


Which Way Western Man?

William Gayley Simpson



Authorized Edition
Edited by J.N. Abbot based upon the author's final revisions
Published by the estate of William and Harriet Simpson

©1978 by William Gayley Simpson. Copyright renewed 2006 by the estate of William and Harriet Simpson. All rights reserved.

<http://www.solargeneral.com/>

Contents

Preface: To My Reader...

Foreword

Chapter 1. The Undying Purpose: The Ennobling of Man

Chapter 2. The Continuing Search: From St. Francis to Nietzsche

Chapter 3a. Jesus: Tribute and Re-Appraisal

Chapter 3b. Jesus in Retrospect (1950)

Chapter 4. The Meaning of Nietzsche for the Modern World

Chapter 5. An Added Faculty of Perception

Chapter 6. Handbook for Explorers

Chapter 7. The Added Faculty of Perception in the Light of Psychology and History

Chapter 8. Reorientation to Social Problems

Chapter 9. The Inevitable Foundations of Any Sound Society

Chapter 10. The Fallacy and Failure of Popular Government

Chapter 11. The Necessity of an Aristocracy

Chapter 12. Toward an Understanding of Woman

Chapter 13. Woman and Marriage

Chapter 14. The Pacifist Position Re-Examined

Chapter 15. Man and the Machine: The Effect of Industrialism on Human Life

Chapter 16. The Necessity of Eugenics

Chapter 17. The Doctrine of the Thoroughbred

Chapter 18. The Everlasting Truth about Race

Chapter 19. The Fateful Crisis Confronting Western Man

To My Reader.

You may find in this book ideas or ideals that at first hearing strike you as abhorrent. They may clash with what you have long believed to represent the highest in human experience, or cherish as too holy to be questioned. Or you may find yourself chilled by conclusions that I reach or remedies that I press that you think too drastic. But I would remind you that the disintegration of our whole society is far advanced, that the time allowed us for action is short, and that the peril hanging over us is — *fearsome*. Extreme emergencies may require extreme measures. Our need is for men of the courage and independence of mind to set aside all taboos, men who will search and reassess the entire experience of our people with discernment and with insight, and will then have the resolution and the dedication to apply to the solution of our problems all the light and the fullest wisdom to which their search has led them — even though it cost them their lives.

And one word more.

In general there is much in each chapter that, if it is to be rightly understood and its spirit fully sensed, must be read in the light of all that has gone before. Therefore, I would urge my reader to avoid skipping around. The reading will surely prove the most fruitful if he begins at the beginning and reads straight through.

William G. Simpson

Foreword.

Between the covers of this book the world of the West is quietly weighed in the balance, and at many critical points found wanting. As long ago as 1920, I perceived that Western civilization was dying, as Rome was dying at the height of her Empire, and as many another civilization has died. In time I came to see that we people of the West were sick not only in the outward conditions of our social and political life, not only in the decay of our character, in the decline of our intelligence, and in our loss of the control of our destiny, but in many respects in the very values and ideals on which we prided ourselves, by which we long shaped our course and thought to maintain our greatness.

As it happened, it was out of the throes of my own personal experience that I first came to suspect the soundness of some parts of our tradition, which for centuries had been most hallowed and most decisive in our historical development. The experience was quite exceptional and exceedingly searching. In 1920, after five years of relentless questing for the place in our world where I might make my life count for the most, I committed myself without any reserve and without compromise to a course dictated to me by the furthest reaches of my religious insight and devotion, my highest idealism, and my most thoroughly thought-out convictions. With whole-souled abandon, I gave myself over to an effort to put the teaching of Jesus into practice. I took him at his word—with absolute literalness—in the same sense that Francis of Assisi did. The story of this is not to be told here, though bits of it will crop out now and then in my pages to follow. For the present, suffice to say that the undertaking proved to be spiritually arduous in the extreme, as only those can appreciate who comprehend how austere Jesus' real teaching was. Its requirements tested all I had in me. After nine years of such experience, I came to a dead end. I was left in a state of exhaustion and with a profound suspicion that something was wrong. But the experience of those nine years did more than test me: it tested no less all the foundations I had looked to when I decided on my venture, and which alone and throughout had sustained me—my ardent Christianity, my starry-eyed idealism, and my "liberal" philosophy.

The breakdown of my venture threw me into spiritual and intellectual chaos: for years afterwards, I did not know what I believed about anything. I found myself compelled to make ruthless investigation of all my underpinning. Before I was through, many of the fundamentals of our Western White man's heritage of wisdom, together with much critically important evidence brought forth by modern scientific investigation, had to pass through the crucible of my relentless search for truth. And my steady reading of Nietzsche blew this to a white heat. This search has lasted ever since, and it will go on as long as I live. It has been absolutely free. No one has paid me for it, and there has been no one to stop me. I soon provided myself with economic independence, largely by the work of my hands. For forty years the best of my free time has gone into this quest. I have ransacked heaven and Earth for honest answers to my questions. Nothing has been taboo. No doors were closed. I could draw any conclusions the evidence seemed to support and to call for. And I was free to say what I thought. For my own very existence—for the very ability to live with any vital meaning and with any deep peace of mind—this was an ineluctable necessity.

I knew full well that I was no specialist, and I was soon to be told that in this specialist age no man—not even any scientist, let alone any layman—could make a synthesis, even of scientific findings, which anyone would consider significant; and that any attempt to cull, not only from science but from religion and history as well, the materials for shaping a wisdom about life would be as foolish as it would be impossible. Of course, to my way of thinking, unless each of the more important specialisms does, sooner or later, render up its meaning for human life, and unless all of these are gathered together to form a wisdom about how man must live if ever he is to come to his fulfillment, science is ultimately useless and must at last be cashiered. But in any case, at the time, I was very little concerned about gaining anyone's attention or with what the professors might say by way of deprecation. I was too much like a man who has been thrown overboard in mid-ocean: I must find something to sustain me or I should drown. As against this, nothing else mattered. Let people think about me what they liked: before I could ever again know where I was in the universe, I must find ground that I had reason to believe I could stand on, ground that I was sure would support me. Only then could I hold myself together, get my bearings, know in what direction to head, where to draw lines, with whom to take my stand, who were my friends and who my foes. In short, only on this condition could I live. And it was some fifteen years of such research, experience, and reflection that finally resulted in the original manuscript of this book.

As my struggle moved on toward certainty and peace of mind, it began to come to me more and more that, after all, in an age of disintegration and dissolution like ours, when, from one quarter or another, all standards and all values are being not only challenged but rejected, when the old moorings to tie to are being washed away and the stars that for centuries men steered by are falling from our sky, there must be a multitude of other men who are feeling a desperate need of some tested certainties to hold to and to live by. Some of them, in particular, might take great heart to learn of one whose primary concern was with nothing so tawdry as mere human survival, but who on the contrary was concerned above all else with quality in human life, who longed and struggled everlastingly that Man, and especially his own kind, his own race, those with whom he felt the deepest affinity and for whom he recognized his greatest responsibility—should not only go on but go up.

And so on July 1st, 1944, in part to test my own thinking in the light of that of my more thoughtful friends, and in part because I was in hope that my own experience might prove of value to others, I approached some 250 of my friends and acquaintances in this country and abroad, in regard to a series of occasional mimeographed papers that I might write them on a subscription basis. The substance of this letter will form part of the opening chapter, "The Undying Purpose: The Ennobling of Man," of my present work. I proposed to examine, and to present my thinking on, a number of the problems that I felt must confront every thoughtful and earnest man as he contemplated what science and technology and the impact of two world wars and the dogmas of democracy had done to the spiritual certainty and direction within him, and to the security and tone of the society in which he lived. As the response favored the venture, the papers began to appear that summer, and continued, at irregular intervals, over the next four years, to a total of nineteen. My readers were mostly intellectuals—some of them, in their respective fields, of world-wide reputation. There were some artists and scientists among them, but on the whole they were professors, college presidents, authors, ministers and doctors, with quite a sprinkling of university students.

These papers may in a real sense be looked upon as the nucleus of my present book. In fact, my basic values have remained pretty much unchanged; and even my most trenchant criticisms and my farthest-reaching conclusions, though some of them may have been stated less explicitly in the earlier work, were clearly foreshadowed there. Nevertheless, my experience, my research, my observation and thinking have never stood still, and have so fed this nucleus that in the course of thirty years the manuscript has grown into what is virtually a new work, in which the earlier one is both confirmed and consummated, as the grown man is the fulfillment of his youth. Certainly it is the embodiment of much of my fullest knowledge, clearest vision, firmest judgment and most mature thought. In the light of this, the original manuscript has been thoroughly worked over, brought up to date, expanded, and largely rewritten. But the chapters that perhaps are most revealing of the growth in my thought are Man and The Machine, the one on Pacifism, the two on eugenics, and most of all the two on race. Events in the world in the past twenty-five years, together with the great increase in my knowledge of racial realities and my growing sense of the absolutely pivotal importance of race in the destiny of all peoples, and in particular in that of my own kind, have necessitated the almost complete rewriting of the original chapter. And in the rewriting, one chapter became two.

But I have run a little ahead of my story.

I had proved quite right in my hope and my expectation, before I even approached my prospective readers, that among them I should find some who were responsive. In fact, as the series of papers ran its course I was constantly receiving letters in which my readers expressed their responsiveness in very extreme terms. The letters were understanding, ardent, unequivocal, moving; and those that were most strongly with me came from readers who were most distinguished. Repeatedly they even called for the publication of the series as a book. That this never came to pass seems to have been the result of circumstances that had little to do with the worth of the work, and hence I need not go into them here. But there is one thing further it is important to make clear.

Gradually, and hesitatingly, and only long years after my series of papers had been finished, it began to dawn upon me that perhaps my quest, my struggle, and my achievement had some much wider significance than for my own life or for my readers. Was it not true that in a real sense my experience had given me something by which I was enabled to pass much of what is most representative of the West, its traditions, philosophy, art, religion, principles, ethics, institutions and history, as it were through a filter, and thus to separate the true from the false, the beautiful from the ugly, and the high from the low? Had not I myself—no genius, to be sure, yet possibly a man in some degree distinguished by an unusual combination of concern, purpose, values, dedication and experience—been a balance in which the West stood tried? And had not this man's admittedly unusual experience perhaps deepened and clarified his insight and vision to a point where he could perceive not only where and why his people had made the monstrous mistakes that have led to their present desperate plight, but also what they must cut from themselves, and what course they have no choice but to follow, if they are to survive the catastrophe that lies ahead of them, and at last come to the fulfillment of the nobility and the greatness that are in them?

