

THE NEXT GENERATION

FREDERICK A. RHODES

PRESENT DAY PROBLEMS SERIES



Class HQ 455

Book TP 4

Copyright N^o _____

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

THE NEXT GENERATION

BY

FREDERICK A. RHODES, M.D.

President, Economic and Sociological Section, Ex-
President and Ex-Secretary, Eugenic Section of
the Pittsburgh Academy of Science and Art;
Chairman Pittsburgh Morals Efficiency
Commission.



BOSTON: RICHARD G. BADGER
TORONTO: THE COPP CLARK CO., LIMITED

HQ 755
TR4

Copyright, 1915, by Richard G. Badger

All rights reserved

\$1.50

THE GORHAM PRESS, BOSTON, U. S. A.

JUN 18 1915

© Cl. A 401424

No. 11

PREFACE

No man knoweth what a day may bring forth, and no body of men can declare what may be the condition of this or that nation a generation hence. To present a book on "The Next Generation" may seem presumptuous to the careful students of history. While our best plans for the future may be overthrown by unsuspected coming events, we must build for the future, let come what may. Since society cannot exist without government in some form or another and since a good state of government requires that a majority of the individuals be of a reasonable mind, any treatise which considers seriously those things which are for the betterment of the race should command some consideration.

Does blood tell? Can a mother influence her daughter by thoughts, deeds and things seen during the development of her child? Can we safely adopt a foundling? Who is to blame that the child is born deformed or mentally defective? These are only a few of the many questions which are continually being asked in any discussion concerning future generations.

Any teaching which states that the son of a thief must steal or that the son of a drunkard is condemned to a drunkard's grave is doing much harm. We all agree that good parents with a good state of society predisposes to good children, but religion demands that all be given a chance.

Any statements made prior to 1875 concerning the development of the body must be taken at a discount, for it was not until that year that Hertwig demonstrated that the ovum and the spermatozoon acting together caused fertilization. Much stated along these lines since 1875 is of little value, because embryology is a science understood partially by few and completely by none.

There are over 200 religions, and while the most of us believe all of the essential things, there are some details in which we disagree in part, even in our own particular religion. We must remember that a normal man has a free will and is not predestined to eternal punishment even though he be a Jew, Catholic, Unitarian, Presbyterian, or an unbeliever.

Pure heredity for all our characteristics means strict eugenics, euthenics being impossible. This cannot be accepted by any body of rational religious men. Practical eugenics with euthenics makes possible the salvation of sinners, even though so vile. It is the reward of justice tempered with mercy.

It is impossible to discuss a scientific subject without a fairly good understanding of that subject. There is no more interesting and difficult subject to fully understand than man himself. Could the child in utero be influenced by mental impressions of the mother, some of the children born would be awful specimens of human beings. We thank nature; it is not so. Most children are born without physical blemish. Those marked, deformed and mentally defective are such as the result of disease and injury on the part of the parents. Such conditions are due to the natural workings of physical laws. Maternal impres-

sions are not possible because at no time in the development of the child is it connected to the mother by means of the nervous system. The only connection is by the blood which cannot carry any impressions from the brain. If the adult is an enigma, the child at birth is more so. Why he presents this or that aside from "like begets like," is not only interesting, but often difficult to explain.

In the last few years we have much evidence of eugenics gone mad. There are those who would cure all ills by having the next generation so ideal that all the children would be born perfect, at least to those who give the blue ribbons at the baby shows. To obtain such prize children, these faddists and poorly informed, would-be eugenisists would breed men and women like chickens and Angora cats. Were it even possible to produce a generation of physically perfect infants, the problem of the adult deterioration would not be entirely solved. Much could theoretically be accomplished by this perfect mating, but it must be remembered that some of our most perfect babies become poor citizens while some of our highly cultured men and women, whose lives have been most beautiful, and whose names shall be long remembered in history, were poorly nourished and were not of a physical type to command admiration. It would require many generations to eliminate many undesirable qualities from many selected perfect types of physical development, even though we could completely segregate them. We are all more or less hybrids or mongrels; latent characteristics are continually cropping out, and we blame a remote ancestor for some present imperfection, even though it was due to sin or disease in ourselves or our parents.

Is physical perfection a thing to be desired? Most of us on first thought would answer that it is. Yet, the various qualities are at best only relative. What would be a state of society in which all were of perfect physique, in perfect health with plenty of this world's goods? Would the world move as rapidly? Physicians, undertakers, policemen, physical culture teachers, misfit clothing merchants, etc., would need to turn preachers, for just as soon as man has all he needs, no worries, he often forgets his church and enters upon a life of ease and dissipation. This would probably be a very unsatisfactory place to live with no sick to care for, no needy to look after, nothing to stir our souls to acts of kindness and mercy. Such a condition might tend to the "survival of the fittest," with man reverting to the animal.

In the various chapters of "The Next Generation," no attempt is made nor is it thought possible to provide any scheme of society where such a state of idealism can for generations to come attain whereby all will be physically and morally perfect. Attempts only are made to show how it is possible by prevention and education to eliminate much of the misery, sorrow and crime in this good old world. It is possible to demonstrate that physical laws always act truly; when they are broken, physical sins will be committed, and "wild oats" when sown produce results which must be cured by physical laws.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
WHY WE ARE WHAT WE ARE	13
EUGENICS: MEANING AND IMPORTANCE	28
EUGENICS: BIOLOGICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL	36
PARENT AND CHILD	42
LIFE AND REPRODUCTION	47
VARIATIONS	57
THEORIES OF INHERITANCE	61
DETERMINATION OF SEX	71
WHAT CONDITIONS ARE INHERITED?	76
INSANITY AND ALCOHOLISM	83
SYPHILIS AND TUBERCULOSIS	95
DEFECTIVES — WHO ARE THE SANE?	98
MIND AND BODY	113
IMMIGRATION	123
CHURCH AND EUGENICS	138
THE CHURCH, SOCIETY AND THE SOCIAL EVIL	149
FEMALE LABOR: EFFECT ON OUR HOMES	157
RACE SUICIDE	175
CRIME	184
POVERTY AND CHARITY	190
WAR AND FUTURE GENERATIONS	199
TEACHING SEX HYGIENE	209
MARRIAGE AND EUGENICS	220
WHY GIRLS GO WRONG	233

CONTENTS

	PAGE
WHY MEN GO WRONG	240
WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?	250
APPENDIX	264
<i>Hereditary Insanity a Defense</i>	264
<i>What Eugenics Does Not Mean</i>	265
<i>Modern Women — Maternity</i>	265
<i>Eugenic Belief — Charity</i>	266
<i>Criminals</i>	267
<i>Value of Disease in Character Development</i>	267
<i>Eugenics: Biological</i>	269
<i>Eugenic Limits</i>	269
<i>Marriage Advice</i>	270
<i>Sex Mutilations</i>	271
A PRACTICAL STUDY OF THE SOCIAL EVIL	273

THE NEXT GENERATION

Practical eugenics includes eugenics, hence means both heredity and environment.

“Eugenics is the study of agencies under social control that may improve or impair the racial qualities of future generations, either physically or mentally.”— Galton.



THE NEXT GENERATION

WHY WE ARE WHAT WE ARE

There lived a man who raised his head and said,
 " I will be great,"
And through a long, long life he bravely knocked
 At Fame's closed gate.
A son he left who, like his sire, strove high place to win;
Worn out he died and, dying, left no trace
 That he had been.
He also left a son who, without planning how,
Bore the fair letters of a breathless fame
 Upon his brow.
" Behold a genius, filled with fire divine,"
 The people cried,
Not knowing that to make him what he was,
 Two men had died.

—*I. E. M. Unknown.*

THERE can be no dispute concerning the scriptural statement that man born of woman is of few days and full of trouble. While our sojourn here may be pleasant or otherwise it must be admitted that our birth was not due to any thought on our own part. It does not appear profitable to continue the old controversy as to how, why, and by whom this old world was created. We are here; we recognize our inability to solve unsolvable problems; we believe in a greater force

than our mind and we are satisfied that there is a future life in some other form than that we now possess.

Is the parent responsible for the child? Can a good condition of society exist without the majority of the individuals being good physically and morally? The existence of the state demands a condition of social adjustment for the welfare of all concerned; the majority of persons determine the physical, mental, and moral standards of the various social units. In the final analysis of man, it must be concluded that morality is the world's problem to-day. Notwithstanding our supreme efforts to obtain as much as possible of earthly possessions and indulge in the pleasures of life, a state of true satisfaction is not attained by these things.

In a recent number of the *Lancet*, David Nicholson, M.R.C.P., in discussing Mind and Motive, says: "Crime is to be regarded in the main as an occupation. It is too much to expect a young thing—an infant or infant brain—to rise superior to the compulsory education in crime with which criminal parentage and the criminal atmosphere generally smother it. I defy the children of the most intellectual and cultured and moral Lord Chancellor or Lord Archbishop not to succumb under similar circumstances. Besides, the heredity idea to crime takes the heart and hope out of all philanthropic and legislative measures for the education and proper upbringing of children and youths."

The father of an idiotic child, in answering my inquiry as to the possibility of his having been drunk at the time of the conception of this child, said that his wife had always accused him of having been drunk at that time. It

is certain that alcoholism or illness in either parent at the time of the conception is very likely to affect the child. We must take a reasonable view of the subject and can say that the children of alcoholics may be defective, but are not always such. When they are we have an explanation. If a marksman only hits a bull's eye once in ten times, he is still too dangerous for any one to want to put himself up for a bull's eye. You can never tell when and where some things will hit.

Sin is defined as a departure or transgression from the normal. A normal man is defined by the alienist as one who conforms to the customs and laws of the country, by knowing right and wrong.

Sin is defined by the Church as of two kinds: original, or that inherent predisposition in every man to do wrong, handed down to us on account of Adam's sin; and actual sin, or our departure from known laws which are laid down for us to obey.

Let us consider as a basis of argument in the remarks which follow, that we have before us a man of good physical development. For our premise we grant his having been influenced by two forces: (a) the blood and mind of his ancestors; and (b) the external influences to which he has been subjected since his birth.

We may presume him to have had a very pious and submissive mother, a God-fearing and fiery-tempered father, a highly intellectual grandfather, a common every-day grandmother on his mother's side, while one of his great-grandfathers was of powerful physique, whose wife was an Irish lass of high spirits and later a great scold.

As far as we can determine, the development of the

child in the maternal body is from the union of two germ cells, the ovum and the sperm, and is entirely organic and material. These cells unite, divide, and multiply, adding to themselves continually for their nourishment material substances from the blood of the mother.

The child is born; nothing of mind or soul that can be demonstrated has been added to the child in its development, except the potentialities of the cells in their differentiation in the formation of tissues and organs. Should the child die, the soul (can this be a creation of the human mind?) must take flight to regions unknown. Should it live and the physical development continue in a normal way mind is gradually developed until in later years it becomes the man referred to above, whom we will suppose to be a reasonable being.

A missionary from a Protestant church preaches to a small gathering of heathen in Korea, and as is to be expected, a certain number of them accept the teachings as new truths. They believe and are saved. Let us suppose then, there is a missionary from the Catholic faith, another a follower of Mohammed, another preaching the doctrines of Buddha, and still another and another, until many of the various religious beliefs are represented in heathen Korea.

Our supposition is that each of these religious teachers invades a different section of that country and that in each case the missionary is blessed with a number of converts and is happy. Do any or all of those accepting the new religions understand the meaning of their new beliefs?

Our conclusion must be that most people, regardless of their geographic location, accept and believe the teachings

of their own parents, sect, church, or tribe, without a satisfactory explanation as to why they believe as they do. All religions are to a great extent at least based upon mysticism, added to which we have superstitions which are taught from birth and which become the great determining principle in their religious beliefs.

It is quite evident from a study of history that there is no fixed code of laws for all people. It is also evident from a study of religions that each and every one of their teachings requires a strict observance of certain laws, based upon their individual understanding of what they believe is right and wrong. All the lawgivers, whether Buddha, Confucius, Mohammed, Moses, or Christ, taught a belief in a supernatural Being, a higher ruling Power, who is all-wise, always present, and who administers justice with a firm hand. It is for this reason that their ideas of actual sin, or transgressions against the laws of God or man, are similar in many respects. Yet in spite of these universal teachings we recognize that many things right to-day are wrong to-morrow — that what is permitted in one Church is forbidden in another. Those things virtuous in one part of the world are sins in another part.

“No man,” says a theologian, “can demand the forgiveness of his sins. If forgiveness is granted, it is an unmerited favor, for which gratitude and praise is the appropriate response.”

Protagoras — “Nothing is, in itself, by itself, but only a certain relation to some other things.”

Socrates — “Not knowingly, nor voluntarily does any man do wrong. Nay more, he who should knowingly do wrong were a better man than he who should do the same

thing ignorantly. All virtue is intelligence, wisdom; and as wisdom embraces all virtues, virtue may be called a science."

Aristippus — "Whatever contributes to pleasure is a good thing, as wisdom, virtue, friendship — good for the reason only; whatever interferes with it, an evil thing. Pleasure is good, but not the desire of pleasure."

Plato — "There are three great principles; sense, reason, and emotion. Emotion is inferior to reason, but superior to sense. These three potentates rule the soul; appetite, spirit, reason, like the three divisions of the plant, animal and man in nature. The soul has existed in a previous state, is indeed an eternal imperishable existence. Virtue is knowledge; the two ideas are inseparable. No one is willingly or voluntarily evil; only from ignorance does any man do evil. Where science is, then, there is knowledge of the true and good, and so there is morality. The vicious, ignorant man is a bungling artist."

Euripides — "I know that what I am about to do is evil, but desire is stronger than my deliberations."

Paul — "That which I do, I allow not, or approve not."

Aristotle — "It is absurd to suppose that we knew all along certain things without knowing that we knew them until the moment of sensation and reminiscence. Sensation is often erroneous in its conclusions, however reason is not so. Sometimes we desire real good, at others only apparent good. The basis of all moral acts is some natural disposition. First there arises an irrational impulse to good. Reason comes in afterward with its sanction. Virtue does not come in life until reason is developed.

Men have power by their conduct over their imagination and conception. Those who sin ignorantly should be punished for their ignorance, provided they should have known. It is better to live gloriously for one year than for many years as the common herd."

Spinoza — "Nothing is contingent since everything is determined to act and be by the necessity of its nature."

Malebranche — "Passions differ from inclinations in this: the latter relates to the soul as their object, the former to the body. Passions are the impressions of God on us which dispose us to love our body and seek its welfare. Inclinations are impressions leading to the love, not of body, but of soul, as God, ourselves, our neighbors, etc. Virtue consists in pure intentions and dispositions of mind."

Leibnitz — "Moral evil is based on the premise of human freedom, or the choice of many acts, all of which are physically possible. From various causes he chooses oft that which is ill — hence moral evil or sin; yet in the end even this shall prove for the best as regards the whole."

Hobbes — "Thought is only transformed sensation, so good and evil are only other expressions for pleasure and pain. Avoid the disagreeable and seek the pleasurable. Our volitions or desires are determined by motives external, so that we are creatures of irresistible necessity. Reason teaches to do whatever can be done to promote our own enjoyment. In other words, might makes right."

Abelard — "Sin is, properly speaking, a voluntary error. The propensity to evil which we inherit is not itself sin. Only the consenting to evil is sin; only that

which is in conflict with our own moral consciousness.”

Descartes' Rules —(1) Obey the laws and customs of the country.

(2) Adhere with constancy to a given course and be not easily turned aside from any proposed measure.

(3) Take the side of moderate opinions, because in morals, that which is extreme is almost always wrong.

(4) Labor to overcome yourself rather than fortune, because one's desires are more easily changed than the order of the world, and nothing is in our own power but our thoughts.

Mill —“ Because certain things are so in our experience, it does not follow that it is everywhere and always. Moral responsibilities do not involve freedom of the will. Volition follows moral causes. Necessity teaches that a superior power overrules our destiny, and that our characters are formed for us, not by us.”

Spencer —“ No idea or feeling arises save as a result of some physical force expended in producing it.”

Tyndall —“ Thought has its correlative in the physics of the brain; it is probable that for every fact of consciousness, whether in the domain of sense, of thought, or of emotion, a certain definite molecular condition is set up in the brain; this relation to consciousness is invariable, so that given the state of the brain, the corresponding thought of feeling might be inferred.”

Huxley —“ All vital actions are the result of the molecular forces of the protoplasm which displays it. Even these manifestations of intellect, of feeling and will, which we rightly name the higher faculties, are not exceptions to this rule, but are known to every one but the

subject of them, only as transitory changes of the relative positions of the part of the body.”

Maudsley —“The brain cells manufacture thought, emotion, and the various operations of what we call the mind. This is their function as really as it is the function of other organs to secrete bile, gastric juice, etc. To think and to feel is as truly the function and province of the brain cells as is that of the stomach to digest food. If the mind is disordered, the consciousness partakes of the disorder, and reports accordingly,—that is, falsely. The man is conscious that he is king; or that he is made of glass, and the like. It cannot, therefore, be trusted. The soul is an entity in the sense in which a tree or a house is one by the combination and coöperation of the several parts of which it is composed. It is one only as the brain cells coöperating to produce a given effect, and the ceasing thus to act, the disorder of dissolution of the cells which constitute mental activity, would be the dissolution of that unity, and in fact of the soul itself.”

A number of opinions of the greatest philosophers have been given. In some respects they agree, but in the great part they are at variance. After a somewhat careful and critical study of philosophy, it must be concluded that the age and customs of the country in which the philosopher lived determined largely the nature of his particular philosophy; this depending upon certain other factors as his own environment, observations and physical condition. It is found that many philosophers were deformed, sickly, and could not enjoy pleasure. The philosophy of the individual is not the philosophy of the nation. The only way many of these righteous men could uphold their ideals

was by living in solitude. Is it virtue in the monk who will not mingle with the mass of people, or in the old maid who is so homely, sour, etc., that she cannot be tempted? Is it virtue in those who are born free from certain emotions, sensations and passions? Seneca said that he who wished his virtue to be blazed abroad is not laboring for virtue, but for fame.

Do we forget the adjustment of man to light, heat, physical conditions, etc.? Know we not the incorporation or transformation of the inorganic into organic and back to inorganic in the metabolic changes of our body? The irritation of the already live tissues producing again dead substances. In all cases energy is transformed. In man we see the various products of force, dissimilarly arranged, giving at one time genius, at another power, ad infinitum. Possibly it will be only a few years until it can be demonstrated that we can discern, with the power of the mind, with our fingers; mind being present in the entire body and not confined to the skull box. Could we analyze the complex structures in man, quality not quantity of cells in each, we would find there is exerted some force causing metabolic changes which are eventually recognized in the psychical and moral manifestations of the one and same entity. The cells of the stomach, which determine the quality and the quantity of the gastric juice; the cells of the kidneys, which determine exactly what substances shall remain in the blood; the cells of the glands beneath the skin, which determine the nature of the sweat which leaves our body daily in a large amount; all these must be thinking cells.

“When we remember,” says Prof. J. Mark Baldwin,

“that in the search for causes in the natural world, the difficulties are vastly enhanced by the fact that single causes are never at work alone, and that it is the function of experiment so to eliminate elements in a causal complex that isolated agencies may be observed at work; and when we further reflect that no single function of mind is ever found operating alone, but that all accompany and modify each, the inadequacy of simple observation in this field becomes apparent.

“A sense stimulation, for example, may arouse an intellectual train, an emotional outburst, a course of action; are all these effects of a single cause? A course of action, conversely, may result from an emotion, a thought, a sensation, an inspiration; can the simple description of the resulting action indicate which is its cause? External or bodily causes, an odor, a spoken word, a pain, and internal organic movement, may start a train. How can we single out the cause in the network by observation? Only one step can determine; the reconstruction under artificial circumstances of the conditions and the endeavor to exhibit a single isolated cause. This is experiment.”

Professor Rice says: “The temperament of the genius is a compound of exquisite sensibilities without adequate control. In the case of certain artists, the over development of their special senses, checks the operation of the higher inhibitory processes, which are perhaps naturally weak. All control is removed and the wild animal rages in her without restraint.”

Why did Cain kill Abel? Was the murderer a rational being? Did he inherit certain evil propensities from his parents, who themselves, although made in the image of

God, were tempted by the devil and fell? It is not profitable to enter into theological arguments as to why we were created with the ever-constant tendencies to fall from grace; enough to know that each and every one in varying proportions has in his own self inclinations to do those things selfish and apparently pleasing.

Although many may deny, yet the fact remains that some of the sins of the father are visited upon his children and their children. The child is frequently born with a body so physically constituted that it is entirely impossible for a knowledge of right or wrong, or if it may know, it cannot resist the workings of certain physical laws which compel an action along the lines of least resistance.

What concerns us is how far can we determine our own acts? How much responsibility can we place upon our ancestors? And how much of the good or evil in the world to-day and after years is charged to us, for which we shall receive a reward or punishment?

Our Moral Obligations — 1. Duty is the result of custom and experience and utility.— *Hume, Spencer, Bain.*

2. Moral obligation is the innate sense of an external law and of our right and duty to conform to it.— *Kant, McCosh.*

3. Moral obligation arises from the presence in him of the absolute revealing itself more as he advances in righteousness.— *Hegel, Green.*

Responsibility depends upon the conscious determination of the will. As in plant life we see the influence of tropisms, viz., light, heat, electricity, etc., on its development and reproduction, just so in the higher forms of life

we find many influences acting upon various natures of the individual. In the human, reactions are very great in many so-called physiological functions, as menstruation, pregnancy, hunger, fatigue, etc., so great at times that there exists a veritable exhibition of a double personality, Jekyll and Hyde. More marked are the changes in nature due to poverty, infirmity, removal of sexual organs or organic disease.

Some one has said that whatever is, is right. Hence he would say that if a thing is certain to happen it cannot but happen. A corollary would be, what is to be, will be, and a second corollary then is, if it could not be prevented, will could not change and freedom of will does not exist. We need not argue further along this theological line. Philosophy embraces both religion and science; if a statement in religion is not scientific it is not good philosophy. It is better to say, that if it might have been otherwise, then the thing was a sin.

Freedom of will implies consciousness; a conscience implies a sense of obligation; this in turn depends upon an understanding of right and wrong and the faculty at all times of reasoning as to the sin of disobedience, or more properly the deviation from fixed laws.

In considering the dissensions between science and religion, Drummond said that the spiritual laws are not analogous to the natural laws, but that they are the same laws. That it is not a question of analogy, but one of identity.

Our conception of matter is very different from that of many of the philosophers whom I have quoted. Could they have been acquainted with the present known facts

and hypotheses in modern bio-chemistry and physical chemistry, could they have known the wonders of wireless telegraphy, etc., many of the wise (?) sayings of these philosophers would be entirely contrary to what they then proclaimed.

All thought implies molecular activity of nerve cells; the activity depending on the power of these cells to respond to various stimuli. All energy, regardless of its nature, is dependent upon fixed laws. If cells (a) are acted upon by force (b) the result is action (c), but let cells (a) be affected by + or — force (b), or if cells (a) are + or — in ability to react, action (c) will not be manifest. Hence it naturally follows that if the nerve cells of the brain are fatigued, or poisoned by toxins circulating in the body, then the response will not be that of a normal man. It is only necessary to observe the effect of fever producing delirium, or alcohol benumbing man's higher intellectual faculties.

In life's struggle to live properly innumerable factors are continually at work to alter the normal reactions of our body. Our social conditions are such that greater efforts are necessary to maintain a proper standard of living than existed in the time of our forefathers. The German story, *Der Fluch der Schönheit*, is a good illustration of the many temptations in the life of the beautiful young girl to-day.

In a recent observation of the inmates of an excellent reformatory, I believe that many of the boys and girls at that institution are no worse than many of the children in some of our homes. Many of our good children would have reacted as they have done had they been placed in

the same environment. The character formed by certain children when given an opportunity to develop their better faculties, convinces me that their bodies did not possess all the attributes essential for a responsible being.

Laying aside all traditional views of the Garden of Eden and Adam's fall, with the theological dissensions regarding Adam's sin affecting all, what can we say as to our actual sin to-day? Our reasoning has been such that we can conclude that the man with a normal mind and body is a responsible being, and can will to do or not to do a thing.

A sinful act may not be prevented to-day, but a normal mind responds with repentance and a determination to prevent a second indulgence in the same sin to-morrow. A new environment must be created for the low power of resistance. The individual is dependent upon society, and society largely determines the acts of each individual. Therein lies an important duty of the Church to properly care for the individual members of the community.

It naturally follows that a disordered body will produce an unreasonable mind, but as it is impossible for any one to tell at just what age the irresponsible child becomes a responsible youth or man, just so difficult is it to say that this or that man is sane or not, and is accountable for certain actions. As the good of the community is above that of the individual, so must the community or society in turn to a great extent be responsible for the individual.

EUGENICS: MEANING AND IMPORTANCE

THERE is no subject before man to-day to which the words of the song, "Let a Little Sunshine In," are as applicable as to the study of man himself. The important question is how each person should live that he may most benefit himself, his family, his country, and his posterity.

The word "eugenics" is derived from two Greek roots. "Eu" signifies "good," and the last part of the word means "beginning," coming from the same root as the title of the first book of the Old Testament; liberally translated, the word implies "well born," or "good breeding." By some the word "genetics" is used synonymously with eugenics. Genetics implies beginning, birth, development, to be born, etc. This term is satisfactory for a class in elementary biology, but is inadequate for the meaning of good breeding, or the promotion of better social conditions. Eugenics means a study of conditions which may influence the parents, society, and the State in the determination of the character of future generations. An excellent definition of "eugenics" is that by Galton—see frontispage. To obtain a clear understanding of this subject we must know the effects of physical, mental and moral development, and the restraint of the same upon individuals. In these observations it is important to note how education, food, climate, disease, geographical distribution, alcohol, city and country life, sanitation, immigration, labor conditions, marriage and divorce, proper

housing, poverty, age, physique, conditions of society, etc., may effect individuals and their children. Eugenics is studied primarily from the standpoint of the biologist and the sociologist. As an illustration of the difference of opinion among able scholars in the study of eugenics, let me quote briefly from a very few:

Dr. F. A. Woods: "Experimentally and statistically there is not a grain of truth that ordinarily environment can alter the salient mental and moral traits in any measurable degree from what they were predestined to be through innate influence.

"All evidence we possess renders it highly improbable that any of the ordinary differences in human environment, such as riches or poverty, good or bad home life, have more than a very slight effect in modifying these complex and highly organic functions, the improvement of which is the hope of the altruist and the reformer."

Professor Spillman: "Improving environment does not from generation to generation give better material for our schools to work on. We have been dealing with the wrong problem. The plain and evident course to pursue is for us to be more careful in the choice of our parents and grandparents."

Havelock Ellis: "So far as practical results are concerned, it is not enough for men of science to investigate the facts and the principles of heredity, and to attempt to lay down the principles of eugenics as the science with which the improvement of the race is now called. It is not alone enough for moralists to preach. The hope of the future lies in the slow development of those habits, those social instincts arising inevitably out of the actual

facts of life and deeper than morals. The new sense of responsibility not only for the human lives that now are, but the new human lives that are to come . . . is a social instinct of this fundamental nature. Therein lies its vitality and its promises."

The first practical study of eugenics in America was by the eugenic committee of the American Breeders' Association, an association of scientists and practical men and women to study the development of plants, animals, and human beings. This eugenic committee was appointed in 1908, and included among its members Dr. David Starr Jordan, Luther Burbank, Major Woodruff, Alexander Graham Bell, and Prof. W. E. Castle. The year following a permanent section of eugenics was formed by the American Breeders' Association; since which time many investigations have been made, and already much good has been accomplished. This society is now called the American Genetic Association, and publishes monthly, *The Journal of Heredity*, devoted to plant breeding, animal breeding, and eugenics.

To-day in many cities, either as scientific societies or as groups formed by churches for the study of sex-hygiene, parenthood, etc., the various phases of eugenics are being discussed. There is an ever-increasing demand for speakers by organizations which desire a better condition of society, physically, socially, and morally.

The importance of good breeding is being realized more and more. At the meeting of the International Purity Congress, held in Minneapolis, November, 1913, there were fourteen papers dealing directly or indirectly with the subject of eugenics. Probably the best and most

pointed was by Judge Harry Olson, of Chicago, on "A Constructive Policy Whereby the Social Evil May be Reduced." He said in part: "Comprehensive figures, taken from all sections of the country, prove a startlingly large per cent. of recruits from among women who have been mentally defective in childhood, subnormal children. The early detection of these defectives is imperative, not only for their own benefit and happiness, but for the protection of society. The public schools should be used as clearing houses."

The proceedings of the National Conference on Race Betterment held at Battle Creek, Mich., required a volume of 625 pages.

Epictetus said two thousand years ago that one horse would not say to another, "What fine bridles and saddles have you?" but rather, "How swift are you, and how much can you draw?"

Scripture says, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. And the earth was without form and void and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light; and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness. . . .

"And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so. . . . And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and the fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. And God created great whales, and every liv-

ing creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind; and God saw that it was good. . . .

“And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping things, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so. . . . And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness . . . so God created man in his own image . . . and the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. . . . And the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman. . . . And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived and bare Cain. . . .

“For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generations of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.”

Several years ago the writer urged a course or chair of eugenics in every large college and university. It is pleasing to know that this dream is rapidly becoming a reality. Many of these institutions have placed this study in their curricula, and in a few years no school of standing will dare omit eugenics from the list of compulsory studies, while smaller schools will be compelled to give a course of lectures.*

It is amusing but sad to realize that our public schools

* In the March, 1914, number of the *Journal of Heredity*, the announcement is made that there are now forty-four colleges giving either a complete course in eugenics or some lectures on it as a part of another allied course. Sixteen teach eugenics in their zoölogy department, eleven in their sociology department.

have expected the pupil to know the location of small islands in the South Pacific Ocean, the height of a mountain in Asia, the population of Honolulu, how many men fell in the battle of Marathon, to learn by heart "The Charge of the Light Brigade" and "Thanatopsis," translate and scan Virgil, memorize verses of the New Testament in Greek, and find the value of "pi" in geometry, but not a word about eugenics. It is impossible to believe the ignorance of natural physiological laws which many of our children exhibit at the time of graduation from our high schools and colleges. The average mother has failed to teach her daughter important truths, because she thought it was too delicate a subject to discuss with them. But things are changing. The father is teaching the boys, the mother is teaching the girls, and the public schools are teaching the pupils practical biology. Plants and lower animals are studied in such a way that the endowments of sex are more easily understood. "The proper study of mankind is man."

Prof. Karl Pearson, of the University of London, in the *Popular Science Monthly*, on "The Scope and Importance to the State of the Science of Eugenics," November, 1907, stated: "It needs more than a little boldness to suggest within the walls of one of our ancient universities that there is still another new science which calls for support and sympathy; nay, which in the near future will demand its endowments, its special laboratory, its technical library, its enthusiastic investigators, and its proper share in the curriculum. The true test of all technical education lies in whether we can answer in the affirmative the question: Does it provide adequate mental training

for the man or woman who has no intention of professional pursuits? If we can, then only may we assert that it is a fit subject for academic study."

A report of the Eugenic Section of the American Breeders' Association says: "It is a pressing problem to know what to do to increase the birth rate of the superior stocks and keep down, proportionally at least, the contribution of the inferior stocks. Another great need is the simplification of the standard of living, for it is the inordinate desire for display that makes many persons hesitate and begrudge the expense of children."

A prominent eugenicist has recently said: "The fact of the matter, which eugenics hopes to mitigate, is social, and its roots lie in social clauses. It can be cured only by social remedies. Bracing up an individual here and there does not help; more are cast down in a day than are picked up in a year. Bringing about an occasional 'eugenic marriage' only serves the immediate individuals, and serves them only until they learn that artificial mating without love brings no more social health than when a king mates his daughter to a neighboring prince for political reasons.

"Eugenics proposes its body of scientific fact as the vehicle for its social message. We are all to blame for these anti-eugenic things. There is a child condemned from birth to epilepsy or syphilis because of its father's sin; but we all helped and permitted that father to sin by neglecting to do our job in eliminating the brothel or the saloon. There is a brood of feeble-minded children born to misery and to be a social cancer; we are to blame in not demanding that the parents be segregated before

they became parents — segregated as though they had smallpox. There is a mother bringing a succession of under-nourished children into the world to be prostitutes and criminals; we are to blame for the slum where that mother grew and for the sweatshop where she played out her vitality before she married in desperation to escape it, or in the passion which was the natural result of her untrained parental instinct.”

EUGENICS: BIOLOGICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL

PLATO, in the fifth book of the "Laws," described what he termed a purification or purgation of the State, and said: "The shepherd or herdsman or breeder of horses or the like, when he has received his animals, will not begin to train them until he has first purified them in a manner which befits a community of animals: he will divide the healthy and the unhealthy, and the good breed and the bad breed. The best kind of purification is painful like similar cures in medicine, involving righteous punishment or inflicting death in the last resort." Charles E. Woodruff, U. S. A., stated some years ago, "Whenever the idea is suggested that some means must be taken to lessen the terrible modern burden of the pauper, insane, defective, and criminal, and that the race must be made better, it is at once imagined that the only way to do it is by copying the methods of the plant and stock breeder. Although these methods are hopelessly out of the question, the full absurdity of applying them to man is not realized until the matter is explained."

Education for the criminal, fresh air for the tubercular, rest and food for the neurotic — these are very excellent, they may bring control, sound lungs, and sanity to the individual, but will they save the offspring from the need of like treatment or from the danger of collapse when the time of strain comes? Can they make a nation sound in mind and body? Should our highly developed human

sympathy longer allow us to watch the State purify itself by the aid of crude natural selections?

It is generally agreed that criminals are due to environmental causes and not to heredity. Recent prison statistics show that many criminals are the children of parents who were moral, or whose immorality has not been attributed to discoverable crimes. Few criminals are descended from criminals.

We return our criminals, our insane and tuberculous after "recovery" to their own lives, and we leave the mentally defective flotsam on the floodtide of primordial passions.

A few absurd experiments in marriage have been made without success. Selected marriages violate the normal moral sense of the higher races, and this of itself is unnatural, for morality in the long run is highly scientific, says Woodruff, as it is the crystallization of natural laws followed instinctively. Immorality is contrary to nature. Within the past few months many cases have come to our notice where some man or woman, who, believing that he or she was perfect from an eugenic standpoint, has advertised for an equally good mate with the hope of giving to the world perfect children. We have also seen such perfect children reverting to a former poor type. Practical eugenics does not have to do with experimental marriages. Sanity must prevail in our efforts to better mankind or else we fail.

Our best hope to improve the human race is to discover the worst varieties and then remove the causes. We must know why so many children of normal parents drift into crime.

Bad food, bad housing, bad clothing, poor environment, and hundreds of adverse conditions have affected the poor child in its development into the adult. The aim of eugenics is not limited to the selection of parents; it includes all the measures which promise to improve the quality of parents or to prevent their degradation. "The people dwelling in the lower wards are not all equally good or bad, and that applies also to those living in the mansions of the rich. If, as there are good reasons for supposing, the unselfish and domestic in any class of society leave on the average more adult offspring than the self-seeking, the vicious and the depraved, we have here a contrary force working towards race improvement."—*Woods*.

"All recognize the fact that the laws of heredity which apply to animals also apply to man; and that, therefore, the breeder of animals is fitted to guide public opinion on questions relating to human heredity. . . . We should impress upon the public the point that one certain means of increasing the prevalence of any hereditary characteristic in a community is to induce the individuals who possess it to marry one another; and thus produce a more potent stock in the next generation."—*Alexander Graham Bell*.

"The difficulty of applying to mankind the same methods of breeding that are used with plants and animals has been considered by some writers as an obstacle to human progress, but in reality it would not be desirable to apply breeding methods to mankind, even if it were possible to do so. Eugenic reform is not likely to attain very wide popularity if it is expected to result in a condition in which all the children of a family are to be as

much alike as twins. Too many writers on eugenics overlook the need of a broader and more truly biological point of view, and restrict their attention to the facts of heredity that have been learned from garden or laboratory experiments with domesticated forms. Young men and women who prize life highly enough will not be tempted to choose weak, diseased or defective partners, or to take the risk of bringing crippled or weak-minded children into the world by marrying into families that have shown hereditary abnormalities."—*O. F. Cook, United States Department of Agriculture.*

"If we wish to gain a knowledge of human heredity we must study human beings and not plants and animals. Much danger and confusion may arise when any facts drawn from our knowledge of the lower organisms are, by analogy, made to apply to man."—*Woods.*

Eugenics is full of hope and appeals to the noblest feelings of our nature. Says Alexander Graham Bell: "The great hope lies in the fact that human beings possess intelligence, and a desire that their offspring may be fully up to the average of the race in every particular if not superior."

To-day our problem is for a vigorous race if possible, but above all this we are demanding a more moral people. We can account for the moral decadence of the ancient and mediæval nations. At the present time similar forces are at work with the savage and civilized peoples of Asia, Africa, and the islands of the South Seas. The carnal spirit is rampant: polygamy, sexual relations, etc., offend civilized man. The pride of tribe conquest demands these conditions. The preservation of good people in intelli-

gent countries compels us to be filled with alarm as the birth rate falls with such nations.

The practical problems of eugenics are many: Better homes, better society, more sobriety, less vice, an understanding of good citizenship, better and more healthy children, less of the selfish spirit, peace on earth and good will to all — truly a proper and worthy ideal. May it be more and more a reality.

Probably in about the order mentioned, the biologist, physician, minister, educator, editor, lawyer, parent, property holder and citizen have become interested in eugenics and will labor to make it a practical study.

The minister thinks of the moral welfare of mankind, the lawyer of rights and liberties, the physician of the normal body, the civic reformer of good citizenship, while the eugenist labors for a condition which will promote the accomplishment of all these high ideals.

In a restricted sense eugenics has been limited to the study of "heredity," pure and simple, with no consideration of those real factors which influence the individual. To this other phase of the question, which we understand as "environment," has been given the name *euthenics*, meaning "good influences." The practical man recognizes that the laws of heredity are not so fixed that regardless of the health, vigor, etc., of the parents, the offspring will always bear true. Heredity and environment are inseparable, they go hand-in-hand, always working together. Many relief associations expect to take children of vicious parents from very poor surroundings and to reconstruct the child under good influences, believing that it will become a good citizen. On the other hand

many believe it is safe to entrust the sons and daughters of good parentage to any environment, feeling that their good blood will prevent them from slipping on any of the icy paths of sin. Can a child be safely adopted from a foundling home? Do reform schools reform? Is the good child always sure to become a good citizen?

In studying researches as to the cause of intelligence or lack of such in the child, I am led to believe that if the character of the child differs from that of the parents, some investigators are too apt to call it reversion or atavism. The sudden bursting forth of great men — mutations, if you please — is held by some to be the result of seed sown by the Divine hand for a purpose. A crisis, as war, may be responsible for the greatness of many men. The time and the circumstances are determining factors. General Grant would probably have been as able a defender of Confederate rights had he been born of Georgian parents.

In the extended research by Dr. Woods on "Mental and Moral Heredity in the Nobility," we find expressions like these, "a perfect conformation of the theory of mental and moral heredity," . . . "the origin of the genius of William the Silent is not quite clear, since none of his ancestry were worthy of being called great." In a research of this nature I believe that the writer is too willing to call it a case of reversion or atavism. The change in the line of transmission of characters is frequently charged to a poor marriage. In searching for the ancestry of Uracca, a tyrannical queen, Dr. Woods found that her grandfather had a violent temper, and her great-grandfather was an intriguer.

PARENT AND CHILD

IS the child responsible for its existence? Is the parent to be held accountable for the actions of the child and the adult into which it is to develop? Can we blame our parents for the training and teaching that we are such and such? That we are intelligent or uneducated? These are questions which demand the careful consideration of every thinking person.

Are any prone to shift the responsibility of their existence and actions upon an invisible higher being, or to blame their ancestors for what they may be? It is true that we are brought into the world without our consent having been asked, and it is also true, as reason tells us, that a great responsibility rests upon each and every person responsible for the birth of a human being. Natural laws work for the perpetuation and preservation of the individuals and the race. It does not follow from careful observations that healthy, intelligent and moral parents will always have children who will become as their parents have been.

