

LITTLE BLUE BOOK NO. 717  
Edited by E. Haldeman-Julius

# Modern Sexual Morality

Clement Wood

HALDEMAN-JULIUS COMPANY  
GIRARD, KANSAS

Copyright, 1924  
Haldeman-Julius Company

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

## MODERN SEXUAL MORALITY

## CONTENTS

- Chapter I. Christian Sexual Morality, in Theory
- Chapter II. Christian Sexual Morality, in Practice
- Chapter III. Morality Today
- Chapter IV. Morality Tomorrow

# MODERN SEXUAL MORALITY

## CHAPTER I

### CHRISTIAN SEXUAL MORALITY IN THEORY

*Social Progress.*—“The best thing any of us can do for our ancestors is to be better than they were,” Charlotte Perkins Gilman observes with no less wit than wisdom. Social progress, however, is yet far from being a universal ideal. It was not common stock of ancient thinking. As Bagehot says, “The ancients had no conception of progress; they did not so much as reject the idea; they did not even entertain it. Oriental nations are the same now.” Maine says, “It is indisputable that much the greater part of mankind has never shown a particle of desire that its civilized institutions should be improved, since the moment when external completeness was first given them by embodiment in some permanent record. . . . Vast populations, some of them with a civilization considerable but peculiar, detest that which in the language of the West would be called reform. To the fact that enthusiasm for change is comparatively rare must be added the fact that it is extremely modern.”

It is furthermore true that even the few persons in the most enlightened countries who desire change or reform, desire these only in a limited number of institutions. Ross puts it succinctly: “How few are there who honestly believe that improvement is possible anywhere and everywhere? Who expects change in worship or funerals, as he expects it in surgery? Who concedes the relativity of woman’s sphere or private property, as he concedes that of the piano or the sky-scraper?” Who looks for progress in sexual morality, as he demands it in the coffee percolator and the farm tractor?

The popular social ideal everywhere is to preserve life as it was in the days of one’s father and grandfather, more or less back to the day of the first pithecanthropoid, entirely unaware of the fact that social non-progress is stagnation, and ultimately death. The higher ideal is the recognition that there is no human institution not susceptible of continuing improvement. Morality is recognized today as indisputably a human institution. The anti-progressives resent most bitterly of all suggested improvements in it, for it is deeply embedded in the chasmed ignorances and prejudices of the past. An editorial in *The New Republic*, defending progressive views upon the subject of modern sex morality, stated: “The people who consider it wrong to challenge sexual conventions and wish to prohibit writers from doing so are, of course, the spokesmen of a great fear. . . . They are afraid of the sexual instinct. They are afraid that unless society invokes all its powers of moral condemnation against those who disobey the prevailing conventions, the family will break up and young people will ruin themselves by consulting only their inclinations with regard to their sexual conduct.” We will see in detail what has resulted from the accepted sexual morality; meanwhile, it is well to remember the thoughtful words of Haldane: “The conservative has but little to fear from the man whose reason is the servant of his passions, but let him beware of him in whom reason has become

the greatest and most terrible of the passions." The light of reason has been turned upon the whole field of sexual morality, and out of the illumination there is bound to come improvement.

*Variety in Sexual Moralities.*—There is no fact more obvious to the student of the subject, than his early discovery that morality has differed among all peoples; and that the very custom held most wicked in any given time and place has, at a differing time and place, been the height of morality. We can merely mention some of the more outstanding instances of morality different from our own; of customs popularly regarded as unthinkable to modern civilized man, yet, not without strong reasons, once practiced on a wide scale. Morality once held, even among our own ancestors, that a woman was the absolute and unqualified property of her man, as fully as his dog or his food was his property. She was a slave; and a man could do what he willed with his own. That this is true not only of remote times appears from Lubbock's picture of native life in Australia recently: "The position of women in Australia seems indeed to be wretched in the extreme. They are treated with the utmost brutality, beaten and speared in the limbs on the slightest provocation. If at all good-looking their position is, if possible, even worse than otherwise." "Almost everywhere in Africa" says Letourneau, "woman is the property of her husband, who has the right to use her as a beast of burden." Again he says, "In certain Himalayan regions . . . the Aryan Hindoos have adopted Thibetan polyandry. The women are for them veritable merchandise whom they buy and sell. They also freely sold their daughters, and the brothers of each family bought a common wife, whom they rented without hesitation to strangers." In New Zealand, according to Moerenhaut, a father or brother, on giving his daughter or sister to her future husband, would say, "If you are not satisfied with her, sell her, kill her, eat her, you are absolute master of her."

If you think this is only true of races backward in culture, look at the classical races. Again we quote Letourneau: "In the first age of Rome, the wife forms part of the family of her husband only in the quality of a slave. The virtuous Cato lent his wife Marcia to his friend Hortensius, and took her back on the death of that friend. According to the expression of Monica, Roman marriage was 'only a contract of servitude.' Once married, the woman belonged to her husband, body and goods." The same spirit animated the English Common Law provision that a husband might beat his wife, but must use a stick no thicker than his thumb. You will find vestiges of all this in our current morality. When such customs prevailed, the conservatives opposed any lightening of woman's load as vehemently as conservatives or, better, anti-progressives, today oppose intelligent reform or even discussion of sexual morality. In spite of such protests, change has come and must come.

Incest, or physical union with persons within close degrees of kinship, such as parents and children, or brothers and sisters, is today held in abhorrence. Yet Strabo relates (66 B. C.) that among the Arabs brothers have sexual intercourse with their sisters and sons with their mothers. Incest was originally a requirement, to make it possible for human beings to multiply, as Bebel points out. All early religions include this. Brahma wedded his own daughter Saravasti; the Egyptian Ammon was the husband of his mother; Odin was the

husband of his daughter Frigga; Jupiter, of his sister Juno. Bastian points out how the custom persists in certain sections of India today; in Swaganwara, for instance, the four sons of the Rajah recently married their four sisters.

Group intercourse was once widespread. Herodotus says of the Massagetes, "Every man marries a woman, but all are permitted to have intercourse with her." Bachofen established that this was once widespread among the Lycians, Etruscans, Cretans, Athenians, Lesbians, and Egyptians. Religious defloration was another wide custom. In Babylon, for instance, it was a religious duty for young girls upon reaching maturity to go to the temple of Mylitta and there yield to some man, making a sacrifice of their virginity. Similar customs were observed in the Serapis of Memphis, in Armenia, and in Tyre and Sidon. The Libyan maidens earned their dowry by their surrenders, enjoying sexual liberty before marriage; the men gave preference to the girl who had been most desired. Herodotus points out that the Thracians had the same custom. A legend relates of a daughter of King Cheops of Egypt, that she had a pyramid built from the proceeds obtained by the barter of her body.

Similar conditions exist today in the Marquesas Islands, parts of the Philippines and Polynesia, and, according to Waitz, among various African tribes. Until recently, in the Balearic Islands, on the bridal night all men related to the bride were admitted to her successively, in accordance with their ages, the groom coming last. Other peoples have this right of all men to a woman symbolized by her devirgination by one man, the high priest or tribal chieftain. The Claimars in Malabar engage priests to deflower their wives. Regions in India and the Pacific maintain this custom today; in Senegambia, the tribal chief has this function. Among other races, the defloration of the virgins is accomplished by idols constructed for this purpose. The "Jus primae noctis," or right of first night, which was in practice in Europe until far in the middle ages, derived its origin from the same custom.