But any readers' appreciation of the significance of such a man's findings, as of his judgments, must largely depend upon their knowledge of what kind of a man he was when he wrote. If what he has to say was merely culled from books, or put together by a lively brain, or written from an easy chair—if he wrote, let us say, only with ink, then it can have no more value than any modern "liberal's" theorizing and speculation. But if it was written not with ink but with blood, with his own blood, then the reader may be moved to put himself in the author's place and live through his experiences with him, so that he comes to sense the reality that the author sees so plainly and the dire calamity ahead of us that he predicts; then perhaps will he too have the full fatefulness of our present days gradually dawn upon him, and at last begin to recognize and to face and to grapple with the fact that the fearful path, which his people must follow if they are to survive, is inescapable.

For this reason it has seemed essential that I give my readers at the very outset some idea what sort of man it is whose words they are reading. What qualifications for his present undertaking show up in the native endowment he inherited from his forebears, in his earliest training, his scholastic record, his dominant motives holding firm and undeviating from his late teens even into the present hour? What were his crucial decisions, from which everything else followed, and what were the searching experiences in which he was tested and proved? This information I will now give my readers as objectively and briefly as I can, though doubtless the story has been told best, up to the year 1935, by Professor Jerome Davis of Yale University in his Introduction to my *Toward The Rising Sun*, published by the Vanguard Press.

1944, 1973.¹

¹ These dates give the time when work on what was to become the Foreword was done. Similar dates, serving the same purpose, will be found at the end of each of the chapters to follow.

Chapter 1.

The Undying Purpose: The Ennobling of Man.

The life of our family, into which I was born in 1892, was exceedingly closely knit, and it was absolutely centered and rooted in the Church. But this was not more true of our immediate family than of the ancestral family of Nordic Scottish Protestants from whom we were all sprung, and who, I take it, had for centuries been established in northern Ireland as a veritable citadel of conservatism and rigid orthodoxy. On one side we traced from substantial and sturdy yeoman stock, and on the other from a long line of scholars, schoolmasters and ministers.

Nevertheless, even before I finished college, where I led my class and was graduated while still in my teens, my reading of Thomas Hughes' *The Marliness Of Christ* had led me to the very far-reaching conclusion that Jesus, primarily, was but a way-shower, that not only in his teaching but in his life was revealed what all humans were meant to become and ultimately had it in them to become. I also developed enough independence to reject the orthodoxy in which I had been brought up, and, in the face of parental opposition, chose to study for the ministry at what was then looked upon as the storm center of heresy, Union Theological Seminary.

I entered in the fall of 1912 with a prize scholarship based on a competitive examination, and three years later was graduated *magna cum laude*. But then, in spite of faculty pressure to the contrary, and even pressure from the president himself, I turned down a call to the "college church" at Bryn Mawr, Pa., a church of great prestige and wealth, and went instead to a very small, broken-down church in a sordid and very largely foreign industrial district in New Jersey. There are those who think this decision gave the set to all the future direction of my life.

What I saw in this town between 1915 and 1918 turned me toward socialism. This, and even more my opposition to the War, broke up the church, which until then had grown rapidly and greatly. By the time I resigned in 1918, I felt completely disillusioned with Christianity. Two years later, I went to the pains of getting myself unfrocked. I had come to realize that there was no way in which I could be an honest man and remain a minister.

In the meantime, immediately following my resignation, I had accepted a position as Associate Director of what became the American Civil Liberties Union, but six months of this satisfied me that it was not to be my lot to sit in an office and deal with my fellow men by letters, telegrams, and articles. I wanted personal contact.

But during these same six months, by what at the time seemed sheer chance, I read Sabatier's *Life of St. Francis*. This came to me as the greatest inspiration and challenge I had known up to this time. I felt that St. Francis had been dead right in his conviction that he was only doing what Jesus had meant all his most dedicated followers to do, and that therefore he was the truest and the greatest Christian since Jesus himself. With all my being I

wanted to go and do likewise. But I appreciated the gravity of the decision that confronted me. I needed time in which to make very sure.

I therefore quit my Civil Liberties job in the spring of 1919 and worked my way across the continent as a common laborer—in coal mines in Scranton, in a steel mill in Pittsburgh, in the tire factories of Akron, in the Ford plant in Detroit, in a department store in Chicago, in the open-pit iron mines northwest of Duluth, with a railroad section gang in the Rockies, and half a mile down in a copper mine in Butte, where a fall of rock came within a few inches of crushing me. I had wanted to find out what men in our country had to do to earn a living, thinking I might become a revolutionary labor organizer. The experience was invaluable, but in the end I perceived clearly that, more than we needed a change in our economic system, we needed a change in the quality and caliber of our manhood and womanhood, which, after all, is what finally makes or breaks every society.

I returned from the West Coast through the Deep South, where my initial reactions to Jim Crowism and to the rest of segregation were wholly in sympathy with the Negro.

Feeling my need for still more time in which to weigh the consequences of the break with my past that I was contemplating, in an effort to go the way of Jesus and St. Francis, I accepted a position on the faculty of the newly opened Brookwood School in Katonah, N.Y. But before the end of the year, though I was asked to become the head of the school the year following, I felt virtually certain that nothing could ever satisfy me but to give myself with abandon to what was then my highest vision. And so, after a month alone on an island in the St. Lawrence River, where I meditated much and long, and set down in black and white just what I was going to do and why I was going to do it, I returned home in the fall to part quite literally with everything I possessed. And early in October, 1920, penniless, and with little more than the clothes I was wearing, and some tools to work with, I went back to the town in which I had had my church, there to do my labor as a gift and to learn to depend for my own needs, no matter where I might be, on what people wanted to give me.

After six months or so I began to speak, at first on the streets and in parks, and then in churches, and then more and more, as word of what I was doing spread, to students in colleges. In 1922, I moved to Wallington, a foreign and Negro section on the edge of Passaic. Gradually, there came to be a small group of us, all college men, united in a common will to walk in the footsteps of Jesus and St. Francis. On land near the town dump, which was lent to us, and with materials donated, we built ourselves a shanty, in which each man had a room six feet square. We worked for people in the neighborhood, doing any kind of work we knew how to do from highly skilled to the most menial. Always our labor was our gift. I myself spent more and more time speaking in colleges and churches to which I was invited. It came to be a common experience that meetings beginning, say, at 8 o'clock, would in large part linger on, for the most searching kind of questions and discussion, until one and even two o'clock in the morning. Often, at last, I simply had to close the meeting in order to get the rest necessary for my next day's work.

This ever-widening contact with some of the most earnest student life of the U.S. and Canada continued until after my pilgrimage to the Orient. This trip was made possible by the trust and generosity of many friends. With a knapsack on my back, I set out in the fall of

1927. So many were the doors opened to me by my letters of introduction that, from the time I set sail from San Francisco until I landed back in New York, I never once spent a night in a place of public lodging. My close contact with the native life of the three outstanding peoples of the Orient, and especially the many intimate and extremely searching hours I spent with some of their great thinkers and seers, proved to be an experience of deep and lasting significance, but here I must pass it by with this bare mention.

By the summer of 1929, however, my faith in the course I had been following began to break down. I saw that a pure heart and will was not of itself enough. The needs of my mind and a certain realistic common sense began to reassert themselves. Moreover, I was finding myself deeply moved by what I read in Nietzsche's *Zarathustra*. Thus I came to be so shaken with uncertainty that I could not go on. I left Wallington, never to return, and my Franciscan venture of faith came to a complete end.

And then followed, for some four or five years, a period of devastating skepticism, in which I doubted everything I had ever believed. I deliberately turned the heaviest guns I could find on all my most cherished positions. I wanted to get down to bedrock. I moved to New Haven and spent solid months reading and studying in the Yale Library. It was a period of slow, painful inner reexamination, reorientation, and reorganization, made all the more difficult by my efforts to see my way clearly in regard to my wife and child. I suppose it is but to state plain fact if I say that I was able to go through it only because I put truth above peace of mind, and integrity above social recognition and public opinion. I came to be filled with a growing sense of the madness of cities, and indeed of our whole civilization, with a deepening hunger for mountains or the sea, and a desire to live close to the earth and to grow my own food. And I had the sick animal's instinct to be alone for a while. In this emergency, a friend made the down payment on the farm far back in the Catskill Mountains to which I moved in the spring of 1932, and where I still make my home. For several years I was in complete retirement, devoting myself to much study, chiefly of Nietzsche, and to constant thought about some of the profoundest problems that confront humankind.

As early as 1920, I had written that our civilization was dying. But now I wanted to know *why* we were dying, and what we must do to arrest our sickness and to become well again. I had come to mistrust the too narrowly personal approach that had marked my "Franciscan period" of 1920 to 1929, and I recognized that a people is something more than a collection of individuals. It is only exceptional men, only a few, who can achieve and maintain spiritual and intellectual health and wholeness in the midst of an alien, decaying, or poisonous environment. Therefore, the potentialities of the individual, on the one hand, and, on the other, the form of social organization, which can so largely further or frustrate personal instinct and effort, must be worked at together.

And so I now undertook as never before, to fathom the being of Man and not just the superior or exceptional man, but as well the general run of men, and "mass-man." For I saw clearly that all thought and effort for a higher human future must forever remain but folly and futility except as it recognized Man's inborn and fixed limitations and was adjusted to the range of his capacities. I needed to know, too, by the verdict of history and of genetics, which, as a rule and in the long run, had more to do with determining what a man becomes: what he was born into, or what he was born *with*; his environment, or what he got from his

ancestors, his heredity. Upon the answer to this must depend the socialist's ability to make good the promises by which today he lures mass-man all over the world to follow his call.

Further, I tried to learn from history whether or not there was any form of social organization that seemed most generally to have provided the foundation for societies that have lasted long, proved culturally significant, and provided their people with health and contentment. I paid special attention to the respective claims of Aristocracy and Monarchy, on the one hand, and of Democracy and Socialism, on the other; and I began to take a good look at these questions through the eyes of modern psychology and sociology.