Animals protect their offspring and nourish them until they are able to care for themselves, oftentimes better than man cares for his children. Generally speaking, good parents may have bad children; but good parents will more likely have good children if the community at large is good — if the surroundings of the child are for the best at all times. How willing we are to censure the pious

parents if the child goes wrong. We demand that society shall be of the highest possible type that each parent may produce and develop good children. With these thoughts in mind, can we look back and blame our parents that we are not better than we are? Should the parent neglect the child, or the child be left an orphan, then will that child become the ward of a relative, friend, or of society in general.

By virtue of the many physical laws which enter into the mysteries of reproduction it is quite evident that no two persons are born exactly alike. Recent investigations of the ductless glands have clearly demonstrated that the secretions from these bodies very materially change the physical and mental natures of many persons. To a great extent the nature of many a man and woman is determined by a greater or less output of metabolic substances from the adrenals, thyroid, pituitary, ovaries, and testicles. Their influence for evil may be greater than the forces for good are able to overcome. This knowledge enables us to better understand the "law of sin in our members," as described by Paul. "For that which I do I allow not: for what I would that do I not; but what I hate, that do I." And again, "Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but that sin dwelleth in me." Euripides said, "I know that what I am about to do is evil, but desire is stronger than deliberations." "All vital actions are the result of the molecular forces of the protoplasm which displays it."—*Huxley*. It is high time that the Church recognized man as an individual; it must know that individuals do not respond in the same way to temptations or to means of salvation. Disease and removal of

ductless glands do occasionally make the person better or worse morally.

There is no greater fallacy taught than that we are born equal. Even the children born of the same parents under what may appear to be exactly similar conditions are different in many ways. One may become intelligent and a good citizen, reflecting the virtue of worthy parents in his every action, while another may be a disgrace to the same parents all the days of his existence. Birth plays a great part, but opportunity plays a greater, and it is this factor, that of our social laws and their demands, that must awaken the interest of those who study the questions pertaining to the uplift of mankind.

After much careful thought and research in history I conclude that a good child may be born of parents rich or poor; but the same study shows that it is quite difficult for the child to be properly trained in a home where vice and poverty are evident or in a home where all is luxury, in which latter case the child is frequently given over to a nurse girl, governess, and fashionable schools. We notice and remember the cases where the boy has been born of poor parents and became a President of the United States, or on the other hand, where the child of the good clergyman went wrong. We do not consider the children of the average parents who have led an average existence. Strange to say, man presents little to attract the observer when all is normal. But let him be out of harmony in any sphere, physical, mental or moral, and he becomes an object of interest and investigation from many sides.

The physician is frequently asked: "Is the child all right?" If a child be born malformed, is it not asked

as of old: "Who sinned that the child is born thus?" We hear the expressions: "He is a chip of the old block." "How much she looks like her mother." "Blood will tell," and many others of a similar nature, signifying that the child is like the parents in many ways.

The child of a Raphael will not necessarily become a great artist, nor is the son of a thief doomed to the penitentiary. Do not blame a remote ancestor for your sins. Because Mr. A—— is a drunkard it does not follow that he inherited it from his intemperate uncle.

Jesse James, Jr., son of the outlaw, is a full-fledged lawyer. In a class of thirty-seven applicants for license to practice law, he stood at the head. His father was killed when the boy was at the age of eight. He has never tasted whiskey, beer or tobacco.

The thirteen children of Jonathan Edwards and their seventy-four descendants have all been of normal upright character, except Aaron Burr. For the cause of Burr's actions some go back to his grandmother, who had shown herself to be an extremely clever woman, but of a most erratic temperament. No wonder many people are inclined to reject the opinions of such scientists.

If, as Patton asks, children inherited all their characteristics from their parents, would they have to be taught? The human family, like animals, do inherit many instincts which are for the preservation of the race. The ducklings incubated under a hen will surely take to water. The bird will fly: there is a natural tendency to seek food and safety. The illustration mentioned by Burbank on the inheritance of these instincts by the baby bear picked up by some miners within a few days after its birth — before

its eyes had opened, is well to the point. The bear became thoroughly domesticated, almost as, he says, an old maid's cat. One day, when mature, the bear was taken to a tiny salmon stream. This bear had never fished for salmon, but it was able rapidly to scap the onrushing salmon out of the stream, throwing them into a pile on the bank. It then sorted them into two piles, males in one pile, and the females in the other. Then with its sharp claw, it opened the female salmon and extracted the roe, which it ate with a relish. This consumed, it finished its meal on the other meat of the fish.

LIFE AND REPRODUCTION

IT is very pertinent in studying practical problems dealing with the various manifestations of organic structures, to make careful inquiry relative to life itself. Highly complex organisms, as animals, furnish questions as yet unsolved. Are we more satisfactorily acquainted with the life and death of the tadpole or of a grain of wheat? Explain life, its origin, its continuity by the many different methods of reproduction, and finally tell us why life ceases through death of the organism. Then, and then only, may we explain the various phenomena giving us physical characteristics and many mental and moral attributes.

In order that we may intelligently discuss practical eugenics, it is necessary that we have a fairly good understanding of the development of plants and animals; after which we can make a comparative study of these and of human beings. We can then know what statements in reference to inherited characters in man seem unreasonable. We must not allow sentiment to permit us to accept and teach those things which are contrary to science. "Man is a man for a' that." We cannot yet be compared to prize chickens and thoroughbred cattle. There are still some great minds being carried about on small shoulders.

The laws of compensation are still at work. The student who cannot excel in athletics may still have a greater

incentive for study, and the boy who has to make his own way in the world may be a little more industrious than his rich cousin. Some one has said that the world could not endure the intolerable burden of a continuous line of great men. We could not even endure the permanence of great men of genius. "Nature kindly uses her greatest sons for great tasks, and then dissolves their powers in the common social group, in order to make securer the democracy of life."

In the animal kingdom, I have defined life as the correlation of irritable tissues. Some classic definitions are: "Life is a collection of phenomena which succeed each other during a limited time in an organized body." "Life is a series of definite and successive changes which take place within an individual without destroying its identity." "Life is the continuous adjustment of internal to external relations." A pollen of grain, acting through the pistil, sends its nucleus to unite with the nucleus of the ovule. Life results. Whence comes the vital principle? Is it created afresh for every plant and animal? A protophyte or a protozoon, having reached a certain size, undergoes a series of complex changes, ending in fission: One has disappeared, two have come into existence. In the individual state it has the vital principle. What is life in the divided state?

The function of some organs is carried on for a time after removal from the body. The liver, if kept at a proper temperature, and supplied with blood, will secrete bile for a time. Likewise will many other organs if transplanted or even removed and fed with blood, perform their function for indefinite periods. The activity depends

largely upon the integrity of the cells of each organ. The heart of many animals under certain conditions will beat in perfect rhythm for quite a time after removal from the body. The cilia of the air passages and leucocytes still retain their functions for many days. Again we ask, What is life? The answer of many physiologists at the present time is, "Life is a series of fermentations." Ferment action is not only destructive, but constructive. Ferments are present in nearly every cell, and intimately concerned in all manifestations of life.

Organic development is the great proposition or theory around which the facts and phenomena of the vegetable and animal kingdoms gather for correlation and explanation. One of the first steps toward this theory is the observed unity of all forms of life, as shown by the facts that plants and animals have about the same chemical composition; that plant and animal protoplasm appear to be identical; that the germinal vesicle and sexual reproduction are similar in each; that there is a great difficulty in distinguishing between the lower forms of animals and plants; that plants and animals are cellular in structure; that plants and animals as individuals develop from a bit of structureless protoplasm to a complicated organism, each growing by the single multiplication of cells; and that animals and plants are affected in much the same way by physical environment. Another fact is, that the offspring inherit some of the characteristics of their parents, but not all. In the study of development and reproduction of living things, we deal with two different classes of organisms: animal and vegetable life. In the classification of each of these two great divisions, we find at the

bottom of the scale of life certain organisms which are said by the botanist to belong to the vegetable world, while the zoölogist claims them for his. Animals are born with recognizable germ cells, but plants do not show these until somewhat developed.

The ease with which a plant may be reproduced by a cutting, or the production of hybrids by grafting, has been a great stumbling block to the scientist who claims that "like bears like," and to the pathologist who affirms that an epithelial tumor can arise only from epithelial tissue. It is true that in the lower forms of animal life the entire organism may be regenerated from a single part, thus worrying the theorist, who claims that all life is reproduced through the germ cell. It is safe to say that all of the laws which apply to reproduction and development in the vegetable world will not apply to all of the laws for the animal world; nor as far as it has yet been demonstrated will all of the laws for the higher forms of animals apply to man. It will appear that man is frequently a law unto himself. This applies not only to man as a class, but frequently to the individual man.

Reproduction occurs in the animal kingdom in two quite different ways, sexually and asexually. Asexual reproduction occurs in fission and gemmation. In fission the organism finally divides into halves, about equal, which grow to the size of the parent. In gemmation only a part of the body of the original individual develops into a new animal. Regeneration is the power of replacing parts of the body which have been lost by some accident, etc. Secondary sexual characteristics are the distinction between males and females, such as size, shape, color, etc.

By hybridization is meant that in most cases it is possible for ova and spermatozoa of nearly allied species to unite. Parthenogenesis is a name meaning that the ovum can be developed without being fertilized, e. g., those of insecta, crustaceans, etc.

Alternations of generations show that some animals produce both sexually and asexually. The asexual animals produce by gemmation or fission sexual individuals whose fertilized ova again become sexual animals; or two or more asexual generations are followed by a sexual brood, these again by more asexual generations. Heterogeny embraces all cases of regular alternations between sexual generations, whether these differ in appearance or in their mode of propagation.

Atavism is the peculiarity seen in some animals, including the human, when the characteristics of the offspring are not like those of the parents, but like those of the grandparents or remote ancestors. Ontogeny is the study of animals as individuals. Phylogony is the study of animals as a class.

The law of Biogenesis states that each living being arises from another living being, that there is no life without preëxisting life, while spontaneous life cannot occur. Each new egg begins life as a single cell or egg. The egg does not contain any pre-formed structures that it hands down unaltered, but is so constructed that the same kind of structure is produced.

The cells of organisms are constantly dying and must be replaced. In some tissues the processes are evident; probably no repair takes place in the highly organized tissue. The skin has every stage of cell life. The epi-

dermis is constantly being replaced from lower layers. Some structures increase in size by the formation of new fibers, and enlargements of old and new. Muscles generally repair by new connective tissue. Nerve cells may be, but rarely are, newly formed. The lower the form of the animal, the easier it is to make good a loss and to reproduce. The deeper layers of cells in the skin can reproduce only similar cells.

A root or leaf of some plant may give rise to an entirely new plant. In higher animals reproduction is sexual, and sexes are separate. The fertilized ovum has the power to reproduce other ova, also every body tissue found in the adult. Direct contact of the male germ with the ovum produces fecundation. The ovum is formed and discharged from the ovaries.

Somatic cells are differentiated into tissues and form the body, giving life to the body. Germ cells have minor significance for life; they are for reproduction. Somatic and germ cells have no resemblance when matured. The cells from each group have a common origin in the parent. Both may have the same power of development. The distinction between somatic and germ cells is an expression of the physiological division of labor. The differentiation is very clear in multicellular life, as the volvox. In higher life, the somatic cells surround and nourish the germ cells, this being their special function, and form distinct sexual organs. In the early embryonic life the germ cells appear to be the same in both sexes.

Until quite recently, most people believed that the sun, moon, and stars, the earth with all its varied forms of life and all material were created out of nothing. A careful

study of the phenomena of life has led many students of botany, zoölogy and geology to the conclusion that special creation was not God's method in nature, but that some form of evolution or development was probably the method employed. "This is a beautiful view of life breathed by the Creator into few forms, probably into only one. Beautiful and wonderful forms have been and are being evolved from this simple beginning."—*Darwin*.

Death is a cessation of life. According to the theory of the "survival of the fittest," it is due to the death of the individual that the race is made better, and that the population is not multiplied too rapidly. Weismann stated that the length of life of individuals of a species has been regulated by the natural selection of the individual variations.

The length of life is really dependent upon adaptations to external conditions and is governed by the needs of the species. The length of life is not determined by the constitution of the animal, for a queen bee may live for several years and the male for only a few weeks. Long life is hereditary.

Evolution is the becoming visible of preëxisting details of shapes. As before stated, the structure of both animal and vegetable organisms is divided into two forms of cells: the somatic or body cells and the germ or reproductive cells. In 1875 Herwig demonstrated that the egg and sperm acting together cause fertilization. The interpretation of cleavage as a process of cell division was followed by a demonstration that cell division does not begin with cleavage, but can be traced back into the foregoing generations, for the egg cell as well as the sperm cell arises

from the division of a cell preëxisting in the parent body. It is therefore derived by direct descent from the egg cell of the foregoing generation, and so on *ad infinitum*. No doubt the effect of the somatic cells upon the ova will always be a mystery.

It is quite apparent that as far as the male germ cell is concerned, all the characters inherited by the child from this parent must be contained in the germ cell, but it is not apparent that this cell was entirely independent of the somatic cells during its development. It is not conceded by all biologists that the ovum contains all the characteristics at the time of its maturation for the part furnished in transmission from the female parent. In the ovipara objections cannot be made for reasons quite apparent. On the one hand then, it is claimed that the ovum contains all the characteristics it conveys when the parent is born. On the other, it is claimed that the germ cell or ovum can be affected by conditions of the mother, from the time of birth until the birth of each respective child, thus transmitting many acquired characters, diseases, etc. How can the increased dexterity and power in the hand of the well-trained piano player so affect the molecular structure of the germ cells as to produce a corresponding development in the hand of the child? It would appear that the child inherits from the germ cell, not from the parent body. Consequently the germ cell owes its characteristics not to the body which bears it, but to its descent from a preëxisting germ cell of the same kind.

It is believed by some that the age of the parent has much to do with the determination of certain qualities in

the progeny. According to which idea, a male child of a father in the prime of life, with a well developed and muscular body, will become a stronger man than a brother born when the father was in the development period under 30 or during his decline. In a similar way they would explain mental qualities as well as the likes or dislikes for certain arts or sciences. Personally I do not think the germ cells are as much influenced by the age and mental and physical development of the parent body as is claimed by the advocates of this theory. Robinovitch states:

“(1) Most great men were not born of youthful parents; (2) the majority were not the first offspring; (3) the majority of great men were the youngest children.”

Let me ask what would be the physical condition of an adult woman whose parents, grandparents for six generations, had married at from sixteen to eighteen years of age and had borne children at an early age? Would this woman at thirty years of age have a fully developed body? Would she have cut all her wisdom teeth? Would her hair be a proper length; in short, would she be a normal woman of her age?

In a recent Galton Eugenics Memoir, by David Heron, D.Sc., he says: “The conclusion was reached that home environment, as measured by clothing, cleanliness, nutrition, stature, and weight could not be the chief determining cause of the differentiation of intelligence; nor was defective physique its source. Other factors of environment have yet to be discussed, but so far — and this generalization covers much more than the 400 coefficients

calculated in the memoir disclose — there is no sign of environmental condition producing an effect on the mentality of the child at all comparable with the known influence of heredity.”

VARIATIONS

IN order that we may understand the practical lessons to be learned from a study of successive generations of any form of life, particularly the human, it is necessary to notice briefly the present accepted explanations of the factors and laws of evolution. The factors in evolution for plants and animals are: Variations, heredity, segregation and selection. To these four, we might add environment. Another very important force, affecting plant life and to a lesser degree animals and human individuals, is that of "tropisms." By tropisms we mean those reactions which organic matter shows when acted upon by heat, light, electricity, gravitation, etc. Who does not know the effect of these forces on plant life? A little thought makes positive the effect of heat, cold, darkness, altitude, humidity, etc., upon man also. In a discussion of variations we are confronted by two questions: What is a variation? and what is meant by "species"? Darwin arbitrarily conceived that when certain germs of animals showed differences sufficient, they were divided into species, these again differing were classed as variations, which in turn were subdivided finally into the respective individuals.

In many writings, we see the terms "variation" and "modification" used, apparently implying any change in the individual during its life. On the other hand, as used by the majority, variations refer to an accident, etc., but are dependent upon natural selection, environment, etc.,

which alterations are transmitted to the next generation. In this class we can place the changes brought forth by DeVries in the "Evening Primrose," by Burbank in his work on many flowers, and by the altered "strains" in the breeding of animals and growing fruits. Modifications are those acquired changes due to the use of a part, as thickening of the skin on the soles of feet, enlargement of the biceps, etc. These characters are not transmitted.

The scientist is led to believe that in the process of development most of the structures of the body are as they now exist, in order that the individual may be the better able to subsist, protect itself from its enemies and propagate its kind. In our own body, what many call compensations, are in fact "adaptations" for the protection of the body. Immunity to disease is gradually acquired from a series of adaptations to small doses of poisons.

It is a fixed law that in order to avoid confusion, every living thing, whether it be plant or animal, shall produce offspring after its own kind, thus establishing the law of heredity. Like begets like under like circumstances. While no one, from the scientist down to the most ignorant casualist, denies the matter of heredity, we expect offspring to be much like their ancestors, yet many biologists, as well as psychologists, have devised different and antagonistic theories to account for heredity and its correlative factor, environment.

Prine A. Morrow said, "Strange as it may seem, an alcoholic heritage is scarcely more likely to come from an habitual drunkard than from an abstainer who may be intoxicated at the moment of procreation for the first time in his life. In twenty-three families in which I have found among

children in good conditions, the existence of a degenerate, as infirm, or an idiot, twenty-two times I have been able to determine and make known to parents that one of the two was at the moment of procreation, either sick or convalescent. I am firmly convinced that every pathological state and mental depression of the generators, one or both, has a manifest influence upon the product of conception and its future development."

To a careful unbiased critic, it is evident that, in approaching these very dark mysterious problems, each investigator endeavors to work along certain preconceived lines, and consequently attempts to make every result conform to his prejudicial ideas. Quite often the student along any line becomes so enthusiastic over his own reasoning and observations that he is in a condition similar to a person with aphasia. The circle of reception, reflection, memory and action is broken. The impulse has been so intense that at some part of the circuit of reasoning there is a block, and the student is called a "crank."

The investigators who were the first to produce anything like satisfactory evidence in demonstrating beyond theory certain laws of applied evolution, I refer to Darwin, Wallace, Lamarck, etc., have been and are still being severely censured for many theories which they did not proclaim. Much of the most recent knowledge along these lines could never have been obtained but for the work of these pioneers of this science.

Furthermore, much of the controversy between present day investigators is due to the fact that it appears impossible for one to interpret the views held by another. A writer in *Science* required eight pages to explain how

a certain scientist did not understand the term "Mutation" in an address he had made before the American Zoölogical Society. Read if you will the criticisms of Darwin: how one will state that Darwin was a firm believer in inheritance of acquired characters, another says he did not believe they are transmitted, and another knows that later in life he changed his views.

Man to-day is, as far as we can ascertain, very like Adam. The animals which he had with him in the Garden of Eden ate the same way, walked the same, reproduced their young as do those of the present time. The anthropologist, paleontologist and geologist tell us that Adam lived but a few years compared with the time since the first beast trod the earth. Millions of years ago animals walked upright, and were so large that they were able to pluck the fruit from the trees. After serving their time they laid down and died, their fossils to be buried in the different formations of later years.

These facts, I neither try nor desire to deny; suffice to say that if our idea of variations is correct, in the very few generations from our first parent until to-day, how very complex must our nature be if any of these alterations are transmitted from father to son!

Strictly speaking, inheritance is the transmission to the child of characteristics and conditions present in either one or both parents and also in the germ cell or cells when the new individual begins its existence. Any influence modifying it after this moment is something acquired by an "already entity," it is not inherited. "Heredity has actually more power over our mental constitution and character than all external influences, physical or moral."

THEORIES OF INHERITANCE

IT is told that an impertinent man made inquiry into the ancestry of the great Dumas. A conversation somewhat as follows took place: "I understand, Mr. Dumas, that your father was a mulatto?" "Yes." "And what was your grandfather?" "He was a negro." "What was his ancestry?" continued the impertinent man. "He was an ape," replied Dumas. "You see my ancestors began where yours end."

Francis Galton in 1889 was the first to recognize that in the case of certain characters the results of inheritance is a blend of the conditions found in the parents, while in other characters inheritance is ultimately between the conditions found in the parents. It has been thought until recently that hereditary processes in general were of this sort and that any results other than a blend were exceptional. It will be very helpful for those who desire to study the various social factors in their influence upon future generations to consider in a brief way some of the explanations by which the germ plasm, the male and female germ cells, and the body which develops and nourishes these cells, may be affected.

What value is it for us to understand how two human germ cells, so small that we must use a microscope to observe them, by as yet unexplainable physical and biochemical forces, become a man or woman endowed with will, feeling, strength and a spiritual soul, to be punished in the present and future life because the body which

developed from these two minute particles of protoplasm has not at all times behaved in a seemly way?

To the eugenicist these thoughts are serious by reason of the fact that these little germ cells carry in them the characteristics of ancestors to progeny from generation to generation. These cells may or may not have been affected by certain evil deeds of a grandfather or some illness of a grandmother. If they were, then you and I have to compete in life with others who do not have this terrible handicap thrust upon them.

We say that "like bears like" under like circumstances. Either certain diseases of the parents, the effects of alcohol, fatigue, etc., are manifested in the germ cells or they are not. Either the physical conditions acquired by the parents are handed down to their children or they are not. There is no guess work, no half way of doing things in nature. Some one has well said that the supernatural is the not knowable yet. Mystery is too often ignorance. A very little thought makes clear our duty. Society demands to preserve the health of its individual members, to diminish the enormous cost of keeping alive the defectives and undesirables and to protect present and future generations from these unfortunates. If our ancestors have handed us certain good or bad heritages, physical, mental or moral, then we can in like manner transmit desirable or undesirable conditions to our children.

For the above reasons, for a practical consideration, we may divide the theories of evolution and development into four great classes: (1) Those in which our characters are transmitted from parent to offspring unchanged — strict Weismann theory; (2) those in which

the characters acquired by a parent can be transmitted to the offspring — strict Lamarckian theory; (3) those in which characters may suddenly appear, these to be transmitted to next generation — theory of De Vries; (4) those in which certain characters are dominant and others are recessive; we can determine quite accurately these characters in the offspring — theory of Mendel.

Weismann asserts continuity not only for the sexual cells, but for the germinal protoplasm, which he believes to pass along definite cell tracts, until it formed sexual cells. He states that the substance, which is a bearer of hereditary characters of species (the idioplasm of Naegele) lies not in the protoplasm of the germ cells, but in their nuclear matter. This he calls the germ plasm. A rational interpretation of this theory in its strict sense would be that the protoplasm which produces and nourishes the germ cell would be affected by alcohol, disease, etc.

The Lamarckian theory is that of inheritance of acquired characters. In explanation of the theory we note that the use of a part leads to an increase of size, and disuse the opposite. Lamarck maintained that the desire to use a particular organ to fulfill some want led to its better development through exercise and that the result was inherited; not as has been stated of him that the desire of the animal for the particular part had led to a development of that part. He concluded that the appearance of stability is always mistaken by the layman for the reality, because in general every one judges things relative to himself. The work of elimination of useless eyes of blind fish has been going on for hundreds of generations,

yet still incomplete rudiments appear. The teeth of some animals, which were formerly used for defense, are now used for mastication. In opposition to this theory we know that Brown-Sequard cut off the tails of mice soon after their birth for generations, and they were still born with tails. Circumcision has been practised by the Jews for thousands of years and must still continue to be. The feet of Chinese girls were tightly squeezed to allow the adult woman to wear a number two shoe, but since they are allowed to go unbound they become as large as those of the American woman.

By the theory of DeVries we learn that occasionally for reasons not satisfactorily explained a plant or animal may show a structure so different from others of its kind that it appears to be an entirely different structure. This is often termed a "sport" or a mutation. When these extreme varieties are bred and cultivated under the best possible conditions the result is that many scientists state they have developed a new species. It is by the selection of the best and the survival of the fittest that many explain the theory of evolution whereby we can trace back our ancestry to the lowest forms of life. It is by the selection of a few and casting aside the many thousands that Burbank has succeeded in producing such wonderful results in crossing various plants. And yet it is said that he has not produced a new species.

The law of Mendel is one which requires special attention for the reason that many scientific breeders are making successful application of this law in improving plants and animals. This application is worth millions of dollars annually in the production of new and better kinds

of flowers, fruit, vegetables, animals, etc. And some eugenists have gone so far as to say that we should apply this law to man. It has been known for many years that the characters of the parents could be split up and redistributed in the offspring of hybrids.

By this we understand that two or more descriptive points of the animal as color, texture and coarseness of the hair, may be so combined in the germ cell of the parent as to be called a unit character and in a pure breed these points are transmitted as one unit. Now, by Mendel's law the parts in the unit are split up and redistributed, making the unit character of inheritance different. The application of the law requires that the two parents possess certain characters which are opposed to each other, and which when crossed form what may be termed a character pair. It is also important that the germ cell be pure as to unit characters. When such conditions exist in the parent there is then a certain fixed law of probability of unit characters appearing in the offspring, which are so definite that the scientist can determine mathematically as to the characters of the succeeding generations.

Mendel found that in cross breeding between alternative characters, one uniformly dominates in the offspring from its very nature, while the other disappears. Mendel called the characters seen in the offspring Dominant, the unseen ones he called Recessive. The coat characters seen in the offspring, color, length and texture, are the three dominant characters, two of which were received from one parent, one from the other; the three alternate recessive characters are present but unseen.

When pure bred black guinea pigs are mated with red ones, only black offspring are as a rule obtained. The hairs of the offspring do indeed contain some red pigment, but the black pigment is so much darker that it largely obscures the red. In other words, black behaves as an ordinary Mendelian dominant. In the next generation black and red segregate in ordinary Mendelian fashion and the young produced are in the usual proportions, three black and one red.

These experiments illustrate, says Castle, two important principles in heredity: First, if as regards the hair alone there exists such a variety of characters separately heritable, how great must be the number of characters in the body as a whole, and remotely probable that any animal will in all characters resemble any individual ancestor; secondly, the experiment shows that a variety of new organic forms may be quickly reproduced by cross-breeding, leading to the combination in one race of characters previously found separately in different races.

Bateson states that we will soon be able to produce a hybrid with the same accuracy as the chemist does a compound. In the second and later generations of a hybrid every possible combination of the parent characters occur, and each combination appears in a definite proportion of the individuals. Another example: When a pure polled bull (one incapable of transmitting the horn characters) is bred to horned cows, all the calves will be polled (hornless) hybrids. Some, possibly all, of these will have imperfect horns, which may be large or small as a pea, but their presence is a sure sign that the animal is a hybrid and not a pure poll. The polled character is a Mendelian

unit character.

As to what are and what are not character units in the Mendelian sense of transmissibility in the human family has not been determined. There is no doubt that it might be fairly well determined for physical characters if we were predisposed to select men and women for marriage with a view to the unit characters of their children which we know could be transmitted. Davenport states that very many characters, good and bad, are Mendelian in inheritance, viz.: Stature, weight, facial expression, color of hair, general mental ability, special aptitude for music, art, mechanics, moral sense, temperament, etc.

We know that children do not develop hair darker than the darker parent, i.e., dark-haired children are probably never bred from flaxen-haired parents. Red-haired parents beget red-haired children; red-haired children may come from glossy black hair, the gloss of which being dependent upon the presence of red pigment. Light brown bred to light brown yields tow, yellow, golden or red hair. But if we knew just exactly what would be the color of the hair, eyes, stature, weight, etc., of our children it would not change the minds of those who apply for marriage licenses in the least.

In concluding the subject of evolution and reproduction, let us look at a few of the many scientific explanations. As mentioned in a previous chapter, the Law of Biogenesis states that each living being arises from another living thing, that there is no life without preëxisting life, while spontaneous life cannot occur. Each new egg begins life as a single cell or egg. The egg does not contain any pre-formed structures that it hands down unaltered,

but is so constructed that the same kind of structure is again produced. Should something affect the egg, we can imagine it might form a new combination on the same plan as the old, yet one that differed from the original in every detail of structure. This idea lies at the base of the transmutation theory.

DeVries suggests by Darwin's doctrine of pangenesis that gemmules are small particles endowed with the power of division, and are the material bearers of hereditary characters. In this he distinguishes simple and complex components of higher and lower order. To the smallest material units belong fundamental qualities of life, assimilation, metabolism and reproduction by division. The next higher units are composed of groups of the smallest. The germ plasma must possess as many of these as there are in the organism, cells or group of cells, independently variable in the germ or later stages. A third group is a community of the second; these must be able to grow and multiply. A single large group would suffice for the conduct of a single life history. The second classes are so grouped that in the highest they are liberated and become active when the time comes for development of that part of the body which they control. The highest groups are supposed to contain the inherited material for a complete new organism. It is suggested that they are tiny beads in the chromosomes.

On the theory of descent all ancestors are supposed to have lived at some time in the past or present on the earth. If their remains should be preserved, we expect to find at least some of these remains to be like the present forms, while on the transmutation theory, we should expect to

find most if not all of the ancestral forms to be different from the present ones.

Within the period of human history we do not know of a single instance of the transformation of one species into another one, if we apply the rigid tests to distinguish wild species from each other. The evidence suggested itself to our early writers that the embryos of the higher forms passed through the adult stages of the lower animals. The first writers of this theory found that the tadpole resembled an adult fish. It was stated as early as 1808 that the human fetus passes through its metamorphosis in its development in such a way that it repeats all classes of animals, but remaining permanently in none, develops into more and more the innate human form. The gill slits of the chick in embryo are not to be compared with the adult fish but with those of the embryo of the fish. It is significant that the gill slits appear as early in the embryo of the fish as they do in the bird.

According to Darwin's principle of selection, when two germ cells form units, we do not find that the young show all the characters of the mother, plus those of the father — i.e., each peculiarity that is the same in both increased twofold; on the contrary, the young is in a vast majority of cases not essentially different from either parent. Darwin thought that a large amount of the variation shown by domesticated animals and plants is due in the first place to new conditions of life, and also to the lack of uniformity of these conditions. No case is on record of a variable organism ceasing to vary under cultivation. Monstrosities cannot be separated by any distinct line from slighter variations. He also thought that

the amount of use or disuse of a part had much to do with the variations, these being inherited, and generally known as the Lamarckian factor of heredity. Darwin thought that the changes in the body due to the disuse of a part could be transmitted to descendants.

DETERMINATION OF SEX

THERE is probably no one question so frequently asked the physician and to which the answer is always "no," as, "Can we determine before the birth of the child whether it will be a boy or girl?" Much has been written on this subject in the last few years. Investigators have written books telling the mother how we may have boys or girls. Kings have paid handsome sums to scientists for directing the diet of the mothers that boys may be born to perpetuate the royal lineage of the throne. As the chances are as much for as against success, the scientist who can persuade the royal gentleman that sex can be determined, certainly has all to win, and little to lose, in his attempt to convince the king that a son will be born. It is needless to say that a solution to this problem would create much happiness in many homes in all lands. It is quite sad indeed, to see parents with several daughters longing in vain for a boy, and vice versa.

So serious is the problem and so earnest have been many worthy investigators, that years of study have been given to this question. Experiments have been made on many forms of animal life, but when the test is made on human beings, the solution is no nearer to-day than in the beginning. Nature certainly worketh in her own mysterious way. Life itself is unexplainable; likewise we cannot tell why death ensues after a number of years. There are fixed laws of physical activity which maintain a certain

balance in the workings of organic life. Probably the most interesting fact to note along this line is that the number of males and females born are about the same. The last census of the United States gave over 47,000,000 males and over 44,000,000 females. Of foreign birth, we find over 9,000,000 of each sex. In the New England States there was only a difference of 22,000 in the sexes, and in the South Atlantic States only a difference of 74,000 out of over 12,000,000 people.

In one of our large cities for 1908 there were born 7,644 males and 7,016 females; in 1909, 7,607 males and 6,677 females; in 1912, 7,799 males and 7,267 females. We notice here about the same number of children born each year, regardless of living conditions; and the proportion of boys and girls is very nearly the same for each year.

It is not until somewhat along in the development of the child that sex is recognized. For this reason, that structure which gives rise to the sex organs has been called the undifferentiated gland, in the belief that the structure was different for each sex, even though it could not be demonstrated. According to this view it is impossible for the sex to be determined after fertilization has occurred by any kind of diet or mental impressions.

Quite recently Ahfeld writes that he is convinced the sex is determined before fertilization occurs. On this hypothesis, sex is explained by a difference in the glands. Somewhat on this theory, Weill has suggested that the difference in the mass and in the motility of the two germ cells will account for the victor in the contest which is presumed to take place.

From such data as we possess, it has been claimed that with a few exceptions the primordial germ cells are sexually indifferent, i.e., they are neither male nor female, and that their transformation is not due to an inherent predisposition, but is a reaction to external stimuli. That in the determination of sex, the problem of nutrition is not the only determining factor is shown by the long-known case of the honey-bee. Here sex is determined by fertilization, the males arising only from unfertilized eggs by parthenogenesis, while the fertilized eggs give rise to females exclusively, which develop into fertile forms (queens), or sterile forms (workers), according to the nature of the food.

While these conclusions may be formed regarding some form of animal life, we are convinced that in man and all higher animals that the sex of the animal is determined in a very early period of its development.

I quote from Densmore in "Sex Equality": "Males and females, whether they be more or less alike, arise from the same germinal material. The germinal material itself is sexless; that is to say, there is not a male and a female germinal material. Whether the male or female forms be produced depends on external influences of food, temperature or other agencies."

O. Hertwig says: "Every organism, whether male or female, develops from a fertilized egg cell apart, of course, from the occurrence of a sexual and parthenogenetic reproduction. This material which in our case develops into a male is, as far as our experience can go, always the same; and just when the sex of the organism is absolutely decided is a question to which no general answer can be

given. The constitution of the mother, of the father, the state of the male element when fertilization occurs, these and yet other factors have all to be considered."

In "Evolution of Sex," by Geddes and Thomson, we note the following statement of A. Weismann: "Both in plants and animals essentially the same substance is contained in the nucleus, both of the sperm-cell and the egg-cell, this is the hereditary substance of the species. There can be no longer any doubt that the nuclei of the male and those of the female germ-cells are essentially similar."

Professor Thomas, in "Sex and Society," quotes from various observers who claim that there is an abundance of evidence to show that good nutrition produces females and a scarcity of food, boys; that rich regions yield more furs from females and poor regions more from males of fur-bearing animals; that more boys are born in the country than in the city, there the diet is richer, especially in meat; after war, famine and miseration, more boys are born; when food stuffs are high and less marriages, there is a higher percentage of boys, etc. Professor Thomas assumes that the chemical constitution of the organism at a given moment conditions the sex of the offspring, and is itself conditioned by various factors as light, heat, water, electricity, etc., and that food is one of these variables.

Wilson says that sex is not inherited; that the animal inherits the capacity to develop into male or female, the result being determined by the effects of conditions external to the primordial cells. He believes that in regard to the influence of nutrition in the determination of sex, if any influence is made manifest at all, it is not the quan-

tity of the food taken, but rather the quality which is important.

Expectation and disappointment determine the policy of most people. With a happy expectation, plans are made from the air-castles we have been building for years, and if the long-looked-for boy arrives, the plans are executed. If not, in some cases the disappointment even changes the map of a locality or a nation. Who can say it is for better or worse? Had parents the choosing of the sex of their children the world would be in a topsy-turvy condition in a very few generations. Let us be satisfied with the uncertainties of life which develop in man the finer qualities and make for a better condition of society. Old Nature has been on this work for a long time and cannot be improved upon.

WHAT CONDITIONS ARE INHERITED?

ARE we a chip of the old block? Does blood tell? If your mother had married more than once, would you have the malformations of your father or an older brother's father, both having the same mother? Will our children have our habits, aptitudes, mental qualities, and any of our infirmities? An attempt is made to give as accurately as possible whatever information on this subject may be known to be reliable at the present time.

The first consideration will be given to the inheritance of physical conditions, viz., malformations and disease. Before discussing these, let us look for a moment to three terms: Congenital, inherited, and acquired. Inheritance must come through the germ cell or cells. A disease to be inherited must have been present in one of the parents before conception. A congenital disease is one that was present in the child at the time of its birth, and is either in the strict sense inherited or acquired. This term is generally used as referring to a disease which was not inherited, hence an acquired condition, which in itself means all that the child receives from its parents after conception has occurred.

Professor Orth says: "That which the child receives from its mother in the course of its development is not inherited, because the essence of heredity does not consist of the circumstances that the descendants have obtained

a particular peculiarity from their descendants, or that a disease has been transmitted to them by their parents or even their ancestors.”

There is probably no subject encumbered with more fallacy than heredity, as relating to the transmission of diseases. Laws of hereditary transmission are frequently ignored by medical authors. On the flimsiest evidence, they have attributed all kinds of acquired diseases, often of infectious nature, to heredity. Family histories are continually produced, other causes than direct heredity are ignored; even in the absence of any family history evidence, it is not uncommon to allude vaguely to the probability of heredity as a contributory cause. Any investigation of medical literature will, I believe, convince any unbiased observer that specific forms of disease are seldom transmitted, but instead a lower grade of equilibrium of metabolism is exhibited.

There is no dispute among observers as to the transmission of certain malformations which are present in one or more members of each generation. Among these we find cases of six fingers, cleft hand, hare-lip, cleft palate, dextro-cardia, birthmarks, multiple exostoses, tumors of the nerves, errors of refraction, absence of pigment in iris (albino), forms of taxi, dwarfism, giantism, malformations of sex-organs, etc. Lazarus-Barlow mentions a family where in four generations, of 27 descendants, 20 had malformed fingers and toes, similar to a deformity of the first parent.

A few years ago I took the following history: Mrs. H—— has given birth to four boys, has had no miscarriages. She was at that time eight months pregnant.

Her condition was normal as far as the pregnancy was concerned. Has had a simple goiter since a girl. The first three boys were born blind. First one died at thirteenth month; second one died at ninth month; third at twenty-first month. All of whom developed hydrocephalus. Fourth, six years of age, living and well. Mrs. H—— was one of eleven children. The eldest died at the age of four years. Youngest at age of two years; eight were boys and three were girls; three of the boys were born blind, and developed hydrocephalus. Mrs. H——'s grandmother had eighteen children; eight boys, two of whom were born blind. Nothing can be learned as to presence of hydrocephalus. No blindness has been manifest at any time on Mr. H——'s side. Later. The child was born in October, apparently normal. A short time after birth I noticed eye trouble and had the child examined by an eye specialist. He pronounced the condition one of congenital cataract, affecting both eyes. This child died of hydrocephalus at the age of seven months. Still later.— Another child was born apparently quite normal, and was still so at six months of age. In four generations, numbering seventy persons, seventeen (all boys) were either born blind or became so a short time after birth. These children developed hydrocephalus and died in infancy.

In a family of eight children, four of them after the age of puberty had to be sent to a home for the feeble-minded. Other children seem normal. Parents were cousins.

Miss A—— has the second toe lapped over the first toe; little toe lapped over the third toe. Space between

second and third toes normal. Her mother and mother's mother had the same condition.

Mr. C—— was injured in the army: had his arm amputated. His son, a normal man, married a wealthy woman: the first child, a son (grandson of the soldier), had a similar stump of arm.

Mr. D—— reports case of a woman, eight times pregnant: second, third, fifth children were born anencephalic, the other children normal. No family history of this condition.

Mr. Davis and wife, both colored: first child very light. They present the following history: Mr. Davis has two white grandfathers: his grandmothers both black. Mrs. Davis had one white grandfather, remaining grandparents black.

Mr. L—— has a deformed arm, without a palm of the hand, but with rudimentary fingers. One of his daughters has a similar deformity; so has her child.

Mr. U—— has normal arms, but one of his sons has the deformity of an uncle.

Mr. W—— has stuttered all his life. His mother has stuttered all her life. He has two brothers, one of whom is as bad as himself. None of his sisters have stuttered. No stuttering on his father's side. His mother's mother stuttered.

Family of six children: all of whom developed hydrocephalus about the age of two years, and all of whom died before the age of three years. No hereditary history.

Family of twelve children: all of whom are married; each have one child which is insane. The family history is excellent.