At the height of Greek culture, Sappho and her pupils in Lesbos practiced Lesbian love, or homosexuality; and Socrates and Plato were only two among many outstanding Greeks who advocated this for men. There is perhaps no path or bypath of sexual activity which has not had some sort of religious or moral sanction in one or many places at various times. In studying the theory and practice of our sexual morality, it is important to begin with an understanding of the complexity of the subject, and to slough off at once the idea that our moral ideas are the only ones which ever existed. In the practice or spirit of the ways of other times we may secure light upon the direction in which we should go.

*Old Testament Sexual Morality.*—Modern Christian sexual morality is based upon the morality of the Old Testament, as modified by that of the New Testament and its subsequent interpretation. Old Testament morality began with an approval of mating between man and woman: "And Jehovah God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a help meet for him." "Male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply and replenish the earth." No matter how zealously the early Christian moralists preached abstinence, the basic Hebrew religion preached the contrary.

As to the form of union, polygamy was common. As early as the seventh descendant from Adam, we have "And Lamech took unto him two wives." The High Priest was ordered to have but one wife, and the late Deuteronomic lawmaker wrote: "Neither shall a king multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away." This was followed by a prohibition against a king's multiplying silver and gold to himself; vigorous kings scorned the former as readily as the latter, as David's many wives and Solomon's seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines attest. On the question of incest, Abraham married his half-sister Sarah; and the law of the Levites required a man to marry his brother's widow. Abraham furthermore had a child by his wife's hand-maid, and Jacob, after marrying two sisters, had children by the two handmaids of his wives.

*Position of Women.*—The wife under the Hebrew law became virtually the property of her husband. She had no legal redress if wronged by him. Divorce was recognized; but this was allowed only to the husband. "When a man taketh a wife, and marrieth her, then it shall be, if she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some unseemly thing in her, then he shall write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife." The husband in such cases was required to write the bill of divorcement; this may have worked as an invaluable pedagogic device to encourage men to learn writing.

The father's power over his children was absolute, even extending to the death penalty. This included, of course, the daughters; he had the power to sell them into slavery. There was a blanket prohibition against adultery, in the ten commandments; when this was expanded elsewhere, it becomes clearer that the woman was regarded as property, and the man's adultery with a married woman was regarded as the violation of a property right. "And the man that committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that committeth adultery with his neighbor's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death." There is no specific provision against the unmarried woman who commits adultery with some woman's husband. The same property right applied to a betrothed maiden: "But if the man find the damsel that is betrothed in the field, and the man force her, and lie with her; then the man only that lay with her shall die; but unto the damsel thou shalt do nothing; there is in the damsel no sin worthy of death." There were several prohibitions against making a prostitute of one's daughter; yet the institution of prostitution was well established.

Perhaps the moral custom which indicates the position of woman best appears in the story of Lot's entertainment of the two angels, and in another incident narrated in Judges. Unbelievable as the moral custom appears to us, Lot did the accepted thing in holding that his duty as host to strangers who stopped under his roof came ahead of his duty toward his own daughters. When the citizens of Sodom demanded that Lot turn over to them the two strangers who were stopping with him, Lot offered to surrender to them his two virginal daughters, to do with as they pleased, if they would not cause him to abuse the laws of hospitality by mistreating the two strangers under his roof. In the story in Judges, the same offer is made by a man of Gibeah in Benjamin to the crowd, of the surrender of his daughter and the stranger's concubine. A man rated the virginity of his daughter lower than his duties

as host to a casual stranger spending the night beneath his roof. Such was the high position of women under the sexual morality of the Old Testament, upon which Christian morality is based.

*New Testament Morality.*—When we come to the ethical teachings of Jesus, we are at once upon a less physical and more mystical plane. “But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.” This is hardly a workable test; if a court convicted a man of adultery, upon proof that he had merely lusted after her, we would soon have a race in jail. The provision concerning divorce is as strict: “But I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.” This is a magnificent standard of high restraint; but it was not suited to the people to whom Jesus spoke, nor is it a practicable working guide for men and women today. If marriages were really made in heaven, they surely should not be terminated in the chancery court; but if, as seems obvious, they are made on earth, it should be possible to terminate them on earth.

More than this, with Jesus we begin to meet the expression of that Christian philosophy which goes counter to the first chapter of Genesis, and holds that physical union between man and woman is not the highest state for them. “All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother’s womb; and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men; and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven’s sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.” This speaks praise of the man who makes a eunuch of himself for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. Needless to say, if this were the general practice, the race would expire in one generation.

This preaching was done very timorously; but it is omnipresent, wording its disdain of woman, degrading human love, placing the highest state as a chaste or eunuchic entrance into the shadowy kingdom of heaven. Paul looked down on women: “I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot contain, let them marry; for it is better to marry than to burn.” It is not surprising that he further ordered women to keep silence in the churches, to continue obedient to men, and to submit themselves to their husbands. For the husband “is the savior of the body,” as Christ is savior of the soul. Peter had the same attitude, as when he ordered wives to be in subjection to their husbands; his recommendation to husbands was to “dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel.” Thus the original Christian attitude was that complete abstinence, with physical alteration, was the highest state possible to man and that lower than this was marriage, in which the woman must remain subservient to the husband.

According to early Christianity, woman was impure. She was the seducer, who brought sin into the world, and wrought man’s destruction. Tertullian exclaims: “Woman, you are the gate to hell!” Again, “Celibacy must be chosen, even though the human race should perish.” Hieronymus says, always a vice.” Origenes declares, “Matrimony is impure and unholy; a

means of sensual passion.” Thomas Aquinas, in the late thirteenth century, held “Woman is a rapidly growing weed, an imperfect being. Women are born to be eternally maintained under the yoke of their lords and masters.”

It must be confessed that this long sneer at their mothers and sisters and lovers and wives is not confined to Christianity. In the Indian book of laws of Manu we find: “The cause of dishonor is woman; woman should be shunned.” But Christianity concerns us most; and it is slight relief to reflect that, in the Council at Macon during the sixth century, it was solemnly adjudged—by men—that woman did have a soul; and this was by a majority of one! In its great similar wisdom, the Legislature of Kentucky recently decided by a majority of one that Darwin was right, and that man did rise from the animals. The Roman Catholic celibate priesthood is an outgrowth of this early attitude; but since men and women are human beings, the long narrative of the actual practices of monastery and nunnery makes spicy reading.

*Our Theoretical Morality.*—The theoretical morality of modern Christian culture, then, is on a high plane, with a bodiless existence as the peak. Highest of all are the men who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven’s sake. Below this comes union with that inferior being, a woman, that “gate to hell,” that “imperfect, rapidly growing weed.” According to this code, the love life of a man or woman is to be confined to an after-marriage relationship exclusively with the wedded mate; the unwed are to have no sexual relationships. There is to be no divorce, except for fornication on the part of the woman. There is no room for prostitution or any sexual irregularity in this code of morality at all. It has been the accepted code for some nineteen hundred years now. This is a good time to survey the effects of the code, and see how thoroughly the practice of self-castration for the kingdom of heaven’s sake has spread; how absolute is the moral monogamy; how complete is the avoidance of all irregular sexual relationships and prostitution. There is an element of truth in the pragmatic attitude, that a thing is good if it works. If we have made even a passable start toward this Christian ideal, that is something in its favor. If, to the contrary, we find that there has never been even a working start toward this ideal, that brings up the question of whether something is not basically wrong with the ideal.

