

The Church and eugenics / by Thomas J. Gerard.

Contributors

Gerrard, Thomas J. 1871-1916.

Publication/Creation

London : P.S. King, 1912.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/awxcu5xy>



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

41. 12/1.
CATHOLIC STUDIES IN SOCIAL REFORM

A SERIES OF MANUALS

EDITED BY

THE CATHOLIC SOCIAL GUILD

THE CHURCH AND
EUGENICS

By

THE REV. THOMAS J. GERRARD

AUTHOR OF

"MARRIAGE AND PARENTHOOD," "CORDS OF ADAM,"

"THE WAYFARER'S VISION," ETC.

LONDON

P. S. KING & SON,

ORCHARD HOUSE, WESTMINSTER

1912

CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	7
I. RISE AND SPREAD OF THE MOVEMENT	9
II. THEORIES, NON-CATHOLIC AND CATHOLIC	15
III. RACIAL DISEASES AND EUGENIST REMEDIES	25
IV. CHRISTIAN REMEDIES	37
V. THE EUGENIC VALUE OF MARRIAGE	43
VI. THE EUGENIC VALUE OF CELIBACY	51
VII. THE SPIRITUAL FACTOR IN EUGENICS	54
BIBLIOGRAPHY	61

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
Wellcome Library

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

WHEN the Wise Man wrote, "In the multitude of counsellors there is safety,"¹ he presumably had in view a society wherein the fundamental principles of belief and conduct were not in dispute. Nowadays his assertion cannot be accepted without much qualification. In matters of purely temporal concern, it is doubtless prudent to hear every side before coming to a decision; but in matters affected by the unchanging moral law, the same prudence suggests recourse to whatever authority exists to preserve and interpret that law. Catholics believe that they have such an authority in the Church of Rome, and to the teaching of that Church they naturally turn when faced with any project of political or social reform which has a moral bearing. In the multitude of counsellors that beset them, safety, they feel, lies in following that one in whom the Spirit of Truth and Wisdom permanently abides.

The series of Manuals on Social Questions, of which the present volume is the fourth to appear, has been planned by the Catholic Social Guild with the express object of examining current problems of citizenship in the light of Christian principles, thus furnishing, for the benefit of those who are bewildered by the number and variety of the social panaceas proposed, some means of

¹ Prov. xi. 14.

distinguishing what is ethically sound from what is based upon false or distorted ideals. As has often been pointed out, it is no part of the Church's direct mission to originate or promote works of merely worldly utility. Her business is to teach the individual to observe the laws of justice towards God and man, and so secure his soul's salvation. She rejoices, of course, in the fact that their observance is also highly conducive to the well-being of the community, but that is not her first or chief care.

Hence it is that the Church claims, in the interest of her children, the right of criticising such measures of social betterment as are not entirely material in their scope and effect. Those who believe in her claims have no difficulty in accepting her decisions, for they know that the divine assistance, which guarantees the correctness of her final judgments on moral questions, operates also to prevent her judging on insufficient or unsafe grounds. Where principles of morality are not involved, or where their precise application is really doubtful, she is careful not to interfere with the liberty of her members.

In this series, then, it is proposed, after a sketch of the history of each question, to show in what points and in what degree Catholic doctrine is involved, what projects are, at least negatively, sound, what motives exist for energetic action, and what Catholic agencies are already at work. It will thus be abundantly clear that the Church, which played so prominent a part in social reform in the past, has a distinct and very salutary message for the present generation—a message which it is the duty of her faithful members to promulgate with all the zeal and energy in their power.

THE CHURCH AND EUGENICS

CHAPTER I

RISE AND SPREAD OF THE MOVEMENT

IN the modern eugenic movement there is much which is opposed to Catholic principles. But at the same time there is much in it which is in harmony with Catholic principles, and indeed highly conducive to the end for which the Church exists. It were therefore most unwise either to approve or condemn the movement without many distinctions and reservations.

The purpose of this Manual is to indicate briefly the chief elements of the movement and to offer such criticism as may help to form the judgment of the Catholic social student.

Although race culture has more or less been a factor of life ever since the world started, yet not until late in the nineteenth century did it begin to shape into a formal science. Sir Francis Galton is the man who is looked upon as the "Founder of Eugenics." He was born of a Birmingham family in 1822. By a relationship on his mother's side he was half first cousin to Charles Darwin. He studied for the medical profession, but independent means enabled him to devote himself to travel and to research rather than to professional

Galton's
Work.

practice. The appearance of Darwin's "Origin of Species" in 1859 led him to consider the application of its theories to the improvement of the human race. In 1865 he had written the following paragraph in an article in *Macmillan's Magazine*:—

"The power of man over animal life in producing whatever variations of form we please is enormously great. It would seem as though the physical structure of future generations was almost as plastic as clay under the control of the breeder's will. It is my desire to show more pointedly than, so far as I am aware, has been attempted before, that mental qualities are equally under control."

This was the germ of his theory. He developed it in the following works:—"Hereditary Genius" (1869), "English Men of Science" (1874), "Inquiries into Human Faculty" (1883), "Life History Album" (1884), "Record of Family Faculties" (1884), "Natural Inheritance" (1889). It was in the "Inquiries into Human Faculty" that he first used the word "eugenics," a word which he himself had coined.

In order to encourage the study of the science, Galton founded in 1904 a Research Fellowship and a Research Scholarship in conjunction with the University of London. He also, in consultation with the authorities of the same University, established a "Eugenics Laboratory." This is at present presided over by Professor Karl Pearson, who continues a special line of study started by Galton, the science of Biometry.

Through the influence of this work, together with that of the Moral Education League, there has arisen a "Eugenics Education Society," which has its own organ, the *Eugenics Review*. Speaking generally, the Laboratory collects facts and co-ordinates them, whilst the Society and the *Review* manufacture theories and carry on a propaganda.

Galton died on the 17th of January, 1911. His doctrines have spread with considerable rapidity, although his followers very much lament the slowness of the general public to embrace the new proposals. The truth is that many of the new proposals are opposed to the fundamental instincts

and laws of human nature. The British and American peoples are very jealous of their liberty and very suspicious of any movement which seeks to curtail that liberty. The slowness to welcome the eugenic movement *may* be due partly to ignorant prejudice. But it is also partly due to the instinct of self-preservation, and partly to a keen recognition of certain eugenist fallacies.

The writings, for instance, of Mr M. Crackenthorpe, K.C., Dr A. F. Tredgold, and Dr Rentoul, are quite sufficient to give pause to any reasonable person. They are far too ready to impose what they call Restrictive Eugenics on certain classes of persons whom they deem to be "unfit" members of society. Professor Karl Pearson, however, is more alive to the danger of propounding theories and passing legislation before sufficient evidence has been accumulated.

Other
Prominent
Eugenists.

Amongst those who are doing most to popularise the eugenics movement is Dr C. W. Saleeby. He has been shrewd enough to observe the inhuman tendencies of some of the more radical eugenists and his work marks a distinct change for the better. It takes into account the personal dignity and the spiritual nature of man. It is, however, overweighted with an exaggerated and discredited theory of evolution.

Dr Inge, the Anglican Dean of St Paul's, professes to bring the influence of Christianity to bear on the subject. He advocates voluntary small families.¹ And this neo-Malthusian proposal will be sufficient to indicate what right *he* has to speak for Christianity.

The latest indications of the vitality of the eugenic movement seem to show that it is going to be very active in the immediate future. The First International Congress is to be held in London at the end of July. The following programme shows the scope of its operations:—

1. *The Bearing upon Eugenics of Biological Research.—**Papers:* Dr Raymond Pearl (Director of the Maine Agricultural Station), "The Inheritance of Fecundity"; Professor

¹ *Eugenics Review*, April, 1909, page 30.

R. Punnett (Professor of Biology, Cambridge), "Eugenics and Genetics"; Dr David F. Weeks (Superintendent of the New Jersey State Village for Epileptics), "The Inheritance of Epilepsy"; Professor Giuseppe Sergi (Professor of Anthropology, the University of Rome), "Heredity and Mutability in Human Races"; Professor E. Morselli (Professor of Psychiatry, University of Genoa), "Persistence and Variation of Racial Characters, particularly with regard to Ethnical Psychology"; Professor V. Gruffridi-Ruggeri (Professor of Anthropology, University of Naples), "The so-called Laws of Heredity in Man." *Discussion*: Professor W. Bateson, Professor J. Arthur Thomson, Dr Archdall Reid.

2. *The Bearing upon Eugenics of Sociological and Historical Research.—Papers*: Dr Corrado Gini (Professor of Statistics, University of Cagliari), "The Problem of Eugenics from the Democratic Point of View"; Dr F. A. Woods (Harvard Medical School), "Some Inter-relations between Eugenics and Historical Research"; Mrs C. D. Whetham and W. C. D. Whetham, F.R.S., "Race as a Factor in History"; Dr Ignacio Valenti y Vivo (Professor of Medicine and Toxicology, University of Barcelona), "A Healthy Sane Family showing Longevity in Catalonia."

3. *The Bearing upon Eugenics of Legislation and Social Customs.—Papers*: Dr C. B. Davenport (Superintendent American Eugenics Record Office), "Marriage Laws and Customs"; Professor J. L. Kellogg (Professor of Entomology, Stanford University), "Eugenics and Militarism"; Professor D. Starr Jordan (Professor, Leland Stanford University; President American Eugenics Section), "War and National Welfare"; Professor Alfredo Niceforo (Professor of Statistics, University of Naples), "The cause of the Inferiority of Physical and Mental Characters in the lower social classes"; Professor A. Loria (Professor of Political Economy, University of Turin), "The Physio-Psychological Aristocracy and the Social Aristocracy"; Monsieur Lucien March (Superintendent of the Bureau of the Statistique Générale de la France), "The Fertility of Marriages, according to profession and social class"; Fräulein Dr Agnes Bluhm (Berlin), "Race Hygiene and Midwifery." *Discussion*: Sir John Macdonnell, C.B., LL.D.

4. *Consideration of the Practical Applications of Eugenic Principles.—Papers*: Sir William Osler, M.D., F.R.S. (Regius Professor of Medicine, Oxford), "Eugenics and the Medical Profession"; Mr Blecher van Wagenen (Chairman of the Sterilisation Committee American Breeders Association), "Report of Recent Investigations as to the effects and

practicability of Sterilisation"; Dr H. E. Jordan (Professor of Anatomy, University of Virginia), "The Place of Eugenics in the Medical Curriculum"; Dr F. C. S. Schiller, "Practical Applications of Eugenics to Education"; Dr A. Ploetz (President of the International Society for Race Hygiene, Germany), "The Bearing of Neo-Malthusianism on Eugenics"; Dr Pinard. Dr Louis Quinton (Belgium), "The Practical Organisation of Eugenic Action"; Dr J. Mjörn (Norway), "Recent Eugenic Legislation in Norway." *Discussion:* Professor Sadler; Dr Murray Leslie, Dr Saleeby.

