

The Awakening of Woman

THE PSYCHIC SIDE OF FEMINISM

FLORENCE GUERTIN TUTTLE

California
National
Library

THE AWAKENING OF WOMAN

SUGGESTIONS FROM THE PSYCHIC
SIDE OF FEMINISM

BY
FLORENCE GUERTIN TUTTLE



THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK CINCINNATI

BLA
///

Copyright, 1915, by
FLORENCE GUERTIN TUTTLE

TO MY SONS,
DAY AND GUERTIN TUTTLE,
WHOSE COMPANIONSHIP AND NECESSITIES
HAVE AWAKENED IN ME A SENSE
OF LARGER RESPONSIBILITY

“And a little child shall lead them.”

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
FOREWORD	7
I. THE MISUNDERSTOOD WOMAN QUESTION.	11
THE CREATIVE AWAKENING	
II. WOMAN AND GENIUS.....	31
III. WHY A MENTALLY CREATIVE WOMANHOOD IS DESIRABLE..	50
THE SOCIAL AWAKENING	
IV. MOTHERHOOD.....	77
V. WOMAN AND THE REVALUATION OF LIFE.	99
THE AWAKENING OF THE SENSE OF RACE RESPONSIBILITY	
VI. THE RELATION OF WOMAN TO EUGENICS..	123
VII. NATURAL AND SPIRITUAL SELECTION IN MARRIAGE.....	146



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

FOREWORD

THE European war instead of relegating the woman question to the background in reality forces it to the front. The work of Europe to-day is to a large degree being done by women. While the war is making widows and orphans it is also creating feminists of an advanced type.

A feminist we assume to be a woman with an awakened sense of individual responsibility toward life, expressing this responsibility in action. Feminism becomes thus a matter of spiritual initiative and impulse.

The woman's movement has been viewed from many angles. It has been seen as a sex problem, a domestic problem, an industrial problem, and a political problem, according to the insight, or the bewilderment, of the spectator. But the psychic awakening—the real cause of feminism—has been relatively overlooked.

These chapters are an effort to trace to

their mental and spiritual sources the growing activities of women, and to indicate that the freeing of woman's creative energies, instead of being inimical to human progress, is in reality necessary to it.

F. G. T.

**THE MISUNDERSTOOD WOMAN
QUESTION**

CHAPTER I

THE MISUNDERSTOOD WOMAN QUESTION

IT is hardly an exaggeration to say that no other question of modern times has been so much discussed, and so befogged and obscured in the discussion, as the omnipresent woman question. And the reason is not far to seek: we are still in its throes. An object viewed too near is likely to be thrown out of focus. Also the very magnitude of the question alarms and confuses us. One half the race, and all posterity, seem threatened by the new activities of women. The business of life is to preserve racial integrity. Small wonder, then, that the world regards obliquely and with suspicion the apparent revolt of so large a proportion of its component parts.

But is there any occasion for real alarm? May we not, by a process of elimination, arrive at the source of misunderstanding? We may not comprehend the woman question, for instance, if we regard merely the

woman of to-day. It is necessary to take the long look down the ages and visualize the woman of all time. And one must focus this woman in her relation to the march of human events. To isolate the question is to see woman under the shadow of an eclipse, an attenuated crescent, not a fully rounded orb.

When woman is placed, thus, in her historic setting, the question of feminism becomes not a woman's problem but a race problem. For the woman question is the child question, and the child question is, or should be, the subject of paramount importance to both men and women. The woman question becomes, therefore, of supreme interest to humanity, ranking first in those problems that loom largest on the twentieth century horizon.

Nor may this vital subject be comprehended while it is still regarded in the light of sex, only. In the great changes of modern life the position of woman has become not a sex but a social question—a question of how best to utilize to social advantage

woman's liberated energies. He who still considers woman as an individual in her relationship to man alone—after the manner of certain novelists upon whose sensitive souls the undigested woman question lies heavily—must necessarily regard her with sex predominant. Scientific sociology forbids this exclusive view. To comprehend the woman question fully one must also consider woman in her relationship to society, with its multifarious, complex demands.

The true banner bearers of the woman's movement are women who, for the most part, have fulfilled themselves as wives and mothers and who are now fulfilling themselves still further in some form of socially productive work. Such women embody the true meaning of feminism: mental and spiritual advancement. They do not decry sex. They are too sane and too human. Neither do they unnecessarily extol it nor acknowledge its so-called "limitations." If women in the past, they would argue, when families were large, could still fulfill themselves as industrial workers, when the labor

of the world was cruelly manual, and woman bore the lion's share—surely woman to-day can fulfill herself as mother and world worker, when the family is reduced and work has become largely mechanical or clerical. The woman's movement includes sex but is not limited by it.

Above all, the woman question is not one of sex antagonism, as a few ultrafeminists charge. No movement in history has ever made for so profound sex unity, since the aim of feminism is to place humanity on a more equitable and unifying plane. The interests of men and women are equal and indissoluble: race guardianship and preservation. The opportunities must also be equal. One might as well talk of antagonism between wave and tide, or moon and star. Fortunately the deep-seated law of attraction between men and women is potent enough to offset any antagonism, fancied or real.

How do we judge this subject of primary racial importance? Do we view it in the light of pure reason and applied science?

The very strength of our interest forbids. It is not an exaggeration to say that two thirds of the world consider the woman question, not according to reason and logic, but from the mists of individual prejudice and an inherited bias.

Yet because of its very gravity no other problem so challenges the impersonal, scientific mind. No question is regarded seriously, to-day, that will not survive the scientific test. Scientific formula is applied in every direction, from the efficiency of the brick-layer to the method of the college professor, but not to the woman question. A womanhood evolving, according to well-established laws, from the lower to the higher, from the simple to the complex, from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, is not yet considered, except in rare instances, a normal, scientific growth.

In the average mind, wherein lies the supposed menace of feminism? Analyzed, would it not read thus: if woman be allowed unlimited freedom to expand and to enter all channels of creative activity, will she

not neglect the most fundamental part of her nature, motherhood, or at least disregard the more than precious blood of her blood and bone of her bone?

This view of the question is supremely important. But it is a material view and as such only partial. For herein lies the crux of the misunderstood woman question: it is usually regarded in its material aspect, whereas the woman's movement, in its original essence, is spiritual. It is an inner revolution before it is an outer revolt, subjective before objective. All the recent unprecedented activities of women have been but manifestations of this inner quickening. Arising from interior necessity, they are but symbols of a spiritual revolution sweeping the sisterhood of the earth. They are the result of cause and effect, of action and reaction on a psychic plane. Any view less comprehensive than this spiritually inclusive view is superficial, and therefore imperfect.

What occasioned the feminist movement? Throughout the ages the life of woman, from evolutionary necessity, was one of hard

labor, almost exclusively physical. Before woman could develop psychically it was necessary that she should first be freed from the obligation of the world's drudgery. The invention of machinery was the real emancipator of woman's spiritual energies, bestowing an unprecedented leisure. The privileges of the higher education, granted in the middle of the last century, awoke the feminine brain cell and released woman's intellectual faculties. For the primitive occupations of woman, it must be remembered, while absorbing her complete attention, did not directly exercise or develop her mind. There was no specific training of the feminine intellect. The projecting cause of the woman's movement, then, was a stimulated mentality.

Admitting that the woman's movement has arisen from the compulsion of newly awakened powers, what do the terms mental and spiritual expansion for women imply? Do they embrace qualities of practical race value? Or do they signify the mystical, the visionary, and the unreal?

Considering mental enlargement for women—does feminism aim to make an intellectual Amazon of the future woman? Freedom of mental opportunity has not thus abnormally transformed man. All that can be claimed for man is that widespread educational opportunity—long confined to the nobility and the clergy—has raised the mental average. Can we not endure a like elevation of the sex whose average mentality has been the joke of the ages?

The woman's movement is teaching women to think and that not by indirection. It is teaching that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points, even in mental measurement. To-day, if a woman meditates a journey across the continent of Thought she need not drift, as heretofore, around Cape Horn. She may go straight from New York to San Francisco. This is great gain, not only for woman but for the race. For the value of human efficiency is now measured by the ability to think in a given line. All the long-established outlets for woman's energy, from housework

to child-rearing, may be improved by a responsive, well-organized mind; while the newer activities—office and shopwork, requiring concentration and alertness—are absolutely dependent upon mental development and control.

Mental expansion for women, then, implies a higher average of trained intelligence unfolding normally into all lines of human activity, not only where a certain accuracy of thought is required, but also where success depends absolutely upon the efficiency and initiative there attained.

To define spiritual expansion becomes far more difficult since we find ourselves in the realm of the abstract rather than the concrete. Perhaps no phrase in the English language is more misinterpreted than the phrase, "The life of the spirit." Belonging to the unseen, we do not yet recognize its relationship to the seen. Itself immaterial, we do not yet grasp its value materially. Invested almost entirely with the idea of religion, of the mystic and supernatural, the life of the spirit has been dismissed by the

practical as good, possibly, for priests, for dreamers, for women, but not for strong human beings with coursing red corpuscles. Yet modern metaphysicians tell us that the life of the spirit is as real as flesh and blood and doubly important since it dominates the physical.

It is true that the life of the spirit is the God-life. To worship, however, is but one of its functions. The life of the spirit is also the life of the imagination, without which there could be no conception of Deity. To originate is its high mission. Consciously or unconsciously it becomes the motive power of character, of vocation, of destiny. The life of the spirit must, therefore, be widened to include the life of the imagination, of creative gifts and capacities. No invention, no work of art, no great business enterprise, but must first have its spiritual, imaginative prototype. The cultivation of the imagination becomes, thus, of the highest practicality since upon its recognition depend all kinds and all degrees of success. The life of the spirit, instead of being supernatural, be-

comes, in reality, the supreme expression of the natural—not yet understood.

The term, “the spiritual awakening of woman,” then, does not denote the religious awakening of woman, though a higher form of religion is necessarily a part of it. It signifies a womanhood moving irresistibly toward this highest realm of existence—the exercise of creative imagination—a movement absolutely essential for symmetrical racial development if humanity is to utilize all its creative possibilities.

From this spiritually creative realm women, by the necessity of past material obligations, have been almost entirely debarred. No sex is responsible for this inhibition. Evolution is responsible. In the establishment of civilization it was imperative that material foundations should be laid first. And women have been the pile drivers of the race.

Does this belated unfolding of feminine creative faculty indicate that the magic of feminism is somehow to transform every woman into an embryonic genius? Not at

all. It is not probable that genius, in the future, will be more common among women than among men. That the time has arrived when it will be increasingly recognized and encouraged may not be doubted. Not every one is gifted with creative imagination, but some kind of imagination is an original endowment with all. There is a perceptive and receptive endowment, capable of wide cultivation through intimacy with high standards, as well as the less general creative genius. The spiritual awakening of women will have its most direct racial results in a keener recognition of genius in the young and a more widespread appreciation of its value to society.

What the race has lost from centuries of undeveloped imagination in mothers can never be computed. To consider the effect of a quickened maternal imagination, reacting upon the mind of the child, opens vistas dazzling to human possibility. And this, not alone through heredity, but through a more intelligent comprehension of the child mind.

The misunderstood child forms no little part of the misunderstood woman question. How often a youthful imagination—a small human dynamo—has had its natural abilities checked through lack of a maternal faculty capable of recognizing power and directing it. Only imagination recognizes imagination. Spirit only sympathizes with spirit, and by intelligent, loving cooperation guides its natural aspirations.

The imagination of the child is the passport to its future. Upon this passport depends the country the child is to enter. Or again, the imagination of the child is like a bird with untried wings. If the mother be unable to recognize them, except for purposes of millinery; if she be ignorant of the first principles of flight, the small pinions may never be unfolded. The spiritual comprehension of the mother is a great factor in determining whether the child is to creep through life or to soar. Many a vocational misfit might thus be avoided, and an enormous percentage of human waste be saved.

Comprehended, then, as the liberation of

woman's mental and spiritual energies for racial advantage—is the woman's movement scientific? That is, does it run counter or parallel to established ideas of human growth?

To do any logical thinking we are told that we must think in terms of the controlling scientific thought of the age. As is well known, the scientific principle of to-day is the one of evolutionary development—that the species, acted upon by heredity and environment, is constantly passing through certain organic variations and adaptations. Without knowledge of this widespread law, human crafts have little perception of whence they came or whither they are going. Evolution becomes thus more than a compass. It is a mariner's chart for life.

Comparatively recently this principle has taught us that nothing is fixed and stationary, as we once amazingly believed, but that all things are moving, dynamic, being constantly acted upon by attractions from within and without.

Darwin traced the law patiently through

the tireless formation of species. Herbert Spencer applied it to government, to education, to marriage, and to religion, showing that human institutions, too, are not fixed and final, but are fluid, plastic, still in the making. Karl Marx fitted the development theory to the evolution of industry, foretelling, as only the man of science who deals with law may foretell, the great industrial combinations of to-day. And Buckle, in his monumental fragment of generalization, successfully applied the idea to the growth of English civilization.

We are generously willing to admit the working of this universal law in all these directions. Only over the heads of women do our affections, ever blinding our interests, inscribe, "Thou, and thou only, must not change." The habit of ages is against our possessing sufficient elasticity to allow even natural law to work, without protest, in the mothers of men.

But is natural law unnatural only where women are concerned? Is science not science in conjunction with mothers only? Is evo-

lution going off at a tangent in women? We may answer only by learning what direction it has taken in man. Women are the other half of the same species.

We know that the variety of man's experiences has been the instigator of his progress. He has grown in proportion as he has exercised new functions, new abilities, daring to enter new fields. To the privilege of unrestricted range man owes his supremacy as world builder and master.

The history of woman reveals a creature specialized almost entirely to one set of interests. From such specialization we should not expect versatility nor complete expression.

In point of developed mentality and exercise of the imagination, woman is far behind man. With woman, evolution has only just begun the conscious unfolding of the psychic. But it has begun. The same law is at work. Conditions at last permit. Racial advance demands it. The barque of womanhood, bearing the sacred freight of the children of the future, is turned in the same general

direction of creative evolution as that of man. Together they sail on the same seas, moving toward the same goal—the port of a spiritually perfected race.