There are thinkers today who challenge every item of the ideal; who hold that self-castration is almost invariably wrong, and never a high moral standard; that iron-bound monogamy induces prostitution and a horde of sexual irregularities; and that the whole system produces far more injustice and unhappiness than their reverse. Let us first see how the system has worked in practice.

## CHAPTER II

### CHRISTIAN SEXUAL MORALITY IN PRACTICE

*How People Behave.*—In “Men, Women and God,” the Rev. A. Herbert Gray distinguishes sharply between the Christian sexual morality and the working moral standard of society. Christian morality, he says, “call for absolute continence and chastity before marriage, and absolute fidelity after it.” As to the working moral standard of society, he says “it treats lack of chastity among unmarried men as a very venial (pardonable) offence, and punishes the same offence in women with very severe social penalties.” This, of course, is far from comprehensive; but we will return in good time to Dr. Gray.

As a witness on social phenomena, Upton Sinclair is comprehensive, comprehending, and, as a rule, accurate. Since he is in favor of monogamy (subject to his own qualifications), he may be allowed to tell us the present state of morality in society under our Christian standards. His “The Book of Life” goes exhaustively into the question. “The institution of marriage,” he says, (meaning marriage as the only method of sexual union), “is an ideal which has been preached and taught, but which has never anywhere, in any society, at any stage of human progress, actually existed as the general practice of mankind. What has existed and still exists is a very different institution, which I shall here describe as marriage-plus-prostitution.” We live under a double standard of morality, he explains, in which the faithless wife or the girl who experiences physical love without marriage is severely punished; while the man who does the same thing is punished lightly, or not at all. “It is a breach of honor for the ruling class male to tamper with the wife of his friend; it is frequently dangerous for him to tamper with the young females of his own class; but it is in general practice taken for granted that the young females of lower classes are his legitimate prey.”

Sinclair then turns to a study of how people actually behave in sex, as distinguished from the way they pretend to behave. He starts with the young people of today. With young college men and the modern type of girl called the flapper, “petting parties” are one of the indoor sports. The French have the word “flirtage” to describe what goes on, which usually stops short of actual sexual intercourse, but not far short. The typical ingenue role in the movies is that of the innocent young girl whose virtue is threatened, but never lost: it is a charming corollary on our public taste, as Sinclair points out, that “in order to get an important job in the movies, a girl must regularly and as a matter of course part with her virtue.” The “swell” hotels, especially in Southern California, are haunted by married women with automobiles, who make a habit of taking young men with them for “sexual riots—even elderly women, white-haired women, old enough to be your grandmother!” A prominent physician in New York City, when asked to state what in his opinion was the most significant development in the social life of New York, answered “the spread of male prostitution.”

Turning to the so-called “smart set,” Sinclair indicts them for the prevalence of all sorts of sexual irregularities. Wholesale jaunts of steel millionaires with a large party of prostitutes,

exchange for the night of wives among Wall Street millionaires, the general corruption of young girls by millionaires—these are a few of his conclusions, buttressed by case after case with specific details. One physician in New York City in fifteen years examined nine hundred children who had been raped, the age of the youngest being nine months. Among the poor, conditions are worse, and at times indescribable.

*The Christian Remedy.*—When confronted with these facts, even the clearest thinkers among the apologists for the present system are at a loss. Dr. Gray, previously quoted, says that “lust is the vilest thing on earth, pure love the most beautiful”; which is as sound as to say that a lily’s roots are the vilest thing in the vegetable kingdom, and its flower the most beautiful. The two are indispensable; the one is the root of the other. Dr. Gray is accurate, however, when he assures the young people who read his pages “that there is nothing whatever in the facts of the case to be afraid of—nothing that they cannot know with perfectly clean minds. There are no horrors in normal sex life. The truth about even the ultimate intimacies of body between men and women is that when truly achieved they are beautiful, and holy, and happy.” With the exception of his religious adjective, no one can quarrel with this intelligent stand.

The same authority goes further. “When the right time does come, then lovers who have already been attaining to union of heart and mind express their passion also in the union of their bodies. Real love is not satisfied without physical intimacy. The ultimate bodily union of two lovers is a beautiful and happy thing.” While granting that the union of true lovers apart from marriage is not impure, he gratuitously adds that it cannot be perfect emotionally, because parties cannot come to it with free and untroubled minds. Needless to say, married lovers are far from having, as a rule, free and untroubled minds; such minds may often be held by unmarried lovers. It may be known to him that a large percentage of engagements culminating in marriage today include sexual union before the legal union is made. The historical reason for monogamy he finds in “the inalienable right of a child to be brought up by a father and a mother.” We will consider this haphazard blend of blessing and curse later; it is enough here to indicate in passing that it is an unsound historical reason. The real reason was by a chain consisting of (1) marriage as a contract of servitude to bind the woman, and (2) monogamy as a democratic revolt against the polygamy of the wealthy and powerful. The picture he draws of promiscuity is sensational: “Both men and women would pass from one temporary union to another, mutilating their better natures in the process.” What else do a large proportion of men do today? Nor has promiscuity, in lands where it is moral, had any such result.

After deciding that continence is not injurious, but leaves a man stronger (he quotes one Fere as authority for this astonishing conclusion)—a subject we will consider later—he passes to his Christian recommendation for the man or woman who cannot find a mate, due to excess of the other sex in the population, or some other involuntary cause. To such he recommends that they fix their eyes on God, and knows that “in some mysterious and wonderful way He understands and meets all our needs.” The old negro said that, if he prayed the Lord to send him a turkey, his prayer was never answered; but if he prayed the Lord to

send him after a turkey, he always got it. The same is true of the prayer of the celibate man or woman. No one need absolutely lack sex experience; nor does fixing the eyesight on God appeal as a sound remedy. There may be a god, although science and philosophy are increasingly doubting it; if there is, what are hosts of intelligent skeptics to do? And if science and philosophy are right, and there is no god, it is like satisfying one's powerful hunger by thinking of Santa Claus. It won't work. He finds the cause of failure in marriage in that people lack God in their lives. This overlooks the fact that many who have a God or a whole pantheon of divinities make a general hash of their sex lives. The cause of failure in marriage lies, not in God, or belief in him, but in some emotional or physical lack of adaptation in the parties to the union. Joint attendance on prayer meeting and Sunday services will not cure a lack of love.

*A Layman's Remedy.*—William Jennings Bryan, a prominent Christian layman, in a recent article on "Morals for Men and Women," has detoured from his beaten tracks of free silver, alcohol-free prohibition, and anti-evolution, into the more pervading question of the love relations between men and women. His cloudy generalizations resolve themselves into three demands: 1st, for a single standard for men and women in sexual morality; 2nd, for a legislative enactment of the sacredness of the home; and, 3rd, for the elimination of passion in the relations of men and women. These are of varying merit and demerit.

It is an easy thing to demand a single standard for men and women; Mr. Bryan avoids the harder task of stating what this standard is to be. His demand apparently is for men to conform to the code now generally exacted of women in the United States. Dr. Gray worded it, "absolute continence and chastity before marriage, and absolute fidelity after it." The unwed, of course, are to have no sexual relationships. This is, at least, a definite theme for discussion. Bryan's strictures against prostitution are in the main well taken. It is only a compromise logic which defends that type of prostitution known as "white slavery," in which the woman is an imprisoned prostitute: a logic which claims to see man's lust and "good" woman's protection, and is blind to the women most concerned. There is a just and general stigma against any form of involuntary prostitution, as against anything unreasonably involuntary. We must favor steps to end the theft or swindling from a woman of her body's usance, and its subsequent commercialization. Man's profit from this industry is almost as unsocial; although, if the woman chooses it, the case is slightly altered. Yet this is a protection paid to a man against forces that prey on the woman. Remove these forces, as by ending the unofficial tax on the outlawed business, levied in the shape of routine arrests and fines, and the prevalence of such voluntary protectorship ends.