The following interesting history I obtained from two men who were members of a theatrical company:

Mr. C. S——, thirty-seven years old. Has a brother thirty-nine years old. Weight of Mr. C. S——, ninety-three pounds, that of brother, ninety-six pounds. Height of Mr. C. S——, three feet, five inches, brother, three feet, six inches. He has two sisters quite tall. Father, six feet, one inch, and weighs 180 pounds. Mother of ordinary size and weighs 130 pounds. Grandparents were all large, and born in Germany. Mr. C. S—— takes six and seven-eighths hat, chest thirty-five inches, in-seam of pants, fourteen inches. Went to school for eight years; has never been sick. Mr. B——, thirty-three years old. Father very tall and thin. Mother very tall and slight. Mr. B—— weighs eighty-seven pounds, thirty-seven inches tall. Has two brothers, all large; two sisters, one large and the other very small, being twenty-nine inches in height. This small sister is twenty-seven years, has been married for four years, has two children, both large, one being an instrumental delivery, while the last was without a physician. Her husband weighs 200 pounds. All their ancestors were large. Mr. C. S—— has been married for four years, has no children. Both Mr. C. S—— and Mr. B—— have deformed chests.

These are but a few of the many cases I have collected. They serve to show peculiar congenital conditions, most of which we cannot explain, either by heredity or influences bearing upon the children in utero. All of the cases which I have not seen personally have been vouched for. I might say that I have never seen any cases where a mutilation, like in the soldier's grandson, has appeared

in a succeeding generation; I will be a "doubting Thomas" until I do.

Malformations owe their causes to either intrinsic or extrinsic origin. The intrinsic causes are that either one or both of the sexual nuclei which enter into the germinal union may have been abnormal, or both may have been normal, but from their union a variety has arisen which from one point of view must be regarded as abnormal. It is also possible that disturbances in the processes of fertilization can give rise to pathological variations. When a similar malformation has been present in the parent, the case is one that has been inherited. The extrinsic causes include concussion, pressure, disturbances in nutrition of the child and infections. The malformations so produced are congenital, but not inherited. One writer says that the assumption that the occurrence of a birthmark in a child in the same region of the skin as that in which the mother has a scar is a proof that this deformity is not inherited, inasmuch as birthmarks and scars are two entirely different pathological processes.

In some physical abnormalities as hemophilia (bleeder's disease), color blindness, etc., it is seen that generally the males are affected, but the disease is transmitted by the unaffected females. Myopia, short-sightedness, generally affects the same sex, i. e., father and son, or mother and daughter. When two parents are normal, with affected ancestors, the children will be normal, but if one of the parents is affected some of the children will most likely have the same condition. When both parents are deaf mutes, one-fourth, at least, of the children will be deaf. If both deaf mute parents are cousins, one-fourth of the

children will be deaf mutes. If the deaf mute parents are not relatives, 7 per cent. of the children are deaf mutes. Acquired deafness is not hereditary.

There are many families in which are found many cases of cancer, gout, rheumatism, goiter, heart disease, lung disease, etc., but still these diseases cannot be said to be inherited. There is frequently no doubt a family predisposition on account of a very feeble resistance to infections, which weakness may be increased by family traits, diet, form of living, etc., so that many an observer might without careful investigation conclude that these conditions were actually inherited.

For similar reasons many nervous diseases as chorea, hysteria, etc., are said to be inherited. I have never blamed any girl for being nervous when she has been compelled to live in the environment of a hysterical mother. We must remember that in these diseases, as well as to a lesser extent, epilepsy, insanity, tuberculosis, alcoholism, criminality, etc., which will be considered in later chapters, there is an inheritance of predisposition to the disease. The morbid condition itself is developed through the action of external harmful influences upon the central nervous system.

INSANITY AND ALCOHOLISM

WHILE medical opinions quite agree in regard to the transmissibility of tuberculosis and syphilis, there is a wide variance of opinion of the best men as to the inheritance of insanity, alcoholism, epilepsy, and different forms of degeneracy. In no line of research do we find so much controversy in arriving at a conclusion as we do in the inheritance of alcoholism and insanity. Equally intelligent men studying the same or similar cases do not agree. The conclusions are affected by the forces behind the investigator, by previous cases, by a desire to prove or disprove certain theories. It often requires almost a superhuman spirit of justice to permit a recognition of phenomena which are the positive results of physical laws. The reason for this being that the investigator is continually endeavoring to confirm certain preconceived hypotheses. I am firmly convinced that it is only occasionally that insanity or alcoholism is transmitted unless both of the parents are affected. This statement should be somewhat qualified, for we do see many cases where only one of the parents or only a grandparent was affected and the disease is present in the child or grandchild. In such instances the germ plasm of that parent has been affected. Mott says that a hereditary predisposition is the most important factor in the production of insanity, imbecility and epilepsy. He further states that the mother transmits insanity more frequently than the father.

We know that when both parents are neuropathic that all the children will be neuropathic. If the parents are normal, with a pure normal ancestry, the children will be normal. In examining the statistics of insane asylums, we find tables giving causes of insanity of the inmates. A careful study of these tables shows that very little dependence can be placed upon these statements for the reason that very many of the causes are those given by friends or members of the family, who have either not been able to obtain or do not desire to give the exact facts in the ancestry of the inmate. It is only in those institutions where a complete family history of the case is taken that any reliance can be placed in such data.

Further, it is only in the past few years that any of the institutions for the care of our defectives, as insane, feeble-minded, criminals, paupers, etc., have included on their staff a competent psychologist or sociologist. It is extremely important from an economical and remedial standpoint that such persons should investigate all cases in these institutions. Then our information will be more reliable and we will be much better equipped to deal with these difficult problems. The writer hopes from time to time to make a personal study of many of our institutions with a view of obtaining a better method of classifying these cases.

The time has arrived when we must come to a clear understanding of the duty of eugenics. If we would believe many of the scientists that heredity plays as great a part as many of them claim, then the work of the Church, charitable institutions, and uplift organizations will have been in vain. The Church can never accept the teachings

of these men. I agree with Dr. Maudsley, quoted below, that our social conditions with alcoholism, disease, etc., will in a very few generations destroy the vitality of the hardiest of races.

“If all the insanity from all causes was wiped out today in three generations the amount would be as great as it is at present; if from alcohol alone, provided that people continued to live as they now do.”—*Maudsley*.

“Statistics will not show accurately the amount of insanity due to alcoholism, for in many so-called alcoholism cases alcohol has been only a sort of a means to bring out some hereditary weakness, such as epilepsy, which, had it not been present, no insanity would have occurred.”—*Dr. Walker, Dixmont, Pa.*

Dr. K— reports 500 cases of inebriety. In 225 cases he was able to trace the ancestral history showing like conditions. In 125 cases he found deficient brains. Mr. Nicholl, studying school children, finds that of prosperous pupils, 32 per cent. had drinking parents, and 68 per cent. abstaining parents; while of poor pupils, 85 per cent. had drinking parents, and 15 per cent. abstaining parents. Out of 102 children in 25 families of heavy drinking parents, he found that 8 showed tuberculosis, 31 nervous diseases, 41 drinkers, 6 degenerates, 4 idiots, and only 5 normal.

Dr. H— reports 1400 cases. In 613 he found intemperance. Insanity was found in ninety cases. He was able to trace a degenerated condition or intemperance, etc., in two-thirds of the parents, one or both; he also found that the condition existed in one-twenty-fifth of the grandparents.

In a New York home for inebriates, insane, etc., it was found that of 600 confined in the home at the time, 265 were inebriates, and 38 were insane. Inebriety was seen in the father in 168 cases, in the mother in 9, and in both father and mother in 12. Insanity was seen in the father in 3 cases, in the mother in 3, in a brother in 6, and in a sister in 7 cases. In discussing variations in man and woman, Ellis says: "Idiocy is mainly a congenital condition, and therefore a good test of organic variational tendency; insanity, though usually on a hereditary basis, is invariably an acquired condition, dependent on all sorts of environmental influences, so that it cannot possibly furnish an equally fundamental test."

Dana recently states: "The most immeasurably important factor in the attempt to limit and prevent insanity is to secure well-born children. To see that persons who have weak constitutions, or those poisoned, do not propagate their kind. This can be accomplished by long years of training and careful education. He says that if we could subtract alcoholism from our social life and nothing took its place we could cut out one-tenth of the cases of insanity brought on directly by this poison. We could possibly subtract a large number brought on indirectly. If we could subtract syphilis from our civilization we could cut out one-tenth more of the insane. But after all, supposing these impossible facts could be accomplished, there would still be left a large percentage of the alienated, and this percentage would include persons who developed disordered minds because they were born with a tendency to mental degeneration. There is an increasing conviction among psychiatrists that some inherited de-

fect, often the most subtle and difficult to recognize, is present in all those who develop mental disorders. Without some original weak spot and the psyche or soma, a man who is infected will not get paresis or tabes; the man who has fevers, toxæmias, will not get a delirium or insanity." Our later conclusions will not entirely agree with Professor Dana.

"In regard to the effects of alcohol upon the descendants, anything which devitalizes the parent, unfavorably affects the offspring, and clinical experience supports this in the lowered height and impaired general physique of the issue of intemperate parents. It also records the fact that no less than 42 per cent. of all inebriates relate a history of either drink, insanity, or epilepsy in their ancestors."—*Dr. Robert Jones, F.R.C.S., Medical Superintendent Claybury Asylum.*

"From the medical and scientific point of view we have this great physiological fact before us, that the first thing alcohol does in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred is to affect the mental working of the brain of the man who imbibes."—*Dr. Clouston, Medical Superintendent Morning-side Lunatic Asylum, near Edinburgh.*

"During the years 1861-65 there entered the asylums of France 14,983 insane persons. In the same space of time, twenty years later, there entered more than 57,000. . . . Dr. Serieux made researches, and found that of the relapsed cases, 78 per cent. were drinkers, while of violent lunatics, 88 per cent. were drinkers."—*The Lancet.*

In the 1913 United States Brewers' Association Year Book, under the heading of Alcohol and Heredity, some of the above quotations are given and many more. After

reviewing these, the writer of that association says, in part: "To begin with, several circumstances must be considered which most of the authors overlook. When one proceeds, for instance, as Dugdale in *The Jukes* and Lidstrom have done, by taking a male progenitor who is alcoholic and paying no heed to the female progenitor, and to the admixture of all the foreign blood which makes it possible for a family to build up one generation after another, one has admittedly foregone the possibility of judging how far any causative relation whatsoever can be supposed to exist between the alcoholism of the parents, grandparents, etc., and the defectiveness of the offspring. In order to arrive at correct judgment it is necessary to prepare and study not only family trees, but genealogical tables. . . . Thus the question of 'alcohol and heredity' may, for the present, be summed up by saying that, so far as hereby is meant the power of alcohol to injure the organs of heredity, research has not hitherto succeeded in showing that such an effect is produced. Moreover, the facts that have been gathered and critically worked over do not seem to support the probability of such a power; but its possibility cannot be denied."

We cannot believe that because a man has been a drunkard his children are necessarily damned, yet there is much in the statement of Johnson, who says that there are in France two periods in each year for the production of degenerates: these are the periods of the vintage and the carnival. Here the effect of alcohol on the parent is such that at the time of conception the germ cells are poisoned and the result is shown in the nervous system of the children.

Dr. Matthew Woods, at the International Congress of Medicine, held in London, in 1913, reported seven cases of epilepsy in children which were traced to alcoholic intoxication on the part of one or both parents, otherwise teetotalers, i. e., these parents were known as abstainers, but for some reason, as a farewell banquet, etc., a condition of alcoholic excitement (for the first time in these cases), was followed with the consequent poisoning of the germ cells, producing the epileptic children. Dr. Woods quotes Maudsley as saying that epileptics, because of drink on the part of the parents, are as much manufactured articles as are steam engines or calico printing machines. Molli has assured us that of all persons inheriting impaired nervous systems from drunken parents, from 30 to 40 per cent. were epileptics. Djerine says that in France 51.5 per cent. of all epilepsies in children were due to parental alcoholism, and but 21 per cent. to parental epilepsy.

Dr. Demme's studies, conducted in Berne, Switzerland, covering a period of twelve years, gave this result: Of the descendants of ten very temperate families, 82 per cent. were normal, and 18 per cent. were feeble or subnormal. Of the descendants of ten intemperate families, with nearly all the same number of children, only 17.5 per cent. were normal, while 82.5 per cent. were feeble and subnormal. Of this group, 43.8 per cent. died in infancy, while of the normal group only 8.2 per cent. died in infancy.

It is quite agreed, then, that alcoholism in the parents is manifested in the children in epilepsy, feeble-mindedness, insanity, immorality, criminality, pauperism, etc. A

woman drunkard who died early in the nineteenth century was the direct ancestor of 834 persons, of whom there were 700 records. Of these, 167 were illegitimate, 162 mendicants, 64 panderers, 187 prostitutes, 7 convicted murderers, and 67 convicted of lesser crime.

Quite a lively discussion has been going on in England for the past four years on the question of whether alcoholism is the cause of degeneracy or is a result of it. In other words, does a man become a drunkard because of the continued use of alcohol, leading to paresis, etc., or is his alcoholism the result of a weakness which he inherited and which determined his desire for drink? The practical man still believes that every normal person has a will and with the average opportunity he can refrain from such degenerate tendencies if he desires to do so. A most radical view, which but few would accept, is that given by Krafft-Ebing, and others, who say that while it is undeniable that an excess of alcohol occurs in degenerate stocks, yet an intolerance is also an expression of degeneracy. This tolerance, they claim, in the abstainer is either because of an idiosyncrasy whereby he cannot drink or does not on account of parsimony. They assert that abstainers have degenerate offspring, in which the degeneracy assumes the type of excess in alcohol as well as even lower phases. Certainly a little learning has made some learned men mad.

It is frequently stated in articles on degeneracy that the percentage of alcoholism among the parents of the feeble-minded is so much, but no attempt is made to estimate the amount of alcoholism in the parents of the non-feeble-minded of the same class of society. Many assert

the percentage of feeble-mindedness is not very great in the population at large. We often forget to include cases in "good families," where the patient is not confined in a charitable institution. The question arises which we would like to settle: When we find alcoholism associated with insanity, should we attribute the latter to the former, or is it quite as probable that the general want of mental balance produces the alcoholism?

"The latest and most authentic statistics show that over 10 per cent. of all mortality is due to the abuse of alcoholism, and fully 20 per cent. of all disease is traceable to this cause; also that over 50 per cent. of insanity, idiocy, and pauperism springs from this source. It is quite generally agreed that from 75 to 90 per cent. of all criminality is caused by the abuse of alcohol. These and other well authenticated facts indicate the necessity of a more exact medical study of alcohol and its effect and influence on society and the individual."—*T. D. Crothers, M.D., Hartford, Conn., Superintendent Walnut Lodge Hospital, 1905.*

Dr. Kerr observed that among 1500 cases of alcoholism, 755 had a history of parental inebriety. Mott finds 5 per cent. of the inmates of the London asylums related. The following case related by an observer gives us a fairly good idea of the problems: Mr. A—— is an epileptic. His parents were apparently healthy until along in life. They died, one of cancer the other of tuberculosis, two years after birth of A——. Grandparents were healthy. A—— was consequently a weakling. The somatic cells of both parents were evidently much diseased at the time of the conception of A——. In such cases we see that

infections and alcohol actually injure the germ plasm and produce nervous defects in the children.

In some recent statistics by Gordon we note: "Bourneville, in 1896, investigated 1000 idiots and found alcoholic parentage in 62 per cent. Legrain's investigations show precocious mental disturbances. In 57 per cent. the subjects were idiots and imbeciles, and 44 per cent. were classed as insane, these being the children of alcoholic parents. Alcohol holds first place among all the poisonous or noxious factors capable of producing degenerative conditions in races, individuals, tissues, organs, and cells which are transmitted to several successive generations. Congenital internal hydrocephalus, various meningocele, encephalocele, anencephaly, and spina bifida, can all be traced to inherited syphilis."

Dr. K—— states that there is a transmission to drink impulse. Defective will power, physical disease, etc., are transmitted by alcoholism. The same authority claims that in inherited alcoholism, the conditions can be overcome by education, culture, etc. Morel says: "I have never seen a patient cured of his propensity to drink which was due to hereditary predisposition. Intemperance is so destructive to the length of life that the expectation of life of a man of thirty of intemperate habits is given as thirteen years, while that of a healthy farmer is given as thirty years.

"The family histories collected during some years in the Galton Laboratory, as well as masses of other data, seemed to indicate definitely that extreme alcoholism was only consequent on the preëxisting degeneracy of the stock. To those who have studied the heredity of physical

and mental defects and noted the frequent appearance of alcoholism in such stocks, it must appear the height of absurdity to attribute deaf-mutism, dwarfism, and physical deformity to parental alcoholism. If extreme alcoholism therefore, be, as we believe from our data, a consequent and not an antecedent of defectiveness, then of what service for eugenic purposes can be a campaign which confuses all grades of alcohol users, and which would not reach the root of the matter, if it succeeded in cutting off entirely all opportunities for the procuring of alcohol? One step only in this direction — the segregation of the mentally defective — would affect at least 50 per cent. of the persons who ultimately find their way into a prison, asylum or inebriate reformatory.”— *Prof. Karl Pearson*.

The Pennsylvania State Board of Charities, in its report to the Legislature, January, 1915, points out that considerable adverse criticism has existed because the State did not have an institution for the treatment of those addicted to the use of alcoholic drinks or intoxicating drugs.

“While on this subject,” says the report, “we are constrained to remark, whether it be directly or indirectly or not within our province, that legislation looking toward the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of harmful products within our Commonwealth might be inquired into with laudable results, and on this subject of legislation generally, that which is preventive in its character is most desirable and might be profitably employed in this instance. In every class of institution within our charge indisputable evidence is constantly before us in the form

of the ravages of disease and delinquency due to the use of alcohol and drugs."

New York State has 30,000 insane in her institutions, which require 11,000 attendants, superintendents, doctors, stewards, guards, and the like after them. Eight million dollars was appropriated by the Legislature for the institutions. An editorial writer recently states: "If affairs are anything as bad as officially reported it must seem that the really feeble-minded are the voters of the State who have indifferently or blindly allowed themselves to be so victimized by the politicians."

In many States the present system of dealing with charities tends to political favoritism. It is absolutely essential that politics be divorced from our charitable institutions. A comprehensive plan for the segregation of the feeble-minded is reasonable and economical. The good of society demands the most complete segregation of all who might be dangerous to future generations as well as a menace and nuisance to this. The intelligent consideration of this problem demands an unselfish policy on the part of our lawmakers and social workers.

SYPHILIS AND TUBERCULOSIS

FROM a practical standpoint it can be said that there are only two infectious diseases that may be considered hereditary. These are syphilis and tuberculosis, and the opinion of the best medical men to-day is that in a strict sense tuberculosis is not inherited; so we have but one infectious disease handed down from generation to generation, viz., syphilis. There can be no doubt that this is the disease which is referred to in the third commandment of Moses, which reads in part as follows: ". . . visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generations of them that hate me." There are authentic cases on record showing where this disease has appeared in the third generation without the second generation having presented any evidence of the infection.

This disease produces more misery, infirmities, poverty, and crime than any several diseases combined, and is a greater "agenic" (against eugenics) force than any other, alcohol excepted. It is a most common thing to see a child born with this disease so severe as to cause its early death, neither parent having known that he or she had the disease, or if knowing it had considered it of little consequence and had married accordingly. A recent report of a New York State insane asylum states that 25 per cent. of the cases of insanity in that institution were due to syphilis. We know that it is the cause of nearly

all the cases of locomotor ataxia, a large percentage of cases of paresis, and other nervous diseases of the adult, apoplexy, malformations of the new-born, and premature births. Surely every intelligent man and woman can see the awful tragedy of human lives due to this one disease. Why then should any one, unless it be for selfish motives, refuse to see the importance of practical eugenics? As a eugenic factor in our social and economic conditions venereal disease will be given subsequent consideration.

In order that the subject of inheritance of tuberculosis may be made clear, allow me to quote from Nothnagel, who says: "Baumgarten and others believe that children are born with the bacillus tuberculosis. The majority of medical men assume that a certain predisposition is transmitted. Jani found the bacilli in healthy male sex organs in five out of eight persons who had died of pulmonary tuberculosis. Dogs have been infected by injection of semen from seminal vesicles of tubercular individuals. Other experimenters have found that if the uro-genital system is healthy, the sperma of tuberculosis patients are, with rare exceptions, free from the bacilli. Infection can take place through the placenta. An intrauterine infection in any one case is proved conclusively if tubercular changes in the fœtus are noted immediately or shortly after birth, so that post partum infection can be excluded. In many cases cited the mother had tuberculosis. The autopsies of children show the slight possibility of transmission, except in rare cases."

I desire to emphasize as strongly as possible the fact that a child is very rarely born with tuberculosis. It is born with a weaker constitution and into an environment

which will soon lead to the infection of the child. A few statistics will be of value.

Demme found out of 361 children in a hospital, but eight tubercular. Dannelongue in 1,006 cases, at one year of age, eighty-seven tubercular. Biedert, in 134 autopsies, found 7 per cent. under one year of age. Heller at Kiel in the deaths from tuberculosis up to one month,—.0 per cent.; two months, 0.83 per cent.; six months, 11.3 per cent.; 12 months, 22.5 per cent.; two years, 29 per cent. In 1,805 autopsies from report of Virchow, none had tuberculosis under two months. Epstein saw no cases of tuberculosis in the foundling at Prague; infants being fed by wet nurses. In the orphan asylum at Nürnberg, with average capacity of 100, many with a tubercular family history, Stitch saw only one case of tuberculosis in eight years. In the Munich Asylum, 41 per cent. of the children showed tuberculosis in both parents; yet only two cases were seen in 620 children. There is no record of atavistic transmission of tuberculosis.

Eugenic measures are accomplishing much in eliminating this disease. The child very rarely, if ever, inherits it. Segregate all the tubercular now living and it would be wiped out entirely, provided, of course, we killed all the tubercle bacilli in our houses, food, etc.

DEFECTIVES — WHO ARE THE SANE?

THE intense eugenic discussion of the day has brought to the public notice many of our social defects, some of which our law-makers are compelled to meet in the best way possible. When doctors disagree, it is quite difficult to know what to do with the patient. Yet, notwithstanding the different methods of treatment, practically all good citizens agree that something must be done with our 300,000 defectives: this is the number in prisons, insane asylums, institutions for feeble-minded, etc., at the present time.

It is estimated that in 1913, 500,000 persons were committed to penal institutions in the United States. The number of the insane in the United States for 1913 is given as 200,000. New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania together furnished over 50,000 of these.

Who are the defectives? Have one interested go to the insane asylum, city poor house, county home and a psychopathic hospital; in these places he will find several thousand insane. Next have him visit a reformatory and an industrial farm and study the hundreds who would not obey their parents and teachers. Then tell him to go to a home for feeble-minded where there are hundreds who have been feeble-minded from birth. He should then visit the penitentiary, workhouse and the county jail and explain why these institutions are so popular that at times it is almost a case of "standing room only." Having looked carefully over those who are clothed and fed at

the expense of the tax-payers, then have him take a little divergence and call at the police stations early in the morning, and later in the day visit the Juvenile Court. In these places he will notice many who are being trained by their lives for a period of rest and relaxation in the institutions previously mentioned. By the time the interested student of sociology has seen this vast army pass in review before him, he will have arrived at that part of his social journey when he will feel like seating himself in some quiet place to ponder over the terrible things he has seen.

Perhaps he may cry out in his bewilderment, "Oh, Lord! How long must such things exist? Whose fault is it that these people are so punished?" Or should he be like the Pharisee, he may say, "I thank thee, oh Lord, that I have been better than these!" Whatever his feelings may be, let him hasten to resume his travels. Have him enter the busy city and glance carefully at those whom he may meet in the crowded streets, observe the penitent ones who are entering churches, spend a few hours in the various grades of the public schools, and then when tired and weary from having gazed into the faces of the great masses of humanity, have him go home, study his family, and at last, before answering the question, "Do any of these who are free to do as they please, look like those in any of the institutions?" Let him look into the mirror for a moment.

It is said that over 60 per cent. of those who live the life of shame are feeble-minded. I neither deny nor affirm the percentage, but verily believe that should any test applied to the men who caused them to become and

continue such, just so surely would many show a marked deficiency in their mental or moral storehouse. There is just as great a vacuum in the cranial cavities of one sex as in the other.

Surely we are not all insane. At least some of us are of a reasonable mind. How then can we determine who is a defective? This article is not a burlesque on all efforts to separate the sheep and the goats, the sane and the insane, but rather an effort to cause good earnest people to pause and listen to what the wild waves are saying. It is a serious thing to stigmatize a rational human being, and is hereafter shown, the poor man with no means for defense has the same right to his liberty and a good name as his brother, who may possess much of this world's goods and have great influence.

The story is told of a murderer who, about to be executed, was visited by an expert anthropologist, who carefully examined his head, measuring it at every angle. After the examination was over the criminal asked, "What do you think of my head?" The expert replied, "You certainly show the positive features and lines of a degenerate." The murderer then said, "If I had as ugly a face and misshaped head as you, I would want to hang." This story well illustrates the sad fact that we all must realize that there is no hard, fast, normal standard by which we can measure sane and insane men.

Our defectives are classed as the insane, epileptic, imbecile, idiot, feeble-minded, criminal, etc. They are required to answer certain questions; they are photographed, examined physically and then properly classified. According to certain tests, children of a certain age

should be able to answer questions and show a memory requiring a fixed amount of mentality. For each school grade there are fixed tests. A psychologist had been subjected by a friend of his to some of these mental tests and failed to make a high average. It is needless to say that he was much chagrined at his poor showing.

As already mentioned, it has been stated by many investigators that over 50 per cent. of prostitutes are below a normal standard. While not disputing these conclusions it certainly would be interesting to take one thousand men and a similar number of women, as they pass us on a crowded street, and subject them to the same tests which were applied to those who were found to be mentally defective. How many of these would have the intelligence of a six-year-old child, a boy or girl of ten or of twelve years of age? If many so examined should be deficient, should we class them as defectives if they had not shown any criminal tendency? If we should thus conclude that many of those on the street are deficient although they have not been known to have shown any criminal tendency, the next logical question is, what determines the criminal? Now, a further investigation will demonstrate that many criminals are intelligent and can successfully pass an examination for his being a perfectly rational being. What then makes the criminal? Is it the devil within the man which cannot be tested, or is it a poison like small-pox which infects by contagion? Can we quarantine only a part of those who might be infected and not those who do the infecting? We must begin on society.

Dr. Arnold Geselt is quoted in a recent publication of

the United States Bureau of Education as saying, that in an ordinary kindergarten and in the first grade with a combined enrollment of 100 pupils we may expect to find one child feeble-minded; one child who stutters; two or three who seriously lisp; another anemic; a badly spoiled child; another babyish, a year or two retarded in mental or moral growth; and still another morally weak. There will be one "negative" child, passive, colorless; one over sensitive, nervous child; another distinctly superior, eager, ardent, imaginative, sociable. We owe much to men and women who are giving their time freely to study abnormal conditions, but we must not always take their conclusions too seriously. It is a much more difficult task to interpret X-ray pictures than it is to make them. It is likewise more difficult to determine just what and how much of the conclusions which are given us in regard to defectives can be accepted. Again, allow me to insist there is no normal standard in religion, politics, morals, or in physical and mental types. Take 100 men at random on the street, in the shop, in the bank or in the church; should we say to them that all should conform to a "standard type" as determined by a specialist? Probably he himself has indigestion, has a bad temper, believes in Christian Science and has few or no children. Practical sociology demands a reasonable consideration of the problems.

We are told that both the insane and the genius have abnormal brains. We see genius and insanity in the same family. Genius is said to be both a product and a cause of degeneracy. Many men of genius are known to have been degenerates. Would the world be better had these

men been treated as we now treat our defectives? If so, should we consider in the same way a genius to-day?

A clipping credited to the *London Saturday Review* says, "Most of the talk at conferences of doctors, sanitary 'experts,' eugenics enthusiasts, lunacy specialists is widely and obviously fabulous, though in apparently unimpeachable figures. One must have first some definition of physical defect, moral flightiness and weakness of intellect. Almost every great man one can think of would be condemned by some congress or other. It is just as easy to prove a steady advance in physique, intellect and character as it is to satisfy the nation that it is chiefly made up of puny and vicious imbeciles."

Why is this treatment of the defective necessary? The answer is that society demands it. These defective persons and their progeny are a menace and expense to good society. Now, does society care? How many men in the best homes, men with great fortunes whose power is felt far and wide, do more real harm to society than many of our so-called degenerates? Granting it to be true, that the idle or the cruel rich are also harmful to society, does not deny society the right to protect itself from the burden of the feeble-minded, etc., constantly thrust upon us. How best to contend with the other part of this problem which has to do with oppression by the capitalist, with vice, etc., is one which must also be solved.

In the United States each year there are several hundred murders. The murderer is classed as a degenerate by many. But the murderer as a rule is not of a class considered dangerous to society. He takes a life, for which he is generally sorry. Few murders are premedi-

tated. Many would like to kill, but for fear of punishment, present or future, do not. You may say that the murderer should be punished because he drinks, because he was drunk at the time. I do not deny the statement. Is he the only one who gets drunk? Who wants him to drink and who profits by his drinking? Hundreds of working men are being discharged by their employers because they drink. This is a good thing for society, but do the employers drink?

Do any "big men" get drunk? Go to their clubs and see. After too much indulgence they are cared for, put to bed, taken home in taxi-cabs and limousines. These same men might have become dangerous with the same amount of liquor had they not been guarded by their friends. You may say that the murderer was jealous. Does his wealthy brother ever become jealous? If not, he is probably able to have an affinity or two; the privilege of the rich. Or you may say that the murderer is insane. Do people with plenty become insane? How much does it cost the State to prove it, or the family to show that it is not so?

Now, if we determine defectives in the same way as we classify the genius, who has a part of his brain hyperactive at the expense of other parts, making an unbalanced mind, just so much must we say that the defectives include all those who have diseased society and leave bad posterity. In which connection let us not forget that this great land of liberty has caused old Europe to give of her best sons and daughters in the belief that justice would be the same to one and all. Should all be weighed in the same balance, even the idle rich with the idle poor?

Those found wanting in intelligence must pay the penalty, for it has been said that "the fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge"; also, "as is the mother, so is her daughter."

Right is might, and although the present generation is witnessing rapid and powerful twists of the old devil's tail, yet he still holds sufficient grip on the running gear of our civic and state organizations to permit many of the bondholders to forswear taxes or to prove alibis against any assertion regarding an incident containing evidence of a lack of sanity on the part of the defendant. Shall our reason be without result? The natural course of natural events will be that ere long things will right themselves. In the meantime let us improve where and when we may.

Having learned that there are over three hundred thousand defectives in the United States who are a burden upon society, and who if allowed to marry and procreate will bring forth thousands equally as bad or worse, the question of remedy is before us. Sociologists are quite agreed that the good of society is paramount to the desires of the individual. It is for this reason we have our detention camps and quarantine for immigrants, that we quarantine those about us who may be infected with small-pox, scarlet fever, etc., frequently to the discomfort and financial loss of the individual, family or property owner. These are really good eugenic attempts to prevent the disintegration of society from the physical standpoint. The order from Scripture: "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out, etc.," is particularly fulfilled. We make one sad mistake in much of this work; we spare the individual

and spoil the community. We are prone to make the old diseased trees of society, grown in any old soil, in any climate, bear good fruit by removing the imperfect apples, peaches, cherries and quinces, in order to make the tree look better; but the tree still bears imperfect fruit. We permit the "yellows" of society to reproduce. The Government orders all trees affected with "yellows" to be cut down and burned. We must likewise treat human defectives. We need not cut down and burn, but we must "remove"; but this removal must consist in preventing these defectives from reproducing their kind.

There are two methods of preventing the progeny of these defectives from being a burden upon us: (1) segregation; (2) sex-mutilation; both of which removes their progeny from society by not permitting such children to be born. Segregation is the ideal method if sufficient suitable institutions could be provided, and the defectives detained until positively cured or past child-bearing period. Segregation is very expensive, and to detain all defectives for so long a time would be a severe burden upon the taxpayers. Segregation of all defectives even until the time of the death of each individual, although so expensive at the time, would be very cheap in the end. If we could eliminate all such by this treatment, but such cannot be accomplished, because alcoholism, disease, etc., would replenish the ranks, we would soon again be in a condition as bad, partially at least, as before we began our treatment. Another disadvantage of segregation is that on account of "rights" of the individual, claims of the family, etc., he is set free, may marry, have a family or produce illegitimate children, and our children then have

these to care for.

Sex-mutilation includes either removal of organs or a less severe treatment called sterilization. The objection to these mutilations are generally sentimental. Sex-organs, they tell us, are sacred and must not be interfered with. Man's nature would be changed by such operations, hence mutilations must not be thought of. For the sake of argument, I will say that some form of sex-mutilation should be practiced on every positive defective as well as on many tubercular, chronic drunkards, etc. It is the ideal treatment. Children cannot be the result of marriage or illicit intercourse. Removal of organs can affect to a certain degree the nature of the boy or girl. The younger the person, the greater the effect of such removal. Sterilization in the male is a trivial operation, and one not dangerous in the female. There is no change in the nature of the individual. Our sex organs are given us for procreation, you say. Do you believe it, and does the present generation prove it? What about our Infant Mortality and Race Suicide?

Why not look truth in the face? Thousands of parents will not have children. Why? Many desire children and are not blessed with such. Why? Listen! Almost as many cases of childless families are the result of the man being sterile as the woman. Why? Disease has destroyed these organs we say are sacred and must not be injured. This is but half the truth and not the saddest part of marital woes. Again, many wives are rendered sterile and operations must be performed on account of disease acquired after marriage. Occasionally women must die as the result of social standards and sentiments.

Furthermore records show that there are one-fourth as many cases of abortion as there are children born. Abortions kill many women. It sterilizes thousands. Remember most of these are self-sterilization. Do not forget that man self-sterilizes himself. Woman self-sterilizes herself. Each sterilizes the other. These are nature's efforts at preservation of a good race; the survival of the fittest. Most of our prostitutes are sterile as a result of disease. Who dares then to talk of sentiment and sacredness of sex organs to-day? Let him but visit our hospitals and see the mutilations which are daily made necessary on our women on account of venereal disease.

If there is any one thing which should be given as a good reason for the votes of good women, it is the preventable sex mutilation. Had the men to submit to pain and removal of sex organs as do the women, there would be such a cry for a special session of legislatures as the country never saw, even in a money panic or a call for war. Venereal diseases would then be treated as are small-pox and the plague.

Two arguments are made against sterilization which must be mentioned. One is that the sterilized man would be free to have intercourse without fear of children. Does he fear to-day? The other is that many married men would be glad to be sterilized, knowing that they would have no children. Such men should not have children and society would be the better therefor.

Let us hope that sterilization will be the treatment of certain criminals, diseased and defectives in future years. Removal of organs should be reserved for severe forms of perversion. We are not yet educated to the necessity.

But, to-day, education must be toward the removal of defectives and toward a rational treatment. To-day in six states, certain criminals, insane and feeble-minded in institutions are being sterilized.

Finally, should it be found in after years that any of these who might be sterilized by a clean surgical operation (not by disease) should have become sufficiently strong in mind to be granted the privilege of parenthood, a second operation could repair the damage done. This vision would do no harm and much good. This view is endorsed by many of our best medical men, clergymen and statesmen, even to-day.

Get in the procession at once! Do not hang on to the tail-end. Seven years ago people laughed when I mentioned anything about eugenics. Now, every organization must talk about it. Get in!

It must be granted that the advocates of sex-mutilations have very little except theory to support them in their contention that no evil results can follow, for so far there are not sufficient data to justify an intelligent opinion as to the end effects of sterilizing operations upon either the individual himself or society at large.

Indeed, sentimental reasons for segregation in training schools are in themselves justification of the policy. According to Prof. Johnstone of the school at Vineland, N. J., these are threefold: First, the privilege which society should be granted to remove from public gaze the idiot and low-grade imbeciles, who are, as a rule, extremely disagreeable or even loathsome in appearance; the inherent right of every child, whatever may be his mentality, to have such education as he is capable of receiving; third,

the right of the normal members of the families of the feeble-minded to live their lives unhampered by the worry and care which the presence of such an unfortunate constantly imposes upon them. . . . The value to the community of the unfortunate classes is not solely the keeping alive of the virtues and charity, but likewise to render an actual service in the advancement of learning.”— Editorial, *New York Medical Journal*.

Dr. J. Madison Taylor answers the above, a part of which follows:

“Abundant and convincing reasons are on record in favor of mercifully and scientifically checking the propagation of the unfit. Now and then asexualization is opposed. Legislation is too often thwarted. The only forceful reasons urged against this eminently humanitarian and economic procedure, however, seem based on shallow sentimentality; on pleas for individual freedom to do as any one may choose or desire . . . painful is it to contemplate a state of society which invites the blackest horrors to fall on innocent members, and is willing to protect itself only after the blow has fallen. There remain to mention a few degenerate scale, so like unto no being made in God’s image, that they are a burden to themselves, a strain upon their ancestry, a blight upon the good green earth, a perpetual horror and reproach to all who see them, cumbering the ground. They are lower than the beasts, far lower than the mangiest cur, the wretchedest abandoned cat. Animated by archaic notions of sentimentality, morbid softheartedness, overwrought, vitiated philanthropy and blind to teratological truths, there are those who insist that these derelicts shall

be permitted to come freely in contact with those of the opposite sex, even encouraged to marry and beget children worse than they."

"If New York State is already providing for 33,000 insane in public institutions it should be able to provide for 15,000 feeble-minded.

Why is it that the State has provided institutions for only 5,000 feeble-minded? It is because of the popular superstition in the community that the insane are dangerous while the feeble-minded are harmless. We are learning at last that the feeble-minded boy and girl are three times more of a menace to the community than the senile dement and the mild chronic insane in our hospitals.

In answer to an inquiry, Dr. H. Goddard of Vineland, N. J., stated that the feeble-minded girl is vastly more dangerous to the community than the feeble-minded boy. The reason for this statement is that the heredity of feeble-mindedness for the most part comes from the feeble-minded girl. Not only is this true but investigation made in New Jersey has demonstrated that the feeble-minded woman is twice as prolific as the normal woman. This arises partly from the fact that the feeble-minded woman is unable to protect herself, partly from the fact that she is not affected by the moral restraints or the regard for consequences which restrain the normal woman."—*Hastings H. Hart, LL.D., Director Department of Child-Helping Russell Sage Foundation.*

The above studies explain quite conclusively the cause of degeneracy, whether it be in form of epilepsy, imbecility, idiocy or feeble-mindedness. All agree that children of such are still worse than their parents. There is no

case on record in which the children of parents, both of whom were feeble-minded, were not feeble-minded or had a worse form of degeneracy. Such births must certainly be prevented in the interests of society as well as from an economic standpoint. How then shall we prevent the multiplication of the unfit?

The data of the New Jersey State Village for Epileptics contain records of 26,422 persons in the pedigrees studied, 10,233 of whom are classified. Of those classified, 28 per cent. are normal, 9 per cent. epileptic, 5 per cent. feeble-minded, 2 per cent. insane, 7 per cent. alcoholic, 9 per cent. tubercular, 19 per cent. died before two years of age, 6 per cent. died between two and four years of age.

In 33 per cent. of the cases studied, there is a history of epilepsy in one or both sides of the family. In 53 per cent. there is a history of a neurotic taint or feeble-mindedness in one or both sides of the family with no history of epilepsy. There are about 400 epileptics in this home with an annual expense of over \$200,000.

MIND AND BODY

ALTHOUGH it is not possible for the developing child to be marked by maternal impressions, we must recognize the great influence our emotions, desires, likes and dislikes have on the physical side of our bodies. Mental impressions for augmentation or inhibition of our various activities are both eugenic and agenic, according as the effect is good or bad. Dr. Crile in his well-known article on Anoci-Association says: "Whatever the origin of fear may be, its phenomena are apparently due to a stimulation of all the organs and tissues that add to the efficiency of a physical struggle for self-preservation through the motor mechanism and an inhibition of the function of the organs that do not participate, the non-combatants so to speak. We fear not in our hearts alone, not in our brains alone, not in our viscera alone; fear influences every organ and tissue, each organ and tissue is stimulated or inhibited according to its use or hindrance in the physical struggle for existence." We might well say that whether we eat or drink, whether we run or remain seated, whether we are joyful or sad, these things influence our bodies, lives and consequently our progeny.

