgment in accordance with this estimation of them. We should suspect of some inner foulness anyone who ventures to display moral disapproval about any natural sexual act—whether it be the play of man and woman before congress, the moment of congress, or any other instinctive satisfaction of the sex appetite between two adult desirable human beings of different sexes. Our loathing should be reserved for the procreative act performed by those who have no right, no natural mandate, to reproduce their kind. And it is typical of the Christian standpoint, that while the unmarried mother, however beautiful and desirable, is looked at askance, the Church marriage of two deaf and dumb or two

congenitally blind, or two constitutionally repulsive people, is looked upon with complete approval.

But we should not necessarily suspect of inner foulness anyone who was indignant about a natural sexual act that had been committed without any sense of responsibility, self-reliance, or consciousness of the future. On the contrary, while elevating natural sexual relations between two desirable people to the highest place among the joys and experiences of mankind, we ought to know precisely in what circumstances indignation about them is justified. And these circumstances occur only when they are consummated without any sense of responsibility on the part of the couple enjoying them.

To-day, however, while under Christian influence we regard sexual relations in any circumstances as degrading, we have without any indignation whatsoever, relieved the act of all responsibility—exactly the reverse of what is recommended above. To-day everybody, however foul, can force the consequences of his sexual recreations upon the shoulders of the community, and this is not regarded as immoral, while the act of procreation itself is still referred to only in a whisper of shame.

Two transvaluations are therefore needful here to restore health to society. The sexual act must be freed from its Christian associations of guilt and degradation, but it must be made a responsible act. This reform, by greatly liberating the passions of the sexes, and giving freer expression to deeply rooted desires, particularly in the pre-procreational stage, will substantially help to reunite man and woman, to enlighten both regarding the secrets of life and their own natures, and sweep away much of the false and sentimental psychology on which present social life is based. Moreover, it will bring into disrepute and contempt only those who indulge in sexual recreations who have either no sense of responsibility, or who, owing to their physiological botchedness or foulness, have no human mandate to reproduce their kind.

In the realm of mating, we must depend upon the change in taste referred to above, to effect the necessary reforms, and in time it will suffice. But we must also restore the old and valuable prejudices against excessive mixed breeding, whether of races, stocks, or strains (professional, etc.). We must learn to understand character and personal gifts as the guerdon of long endeavour in the same direction during several generations. Thus families working at the same task and ruled by the same values for many generations garner gifts and virtues in the same way as a man acquires proficiency and wisdom in his lifetime ; and to proceed to overmuch mixing of stocks, therefore, amounts to destroying or discontinuing the process of garnering. A family that has produced artists for three generations therefore commits suicide, as far as gifts and character are concerned, when it selects mates in a family of commercial or industrial traditions, and *vice versa*. This dissipation of garnered qualities has been going on for so long (not to mention the mixture of races) that we are fast losing all ability, all character, and all special gifts. The Middle Ages were wiser in this respect, for they regarded it as scandalous for a butcher's daughter to marry a plumber's son, and so on ; and the wise civilization of Egypt and India had similar conventions. Inbreeding, therefore, will sooner or later have to be restored, in spite of the havoc that it will necessarily create among our degenerate stocks ; for the extreme and dissolute cross-breeding of the present day is merely covering up our taints and destroying every shred of character and virtue (*virtù* = capacity) we ever possessed. But the rewards of inbreeding will soon make themselves felt, and a regenerate manhood will be led by the stocks which have been the first successfully to survive a long discipline in inbreeding, and steady endeavour along firmly fixed and similar lines. It is here that Mr. Freeman's suggestion of a segregation of the " fit " (in my terminology—desirable) comes in, and on these lines, provided that all degenerate stocks and

strains have achieved self-extermination by inbreeding, it will be fruitful of surprising and magnificent results.

In politics we must endeavour to bring about the evanescence of democratic institutions, by exposing the shallowness, impracticability and danger to national survival of democratic control as we understand it. The great suffering and chaos to which such forms of government have led have made a deep impression upon the soul of humanity, and this impression will help the leaders of the Masculine Renaissance to remodel the national life without having recourse to the discredited and preposterous vote. Already in the countries which have hitherto led civilization and cultural reform we are witnessing the break up of Parliamentary institutions, and since the idea of Parliament itself originated in the climes where these changes are now taking place, we may confidently hope that they may soon be introduced over here. The inevitable association of democracy with national decline has been insufficiently emphasized by historical and political writers, because they have, during the last two hundred years, been chiefly Whig or Jacobin in tendency. But a literature on the subject is now growing, and I am proud to be able to say that I have already contributed two volumes to it, and will soon contribute a third.

In the realm of industry, the endeavour must be not only to bring about a revival of agriculture, but also to reinstate as many of the old crafts as possible. For, seeing that one of our hardest tasks is to arrest the dry-rot that is now destroying the spirit and body of man, we must restore to the masses the chance of deriving some inner benefit from their bread-winning labours. Only then can they learn to respect themselves once more. They must be able to express their highest impulses in their work; for this means not only happiness, but also the reaping of the natural guerdon of all skilled labour—the qualitative improvement of the individual and his natural self-discipline. They must become agricul-

turists and craftsmen again, because this is the only means whereby they can recover their dignity, their lost faculties, and above all, their self-esteem ; and one of the hardest problems of the future will be the reorganization of society on such lines as to make this end a possibility.

In science, particularly the science of medicine, the energy of research and invention must be directed not along the present lines of discovering ever more and more artificial aids to faulty functioning, but towards correcting and preventing faulty functioning at its inception. Thus the aim must be ultimately to abandon artificial aids as useless for improving human stocks, and meanwhile only to apply them as sparingly as possible. For example, defects of vision, which are chiefly due to faulty co-ordination of the eye muscles, will be treated by a general correction of faulty muscular co-ordination throughout the body, instead of being merely relieved, as they are now, by correcting through glasses, the image that is about to reach the retina.

The other means which, as I suggested in my *Lysis-trata*, must take the place of artificial aids will consist, (a) in the re-education of man in such a manner as to prevent that wrong use of himself which, at present, is such a fruitful source of faulty functioning, and (b) in the attainment of natural individual immunity instead of the present artificial immunity which is attained by means of inoculations, disinfectants, sterilization of food products, etc. This natural immunization of the individual will be achieved largely by an improvement in food conditions, a better understanding of hygiene, the restoration of breast feeding as a universal custom and duty, the return, wherever possible, of the bulk of the population to healthy out-of-door occupations, and above all, the raising of the general tone and resistance of the individual by re-educating him in a correct use of himself.

Medical men will also have to take up a firm attitude

towards the question of the right of human rubbish to survive, and will have to resist with all their might any attempt at establishing this right in the case of those whose condition at birth or at puberty makes the prospect of normality in adult years quite hopeless. Only, however, when botchedness or physical depravity ceases to be regarded in the same light as moral depravity, will this reform be possible. By means of it the healthy and the sound will be relieved of a burden which at present presses too heavily upon them, and more energy and wealth will be liberated for the rearing of desirable members of the community. It will also be necessary to take measures either, (a) against the freedom of mental defectives, so that they cannot mate or reproduce their kind, or (b) against the retention by mental defectives of their sexual potency. In time this policy would have to be extended to the congenitally blind, who are blind through hereditary taint (as, for instance, retinitis pigmentosa which runs in families), to the deaf and dumb, and to all people revealing the stigmata of degeneration. The taste resulting from the new values would do a good deal in the way of preventing the multiplication of such people, but what is chiefly needed is to relieve the present crushing burdens as quickly as possible.