Also, in probing for the causes of the decay that manifests itself on every side of us today, I had to spend much time on the problems of human breeding. To what extent were we suffering from the fact that we were no longer the same people we were once, that our better elements were being outbred by our worse and worst, that the very caliber and character of the stock that founded this country had gradually but demonstrably and markedly deteriorated? What should we do to remove the burden and the contamination of our human rubbish, which was genetically quite incapable of doing anything but producing still more rubbish? (I do not use the word "rubbish" lightly or unfeelingly, but by what other word can I refer to those unfortunate and helpless human beings who can be nothing more than a dead weight on any human society?) What was wrong with our women on the upper levels, that they should so generally have gone on strike against bearing children? What should be done to make marriage the institution by which our breeding stock is not merely perpetuated but constantly purified, strengthened and enriched? What rules should be instituted, but above all what traditions should be fostered and established, by which people might be given sound guidance in their selection of mates?

Again, I found it necessary to look closely into the question of race, and particularly into the origin, characteristics, and record of those races that had been most involved in our own civilization. What *is* race? What makes it? Is it something so superficial that it may safely be ignored if a man and a woman of widely different race, but themselves of sound body and mind, wish to marry? Or is it something so deep, ineradicable, far-reaching, and determining that marriage between individuals of widely different race should be absolutely interdicted, and severely punished when the rule against it is broken? And then, what of the claim, today so prevalent, that the races are equal, that they have all proved, or when given opportunity will prove, of equivalent cultural capacity? To what extent was the truth with Disraeli, who declared that "race is all" and pronounced it "the key to history," provided only the race be of superior inborn capacity and sternly keep its blood unmixed with that of aliens and inferiors; and to what extent was it with those opponents, who saw in race a thing of so little consequence that they would turn the whole Earth into a racial melting-pot, and thus entirely obliterate race as a mark of distinction among human beings?

And then there was the practical and, for the man who is out of step with his age, the very important question, of how he could best maintain health of body, mind and soul amidst a world that was rotting to pieces? How could he assure himself a livelihood while he resolutely pursued his bent and freely spoke his mind? How could he find time for the things he believed most important? How should he avoid wasting himself in mere resistance to a world that pressed itself upon him all too closely in the headlines of every paper, in every

radio program, and in almost every person he met? How should he keep his spirit unembittered, holding in perspective the onrushing tumult of events, and judging them steadily in the calm light of his final comprehension of the meaning of life? How should he manage, to the end and come what might, to keep his eye serene, his step firm, and his heart full of sympathy and love?

In seeking the answers to these and like questions, my thinking often led me into paths that were either forbidden or badly overgrown, and to conclusions that at many points were far removed from those of my Franciscan days, and often both uncongenial to the modern American mind and very unpopular. Perhaps it was on this account that, by 1941, a growing and hardening antagonism to my views, most marked on the part of university authorities but also among my old friends, gradually led to the almost complete termination of my speaking engagements. It would be a mistake, however, to assume from this that the students themselves had become less responsive. On the contrary, whether it was in New England, New York or Pennsylvania, Chicago or California, the meetings always ran on for hours over time. Primarily the difficulty did lie in the opposition of the university authorities and in the failure of my friends any longer to make the necessary arrangements. But two other factors need to be noted. For one thing, I became increasingly aware that my values and my point of view on life and all of its problems were so vastly different from those of the overwhelming majority of my audiences that I could hardly hope for deep understanding without a *series* of meetings—something that the crowded setup of college life rarely allowed room for. Also, my own growing deafness created real obstacles to my continuing any longer to participate easily and spontaneously in the period of questioning that always followed my talks and that gave me my best opportunity to clear up misconceptions. At any rate, as the end result of these combined difficulties, my speaking virtually came to an end in 1941.

Nor was the situation very different when I turned to writing. To be sure, my *Toward The Rising Sun*, published in 1935, had traveled to the ends of the Earth and by many congenial spirits, some of them quite distinguished, been very well received. But very shortly afterward there began that then-puzzling and quite unexpected change in the attitude of publishers toward everything that did not conform to the sort of new orthodoxy that was taking shape in American life. Perhaps, I thought at the time, the coming of the Second World War had something to do with it. Anyway, a book that I had been working on for some years was written from a point of view and was full of ideas that, even friendly critics maintained, would prevent its publication at least until the war was over.¹

But I did not like the deepening isolation in which I found myself. From the beginning I had turned to people. If I had sought solitude at the farm, it would prove, I thought, only for an interim and as a means by which to recover from the debacle in which my Franciscan venture had come to an end. For a time I had *had* to be alone, that I might search my innermost being anew, and explore the tested answers to our problems afforded in the historic record of great peoples and in the wisdom of great seers, in the hope that once again I might be sure of my bearings and locate within myself the strength to follow my star.

But when I turned to my friends and supporters, as I did in 1944, in regard to the series of papers that I might address to them, I was moved primarily by my need to find people with whom I could travel, people who, whether or not they were yet aware of it, really longed to

find and to follow paths and stars very like to those that lured me. Now as always I reached out to people, for friends with whom I could freely share what I had found, and with whom I could realize the greater strength that grows out of deep fellowship.

But I warned my prospective readers that I should have little to say by way of interpreting current events. On the whole I did not even follow these closely. I believed that there was absolutely nothing that could be done to "save the social situation." The "social situation" was completely out of hand. Catastrophe was upon us. The stars by which for long centuries we had set our course had darkened in our sky; the cohesive forces that had long bound us together as peoples and as a people had died long ago; and now the body of our society was falling to pieces. Believing as I did that we were already in the midst of this tragedy and that there was no power that could keep it from working itself out to its bitter end, it did not *make sense* to spend energy on resisting it. The part of wisdom was to begin to prepare for what might follow.

To some this may have seemed pessimistic, but basically and ultimately I was anything but a pessimist. I believed in life; I believed in Man; I believed in what Man had done and in what Man would yet do again. But I could not close my eyes to what I saw as actualities before me, or to what these actualities meant.

One thing they meant was that those of the requisite vision, intellect, and devotion would narrow their efforts to what, after all, remained forever the basic problems of human existence—the nature and the potentialities of man, and the goals, together with the means for reaching them, by which the life of mankind might develop a health, a robustness, a beauty, a nobility, and a significance, beyond anything we knew of in our past. It was to the future that I wished to address myself, out of the hope that whatever time and strength might still be left me might help, in however small a way, to prepare for the new dawn, which I believed must at last follow the storm and night. For when that great day came, with its opportunity for new building, I longed that our children might know how to build better than our fathers built.

But these were strenuous tasks, beyond the wisdom or the strength of any one man. There was the uttermost need, therefore, beyond even the need of starving people for bread or of broken people for peace, that somehow as many as possible of the best minds and spirits of our day should together concentrate upon solving the problems they raised. Doubtless very few men would be able to detach themselves sufficiently from the holocaust before their eyes to achieve the perspective necessary for wisdom. And it must be recognized from the start that whoever set his hand to this task gambled with circumstance: he might give to the solution of the problems upon which the whole future of mankind depends, the very best he had, and all he had in him, and he might perchance find much wisdom, and yet it might all be swept aside by the seemingly indifferent hand of fate or be swallowed up in the ignorance and vulgarity of a day given over at last to the "happiness of the greatest number."

Nevertheless, the task must be essayed, if only for the sake of trueness to oneself and in the hope that it *might* count for the higher life of the race. And we could support ourselves through dark hours by the memory that more than once in the past, work that was done quietly and almost unseen, did finally count for much. After all, the form any society takes is

largely determined by the molding power of its ideas and ideals. "Thoughts that come with doves' footsteps guide the world." It was in such words, and in such spirit, that I invited a large circle of my friends, here and abroad, to listen to what I might say in a series of papers, in which I would undertake to explore and to discuss with them some of the most crucial questions by which I found myself confronted.

1944, 1973.

¹ It was not until many years later that I learned the explanation of this development. It will be found in my first chapter on race.

Chapter 2.

The Continuing Search: From St. Francis to Nietzsche.

The foregoing chapter was little more than a bare outline of my life experience up until 1932, when, at the age of 40, I moved to my farm in the mountains. But if my reader is to have any conception of what those years meant to me, of their spiritual content, and of what they were as preparation for all the years that still stood ahead, in which I was to lay myself wide open to all the light that history and science might throw upon our problems, I think it necessary, for one thing, to make it clear *why* I gave up my Franciscan venture, and the full extent of what was involved in my giving it up.

It was near the end of August, 1929, that I left our shanty in Wallington, the foreign quarter on the edge of Passaic, never to return. Here, since the fall of 1923, our little group had undertaken to walk in the footsteps of Jesus. Nothing had we called our own. Whatever we had on our backs or held in our hands, we had stood ready to give to anyone who had need or desire for it. Here we had made a gift of our labor, and done both highly skilled and very menial labor for the working people about us, White and Black, native and foreign. Here I had spoken on the streets. Here we had intervened in behalf of the striking textile workers and been arrested for it. Here, out of my knowledge of the plight in which the World War had left the peoples of Central Europe and in obedience to the Voice within me, as a seal of my devotion, I had taken off my shoes at Christmas time in 1923 and for two years thereafter had gone barefoot. And now it was all over. At the time, I think that I did not fully realize it had come to an end. To be sure, I do seem to have had some sense that something fearful was happening to me. Intuitively I felt myself on the edge of an abyss, and foreknew that I must go down into it. I must go down into chaos. But it was only years later that I came to any clear understanding of *why* I had had to give up my Franciscan venture. But one thing seems clear. I came to the end of it because I *could* not go on. I was *beaten*.

What had beaten me, do you ask? Why was I at the end of my rope?

In all honesty, I should say that the most important cause, from the beginning to the very end of my Franciscan venture, was my love for Genevieve,¹ who in 1922 had become my wife. This story I already have told in my autobiography (not yet published), without sparing myself and, I believe, lovingly and not unfavorably to Genevieve. Here, however, I will say only what is essential to the point in question. My love for her rivaled and divided what I then conceived to be my love for my God and for the universal family of men. And my love for her called for and seemed to require a kind of life that I never was able to reconcile with my life as a follower of Jesus and St. Francis, to which I felt deeply and inescapably called. For ten years—and even longer—I was so divided by it that the singleness of my devotion to my God was constantly menaced and shaken. The struggle over it certainly drained out of me an enormous amount of energy that otherwise might have gone into my work.