Next, a sum of £20,000 has been given anonymously for the endowment of a chair of "genetics" at the University of Cambridge.

Lastly, there are at present two Bills before the British Parliament, one introduced by a private member, the other by the Government, for the control of the Feeble-minded. The private Bill has little chance of passing through, but the Government Bill will probably pass, though it is to be hoped with serious and much-needed modifications. It contains some excellent provisions for dealing with this urgent problem, but also some that are undesirable, and it lacks sufficient safeguards for individual liberty.

In America the movement is promoted by the Eugenics Section of the American Breeders Association, and an institution corresponding somewhat with the Galton Laboratory exists under the name of the "Eugenics Record Office." The States of Indiana and Connecticut have each enacted a law for sterilising the insane by surgical operation. These enactments, however, although they have been associated with the eugenic movement, belong rather to a school of penal jurisprudence. The jurists maintain that there are certain classes of criminals who can neither be cured nor deterred by any form of punishment. The criminals in question are differently constituted from the rest of mankind, and the only way in which they can be prevented from doing injury to the race is by segregation and sterilisation.

The student to whom this school of jurisprudence is most indebted is the Italian army doctor, Cesare Lombroso. By

a long series of investigations amongst the Italian criminal classes he professed to have found abnormal structure in brain, face, and skeleton which showed that many of the criminals were allied with degenerate stocks which had disappeared from civilised society. Others he pointed out who had a family history indicating epilepsy, hysteria, insanity and alcoholism. Crime, therefore, in these cases became a question of nerve structure rather than of bad will.

In Switzerland surgery has been practised on patients discharged from the lunatic asylums, but only with the consent of themselves and their friends.

These are some indications of the logical issues of eugenist principles when pursued without reference to considerations suggested by Christian belief. Their bearing on morality will be estimated later.

CHAPTER II

THEORIES, NON-CATHOLIC AND CATHOLIC

"EUGENICS" means good breeding. As a science it is defined by the Eugenics Education Society to be "the study of agencies under social control that may improve or impair the racial qualities of future generations either physically or mentally." The analogy of the racehorse is freely used to illustrate the end proposed and the means of attaining it. Just as the animal can be improved by attention to heredity and environment so also can man be improved.

Clearly such a proposal overshadows every phase of human activity. Sir Francis Galton indeed can scarcely have realised the magnitude of his task. Nevertheless some activities of life do bear more particularly and more directly than others on the improvement or deterioration of the human race. Thus biology is given the place of first importance, for that is the science which deals with heredity and selection. Anthropology is brought into requisition as throwing light on questions of race and the institution of marriage. Politics in its broader sense is studied as a way of learning the relationship between parenthood and civic worth. Ethics is given a place as being useful for improving social quality. Then, lastly, religion is brought in and assigned the function of strengthening and sanctifying the sense of eugenic duty.

With the aid of the foregoing factors it is proposed to decide what are the evils which hinder race betterment and what are the perfections which promote it. Thus eugenics fall into two divisions, negative and positive.

Negative eugenics are taken first because they are more tangible. The ideal which the eugenicist aims at is somewhat ill-defined. But he has no difficulty in seeing that there are certain classes of the community which somehow are undesirable. Whatever be the final end of man it is clearly his duty to eliminate from his race, if possible, such evils as alcoholism, feeble-mindedness, hereditary disease, and what is practically the same thing, hereditary predisposition to disease, as in the case of tuberculosis.

The Mendelian laws are found to play an important rôle in the strengthening of good qualities and in the

The elimination of weak qualities. The Mendelian Theories of laws are so called from the Abbot Mendel, Abbot an Augustinian priest of Silesia, in Austria.

Mendel. Although he himself was probably unaware of the science of eugenics as it is now known, yet his work must be counted as one of the most important factors of the movement. He was born, like Galton, in 1822 and died in 1884. Being the son of a farmer, he had from childhood possessed the taste and opportunity for the botanical studies which afterwards made him famous.

By experimenting in the cross fertilisation of plants, Mendel discovered two great laws of heredity. His chief experiments were with peas. Taking two races, the tall and the dwarf, he found that the first generation of hybrids were all tall. But when these hybrids in their turn were sown, the resulting plants were mixed, some being tall and some dwarfs; and they were mixed in definite proportions, three tall specimens for every one dwarf. To the quality which appears in the children of the first parents is given the name of "dominant," whilst to the quality which disappears in the children but which reappears in the grandchildren is given the name of "recessive." The first law then is this: when two races, possessing two antagonistic peculiarities, are crossed, the hybrid exhibits only one, and as regards this character the hybrid is indistinguishable from its parent. There are no intermediate conditions. The second law is that in the formation of the pollen or egg-cell the two antagonistic peculiarities are

segregated, so that each ripe germ-cell carries either one or other of these peculiarities, but not both.

Professor Bateson of Cambridge is the man who in England is doing most to continue research on the lines laid down by Mendel. It is sought to apply Mendelianism to the improvement of the human race. The dominant and recessive qualities in man are, in their respective proportions, reproduced. A weakness, for instance, may not be fully inherited, but at least the tendency to it is inherited, and the evil may develop in a favourable environment.

Negative eugenics, therefore, falls into two sub-divisions. When a person is afflicted with one of the recognised racial evils he must be discouraged from propagating his kind; or when a child is born with a tendency to a racial evil it must be kept away from the environment favourable to the development of the evil.

Rejection however involves selection. If negative eugenics seeks to prevent the wrong people from being born, positive eugenics seeks to ensure the right people being born. Then the question presents itself: right people for what? And the most definite answer yet given by the eugenicist is "civic worth." For any part of civic usefulness there is wanted good health, a certain amount of energy, a well-balanced brain and good moral training. But even with this minimum of definition the eugenicist acknowledges that positive eugenics is less practicable than negative eugenics. This did not however deter Galton from making definite proposals. Whilst an undergraduate at Cambridge he had noticed that distinguished scholars and mathematicians belonged, as a rule, to families having other members similarly distinguished. Later he emphasised the point by an inquiry into the family histories of Fellows of the Royal Society. Then he studied representative classes such as philosophers, artists, financiers and soldiers. Within each group he would compare the qualities which made the group flourish with the qualities which made it decay. His conclusion was that the chief among the causes of civic prosperity was a large capacity for labour—mental,

bodily, or both—combined with eagerness for it. To encourage this and other qualities which he named, he proposed that a suitable authority should issue eugenic certificates. These should imply more than an average share of goodness of constitution, of physique, and of mental capacity.

The great objection to these proposals was that the race would become unbalanced, the excessively good and strong at the top, and the great majority, excessively bad or weak, at the bottom. To this Galton replied with what he called "the law of regression towards mediocrity." The members of the lower stratum of society would, he said, frequently produce offspring superior to themselves. Some of their offspring might be as bad as themselves or perhaps even worse. But on the whole it would be better. And the same thing would happen in the next generation, and again in the next until the standard of mediocrity had been reached. Assuming this law to be true there was some plausibility in his demand for a change in the relative fertility of the two stocks. Both would raise the average.

From the foregoing observations it is evident that the predominant aim of Galton was the production of animal or physical fitness. He did not of course exclude mental and moral fitness, but these—especially the moral—would seem of less immediate urgency than the physical.

Dr Saleeby makes a great advance on Galton. He strikes a new note in eugenics with his doctrine of **Dr Saleeby** maternalism.¹ It is not one that a Catholic **and** can accept in its entirety, but on the whole it **Maternal-** is a marked departure from the early eugenicist **ism.** towards the Catholic ideal. He insists on the dignity of motherhood. As a leading motive he takes Ruskin's maxim: "There is no wealth but life." Hence, since life begins at home, the true "politics" is "domestics." He carries on an incessant war against all those writers and economists who are in favour of permitting infant mortality. Once the life is in being it ought

¹ "Parenthood and Race Culture," by C. W. Saleeby, Chap. ix.

to continue in being. To deny this is to be immoral and to work against the eugenic end. He would prevent the unfit from coming into existence, but once they are in existence we must make the best of them.

In order to produce the wealth of life it is needful to study what he calls survival-values, those qualities which enable the individual to struggle and to live against adverse circumstances. And he concludes, and rightly concludes, that it is the psychical element in man rather than the physical which has the best survival value. This psychical element moreover is not merely intelligence but also love.

"Without love no baby could live for twenty-four hours. Every human being that exists or has existed or ever will exist is a product of mother-love or foster-mother love. No morals, no man."

Thus does he probe his way through an abundant mass of overgrowth which has covered the real root of the problem.

"With all deference to Mr Galton" (he writes) "I am inclined to think that a cardinal requisite for a mother is love of children. . . . The woman who does not think the possession of a baby a sufficient prize is no fit object, I should say, for any other kind of bribe or lure."

The same principle, too, throws a brilliant light on our politics.

"There is no wealth but life: and if the quality of the life fails, neither battleships nor libraries nor symphonies nor anything else will save a nation. Empires and civilisations have fallen despite the strength and magnitude of the superstructure, because the foundations decayed: the bigger and heavier the superstructure the less could it survive their failure."

It also serves to show up the destructive teaching of Mr G. B. Shaw. This writer, counting his readers by hundreds of thousands, can say:

"What we need is freedom for people who have never seen each other before and never intend to see one another again, to produce children under certain definite public conditions, without loss of honour."

This is a complete return to the life of the beast, and the

plea is characteristic. Mr Shaw is brutal and fearless in all his rebellions. It is well, however, for us to know exactly what the goal is to which one tends when one turns away from the spiritual ideal. It is sheer animalism. We welcome, then, the advance of Saleeby in respect to Galton even as we do that of Galton in respect to Shaw. Scientific race culture demands, at least, that instinct shall be ministrant to intelligence, and intelligence ministrant to love.

It was inevitable in such a movement that Nietzsche's catchword "superman" should figure largely. I say catchword deliberately, for there is no definite idea behind it. In Nietzsche's perturbed mind it meant only something which was other than man, a lawless being considered to be above man simply because it should be lawless. Mr Shaw's "Superman" is not that of Nietzsche. It is too definite.

However, as I say, the eugenist has yielded to the temptation.