The woman's movement, running thus parallel with accepted laws of human growth, and not counter to them, is distinctively scientific. Viewed in the light of human evolution, with its steady push from the physical to the mental, from the mental to the spiritual, the feminist movement takes its place logically in the sequence of the development of the human family. In cosmic history it is of all events the most significant and far-reaching.

To those of us who sit at the feet of science and still retain the old faith in expanded form, this spiritual development of the race seems a not impossible ideal. In fact any lesser goal is insufficient. Life on the material side, merely, fails to satisfy. We are born for spiritual adventure, true sailors, not of the wave but of the soul.

Considered thus in its spiritual interpretation, alone, may the misunderstood woman

question be comprehended. It is then recognized as constructive, not destructive, in character. To recapitulate: the woman question is not an isolated question, but a related question. It is not a woman problem; it is a race problem. It is not a sex question only—it is social. Above all it is not material; it is spiritual—a loosening of the psychically creative forces of women for race advancement. As such it follows the general trend of all human development on the three planes of being: body, mind, and spirit, and becomes scientific. It is not making for sex antagonism, but for deeper sex unity. Its influence is, therefore, not baneful but beneficent. Its object is not race confusion but race completion. With far higher aspirations than women were capable of fulfilling in the past, it is developing a far higher type of motherhood than the world has ever known. It is Nature's own movement. To misunderstand and try to check it is not only to retard the cause of woman, but also to retard the spiritual advancement of mankind.

THE CREATIVE AWAKENING

CHAPTER II

WOMAN AND GENIUS -

MONSIEUR GONCOURT once said: "There are no women of genius. The women of genius are all men." Fifty years ago this statement was largely true. To-day it is questionable, and in the expanding possibilities of the future it is likely to be increasingly doubted. The genius of women is beginning to unfold in every land.

Twenty-five years ago the Norwegian seer, whose prophetic soul perceived the coming revolution in its most subtle aspects, said, "The women are knocking at the door." To-day that door has swung open, and women in hungry throngs have entered the realm of the arts, the sciences, and the professions.

In denying the genius of women in the past the custom has obtained of comparing men and women as if psychological expansion had been simultaneous with them. The

recent revelations of science, however, have altered the point of view. No student, today, would dream of considering the centuries, critically, through the eyes of the artist, the musician, or the literary man, merely. To wrench the secrets from the past one must gaze through the eyes of the biologist and the sociologist. Only thus may the past lack of developed imagination in women be clear as a race necessity, or the present freeing of creative energy, with its great human possibilities, be understood.

To the sociologist the genius of the early woman was expended just where it was imperatively needed: in civilization building, in family construction. For this gigantic task all woman's energies, poured out on a material plane, were unflinchingly demanded and given. To have had any other form of genius generally expressed at an earlier period would have been detrimental to race establishment. The greatness of the early woman lay in the intense devotion of her service to humanity. Racially she was always great.

When the anthropoidal life became "man," to aid in establishing this new, crude species two obligations were laid upon woman: first, to help make the species human, and second, through the human to attain the spiritual. The dark ages of the subjection of woman and her dependence upon man contributed toward the first necessity by establishing the family virtues. The glory of to-day, with its unusual creative privileges, is her opportunity for the second.

The recrimination of one sex by another for past transgressions becomes, therefore, superfluous. In the light of evolution there was no other way. Each sex did its best according to its light.

To the scientist, then, woman looms great as the molder of family life, as constructor of the humanities. There is genius enough in this achievement to satisfy the most ardent feminist, while as a foundation for future greatness it is a priceless heritage. For the basis of all true art is a knowledge of the humanities. The woman of the past instinctively obeyed nature's call.

What is not generally comprehended in the present is, as has been noted, that the universal awakening of woman to-day, with its consequent stirring of mentally creative powers, is also nature's call for race advancement. The time has arrived when mankind requires a freer, more developed womanhood; when, through the agency of mechanical invention and the smaller family that is considered of modern social advantage, all the energies of woman are no longer required upon a material plane; when spiritually creative qualities are racially the most desirable to be developed and transmitted, and must be so transmitted if we are to have a progressively evolving posterity. For it is as logical as the conclusion of a mathematical theorem: a developed imagination in the mothers must be followed by a developed imagination in the race.

What proof have we to substantiate the claim that the woman's movement heralds the awakening of the imagination of woman? Immediately some skeptic—quite as likely a

woman, since the introduction of a new idea is more difficult of entrance to the conservative woman's mind than to the man's—inquires: "Where is your great woman genius, the product of this half-century movement? Show us your feminine Phidias, your Dante, your Raphael." We might reply, show us their antitypes among modern men. The facts seem to indicate that every age produces its own peculiar type of genius, and that the needs of the age determine what the character of the genius will be.

We hear frequently that the Greek intellect, the Greek art, have never been equaled, consequently mankind has not progressed. It is not likely, nor is it essential, that a period of its kind ever will be surpassed. It gave the world classic standards, following the requirement of the times. The genius of to-day is none the less great because it creates new standards, ministering to new requirements. The imagination of a Darwin, that weaves an epic poem from a skull; of a Marconi, who writes his messages on the skies; of an Edison, who uncoils and

sets in motion the electric currents of the earth, is none the less great because different and serving the needs of their times.

Can we match these modern wizards with the names of women proportionately great? Happily we may, though the genius of woman has not been liberated that it may enter the lists with man. Not for sex competition but for sex completion is the imagination of woman to flower. The names of three women suggest themselves as showing that order of creative imagination which "perceives what no one else has perceived" and ministers to the needs of the times. Two of these women have made the entire race their debtor. The first, Madame Montessori, who originated a system that in time will revolutionize education—namely, the development of the intellect through the freeing of the spirit of the child. Second, Madame Curie, codiscoverer of polonium and radium, the only human being who has twice won a Nobel prize. And the third, Mary Baker Eddy, who, no matter what we may think of her propaganda, did what no woman

in any other age could have done: successfully established a religious cult and a philosophy of life.

Too much should not yet be expected of this newborn attribute of women which is flooding schools of technical training and capturing often the highest awards. As yet it is a crude imagination. It has all the faults and all the rapture of youth. But the dew of spring is on it and the brightness of the morning. It has put a new light in the eye of woman, a new hope in her heart, for to her soul it has brought that bluebird of happiness—the joy of congenial work—the secret of eternal youth.

Behind all genius, Emerson tells us, lies intellect, since genius is intellect constructive. Before the genius of woman could function it was necessary that the intellect of woman—so little in evidence that it was denied existence throughout the ages—should be aroused and trained. The gift of education, granted spasmodically at different historic periods, was not a universal privilege until sixty years ago—a tick of the

clock on eternity's timepiece. To look for a high order of genius before this quickening of the feminine brain cell is folly. The genius that occasionally asserted itself in the past becomes almost superhuman in the light of the obstacles overcome. The exceptions are the achievements of Hypatia in science, of Aspasia in philosophy, of Sappho in poetry, all examples of the exercise of woman's imagination where conditions, for a time, in a veritable Golden Age, were favorable to her psychical unfolding.

It is frequently affirmed that genius makes its own opportunities. An examination of creative methods, however, indicates that even genius must have its favored conditions. Briefly considered, what were the requirements of masculine genius in the past?

The first essential was singleness of purpose, devotion to an idea. Given the vision, men have passionately lived and died for it.

The second necessity was laborious training to attain mastery of technique.

The third requirement was seclusion, solitude, that the gift might bear fruit. Creative

processes are silent. One must listen with the inner ear to the spirit's whisperings. It is true that inspiration will make solitude anywhere. Yet inquire of a brain worker whether his genius burns brighter in the nursery or in his own sanctum. "Meditation means something growing," and in quietness do all things grow. Does this explain the magnetic attraction between genius and garrets? How many a masterpiece has sprung into being in an attic! How often has a materialistic world misjudged, attributing the creation to the poverty rather than to the seclusion of the attic! The creative artist creates because he must, to save his own soul, "genius being that in whose power a man is."

Serenity—freedom from carping care—has been a fourth necessity in the development of genius. This does not imply exemption from those great cataclysms of humanity—emotional shocks that shatter and send the rays of genius soaring still higher. Sorrow and joy are heaven's manna to genius. Rather does it denote freedom

from those little, soul-wearing obligations against which Renan protested when he said, "My dream is to be housed, fed, and clothed without having to think about it, by some one who will take care of me, and leave me free."

The biographies of most men of genius show that they have been housed, fed, and clothed and left free by some one—generally a devoted woman. The world does not always know of the sacrifice, as in the case of Jane Carlyle. A ewe lamb has nevertheless been offered on the altar of nearly every successful genius.

In the expression of genius, we see, then, that many things besides the original endowment have contributed. If we apply these requirements to the woman of the past we perceive how little the conditions of life have allowed her to meet them.

Singleness of purpose—how would the woman of early times have fulfilled this essential? What singleness of purpose, except the welfare of the raw thing called humanity, could this patient mother of

countless sacrificed millions possess? She could not even consider the impulse. She would have been forced to throttle it, as doubtless often she did, throwing it back into the glory from which it had sprung.

Time to perfect her gift? The burden bearer of the ages had no unoccupied time. And if she had leisure, where could she have received technical training since training schools for women did not exist? Seclusion? No woman knew the meaning of solitude, with little ones always at her breast or knee, even while she toiled. Serenity? Where was the unselfish man to stand between this servant of the ages and the world to see that she was "fed, clothed, and warmed without having to think about it," leaving her spirit free to give out its divine message? He did not exist, and in the light of sociology we realize at last the blessing that he did not exist. In the establishment of early civilization the world did not require the fruit of woman's mind as well as that of man's. It required the fruit of her body and of her hands. No sex—no man—muzzled woman's

genius. A stern "Verbodden" was not written over the sacred temple of Art. Life itself prevented. Conditions forbade. The modern racial requirements of living were not yet ripe.

In the rare examples where feminine genius did succeed in becoming articulate, examination proves that in some way the ordinary feminine obligations were set aside, and the requirements of genius were fulfilled. The life of Elizabeth Barrett Browning offers a striking example. Ill health exempted her from the usual feminine tasks. An ambitious father awoke and trained her mind in classic lore. The quiet of a sick room offered seclusion for meditation. By virtue of her invalidism the essentials for the fruition of genius were realized as in her solitary sick room Elizabeth Barrett communed with her own soul and gave the world immortal results.

A striking case in literary history also presents itself where a man stood between a woman and the demands of the world. The guardianship of George Henry Lewes

over the genius of George Eliot offers an example of a man's stimulating devotion creating the environment in which a woman's gift might blossom.

In the past, if the push of a woman's talent did break through the conventional crust of ages, she became an object of scorn and sought in every way to cover her misdeeds.

Witness the gifted Brontë sisters. All three were vibrant with creative power. To the expression of the gift each brought a passionate singleness of purpose. Mental activity was trained by the guiding mind of their clergyman father. The quiet parsonage on the lonely moors offered solitude and serenity. Yet timidly, under the protection of masculine pseudonyms, like veritable thieves offering pilfered wares, these three sisters presented their virile works to the world. In short, no crime was ever more carefully concealed than the fact that these extraordinary women, one of whom was to blaze a new path in fiction, had developed genius of the first order.

What indications have we to-day that the conditions of life are at last favorable to the demand for the freedom of the feminine imagination? The servant of the ages may now herself be served. With great combinations of industry to minister to her, with cooperative methods of living, with gigantic products of garment-making for selection, almost may she be "housed, clothed, fed, and warmed without having to think about it," leaving her spirit free to receive impressions and to create.

Does the world need the creative genius of women as it needs that of men? In the complexities of modern life, the world needs all inspirational value that it can obtain—the revelations of exceptional women as well as of exceptional men. No one sex possesses a monopoly of truth. Both must interpret it. The realm is inexhaustible, therefore there is room for both.

Upon what will the unfolding of feminine genius depend? Upon the same power on which all human ability depends: upon the development of the imagination. But, some

one inquires, is not imagination a special gift? Is it something that may be cultivated? No one accustomed to being with little children could question the possibility of imagination being, on the start of life, at least, a universal endowment. Children are full of imagination. Adults lose it. What becomes of this practical, spiritual gift, invaluable to the human family? Education ignores it. ~~The routine of life crushes it.~~ In the ledger of daily events it is entered on the side of enormous waste. We have not yet learned to discern real human treasure.

Economic conditions have probably done more to extinguish genius than any other direct cause. For every message that has been given to the world in spite of poverty, countless inspirations have been ruthlessly snuffed out because of it. Many an illumined soul has been exhausted in the twenties or thirties by the material fight for food, clothing, and shelter. Witness Keats. Stern necessity may have been the impelling power in certain rugged minds.

It has been the gravedigger in myriads with more subtle gifts.

As the imagination of women is exercised and developed it will be quicker to recognize creative ability and so to environ it as to prevent these tragedies of mute genius. As the efforts of women are contributed more to society, halving the world's work, the grip of the economic and industrial system upon men will become less pressing. A new perspective will be given to the importance of spiritual gifts. First things will then be placed first. The real riches of the earth will be seen to lie in the spiritual power of its creative men and women. Massenet said that he could compose only when his spirit was rested. To conserve the energy of these creators so that spiritual force may not be worn fine in soulgrinding struggles will take precedence over all social obligations.

Genius is supposed to be unaware of its own mysterious methods, creating blindly because it must. Yet in these days when the impenetrable is photographed, surely

some X-ray of thought may pierce even the baffling method of creative processes. As far as analysis may go we know that out of the infinite mind in which we live intuition flashes ideas to the imagination. And this we call inspiration. The imagination then bathes the idea in the emotions and decides on its technical form. And this we call Art. Intuition and the emotions become thus the handmaiden of the imagination, and through this of the arts.

What attribute throughout the ages has been generously, though satirically, conceded to woman? Not reason. Unthinking beings do not reason. Has it not been intuition—that quality facetiously defined as the thing a woman feels when she is wrong? Right or wrong, until recently, she has had to steer by it. She has had no other guide. Hence the intuition of woman developed to an abnormal degree.