In the matter of education, particularly of the masses, our object should be not so much the inculcation of knowledge (except where this consists of a thorough grounding in the mother tongue) ¹ but in the teaching of discipline.² Self-rule, not in the sense of merely negative inhibitions as taught by Puritanism, but in the sense of the skilful management of a fiery horse, and in the husbanding and wise direction of one's strength, is the greatest need of all. The morbid speed of reaction to-day is the result of lack of discipline in mind and body, a sign of automatic

¹ For an explanation of this point, see my *False Assumptions of Democracy*.

² This was wise old Kant's view, and it was a view largely held by pedagogues of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

response, and not of conscious and controlled response. In this particular modern man is different only in degree from the certified lunatic of his generation, who is entirely automatic. Now this condition is due not only to the lack of character which is everywhere noticeable, but also and chiefly to the absence of discipline. The susceptibility and emotionalism of modern man are due to the same cause, and they are dangerous because they lead to irresponsibility. Thus discipline will have to be restored to its proper place as the principal object of all education, and knowledge must take a much more modest place. Seeing, however, that knowledge without self-discipline, is merely a dangerous weapon, the priority of discipline in importance is surely obvious.

The increase of character and will resulting from discipline will certainly reduce the sponge and blotting-paper quality of the modern type, which causes it instantly to absorb whatever it touches, and which is regarded as a sign of quickness and intelligence on that account.¹ But the benefits of increased resistance will be so widely recognized, that this reduction in absorptivity will willingly be sacrificed. For it should be remembered that this is a pencil and notebook age, and not an age of good memories. This means that the extreme absorptivity of modern man is entirely uncontrolled, it is a mere infection, which passes off when the influence is removed—hence the bad memory of modern man, despite his apparent excessive impressionableness.

In regard to children, too, the attitude must be changed. When once the Puritan and Christian sex-phobia is suppressed, and the relation of the sexes—the oldest part of us—is allowed to resume its proper place as one of the most elevated and elevating concerns of

¹ The speed with which a solecistic vulgarism like the phrase "quite all right" enters the current speech of all classes nowadays (I have heard the highest and the lowest in the land use it) is a sign of this morbid and automatic absorptivity of modern man which is largely due, in addition to the causes given above, to worn-out nerves.

adult emotional and physical life, less stress will be laid on the child ; its alleged innocence will be seen to be a foolish myth ; it will loom less prominently in our lives, and consequently it will take a more subordinate position. This will facilitate a restoration of discipline in the younger generation, and greatly help the general movement towards the formation of character and will. It will then be seen how largely Puritan the present exorbitant estimate of childhood is, and the proper order of rank will at last be restored between maturity and immaturity, to the great advantage of the child's mind, body and volitional powers.

But the greatest hope for the future lies in re-education rather than in education in the old sense. Modern man must be re-educated in a knowledge which he has lost, and the loss of which causes him to do untold damage to himself. The animals have apparently not lost this knowledge, which consists in the proper use of self. And here I come to Mr. Alexander again and to his second searching question. It will be remembered that Mr. Alexander, having come to the conclusion that our instinctive reactions to environment are no longer reliable and lead only to a faulty use of ourselves, proceeds to ask whether we have any other means of reacting to environment. To this question he replies most emphatically "Yes," and he says that the old instinctive reactions must be replaced by consciously controlled actions.

What does he mean by this ? He means that every action performed by the lower animals, or by primitive man in a stable environment, is performed by means of a central control which prevents a vicious co-ordination of their bodies.

Let me give an example : a female cat finds one of her blind new-born kittens placed on a ledge three or four feet above the floor (this experiment can be tried by anyone at any time, provided that they are dealing with a cat which is used to them, and which, moreover, is a good and passionate mother). To recover the kitten

she will spring on to the ledge, and seizing the little one in her mouth, proceed to make preparations to descend with it to the basket on the floor. Now she may have to jump twice—first on to another ledge and then on to the floor—or she may accomplish the whole descent at one spring; but which ever method she adopts, her jaws will not be jarred by the leap, *although they are at tension*, and her teeth will in no wise press through into her offspring's skin to hurt it.¹

To the modern man such a feat would be impossible. The tension at his jaws would be appreciably increased, probably with an uncontrolled jerk, at the conclusion of each jump when his feet touched the ground, and the tendency would be for his teeth to try to meet in a penetrating bite.

The reason of this difference between the cat and modern man is that the cat still possesses a central control of her muscular system, which enables her to arrange a harmonious co-ordination of her body for any effort connected with the normal demands of her life, whereas man has long ago lost his central control through having had to meet too many extraordinary demands at too short notice—without, that is to say, having had time to re-educate himself.

But what is the consequence of this to man? It may be argued that, since man does not have to carry his young in his mouth from ledge to ledge of a mountain pass, there is no reason why his difference from the cat in this matter should be deplored. This is perfectly true. But man performs many other movements with his body quite as intricate as the mother cat's feat, and if we can for a moment picture the wrongly communicated strain or stress resulting from the faulty co-ordination of each muscular effort, we at once recognize the gravity

¹ I have tried this experiment with one of my own cats which is an exceptionally good mother, over a jump of four feet. But I warn the reader that not every cat will make an effort to recover her kitten, and the passionate desire to do so is essential to the experiment.

of the consequences to the individual. For although there may be no second party (the kitten in the case of the cat) to register the jar on the jaws, we must remember that the faulty co-ordination is there all the same, to produce undue pressure, constriction, friction or strain in some other part of the body at each muscular effort, and that the cumulative result of such repeated misuse in the individual himself can become very much more serious than the worst bite into the muscles of a second party.

If this is admitted—and it is easily demonstrated as a fact on the body of any modern man, be he an athlete or a sedentary philosopher—the wrong use of self is sure to be a most insidious and potent cause of faulty functioning and therefore of disease.¹ And Mr. Alexander's claim that he can correct it, by means of re-educating the individual in the use of his lost central control, becomes extremely interesting and of the greatest importance for the problem of progressive physical deterioration.

Indeed, if it be true that the function of the intellect is merely a derivative of the muscular sense—and there are many cogent reasons for accepting this view—then it is obvious that a faulty use of self debauches the mind itself; because a perverted sensory appreciation in the body must find its counterpart in a perverted consciousness.² And thus even the modern man's concepts become suspect and unreliable.

When once this is acknowledged, the importance of Mr.

¹ Mr. J. E. R. McDonagh, F.R.C.S., the eminent specialist, writing in *Truth* on Dec. 30, 1925, says: "I have spent many years in attempting to discern the nature of disease . . . and in *The Nature of Disease*, Part II, which is now in the Press, there is clearly portrayed what disease is, why it occurs and why it gives rise to signs and symptoms. But it is necessary to go even further back and to find why the human body should so readily become the seat of disease. This has been done by F. M. Alexander, who has shown it to be the sequence of wrong functioning, an inheritance of civilization."