Most physicians agree that there is little or no evidence for a belief in maternal marking of the child. Many cases are seen where markings occur on the bodies of the children, the locations of which correspond to parts injured

by the mother. These are simply cases of interesting coincidence. The power of the mind over the body is certainly great, but such effect is always made manifest directly through the nervous system. There is no nerve connection between the mother and the child at any time during its development. Many persons even assert that a child was marked because the father was injured during the period of child development. The unreasonableness of such a statement is evident to any intelligent person. Why not claim that markings on a young chick were due to impressions of the mother hen during the incubation of the egg. If nature would mark children on account of fear or injury on the part of the mother, practically all children would be so marked. The scriptural account of Jacob increasing his herds by maternal impressions is of no more importance from a scientific standpoint than is that of Jonah and the whale.

Forel believes that two-thirds of all persons who are ill recover without medicine, and that one-half of the remainder do not care for a physician, or will die regardless of treatment, leaving but one-sixth of those ill who can be cured by the physician. The effect of the mind over the body has a scientific side; this phase of the question will be very brief, attention being given to the practical side of this question. As a result of many experiments, it is quite convincing that the mind and the body are one and the same thing, and that a muscular contraction and a thought are but different manifestations of the one and the same entity.

We are much confused by the terms spirit, breath of life, mind and body. It is essential to remember how the

body is developed from two microscopic germ cells. At an early period of the development, life is made manifest by the movement of the blood, by contraction of the heart, etc. We must leave it to the theologian to tell us when the IMMORTAL SPIRIT entered this body and whether this spirit is synonymous with "the breath of life." As far as the mind is concerned, I am satisfied that a careful study of comparative physiology and psychology can explain the evolution of what we call mind or brain power, to be but the highest developed form of matter. Nerve tissue is the last tissue to be developed and the first to degenerate. It correlates the various parts of the animal organism. It connects the animal with the external world, is the seat of our intellect and makes us a responsible being.

Did we dare enter the mysteries of unsatisfactory psychology, we might discuss the two or more natures of the average man. We might grasp at the explanations of these learned "ologists," as to when we were ourself in the natural mind and when we presented a "different ego" because the subconscious or the subliminal mind was then the active force. Such studies may seem fanciful, but they present actual workings of these wonderful bodies of ours. Hypnotic suggestion can compel a man to assume an entirely different nature from the one by which he is known and it is not unreasonable to believe that each of us is daily being affected by suggestions, not intentionally hypnotic, which can alter our personality. Yea, even by auto suggestion, we hypnotize ourselves, commit overt acts which later compel us to pause and wonder why we did this or that. All our senses, emotions

and passions are by various stimuli, many of which are external to the body.

From a biological standpoint, however, it makes but little difference whether mind and body are the same or not; it does concern us whether we can cause illness by some manifestations of mental activity or whether we can remove disease by concentration of thought. There can be no doubt in the mind of any reasonable person that many of the ills with which we are afflicted are self-imposed by the conditions of our mental state. The effects of anger, grief, pain, etc., upon the body are very apparent; yet they are not appreciated. It is quite possible to produce disease which will confine the victim in bed for years by suggestion. A half dozen persons can suggest to Mrs. A. that she looks badly and that she should consult a physician, with the result that she will actually become ill and go to bed. I recall a visit to me by one of our business men. His entrance into the office was indeed pathetic. After a careful examination he was told that nothing wrong could be found and the diagnosis was "business," "tired" and "worry." He immediately became a new being and said, "Let us go to the ball game." John Kendrick Bangs in one of his books tells of the young medical student who had every disease in the book except housemaid's knee. The charlatans know this quite well and make use of it when submitting a list of symptoms to their prospective victims.

Dr. Hunter, the great anatomist, stated that the cause of the heart disease from which he suffered was due entirely to a fit of anger. He died in one of these passions. There is no pain so severe but what some emotion

can at least temporarily inhibit this sense. Accidents, so severe as crushed limbs, etc., do not cause the mental suffering and outburst of pain that we see in one who is having a large molar tooth extracted, or is having a small cut made in his skin. How many persons could suffer an accident to happen and know of it a few hours before it occurs without the greatest mental anguish?

I firmly believe that a large amount of the wrath and rage of this world is due to certain conditions of our body, which act as stimuli to the centers which produce these outbursts. It is more important for the young girl to learn how to cook and be tidy than it is for her to speak French or be an artist in many lines. Alcohol has rightly been accused of being the cause of many wife beatings, but did you ever stop to inquire as to the cause of those not due to alcohol? Irritable temper is given as the principal cause. But why the irritable temper? Is it a natural part of man's nature? By no means, a torpid liver, poor digestion, overwork, worry and many other ailments are the cause of many a crime and much misery. It is contended by many that our better or baser emotions, our most loftiest ideas or sensual passions may be stimulated by the rhythmic vibrations of strings and reeds in musical instruments.

“The exaltation of victory makes wounded soldiers oblivious of pain, and the depression of defeat increases mortality. If a cat is frightened for ten or fifteen minutes by a barking dog, a sample of its blood will make strips of certain muscles relax when they are immersed in it, though such a portion of blood had no effect on them before the emotional disturbance. Frightened rabbits

show almost complete prostration, and their brain cells, in contrast with those of normal animals, take a deeper stain from certain chemicals, and their size and shape are strikingly altered. Finally, if an individual is placed in a circuit with a delicate galvanometer and made to laugh, to feel sad, or is suddenly surprised, there will be movements in the instrument indicating the passage of small electric currents. Such interesting scientific facts as these, and many others, make it clearly evident that emotions are something more than mere states of mind."

F. W. Eastman, in Harper's Magazine.

" But with an angry wafture of your hand
Gave sign for me to leave you. So I did;
Fearing to strengthen that impatience
Which seemed too much enkindled and withal
Hoping it but an effect of humor,
Which sometime hath its hour with every man.
It will not let you eat, nor talk nor sleep,
And could it work so much upon your shape
As it hath prevailed on your condition,
I should not know you, Brutus."

In the above lines Portia censures Brutus for his conduct. This is a very positive demonstration of what man's mind will do to his every action; to his digestion as well as in forming plots against his enemies.

No doubt we will agree that the destinies of nations are determined by the various emotions. Worlds have been conquered and nations crushed by love and hatred. Man is not himself when under the powerful influence of these great passions, if they be not under control. They de-

termine riches, poverty, strength, weakness, bravery, fear, our homes, and the nature and future of our posterity. If then, the negative attributes of our lives act as a hindrance to race improvement, direct efforts must be directed to such culture as will make man a stable mental being. Fear of poverty leads to many crimes; fear of death is a serious handicap to a successful operation; fear of failure in examination is making wrecks of many school children; fear of results with its consequent worry must be regarded as the great factor influencing much of the physical and moral disease seen to-day.

We must be satisfied that a large percentage of the cases of illness will recover without medicine; furthermore, physicians recognize that certain ailments are imaginary. These statements being true, what shall the patient or the member of the family responsible for the care of the patient do? Shall we advise them to wait for nature to produce a cure, or tell them there is no such thing as disease and let them die? The duty of all concerned should be clear. Reputable physicians will declare whether a person is really ill. You may say that many physicians will err in their diagnosis, also after a long period of illness many a case will recover without medicine. I grant this; in such cases recovery is due to one of two reasons — either the patient has been ill and nature has asserted itself and produced a cure, or the patient has not been ill, but lacked the will power to throw off the shackles of a disordered imagination.

In some ailments, drugs to a great extent produce their effect upon the bodies of those sick, according as the physician believes in his treatment and the patient has

faith in the physician. In an old discussion in one of the Oriental tales, we find these interesting truths: "Discuss the symptoms of disease and you will tremble fearing death; but turn your attention to the wonders of various remedies and you will think of life immortal." In another place we find a treatment which was frequently found efficacious: "For skin disease, take three of Aristotle's Categories, two metaphysical degrees, 14 lines of Homer's Iliad, one line from the letters of Abbe St. Cyran. Write these on a piece of paper, fold, tie in a ribbon and carry around your neck. A cure will result."

Dr. A. became convinced that the suffering of Mrs. B. was entirely imaginary, and although she had been unable to get out of bed for several months, he decided upon a novel method of treatment. The doctor got a few mice and when the patient was not looking he let them loose upon the bed and upon the floor. The family was convinced by the way she jumped out of bed and ran round the room that her weakness was curable. Physicians are continually using similar but more pleasant methods in treating such cases.

Some persons are so aberrant in their mental conditions that they can enjoy certain pleasures only by injuring themselves or afflicting injury upon others. How many wives expect their husbands to beat them mercifully in order that their devotion may be shown? This actually occurs in some countries. How many laugh at the idea of taking bread pills? But I venture to say that most persons have taken inert substances faithfully and then been cured as a result of the faith necessary. The physician recognizes that at certain times drugs are harm-

ful and that the patient would be offended were he told that his disease is not real. Many a patient is relieved of her pain and goes to sleep as a result of a hypodermic injection of sterile water. She believed she was getting morphine and knew its value to relieve pain.

There was much virtue in the discordant noises of the "old Indian doctor," who beat upon his kettle drum to restore the sick. The history of witches in the early colonial times shows the state of mind which can be produced by allowing it to be concentrated upon such things. Have you ever witnessed the religious exercises of any of the fanatical sects? I have seen persons so worked up that they would jump over the seats, put out lights and cry out in the greatest agony to be rid of the devil within them. Medical men class as a form of chorea or St. Vitus' dance, the so-called religious sects of the Holy Rollers, Jumpers, etc. By that is meant that they are actually diseased in body, hence their form of worship, which certainly is very harmful in its influence.

Is it possible for the will power to conquer all forms of disease? This question has called forth much discussion. So greatly, in fact, are people interested that we have large sects whose existence is based upon the power of the mind or the influence of prayer to cure disease. As stated before, many of the persons cured would have recovered and many were not ill. Have we forgotten the thousands who were treated by the divine Dowie, now deceased, and his sect almost forgotten in a few years? It can be stated emphatically that many persons were cured of disease by Dowie. Many are being cured by other religious societies uniting faith and prayer. I will go still further, though,

and say that I do not believe that the prayer cured a single one of these persons, only so far as the prayer augmented the faith of the persons under treatment.

“ Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow,
Raze out the written troubles of the brain,
And with some sweet, oblivious antidote
Cleanse the stuffed bosom of that perilous stuff
Which weighs upon the heart.” — *Macbeth*.

“ With respect to the manner in which this kind of suffering comes to be, it may be said that almost every unusual experience has in it one or more elements of causation of subsequent mental pain and derangement. Most certainly, even such experiences as broken bones may lead to it. Likewise, post infections as well as certain endogenous poisonings are sources not to be neglected; also, too many children, too heavy financial burdens, too prolonged hours of arduous labor, physical or mental; too overweening or unrealized ambitions; or poorly cooked food and noxious air; disappointed love or social aspiration; financial reverses and other forms of ‘ill-luck’; as well as unsatisfied deeply implanted longings of every sort; weak will or over-emotionalism; gluttony and laziness; early impressive childish experiences, especially terrorizing dreams, frightful shocks, prolonged perversions of development; gloomy or inadequate education; unpropitious parenthood; vicious or disturbing neighborhood — all these may contribute in incalculable proportion, yet never except by their due share, either to the genesis of a mind painfully diseased, worse still, in many instances, to most serious interference with cure.”—*Dr. Smith Baker* in “ *Canst Thou not Minister to a Mind Diseased?* ”

IMMIGRATION

THE demand of the eugenist is for healthy children. Healthy parents are necessary for healthy children. To a good physical condition we desire the addition of good mental development. Alcoholism, disease, feeble-mindedness and criminality are the great forces working against the ideals for a healthy race. If we further consider poverty, illiteracy and the environment of homes, at times very unsanitary, we have the principal objections continually given against the admission of the multitudes who are yearly coming to this country and settling chiefly in the large cities, making colonies of their own.

To a lesser extent objections are raised on account of the low standard of morals of these immigrants, to their living cheaply and sending large sums of money to their native land, and to their influence on the political situation in these large cities.

At the present time there is much discussion as to what should be the physical and mental tests for their admission into the country, as well as to when and by what tests these foreigners should be naturalized. On account of the large number of illiterates who are given the privilege of the franchise, Congress is now debating and the press is full of news items and editorials as to what should be done to correct this supposed evil. Opinions seem to be quite evenly divided on the question of making more

rigid regulations or allowing present conditions to continue.

"In 1812, the Hartford convention claimed: 'The stock population of the States is amply sufficient to render this Nation in due time sufficiently great and powerful.' In the early fifties, opposition to the alien culminated in the Know Nothing movement, when misguided fanatics, actuated by an insane jealousy of foreigners, not only discriminated against all aliens, but attempted actual persecution.

"It is fortunate for our growth that the immigrant of those early days was of a caliber vastly superior to that of the immigrant of to-day. Of late there has been a rebirth of distrust of the immigrant. That this feeling exists and is even stronger than ever is attested by the numerous magazine and newspaper articles on immigration. Time and again we read protests against the 'horde of illiterates,' or the 'scum of Europe,' or the 'pauper invasion,' which is 'swarming into our country.' The articles are usually the feverish output of some enthusiastic patriot who has not come in close contact with the immigrant for any extended length of time, and whose remarks are misleading, though eloquent and readable." In order that the question of immigration may be clearly presented and the better understood, some interesting statistics are here given:

1910 population United States.....	91,000,000
Foreign born.....	13,500,000
Foreign parents.....	13,000,000
Foreign and American parents.....	6,000,000

IMMIGRATION

125

	Inc. or dec., per cent.
Foreign born from — 1910	Over 1900
Northwestern Europe..6,740,000	Dec. 4
Southwestern Europe..5,000,000	Inc. 175
Italy1,300,000	Inc. 213
Russia and Finland...1,700,000	Inc. 177
Austria-Hungary1,670,000	Inc. 162
Roumania 66,000	Inc. 338
Greece 101,000	Inc. 1,089
Spain 22,000	Inc. 213

	Males	Females	
Foreign born — 1910	7,600,000	5,800,000	
Balkans	19,000	1,700	1,107 to 1
China	54,000	1,800	3,074 to 1
Greece	93,000	7,800	1,192 to 1
Japan	60,000	7,000	870 to 1
European Turkey	28,500	3,700	770 to 1

Foreign born from —

Austria	72 per cent. in cities of United States.
China	73 per cent. in cities of United States.
Hungary	77 per cent. in cities of United States.
Ireland	84 per cent. in cities of United States.
Italy	78 per cent. in cities of United States.
Russia	87 per cent. in cities of United States.
Roumania	92 per cent. in cities of United States.

This percentage is greater in Middle Atlantic States.

Pennsylvania — Population 1910	7,665,111
Allegheny County — Population 1910	1,018,463

Pittsburgh — Population 1910.....	553,905
Pennsylvania — Foreign born 1910.....	1,442,000
Pennsylvania — Foreign born 1900.....	985,000
Pittsburgh — Foreign born 1910.....	141,000
Pittsburgh — Foreign born 1900.....	115,000
Pittsburgh — Foreign born 1910:	
Austrian	21,400
German	29,400
Irish	19,000
Russian	26,400
Italian	14,000
Roumanian	1,521
Pittsburgh — Foreign or mixed parents, 1910	191,000
Pittsburgh — Illiterate, 10 yrs. and over, 1910	26,000
Pittsburgh — Illiterate males of voting age...	14,165
School children in U. S., 1909-10.....	18,000,000
Native born	15,600,000
Native parents	11,100,000
Foreign or mixed parents.....	4,500,000
Foreign born	650,000
Illiterate in U. S., 10 years and over, 1910...	5,500,000
Native white (25 per cent. of total).....	1,378,000
Foreign born (30 per cent. of total).....	1,650,000
Foreign mixed (3 per cent. of total).....	155,000
Negro (40 per cent. of total).....	2,227,000

Percentage of illiterates in population 10 years of age and over:

	City	County
Total	5.1	10.1
Foreign born	12.6	13.2

Three per cent. of native whites and 13 per cent. of foreign born, 10 years of age and over were illiterate.

Only 6.3 per cent. of farm operators in Pennsylvania were foreign born whites.

“An important fact demonstrated by statistics is that in those States which receive a great proportion of aliens every year, the percentage of illiteracy is low, while in the States where the percentage of foreigners is lowest, as Georgia, Tennessee, and Kentucky, the percentage of illiteracy for the State is very high. Illiteracy is seldom a matter of choice with the peasant. It is usually a matter of bad government. It is also necessary to discriminate between the man who is illiterate and the man who is uneducated.

“The majority of the immigrants who are illiterate come here to supply the demand for unskilled labor, and the mere fact of being able to read or write in their own language would not aid them one iota in their work or make them one whit more desirable to their employers. There is often expressed a fear of the growing numbers of the illiterate laborers in this country, because of their tendency to socialism or anarchy. As a matter of fact the illiterate laborer can only be reached from the public platform, and the anarchistic exhorter can be easily suppressed or deported, but it is not so easy to prevent the dissemination of anarchistic pamphlets, which sow the seeds of discord and fan the flame of discontent in the heart of the laborer who can read.

“The great majority of male immigrants are not mechanics, but unskilled laborers. The native American does not engage in the digging of excavations, carrying the

hod, or mining. No native American resents that the immigrant has turned them out of the great Pennsylvania mines. There is quite a large class of immigrants composed of men of poor physique, with their families, admitted every year, because they are skilled in tailoring, shoemaking, baking or other trades which do not require much physical strength. These people are undesirable immigrants. They enter into direct competition with the American tradesman or mechanic, accepting lower wages and working more hours.

“There is no doubt that such a mass of ignorant voters constitutes a great power for evil. But the blame can hardly be charged to the immigrant; rather it is due to the unscrupulous ward politicians who thus increase their following and to the judge who grants citizenship papers without proper investigation of the applicant.”

Mr. C. V. C. Van Dusen says in part: “I find that it is and has been for years past the practice of judges of State courts to hold evening sessions of the court at the behest of the political leaders for the sole purpose of naturalizing hundreds of aliens for political purposes with a full knowledge on the part of the judges that the aliens have been bribed to become citizens and voters by the payment of their naturalization fees by the political organizations.

“It is unfair to charge to the alien the political corruption and cheapening of the rights of citizenship, resulting from this condition of fraudulent or careless naturalization. The fault is in our laws, and to an even greater extent in the lax administration of them.

“The power of issuing certificates of naturalization

should be withdrawn by Congress from the various State courts and should be restricted to United States courts."

There is no longer demand for foreign skilled labor in the United States. Americans can fill the requirements of the skilled laborers and mechanics, but if capitalists had to depend on native Americans for the unskilled labor necessary for their projects, these projects would never be carried to completion, or, if attempted, would be certain of financial failure.

While it must be admitted that the illiteracy test would debar many thousands of undesirable immigrants and prospective dwellers in the tenements, it is doubtful if this result would compensate for the loss of 32 per cent. of such sterling laborers as the Poles, or 35 per cent. of the Slavs in general, in view of the fact that as large, if not larger, proportion of the undesirable immigrants could be debarred by requiring a high standard of physique, without seriously affecting our supply of unskilled labor. Much of this chapter is from the studies of Dr. McLaughlin and others, to whom due credit is herewith given.

President Roosevelt in his message to the Fifty-eighth Congress, December, 1903, said: "We cannot have too much immigration of the right kind, and we should have none at all of the wrong kind." The great importance of immigration to eugenics is easily understood when we observe the constitution of our children as studied in our schools and the proportion of foreigners in our hospitals, penal institutions, and among the unemployed.

From an ethical standpoint, the foreigner who will not be a burden upon society has the same right to come to our shores and dwell among us as had our forefathers.

Further, those coming to-day are compelled to purchase any land which they might claim as their own, while the early settlers obtained theirs by might and skillful trading with the Indians.

This country is sufficiently large and the natural resources so unlimited that many more millions could easily earn a livelihood, were the population properly distributed. Important studies are being made, and laws enacted to conserve our forests, the water supply, mineral deposits, etc. We are just beginning to observe the great extravagance that has been manifested in the use of our agricultural land. The future of America must depend primarily on the fruits of the soil. Millions of acres in our Eastern and Southern States are not under cultivation. Large tracts have been neglected. Regeneration has already begun. Intensive farming must be the aim of the agriculturist. Scientific farming must more and more take the place of the factory.

Such being the case, how does immigration affect these results being accomplished? We have already seen that but a very small percentage of foreigners can and will till the soil. Professor Ross, in the November, 1913, *Century*, says: "Failing to contribute their due quota to the production of food, these late-comers have ruptured the equilibrium between field and mill and made the high cost of living a burning question. Just as the homestead policy overstimulated the growth of farms, the new immigration has overstimulated the growth of factories." Our forefathers were a hardy race; many immigrants to-day are of poor physique, these going to the large cities, either to be parasites or competitors of skilled labor. This is

what is taking place, and our farmers are not able to obtain sufficient help much of the time. Our female house servants are largely recruited from the immigrant girls. Many of our own young men will not perform manual labor, preferring to remain in idleness than to do the work of a laborer. The result of this is that many of our girls grow up ignorant of housework, physically unable to become wives and mothers, a very sad condition for future generations. Many of the men are unable to support such homes and the domestic relations are very unhappy and divorce must result.

Some of our economists believe that the Government should determine where the immigrant should settle, in order that there will not be so much stagnation in the large cities. This country has been rightly called a great "melting pot," and it would appear that the great vessel was filled with sweet scented things to attract so many to it. Our schools, civic organizations, churches, etc., must be great refineries. It is not possible to make this vessel a separator. We must amalgamate. The immigrant must merge his identity with that of the Nation. Our democracy permits the Russian, the Italian, the German, the Briton, the grandson of a black slave, and the sons of those blue-blooded Bostonians who came over in the *Mayflower* to sit side by side and discuss the civic and political affairs of this country, which grants certain liberties to all. This is an ideal state of society, and if all nationalities in this country can so adapt themselves to the best interests of all concerned there should be no opposition by the eugenists to the great influx of immigrants annually coming to this country. In a recent bul-

letin of the National Geographic Society, an organization of more than 250,000 members, the director says, "The United States is taking more pains to-day to see that a Hereford bull or a Southdown ewe, imported for the improvement of our cattle, are sound and free from disease than it takes in the admission of an alien man or woman who will be the father and mother of American children." The bulletin suggests that immigration should be considered from the eugenic standpoint.

The present agitation in Congress as to illiteracy of the alien being a sufficient reason for debarring him is hardly to the point. Our laws are probably sufficiently good, but the regulations as to who should be excluded are not enforced, and those offending are not punished for the part they play in making the laws noneffective. The influence of the steamship companies is too apparent. There is too much economy in the provision of inspection of those entering our ports. It is impossible for two medical officers to inspect 5,000 immigrants in a day, which task they frequently have to perform.

In brief, our restrictions are as follows, the classes of aliens named being excluded:

Class A — All idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded, epileptics, insane, and persons who have been insane within five years previous; persons who have had two or more attacks of insanity at any time previously.

Class B — Paupers, persons likely to become a public charge, and professional beggars.

Class C — Persons afflicted with tuberculosis or with a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease, and persons physically and mentally unable to earn a living.

Class D — Criminals, polygamists, and anarchists.

Class E — Prostitutes or those who are commercially interested in prostitution.

Class F — Persons called contract laborers.

Class G — All children under sixteen years of age, unless accompanied by one or both parents, at the discretion of the Secretary of Labor; there are several exceptions.

An alien should have, generally speaking, enough to provide for his reasonable wants and those dependent upon him until he can obtain employment. There are now twenty to twenty-five thousand aliens debarred annually. I believe that most persons who are interested in the welfare of our future generations will agree that those restrictions are quite sufficient if they are enforced, and if proper wage, working hours, restraint of trade, sanitary, educational, etc., regulations are made for all persons in the United States. Special restrictions are already made for Chinese and Japanese.

Let us look briefly at a few of the problems of the immigrants as they affect our social conditions and consequently as they influence parenthood and the children. Many of our immigrants to-day are of the age and sex which predispose to crime. We observe that a large percentage come to this country to obtain better wages than they could get at home. A very important factor in the moral aspect of this male adult problem is the fact that for one Chinese woman who has been admitted, there were over three thousand Chinamen, and for one woman from Greece and the Balkans there were eleven hundred men from these countries. The importance of these figures is surely grave when the question of prostitution is considered.

It is very possible that some writers censure too severely foreigners as a whole, in that those who are now being admitted are under a certain degree of censorship, while much of the crime is committed by those who came into the country when the regulations were less rigid. Our slums are always pointed to as the result of the foreign element among us. It is continually stated that our race is being multiplied from the classes dwelling in the unsanitary localities. This is true to a great extent, but the slums were already established and it is probable that the immigrant is a victim of these conditions, not the cause of them. Not only in the United States, but in other countries sanitary laws are being enforced. In London, many thousands of bad dwellings are being torn down. We can only expect that the foreigners from the various countries will keep much together in our cities.

In Pittsburgh we have our colonies of Italians, Hungarians, Polish, Syrians, etc.; such an arrangement is better for them socially and from an economic standpoint. It is possible for them to have their own churches by such settlements. It takes about three or four years for these persons to acquire our language and understand our customs sufficiently to live apart from their own people.

The school problem is a very great one, for the children of the foreigner must be educated. Our laws require all children between certain ages to attend school. Their parents are very anxious for their children to be educated, knowing that they will therefore be the better able to learn our language. Many of these children teach their parents to speak English. It is even said that many mission Sunday-schools are well attended for this reason.

With the exception of the Russian Jews, but few foreigners come to us to escape religious persecution compared with former years. The only objection to these is that many of them are revengeful and continually complain of their old persecutions. They are often in strife; many are restless, continually in litigation. As in Europe, they frequently settle in localities where the population is the most dense, where there is more or less political turmoil, for there their restless and unrelentless spirit will be less offensive. Most of these have a certain inherent family pride, they are quite ambitious, filled with a marked degree of parsimony. They have respect for our laws and customs as a rule; they have a nervous make-up, all of which make them such as to be classed as our best or worst citizens. Summing up, I would say that the foreigner is with us. We must do the best possible for him. He must be taught to assimilate the best of our customs and abhor the worst. Labor conditions must be such that vast numbers are not idle in our great cities. He must not increase alcoholism and crime among us. He must be taught how to live that the percentage of infant mortality will not continue to be so great with them. He must not be a burden upon our hospitals and charitable organizations. He must know that a healthy body is essential for good parentage. But in teaching our immigrants these things let us not forget that we ourselves are not free from many of the sins for which we blame him, and as Mary Antin says: "All these things shall be interpreted to mean that the love of liberty united all races and classes of men into our close brotherhood, and that we Americans, therefore, who have the utmost of liberty that has yet been attained,

owe the alien a brother's love."

In conclusion I quote from a recent speech by Hon. Lathrop Brown, Congressman from New York, on "Immigration": "In the light of recent research I am forced to the belief that, by reason of the inherited qualities of mental soundness or defect, this house in this legislation must now decide whether, by adopting the unjust and inefficient literacy clause, it will burden our splendid and unequalled race with defectives, degenerates, and criminals through unnumbered generations, or whether, by rejecting the literacy clause and by substituting therefor some wise amendments, it will admit the progenitors of normal, sane and industrious citizens, whose good qualities through the years to come will be transmitted unimpaired to their, sturdy American descendants."

In his message to Congress concerning his veto of the immigration bill, January, 1915, President Wilson said in part: "It is with unaffected regret that I find myself constrained by clear conviction to return this bill (H. R. 6060, an act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States) without my signature. Its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which the measure relates. But candor and a sense of duty with regard to the responsibility so clearly imposed upon me by the Constitution in matters of legislation leave me no choice but to dissent."

"In two particulars of vital consequence this bill embodies radical departure from the traditional and long established policy of this country, a policy in which our

people have conceived the very character of their government to be expressed, the very mission and spirit of the nation in respect to its relations to the peoples of the world outside their borders. It seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of men; and it includes those to whom the opportunities of elementary education have been without regard to their character, their purposes, or their natural capacity."

"Restrictions like these adopted earlier in our history as a nation would very materially have altered the course and cooled the humane ardors of our politics. The right of political asylum has brought to this country many a man of noble character and elevated purpose who was marked as an outlaw in his own less fortunate land and who has not yet become an ornament to our citizenship and to our public councils." By a narrow margin the House failed to pass the bill over the President's veto.

CHURCH AND EUGENICS

IT is not surprising that some of the clergy should not only hesitate to accept some of the teachings of eugenics, but should even preach against such doctrines. The reason for such opposition to this most noble science is due to the fact that many eugenic scientific brethren teach only the improvement of the physical nature of man. Those opposed say that this eugenic teaching to better the physical side of man is dangerous in that the morals are forgotten. Eugenics pertains, they say, only to what is of the brute nature. They claim that a good man is not of any perfect physical type. To this I agree, and will even go the enemies of eugenics one better and say that an infirm body is often the reason of such a man's piety. For him who cannot sin, there is no sin. The miser may hide himself from society, that he will not spend his savings, and the burglar with a broken leg will not risk capture by housebreaking.

I would ask any who do not believe in eugenics to read and study carefully the definition given on frontispage by Francis Galton. We believe that a healthy man is generally a more rational man than a weakling; that a healthy race is better morally than one composed largely of tubercular, insane, syphilitic and otherwise diseased persons, and that when the physical make-up of the people of any country shows marked decay such a nation must fall, and in its decline it will also show a moral decadence, which immorality is largely due to the physical constitution of its people

and the causes which produced such a decline. On the other hand I will agree that a strong race, as the American Indians, never was an ideal people because they lacked a religious training.

Our contention is that man is better as an individual, family, race or nation if he is improved physically, to which must be added the religious training of faith in a superior being and controlled by a rational code of moral laws. Only such gives us a vision of the ideal superman. Eugenics assists in this development.

The Scripture from the book of Genesis to the end of the New Testament is full of eugenic teachings. Man and animals are reproduced, like bearing like. The effect of disease on the physical and moral natures is frequently pointed out. In the commandment we are told that disease is handed down to the third and fourth generations. Many laws on health were given to the children of Israel. The effect of association and marriage into idolatrous nations is emphasized many times.

It is quite evident that most religious denominations have a strong belief in eugenics. It is being taught in many pulpits. The writer has discussed the subject in very many churches of Pittsburgh and vicinity, and never once has he stated that a perfect physical body would save any man future punishment, but has taught that health is a means to an end. A man will sow wild oats and be forgiven by repentance. But prayer and repentance alone will not remove the effects of broken physical laws nor prevent the wife and children from suffering on account of the sin of the husband and father unless the disease is cured. The spiritual life awakens the conscience of man

so that he will endeavor to remove disease from himself as well as prevent others from being afflicted — provided he knows what he should do in such a case.

Let us then all labor to improve where we may. Man has always been a great composite; at birth he inherits from many hundred forefathers, and during life he is a great mirror reflecting rays from the multitudes with whom he comes in contact. The strong is strengthened by helping the weak physically and morally. Sparta has left no trace but her history; she cared only for physical strength, and wasted that strength and power which are in weakness. The heathen in Korea will accept and have faith in the teaching proclaimed by the Methodist, Presbyterian, Catholic or Mohammedan. Why? Man lives by faith. He has always strived to grasp the supernatural. A healthy mind, as the result of a healthy body, assists much in removing myths, superstition, etc. There is no dissension between science and religion. The supernatural is but natural if understood. Love and nature, man and God implies beauty. Beauty presents a sense of completeness, of harmony in itself, nothing lacking, nor too much. Let us then cultivate the beautiful and destroy those things which should not be a part of nature. Society demands it; the Church progresses thereby. Wells once said that he was afraid to permit any man to be sick, poor or miserable, and bring up sick, poor, miserable children, for he could not tell what man's grandchild would one day marry his grandchild.

I give herewith a statement on "Eugenics and Marriage" by Dean Sumner, and some opinions of the clergy and medical men on Dr. Sumner's position as presented in

a symposium by the *Medical Times*:

“The time has come when false modesty should be laid aside. We should face the grim facts that present themselves to us from every quarter. The American people are too conventional about such matters. It is the daily duty of the medical profession to assist in preventing marriages between the unfit, and the medical journals should join hands in proclaiming the necessity of a closer study of eugenics.”—*Rev. Walter Taylor Sumner, D.D., dean of the Episcopal Cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul.*

“It is criminal to allow physically and mentally deficient persons to marry and propagate their kind. Sentiment in favor of the prevention of such mesalliances is growing rapidly and a decided impetus has been given the movement by Dean Sumner of Chicago, who demands health certificates from prospective bridal couples.”—*Medical Times.*

“The attitude of the church people toward the problem of eugenics is largely one of indifference through ignorance. There is, however, among clergymen a growing recognition of the fact that the philosophy of eternal well-being has a very necessary counterpart in the science of physical being. When the American people will be willing to cease talking flippantly about virtue, toning down harsh names to such glib and cant words as ‘affinity’ and ‘flames,’ and will be willing to call adultery by its right name, and when they will guard their homes and their children with as much vigilance as they guard their business investments, then we may be ready for such a sweeping law to guard our liberties as the one suggested.”—*Rev. William Hiram Foulkes, D.D., Rutgers Presby-*

terian Church, New York.

“There is no doubt that the decision of the Chicago dean is a step in the right direction. Clergymen, physicians and educators ought to coöperate in using their influence to see that proper laws are placed upon the statute books whereby the end sought could be attained.”—*Rev. Addison Moore, D.D., Fifth Avenue Baptist Church, New York.*

“Nothing is more important, to my mind, in our question of marriage, than to use our powers of social control to prevent many people from marrying — those, namely, whose marriage, for one reason or another, can be ‘nothing but a tragedy,’ and whose parenthood is a social danger and disgrace.”—*Rev. John Haynes Holmes, Church of the Messiah, New York.*

“I am in hearty sympathy with any movement which will prevent the abnormal and the physically and mentally diseased from entering into matrimonial relations. The future physical life of the American people demands that something shall be done.”—*Rev. William H. Crawford, president of Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.*

“It will be much easier to settle the question whether both parties are free from the venereal taint than to determine whether they are fully en rapport with each other in the deepest things of marital life. It is clearly within the province of the State, as a matter of health, to forbid the marriage of diseased persons.”—*Rt. Rev. Samuel Fallows, Presiding Bishop of the Reformed Episcopal Church, Chicago, Ill.*

“I sympathize with any effect to improve our race by a stricter supervision of marriage in the way of physical

and mental qualifications of the contracting parties. The science of eugenics demands that we give more attention to the improvement of mankind, by care and selection, as we do to bettering the breed of animals."—*Rev. Henry M. Sanders, D.D., late pastor Madison Avenue Baptist Church, New York.*

"There are certain changes needing to be made in our social life, changes which are rather generally recognized as desirable and even necessary. One such change has to do with requiring candidates for marriage to come before the officiating clergyman, civil official, equipped with a certificate furnished by a reputable physician testifying to the physical fitness of the intending parties, and to the fact of their sound mentality and their freedom from incurable or contagious disease."—*Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst, D.D., Madison Square Presbyterian Church, New York.*

"Whatever sceptic could inquire for,
For every why he had a wherefore."

—*Butler: Hudibras.*

The more we appeal to reason, the more reason there is why the Church should be a unit in teaching eugenics. A Pittsburgh minister preached a sermon one year ago on the subject of "Give the Church a Rest." He took for his text: "And now also the ax is laid to the root of the tree."

Among other things he said in explaining this text: "The Church should not cut off a few obnoxious branches." "Cutting off a few limbs adds strength to the other limbs." "Checking evil along any certain line

usually intensifies it along other lines." "Cutting off branches makes new roots to appear." "Cut the roots and all the branches of the tree die." "To bring about personal and social regeneration with the gospel of Christ is the mission of the Church." "The hobby-horse of eugenics ought to be tied to the front of the doctor's office."

I do not believe that any clergyman, be he Jew, Catholic, or Protestant, would preach that sermon to-day. They are quite all of one accord as to the duty in personal and social regeneration. Would this preacher prevent his boy from telling a lie? If he did he might be worse in his other sins. Does the city allow arson and burglary in order that there will not be more murder? Is the Church afraid to preach against certain sins, fearing that thereby others will be worse? The individual must be entirely regenerated to be sanctified, but among the righteous there is none perfect, no, not one. No, we must not kill the tree in a literal sense. Pruning a tree does make it better, but man is not all sin in all of his branches.

Some minister has said that the only remedy against sexual sins is self-denial, and for self-denial man must have a motive. The motive is supplied by supernatural faith alone, faith in God and the hereafter.

This is true, but we must not forget that the real practical translation of a common Scriptural phrase would read: "Faith without works makes many dead." Do we allow our doors to remain open that thieves may enter and help themselves? We are not yet so charitable. When it comes to money, jewelry and other earthly things of value, we take every precaution, but when it is only the health of our family and the physical welfare of society

we are prone to be apathetic or say that man is made in God's image and we must put all in faith.

Another says that legislation can control only the external acts and cannot touch the things of conscience. Did Moses so instruct the children of Israel? Is it not a matter of conscience when man breaks many of the physical laws? Do men who have lust of the flesh, men who steal and murder, never have a sense of reason? If so, it is because their physical bodies have so reverted to the animal that they are no longer men.

"Marriage is a fundamental contract between man and woman," says another. Would that it were always so. But how about the mother who says her daughter must marry the rich young rogue? How about the customs of kings and those who control the descent of the crown? Are their sons and daughters free to marry for love? How about the Church forbidding the sons and daughters from marrying into other religious beliefs? I am not condemning all these, merely say that they are cases of positive eugenic or agenic marriages. The preacher may not believe in evolution and the laws of heredity, but when he tells his hearers that the wicked man will be a curse to his children, he emphasizes the danger of intemperance of the father, of sexual sin of the mother their children will suffer, he preaches eugenics and denies its value at another time.

Montesquieu said in "The Spirit of the Laws," almost two hundred years ago: "We ought not to decide by divine laws, nor determine by human what should be determined by divine laws. . . . Human laws appoint for some good: those of religion for the best. The influence

of religion proceeds from its being believed: that of human laws from their being feared. . . . The laws of religion have a greater extent. . . . The law of religion (speaking on marriage) insists upon certain ceremonies, the civil laws on the consent of fathers; in this case they demand something more than that of religion, but they demand nothing contrary to it."

Auguste Comte said: "All phenomena, without exception, are governed by invariable laws, with which no volitions, either natural or supernatural, interfere." We grant that physical laws are fixed, but while it is true that inflammable material when lighted will burn, producing certain substances, reason tells us that we can frequently prevent the material from being so inflammable, and we might prevent the fire entirely. The Mississippi River may overflow its banks with the loss of many lives and much property, but cannot we build levees? Can we not put rods on our buildings to thwart the path of the lightning? Do we not have airships, wireless messages, hypnotism, etc.? In fact where we see that physical laws are detrimental, we endeavor to prevent those laws from being effective as far as we are capable of so doing. We cannot agree with Comte.

Some great physician of France once said that he had dissected many men and that he had never found anything in nobles different from the rest of us. How mighty is the power of such reason! Did he study men alive? I am firmly convinced that sanity depends upon a healthy body, that reason can only come from normal brain cells, that a healthy body is more likely to produce a normal mind than a diseased one, and that a faith in right and

God is only of value when coming from a mind capable of reason. The prayers and religious experience of those under a great emotion are not as the result of reason, hence not real or of value.

It is pleasing to note that a prospectus for a course in eugenics given at the Mount Morris Baptist Church, New York, says: "If the Church is to assume authority over the marriage contract, it has a much greater duty to its young people in educating them on the significance of the propagation of the race and to the ultimate happiness of the home." In conclusion let us urge Church union: a closer bond between all religious beliefs in the common brotherhood of man. The people of early Christian times did not know that the child could be punished when the question was asked: "Who sinned that this man was born blind?" We know that 30 per cent. of the children in the blind asylums are there because of venereal poison having been in those eyes. Let us forget our difficulties as to the "dividing of the Red Sea," the story of "Jonah and the Whale," and many others, and become practical eugenists and obey the eleventh commandment, loving one another, even to the caring for the sick and preventing the disease and misery to the utmost of our ability.

"Churches are taking a new interest in the questions which arise out of unhappy marriage and easy divorce. Many persons who get a smattering on eugenics are eager for legislation to make marriage conditional in bodily and mental health, and to keep in confinement the feeble-minded, the alcoholic and the insane, not only till they are of age, but till they are incapable of breeding their like. Some knowledge of social hygiene and eugenics has

led many persons to advocate hastily-prepared legislation as a panacea for evils which terribly afflict modern communities, and yet are ancient. Such is the genesis and such the immediate outcome of the new and widespread interests in sex hygiene. . . . Nothing but the compulsory seclusion of all defectives under humane housing, training and labor conditions will accomplish the eugenic object of the community.”—*Dr. Charles W. Eliot, in an address before the International Congress on School Hygiene, August 30, 1913.*

THE CHURCH, SOCIETY, AND THE SOCIAL EVIL.