The case of the voluntary prostitute, from the woman's standpoint, is different. It must be remembered that a woman's body is her own, but for those rights voluntarily surrendered to organized society. Old Testament, early Christian, and all other moralities which held that a woman's body belonged first to her father and later to her husband, are agreed today to be in error: a woman's body is her own, as a man's body is his own. Take, then, the case of a girl who chooses the temporary affluence of being a rich man's mistress, rather than the continuing poverty of continence: this choice is ethically not remote from a parent's disposal

in marriage, or a scheming girl's marriage, for worldly advantage; it is often more remunerative. Nor is the woman who elects promiscuity for pay ethically different from the mistress or wife for money. The evil in all three cases is the marketing of this intimate and satisfying relationship; for the sale of love is a transaction which usually spells unhappiness, whether the title worn be call-woman, mistress, or wife. And yet the hoarding of love, in our commercialized society, due to the Christian morality, may breed greater unhappiness. Fixing one's mind on God, which Dr. Gray suggests, is no more a cure for love desire than it is for hunger or tuberculosis. The chance for happiness comes most to those who do not market their affections. And yet, in case the love is sold in any one of the three ways, the matter is experimental; and a woman is entitled to choose which experiment she will make. Our utmost right is to enlighten her, as far as possible, upon what lies in front of her.

*Love and Sex.*—Where there is no commercialized consideration, wifehood, mistress relationship, or promiscuity is of course not prostitution. The motive here, when the money motive is eliminated, is some aspect of love: intermediate motives may be resolved into their worldly and affectionate components. Man's relationships, whether called monogamous or polygamous, have long been largely promiscuous; the unethical part has come in where he has secured his women through cracking the financial whip, left so long in his hands. Without this whip, when love or sexual desire has been both motive and method, unless victimization has occurred, his activity has been ethical. Love and the sexual desire are in their roots the same. Sexual desire is animal love, the first form of love to develop; romantic love, satisfied by the presence rather than the possession of the beloved, came next, during the feudal ages; and conjugal love, or a love for a spouse after the gust of passion has been satisfied, came last. But all are based upon sexual desire; in finely tempered individuals, the desire is overcoated with tenderness and allied emotions, while in coarser, more primitive natures the desire remains simpler. But both connubial affection and spasmodic lust are forms of love.

Woman today is increasingly becoming a wielder of the financial whip. The home of yesterday has spread into mill, factory, office, a multifold specialized substitute; woman has followed the scattering, enlarging home, thereby acquiring wages and profits. The acquisition of legal, political, and social rights has naturally grown from her altering status. Her body's usage is no longer her sole coin for buying bread and butter, whether the token was stamped sacred by a marriage license or not. She can now increasingly buy her will of the world; and Mr. Bryan is this far right, that she will not buy the old double standard of morality, of abstinence or monogamy for herself, and promiscuity for the male. This is true of the modern business woman, the flapper, and the liberal wife. What, then, does she desire to buy of the world? She might have sought to buy a common monogamy: if this had been her universal desire, and she had all financial power, she might have fixed this choice on reluctant man. But the altered conduct of woman today establishes beyond argument that this is not her universal wish. Woman is probably less promiscuous than man, as a sex; but she too is kin to her father, and shares, at times to an enormous degree, his mental and spiritual nature. Shaw glowed wittily that the wise modern woman today prefers part of a first-rate man, to all of a

second-rater. An increasing number of women insist upon widening sexual experience. Of course, woman has no exclusive dominance of financial power. She may, and should, demand a single standard for man and woman; but this will be less a hard-and-fast monogamy, which would fit all men and women no better than a coffin exactly 5 feet 6 inches long; this will be rather an elective monogamy or reasonable promiscuity, depending upon the preference of the men and women individually involved.

The Bible, or Christian morality, does not favor the absolute monogamy favored by Dr. Gray and Mr. Bryan. Prostitution was recognized in both testaments; polygamy openly in the first; castration as a moral peak in the second. Even if it were a tract for monogamy, the case would still be feeble; modern science has mirrored too clearly the folklore origin of the books, to permit a thoughtful modern man to accept them as more than persuasive suggestions. Nor does modern science condemn everything except abstinence or monogamy. Mr. Bryan believes to the contrary: "Indulgence is not a physical necessity in man, any more than it is in woman. . . . The God who made man and endowed him with a passion essential to the perpetuity of the race, not only made continence compatible with health but punishes sex immorality by inexorable law." This is typically misleading. Indulgence is a physical necessity from the standpoint of the race, without argument; it is also a necessity from the standpoint of the individual, in order to produce a roundness of human experience, a complete manhood or womanhood. Its omission leaves a physical, mental, and spiritual gap. A man abstaining for life is little better than a eunuch; and a eunuch is much less than a man. We speak, not of rare exceptions like high bloodless ascetics, but of humanity in general. It is as untrue that sex immorality is punished by inexorable law (using "sex immorality" as he uses it, to include everything not strict monogamy.) A limited promiscuity, with healthy members of the opposite sex, produces no physical punishment, no attendant venereal disease. Germs are no longer regarded as punishment by God.

Postponing the question of children for a moment, the haphazard selection of mates is a strong argument against monogamy. There is no legal provision for trial marriage, or adequate knowledge of the intended mate. Many contracting parties are mentally, physically, or spiritually incompatible at marriage; many more lack similar aptitudes for growth. Tragedies fester out of sight, where one of the mates is frigid or otherwise unsuitable; an occasional ochre scandal lifts such a case to view. Unhappiness bred of marriage is no divine dispensation, but a human error, demanding human correction. Abstinence, during the vigorous twenties, is unnatural; marriage then is increasingly unwise financially. More and more of our youth of both sexes will not accept abstinence. Many a woman is unwilling to surrender her art or profession, her trade or work, for the low domestic industry of home-making, "clothes and church and children": nor do such women invariably decide to remain continent. The varied contracts of the war were liberalizing and liberating. Experimental promiscuity is an increasing fact; the clock cannot be turned back to genteel, unjust yesterday. There is no sound argument for the alternatives of abstinence or monogamy for man or woman.

*The Unholiness of Passion.*—Mr. Bryan's second point, that there should be a legislative enactment of the sacredness of the home, is far weaker. Whatever "sacred" actually means, from a scientific standpoint, its localization on any human institution has always been a blight. We call the church sacred, and baseball and the movies profane; the front pews are sparsely tenanted, while the bleachers and movie houses are packed. All life may be spoken of as sacred, or, more accurately, as natural; and no enactment that the home, with its splendid virtues and its vicious failings—and the adjectives may also be reversed—no enactment that the home is or is not sacred, will add one tittle or one jot to its qualities. There is a land which has a Sacred Cow; it gives no more milk than a profane one.