Emotional capacity, also, has never been denied woman in the historical or hysterical past. Emotion banked up into but one outlet of expression—domesticity—might well

be hysterical. Yet inherited excess of emotion should fertilize rather than sterilize woman's creative power and endow it with a humanness peculiarly its own.

We see, then, that even as the derivation of genius—"to beget, to bring forth"—is peculiarly feminine, so the most striking characteristics of genius are also woman's most striking characteristics. Does this explain why many masculine geniuses have been noticeably feminine? It proves at least that in the essential qualities of genius there is nothing foreign to the feminine temperament.

But there remains a far deeper reason why the spiritual insight of women should be embodied in concrete form. In motherhood, as sculptor of humanity, woman rises to the supreme height of creation—a height that only one sex may know. Man, the artist, has ever been impelled to depict woman, the Madonna—and we have canvases covered with flesh-and-blood mothers, with the spirit left out. When woman, the maternal, at last registers the profundities

of her peculiar experience, emphasizing the psychic character of motherhood, humanity should be enriched by its noblest renaissance in art. The fact that nature has given to one half the world fundamental-spiritual revelations that are denied to the other half, places a new obligation on the creatively awakened woman. The ear of the world is listening for the message she will have to utter.

CHAPTER III

WHY A MENTALLY CREATIVE WOMANHOOD IS DESIRABLE

THE question no longer is relevant: "Is a mentally creative womanhood desirable?" as if repression were within the bounds of possibility. As well try to stem Niagara as to suggest crowding woman back into channels of noncreative activity. The facts of the case are that feminism has opened the casket of woman's mental treasures and the precious gifts within have escaped on wings. For weal or woe the mind of woman has invaded almost all realms of the constructive imagination; and having once tasted the joys of creation, and reaped the often substantial rewards, nothing less than utter annihilation can restrain its expression.

For years the world accepted the dictum of certain scientists who kindly but elaborately explained that the "germ plasm of

originality was lacking in the feminine brain cell." For centuries this statement seemed true. But what is the situation to-day? Take the realm of invention, for instance—in the last part of the nineteenth and first part of the twentieth century nearly ten thousand patents were taken out in the United States by women alone—more than in the whole previous record of the patent office. In this one direction, at least, a very good substitute for the "germ plasm of originality" in women seems to be actively at work. In the field of literature—the novel and the short story, the first creative realm to be invaded by large numbers since writing is supposed to "come naturally" and to require less technical training than the other arts—the golden profits of popularity are reaped as abundantly by women as by men. In the drama the box office receipts have been increased by woman's newly escaped brain cell, from Margaret Mayo's gold-mine farce, "Baby Mine," which convulsed two continents with clean feminine humor, to Josephine Peabody's poetic drama, "The

Piper," which captured the Shakesperian prize of \$1,500 at Stratford. Note also the Winthrop Ames contest, which awarded \$10,000 to the play, "Children of Earth," by Alice Brown. In sculpture, the daily prints abound with the work of women sculptors who toil for the love of the working. In painting, women are forging to the front not only as portrait painters and illustrators, but as mural decorators for libraries and municipal buildings. In conservatories of music women are winning prizes, though music is the most abstract of the arts, and the technicalities are the most difficult. And the wonder is, not that much of this flood of creative effort is on the plane of mildly entertaining mediocrity, but that a saving fraction is illuminated by the promise of better things to come.

The charge has been made that throughout the centuries woman has been "spiritually sterile"; and as far as the expression of imagination is concerned, except in rare instances, this has been true. Like Margery Daw—there wasn't any. Or to be more

exact, the imaginative faculties were not yet awakened. But let it not be forgotten that woman would have been traitorous to the race she was fostering had she followed the course of mentally creative activity earlier. As has been pointed out, the gifts that ancient civilizations demanded of women were gifts of an intensely practical nature, and she gave them royally in the blood and sinew of her body and the toiling sweat of her brow. Continual childbearing and incessant manual labor were her portion. Historically, civilization has left its dark period of savage emergence from physical combat and struggle and entered a new era: the period of mental conquest—of social and spiritual development. In this modern period of psychical activity woman has her contributory share quite as important as in the primitive regime. Only the character of the obligation has altered—not the obligation. The demand to-day is that woman should be spiritually fertile, psychically fertile. For the first time in history the duty of woman and the desire of woman may

coincide. She may discharge her racial duty as mother creator, and still fulfill a desire for other forms of creation. She not only may but must, if progress is to be continuous.

It is important that the fact be kept in mind that the power behind the recent creative output is the stimulating force of newly aroused emotional and intellectual faculties and that spiritual awakening always precedes imaginative expression. When its origin is considered it will be seen that a womanhood, awakened in its highest inner forces, could no more resist creating than a seed could refrain from breaking through its shell.

And the consequences? They are not disquieting, though those to whom apprehension is an occupation may still find employment. At the heart of things dwells infinite wisdom neither slumbering nor sleeping. The main result, and the main cause for congratulation that at last we have crossed the threshold of a mentally creative era for women, is that whereas in the past

the world has been led largely by the spiritual ideals of men, in the future it will be led by the spiritual ideals of men and women—and be richer by one half.

The spiritual awakening of woman, then, indicates that woman is now living, or may live, with the full expression of all her inner powers instead of only a part. The house of the brain is a many-roomed mansion. In her long, previous condition of race servitude, the practical activities of woman seldom allowed her to penetrate above the ground floor. Hers is now the joy of the explorer. She may be a Columbus to her own soul and mind. Like a child she is running curiously from cellar to cupola, investigating and inhabiting this true home of all humanity—the wonderful house of the brain. Who lives in only a part of this mansion is but a lax tenant. To be human implies living in all one's mental apartments. This alone distinguishes from the brute.

While a human being living at the full capacity of his powers is the accepted standard, it must be admitted that it is a plane

to reach which few men or women care to make the effort. There is mental and spiritual inertia, as well as physical lassitude, to be overcome. Human nature, for the most part, prefers its necessary rut and follows the line of least resistance. We are strangers to the wonderful possibilities of our own endowment.

When the novelty of being allowed a feminine mind with permission to use it has worn off, it is unfortunately not likely that the average woman will develop an ambition much greater than the average man. The residuum of great women, like the residuum of great men, will probably be small. Yet the spiritual minority are those by whom the race will be led.

But suppose that this ghost of misapprehension that stalks through the world in regard to the new activities of women were to become real—the fear that somehow the alchemy of modern conditions will transform every woman into that rare type, the unusual woman, and so lure her to neglect of physical function; suppose, even, that she

develop genius? Would the desire to create on a spiritual plane rather than physiological plane, merely, enrich or impoverish the race? Would it still be desirable for this woman to live up to her highest inner impulsion?

The treasure of the world lies in its storehouse of spiritual truths, messages that still come from the burning bush and from the wilderness. Revelations are not outgrown. Decalogues are still being written, parables unfolded. By these truths the vast proportion of humanity that has not yet learned to receive its revelations directly is admonished and led. When an ethical genius of this character appears—and the transcendent genius is always ethical—it matters little whether the instrument be a man or a woman. The vital point is the message for a needy world.

Society to-day demands service of each individual. Somewhat of one's self each one must contribute to the social machinery—or be a clog in the wheel. A few persons contribute ideas—and these are the world's saviours. The majority give themselves in

some form of productive labor—and they are the indispensable warp and woof of the social fabric. All are supposed to contribute an improved grade of children, that physical progress may not halt.

In the first group—the people who contribute ideas—if the ideas be large enough, valuable enough to all mankind, we consider embodying those ideas in concrete form to be imperative. No phase of human endeavor exists that the emotions of parenthood will not enrich. But in those rare cases of universal spiritual profit the highest loyalty to the world and to the individual remains to bring forth and perfect ideas.

If the man of genius be faithful to his gift; if with travail of soul he begets the children of his vision, we exonerate him from the commonly accepted racial duty. Could anyone claim that Spencer would have served his age better by fathering a dozen children than by contributing his "First Principles"? Would a galaxy of little Carrols have permanently delighted the reading world as the immortal "Alice"? No one

disputes the prerogative of a Plato, a Kant, or a Swedenborg to be celibate. Can we not grant the privilege of the same choice of life to women when driven by inner necessities? Did Harriet Beecher Stowe discharge a higher duty in begetting a family than in writing "Uncle Tom's Cabin"? Was Mrs. Browning's beloved son as great a world contribution as "The Sonnets from the Portuguese"? Which creation could society best afford to spare?

Whether the expression of genius be "masculine or feminine," then, the spiritual heritage of women as well as men is needed and the creative faculties should be equally encouraged to function. Neither sex has a monopoly of vision. Ideas, like children, should not be stillborn.

But suppose that we are willing to admit hurdling the obstacle of fear of the rare woman of genius developing her gift, acknowledging even the possibility that the race might be stimulated by the infusion of woman's inspiration as well as man's—there remains the question of the average woman.

Is an average womanhood, mentally developed and exercised as the woman's movement aims to develop and exercise the brain of woman, a menace or an advantage to posterity? In short, if the average woman be allowed complete latitude to energize in a mental sphere, will she retain sufficient vitality to energize in a physiological sphere, also?

The amount of energy in all things, physicists tell us, remains constant. It may be transformed, as when coal becomes steam. Its form varies, but its value remains the same.

Every individual possesses an inherent amount of energy to be wisely used and conserved, or to be dissipated and rendered valueless. Certain alarmists, who view the horizon in part, and whose narrowed eyelids do not perceive the entire sweep of changed world conditions, observe a universal racial tendency to a lowered birth rate in highly civilized countries; and without analyzing causes they cry "race degeneration," announcing the fact that women are

expending their energies on planes other than motherhood as the explanation.

(As already stated, the energy of women always has been expended on other planes. If it had not been, man would not find himself at that proud pinnacle of intellectual supremacy where he now stands. Without the manual labor of women there could have been no such liberal mental development for him. In the days when woman energized to the extent of an average of eight children she was not exempt from working also as the pack horse of humanity. At no period of the world's history could man have spared woman, either as originator of industry or as coworker with him, to specialize on motherhood alone.)

As in the past, when families were large, not all of the energies of women were spent in motherhood, but some went into vital labor, so to-day—with the reduced, more highly developed family and the changed and vastly improved conditions of modern life—all woman's energies are not consumed in child-rearing. Even if woman herself

were willing, society would not permit. Society, at an enormous expense per capita, places the child at an early age in the hands of trained educators. Theoretically, we do not believe in the separation of mother and child. Practically, this is the condition that exists. School occupies the morning hours, outdoor play the afternoon. Many schools now provide luncheons for children—with a decided improvement in nourished bodies and brains. A plan is also being considered, suggested by the Gary idea of combining “work, study, and play,” to annex playgrounds, keeping the children all day, that play may be supervised, under the right conditions, and made as wholesome as work, since it is recognized that most of the evil in childhood is learned in the streets.

In the *Brushwood Boy*—that glimpse into spiritual dominions—the mother continued the custom of tucking her son into bed even when he returned as an officer; a habit, Kipling tells us, that must be maintained if the empire is to be preserved. In the activities imposed upon the modern male, the

curfew hour, alas! is often the only hour in which the mother is permitted this sweet communion. Fortunately, it is the best time for the exchange of confidences, for the strengthening of human ties, and for the forging of permanent spiritual bonds.

During the daily absence of husband and children a woman may now energize in housework or some more congenial occupation outside the home. The home will not depart from the house because the woman leaves it. Home consists of the quality of spirit diffused when the family is reunited. The important thing to preserve is the buoyancy of the mother's spirit, that she may not be too exhausted from work, whatever its character, to give of her inner forces to husband and children when they return. This attribute of light-hearted gladness in the mother is the true home cheer and the most precious memory of after life. Excessive social engagements may exhaust the mother's vitality quite as much as excessive housework or office toil. For some temperaments there is no more nerve-racking preparation

for a joyous home reunion than several hotly contested rubbers of bridge.

It is right that every step of the way of woman's new expenditures should be measured by their effect upon motherhood. Above all others this is the criterion to be considered. It is also fair that the corresponding changes in the output of all energy should be observed as well as woman's changed relationship to industry and to social life. It is then seen that woman and labor are no more divorced than woman and motherhood.

The truth about energy seems to be that every individual is a dynamo possessing not only a fixed amount of physical force, but a potential amount of mental energy also, and that the one needs exercising quite as much as the other. We all know this truth but persistently fail to practice it. The man of letters becomes pale from the excessive exercise of his intellect. A woman may glow like a rose from athletics, yet be withered at the top from an undeveloped mind. Only an occasional Maeterlinck or a Gladstone

embodies the double power of exercising both the mental and the physical powers. Hence, the difficulty in later life, either of using certain muscles or of making new brain paths, and the utter impossibility, in some minds, "of hospitality to a new idea."

To those who would still keep the iron heel of convention on woman's progress, believing sincerely in the continued restriction of her sphere, it has been pointed out that, physiologically, child rearing occupies only about one third of a woman's life. She may energize conscientiously as a mother, finding herself a grandmother at forty with a rich, new life of creative activity before her; or she may find herself still capable, but discarded on society's scrap heap, the waste product of a system that has not yet learned to employ all its social forces.

Earl Barnes tells us that the unutilized energies of the average woman of middle life, after her children no longer need her immediate attention, when with mature experience she should be of greatest world value, is one of society's inexcusable wastes.

From this loss arises the problem of "the woman with the empty hands."

Which shall it be for the still young matron whose children are out in the world, undergoing training from modern specialists whom no one mother could possibly rival—real work, or fictitious busy-ness—a potent social force or an effete has-been? This problem looms large as the specter of feminine middle life.