PROSTITUTION is the abuse of natural and proper body functions or processes whether they be sexual or otherwise. Any force attracting one sex to another in such a degree that empires are determined to rise or fall by its influence, certainly demands full consideration. The manifestations of the sex-pull have been observed since the beginning of time and will be for generations to come. The most holy human individuals who know or see no sin declare that this question is not within the pale of polite consideration. This also applies to those "nice" people with a social standing who care not to soil their hands and minds with the doings of the "inferior classes." May the Lord have pity on these Pharisees! The Scripture is full of the natural man and his sexual sins. In Tamar, we find the first sacred account of public prostitution; in David, we observe that the sex impulse was the same in the royal man as in the humble servant. It is in St. John that we find the real consideration of the adultress when Christ said, "Neither do I condemn thee, go and sin no more." . . . "Let him that is without sin be first to cast a stone."

The libertines of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Greece, and Rome furnish history replete with this evil. In modern France considerations were given to the dangers of prostitution and the attempts to abolish the brothel were entirely due to the fearful destruction of the health and life of even the innocent at home by the spread of venereal

disease on account of the general cohabitation of the men of France with these infected women.

Practically, to-day most of the efforts which are being made to eliminate this evil are due to the terrible ravages of venereal diseases upon the health and life of the better classes, who are awakening to the necessity of vigorous treatment against these diseases. Very few organizations have come into existence on account of the sin of promiscuous intercourse, aside from the physical considerations. It is for this reason that the Church has been slow to take an active part in this warfare and the philosophy of prostitution becomes a more difficult problem therefore.

Mandeville, 250 years ago said, "It is manifest that there is a necessity of sacrificing one part of womankind to preserve the other."

Luther waged a merciless war against houses of ill-fame. Henry VIII of England suppressed them; Berlin, in 1607, closed them, since which time they have been closed and opened many times. In Hindoo literature we find, "Let the woman who approaches a stranger be regarded as a spirit of hell."

The public knows but little of the enormous amount of the psychopathic state so evident in the prostitute and her co-partner in the awful practice of some forms of perversion. Studies show that frequent visitations to the brothel soon produce some form of perversion or mental depravity.

The animal sexual instinct is a natural attribute which provides for the preservation of the race. In man with intelligence and reason we frequently observe that knowl-

edge of the result of an infraction of well-known physical laws does not prevent the offender from committing acts which he certainly knows may prove disastrous to himself and others dependent upon him.

We cannot gain much by discussing the primal cause of prostitution. To solve that problem would be to solve original sin and the effect of all of our digressions to-day.

Comparative physiology implies an understanding of comparative normal anatomy, hence in like manner a study of comparative social pathology means a knowledge of man's nature, the composition and diseases of society, which problem has baffled scientific men since the beginning of time. Moral acts must be mental acts. Every moral act must embody a purpose, be a choice of two or more ends, and is judged by the doer before and after.

Prostitution has always been present with us. The explanation is quite clear; the animal nature for sexual intercourse unrestrained by custom and philosophy of the various ages and places. Let us not criticise others who have lived in a darker age for committing acts repulsive to our day, for history shows that many of the ancients while practicing idolatry and strange customs were far superior to some of our intelligent men. These same heathen would shudder at the sight of some of the modern sexual sins and horrible deeds practiced by those living on vice to-day.

Laws of state take no recognition of any inequality in man's liability and responsibility. There is no variability in the results of physical laws broken by the rich or the poor, other things being equal. But the divine judge who alone can administer to the wants of all persons and

knows that each individual is a great composite of many ancestors and that each individual is constrained by different influences, will certainly take into account these differences, else such a judge does not exist.

Virtue and vice are only relative terms. In some persons a state of neutrality exists and there is neither present; this is due to defect.

The sex attraction is rightly called the master passion. When all goes well with this passion and its belongings, the whole passion and nature becomes an instrument of music and harmony. When reverses are met, the emotional nature is convulsed and there is no longer music but harsh discord. The passion can produce the most exquisite pleasure or direful misery. Its powers for gracious mercies or for wrathful vengeance knows no bounds.

Man's actions are largely controlled by and he labors for, woman, pleasure and money. The fight against sin is the struggle against the methods and customs for obtaining these three desires. The desire for these three may be right or wrong. When there is no desire for these three upon the part of man there is decadence or defect. Religious sentiment, reverence, piety, contrition, sorrow, charity and abstinence are frequently the result of experiences in pursuit of these three things or on account of some physical inability to pursue them.

Each individual is in a large sense a law unto himself, in that no two persons are created alike in ability to react in the same way to similar stimuli. Lower the power of resistance, increase the susceptibility to reactions or increase the stimulus in the way of temptations and man will sin more easily. The effect is more positive if any

one or more of these conditions are made continual in action.

Ask the man why he commits sexual sins and he replies, "Eve tempted me." Ask the woman in turn and the answer is, "The serpent man is responsible." The solution is as unsatisfactory as the biological problem of which came first, the hen or the egg.

In all attempts to restrict and eliminate the social evil, the honest worker is always under the influence of three classes of persons: (1) Those who say that prostitution has always been present with us and it will always exist. All attempts to eliminate must prove fruitless. (2) The only way to solve the problem is to close all houses at once. (3) A class between the first two, who acknowledge the tremendous task but are willing to assist or encourage methods of minimizing this evil. In the second class we find many who demand "all or none" should be eliminated. Churches have refused to assist for this reason; but I am glad to state that very many of the churches are becoming very active in the fight against vice, knowing that to save a certain number of girls is better than none, and helping to eventually reduce the evil to a minimum or eliminate public prostitution entirely if possible.

The Church has learned that religion and efforts to improve must be practical. It realizes that there can be less discussion of "Moses and the bulrushes," "The dividing of the Red Sea," and "The fall of Jericho," and more work like that done by Christ and the Apostles who went into the midst of sinners and who did not make a difference of rank and file. The Church must not be afraid to soil its hands; it must know that prevention is

better than cure. The organization of the Church must put aside petty jealousies and labor together for the great common good of all. There must be a definite purpose in an organization. Citizens are willing to assist and donate money to a society which does things, but not for organizations which simply elect officers and meet from time to time. The Church must realize its power; it must fight vice with the weapons they use, but in a proper way. If the Church forces were organized like a political party, it could compel the agents of the devil to get out of business in a very short time.

The Church must improve society by studying the constitution of society and its individual members and the factors which cause public opinion to be expressed as it is to-day. Society must not be allowed to sanction evil things. Society permits the young man to sow his wild oats, but ostracizes the girl who has the stigma of having led a life of suspicion. Society permits illegitimate children and forgets the man who sinned, but forbids the woman to regain her lost honor. Society permits the man to disease wives and children, causing frequent mutilations and removal of woman's sex organs, but forbids that laws be enacted to prevent these things. Society permits married men to support affinities, mistresses, and support houses of prostitution, but forbids efforts to ostracize these men. Society permits men to see the sights, to get drunk, beat their wives, but forbids woman to do such things. Society permits our daughters to marry any man who may have money or a position, but forbids a man from marrying any but a virtuous woman — one who has never sinned.

Man will defend his flag and country to death if necessary, but he makes little effort to save the daughters from a life of shame. The man who insults the flag may be shot, but he who despoils the virtue of a girl, often starting her on a life of shame is allowed to live as an honorable citizen.

The *Titanic* disaster produced a gloom to be spread over civilized countries for months, but there is every day in our own land more women going down to much more miserable graves, which could be prevented, of which little is said. There are no head lines in the papers of this great catastrophe. We fought against the sin of a physical black slavery, but we are content to permit a more disastrous physical and moral white slavery. Oh, the awful tragedy of human lives! How inconsistent in society.

The citizens are responsible for the officers who enforce the laws. Many citizens permit vice and complain of conditions, but do nothing. In a speech before the United States Senate, John C. Calhoun once said, "Society can no more exist without government in one form or another, than man without society. The political then is man's natural state; it is the one for which his Creator formed him, into which he is impelled irresistibly and the only one in which his race can exist and all of his faculties be fully developed."

Are we awake to the situation? Do we support the good candidate? Do we always take an interest in the welfare of the community and show that interest in the same degree as the friends of vice? In the future, organizations will be powerful, not for the politician or a party,

but for the good of society. Be optimistic; times are getting better and will still continue to improve. Our homes will be as in the good old days when parents knew each other and when they were well acquainted with their own children. There will be better efforts for sanitation and pleasure and the poorer classes and the children will not be compelled to seek companionship in dens of vice. It will be a disgrace for a young man to do those things he has been permitted to do. The drunken man will not be able to obtain employment. The lawmaker, the professional and business man cannot have his mistress and have a standing in society. Wages of women are being increased and beauty of women will not be a curse as it has been to many.

We are our brother's keeper; society must care for and protect the weak. The almighty dollar must not reign supreme and the sin of selfishness must be destroyed.

FEMALE LABOR; EFFECT ON OUR HOMES

IS woman to-day as able to bring forth healthy children and care for them as in former generations? Does the fact that each year more women are gainfully employed fill us with alarm for the future of this glorious land of plenty and liberty? The economists and sociologists do not agree as to the answer of these questions. The eugenist has now entered the arena of discussion and declares that the problem be considered in the light of health of parents and the ability and willingness of the female breadwinner to reproduce, giving us offspring, strong and free from disease and mental defects.

We dare not dispute statistics given in the United States Census reports. A few of these are interesting and will be useful for comparison with the part played by men and women in providing for the home in earlier times.

In 1880, 16 per cent. of the breadwinners in the United States were females. In 1900 it had increased to 20 per cent. To-day it is somewhat higher. In 1900, 43 per cent. of the female Negro population over sixteen years of age were classed as wage earners. In 1900 there were almost 5,000,000 female wage earners in the United States. Among these were classed the following: 700,055 agricultural pursuits, 338,144 dressmakers, 328,935 laundresses, 327,206 teachers and professors, 231,458 textile-mill operatives, 146,929 housekeepers and stewardesses, 142,265 saleswomen, 138,724 seamstresses, 108,916 nurses

and midwives, 106,916 laborers not specified, 85,086 stenographers and typewriters, 82,936 milliners, 81,000 clerks and copyists, 72,896 bookkeepers, 61,571 tailoresses, 59,010 musicians and teachers.

In 1909 there were 1,300,000 females over sixteen years of age engaged in the manufacturing industries. In these industries 32 per cent. of all the employees in Rhode Island were females over sixteen years, while in Arizona they found but 6 per cent. of those employed. These figures are accounted for by the reason that in Rhode Island a large part of the people are engaged in manufacturing and but few in the Western States. In these industries almost 13 per cent. of all employed were under sixteen years of age, both sexes, while in the District of Columbia only 2 per cent. were under sixteen. The difference in the child labor laws of the various States explains the situation.

Women are found in all the 303 occupations reported for man, except eight, viz., soldiers, sailors, marines, street-car drivers, apprentices to roofers and slaters, forewomen of fire departments, helpers to steam boilermakers, helpers to brassworkers. Certainly no man would dare to say that there are not many women physically able to do the work of a soldier or a street-car driver, were she compelled to do so. There have been some very good female soldiers in men's clothing in every war. Who said women were the weaker sex? They require less food, less sleep, and less clothing, and they do not succumb to cold and physical exertion more quickly than man. The wonder is that modern young women do not die off by thousands, yes, tens of thousands from pneumonia, on account of lit-

tle dress, lowering their power of resistance; but do they? They are slowly getting back to nature.

In Pittsburgh the census of 1900 gave 22,000 women working gainfully. Of this total we find the following:

- 7,000 servants.
- 1,800 dressmakers.
- 1,000 saleswomen.
- 1,400 teachers.
- 1,000 laundresses.
- 800 stenographers.
- 650 nurses.

Many of these figures are more than doubled to-day. Of the 22,000, 13,000 live at home and 9,000 board, including those living with their employers. In the United States about 60 per cent. of the working women are single, 18 per cent. married, and 22 per cent. widowed or divorced.

Having studied these figures, which are increasing rapidly each year, together with the fact that before long women will have the right to equal suffrage with men, we must decide as well as possible whether female labor is making society better or not.

The position of woman has varied with time and country. Her position here to-day is quite different from that of 100 years ago. She has attained a certain independence for herself, has become more like man in many respects; but is she held in the same reverence as then? We must remember that the girls of to-day will be the mothers of to-morrow. Primitive woman was the executive part of the house in many respects. To a large ex-

tent she was the owner of the household and all looked up to her for the fruits of the soil. Noble man could not stoop to do the menial work; he had to hunt and war with his neighbors.

In early times, even in the days of our grandparents, the demands of the home were largely for protection from the enemy, for food and clothing. To-day a large part of our population are still struggling to obtain sufficient money to buy this food and clothing. Then but little money was necessary to maintain an existence. Barter was common. Each planter raised his food, and the wife made the clothing. To-day the better classes strive to procure a sufficient income for the actual necessities, more comfortable homes, more lavish dress, and no end of pleasures.

Almost in direct proportion as women have had to do with tribal industries, to that extent were they allowed to represent the people in civic counsels. As they had nothing to do with things military, in like manner they had no voice in the tribal military plans. Should woman become the breadwinner in America, in a very short time she would control political affairs.

Roman women successfully (Livy) blocked the streets and approaches to the Forum, importuning men to vote for the restoration of their rights. In the wars which had preceded, women were forbidden to wear jewelry, etc., those in power fearing that a display of wealth by the rich would stimulate class feeling and decrease patriotism. Woman has had to do the most menial forms of work, even in civilized countries; enlightened England in the early part of the last century allowed women to be har-

nessed with mules in underground mines and assist in the hauling of coal cars. Woman has from early times in certain countries been made a slave; she has been compelled to remain from the public view; if on the street, she was heavily veiled, that her sacredness would not be endangered by the eyes of wicked man.

Society sees woman to-day in our own fair land as a creature to be adored, to look beautiful, to bring forth children, to care for the home, to come at man's beck and call, to listen and hear the wisdom of man, to receive the required allowance and disburse same with the greatest economy, to be the ever-present and ever-ready when needed, to do little herself of domestic affairs, to have a nursery and governess for the children, to spend much time at bargain counters, millinery openings, pink teas, bridge parties, sewing societies, musicales and in the study of Ibsen and Browning.

The true mother is pictured as the most perfect work of God; one who would give all her time and energy to please and make comfortable her children; one who knows not the meaning of fatigue and need of sleep; one who had no thought but that of home, sweet home; one who knows nothing but virtue. We have seen her working much with little; with few pleasures but those of comforting others. Thus we saw our mothers; may their last days be their best days.

One writer who views with alarm the elimination of men from many of the various forms of business writes: "When 20 per cent. of women (make the percentage as small or as large as you please) become wage-earners primarily or solely that they may live more extravagantly,

dress more beautifully, or indulge in more expensive pleasures and luxuries, we have an artificial and an unhealthy economic condition that cannot endure forever. Woman cannot continue to supplant the male with impunity; they cannot disturb the economic equilibrium without paying the penalty." He further says:

"It is a fundamental economic truth that the male is the economic unit of the social unit, the family. This is neither theory nor sentiment, nor sex talk; it is adamant fact; it is the basis of our social system; it is the ancient rock upon which the family is builded. Change it and you destroy society; disturb it and civilization must perish. He, the husband, the male, is the official head of the family, the official bread-winner."

I am positive that such an essay would neither win a prize in a ladies' seminary, in a suffragette society, nor with any body of intelligent men. That writer has not read his ancient history well, nor does he know that to-day in thousands of homes the man has refused to be the bread-winner, for that noble creature is kept in alcohol and tobacco by allowances given him by the worker of the family. Such a man is allowed to vote for men who make our children and women to labor and incidentally he gets an extra drink or two on election day.

On the other side of the question we have the amusing statement of one of our university professor sociologists, who said: "The wife should rise at 6:30, prepare breakfast in fifteen minutes, get the children off to school, after breakfast, go to work and earn at least three-fifths as much as her husband, come home and prepare dinner, keep the house furnished, never gossip, do her own housework,

retire at nine that she may rise at 6:30." It is a pity that the professor forgot to add that such a model wife should be her husband's valet, carry a wireless station in her pocket to keep in touch with all the great cities, and for amusement sell a side line of boots and shoes to and from work. Whither are we drifting in our higher institutions? Much learning certainly hath made some men mad. Reason has certainly run riot.

Whether it is a blessing or not that woman must at times be the bread-winner, I am not able to answer. Surely, could we change conditions many of these women would not work as they are now compelled to do. But even hard work has its reward and many women are better physically and morally by reason of having to work. From the standpoint of the eugenicist, a large proportion of women who work are physically better to become mothers and will rear their children with more care than many of the idle society women of to-day. It is to be deplored that a large number of our women are not able to undergo the physical strain of maternity. Still more disastrous to our nation is the fact that many women refuse to have children, and if they do have one or two, these are given over to the nurse maid and governess and we have thousands of cases of "the poor little rich girl."

The number of women who work and the nature of their labor varies much with the part of the country studied. For example, in the Southern States we find a large percentage of women working in the cotton fields; these are largely Negro women. In the New England States the large number of factories manufacturing boots, shoes, cotton, woolen and silk goods by machinery make female

labor a necessity. In the large cities the manufacture of clothing, cigars, etc., determines the large number of women in these occupations. There is a high percentage of tuberculosis among women working with tobacco. Since it is not so strenuous as some other kinds of work, many who are already tubercular seek employment in tobacco factories.

According to the nature of the work and the amount of wages received, so will the number of women employed be great or small. In some factories where the size of machines have been increased, it has been necessary to supplant women with men, since the improved machines permit the employer to pay sufficient wages to men. In this connection we hear much of women entering into competition with men. It is not strictly so; they do not as a rule underbid. Most women work from necessity. Our social conditions are such that we demand more seamstresses, servants, silks and satins, etc. Occupations have been made for women.

As society has created these demands for comfort, just in the same process of social evolution do we demand professional women and business women; and opportunities are made for the artists. Of the 868 women, who are classed as having become eminent in the history of the world, 337 of them were made so by their literary ability. To-day, we find women standing side by side, with equal ability in all the professions, law, medicine, and the pulpit; they control large enterprises; they stand at the head of our public schools and thus they must be recognized as a fixed part of the heads of the family, political affairs and society in general.

Could we emphasize maternity as a part of woman's nature and duty, the discussion from the standpoint of eugenics might end. But the remark is continually heard: "Women of ability, education, and position will not marry, and if they do, they have no time for children." This phase of the question is worth special consideration. One hundred and forty-two or 16.3 per cent. of the world's eminent women did not marry. In America 42.6 per cent. did not marry. A large per cent. of the women who graduate from Wellesley, Vassar, Bryn Mawr and other higher institutions of learning for women do not marry. Why? They have more important business to attend to, some will say. They cannot be satisfied, say others. But be the reason what it may, is the country worse off by their not marrying? Is there not such a thing as a law of compensation in a woman's work for social betterment even though she does not marry and have children?

William Howard Taft in a recent address to girls said: "According to your report, 2,700 girls have been graduated from this school, and I am glad to see that only 260 got married," said the former President.

"Now I am not opposed to matrimony, but I am one that believes that there are thousands of women who have made the world sweeter, purer and better, and who did not marry. The trouble is that many women have to marry not because they love the man of their choice, but because it is a custom. The only way to avoid that condition is for the girl to become independent by learning a useful trade. Then when a man who is a scrub asks her to marry she can say: 'I can do better, as I am independent.' In this way she can make no mistake."

We forget that many more men never become benedicts. Why not compel these to marry? We know that it is easier for the intelligent woman to remain virtuous unmarried than it is for the man. Further, how many of our great men and women have descended from great parents? In a former chapter it was shown that men of genius seldom left children to perpetuate their great name. And again, the ratio of the number of female college graduates to the total number of women is so infinitesimally small that we can almost dismiss the danger of spinsterhood and bachelor women from our mind for a few generations at least. These good women will assist in compelling better working and living conditions for those who will marry and we shall be glad to have them with us. It was said of old, "beware when the world sets loose a thinking man." The same can now well be said of women. There is no doubt but that the majority of women will marry. Very many women marry from necessity; for fear of being left helpless in the world; they want a home; many wish an easier life; consequently the proportion of unmarried will not materially increase. It appears greater because we know so many ourselves. What we want is a study of the women who do bring children into the world. Let us strive for more good, but prevent the bad.

Statistics from insane asylums and life insurance companies show that a higher percentage of insane come from the class of domestics and housewives than from women in trades and professions, and that longevity among women has increased during the last twenty-five years. Most of the women who break down from work do so from causes

which are in no way related to sex. Dr. Morton has shown that women in shops, factories, etc., only pay one-half as much for their lunch as do the men; also that there has been less illness in those factories where a substantial lunch was provided for the employees. Of one thing we can be certain, the working girl is seldom lazy, and will make a better mother, other things being equal, than the girl who "dolls herself" and spends her time at matinees and evening parties. By being usefully employed, I do not mean to infer that all girls should become a wage-earner in the literal sense. Work as a part of one's nature, from necessity or because we are active animals may be made manifest in many ways and places. Work for others is a great blessing to those who can find the opportunity for developing one's self.

A recent contemporary writer, discussing the "Discontent of Women," concluded with the statement, "the proper study of mankind is woman." To answer the question why women work would require a very exhaustive study of economics. A large percentage of the entire number employed work because of the necessity of supporting, besides themselves, one or more members of the families. In Great Britain 12,000,000 are under, or on, the poverty line. In the United States the number is not so great. Quite a few women in this country work not on account of poverty, but as a matter of family pride and vanity on the part of the person working. As the social conditions of the times have demanded so much of actual necessities and much of unnecessary extravagance, it is frequently obligatory on the part of all members of a family who can make a dollar to do so. There is nothing

but sympathy for those women who must support several children left fatherless and penniless at the same time. There is much pity for the mothers and daughters who have to labor hard to provide for the home in which the father and husband exists as a worthless drunkard; or perchance he may be an invalid, in both of which cases the mother and daughters are doubly burdened by the extra expense necessary to care for these men, who must live.

As has been so well explained by James J. Hill, the railroad magnate, one of the great dangers of this nation is the extravagant way of living. Families of very limited means may have a table laden with delicacies fit for a millionaire; homes where the building is dilapidated, children with hardly enough clothes to cover the body in a respectable manner, may have a new piano in the front room, often placed there in order that the young lady might tell her friends of her piano lessons, or the young man who sees no other room will think them well to do.

Granting that some families so desire to show off by having a piano and a fairly presentable front room, is not such an arrangement often better for the family, especially the girls? Will they not become better women? Their ideals of home life are thus much higher than their less fortunate associates, who have no place to entertain their friends, as a lack of which these tend to drift to the streets. If there is any injustice in some girls working for pin money, there is no doubt a real just compensation in the creation of the higher ideals and a desire for the better things of life, provided such work is of a healthy nature and socially safe and sane.

Many of our girls and women do not like to be confined

at home: they do not like the humdrum of this quiet life, and consequently seek some form of employment, respectable and at the same time remunerative. Others will work at something until they can attain their chief aim in life — marriage.

The daughters of the farmer usually have work enough at home to keep them busy, and there is not the call of the excitement of the city to attract them; they do not need to worry about dress as do their city cousins, and as a result of the different conditions we find a very small proportion of women from our country homes gainfully employed.

Much has been written and great fear has been shown regarding the displacement of good young men by women. I grant that some of the arguments are good. Girls who do not need to work have no right to demand a position which should be filled by deserving young men. Still, in many cases, it is not the young women who are so much to blame as the parents and the employers who desire women employees.

There are two factors which are influencing very much the necessity of women working, particularly married women and widows, viz., compulsory education and child labor laws. Since the law forbids many boys working at night and under sixteen, at certain occupations, this compels many a woman to work.

The worst feature of women working is not the physical side by any means, for in many cases the proper kind of employment and limited number of hours ensures health better for this work. It is the effect upon the home and society which is commanding the attention of many of our

students of sociology. Can a woman be a good mother and be absent from home the entire day? Can she leave the little children with a girl of ten or twelve years of age? Can she leave her children in a day nursery, where they are mingling with others whose physical and moral natures are probably questionable? Can the young girl be away from home all day and much of the evening and develop in all respects as she should? When we remember that in the last census report that almost 45 per cent. of the women employed did not live at home; when we should remember that every child should have at least a certain amount of the mother's time for its training, which cannot be granted when she works in a factory all day and at home till late at night; when we remember that many women who work are continually placed in the society of unscrupulous men, these, together with many other factors, make it plain that this phase of the question is a very important one.

A further factor in the home relations and that of society is seen in the wage problem of working women. It has been variously estimated that for the same kind of work man receives from two to three times as much pay as does woman; in some cases this is determined by piece work, the men doing much more than the women. The amount of the work does not always determine the rate of wages, for in many an instance the girl will receive more than the young man equally good would gladly work for. This is explained by the fact that many employers want girls in their employ. Some are employed when not needed and the salary is raised for reasons which do not need explanation.

A woman cannot be as good a mother if absent from her children as if she were at home. It is true some women who work away from home are better mothers than many who are at home and at leisure, but these women would be still better could they devote the time to their homes which they would like to give.

In the use of modern machinery where a woman has to follow from two to ten needles with her eyes, in many cases in shirtwaist factories where the hours are long and the surroundings very unsanitary, in work of toymakers, workers in various metals, in factories where there is a large amount of dust, in stores where the girl has to stand on her feet all day — in these and many other places much worse conditions exist which certainly shorten the lives of these women very much. As our eugenic laws are improved, and the employer is compelled to learn more of the physiological demands of a woman's nature, just so soon will the effect of work upon woman's health be less dangerous. But let us not forget that the women at home, with many small children, frequently suffer more than their sisters who are classed as working women.

Enough has been said to show the effect of female labor upon morals. The demand for a sufficient amount of money for dress, which exceeds by far that which the girl is making; the association of girls and boys in factories, the demand for recreation after a hard day's labor which cannot be found in the home of one or two rooms, the pleasures of the dance hall, theater, café, etc., with acquaintances casually met, all are very powerful in determining just what a girl will do.

Woman can be the most merciful being, but on the other

hand she can be the most cruel. Her passions have no bounds. The story of Octavia, sister of Octavius, and wife of Mark Antony, shows the faithful devotion to the base Mark, who falls a prey to the wiles of his captor, Cleopatra. I mention these characteristics of woman's nature to show that when she once starts on the downward path she seldom returns. She recognizes that the world is against her, and she cares for naught. Many men reform from a wayward life, but few women.

The economist would naturally desire conditions to be such that few women would have to work for their living. The indications are that the opposite results would be evident, especially in the better occupations. Woman is asserting herself; she is educating herself in a manner similar to man; she has business capabilities and soon, unless reform occurs with the men, she will be a very powerful political factor. The time is evidently ripe. She is educating herself to the needs of the situation and she has a desire to improve society. Some of the female votes will be furnished by the class of women who would make matters worse than at present, but not the majority.

We need education, not of colleges, popular novels, or the theater, but good plain common sense education concerning the nature of our body and mind. We must study each other mainly from the psychological standpoint. We must learn the laws of health. If this is accomplished there will be less need for the study of sociology, which to-day stands at the head of the sciences which concern man.

It is not fitting to conclude the subject of female labor without mentioning the question: What is the matter

with our servants? Just so long as the servant is held to be beneath the average girl, just so long as she must remain aloof from the family, work from sunrise until after sunset, with little time for recreation, just so long will this question be with us. The difficulty will increase until in a few years, as the demand becomes greater and the native-born servants are few, we will have to go to work ourselves, and it will become fashionable to bake the bread, do the washing, etc. Probably our atavistic characteristics will assert themselves and we will have quilting parties, house-cleaning parties, baking carnivals, as we had the log-rolling and husking bees of old.

Finally, men may censure women for working, for extravagance and for immorality, but let it be remembered that the majority of women would not work were it not necessary to maintain a standard of life demanded by man. Woman demands dress, because man chooses the well dressed woman. As long as man will endeavor to be the aggressor in sexual selection just so long will women continue to try to please. But should woman reign supreme, then and not till then will her chief thoughts be other than dress.

Dr. Simon Baruch sums up a discussion on Feminism as follows:

“Biologically. If ‘the male is but an afterthought of nature,’ as the feminists claim, and he is typified in the animal world by the bull that paws, by the rooster that crows, and the drone that fusses, and the female is typified by the cow, the hen and the bee, which quietly do the work, then the male deserves the fate of ‘the spider which is destroyed by the female.’”

“Economically. If man, as the American leader of the feminists holds, has been taken in as a kind of extra child, by the woman who rears, cooks and sews to keep him alive, then ‘the lord of creation’ should be relegated to a subordinate place, and ‘the wife and child should not be forced to take his name.’

“Politically. If feminism is a revolt of women against being the ‘slaves or servants or dependents of men’ they are entitled to emancipation from the yoke, by any means in their power, including the franchise.

“Historically. If the utterances of the feminists are regarded as the vaporings of emotional women that ‘are not worth getting excited over,’ then let it be remembered that the Southern fire eating politicians similarly ridiculed the idea that ‘the Yankee would fight.’ Result, their conquest. The early woman’s rights shriekers were similarly ridiculed by the men. Result, women now vote in ten States.

“I have faith in evolution and the survival of the fittest.

“Whether the present discontent of women is due to biological, educational, political or economic causes is the momentous problem before the American people.

“The proper study of mankind is woman.”

RACE SUICIDE

PHILOSOPHERS may be able to explain the “ego,” “a priori” reasoning, and clearly demonstrate that that ethereal substance does not exist, but never has any man, philosopher or fool, been able to prove satisfactorily why any nation should say we are populating too rapidly, or there is not too much race-suicide.

The natural instinct of the animal is for procreation; it does not know that offspring will be the result of the sexual relations. Primitive man filled with the animal instinct replenished the four corners of the earth. Intelligence told civilized man that certain restrictions should be thrown about the sex relations and hence marriage was instituted; another example of man still possessing the instinct, seen with animals — that of mating. Marriage exists then either, as in most civilized countries, as monogamy, or as is practiced among the less intelligent nations in the form of polygamy and polyandry. Speaking of animal instinct in mating let it be said that, at times, the lower animals care much better for their offspring than some of our intelligent citizens do for their children.

From the *Journal of the American Medical Association* we learn that Andrew J. Peters, a member of Congress from Massachusetts, asked this rather startling question at a mass meeting on child labor held in Louisville: “Are the children of the United States worth one-seventieth as much as the bugs?” Mr. Peters showed that the Bureau

of Animal Industry cost \$2,051,686. The proposed children's bureau would cost \$29,440 and would investigate child labor, infant mortality, and other important phases of child conservation. It was opposed, but this bureau has been established.

I interpret pragmatism to mean, "does it pay"? or, "is it of value"? This must have been the philosophy of many ancient nations, and is even thought of to-day in some of our States and the many foreign countries, where a tax is laid on those who do not marry and a pension is given to those families who have a certain number of children.

The pragmatic or utilitarian idea was much in vogue in Rome; Cæsar rewarded those who had children, and Augustus placed a severe penalty on all who did not marry. Those who had many children were given the special favors; for instance, they were given the best seats at the theater. Women who did not have children were not allowed to wear jewelry. Those who see disaster in our increasing race suicide might suggest that unmarried men could not go to the ball games, and married women who did not have children could not wear the latest dresses and millinery. Very soon the marriage license court and the stork would be working overtime. To still further increase the population of the Roman Empire men of sixty years of age and over were not allowed to marry women under forty. These laws were made necessary by reason of the country having been depleted of men by wars.

On the other side of the question we find that two centuries ago the Isle of Formosa did not allow women under

thirty-five years of age to have children, all such pregnancies had to be interrupted; Aristotle advised abortions; in some countries the weaklings were killed, and in China the girl babies were thrown into the Ganges. Here we see that either they were not sufficiently strong, or religious beliefs demanded the sacrifice of the young. To-day some men have dared to advise, as was compelled in the West Indies, that children of ten and twelve marry in order that there be more families upon whom tribute would be exacted.

In Pennsylvania in 1911 there were reported 212,994 births (excluding still births) and 111,286 deaths. In Pittsburgh in 1912 there were 15,050 births and 8,769 deaths from all causes. There were 1,818 deaths of infants under one year of age. In 1912 there were 300,000 deaths in the United States under one year of age. In New York City (Manhattan) in 1912 there were 66,249 births, with 2,547 deaths in infants aged under one month; a slightly lower rate (3.9 per cent.) than that of the previous year. Of the deaths there were 7,675 in infants under one year. Thus, 34.5 per cent. of the deaths in infants under one year occurred in the first four weeks of life. Vital statistics in this country and Europe prove that from one-fourth to one-half of the deaths in children occur within the first month.

In Germany in 1906 there were 62,261 still births. In New York City in 1911 and 1912 there were 6,749 still births, 5 per cent. of all the births.

The following figures of the annual death rate of infants is very significant:

Death Rate per 1,000 Births

Germany, 1906	198
England and Wales, 1903	125
United States, 1900	149

Census 1900, United States

106 cities	excess of	175
49 cities	between 175 and 200	
38 cities	between 200 and 250	
10 cities	between 250 and 300	
9 cities	excess of	300
Charleston, S. C.		419
Savannah, Ga.		287

From an eugenic standpoint the economic importance of this subject in certain European countries, especially Germany and France, has been engaging the attention of these governments, and the question of infant mortality is being studied with great interest. In all European countries a steadily declining birthrate is evident. This decline in the last twenty-five years in eleven European countries has been from an average of 33.7 per thousand of population to 30 per thousand, or about 10 per cent. of births. The fall is least in Ireland, Norway, and Sweden, and greatest in England, Germany, and Italy, Austria and Hungary. In the best residential portion, the present birth-rate is four per thousand of population; while in districts occupied chiefly by Italians and Russian Jews, it is from forty to forty-five per thousand.

We dare not dispute the fact that race suicide is the prevailing spirit in most civilized countries. Franklin stated that in the Colonial times the families averaged eight children. To-day less than two children are found

in the native American families to survive and be able to reproduce the race. As seen above, the birth-rate in the best families is only four per thousand, while among the foreign families it may reach forty to forty-five, or nine times that of the best American families.

“We find an analysis that as the standard of education in matters of hygiene increases, the number of unsuccessful pregnancies increases. We have other statistics which show that these women who had superior intelligence also had better housing conditions, better food, etc.; in fact a better condition as to all the elements that promote normal, full term pregnancy. Even considering the possible existence of greater frequency of diseases predisposing to miscarriage, we are obliged to reason from such figures that these more sophisticated women have, in greater proportion, taken measures to avoid the responsibility of additional maternity.”—*Dr. George J. Engelmann, in “Race Decline.”*

In New York nearly one-half of the women yearly delivered have only the care of midwives and do not have it early enough. Much has been said about the small families on account of late marriages and education. The fact is, late marriage may and does tend to lower the morals, but it does not surely diminish the number of children. Most children are born within eight or ten years after marriage; some say in from five to seven years. While less than two children survive in the families of all native Americans, the families of college graduates show a survival of 2.1 children in these families of educated parents.

“A set of questions, covering the occupation before

marriage, the number of children, manner of birth, infant feeding, etc., were sent to 105 married graduates or former students of a successful normal school of physical education. The investigation covered a period of nearly seventeen years. Of the ninety-one marriages, twenty-five have been sterile to date. There are living to-day at the end of almost seventeen years, one hundred children. This gives a total death rate from all causes of 10.7 per cent.; 70 per cent. were breast-fed for periods varying from one month to twelve months."—*Dr. Sterling.*

We now have before us in this discussion two important eugenic factors: race suicide and infant mortality. As to the cause of the first, there are several causes given. These are, extravagant living of to-day (cost of high living); high cost of living; desire to live like the best; ambition to reach certain positions before having children; craze for pleasures, and the unfaithfulness of men and women. It is unnecessary to explain these, as they are well understood. Probably the most distressing thing concerning race suicide is the fact that thousands of women are accused of preventing conception, while the truth is that these unfortunate wives are very desirous of having children. The cause of *non-fertilitas matrimonii* may be either in the husband or the wife. Let us be charitable to woman. She does the suffering; she gets the blame; and when she is being told why women suffer and die, may cry out in horror: "Don't talk sex!" "It is awful!" "It is nauseating!"

The causes of infant mortality require a little more consideration. The causes of this deplorable condition are almost purely eugenic and have to do with the phys-

ical side of mankind. The child has a right to be born healthy. It is a natural heritage which should be given to all, regardless of the position in life of the parents. Some one has said that in the ideal future the right of parentage will only be given to those who can reasonably assure their offspring a healthy birth and proper nurture. Healthy parents in a proper environment undoubtedly insure healthy children.

One-third of the deaths in the first year of life are due to antenatal causes. The most important of these are syphilis, tuberculosis and alcoholism. A failure to properly nourish children after birth is the cause of a still greater proportion of deaths in childhood. Four times as many deaths occur in bottle-fed as in breast-fed infants. Nearly every mother should be able and compelled to nourish her child. There are certain exceptions in cases of disease of the mother. Labor and social conditions should permit the future mother to prepare for this important period of child raising.

The heat of the summer affects the milk of the bottle-fed more than it does the infant primarily. This milk soon laden with bacteria affects the child. The effect of the heat is not so marked on breast-fed infants.

Krieg and Senteman have shown that under the favorable condition of home-comforts and surroundings, mortality and morbidity among bottle-fed infants are reduced fully 50 per cent. The social standing of the family affects the mortality of breast-fed infants but little, whereas it is of far-reaching influence among bottle-fed infants.

According to the first report of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor, just issued, certain condi-

tions are pointed out as coincident with a high infant death rate in Johnstown, Pa., in which city it has just completed a study. These investigations form a very important eugenic study. It was found that the infant death rate varied in various parts of the same city. In the poorest sections where sanitary conditions were at their worst, the death rate was 271 per thousand, or more than five times that of the choice residential section of the city. Babies whose fathers earned less than \$10 per week, died at the rate of 256 per thousand. Those whose fathers earned \$25 or more a week died at the rate of 84 per thousand. Artificially-fed babies died at a much more rapid rate than breast-fed babies. Where mothers were employed a large part of the time in heavy work, babies died at a much more rapid rate.

In one group of nineteen mothers whose babies all died, fifteen had been keeping lodgers, an arduous occupation among the foreign women. According to Miss Julia Lathrop, chief of Children's Bureau, at least 300,000 babies die annually in the United States. In this report it has been shown that city and street environment, housing, nationality, mother's age, literacy, married history, the feeding of the baby, occupations of the mothers and the family earnings are very important eugenic factors.

Dr. Henry Koplik says: "The children of parents who suffer from organic diseases, such as syphilis, tuberculosis, heart disease, diabetes or nutritional disorders may be either premature or unfitted to live. We can understand some weaknesses of the father, such as syphilis, pulmonary diseases, general nutritional disorders, etc., but the influence on the part of the father which causes the weak-

ness of the new-born is, in many phases, not as yet clear. Among the working classes and the absolutely poor, lack of proper food, rest and habits react against the fetus and produce a congenitally weak infant."

We have seen that the early sentiment of the State was, "We want children that can be useful to the State." They were demanded or eliminated as the case might be. To-day, there are those who believe in the survival of the fittest. It is claimed that the unfit do not survive infancy and thus the race is the better therefor. These same persons lament the millions annually spent on our feeble children, the crippled, the idiotic, the pauper, and criminal classes. Why not allow them to eliminate themselves? There might be some semblance of humanitarianism in these demands if it were true that they were all unfit; but many of them are, strictly speaking, unfortunates and society must do its best to improve the whole. Each part of us is dependent upon the other parts. We cannot live for ourselves. We are our brother's keeper.

"About 10 per cent. of our population is estimated to be defective and so a racial menace. If we succeed in raising all infants, obviously some unfit stock will be raised to reproduce its defective type, thus working injury to the race. Theoretically, a certain small amount of differential infant mortality seems socially allowable — which it is not — no discriminating procedure would be practical, for it is impossible by present means to distinguish absolutely and certainly in early infancy between the potentially fit and strong and the grossly unfit and weak. We cannot lower our idea."—*Dr. H. E. Jordan, in "Infant Mortality in the Light of Eugenic Ideals."*

CRIME

IT is impossible in a short article to give a complete discussion of crime, its causes and remedies. It requires volumes for the psychologist to explain the workings of the mind in the behavior of man toward his fellow men. An understanding of crime and a cure of its many forms would be the attainment of the millennium — an earthly heaven. This will not be accomplished at our rate of progress for some generations at least.