"We might call the race of supermen" (writes Mr M. A. Mügge) "the Hyperteroi"—γενεῇ ὑπέρτεροι—higher by birth, nobler; for only through a selective birth-rate does the perfecting of the race become possible."¹

Nietzsche is claimed to have founded a eugenic religion, a valuable ally of the eugenic science. The superman, it is said, cannot be produced merely by anthropometric measurements, statistical observations, human experiments in test of Mendel's laws, and biological legislation. These things are not sufficient to direct man's will and action. There is need of a sentimental artistic factor, and this is provided by the unknown quantity represented by the word "Superman"—that is the centre and aim of eugenic religion.

The goal proposed by Nietzsche might well be allowed to take care of itself. Every sane-minded person perceives that "superman" means either super-beast or imbecile. Super-beast indeed, not in the sense of being something higher than beast, but rather in being supereminently

¹ *Eugenics Review*, October, 1909, page 184.

beastly. The danger is in the means which are proposed in order to arrive at the "superman." This is simply the ignoring of all law and convention. When the lower nature of man chafes against law, the proposal which bids him be above all law is both attractive and flattering. He who is slave to his passions is likely to become more and more enslaved, as soon as he has admitted to himself that indulgence is the same thing as freedom.

The introduction of the Nietzschean idea proves the want of a religious factor for the promotion of race culture. But "a sentimental artistic factor," which is all that is claimed for the Nietzschean idea, will not supply the want.

Nor has the Anglican Church anything very definite to offer instead. The Very Rev. W. R. Inge, D.D.,¹ and the Rev. J. H. F. Peile² have ventured to speak on its behalf. Mr Peile apologises for the Anglican clergy not taking an active part in the eugenic movement on the grounds that they have not sufficient knowledge of the details of the science, and that in so far as they have any definite views upon the matter the opposition of public opinion deters them from giving expression to such views.

Dean Inge is more courageous and also a little more definite. He faces the fact that physical, intellectual, and moral excellence have each an independent and positive value, and admits that these values are not equal; intellectual excellence having a higher worth than physical, and moral than intellectual. He even goes so far as to hint that there is a *religious* element in man over and above the moral. But then he would not allow even the moral factor to have complete sway over the intellectual and physical.

"We can only defer to the moralist so far as to place virtue above brains and brawn; we cannot allow him to have everything his own way. We certainly do not want a society so plethoric in altruistic virtue, and so lean in other goods, that every citizen wishes for nothing better than to be a sick-nurse to somebody else."

¹ *Eugenics Review*, April, 1909.

² *Eugenics Review*, October, 1909.

The aim of Christian ethics is declared to be the production of—

“ ‘the perfect man’; a man full-grown, complete and entire; spirit, soul, and body altogether without blame. These are eternal values. They involve a drastic revaluation of all the good things of life. They lead us to the conclusion that any sacrifices which a good man would make for the good of his kind ought, when the time comes, to be exacted from those who are not good.”

If the foregoing statement means anything at all it means that religion (or religious ethics) is to be the handmaid of eugenics. The religious ideal is to be subordinated to the eugenic ideal. Nothing else can be implied by the Dean's statement concerning celibacy and virginity. He expresses his astonishment that—

“ We do not think it wicked to encourage a beautiful and glorious specimen of womanhood to become a nun or sister of mercy, with vows of perpetual virginity. Here, surely, is a case in which the Eugenics Education Society ought to have something to say. A man or woman belonging to a good stock ought to be told by public opinion that it is a duty to society for him or her to marry and have children.”¹

The truth is that eugenists, from Sir Francis Galton to Dean Inge, have been carried away by the initial racehorse analogy and borne on to the wrong track. The illustration of breeding for points is not one that is applicable to a being with a spiritual nature. Hence we find instead of a sleek steed nothing but a hobby limping all along the line. First a fine physique and constitution is asked for. Then it appears that a worthy citizen must be intelligent. But for an intelligent and muscular citizen a mother's love is wanted. Yet none of these is possible without an emotional and artistic stimulant. Nay, they must be sanctioned by religious ethics. Whatever factor is introduced it must be directed towards the improvement of the breed, and breed signifies in the mind of the average eugenist either the animal horse or the animal man.

¹ *Eugenics Review*, April, 1909.

Let us try another ideal and see how it fits the case of man's nature. The physical element in man must always be subordinate to the psychic and the psychic to the spiritual.

**The
Catholic
Ideal.**

By the word "physical" I mean the same as "animal." It denotes those functions of man which are merely vegetative and sensitive in their operation, such as the circulation of the blood, digestion of food, sight, hearing, touch, imagination, and emotion. By the "psychic" I mean the operations of intelligence and will in the strictly natural sphere. The "psychic" man is the man, together with all his natural functions and powers, considered apart from their relation to grace and revelation. The "spiritual" man is the same man duly informed with the truths of faith and ennobled by grace.

But revelation and grace are from their very nature helps towards a higher and other life than this. Revelation indeed makes clearly known the nature of that other life, assures man that he is destined to it, and that he is provided with all necessary help to enable him to attain it. Any proposal therefore for the improvement of the human species which does not take these facts into account must be regarded as so far unscientific. So we are compelled to reverse the eugenic ideal. The final end of man is not civic worth. That is but a means to the end. The end is another world, and this world is but a preparation for it.

From the gospel times until now there has been a tendency to use the claims of the Other-world to the detriment of the claims of the This-world. But sound Catholic philosophy has ever insisted on the right use of this world as a means of attaining the next. Fine physique, good digestion, clear eye, keen intellect and indomitable will are gifts of God and are given precisely to enable man, under the influence of grace, to develop his spiritual nature. Only in so far as these things hinder that development must they be restrained. But, normally speaking, their full perfection pertains and tends to the full perfection of the spirit. That was the condition in which they were made at the beginning, and that at least will be the condition to which

they will be brought when at the end they shall be glorified. Because, then, all man's functions, powers and environment are ordained to so sublime an end, therefore they all acquire a dignity and an importance far higher than if man aimed merely at civic worth, and much more so than if he subordinated religion and morals to civic worth. We have to seek first the kingdom of the spirit and then all the riches of the psychic and physical kingdoms are added unto us to aid us in our quest.

CHAPTER III

RACIAL DISEASES AND EUGENIST REMEDIES

IN the light of the respective ideals just sketched we may venture to examine some of the practical measures of eugenic reform. Negative eugenics is concerned with the elimination of racial poisons.

These racial poisons are evils which we all deplore. A racial poison is defined as one that injures not only the individual who takes it, but also the race of which he is in some sense a trustee. It is not an inherent defect of nature, as feeble-mindedness is said to be, nor yet an acquired mental proclivity such as criminality. It is a substance which is introduced into the blood, and with the blood is transmitted from parent to offspring. There are three chief racial poisons, namely alcohol, lead, and the germ of venereal disease. All three tend to destroy the reproductive powers. All are causes of a terrible amount of infant mortality. And wherever infant mortality is increased by these causes there is always a large proportion of children who survive as defectives.

Racial Poisons.

Many remedies have been suggested. The first is systematic instruction as to the nature of the poisons. Every facility is to be given for treatment when the poison has been introduced into the system. Laws must be enacted for those who are affected. The whole of our licensing legislation, our factory laws, the laws dealing with overcrowding and the provision of workmen's dwellings, all bear on the subject. So far, the work of healing is easy, the duty obvious, and there can be no clash of ideals. But so far the work of healing is hardly anything more than an alleviation of symptoms, a radical cure is unattempted.

And the eugenicist, above all things, professes to deal with the very fountains of good and evil. Eventually the question of racial poisons harks back to the one of selection in marriage. How can public opinion, private judgment, and legislation be brought into operation so as to prevent those people from marrying who are likely to transmit the poisons? The remedies of segregation and sterilisation have been proposed. As to how far these are right and good we shall speak later. Whilst allowing full value to the remedies of segregation for inebriates and diseased subjects, whilst giving all encouragement to legislation for the protection of the workman, the Church sees in these things but temporary palliatives. With true eugenic instinct she goes to the source of the poisons. The only real preventative of alcohol poisoning is the cardinal virtue of temperance. The only real preventative of venereal disease is the angelic virtue of purity. The only real preventative of lead-poisoning is the rightly informed and rightly trained conscience of the employer. Not for one moment would we relax or undervalue legislative forces in these matters. But mere police regulations are only fit for degenerates. The perfect man, perfect both in his God-given nature and God-given supernature, needs the higher intellectual light of revelation, and the higher volitional energy of grace.

No method of race cultivation is worthy of attention which does not take account of that great hindrance to racial development, the "White Scourge." **Consumption.** Consumption is not considered a racial poison in the same sense as alcohol and white lead. Although it is doubtful whether the disease itself is hereditary, there is no doubt that the predispositions to the disease are hereditary. But, after all, these are details of the question which do not concern us here. There are two broad facts which need immediate emphasis. The first is that the most excellent means of combating the disease is the propagation of the doctrine of fresh air. The second is that in our churches we have a magnificent opportunity of spreading this gospel.

It is worthy of remark that the provision of open-air sanatoria within reach of the working classes is a conspicuous feature of the Government's social legislation. It may be found necessary by future Governments to insist on the campaign against consumption being furthered by due attention to ventilation in all places of public resort, and it is obviously fitting that the Catholic Church, which alone of all forms of Christianity insists on her members assembling for public worship under pain of sin, should be conspicuous in her regard for their bodily health as well. We cannot yet claim that she is so, but the blame for unhygienic results must be divided between the authorities, the architects, and the public themselves. Now that the Catholic Social Guild has included in its programme, under School Hygiene, the fight against consumption, we may insist on what is at once the most effective, the most obvious, and the most easy part of the propaganda. It is that our churches should be examples to the world of the value of open windows. But much of the following will refer to schoolrooms, theatres, ballrooms, and so forth.

Speaking roughly, air which has been once breathed has gained five per cent of carbonic acid gas, and has lost five per cent of oxygen. It contains in addition a considerable quantity of animal matter of a highly decomposed character. Thus if a man be shut up in a closed room having the form of a cube, say seven feet high, every particle of air in that room will have passed through his lungs in twenty-four hours. A fourth of the oxygen in it will be replaced by carbonic acid. Carbon acid, as the name implies, contains carbon. Carbon is the same thing as coal, or soot. If the quantity of carbon eliminated in twenty-four hours from one man's lungs were gathered together, it would amount to a piece of solid charcoal weighing eight ounces. Similarly the water which is given off by the lungs in the same time would be a little less than half a pint.