But this was not the only thing by which, toward the end, I became divided. Many kinds of doubts had been sapping the foundations of my certainty. For instance, my reading of rationalistic psychology had caused me to look behind the scenes of my mystical experience

and to question its validity and the reliability of the inner direction I derived from it. But also my Franciscan life was challenged by a deepening spiritual insight and by the mounting pressure of some new thing within me. In our life in Wallington we had, as it were, been laying ourselves down in the gutter because others had to lie there. But now I came to the conclusion that this was not necessarily the best way to help a man, or even the truest way to show him love. Then, too, I doubted whether a Franciscan life was a true expression of my own make-up. I began to feel that to too large an extent I had been under Jesus' *spell*. Without fully realizing it or what the effects of it must be, I had been animated by a desire to make my life a literal fulfillment of Jesus' teaching, and this even long after my head at least knew perfectly well that it was spiritual suicide to copy any other man. But toward the end of the Wallington days I began to suspect what I had been doing. I had been straining to wear a coat that did not fit me, that had not been made for me, that did not come out of me as my own skin came out of me. I had been in love with an ideal, with a picture in my mind of the way Jesus had lived. The love was real enough and alone had sustained me, but the picture, the way of life, what I tried to become, was taken over from another, from outside me, by my head. It did not come out of my own organic necessity, as it were out of my own viscera, my own loins, as a child comes out of its mother. But no man can live thus. He can only push himself—with his will. My effort was bound to fail.

Moreover, this effort to walk in the footsteps of Jesus, had, of course, actually been a hindrance to my realizing and fulfilling my own life. But now I was beginning to feel the slowly growing demands of a new life within me, that would fain give itself its *own* law. A part of this new life was the reassertion of the claims of the mind, which as a Franciscan I had tended to disparage and to dismiss. Now would I think. Now would I know. Now would I read more psychology, and history, and science. Now would I question—anything, and look into, and under, and behind, everything that aroused my doubt, or my curiosity, or my interest. Implicit in the growing life within me, too, was doubtless the aristocratic instinct and taste, which I suppose have always been native to me. Even when I had struggled hardest to make myself equal with the lowest and least, at the bottom of my quest had been my desire to find those who had "eyes to see and ears to hear," spiritually superior persons, those who regardless of their clothes or their bank accounts were (or had it in them to become) Earth's noblemen and kings. My willingness any longer to hold myself stripped for others' sake, to call nothing my own, to give anything I had to anyone who might want it, was now undermined by my clearing perception that men are by no means equal, that many of them were not even my equal. And certainly if I were looking for those who had eyes to see and ears to hear, people of deep spiritual perception, great courage, love, strength of will, and supreme devotion, I was in the wrong place and living the wrong kind of life. Despite their friendliness, precious few of the people about us had any interest in our presence among them deeper than the opportunity we afforded to get good work done for little or nothing. The squalor and brutishness of the life about us seemed to be almost symbolized by the stinking city dump on the edge of which our little cabin was built. I fairly held my breath each time I came back to Wallington. I was coming to hate it and all that it stood for. I longed for a period of quiet, until I should be able to see clearly what all the unrest within me meant, and in what direction I should go. But for the time there was no clear or steady vision left in me. And I was utterly exhausted.

And so, at last, I left Wallington. And I left it, I say again, simply because I *could* not go on any longer. I was beaten.

In the days of his youth every man, if he has any vision and venture in him, is likely to write, as did Blake, his "Songs of Innocence." And in my Franciscan venture I had written mine, not in words but in life, in act. But now experience had bitten into me deeply. My youthful enthusiasms had broken up on the unyielding realities of human nature and of human existence. Now, as I have said, I felt a necessity to get down to facts, and to evaluate them. Now also I must face a larger world, the life of man as a society and not just as a collection of individuals. I must see him against his background, know his past as well as his present. And not least, I must be more realistic. I must have the courage to face men not only for what they may become but also for what they are now.

Yet I foreknew that people would turn away from me if I gave up my Franciscan way of life, especially the Church people. And, to their minds, to turn away from their ideals might well have seemed a descent to lower ideals or an abandonment of all ideals. That their Christianity might be a sickness, and that my sloughing it off might be a precursor to convalescence and a sign of hope and new life, that of course rarely occurred to them.

And indeed their expectations might easily have proved correct. For the first result of my giving up my Franciscan venture of nine long years was no new bloom or sign of promise. It was chaos. I had staked everything I had on my still small voice, and it had come to nothing. It seemed as though my very God had led me astray, had led me up a blind alley and left me. Only after years was I to realize that men did not know, never had known, could not know, anything about any metaphysical Lord of the universe, who was omniscient, omnipotent, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable. That which had spoken within me, which I had called God and to which I had entrusted my whole life, was nothing absolute or infallible. There might be no higher source of self-direction to which any man could turn, yet was it ineluctably conditioned by a man's heredity and by all his experience since the day he was born. It represented, therefore, only the best light that was capable of reaching him at any particular stage of his development. As such it was to be followed as if it were indeed the voice of God, and if sometimes it led a man into a course that later proved unsound (as must happen now and then), there was no ground for feeling disillusioned or for distrusting it as a source of direction for the future. The error into which it had led him must be recognized for the error it was and cast out, yet would his "inner light" continue, as before, to yield him the best wisdom about the situation before him of which he was then capable. And as such he must follow it with his uttermost devotion. Yet at the time, as I have said, all was darkness and confusion. And the confusion spread and the darkness deepened as the months passed. The breakdown proved to be greater than I had first realized.²

And yet I am bound to maintain that I am thankful that our Franciscan venture failed, and especially that it failed to become a movement, as it might have.

For one thing, it was full of the folly of Christian pity. It is no less than a crime against life when the superior is sacrificed to the inferior, a crime that is in no wise mitigated nor its effects alleviated when the sacrifice is made by a man's own free will and choice. Yet the men in our group in Wallington, in training and in actual capability if not in inherited

potentiality, were certainly the superiors of all the people among whom we lived and for whom we gave ourselves. The kind of thing the great scholar and musical authority Schweitzer did for years in the jungles of Africa is a sentimental waste of life. Instead of being held up for admiration and emulation, as it has been of recent years in the churches of America, it ought to be cried down as a betrayal of life and a thing of shame. For anyone to admire it is evidence of his degeneracy, even as it was evidence of my own degeneracy when I myself did much the same sort of thing in Wallington. *We must become aware of the diseased values* that are working in our midst and in ourselves. It is our peril that we awaken to our condition when it is too late.

Our belief in equality, likewise, was a betrayal of life—I should say, rather, of *quality* of life. Where all are believed equal, the voice of the superior man is drowned in the roar of the mob, and taste tends to gravitate to the level of the gutter. This is happening all over America. Furthermore, wherever this belief in equality spreads, there goes a *disbelief* in the importance of heredity, of blood. The cry always becomes the weakling's cry for a change of environment, which the strong man wills to master and to dominate; and all effort to weed out the defectives by cutting off the flow of tainted blood at its source and to build up an improved stock of men and women by attention to intelligent mating, is rendered almost entirely impossible.

All are equal, is the cry. Anybody can marry anybody else. Even the races are equal. There is no good reason, even from the point of view of genetics, why Blacks and Whites should not marry, or Whites and Yellows. Well, if I may anticipate the conclusion that I buttress with massive documentation toward the end of this book, let me say here and now, after such study as is possible to an earnest and intelligent layman, that in my sober judgment it is the *suicide* of a people when they allow themselves to be made into a "melting pot," where you no longer have a people but only a hodge-podge of peoples, a stew of conflicting bloods, traditions, values, and tastes. It is the betrayal and surrender of those differentiations that their ancestors painfully achieved through many thousands of years, and which give their existence on the Earth all its worth and meaning. I am glad my venture failed, if for no other reason, because I am convinced that my preaching of equality would have worked against the only kind of life I believe to be worth striving for—that is, *quality* of life.

But there is another reason that I am glad it failed, and for me a very important reason. If it had succeeded and had become a movement, I can but wonder whether, with my absorption in it and with the reassurance as to its soundness that its very success would have tended to give it, I should ever have been able to achieve enough perspective to discover the errors in it and get rid of them. Might not this very triumph of my spirit have brought my spiritual growth to a standstill? Might not my "success" have become my grave?

As things actually worked out, however, my venture broke down, and the immediate effect was chaos. Bit by bit my whole world fell to pieces, and passed into solution. I doubted everything. Nothing escaped the acid of my skepticism. I questioned the soundness of the teaching of Jesus, the existence of any moral order in the universe, the validity of the mystical experience, the doctrine of human equality and all the collectivist philosophies that have been built upon it. I challenged even those beliefs upon which depended my very sense of security in the face of the universe. I did not know whether I should ever again be sure of

anything. The years from 1929, when I left Wallington, to 1932, when I came to the Farm, were years of bitter struggle and inner chaos of mind and soul—the period of the worst desolation that I have ever known.

* * * * *

At the Farm it was never any part of my purpose to earn all my living from the land. I felt that for me, just then, to try to do so would frustrate my very object in going there. I wanted solitude, and silence, and the contact with the earth and with the vast spaces of mountains, but also I wanted free time to study, to think, and to write. It was my purpose, therefore, to use the land so to meet my own requirements that my need of money would be reduced to a minimum, and my independence of the world about me greatly increased. And it was. In the journal, which I kept at the time, there is a statement that in the week that had just passed my outlay for food came to fifty cents.

It was here at the Farm that I soon settled myself to continue the exploration of the teaching of Friedrich Nietzsche, which I had dipped into even before leaving Wallington. In fact, he was a part of the turmoil that had ended in my breakdown. And it probably took me the best part of a decade to come to terms with him.

I am well aware that the very name “Nietzsche” is a definite roadblock in the minds of many. But I judge that, as a rule, this is not because such people have read him firsthand, or with any degree of thoroughness. Rather is it that Nietzsche’s name has been blackened and his teaching misrepresented by those who lacked the insight and comprehension to appreciate what he was about, or by those who had reason to hate all he stood for.

I myself, as I have already intimated, did not take to him easily. My reactions, from the start, were mixed. On the one hand, I was drawn to him not only by an almost unmatched beauty of literary form, as I found it first in his *Zarathustra*, but above all by the unquestionable elevation of his spirit and purpose, and by the singleness and depth of his dedication to his task of exalting the life of man. On the other hand, I kept coming upon ideas and conclusions as to necessary means that were so anathema to all my previous and still lingering ideals and assumptions, that more than once I threw down the book I was reading with the exclamation, “If that is where he would take me, I’ve had enough.” But already his barbed idea was stuck in my mind, and the more I resisted it, the deeper it worked its way in. And besides, almost from the beginning and deeper than the resistance of my head, there was my intuition that here was a man whom I should not be able to lay aside until I had read all he had written. To my head he might stand before me as an implacable foe, but yet more deeply I felt that he was my friend, and that ultimately I must range myself on his side, that to me as to every other man he had come to bring more exalted life.