Acts criminal in some countries are permissible in others. Most people regardless of their geographical location, accept and believe the teachings of their own parents, church or State, without a satisfactory explanation as to why they believe as they do. Religions to a great extent at least are based upon mysticism, added to which we have superstitions taught from birth and which become the great determining principles in their religious beliefs.

To-day there is an increasing tendency on the part of our best jurists to determine a criminal's responsibility by his mental ability to know right and wrong; to know whether the concrete thing is wrong, rather than his understanding of sin in general. The criminal is not responsible when he is insane, even though his insanity has been caused by his vices. Further, the unsound mind must have been the cause of the crime and overcome reason, conscience and judgment. Illness, fear, excitement, jealousy and frenzy are not excuses for crime.

Mill says: "Because certain things are so in our experience, it does not follow that it is so everywhere and always. Moral responsibility does not involve freedom of the will. Volition follows moral causes just as physical events follow their physical causes. Necessity teaches that a superior power overrules our destiny, and that our characters are formed for us, not by us."

Responsibility depends upon the conscious determination of the will. As in plant life we see the influence of tropisms, viz.: light, heat, electricity, etc., on its development and reproduction, just so in the higher forms of life do we find the many influences acting upon the various natures of the individual. In the human, reactions are very great in many so-called physiological functions, so great at times there is an exhibition of a double personality, a Jekyll and Hyde. More marked are the changes due to poverty, hunger, passion, infirmity, removal of sex organs, disease of organs producing internal secretions, etc.

Having briefly mentioned how difficult it is to understand the nature of man's mind and how peculiar are its workings, we can a little more intelligently look into the mysteries of crime and the remedies to be applied from an eugenic viewpoint. Dr. Frank Lydston says that in America there are 843 anti-social acts classed as crimes. There are attacks upon public order, the persons of individuals, upon government as political crimes and against the currency. In order that any of the foregoing should constitute a crime, the intent to commit crime must be shown.

Charles E. George, LL.B., in "Causes of Degeneracy,"

says: "Crime is a disease as much as rheumatism. . . . There is no difference between the social offender and the one guilty of an act made criminal by statute, save in the degree. . . . Man is born without a conscience. He must acquire a moral sense or will."

It is conservatively estimated that in the United States we are spending annually almost ninety million of dollars to prevent crime, prosecute and keep our criminals. And the amount is increasing each year. Surely we are able to diminish this awful condition, where not only the liberties and property of man are interfered with, but added to these we have untold miseries and countless souls sent to perdition.

Is there a criminal type which can be recognized and removed from the rest of society? If all persons now having criminal nature were segregated would the next generation still show a large number of criminals? Eugenics teaches that a very large part of crime could be prevented by not permitting the criminal of the low type to procreate his kind, by segregating the mentally defective who breed criminals and by improving our social conditions in such a way that certain criminals will not be produced. I agree with E. Ruggles-Brise, the president of the British Prison Commission, who says in the *New World and Crime*: "Examinations of 3,000 of the worst convicts in England, including measurements, family history and mental and physical characteristics, have failed to confirm the existence of a criminal type, both as regard to measurements and presence of physical anomalies in criminals, these statistics present a startling conformity with similar statistics of law-abiding classes. The idea

that criminals are the product of heredity has paralyzed efforts at reform."

This statement is almost contrary to the Italian school, of which Lombroso was the great sponsor. With this latter school the study of the criminal from the anthropological standpoint was almost a perfect science. In defense of these views it must be agreed to by those who have visited the rogues' gallery and who have stood before an audience of criminals in a penal institution, that there is a marked stigma on most of the faces. But this crime cannot be determined by their weight, stature or measurements of the head. There are many persons in the prisons who appear normal and many criminal types at large who have never been accused. The facial expression of the criminal is largely due to the life that individual has led with his many evil associations. The trouble has been the penologists have studied only convicted criminals, not the criminal class. The advent of the practical psychologist into the study of abnormal sociology is sure to be of much assistance in the solution of crime.

Dr. Paul E. Bowers, physician in charge of the Indiana State Prison, states that of 2,681 consecutive admissions into that institution, 2,293 had used alcohol, and 83 per cent. of this latter number had used it to excess. Over one-half of all had admitted having venereal disease; 1,879 had been previously convicted; 242 had been convicted of perversion and inversion of the sex instinct; 112 were actively insane when admitted; 47 were epileptics, and 596 were feeble-minded.

The population, at the time of 1912 report of the Allegheny County, Pa., Workhouse, was 827. There were

committed during the year 3,764; of this number 519 were illiterate. These were classified under 147 different occupations; 572 were committed for the second time; 95 for the sixth time; 17 for the sixteenth time; 4 for the twenty-ninth time; 5 for the forty-first time; 7 for the fiftieth or more times; 299 were registered as abstainers, 512 as intemperate, 2,863 as moderate drinkers. The cost to the institution annually was over \$300,000.

A recent report of Western Pennsylvania Penitentiary shows the annual cost of taking care of the prisoners to be \$400,000. The same report of 321 commitments shows that 85 had been committed two or more times, 61 the second time, 5 the fourth time, and 1 the tenth time. Of the prisoners, 58 were classed as abstainers, 51 intemperate, and 212 moderate drinkers. From observations of the trial of commitment and treatment of our prisoners and knowing that many of them are returned time and again to these penal institutions, it is compulsory that more rational methods of study and remedy be applied. There must be a competent person connected with every penal institution as well as homes for the feeble-minded, who can examine the inmates from the standpoint of practical psychology. A real psycho-analysis is the most important, economic and practical investment any institution can make for its defectives to-day.

The population of the various institutions in Pennsylvania at the end of the 1914 statistical year was 75,410, classified as follows:

In insane asylums, hospitals, state and county institutions	18,602
---	--------

CRIME

189

In homes for children and aged persons	19,103
In state hospitals for miners	704
In various private hospitals	9,835
In institutions for weak minded	3,292
In various reform schools	1,637
In institutions for the blind	337
In institutions for the deaf and dumb	913
In penal institutions	2,919
In jails and workhouses	2,030
In almshouses	16,101

There is an annual increase of 500 to 600 in the number of insane in Pennsylvania. The annual cost of caring for the insane in Pennsylvania is \$5,000,000. One per cent. of the total population of the State is cared for during the entire year by public and private charities.

POVERTY AND CHARITY

SCRIPTURE says: "The poor ye have with you always and whensoever ye will ye may do them good." There is no reference to the value of being poor or that it is a necessary evil. In the above statement we have a condition of poverty and problematical charity.

Some one has wisely spoken when he said: "It is better to build a fence at the edge of the precipice than a hospital below." Eugenics teaches prevention. Charity, pity and humanitarianism, are or are not the means necessary for relief of the poor; they are the result of a proper spirit of love and brotherly interest. In the ideal there should be no poverty, hence charity is not idealistic, for without poverty there would be no necessity for charity. Private charity is not the ideal, but since we are not sufficiently communistic or socialistic we must assist where we may.

Were all of us sufficiently supplied with the material things in life, would the world be better or not? Is it possible to deduce that in such a state of society that misery, pain and sin would still be present, since history past and present shows us that these undesirable conditions are seen in the rich as well as the poor? Or shall it be conceded that inasmuch as individuals are different physically and mentally, and that there is no fixed state of emotion and ability to care for one's self and those dependent, that a just compensation exists in man's nature

whereby the more fortunate man must care for his weaker brother.

With these introductory remarks, we are confronted with the question at issue: Can the poor man raise a family which will be a blessing to the country? If not, should he and his family be cared for at the expense of the taxpayers and private philanthropy? It is estimated that each year public and private charities cost this country over \$200,000,000. Then we must believe that a very large number of persons actually in desperate circumstances never make known their condition and never apply for assistance. It is said that 10 per cent. of those who die in New York City (Manhattan) are given pauper burials. Twenty-five per cent. of those living in the large cities of the United States are in a state of poverty much of the time.

Hunter states that 31 per cent. of the families of this country are classed as renters, and that in New York City 94 per cent. of the people do not own their own homes. In the United States there are between four and five million paupers. In New York City, 70,000 children go to school hungry. One per cent. of the population owns more than the other 99 per cent. In England it is said that there are over 1,000,000 rich persons who do nothing; many of these own estates of thousands of acres of the best land which would support millions of people if properly divided and cared for.

According to a recent report of a statement made in Congress by Representative Buchanan, he presented statistics, in part as follows: Of the 20,258,555 homes in the United States, 10,697,895, or more than one-half, are

rented outright; 2,931,965 are mortgaged, and only 5,984,284, or 29 per cent., are owned free from mortgage. . . . In fifty cities with a population of 100,000 or more, there are 4,424,326 homes; 74 per cent. of them are rented outright. This is to say that 3,196,941 of these homes are rented; 574,723, or 12.8 per cent., are mortgaged; and only 13 per cent. are owned free of encumbrance. . . . There is hardly a State that does not show an increased percentage, not only of rented, but mortgaged farms, if we compare 1910 with 1890.

What are the causes of poverty in this country? Drink; inability to get work at a living wage; illness; high cost of living; laziness; crime; desertion of wives; feeble-mindedness, etc. It is stated that in 1912, the drink bill of the United States was \$2,336,662,338, or more than ten times the amount of our fire losses; this drink cost the lives, directly and indirectly, of more than 150,000 people. There were produced in 1912, 62,176,694 barrels of fermented liquors, and 135,826,789 gallons of distilled liquors. It costs us over \$25 for every individual or \$150 for a family of six. Drink is then certainly an important cause of poverty.

The United States Brewers' Association in its 1913 report, quoting Mary E. Garbutt in the *Garment Worker*, answers this statement as follows: "Now what are the real facts in the case? Is intemperance the immediate cause of poverty or on the other hand, does poverty act as a cause in producing intemperance? . . . Two things are absolutely essential for the working man to have the necessaries of life. First, work to do, and second, large enough wages to meet the needs of himself and family.

If he is only employed a part of the time and his wages are low, poverty must as a matter of fact follow whether he drinks or not. In the year 1903, Carrol D. Wright gave the percentage of those unemployed during some portion of the year as 49.8 per cent. He says drunkenness caused only .26 per cent. of the idleness. . . . Less than 3 per cent. of the appalling total of idleness which exists in this country can be charged to the working class. If the saloons were closed and the people were all abstainers, the pall of poverty would still hang over the home of the working man, because of his enforced idleness at times and the poor wages paid for his labor. . . . Frances E. Willard said: "Under the searchlight of knowledge in these later days it is folly for us longer to ignore the mighty power of poverty to induce evil habits of every kind. . . . The only way to have sober people is for us to strike at the root of evil which causes inebriety. Poverty, many hours of labor, the nerve-strain under which men toil, the anxiety from the insecurity of their jobs; remove all these, and in a short time the demand for a stimulant would cease and drunkenness would be unknown."

This argument might be very satisfactory, did we not know that the drink habit and drunkenness are seen in the rich man as well as in those in poverty. The big club, the large hotels, cafés, etc., are patronized by the well-to-do class of persons, both men and women.

Some of these surely fall to the poverty line in time. It was formerly stated that the life of shame was followed only by those too poor to live decently. Recent investigations have shown that this is not true. These women

come from every walk of life; feeble-mindedness is a greater cause than poverty.

The principal cause of poverty is the inability of the working man to obtain a living wage all the time. When business is good, mills all running, railroads all active, most men are employed, but when panic comes and money market is bad, hundreds of thousands of families are in want; bread lines are formed and charity organizations are overtaxed. Our economists and sociologists must solve the problem of how to give employment to the greatest number of men the greatest amount of time, and how the earnings may be divided so that there will be enough for all in the occasional idle hour.

I do not believe that laziness is directly a very great cause of poverty, aside from its association with alcoholism and crime. The lazy man is the product of his surroundings and can be eliminated if proper means are applied. The New York Legislative committee to investigate crime, recently stated that 80 per cent. of crimes against property and the person, were by individuals who have either lost their connection with home life or never had home influences.

Idleness and injuries cause much poverty. Tuberculosis, insanity, feeble-mindedness and syphilis are the diseases responsible for most of this inability to work. "Hunter states that in the seventeen years ending 1902, there were 103,320 persons killed and 587,028 injured by our railroads. The Interstate Commerce Commission gives 73,000 injured or killed by the railways in 1902."
—*Ralph Waldo Trine.*

Many students of this question say that there are too

many laboring persons coming to this country, and that there is not work enough for all. In the chapter on Immigration, that phase of the subject was discussed, the conclusion being that there were not too many of the right kind, but there were too many of the inferior class, those who would not amalgamate with the social conditions and especially too many who would not go into agricultural pursuits, preferring to remain idle if they cannot get a certain kind of work to do.

Where the great industries exist, viz., railroad centers, manufacturing and mining, there most frequent and most serious are the disturbing labor conditions. In the agricultural districts want is not so evident. Nature has given man and animals certain instincts for preservation from want. The bees and the squirrel teach man how to lay food aside. Primitive man knew how to prepare for the long dreary days when he could not plant and hunt. Civilized man knows still better how to keep meat, butter, eggs and poultry for months and years. But is it the business man who prepares in the day of plenty for the poor man in time of want? The period of Israel's famine and Egypt's plenty, forecast by Joseph's interpretation of Pharaoh's dreams is of more than historic interest.

Even to-day there is enough good land uncultivated in this country with its many natural resources that if properly tilled all could be fed and that quite well, provided the population was properly distributed and the people inclined to do agricultural work. All over the United States farm help is scarce, yet charity must care for thousands. The ingenuity of man is rapidly overcoming the great disasters to our crops by drouth, etc. The

great streams are being utilized, the desert is being reclaimed to produce food, and our wizard scientists are increasing the size of our fruits, grains and vegetables and even the thorny cactus can be made an edible plant.

Is poverty then destroying our race, and do our charitable institutions create a spirit of fearlessness on the part of those who know that they may come to want? We furnish free food and clothing, we help to pay the rent, we provide summer outings for the mothers and children, we establish depots in our large cities giving certified milk and ice for the babies (many of whose mothers prefer this milk for family use), we send physicians to their sick, care for and operate on those needy in our hospitals, and in fact we are endeavoring to relieve every want of those who are poor, even to giving the dead a proper burial.

Humanity demands such mercy. "Though I speak with the tongues of man and angels and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." Enlightened America shows much disregard for prevention, but a great willingness for almshouses, hospitals, insane asylums and penal institutions. Surely we must build more fences about our precipices. We are rapidly learning that it is more economic and more humane to prevent disease than to alleviate suffering and care for the dying. In the future many of our infectious diseases will be eliminated. May we say the same for alcoholism, crime and poverty. The majority of the public do not yet appreciate these efforts for prevention. Many only learn by sad experience. The story is still true of how many a "prodigal" appreciates the "husks" in his hun-

ger, when he had cast aside plenty and a seeming restraint. It might be well said that dire want is often the mother of appreciation.

As stated in the beginning, charity is not idealistic. We desire a day when it will not be necessary, when want will be no more. Some fear that should such a happy state of affairs come to pass that many of our better attributes would not be developed; no poor to feed, none of their sick to care for, a day when charity organizations would be no more. But as that ideal is in the dark, dim, distant future, we must continue to develop the better spirit and care for those who may be in need. While doing this, let us apply eugenic principles and by proper methods of prevention we can markedly diminish those in want, thereby making a better and happier state of society.

Many of our philosophers have taught that virtue and ultimate happiness are only possible by separating one's self from worldly pleasures and selfish desires. Many have sought a state of poverty to attain this virtue. Did we accept this line of reasoning, many changes must need occur. But since even philosophers cannot agree, so poor man knows not what is best for himself at all times. We must agree that a condition of want in many a family has produced great men, and the name of a rich man never lives in history on account of his money. Each year competition becomes greater, there are less chances for the poor boy, education, practical of course, is necessary and the battle of life becomes more strenuous.

Even in the day of great achievements, of speed, luxury and pleasure, it must be conceded by all thinking persons that the greatest heritage any boy and girl can possess

is a good Christian home training. This is possible with the poor even where there is great want. These good homes are the ones we must provide and protect. It may even be necessary to say that "The curfew must ring each night," not only for the boys and the girls, but for the fathers and mothers as well.

In conclusion, we must all grant that private charity organizations must assume much of the responsibility of caring for those in want, until our municipal governments realize the importance of this question. We shall arrive at no solution of dispensing charity until more equal methods of taxation are in force. The common man always pays more than his share. Individual acts of kindness and relief will always be the one great method of developing the spirit of brotherly love. Giving to street beggars, especially to children, is a very dangerous form of charity; it develops criminals. The true philanthropist is not the man who gives vast sums to relieve conditions for which he is largely responsible. "The man who has no sense of service to his fellow-man, whose idea is primarily gain for himself, whether honorable or dishonorable, is the supreme fool in life by virtue of his ignorance leading him into the violation of a law that condemns him to a pinched, a stunted, seamless, joyless life."—*Ralph Waldo Trine.*

WAR AND FUTURE GENERATIONS

DR. DAVID STARR JORDAN, in discussing the decline of Rome, says: "Does history repeat itself? It always does if it is true history. If it does not we are not dealing with history, but with a mere succession of incidents. Like causes produce like effects, just as often as man may choose to test them. Whenever man uses a nation for the test, poor seed yields a poor fruitage. Where the weakling and the coward survive in human history, there 'the human harvest is bad.' . . . And it can never be otherwise."

Dr. Jordan believes that the fall of Rome was due to breeding from inferior stock as the good stock was thinned. And just as Rome fell, so have other nations of the past. This is called the reversal of the laws of eugenics. Gibbon says: "After a diligent inquiry, I can discern four principal causes of the ruin of Rome, which continued to operate in a period of more than a thousand years: (1) The injuries of time and nature. (2) The hostile attacks of the Barbarians and Christians. (3) The use and the abuse of the materials. (4) The domestic quarrels of the Romans."

Writing of the causes which destroyed Rome, Baron de Montesquieu says: "In a despotic state, indeed, which is immoderately exerted, a real division is perpetually kindled. . . . It must be acknowledged that the Roman laws were too weak to govern the republic. . . .

She lost her liberty because she completed her work too soon."

Dr. Jordan, in the "Eugenics of War," says: "England has made this a British world. Her young men have gone to all regions where free men can live. She has carried the British peace to all barbarous lands, and she has made it possible for civilized men to trade and pray with savages. . . . What has all this cost? It could not be done unless it was paid for, and we must not wonder if such strenuous effort, such sacrifice of life and force, has left her with something like exhaustion."

With this consideration of the fall of nations, can we seriously contemplate that the United States may ever be drawn into such a war as Dr. Jordan would believe must surely result in the disintegration of this powerful nation? Such a result depending on the loss of good stock, the inferior men remaining at home to replenish the race.

Is war ordained of God to promote justice, to increase all that is noble in man, making for better succeeding generations, or does the reverse naturally follow by the slaughter of thousands of hardy men? Is it true that this country would have prospered more surely and be more stable had our wars not have occurred?

History records little else than the struggle of nations, the rise of this and the fall of that empire. The few other pages of history deal with the character, habits and tastes of these nations during their years of peace when they were preparing for the next conflict. Man has inherited the natural instinct of animals for self-preservation. To accomplish this, prey is made by the animal upon its weaker adversaries. It is the natural survival

of the fittest.

From the earliest history of man war has been waged, chiefly for three reasons: (1) Conquest, for personal or national aggrandizement; (2) for the sake of religion; (3) for the love of woman. To-day we may add three others: (a) Protection of investments in a foreign country; (b) protection of a persecuted people as in the case of Cuba; and (c) for commercial supremacy.

Study our most justifiable war of the Revolution and with this the opinion of two Indian chiefs. William Pitt, speaking in the House of Commons, June, 1781, said: "Gentlemen have passed the highest eulogiums on the American War. Its justice has been defended in the most fervent manner. A noble lord in the heat of his zeal, has called it a holy war. For my part, although the honorable gentleman who made this motion, and some other gentlemen, have been, more than once, in the course of the debate, severely reprehended for calling it a wicked and accursed war, I am persuaded, and would affirm, that it was a most accursed, wicked, barbarous, cruel, unnatural and diabolical war!"

Horace Walpole, a member of the British Parliament, said in 1775: "However, we are determined to know the worst, and are sending all the men and ammunition we can muster. The Congress, not asleep neither, have appointed a generalissimo, Washington, allowed a very able officer, who distinguished himself in the last war. Well, we had better gone on robbing the Indies! It was a more lucrative trade." Sir Horace had a very excellent premonition of coming disasters to the British army. We all agree that the colonies were engaged in a righteous war.

Many of our most able men were killed; still the country prospered in a short time as never before or since. Most eugenists will say, and that rightly, too, that the prosperity was possible and natural, as vast multitudes of sturdy immigrants flocked to this land of liberty and plenty.

Nevertheless, we had our internal dissensions with the first owners of the soil. By treaty, purchase (?) and power, we have finally subdued the aborigines. As to the land of religious liberty the opinion of Red Jacket on "The Religion of the White Man and the Red" is quite interesting. "Brother, you say that there is but one way to worship and serve the Great Spirit. If there is but one religion, why do your white people differ so much about it? . . . Brother, we do not wish to destroy your religion or take it from you. We only want to enjoy our own." The great chieftain, Black Hawk, said after his defeat: "That was the last sun that shone on Black Hawk. His heart is dead, and no longer beats quick in his bosom. He is now a prisoner of the white men; they will do with him as they wish. But he can stand torture, and is not afraid of death. He is no coward. Black Hawk is an Indian. He has done nothing for which an Indian ought to be ashamed. He has fought for his countrymen, against white men, who came, year after year, to cheat them and take away their lands."

Does any American to-day dare say that Black Hawk was not filled with the same patriotic spirit the colonists showed in the war against England? Was it not a more righteous spirit than many of us display in our efforts to conquer foreign countries simply to protect invested

interests of our great capitalists? There is over one billion of United States capital in Mexico; Mexico has about two-thirds as much, and England one-third as much invested in these enterprises. To protect these the lives of thousands of the common able-bodied soldiers may be lost, while the interested ones remain at home enjoying themselves and proclaiming that we should always be patriotic. The words of William Penn and Horace Walpole might well be studied to-day.

Is war of value to a nation? Do we develop the spirit of manhood and are the shades of the fallen brave a stimulus to each succeeding generation? It is not true that it is only the most sturdy who can shoulder the gun and withstand the fatigue of the long march. In any great war like our Civil War, regiments were filled from every walk of life, the laborer and the clerk, the artisan and the professional man marched and fell, side by side. It was not a war of sinew alone, it was right and patriotism, seen in both the Northern and Southern armies. Few men to-day would be willing to erase that awful struggle from the pages of history, but a much less number would desire another such conflict.

The great nations of the world are spending from 25 per cent. to more than 50 per cent. of their national expenditures on their armies and navies; to prepare for war in times of peace. To preserve peace, many say.

Dr. Jordan quotes Benjamin Franklin as saying that the system of standing armies and war in vogue in Europe in his time could not endure, because the result of it would be that the nations would breed inferior stock, that the strong men would be destroyed, or kept from mar-

riage, and those at home — those that war could not use — would be the parents of the next generation. And so, he says, that system cannot stand. While there are continued rumors of great wars about to break out in Europe, it must be granted that the countries of Europe are no nearer decadence on account of war than when Franklin made the above statement. If there has been any retrograde movement in the last few decades it is rather on account of race suicide, labor conditions and religious feelings than that of war.

Much as we deprecate war for any reason, we must grant that it does develop courage and a spirit of national patriotism. The percentage of the entire number killed in battle is very small compared to the deaths to-day from disease, alcoholism, and the number of defectives which are being thrust upon us. More persons die annually in the United States than were killed in the Civil War.

The report of the Coroner of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania for 1914, shows that there were 2,914 deaths investigated. Of these we find that there were the following:

Burns and scalds	132
Mines and mills	156
Murder	56
Drowning	91
Railroads	178
Automobile	50
Falls	153
Street railways	51
Accidental poisoning and shooting	43
Asphyxiated	24

The sons of great men are rarely great and all great men have not descended from the sturdy class. War cannot develop this noble spirit of patriotism to be emulated by our sons and grandsons unless it be a just cause. Justice is often hard to determine since Scripture is full of wars of conquest. England, France, Scotland, and Spain have killed their hundreds of thousands simply because of religious feelings. In 1806, John Randolph, in the House of Representatives, spoke against another war with England. He said: "But the gentleman has told you we ought to go to war, if for nothing else, for the fur trade. Now, sir, the people on whose support he seems to calculate, follow, let me tell him, a better business; and let me add that while men are happy at home reaping their own fields, the fruits of their labor and industry, there is little danger of their being induced to go sixteen or seventeen hundred miles in pursuit of beavers, raccoons, or opossums — much less of going to war for the privilege. They are better employed where they are." We had the war a few years later and men do go far away to obtain these furs for milady's vanity.

Speaking of religious wars, the words of Meagher on "Abhorring the Sword in Dublin," 1846, are strong: "Then, my lord, I do not condemn the use of arms as immoral, nor do I conceive it profane to say that the King of Heaven — the Lord of Hosts! the God of Battles! bestows His benedictions upon those who unsheath the sword in the hour of a nation's peril." He was not allowed to finish that speech and was compelled to flee to America.

We cannot but admire Patrick Henry for his words in

1775: "There is no retreat but in submission and slavery! Our chains are forged! Their clanking may be heard on the plains of Boston! The war is inevitable and let it come! I repeat it, sir, let it come!" Still to-day we see no cause for such a patriotic speech. Blessed are the peacemakers. The murderer may kill in self-defense and our statesmen claim that war is for the purpose of the preservation of our nation. Every man should be a fighter; a fighter against oppression of every kind. Every true American has courage, courage to enter the thickest of the battle, and will give his life without a word. But how many have the real courage of life to protect suffering man and woman? The hero rescues a drowning person and receives a "hero medal." A dog will rescue his master oft-times. How many have the courage to do the real things of life?

I cannot conclude better than to quote from an article by the late Prof. William James on "The Moral Equivalent of War," *Popular Science Monthly*, Vol. 77: "The military patriotic and romantic minded everywhere, and especially the professional military class refuse to admit for a moment that war may be a transitory phenomenon in social evolution. The notion of a sheep's paradise like that revolts, they say, our higher imagination. Where then would be the steps of life? If war had ever stopped, we should have to reinvent it, on this view, to redeem life from flat degeneration. . . . Militarism is the great preserver of our ideals of hardihood, and human life with no use for hardihood would be contemptible. . . . War is in short, a permanent human obligation. . . . No victory, says S. R. Steinmetz, is possible save in the resultant of

virtue, no defeat for which some vice or weakness is not responsible." War may have been an agenic factor in the time of Rome, but I cannot believe it is in this country to-day. War is becoming more impossible each year and the patriotic spirit must be developed in more righteous ways. Pleasure and pain may be relative experiences, but we must place a new interpretation on the saying: "We can only get *to heaven through hell.*"

The above article was written and published in March, 1914, since which time we are witnessing a war the like of which the world has never seen. From the standpoint of the eugenicist, we wonder and try to determine what will be the effect of this great struggle on future generations. Will the killing off of the many thousands of strong men who could have been the fathers of healthy children be evenly or more than balanced by the betterment morally and socially of those who survive?

Will this tendency to a more religious feeling and less socialistic differences be so manifest that it will be said a century hence that this war was a good thing? We can only argue and imagine what must occur for eugenic reasons. Without wars to depopulate the world, some assert that many nations would multiply too rapidly. Peace increases race suicide.

It is possible that the desire for children is more manifest in a nation following a great war, notwithstanding the financial losses suffered by the survivors. War increases marital ties, there is a closer bond between husband and wife, more fidelity on the part of each, due to the long suffering of the soldier and the struggle for existence

of the wife at home. The unmarried soldier longs for a home and hastens to the altar as soon as possible.

War creates a spirit of charity in many who would otherwise not care for those in want. War diminishes the amount of sensual indulgences; pleasures give way to diligence. Maclay, in *The North American Review*, September, 1914, details at length on the "Horrors of Peace." He says, "When there is no strife we are continually in pain and sorrow, due to diseases, accidents, race suicide, divorce, etc., all of which (although constantly decreasing in proportion to the population) are as distressing as war." Race suicide and divorce are markedly on the increase. I mentioned these calamities, destroyers of the race even in peace, in the above article. The effect of war and peace must be judged by the moral effect upon the nations concerned. Even from an eugenic standpoint a righteous weakling is yet superior to an immoral giant and will in the long run produce better children.

Just so long as our false idea of national patriotism compels two neighbors who are the best of friends, but who happen to live on opposite sides of a boundary line, to take up arms against each other, because they must be true to their country, must we continue to argue, as to the horrors of war and the value of peace. In the same line of argument must we consider those who would kill a friend and brother because their birth was solemnized in one church while that of his brother was written in a sanctuary which had a different belief in some detail of a God whom they each believed listened to their supplications and would make them victors in the end. Victories they may be, but not such as they believed.

TEACHING SEX HYGIENE

SOME one has facetiously said that it is now, "Sex o'clock." Before beginning a serious consideration of this maligned subject, it is advisable that the honest student read carefully the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus. After a careful study of the Jewish laws, we are in a better position to ask the question: "Are we as thorough in teaching sex matters and administering laws dealing with social ills as were our ancestors many centuries ago?"

We all do agree that every intelligent man and woman desires a state of sexual purity in his own household; but the idea is common to many that sex sin is necessary and should exist. We can quite agree concerning animal nature unrestrained, but cannot consent to the necessity as a part of the natural physiological functions of the human body.

Man is an animal normally endowed with more or less of the "sex pull." A proper restraint of this nature depends upon a healthy body and a sufficient degree of intelligence. The various structures of the human organism are capable of reaction to many stimuli, internal and external to that organism. An abnormal condition of certain parts of the body permits abnormal reactions to these stimuli in such a way that individuals become different. Idealistic psychology provides a study of the individual as well as the class. Nowhere is such observation of greater importance than in the sexual associations

of men and women. The student of sociology must recognize these variations in his endeavor to provide solutions for our social ills.

In the attempt to establish a condition of universal social purity, many enthusiasts have a panacea in "sex hygiene." If our girls and boys can only be taught to know themselves, biologically, physiologically and sexually, then the problem is solved; vice and immorality will diminish. These persons mean well and possibly even the teaching of the most radical might do no harm, but this treatment is no "cure-all." Many of these sex instructors should be given a lesson or many lessons in practical physiology and sociology. They are not beginning at the bottom of practical eugenics. We can temporarily subdue a wild beast by an iron cage and the trainer's club, but its nature changes but little. Reason and a healthy body are necessary for man to subdue himself.

Education is an essential thing, but a simple knowledge of abstract things is frequently of little value. The thief knows he may be imprisoned, the murderer knows he may be executed, the young man sowing his wild oats knows he may reap tares, but the knowledge of the penalties does not lessen crime. In the last report of the Allegheny County Workhouse, we learn that from 1869 to 1912 there were committed to that institution 152,432 persons. Of this number 71,704 were committed two or more terms; 451 ten times; 361 twenty times; 112 thirty times; 54 forty times; and 357 fifty or more times.

There were 3,994 convictions in the women's court, New York, in two years ending August 31, 1912. In this short time, 1,740 were repeaters; 164 were convicted five times;

57 seven times; 7 ten times; and 2 twelve times. Surely the besetting sins of these unfortunate persons were too strong for their power of resistance. An early knowledge of sex matters might have prevented a few of these women from living a life frequently leading to the prison cell. A good home would have saved most of them from this sad fate.

Dr. M. J. Exner, secretary student department of the International Committee of the Young Men's Christian Association, recently sent a questionnaire of thirteen questions relative to sex education to the secretaries of the college Young Men's Christian Associations throughout the country. Sixty-three replies were received from prominent colleges and universities located in all sections of the United States. The replies show that every one of the sixty-three institutions make some provision for educating students in the matter of sex.

The reports indicate that there is a decrease in venereal disease in these institutions (in one college, instead of 125 cases of venereal disease after a single football game, 15 is now a fair estimate); the attitude of coarseness and vulgarity toward the subject of sex has given place to one of serious respect; and the whole moral tone has been changed. It would thus appear that college football is not an eugenic factor; the physical development of the players is more than counterbalanced by the effect of venereal diseases on the enthusiastic cheering sections and many women and children in later years. College presidents will please take note. I have little sympathy with any college which compels chapel attendance in the mornings and then closes its eyes to the evils attending contests

and social events followed by drinking and debauchery. We have shown that "wild oats" are not necessary for men, and in like manner the college boys are not obliged to commit overt acts which can only be a hindrance to race development.

This is a serious attempt on the part of the writer to show why public sentiment is opposed, as it is clearly demonstrated in the press, against the teaching of sex hygiene in our schools. There is no hope of success in sex instruction to our school children as long as the parents themselves do not maintain a higher standard, knowing sex matters as they do. In the same spirit of relaxation and celebration, the more august fathers who convene as delegates to a political, fraternal or business convention occasionally see the sights when away from home. Would it be thought the teaching of sex matters to these delegates on the way to the convention would produce a state of subjugation? Or does it clearly prove there are many factors besides simple knowledge which must be reckoned with?

Let us hope that none of our intelligent fathers wish to prevent their wives and children from learning important truths; from knowing that sexual sins are punished by awful penalties. Every boy and girl should know the mysteries of life as far as the father and mother can teach it. It is true that many a child is born in the maternity hospital, with the stigma of "no father" branded upon its forehead for life, simply because the mother did not tell the innocent girl a few simple facts of reproduction.

If the parents neglect to instruct their children concerning these most important things, should the school

undertake this task? The agitation on the question is becoming very warm. At the last meeting of the World's Purity Congress, a resolution was passed urging the introduction of safe and sane sex education directly into normal and high schools, and indirectly into secondary schools. It urged that teachers be prepared to avail themselves for giving this instruction, and that it be given a place in teachers' institutions and conventions. It also urged parents to avail themselves of opportunities offered through the church, school and other organized forces in preparing themselves to properly instruct their children in sex matters.

B. S. Steadwell, president of the above congress, says: "In all movements that spell progress there are certain questions or principles that are absolutely fixed and that must be steadfastly adhered to or the cause itself must fail and go to pieces. This is signally true to-day of the movement that demands the instruction of children in the purposes, problems and perils of sex. Our policy of silence on these matters throughout all the past has wrought disaster and cannot be honestly reviewed with satisfaction. Therefore we believe that every child has a right to know all there is to be known, that can serve him, as to himself, and especially as pertains to his physical body, and that this knowledge ought to be imparted to him in a form adapted to his age and powers. Now what is to be done with debatable questions? The only earthly thing is to debate them. Therefore let us be glad for the present discussions on the hygiene. It is the best thing that can happen. Opposition never killed a righteous cause. Apathy, lethargy, inanition mean death to any

movement.”

The objections to teaching sex hygiene in the school are: (1) Public opinion; (2) few teachers are capable of giving instructions in matters of sex; (3) absence of tested courses of study; (4) to be effective must include the elementary schools, which are considered dangerous for this instruction; (5) danger of awakening an interest in sex matters at a too early age; (6) knowledge would rob the children of that sweet ignorance of the terrible evils of life. The editor of *Vigilance*, the organ of the American Social Hygiene Association, says: “Sex education cannot be comprehensively treated without a consideration of sex morals, nor is the welfare against commercialized vice adequate without consideration of sex education. Our problem is in its essential elements a scientific one. On one side it enters the domains of physiology, psychology and pathology; on the other those of sociology, criminology and of political science.” In looking over 141 clippings for one month, this editor found the majority in favor of sex instruction in the home and opposed to it in the schools. Some of these opinions on this subject are quite interesting and relevant to a solution.

Prof. Thomas H. Balliet says: “No one questions the possibility of doing a vast deal of good by enlightening fathers and mothers on this vital subject. Public sentiment is ripe everywhere for this step and competent persons can be found usually among the medical profession.” The *Philadelphia Ledger*, September 7, 1913, protests against that alarming fad now possessing some advanced educators — the dangerous fad of giving to little children in the schools the sort of instruction that is tantamount to

a mud bath. It says: "The country is obsessed by an unholy wage for vice investigation and vice exploitation. It has threatened to debauch the stage, but wise men and women, whose strong sense is above the superficial speculations of amateur sociologists, will oppose the attempt to institute vice teaching in the public schools."

The fear of sex knowledge is seen in *Collier's*, October 18, 1913: "The psychologists are welcome to their endless wrangles as to the precise extent to which sex discussion arouses. . . . Any system of instruction which gives a knowledge of sex hygiene merely as mechanical knowledge will be a gigantic mistake." Monsignor John A. Shepard writes in the *Journal* of Jersey City, October 6, 1913: "Just at present our ears are dinned with a fad of sex hygiene. Its introduction into the schools is discussed throughout the country. If ever there was a system diabolically devised to injure our youth, and to make them voluptuaries, this is by far the most effective."

The *Lowell Sun*, September 26, 1913, says: "Sex education in the schools is one of the latest manifestations of modernism gone mad." The *Milwaukee Free Press*, November 1, 1913, quotes Miss Ida Tarbell: "I am extremely doubtful as to the wisdom of teaching sex hygiene in the public schools, much as I realize the need for sane, clean consideration of the matter. I believe it would be wiser to bend all our energies toward convincing mothers and fathers of their obligation in meeting this need."

The *Free Press* agrees with Miss Tarbell, but remarks, as we all should know: "There will always be a host of parents, especially among the uneducated and irrespons-

ble, who, no matter what their knowledge on the subject, will be unable to convey it to their children in a tactful, sensible, wholesome and impressive manner."

Aye! There is the rub. It is the great mass of parents who will never know or care to know how to instruct their children in these matters. Enough has been said in these articles on the defectives, on crime, and on poverty to clearly show that society must demand conditions which will be for a betterment of our inferior classes; those whom we burden and who are a burden to us. The above quotations from the press are from *Vigilance*, December, 1913, and as it stands for the highest ideals in all matters of purity, favoring sane teaching of sex hygiene, much credit must be given this journal for quoting these adverse opinions. It follows the criticisms with many quotations which are very favorable to and insistent upon instruction on sex hygiene in the public schools. These opinions are too well known to be quoted.

The Louisville (Ky.) *Times*, November 7, 1913, says: "The social hygiene exhibit of the Kentucky School of Social Hygiene was opened to-day, in the Y. M. C. A. building. The purpose of the exhibit is to educate in the methods of prevention of sexual disease and vices, and through instruction in sex hygiene to improve society and protect future generations."

Ella Flagg Young, many years superintendent of the Chicago schools, recently stated: "Parental objection to the teaching of sex hygiene in Chicago schools has practically disappeared, since the parents learned the exact nature of the new course. The only opposition that now exists comes from outside sources and from persons who

do not really understand what we are teaching." The Chicago School Board has since, on account of politics, by a vote of 13 to 8, taken the instruction of sex hygiene out of the high school.

Knowing society as we do, with thousands of children growing up without proper sex instruction, what should we advise? I am firmly convinced that the child must be educated by some one in these matters, or he will acquaint himself with these things at the wrong time and place. A general plan of morals can be interwoven with other lessons by any teacher of ability. This does not mean that she must teach sex matters, but this instruction must develop a moral tone in a child so that it will seek for further instruction at home. I agree with the editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*: "Whatever the outcome, and if we are to make progress to this use of education it is evident that the first party to be educated is the parent. Their diffidence in approaching the topic, and clumsiness in handling it, are two of the hurtful objects to a splendid conceived movement."

If the parents are to teach their children these things we must teach the parents. A good example is the Buena Park Parent-Teacher Association of Los Angeles; there the mothers of that district got together, decided that for the sake of their children it was their duty to study sex hygiene for themselves. They purchased books, provided lecturers and are now able to instruct their children.

A limited course in these matters should be given by women physicians in the high schools and colleges, and similar instruction to boys by men physicians. Very few teachers are capable of teaching these questions properly.

It is quite possible that men's organizations of the churches is the best place to instruct the fathers and young men. Similar mothers' meetings should be held in churches and schools for providing knowledge pertaining to the girls. Every mother should instruct her daughter to look after her physical welfare. She should decide as to the fashion of the dress. Modesty, we believe, is due to the wearing of clothes. Such being true, it will not be long until many women will have lost this modesty, for unrestrained animals and plants always revert to former parents, and woman is fast reverting to the Garden of Eden. The Fiji Islanders are not modest.

Mothers must be taught what amusements, habits of life, and companions are best for the children. They must be able to instruct the girls as to the true wife, duties of motherhood, and finally the nature, acquirement and dangers of venereal disease.