To grow old serviceably and let the gracefully take care of itself, that is the true ideal. Only in the complete use of all her energies may the years be robbed of their age-long enmity to the woman heart. There is hope for the woman of advancing years when, instead of finding herself a sere and yellow leaf, she becomes a social olive branch; when instead of facing society's cold shoulder, youth's snubbings, the world's shadows, she finds herself embracing life's highest privilege—the expression of personality—when with ripened years and faculties she is peculiarly fitted to serve the community and does serve as creative agent in some needed direc-

tion. For it must be remembered that social creativeness is quite as important as the expression of artistic or inventive power. A Katharine Davis, who introduces new ideas into prison life, a Jane Addams, who revolutionizes social work, is no less creative than a Rosa Bonheur. The "germ plasm of originality" has but taken a different course.

What effect a consciously cultivated imagination, even in one sex, would have on humanity may not be estimated since education has never concentrated upon developing it. We have cultivated everything except this supreme human gift.

The science of an improved race, studying life from within as well as from without, opens a comparatively new field. In the scarcity of material at hand, no more enlightening work of the effect of developed mentality in both parents is available than Francis Galton's *Genius and Heredity*. The genius with which Galton deals, however, must be translated as unusual ability to contribute something of value to society.

This work of the last century was not

written to advocate feminism nor is it the final word on heredity. Yet unconsciously it is the staunchest argument in favor of a womanhood living with the complete functioning of its inner powers. For, by a series of genealogical tables of distinguished families—judges, statesmen, ministers, artists—Galton shows that ability seldom is isolated but tends to run in families, transmitted by cultured *mothers as well as fathers*, the maternal strain being shown to be especially strong. One example is the remarkable Darwin family, of which Galton himself is a member, also Josiah Wedgwood, of pottery fame. In our own country, the Beecher family at once suggests itself.

But perhaps the most striking illustration of the infusion of maternal talent is in the case of Elizabeth Tuttle, founder of the Jonathan Edwards family. This brilliant woman was the progenitor of a long list of eminent personalities—United States presidents, college presidents, senators, governors, jurists and writers, including Timothy Dwight, Grover Cleveland, and the Amer-

ican Winston Churchill. Charles B. Davenport, in his interesting work on Heredity, tells us that the history of the United States would have changed its course if Elizabeth Tuttle had not lived and exercised her mental faculties as well as "energizing" to the extent of a number of children.

A significant fact is, that when her clergyman husband divorced her and married again, none of his children by the second wife became distinguished. In spite of her faults, the mentality of Elizabeth Tuttle supplied the "germ plasm" that helped to make her descendants, and the continent of America, great.

In his valued work Galton does not claim that gifts may be transmitted at will. Acquired characteristics may not be inherited.

What Galton does claim of the transmission of ability is that given two children, the one of gifted, the other of ordinary parents, the chances for talent lie largely with the child of the talented parents. What the average mother makes of herself before

Da
in
Here
Rela
Eng
Ed
husband
was
That
you
life
more
or
of
strong
down
the
to

parenthood becomes, thus, in the light of heredity, of first importance. The ability will surely reappear, if not in the first, then in a later generation. Biologically and psychologically nothing is lost. The mentality of to-day is surely reinforcing the character of to-morrow.

Society has long cherished the illusion—strengthened unfortunately by many examples—that the man of superior intellect has usually sought the woman of inferior mind, finding rest in an environment of mental weakness—a direct refutation of the law of like seeking like. Galton, in his instructive tables, shows that the great man has ever sought the great woman, demanding above all else mental and spiritual satisfaction in his union. “Where the heart lies let the brain lie also,” wrote a famous poet when he dedicated his volume of verse to his wife.

May not an explanation of past marital blunders in men of genius—also an explanation of their unrest and seeking of true affinity—lie in the paucity of selection, the

range in the choice of mentally developed women in the past being of necessity small?

But what of the child of this average woman living with the flowering of her inner faculties? Let the scientific answer of a man of genius avail. Thomas Edison, who is working to perfect household implements to free woman from drudgery, says, that the child of the future, of the mentally exercised and developed mother, as well as the mentally exercised and developed father, will be what would be considered to-day a prodigy, but in course of time will become normal. He will be the child of a balanced humanity, born in the fullness of love and knowledge, since he will begin life high in the psychical scale.

The saying has become proverbial that great men have had great mothers—women at least potentially great. Were the sons great because the mothers' powers were restricted?

A faculty is not exhausted by using it. One devitalizes it if one does not use it. Use or lose is a relentless law.

For many years the advance guard of the woman's movement, from John Stuart Mill to Olive Schreiner, has sounded the tocsin that rights are higher than privileges. Twenty years ago came the clear, scientific tones of Charlotte Perkins Gilman—member of the Beecher family—with the simple truth that women are people—not merely feminine, but real human beings. And the world is only beginning to acknowledge this truth and adapt itself to it.

To-day the kaleidoscope of public opinion must again be turned—since it is all a matter of angle—and a new attitude be assumed. Women are not only human beings: they are mentally creative beings. If human they must be creative, since mentality is the mark of the human. Woman must express herself psychically, or be an abortion of what she might become, and thus affect the race.

In biology the law bids one to select for the qualities one wishes to transmit. If speed is desired one selects for swiftness; if bulk, for size, giants of the same species—not a giant and a dwarf. Psychologically, also,

the principle holds good. If creative ability is desired one must select for creative ability. If gifted children are an advantage one must have gifted parents—not one parent, but both.

Viewed in this light, the dictum “Like mother, like son,” takes on a new and serious significance. Does it not also enforce a new and compelling obligation?

A mentally creative womanhood is desirable, then, because the time demands a mentally creative race. To realize all human possibilities one must liberate all human values. To augment the racial imagination one must augment the pressure. There is no choice. It is the unavoidable logic of progression.

THE SOCIAL AWAKENING

CHAPTER IV

MOTHERHOOD

IN spite of all chatter to the contrary the strength of the woman's movement lies in its improved mothers—not in the women on the firing line, bravely fighting to overcome the Gorgon of Public Prejudice—a needed though thankless task—but in the numberless awakened mothers who have been steadily growing, steadily becoming the best kind of mothers the enlightenment of the age would allow, and contributing to society an increasingly improved child. It is not a coincidence that civilization has advanced more in the last hundred years than in the previous thousand—ever since, in fact, it decided to give intellectual and spiritual opportunities to its women.

Occasionally one of these awakened mothers is inadvertently brought before the public and convinces us that the leaven of spiritual revolt is silently but powerfully at

work. A man was recently rejected for duty on a New York jury in a murder case because, as he said, his wife did not believe in capital punishment. A reporter, scenting a sensation, hunted this woman to her lair. He found a home with healthy children, and a happy mother, apparently "steeped in domesticity." But when he interviewed her, the wife, in clear, strong English, showed herself to be a feminist of the most modern type; that is, a woman who believed in the expansion of women with complete freedom for expression. She herself had a profession and was simply biding her time to return to it, when her children should be older. She, being a devoted wife and mother, with her sex was subservient to life, to self-development, and to service.

The papers expressed genuine surprise that a "home-woman" should possess so "advanced" views. The feminist felt no surprise, knowing that the principles of the woman's movement must produce the best mothers and the best children. For inner development to promote an improved social

expression is the aim of feminism. A psychically developed womanhood means an immeasurably improved child. And it is the awakened average mother who is carrying the race forward by embodying the needed spiritual type. We may not always hear of her, but this woman is making history nevertheless.

It is impossible to speak of this type of mother without first considering the black charge against her—the limiting of motherhood in producing the smaller family of to-day. When we secure our historic perspective, however, on this modern social phenomenon, we at once ask ourselves is woman or is civilization responsible for the unquestioned change? Is not the smaller family of greater present-day advantage? May it not be a blessing and not a bane?

When the population of the earth was scattered, when progress came through conquest and the chief of the tribe demanded legions for sacrifice, large families were a distinct social advantage and a necessary contribution. To-day, with the gradual les-

sening of war, with science improving and prolonging life, with congested housing conditions and the high cost of living; above all, with the world emerging from its physically constructive period and entering a new period of mental expansion—the smaller, more highly developed family is of greater social worth. Not more human beings, but psychically perfected beings is the world necessity.

Napoleon is said to have looked over his broken battalions and exclaimed: "What France needs is mothers," but he was mistaken. Napoleon's own armies were proof that mothers had done their duty. What France needed was to rid itself of its Napoleons—utterly outgrown in spirit and in knowledge of democracy, in lust of conquest and disregard of human life. The tomb of Napoleon is the mausoleum of militarism. It foreshadowed the futility of warfare and the beginning of the end of the period of progress through bloodshed. That a large proportion of the civilized world is to-day engaged in mortal combat, paralyz-

ing industry and pauperizing nations, only emphasizes this truth.

The question of the falling birth rate is not an isolated one, but is closely related to social, economic, and industrial questions. Various causes have helped to bring about the modern small family. For example, immigration—the great movement toward the redistribution of the peoples of the earth. In America how seldom we consider what effect the unrestricted flood of immigration has had in lowering the native birth rate; how it has drained the means of subsistence and so advanced the cost of living. Previous to 1840 the increase of population in the American colonies was phenomenal—owing to the need of populating a new country and to the abundant food supply. From 1840, after the immense flood of foreigners began to pour in, the native population at once dropped, and food prices soared. It is interesting to note that in the second generation of foreigners, the birth rate also diminishes, owing undoubtedly to the same economic conditions. So much is the birth

rate dependent upon the level of subsistence that Buckle, in his *History of English Civilization*, tells us that in England the number of marriages, and, as a consequence, the number of births, are regulated absolutely by the price of corn.

From the financial side—under the form of paternalism in which we now dwell, shudder as we may at the term—the State, assuming the old-time functions of the family and educating each child at a large expense per capita, would be financially swamped if modern congested districts poured out the immense families of old.

It is true that the resources of nature have not been exhausted; that mother earth could feed all her children adequately if humanity could be spread evenly over her surface. But men are gregarious. They love herding. Hence cities have come to stay. And the explanation is found in the fact that the spiritual requirements of man have become equally as pressing as the physical necessities and must be satisfied—the appetite for companionship, for sympathy, for

intellectual nourishment. These requirements are to be found only in communities throbbing with the hopes and aspirations of a conquering humanity; in standing shoulder to shoulder and feeling the vibrations of one's fellow men. It is useless to advise "Back to nature" to people who psychically could not yet endure solitude. The wilderness is for the poet, the seer, and the prophet, for men of inner resources. And so cities have aggregated to minister to man's spiritual demands until he, through the revelation of his inner experiences, comes to find himself. Then he may live where he will. His kingdom will know no geographical bounds.

Throughout history it is a fact that a falling birth rate has been the sign not of a declining but of a rising civilization, and is not to be feared while a falling death rate is also maintained. Otherwise would the Orient outstrip us.

When we accept the theory that the smaller improved family is of more definite modern advantage we at once ask ourselves

if so-called race suicide is really race suicide? May it not be race sanity? May not the motto of William Morris in house furnishing, "Fewer things, and better," be paraphrased, in all reverence to motherhood and a sincere regard for society's complex needs, into "Fewer children, and better"?

When we learn that the establishment of milk stations one summer in New York City alone had an almost incredible effect on the mortality of babies—and let it not be forgotten that it was one of the awakened mothers, Mrs. E. H. Harriman, who taught this practical lesson to the city fathers by maintaining stations from her own purse—we begin to see upon what civic practicalities the question of race perpetuity depends. When politics have become domestic—as they really are, though we are pleased to relegate them to distant realms called political—we shall lay the blame for fewer children, not on a falling birthrate, but on ourselves for letting them needlessly die.

As the glacial period has been outlived, as the dinosaur and all the huge crawling

vertebrates have been outgrown as too large and unwieldy for modern life—so the mastodon family has been sloughed off because unfit for a period that has outgrown brute strength, and has substituted a more highly organized and developed animal mentality in the struggle to survive.

The ideals of each age change. And the parents of every age must improve if racial stagnation, or, worse still, degeneration, is not to ensue. Our mothers were good enough for us, we say, and so they were. But they are not good enough for our children any more than we should be adequate parents for the children of 1930. The qualifications of motherhood are not static. In fact, no other relationship calls for such plasticity, such fluidity to reflect the spirit of the times, and to move with it, as motherhood.

The needs of the state have ever determined what the population, what the motherhood, of the state shall be. And parenthood, instead of being the individual function we have always considered it, is in reality a

social function in which the necessities of society determine the social contribution. In the spirit of the times lies the heart of all causation. And it is this spirit that determines the character and the volume of the increase.

What is the spirit of the times to-day? What is the great, new characteristic that is engaging and molding the minds of men? Is it not a passion for racial betterment, a stirring consciousness that all is not right with the world, as we have so complacently sung, but that much of it is shamefully wrong, and that we, and not a far-off Deity, are to blame?

The most striking characteristic of the new motherhood, then, is the social passion which marks the spirit of the age—an awakening of ethical and moral forces which precede all great concerted action where social justice is the goal. Ellen Key has said that the last century was the century of the woman, the present the century of the child. To the feminist the one is necessarily antecedent to the other. There could be no

century of the child until there had first been the century of the spiritually and socially awakened woman. The agitation over child labor, and all questions of child improvement, have been an inevitable outcome of the new social passion of mothers. Never has welfare work been so nearly universal as to-day. Never have factory horrors and tenement evils been so exposed, so related to the injury done to the child, and through the child to the future citizenship. A socially alert motherhood's first instinct was to follow the child into the street, the school, the factory, the prison—there to guard and protect its own.

Through the force of this social passion we see the type of the old, individual mother—the natural product of a period when families lived in isolation—expanding into the world mother, the equally natural product of the crowded living of to-day. This mother does not see duty circumscribed even by the circle of her own little ones, but her tender sensibilities, because of this home group, go out to the world's little

ones—the children of poverty, of consequent neglect, of dirt, and of grim despair. To such a mother—impersonal through having first been passionately personal—the fact that any child should be hungry while her child is fed, any child cold while hers is warm, is intolerable and sufficient motive power to account for a large part of the organized social work by which the age will be known. For the expression of the social passion is maternal above everything else. It is the great spirit of motherhood brooding over the world. It goes into all unclean places. It cleanses and changes the social environment in order that the small human plant—the woman's own heartbloom—may grow erect, unhindered.