In any case, he was a force with which I was compelled to reckon. He leveled such an attack on my very ideals and all the world that had given me birth, that I simply dared not go on leaving him unreduced in my rear. So I turned to face him squarely, and fought him, with the result that in the end *he* reduced *me*. I read twice all that he wrote, some sixteen published volumes, and several biographies about him—all this before I read any interpretations of him, for I wished, before I knew what others made of him, to get my own reaction fresh and

firsthand. For four years the best of my free time went into the study of Nietzsche. But despite all this I must add that since the late Thirties I have looked into him comparatively little. I am quite able to criticize him, and some of his teaching I reject. Nevertheless, taking him as a whole, I am very ready to admit that I stand as his ally. I look at the fast-shaping issues of our day from his side and from his angle, and I believe that the future belongs to the people who accept the essentials of his teaching.

In this chapter it was impossible to do more than introduce Nietzsche, as one of the two men who have had the greatest influence on my outlook, Jesus being the other. In my next chapter I wish to give a picture of what Jesus meant to me in the years when his hold upon me was strongest; and in the one following that, to present Nietzsche, with special emphasis on his thought. I shall try to make it clear why I find so much in common between Nietzsche and Jesus, and which of them, to my way of thinking, cuts the more deeply into life, and *contains the more promise for the future of Western man.*

1944, 1973.

¹ Here, and throughout this chapter, I use a fictitious name.

² I would not for a minute minimize or forget the spiritual exaltation born of the dedication of those days. Something in me still stirs deeply when I think of the call they made upon us to be ever-girt for battle, to trust the unseen, to live in the present, to make life a constant spending of oneself. I love their abandon and reckless gambling, and their scorn and defiance of the paltry prudence of a mean, money-grubbing, ease-loving commercial age. And often I feel that I shall not have brought my life to the heights it aims toward until, without losing the broader, fuller, better-balanced vision of the present days, I shall have recovered more of the spirit that filled those days with so pure, even though so exotic, a beauty.

Chapter 3a.

Jesus: Tribute and Re-Appraisal.

The Vision of Christ that thou dost see
Is my vision's greatest enemy.
Thine has a great hook nose like thine;
Mine has a snub nose like to mine.
Thine is the friend of all Mankind,
Mine speaks in parables to the blind,
Thine loves the same world that mine hates,
Thy heaven-doors are my hell-gates....
Both read the Bible day and night,
But thou reads black where I read white.

—William Blake: *The Everlasting Gospel*

FOREWORD

A quarter of a century of further experience and thought have gradually but steadily weaned me away from that Jesus who had stood before my mind and heart through the days and nights of my Franciscan venture—as in a vision. Many of the pages of this chapter, originally penned in 1939, I could not write now. Nevertheless, the inspiration that I originally got from Jesus probably had more to do in determining the basic direction and the essential and enduring character of my life than any other that I have ever known—if only because it came to me in the formative days of my youth. And I am satisfied that this book would be incomplete and inadequate for its purpose if it did not contain something more about Jesus than is to be found in my series of papers dating back to the Forties.

It is not so much that I owe Jesus any further tribute. Any tribute I could pay in words must pale beside the stark fact that for nine years I literally laid my own life at his feet. But inevitably the consequences of this experience so worked into and permanently determined the very tissue and texture of all my innermost being—my dedication to truth, to beauty, to right, to the elevation of the life of man, that *there* is revealed, more fully and accurately than anywhere else, what manner of scales it is in which the civilization of the West is to be weighed in this book. Whether or not it is “Christian” each reader will have to decide for himself. But certainly religion, when it is vital, when it embodies what men live by and live for, what they hold most true and beautiful and sacred, is the most formative power in the world. And in my Franciscan days my conception of Jesus was the very embodiment of my religion. And if now it wound some of my readers to learn that I have moved on, let them ask themselves and face honestly, whether the same love for men and the same devotion to the truth as he saw it, which made Jesus what he was in the Gospels, might not have compelled even him to alter his course and to move on into new fields and new thought, *if he had lived long enough to learn the lessons that his own experience might have taught him*. What I myself have moved on to (was *compelled* by my *very honesty, intelligence, and devotion* to move on to), will

gradually be revealed. But I suspect that an ineradicable element of Jesus still remains in it, and will remain to the end. Let us now see, therefore, what Jesus meant to me—meant to me even ten years after my Franciscan venture had come to an end.

But at this word let none of my readers settle back to go to sleep. Jesus, as I conceive him, is not for the conventional, or for the orthodox either. For me in my Franciscan days, he was no less dynamite than Nietzsche was later. Perhaps, if any of my readers be good Church people, they will find themselves wondering how in the world they could ever have read, and heard their preachers read, year after year, the words in the Gospels about Jesus, and ascribed to Jesus, without letting such a picture form in their minds as the words properly call forth. Well, they that have ears to hear, let them hear, even now. Let them ask themselves whether the Jesus that I picture doesn't fit the words better than any other they have ever seen, whether it doesn't make more sense, answer the troublesome questions, and—above all—bring before us a man who was real, who was alive, and who moves us to this day as no Jesus of the conventional and orthodox mold ever did or ever could.

But after this Foreword, let me now step aside and leave my reader alone with these words that I wrote about Jesus in 1939.

* * * * *

Jesus is for everyone. So the Church has taught. So practically all the world takes for granted.

But gradually it has come to seem to me preposterous that Jesus and his message could ever have been so conceived. Do we expect everyone to understand the theory of atomic fission, or to appreciate the last quartets of Beethoven? The treasures and deep secrets of the universe do not lie so open as this. In truth, they are very well guarded. Neither force nor presumption will ever unlock them. And in Jesus there was one greater than either Beethoven or our foremost physicist. To understand such a seer, one must be very much of a seer oneself. There is no other way.

But in trying to *make* the teaching of Jesus a teaching for everyone, it was inevitable that the teaching should be dragged down to the level of those to whom it was preached. That is, it was perverted into the opposite of Jesus. Sheep (which the great masses of people are) can hardly be expected to appreciate the virtues of the lion. And while Jesus was tender, he was no less terrible. We have remembered his talk of love (as is natural to sheep), but we have almost entirely ignored (as again is natural) his insistence on the place of hate and of the sword—or, if you prefer, of really having one master, and keeping one's eye utterly single, and of having a God whom you love with your entire being.

Organized Christianity has looked too long and too far afield for the Anti-Christ. The Anti-Christ is none other than Jesus himself. For "Christ" is the name for what Christianity has made of Jesus, and what Christianity has made of Jesus is the *opposite* of what Jesus himself actually was.

Let me turn first to examine the conception covered by the word "Christ," which, in the large, is the conception of Jesus that organized Christianity has been giving to the world

since it first became a significant institution. It is the conception that has been the established, the prevailing, and the orthodox view of the Church, the conception—by the way—with which I grew up. We will try, next, to piece together from the fragments of historical evidence that have come down to us, what sort of person Jesus himself must actually have been. And in each case, both for the conception that is behind the word “Christ” and for the conception I put behind the word “Jesus,” we will examine his mission, his teaching about life, and the field where he chose to plant his seed.

First, then, I present the view of the Church.

The mission of the Christ was to “save the world.” There was a transaction between the “Father” and the “Son,” and the Son’s part in this, the Christ’s part, was to “pay the price.” Man’s part may have been to “believe in” him, which was to believe something about him, believe that he was God, or that he actually did pay the price. But the Christ’s part was to die for man’s sin and so to “make atonement” for man’s shortcomings, to “fix it up” with God. Such was the belief, and such was the teaching.

In fulfillment of this mission, the only parts of his life that really were relevant were his alleged virgin birth, his death on the cross, and his resurrection. Conception without bodily passion made it possible for a divine life to enter human flesh. Thus was it ensured that the destined victim should be man paying the price for man, and yet divine, so that the sacrifice could have the necessary value to compensate for the sins committed.

The life thus conceived is not so much superhuman as un-human. It has no organic connection with human life. It is shaped according to the cold hard demands of an abstract, mechanical and mechanizing logic. It is something done for man, to be sure, yet neither as inspiration nor as example. It is merely the fulfillment of a transaction.

In Protestantism, of course, and in so-called modern times (as I shall point out later), there has been an effort to stress the significance of Christ’s life and his place as a reformer, but it never really fitted in with the rest of the picture nor was it ever very effective.

Of Christ’s psychology (according to the Church), of the thinking that went on in his head in connection with his part in the transaction, it can only be said that it was utterly unreal. He might as well have had no head. Certainly he did not need any. Anything in the way of a problem, or consequent doubt, was pure pose and pretense. He knew from the beginning why he was on Earth and how his life must end. And as he had divine power there was never any question but that he would carry out his part faithfully and fully. He was an actor with his role all laid out for him. Indeed, he was little better than a puppet pulled by heavenly strings.

With us, on the other hand, the greatest struggle is not so much to do what one sees, as to *see*—amidst all the conflict of values and loyalties, to be sure. We fail not so much from lack of courage as from lack of certitude. Which is to say that the experience of the Christ simply lies outside our world. It does not touch us. It is dead, alien, other, mechanical—like a dynamo, if you will, something that we may be able to use for our advantage, but which really does not touch the springs of our own human existence. The teaching, therefore, that

the Christ really took human flesh upon himself and was “in all points tempted like as we are,” simply has no foundation. It would hardly be too much to say that it is a hoax.

The character that the Christ manifested was quite in keeping with his life purpose. He was sinless. And indeed, as this purpose was conceived, this was logically necessary. The sin against an infinite God could not be paid for by the death of any ordinary man, but only by the death of one who was perfect. So—the Christ, though “tempted like as we are,” was yet “without sin.”

Moreover, the “perfection” that we see consists largely of the feminine, and herd, virtues. The Christ is represented as the essence of unselfishness, charitableness, forgiveness, humility, patience, pity. His life was one of doing good, of helping others, of service. For the ordinary churchgoer, it is epitomized in his parable of the Good Samaritan and in the miracles of healing. He is the Good Shepherd, the Shepherd of the sheep. His work was largely an expression of pity—for the weak, the sick, the defective, the inferior, the suffering and the sorrowful. He is love all over.