The Church and society must demand that there be more mothers and fathers in the real sense of these words; let home be a place where parents and children love to dwell, and if such can be accomplished there will be less danger to those who may still be innocent on sexual matters.

Dr. J. A. Doleris, *La Gyn*, November, 1910, says: "Sexual education will lead young people toward a higher goal, show them early the true significance of life, guide them to a sufficient knowledge of human biology, and inculcate a logical conception of the laws of nature which rule our lives. It is time to put an end to the ignorance, and mystery of sexual matters, derived from religious dogma, which has been thrown around the highest and

most essential function of life, reproduction. The austere morality of religion has accomplished little. There is no desire to lessen the dominance of true love in marriage by education, but to give a true appreciation of the physical and psychical qualities necessary to produce healthy and strong offspring; to substitute this for an idealized romantic sentiment, or a materialistic satisfaction of the sensual element. We must break with a system of education whose worst consequence is to give a false judgment to children, to pervert their imagination and sometimes even to indicate them to vice."

MARRIAGE AND EUGENICS

THERE is no problem in eugenics which has caused so much consideration as that of marriage. It is probable that eugenists have given more attention to this phase of producing a healthy race than to all other related subjects. It is but natural that such should be the result of a study to improve mankind. Since "like begets like," the attention of students of sociology is directed to the fact that good healthy parents will more likely have healthy children than will those less healthy. Then it must be concluded that persons healthy at the time of marriage will more likely be healthy at the time of procreation than those who marry, tainted with syphilis, tuberculosis, alcoholism, mental deficiency, etc.

For these reasons, to-day, on the one hand we find very free discussion of healthy persons who should marry, and on the other, reasons why some others should not marry. Explanations are given why healthy, intelligent young men and women refrain from entering into the marriage relation, until a late age, if at all.

In the United States census of 1910, there were of all ages, 41.7 per cent. males and 47.2 per cent. females married, widowed or divorced. Of the males, 38 per cent. were married, 3.1 per cent. widowers, 0.3 per cent. divorced, and 0.3 per cent. reported. Of the females, 39.6 per cent. were married, 7.1 per cent. widows, 0.4 per cent. divorced, and 0.2 per cent. not reported.

Sixty per cent. of all males and 70 per cent. of all fe-

males, over fifteen years of age, were married, widowed or divorced; 4.5 per cent. of these males were widowers and 10.6 per cent. (more than twice as many) females were widows. This proportion of widowers and widows is partially accounted for by reason of more widowers remarrying and because men die earlier on account of the nature of their work, and to some extent their pleasures.

There were over seven million single men and only four million single women between the ages of twenty and forty-four. We have already shown that the number of male and female children born is about the same, hence it must be concluded that women marry at an earlier age; furthermore, our immigrants show a much greater proportion of single men than single women. Were all of both sexes between twenty-five and forty compelled to marry, the excess of single men over the single women would be balanced by the widows being much more numerous than the widowers. Nature always endeavors to maintain an equilibrium.

In the United States there are over thirteen million persons of both sexes unmarried. It is interesting from a sociological standpoint to note that in the cities and towns, 38 per cent. of the men and 26 per cent. of the women, between twenty-five and thirty-four were single, while in the country or rural districts, but 31 per cent. of the men and 15 per cent. of the women were single. Surely farm life predisposes to a sure and generally an early marriage.

Practically all writers on the question of marriage begin their argument with the mating of animals, showing that many of them live a monogamous life; then they mention

the social relations of primitive races of man. Many of these by virtue of their nomadic life lived in a state of exogamy.

To many it may be surprising to know that since the beginning of authentic history to the present time there have been many tribes of savage, barbarous, and semi-civilized people in which the maternal system of family inheritance was the custom and law. Is it not mentioned in Genesis, "Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife"? Under this system the man would become a part of the wife's family, in some places even taking her name.

"It has been very generally assumed that maternal descent is due largely to uncertainty of paternity, and that an admission that the maternal system has been universal is practically an admission of promiscuity. Opponents of this theory have consequently felt called upon to minimize the importance of maternal descent. But descent through females is not, in fact, fully explained by uncertainty of parentage on the male side. It is due to the larger social fact, including this biological one, that the bond between the mother and child is closest in nature, and that the group grew up about the more stationary female, and consequently the questions of maternal descent and promiscuity are by no means so inseparable as has been commonly supposed."—*Professor Thomas, Sex and Society.*

As was mentioned in the discussion of Female Labor, much of the history of man shows that by nature man is the warrior and the hunter, while woman had to raise the family, till the soil and even made the arrows, mold the

bullets and tan the hides of animals brought home. Since she was the mainstay of the home, she was the government and sometimes she was allowed to have several husbands.

The relation of the sexes has at different times and places taken every possible form we are able to conceive of. These different forms of the sexual status have been determined by the condition of the people and their relations to one another. But whatever the form, it has always been an example of motion in the direction of least resistance, or greater attraction.

Let us grant for the sake of argument that Adam was created in the Garden of Eden, made in the image of God, and that a perfect physical woman, Eve, was made for him from his own rib. We have here then man and woman perfect from an eugenic standpoint. Their children, and children's children to the present time, if no attempt had been made to improve each generation by special selection should be the same to-day as when they first saw their nakedness and were ashamed. We believe man is the same to-day as he is described in Genesis. Man is full of the "old Adam," just as bad as he was. Man can kill as easily as did his son Cain. Man is the same old man. But we do change our natures, we are continually being acted upon by the various forces, which producing variations and modifications, have many classes of people with various varieties of families, many of which have more or less pronounced types of individual hybrids and mongrels.

The animal breeder, who may observe twenty-five parts of a Plymouth Rock's make-up and marking to be judged at the bird show, or who may pay ten thousand dollars for a White Orpington hen, or who may feed, stable and

breed his sheep and hogs as if they were worth their weight in gold, has been busy teaching man that children were almost as good as pigs and goats. Society has awakened, and realizes that there has been too much "falling in love," and "heaven-made marriages." Many aëroplanes have broken their steering wheels and fallen to earth. Many angels (for a while) are now every day human beings. Marriage is a reality; courtship was a mirage. Many are hunting for the oasis.

Virtue may be blind to a degree, but its vision is most excellent compared to that of love. Love is too often blindness personified — the shades of night in the Arctic winter. Too oft it is but the beating of a passioned breast; the physical emotion without any semblance of a spiritual man or woman. On the other hand true love, unbiased by physical "tropisms" to distort and annul normal reason, is the sweetest thing on earth; it is life itself; a continual sunshine, with no thought of clouds and storms and the bitter things of life.

Such a true ideal union of two lives would require but little eugenic consideration. But we must accept the situation as it presents itself. The divorce courts, the cases of wife beating, nonsupport, infidelity, and many others too numerous to mention, furnish the press with a large part of the important daily events. It is for such reasons that eugenics must furnish a partial solution for our social whirlpool of domestic infelicity, illegitimate children, etc., in the great social unrest.

It is plain from such considerations that, with the progress of civilization, marriage becomes an institution which may give greater joy, or which may inflict deeper misery.

There are three general methods of looking at the marriage relation: (1) Marriage for love; (2) business method, as marriage for property and family considerations; (3) friendship and companionship. In the primitive tribes we find the sexual interest very great, and a woman was of great value from this viewpoint.

Later, we find that many conquests were followed by marriages between men and women of the victorious and the conquered nations. Alexander chose his wives from the nations he subdued; he insisted that his courtiers do the same. When the Romans wanted to weaken Macedonia, they ordered that there should be no inter-marriages between the people of different provinces. The national reason is seen in royal marriages of to-day between prince and princess of nations who wish thus to seal an agreement to remain on friendly terms. It is for power, prominence and finance that the articles of agreement are signed whereby a "has been" count or a "duke's mixture" agrees to deliver the name of the family crest and the keys of an "about to be foreclosed" castle, to a certain "butter-scotch" or a "pork and beans" Chicago millionaire, once a poor boy, in return for which the generous count or duke is to receive a small sum of "hand money" for signing the valuable articles, also an annuity of some hundred thousand as long as the guarantor remains solvent, and finally he is to take charge of the donor's daughter "to boot." This form of marriage is not recommended by any eugenists for the titled gentlemen could seldom present evidence of being eugenically able to continue good healthy generations.

Most people with even a small amount of American

patriotism decry such an international marriage, whereby we lose so much gold to Europe, and receive in return only scandal in years to come. But how many mothers and fathers, how many daughters themselves are not using every means at their command to make a certain catch regardless of who and what the man is, physically and morally? How many men have set their nets for fish with golden scales?

The morality of the marriage state is very different as it is looked at from these different points of view. The marriage relation is said to be pure if legally sanctioned, and the Church makes it holy by giving its blessing, although the parties bound by it may have neither love nor friendship for each other.

The Kansas Board of Education recently called attention to the value of domestic science courses in the schools as a check upon divorce. Of 800 girls graduated from the higher State schools since domestic science courses were added, 440 have been married and not one has sought either a separation or a divorce. Therefore the board concludes that a girl who can furnish a good meal properly cooked and daintily served, is liable to do her own mending and trim some of her own hats, besides keeping her home neat and attractive.

Enough has been said to inform the man and woman contemplating marriage to stop and seriously consider whether or not each or both of them are physically, morally and financially capable of entering into and continuing a reasonably satisfactory married life. Both parties may measure up to every requirement any body of scientific men might present and still the marriage would

not be a success, because the two parties were temperamentally different. The marriage state is somewhat of a lottery. It is the only institution into which, in most States, all may enter — the lame, the halt, the diseased, the pauper, the convict, the mentally defective — and be allowed to reproduce their kind, many of which will be supported in penal and charitable institutions.

So difficult is the solution of proper mating and of the right to bear children that we have many views, beginning with that of free love societies where the State may care for all children; then the opinion of Bernard Shaw, who believes that all women should have the privilege of maternity, married or not; and next, the general view of most persons who believe that all who desire should be permitted to marry; finally, we see that of the extreme eugenists who claim that only those passing the most rigid physical examination should be allowed the marriage privilege.

In the near future we must demonstrate that plants, animals, and human beings are entirely different as far as "breeding true" is concerned. So many influences are brought to bear upon the various forms of organic life that this might be so. Burbank will cast aside thousands of plants just to secure one that is just right for his experiments. Civilized people, at least, are mongrels, in that each individual contains "units" representing innumerable ancestors in the dominant and recessive characteristics of their physical structure. What then must be the presentation of various ancestors in their mental manifestations? A reasonable effort should be made for more better and less undesirable marriages, which will give

us happier homes, better society, and from an economic standpoint save us millions of dollars in caring for the defectives, diseased, paupers and criminals.

Oscar Heath of the Englewood High Schools, Chicago, in "Composts of Tradition," says: "Marriage is a restrictive device which interferes with the greatest function for which mankind was created, and at the same time supplies an opportunity for the grossest immorality under the guise or disguise of holy matrimony. The greatest virtue a woman has is her longing for children. The greatest vice man has is his desire to monopolize her productivity. The wedding ring is the badge of the bondage of woman's virtue to man's vice. Why should not the man wear the wedding ring as a token that he belongs to woman? Society should pension mothers who are wives and should provide both subsidies and pensions for mothers who have the courage to become such without first becoming wives."

With some of this I agree, but the average mother who has support for her children does not wish medals and pensions. Her children are her honor. Those who should and will not have children are the ones who will be dishonored, and there is the reward of the real mother. The poor mother trying to support her children frequently deserves and will soon receive support from the State. The greatest coward in a civilized country is the man who is responsible for the birth of a child and allows the unmarried mother to bear and care for that child without giving them financial assistance. Our laws must be revised in this matter. If he refuses his support he should be sentenced to the workhouse and the value of his wages

given to these poor unfortunates for their support.

Dr. Emmet Densmore, in "Sex Equality," says: "We cannot determine by experiment whether a day nursery, under competent supervision is not as much better for our infants than home nursing, as our day school is better than any ordinary method of home teaching. . . . The strong vigorous mother skilled in some trade or profession by which she might earn as much as or even more than her husband has time in the morning to give her child an ample caressing, to look into the adequacy of its care, and then leave for the day to engage in lucrative, congenial employment that to many would be more attractive than the monotonous tedium of an unchanging environment where endless household cares, routine work and drudgery weary and dishearten — she is far more likely to engage her husband with interesting or intellectual conversation and make herself attractive than her worn-out prototype of the present day. He is not nearly so apt to seek his evening relaxation elsewhere."

The views of Dr. Densmore are certainly very radical. He cannot want the average woman whose husband can support her, and in the ideal state of home life all should, to seek employment elsewhere. He evidently realizes the great demand of the family to provide modern dress, home furnishings and amusements to keep up with the times. He thinks of the New York school teachers who cannot be married and have children. He observes the vast army of girls who are working at good salaries and cannot marry the average young men who are unable to support them as they have been accustomed to by their own efforts. Many of these women as well as those working at a less

wage and those unemployed finally hear the call of nature, the maternal instinct, and marry hoping for the best.

I am firmly convinced that we should make labor and social conditions such that more of our men and women could marry at an earlier age. And while we are striving for the marriage of more of the physically able, we must prevent by rational methods the marriage of the unfit. As long as the sanction of the Church is asked and their ministers and priests solemnize the wedding ceremonies, they must feel it their duty to assist in preventing the unfit to marry. Many of these excellent men are already doing much in this respect.

The parents and women must demand that man be as good physically as the woman. The unfortunate woman is cast aside, a stigma upon her and her child while the man demands a woman who has always led a life of virtue.

“If the vilest mortal that lives sees proper to marry, the law issues the license for the asking, takes the fee, makes the record, and leaves the offspring and society to shift for themselves as best they can, even paupers, while in the poorhouse, and criminals, while in jail, are in every way encouraged and given licenses to marry, and are protected by the law. No thought is taken for the unfortunate offspring, or for the body politic and social, and the irreparable evils that must fall upon all. The Church adds its sanction, and its ministers aid in making these contracts by performing a ceremony with prayers and benedictions. If it is wise to prohibit polygamy, marriage between relations, and between persons whose insanity or idiocy is self-evident, it is equally wise to prohibit

it in all cases where evil may follow. If the law has the power to prohibit or punish violation in the one case, it has equal right in all others.

“There is an endless procession of children from all these sources coming into the mass of population to live lives of crime, immorality, want, suffering, misfortune, and degeneracy, transmitting the taint in constantly widening streams, generation after generation, with the ultimate certainty of the deterioration of the race and final irreparable degeneracy.”—*Reeve*.

“However much of our optimistic bent may incline us to envelop the future in an effulgence of bliss, we must, nevertheless, come in our cooler moments to the facts of recorded and present experience, and these compel us to reject the notion of perfect harmony in the affectional relations at any time or under any circumstances, as a Utopian dream.”—*Anonymous*.

“Why Men do not Marry,” from the *Strand*—Dr. C. W. Saleeby: “We shall need to make the conditions of marriage, including divorce, infinitely fairer for women if marriage is to maintain its place in the social structure.” Canon Horsley: “The cause which occurs to me as the chief, is that young men, more than young women, require a higher standard of living at the beginning of housekeeping than their parents.” Sarah Bernhardt: “It is, I feel sure, the change in manners, habits, customs of the times that is responsible for the steadily decreasing marriage rate.” Arthur Bourchier: “In my humble opinion the fact that the marriage rate is declining is almost the fault of the woman. The modern woman is less forbearing and patient than was her grandmother. She

is too excessively prone to indulge in that most unpleasant of all habits — nagging.” Sir Hiram Maxim: “Higher education of the children; increase in number of the dependents; high cost of living; and desire of young ladies for as luxurious a home as they have.” Mrs. C. N. Williamson: “Because the cost of things keeps going up. Poverty seems to come in at the door unless a chauffeur can drive up to it with some vague cheap suggestion of a motor-car, and Love stands ready to bolt out of the window unless it can be curtained with the most charming muslin and chintz.”

George K. Kneeland, a well-known investigator, says, in discussing a solution to diminish social ills: “Use your influence to bring about better economic and industrial conditions so that fathers can be masters in their home; so that young men can marry early in life. Teach ignorant mothers and fathers so that they will love and understand their children more than they do.

“Teach boys and young men to honor womanhood. You can make them realize that young girls represent more than half of all future generations; that upon them depends the health and power of the race, that to injure a girl, take advantage of her racial instinct at a critical moment is a crime against unborn generations. Men must learn to sacrifice themselves, if need be, for the good of the race. Use your influence to restore to the home the simple, yet powerful protection which grows out of the belief in the religion of our fathers.”

WHY GIRLS GO WRONG

Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
As to be hated, needs but to be seen;
But seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We must endure, then pity, then embrace.

THESE words of Pope open up a great philosophical problem. In each of us there is a residuum of our forefathers, including no small amount of disease. Some of us may have a certain amount of natural immunity to certain temptations and vices, others acquire a further immunity by continual resistance to these assaults on our various natures, which eventually becomes sufficient to withstand the average temptations of life.

Man is an animal normally endowed by more or less of the "sex pull." A proper restraint of this nature depends upon a healthy body and a sufficient degree of intelligence. The various structures of the human organism are endowed with the property of reaction to many stimuli internal and external to that organism. An abnormal condition of certain parts of the body shows abnormal reactions to these stimuli in such a way that no two persons, although apparently alike, will show exactly the same response, hence they are more or less different. The student of sociology must recognize these differences in his endeavor to provide solutions for our social ills. We may classify conditions, but in the end the active worker must

study the individual, hence the difficult task before us in providing a cure for the social evil. In my investigations of this enormous problem I have studied hundreds of individual cases. In five years' service to a Maternity Hospital, it was my duty to take care of several hundred girls and young women who gave birth to illegitimate children. Who can imagine the sorrows in the lives of these unfortunate women! What was the cause of their failure to show a sufficient amount of resistance? Who can point the finger of scorn at these women and say that they alone were to blame?

All temptations are much less dangerous if the individual secures every possible means to increase her resistance. As will be mentioned later, companions determine largely the needs of an individual. Frequently one is compelled to associate with those who exert a very evil influence over others. As reasonable judges we cannot expect young girls to choose the best. Natural forces follow the lines of least resistance; it is easier to play than to work and to satisfy the animal nature than to resist. The remedy lies with society or that part of society that has to do with the uplift of mankind. It is the duty of the Church as a whole, not this or that denomination, to provide means whereby every girl can be surrounded with good influences much of the time. Utopia provides a "big sister" whose duty it will be to prevent the downfall of those less fortunate. It will be the duty of society to provide safe employment, healthful exercise, clean amusements and religious teachings for every girl. Thousands spent in prophylaxis is many times better than millions in cure of social ills which rarely cure.

Why do girls go wrong? The social evil has always been present with us and to a greater or less extent will be for generations to come. In civilized communities the double standard of morals, where the girl is censured, disgraced and cast from society with no helping hand, none to care for her and restore her to a happy home, while the man is allowed to remain an ornament to society, often pitied, is the most important factor in producing this evil. Second in importance is the home life where a failure of the parents to properly provide education in morals, where the home life is full of strife, misery, improper chastisements and lack of healthful pleasure. Countless parents to-day are either too ignorant or occupied in other things to care for the welfare of their children. To a great extent the mother is to blame for the waywardness of the daughter. This training must be begun sufficiently early to be effective. The mother should know the character of the boy and girl friends; she should know positively as the daughter reaches the age full of temptations, whether or not she is always at places told her. Remaining over night with a girl friend or at a public café for dinner or after theater supper, is dangerous to some young girls and many older ones. In this connection we mention poor tenement houses badly ventilated, illness of parents, drunkenness, poverty on one hand, and on the other the demands of society, small families, children given over to a governess, balls, wine suppers and divorce.

The next factor is that of companions. The good apple never improves the bad one. The words of Pope are very pertinent in this connection. The girl who works in a

factory, or stands behind a counter all day, going home tired at night, compelled to live in a house full of turmoil, probably giving most or all of her small earnings to help the family, will after a time give close attention to those of her companions who are passing their evenings in a more exciting way, at a dance hall and other places of amusement. She soon learns that many are obtaining money other than what they receive as wages. Finally the temptations of a still further life of ease are presented to her and her downfall is easily accomplished.

The wage question has been continually mentioned as the one reason why girls go wrong. I cannot agree with those who place this first; other conditions being as they should, very few girls will fall for this reason alone. It is true that many girls in factories and stores will and do go wrong, but there are other factors back of low wages. We should have a minimum wage for all working women and all should work to secure the enactment of such laws. But in studying the wage of the girl behind the counter we must not lose sight of the temptation with which she is continually met. The good looking girl falls before her homely sister with similar home life and wages. The events in the downward path of the clerk are frequently as follows: A man, too frequently married, is attracted by the comely appearance of the girl. He starts a conversation with her, using a little flattery; at a second or later appearance he importunes her to lunch, then a dinner, theater with wine supper, automobile ride perhaps, and likely a visit to the house of a friend, which proves to be an assignation house; presents as hats, dresses, complete her desire for a life of ease. She may become a

mother, disgraced, and pass her subsequent life in a house of prostitution.

Very many a virtuous girl believes the man who promises to marry her and is happy and secure in this belief; she permits her resistance to temptations to be lowered to such a degree that she virtually becomes his mistress. The knowledge of her weakness and his desire for a virtuous girl causes him to grow cold, and finally abandon her to a life of shame. Having taken one bite out of the apple of dangerous experience she may think that a few more bites will not make her any worse. If she has become pregnant many a man will not be willing to face the world with a wife in trouble, even though he be the cause of it. No, he must marry when he may choose and be able to look the world in the face and say he did no wrong. Many thousands of women are in houses of prostitution and supporting illegitimate children, for the only reason that these women were forsaken because *they believed in the promise of man.*

A mother that does not observe that her daughter is wearing clothes which could not be purchased with her share of her earnings is certainly assisting in her ruin. Vanity and a life of ease with amusements easily follow when these opportunities have been offered and accepted. The cloak models and higher priced sales-ladies accept these offers as frequently as their poorly paid sisters. A very small percentage of girls become prostitutes from sexual desire alone. An increase of wages is too frequently followed by an increase in expenditures for dress, with the result that the savings are no greater than before. Home extravagances are becoming so great that the *age of mar-*

riage is becoming too late for real homes. The ability of the woman to obtain a salary equal to the man frequently prevents her marrying until late, if at all. The *automobile, alcohol, and late hours* are very important factors in lowering the resistance of the girl to a life of virtue. When the courting hours reach into the small hours of the night, the young people are treading on dangerous grounds. As when a man is intoxicated with too much alcohol, so are those sexual passions which are allowed to have full sway, with no restraining hand of reason which has been banished in those late hours of imaginary love.

Last but not least is the *marriage of the unfit*. The day is not far distant when the marriage license will include a certificate of health which will permit the married couple to live a more happy life with less possibilities of extra-conjugal intercourse and later divorce and what frequently happens to the woman, a life in a house of prostitution. The girl must be taught that she has sexual organs which must be properly cared for; that certain physiological processes are especially active during puberty. That in this developmental period certain events must occur and should do so regularly unless interrupted by pregnancy. They must be taught how this pregnant condition is brought about, what it means and the result. They must know the result of infection with venereal disease, how it may affect their health and children. I must add that if the men had to suffer as a result of venereal disease, frequently having their sexual organs removed, as do women, the social evil would diminish very much. In conclusion we must recognize that certain factors cause a woman to sin a first time, while entirely different reasons

cause a woman deserted by her husband or a pregnant girl forsaken by a false lover to enter a house of prostitution.

WHY MEN GO WRONG

IN the chapter "Why Girls go Wrong," I attempted to show that each individual is in a large sense a law unto himself, in that no two persons are created alike in their ability to react in the same way to similar stimuli. What applies to woman in this respect is also true for man; lower the power of resistance, increase the susceptibility to reactions or increase the stimulus in the way of temptation and man will sin more quickly. The effect is more positive if any one or more of these conditions are made continual in action.

Ask the man why he commits sexual sins and he replies, "Eve tempted me." Ask woman in turn and the answer is, "The serpent, man, is responsible." The solution is as unsatisfactory as the biological problem of which came first, the hen or the egg.

In studying prostitution in a practical way I am impressed and depressed by the fact that the public knows but little of the enormous amount of the psychopathic state so evident in the prostitute and her co-partner in the awful practice of some form of perversion. Studies show that frequent visitations to the brothel soon produce a state of mental depravity exhibited as frequently, or I often believe more so, in the professional or business man, than in the laborer, because in a stage of more or less sexual excitement with less power of reason and inhibition due to alcoholic stimulation the passions demand unnatural methods of satisfaction.

In these respects man is far inferior to the brute. The animal instinct is a natural attribute which provides for the preservation of the individual. In man with intelligence and reason we frequently observe that knowledge of the result of an infraction of well known physical laws does not prevent the offender from committing acts which he certainly knows will prove disastrous to himself and others dependent upon him.

We well know when a man jumps into a river and rescues a drowning companion, he may be given a "hero medal." It requires many times more courage for a man to resist ordinary temptations or to take the stand for right principles in the face of adverse criticism, than to perform any of these glorious feats of daring in saving life. It is not the fear of death that prevents a man from doing these worthy deeds of rescue, for most men will face bullets in the battle with possible death in each instance. Moral courage demands a higher development. We need real men to fight in this social warfare in which so many victims are already "battle scarred" from degeneracy and venereal disease.

We need men who think of something superior and more lasting than the almighty dollar. Were it not for the greed of money to be so easily gotten in trafficking in so many ways in vice, our problem would be quite easy to solve. The merchant who sells to the brothel, the lawyer who acts as counsel, the physician who carelessly examines the prostitute, the cadet who obtains a miserable existence as a parasite upon these unfortunate women, the politician who profits by their persecution, and many others demand the continual existence of prostitution, making it a per-

fect system of organized vice.

Why do men go wrong? The first answer is the natural one of supply and demand. The first demand in the large city is the demand above mentioned for its necessary existence, not for the physiological safety of the man, but the demand of these vultures for this business from which they gain such enormous profits. The houses having come in existence, attractions of music, dancing, liquor, etc., having been added to the wiles of the prostitute, the patronage is soon established and then the second demand for so many inmates is created and is continued as long as demand number one is insisted upon.

We have easily proven that with less houses and no attractions the visitors diminish to those still in existence; but the former inmates forced into the city streets, rooming houses, apartments, cry out in distress, "Here we are, we cannot work for small wages, we must live." Now the conditions are changed. It is not the demand of the men for those women but the demand of women for men whom they desire for revenue, hence she goes out in search for whom she may devour.

Provide a solution as to how these women can be cared for charitably. Compulsory laws may be necessary whereby those unwilling to lead a respectable life at honest wages may be placed in industrial homes where they can comfortably live, work and save a certain portion of their earnings. Remove the temptation of the street from men who have little power of resistance and much will be accomplished.

I have already shown the fallacy of the double standard, but I do not deny that man has ever been a slave to

the beauty of woman. "A fool there was," has been and will be true. Nations have fallen, homes have been deserted, every crime possible committed for a woman, not for love, but for passions, which knew no end and over which reason, if it existed, had no control.

I must repeat, good women are largely to blame for man's sin, for she permits him to insist that he must have a virtuous wife, regardless of what he may have been. She is willing to become a martyr and endure the surgeon's knife, probably death, because the disease was not cured. He may have repented of his physical sins but the repentance does not restore normal physical conditions which existed before disease, the seed is still growing. Let her demand a certificate of health from the man before marriage and we will soon observe that he will be more careful in his years of discretion. Could we compel man to have his organs of generation removed when he has venereal disease as frequently as woman must suffer for this reason, prostitution would cease immediately. Man would not endure these things he forces upon woman.

A woman, when asked why men go wrong, replied, "They have never known any better. God laid down through Moses, the Commandments, Thou shalt not do this and Thou shalt not do that, but man has said to woman these things refer to you in which *thou shalt not*. Man makes law for man." This woman is right; man will generally do what custom says is right. He will defend the flag to death; but insults woman repeatedly; he will be true to his party, but forget his church; he will spend millions for coast defense, for expositions, for protection of animal and plant industries, but little or nothing for saving the

virtue of our daughters and the health of our wives and mothers. It is true they have never known any better.

Compel the man who enters a house of prostitution to be examined or show a certificate in the way he demands of the inmate and the doors of these houses would be closed by the sheriff in a short time. Compel man to abuse himself in such a way that his life of activity would be shortened to a very few years, and add to this continual harassments, compelled to move from place to place, disgraced by all men, no one to offer a helping hand should he desire to reform, and every legislature would call special sessions to speedily exterminate all who had a voice and hand in permitting such barbarous and pernicious conditions to exist. Is not the female child of the same flesh and blood as the male? Is not the daughter of the laborer or the widow as dear as your daughter?

Would you, Mr. Man who visit the prostitute, allow your sister or your daughter to lead such a life? Would you not rise up in arms against any one who would compel them to become such? Men go wrong, because some one, because many of us make conditions, whereby the unprotected are forced by attractions of a better income and less misery to leave their previous troubles, to enter prostitution. The red light district and screened door silently proclaim for these victims, "Come, enter, you have accomplished your purpose, enter and enjoy yourself, you miserable ingrate, fulfill your promise, while they have health and beauty; they have no friends, they are outcasts of society, they are of your making, come and pay."

Reviewing history for its recital of sexual sins, particularly prostitution, we are astonished at the amount

of literature devoted to this subject. The libertine, prostitute, mistress and affinity have been ever present with man. India, Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Greece and Rome furnish ancient history replete with the part played by these women in the rise and fall of these nations. It was not until in modern France that any serious considerations were given to the dangers of prostitution and the attempts to abolish the brothel were entirely due to the fearful destruction of the health and life of even the innocent at home by the spread of venereal diseases on account of the general co-habitation of the men of France with these infected women.

Prostitution has always been present with us. Why? The answer is quite clear; the animal nature for sexual intercourse unrestrained by custom and philosophy of the various ages and places. It is useless to discuss any moral law or a particular sin without looking to man past and present, his birth, beliefs and reasons for his conduct. Let us not criticise others who have lived in a darker age committing acts repulsive to our day, for history shows that many of the ancients while practicing idolatry and strange customs were far superior to some of our intelligent American men. These same heathen would shudder at the sight of some of the modern sexual sins and horrible deeds practiced by those living on vice to-day.

Rabbi Yochanan plaintively recorded, "I remember a time when a young man and a young woman sixteen and seventeen years of age could walk in the streets and no harm would come of it."

In describing the Hundred Gates of Paradise the Persian writer says of gate the sixty-ninth, "We believers

beware of any intercourse with a courtesan or unchaste woman, also of voluntary degradation and adultery."

Gate the seventy-fourth, "for when the wife of a stranger has been visited by a strange man, she becomes accursed to her husband; to put such a woman to death is more meritorious than slaying a beast of prey."

In Hindoo literature we find, "Let the woman who approaches a stranger be regarded as a spirit of hell."

These few quotations from ancient literature show us that our problem of combating the social evil is not a new one. The question before us is how we may best deal with the evil tendencies and social customs of the present time. I shall conclude by mentioning some of the factors which produce this evil. I am firmly convinced that we will accomplish but a small part of the task before us if we close up all the existing houses of prostitution if we do not deal effectively with the causes of prostitution open or clandestine as mentioned hereafter.

Sex stimulations: Attractions of women, alcohol, food, sedentary life, evil companions, etc.

Explanations of married men as to why they visit the prostitute:

1. Unfaithfulness of wife.
2. Illness of wife.
3. Unwillingness of wife to have children.
4. Unhappy home relations, as temper, unattractiveness, late rising, poor cooking, card playing, extravagance, absence from home, etc., on the wife's part.
5. Foreigners who have left their wives in Europe.
6. Perversion. (These men deny this.)

Most boys and young men are influenced to go wrong by:

1. Parentage; inherited tendencies to sin.
 2. Poor home surroundings.
 3. Ignorance of sex hygiene.
 4. Belief that sexual intercourse is essential for health.
- Some fathers assist their sons to sin.
5. Desire to see sights and to be like other boys.
 6. Habit formation.
 7. Sex-pull without restraint. ✕
 8. Late age of marriage on account of high cost of living, or cost of high living.
 9. Seduction by married women; many of these women exert a powerful influence over boys from fifteen years of age up.
 10. Laxity of social customs; boys see that men can freely indulge, are not censured or quickly forgiven.
 11. Burlesque shows.
 12. Indecent literature and pictures.
 13. Some abnormal condition of sex organs.
 14. Repugnance to work.

I am firmly convinced that many more men and women fall through the use of alcohol than from any other cause. It is a very powerful sex stimulant and coincident with stimulation it diminishes the power of restraint. The evil produced by alcohol is as great among the better classes of society, I truly believe much more so, than in the poorer ones. The saloon is the poor man's club. Remove liquor from the clubs, midnight suppers and many of the card-parties and most of these would vanish immedi-

ately. Forbid the women to drink in public places and we would do more for the good of this nation than by millions spent for public defense or religious teachings. It is in these places that thousands of men and women first buy tickets on the railway of sexual perdition.

As to the pulpit, I have much respect for the good that is being done by the clergy and believe that a united stand by the church can defeat any system of organized vice at any time and place. But I am ashamed of those who call themselves servants of the Lord, who have not real courage. Our city churches are largely controlled by and the voice of the pulpit made pleasing to those in the pews who must not be injured. In many cases the apathy is one due to protection of the prominent man who is associated with the evil in some way. Still prayers are offered up for the Lord to save the boys and girls by those preachers who are afraid to come out and fight the devil and his agents.

There is a too general weakness of popular support in fighting vice. There is too much procrastination in the administration of justice.

If it be pleasant to look on, stilled in the packed serai,
Does not the Young Man try Its temper and pace ere he buy?
If She be pleasant to look on, what does the Young Man say?
"Lo! She is pleasant to look on, give Her to me to-day!"

Kipling — Maxim of Hafiz.

For if I sinned and fell, where lies the Gain
Of knowledge? Would it ease you of your Pain
To know the tangled Threads of Revenue,
I ravel deeper in a hopeless skein?

“Who hath not Prudence,” What was it I said,
Of Her who paints Her Eyes and tires Her Head.
And gibes and mocks the People in the Street
And fawns upon them for Her thriftless Bread?
Accursed is She of Eve’s daughter,— she
Hath cast off Prudence and Her End shall be
Destruction****Brethren, of your Bounty grant
Some portion of your daily Bread to Me.

—*From the Rubaiyat of Omar Kal’vin.*

Laying aside all traditional views of the Garden of Eden and Adam’s fall, with the theological dissensions regarding Adam’s sin affecting all, what can we say as to our actual sin to-day? Our reasoning has been such that we can conclude that the man with a healthy body is a responsible being and when in a normal state can will to do or not to do a thing.

It naturally follows that a disordered body will produce an unreasonable mind, but as it is impossible for any one to tell at just what age the irresponsible child becomes a responsible youth or man, just as difficult is it to say that this or that man is sane or not and is accountable for certain actions. As the good of the community is above that of the individual so must the community or society in turn to a great extent be responsible for the individual. In conclusion I would say that one of our greatest sins this day in the disobedience of the moral laws, is our failure to observe the eleventh commandment; the sin of selfishness is the modern sin, and man must know that we individually and collectively are responsible for the fall of the sinner and to a large extent for their remaining fallen. We are our brother’s keeper.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?

SOME one has recently said: "The's a lot o' folks nowadays who take so much comfort in what a grand lot of ancestors they've had that they don't qualify to be ancestors themselves."

In the preceding chapters we have considered many phases of this important subject. We first studied life, its many manifestations in plants and animals and finally the changeable nature of man. As we look at the great cosmopolitan mass of humanity in our large cities, as we read the daily papers which record so much of murder, theft, arson, treason, graft, malice, greed, hatred, avarice, jealousy and revenge, we are compelled to ask: "Who is responsible?"

To combat these perverse attributes of man, many forces for good, dispensing charity, love, mercy and forgiveness, are continually at work to prevent the pendulum from swinging too far toward individual, family, and state degeneration. For all things good or bad, there are their opposites. Nature must compensate the small animal with speed, and often the weak may change the color of its coat to correspond to the color of the plants in which they move.

"Think, O gentle reader, what you might have been if your ancestors had not been so brutalized and demoralized. Such is one of the absurd lengths to which the study of plant metaphor and of biometrics carries its disciples. Biometrical philosophy, as exemplified by Prof. Karl Pear-

son, asks: 'What reason is there for demanding a special evolution for man's mental and moral side?' No reason, if we regard man as analogous to a plant, or even to a 'horse, a greyhound, or a water flea,' or if we can settle the question of his evolution by the computation of tables of statistics. With these biometrical gentlemen, heredity is everything, environment and education futile, except with selected stock. While acknowledging that the Fagins of London can train criminals and thieves, they deny philanthropists can evolve useful citizens from unpromising material. Yet of the castaways in Doctor Barnado's institution, 98 per cent. became respectable citizens, while a similar result (97 per cent.) has been obtained in the city of Glasgow."—*Dr. C. E. Nammack.*

Having studied the various causes which alter the development of a normal life, can we now conscientiously say that our parents are to blame because we did not make a greater success in life? Can we content ourselves and say that regardless of how we train our children, they will be a success or good just the same?

It is a serious problem. The world may be getting better, but as we improve we see more faults, just as the more highly developed telescopes are able to see more of the milky way and "discover" bodies which have been there all the time. As we improve, we wish to improve. Stability demands sobriety and faithful service means honesty. If we lack stability, if we are dishonest and if we live in the spirit of "do all you can, when you can, as thoroughly as you can," society must answer the question: "Who is responsible?"

We have now three solutions for man's conduct and as

a result of his action, the condition of society: (1) man is what he was determined to be by his parents; (2) man is the product of heredity, plus the important influences of his surroundings; (3) man has been predestined to be what he must become, try as he may, he cannot change the outcome.

“In the lottery which human inheritance at present is, good qualities will commonly, when they appear, lack the support we could wish for them; but when this is true, there can be no doubt that much of the evil resulting from this can often be remedied by good social conditions. That is to say, we can help the individual to leave unstimulated the bad and to make the most of what is good. Thus, in a sense, he may actually choose his ancestors. Instead of doing this, however, I fear we often do the reverse, and especially is this true when men have to appeal to the multitude instead of to their peers.”—*Professor Cockerall* in “The Biologist’s Problem.”

Were we predestined to be this or that in a strict way, then any reasonable man would conclude that, try as he might, he could influence his own character no more than he could change the movement of the tides or the time of the eclipse. Be it true or not as Emerson said: “Whatever is, is right,” the most of us will consider the future a sealed book and endeavor to influence mind and matter as best we are able. If we are defeated in the end it will not be because we had to accept fate without a murmur.

Having cast aside the belief of “convicted before birth, we are face to face with the only two forces which can influence man: heredity and environment. The study of heredity, like immunity to certain diseases, involves many

factors. The history of man is recorded by the deeds he has performed. Many scientists can only see man through the one field glass — inheritance — and that at a distance without a range-finder, without any regard to teaching, training, environment or external influence of any kind.

The fact that children are said to inherit a criminal nature, that alcoholism in the parent may change to insanity in the child would show that no law of inheritance for conduct is obeyed. All the victims except many of the insane and other segregated defectives live in an atmosphere of inebriety. Who can tell the surroundings of many of those who have become insane? Drunkards as a class become paupers, that is as far as the recorded cases are studied, and the result is that they and their children are poorly fed, poorly clothed and not educated. They live in an atmosphere of very bad hygienic surroundings with little thought of morality and in so many of these recorded cases they are compelled to do without medical attention on account of ignorance and poverty, hence the great death rate from inanition, etc. The great wonder is that society is not worse than it is. Certainly, in many an instance man controls his spirit of revenge, even when severely persecuted by oppression.

“Blood will tell” and similar expressions have done much to produce a quite general opinion that children will always be like their parents. Careful study and good judgment is overcoming this fear that the child might go bad when the adoption of children of unknown parentage is considered. As already stated birth plays an important part, but opportunity plays a greater. We are prone to remember the daughter of a clergyman who goes wrong,

or the sad case of an adopted boy not turning out right. But I challenge any investigator to show that where a perfectly healthy child has been adopted into a good family, given a proper training in an average community, that he has not become as good a citizen as the average son of the average parent. I do not permit a consideration of exceptions, for if such should be studied, think of the thousands of children of good parents, with good homes, good education, who have gone entirely wrong. No child should be adopted until a careful examination is made by a physician to determine whether there is any evidence of tuberculosis, syphilis, low mentality, deformities, etc.

