

Edited by
E. Haldeman-Julius

B-529

Hypersexuality---Is Anyone Oversexed?

VIEWPOINTS OF PHYSIOLOGISTS, PSYCHIATRISTS, AND
SOCIOLOGISTS ON PRECOCIOUS SEXUALITY
AND NYMPHOMANIA

By

D. O. CAULDWELL, M.D., Sc.D.

Hypersexuality---Is Anyone Oversexed?

VIEWPOINTS OF PHYSIOLOGISTS, PSYCHIATRISTS, AND
SOCIOLOGISTS ON PRECOCIOUS SEXUALITY
AND NYMPHOMANIA

By

D. O. CAULDWELL, M.D., Sc.D.

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD, KANSAS

Copyright, 1947, by
E. Haldeman-Julius

Printed in United States of America

INTRODUCTION.

To write this book in other than the first person would be comparable to prostituting my toothbrush, my pocket comb or lending my best pair of shoes to a person known by me personally to have athlete's foot.

The reason is simpler than one might think. It is that the matter of hypersexuality is still controversial. The question: Is anyone oversexed? is, fortunately, not one of those legal involvements wherein one can be pinned down to a directed "yes or no." The pertinent evidence is far too interesting to justify us in being satisfied with a verdict of finality.

Physiologists, psychiatrists and sociologists have combined to contribute some highly interesting findings upon hypersexuality. In this, it is well to accept the truth that the physiologist, with his test tubes and microscopes, contributes knowledge which is as basic to understanding as is the foundation of the world's largest building. The psychiatrist literally takes the human mind apart in his laboratory. It is the sociologist who actually feels the throbbing, pulsing heart of humanity. When these three pool their findings, we have the basis for an informative and engaging human interest document. Such a document can look upon the drab side of life without being devoid of humorous sideglances at the mysteries, rather than the miseries, of life.

As to whether anyone is oversexed could be a dull subject were it not for the incongruities which seem to have a way of creeping into every conceivable subject. Here, I am reminded of a former lady patient. Her life, instead of being "just one damned thing after another" was just one pregnancy after another. Seeing her at market one day, I inquired, after the usual pleasantries, as to the health and welfare of her husband. The lady was noticeably pregnant at the time. Her reply to inquiry concerning her husband was: "Oh! That big oversexed ox!"

The word, ox, has several definitions, but I naturally thought of the one reading: A castrated bull.

Once, when a jurist friend was faced with a grave decision involving the fate of an elderly man convicted of the technical rape of a nine-year-old girl, he asked me about hypersexuality. He referred to the convicted man as "that oversexed moron." The convicted man was not oversexed. No man of normal or superior sexuality would think of raping a child.

Modern Casanovas are not oversexed. Casanova, himself, was not oversexed. His conquest of beautiful women stemmed from hyposexuality and homosexuality. He was determined to give the outward appearance of being a highly sexed and, according to his conception, a normally sexed, person. Although a nymphomaniac, Amber, of "Forever" fame, was not oversexed. Nor was Peggy Guggenheim, whose autobiography, "Out of This Century," was labeled "Nymphomaniac Confession" by the press, oversexed. She was decidedly undersexed when measured by the yardstick of cold science.

On the masculine side of the question, just to mention one case, William Heirens, now serving time in Illinois for his crimes, was neither oversexed as some newspaper reporters labeled him, nor an intellectual giant; another false label.

It is convenient, when writing upon a controversial subject, to toss the subject into the midst of several groups of scientists, and either take the decisive words from their pens or put such words into their mouths. In this book I am drawing freely upon knowledge which belongs in common to various groups of scientists. The reasoning, which

gives substance to the discussion, is mine. That is why, as I said in the beginning, writing this book in other than the first person, would be, in a manner, a prostitution.

Montaigne, writing in the 16th century, said: "A hundred students have caught the pox (syphilis) before they came to Aristotle's lesson on temperance." There has been nothing in history to indicate that students became more temperate after coming to Aristotle's lesson. There is much to indicate that they understood a great deal more after catching the pox than before. This book cannot change basic law. It may help many to understand it.

During all of my years in school it is quite possible that I did not learn much. Undoubtedly and unquestionably, all that I did learn was learned easily. If the reader learns anything from this book he will learn it easily. It is contrary to my policy to make things difficult. With this in mind, let us examine the findings of scientists of various schools, and let us learn, also, from a thoroughly authentic source—people. People like ourselves. And because I am human with no aspirations for wings and glory, I want to give the warning that although my conclusions are intended to be logical, honest critics may feel that error has entered into such conclusions. Rather than be dogmatic, therefore, let me lift a gem from the pages of the informative magazine, *The American Freeman*: "Heywood Broun, presenting a new contract to his employer, was afraid he might be particularly vulnerable, so in order to make sure of a model contract, Broun said: 'I want to be sure nothing has been left out of this contract. So, let's add a clause that if anything is left out that should be in—it's automatically included'."

If honest critics, after reading the last word of this book, feel that some of my conclusions are illogical, I hereby insert a clause that they, too, may be wrong.

WHAT THEY SAY

Each School of Thought May Be Slightly Biased in Favor of Its Own Theories

If Grampaw Gramps, with his "rheumatics," consults a doctor who crammed on physiology, he'll probably find his kidneys blamed. They simply aren't functioning right. The pathologist will be certain to blame a germ. The psychiatrist may excuse himself while believing the trouble largely a matter of hypochondria. The surgeon will blame the appendix or some other organ or part subject to the knife. The urologist will not hold with the psychiatrist's hypochondria (imaginary) theory, and will insist that Grampaw's rheumatism is real — quite likely gonorrhoeal.

Whether physician or layman the fanatical moralist will be quick to agree with the urologist. He'll rant that at one time in life Grampaw was wickedly oversexed, and he may gloat over his observation that Grampaw is getting his punishment.

The truth is that the fanatical moralist is the only one who may be entirely wrong. The highly sexed person often escapes venereal disease entirely while the timid soul, or milquetoast, who chances one little trip into Cupid's Elysian Fields without benefit of clergy or legal sanction, gets set up with a case of venereal disease. It is not a matter of being hypersexed or hyposexed.

In medico-scientific writing (or literature), the term *hypersexuality* now appears with considerable frequency. I have not found this term in current medical dictionaries. As a matter of differentiation, let us see what certain authorities say, not of hypersexuality, but of hyper-eroticism. In a book entitled, "Encyclopedia of Sexual Knowledge," prepared under the general editorship of Dr. Norman Haire, of London, England, and published in the United States by Eugenics Publishing Company, New York, the following is found on page 486:

"There exist sexual anomalies which cannot be classified in either of the two great categories of perversion of subject and of object, for they are quite a different character. We are concerned in the first place with a perversion of intensity which one might call *hyper-eroticism* or *erotomania*. But usually, two different terms are employed, according as to whether it is a question of masculine or of feminine perversion. The term *satyriasis* is used for men and *nymphomania* for women.

"The causes of these sexual anomalies are most frequently physiological."

It is impossible to establish what might be called a *norm* for the intensity of the sexual drive. It must be borne in mind, also, that the sexual drive is not always in the direction of erotism. It is well, perhaps, to regard any perversion of the sexual drive, or its intensity, as an abnormality. Thus such perversion is classed as pathological—disease. It has its basis in physiology. This is the science which treats of the functions of the human body, and indeed, it includes the functions of living organisms, vegetable and animal.

Stedman's Medical Dictionary defines *satyriasis* as excessive venereal excitement in the male. The same source defines *nymphomania* as

extreme eroticism, or sexual desire, in women; correlated with satyriasis in men.

Neither satyriasis nor nymphomania can be logically regarded as constituting hypersexuality, nor indeed, any phase of hypersexuality. Both conditions are perversions of the intensity of the sexual drive. As perversions, scientists and students of the sciences, see in these and other perversions, actual hyposexuality.

Hypo is from the Greek and means *under*. It is defined thus: A prefix, equivalent to *sub-*, denoting (1) a location beneath something else; (2) a diminution of deficiency; (3) the lowest or weakest in oxygen, of a series of chemical compounds.

Summarizing we may well consider the viewpoint of the physiologist as of utmost importance: "Without function there would be no life; hence, neither psychology nor sociology." Then, in the realization of the physiological basis of life, we may derive information and benefit from the viewpoints of the psychologist and the psychiatrist, who say: "The functions of the body may be altered by the functions of mind, and vice versa." The sociologist embraces both the social and the anti-social. He does not seek to establish either mental or physical norms; instead, he is concerned with the effects of extremes upon herd—society.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Cases Cited — Excerpts from the Literature Explained

Hypersexuality? It is well to follow the word with a question mark. In milling the word over in the mind the absolute lay person will likely conclude that hypersexuality involves little beyond satyriasis and nymphomania. In the absence of thorough analysis, the professional mind will incline strongly in the same direction. As an example of how the lay mind inclines I shall quote liberally from an article entitled "Hypersexuality." It appeared in *Sexology* for July, 1946. Being on the staff of *Sexology*, I am taking no undue liberty when I use liberal quotations.

The article confused me slightly—it still does. Or perhaps not so much the article as the status of its author, Homer Sinclair, B.S. The name *Homer* naturally gives a masculine impression. The reader must therefore be excused for wondering when he reaches this sentence: "As our frequent guest, she shortly aroused the disgust of my husband." That one sentence caused me to read the entire article the third time. There was no conclusion but that Homer was a mother as well as a woman.

The B.S., or Bachelor of Science, is certainly a layman. Even the Ph.D., Doctor of Philosophy, is a layman. There are many scientific laymen. Many laymen, from the medical viewpoint, are scientists. For our purposes here let us give credit where credit is due. The medical man is certainly a layman when we consider the field known as theology. (Supporting this statement is that oft-repeated claim that where you find three doctors of medicine you will find two Atheists). The lawyer, or jurist, regards all who are not qualified in the law as laymen. And so it goes. This digression serves to show, however, that Author Homer Sinclair, B.S., is a layman insofar as medical science and sexology are concerned.

We may now consider her statements:

"If hypersexuality is recognized and treated in time, the results are often satisfactory, and harm is unlikely. The trouble and danger lie in the fact that most mothers, blinded by maternal love, refuse to recognize the symptoms, and shut their eyes

to the danger signal. They think—this couldn't happen to a child of mine.

"But it can and the thing for you to do is to be alert, modern, observant, and sensible in effecting a cure before dire results occur.