The reason why people do not fight violently against impure air in churches and elsewhere is because they cannot see it. What would happen if five hundred people washed their hands in water and then offered it to their

brethren to drink? Yet that would be no worse than offering people air to breathe which is mixed with air already breathed.¹

Again, in all our congregations there are probably several consumptives in the earlier stage who do not know they are ill. To keep the windows closed against the fresh air which they need is to develop their illness and perhaps cause their death. Consumptives whose disease has been recognised do not suffer from such selfishness because, if they are under competent medical direction, they are forbidden to attend church. The ordinary un-ventilated church is a menace to life; nor would any confessor oblige a penitent to hear Mass at such a risk.

Other racial evils, as distinct from poisons, are inherent and hereditary defects. Chief among them are deaf-mutism, feeble-mindedness, epilepsy, insanity, colour-blindness, hæmophilia, and tuberculosis.

Hereditary Defects. Some eugenists include criminality and vagrancy. The problem of feeble-mindedness is regarded as the most urgent in the field of eugenics, and calls for a fuller statement here.

In England a Royal Commission has sat for four years and has published the results of its inquiry in eight large blue books. Its conclusions have moreover been adopted in both the **Feeble-mindedness: the facts.** Majority and Minority Reports of the Poor Law Commission. The problem acts and reacts on the allied problems of pauperism, drunkenness, immorality,

¹ The soul suffers along with the body. All true worship consists in the right functioning of the will in relation to God. But the will cannot act unless the intelligence acts also, for nothing is willed which is not previously understood. Now neither intelligence nor will can function properly when the brain is fed by impure air. The respiratory machinery is worked by a nervous apparatus having its centre in the spinal cord. This mechanism is disturbed and thrown out of order by deprivation of pure air. The stimuli being confused, the respiratory movements are quickened and require conscious action. Thus the attention is drawn from its proper object, and we suffer what is known as distractions in prayer. The mental effort required to deal with the sensations caused by carbonic acid gas, dirty water, and animal refuse, inevitably results in fatigue and strain. The prayer of distraction degenerates into sleep !

and unemployment. The feeble-minded are defined as

“persons who may be capable of earning a living under favourable circumstances, but are incapable from mental defect, existing from birth or from an early age: (1) of competing on equal terms with their normal fellows or (2) of managing themselves and their affairs with ordinary prudence.”

The commissioners state that out of a population of 32,527,843 persons (England and Wales) there are 149,628 mentally deficient (apart from certified lunatics) and of these about one half (66,509) are in urgent need of care and assistance.

Two chief plans have been proposed for the elimination of feeble-mindedness, namely segregation and sterilisation. When we speak of segregation we mean not only the separation of defectives from the rest of the community but the separation of sexes from each other amongst the defectives themselves. This can only be done by keeping them in special homes or colonies provided for the purpose. The aim of segregation is to prevent defectives from propagating their kind. This has led some writers to confound segregation with sterilisation. But that is quite another process. Sterilisation means the performing of a surgical operation by which the subjects thereof are rendered incapable of procreation. In former times this operation involved castration in the case of men and excision of the ovary in the case of women. Both were dangerous operations, constituting a grave mutilation. But in recent times two much simpler operations have been discovered which have somewhat modified the moral and social questions involved. These are known respectively as “vasectomy” and “ligature of the Fallopian tubes” (Kehrer’s method) and are comparatively harmless, in the sense that they do not involve danger to life. When compared with say, an operation for cancer or appendicitis, they are not grave operations in themselves. They are effective for their direct purpose and, in that sense, grave as regards their subject and society at large. But—and this is worthy of serious

**Feeble-mindedness:
proposed
remedies.**

remark—they are not sure remedies against incontinence, although they prevent its physical effects.

Further, both segregation and sterilisation may be either voluntary or compulsory. The latter has already been legalised in several States of the American Union. The State of Indiana, for instance, has passed a law by which criminals, idiots, rapists, and imbeciles, at the instance of a medical committee, may be operated upon. The Act says:

“If in the judgment of this committee procreation is inadvisable and there is no probability of improvement of the mental condition of the inmate, it shall be lawful for the surgeons to perform such operation for the prevention of procreation as shall be decided safest and most effective.”¹

The State of Connecticut, too, has enacted the following:

“The directors of the State prison and the superintendents of State hospitals for the insane at Middletown and Norwich are hereby authorised and directed to appoint for each of said institutions, respectively, two skilled surgeons, who, in conjunction with the physician or surgeon in charge at each of said institutions, shall examine such persons as are reported to them by the warden, superintendent, or the physician or surgeon in charge, to be persons by whom procreation would be inadvisable. Such board shall examine the physical and mental condition of such persons, and their record and family history so far as the same can be ascertained, and if in the judgment of the majority of the said board, procreation by any such person would produce children with an inherited tendency to crime, insanity, feeble-mindedness, idiocy or imbecility, and there is no probability that the condition of any such person so examined will improve to such an extent as to render procreation by such person advisable, or, if the physical and mental condition of any such person will be substantially improved thereby, then the said board shall appoint one of its members to perform the operation of vasectomy or oophorectomy, as the case may be, upon such person.”²

Not long ago, at Wil in the canton of Berne in Switzerland, the more severe operations indicated above were

¹ *Eugenics Review*, April, 1910, page 74.

² *Eugenics Review*, April, 1910, page 75.

performed on two men and two women, inmates of the Cantonal Asylum. The Asylum authorities wished to discharge them, but the municipal authorities objected, not wanting to be burdened with any more defective children. The solution determined on was accepted by all parties, the patients submitting to it as a condition of obtaining their freedom.

In the Mental Deficiency Bill at present before the British Legislature, Clause 50 runs as follows:—

“If any person intermarries with, or attempts to intermarry with any person whom he knows to be a defective within the meaning of this Act, or if any person solemnises or procures or connives at any marriage knowing that one of the parties thereto is a defective he shall be guilty of a misdemeanour.”

These various enactments, actual and prospective, are mentioned here to give some idea of the trend of thought outside the Church. The encroachment of remedies such as the above on the liberty of the subject and on the actual matrimonial discipline of the Church will be immediately apparent. The moment they are mentioned there arises a clash of interests, ideals and sentiments. To allow defectives unrestrained liberty would appear to be a menace to the welfare of the community, whilst to subject them to all the remedies proposed would seem to be an unnecessary violation of their rights and perhaps an infliction of unwarranted cruelty. We must move warily and scientifically.

**The
Morality
of these
Remedies.**

We may state at once that the Holy Office, which is a practical guide for the Catholic in all moral questions in any way dubious or controverted, has not yet pronounced any express decision on the morality of vasectomy. But, pending its directions, we may safely put forward the following as representing the prevalent teaching of theologians and Catholic physicians.¹

¹ The question was discussed at great length in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* for 1910 and 1911. The latest pronouncement on the subject we have met is in the fourth edition of Fr. A. Klarman's "The Crux of Pastoral Medicine" (Herder, 1912). Fr. Klarman decides strongly against the moral lawfulness of vasectomy.

(a) An operation undertaken to cure physical disease is perfectly lawful even though it has sterilisation as a concomitant effect. This principle—the sacrifice of a part for the sake of the whole—is universally admitted.

(b) Vasectomy is no remedy against concupiscence: and, even if it were, the Church condemns mutilation as a means of avoiding temptation.

(c) The operation, as only preventing one inconvenient effect of the licence of the degenerate, would by the very fact tend to increase immoral practices.

(d) Being in itself slight and practically painless, it is useless as a punishment for criminals or a deterrent for others.

(e) The principle once admitted would open the door to malpractices in matrimonial relations.

(f) The welfare of the State, if seriously threatened by the degenerate, may be safeguarded by other means such as segregation, which, if more expensive, are morally unquestionable.

(g) Therefore the operation is not permissible, except as a necessary means to corporal health, and consequently may not be performed, outside this case, even with the patient's consent.

(h) The Church has never regarded the marriage of degenerates as unlawful in itself: they cannot be deprived of their right without very grave reason.

However, the application of general laws to particular cases is always dubious, especially where facts are still in dispute. Hence this question remains speculatively an open one, but in view of the above teaching it would not be safe to advocate even a restricted application of the practice. And we are glad to say that many modern eugenicists are more or less at one with Catholic doctrine. Dr Saleeby himself declares:—

“We are dubious as to the help of surgery. . . . It is necessary to be reasonable, and, in seeking the superman, to remain at least human.”

Dr Havelock Ellis too writes as follows:—

“It must always be remembered that the sterilisation of the unfit, if it is to be a practical and humane measure commanding general approval, must be voluntary on the part of the person undergoing it, and never compulsory. It is probable that many persons have been prejudiced against

sterilisation, as I also have, by the reckless and violent manner in which the method of effecting it has been advocated, occasionally in England, and often in the United States. Persons who claimed to speak with authority, have clamoured for its adoption, not as a voluntarily adopted method of social hygiene, but as a barbarous punishment, to be inflicted for the purpose of inspiring terror in others, and sometimes to be applied to persons whose acts were not really anti-social at all."¹

A little positive knowledge, however, of what has actually been accomplished in the way of voluntary segregation is enough to demonstrate conclusively the needlessness of surgery. Feeble-mindedness is a **Segregation** defect for which there is absolutely no cure **sufficient**, though there may be improvement. Therefore if the patients are to be cared for efficiently, the care must be lifelong. Farm and industrial colonies are admitted on all hands to be the best-suited institutions for this purpose. Herein America undoubtedly leads the way. For efficiency and success there is nothing to surpass the school at Waverley in the State of Massachusetts, together with an allied colony at Templeton. The conjoint institutions have 1311 inmates. In 1905 they were visited by the British Royal Commission, who were most deeply impressed with all they saw and heard. The Commissioners were able to realise that this permanent employment of custodial cases was not only the best thing for the health and well-being of the colonists, but also that it was the best economical utilisation of such capacities as they had. Moreover, it was an object lesson showing the adaptability of the method to every class of defective. It gave opportunity for experiment and variety of employment. Its marked success reconciled the relatives and friends of the patients to their permanent detention. The public, too, who might reasonably object to keeping them, saw that in such a permanent colony they were less of a burden and less of a danger to the community. The Commissioners declared it was a pleasure to see the happiness of the colonists, the

¹ *Eugenics Review*, October, 1909, page 205.

humanity of their treatment, and the social utility of their employment in reproductive work, with prospects of good economical results.

In England there is an excellent school at Sandlebridge, Alderley Edge in Cheshire, founded by Miss Dendy, and supported by the Incorporated Lancashire and Cheshire Society for the permanent care of the feeble-minded.