Can the investigations of any man lead you to believe that the education and influence of our civilization taught to the Indian of the Carlisle School is not accomplishing the results desired? Why do not all of them break loose and murder many? Will their offspring revert to that of Tecumseh? Why is it that the German who drinks beer from the cradle to the grave does not show as many drunken criminals as his English and American cousins who are taught to despise drink, and at the age of twenty to thirty may first partake of the same? The explanation of many to-day is that alcoholism is due to mixed drinks, and that distilled liquors should not be permitted. But even the German must suffer as a result of his beer since the German Emperor himself has set the good example of giving up the time honored national drink.

In the June, 1913, *Everybody's*, Dr. Sleyster states that in a study of 592 men in a hospital for Criminal Insane, he found that 217 were the sons of drunkards; 311 drank to

excess; only 57 were abstainers, and 384 spent their evenings in saloons, at cheap shows or on the streets. In a study of 269 murderers he found that alcohol was used to excess by 41.5 per cent., while but 12.6 per cent. were abstainers. Nearly half were under the influence of alcohol when the crime was committed, and 27.9 per cent. had a history of previous arrest for drunkenness.

In the same discussion on rum, Louis G. Copes says: "It is said that liquor ruins homes, lives, souls, health, morals, and what not. There is not a foundation in fact to this assertion. Liquor does nothing of the sort. What causes all the trouble is the abuse of it. The abuse of liquor may be and probably is, the root of practically all of man's iniquity; but the temperate use of it, like the temperate use of all things made to use, is utterly beyond and above censure."

These two opinions show quite conclusively that there are two factors in the production of alcoholism, and the vices and crimes which result from its abuse. We discover man's weakness through inheritance and a lack of resistance peculiar to each individual.

It naturally follows that any attempt to improve society and produce a more healthy race of parents must take into account the individual differences and how the various environmental influences may manifest their effect upon mankind. After which observations we must determine what things may be permitted and what must be forbidden in working out Church and social problems. No study of the effect of alcohol, for example, would be of value unless we had a knowledge of how many persons drank moderately and how many drank to excess. How many

of each of these classes were social and racial offenders, and why each of these so offended. Our statistics concerning the number of deaths which are due to the use of alcohol are of no value because in nearly every instance where alcohol has been a predisposing cause of the disease from which the person died, the cause of the death is given as some condition of the heart, liver, kidneys, blood-vessels or brain.

In the same way we fail to observe many conditions produced by environment; all is blamed on heredity. Many nervous children are so on account of their association with hysterical parents. In the homes of the degenerate, neurotic and inebriate, there is continual strife, and how could the offspring, no matter how well developed in body and mind at birth, become other than like their parents in such environment. We may have epilepsy, insanity, drunkenness, in fact any form of crime where there is no ancestral history of same. This is what we see so frequently among the better classes; these are not reported to the investigators, who collect the statistics for us.

We know at the present time the many avenues by which we may acquire such diseases as tuberculosis, etc., and as alcoholism is a common affliction among the total number of people, why cannot such men, when placed in certain environments, acquire some form of degeneracy? Why do we not collect the number of cases of race suicide, of indigestion, men with voracious appetites and explain the conditions as due to inheritance?

The opium habit is easily acquired, should the opportunity be present, beginning as a sense of comfort from its use as a medicine, or for a little experience, until at last

it is impossible to destroy the habit. The country boy may appear perfect to his mother and best girl, but let him enter the city with its many entanglements, its attractive avenues of vice, and the same boy who may have the misfortune to fall from grace, might have become a pillar in his home country church.

Observers quite agree that but a very small per cent. of prostitutes are drawn into their course of life by sexual appetite alone, that most others are the victims of vanity and idleness. It is reasonable to suppose that the susceptibility to temptations among men and women is a symptom and therefore unstable. Whenever great wealth and luxury exist side by side with inferior intelligence the first sign of decadence appears in the resurgence of the primitive instincts of sense repletion, as sexual gratification, etc.

Probably nothing is so destructive to good parentage and prevents healthy children as venereal disease. We can place a large part of the blame of venereal disease upon ignorance. No intelligent man or woman would knowingly infect any one. Education of the people is absolutely necessary. Sex physiology must be properly taught to our boys and girls, preferably by their parents. The good of society frequently demands the restraint of the individual. Many innocent are afflicted — innocent wives, innocent husbands and innocent children. I would emphasize the importance of marriage of healthy persons for the following reasons:

1. The child has a right to be born healthy.
2. There would be fewer divorces, because unhealthy

husbands and wives lead to unfaithfulness and desertion.

3. Venereal disease is the cause of 30 per cent. of the blindness occurring in young children; it is the cause of from 50 per cent. to 60 per cent. of the operations upon the pelvic organs of women; it is the cause of at least one-half of the sterility occurring in man and much in women. It is the cause of a very large percentage of nervous diseases in the adult.
4. Our race is being multiplied from the lower classes of society.
5. Our children will be compelled to care for many of the children of our present insane, epileptics, etc.

We examine young men rigidly for military service "to kill"; we do not care how future parents are diseased. The agricultural departments of the various states destroy trees, plants, and animals which are injurious to other of their kind. The same departments spend much time, energy and money to properly help the farmer; but how about the "boll weevils" and "yellows" of society? The good of society is paramount to the rights of the individual. The young woman must learn that a man may honestly repent of his "wild oats," but they may be still growing. Repentance and prayer do not cure physical ills. They are of value, but physical ills must be cured by physical means.

"No law absolutely suppresses crime; there is, however, an educational factor in every law that is placed upon the statute books, whether that law is properly enforced or not. No man, unless he is an imbecile, is so ignorant that

he does not know the fundamental principles of the ten commandments. Yet would any man say that the laws embodied in the decalogue are not right, or that they should be abolished because they are often broken? There is no class of persons so anxious to marry as those afflicted with tuberculosis. The cause of this anxiety I will leave with you to explain.”— *Dr. Burr.*

Shall mental and moral teaching cease in order that we may more fully show that the “laws of heredity” are true for succeeding generations? We are told that a mutation occurs when one species is formed from another. Do we forget the adjustment of man to light, heat, etc.? Know we not the incorporation or transformation of the inorganic into organic and back to inorganic in the metabolic changes of our body? The irritation of the live tissues producing again dead substances. In all cases energy is transformed. In man we see the various products of “force” dissimilarly arranged, giving us at one time genius, at another power, *ad infinitum.*

Harriet Beecher Stowe thus described her training by her Aunt Harriet, according to Miss Ida Tarbell: “My Aunt Harriet was no common character. According to her views little girls were taught to move very gently, to speak softly and prettily, to say ‘Yes, ma’am,’ and ‘No, ma’am,’ never to tear their clothes; to sew and to knit at regular hours, to go to church on Sunday and to make all responses, and to come home and be catechised. Along with the catechism went the reading of good books. A girl trained like this took to books like ducks to water.”

In a review of the teaching in our large seminaries by Harold Bolce we find: “Young women are coming out

of colleges believing that it is absurd for humanity to stake its hope of salvation on much of what the Christian world has accepted as inspired writing. The University of Michigan, for example, declares that the books of the Bible are myth and legend, in the form of epos, hero-sage, fable, proverb, precept, folk-lore, primitive custom, clan and domestic law, and rhapsody. It is further set forth that these are of dubious origin. At Chicago and California it is contended that, to the scientific mind, there is no historic certainty that 'Jesus ever lived,' and that no such record (which is known to us only through tradition) is the basis of living faith. Unmistakably the colleges that teach women, as the colleges that teach men, are arrayed as an academic army against the orthodox interpretations of Holy Writ."

Paul Van Dyke, of Princeton, says of those entering the large colleges: "Boys from high schools carry off honors out of all proportions to their numbers. Boys from the Social Registers in Harvard, Yale and Princeton, show a far lower average in ability or willingness; only one of 166 of those with the best chance took an honor in the first class."

What is our duty? These students have doubtless convinced the unprejudiced mind that "man is his brother's keeper." We form one great body of communists, in that we should work for each other's good. Men are but units making up a mighty whole, resulting from many forces working from within and without. I grant that the extent of man's will to do or not to do a thing, individually, is largely what society determines; on the side of good we need and must develop the "Big Brother" or the "Large

Sister.”

Just as long as the public demands that the minds of the youth be filled with books at \$1.08 while many of the best masterpieces can be purchased in better binding for 25 cents, will the parent who permits such education be training the youth in the wrong direction.

The problem of the future must be how far can the State interfere with man's license to do as he pleases in order that he may not interfere with the rights of others. We forbid children to play with matches to prevent fires. We quarantine the healthy along with the diseased to prevent the spread of the disease. We restrain the insane; we are segregating the feeble-minded and we remove the drunkard from the streets. Since we punish drunkenness and try the drunken murderer for his crime, should we not forbid alcohol to those who become intoxicated? Should we not prevent the syphilitic from eating in public places and deny him the privilege of marriage until cured? We forbid the tubercular teacher from teaching, but should she be allowed to marry, procreate and nurse her children? These are but a few of the many questions which we must answer satisfactorily.

Improve society in each city, by encouraging earlier marriages; by improving the conditions of the servant girl; by taking care of the widowed mother who is compelled to work in the factory to support her children; by increasing the wages of the girls behind the counters; by increasing social settlements; by less extravagant forms of living; by better literature for the youth; by less wine parties for the parents; and by better hygienic conditions, as, for example, good wholesome food, fresh air,

and much water internally and externally, and, last but not least, let us have a few more old fashioned homes where the parents themselves are at home some of the evenings each week. A curfew for many parents would do no harm.

In conclusion, I would say that teaching and training are paramount in our efforts to improve our posterity. We can and must make for the best in regard to those things which can be transmitted from one generation to another, but if for any reason a child is born of poor and vicious parents, or for any reason the child goes wrong, we must not lay all the blame on inheritance, but remember that the work of the Juvenile Courts, of the Reformatories, of the Salvation Army, of the Y. M. C. A. or the Y. W. C. A., the Parting of the Ways, Men's Industrial Home, and other similar organizations of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish Churches, is doing much good. Could we place all the blame on our forefathers and the things which are inherited, what would be the value of any of these institutions and of religion itself? True philanthropy consists in giving time, wealth, and power to all things which improve social conditions so that each succeeding generation will be better every way than the preceding one; but it does not consist in producing those conditions to relieve which much is later given.

We are individually responsible for our own acts in-so-far as we are able to prevent them; we are partially responsible for what our children become, and society is responsible for not preventing many things which when done must be punished. Many times, try as we will to do certain things, all plans fail and we feel like expressing it as I have done in verse:

FATE

Quite oft I would my boat direct,
And sail the stormy seas,
Alas, does Fate my sails unfurl!
So heavy is the breeze.

I stand upon the rock and wait;
My hope of life has fled.
The Gods declare my final fate;
E'en though my heart hath bled.

Together with the spark of life,
The germ of greatness grows;
They both are planted by the One
Who nations' future knows.

.
If in your body seed should fall,
To make a name renowned;
Or if the germ should money be,
So you in wealth abound,

Do not yourself laud high and praise,
For you are but a man;
It happens that this way you fill
Your place in God's own plan.

APPENDIX

HEREDITARY INSANITY A DEFENSE

THE case of Mrs. Leckwood of Minneapolis, Minn., is very interesting in the study of defectives. A recent editorial says: "Those who take little stock in eugenics, or scientific mating of the human kind, need only read the newspaper accounts of the Leckwood murder case. Children of sisters married and the result has been two generations of children physically or mentally defective or both. A child of tender years is taken to court to tell through her years of poverty-stricken home life, the abuse of the father, the pitiful infirmities of the mother. Such unions are high treason against humanity."

The attorney of Mrs. Ida Leckwood, on trial for the murder of her daughter, held that she was irresponsible when she committed the deed, if at all, as he would prove by the testimony of the alienists. The statements of the alienists were based on the following:

"Heredity transmission through three generations suffering from various forms of epilepsy."

"Inter-marriage of cousins, her mother and father being cousins."

Mrs. Leckwood was found not guilty, because she was insane when she gave the poison to her daughter. This is a most important case, not only to the jurist, but to society at large, especially to those interested in the study of eugenics.

The Supreme Court of Mississippi has recently said that insanity was hereditary, and such evidence was sufficient to acquit the defendant of a charge of assault and battery to kill. The court stated that at one time it seemed to have been supposed that the heredity of insanity must be proved in each case before evidence of insanity among blood relatives could be received. But the court ventured to say that no court of to-day would hold the necessity of proving insanity hereditary. This decision, like the one reported some time ago, from Minnesota, must have great weight in future trials, and consequently show the necessity for more insane asylums,—but greater still a practice of practical eugenics.

WHAT EUGENICS DOES NOT MEAN

“The practice of eugenics is not opposed to religion. It reaches out over religion and desires to promote the cultivation of the same morality and ethics that true religion should teach. It transcends all religions. It unites all religions on a common fighting ground. It should draw its adherents from all good men of whatever religion, from all men who desire to better the world, to prevent suffering and misery. Eugenists wish to make eugenics a part of religion — to make it the religion of the religions of the future.”—*Dr. Myer Solomon* in “What Eugenics Does Not Mean.”

MODERN WOMEN — MATERNITY

“The changes which have taken place in the nervous organization of our modern women, particularly the over educated or over civilized among our population, are so

great that a large proportion have ceased to be natural women. This condition naturally leads to the conclusion that at least half of the society women are nervously unfit to undergo unnecessary burdens in their after life, and every safeguard must be employed to prevent the duties of motherhood from producing serious and perhaps lasting effects. It is the rule rather than the exception at the present time that the day and evening of the city bred girl is entirely taken up with fixed engagements, and no time is left for rest and relaxation.”— *Dr. F. S. Newell*.

While these statements may be very strong, yet the fact remains that the woman of to-day is not able to endure the difficulties incident to bringing up a family in the same way as did our mothers. It is very evident that our social conditions must be changed in such a way that the girl can be better fitted for motherhood; that marriage may be entered into at an earlier age than is the custom. After the birth of the child it is necessary that it be nursed by the mother. Social demands must not be such that the child is for convenience artificially fed.

EUGENIC BELIEF — CHARITY

“Eugenic belief extends the function of philanthropy to future generations. It renders its actions more prevailing than hitherto, by dealing with families and societies in their entirety, and it enforces the importance of the marriage covenant by directing serious attention to the probable quality of future offspring. It strongly forbids all forms of sentimental charity that are harmful to the race, while it greatly seeks opportunity for acts of personal kindness as some equivalent to the loss of what it forbids.

It brings the tie of kinship into prominence and strongly encourages love in family and race. In brief, eugenics is a virile creed full of hope, and appealing to many of the noblest feelings of our nature."—*Francis Galton*.

CRIMINALS

"The idea that some individuals are immoral because of constitutional defect of the neural organism is most repugnant, as it seems to challenge the traditional belief in man's free will, and this is especially true of those unfamiliar with mental diseases. Yet we who have delinquent individuals within our care and custody know that there are persons who cannot refrain from crime because of their degenerate organizations, which predispose and impel them to immoral and illegal acts. . . . Why should not the born criminal remain in prison so long as he is dangerous to society? We do not release the violent and dangerous insane from hospitals merely because they have been detained there a number of years; then why should we release the instinctive criminal to practice his criminal acts upon the public? We quarantine small-pox, and we exile the leper; then why should we not isolate the incurable moral defectives who disseminate dangerous moral contagion?"—*Dr. Paul E. Bowers*.

VALUE OF DISEASE IN CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT

"We must be convinced that the relative decrease of any stock would be a net gain or loss. Take the case of epilepsy. It is without question in itself a very serious defect. But can we be absolutely certain that the disappearance of all epileptic stocks would be a net gain?"

At present we know so little with regard to the correlation of one such character with others that we are ignorant concerning the full effect of the elimination of any one character.

“To take another example — let us consider the case of tuberculosis. Here again we are faced with the difficulty that we do not know in the least what the net result of elimination of tuberculosis stocks would be. If all the tuberculosis stocks had been wiped out three hundred years ago, many eminent men to whom the human race is deeply indebted would never have been born. Of that we can be certain; it is quite beyond our powers, however, to weigh in the balance the undoubtful mental and physical suffering and the material loss, due to the presence of a pathological stock on the one hand, and the services rendered by those afflicted with this defect on the other. Until we can make this calculation, how can we advocate measures that would deliberately tend toward the disappearance of the tuberculosis?”— *A. M. Carr-Saunders* in the *Eugenics Review*.

After reading the above I thought that it would be very easy to answer the doubts in the mind of the writer, but after more deliberate consideration and a little search along the line of the existence of sin that good may result, I have found that this is one of those problems that have puzzled philosophers for centuries. Hence, I have decided to allow the readers to carefully study this very important question. It would be profitable for all interested to read carefully Emerson's essay on “Compensation” before arriving at a conclusion. I will say that I firmly believe that we should endeavor to eliminate all

disease as rapidly as possible. If Benjamin Franklin had an acute mind on a vegetable diet he might have had a still better mind with a little meat; and if the existence of tuberculosis in the body has at times produced a good mind, the germs from that same individual may have prevented by early death the development of still greater minds.

EUGENICS: BIOLOGICAL

“The problem of eugenics and evolution are primarily biological, but can be approached only if social conditions allow the application of biological methods.” . . . “I can in imagination see the day when the compilation of inheritance data for each citizen will be compulsory, and when the files of these records will be most valued of all state documents; when no marriage license will be issued except after the most careful searching of the inheritance; and when the State will debar from marriage those whose children will be a burden to the State. The bearing of children is, of course, not an individual right, but a social privilege, and in time it must come to be so recognized.”—*Prof. Maynard Metcalf* in “Eugenics and Euthenics.”

EUGENIC LIMITS

Prof. Herbert Miller, in the “Psychological Limit of Eugenics,” says, “I am not denying a great deal of good in this movement, but too little attention has been given to either psychology or sociology by the eugenicists, and unjustifiable conclusions have been drawn. . . . I myself am convinced that as a move for race improvement, the equal suffrage of women, with the eventual consequent assump-

tion of intellectual and moral responsibility and economic independence, would be infinitely more valuable than all the eugenic laboratories in the world. We should use all the forces of science in dealing with pathological conditions, but an attempt at artificial selection of mental and moral characteristics is working in the wrong direction."

An editorial in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* on "The Limitations of Eugenics" says: "Let us therefore hesitate to charge all defects to heredity, to make men irresponsible, to hold that everything is predetermined. One antidote lies in 'euthenics' or the science of uncontrollable environment in the appeal to develop the unknown possibilities of our inheritance. Such a doctrine brings vigor and inspiration. It gives a chance for self-discovery. Responsibility makes men wrest from themselves powers which otherwise would remain latent. Supposed defective inheritance or arrested development is sometimes merely the expression of some inhibition which can be overcome by intelligent control from within or without. 'To most of us heredity has been kind — kinder than we know.'"

MARRIAGE ADVICE

Prof. E. G. Conklin says: "Giving advice regarding matrimony is proverbially a hazardous performance. . . . With a more complete knowledge with regard to the inheritance of human defects than we now possess, at least in many instances, it will be probably possible to give such advice wisely; but apart from certain bodily peculiarities, he would be a bold prophet who would undertake to predict the type of personality which might be

expected in the children of the given union. Some very unpromising stocks have brought forth wonderful products." And we might add that some promising stocks have brought forth some poor products.

“SEX MUTILATIONS”

“Any consideration that may be shown the confirmed criminal by society should be regarded as entirely gratuitous and founded purely upon humane impulses, which forbid unnecessary cruelty. Maudlin sentimentality in behalf of a degenerate’s possible posterity, which would probably rule against its own birth had it any choice in the matter, should weigh but little in the balance of social welfare. The primordial right of man is the right to live. The law does not hesitate to execute the murderer, despite the fact that upon the average he is of all criminals the least dangerous to society. Liberty is a right of man which cannot be gainsaid, yet the law does not hesitate to imprison for life on occasion. In imprisonment for life or capital punishment it would be somewhat difficult to see any conservation of the rights of the criminal’s posterity or of his sex rights, from the sentimentalist’s standpoint. Under the protection of society against the criminal so sentenced, because of the danger of escape, on the one hand, and of pardon on the other.”

INFANT MORTALITY

In fighting against the causes of infant mortality, Dr. Saleeby says: “Conditions initiated in the slums and public houses by some social workers are not natural, they are hideously unnatural.

“Eugenists of the extreme school forget the importance of nurture before birth, of prenatal influences due to environment. They assume that it is simply a question of heredity from birth, when it has been proved that infections and the forces of malnutrition have been playing on the child for months before birth. The nurture of the mother is therefore just as important as if the child had been fed on gin and pickles after birth.”

A PRACTICAL STUDY OF THE SOCIAL EVIL *

IN the tables which follow an analysis is made of over 500 prostitutes, and many landladies, in such a way that we can probably account for their choice of this life and reason for remaining in it. It is quite true that many girls will yield for the first time to a married man, because they know he will seldom tell, and they are not so afraid of becoming pregnant by such men. I firmly believe that the large majority of houses of prostitution are supported by married men. It is so with all of the high-priced houses, and many of the patrons to the cheaper houses are married foreigners, whose wives are in Europe. Cut out the married men, and most of the houses would cease to exist. In some of the tables the landladies are included. In all tables there are some who did not answer that particular question.

SEDUCER MARRIED OR SINGLE

Married95 Single250

Adolescence, or the period of sexual development is full of physiological changes with the incident irritations produced by these changes. This irritability, without a knowledge and proper restraint, is sure to bring ill results. The conscience of the adolescent who has not become seared from sin can be more easily awakened than in

* This study was made in January, 1913. In 1914 the Morals Bureau closed all of the remaining houses of prostitution in Pittsburg.

later years. This is the age of sex companionship. The natural animal nature for mating is at its height. Witness the pairing of even small children of the opposite sex.

The table of age seduction shows that at the age of sixteen to eighteen, when physiological development is at its height and parental restraint is beginning to yield, over one-half of the girls are first seduced.

AGE WHEN SEDUCED

Age	Age	Age
12	4	17113
13	6	18110
14	17	19 69
15	53	20 39
16	75	21 16
		22 to 25..... 12
		26 to 30 1
		16 to 18298
		All other ages.217

Over one-half the prostitutes entered houses between eighteen and twenty-one. There is little parental restraint, they have freely indulged in sexual intercourse, continually frequent the cafés and hotels, meet those of the underworld, and are impressed by their life of ease, with good incomes and fancy clothes, after which the last step is easy. Certainly these two tables are of interest, and should be of much value to parents, the church and society.

AGE WHEN ENTERED UPON PROSTITUTION

Age	Age	Age
14	1	17 8
15	1	19 44
16	2	18 to 21257

Age	Age
20	75
21	113
22 to 24	162
25 to 28	64
29 to 35	15
	Other ages
	217

It will be noticed that after the age of twenty-four they rapidly leave the life. They are less attractive, ill, married, or become kept women, to say nothing of those completely lost to the world.

PRESENT AGE OF INMATES

Age	Age	Age
21	1	27
22	41	28
23	73	29
24	89	30
25	57	31 to 32
26	40	33 to 34
		43
		39
		28
		32
		21
		22 to 25
		260
		Other ages ...
		258

The cause of polygamy and polyandry is not easy to determine. Does polygamy prevent prostitution? Many men supporting the same prostitutes, is certainly a form of polyandry. Polygamy permits more mothers and more children. Polygamy permits the husband to cohabit if one or more of his wives be ill or incompatible.

This table is of little value, except to show that many deserted women, who have led a loose life at home, drift into prostitution. Certainly many who say they are single have been married.

MARRIED, SINGLE OR WIDOW

Married or divorced, 119 Single ...359 Widow ...84

The nature of woman is such that in most cases the normal instinct is such that they desire and expect to become mothers. So strong is this instinct that frequently the woman will resort to sexual intercourse with man, outside of wedlock, in order that she may become a mother; this being the only reason for the act.

It is held that marriage is the result of children, rather than that children are the result of marriage. Every woman has an inherited right to become a mother. While society demands that wedlock should be entered into for this purpose, yet society now realizes that the innocent child born outside of wedlock should not suffer, and already several States have enacted laws making all children legitimate, in that every child has a right to inherit property as well as its characteristics from both parents.

CHILDREN LIVING OR DEAD

None	406	2 dead	12
1 living	66	3 living	4
1 dead	50	4 living	1
2 living	19	Total who had children.	152

This table includes about fifty landladies, many of whom were prostitutes before owning houses. Other things being equal, the mother of the illegitimate child will seek prostitution more frequently from necessity to support her child than will the girl who has not been so unfortunate. In most cases the stigma can be no worse, from

the girl's viewpoint; she is an outcast. Society does not properly care for these women. The grass widow with children will enter prostitution more quickly than the one without children to support, providing she was unfaithful in her marital life. Certainly many prostitutes are supporting children who are in the homes of relatives, friends, asylums, etc.

The attempt is frequently made to reduce immediate and contradictory elements, as they are given in life, to expressions which would indicate necessary conditions.

Lecky, the historian, who wrote on "European Morals Since the Beginning of the Christian Era," said: "The supreme type of vice is at the same time the most efficient guardian of virtue." Solon established brothels in Athens, Greece and Rome and encouraged prostitution. Dr. Woolsey, believini as many others have always held, that the devil is bound to have a share anyway, advocated that the divorced woman should not be allowed to marry, and we should allow the recruits for prostitution to be obtained from this class of women. This, he said, would put the devil off with the least. Were such a custom decreed to be best for society, witness the rush to the marriage altar and the great haste they would make to reach Reno, with the financial assistance of the accommodating husband, who would, he well knows, reap a rich reward for his valor and suffering. Is it possible that this Dr. Woolsey is the discoverer or creator of our "cadets" of to-day? Many a one of these succeed in having a real or false marriage performed, only later to have his "wife" enter a house of prostitution, that he may exist as a degraded parasite on innocent girls and society.

Let me ask you if prostitution is a safeguard to society? Would the unmarried men attack the women in the streets if there were no houses for their pleasure? Common sense says that they would not do so. There are no houses in the country districts, in most of the smaller cities, and in many of the large cities. Rape on woman is not a common offense. It is the result of degeneracy, generally seen in the pervert. Only a very small proportion of the men from the districts mentioned come to the cities where houses exist. There is just as much intercourse in large cities outside of houses of prostitution as in those locations where they do not exist. Houses of prostitution are supported by married men. Therefore the solution becomes still a greater problem.

We have very carefully questioned a large number of the girls who state that low wages were the cause of their downfall. The prostitute is too willing to give a hard luck story in order that she may be excused for her life. Her conscience is not disturbed by frequent visits to the Ananias Club, hence she often forgets the truth. Some of the girls who gave a low wage with their previous occupation never did work away from home. At least one-fourth of our girls never made their living before. I believe that very few of the prostitutes in Pittsburgh began the life on account of poverty alone. Low wages is a very important factor in producing social conditions where the parental cares and home influences are of a very low order. In such a state of society, many a girl whose home life is unpleasant, whose parents if alive care little for the girl except she be able to provide a few dollars toward her own and probably family expenses each week,

will easily be led into the ways of the frequenters of the cheap cafés, dance halls, etc., and in a short time she is adding to her regular earnings, not because she was compelled to continue to make this extra money. Whether she will become an inmate of a house is determined by many factors, as companions, home ties, alcoholism, etc.

Miss A., twenty-three years of age, born and raised in a small town fifty miles from Pittsburgh. Father had small business. Mother dead. Step-mother not very kind to girl, who gave birth to illegitimate child two years ago. Was allowed to go to Pittsburgh and work in store as clerk at \$6.00 a week. Boarded at Home for Christian Girls, room and board \$4.50 a week; other expenses exceeding small balance. To-day she is earning an average of \$25.00 a week as a prostitute. She frequently writes for a little money from home, saying she cannot get along on \$6.00 a week. (This is from report from her town.) She says she is sending home several dollars a week to help support child.

The report shows 169 classed as servants, which includes cooks, maids, etc. These are largely foreign girls with no home or parents in this country. They are easily led astray. But the servant girl in Pittsburgh does not need to enter prostitution to support herself, or even herself and baby.

PREVIOUS OCCUPATION AND WAGES

Waitress from \$3 to \$7	50
Factory from \$2 to \$10	53
Nurse girl from \$1.50 to \$4	10
Servant from \$1.50 to \$7	169
Clerk from \$3.00 to \$8	51

Cashier from \$6 to \$12.50	3
Canvasser from \$4.00	1
Laundry from \$3.00 to \$6	14
Actress, from \$40.00	1
Home	118
Milliner from \$6.00	3
Seamstress from \$3.00 to \$10.00	14
Manicurist from \$5.00	1
Telephone Operator from \$3.50	5
Chorus girl from \$10 to \$12	2
Office work from \$2 to \$15	4
Flower girl from \$4 to \$5	4
Music teacher	1
Furmaker \$4.00	1
Governess \$5.00	1

REASON FOR ENTERING HOUSE

Seduced and motherhood	10
Money	90
To support self	145
To support baby	24
To support parents	14
To support brother and sister	4
Had to	1
Ill health	9
Discouraged and no work	36
No particular reason	34
Always bad	15
Home troubles	8
No place to go	27
Deserted by husband	7

We must not forget in explaining why girls enter prostitution that we are prone to think only of the girl who is actually an inmate of a house. These few hundreds are but a small proportion of the girls who are continually engaged in prostitution. The many hundreds who work as stenographers, clerks, manicurists, etc., during the day, and have their friends for profit at night, the kept woman with her pleasant apartments with plenty of money to spend, all these women are prostitutes as surely as the inmates of a house. Very often the visitor to the cheap house with pride takes "his girl" from the brothel, and keeps her in the same way and for the same reason as Mr. B., the wealthy business man, provides for Madam X., only on a cheaper scale. *MANY OF THE PRESENT INMATES WOULD NOT BE WHERE THEY ARE IF THEY COULD HAVE HAD A LITTLE BETTER HOME LIFE, AND MANY WHO ARE NOT IN THE BROTHEL WOULD GO THERE, COULD THEY NOT OBTAIN THE SOCIETY THEY DESIRE WITH SEX INDULGENCES WHICH THEY EXPERIENCE.*

REASON FOR REMAINING IN HOUSE

Money	112
To support self	168
To support baby	22
To support parents	22
To support brother and sister	8
To support nieces	2
Because I like it	23
Can't better conditions	35

No other home	32
Good health now	2
Till I can get married	6
Ashamed to ask for work	4
Good treatment here	7
Easy life	17
No reason	30

The prostitute never acknowledges her full income. According to the report of 458, their share averages over \$10,000. It can safely be stated that the present 500 girls retain from their one-half over \$12,500 a week, or over \$600,000 a year, which would be \$1,200,000 a year left by the visitors at the present time. What must it have been a year ago, when there were almost a thousand girls and much was spent for liquor, dance, and music? The economic phase of the problem is a large one.

AVERAGE WEEKLY INCOME

From \$5 to \$8	10	From \$25 to \$30.....	30
From 9 to 10	26	From 35 to 40	36
From 11 to 15	81	From 45 to 50	25
From 16 to 20	129	From 55 to 75	17
From 20 to 25	93	From 80 to 100.....	8

About 25 per cent. of the girls state that they have a bank account. I doubt if over 10 per cent., if that many, have any sum in the bank for illness or to quit the life. Since the large majority of these girls claim directly or indirectly that their life is due to poverty, low wages, to support others, etc., and since their own reports show that they make plenty to save, but not over 10 per cent. actu-

ally do save any money, it certainly shows conclusively that poverty and low wages is not the real cause of the girls' going wrong.

HAVE YOU A BANK ACCOUNT?

Yes115 No366

There are several interesting deductions to be made from the last four tables and the one on birthplace. It can be stated conclusively that where the parents are dead or an unkind step-parent exists, the girl is much more likely to be led astray. The religion of parents does not appear to be a factor, as the figures stand in about the proportion of religious beliefs of the general population. The increase in the ratio of the Jewish to other religions is high, but this is due to the large number of foreigners of this belief.

The circumstances of parents and occupation of father compare very favorably with the general population, and argues that people sin in all walks of life. The numbers from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and from various States are in direct relation to distance from Pittsburgh and ease of access. The birthplace of the foreign girl compares very well with the proportion of various nationalities coming to Pittsburgh in the present decade.

PARENTS LIVING OR DEAD

(Landladies and Inmates.)

Both dead260 Mother living103
 Both living 87 Father living 72

RELIGION

(Landladies and Inmates.)

Protestant	272	Free-thinker	1
Catholic	188	Spiritualist	1
Jewish	67	Agnostic	1
Dunkard	1		

FATHER WEALTHY, WELL-TO-DO, MODERATE CIRCUM-
STANCES OR POOR?

(Landladies and Inmates.)

Wealthy.	2	Well-to-do.	10	Mod. cir.	152	Poor.	254
----------	---	-------------	----	-----------	-----	-------	-----

OCCUPATION OF FATHER

Contractor	17	Plumber	4
Carpenter	18	Bookkeeper	2
Stone mason	6	Miner	29
Laborer	135	Officer	3
Postmaster	1	Brakeman	4
Engineer	11	Driver	1
Tailor	8	School teacher	2
Farmer	70	Physician	1
Real Estate	1	Conductor	1
Mill Superintendent	2	Waiter	1
Clerk	21	Merchant	10
Painter	8	Fireman	7
Machinist	6	Florist	2
Pumper	4	Plasterer	1
Shoemaker	4	Mechanic	13
Blacksmith	8	Saloonkeeper	3

Cook	2	Attorney	2
Milkman	2	Mill	6
Butcher	4	Hotel	2
Broker	1	Editor	1
Mechanic	13	Actor	1
Baker	2	Manager	1
Pattern maker	1	Glazier	1
Bartender	1	Glass worker	1
Cigar maker	1	Rabbi	1
Oil driller	1	Don't know	85

BIRTHPLACE — COUNTRY, STATE OR CITY

(Landladies, House-keepers and Inmates.)

Pennsylvania: Pittsburgh, 154; Philadelphia, 10; Surrounding Cities, 29; Rest of Pennsylvania, 151. Total	344
Arkansas, 1; California, 2; Colorado, 2; Connecticut, 1; Georgia, 1; Illinois, 4; Indiana, 2; Iowa, 1; Kansas, 1; Kentucky, 5; Louisiana, 2; Maryland, 7; Massachusetts, 2; Michigan, 2; Missouri, 2; Nebraska, 1; New Jersey, 4; New York, 34; North Carolina, 1; Ohio, 49; Tennessee, 4; Texas, 7; Vir- ginia, 7; Vermont, 1; West Virginia, 22. Total..	157
Foreign: Austria, 51; Canada, 2; Denmark, 1; Eng- land, 3; Germany, 16; Holland, 1; Ireland, 3; Italy, 9; Russia, 18; Scotland, 3; Sweden, 2; Switzerland, 1. Total	110
Complete Total	611

WHAT OF THE FUTURE OF THE PROSTITUTE?

Death treads in pleasure's footsteps round the world,
When pleasure treads the paths which reason shuns.

—*Young's "Night Thoughts."*

Where reason does not exist it cannot shun. The object lesson of others' fate does not deter many an individual from pursuing the much-desired pleasures of life. The sorrow is that 'tis seldom that contrition is manifest after the wasted life in sin. There is much relief to the observing boon companion of the old sinner; "surely," she says, "she was not bad, see how easily she passes away." There is seldom the expression of agony in the dying face of the worst criminals.

What shall we do with the prostitute? Treat her as Christ said. She is no more vile than many others; to rescue her you must study her nature, her pleasures and pains. She must be given a chance to live without the idea that society demands that she go wrong. She must be told and compelled to realize that honest work is no disgrace and that any work is better than disgrace.

Give her a chance, extra assistance to regain her power of reasoning; then if she refuses to show herself a woman, the humane and rational treatment is the Industrial Reformatory, where she can be taught a good trade, probably allowed to accumulate a little for herself, and learn the experiences of the well-behaved in society. These results can be carried out by the many good societies now wondering how they can do something practical. It is for those who sing, "Throw Out the Life Line!" "Rescue the Perishing," "Hold the Fort, for I am Coming,"

etc. I have much sympathy for practical work, but only condemnation for "faith without work."

For those who are in earnest and wish to lessen the number of perishing and stray sheep on the hills, wild and bare, there is one real line of practical work — prophylaxis, or prevention. The illustration showing that it is better to build a fence around the precipice than a hospital in the valley below, is certainly to the point. It has been shown that it is cheaper to purify the water and kill the mosquito than to care for the typhoid and yellow-fever patients, to say nothing of the suffering and deaths from these diseases. Our studies have shown us that good parents who care for their children, provide good innocent amusement, properly guard their companionship, are interested in the kind of books they read, see that the girl's dress is proper, know why and where they allow them to visit a friend over night, what time the beau leaves at night, do not allow them to patronize eating places where liquor is served, and first, last and at all times properly explain to these children what is right and wrong — such parents will seldom have girls go wrong. We are then to teach the parents, and if the parents refuse to do their duty, it will be up to the State to take charge of these children, as it now does when it is too late to prevent the criminal. In our plan of prevention we shall not forget the part played by man in the girl's downfall. Make it a severe punishment to take a minor girl into a drinking place or assignation house. Every girl is somebody's daughter. What if she were yours?

HOW LONG IN DIFFERENT HOUSES?

From 6 to 8 months... 15	10 to 13 years..... 5
From 1 to 2 years... 133	14 to 18 years..... 8
From 2 to 3 years... 76	20 years 1
From 3 to 4 years... 68	
From 4 to 5 years... 76	Over 5 years..... 111
From 5 to 7 years... 52	Over 7 years..... 63
From 7 to 10 years... 47	Over 9 years..... 18

HOW LONG DO YOU EXPECT TO REMAIN IN BUSINESS?

Will leave as soon as possible	8	Don't know and in-definite	271
As long as fate has assigned	3	Till out of debt...	4
As long as I must support others	8	Till I get tired....	4
As long as my health permits	3	1 to 6 months.....	8
Until I have sufficient funds	29	1 to 3 years.....	41
		Till I can marry..	35
		All my life.....	5

Celibacy of the priest or righteous continence in others, is not without a struggle. No matter how imperious the self-control, the tendency still exists, and its perpetual suppression is a sacrifice to the supremacy of a higher law.

REASONS WHY MANY MARRIED PERSONS SEEK
OTHERS — ADULTERY

1. Improper mating, especially a difference in intellects. There is less discord among the peasants and working people on account of difference in moral and intellectual faculties, than in the higher classes of society.

2. Unfaithfulness.
3. Illness.
4. Unwillingness for children.
5. Unhappy home relations as temper, unattractiveness, late rising, poor cooking, card playing, extravagance, absence from home, alcoholism, etc.
6. Foreigners who leave their wives in Europe.
7. Perversion.
8. Neglect of physical charms after marriage.
9. Absence of loving caresses.
10. Man wants what he wants when he wants it.

An intellectual woman has a tendency to become an adventuress. Good behavior is protective where these women are known. Thomas says: "Many women of fine natural character and disposition are drawn in a momentary and incidental way into an irregular life, drift further, are married, and make uncommonly good wives. If you drive nature out at the door, she will come back through the window, and this interest in greater stimulations is, I believe, the dominant force in determining the choice, or rather the drift of the so-called sporting woman. She is seeking what from the psychological standpoint may be called a normal life."

POVERTY AND SOCIAL FACTORS

One per cent. of the families in the United States own more than the other 99 per cent.

In this country there are 4,000,000 paupers.

In a recent winter there were 70,000 children who came to school in New York hungry.

Lydston says in an article on this subject that whatever argument may be brought to bear upon the social evil, nothing can controvert these fundamental propositions:

1. Prostitution has always existed in society in one form or another.

2. Its frequency and form have adapted themselves to the conditions imposed by the customs of each social system.

3. Latter-day social and economic conditions are favorable to prostitution.

4. Prostitution keeps pace with civilization. As this advances prostitution increases. The proportion of prostitutes is greater to-day than formerly.

5. Modern industrial enterprises are peculiarly productive of conditions favoring prostitution.

6. Prostitution is responsible for a large proportion of the diseases that afflict the race.

7. No universally effective method of repression or regulation has ever been devised.

8. Suppression is an absolute impossibility under present conditions.

When lovely woman stoops to folly,
And finds too late that men betray,
What prayer can soothe her melancholy,
What charm can wash her guilt away?
The only art her guilt to cover,
To hide her shame from every eye,
To give repentance to her lover,
And wring his bosom — is to die.

— *Goldsmith.*

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 566 967 3