And as for his teaching about life, this, like the kind of life he lived, was really, or at least logically, without significance. All that finally counted was his death, his paying the price on the cross.

In reform movements, to be sure, the effort has been made, as already intimated, to stress Christ’s teaching and his example, but really this effort has always been brought to nought by residues of the orthodox belief or by the almost total lack of comprehension of what Jesus’ teaching was.

The orthodox teaching has been, virtually, (1) that all of us are born in sin, are evil, and in and of ourselves are worms and nothings; (2) that on this Earth we cannot be like Jesus, since he was God and we are human; (3) that, moreover, we do not need to be like Jesus, since he “fixes it up” for our shortcomings, anyway. Look at the logic of it: no one *can* be like Jesus; no one *need* be like Jesus. The natural conclusion, and in any case the actual result, is that no one *tries* to be like Jesus. The most conspicuous thing about the life in the Christian Church is the almost total absence of any wholehearted attempt to put the teaching of Jesus into practice. Everyone is content to do the very thing that Jesus himself condemned: everyone cries “Lord, Lord,” but no one addresses himself to the difficult and painful, yet always possible task of actually doing what “the Lord” so obviously said.

And why should anyone do so? Such teaching as we have had, has cut the very taproot of moral earnestness and spiritual endeavor. It may all be very true that none shall see for another, not one; and none eat for another, not one; and none climb for another, not one; that none, God, man or devil, so long as we remain responsible growing creatures, shall take the place of, or be any substitute for, any other. But seeing, eating, climbing, and getting over hurdles and recovering from falls are all costly, perhaps painful. And in most people there is a lazy streak. If they can be made to believe that there is an elevator to the top of the mountain, they will ride rather than climb. And they flock to bargain counters. They love to get much for little, something for nothing, and are all too ready to get into the show without paying if they can believe that free tickets are available. Of course it is all a delusion. None

an stand for another; and there is no substitute whatever for our own struggle. He who would get the view and the air that go with mountaintops, must himself climb there. There is no other way. But the teaching that has been given to us has lulled to sleep men who could have climbed, and would have climbed, so that they have laid down and, spiritually, died in their tracks. And each man who makes a mistake pays the price, internally if not externally; and he pays it immediately. If, with his soul, he sees one thing and yet allows himself to do another, that soul of his, his sensitiveness to all that is a matter of value, his aliveness in the realm of all life's meanings, will go a little bit soft, lose its edge, and begin to die. If he keeps on thus, it will die altogether. And there is no forgiveness whatever, either of man or of God, that can make him as he was before. He shall *never* be where he was before, let alone go higher, until again and again he shall have met the same sort of issue in which before he was false, and this time proved true. The law is: *Do what you see or go blind*. Everyone is entrusted with a measure of spiritual comprehension—some with a measure that might be represented by “ten talents,” and others with only five or one. How much one starts with does not so much matter. But there is one law that holds equally for all: if you use what you have you will get more. But if for any reason you fail to use it, if you take it and, as it were, wrap it in a napkin and bury it in the ground, you will wake up at last to discover that even what you started with has been taken away.

And this is the worst of the matter. The worst is *not* that the Church has perpetrated upon mankind a pious hoax, and turned the life and teaching of Jesus into a piece of hocus-pocus, an imaginary transaction to counteract imaginary sin to get people into an imaginary heaven. (For there is no such heaven as people picture, and the sins people labor under are mostly of man's making, and the transaction never took place.) Neither is the worst that the Church has made promises that are utterly impossible to fulfill and that thereby people are lulled into a false sense of security.

It is rather that they are thus led to *trifle* with the only *real Life*, with their spiritual potentialities, with the comprehension, the instinct, the sensitiveness, intuition and living impulse, which alone can lift them to heights and hang rainbows over them, and give them stars—in short, give their days on Earth some meaning, some value, some significance. It is the crime of the Church against Life not only that it promises a life it does not and cannot give, but that it takes away from men the real life they did have, and which might have gone no one knows how far. In the beginning they saw, but led by the Church to believe that doing is not necessary, that Jesus will “fix it up” with God, it comes about that they “see and do not”—as Jesus said of the Pharisees. (Matt. 23:3) And presently they are not able any longer even to see. They “see and do not” and are not aware that they do not do. They are false and do not *know* that they are false. They are stone-blind, and it never enters their heads that they are blind. All sense of reality in their moral and spiritual existence has vanished. They live in an artificial world, a world of imaginary values, which cuts them off from all actuality, so that their organic spiritual existence slowly starves to death. It doesn't work. It doesn't eat. It doesn't digest, assimilate, or excrete. Shut off from food and light and air, it languishes and dies. Dies because it never exerted itself, never kicked, or used its fists, or raised its voice, or got up and went anywhere. It allowed itself slowly to be wound about with grave-cloths, over its eyes, and ears, and mouth, and around its arms and hands, and legs and feet. And now it's a mummy. People walk around, talk and laugh, but within their breasts all the while is a mummy, a dead thing, a corpse. And presently it rots, and stinks,

and infects, and poisons everyone who comes near. Until today almost our whole society is poisoned—poisoned above all with false values, which make our whole direction false, and the sickness is so prevalent that it escapes notice and is looked upon as health, while the truly healthy man, instead of being recognized as the norm and held up for admiration, is regarded with suspicion and pressed to become sick like the rest.

And it is the Church, with its paralyzing conception “Christ,” that has done this thing. The Church has been the great enemy of the Life of man. In the parable, the sower sowed seed in his field, hoping that it would grow each according to its kind, in fulfillment of the shape and color and strength it bore within itself. But in the night an enemy came and sowed tares in the field. But the tares were not so bad as what the Church has done to the field. With the tares the seed could at least struggle. Some of it might come to be what it was meant to be. But the Church has sterilized the soil, so that nothing would grow at all—so that even the weeds grow sickly. The Church has taken away man’s belief in his innermost self, which is his belief in Life. It has taken away his struggle, without which there is no growth, no fulfillment. It has not, as it were, told the seed that it was a life-and-death necessity to struggle—to get its own roots deep down into the soil, to food and drink, and to force its tender shoots up towards the sky, to sun and air. On the contrary, it has told the seed that all this costly and painful labor has been done for it, by another, and that if only the seed would accept this as fact and rest in it, eventually it would be transplanted to another garden and be miraculously transformed into full-grown and perfect flowers. But there isn’t any other garden. Regardless of locale, all life is one. So that the net result is that the garden remains barren and bare. The seed, which might have come to every sort of flower and fruit, comes to nothing. It rots in the ground. And it was this that made Nietzsche to declare that the two greatest stupefiers of the Western world have been alcohol and Christianity.¹

To be sure, a measure of moral earnestness has persisted in the face of the Church teaching. There have been those ready to ask what we must think of the sincerity, not to mention the divinity, of a teacher who tells men to do what he knows beforehand they *cannot* do. Ever and anon, therefore, it has been insisted that Jesus meant just what he said, as for example, by men as far apart in time and space as St. Francis, Tolstoy, Gandhi and Bernard Shaw. But the effort to take Jesus’ teaching seriously and to find some vital significance in his life as well as in his death has been nearly all misdirected owing to the gross misunderstanding as to what Jesus’ purpose was.

Among modern “liberals,” effort has evidenced its lack of comprehension, as well as its lack of really deep moral earnestness, by taking its departure from the parable of the Good Samaritan and the conception of Jesus as the Good Shepherd. The emphasis has been on the herd virtues, and in our midst has appeared the “social gospel,” which its protagonists have thought to be of profound significance, a great rediscovery of Jesus. Everybody accordingly wanted to find some place where he could “help others”—some slum, some feeble-minded, some heathen, some underprivileged, some sick, or sorrowful, or suffering. Would you be a true Christian, then—“do good.” “Service” became the cry of the age. Presently everything became “service”—even government, even profit-seeking and profit-making business. Service! And everyone tried to find someone or something to “do good” *to*. It was *the* way of being Christian, of putting Jesus’ teaching into practice. That is to say, it was the way of climbing in the social scale of the religious world—of gaining virtue,

especially the name of virtue, with all the powers that go with the name. Though of course it was all very "unselfish." The unselfishness was inherent in the doing good. To do good, one *had* to be "unselfish," don't you know?

No, I am afraid that I do not know anything of the kind. What I do know is that all this had rather little to do with the teaching of Jesus. Actually, it was but another artifice by which men *avoided* the teaching of Jesus, and yet hid from their own eyes the fact that they were avoiding it. It was another means of self-deception. They put up as the teaching of Jesus what in truth was *not* the teaching of Jesus, or at best, but an incidental part of it. And then, with this relatively easy and unimportant thing done, they let themselves feel self-righteous and superior: *they* were in the light, in the spiritual vanguard of mankind; it was their mission to open the eyes of their benighted brethren, the believers in the old-fashioned Gospel, to the "selfishness" of trying to get one's own little soul to heaven. One must forget one's self, even one's soul, and become *unselfish*, utterly absorbed, like the Good Shepherd, like them, in "helping others." And yet all the while, commonly, they were only running away from themselves, and dressing up this running away so that they would not *see* that they were running away.

To be sure, wherever the human heart has been sensitive and has felt an underlying unity with the life of all mankind, men have tended to lend a hand as they went the way that belonged to them, and have undertaken to remedy abuses under which other people were crushed or broken. And whenever society has been soundly constituted, it has been recognized that the welfare of the mass of the people was one of the first responsibilities of those in power. But all this to-do about the social gospel, this tearing around to change someone else or to effect some reform has never had anything very deep about it, or significant, nothing especially connected with what distinguished the life and teaching of Jesus. Certainly he never talked, as the social gospelites talk so fulsomely, about "advancing" the Kingdom of God. I venture to say this conception never so much as entered his head. He does not seem to have shared our idea of progress, and maybe *we* shall get over it after a while.