The most practical example for our purpose, however, is the Catholic colony at Ursberg in Bavaria. The patients consist of 284 idiots, 659 mentally deficient, 151 epileptics, 107 deaf and dumb, 99 cripples, 125 blind, 64 sick people. These are controlled by a staff consisting of 405 Sisters of the Order of St Joseph, 148 postulants, 63 pupil teachers, 16 priests, 12 lay brothers, 10 voluntary workers, and the doctor. The patients pay for their keep, the first class £27, 10s. per annum, the second class £17, 10s., and the third class £12, 10s. The occupation is chiefly farming, but there is also a brick and tile works, a quarry, a saw-mill, a brewery, a windmill, a printing press, a village inn, and a guest-house. The feeble-minded are divided into grades on the most scientific principles. It is of the utmost importance that a patient should associate only with his intellectual equals. Amongst inferiors he has no motive to improve himself, but rather every encouragement to sink to their level. Amongst superiors he becomes depressed and ceases to exert himself. Amongst his equals, however, he competes with them both in work and in play, and thus possesses an unflinching interest in life.

There are no walls round the colony, no gates to lock. The sexes live in separate houses, meeting only on special occasions such as at church and at concerts. So long as they are separate supervision is reduced to a minimum, but the strictest vigilance is exercised when they are together. This, together with the good public opinion which prevails, keeps them from trouble. The mere threat to send them away is sufficient to bring them to order. They are all happy. Some earn pocket-money. They like to remain because they have far more comfort here than anywhere else. The eugenic aim is achieved. They do not propa-

gate their kind, nor are they themselves changed into anti-social units. On the contrary, the civilisation is so high that no police are needed.

In this connection it may be mentioned that at the Gheel Colony for the Insane in Belgium,¹ there is less supervision than at Ursberg. There the patients walk about together in the village and round the farms. Yet, during twenty-two years there have been only four cases of maternity, *and the fault in no one case rested with the patient.*

Professor Karl Pearson, the great expert in biometric figures, has said that the Eugenics Education Society ought to wait half a century before beginning to move, so imperfect is the exact knowledge upon which it has to go. It might, at any rate, try to clear up this point: How many of the thousands mentally deficient in this country to-day would be only too glad to be taken care of, only too willing to be segregated, if accommodation were found for them?

Meanwhile, the Catholic community is making experiments with all the light available. A colony is being organised by Dr Alice Vowe Johnson, assisted by an influential committee.

As soon as Parliament has settled the legislation for the mentally deficient with which it is now engaged, a home will be opened in Surrey. Here fifty feeble-minded girls, all over sixteen, will be taught work in the garden, poultry-farming, and bee-keeping, besides household work. In order that the management shall be the most thorough and up-to-date, a company of nuns, the White Sisters, have been specially sent out to the Waverley Home in Massachusetts to be trained. Some £600 is required for initial expenditure, but after that, the home will be self-supporting. The girls will be medically examined every week at the home, and they will also be inspected by the officials of the Board of Education and the Local Government Board.

With institutions then such as Waverley, Ursberg, Sandlebridge, Gheel, and the Surrey Home, before our minds, we have no scruple in brushing aside as anti-eugenic and anti-human the proposal for the application of surgery.

¹ For an account of this institution see *The Month*, February, 1911.

The same institutions, on the other hand, constitute a strong practical argument in favour of compulsory segrega-

Should tion. If the life there is so happy, moral, **Segregation** and useful, both to the patients and to the **be com-** community, then those who need it and are **pulsory?** unwilling to submit to it may be considered

unreasonably unwilling. *Provided all due safeguards are taken in respect of the grades of feebleness*, then there seems every reason why a benign Government should take charge of these dangerous units of society. But, in that case, *there should not be any exception for the rich*. Society suffers its full share of injury from the rich degenerates even as from the poor ones. The success of before-mentioned colonies has shown that it is quite practicable to grade the feeble-minded according to social as well as intellectual standards. This ensures that the patient is not deprived of liberty unduly, that he does not lose his strict rights. Although the spirit of ecclesiastical legislation stands for individual freedom against the tendency of the State to curtail it, we cannot say in the absence of any definite pronouncement on the part of the Church whether or not feeble-mindedness, like leprosy, should be considered sufficient grounds for compulsory segregation. The question is still open. Still, it cannot be denied that there is a possibility of zeal for reform degenerating into oppression. Feeble-mindedness is so often a cause of poverty, and poverty so often a cause of feeble-mindedness, that there is a danger of confusing one with the other. Those, therefore, who have human dignity at heart need to exercise careful vigilance lest, under pretence of eugenic reform, the rights of the poor are infringed. Poverty is no bar to the sacrament of marriage. The poor, and even the destitute, as such, have every right to the joys and the protection of the marriage state. Destitution is largely due to economic causes. In so far as the poor are the victims of these causes and not subject to the racial defects mentioned above, so far must they be protected against the indiscriminate zealot who would deprive them of their most precious rights.

CHAPTER IV

CHRISTIAN REMEDIES

HAVING stated the problem in its modern aspects, we may pass on to give a general statement as to the chief difference between the eugenics of the modern school and the eugenics of the Catholic Church. The modern school is simply not ultimate enough. It does not realise how far-reaching is its much-vaunted principle that there are causes of causes. The Church, however, goes to the ultimate source of things and declares the root cause of degeneracy to be sin and the root cause of betterment to be virtue.

The Eugenic Value of the Church.

It is interesting to note the attitude of the members of the medical profession in regard to the various cures for such diseases as inebriety, nervous debility, feeble-mindedness, phthisis, perversion. All seem to be agreed that whatever remedy is prescribed it is not of much use unless you can get the patient to put his will into it. Yet, with the exception of a few who have made a study of medico-psychic therapeutics and who are regarded with some suspicion by the rest of the profession, they have almost nothing to offer in the way of will-stimulus. Now this is precisely what the Church can do and does. The whole of her sacramental system, nay, her very essence and existence is designed to this one end, to put the human will in the right direction and to keep it here. This quickening of will energy constitutes a development of life. There is a spiritual growth which is hardly analogous to animal growth, so different are the laws by which it is governed. It is a growth of the faithful in the faith and depends on the promptings of the Holy Spirit. If we must use modern

parlance, it may be said to have a principle of selection, but such principle must be admitted to be supernatural, not natural. It is Divine charity which permeates human life and controls all the multitudinous principles of variation, assimilating that which tends towards life eternal, rejecting that which tends towards death eternal.

The result of such a supernatural selection may be a "superman," but it will not be a Shakespeare, nor a Beethoven, nor a Newton, nor a Tintoretto as such, still less the ideal imbecile, the conception of whom tortured poor Nietzsche's brain. It will be an Augustine of Hippo, or a Francis of Assisi, or a Joan of Arc. The ideal at which the Church aims, and actually does at times accomplish, is the production of genius in morality. Intellectual power may minister to this end as in the case of St Augustine, or poetical inspiration as in the case of St Francis, or warrior prowess as in the case of the Maid of Orleans. But all these other accomplishments must be subordinated to the one supreme accomplishment, eminence in sanctity.

Now it is precisely this eminence in sanctity amongst the few which tends above all cosmic forces to produce that rational restraint of the will which is so needful for the production of a vigorous, healthy body and a useful, sane intellect. Eminence in sanctity is eminence in love, and eminence in love is eminence in will-power. But the will-power of the few acts upon the will-power of the many. Just as the leader of an army impresses his volition on the rank and file and leads them chiefly through his own sheer will to victory, so the saints, with their wills quickened by that of the Saint of saints, impress their volition on the struggling multitudes. It needs personality to appeal to personality. And the personality which alone is effective for any widespread moral result is that of God, revealed in Christ, and reflected in the saints.

Now the whole question of eugenics ultimately turns upon this point: How is the sexual appetite to be rendered subordinate to the intelligent will? The Catholic answer to this question is a radical one. It consists in the cult of

purity in all its branches, in the marriage state, as well as in religious orders, and in the world.

First, the sexual appetite is regarded as a good and useful possession. Although it may easily become the occasion and the instrument of sin, yet it is not a sinful thing in itself. Prudery, which is a perversion of purity, has no place in the Catholic system of morals. Reticence and modesty of utterance are, of course, inculcated. But when plain speaking is necessary for the right ordering of the sexual appetite, then we must speak plainly. Delicacy of feeling is a great help in controlling the appetite. But ultimately and in all difficult cases the true guide is the intelligence rightly informed. And the intelligence is rightly informed when it acts in accordance with the revealed word of God.

The Cult of Purity.

Under such guidance we know that the sexual appetite is for the purpose of the procreation of children. It is not for the sake of sensual pleasure. The sensual pleasure which accompanies it is but ministrant to its proper use. Further, the same Divine guidance declares that the sexual function ought only to be exercised in lawful marriage. Children can only be properly cared for and educated through the institution of marriage. And since the sexual appetite is ordained for the good of the offspring, all indulgence outside the marriage state is forbidden. When marriage was instituted there was given with it the command to increase and multiply, and to fill the earth.

Moreover, since the sexual appetite has for its proper object the procreation of children, any perversion of it, even within the marriage state is forbidden. It is the perversion of the appetite within the marriage state which is so largely responsible for the deplorable "race suicide" so prevalent at the present time. Pleasure is made an end in itself rather than a means to an end.

If, however, the pleasure is to be kept in its subordinate and proper place the will must act subject to the laws laid down by the Author of human nature. Sometimes God speaks through the natural law, sometimes through His revealed law, and sometimes through ecclesiastical law.

One of the most insistent and inexorable dictates of the natural law is that which condemns fornication and adultery. These sins tend directly to bring children into the world without proper provision for their nurture and upbringing. Or if that result is designedly prevented, the sins take on an added malice and tend to bring disease on the culprits. In all cases the end for which the appetite was given is defeated and nature is perverted.

But more, the law of nature is confirmed by the written law of God.

"Thou shalt not commit adultery" (Exod. xx. 14). "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife" (Exod. xx. 17). "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are fornication, uncleanness, immodesty, luxury . . . they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God" (Gal. v. 19). "Do not err: neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor the effeminate, nor liars with mankind . . . shall possess the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. vi. 9-10).

In the interpretation of the above texts the Church has due regard to the science of psychology. The sins of fornication and adultery are invariably preceded by lesser sins, sins of thought and look and improper familiarities. If therefore the greater sins are to be avoided the smaller sins which lead to them must be avoided. The true and sincere Christian conscience, therefore, will have regard to the grave consequences which undoubtedly follow upon what, at first sight, may seem small sins. When a person once has full knowledge and gives full consent to any impure thought or act, then it can never be considered to be a small matter. There is a connection between the beginning and the end, and since the end is so evil the beginning must also be evil. From its very nature an impure thought, word, or deed tends immediately to disastrous results. On these grounds our Lord Himself condemns a lascivious glance as practical adultery (St Matt. v. 28).