But Mr. Bryan means more than this, as he proceeds to explain. He desires to guard the home more: "punish conspiracies against the home before they are consummated in its wreckage." Apparently his meaning here is that the dissatisfied mate who plans with an outsider to share his or her love life is to be punished. But this has been considered already: if there is no real reason for the restrictive alternatives of monogamy or abstinence, as a compulsory restriction, there is surely no offense to punish. This thoroughgoing reformer elucidates that he refers to "conduct inconsistent with marital duty and leading to the tragedy of consummated infidelity." How serious must such conduct be? Shall there be a fine for the first kiss, a jail commitment for the second? Incidentally, the "tragedy" of consummated infidelity is often neither tragedy nor comedy, but living—at times magnificent, at times sordid. It does not make it tragedy to call it so.

Nothing is to be gained by calling the home another sacred cow.

His third point is the most unbelievable of all: that passion must be eliminated in the relations of men and women. Yet this logically flows from the generally misunderstood or ungrasped ideal of Jesus, Paul and other early Christians, which placed the eunuch as the highest type of man. Such advice would come with more grace, if accompanied by a personal testimonial. To make sure that this does not misrepresent Bryan, we quote: "Even the conscience and this court of last resort cannot restrain, unless one avoids the beginning of evil. Passion may be likened to Niagara—the current is not irresistible until one is close to the falls; he can row across the stream in safety if he will keep away from the precipice, but he is helpless if he ventures too near. So one cannot sport with the passions. Christ gives us the only rule: 'desire must be stifled in the heart before it finds expression in act.'" Christ at least specifically stated that his rule was not a universal one: "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." This whole conception, that passion is evil, whether found in the New Testament or the peerless orator, is a false and vicious philosophy of life. It is passion that has made the world and us what we are—that is responsible for our joys, as well as our ills. It is largely sexual passion, sublimated into external deeds, by the desire to stand well in the beloved's eyes, to please her or him by a fit home for her or him, and by achievements worth approval, that has made civilization, in its multiform wonder. Stifle it in the heart, and you stifle all progress, all life.

"Virtue," says Bryan, "is the highest property of human life, for it is, in its final analysis, the basis of perpetuity, because it is the price of reproduction." By virtue he obviously means

chastity or monogamy; and this is a restrictive definition of yesterday. Many a healthy race of animals, many a healthy divorced and remarried human being, proves the unsoundness of this. It is common to see a new mate each bearing season, with a conceivable gain in the quality of reproduction. Indeed, this better serves the purpose of evolution, which is the gainer by constant crossing of the strain. Charlotte Perkins Gilman is on higher ground when she defines chastity as selection. We may safely leave it here.

*Time Problem of Children.*—Of course, the matter of children must not be overlooked. If there were no artificial limitation of conception, the average couple marrying at twenty might well have twenty-five children during the course of their married life. Often the poor do approach this; our pioneer ancestors approached it. This as a general thing would deprive the race of education, culture, and comfort. Luckily, prevention of conception is well understood by many married couples; and the same method is open to unmarried couples. Marriage or union for love is justifiable only as long as the love, with its emotional by-products, lasts. If children have come, these must be properly provided for: we have not yet descended to Dean Swift's savage suggestion, by which the children of the poor should be treated as commercial articles of food.

Dr. Gray banks upon "the inalienable right of a child to be brought up by a father and a mother." This is of course at best a late right; the lowest savages do not understand any connection between coitus and birth, and are unaware of fatherhood. Children gain immeasurably by continuing contact with contented parents. But there is no balm in the constant mental, spiritual and physical wrenches and ills that the children of an ill-mated couple must undergo. Society of the future will tend to realize that motherhood for love is as ethical as marriage for love; there is no just stigma of illegitimacy upon any child ever born. Neither God nor law can justly visit the sins of the parents upon the first, much less the third or the fourth generation, beyond the natural toll due for any mismating. Intelligent motherhood will be hailed as a social benefit, which society should recompense. Motherhood pensions are a step in this direction.

Modern psychology has demonstrated the average home training of children is inferior to proper institutional training, bodily, mentally, and spiritually; although of course the average home is superior to most institutions existing now. Charlotte Perkins Gilman's brilliant "The Home" develops this with characteristic penetration. As social service becomes more than a phrase, such institutions will approach their proper functioning. There are many women, there are some men, whose natures are fitted to caring for and training children of various ages. Often these are denied any children by existing society and its ethics. There are many more men, and a large number of women, who are either affirmatively better fitted for other and wider things, or who are negatively unfit for the rearing of children. The whole trend of modern thinking indicts the home. The "good old" tyrannical father and the "good old" ignorant, sentimental mother are types that must be replaced. Today as never before the generation of children are in revolt against the mis-rearing of their parents. We look to specialists to attend to our teeth, our cattle, our eyes, our farm produce, our automobiles, and in general every detail of our lives, except the most important one: the next generation. The

day of the specialist in child rearing is approaching. The argument that children require monogamy on the part of their parents is vanishing.

Upon Sinclair, for all his preachment of monogamy, is almost a whole-souled voice in behalf of more liberal morality. "The suppression of love is a crime against nature and life," he says; and again, "passion is what gives to love and marriage its vitality, its energy, its drive; in fact, it gives these qualities to the whole character." He defends monogamy, not from traditional and religious motives, but from more modern reasoning. First, because of venereal disease; the spirit of his criticism is well taken, but he takes too morbid a view of the prevalence of disease under a system, not of prostitution, but of elective promiscuity. His second reason is an economic one—a reason which will solve itself as modern economic ills yield to intelligent thinking. Yet he does not favor the hard-and-fast Christian monogamy—"spiritual strangulation," he calls it. "My own idea is rather what some churchman has sarcastically described by the term 'progressive polygamy.'" In other words, a love relationship is to last as long as love lasts, and no longer. He favors a sane divorce law as a safeguard of his monogamy or progressive polygamy: such a law as the Swiss one, in which the parties appear before a judge, and express a desire for divorce; and after an interval of three or six months, if they cannot agree to live and love together, he grants the divorce. Sinclair is obsessed by the idea that infinite social wisdom may be found in himself or other social leaders; so he can write: "But when we have made sex laws that we know are just and sensible—then we shall consider that we have the right to restrain sex criminals, and in extreme cases we shall avail ourselves of the skill of science to perform a surgical operation which will render him unable in future to prey upon the love needs of people who are placed at his mercy by their best qualities, their unselfishness and lack of suspicion." The grammar of this (note the indefinite antecedent of "him") is as doubtful as the thinking; for man's wisdom cannot frame laws wise enough to cover the exceptions, by prohibitory legislation. What is called "attractive legislation"—legislation offering a reward for favored social conduct, instead of placing a penalty upon conduct not favored—is more in line with the present tendency. If Mr. Sinclair's idea here were adopted, as brilliant thinkers have pointed out, among the earliest to be emasculated and held unfit to be the parents of the future would be the radical thinkers, the men and women ahead of the crowd. Neither meditation upon God nor the surgeon's knife is the proper method of sex satisfaction or regulation.

## CHAPTER III

### MORALITY TODAY

*Altered Status of Woman.*—Signs are not wanting that the morality of the woman of today has altered as her general status has altered. Nothing is more significant in the history of the present century than the vast forward step woman has taken. Three-quarters of a century ago, she was denied any education but the most rudimentary; she was denied political rights; she was denied artistic, professional, and trade position and preferment; she was denied legal equality. All of this has been altered. She is today offered education on the same terms as to man, in general and specialized institutions of learning. She has won and is winning political equality in name, and is reaching for it in fact. She has entered upon the fields of art, upon the professions, upon all the lines of industry. She is achieving equality before the law. She is ending her age of being a commodity, and entering upon her age of being a human being.