But not only to the woman blessed with children has this inner quickening, this sense of divine world-motherhood, come. The social passion has stirred the great mother spirit to expression in women denied the boon of children, in whom the mother-heart is nevertheless strong. We may not know the inner tragedies that have denied to

these women nature's complete fulfillment. Yet for them life is no longer a sterility and a scoffing. They, too, may now mother communities and in needed, widespread, social expression find the maternal outlet which nature has thwarted.

But as important as the social characteristics of the new motherhood are, they are second to the spiritual qualifications required. How does the modern mother provide for the inner unfolding of her child? On the development of the mother rests the fitness for this supreme task. On her attitude toward life almost wholly depends whether a child is to face the world spiritually armored to conquer circumstances, or stripped of the knowledge of those inner resources that alone will equip him with power.

The psychic atmosphere into which even a baby is introduced has a most powerful effect in molding its disposition. We all know that a nervous mother—a nervous atmosphere—makes a nervous child. A troubled mistress makes a troubled house-

hold. Through laws that we glimpse but do not yet understand, the mother attracts the conditions of her predominating state of mind. There are psychic as well as chemical laws of attraction. One need not be clairvoyant nor clairaudient to sojourn long in a home and discover its controlling temper. There are parents who "wear" on their children, though loving them devotedly; daughters who improve when they leave the circle of the mother's overanxiety; and sons who develop faster when removed from fathers who irritate rather than promote a steady growth.

How important the psychic life is to the developing child is well illustrated by the results of Mme. Montessori's methods. In the Casa Bambini—that home at last built especially for children—the little ones of the poor are taken, children from four to seven years of age. No food was at first served to these unfortunates. But so adequate was the environment to the growing inner needs, so satisfying was the psychic life to the hungry child mind, and so won-

derful the intellectual response of these mentally nourished little ones, that bodily welfare was affected and the children gained in color, in brightness, and in health.

The psychic atmosphere of this school also bestows complete spiritual freedom. "Whatever you want to do—don't" is the attitude of many mothers. "Whatever you want to do, do," in the right environment, and under proper guidance, is Madame Montessori's method. But it is impossible for a teacher or mother to environ a child with this liberating atmosphere until she herself has become spiritually free—that is, until she understands the importance of inner causation as the initial motor force of life. Then she finds herself growing with her child—surely one of life's rare ecstasies—and eager above all things to hold and maintain her lead as she must do if she is to retain a complete unity with her little ones. For the highest type of child-love is not the affection that loves merely the hand that bestows creature comforts; but the abject, spiritual idolatry of a small being to a wonderful mother com-

panion who represents to the ideal-loving child mind, something of inner power, of self-direction, of the beauty of purpose and accomplishment. These are the mothers who are worshiped, living or dead, whose spirits never die.

Great men who have been most loyal in attributing the secret of their power to the motherhood of the past have invariably credited their gifts, not to the housekeeping, but to the companionship, the spiritual stimulus of their mothers.

To be intellectually companionable to her children is the modern mother's ambition. Motherhood alone will not make her society desirable. Congeniality must be established. There are mothers who bore their children to extinction for lack of ability to enter the world of the child. By comprehending that eager fairy world and assuming leadership therein, a mother makes herself more fascinating than mortal may usually hope to be. For to be fascinating one must be interesting, and to be interesting to children one must find the key to that secret garden of

the imagination where life is ever fragrant because pulsating with the growth of ideas that childhood wishes to gather. Even though the time for communion between mother and child is only the precious hours of night and morning, a mutual interest may be established in something in which every child shows a normal delight—pictures, books, music, inventions, play—and a magnetic bond be formed that will be a foreshadowing of the friendships and spiritual standards of the later man. And surely to be a child's best friend, as well as his mother, is a relationship that is lasting in profit and delight.

The spiritually awakened motherhood of to-day is also a consecrated motherhood. It does not believe that life begins only with birth, but is profoundly affected by all the previous period. In this direction we do not yet dream of the possibilities of spiritual impetus that may be given life. If the subject were not considered too sacred to discuss, many awakened mothers could give solemn testimony to the fact of children's

being consecrated to the highest purposes in life before birth, and of their having lived to see this consecration transformed into noble service. Every prayer a mother breathes in this important prenatal period wraps itself into the convolutions of the child-brain. It matters not what physicians say to the contrary; mothers know. The psychic life of the mother, *consciously directed*, has an indisputable, vitalizing effect upon the unborn child. The potentialities for race betterment, in this one direction through a spiritually quickened motherhood, are beyond computation.

The psychically awakened mother is also aware of the importance of health to the life she is to give. And so we have the athletic girl, the athletic woman and—when her duties will permit—the athletic mother. And the result, even in so short a period, of the recognized value of outdoor life for women, is becoming the Greek idea of developed bodies to enfold developed minds.

At a university, recently, the measurement of the students disclosed a new type—

the football type—a race of hardy young giants, attributable, according to the instructors, to outdoor exercise and to healthier, athletic mothers. And this type is quite consistent with the highest psychic development. In Mr. Kipling's thrilling polo story, the pony scribe admonishes the other ponies to play with their brains as well as their heels. Success in athletics always goes to the rounded personality—to the individual who has trained the hand or the foot to respond instantly to the brain. An athletic motherhood is a distinct asset to the race.

The spiritually awakened mother is also a patriotic mother, but the patriotism is of a different order from that of old. It is civic—not militant. The new mother brings her boys up to live for their country, not to die for it; to give themselves to an improved citizenship; to fight the modern common enemy, which is not the host marching around the outside of the city, blowing trumpets before the onslaught; but the quiet forces of corruption silently sapping the city's resources within. The enemy may be

no longer disposed of by the simple process of killing him. His weapons have become more deadly because more complex and subtle. The new patriotism among men and women organizes to fight the invisible foe within the city walls.

Because the warrior ideal is passing, the charge has been made that the world has become feminized, and that the prevalence of women school-teachers is causing the manly virtues to become extinct. If this is true, may it not be that civilization is endeavoring to teach us to alter our definition of manly? Most of the outrages in history were "manly." May we not possibly pursue some of the "feminine" virtues without losing virility? The modern dentist advises: "Be brave—be a woman." It requires more courage, more fortitude, to face motherhood once than a cannon a dozen times. To be feminine is not always to be soft—though man is pleased to cherish the illusion. To be feminine may be to be lion-hearted—and then not to talk about it! If the gladiator type is outgrown it is not because the world

has become "feminized" but because progress has no further use for him. The field for achievement is not destroyed. The ice floes of the North, the blue dome under which we live, woo the valiant souls of to-day who hold life lightly if only their spirits may conquer. The Scotts, the Bleriots, the Wilbur Wrights, and the legions of their intrepid followers, bear witness to the fact, not that the world has become feminized, but that the pathway of valor leads through new realms of heroism.

And lastly the new, psychic motherhood is voluntary. And to be a voluntary mother is to summon all the spiritual forces of the universe to one's aid. A beautiful girl, who had recently become engaged, said to her mother's friend: "I wish to be married and have a child immediately. Do you think that unwomanly? I want to give Him one." The mother's friend did not consider the confession "unwomanly." She knew from what divine sources the impulse came—knew that it was spiritual as well as natural. Instead her eyes filled with tears. She her-

self had felt that voluntary impulse, as had thousands of other pure-minded women, when stirred by a truly complete love. For true love is always creative. It wishes to give and to give.

The value is immeasurable of such divinely desired children—the longed-for child, not the haphazard offspring, the child of irresistible affinity, not of passing chance. If ever the state is to be uplifted, if ever humanity is to improve, if ever the Christian ideals of civilization are to be made real, it will be by these children who are consciously brought into being by high-minded men and women, whether their advent be in a castle or a cottage. These are the children of light who represent the true joy and genius of motherhood. They comprise the world's saviours. Of such are earth's kingdom of heaven.

CHAPTER V

WOMAN AND THE REVALUATION OF LIFE

SOME years ago a clear-visioned Englishman wrote, "There is no wealth but life." And the world, applauding the beauty of the sentiment, repudiated it as a sociological fact. For if a nation had realized that its wealth lay not in the silver in its mints, nor the gold in its mines, nor the bonds in its vaults, but in the quality of its men and women, it could in no wise have debased or squandered its national treasure. Only a strong countercurrent, opposed to materialism and recognizing true values, could have transformed the general estimate. Has the spiritual influx of the woman's movement offered such a current, infusing into public opinion, at least partially, a desire for a new valuation of life?

In every age noble men and women have tried to conserve life; but in no age, before the present, has there been so widespread, so

wholesale a protest against human waste. Conservation is the modern watchword. All the countless altruistic movements of to-day have for their motive one underlying aim—conservation of the individual because of his tardily recognized value to society.

It is not claimed that altruism is exclusively feminine. It is asserted, however, that the conservation of life is, and always has been, woman's charge. If her entrance into the larger world of affairs had not been followed by an unparalleled interest in improving life, her age-long nature would have been belied. For only women know the cost of life. Every ounce of human flesh and blood extracts its toll of pain from some woman. We should expect this payee of humanity, experiencing the first cost of production, to approximate life as no one else could.

Much of the so-called unrest of women has been spiritual unrest because they could not endure the world as they found it. Unnecessary human wastage stared at them on every hand. The inherent nature of woman, once

freed from the benumbing confines of a circumscribed domesticity, ached for the opportunity to set the world's values right. And this is what feminism, opposed like the deadliest virus, has been trying to effect: to direct the spirit of conservation, generously lavished on forests and waterways, into channels of more immediate consequence—the conservation of humanity—in order to check society's reckless and inexcusable waste.

What old blood fails to perceive, inert from familiarity and long usage, young blood espies and rejects. Feminism is the young blood of idealism injected into the hardened arteries of old-world customs. To the many it has sometimes seemed as if, in the transfusion, life itself were ebbing. To the discriminating it is apparent that humanity is building itself a new body on new foundations—foundations broad enough to support the entire human family, not forgetting women and children, and strong enough to allow for all the aspirations of a revalued race.

Unrest is not a crime. Unrest is a symptom of growth. Just how much the unrest of women has had to do with evolving the new ideals that are characterizing the age will never be known. Nor is it important that it should be known. The significant thing for men and women to recognize is that a new valuation has been placed on life and must be maintained by them working *together*. Feminism is not anti-man. Feminism is pro-man. The conservation of life is human, racial business, not of one sex, but of both.

It is not surprising that little value was attached to human life in the past since human waste is one of the most ancient ideas and biological in foundation. For countless ages human evolution progressed, like lower animal evolution, through the sacrifice of untold millions.

In the early history of mankind slavery was the lot of the majority, human lives being as plentiful, and as valueless, as blades of grass. The miracle of the pyramids was made possible because of the cheapness of

human labor, worked at the point of the lash. The exodus from Egypt was the first historical revolt from a light valuation of life. Even in the comparatively recent days of Rome's splendor her population numbered a few thousand citizens and hundreds of thousands of slaves.

Advancing through the ages we find only a slightly increasing conservation. As late as the middle of the last century slavery was practiced by a Christian nation and was abolished only after the sacrifice of nearly a million lives. Before Lord Shaftesbury's recent factory reforms were enacted in England, infants were employed in mills and were beaten awake when falling asleep at their long tasks. When laws forbidding the exploitation of babies were passed large families waned, no longer of advantage when not every member could be counted upon to produce. As men have been forced out of slavery and taught to belong to themselves—the idea impressed by that richest thinker of the Renaissance, Rabelais—and as the needs of childhood have been recog-

nized and guarded, the value of the individual has slowly increased.

To-day we are witnessing the beginning of an almost universal revolt against wasteful human expenditure. Is it an accident that this protest, this revaluation of life, has followed so quickly the social awakening of women? Does the character of the woman's movement contain elements that equip her for this unprecedented crusade?

The two great avenues of enlightenment to women in the last century were the woman's college and the woman's club. The first taught her to think. The second taught her to act. For the woman's club soon outgrew its spirit of mental acquisition and gave rise to a desire to do and to be. It could not long endure being lectured—even by experts. It was burning to know life, not from rocking chairs, as they read about it, nor from camp stools, as they listened to specialists describe it, but from contact, as their husbands and brothers knew it. Committees were formed. Shops, tenements, factories, schools, hospitals, prisons and

courts were visited. Evils, injustices, wrong systems of which the public mind was either ignorant or hardened by custom, were laid bare. And the result? Not one of these places has since known peace; not one of these evils but has been held up to the public eye, to receive public maledictions, if it did not at once institute attempts at reform.

The woman investigator, the woman agitator, and the woman advocate are the direct products of the woman's movement. That the woman investigator is filling a needed world place is proven by the fact that she is being sent forth by awakened, clear-sighted men to make clean the dark spots of the earth.

It may be seen, then, that the new channels of opportunity opened to woman in the last century equipped her not only with theoretical knowledge of life, but also with a practical arsenal of facts. The most intolerable condition presented was the various forms of waste that drained the human family. Almost every effort of women since then, directly or indirectly, to obtain

so-called "rights," has been directed toward greater power to prevent this unnecessary leakage. In States where women are unenfranchised public opinion must still be influenced by the old methods of indirection—beloved by sentimentalists who consider smiles more potent than votes—by agitating, prodding, and annoying public officials until they are exasperated into executing woman's will. In those States where direct action is possible nearly every law placed by women upon the statutes has had a bearing upon the conservation of human life.

We hear often that this is the age of revolution. Rather is it the age of protest. A new idealism vibrates through the air. And its evidence lies in a deeply aroused community conscience. All the widespread interest in better housing conditions, better factories, in wrongs to childhood, in the white slave traffic, in the spot-lighted social evil, in mothers' pensions, in workmen's compensations, in the minimum wage, in insurance, in all the departments of welfare work—are but evidences of the efforts of

an aroused community endeavoring to re-value and conserve life.