Of course imperfect consent or imperfect knowledge prevent such sins from being grave. But when it is a case of deliberate indulgence of bad thoughts or immodest looks, they are sure to fructify in still worse sins. Every indul-

gence of this appetite outside the end for which it is designed increases rather than lessens the flame of sexual passion.

The Catholic catechism, therefore, begins at the beginning and says quite simply that the Sixth Commandment forbids whatever is contrary to holy purity in looks, words or actions. One must not go to immodest plays and dances, nor look at immodest books and pictures. The Ninth Commandment forbids all wilful consent to impure thoughts and desires, and all wilful pleasure in the irregular motions of the flesh. Moreover, there are other sins which are reprobated on the same grounds because they commonly lead to those of impurity, namely gluttony, intemperance, idleness, bad company, and neglect of prayer.

The general principle underlying the above teaching is that occasions which tend to excite sexual imaginations must be avoided. This, of course, is in direct opposition to the much-advocated practice known as "the cult of the nude." This would seek to cultivate purity by rendering the senses and imagination accustomed to sexual images. It is, however, based on a false psychology and is in open violation of centuries of experience.

A False Theory.

Every perversion of nature is followed by nature's retribution. Just as the right use of sex tends to the preservation of the race, so the abuse of it tends to the deterioration and extinction of the race. Nor can we escape the conclusion that the punishment inflicted by nature is a punishment inflicted by God. Since God is the Author of nature, nature is a reflex of the Divine mind. Rightly understood, taken, that is, in its entirety, the voice of nature is the voice of God. Thus God, through nature, punishes sins of impurity in this life as well as in the next. In fact, so terrible is the sanction of this law, that we can only regard it as a mercy of God that, even in this life, He shows us some of the awful consequences of its violation.

The superficial observer may think that this cannot be true of the less sins which are forbidden by the Church. How can the mere looking at a picture tend to the destruc-

tion of the race? It can. And it does. It inflames the passions and makes them more difficult to control. Indulgence is as a two-edged sword: it cuts loose the passions on the one hand and cuts down the power of the will on the other. The slightest immodest thought, freely indulged, produces an effect which can only be counteracted by painful effort, by an effort far greater than would have been necessary for resisting in the first instance. One only needs to look about in the world a little to see how many there are who do not resist in the beginning and who are carried on from bad to worse until unmentionable crimes are reached. It is the old story.

“Thou shalt not eat of the tree, and in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”

But inexperienced youth knows better. He prefers the counsel of the tempter.

“No, you shall not die. In the day that you eat thereof your eyes shall be opened and *you shall be as gods* knowing good and evil.”

The result is that the world is infected with a tremendous plague. The fruits of a tree which has its roots in first wilfulness are seen in shattered nerves, loathsome disease, insanity, unmarried mothers, children with no man to call father, divorce, murder, suicide.

CHAPTER V

THE EUGENIC VALUE OF MARRIAGE

ON nearly all hands the institution of marriage is recognised as the medium through which the selection of the fit and the rejection of the unfit is to take place. A wide difference of views prevails as to what should be the legal conditions which should govern the contract of marriage, and as to the reasons why it should be maintained or dissolved. The tendency of the eugenic movement is to impose restrictions on the making of marriages and to remove restrictions against the unmaking of them.

Eugenist Proposals.

The chief proposal with regard to the restricting of marriages is that which seeks to institute medical marriage-certificates. Some eugenists would bar marriage except to those who can produce a clean bill of health and physical fitness, whilst others would only insist on the certificate in order that it might be privately filed in the Government archives for the sake of public statistics.

“The examination would be perfectly private and confidential and its result would not even be disclosed by the doctor to the other party to the marriage. The certificate would be issued, and the person receiving it could then do as he or she thought fit with it. One alteration in the law might, however, be made with advantage, and that would be to provide that where one party to a proposed marriage refused to show this official medical certificate to the other party, no action for breach of promise would lie. The result of such an examination as that proposed would be that no person could contract a marriage without having attention directed to his or her physical fitness to do so. . . . People assess most factors in a marriage, and here

would be a new one that not only the parties themselves, but their relatives also would show a keen interest in. The 'a' or top grade certificate given to a thoroughly sound and well-developed person would be something worth having; a 'b' would be tolerable; a 'c' would conjure up visions of doctors' bills and physic for a family of future weaklings; and a 'd'—well, a 'd' would be a pity."¹

Sir Francis Galton himself has written at considerable length² to show that selection in marriage is possible. He is not able, however, to go much further in his suggestions as to what the certificate should certify beyond physical fitness. Indeed he confesses that eugenics can hardly take into consideration moral fitness.

"We must therefore leave morals as far as possible out of the discussion, not entangling ourselves with the almost hopeless difficulties they raise as to whether a character as a whole is good or bad."³

Now the Catholic conscience does take account of physical fitness. But it places moral fitness first. When the restraint necessary for the preservation of
The Church's Ideals of Marriage. purity has been cultivated during childhood and youth then the ground has been well prepared for the sound eugenic proposal of proper selection of candidates for marriage. Sir Francis Galton need not have gone to such pains to demonstrate that rational selection in marriage is possible.⁴ It is obvious. The Church promotes it and controls it perhaps more effectually than any other organisation on earth. The way in which she has promulgated the decree *Ne temere* and the firmness with which she has enforced it against much opposition is the latest proof of her power to do these things.

As a matter of positive eugenics she teaches that marriage is a sacrament through which is conveyed a Divine strength enabling the married pair to perform all the duties of their state. As a matter of negative eugenics she places impedi-

¹ *Eugenics Review*, January, 1912.

² "Essays in Eugenics," pages 44 *et seq.*

³ *Ibid.* page 35.

⁴ *Ibid.* page 44.

ments against undesirable unions. Some of them are inexorable as being at variance with the Divine or natural law; others can be dispensed from whenever there is a sufficient reason. In imposing or in taking away impediments the Church always puts religious considerations first. If the sanction of religion is destroyed, other sanctions are ineffectual. When the eugenist, therefore, objects to the impediment of difference of religion (*disparitas cultus*) he must be resisted. But if he is wise he will not object to it, for the religious ideal is the sanction through which the Church controls other impediments which incidentally pertain to animal and psychic well-being.

Impediments to Unfit Marriages.

The impediments bearing more directly on physical and psychic culture are those of consanguinity and affinity. On all hands the intermarriage of blood relations is admitted to be an evil. It tends towards racial degeneration, to feeble-mindedness, to insanity, to consumption. It hinders the formation of new social relationships and thus weakens the social bond. Not merely, however, because of personal and social health does the Church impose the impediments, but for the higher claims of the spirit. The spirit lives by faith; faith is a habit of the intellect; a sound intellect, normally speaking, acts best in a sound body; therefore does the Church enact laws pertaining to bodily health. Indeed at one time in her history she exercised a much more particular choice in forbidding unhealthy people to marry. If she has allowed such impediments to fall into desuetude, it is only in deference to the claims of the spirit in changed circumstances. And who shall say that the limiting of the Church's power has not tended to increase those hereditary evils which the eugenist deplors?

For similar reasons the marriage bond, when once it has been forged, must be held to be perpetual and holy. The mere bringing of children into the world could be accomplished without the institution of marriage, but the educating of them to their highest well-being and destiny could not. We must therefore review the eugenic worth of certain

The Condemnation of Divorce.

proposals which have been put forward in the name of eugenics, but which can produce no other effect than race deterioration.

It will hardly be believed that there is a movement on foot to do away with marriage altogether. There are people now who begin to live together without any marriage ceremony, civil or religious, and who send cards round to their friends notifying the fact. There are others who have been through the ceremony, but who nevertheless mutually agree that they are not bound by it when and if they shall mutually agree to separate.

The Catholic, of course, looks with horror upon these things because they are forbidden by the law of God. That is his first consideration. But there is also an intrinsic evil in the idea. It tends towards the degeneration of the race. And it is this aspect that we must emphasise when treating of eugenics. It is possible that a divorce in individual cases may tend to the good of the individual parents and the individual children in certain respects. But if the individuals gain as individuals they lose as members of society. When the institution of marriage is undermined the institution of society is undermined. If promiscuity or divorce be permitted to those who want it, then the whole of family life is placed in jeopardy. No woman is safe. Children have no surety for their education, bodily, mental, and spiritual.

Dr Saleeby has very eloquently demonstrated this. His chapters¹ on "The Supremacy of Motherhood" and "Marriage and Maternalism," whilst containing much unverified assumption about evolution, do drive home the truth that *true race culture depends upon permanent motherhood, and that the latter in turn depends on permanent fatherhood*. Thus does he break away from his master, Sir Francis Galton:—

" 'We must all be agreed,' Mr Galton declares, 'as to the propriety of breeding, if it be possible, for health, energy, and ability, whatever else may be doubtful.' To this I would add that, whether we are agreed or not, we must breed for motherhood, and that, even if we do not we shall

¹ "Parenthood and Race Culture," pages 1145 *et seq.*

have to reckon with it. . . . Any system of eugenics or race culture, any system of government, any proposal for social reform—as, for instance, the reduction of infant mortality—which fails to reckon with motherhood or falls short of adequately appraising it, is foredoomed to failure and will continue to fail so long as the basal facts of human nature and the development of the human individual retain even approximately their present character. Whatever proposals for eugenics or race culture be made or carried out, the fact will remain that the race is made up of mortal individuals; that every one of these begins its visible life as a helpless baby, and that the system which does not permit the babies to survive, *they* will not permit to survive. There is the beginning and end of the matter in a nutshell. It is not a question of the father's taste and fancy, but of what he leaves above ground when the worms are eating him below. . . . No system yet conceived can compare for a moment with monogamy in respect of the one criterion which time and death recognise, the fate of the children.”¹

But the writer is known as an extreme individualist. Consequently, when he comes to consider divorce, he forgets that he is aiming at *race* culture. He does not see that an individual in conforming to the laws of the race is really promoting his own highest well-being. He falls back into the same fallacy as his master, namely that of changing into a final aim what ought to be an intermediate aim. Good breeding, instead of being the means of attaining man's final end, becomes the end itself.