Her conceptions of morality are altering in accordance with her vastly improved position. "Speaking of morals," Jeffery Farnol, the British novelist, recently observed, "the English women will knock down the double standard and take the same code as men soon." Mr. Farnol does not hold that woman will lift man to her precarious height-and-depth, by which a man will be held to abstinence or monogamy, on penalty of being regarded as a social outcast. There is small indication that this is occurring. Instead, he holds that women will take the same code as men. I am optimist enough to hold that they will not sink to the unbalanced depth of men: that they will restore a balance, lifting man's morality and lowering their artificially raised and depressed morality, until a sounder mean is found for both. The *New Republic* says, "there is an increasing disposition among people who are neither frivolous nor sensual to enter without any sense of guilt into irregular sexual relationships." It continues shrewdly, "the older conventions of sexual morality originated in a pre-revolutionary age when the orthodox believed in the vileness of human nature and its conception in sin, and when the suppression of instinct and inclination was supposed to form the royal road to the higher life. Naturalism has rendered these dogmas obsolete, but rigid conventions of sexual morality which were born of and with them still retain a good deal of their former authority."

How are men to learn a better mode of sex life? The same authority goes on, "The possibility of discovering a more authoritative manual of sexual conduct depends upon an increase in knowledge. The increase in knowledge can hardly take place unless good people cease to fear a wider range of experimentation in sexual behavior. Success will finally depend upon the ability of men and women to combine candor, purity, and poise of mind with fulness of sexual experience." Here we have a new phrase, "fulness of sexual experience," introduced into the discussion. This may be obtained by monogamy; but it may better be obtained by a wider experience. And women, as well as men, are achieving this wider experience—at times with a sensational fanfaronade of trumpets, at times as unobtrusively as grass grows. The

important point is that they are achieving it.

*The Flapper Generation.*—The reverend authorities, confronted with the more liberal practices of the young women and men of today, shout down maledictions and direful forbodings like croaking carrion birds. The Young people of yesterday were right, and these wrong: they were moral, these immoral; they made our admirable today, these will make a hideous tomorrow, say these self-appointed Prophets of humanity. Nor are they wholly wrong; although they are more wrong than right.

The girl of yesterday was the “innocent” girl; often the young man grew up to adolescence as the “innocent” young man as well. Things of the body were vile and evil; they should not be mentioned and explained, even by a parent to his children, a pastor to his flock, or a doctor to his patient. This sounds incredible as I write it: but it was so; I myself grew in this baneful and withering mis-morality. How was a young girl or a young man to learn, then, if those best equipped and closest to youth were not to reveal the truth about these important functions and delights? The young man was theoretically to learn from God, I suppose; I know no other source. At maturity, he was received by his father into the fellowship of men: that is, he was, as a rule, given the address of the Red Light district, which he was supposed to be unaware of, and was also given something of man’s lore of measures to discount the danger of venereal infection. He was then turned loose to sow his wild oats. And the girl? She was not to be enlightened, even by her mother, as to these mysteries; her purchaser—so the husband was regarded, I confess in all sorrow—on the bridal night was to explain the truth, unveil the mysteries, shape his woman from a state of flower-like ignorance to what he would have her be. In practice, the system worked differently. The boys learned from other boys, and first from the viler of their associates; and their whole conception of the love relationship between the sexes was fouled and smutted from the start. The girl learned from other girls, a mixture of smut, exaggeration and mis-statement. This was the sexual education of yesterday.

The sexual practice was simple. The young man sowed his wild oats; married, at times infecting his wife and her unborn children with venereal diseases; and, after marriage, took a man’s privilege to continue his pre-marital intimacies with loose women. The young woman survived the dangers of seduction, due to her ignorance, and became a disillusioned wife; or yielded to them, and became a prostitute, a fallen woman, a social outcast. This describes the American custom: in England education and practice were more liberal, and on the Continent increasingly so.

The young generation of today lives, thinks and aspires differently. In the matter of sexual education, there has been a widespread revolution. It is still possible to jail a man or woman who sells a work containing medical information upon this subject, even in enlightened states; it is even more probable that the person imparting contra-conceptual information will be jailed. But there is an approach toward sexual education even in our school systems; the enlightened parent today gives more or less information to his children; and the books are easily obtainable. We are a long way yet from adequate sexual education. Physical love-making is an art, and should be studied and learned as such. There are

emotional differences in the sexes, for instance, man's precipitancy and woman's comparative initial lethargy: these should be understood thoroughly by men and women, that both could achieve the fullest satisfaction from the union. But the fact remains that even the youngest boy or girl today, before puberty has set in, in any sophisticated environment, knows roughly the facts of sex, and has learned them without the gutter soilure of yesterday.

How does the young generation act? There are tribes in Africa in which morality permits the girls and young men of the tribe to go to any length in sexual play, without actually having a child. There are circles in America today pointing toward this. This is probably an extreme practice; for there is no doubt that conservation of sexual resources, within reason, is an admirable thing. But the flapper generation is noted for liberality in amorous dalliance. The girl has gotten rid of corsets, impeding clothes, long hair and many of her impeding inhibitions and taboos on sexual matters. "Petting parties" may differ in various localities; but in many localities they involve something of the flirtage of the French, which means amorous dalliance stopping short of sexual intercourse. All of this is almost without reflection, it should be noted: the young girls and boys are not philosophers on the subject of love, they are just human beings somehow liberated from the inhibitions and taboos. All of this involves a knowledge of the opposite sex without the glamor of the past, which was so productive of subsequent unhappiness. There is something sound in the core of it all: for the old taboos and inhibitions were unhealthy and unsound. It is possible that the pendulum has swung too far; but it has at least swung far enough to retire permanently much of the poisonous Anglo-Saxon and Puritanic prudery which contributed toward making us a race of hypocrites upon all matters of importance.

*The Older Women.*—There is no definite line indicating where the age of flapperdom stops; but there is a demarcation more definite between the high school, college and debutante type of girl, and the young woman out in business or a profession, or definitely settled upon the career of wife or unmarried society woman. What the flappers have done has been without premeditation; but this class of women, to a greater or less extent, have thought over what they are doing, and have philosophized upon it. It is hard now to speak with exactness: for there are no statistics upon the love theories and practices of living men and women, and the change is too recent to be thoroughly understood. There is the danger of exaggeration, as well as the danger of understatement. It will be safer to say that there is a growing class of young women who are willing to undertake love experiences without marriage; usually seeing to it that these continue childless, but at times, in some cases, desiring to have children born out of wedlock.

The important element in most of these cases is that the financial consideration has disappeared. There are still many cases in which a man keeps a mistress; but this practice was known in the past. The typical modern case is of a woman who is independent financially, or who is earning her own living; and who takes a lover, who earns his own living, so that no element of bargain and sale enters into the love making. This cannot be considered a backward step. It is a necessary outgrowth of woman's increasing financial independence. It

is a result of woman's ability to buy her will of the world, by supporting herself and thereby having power to dictate whom she will or will not love. She no longer must look upon a man as a potential meal-ticket. Love intrinsically has nothing to do with meal tickets. At times these women never accept but a single lover, and marriage may follow the freer relationship; at times they choose a wider range, and there is at least the possibility that the wider contacts in the intimate relationship are valuable in their self-developments. Valuable or not, such relationships are increasingly to be found in modern society.