² Prof. Dewey accepts this consequence of Mr. Alexander's diagnosis. See p. 312, *ante*.

Alexander's proposed correction increases a hundredfold ; for, in addition to being a prophylactic against faulty functioning, it is seen to be a corrective of conceptual aberration or perverted consciousness.

The fact, as we have seen, that school children are found to deteriorate soon after reaching school ;¹ the fact that, as Sir Arthur Keith has pointed out,² there are serious faults in the posture of modern man, and the further fact that, in spite of athleticism and the prevalent enthusiasm for out-of-door games, health is not improving, all point to only one conclusion, that it is not what men do with their bodies that is so important, *but how they employ their psycho-physical mechanism in doing it.*

The position at drill is a strained and badly co-ordinated one, the movements in many physical exercises are damaging unless they are performed with a proper knowledge of the use of self, and the same applies to the movements in many games. Now, it must be clear that, if the bodily co-ordination in each of these activities is faulty, owing to the absence of the central control, very severe damage may ultimately be done by their constant repetition. And, truth to tell, that is precisely what happens.

The faulty co-ordination extends right through the muscular system, affecting even the minute and delicate muscles of the eyes, and one of its promptest symptoms is disturbed functioning. This accounts for the observed speedy deterioration of many children at school, as regards their eyesight and general condition ; for it is in school that they are first drilled and encouraged to engage actively in violent exercise. It also accounts for the increase in heart and eye trouble at all ages all over England, and probably for a large number of functional disorders of the alimentary canal, which are ascribed to modern sedentary conditions, lack of fresh air, etc. It partly accounts, moreover, for the differences hitherto observable between modern man and modern woman,

¹ See p. 187, *ante*.

² See p. 200, *ante*.

in the matter of the degree of their degeneracy, because, since it is only recently that women and girls have gone in for drilling, for violent games, and for physical exercises of all kinds, it is only recently that the evils resulting from ignorant use of self and faulty co-ordination have begun to affect the female sex in an acute form.

But by re-educating people in the proper use of themselves, Mr. Alexander makes games, drilling and exercises of all sorts (where there is not wilful and deliberate distortion of the body by vicious demands in posture ¹) possible without damage being done to the system, and the recovery of one's lost central control is probably one of the most wonderful experiences it is possible to have.

Every action then becomes twofold : the proper means whereby are thought of and then the action is accomplished. The immediate performance of the action on wrong instinctive lines ceases to be the aim, and the means whereby supersede mere end-gaining in every activity. Response slows down, reaction also. Every act becomes a feat in conscious self-discipline, and the use of the central control leads in process to correct and harmonious co-ordination. The result is a truly marvellous toning up of the whole system, and a re-growth of unhealthy compressed nerves, blood-vessels, muscles and organs.

It is impossible to describe in words how the recovery of the central control is achieved inside the individual, or what it feels like, because inasmuch as it is a sensory experience, registered by the muscular sense, it can no more be conveyed by words than can the taste of bacon, or the look of the colour blue, or the sound of middle C of the piano. No phraseology, however skilful, can define a sensation. One can only say that it consists of restoring healthy perception to the sensory-motor system. But the mechanical process by which this is done is the following : On the threshold of every action the instinctive

¹ As, for instance, in the standing attitude : "shoulders back," "knees stiffened and unflexed," "head back," etc., all of which make faulty co-ordination inevitable.

reflexes which are prepared to direct the individual in its accomplishment are inhibited by an act of will. For instance, the moment it occurs to him to get up, the old muscular reactions to this idea are inhibited and he sits still. Then the expert, who is aware of the correct co-ordinations required for the movement, performs the action for him, by seizing his body in such a way that the central control operates from the neck downwards and causes the body of the learner to move correctly from the chair. This constitutes a muscular experience which must be undergone in order to be known, and is the first valuable lesson. From that moment, an alert pupil knows something which he could not have known before—the difference between his former faulty and unconscious lift out of the chair, and his new and correctly co-ordinated lift out of it. This is the beginning and it is gradually built upon until two standards take shape in consciousness—the new standard with all that it means in the matter of eliminated vicious strains and pressures, and the old standard with its vicious strains and pressures vividly felt for the first time. Thus the sensory appreciation, by being re-educated, gradually serves as a check—as it always should do—to vicious and harmful movements of the body; and with this change, the further remarkable change of a chastened consciousness (a consciousness no longer reflecting a debauched bony and muscular structure) comes into being.

Gradually (the change is slow because it consists largely of regrowth)¹ the thoracic capacity increases, the back straightens, the nerves recover serenity, functions tend to normalize, the heart is no longer hemmed in and regains its harmonious relation to the rest of the

¹ See Dr. Peter Macdonald of York (as quoted by the *British Medical Journal*) in his speech before the British Medical Association Conference, 1923. "The effect of his [Mr. Alexander's] training on health and disease is astounding, though he in no way professes to treat disease at all; he professes solely to be a trainer. Flat foot becomes a trifling disability which simply disappeared. Asthma becomes ameliorated or removed; stammering is overcome."

system, and, with the expansion of the thorax, oxidation becomes adequate, irritants are removed from the blood, which otherwise cause the partial toxæmia of debility, rheumatism, gout, etc., and the individual begins to enjoy that physical resistance which is called immunity. The psychical life naturally shares in this general recovery of well-being. Reactions become more controlled, suggestibility loses its acuteness, the basis of character which is resistance (and the counterpart to physical immunity) is formed, concepts become more real, and the quality of sanity, so little understood nowadays, appears as a permanent possession. The uncontrolled man who, to the rest of the world seems normal, then begins to strike the pupil as merely a "border-line case" the gravity of whose automatism is not sufficiently acute to lead to his confinement.

And these changes, as they appear, startle the individual, not only as strangers within the precincts of his inner life, but also as the extraordinary and punctual fulfilment of what the genial discoverer of this method of re-education never fails to prophesy from the start as the inevitable outcome of his teaching.

Nobody concerned with the problem of degeneration and its solution can afford to overlook this recent contribution to the science of human psycho-physiology¹; and it is to those who to-day regard themselves as the most normal and most "fit," that its application will prove most salutary. It is they who will benefit most rapidly

¹ See, for instance, the opinion of the eminent surgeon Mr. Macleod Yearsley, F.R.C.S., in the *Literary Guide* of Oct. 1925: "To my mind, Mr. Alexander points definitely and uncompromisingly the way to man's right future, if man will but follow his directing finger. . . . The misuse of the body, in standing, walking, sitting, breathing, articulation, or any other daily action, cannot be treated successfully upon any other method than a psycho-physical one. Mr. Alexander makes this plain, and he points out decisively that this applies, not to the individual man alone, with his stammer, his faulty drive at golf, or his asthma, but to a whole nation as well in its attitude towards any question which calls urgently for solution."

from re-education ; it is they who will attain to perfection soonest by its adoption, and it is they who will be the first, if their number be great enough, to present a convincing standard and criterion to the rest of the world by means of which it can measure its own corruption.