In his popular manual² in the “New Tracts for the Times,” Dr Saleeby thus voices the proposal:

“The laws of divorce are, of course, part of the laws of marriage; and in all questions of this kind the Eugenist is compelled to remember and consult his criterion. In general, it is clear to him that whatsoever changes are made, by legislation or by public opinion or by both, in the conditions and customs of marriage and divorce must be eugenic. That a woman should have motherhood forced upon her by a chronic inebriate, he being her ‘lawful husband,’ is so evidently wrong that it cannot possibly be right. Eugenic marriages are indeed ‘made in Heaven’; but there are dysgenic marriages which were evidently made in hell. To liberate such a wife as the foregoing illustration describes may be to free a worthy person, who may

¹ “Parenthood and Race Culture,” pages 145 and 166.

² “The Methods of Race Regeneration,” page 42.

marry again, and bring worthy instead of tainted children into the world. Any modification of the laws of divorce such as made this possible would evidently serve the cause of both positive and negative eugenics."

First we may notice the utterly unscientific character of this statement. Emphasis of expression is not evidence. And when a writer keeps on saying "evidently" this and "evidently" that without a shred of proof, one is justified in retorting "quite evidently not." What is gratuitously asserted may be gratuitously denied. But we go further. We claim that if divorce were made possible in such cases as that given it would be a disaster both to positive and to negative eugenics, and we adduce the following considerations in support of our claim.

That which tends to make selection in marriage rash and imprudent is a hindrance to positive eugenics. But divorce under plea of drunkenness tends to make selection in marriage rash and imprudent. Therefore such divorce acts as a hindrance to positive eugenics. When a man first falls in love with a girl it is his duty, even from a eugenic standpoint, to take other things into consideration besides her youth and beauty. But if he is infatuated with these things, and knows that he can get a divorce by merely taking to drink, or displaying other undesirable habits of the kind, then he will more readily stifle reasons for reflection, suggested by health, intelligence, social status, and religion. Whereas if he clearly understands that he is taking her for better or for worse, and until he is parted from her by death, then he will more readily use all his wits to make sure that he is taking her, as far as he can foresee, for the better.

Again, such divorce is a hindrance to positive eugenics inasmuch as it imperils the proper nurture and education of the children. The marriage state is a burden. And in these days there is a strong tendency to shirk the burden, as is evidenced by the declining birth-rate, the large infant mortality, the increase of divorce. How much more then will unwilling parents tend to shirk the burden by divorce if they can do so by merely adopting obnoxious habits.

Divorce, moreover, for such a cause, is a hindrance to negative eugenics. If it restrains the transmission of the racial poison of alcohol, it also prevents its restriction by giving additional encouragement to inebriety. And in the moral sphere, it tends directly to the spread of the racial poison of impurity by lessening the sanctity of the marriage tie.

Let us not for a moment be supposed to suggest that the children born of a drunken mother or a drunken father or both, are not born at a great disadvantage. They are. But the remedy for the evil is not divorce. That were to act like the man who would cure a headache by cutting his throat. *The remedy lies in a return to the old Christian idea of the marriage state*, a sacrament through which the married couple acquire supernatural help to practise continence when circumstances demand self-restraint.

We have taken only one instance to illustrate the anti-eugenic tendency of divorce, but it is an instance suggested by a leading eugenicist, and the one with perhaps most to be said for it. What, however, shall we say when divorce is asked for on grounds of "mental anguish," or merely because one of the parties wants it. Yet that is what we shall have to admit if we admit divorce on the ground of drunkenness. This principle cannot be too much insisted upon, namely, that even though a divorce may be good in some respects either for one of the parties or for the children, yet on the whole it tends towards the destruction of society and ultimately, therefore, towards the disadvantage of the individual. Therefore the Author of the individual and of society has ordained that what He has joined together no man shall put asunder.

We must proceed along similar lines in dealing with the eugenic proposal for restricting the family within marriage. Professor Forel of Zurich is claimed to be the greatest living eugenicist. In his book, "The Sexual Question," he gives somewhat plausible reasons for the artificial interference with the course of nature. The Catholic conscience repudiates this practice because it is repudiated by the law of God.

Entire Indissolubility the only Safeguard.
Neo-Malthusian Theories.

Then reason comes in and asks that the question be considered in its racial aspect. If people are allowed to tamper with the laws of nature for the sake of some temporary convenience reducible to terms of comfort, they cannot be forbidden to tamper with them for the sake of sensual pleasure. This works directly, not merely against the well-being of the race, but also against its very existence. Whereas, on the other hand, if the Divinely sanctioned natural law be observed it may cause material inconvenience here and there, but on the whole, in its racial and eugenic aspect, it will promote the preservation and well-being of humanity.

CHAPTER VI

THE EUGENIC VALUE OF CELIBACY

THE eugenist also wishes to interfere with those who desire, even with a high and unselfish motive, to lead a celibate life. We have already seen what the Anglican dignitary, Dean Inge,¹ has to say about the matter. Sir Francis Galton and Dr Saleeby have also recorded their views to the effect **Marriage not a personal Duty.** that the Church's practice of celibacy and virginity tells against the well-being of the race. In this declaration the eugenists would seem to have made the most anti-eugenic stroke of all. And it is significant of the somewhat confused thinking which characterises their works that they themselves, as will be seen in the next chapter, at times recognise that man is not primarily and essentially an animal nature, and that his betterment is not entirely a matter of germ-plasm, milk, fresh air, sentimental art, and illuminated certificates, as one might gather from much of their argument. Out of their own mouths we could refute them, although they almost wholly ignore the fact that man is essentially a spiritual nature and that his betterment is consequently a matter of spiritual forces. Here we must consider their short-sighted attack upon the principle of celibacy.

Thus Sir Francis Galton, in reference to the so-called Dark Ages, can write, and Dr Saleeby, can say that the words ought to be printed in gold:—²

“Whenever a man or woman was possessed of a gentle nature that fitted him or her to deeds of charity, to medita-

¹ See page 22 this book.

² “Parenthood and Race Culture,” by C. W. Saleeby, pages 116 and 117

tion, to literature or to art, the social condition of the time was such that they had no refuge elsewhere than in the bosom of the Church. But the Church chose to preach, and exact celibacy, and the consequence was that these gentle natures had no continuance, and thus, by a policy so singularly unwise and suicidal that I am hardly able to speak of it without impatience, the Church brutalised the breed of our forefathers."

And further,

"as she brutalised human nature by her system of celibacy applied to the gentle, she demoralised it by her system of persecution of the intelligent, the sincere and the free."

Finally, and logically, the best form of civilisation in respect to the improvement of the race would be one

"where the weak could find a welcome and a refuge in celibate monasteries or sisterhoods."

One of the most important questions for the eugenicist is the relative importance of heredity on the one hand and environment on the other. We must agree with Dr Saleeby, for instance, that in certain circumstances Mozart would have been tone-deaf and Shakespeare a gibbering idiot, and that no education in the world would enable a door-mat to write "Hamlet." It would also be to our purpose did we deny as he does Lamarck's doctrine that acquired characters are transmitted by heredity. Nor do we hesitate to avail ourselves of his expert opinion,

"that the babies of the slums, seen early, before ignorance and neglect have had their way with them, are physically vigorous and promising in certainly not less than ninety per cent of cases."

If so much depends on environment and education, and if heredity is practically nothing without them, then the monks and the nuns of the Dark Ages did the best possible thing for race culture in retiring to such places where they could train themselves in art and literature and where they could impart these acquired accomplishments to others. It is to the celibate life of the Dark Ages that we owe

**Monastic-
ism**

promotes

Eugenics.

all that is worth having in our present university system. Moreover, the strong and intellectual parents of those ages did not send *all* their children into the cloister.

And if this is true of art and literature much more is it true of "deeds of charity and of meditation." Obviously these are not characteristics transmitted by heredity. If one thing is more certain than another in religious experience it is that charity and union with God in prayer are first of all Divine spiritual gifts, given independently of physical and intellectual perfection, and secondly that their perfection is normally wrought only by hard, constant and careful cultivation. If they are wanted for race betterment, as everyone must admit they are, then the monks and nuns of the Dark Ages did the best possible thing for race culture in fashioning for themselves the cloistral environment to perfect their ideals.

What is true of charity and meditation is true of all spiritual accomplishments. The flesh ever lusteth against the spirit. The four strongest appetites in man are those having for their objects respectively wealth, independence, food, and sex. If these appetites are to be controlled and utilised for the betterment of the race it can only be by cultivation of moral power. Thus even to-day the Church sets a higher dignity upon that life which aims at the more complete control of these appetites, namely that life which is vowed to poverty, chastity, and obedience. It is the leaven which leaveneth the whole lump. It works through the whole Catholic body, the members of which are enabled and encouraged to participate in the same life through prayer, fasting, and almsgiving. The force is both negative and positive in its operation, restraining on the one hand the animal and psychic man, stimulating on the other the spiritual man.

CHAPTER VII

THE SPIRITUAL FACTOR IN EUGENICS

GRADUALLY, as suggested in the previous chapter, and by fits and starts, eugenists are beginning to recognise the significance of the spiritual factor in eugenics. Sir Francis Galton had all along seen that it had been a power in the past, but he was at a loss as to what form it was to take in the future. Dr Saleeby thinks that eugenics is itself a religion.

The Needs of the Soul. "And if religion" (he says) "whatever its origin and the more questionable chapters in its past, be now 'morality touched with emotion,' I claim that eugenics is religious, is and ever will be a religion."¹

Professor Whetham, of Cambridge, who, in conjunction with his wife, has just published a popular manual on the subject from the eugenic standpoint, goes so far as to admit that religion is not only a factor in the process, but probably the supreme factor. Since religion is such debatable ground he is reluctant to admit it, yet admit it he must.

"But without religion and without morals" (he says) "there is apparently no possibility of existence for the human race. . . . Thus it becomes certain, not only that religion is a definite biological factor in the social economy, but that its value is probably supreme, and that some form of religious development is an absolute necessity for the successful evolution of human society. The clue to the 'survival value' of religion is to be found in the fact that the interests of the individual are not always identical with

¹ "Parenthood and Race Culture," page 303.

those of the race; that, indeed, in many cases, they are sharply opposed. . . . No merely rational system of morals has yet been found sufficient to induce the individual to acquiesce in rules of conduct and in conditions of life, which, although advantageous to the race, are obviously opposed to his immediate comfort and convenience. Nothing but the forces of religion can keep the scales even between fleeting temporal advantage and eternal spiritual gain."¹

The reason why there is so much vagueness, uncertainty, and confusion in the eugenic treatment of the religious factor is because in the initial definition there is no clear idea as to the end to be obtained. Eugenics was defined as "the study of agencies under social control that may improve or impair the racial qualities of future generations either physically or mentally."