"I speak of feminine hypersexuality—in other words, *the oversexed girl*. But, you may contend, your daughter does not openly pursue the opposite sex, that she is sweet and lovable and attached to her home. You have never had trouble with her, and you admit that she is not strikingly beautiful. She has, of course, the natural attraction for boys. Nevertheless, observe her closely."

In a moment we will study a "case" as presented by Author Sinclair. Meanwhile, let us study the foregoing quotation. In doing this we shall not seek to take Author Sinclair apart but shall, instead, look at a thing or two the author overlooked and another thing or two which she has assumed.

The first assumption is that any girl is actually *oversexed*.

It will be recalled that I explained in the beginning that the question of anyone being actually *oversexed* is a highly controversial one. The man or woman who is qualified by medical training and years of experience, study, research and special observation, hesitates to state dogmatically, that anyone is actually *oversexed*. Dr. Norman Haire described the so-called condition as one of "perversion of intensity." The layman assumes that there actually is such a thing as hypersexuality and states: "If hypersexuality is recognized and treated in time, etc."

Author Sinclair speaks of mothers being blinded by maternal love. Only a fool will dispute that there is maternal love except in rare cases. Unquestionably cases have reached public attention, and even the courts, wherein it was difficult to believe that such a thing as maternal love—mother love—existed. Maternal love does not blind a mother. If blindness to special facts exists, it is either natural or due to ignorance, or to causes entirely apart from maternal love. When sexual aberrations of any kind exist the mother is apt to observe such aberrations promptly. Maternal love does not even exclude jealousy in the matter of the father-daughter relation so broadly elaborated upon by Dr. Sigmund Freud, and many others. I do not say that Author Sinclair did not write a good article, nor do I say that the article is devoid of good points. I do say that Author Sinclair *wrote*. I cannot say that Author Sinclair analyzed, or gave studied consideration to what she wrote. Let us look at the case she described: I quote:

"The girl involved was the daughter of one of my best friends. She was attractive and had been raised by a strict father and a rather subdued mother."

Please observe the expressions, "one of my best friends—she was attractive—strict father." We will have occasion to look at these later. The quotation continues:

"Mary's mother termed her a very lovable girl That's what I thought, too, until the loveliness became too obvious."

It is easy to understand that this loveliness became too obvious when Mary became "overattentive" to Author Sinclair's husband. The husband, of course, did not respond. He was embarrassed and threatened to order the girl from his house. It is explained: "If the object of her attentions was a married man, she drew the ire and disgust of his wife."

Mary's strict father was flattered by the attention of his attractive and loving daughter. Mary's mother was so blinded by maternal love that she could not see her daughter's *hypersexuality*. Mary actually escaped trouble. Reading a further quotation, we may feel justified if we wonder whether the escape was unenvied. I quote again:

"How Mary escaped illegitimate pregnancy is a miracle. Perhaps her escape was due to the fact that she traveled in a circle

of friends whose decency and high moral code quenched any aroused passion and temptation. By some unaccountable luck, or the unrelenting surveillance of her guardian angel, Mary came through and married her boyhood sweetheart."

Author Sinclair met Mary again several months after Mary's marriage. Mary was quiet—changed. In fact, Mary was now quite all right. But we must have one more quotation for examination:

"The symptoms of hypersexuality have been recognized by physicians. The remedy was always apparent—a man. Yet, few physicians cared to take upon themselves the responsibility of prescribing this drastic remedy. I have heard of only one who recommended Nature's cure."

So much for the quotations from Author Sinclair's article: "Hypersexuality." The editor of *Sexology* appended this notation to the end of the article:

"*Sexology* concurs in part with this article. It does not agree with it in its entirety. There are *degrees* of hypersexuality. The next state is nymphomania. Even here there are degrees, mild and extreme. If the hypersexuality is not too severe, marriage often is the solution of the problem—the earlier the better.

"But many extremely highly sexed females are so demanding that they soon make physical wrecks of their husbands—no one man can satisfy their desires—few men can stay married to them for more than a year. Psychiatry is of little help, nor is medical science, at least not so far."

An analytical study of the foregoing lengthy quotations will reveal an approach to the serious study of the question: Is anyone oversexed?

Definitely there was little wrong with Mary. I think that we can safely say that at her worst she was simply a devilish nuisance. She was not even, according to the description, a nymphomaniac. Doubtless her greatest offense was that she was *attractive* and *friendly*. If she constantly traveled in a circle of friends of unusual decency and a high moral code, then Mary's decency must have been as great and her moral code as high, as the average for the circle of friends. Had this not been true the circle would not have been friendly and Mary would have been ostracized—completely excluded.

Physicians do not recognize symptoms of hypersexuality. They recognize perversions of the intensity of the sexual drive. What can a woman be thinking about when she speaks of *man* as being a *drastic remedy* for what such woman regards as a degree of objectionable sexuality in woman? There was some warped thinking there.

When I first read the article I saw misunderstanding. I saw that the ire and disgust of one woman had been so aroused as to cause her to want to write about it—get it off her chest. In the reference to Mary's escape from illegitimate pregnancy I saw that which appeared to me as "unrighteous indignation," because something actually failed to happen to Mary. I'll cast my vote for Mary. I'll wager she was a thoroughly clean-minded girl—that she went to the marriage bed with little idea of the actual part sex, *per se*, played in marriage.

As to Mary's escape from illegitimate pregnancy being a miracle, scientists regard miracles as incredible. And it's a well known law in Nature that pregnancy can't just be wished on to a female.

It is easy to write, see, read or even hear, with a jaundiced eye. To show what I mean let me say that, like Stephen Decatur, I solemnly declare that my country—America—is my country, right or wrong. To me, people are people, whether they be Chinese, Siamese, Japanese, Eskimos, Germans, French, Gentiles, Jews, Negroes, even Irishmen or Russians. Last evening a neighbor lady called to see us and, in the course of conversation, the coal strike was mentioned. She proclaimed:

"They say that old John L. Lewis is a Russian." During the 48 hours previous to this the statement had been broadcast over the radio more than a dozen times that Lewis was the son of a Welsh miner. Our neighbor would not have known a Russian from a Connecticut Yankee. She had an idea that for some special reason the Russians are supposed to be objectionable and, hence, Lewis must be Russian. The real point here is that: As I see it, women blessed with a little extra "sex appeal" were somewhat objectionable to Author Sinclair. She looked at them with a jaundiced eye. In her entire article there was not *one* derogatory remark about a *man*.

Now, let us look at another angle having to do with the intensity of the sexual drive, and its perversions. Reference has been made to Peggy Guggenheim's autobiography, "Out of This Century." It may be well to explain now that the book is practically out of circulation. A letter in my files indicates that not only is the book out of print, but that but a few copies actually reached the public and the press. The Guggenheims are said to own the largest copper fortune in the world. The Seligmans were Peggy's mother's family. My informant explained that these two families promptly "bought up" every copy of Peggy's book they could locate and then bought all rights from the publisher. No one can blame them.

Peggy Guggenheim was married several times. She never seemed able to hold a man long at a time. Sexually there appear to be all of the earmarks of nymphomania in Peggy's case. Her whole story indicates anything but hypersexuality. A woman with superior sexual endowment could hold her man—or men. A man of average sexual endowment, who is suitably intelligent, can hold and control a nymphomaniac wife. It was not Peggy's nymphomania which drove men from her. It was Peggy, herself.

The press was, I believe, fair to Miss Guggenheim. Harry Hansen, book critic of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, had this to say:

"It was tough luck for the Guggenheims, the Seligmans, and everyone else who ever slept under Peggy Guggenheim's roof when Peggy decided to give the world her autobiography. Having cast off all reticence in the years between the wars, Peggy decided to make a complete revelation of life and loves and to characterize with great frankness anyone who crossed her path. The complete absence of any moral responsibility is the trade-mark of this sort of sophistication. Conventions, in behavior or painting, do not seem valid for the generation between the wars. Conduct is dictated, apparently, by caprice. Is this written for our amusement or does publicizing this life mean a catharsis (purification of the emotion) for the author?"

The New York *Times* critic, B. V. Winebaum, said this:

"It is useless to wonder what stimulates a well known woman to write a book like this. Miss G. probably believes that she can afford it. To be shocked is to fall flailing into the trap laid so carefully and knowingly by the author."

Medical science and pseudo-medical science are guilty of some flagrant errors in efforts to find a cure for nymphomania. Heavy injections of the male hormone have been used with no results in most cases and with questionable results in a few cases. Surgery has removed the ovaries and amputated the clitoris. In fact, the entire clitoris has been excised—removed. The gonads have been atrophied by x-rays. These drastic measures appear to have resulted in cure in a few cases and amelioration of symptoms in a few more cases. But, by and large, all such radical measures have failed.

Nymphomania appears to arise from a disordered personality—a mental disease, and the physiologist would say that this resulted from glandular dysfunction or brain pathology. Of this latter there seems

little doubt. In support of this is the statement from the Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry:

"Whether the type of (brain) tumor presented is an extreme rarity among patients with symptoms of nymphomania or whether there are other similar cases which have gone unrecognized is impossible to ascertain until psychiatrists and neurologists direct their attention to the possibility of the existence of an organic lesion in the sensory area of the brain in patients with nymphomania."

Many of the so-called *symptoms* of hypersexuality are strictly indicative of the reverse—or hyposexuality. And, even though the physiologist is logical when he looks for glandular disturbance, the psychologist is right when he seeks a foundation in the measurement of the duration and force of mental processes. Likewise, the sociologist is not far afield when he studies behavioristic patterns. The pathologist pursues a logical course in his suspicions of a brain tumor or other brain disease. The psychiatrist and the neurologist admit all of the possibilities suggested by the several other specialists and are justifiable in their contention that the mind acts as the receiver of the various end results and that therefore psychotherapy, or mental treatment, is indicated.

In the American Journal of Psychiatry, Drs. Benjamin Apfelberg, Carl Sugar, and Arnold Z. Pfeffer, reported on 250 cases of male "sex offenders," who were examined in the psychiatric division of New York's Bellevue Hospital. The data which I herewith present are based upon the report made by these physicians.

The offenses included sodomy, attempted rape, assault, endangering the health and morals of a minor, impairing the morals of minors, disorderly conduct, homosexuality, and indecent exposure.

What the law calls indecent exposure is technically known as exhibitionism. The report mentioned known cases of women who exposed their genitals. These women either were not arrested or were charged with disorderly conduct or intoxication.