We of this generation are too lowly evolved, too far back along the ladder of development, to be able to tell what will be needful, what will be desirable, in the social organization, and in all the institutions of a harmonious and integrated national life, when once mankind will have raised itself from its present degradation. That is why the less we destroy at present the better. We must first mend ourselves, correct our insanity and ill health, and thus modestly prepare the way for the only possible solution of the world's difficulties and problems—a better generation of men. We are not big enough in our present condition to tackle the problems that surround us satisfactorily ; that is why the re-organization of our institutions should follow, not precede, the regeneration of the male sex.

Only in this masculine renaissance is there any hope of a revival for humanity as a whole. And as soon as the men appear who will constitute this rebirth of desirable male material, everything will be found to fall naturally into its proper place. The relation of the sexes will immediately recover its serenity, beauty and elevation. Feminism will not be extirpated, it will vanish like many another nightmare of our degradation. And we shall begin a new era in our evolution. Unlike the past, in which man has played a game of chance with himself and his fellows, the future will find man ready for the first time to enlist his consciousness in the moulding of his destiny. The gamble of present-day life will then be looked upon as a thing of horror, rather like the life of the jungle appears to civilized man, and from these human products of the masculine renaissance the world will receive a new religion and a new goal.

But for this end to be achieved we must modestly assess our present worth at its correct value. We must deprecate any ambitious scheme for which we should have to anticipate a strength we do not yet possess. And we must recognize the maximum of our possible endeavour as an act of preparation and elementary foundation.

This is not a wild, romantic programme incapable of fulfilment. It imposes no exorbitant demands upon the energy or capacity of modern man. It is a practical and perfectly possible solution capable of certain fulfilment. But, just as we cannot now anticipate the strength which one day we shall have for the establishment of a new religion, so we can only vaguely discern the full measure of power and genius that will belong to those for whom we may now make our preparations.

The men that it is thus possible to rear are not a magic fantasy, but a possible reality. The seeds from which they will spring are already half germinated in our highest examples. They are not demi-gods but mortals. And we ourselves, who claim that they are indispensable for the salvation of humanity, do not hope for them as a race of supermen but merely as the genial leaders of a Masculine Renaissance.

Appendix

RECENT RECRUITING STATISTICS OF THE ARMY, NAVY AND AIR FORCE.

THE HEALTH OF THE ARMY IN 1923

(Extracted from *The Lancet*, Jan. 30, 26, p. 243.)

“Dental treatment was required by 63.9 per cent. (74.33) of the men, and two-thirds of them had their treatment completed.

“As to recruiting 376.64 (375.22) per 1,000 candidates for enlistment were refused at once, and 40.09 (32.09) per 1,000 men rejected within six months. In this last group there were 2,354 men, and it is estimated that each of them cost the State about £50. The chief causes of rejection were loss and decay of teeth, defective vision, defects of the lower limbs, and deficient chest measurement. *The causes of rejection which most increased in 1923 were middle ear and heart diseases.*”¹

PHYSICAL DEFICIENCY IN NAVAL RECRUITS IN 1925

(Extracted from *The Lancet*, Feb. 13, 26, p. 371.)

“The total men and boys entered in the Royal Navy and Royal Marines during the year 1925 were 4,092 and 2,979 respectively—i.e., 13 per cent. of those applying. The total number of men and boys ‘failed’ by medical officers during the period was 4,753; separate

¹ The italics are mine.—A. M. L.

figures for men and boys are not available, and there are no records of the numbers rejected by recruiters for physical defects. . . . During the year 1912-13, of those examined by medical officers (men and boys) 26·29 per cent. were rejected, and acceptances were 30·22 per cent. of total number of applicants. During the year 1923-24, of those examined by medical officers (men and boys) 39·47 per cent. were rejected, and acceptances were 14·83 per cent. of the total number of applicants.”

FURTHER DETAILS ABOUT NAVAL RECRUITS

(Extracted from *The Lancet*, March 13, 26.)

“The percentage rejected in 1925 was 87, and of the candidates rejected by the final medical examining officers the principal defects were :—

Defect.	Proportion and Total Rejections.
Defective vision	19·39
Defective teeth	12·66
Diseases of the heart	8·75
Flat foot	8·41
Diseases of the ears	7·61

Similar statistics for candidates who were not sent to the final medical examining officers are not available, as they would have involved an expenditure of clerical work which would not have been justified.

PHYSIQUE AND HEALTH OF AIR FORCE RECRUITS IN THE YEAR 1925

(Extracted from *The Lancet*, Feb. 20, 26, p. 423.)

The number of men passed fit for service in the Air Force was 1,885, the number rejected as medically unfit was 3,414, or a percentage of 54·19 of those medically

examined. The principal causes of rejection were as follows :—

Cause.	Per Cent.
Defective teeth	13·0
Diseases of the heart	12·4
Poor physique	9·5
Diseases of the ears	8·8
Deformities of the feet	8·6
Diseases of the lungs	8·1
Defects of vision	7·3
Defects of the extremities	2·3
Other causes	30·0

INDEX

- AGRICULTURE**, must be restored, 347
- ALEXANDER, F. M.**, his epoch-making discovery with regard to faulty co-ordination, 309-15; on conscious control, 351-7; the vital importance of this, 357
- AMAZONS**, the, of Dahomey, sadistic spinsters, 93 *n.*; their alleged contempt of men, 107
- AMERICANS**, their inability to establish a proper attitude towards the female, 96 *n.*
- APES**, heads of infant, nearer human type than those of adult apes, 30 *n.*; their degeneration, 31
- ARISTOCRACY**, impossible without the superiority of the animal man, 225 *n.*
- ARISTOPHANES**, and the woman question in Greece, 69
- ARMOUR**, arguments from old, no refutation of charge of degeneracy, 150-6; heaviness of old, 154
- ARMY**, the, statistics regarding progressive physical deterioration in, 189-95, 366-8
- ARNOLD, Matthew**, his misunderstanding of religion, 211 *n.*
- ART**, man the only sex to achieve greatness in all departments of, 44; modern, the product of exhaustion, 233
- ARTIFICIAL** aids, no cure for degeneracy, 320
- ARTIFICIAL** feeding, a cause of degeneracy, 163, 164; morbidity of infants brought up on, 183, 184
- ARTIST**, the average modern, a man who lacks control, 232
- ASCETICISM**, in various cultures, 273-5, 294-6; as a ruling idea foreign to Jews, Hindus and Mohammedans, 274, 275; in Egypt, 290, 291
- ATHENS**, nothing of outstanding merit produced by women of, 66; downfall of, coincided with female emancipation, 72
- ATHLETES**, usually nervous and strained, 325
- AUSTRALIAN** bushmen, their genius in tracking quarry, 52
- BACHELORS**, some great, 135
- BACHOFEN**, his misleading use of the term matriarchy, 80, 81
- BEAUTY**, Prynne on sinfulness of, 284; Stendhal's definition of, 298
- BODY**, the exaltation of the soul above the, 272; must cease to be despised, 399
- BOLSHEVISM**, the outcome of Christian values, 212, 222, 223
- BRITISH EMPIRE**, the, the greatest potential force for good, xi; won by might, xii; atrocities committed by, xii *n.*
- BUCKLE**, his sentimentality, 124; his doubtful sexual potency, 132, 133
- CÆSAR**, degeneracy of men and women in time of, 88 *n.*
- CANCER**, increase of, due to longevity, 150; increase of, 166 *n.*, 196; not so prevalent in rural districts, 170
- CARLYLE, Thomas**, his impotence, 133 *n.*
- CASTRATES**, of both sexes tend to resemble the male, 23
- CASTRATION**, for everybody a logical consequence of Christian doctrine, 292
- CASTRATION** Complex, a possible psycho-analytical explanation of women's fight for the vote, 120, 121