Jesus did not envisage an advance of the whole mass. The possibility of movement depended on seeing, and *see* the mass of the people could not. They were without either eyes or ears for the world he lived in. For his purposes they were dead, debris, obstruction to those who could move, trees that could not bring forth fruit and were fit only to be cut down and burned. For him the Kingdom of God was nothing that required any "advancing." It was not like some old prairie wagon or royal chariot that had to be pushed laboriously up a hill. The Kingdom of God did not require any doing-to-it at all. It already *was*, it *existed*, as a present reality. It was a way of seeing life, oneself, other people, the world, the universe. It was a way of seeing that made everything look profoundly different. It was a way of seeing that depended upon having a certain kind of eyes, a new and added faculty of perception, which most people lacked. And the whole task was *to live then and there according to this different way of seeing*, right in the face of a world that was blind to it. Obviously, therefore, he was no reformer. Success at reform depends upon being ahead, but only a little ahead, of the thinking of one's day, upon rallying to one's support large numbers of very mediocre people (if one goes in for numbers, they will of necessity be mediocre); of being sheep enough to attract sheep and to hold onto sheep. One must not put up the hurdles too high.

One must not go too far ahead, lest one lose one's hold on the sheep and fail to keep them at one's heels.

But no such was Jesus. He was no sheep, and he was not looking for sheep. He did nothing to attract the mass or to keep the mass with him. He was one who had cut loose from the mass, cut all the bonds by which the mass could hold him, and was bent on going as far as he could go, though he had to go entirely alone. He did not try to reform anything—not poverty, or slavery, or prostitution, or war. He believed that if one had eyes for that kind of seeing that belongs to the Kingdom of God, and could be severe enough on oneself to live according to one's own seeing rather than the world's, this simple living of one's own honest life, this mere letting one's light shine, would in the long run count more, even as regards change in social institutions, than any kind of social tinkering and patching more even than any revolution that stopped short with a mere change in society's externals. He believed in direct action. He believed in beginning with what was nearest, with himself, where he was. Here was his first responsibility, here the effect was most sure, and here his ability to produce the effect was greatest. In any case, effect or no effect, if he was sincere, here he must begin. If he really believed so much in this better world the social gospelites raise such a sweat about, it would be necessary for him to get at least himself ready actually to live in such a world.

But not so the social gospelites. Simply to be an honest man, simply to stake everything on being true to one's own highest vision, that would be too small a task for one of *their* capabilities. Moreover, if such a course were not tangibly and demonstrably effective in helping somebody, saving somebody, or ameliorating some social condition, it was all "selfishness"—and the thought of any sort of selfishness was abhorrent to the social gospelites. It was all right even to keep a slave in your own kitchen if only it gained you more time to talk against slavery! But all the while, to those who had eyes, it was evident enough that the social gospelite was moved by the same selfishness that in other people he condemned. Only in him it was more odious, because it was not honest and aboveboard. In fact, his sanctimonious philosophizing was but an effort to avoid that most difficult and painful and costly task of putting his own ideals and convictions into practice, by letting himself become engrossed in taking those ideals and convictions to other people. His dishonesty, his cowardice, his *lack* of *real* love, all the escapism of it, he hid from his own eyes by turning it into a duty, a mission, the very imitation of Christ himself. And thus, at little cost to his own comfort, he was able to sun himself in the feeling that he was better than other people, and to rise to one of the front seats of the synagogue.

Another attempt to take Jesus' life and teaching seriously is very well illustrated by Tolstoy. But Tolstoy lacked the direct inner perception and simplicity of the child of the spirit. He was a rationalist. For every position he took he had to have his reasons—if necessary, even to the fiftieth. And the teaching contained in Jesus' so-called Sermon on the Mount, the spirit of which is like air and light, he undertook to grasp and fasten in the hard iron grip of his mind. But behold! when he opened his hand, all that was there were "Jesus' five little rules," as he called them: the light and life that are in the Sermon on the Mount were gone. Passed through the mill of his mind, all that came out was—another moral code. And by no *code*, by no *rules of conduct*, can anyone live, though it be the Ten Commandments or even the Sermon on the Mount, so long as it be received as a set of fixed forms of right behavior. For

all life, so long as it remains alive, lives from within, from within itself, according to its own bent and direction, and not according to any set forms, however ideal some mind may have conceived them. The idealizing power of the mind becomes a dead hand on life when we allow it to force our living impulses into deeds and ways of approved and standardized pattern. No unspoiled and untamed life ever wants to "be good." It wants to be itself. It scorns human approval, and refuses to twist itself out of shape in order to be like others. Unspoiled life is ever breaking the moral codes of society, in order to be true to itself. It has its own good and its own evil, which are in sternest and strictest relation to an inner behest. For it ever lives by the impulse that comes from the depths of its innermost being;²

Jesus, therefore, cannot be useful to us even as an example. If we make him our pattern and authority, if we take what he said as true because he said it, or try to do what he did because he did it, then he whom men have thought of as their Saviour will become our destroyer. For, again, all that lives must live from within itself. What a man does and the way he goes must come out of what he himself sees and believes, as his fingernails come out of his blood, as leaves come out of a tree. Otherwise his deeds are like a foliage that has been, as it were, *pinned* on a tree, pinned on for the sake of some concern for appearance that he has not enough pride and love of life in him to despise and hate and refuse. Foliage, which, moreover, the first storm will strip off, leaving him naked and exposed to the public gaze for what he really is. But when a little oak sapling, a few inches high, finds itself growing in the presence of a maple tree a hundred feet tall and over a hundred years old, it does not, for all its immaturity, try to copy the older and bigger tree. And if the oak sapling did thus try to copy the maple tree, what kind of an oak tree would you get? Nor when you plant a potato in the ground does it roll its eye around to see how the cabbage grows. But each, so long as it lives, struggles with all the strength in it, to unfold after its own kind, after the shape and color and size it bears within its own heart.

There is no use, therefore, in trying to wear the coat that Jesus wore. It might have fitted him perfectly. But he had a different father and mother from any one of us. He lived in a different age, and its problems were different. There is no coat made that will fit you or me. We must grow our own as a turtle grows its own shell, as every son of woman grows his own skin. If we try to wear another man's coat, it will only bind us when we come to strike a blow, so that we cannot swing with our full force; or its long sleeves, dangling (it may be) below our finger tips, will get our hands all tangled up just when they are suddenly needed to grasp a situation. No, regardless of what kind of a figure we may cut, the only way is to keep our own coat. That will never come off, and, like one's naked skin, it will fit perfectly. There is nothing else in which a man can run so fleetly, or strike so hard, or dance with such abandon.

Therefore, let not a man copy Jesus. What he is to follow is not Jesus, but what Jesus himself followed. Let him find the God within himself, and let him love that God, as Jesus loved his, with all his heart, and all his soul, and all his strength, and all his mind—with all the passion of his being. Let him realize that this God within him is his real Self, the core of himself, what he is in his innermost being, and that He contains all the promise of what he may become. The will of his God is his own holiest and deepest desire. And in finding Him he has come home—to himself. Therefore let a man stand forth in what he really is: and in obeying every glance and whispered behest of his innermost will, let him be as ready to be a

child, or a fool, or a “failure” as Jesus was. Then will he also speak with authority and not like the Scribes. And he will not need to quote Jesus and the Prophets to bolster up his own uncertainty. He will be as ready, if need be, to say of Jesus and the Prophets, as Jesus said of Moses and the Prophets, “They have told you so and so, but I tell you the direct opposite.” And his authority? His own experience—his own inner perception. He sees, and what he sees he *says*, and *does*—and that is enough.

As our inspirer, therefore, Jesus serves us, or not at all. But—yet again his inspiration is to be ourselves, as he was himself—not at all to get men to copy after him, to turn themselves into an imitation of him, which must ever be but a poor thing as compared with the original. Even as the sun, in its shining, does not attempt to turn every plant it shines upon into a sunflower, but to make all that grows *more alike after its own kind*.

We have been examining what lies behind the concept “Christ,” which is what the Church, down through the centuries, has made of Jesus. And we have seen that in its most direct results it turned men away from life, sucked life out of them, was the arch-betrayer of the Life in men. Under its touch men died, died in their souls, remained dead in life, as under the touch of some leprosy or some creeping palsy. And even when there has been an effort to take the life and teaching of Jesus seriously, it has resulted in little more than the soft sentimentality of humanitarianism and the escapism and hypocrisy latent in the social gospel, or in the barrenness and slavery of another moral code.

All this, obviously enough, was exactly suited to the plane on which the masses of the people of every land and age have always lived. It was suited to people of little perception and feeble aspiration, weak of will and recoiling from pain, afraid to think for themselves or to stand alone, feeling freest and most content when they were like everyone else (or at least, not too *unlike*)—grains of sand in a sand pile, knowing nothing of a life of their own, seized with panic at the thought of undertaking to stand up in the face of the world and of the universe by a certainty and a strength they found wholly and solely within themselves. In short, it was for the sheep. And as the sheep are in the overwhelming majority and naturally always seek to enhance their importance, and in this case, moreover, were making the pronouncement, they have always declared that their religion was a universal one, it was for all men, its field was the world. And if there were any for whom it was intended especially, it was for the poor, the weak, the sick, the defeated, the lowly, and sinners and outcasts. But there was one part of the population to whom it really offered nothing. These were the well-constituted, and healthy, and beautiful, and capable, and strong, and proud. But as these were relatively few, and as it was always the part of the sheep to bring down these people who carried their heads high and who walked much alone, and to infect them with the sickness of the mass and to make them also like the rest, it was to be expected that no exception should be made for them. It *applied* to them even though, as yet, it was still rejected. Ultimately it was indeed—for everybody.

But such a position as this Jesus himself would have been one of the first to reject, and in no uncertain terms. And I should like now to present, in contrast to what the Church has made of Jesus, what it seems to me Jesus himself and his teaching were actually like. The material for this picture I gather almost entirely from the so-called Synoptic Gospels, Matthew, Mark, and Luke. These, as scholars have long recognized, and as the word “synoptic” itself means,

were written from a common point of view. They are the earliest of the four Gospels, and, as against John, they are in very substantial agreement with one another. So that, if one wants an authentic record of what Jesus actually did and said, the nearest he can come to it is in these three Gospels. John, on the other hand, is in an entirely different class. It is not, and on the whole I should say it rather obviously is not intended to be, an historical record. It has, rather, all the atmosphere of an interpretation. It was an attempt, on the part of its author, to represent what Jesus had *meant* to him. But in any case, this picture of Jesus in John cannot be reconciled with the picture of Jesus presented in the Synoptics. It is simply impossible. One must take one's choice. In Matthew, Mark and Luke, Jesus really walks the Earth, and his body has substance and weight. Whereas in John he does not walk, he *moves*, as one might imagine a ghost moving, without legs, as a shadow moves. In the Synoptics Jesus' voice vibrates to his changing mood. His spirit loves and hates, and caresses and curses, and pleads and labors, or exults and sings and dances. It is vibrant, flexible, varied. But in John it seems always hushed, repressed, pious, something like the tone in which the preacher today reads it. The book has no passion in it, no reality. You can put your hand through it, as it seems you could have through Jesus' body. The whole atmosphere of it is repressed, oriental, ethereal, supernal, eerie. How can anyone let the statements of a book like that stand against the contrary statements of books like the Synoptics? From the latter, in spite of the rubbish of the miracles, you feel standing forth the figure of a man who, whatever else he may have been, was real, who could bleed and who could stab.