Of the 250 cases of male "sex offenders" there were 10 cases of incest, 25 of rape and 26 cases of homosexuality. In the younger groups rape was most common and pedophilia was the most common in the older groups. Of those included in the report 32 percent had been previously charged with sex offenses, 36 percent had been charged with other offenses, and only 32 percent had no record of previous clashes with the law.

One standard medical dictionary defines pedophilia as a fondness for children. Psychiatrists and others classify pedophilia as a sex offense in which an older person has sexual intimacy with children. Intimacy may take any of several forms. The offender may merely expose his (or her) genitals to a child. The genitals of the child may be manipulated. The female child may be assaulted. There may be rape or attempted rape.

On one occasion I was asked by a court for a medical opinion in a case of pedophilia. Two physicians regarded the defendant in the case as being oversexed. A defense attorney pleaded that his client was diseased—that he was oversexed and that in seeking an outlet he had not intended intentional harm. The client, this counsel contended, was in the same category as the kleptomaniac—a person with a compulsion neurosis who steals, often articles for which the victim of the neurosis has no use, or need.

My opinion was that the defendant was definitely undersexed and of inadequate personality. The superintendent of State institutions for the insane concurred in my opinion. The offender was treated psychiatrically and with injections of glandular extracts including pituitary. Some five years later I learned the results of the treatment.

The offender had been definitely cured within three months. His first wife had divorced him. Evidence given by her in her suit for divorce

had definitely established our findings. The man later married again and became a father. At 30, he was definitely a useful citizen—doing good work as a reporter on a progressive newspaper.

The doctors who made the Bellevue Hospital report stated:

"Many of these sex offenders are not vicious and are amenable to psychiatric treatment and social rehabilitation. They are frequently the product of abnormal environmental situations, particularly in the family."

Satyriasis in man is not to be confused with priapism. The former is a manifestation of excessive sexual desire while the latter is a persistent erection, especially when due to disease and not provoked by sexual desire. Neither of these conditions is a symptom of hypersexuality.

Strangely, we may study available literature as we will — a far greater number of cases of perversions of the intensity of the sexual drive in woman, than in man, will be found.

Two cases reported in the Bulletin of the medical association of Puerto Rico, have to do with sexual hysteria. The first case is that of an 18-year-old girl. She was beaten and abused by her parents in childhood. At the age of three she used an obscene word for sexual intercourse. Before the age of 10 she acquired an intimate knowledge of condoms, pessaries and venereal prophylaxis. She early cultivated a desire to view obscene pictures. In her early teens she had a compulsion neurosis which caused her to look at the apertures of men's trousers. She sensed shame when in the company of women in the nude. She could not look upon the nude bodies of other women. Early she began indulging in sexual relations. Such relations were always followed by nervous manifestations. Frequently she entertained ideas of prostituting herself. She was reported as symptom free after psychoanalytic treatment.

The other case was that of a girl into whose life there came numerous sexual aberrations. There was incest with her brother and various perverse acts were committed from time to time. Even in the street, seeing men, she wished for their embraces. In time she was married, and at the end of two years of married life appeared to be happy and contented.

Both cases may have the earmarks of what is loosely called hypersexuality. Medical association members labeled both of these cases: Hysterical neurosis with sexual conflicts.

All too often the sexually ill of both sexes are condemned when they are merely ill and need medical attention. And, all too often, where sex is concerned, physicians do nothing constructive for these sexually (and assuredly physically and mentally) ill.

Society and the conventions roundly condemn promiscuity in the female. Society looks askance at promiscuity in the male. Mothers have been known to say that it was good for their daughter's intended husbands to "get some experience and learn something, because such is too risky for the daughters."

A well known professor of sociology once said this to me:

"Inferiority complexes, family training, the conventions and traditions, seem to combine to place a somewhat restraining hand upon femininity. These same entities exist but do not keep society from condoning promiscuity in the male. I sometimes suspect that another important element enters into the situation. Males are not subject to pregnancy."

Let us look and study cases as we may we are certain to find that many cases apparently manifesting hypersexuality are, in fact, cases of hyposexuality wherein the victims attempt compensation by committing acts which seem to simulate the opposite of the true condition.

VARIOUS SEXUAL TRAITS

Some Psychological Considerations

Authoritative observers far too numerous to mention have agreed definitely that sex is by no means dormant in the infant. Freud was one among the first to elaborate upon the sex life of the infant and the sex life in general in early childhood. The infant in the cradle, while exploring his world (principally himself) finds his or her sex organs and learns that these organs are stimulated by contact.

A little later sex interest manifests through the sensations of defecation and urination. Quite early the male child has little idea of the difference existing between his physique and that of the female child but the female child is early made painfully aware that she is different from the male. She does not understand this although the evidence is unmistakably clear. Many a girl child learns to change the diapers on her younger brother or brothers before she reaches school age. Within her there is usually bitterness because she does not have a visible penis. She comprehends, of course, that she is a girl. She learns that some day she may become a mother and that her brothers may become fathers. She is impressed by this latter fact but it does not occur to her that her brothers cannot become mothers.

Small boys and girls alike, however, have little curiosity about their own differences. They accept the fact simply that they will be quite different when they are "big." Their curiosities are directed toward mature persons. And the manner in which mature persons hide their bodies from small children, acting as though to do otherwise would constitute indecent exposure, the while avoiding the questions concerning sex propounded by children, is highly conducive to sexual hysteria of varying degrees suffered by growing children.

Little girls often develop what is known as a masculine protest. I have analyzed at least a 10th as many differing conceptions of the masculine protest as I have read authors, or studied professors. Some interpret the masculine protest (often mentioned in current literature) as a protest against everything masculine. Others interpret the masculine protest as a protest against each person's own femininity. These are the two broad categories—others are dependent upon them.

If we consider the protest as against everything masculine we cannot accept entirely the claim that Lesbianism (female homosexuality) is a distinct form of masculine protest. In Lesbianism the aggressive partner must assume a male role. A complete protest against masculinity would not allow this because the male role would be an imitation of the male. Lesbianism might conceivably be interpreted as a protest against one's own femininity. It is to be hoped that the descriptive term *masculine protest* which fails to adequately describe anything which it attempts to describe, will be of short duration. It fails in describing the trait or characteristics it attempts to describe. It leads some, on the one hand, to think in terms of *hypersexuality*, and on the other either of *hyposexuality* or sex reversal.

Traits of masculinity in the female and traits of femininity in the male are sometimes due to hereditary factors. In a greater number of instances these traits are due to glandular disturbances and yield to intelligent glandular therapy. It is impossible to estimate the instances in which such a reversal of sex traits is due to environmental influ-

ences—chiefly within the family. Boys of thoroughly masculine physique have been so trained that they have grown up being almost wholly feminine in thought. Girls have come into life when a boy was wanted. Often these girls have been treated and reared as boys. When the time comes that demands are made upon males and females so reared to take their places in the world according to their actual sex, such unfortunate individuals may suffer not only a nervous breakdown, but a complete personality breakdown.

If we would provide humanity and the world with men and women normally sexed we must first look to eugenics. No child should be born without the birthright of being well born. Greater discrimination in mating plus scientifically planned parenthood could, within one or two generations, wipe out more than 95 percent of undesirable hereditary traits. This would have a greater effect in lessening crime of every kind than all of the penal sentences and inquisitional tortures combined since man created laws and punishment. It is essential to teach children truth and truth certainly embraces the known facts of sex and sexuality. Children should be taught the proper terms for all parts and functions of their bodies. The known facts concerning sex should be as familiar to every child as his everyday language and his knowledge of eating and hygiene.

I have devoted especial study to one case wherein the father of the family was distinctly of the bachelor type. He developed far later than is the average for male development. During the years when he should have been a man in every sense, yet was not, he was away from home and home influences. His father was a man of such industrious habits that he gave little attention to his sons. In most instances his preference was to do a piece of work personally rather than be bothered with his sons and their help.

This particular father of whom I speak—he who developed late and was of the typical bachelor type—returned to the parental roof after the death of his father. From then on he was dominated by his mother who, after “having her children” became more masculine according to sexual and personality traits, than feminine. The late developed man married. In actual years he was many years older than his bride. His bride had not reached maturity, either physically or mentally. She came under the domination of her husband’s mother. The first child born to these parents died in infancy. In sexual development the father had just become a man. The second child was stricken with polio. She has never fully grown up although she is now gray-haired. The next child, a boy, was the apple of his father’s eye. His features indicated unmistakably that his mother’s husband was his father. This was true of the next child, a daughter. The oldest son followed in his father’s footsteps. He was dominated somewhat by his father, but chiefly by the women who dominated his father. When he married he came under the domination of his wife, and through her, her mother. He is the father of five children and if his wife tells him to punish this one or that one or the other one, he obeys. He believes himself to be religious because he was taught that he must be religious. He thinks of himself as a good man and a godly man. On the other hand, he boldly proclaims that were he not afraid of eternal punishment after death he would stop at nothing to attain wealth. He would, according to his personal claims, deal as dishonestly with his fellow man as his abilities would permit him to deal and he hints that he might even consider robbery provided he could avoid the consequences at law. Had he been taught truth and controlled rather than taught lies under domination, this man would not be exactly what he is—a potential bad man. He is timid in matters of sex. Pregnancy, tests for syphilis as required by law, and even the fact that he has a bitch that is in heat, are matters to be whispered in asides and by no means to be mentioned in mixed company, even though such company should include his wife, his mother and his sis-

ters. Apart, and in purely masculine company, he has a keen sense of hearing for any "smut" men may talk. The chances are that you have seen this same type of man—often. To be sure, he is a good neighbor and a likable fellow. Through his children he may give the world something, but this will depend upon their contacts outside the family. But, to return to this man's father and other members of the family.

Bear in mind that I am speaking of an *actual* and by no means, an *imaginary* family. I have chosen this family because it seems to me to be a representative family to study. The third living child, a daughter, was indeed her father's treasure. On the mental plane, at least, there was the Oedipus relationship. The father-daughter-daughter-father attachment. The accepted mother-envy and jealousy was not absent. The child was a constant victim of punishment, now and then easy punishment at the hands of the father when he was commanded by his mother—often at the hands of her mother who required no command. Before this child entered her teens and with no thought of anyone offering an objection she had her long pigtailed cut away and her luxuriant head of hair trimmed into a becoming "bob."