From a sociological standpoint, these lovers are in the vanguard of the laboratory experimentalists in love, who are endeavoring to find out the most satisfactory form of love union for the future. They do not have a united public opinion which sustains the morality of their acts; and, in order to brave a public opinion perhaps predominantly hostile, they must have unusual energy and vigor of personality. They are inevitably not the laggards in the human race, but the reverse. They have come to the conclusion that love need not be made sacred by the church—and the majority, as evidenced in our law, is with them; they hold further that love need not be made sacred by the law. A large portion of the thinking public holds that the New York State divorce law, for instance, which grants divorce only for infidelity, is not a sound law: accordingly, when parties who are married determine upon a divorce, they fake a case of infidelity, with a hired partner for the man, and so circumvent the law. These younger lovers do not go through that hypocrisy: they simply ignore the law, and set up a new establishment without legal sanction. America is so prude-ridden, that it is hard to see another course as obvious.

As the *New Republic* stated, these are people neither frivolous nor sexual. All of this is pole-distant from survivals of the visit to prostitutes and the kept mistress relationships, still indulged in by many of the wealthy classes. A pamphlet "Satire: And Why It Does not Flourish in America" by William Salisbury contains ample evidence of the less admirable side of the love-life of the wealthy and famous in America, sparing no one, from the "immensely rich man, now past eighty years of age, who has a country estate near Tarrytown," down to scores of lesser celebrities. But these are vestiges, and not presages. It is the lovers who love for love's sake who are the interesting social phenomena.

## CHAPTER IV

### MORALITY TOMORROW

*The Poet's View.*—We can all see with greater or less clearness what is going on about us; we get a truer sense of its significance if we check it against the visions of the leading poets and thinkers of today. From them we can sense the goal toward which the present may be tending. Walt Whitman, a poet of the recent yesterday, went a long way toward predicting all that we have seen, and more:

And I will show of male and female that either is but the equal of the other,  
And sexual organs and acts! do you concentrate in me, for I am determined to tell you with courageous  
clear voice to prove you illustrious.

His "Children of Adam" is a full-throated enlargement of this theme, bitterly denounced by the conservatives and anti-progressives, and warmly defended by the forward lookers. He speaks of:

The mystic deliria, the madness amorous, the utter abandonment,  
(Hark close and still what I now whisper to you,  
I love you, O you entirely possess me,  
O that you and I escape from the rest and go utterly off, free and lawless.  
Two hawks in the air, two fishes swimming in the sea not more lawless than we.)

The phrases here, like "utter abandonment," indicate the only spirit in which love at its physical crest can be rightly experienced.

This is the female form.  
A divine nimbus exhales from it from head to foot,  
It attracts with fierce undeniable attraction,  
I am drawn by its breath as if I were no more than a helpless vapor,  
all falls aside but myself and I,  
Books, art, religion, time, the visible and solid earth, and what was  
expected of heaven or feared of hell, are now consumed.

If love is this overpowering—and it should be—is it any wonder that it is shattering all conventions of outworn morality which impede it?

It is the new woman he sees, not the old female bred by man toward physical beauty and invalidism, and imbecility:

They are not one jot less than I am,  
They are tann'd in the face by shining suns and blowing winds,  
Their face has the old divine suppleness and strength,  
They know how to swim, row, ride, wrestle, shoot, run, strike,  
retreat, advance, resist, defend themselves,  
They are ultimate in their own right—they are calm, clear, well  
possessed of themselves.

So indeed the present sees them: calm, clear, well possessed of themselves. Thus Walt Whitman anticipated what has come to pass.

*The Economic Factor.*—Edward Carpenter is one among those who hold that an economic revolution must precede the full emancipation of woman. “The freedom of Woman must ultimately rest on the Communism of society—which alone can give her support during the period of Motherhood, without forcing her into dependence on the arbitrary will of one man.” There is cogent reasoning here; although perhaps an enlarged motherhood pension from a society not yet communistic could achieve the same purpose. Naturally, he favors a drastic revision of the present marriage system: “The more people come to recognize the sacredness and naturalness of the real union, the less will they be able to bar themselves from this by a life-long and artificial contract made in their salad days.”

Even more outspoken is Bebel in his view of woman in the future. In the new society, he says, woman will be entirely independent, both socially and economically. She will not be subjected to even a trace of domination and exploitation, but will be free and man’s equal, and mistress of her own lot. “In the choice of love she is as free and unhampered as man. She woos or is wooed, and enters into a union prompted by no other considerations but her own feelings. This union is a private agreement, without the interference of a functionary, just as marriage has been a private agreement until far into the middle ages.” Such a union would of course be dissolved upon the development of incompatibility or revulsion. Love will reach as sensitive a point as that expressed by George Sand in “Jacques”; “No human being can command love, and none is guilty, if he feels or goes without it. What degrades the woman is not the hour she grants to her lover, but the night that she thereupon spends with her husband.”

*The Biologic Factor.*—Some light is thrown upon the question of eugenics, especially negative eugenics, by Bertrand Russell’s “Icarus.” Sinclair, it may be recalled, had recommended emasculation for sexual criminals. Touching upon a phase of that, Russell says “We may perhaps assume that, if people grow less superstitious, governments will acquire the right to sterilize those who are not considered desirable as parents. This power will be used, at first, to diminish imbecility, a most desirable object. But probably, in time, opposition to the government will be taken to prove imbecility, so that rebels of all kinds will be sterilized.” Russell continues with stabbing sarcasm that the tendency will finally be to include all who fail to pass the usual school examinations. He suggests a general alteration of moral standards: “Moral standards may alter so as to make it possible for one man to be the sire of a vast progeny by many different mothers.” He continues, however, with the gloomy reminder that such a scientific reform will be handed over for management to the average citizen; so that the types which it may desire and increase will not be the types desired by scientists today, but rather the types desired by the average official. Prime Ministers, Bishops, and others whom the State considers desirable might become the fathers of half the next generation. Perhaps it begins to dawn upon the most conservative reader that the ideas hitherto advanced are far less radical than the world’s more aggressive thinkers are constantly expressing.

The companion book to "Icarus" is "Daedalus," by the noted biologist, Haldane of Cambridge. England's freedom of thought and speech is amply illustrated in the fact that so distinguished a college educator may utter opinions as searching and heterodox as those in this volume, without promptly being booted out of respectable circles by a capitalist Board of Trustees. Haldane doubts that eugenics will operate in the dry-as-dust scientific manner expected by its sponsors today. He suggests that by 1950 the first ectogenetic child will be produced, or a child born in an ovary removed from the woman's body and preserved in a chemical solution. Soon thereafter, he prophesies, an ovary can be removed from a woman and kept alive in a suitable fluid for twenty years, producing an ovum each month, 90 per cent of which can be fertilized, and after nine months produce human children. Within a hundred and fifty years, he suggests, 70 per cent of human children will be born by this method. This separation of sexual love and reproduction will cause great changes in human psychology and social life. The result, he says with keen wit, will be an increased output of first-class music and a decreased number of convictions for theft. This separation of reproduction and sexual love, he continues, will free mankind in an altogether new sense. "We must learn"—and I recommend his statement to you—"not to take traditional morals too seriously."