Now does the word "mentally" here mean "intellectually *and* morally" or merely "intellectually"? And if it means "intellectually and morally" does it mean merely in the natural order, or in the natural and spiritual orders? Until these questions are answered there must be inevitable confusion in dealing with the religious factor.

In the Catholic system they have been definitely answered. The final destiny of man is to see and know God face to face. That destiny involves a call to a life here on earth which is far above the merely natural life. It is so far removed from the natural plane that it is rightly spoken of as a participation in the Divine nature (2 Pet. i. 4). Such a life will require the highest exercise both of intellect and will, for it consists both in knowing the Divine law and in doing it. Obviously such a life requires help which is beyond human nature to produce. According to Catholic teaching, agencies have been provided for conferring and continuing that help, and moreover those agencies have been placed to a certain extent under social control. They are known as "sacraments," and they are under the control of the Church as under a Divinely appointed visible ruler.

**The
Food of
the Spirit.**

¹ "An Introduction to Eugenics," pages 60 and 61.

They are under the control of the people only in the sense that the people are physically free to use them or not, free to accept grace for their salvation, free to reject it at a cost of spiritual loss.

This spiritual life, however, does not take place in mid-air. It functions through the natural facilities, using them as its organs. The supernatural is that which is built on the natural. It is of importance, therefore, that the foundation, the natural man, should be duly cultivated.

The element of good then in the eugenic movement, and the element which Catholics will gladly support, is that

**"Mens
sana in
corpore
sano."**

which has for its object the cultivation of a healthy mind and a healthy body. Man is a spiritual being but he is not merely a spirit. His spirit must normally act through the instrumentality of the body. The body and the soul have the same God for their Author. Both are good. It is the heresy of Manichæism which says that the body is something bad, something to be crushed and destroyed. But bodily considerations are not everything. Even in the natural order there have been cases in which the mind has wonderfully triumphed over clogging matter. Many great men have been burdened with ill-health. Julius Cæsar was an epileptic. In the supernatural order there have been cases still more wonderful in which the mind under the influence of grace has accomplished stupendous things in spite of a very degenerate bodily organism. But normally speaking, a healthy, well-formed body and a healthy, well-trained mind, are the most efficient instruments, under grace, for the working out of man's highest destiny. Sound ascetics require, not that the body shall be so maltreated as to give rise to nervous disorders, but that it shall be cultivated and restrained so as to become an apt instrument of the spirit. Catholics, therefore, should be only too glad to help on all legitimate measures for restricting feeble-mindedness, alcoholic and lead poisoning, venereal diseases, and consumption. *They must, however, be on their guard lest any of the means proposed tend rather in the long run to militate against the interests of the spirit.* And

in order to find out what means are good and what are bad, recourse must be had to the Divine law, natural and revealed.

In the light of this law, an element may be discerned in the eugenic movement of which Catholics cannot approve. It is that which treats man as if he were no better than a beast. It is that which ignores his call to the higher life of the spirit. It is that which sets him on a level with pigs whose reason for existence is to make prime pork or win medals at cattle-shows. Dr Saleeby is doing much to redeem the eugenic movement from this farm-yard ideal. But then he only raises it from the brutal to the merely human. There is a higher eugenic ideal than that. There is the spiritual ideal, that which considers man to be called to be a partaker of the Divine nature. Even our non-Catholic friends, those who are our co-workers for the social amelioration of our country, will see that this ideal is of enormous advantage in dealing with those vast numbers who are keeping back the progress of our race through drink and impurity and injustice.

Catholicism then, far from seeking to hinder eugenic reform, seeks rather to promote it by setting it on a lasting basis, the basis of the spirit. **The Body for the Soul's sake.** God is taken as the beginning and end of all racial improvement. He improves the race, and He improves it for the manifestation of His own glory. We co-operate with Him.

In such a system eugenics will take its place as a servant, not as a master. In thus co-operating with the Divine process it will derive from it its highest good. The supreme mistake of the eugenicist in dealing with the religious factor is in making religion the handmaid of eugenics, instead of eugenics the handmaid of religion. In this as in every other experience of life we have first to seek the Kingdom of God and His justice and then, in so far as they help towards our highest well-being, the natural gifts of body and mind will be added unto us.

Yes, that is what follows. If we are to be unselfish and live for the good of the race, ourselves included, we must

believe in some supreme Power that can guide the destinies of that race. That is, we must have faith. If we are to continue acting so all through life we must be convinced that we shall have a reward beyond this life and that we shall have all necessary helps in attaining it. That is, we must have hope. Moreover, mere love of the race will not sustain our efforts. We must love the power that controls the race. That is, we must have supernatural charity.

But it is precisely from these three virtues, which bind us to God, that there flow the virtues which enable us to work directly for the race. Here at length we have
The Moral and Social Virtues. the moral force which is the prime factor in eugenics, the supernatural virtues of prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance.

Above all things prudence, supernatural prudence, is needed for selection in marriage. Without prudence, the young people are carried away by their lower passions and faculties, choosing material beauty or material wealth in preference to intellectual culture and spiritual perfection. Prudence is needed, too, in all education for parenthood. Those who give instruction in the laws of sex must do so with a combined fearlessness, implying fortitude, but nevertheless with reticence and reverence, exercising the greatest possible care, so as to give the information at the right moment, not too soon and not too late.

Temperance is needed for the radical treatment of the racial poisons of alcohol and venereal disease. Purity is a species of temperance. Then, when laws have to be made for these things, there is needed both justice and fortitude. It is the strong and just ruler who can devise restraints for the bad without unduly inconveniencing the good, and thus check these terrible racial evils. It is the strong statesman who is wanted to-day to deal with the whole question of seductions to vice, whether in the shape of the "White Slave" traffic or of pernicious literature. Justice, moreover, is the cardinal virtue which has to be cultivated in the employer in order to eradicate the racial poison of white lead. And should the employer refuse to cultivate

that Christian habit of mind, then there must visit him the fortitude of the legislator.

Once more, in the urgent question of dealing with the feeble-minded, it would appear that every virtue is wanted in its highest perfection. Justice is wanted to provide the homes and colonies for those who are unable to support themselves or manage their own affairs. Fortitude is wanted to suppress alike the rash reformer who would resort to surgery with no justification, and the sentimental faddist who, under a plea of false liberty, would stand in the way of every rational reform. Prudence is wanted for those who have charge of the defectives. It is the humaneness of the treatment which is to be the secret of its success. Then for the defectives themselves the virtue of temperance in all its branches will be the most powerful means of improving their condition. Nothing is so striking in the colonies of defectives than the effect of religion in restoring them to a better life, physically and mentally.

The Catholic, with this ideal before him, has no fear for the eugenics of the future. His belief in the Communion of Saints is his guarantee. He knows that in every age in the past, it is Catholicism which has produced the most and the greatest of the real supermen, the experts in moral excellence. If the nineteenth century can witness a *Curé d'Ars* and a Don Bosco, the twentieth and every other century can do likewise.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

NOTE.—As yet, outside Moral Theology books, there is no Catholic literature on this subject, therefore all the books mentioned below must be read with reserve and criticised in the light of the principles suggested in this manual.

“An Introduction to Eugenics” by W. C. D. Whetham and C. D. Whetham. Macmillan. 1s. net (1912).

Marks a more moderate tone in the language of eugenicists.

“Essays in Eugenics” by Francis Galton. Eugenics Education Soc., 1s. 6d. (1909).

“Heredity” by J. A. Thomson. Murray. 9s. net (1908).

“Hereditary Genius: An Inquiry into its Laws and Consequences” by Francis Galton. Macmillan. 12s. net (1869).

“Inquiries into Human Faculty” by Francis Galton. Macmillan. 16s. net (1883).

“Memories of my Life” by Francis Galton. Methuen. 10s. 6d. net (1908).

“Mendel's Principles of Heredity” by W. Bateson. Cambridge University Press. 12s. net (1909).

Professor Bateson is the greatest living authority on Mendelism. Here and there he is unsound on the relationship between genetics and religion.

“Natural Inheritance” by Francis Galton. Macmillan. 9s. net (1889).

“Parenthood and Race Culture” by C. W. Saleeby. Cassell. 7s. 6d. net (1909).

“The Declining Birth-rate” by A. Newsholme. Cassell. 6d. (1911).

“The Method and Scope of Genetics” by W. Bateson (1908).

“The Methods of Race Regeneration” by C. W. Saleeby. Cassell. 6d. (1911).

“The Problem of Race Regeneration” by Havelock Ellis. Cassell. 6d. (1911).

“The Sexual Question” by August Forel. New Age Press. 1s. net (1908).

This is the most generally accepted book on the matter, which is treated strictly from a rationalist standpoint. Whilst affording valuable information, much of which will act as a deterrent to the grosser forms of vice, it is nevertheless wrong on the subject of artificial restriction of population.

TWO BOOKS OF INTEREST TO EUGENISTS

Problem of the Feeble-minded

An Abstract of the Report of the
Royal Commission on the Care
and Control of the Feeble-minded

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS ON
SEGREGATION. By Sir Francis Galton
THE RELIGIOUS ASPECT OF THE QUESTION. By
Rt. Rev. Dean Inge, D.D.
THE ECONOMIC ASPECT. By Professor A. C. Pigou
CAN THE FEEBLE-MINDED BE HAPPY IN CONFINEMENT. THE SANDLEBRIDGE EXPERIMENT. By
Miss Mary Dendy
Demy 8vo, Cloth, 1s. net (Inland postage 2d.)

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE PREVENTION
OF DESTITUTION, 1911

Mental Deficiency

SECTIONAL REPORT

PAPERS:—Presidential Address by Sir William Chance, Bart.,
M.A.—Problem of Defining Mental Deficiency—Heredity in
Relation to Mental Deficiency—Social and Economic Evils
resulting from Mental Deficiency—Work of Public Authorities
and Voluntary Agencies in securing permanent care for
mental defectives—Education of Mentally Defective Children.

Royal 8vo, 2s. 6d. net (Inland postage 3d.)

REPORT OF THE FIVE SECTIONS:—Education—Public
Health — Unemployment — Mental Deficiency — Legal and
Financial. Complete in one volume of 800 pages. Royal
8vo. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net. (Inland postage 5d.)

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1912 CONFERENCE
(containing a similar section). Royal 8vo. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
net. (Inland postage 5d.)

LONDON:

P. S. KING & SON, Orchard House, Westminster