That was the end of the Oedipus factor. Her father was outraged. He regarded a woman's hair as her crowning glory and this act on the part of this child (just a 12-year-old girl and far from womanhood) was just about as brazen an act as she could have committed. The child was practically an orphan after that. She ate at the family table, but she worked here and there, before school, after school and on week-ends, to earn money for her clothing and school expenses.

During her courtship years she was watched over strictly by her mother. On one occasion she learned that she and her young man friend were actually peeped-at or spied-on through a keyhole, by her mother.

Her attitude was a healthy one and, despite handicaps, she became well schooled. She married an intelligent and capable man and, indeed, saw much of the world. She has not become a mother. This may be because of sterility resulting from an injury during her adolescent years, or, it may be that her husband is sterile. Her life is by no means aimless or meaningless.

During the passing of the years this daughter of her father was thrown in contact with her mother. She developed a rather deep-seated neurosis, or perhaps a psycho-neurosis. This reached a stage whereby it threatened her future—it threatened to permanently wreck her happiness. Psycho-analysis and certain of her mother's acts at the time she was under analysis, cleared her mind and gave her a healthy understanding and attitude. She realized that her father had long forgotten his petty hurt during her childhood years. No longer holding his early actions against him served as further mental catharsis. The future is bright for her.

And now, the next, and last child in that family. As a baby he was incorrigible. When he reached school age he went to school but learned nothing. He spent his time pestering other children and being pestered and driving teachers out of their wits. There were days and days that he played hookey. On such days he was invariably up to something. In season he stole fruit and nuts—not because he wanted them, but for the sake of stealing. He delighted in cutting fences and liberating the domestic animals or livestock of the neighbors.

From infancy he was subjected to cruel punishment by the father of the family. About the time he reached the teens he helped a man in a stealing deal perpetrated upon a neighbor—all for the sake of stealing. He got nothing from the deal. But he had stolen from the wrong man. He was arrested and threatened with reform school. A psychiatric examination gave him a chance. He had learned to write his name and to write figures and do simple addition. After the psychiatric examination he went to work as a man. At 17 he married. The girl he married was his age and rather simple. For a while they got along well enough. He

had learned to dress like a sheik or a jelly bean and had developed philandering tendencies, and perhaps practices as well. I am informed at the moment that his wife, who, after being left alone for weeks at a time, moved in with his mother, is still living with his mother, and this, after more than a decade of such life.

This boy has been arrested and jailed time after time, yet he has never served time and has, perhaps, never committed a really serious criminal act. In time he settled into a business which appealed to him and he has done well financially. He has contracted venereal disease a number of times and has passed this on to his wife. So far she has escaped surgery. They have children and it is apparent that these children—at least not all of them—have not escaped hereditary syphilis.

By now the reader may say: "This is all well enough. The dissertation is not uninteresting. It does not impress me as being unusual. Just such things have been happening for ages and are happening at this moment. The dissertation does indicate a number of sexual traits—perhaps patterns. Mothers and fathers have punished their children and tried to bring them up right for ages. They are still making such efforts. Since time immemorial mothers have spied on their daughters. The chances are that such mothers were merely interested in the chastity of their daughters. Fathers and mothers have even turned against their own children. Stories of a father disinheriting a son or a daughter, or running either away from home and forbidding them to ever return are not unknown. So—where does the story of this representative family get us?"

Should the reader say this to me, I could but say: "I'm glad you brought that up."

Let's go back. There was no courtship between this late-developing male—this bachelor-minded man, and his bride, a mere child physically and mentally. Their marriage was one of coercion. They should never have been married in the first place.

The father of this family, while not openly accusing, never believed himself to be the father of the last child. That child, at least partially psychopathic, grew up without knowing anything of parental love. He was beaten frequently by his legal father. He was shown devotion by his mother only when it martyred her to show such devotion. It is a wonder he has not turned out to be either a criminal or a completely anti-social individual. He gives promise, at least, of actually becoming a worthwhile citizen. Even so, his children and his brother's children may become worthwhile citizens. Should this occur it will be in spite of heredity and home environmental conditions.

This youngest son, because of his philandering, is regarded as being oversexed—a victim of hypersexuality. He is decidedly undersexed. He takes no pride in fatherhood. To him fatherhood is incidental to any marriage. But he swells his ego over his conquest of desirable women. Venereal disease has been to him a badge of manhood. As I said—he is mildly psychopathic. And he now shows signs of developing thyroid disease. Pituitary disease has long been apparent. And either or both of these conditions appear to be correctible by proper medical treatment—now.

That such treatment will be neglected goes without saying.

Personality is the distinction of persons. Sexuality is likewise a distinction of persons. Sexual traits may not be positively said to lie at the bottom of mental and criminal traits. Either may lead to the other.

The best time to cure certain diseases and crimes and to rid humanity of these diseases and consequent crimes, is before the person happens.

We can span the earth with jet-propelled planes. Indeed, we can conquer the stratosphere and the circumference of the earth with rockets and atomic energy. We can perform marvels with surgery and we are capable of producing potent medicines in the laboratory. We can

measure the duration and force of the mental processes, and scientists experimenting with the project predict that we can, in time, produce human life (using the ova and the sperm) outside of a mother body. We can do all of this and more. Yet, because of ecclesiastical power and theological dogma, we dare not attempt to apply measures equivalent to those employed by breeders of domestic animals to the breeding of a better, healthier, more humane, and more intelligent human race. Many marriages occur because of unfavorable sexual traits in the parties to the marriage or parties influencing the marriage. Not infrequently both conditions obtain. The parties involved may be satisfied or content. Quite often they are happy. Their progeny it cannot be said that they had a complete birthright as defined by The White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, in 1930. The conference defined a child's birthright thus:

"There should be no child in America that has not the complete birthright of a sound mind in a sound body, and that has not been born under proper conditions."

PRECOCIOUS SEXUALITY

Including Data on Fecundity and Intelligence Levels

Sex precocity may develop at any time from birth to normal puberty. Some investigators believe that the thymus gland is largely responsible for sex precocity or extremely early development of the secondary sex characteristics. There are investigators who agree that although certain standards are accepted as normal, one must permit considerable variation in time and degree of development.

Reporting in the American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Drs. J. P. Pratt and Robert L. Schaefer, have explained that a survey of 2,311 delinquents in the pre-adolescent and adolescent age groups revealed that sex precocity occurred in 13, or 6.8 per thousand of patients. Most of the cases were reported as due to tumors of the gonads or of the adrenal glands. Their report covered a case of sex precocity in a female first examined at the age of 2 years and 9 months. There was a swelling (regarded as unnatural) of the genitals. The child appeared large for her age and there was pubic hair which was coarse, stiff and black. There was an enlarged clitoris with a bluish glans. The lips of the vulva were markedly enlarged. Within six months the child increased six inches in height. Muscular development was such that 12 pounds in weight were gained during a period of six months observation. The child's appearance was notably masculine, even to the extent of a deep voice.

This child was operated upon at the age of 3½ years and a tumor of the right adrenal gland was removed. There was a rapid trend toward femininity following the operation. The clitoris and vulva became diminished in size and the behavior was characteristic of a child of equal age.

In another case a female child manifested a failure to grow at age 5, and before she was eight years old there was virilism accompanied by male body development. She was also quite hairy. An operation six months later failed to reveal a cause for the condition. Soon after this patient's 10th birthday she was reported by her mother as having developed a decided trend toward femininity.

The Drs. Pratt and Schaefer gave the causes of sex precocity as follows:

"The causes of sex precocity may be divided into the following four groups:

"(1) Those associated with adrenal gland tumors. Most of these cases are associated with virilism, hirsutism (over-supply of body hair), enlarged clitoris and marked muscular development.

"(2) Those due to tumors of the ovary. Young girls who have granulosa-cell tumors (tumors of the ovaries) menstruate but they do not ovulate (form and discharge an egg from the ovary); hence they cannot become pregnant.

"(3) Those associated with lesions (injuries or diseased conditions) of the brain.

"(4) The *constitutional type*, considered the most common type of precocious puberty. These patients develop a very early puberty without noticeable disturbances in any endocrine gland or any organ of the body. Such children remain healthy and live on as do the girls who begin puberty at the usual age and they not only menstruate but also ovulate at least soon after the menses are well established. Therefore they are capable of becoming pregnant at an early age. All the cases of pregnancy reported in girls from 5 to 9 years of age have occurred in constitutional cases of sex precocity."

It is well to observe that this report deals with the feminine side of the scale. It is also well to observe that the findings represent those of the authors quoted. Their findings agree with the findings of numerous others. Naturally in a short report these authors have not even pretended to begin to cover the field of sex precocity.

It may be taken for granted that practically every geneticist and student of eugenics, as well as a broad cross-section of the general populace is familiar with the story of the "Jackson-Whites, the Jukeses, the Kallikaks and the Pineys of New Jersey." These names are recorded as being fictitious. The histories of these families are far from being fictitious. Some of the reports fail to include the Jukes family and refer to three great tribes of defectives, i.e., the Jackson-Whites in the north of the State of New Jersey, the Kallikaks in the central section of the State, and the so-called Pineys, farther south. (The Pineys lived in the Pine Belt and from this the legendary name was derived.)

The "tribes" are said to have been multiplying and in-breeding since the American Revolution. In-breeding, we must remember, aside from the social barriers against incest, produces defectives only if there are defectives on both sides of paternity. If defectives exist on one side of incestuous breeding, some of the descendants may escape the hereditary traits of the defective parent. If there are *no* defectives on either side of incestuous paternity, then it is quite unlikely that defective descendants will result from such in-breeding. It may as well be admitted that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to find two persons for mating who would have positively no history of defectives of any kind, even in recent generations. Degrees of defectiveness must, of course, be considered

Conditions arising from the results of defectiveness among New Jersey's three tribes caused the State legislature to grant appropriations to cover the cost of an investigation and "research" to determine the causes or reasons for the mental and moral degeneration of so many of the state's citizens. This was in 1911. The following is from the report of the investigators. It was made public in 1913:

"Picture a colony composed of children 7 to 10 years old . . . and yet who possess fully developed physical power, and it will be clearly seen that the collapse of everything like social order will inevitably result."

Seventeen years later, or in 1928, the same district was again in-

vestigated. The results were published by the Department of Institutions and Agencies. It stated in part:

"Our new findings only strengthen our previous conviction that unless drained at its headwaters this stream of degeneracy will continue to swell, gathering force with time."