- CAT**, the large-headed female a bad mother, 13 *n.*; possesses central control, 352
- CATHOLIC CHURCH**, the, its Pagan tolerance, 240
- CATHOLICS**, the most truly religious of Christians, 208 *n.*
- CATO**, opposed repeal of the Oppian Law, 74
- CHAMBERLAIN**, Joseph, his idea of the Federation of Empire, 327
- CHARACTER**, decline of, owing to decline in health, 215
- CHARLES I**, foresaw decline of England, 219; a defender of liberty, 228, 229; obliged to use violence with his wife, 247 *n.*; a golf player, 322
- CHIEFTAINSHIP**, its origin among primitive tribes, 53; magic and sorcery inextricably related to, 56 *n.*
- CHILD**, the, sexual love enters into relationship of parent and, 18 *n.*; exalted on account of sex-phobia, 19, 254; its false prestige in England, 253; Wordsworth's monumental misunderstanding of, 254; better understood by Browning, 255; as a certificate of potency, 256
- CHILD care**, women's ineptitude with regard to, 64
- CHILDREN**, their exaggerated importance due to sex-phobia, 19; illegitimate, still trace descent through mother, 83; not understood by women, 28, 253; progressive physical deterioration of, 186-9; the Englishman's attitude towards, determined by sex-phobia, 253; and vanity, 254; attitude towards, must be changed, 350
- CHIVALRY**, definition of, 244; some instances of, 245, 246; without responsibility, 246, 247; the Englishman's mistaken idea of, 246, 247; the wrong sort of, a sign of mental softening, 248
- CHRIST**, His lack of humour, 214
- CHRISTIAN Fathers**, concupiscence their idea of original sin, 291
- CHRISTIANITY**, associates shame with sexual act, 127; destructive of true religion, 208; the parent of Bolshevism, 212; identical with Socialism, 221-3; dysgenic influence of, 271-80; its exaltation of the soul above the body, 272; its deep-rooted asceticism, 275-7; makes physiological consideration superfluous, 278; its dysgenic doctrine of pity, 280; sacrifices the greater to the less, 282, 283, 340; dysgenic because it puts moral above æsthetic values, 284-6; its hostility to sex, 286-303; evidences of sex-phobia in, 287; morality of, only attacked by Nietzsche, 298
- CHUCUNAQUE**, provide rare instance of approach to matriarchy owing to extreme degeneracy of men, 92
- CHURCH OF ENGLAND**, concerned chiefly with morality, 209
- COMPLEX**, used merely as term of abuse, 140
- CONCUPISCENCE**, regarded as original sin by early Christians, 291, 292
- CONDORCET**, recommended votes for women, 77; his sentimentality, 124; his doubtful sexual potency, 132
- CONSERVATIVE Party**, the, bankrupt in ideas, 224
- CONSTIPATION**, prevalence of, among sedentary workers, 168
- COOKING**, where still in the hands of women is atrocious, 64
- CO-ORDINATION**, faulty, a cause of degeneration, 271, 309-15; in games, 325, 326; accounts for disease, 351
- COPULATION**, ardour of animals in, 10, 11
- Cows**, large-headed, not good milkers, 13 *n.*
- CRIMINALS**, not always degenerates, 322
- CROSS-BREEDING**, dysgenic influence of, 306, 307
- CULTURE**, decline in, robbed England of self-confidence in self-assertion, 219, 220; a superior, justifies wars of aggression, 220

- DARWIN**, on the precocity of females, 6 n.; on feeding of young by both sexes, 7; had only the problems of his work to deal with, 67; misinterpretation of his doctrine of evolution, 79
- DEGENERACY**, some false ideas of, 140; charge of, resisted by vain people, feminists and doctors, 141 n., 180, 181; definition of, 143; atavistic, racial and national, 144, 145; possession of valour not sufficient refutation of charge of, 146; not disproved by increased longevity, 149, 150; charge of, cannot be refuted by arguments from old armour, 150; caused by bad food, 157-9; by humanitarianism, 159, 160; by modern medicine, 162; by artificial feeding of infants, 163, 164; by factory life, 164, 168; and by urban life, 169-74; charge of, resisted by unscrupulous optimists, 182; prevalence throughout western civilization, 266; owing to Christian values, 272; owing to miscegenation, 304-9; through faulty co-ordination, 309-15; modern medicine as a cause of, 315-21; owing to the wrong selection of type, 321; sport a cause of, 324-8; specialization a cause of, 328, 329; owing to an inadequate standard of manliness, 330-2; the only cure for, the reform of man himself, 337; Alexanderism as a cure for, 351-8
- DEGENERATE**, used merely as a term of abuse, 141
- DEMOCRACY**, must be abolished, 347
- DENTAL** caries, increase of, 188-91; partly due to food, 189
- DERBY**, the, only once won by a mare, 36
- DIABETES**, increase of, 196, 197
- DISCIPLINE**, the most important element in education, 350
- DIVORCES**, increase in, possibly due to Englishman's fear of sex-initiation, 239
- EDUCATION**, elementary, responsible for decay of intelligence among the masses, 263, 264; reform of necessary, 349
- EGYPT**, matrilineal descent in ancient, 86; asceticism in, 290, 291
- EGYPTIANS**, the, marriage customs of, 103, 104; their sound attitude towards the body, 275; forbade gymnastics, 326
- ELLIS**, Havelock, his interpretation of woman's infantile nature, 28-33
- EMOTIONALISM**, though a feminine characteristic not now confined to women, 226; a psychological infirmity in the male, 227
- ENGLAND**, before the Industrial Revolution, well fed, 158; the whole of, degenerate to-day, 227; woman and child slavery in, at time she fought for negro emancipation, 245
- ENGLISH**, the, the best fed people in the fifteenth century, 158; their health when they were still agricultural, 160; the wastefulness of, 173; had the lowest health record of the Allies, 326
- ENGLISHMAN**, the, no longer able to maintain his supremacy, ix; a bad example to the world, x; the "manly" ruled by his women, xviii; his sense of guilt in connection with childbirth, 126; his belief in woman's moralizing influence, 130; his lack of religion, 211; his love of humour a bad sign, 213, 214; at his best a particularist, 215, 216; owing to decline of culture now doubtful of desirability of self-assertion, 129, 220; now deprived of personal liberty, 230; his radical inability to master sex, 234; his sex-phobia owing to Puritanical values, 235; thinks Puritanism "gentlemanly," 236; his misunderstanding of his "lady" bride, 236; often marries a widow through fear of sex, 238; a monk in multi, 240; his lack of versatility, 234; his notion of chivalry