What has awakened this community conscience? A sense of democracy? Partly. Democracy is the mother of Feminism. But in the last century the preponderance of man's energy was admittedly commercially engaged. A period of great invention was followed by a period of great prosperity. Production, distribution, competition taxed man's nervous and mental capacity. Responsibilities of gigantic business enterprises left him little leisure or power to grapple with problems of mere human betterment. Moreover, it must be remembered that business success has been often attained at the price of atrophy of the finer ethical qualities. Competition may be the soul of trade. It is also the skeleton at the feast of altruism. A womanhood unmoved by self-interest or commercial bias, morally and socially quickened, would naturally fix attention on evils that had crept in unnoticed in the din of industrial strife, and to which the governing conscience had become commercially inured.

Morality, like immorality, is contagious. It does not seem presumptuous to assume that the woman inquirer, with her new interest in civic and social righteousness, should be responsible for at least a part of the social sensitiveness of the day. In fact, at this period of man's economic engrossment, it is difficult to see from what source, other than an investigating womanhood, the spiritual stimulus could have come necessary to arouse a public revolt against world iniquities, and a reassertion of human values.

To the woman with more leisure, equipped with first-hand knowledge of preventable waste, the evils of unlivable tenements, unhygienic factories, overworked women and under-nourished children, emerging from the shadows into the foreground of events, have become matters of burning importance. In time the public mind was ignited. An enlightened womanhood, moved by the age-long spirit of conservation, did exactly what might have been expected of it: rushed into the gap of daily overlooked social abuses,

with the sapping of racial vitality, in order to revalue and conserve mankind.

For example, the question of unsanitary tenements. Homes were woman's specialty. Physical comfort had been her "sphere." That two thirds of humanity lived in so-called homes unfit for animals, and that men—churchmen even—were accepting rents for these hovels conducive to race suicide, was a situation to excite immediate feminine protest.

On the subject of child labor—child wrongs, always with us but only recently recognized as the most reprehensible and prodigal of human wastes—the agitation of one half of humanity, the mother-half, in this direction would be very disturbing to public complacency. Problems of childhood are now discussed not only from a humane viewpoint, but also as an insane squandering of potential wealth. In many cases social neglect has arisen from social ignorance. When it was learned that in the city of New York and the borough of Brooklyn, the so-called City of Homes, thousands of

children went breakfastless to school, a wave of revolt arose in certain interested members of the community. A luncheon for public school children followed, given, in certain localities, as a charity. An improved order of scholarship was a consequence of a better nourished body—an important conservation of childhood along practical lines.

Or consider the widespread interest in the age-long social evil. Behind the present unprecedented discussion stands feminine enlightenment revolting against the blind, molelike undermining of the human family. This, of all evils, saps the life of women and children most deeply and touches the problem of race preservation most vitally.

Women of the college settlements have long devoted their energies to human conservation. The new solidarity, the spirit of *esprit de corps* among all women, is illustrated in the recent women's strikes. It is indeed a new manifestation for women of the leisure class—a class fast becoming extinct—to stand shoulder to shoulder with women toilers, moved, though they may not

know it, by the maternal instinct to pluck from the burning the precious brand of life.

When it became known, in the recent garment workers' strike, that women slaved at machines twelve and fourteen hours a day for a mere pittance; that they were obliged to pay for the use of the machines and for the needles they broke; that the hygienic conditions surrounding them belonged to the dark ages, not a trades union, but the well-being of humanity was seen to be at stake. Women high and low responded to the racial call. Women who had never known want left their homes, in the cold winter dawn, to do picket work and help win the battle for their less fortunate sisters who owned nothing but the labor of their hands. Women of wealth opened their purses and helped these workers to live as they fought for life itself. The united protest won. What one woman could not do as an individual, women did collectively. The sisterhood of woman is beginning to keep step with the brotherhood of man.

Every strike won by women for women is

a testimony to woman's socially awakened conscience, acting upon the community conscience, in an effort to revalue and conserve life.

And what is the result of the ethical rebirth that has spread like a tidal wave over all the land? Science is studying causes and trying panaceas in the earnest effort to improve the world's habitation. Citizenship is being widened to include little citizens as well as big, and not to exclude mothers, whose cooperation, because of their experience, should be more sought than that of any other class. Social responsibility, moreover, is being placed where responsibility belongs—on the community as well as upon the individual. Modern social conditions are found to create rather than to check crime. A degree of human wantonness will always be with us. But the proportion of degenerates, like the proportion of defectives, is infinitely small. A noted English sociologist shows us that the number of murders and suicides in congested localities in London scarcely varies from year to year, springing

from conditions rather than from individual origin. To maintain slums is to invite iniquity. To abolish slums is to decrease crime.

That "Poverty is the root of all evil" is an axiom often heard among social workers. That it is beginning to be sounded at the fount of public life is one of the hopeful signs of the times. The president of a great republic, in a recent book, has stated that society stands in a position to reconstruct its economics from top to bottom, and must so reconstruct them, if human values are to be maintained. A political leader of the greatest empire on earth has publicly asserted that there is no occasion for want in a world overflowing with abundance for all. A few years ago the "abolition of poverty" would have been dismissed as chimerical. To-day it is seriously asserted to be the great problem of humanity, not only for the state but for the church if it, too, is to perform its quota in preserving life.

A new appreciation of human worth is also to be found in the gradually changing

attitude toward war. And this in spite of the European turmoil where the "sword drawn for peace" is its claim for justification. When human life is appreciated at its full face value no nation will be permitted to declare war.

One of the hardest lessons to learn is what to revere and what to reject in the past. The socially awakened woman rejects the idea that all nations are natural enemies and must sleep on their arms. No longer does she cherish the military hero as an ideal toward which to train her sons. She recognizes fully his past value and glory, but regards his trappings, preserved in the museums—the army coat, the saddle, the skeleton of his famous horse—much as she regards prehistoric skeletons shown under the same roof: necessary in organic evolution but now outgrown.

That the military hero is passing as an ideal was well illustrated at a recent village improvement meeting. (One indication of improvement was that women were allowed to attend!) A leading citizen proposed an

appropriation of \$1,500 to build a new soldiers' monument.

"The present monument looks like a lead pencil," he began. "We need a large, impressive new monument to keep before the eyes of our growing boys. If we don't build it, no one will do so. The present generation doesn't seem to care a twopence about soldiers' monuments."

"And the next generation will care less," a sweet-faced, gray-haired woman said, as she arose. "Why go backward? Why waste money? We need that \$1,500 to help educate better men." The question of a new soldiers' monument was laid upon the table, not to be reconsidered.

In this connection it is gratifying to recall that the first Peace Conference was held in the realm of a woman, Queen Wilhelmina, of Holland; that the Nobel peace prize of \$40,000 has been won by a woman, the Baroness von Suttner, with her book, *Lay Down Your Arms*; and that all peace movements themselves have met with the hearty cooperation of women wherever the

present circuitous methods of indirection will allow.

It does not affect the truth of the contention that war is outgrown to instance cases of the recent Balkan and European wars where atrocities were perpetrated as in primitive times. Atrocities are the concomitant of war. They follow as the night the day. The fact remains that historically the race has discarded military warfare as the best means of progress. In some localities horse cars are still used. Advanced communities, however, employ electric power. To-day the sober sense of the civilized world realizes that war is regress, not progress.

In her attitude against perpetuating the spirit of militarism the modern woman does not claim that conflict has been outgrown. Its realm only has been transferred. As the struggle for existence among individuals is largely for bread and butter, so that among nations has become chiefly economic. The battlefield of to-day is for trade supremacy. The markets of the world are the spoils.

Witness the European struggle—on the one side an effort to get markets, on the other an effort to keep them. As Professor Vernon Kellogg, in *Beyond War*, has indicated that, biologically, through brain acumen, the human species has outgrown physical combat, so Norman Angell, in his epoch-making book, *The Great Illusion*, has shown that, in economics and industry, a conquering nation may yet be commercially wrecked by the reactionary effect of modern warfare.

The public mind emerges slowly from under the juggernaut of its long-cherished illusions. But the evolutionist is patient. He, and at last she, knows that the wheels of state, once lifted out of the mire of materialism and self-destruction, are bound to move on toward broader highways, unclouded by the smoke of cannon, unpolluted by the stench of human blood.

In the minds of many modern men and women—dreamers, perhaps, yet rulers of destiny and practical conservers of humanity—there exists the vision of a not impos-

sible to-morrow when one fleet will serve the federated peoples of the world, an international guardian of the public peace sent to discipline wayward children among nations.

The voice of the socially responsive woman, in spite of the handicap of disenfranchisement, is making itself heard in public affairs, affairs which are in reality private since they affect so directly the family and the home. How much longer, this voice is inquiring, will the public mind elect to be led by statesmen cast in molds obsolete, confessedly ignorant of the modern, scientific point of view? How much longer will humanity submit to secret diplomacy, sheepishly lifting its back to be sheared for revenue to maintain showy armaments—national playthings, seldom used, yet fostering by psychic suggestion all the effete pomps and glories of war? Above all, how much longer will it allow its national wealth, the manhood of the race, to be crushed out, while the alloy of the unfit and the rejected remain to produce a spurious human strain?

The last and most hopeful sign of the

revaluation of life lies in the birth of the new science of Eugenics. So vital is the relationship of this science to an improved race that it has been claimed that if its significance were recognized no other reforms would be needed. A true eugenist could in no way circumscribe life.

Only eugenics goes to the root of conservation by improving the inner qualities of mankind. For the science of eugenics is not merely physical. It is highly psychical and spiritual. Eugenics invokes all the powers of man by directing attention to the selection of those physical, mental, and spiritual qualities which contribute to the perfecting of human values.

We have seen that in past eras the idea that human life is wealth held no sway. In the middle ages we found it had gained only a glimmer of recognition. To-day we discover the faint, well-directed beginnings, at least, of its conservation.

The noblest ideal known is one of men and women, joint originators of life and jointly responsible for its wastage, combin-

ing forces to revalue and conserve it. Neither sex alone may completely guard the frontier of human spoliation. The lesson of 1914 is proof. The voice of the matriarch must be added to the council of the patriarchs. Then, mayhap, when this dual human mind works in happy, racial unison, the principle, "There is no wealth but life," may become, not the sentiment of a literary visionary, but an ultimate of practical, workable truth.

THE AWAKENING OF THE
SENSE OF RACE
RESPONSIBILITY

CHAPTER VI

THE RELATION OF WOMAN TO EUGENICS

THAT the awakening of woman should be followed by a growing conviction of race responsibility is to be expected. Also that this new human appreciation should relate itself to the compelling power of love.

When the stirring charm of *The Prisoner of Zenda* captured the reading world some years ago, a concluding chapter entitled, "If Love Were All," wrung the heartstrings of every sympathetic reader. Rasendyl, a strolling Englishman, with the red-gold, Hapsburg coloring, by urgent request had successfully impersonated the worthless king of Ruritania and had unexpectedly won the Princess Flavia's heart. Yet these two noble persons, so deeply immersed in each other, tacitly agreed that renunciation was their only course. They could not commit a wrong to the state by consummating a deception; they could not trick the people by

introducing alien blood into the lineage. In short, the lineal ideal became more imperative than the personal. And the romantic reader, while chafing at the separation of true lovers, inwardly admired the fortitude and the principle shown.

The science of eugenics is an effort to inject regard for race into individual love in order to establish a new pride of descent. Instead of denying love, eugenics asserts that "love is all," but it must be personal and racial love, deeply conscious of power and of responsibility.

If the Princess Flavia had lived to-day and had learned of this new ideal, her course might have been different. She might have led Rasendyl rather than be led by him. She might have declared that a royal pedigree should not be perpetuated when it has nothing but decadence to transmit. She might have refused to mother the children of an alcoholic degenerate, even though he were king. "Better to renounce the throne than to commit a crime against the human family by poisoning the strain," she would say, if

she were a true eugenicist according to the ethical definition of the term.

Eugenics is the ethics of love. As such it behooves every true lover of his kind to inform himself as to its principles. That the ethical interpretation is not generally accepted does not invalidate it. The science is new and but little understood. Underneath the outer materialism of eugenics lies the inner flame of the most obligatory moral and ethical duty—the duty of each to improve the quality of life itself. “Eugenics is the science which deals with the influences that improve the inborn qualities of the race.”

The woman's movement, in reality a race movement, is an effort toward a more ethical interpretation of life and of love. It is an effort to establish a truer equilibrium between men and women, especially in regard to the past overemphasis of sex. The all-round, symmetrically developed woman of to-day wishes to be loved for her human, social value, rather than for her face and sex value as of old. In this attitude she

claims to have lost none of her inherent attributes—since sex, as some one has said, is not a thing that rubs off—but rather to have gained in human emotional qualities that go to complete character and make up race values.

The birth of the science of eugenics bears a significant relation to the feminist awakening. The same century ushered in the dawn of both. The fullness of time, the ripeness of ideas, a transformed social order, were necessary before these movements, so distinctively educational in purpose, could gain ground.

That eugenics is to help women in their struggle for spiritual freedom is as true as that women are to help eugenics. To comprehend the manner of the help the science must be taken in a positive, rather than in the popular negative understanding. Also it must be understood to have no quarrel with the human heart. We read of the prohibitions of eugenics, of segregation, and the prevention of the multiplication of the unfit, negations important to consider. But

the unfit, like the criminal class, represent but a small proportion of humanity. Positive eugenics is the more vital, teaching that the mass of the population should increase consciously and wisely; that public opinion should be educated until it becomes as impossible for one to profane the race as to stain one's own name. It is not enough that the undesirable must not transmit impaired life. The desirable must transmit better life, and increasingly better, with all children the offspring of an open-eyed, not a blindfolded, love.

Eugenics is the science of an improved race. The race is the outcome of sex. One cannot improve the race, eugenics asserts, unless one understands the scientific principles of sex. A few years ago physicians, surgeons, genealogists, biologists, reformers, and other scientific men began to discuss sex as they discussed all other race questions, in the light of reason and fact. To go on pretending and ignoring was unscientific, and Science is the only standard to which these men bowed. But because they per-

sisted, because in the name of the new humanity they exhorted, agitated, and even dramatized sex and its problems, the taboo on sex is passing, the ancient curse has fallen away from woman, never, we hope, to return. To-day it is a glorious thing to be a woman, confidently, not apologetically, female. The shame lies only in denying the privilege of sex—love and motherhood—which sex completion implies.