The published report carried the testimony of an expert, Dr. E. A. Doll, then Director of Research in the Vineland Training School. Dr. Doll wrote:

"Vital changes brought about by improved transportation facilities are scattering the members of these degenerate families to all communities of the State. . . . These evils are spreading beyond the borders of inbreeding among the deficient themselves and sharply portray the real menace to our better stock. . . Existing panacea for existing ills merely aggravates the situation. This temporizing with natural selection merely aids the survival of the unfit and brings society no ultimate relief."

During the past two decades at least 13 bills seeking to establish laws for the amelioration of the conditions which have been described have been introduced in the New Jersey legislature. Any success at passage has been thwarted by a declaration of unconstitutionality before law or laws had a chance for application.

At the present time 20 States have effective laws which, to an extent at least, prevent procreation among the insane, the feeble-minded and certain others. Even suitable laws are impotent to bring out innumerable family "skeletons-in-the-closet." Broader education and the promotion of sociological science may accomplish far more than law which is often dominated by the personal motives of officials and into which politics may reach and withdraw a trickling, briny hand, loaded with the proverbial political pork.

It seems to be a strange fact in Nature that the lower the intelligence level of a family the greater is the fecundity of the female. Perhaps it would be better to say that the more ignorant and even, in untold cases, the more degenerate, are far more prolific and breed at a much higher rate than the more intelligent. There are, of course, the usual exceptions to the rule.

"The fecundity of half-breeds" has become common verbiage among students of genetics. Incidentally, this does not mean that all half-breeds produce degenerates and children of a low intelligence level. The half-breed (regardless of the racial mixture) is just naturally a more noticeable person because of his breeding. We may rely upon figures, however, and these do show that half-breeds are of high fecundity, and that half-breeds do produce fewer really intelligent offspring than do most others except, perhaps, those in the categories of New Jersey's noted tribes.

There are other degrees of precocity, and forms of precocity which I have not yet mentioned specifically, which I would now like to call to your attention. One form (which manifests in varying degrees) applies particularly to the male. Development is fairly early and rapid. The outstanding feature is the excessive development of the genitalia. In certain of these cases (and this depends largely on family background and heredity) the precocious males develop and maintain a high degree of mentality. When this high degree of mentality obtains, we have something akin to hypersexuality. A better term would be super-sexuality. The reason is: These individuals have their sexuality directed into normal channels. They are not fond of displaying an apparent excessive erotism. Marriage to them means monogamy. They devote any excessive intensity of sexual drive toward accomplishment — and not in Ero's direction. Invariably they are successful in their chosen walks of life, are good fathers and worthwhile citizens. Their judgments and their dealings with their fellow man are tempered with tolerance. They help

to hold civilization together and indeed to promote the cause of civilization and the betterment of the races.

It is believed that precocity in these cases is dependent upon lessened activity of the thymus gland and that there may be some adrenal abnormality. Diminished activity of the thymus would serve to hasten secondary sex characteristics. Adrenal abnormality (and here it seems likely that the abnormality is lessened activity for the reason that adrenal tumors which decrease the function of the glands are conducive to precocious development) permits rapid and excessive growth of the genitals.

Increased activity of the pituitary gland may contribute to precocious development of the male genitalia. In pituitary tumor (and consequent diminished activity) the genitalia of both sexes may remain infantile.

When heredity is unfavorable, and especially when adrenal tumor develops, we are likely to have the type of precocious genital development which leads toward satyriasis early and sexual and personality degeneracy and disintegration. This contrasts sharply, as we may readily see, with the first type of male sex precocity described.

Now and then the "child prodigy" early shows signs of retardation and subsequent degeneracy. Biopsy or autopsy (either or both) will be likely to reveal extensive adrenal tumor. The pituitary may be diseased and the pineal body may be involved.

NOTE: It is well here to digress by explaining that space will not permit me to go into a description of the endocrine glands and glands known to have definite endocrine function. The endocrine glands are ductless glands. They receive substances direct from the blood stream, convert these substances into still other substances and discharge such substances directly into the blood stream. In the endocrine group proper are: The thyroid, parathyroids, pituitary and the adrenals. Glands having endocrine function are the sex glands, called the gonads. In woman these are the ovaries; in man, the testicles. There are other "accessory" glands of definite endocrine function. The exact function of the pineal body (located as is the pituitary in the brain) is not yet known. In two other Haldeman-Julius books, "What Is a Hermaphrodite?" and "Sex and Psycho-Somatology," I have given fairly extensive endocrine data.

ELEPHANTIASIS

This Disease Is Often Mistaken for Precocious Sexual Development

This condition is interesting to us in this discussion because of the fact that it often affects the genitals, this being true of both sexes yet more notable, as a rule, in the male, giving the appearance of precocious development of the sexual organs.

This will be more readily understood when it is mentioned that in at least one especial type or kind of elephantiasis the scrotum may attain a weight of 50 pounds.

During World War II, our Phillipine Guerrillas (and in numerous instances their wives), observed this genital enlargement with frequency, particularly among the hill people or dwellers of the Phillipines. From reports those so observing seldom knew, or even had an idea, of the cause.

There are numerous causes and although all causes are significant, the cause most often found in the tropics, especially the Phillipine Islands and tropical India, appears to be of greatest interest to us here in the United States. The reason for this is that numerous cases in the United States have been traced to one focus in South Carolina.

Presently, I shall describe certain causative factors. One of these factors can become quite involved with technical terms, but we shall avoid getting deeply into these. The reader who has been trained in medical technicalities, as well as the physician and nurse, will understand, whether there is or is not involved technical terminology. The lay reader will prefer to have his served plain.

We are often more interested in effect than cause. And in thinking of a scrotum weighing 50 pounds we are aware that here, unquestionably, is effect.

The hill people of the Phillipines (and numerous other tropical localities for that matter) wear little clothing. Often, the men wear no more than a breech cloth. The average breech cloth is not designed to cover 50 pounds of scrotum. In many cases the scrotum enlarges, practically burying an unenlarged penis within it. In some cases the external genitalia *en toto* become enlarged.

Our American guerrillas have told and written of some grotesque cases. At first, being laymen, they marveled at the terrific sexual development. Seeing women with vastly enlarged vulva, it was at first decided that these strange people mated according to precocity. On the other hand, the husband and wife relation was often unmistakable, and the marvel gained importance when it was observed that only one of the marital partners showed precocious development of the genitalia.

In parts of India, elephantiasis of the genitals is said to be about as common as malaria, and that is universal.

While a medical examiner for the U. S. war industry I encountered (out of thousands examined) several mild cases of elephantiasis of the genitals and innumerable cases of other forms of elephantiasis. There were but two outstanding cases of elephantiasis of the male genitals which were of sufficient propensities to evoke serious attention. One of these was a man who was a member of the guard force. This fellow was a likable chap and had many friends. It seemed that not only all members of the guard force knew about him but that many others throughout the shipyard knew him or knew concerning him. He was known by a nickname and although it seemed strange to me that his nickname was pronounced by all with a rather peculiar emphasis—something bespeaking admiration and wonderment, I was in the dark.

My work, as will be understood, did not extend to therapy. I had no time for treating the ill. As a matter of friendship, however, I now and then conferred the favor of a consultation after regular hours or during a slack period. I had been told that "Stokie" was having some throat trouble. He wanted to know if I would be kind enough to look at him. The adjutant of the guard inquired and I agreed. Later, I asked someone if they had seen Stokie. The answer was: "Stokie! Ah, no, but he's having some throat trouble. I wish you'd see him." I said that I did not know him. "You don't know Stokie?" The question was more like an exclamation.

Stokie's throat must have gotten well because he failed to put in an appearance even after all of the solicitation of his friends. Not long afterward, I received a note from the guard adjutant. In substance he asked me to please examine Mr. So and So with a view to determining whether he should be given a medical release. (Workers were frozen on their jobs at the time, it will be remembered.) The note explained that the loss of Mr. So and So would be keenly felt; yet, if he was in the unhappy physical condition he seemed to think he was in, my recommendation would certainly secure his release.

Later, when the applicant for examination was in my office, I was amazed at his condition. I asked how long he had been a victim of elephantiasis. He did not understand. He was quite cooperative and his personality was pleasing. I did not marvel that he had friends—after I learned that Mr. So and So was Stokie!

Stokie's genitals were, to use the most understandable description,

of dimensions about three times as great as the average. The condition was unmistakably elephantiasis.

When elephantiasis is confined (as it often is) to one leg, that leg may attain dimensions three or four times as great as the normal leg. Long ago the condition was observed as of high prevalence in the Barbadoes Islands and hence came the name, Barbados Leg. Some cases of questionable elephantiasis have been called "White's Swelling." Then there is what is known as congenital elephantiasis in which one or more of the limbs or other parts may be immensely enlarged because of a dilatation of the lymphatics. A dilatation of the blood vessels causes a form of elephantiasis known as elephantiasis telangiectodes.

The most noticeable cause of elephantiasis, and especially wherein the genitals are involved, is that of the infestation known as filariasis.

In filariasis the human body is infested with one of the species of the nematode family, known as filariidae. This nematode family, as you have probably surmised, is parasitic. Lesions occur in the areas where the adult worms locate. There is lymph stasis, lymph spaces may be dammed off even by a deposition of the eggs, and the local circulation of blood and lymph may be seriously interfered with.

As filariasis develops elephantiasis becomes notable. There is hypertrophy (enlargement) of the skin and its underlying tissues. When the genitals are attacked, enlargement reaches the proportions I have described. When the enlargement is not too great, especially in the male, the victim is merely thought of as being of somewhat precocious development.

Elephantiasis of the genitalia produces impotence in time, much depending upon general effects and the actual proportions attained by the genitals.

Stokie's story was typical, yet interesting. As a 15-year-old boy he had sworn to a greater age and had been enlisted in the army during the Spanish-American war. He had served in the tropics. Being in the developmental stage nothing had been thought of his remarkable genital development. In all physical examinations where many men were examined *en masse* and in the nude, Stokie had stood out in the crowd. He had married in due time, but no children had been born to the marital union. He was 58 when I examined him and was well preserved. He had been impotent for several years. He and his mate were, however, quite contented and happy.

Various insects, including flies, gnats and mosquitoes, both the anopheles and culicine, act as intermediate hosts and transmit the parasite causing filariasis and elephantiasis to mankind.