- makes him an easy prey to women, 244, 245; his mistaken idea of chivalry, 246; his lack of penetration, 248; not respected by his mate, 249; to-day lacks will, 250-2; his attitude to the child determined by sex-phobia, 253
- EPIDEMICS**, decrease in, not necessarily argument against charge of degeneracy, 147, 148
- EQUALITY**, between man and woman obviously nonsense, 45; claim of sexual, a symptom of male degeneracy, 48; and of a decline of civilization, 67
- EXHIBITIONISM**, normal in the female, 16
- FACTORY** life, a cause of degeneration, 165
- FEMALE**, the, her adaptation to the male older than to her progeny, 4; her relationship to progeny gradually complicated, 5; resembles her young owing to arrested development, 6; the passive partner in coition, 8, 16; finds pleasure in exhibitionism, 16
- FEMINISM**, definition of, ix n.; a condemnation of man, xv; began in the home, xvii; its false interpretation of the disparity between male and female achievement, 51; took its root in Greece among the *betairæ*, 68, 69; a quack cure, 117, 335; inspired by contempt of the male, 118, 119; triumph of, due to male support, 122, 138; sentimentality among supporters of, 124, 137; a proof of male degeneracy, 138 n.; increases dysgenic influence of Christianity, 283
- FEMINISTS**, their wrong explanation of women's inferiority, 51, 63; some early French, 115 n.; men, generally below par sexually, 132, 133
- FETISH**, an engine of government, 56 n.
- FISH**, reason for eating, on Christian fast days, 292
- "**FIT**," the, segregation of, exceedingly difficult, 336; how segregation of might be possible, 346
- FOOD**, adulteration of, a cause of degeneracy, 157-9
- FOOTBALL**, a most unhealthy game formerly forbidden in England, 324
- FRANCE**, the Revolution in, heralded by feminine emancipation, 76; some powerful Feminists in, 76
- FRAZER**, Sir J. G., on origin of Kings, 54 n.; on profession of magic, 55 n.; on sorcerers, 57; on gynæcocracy, 95 n.; on mistake of confounding mother-kin with mother-rule, 97
- FRENCH REVOLUTION**, the disorderly behaviour of women during, 77; cruelty of women during, 90
- GENIUS**, more common in men than in women, 25, 34, 37; in man due to his full development, 43
- GIBBON**, had only the problems of his work to deal with, 67; on degeneracy of Romans, 144; on valour, 146
- GISSING**, G., on the curse of sex, 234
- GOETHE**, had only the problems of his work to deal with, 67
- GREECE**, in early, inferiority of women strongly asserted, 68; rise of Feminism during decline of, 70
- GYMNASTICS**, recommendation of, suicidal to-day, 315; forbidden by the ancient Egyptians, 326
- HAIRE**, Norman, quoted, 241
- HANDICRAFTS**, must be revived, 347
- HAPPINESS**, dependent on sex life on fulfilment of specialized functions, 9-11, 14, 16; of women incomplete without motherhood, 20
- HEATHCLIFF**, the finest male character created by a woman, 38
- HETAIRÆ**, the, companions of men, 68; Greek Feminism took its root among, 68, 69; powerful when Athens was degenerate, 70; instructed Socrates, 89, 90

- HINDUS**, their healthy attitude towards sex and procreation, 287-8
- HORMONES**, their formative influence, 34
- HUMANITARIANISM**, excessive, merely inverted sadism, 91; a cause of degeneracy, 159, 160
- HUMOUR**, a sign of shallowness and lack of vigour, and lacking in all great men, 213, 214; denotes lack of passion, 241
- IBSEN**, his sentimentality, 124; his doubtful sexual potency, 132; his Puritanism, 133
- IDIOCY**, more common among men than women, 25 n., 38
- ILLUMINATION**, in the art of, women always inferior to men, 65, 66
- IMMUNITY**, in our day artificial and not natural, 147; relation between, and degeneracy, 149
- IMPOTENCE**, leads to maudlin attitude towards women, 125, 130, 136
- IN-BREEDING**, eugenic value of, 304, 309
- INCEST**, eugenic value of, 304-7
- INDUSTRIALISM**, diseases due to, 167; stultifying influence of, on the mind, 168
- INFANTS**, morbidity of, through artificial feeding, 183, 184; increased mortality and disease among artificially fed, 184-6; tables of deaths of, 185
- INSANITY**, increasing, owing to density of population, 174
- INTELLIGENCE**, general decline of, 261, 262; this among the masses due to elementary education, 264; decline of, also due to ill health, 264
- JEW**s, the, their regulations concerning the care of the body, 275; their superior health due to in-breeding, 308, 309
- JOHN THE BAPTIST**, an oriental ascetic, 275
- JOSEPH**, false interpretation of his repudiation of Potiphar's wife, 103
- KEITH**, Sir A., on skulls, 198; on posture, 354
- LACTATION**, a comparatively recent function, 3; a need and pleasure to the female, 12, 13; poor capacity for, or cessation of, means less maternal attachment, 13; a toll on women, 35
- LANE**, Arbuthnot, his view of civilization, 220 n.; on incurability of chronic disease, 316
- LAW**, modern, always in favour of the woman, 251
- LECKY**, revolting nonsense written by, concerning sexuality, 127 n., 299 n., 344
- LEPERS**, the burning of, 160; tainted food considered good enough for, in the Middle Ages, 161
- LESBIANS**, unfair and unscientific to call women, xiii
- LIBERTY**, the decline of, owing to despotism of democracy, 228, 229; Charles I a defender of, 228, 229; now a myth in England, 230
- LITTLE ENGLANDER**, the, rise of, due to decline in culture, 220
- LONGEVITY**, not necessarily an argument against charge of degeneracy, 149, 150
- LOVE**, can only be inspired by the lovable, xiv; between the sexes in animals sometimes very great, xiv; between male and female the oldest of the instincts, 12; artistically consummated leads to the greatest bliss, 18; sexual, disturbed by offspring, 18; of the sexes more primordial than of offspring, 19; arts of, destroyed by Christian sex-phobia, 235
- LUNACY**, some statistics about, 175-7; increase of, 196, 197
- LUNATICS**, some statistics about, 175-7
- MAGIC**, a useful social function in primitive societies, 56; a means whereby the ablest men acquired power, 59, 62