Following logically the removal of the sex taboo came the new questioning of the double moral standard. For years interrogations as to the justice of this standard had been whispered. To-day, these whisperings have grown into a loud challenge, from men themselves—the minority interested in race improvement—a cry from the housetops of the world, protesting: "Away with moral duality! Away with race pollution and infection! One cannot cleanse a channel by sending crystal water through it on the one side and devastating poison on the other." The strongest champions of the racially developed woman of to-day are men of

science who, by pointing out the ensuing evils, have decided that the dual moral standard, like the taboo, must go.

From the modern Sinai of Science these men are thundering the new commandments of sex life to women as well to men. Eugenics has invaded the home where the protected mother now sits too often alone, a shepherdess forsaken by her flock, and stripping the conventionally trained youth of attractions that in many cases have concealed unspeakable disease and decay, has commanded, "Woman, behold your son! He is not the other woman's, as you have so complacently thought. He is yours. How have you safeguarded him? You who have generated must also regenerate. In the world, as in the cradle, responsibility is still yours."

Ignorance of life no longer excuses the inaction and contributory negligence of parents. Eugenics has thrown down the walls in forbidden places and disclosed the unsavory truth. Once informed of these evils it is inconceivable that a parent should

examine the financial status of his daughter's suitor without a searching inquiry as to his health and moral character. With this knowledge, such a parent will have stirred within him an imperative new sense of moral obligation to his children and to the race. He may even remove from his daughter's hands Tennyson's *Dream of Fair Women*, bound in limp suede, and place there for her future guide the stiff realities of life contained in Percy Mackaye's eugenic drama, *To-morrow*. And to his son he will present Brieux's relentless excerpt of life, *Damaged Goods*, and be sure that he reads it. The new ethics demands that parents themselves shall insist that love no longer be blind.

Eugenics is contributing to the aspirations of the new mother by dividing the ethical responsibility of parenthood in emphasizing fatherhood. In the past, when parenthood has been mentioned, by tacit consent motherhood has been implied. Fatherhood was often a nebulous ideal, necessary, of course, but seldom actively realized. The loud pedal was held down

hard on motherhood with the result that the training of children often assumed too feminine a key. Ethical eugenics declares that parenthood requires also the deep tones of the father if the truest harmonies in the family symphony of the future are to be sounded. Parenthood must be not only materially but also spiritually shared.

In a social order where men were specialized to commercial life and women to house labor and childbearing, such a lack of parental equipoise was inevitable. And the child has suffered. For the all-round development of the child, in the earliest most impressionable years, demands the masculine interpretation of life as well as the feminine; requires masculine discipline, masculine guidance, masculine adjustment to problems if we are to have a balanced progression.

At a summer resort recently a lady said, humorously, to a young mother, "Your husband admires the children, but seems to think that they are yours." It was true. The short time that the father saw his children

morning and evening, separated by the day's routine, gave him no sense of possessing them. To the children, the tie between them was largely material. Father represented power to provide food and clothing, a kind of animated cash register. So far as ethical responsibility is concerned, in many cases the male parent has been a married man and a bachelor at the same time.

The woman of to-day has often been accused of shirking motherhood. Such women, sensationally limelighted, are in a minority. We do not hear of those heavy-hearted women whose passionate wish for motherhood is ungranted. A visit to an expert in obstetrics will reveal their number. A sorrow's crown of sorrows is motherhood denied. As for those abnormal women who do not wish offspring, they may be balanced by men who shirk fatherhood—men who prefer a wife unhampered by family cares; men who wish for quiet in their homes or else balk at the expense of children, no inconsiderable item in the well-cared-for child of to-day. The standard of living has ad-

vanced here as in other departments. Men and women of this type are egoists and uneugenic. The only hope for them is to teach their kind, when young, the higher racial duty—the happy privilege of the complete fruition of love.

Eugenics, lastly, is promoting the aims of feminism by dispelling that age-long chimera, the “mystery of sex.” Curiosity, combined with ignorance, is responsible for two thirds of the wrongdoing of youth. The other third may be attributed to natural depravity, though we doubt if the apportionment is so large. The unknown is always fascinating. The spirit of man moves swiftly to meet adventure, even in the young boy. “I did not know,” was the excuse offered by the hero of *Damaged Goods* when he gazed at the family wreckage he had caused—forgetting the doctor’s warning. “I did not know,” was the excuse of every human derelict whom the physician summoned in turn to pass before the young wife’s father. By throwing the searchlight of science on these vices and showing that

their results are not merely temporary and personal, but far-reaching and racial, eugenics is performing, not only for women, but also for humanity, the most vital service. When the high aim of generation is understood, it assumes place in the mind of the young in the order of natural phenomena, no more mysterious than Harvey's circulation of the blood or the process of digestion and assimilation, yet invested with a spiritual beauty that lifts it to the realm of the Divine. For the normal health of the individual and the community, as well as for posterity, it is necessary that the laws controlling all physical processes should be scientifically made clear.

Eugenics declares that it is an unthinking, irresponsible mother to-day who does not, herself, impart to her little ones acquaintance with these supposed "mysteries of life" before the sensitive child-mind is polluted by hearing the laws of creation first whispered in dark corners as life's indecencies and causes for shame. It is often the first contact with a subject that counts and colors

it for all time. To-day there is nothing in sex nor in the racial instincts to be ashamed of, except "To be ashamed of being ashamed." Nor does knowledge destroy innocence; it rather maintains the needed spiritual type, true innocence of mind. The most crystalline purity conceivable is the mind of a little child. No greater crime exists than to stain it morally. Eugenics says that knowledge of Godlike function alone will keep the mind pure. The calm acceptance of the facts of nature is characteristic of the child-mind, just as a confiding faith that the world is benevolently inclined toward him—as opposed to the adult belief that every man's hand is against him—is another characteristic of childhood.

No mother who has had the experience of initiating her children into the knowledge of great natural processes will fail to bear witness that the effect has been to cement still closer the bond between them. This is particularly true between mother and son. No boy learns that his mother loved him before she saw him, bearing him

long under her heart, nourishing him with her life's blood, fashioning him according to Nature's marvelous sculptoring; that she grieved at giving him over to a world where she could no longer entirely enfold and protect him—no lad learns these truths without the little heart responding in a flood of new tenderness toward this magical mother-creator.

Two objections are entered against the eugenic method of substituting knowledge for ignorance in children. The first lies in the power of suggestion, an imperative principle, most potent, without doubt. May not an early explanation of sex, it is maintained by the believers in the old ethics of silence, suggest to a child an evil not otherwise present in consciousness? There is plausibility in this objection. The remedy seems to be in answering the questions of the inquiring mind as they appear naturally, never forcing or overweighing them by revealing too much at one time, and never overemphasizing sex. Between the possibilities for suggestion in the new method

of parental frankness, and the certainty of criminal racial negligence in the old way of sexual silence, the eugenist declares there is no room for choice.

“A sense of shame” may be protective and valuable, as believers in the old idea claim, but only if the child has done something to be morally ashamed of, not for the possession of sex functions, he does not understand. Nor does the appeal for parental frankness and mutual understanding extend to a complete abolition of reticence on matters of sex. Good taste maintains still in people of refinement, while bad taste reigns in the vulgar or coarse-grained. “These laws of nature are true, but so private and intimate that we do not discuss them generally,” is supplemented by the careful mother in allowing herself the privilege of enlightening her child. Also knowledge of sex is valueless unless accompanied by knowledge of the necessity for self-control. Nothing appeals more strongly to the child-mind than consciousness of a sense of power. The line of mastery of

self and of circumstances may at this time be indicated and inculcated through an early introduction to the control of the human will. Control and self-direction, through knowledge of self, is the first aid to conscious character-building in the child.

The second objection to sex-candor is more mature and so more subtle. If the "mystery of sex" be removed, as contended even by race lovers, one of the chief charms of life will be destroyed—the attraction of one sex for the other. If this were true it would, indeed, be deplorable. But is it true? Is not the real source of attraction found in the mysterious charm of temperament rather than in the drawing power of sex? Many beautiful women are not magnetic, though distinctively feminine. In reality there is little "mystery" in predicting the vagaries of sex. Its course is frankly limited, whereas a thousand lenses reflect the changing attitudes and lures of temperament, which may never be definitely foretold. The wells of sex may soon be fathomed. The oceans of temperament are never sounded. Rather

are they heights than depths, since sex is physical and temperament is spiritual. Man will never find woman an "open page" easily deciphered—which seems to be a lurking masculine dread—so long as temperaments have freedom to develop varying personalities. The woman of to-day may, if she chooses, charm in a thousand roles instead of only one, as of old. Will she choose? She is no longer economically compelled to do so. May not the time come when the "business of being a woman" will be to inspire a man's soul rather than to charm his senses? Only when love is held fast by this inviolate, unpurchasable attraction of spirit does it become, indeed, "all."

Eugenics, then, has ministered to the ideals of an ethically awakened womanhood by disclosing the evils of the double moral standard; by dividing the moral responsibility of parenthood in emphasizing fatherhood; and by insistence on substituting scientific knowledge of self for ignorance and thus abolishing that will-o'-the-wisp, the physiological "mystery of sex." On the

other hand, what may the enlightened woman do for eugenics?

The final Court of Appeal in all human actions is Public Opinion. We cannot legislate the public mind into higher ethical states. But we can educate it. Woman's greatest contribution to the new science will be to aid in a general publicity campaign of education supported by facts furnished by scientific and social experts.

To mold the public opinion of to-morrow we must train the mind of the child of to-day. In cooperating with eugenics in this particular the awakened woman would plead for a greater amount of science incorporated early into school life, and particularly for the teaching of the science of organic evolution. The value of science is that it deals with law. The value of teaching organic evolution lies in the fact that its principles deal with the organic development of life itself. And the principles of life are also the principles of love. Only in this way may a child learn, naturally, of the laws of his own being, of the suffering he

causes himself and others if he break these laws, and so of his relation to the universe. When he realizes his place at the top of the cosmic scale, a new spiritual dignity enfolds him. The racial instincts fall naturally into place, the "mysteries of sex" being dispelled by the wonders of natural and spiritual sequence. That these instincts are not to be dissipated but are to be conserved and consecrated to the highest personal and social ends, seems natural and inevitable. That they may no longer be ignored, if a conscious, higher development is to be attained, is certain. Life is not merely a science. It is an art, with a technique of living that must be acquired, consciously or unconsciously. Which is the better way—to blunder along, deliberately held in ignorance of principles that govern conduct, absorbing knowledge at the price of bitter personal experience and blighting social cost, or to learn the beauty of self-mastery through obedience to law, of happy self-direction to a desired goal?

After teaching a child the scientific truths regarding its own being, the ethically devel-

oped mother would awaken early a sense of individual moral responsibility. A boy should be taught that he is a Godlike creator, responsible to society for what he creates. A girl should learn that she is not only a co-creator, but that her body is the channel through which posterity must pass, and that the channel must be kept pure. A spirit of personal responsibility, absorbed early by the plastic mind of the young, reacts far more strongly later in the adult than tardy legal compulsion when character is already formed. The ethics of sex, as well as the ethics of love, is not yet fully realized. And children, with their peculiar responsiveness to idealism, should absorb these ethics through every pore, until the ethical becomes the normal, controlling and directing the physical instead of being blindly controlled by it. But will not knowledge destroy the "bloom on the peach" in the child mind? Aspiration never destroys. It rejects the counterfeit for the real. Yet if it did, surely "bloom," often artificial, is not so essential to growth as rooting out the moral

decay that has long eaten at the heart of the social core, often under a rosy exterior.

All ideas to-day may be classed as social or antisocial. The child must early learn that the law of self-gratification alone, in any form, is antisocial. We are members of a closely knit social organism as well as of a sex. The doctrine of each man for himself, a survival of the old tooth and claw, me-and-mine tenet, must give way to the modern creed of each for all. Utopian? Every new idea is called Utopian until proved of greater practical value than the old. The plan of free schools, free playgrounds, free hospitals, free social service was once all considered Utopian. Humanity progresses only as the whole army of mankind is enabled to move forward, usually by so-called Utopian tactics. The Utopian is the spiritual, and the spiritual is the practical for a species evolving on a psychical plane.

Finally, the modern woman would contribute to eugenics by training the young to a higher form of selection in love and mar-

riage, especially among the girls. Selective love must replace random love. Spirit must direct if love is to be "all," as it should be. The Flavias of the future must be conscious of their transcendent power to rehabilitate the race.

The aim of eugenics is seen to be racial and ethical. The aim of the Woman's Movement, a race movement, highly ethical, overflows naturally into the field of eugenics. To introduce into the precious strain of life undesirable citizens, in any way subnormal, is counter to the high purposes of each and an affront to so-called love. That both movements must suffer from misunderstanding and unwise actions on the part of friends as well as enemies is to be expected. It is the history of all innovations. As the truth vitalizes them they will be enabled to conquer abuse and attack.

In this day of bewildering social metamorphosis one fact only remains unshaken: men and women are still the parents of the race. Surely that is a fundamental truth worth clinging to and should bind them closer.

They rise or fall together as they discharge this debt of imperative obligation.

The spiritual ideals of the Woman's Movement, then, cannot be embodied without a wider diffusion and comprehension of the science of eugenics. And eugenics must suffer partial paralysis unless it gain the cooperation of the thinking woman as well as the thinking man. The relation of woman to eugenics and of eugenics to woman is, therefore, one of strong interdependence if the torch of love and life is to be handed on pure and flaming, and the high ideals of each are to be realized.

CHAPTER VII

NATURAL AND SPIRITUAL SELECTION IN MARRIAGE

IN spite of current discussion of race suicide, in spite of statistics that show the increase of bachelors and the aloof tendencies of bachelor girls, the subject of marriage is still the subject of paramount interest to both sexes, and the "way of a man with a maid" remains the most fascinating of all ways.

In the present period of social reconstruction, when all traditional agencies are regarded with suspicion, it is inevitable that marriage, as a human institution, should be challenged. It is also inevitable that many false trails should be followed, many will-o'-the-wisp theories, suggested by uninspired prophets of the new order, should flash inconsequently. All great reconstructive movements must triumph over the zeal of

friendly misinterpreters as well as over the purposeful opposition of foes.