In mentioning other forms of elephantiasis I did not mention surgical elephantiasis. This is the swelling of a part due to obliteration, following a surgical operation, of the lymphatics draining the part..

When pausing to reflect upon cases like that of Stokie, it may be well to remember the old saying now made into song: All that glitters is not gold.

SEXUAL NEURASTHENIA

Aspects of the Hypersexuality Hoax, Hypochondria—Therapeusis

Sexual neurasthenia is simply neurasthenia involving sexuality and the sexual life. *Neuro* means nerve; *asthenia* means weakness. We may define sexual neurasthenia as a nervous sexual weakness, but when we thus define, we leave out a great deal that is understood by both the laity and profession as being involved in even the consideration of neurasthenia. When the neurasthenia is referred to sexuality, a simple

definition means little when compared to the broad general conception of thinking people.

Not many years ago medical texts, lectures, and literature in general, sought to ridicule the idea that there was, or indeed could be, such a thing as neurasthenia. In the lecture halls (sans microphone) a deep-voiced professor would boom and a contralto would shrill: "I never want to hear of one of you students going out into practice and making a diagnosis of neurasthenia. Should you do so, and should I learn of it, it would be my pleasure, if possible, to have your diploma voided and your license revoked. To make a diagnosis of neurasthenia is to admit you do not know what is wrong with your patient. Blunder on something more material, if you will, but never be guilty of diagnosing neurasthenia."

Was there no such thing as nervous weakness? Were the professors so condemnatory of the diagnosis of neurasthenia because it was a convenient cover-all? Many of us believed the latter. We knew, at the same time, that numerous of our professors were biased. We knew that others were actually ignorant. But above all we knew that each individual among us had to seek his own solution.

Even today many doctors smile a sort of vacant smile meant to be derisive and say: "Don't you know any better?" when various mental conditions are mentioned to them. Even now, we have doctors who feel that the mountains of psychologic data and psychiatric material which have been accumulated by sweat and burning the midnight oil should be labeled "bosh and bunk." These doctors feel that in the mental realm there are but two diagnoses: They are: Either you are crazy or you aren't.

An even greater number of doctors still live in the dark ages when we consider matters *sexualis*. Many of these doctors may have their difficulties; yet they have a line of reasoning about matters *sexualis* similar to their reasoning or lack of it, in matters psychiatric. They hold: Nothing to do about sex except follow Nature. Either as a man you are potent or you are impotent. A woman is either frigid or she isn't. And they offer relief for the man with a frigid wife. He should have sense enough to know what to do, they reason. Perhaps, they grant, a woman may pursue a similar course, if she wants to be a damned prostitute.

The number of such doctors is diminishing. I grant that. The rate of diminishing is far too slow.

Suppose you are a victim of sexual neurasthenia? You consult your regular physician, or in the event you do not have one, needing medical services seldom, you may consult a general practitioner. What happens 99 times out of a 100? If innumerable letters I receive each month is any criterion, you get laughed at.

That sounds terrible, doesn't it? Should one physician speak of other physicians thus? Perhaps not, but if you'll permit me to fall into the vernacular, being frank, I'll say: "Bro-thur! You just ought to hear doctors at gossip. Do they say pul-len-ty? They really do."

There's a crying need for reform and reform is slowly coming about. Within a few years all doctors are likely to understand sexual neurasthenia. More than likely neurasthenia will be understood.

A neurosis is a nervous disease. It is especially what we regard as a functional nervous disease—a disease regarded as not being dependent upon a special lesion. It is also a peculiar state of irritability or tension of the nervous system. Psychiatrists usually extend the definition of neurosis to include any form of nervousness.

A neurasthenia is a divisional part of a neurosis. Sexual neurasthenia may be transitory—fleeting. It may be chronic. I have always regarded sexual neurasthenia as any upset affecting the sexual life. The physician or patient who will accept this definition will find that he has a rational basis from whence he can start in pursuing a course of corrective treatment.

To clarify my remarks about doctors and their opinions concerning mental disease and sexual disorders, allow me to point out that some authorities have estimated that we now need four times the number of psychiatrists we have to care for those needing mental hygiene and therapeusis. This is such a conservative estimate that we cannot accept it except as applying to persons seriously needing psychiatric treatment and care. Ten times our present number of psychiatric specialists would be insufficient to give anything like general psychiatric service to our citizens the country over. We are now training about 300 psychiatrists per year. Dr. Edward Strecker, formerly president of the American Psychiatric Association, has estimated that at our present rate of training psychiatrists, a hundred years would be required to educate a sufficient number of psychiatrists to render efficient service to the general public.

THE HYPERSEXUALITY HOAX

We do not speak of a person as being of a hyper-personality. We do speak of persons as being of impressive personality. To be of a sexuality so much above the average as to attract attention, would mean to be of an impressive personality. *Hypersexuality* is a hoax. The term is a misnomer. Its increasing frequency as a term in the literature may serve to give the term an accepted place according to usage. If such acceptance comes about, then marked refinement of what it signifies must accompany it. As of the present the term is in bad odor. It is regarded as being analogous to *oversexed*. No one is actually oversexed. The person of superior or impressive sexuality is to be likened to the person of impressive personality. Superior sexuality does not send persons endowed with it on the road to degeneracy through a life devoted to sexual conquests. A person of superior sexuality is likely to be a person of high intellectuality. Such a person will direct his or her efforts toward accomplishment—toward building and improving to the end that the races may benefit. It matters not if the efforts directed toward such accomplishment are not philanthropic. It matters not if the attainment of accomplishments are selfish and are rewarded financially. Our most renowned philanthropists are magnified Jesse Jameses with the danger of conquest removed.

We are all familiar with that exclamation which became popular a few years ago: "Can I help it if I got glands?" Having *glands* seemed to be an excuse for just about everything. Research and investigation have brought knowledge which leaves the old glandular excuse without a peg to stand on. And now we are hearing from the *wolf* and the *wolverine* the question: Can I help it if I am oversexed?

Neither the wolf nor the wolverine is oversexed. They are undersexed and suffer from sexual neurasthenia and other neuroses. The condition sometimes becomes psychopathic (of the nature of a mental derangement or disease).

Individuals who regard themselves as being oversexed (and who are often so regarded by others) actually suffer from hyposexuality—sexual inferiority. They are not to be blamed. They are to be treated. Their belief needs correction, not that they do not realize their condition as one of inferiority, but because their neighbors and the public generally are unaware of the real truth—the truth that the theory of hypersexuality is a hoax.

Letter after letter coming to me, through special educational work I engage in, brings the plea: "Please do not laugh at me. I explained my case to my personal doctor and he laughed at me. I hesitate to see other doctors in person because I do not want to be laughed at."

HYPOCHONDRIA

Hypochondriasis (hypochondria) shares, in part, today the position occupied by neurasthenia a few years ago. Hypochondriasis is regarded as that condition in which the victim imagines he or she suffers from various diseases. The name derives from the hypochondriac region or, properly, regions. These are the right and left hypochondriac regions. You can best understand them by thinking of your anatomy just above and to the right and left of your stomach and beneath the ribs. Actual imaginary disease is frequently referred to these regions or to the liver which is in the right hypochondriac region. It is unfortunate that hypochondriasis is not yet fully understood. Many of the conditions embraced under hypochondriasis, imaginary though they be because no specific lesion can ordinarily be demonstrated, are painful.

Conscientious investigators have not concluded that the conditions often included under hypochondriasis, are without basis insofar as the lesion theory is concerned. Some progress has been made in proving that numerous hypochondriacal conditions are due to lesions of the autonomic nervous system; other conditions are believed to be due to brain lesions affecting the central nervous system. Syphilis of the central nervous system is evidence of the substantiality of this theory, per se.

Hypochondriasis is often a feature of hyposexuality—even when hyposexuality is mistaken for hypersexuality.

When such conditions as neurasthenia, sexual neurasthenia, hypochondriasis and hyposexuality are better understood, human happiness will be greatly increased. Meanwhile, the more down-to-earth-information gained by each individual, the better. As time goes on and knowledge advances, the expression *abundant* sexuality, will replace the misnomer, hypersexuality.

THERAPEUSIS

Therapeutics (therapy) may be defined as the practical branch of medicine dealing with the treatment of disease. In the several conditions to which we have devoted study in this book, various branches of therapeutics may be called into action. Medicine must supply deficiencies (including glandular preparations), and specific germ diseases must be treated according to the form of therapy which has proved of greatest value. Surgical conditions must have attention. The psychologist should determine the mental status quo so to speak through psychometric instrumentalities, and the sociologist should have an opportunity to improve the environment. To the psychiatrist falls the work of effecting mental catharsis and both education and re-education of special faculties.

Back in the days of the horse and buggy, the advent of the automobile was resented. Even now powerful interests are bucking the airplane—yet the personal airplane is coming. Everywhere we learn of specialization. The armed forces give specialization great credit for our victory in World War II. Yet, in the press, at the theatre, on the radio and in every day common conversation a huge joke is made of the medical specialist—until he or she is needed.

We hear those old horses about the specialists for the right leg, the left leg, the right eye and left ear, etc. Isn't a doctor supposed to be a doctor? Should not one doctor learn all about medicine? Aren't our doc-

tors today as smart as were the old fellows of the past century, many of whom never saw medical school and would not have known a diploma had they met it in the broad daylight with his name on it? Why, those gentlemen did not have elaborate hospitals, x-rays, expensive laboratories, and—well, now and then they *did* have consultants. Didn't they just go in to where a sick person lay, examine such person, and, within a few minutes, tell you what was wrong with him? And if a person was crazy any doctor could say so—he did not need to be a specialist with a special name like psychiatrist. What's the matter with the doctors of today who seem to have about everything?

Have you heard such reasoning and questioning? I not only have but now and then I have read it. I have even read it from the pens of several physicians. The substance of what they wrote was this: Our predecessors were masters of the clinical art. Their manner of arriving at conclusions was often clumsy but we must admit that their conclusions were usually sound and their therapy effective.

Yes. I have read such substance from the pens of learned physicians. Sometimes I think they were pouring oil or soft soap. Questions like those I have stated have but few answers: Potent answers. Let us look at them unblinkingly.