- MALE**, the, the senior sex, 3, 4; in animals frequently develops paternal feelings, but is also often jealous of youth, 14; leads in everything after successful consummation of love, 18
- MAMMALS**, the male less changed than the female in course of evolution among, 3, 4
- MAN**, as father the chief sufferer in the family, 20; his greater variational tendency, 25, 34; age of maturity in, 27 *n.*; understanding of child psychology due to, 28; light toll of reproduction on, 36; his shorter sexual cycle, 36, 43; great agility of, 36, 43; late ageing of, 36, 43; genius and idiots more common in, 38; the senior sex, 40, 42; the pioneer in every sphere, above all in that of religion, 41, 44; and woman essentially unlike, 42, 47; naturally equipped for achievement in every sphere, 44, 45; has played most distinguished rôle in civilization, 50; always the leader, 50; the superior, chosen for utilitarian motives as leader, 52, 53; not necessarily chosen as leader on account of physical strength alone, 54, 55; instances of gifted men being chosen as leaders in savage tribes, 58-61; his achievement in spite of unfavourable circumstances, 67; his powerful position in mother-right societies, 84-6, 96; femininity in, made recessive in virile cultures, 87; retrogression of, gives impression of equality between the sexes, 116; guilty conscience of modern, with regard to procreation, 126; psychology of the impotent, 136, 137; now emotional in his judgments, 225-8; lack of solidarity, too rapid reactions and too speedy absorptivity of modern, 258; increasing vanity and decline in vitality of modern, 259; increasing femininity of modern, 259-61; racial degeneracy of, universal, 265; the regeneration of, the only hope for the future, 267; not engaged to-day in manly occupations, 321, 322; modern, not his institutions at fault to-day, 333, 334; reform of, the only cure for degeneracy, 337, 342; what should be expected of the future, 342, 343; values concerning, must be altered, 342, 343; the receptivity of modern, a bad sign, 350
- MANLINESS**, secured by values, 87
- MANU**, Laws of, their insistence on the dependence of women, 101; allow a woman to choose a mate only when her father has failed to do so for her, 102; guard against dysgenic effects of miscegenation, 273; and ill-health, 274; on purity of women, 286; on the perfect man, 286
- MAORIES**, the, their chivalry, 244
- MARX**, Karl, found his data in English conditions *x n.*
- MASCULINE RENAISSANCE**, the necessity for, 267; our only hope for the future, 337, 358; how to prepare for, 337-58; must precede revival of true religion, 338
- MATERNITY**, mammalian, an innovation in the sex relation, 12
- MATHEMATICIANS**, often subnormal in sex, 132
- MATING**, of unsound people forbidden by Brahmins and Buddhists, 278; change of taste regarding, necessary, 346
- MATRIARCHY**, fantastic theory of, 78; theory of, originated by Bachofen, 80; practically non-existent, 81, 84, 95; theory of, originated from confusion with mother kinship, 81, 82; among the degenerate Chucunaque, 91, 92
- MATRIMONY**, regarded as consummated without the act of procreation by early Christians, 293; regarded as inferior to virginity, 293, 294
- MCDONAGH**, J. E. R., on the nature of disease, 353 *n.*

- MEDICINE**, modern, a cause of degeneracy, 162, 271, 315-18; theological bias in, 157 n., 316; barbarian conception of, 317; suggested reform of, 348
- MENSTRUATION**, a stress on woman's system, 23, 24, 35; in animals, 23 n.
- MIDDLE AGES**, their healthy attitude towards the undesirable, 160, 161; rudimentary state of medicine in, 162
- MILL, J. S.**, knew little about women, xiv; his wrong interpretation of Feminism, xiv; an under-sexed male, xvii n.; his false interpretation of female inferiority, 45 n., 63; his sentimentality, 124; on ignorance of Englishmen, 249
- MINIATURE** painting, women inferior in art of, 66 n.
- MISCEGENATION**, a cause of national decay, 218; a cause of degeneracy, 304-9
- MISERY**, achieved by making a sex break its bounds, 16
- MOMMSEN**, on the degenerates of Rome under Cæsar, 88 n.
- MONGOLIANS**, an inferior race, 32
- MONKEYS**, protection of the young by male, 14
- MONOGAMY**, intolerable for man and leads to degeneracy, 36
- MORAL** indignation, always a suspicious manifestation, 249
- MORALIZING**, modern meaning of, 128
- MOTHERHOOD** spoils relationship of woman to man, 20; woman incomplete without, 20, 38; maudlin attitude which regards, as self-sacrificing martyrdom, 125, 137
- MOTHER-RIGHT**, in primitive societies, 82, 83; leads to mistaken idea of matriarchy, 82, 83; among primitive tribes, 84, 85; power of males in, communities, 84-5, 96, 97; woman rule in, 84; in ancient Egypt, 86
- MURDERERS**, sentimental appeal for release of, 123 n.
- MUSIC**, women have never achieved greatness in, 66 n.
- MUSONIUS RUFUS** taught equality of sexes in time of Nero, 76
- NAPOLEON**, inaugurated fresh manly era in France, 77; misunderstood by Madame de Staël, 260
- NAVY**, the rejection of applicants for, 191; some statistics, 367
- NEGROES**, an inferior race, 32 n.
- NEURASTHENIA**, in women caused by Puritanical fear, 17
- NIETZSCHE**, his penetrating analysis of Socrates, 90; a great bachelor, 135; understood degeneracy through knowledge of himself, 142; his mistaken idea of religion, 208 n.; his attack on Christian morality, 298
- NONCONFORMITY**, its irreverence and lack of religion, 210, 211
- ŒDIPUS** Complex, defeated by mother-right societies, 82
- OFFSPRING**, disturb sexual love, 18; sexual love deeper than love of, 19
- OLD** men, their vitality, 37 n.; chosen as leaders, 62; their jealousy of the young, 300, 301; their monopoly of young females, 300, 301
- OLD** people, their jealousy of youth, 299-303; Registrar-General's Report of deaths of, 303, 304
- ORIGEN** castrated himself for the Faith, 290
- ORIGINAL** Sin, Christian doctrine of, 291
- OVER-POPULATION**, among which a high percentage are degenerates, 175-8, 180
- PARASITE**, the beloved, women's loss of freedom owing to, 35, 38; man's freedom from, 43; limits freedom of the female, 112; woman not unselfish in her care of, 129
- PARLIAMENT**, the idea of, essentially foreign, 215; hated in England when first introduced, 216; the break up of, now in progress, 347