The racially quickened woman realizes that any proposition to abolish marriage is not only stupid but unscientific. We must learn, here, from nature, whether we would or not. The institution of marriage is of all institutions the most ancient and deep-rooted since it may be traced to our animal ancestors, as Westermarck has so convincingly shown. Wherever the prolongation of the period of infancy necessitates care of the young from both parents—as in the cases of many birds and higher mammals—nature herself has instituted some form of family life. So long as it is of advantage to the child to have the continuous ministrations of one mother and of one father, monogamous marriage may be considered as permanent as the everlasting hills. Moreover, the human mind hungrily craves monogamy. No harem even is without its white rose—its starry-eyed favorite and queen. All the refractions of marriage are but proofs of this great natural fact: the insatiable craving of

one man for one woman and one woman for one man and the spirit's unresting search after this ideal, with the feeling of "home" when it is found. For home is not a thing of brick and mortar. It is the reflection of a personality. "Home is not a hearth but a woman."

The awakened woman of to-day realizes that the difficulty with marriage lies in its failure to conform to modern requirements. And this inelasticity is found, not in the institution of marriage itself, but in the hidebound mind of mankind. As long as marriage still reflects masculine proprietorship, a survival of slavery, as long as there is a shadow of dependence—except that of spirit which will be deeply mutual—so long must marriage be a hard and fast compact out of harmony with the demands of expanding character and modern life.

As for the restrictions of marriage, these too belong largely to custom and to the public mental attitude, colored by tradition and theology. When marriage confers spiritual freedom and equality of oppor-

tunity upon both partners, the bond of union will not be clanking chains. In the past, marriage meant segregation, the entrance of a couple into a species of domestic cloister, with no other choice, especially for the woman, but to take the veil. To-day, true marriage should mean a larger life, a mutual stepping out into the world's wonder house for both participants, and a happy service in performing together the world's needed tasks.

Feminism is not a desire to establish free love. However the "emancipated" woman may shrink from the surviving abuses of marriage; however she may desire love's greater freedom—a freedom that is surely dawning through the increasing economic opportunities of women—families established "without benefit of clergy" are not her panacea for future ills. And this, again, partly because of the social necessities of the child which demand social stability, social permanence, and social loyalty. A woman may make herself a pariah for the sake of a great love if she wishes. She

has no right to jeopard the social future of her child.

The greatest disaster the woman's movement could bring, both to itself and to society, would be to advocate a love that sought only its own enhancement. Such a love would be distinctively unsocial. Civilization advances as the good of the whole is considered, not the individual. For this reason the individual often has to suffer. But spiritual suffering is not fatal, nor is it so dangerous as moral chaos. Spiritual suffering is the furnace for forging impersonal power. An individual is of little value to himself or to society until he has died to his own will and arisen universal and triumphant. The law of life, Goethe tells us, is, "Thou shalt renounce, and renounce, and renounce."

Every age has had its free-love advocates, often high-minded souls, ethically rebellious. Mistaking the effect of marriage on certain ill-mated temperaments for the cause of widespread social discontent, they propose a form of promiscuity more disastrous than

anything they condemn. True feminism is not of this character. Nor should it be held responsible for the gnarled theories that are grafted on its spreading boughs.

The thoughtful woman of to-day believes that the path of racial advance lies, not in the destruction of marriage, but in its improvement through the substitution of spiritual for material standards of selection. In this attitude she is upheld, not only by the eugenist, but by the biologic and sociologic science of the day. When Sir Alfred Russel Wallace, codiscoverer with Darwin of the theory of Natural Selection, in his recent book, *Social Environment and Moral Progress*, declares that the socially developed woman, through "a freer power of selection in marriage," must be the "future regenerator of the entire human race," he lays a large duty upon her—a duty the scope of which she must feel and know. Will the modern woman rise to meet this far-reaching obligation? If womanhood is racially conscientious, racially ethical, as it has always been, historically, then womanhood must

appreciate clearly what is meant by scientific selection, weighing well its claims as an adequate process for an improved human family.

What is this tireless process of endless creation which woman is advised to follow consciously and conscientiously? Briefly, the two chief characteristics of all species are power to vary and power to increase. Operating through these attributes, nature seized upon and accentuated those characteristics of greatest advantage in perpetuating a species. In this selective manner, modified by heredity and adaptation to environment, innumerable differentiating species were formed from those already existing. Nature was the anvil and selection the hammer that, descending through long centuries, struck out countless deflecting sparks. The distinguishing traits of animals, as we are aware, were thus formed, nature seizing upon those traits of greatest survival value in perpetuity, and ascending mercilessly upon a staircase of sacrificed millions of the unfit.

And is this the process that has developed the unlimited powers of man? Not entirely. When *genus homo* appeared, a new element entered and evolution took a different course. From that time on the variations became psychical rather than physical, natural selection itself giving way before a process of greater survival value, namely mind selection, and the mastery of man began. The horse offered wings for the desert—and man bred him for speed. He saw in the cow a multiple mother—and specialized her for food. He bade the waterfall grind his corn; and, collecting the powdered dust of heaven, weighed the distant stars. Instead of being subdued and controlled by nature, man balanced the universe on his palm and laughed at space and force and time.

But had human selection stopped on the plane of mind the power of man would have been circumscribed. Another realm remained to be conquered. The spirit of man flamed forth, too great to be limited to the interest of self. To the struggle for existence was added a new and humane element

—the astonishing “struggle for the existence of others.” Savage tribes did not leave their wounded to die. They bore them home on boughs and applied soothing herbs. Man did not let the old, the weak, the unfit perish. He built institutions for them. And human power waxed strong in proportion as it practiced the spiritual qualities of mercy, and altruism, and love.

Nor was this all. By the power of the spirit within him, man discovered not only his relation to the outer universe, but also discovered his relation to the sources of inner strength. He discovered himself. He was not merely a body with strong appetites, and a mind that could conquer matter. He was a creative spirit, at one with infinity. Not only could he develop arts, sciences, religions, but gain that highest of all supremacies—power over the tempest in his own soul. He learned the majesty of self-control, the kingship of self-direction. He was not only a thing created. He himself was a creator. He was not the plaything of evolution. He was its master. This truth became

at once the hope and the glory of evolution: through the potentiality of man's self-directing spirit he is now becoming the arbiter of his own destiny, master of his fate, captain of his soul. Without entering into any metaphysical arguments as to the freedom of the will, evolution sweeps aside all discussions and declares that man, through his unconquerable spirit, stands at the pinnacle of creation, his future bounded only by the circumference of his own will.

Admitting the scientific value of natural selection as a principle of biological improvement, and also the value of spiritual selection as an aid to social progress, how is this higher selection to be applied to marriage? Is a husband to be selected according to rule? Is Eros to be dogmatized out of existence? No. Yet if a woman select the father of her children unmindful of the relentless laws of science, she may commit a crime against society and sow a whirlwind of intense personal suffering as well.

Before applying spiritual selection to marriage as a working principle, let us first

strip the word spiritual of some of the barnacles of the past. Spirituality is not to be associated with psalters and sermons, with incense and Sundays, merely. Spirituality is above all for the laymen, for the week day, for the fireside, and for the daily task. It is as useful to the man with the hoe as the man with the cassock. As a means to an end spiritual force is the most practical force a human being possesses, since it not only generates but regenerates man. Manifestations of spirit may differ. The power is always the same, the fuel is all within. To "find one's self" is to become conscious of this inner power, and to gain a knowledge of how to direct it. When we elect to find ourselves—and it is all a matter of election—we elect to become spiritual, to become creative, and to cooperate with evolution's highest ends.

Much harm has resulted from the doctrine that the spiritual is not the natural. Modern psychology teaches above all else the unity of being. It teaches, also, that it is more natural for man to aspire than

to descend, since the trend of nature is upward. All the prisons and pillories of the past, great accentuators of evil, have not sufficed to hold man down. The spirit of man gravitates toward the good, the true, the beautiful as the sparks fly upward. Not in antagonism, but in harmonious unison, do all the forces of being find full play. Natural and spiritual selection are not, therefore, to be regarded as enemies at warfare but are one and indissoluble, twin branches of the same root, demanding equal recognition.

Spiritual selection supplementing natural selection in marriage signifies, then, that marriage is a psychical as well as a physical contract. It implies complete and unified character selection. Character denotes those dominating qualities that the individual has grouped to constitute personality. Character becomes, thus, spiritual capital, an investment in qualities we choose to possess.

It is true that some form of selection in marriage has always held sway. But let no one assume that natural selection alone was

1 allowed to prevail. Otherwise should we have made greater progress. Rather have we had unnatural selection, according to artificial standards, with years of disadvantageous results. In earliest times we had savage selection, women being appropriated, when it was necessary, through the persuasion of a club. Later we had what might be called slave selection, marriage by purchase, a man's wives being chronicled with his chattels, his "men servants and his maid servants, his wives, his oxen, and his asses." This was followed by a form of parental selection, leaving the contracting parties little choice—a method still maintaining in certain parts of the world as illustrated by the arranged marriages of royalty—"marriages of convenience"—so notoriously marriages of inconvenience in the end. Lastly, we have had economic selection, a method inevitable where marriage meant feminine dependence for sustenance, the woman's sex value being exchanged for support. This has led to one of the world's most widespread social evils—selection for material or financial advantage

2

3

4

—an evil that may not be overcome in a day since it involves changes in the world's economic and industrial structure, changes that evolution is slowly but surely bringing about. So long as any girl is dependent upon even the kindest of fathers, she is not free to exercise character selection in marriage but must still be influenced, though it may be subconsciously, by the traditions of the past. Only when every girl assumes the human privilege of engaging in congenial, productive work may she be released from the necessity of looking to some man—within or without the law—for her support.

If, then, for racial improvement we desire neither parental, nor economic, nor any form of material selection, but choose for our standard character, or inner selection—what have we to guide us? Is spiritual love gossamer and illusive, or does it possess some tangible measure of attraction that flesh and blood men and women may grasp?

The stronger the spiritual nature the stronger the control over the physical. Spiritual love is normal in that it only recog-

nizes nature's complete unity. Spiritual selection is practical since it warns love not to be content with a fraction of its rights, a sensuous portion of its necessities. It recognizes psychical needs, and rejects as transitory and unadvantageous any attraction that fails to satisfy spiritual as well as material well-being.

To speak of this type of love is indeed to enter humanity's Holy of Holies. Yet this unifying form is the sole love that has regenerating value, and that at this period of mental evolution has progressive, racial worth.

The test of consummate love is unailing. Does it *inspire*? True love is a call to greatness—to the mountain top of existence, there to live with the flaming use of all one's powers. We are larger or smaller human beings according to the height and the depth of our love.

How may spiritual affinity be recognized? Some standard of inner attraction each heart must find. It matters little so long as the ultimate selection be of the spirit. In a

life union, will the soul find companionship? Otherwise the body will be a house without a tenant. The soul will have traveled on.

What is the unfailing magnet that determines this highest order of attraction? Swedenborg expressed it when he declared "Do you love me?" means "Do you see the same truth?" Two people may have many points of congeniality. They may even have bodily possession. But unless there is agreement in the realm of truth they are strangers. Their spirits do not belong to each other.

Is it possible for two personalities, through the lenses of varying temperaments and different sexes, to see truth alike? Does "belonging" imply complete unanimity at every point, the orbit of one mind fitting closely on the other? If this were essential, spiritual love would, indeed, be unnatural. Nature seeks variety and combinations of varying types. Complete uniformity is not found in any of her species. But do you possess a similar vision? Does life imply to both the same high opportunity, and is mar-

riage one of the means to this end? That is the essential. Minor differences may exist and lend zest to interest. Agreement must exist in the fundamental facts, in belief in life's high purpose, direction, and goal.

X For two people to see the same truth, to pool their vision and jointly work for it, is to enrose life with a new color and enthusiasm. Such was the secret of the complete union of Robert and Elizabeth Browning, so strongly robust yet so exquisitely spiritual, and of certain social workers of to-day. Such unions illustrate the inevitable accord of souls bound together by a mutual vision for humanity, spending themselves for it.

Must a youth, then, ask a maiden, "Do you see the same truth as I see?" The question would be as superfluous as it would be ridiculous. If normal opportunity to meet her is furnished, her conduct, her conversation, her interests will declare her relationship to truth. What you are, Emerson tells us, shouts from you louder than what you say. To recognize truth, embodied in

personality, however, one must first possess it. In spiritual affinities, as in chemical attractions, the law is of like to like.

Will spiritual selection sift the strong from the weak mercilessly as did natural selection in the past? Happily it may. If selective love refused to accept any individual lacking the spiritual requisite of character control, all forms of iniquity would eventually die. "The survival of the fittest is the extinction of the unfit."

Spiritual selection alone must regenerate since it is the only power that will overcome the materialism that still beclouds marriage. What a man is must be recognized as of greater racial consequence than what a man has. When what a man intrinsically is becomes the first consideration—that is, what he has made of himself by the self-directing power of his own will, health, character, and ability becoming the criteria—the little pile of gold dust that a man has collected, usually from the lifelong toil of some other man, will become an all too petty standard of selection. A fortune in itself

is not an evil. It is the cost of acquisition that condemns it—the development of commercialism often at the high price of atrophy of inner qualities that racially count. In the future deeds of character, not deeds of land, must determine fitness. A new aristocracy will then be formed with a new pride of pedigree, a new hope of descent.

When the transforming ideals of the woman's movement are more widely recognized; when marriage is regarded as a union of individualities as well as of individuals; when men and women select for lasting rather than for ephemeral possessions, humanity will leap forward impelled by the vigor of its own momentum. Then the fruits of the spirit—goodness, gentleness, faith, self-mastery and self-direction, the inspiring Pauline Virtues—will be accentuated as of greatest survival value. They, only, are the spiritual bed rock on which to ground a regenerated race.



1206
T85

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

2316737

ILL:8886544

5-1

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 868 263 5