In the last century physicians did the best they could under the circumstances. There were no elaborate means at their command. The country (and the world) experienced epidemic after epidemic. The average life span was far less than half of what it is now. Smallpox was indeed a plague. The toll of life from typhoid fever was heavy yet death is not painful. The suffering occasioned by typhoid fever, smallpox and innumerable other plagues was intolerable and inhumane. It was hellish. Disease after disease could be named—diseases we, of today, have almost forgotten about because they have been conquered. No more does yellow fever take such a toll of life that humans must be piled in heaps and thus buried.

Today, in New Orleans, there are survivors of the last highly destructive or devastating epidemic of yellow fever. Some of these survivors have not forgotten how to intone: "Bring out your dead," just as those who did the scavenger work in that epidemic intoned.

Indeed we have specialists, elaborate hospitals and laboratories. And we have a longer life span and greater happiness for those who live. We need more specialists. To go just as far as the dull jokesters (who can't enjoy a real joke, for a real joke isn't dull) it may be said that there would be no harm done if we had psychiatric specialists for the conscious mind, the subconscious mind and the unconscious mind. We might even go further and think of a specialist for each disease, as for instance, one specialist for hypochondria, another for neurasthenia, another minor injuries of the emotions, and so on. Of course, this would be carrying things too far. But specialization is not a joke.

He who will look behind the scenes may find truth. Many scientists who have done the most to promote human health and medical knowledge were not doctors in the medical sense. At least they were not M.D.s, and to cite an example or two let us remember Leuenhok with his eternal grinding of lenses; Pasteur who learned to interpret what one saw beneath the lenses, and Jenner who scratched some pus from cow pox into human tissue. Now respectable veterinarians, not long ago labeled just "Old Horse Doctors" have contributed vastly to medical knowledge and to sanitary science. Sanitary engineers have made life more worth living and they are still doing so. Men and women from all walks of life have offered themselves as human guinea pigs that others might benefit. Even *they* were *specialists*.

The history of medicine shows that medical progress was held in bondage through priestcraft for ages and ages. And let no one blindfold himself to the truth that priestcraft (which is not limited to any sect or denomination of religious or theological creed) is still tossing monkey wrenches into the machinery of medical progress.

If this be doubted, take stock of theological dogma and birth control. "Natural selection," they shout. "Let Nature have her way. Let more babies be gotten for God." Oh, yeah! Yet when man and woman seek to satisfy libido—to enjoy their sexual appetites, something which is as natural as water and sunshine, they yell: "Shame! Sin!"

Therapeusis extends far beyond administering a pill or a sacrament to soothe the emotions wrongly trained. Therapeusis extends beyond sanitary science and isolation of diseases such as leprosy. Therapeusis extends beyond merely improving environment and the general sociological status. Therapeusis extends to improving the races by preventing "natural selection" from running rampant and creating more Jackson-Whites, Kallikas, Jukeses and Pineys. Would to all the Fates (if such there be) that surgery could extend to the excision of all "Thou Shalt Nots" replacing them with reason. The Spanish have a saying which when interpreted means: One gift is worth a thousand promises. We can in truth accept the fact that one constructive action is worth an age of prohibitions.

Therapeusis equals treatment which equals knowledge which equals reason.

CONCLUSION

Members of various branches of medical science are sometimes dogmatic. Each practitioner upholds his own particular branch of science and all too often is unduly critical of the advocacies of members of other branches. This is an unfortunate part of specialization which must be overcome and will, of necessity, be overcome in time, if for no other reason than that each positive branch of medical science will find itself dependent upon another branch and all branches will in time find themselves interdependent.

Sexological science, not even taught per se in medical colleges today will, in time, take its place alongside other equally important components of the whole of, not only medical science, but science in general.

In the not far distant past there were but few capable surgeons in the world. Today capable surgeons are legion. The pathologist came into being after Pasteur. The anesthetist (who came into being after anesthesia had slept far too long) is less than a century old, but he has arrived. At the turn of the century there were but a handful of psychiatrists in the world. Mental medicine was still largely in the hands of the priestcraft, side show hypnotists and the magicians. Christian Science ran neck and neck with psychiatry until the rationality of psychiatry produced results while the emotional intoxication wrought by Christian Science died like the effects of various stimulants and became as a hangover to its adherents.

At this moment it is little wonder that people go about talking about hypersexuality—about being oversexed—when they are but suffering the pangs of an inferiority complex. A few enterprising physicians and laymen have made all of the progress that can be measured to date in sexological science. We now have perhaps one tenth of the number of psychiatrists needed and so—perhaps within a quarter of a century we will have a proportional number of sexologists—or possibly more. The powers of the priestcraft and perverted reformers will have receded proportionate with past recessions in the face of asserted truth and disseminated knowledge.

The sanctimonious pray for a better world while fighting against the attainment of that for which they pray. The unperverted pray not and yet they toil and spin to produce a better world in which to live—tolerating the sanctimonious drones—and in peace with each other.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

By E. Haldeman-Julius

Reprinted from The American Freeman, Published at Girard, Kansas.

THE MIRACLE OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY

The only thing that is miraculous about ancient miracles is how they survive after being refuted thousands of times. A Louisiana paper recently offered its readers a short article by a Litt.D. with a richly Hibernian name—obviously paid Catholic propaganda—on the miracle of the rapid growth of the early church. This alone is enough to prove the divinity of the present Roman church to any man of common sense, the man says. It is remarkable how much uncommon nonsense is now addressed without protest to the man of common sense. Three witnesses are quoted. One is a clumsily twisted quotation from the Epistle to the Romans, whereas we have the official admission of the Papal Chronicle that the Roman Christians were so few and poor that they had no church—and then only a room in a deserted suburban wineshop—until the 3rd century. The second witness is Tertullian, a professional rhetorician, a reckless and impulsive writer, and, when he speaks of the Popes, described by the Catholics themselves as an unmitigated liar. The third witness is a supposed quotation from Renan, but in the usual grand Catholic manner no reference is given. There are five or six standard works in which a severe attempt is made to estimate the growth of early Christianity. They calculate, generously, that at the end of 250 years of proselytism there were two to five (different estimates) million Christians in 100 million people; and all but a few score apostatized when Diocletian put the screw on. Yet we have shown repeatedly that between 1920 and 1934 Atheism won more than 100 million converts from the Roman Church. This is the sort of stuff that the majority of American editors now, for money, allow the Catholic authorities to thrust down the throats of their readers.

* * *

HOW TO WRITE HISTORY

There is a quarrel among the big bugs of history. Some of them claim that it is a science and writers on it must treat it as every other branch of science is treated, without regard to the general public. We gather that they want a wall with spikes or broken bottles on top built round it to keep out readers like us. Dr. G. M. Trevelyan, perhaps the best living writer of history in the English language today, joins issue with them and says that the writing of history is an art and it ought to be attractive to every outsider who likes well-written books. He holds that "the discovery of historical facts should be scientific in method but the exposition of them for the reader partakes of the nature of an art." Too many of these scholars go on fiddling while Rome is burning. The idea of suspending scientific research until we get the world in order is too childish to discuss. It is precisely science we must consult about

the restoration. But we should not lose much if we suspended academic history for a decade or two. There is little to be discovered in the field of history except ancient coins and buried ruins. But there is a mighty lot to be done in the way of a simple, attractive, and sound account of history for the general public. The great majority of people have a totally false idea of character and culture in the last stage of the ancient world, what happened in the first 400 years of the present Era, what caused the Dark Age and how dark it was, what caused the recovery of civilization in Europe, and what was the real source of the scientific-humanitarian civilization of modern times.



WE LISTEN TO THE VOICE OF PROPHECY

It is a lie that we never read or hear the other side. At the risk of a severe bilious or dyspeptic attack we take an extra dose of vitamins occasionally and plunge into the Dead Sea of religious literature. So the gentleman who lately wrote us from Missouri (of all places) giving us hints how to get rid of our doubts is mistaken. His letter is written on a crowded sheet of paper that looks like a compound advertisement of kidney pills, a troupe of crooners, and a new soap. The general title is *The Voice of Prophecy*, and we have photographs of six gentlemen who work the oracle. Only one of them is described as a story-teller. Apparently they have marked out either Haldeman-Julius or Joseph McCabe for conversion. The campaign opens strong. "Do you really believe in evolution?" and "How can anyone look at the starry heavens at night and say that a wise creator isn't behind them?" are first thrusts. We are invited to say how a maple seed can become a maple if there is no God: to admit that being a Christian never hurt anybody, and that we are throwing away the chance of a wonderful time beyond the grave. Really, grandpa, we went through all this when we left the primary school many decades ago and have not yet got to our second childhood. It appears that these people have the free run of broadcasting in every state of America, while those of us who want to give the people the kind of knowledge that 90 percent of the best brains in America recognize as knowledge are refused a hearing. In our next incarnation we are going out for dollars and religion.



THE SLOGAN OF RESPECTABILITY

It is related of Edward Carpenter, a distinguished and idealistic social reformer of 50 years ago, that when he came to a crisis of his life and felt that the conventions were choking him he one night put his evening or soup-and-fish dress, with his patent leather shoes, silk hat, starched shirts and collars, and white tie, on the dining room fire and sat with a small circle of friends watching them burn. This rebel member of the circle published a book with the title "*Civilization: its Cause and Cure.*" Another got out a book titled "*The Blight of Respectability.*" Most of the members of this British circle came to a bad end—a respectable end. One became Prime Minister of the country, another an Under-Secretary of State, and spoke casually of what "*Lady Fitznobbins said to me*" and even what "*His Majesty said to me.*" Carpenter almost alone continued in his conventional simplicity, wearing sandals and loathing starch and lords and ladies. The famous organic chemist Professor Armstrong also outraged conventions by wearing brightly colored clothes and making a virtue of bad temper.

Probably one would find similar little groups in most cities of most civilizations, and the spirit of the thing is good. Fashion is a monstrous tyrant. It is a relic of the salad days of the race when, as amongst savage peoples today, tradition rules with an iron hand. But

a more serious thing than the expression of one's individuality against the routine of tradition is to get the social groups to see how it is fooled by the phrases and slogans that are used to persuade men to follow it; which generally means to respect some ancient institution like royalty, nobility, wealth, the wisdom of statesmen, or the churches. "Speech," said Tallyrand, "was given to man to conceal his thoughts." We sometimes wish it were, but, of course, that fascinating French adventurer (in a genial sense) meant that speech is so often used to compose slogans that are more sonorous and more effective than truth. American traders have invented a form of advertising that Europe is copying. A cloth-manufacturer will not say, "This cloth of mine wears longer than anybody else's" but simply "It wears," and the world lines up for it. They do not reflect that he does not say that it wears longer than Smith's or Baldwin's cloth.