- PARTICULARISM**, the noblest of manly attributes, 217; dependent on good health, 217
- PARTURITION**, a comparatively recent function, 3; a toll on women, 35; now a disease among women, 125
- PAUL**, the most venomous of body haters, 277; his hostility to sex, 289, 295
- PHYSICAL** strength, not the only gift required for leadership, 54-62
- PITT-RIVERS**, Capt. G., quoted, 35, 56, 59, 202
- PITY**, dysgenic influence of Christian teaching of, 280-2; definition of right kind of, 280; modern concept of, must be altered, 340
- PLATO**, his principle of the equality of the sexes, 69; de Quincey's condemnation of, 90 n.; his rules for securing sound human stock, 274
- PLUTARCH**, his description of the Greek wife, 69; on life in Sparta, 71
- POETRY**, women's limitations in, 37
- PRIVATE** judgment, right of, now a myth, 263
- PROGRESSIVE** deterioration, proofs of, 180-95; of children, 186; in applicants for Army and Navy, 189-95
- PRYNNE**, on the sinfulness of beauty, 284
- PURGATIVES**, increasing demand for, 195
- PURITAN**, the, anything better in the eyes of, than an artistic knowledge of sex, 238; incapable of religious feeling, 212
- PURITANISM**, bound to lead to Feminism, 252; the creation of jealousy, 302 n.
- RATS**, in-breeding experiments on, 307
- RELIGION**, man the pioneer in, 41; women scarcely ever on an equality with men in, 41 n.; the root of, 205, 206; only possible for the vigorously endowed, 207, 208, 212, 213; decay of, in England, 208; Matthew Arnold's misunderstanding of, 211 n.; great things impossible without, 214; revival of true, impossible to-day, 338
- REPRODUCTION**, a heavy toll on woman, 35; a light toll on man, 36
- ROMAN** matrons, their cruelty, 90
- ROMANTICISM**, in men a sign of degeneration, 39
- ROME**, nothing of outstanding merit produced by women of, 66; fall of, coincided with female emancipation, 73-6; male and female degenerates of, under Cæsar, 88 n.; fell through miscegenation, 218
- RUSKIN**, his sentimentality, 124; a maudlin woman-worshipper owing to impotence, 133, 134; his idea of chivalry, 134; went to extremes of silliness, 135
- SACRIFICE**, ideas about, must be altered, 340
- SADISM**, maudlin humanitarianism merely a socially permitted form of, 91, 95; among women due to celibacy, 95
- SEX**, difference of, responsible for radical differences of nature, 8; functions of, pleasurable, 9; controls the part played by man and women in life, 15; man the senior, 40, 42; adaptation to, very deep rooted, 112; associated with shame in Christian countries, 127; modern Englishman's radical inability to master, 234; abstinence in, among men more common than is generally recognized, 237; lack of mastery in, due to lack of stamina, 239; hostility of Christianity to, 271; values regarding, must be changed, 344, 345
- SEX** characteristics, interchange of, between male and female, 7 n.
- SEX-PHOBIA**, definition of, 202; destroys art of love, 235; not prevalent in Southern Europe, 240; determines Englishman's attitude to

- children, 253, 254; evidences of, in Christianity, 287; leads to Puritanical restrictions, 301
- SHAW, Bernard, eschews all sport, 327
- SHEIK NEFZAUI, on love, 235
- SKULLS, Sir A. Keith's comparison of ancient and modern, 198
- SMOKING causes diminution of sexual potency, 135
- SOCRATES, consorted with *hetairæ*, 68, 89; de Quincey's opinion of, 90 n.
- SORCERERS, their power in primitive societies, 55, 57
- SOUL, the, exaltation of, above the body a cause of degeneration, 272-9
- SPARTA, suffered from too narrow an idea of manliness, 71; the downfall of, coincided with female emancipation, 72
- SPECIALIZATION, its besotting effect, 328, 329
- SPENCER, Herbert, on man's exploitation of woman, 56; mistaken interpretation of his phrase "survival of the fittest," 79, 81; on woman as the "unselfish" principle in life, 129; on vaccination, 148 n.
- SPINSTER, the enjoyment of the Roll of Honour by the bitter, 302
- SPORT, a cause of degeneracy in man, 271, 324-8
- STUPIDITY, the only family heirloom to become more and more polished in modern times, 168
- SUCKLING, of infants decreasing, 163, 164, 183
- THACKERAY realized that contempt of man begins at home, 119 n.
- THOMAS AQUINAS, his view of matrimony, 293
- TOLSTOI, partially impotent, 131
- UNSELFISHNESS, quite meaningless in connection with woman's sexual functions, 129
- URBANIZATION, a cause of degeneracy, 169-84; bad moral effect of, 173, 174, 187 n.
- VACCINATION, a possible cause of degeneracy, 148 n.
- VAERTINGS, the, the fallacies of their *Dominant Sex* exposed, 98-108
- VALUES, transvaluation of, a prerequisite of regeneration, 339
- VOYEURISM, normal in the male, 16
- WAR, the Great, men's bravery in, not a refutation of the charge of degeneracy, 135; national physique did not improve between the Boer and, 148 n.; happiness of old people during, 302
- WIDOWS, large numbers remarry owing to Englishman's fear of sex, 238
- WILL, the best Englishmen not lacking in, 250; decline of, in periods of physical debility, 250
- WOLLSTONECRAFT, Mary, her *Vindication of the Rights of Women*, 115
- WOMAN'S MOVEMENT, the, the success of, proves male degeneracy, 116; not led by the least desirable women, 117; not inspired by mere desire for the vote, 120; supported by maudlin men, 122, 123; won through anarchy and sentimentality, 124
- WOMEN, their revolt against modern men, xii; their revolt due to lack of confidence in men, xv; incomplete without motherhood, 20, 38; more infantile than men, 21, 22, 24-34; more precocious than men, 22; their lesser variational tendency, 24, 25, 27, 34; age of maturity in, 27 n.; do not understand children, 28; heavy toll of reproduction on, 25-39; their longer sexual cycle, 35; loss of freedom owing to beloved parasite, 35; inferior wieldiness of their bodies, 35; earlier ageing of, 36; cannot understand men, 38; utterly from different men, 47; argue as if men's regression were their advance, 48, 113; quite inconspicuous in mental achievement, 50; not chosen for leadership on account

of inferior ability, 54-61, 113; only filled minor positions in religious systems, 58, 60; no such thing as subjection of, has ever existed, 63, 114; have always had as many opportunities as men for achievement, 64; never equalled men in the art of illumination, 65; or of music, 66 *n.*; their failure in achievement not due to unfavourable conditions, 67; their inferiority strongly asserted in ancient Greece, 68; their position in ancient Rome, 72-6; their disorderly behaviour in the French Revolution, 77; masculinity in, made recessive in virile cultures, 88; but asserted when men are degenerate, 89; their cruelty under the Roman Empire and in the French Revolution, a sign of male degeneracy, 93; regarded as inferior by the Indians, 92; sadism among North American Indian, 94, 95; sadism in, due to celibacy, 95; anxious to give men guilty consciences, 125; the absurdity of regarding, as the moralizing sex, 125, 127, 128, 137; more sensual and "immoral" than men, 129; the fallacy of regarding, as unselfish,

129; their degeneration as compared with that of men, 201; their advent into government will only increase the chaos, 225; their judgment determined by emotion, 225; the interest of married, in Causes due to sexual dissatisfaction, 235; despise men who lack mastery in sex, 242; because treated as "pals," 243; to find complete male environment to-day require several males, 243; power has passed into hands of, owing to insensate interpretation of "chivalry," 247; often desire violence from their mates, 248; moral indignation in, very suspicious, 249; the absurd myth of their moral superiority, 251; not so degenerate as men, 266; can do men's work to-day, 321, 322; tend to become more masculine in modern careers, 323; more versatile than men to-day, 329; necessity for bad taste in, 340; values concerning, must be altered, 341

WORDSWORTH, his monumental misunderstanding of childhood, 254

XENOPHON, his description of the Greek wife, 68

155.332
Lud.

अवाप्ति संख्या
Acc. No. 100392

वर्ग संख्या
Class No. _____

पुस्तक संख्या
Book No. _____

लेखक
Author Ludovici.

शीर्षक
Title Don : An indictment.

निर्गम दिनांक Date of Issue	उधारकर्ता की संख्या Borrower's No.	हस्ताक्षर Signature

155.332
Lud.

LIBRARY
LAL BHADUR SHASTRI
National Academy of Administration
MUSSOORIE

Accession No. 100392

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its double value shall be paid by the