In a limited way, a phase of this separation of sexual love and reproduction comes up often today. There is some argument to be made for fidelity in marriage, while the married couple is producing children. But once they have decided that they have given birth to all the children that they desire or can afford, the case is different. The matter of reproduction is ended; only sexual love remains to be considered. Since the worthier individuals today and tomorrow will be those who own themselves, such men and women will then follow love to its logical goal, no matter what traditional morals provide. For, as Haldane says, we must learn not to take traditional morals too seriously.

*A Novelist's Dream of the Future.*—Mr. H. G. Wells, in his "Men Like Gods," makes a late and splendid attempt to picture that Utopian condition toward which civilized man is tending, and which he may achieve, unless some race-destructive war so weakens him that he falls, like a tree felled by boring-ants, before an attack of black or yellow races. In the story, certain human beings or Earthlings visit an earth kindred to ours, in an Einsteinian 4th-dimensional solar system—but an earth which is three thousand years ahead of ours in development. The dwellers on that earth wear no clothing, for false modesty has been abandoned. An amusing character in the story is Father Amerton, an Episcopal priest, of a reforming breed America knows too well. He cross examines one of the Utopians: "Do you still respect the marriage bond?"

"He paused, and in the pause the Utopian reply came through to Mr. Barnstaple: 'In Utopia there are no bonds.' But Father Amerton was not asking questions with any desire for answers; he was asking questions pulpit-fashion. 'I want to know,' he was booming out, 'if that holy union revealed to our first parents in the Garden of Eden holds good here, if that sanctified lifelong association of one man and one woman, in good fortune and ill fortune, excluding every other sort of intimacy, is the rule of your lives. I want to know—'"

The Utopian observes truly that the good father *doesn't* want to know. Yet the answer came clear and explicit. In Utopia there was no compulsion for men and women to go about in indissoluble pairs. For most Utopians that would be inconvenient. Very often men and women, whose work brought them closely together, were lovers and kept very much together. But they were not obliged to do that.

There had not always been this freedom, Wells points out, and proceeds to give his summary of earthly morality. "In the old crowded days of conflict, and especially among the agricultural workers and employed people of Utopia, men and women who had been lovers were bound together under severe penalties for life. They lived together in a small home which the woman kept in order for the man; she was his servant and bore him as many children as possible, while he got food for them. The children were desired, because they were soon helpful on the land as wage earners. But the necessities that had subjugated women to that sort of pairing had passed away. People paired indeed with their chosen mates, but they did so by an inner necessity and not by any outward compulsion."

Father Amerton demands whether not Utopia has abolished the family. No, he is told, Utopia has not abolished the family; it has enlarged and glorified the family until it embraces the whole world.

Whereupon the "good" Father turns loose a typical stream of pulpit Billingsgate: "It speaks for itself—the shamelessness of your costume, the licentious freedom of your manners! Young men and women, smiling, joining hands, near to caressing, when averted eyes, are the least tribute you could pay to modesty! And this vile talk—of lovers loving—without bonds or blessings, without rules or restraint. What does it mean? Whither does it lead? Do not imagine because I am a priest, a man pure and virginal in spite of great temptations, do not imagine that I do not understand! . . . You are all living—in promiscuity! That is the word for it. In animal promiscuity! In *bestial* promiscuity!"

The Utopian is not put out by the foul outburst. He speaks quietly and clearly: "Manifestly this man's mind is very unclean. His sexual imagination is evidently inflamed and diseased." And Father Amerton was led away, to be dealt with as an unclean and diseased sexual imagination.

The lower Earthlings—the chauffeur types and sporting nobility—of course misunderstand the Olympic nudity, and call the Utopians "bally degenerates" and worse. So Penk, a chauffeur who has attempted to caress one of the magnificent Utopian women, and received in return a quiet blow that knocked him down, characterized them.

"The young woman's arm doesn't seem to have been very degenerate," said Mr. Barnstaple.

"Don't it?" said Ridley bitterly. "That's all *you* know. Why! If there's one sign more sure than another about degeneration it's when women take to knocking men about. It's against instinct. In any respectable decent world such a thing couldn't possibly 'ave 'pened. No 'ow! In *our* world, such a girl would jolly soon 'ave her lesson. See?"

This final touch, of what would happen to a girl who shows a spirit of decent self-reliance in the man-ruled world, is a keen glimpse of what woman is leaving behind. And of what men

are leaving behind, as in this conversation concerning Father Amerton:

“The priest is mad. His behavior became offensive and obscene, and he is under restraint. What did he do? He made a number of aprons of black silk, and set out with them to attack our young people in an undignified manner. Will your world allow that sort of thing?”

“We call that sort of thing Purity,’ said Mr. Barnstaple.”

We get a glimpse of the training of the young in love. A Utopian boy is speaking: “It is not necessary nor becoming to make love too early in life, nor to let desire take hold of one. It weakens youth to become too early possessed by desire—which often will not leave one again. There is no hurry. No one will prevent me when my time comes.” What was love like, an Earthling asked himself, in Utopia? “Lovers still whispered in the dusk. . . . What was the essence of love? A preference, a sweet pride, a delightful gift won, the most exquisite reassurance of body and mind.”

With this touch we may leave the brilliant and courageous picturing. Wells has not done better in any of his stories than in “Men Like Gods:” and it offers a sound ideal for men and women to work toward. With humility, and sincerity, and energy, they may build much of it.

*Summary.*—The Christian sexual morality placed as its apex a man who made himself a eunuch for the kingdom of heaven’s sake; and this is not a sound ideal from either the individual or the social standpoint. If ranked next monogamy, but took cognizance of the existence of prostitution. Furthermore, it degraded woman, describing her as “the gate to hell.” Modern Christian moralists insist upon absolute monogamy; to those who are unable to get a mate, they offer the consolations of religion, which modern men and women find as unsatisfactory as wings of solid lead.

In practice, Christian sexual morality has not worked. Instead, we have had the subjection of women; a double standard, by which a man enjoyed wild oats, monogamy, and intermarital infidelity; while women either remained absolutely pure, or were regarded as social outcasts, and gradually lowered to the position of prostitutes. Our current morality consists of marriage-plus-prostitution.

Out of this a new morality is appearing, due largely to the altered status of women: a morality commencing with adequate sexual education, followed by first-hand experience in love, which in some case resolves itself into unconventional sexual matings not recognized by church or law, and without the element of barter and sale.

The ideal mating will include provision for a novitiate or trial, in which incompatibility from any source will permit a graceful dissolution. It will include a duration dependent upon mutual desire and willingness, limited by society’s right to insist upon the proper upkeep of the children—a task which at any time society may take over. It will permit dissolution when either party finds it a failure. During its course, outside relationships are not matters to be punished by society, but are reasons to be weighed by the other party as possible grounds for terminating the mating. More transient relationships will always be permitted, as pragmatic education in living, as answering certain specialized needs, or as accentuating the sensation of living. Morality consists, the wisest philosophers say, in that which brings the greatest joy

to the greatest number; and joy's essence they find to be the utilization of power. Whether this power be financial or physical, mental or spiritual, on the part of men or women, its existence will demand and achieve ultimately that ethic which permits its exercise, in a way that impinges as little as possible upon the welfare of others. Monogamy has never existed in the world's history as the sole method of sexual life; our present custom is a partial monogamy for many women and some men, and divorce, remarriage, prostitution, and promiscuity for others. It is society's unreasonable taboo against widespread and inevitable human practices that is at fault. No statutory increase of the taboo will aid; what is needed is a liberation of human forces, so that in their own fine natural way they may seek and seek, until they approach the postponed dream of a heaven on earth.