The world's higher merchants, the political and clerical bodies, have been doing this ever since the world refused any longer to let them push their goods at the point of the sword. It is said that Frederick the Great, who was really the most enlightened and benevolent monarch of his time—he had Voltaire living at his Court for some years and contracted the taint—that he had engraved on his cannon the Latin words *ultima ratio regis*—; which might be translated: This, not the divine will or the social good, is the real basis of royal authority. Then the French Revolution burst upon Europe, and the world was supposed to enter upon the age of criticism. Someone once said that the monomark of the 19th century was a note of interrogation or, as another wit put it, its coat of arms was "two bishops dormant and a note of interrogation rampant." The privileged orders had to change their technique, and instead of saying, "Little children should be seen and not heard" had to give the workers slogans that filled their bellies with wind.

The restored monarchs after the fall of Napoleon still relied upon cannon but they said that they were acting upon the principle of "Law and Order." Tallyrand was at their Congress of Vienna and possibly it was that that inspired his cynical epigram. In the humane-sounding name of Law and Order they led Europe into far worse disorders than it had witnessed in the 18th century. The Popes, as kings of central Italy, were murdering folk until 1860. Their dear royal cousins of Naples kept up the butchery for a few further years. The kings of Spain were killing or torturing rebels against Law and Order when the 20th century dawned, and the paste-board kings of China, Spain, and Portugal, Chiang, Franco, and Salazar, are still doing it. They have only to tell foreign statesmen and the press that their victims are bandits (even Communists) and that they are just enforcing Law and Order, and the foreign offices or the editorial staff dip their pens in honey. It is the motto in their own offices.

Another slogan is what used to be called the White Man's Burden or the shining sentiment that the higher races, which have grown wise and humane by centuries of political experience and their Christian faith, have a heavy duty to bring up the lower race to the same level. For the purpose of the argument a lower race is one that may or may not have walked in the ways of civilization a thousand years before their tutors but it has, like India and China, a market that is capable of enormous expansion or one that it wants to control in its own interest. It does not want the trusteeship of more powerful nations but their offer of service is generally backed by armies, navies, and airforces, if not atom bombs and poison sprays. All sorts of subsidiary slogans are brought in. Some statesmen say that they merely wish to be sure that the ideals of Freedom and Democracy are set up, but as they are friendly with half a dozen nations that notoriously do not respect those ideals the situation at times gets embarrassing and they protest that they are merely teaching the Chinese or the Hindus, the Egyptians or the Italians, to govern themselves and will withdraw "When the

Time is Ripe," or "As Soon as Possible." One fancies the shade of Tallyrand smiling from his velvet armchair in heaven.

And all this is greatly helped by the clergy, who have even longer experience if not greater skill in the manufacture of slogans. But the clock inexorably indicates that it is time for this little sermon to close, and the theme will be resumed next Sunday morning. See that you have a dollar bill for the collection plate.

* * *

BALANCE OF TRADE

A critic has pointed out, with much bitterness, that just in the most dangerous and critical period of modern history that ever called itself "peace" the two nations, Britain and America, that want to impose their will upon the world are represented by foreign secretaries who little more than two years ago knew nothing about foreign affairs. Doubtless that counts in the world-muddle but we must not forget that behind each man is a permanent department of state with experienced officials. The truth is that behind all the pressure and counter-pressure, the pretty slogans and pious pretexts, there is a great fight for and anxiety about markets. We may doubt if any serious person in high position in Washington or Westminster, New York or London, believes that Russia has any idea of warlike aggression. The presumptions are overwhelmingly against it. But that both powers are mortally concerned to capture the world's markets before Russia is in a position to export on a large scale is equally certain. It was from no tenderness for royalty that Byrnes backed Britain in Greece, and it was not from a real concern about Russia approaching the life-line of the British Empire that Bevin acted. You can see the same real policy at work in Japan and China, in Persia and Germany. Politicians promised the American workers 60,000,000 jobs, and their throats are in danger if the workers don't get them; and they can't get them for the long pull unless America nearly doubles its exports. So far so good. But it is one of the most elementary principles of economics that exports must be balanced by imports, visible or invisible, or paid for in gold, which would be useless to America as the gold of Peru proved to the Spaniards. We have been asking for a year how our economists and big business men answered that. We still wait to know. The American worker ought to demand an explanation.

* * *

RAISING LAZARUS IN RUSSIA

One of those touching stories in the gospel which has been taken up by painters and by as many preachers as would fill the entire surface of Mars is the raising from the dead of Lazarus. Feeling in a pious mood the other day we took out our Bible and read about it, and we made a curious discovery. In the earlier gospels there is no Lazarus. In *Luke* Lazarus is an imaginary person, a symbol of the poor living happily in what is poetically called the bosom of Abraham. But in the latest of all gospels, written probably three-quarters of a century after the supposed event, Lazarus is a real person who died, rotted, and was restored to life. We always felt that it was cruel to bring the poor man back from Abraham's bosom, which is understood to be warm and succulent, to the miseries of this life, but we may now fall back upon the earlier version. What sets us thinking about these sacred matters is the announcement that the Russians, who have not even a Messiah and are, of course, generally disreputable and unintelligent, are making quite a business of raising the dead to life. Professor Nagovsky has revived over 51 corpses, mostly of soldiers killed during the war, and 12 of them were permanently restored. A scientific weekly says that there have been 284 cases since 1900 and that many of the recoveries were permanent. Naturally

there are cases in which the body has been dead for some time, and in many of these cases important tissues have been too much injured and are too far gone in decay for a complete restoration. When there is only an interval of one or two minutes any hospital can "raise the dead." We personally know a woman who only three months ago died twice in one day—the heart quit beating—and was restored. The immortal-soul theory is looking sicker than ever.



WHAT ARE VALUES?

The preacher for today has just reached home and resumed his reflections on life after a visit to a movie, which he prefers to the synagogue on Friday evenings. Between two exceptionally good pictures a series of photographs illustrating the stupendous, world-wide humanitarian work of the Y.W.C.A. were thrown on the screen, and the audience was told that usherettes, in natty pants, were coming round to collect. We saw sweet, innocent, happy girls working in factories, conducting buses, sipping tea and coffee in military canteens—in fact everywhere where the language is usually basic English—and the film star who played the part of conducting angel never said a word about Christianity. But at the end she hurriedly and nervously, as if she were repeating a phrase she had learned in Greek or some unfamiliar language, said that besides all these varied services the Y.W.C.A. taught girls "the essential values." All this, and Heaven too. We often wondered where girls learned the vital facts at so early an age.

Seriously, how many folk in a crowded cinema would know what on earth values are? It is the latest slogan prepared by the clergy for the use of coin collectors and political orators. There was a time within living memory when it was laid down as confidently as the laws of Euclid, that since the leading nations all lived in the temperate zone or had excellent sewage systems it was necessary to live in the temperate zone or have a good sewage system to have progressive civilization. However it presently became painfully apparent that in the most civilized class of these leading nations, the class with higher education, the Christian faith was rapidly disappearing. In fact we had the paradox from the Christian angle that almost exactly in proportion to their importance in the creation or advancement of a civilization men and women were farther away from Christianity. For instance, exact inquiry in our country showed that freshmen at the universities were 80 percent believers in fundamental Christian doctrines, sophomores were only 76 percent believers, and so on until you came to the professors, of the general ruck of whom less than 50 percent believed, while in the small category of the greater men less than 30 percent believed.

Although these skeptical scholars had too much good taste to raise any objection to the prevailing fashion of representing us all as Christians except a few scurrilous outcasts the broad fact that belief faded somehow with the acquisition of knowledge and the full development of the mind could not be suppressed, and a new slogan was necessary. A Danish philosopher, Harold Hoffding, one of those men who felt that their intellectual self-respect forbade them to be Theists while their good taste forbade them to be Atheists, invented a new label for all good men and women, the real recipe for the maintenance of civilization, in the phrase "the conservation of values." At first it seemed too metaphysical for what you might call political purposes, and the new slogan took the shape "spiritual values." After all while the professors of ethics could not agree upon the nature of moral values, the professors of esthetics were decidedly concerned about values. Captious folk wanted to know whether these were or were not spiritual values, but we suspect them of Materialism and take no notice of them. "Spiritual values" was the missing word, and it became popular. Senators and representatives found it useful in their election

campaigns. It got the help of the churches, and it was always a good punch at Russia.

Whether the word spiritual was found to have a disturbing effect on the liver or the stomach, which is the experience of many of us, or whether it was discovered that Materialism was not quite so dead as the oracles had announced, or whatever the reason, the word is dropping out of the magic formula. The great thing is "values" or "essential values." The word values is a good mouthful in itself and nicely calculated to give audiences or readers that general feeling of satisfaction and importance that dispenses a man from examining its meaning too closely. Civilization is based upon an appreciation of values; and back of this it is the subtle insinuation that science has nothing to do with values and the churches are the experts on them. We put the clergy out at the front door of public life and let them in at the back.

What are values? When the charming lady to whom I referred above spoke of essential values you could gather from her demure expression that she meant our old friend the virtue of chastity. When a statesman speaks of values he means Private Enterprise and an Open Market for Americans. It is really an incongruous, evasive, and ambiguous expression. Half the people who now use it attach no definite idea to it and only use it because half their audience feel that they be recommending the churches and the other half can't prove it. The one idea which any sensible person can read into the statement that the maintenance of civilization depends upon the cultivation of values is that unless men and women upon whose activity the soundness of civilization depends appreciate qualities in it that are above the level of swing, vaudeville, sport, fiction, bridge, money, clothes, and shows it will suffer. You may appreciate that as much as you like. You are probably a bore if you do not—but you must be concerned, as far as it is in your small power, to see that public life is conducted honestly and vigilantly, that social life is purged as far as possible of cruelty, injustice, and preventible suffering, that a fair general standard of taste is maintained, that people are not so lost in the nerve-tickling and mind-intoxicating thrill of the dance or the game that they get incompetent to read about or reflect upon the less obvious aspects of the collective life. Tell people this in plain English instead of talking about values. That word suggests asceticism, high-brow culture, church-going, and various other spurious or not-essential values. And if any man still kicks, ask him how he enjoyed himself from 1930 to 1935, and 1942 to 1946.