But worse than this is the complete change as regards the person, and purpose, and teaching of Jesus. In the Synoptics the important thing was how you lived, what you loved, and how much you loved. Jesus does not point to himself. Rather he always points on to God. What one thinks of *him* does not greatly matter. A man cries, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life"—or, as we should more likely put it today, "What must I do if I want *really* to live?" Jesus had reason to consider his answer well, and his answer was, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all the passion of thy being; and thy neighbor as thyself. This *do*, and thou shalt live." Really live. Know what really living is. But there is no mention of himself. This saying, however, is confined to the Synoptics.

In John, on the other hand, Jesus occupies the center of the stage, and the stage is a time-less and place-less stage, a world-stage, a stage suspended in the middle of the universe—in short, an unreal stage. And from this stage, this imaginary stage, he utters eternal truths for all mankind. He does not talk to the actual individual or group of people in front of him. They are almost like dummies, stooges, set there to give Jesus a show of justification for a long disquisition on some idea or other. And it seems that he speaks less to be understood than to make an impression—one is almost tempted to say, to show off his superior wisdom. In the Synoptics, on the other hand, everything is said, as it were, at high noon. Everything stands out sharp and clear. And the purpose is to *make* clear, to reveal, to let light in, to be understood, and, at that, to be understood by the people to whom he was talking. Whereas, in John, it often seems that Jesus' purpose is not to illumine but to obfuscate. To "love your enemies" and to "judge no man," injunctions found only in the Synoptics, may be very difficult to do, but they are not difficult to understand. But when he is made to talk about himself as the "bread of life" or about the "vine and the branches" (which occurs only in John), one feels confronted not so much with the inherent, impenetrable, and eternal mystery of life, but with mystification. The razor-edged masculine "hard sayings" and the

simple luminous similes of clear direct child-like inner gaze, which you get in the Synoptics, are replaced by the soft, sugar-sweet, feminine fairy-airy generalities and abstractions that the reasoning faculty has fabricated in John. Mystery is made more mysterious. The listeners are not let in but held off. Jesus talks over their heads. He does so deliberately. His unavowed but real purpose is not to reveal but to impress. The teaching is less important than the teacher. The effort is to make Jesus sound like a God. The effort is to make people feel that he *is* God, Son of God. The only trouble is that this God-Jesus does not talk so well as the man-Jesus of the Synoptics. His teaching is less deep, less clear, less beautiful; and there is far less love behind it.

From the point of view of the teaching, the drop from the Synoptics to John is really enormous. The "hard sayings" are gone entirely: there is nothing about judging not, condemning not, never being angry, not resisting evil, loving one's enemies; nothing about "if a man does not part with all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple"; nothing about "if any man comes unto me and does not hate his father and his mother . . . and his wife and his children . . . and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple"; nothing against repetitious formal prayers and praying in public, or about the absolute necessity of rising above all one's resentment: "forgive all men always." The talk is constantly about "love," and in a soft "loving" voice, but nowhere is there the Synoptics' clear definition of *what* you are to love, without which all loving becomes but softness, sentimentality, effeminacy. The author of the Gospel of John must somehow have lacked full manhood.

The worst thing about the Gospel of John is that it *does not cut into life*. The central question is no longer how to live, but only what you *think about Jesus*. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on him. . ." "He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live." No matter what these lines may have meant to the man who wrote them, there is no question but that for the Church, even for the authorized teachers of the Church, the "belief" spoken of here has meant "belief that Jesus died for you." From the Synoptics' emphasis on Life, innermost perception and vital effort, from something involving your entire being, there is a qualitative drop in John to a mere matter of what you think, of something you can turn over in your head: "Jesus was born of a virgin," "Jesus died on the cross." The rigorous, vital, moral demand of the Synoptics has given way to something that may mean no more than the acceptance or rejection of an idea, without its necessarily having any effect whatever on all the rest of your life. The message of John is therefore apart from living, something even against living, because it placed emphasis not on living but on a mere idea, on the importance of having the correct, the approved idea, and not even on an idea about life but only on an idea about something that was itself apart from life, unreal.

Here, in the Gospel of John, and in the Apostle Paul, we have the beginning of that shift from an insistence on the primary importance of how you live to an emphasis on what you think about Jesus. And it was this shift that was finally to result in that denial and opposite of Jesus, that frustration and betrayal of Jesus, which is organized Christianity. For the Church is due less to Jesus than to Paul, and it always has taken its picture of Jesus less from the Synoptics than from the Paul-like Gospel of John. Though in so doing churchmen have revealed their lack both of taste and of perspicacity in spiritual things.

But for myself I *reject* John, as I reject Paul. My picture of Jesus, as I believe he actually was, will be based upon material I find in the Synoptics.

But I am by no means able to accept everything even in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. But if one is going to select, one must have means by which to make sure that one does not merely pick out such parts as fit into a picture that is preconceived. My means seem to be chiefly three.

First, for help in resolving conflicts between the different records, or between the record and my reason, I turn to the scientific assistance of Higher Criticism. The correction of a text may immediately lift the obscurity that has long hung over a passage, and make its meaning both clear and consistent with its context. The absence of any mention of the "virgin birth" of Jesus in Mark, the earliest Gospel, the references in the body of the Synoptics to Jesus as "the carpenter's son," or the like, and the inclusion of the genealogies of Joseph, which are simply irrelevant and their presence in the text meaningless except on the assumption that Joseph was Jesus' father, all make it easy and yet sound to reject the birth stories almost *in toto*. Joseph was Jesus' father, and the birth stories are simply a halo with which pious followers, with great reverence but with little comprehension, attempted to express their wondering adoration, long after the events recorded. Also, the discovery that the oldest manuscript of the earliest Gospel—i.e., Mark—ends with Chapter xvi, verse 8, before there is any allegation that Jesus was ever seen in the body after his body was dead and buried, lends support to the conviction, towards which reason of its own accord inclines, that the appearances to the various disciples were later additions, accepted because they helped to substantiate a growing belief in Jesus as the Redeemer. That belief was of great importance for the post-mortem attempts to understand and explain what had happened on Golgotha, but for which, actually, there was no factual evidence. At first no one knew anything about either a virgin birth or a resurrection.

The miracles fall into two classes. There are the cases of mental healing. These I have least difficulty in accepting. The presence of any man who is whole, who is deeply at peace with himself and with the universe, is very quieting and ordering to anyone who is nervously or mentally unstrung. That sort of thing happens even nowadays. The other group of miracles, such as the walking on the water, the healing of the blind, the raising of the dead, I frankly incline to reject altogether, simply on the ground that such things do not happen. Those dead to the point where organic disintegration has set in, do not rise—ever. But when it comes to the walking on the water and the healing of blindness, I must admit that I can no longer be so dogmatic as I might have been ten years ago.³ When science is confirming the mystic's perception that matter as it presents itself to our eyes and to our consciousness simply does not exist, that matter is only something stamped upon our energy that reaches the subconscious receiving-apparatus of our organism and has no reality except for a receiving-apparatus of the human sort; when trained and experienced scientific observers of the English Society for Psychical Research can report (and show actual photographs to support their statements) that a certain Indian yogi had walked across a prepared bed of red-hot coals, some fifteen feet wide, without any apparent injury even to the skin of his feet, whereas the feet of others who attempted the same thing were so blistered that they were forced to give it up;⁴ when a scientist of the standing of Alexis Carrel, famous as a winner of the Nobel Prize and for brilliant biological research at the Rockefeller Institute, can soberly

record "his awe at seeing a large cancerous sore on a workman's hand shrivel to a scar before his eyes," and cures of other sorts involving an alteration in the whole human organism, effected either by the faith or prayer of the patient himself or even by the faith or prayer of someone else nearby⁵—in view of all this, it has become almost impossible for me to draw the line anywhere and say, "This cannot happen." I *don't know what can happen*. I don't know what can *not* happen.

Nevertheless, I must admit that for me, for my conception of Jesus, the miracles are most unimportant. The whole lot of them, even if they were *all* true, would not weigh heavily. For one thing, there is internal evidence enough, if one but have the eyes to see it, that Jesus himself did not like doing them, did not like having people come to him for this sort of thing.⁶ Their self-centered absorption in being relieved of their physical ailments got in the way of his real purpose. He was combing the land for men who had eyes to see and ears to hear, whose spirits hungered and thirsted for what he had found, and throbbed and leaped in response to what they heard him say—about Life, Life here and now; and in all the length and breadth of the land he was able to find only a few, only a handful. Instead, all these sick, crippled, defective people throng him and with importunity demand his time and strength—the blind, the deaf, the lame, the leprous—yes, they actually bring their dead to him—to him who showed how he felt about the dead when he said, "Let the dead be attended to by those who are spiritually dead, but go you and preach the good news." (Luke 9:60). Just picture this swarming mass of diseased humanity—limping, crawling, dripping, smelling—pressing close to plead piteously for some sort of salve—not caring at all about Life as Jesus saw it, not at all about quality of Life, about that complete renovation of Life, from the very core out, that he had achieved in himself and that he was eager to help other men to achieve. What, therefore, could there be in common between Jesus and these people with their lust for healings? What could they be but an obstacle to him, something that stood *between* him and his purpose?

No, I am afraid that in spite of Alexis Carrel and the Indian yogi, I cannot believe *these* miracles *happened*. I may be unable to deny their possibility, but I cannot believe that, as a matter of fact, they did happen. Or, if they did, it was the result of some intangible power that involuntarily emanated from Jesus, which people felt and sought to bring themselves within reach of. But Jesus himself—no. He must have felt about it more like Mohammed, who "disclaimed supernatural powers"⁷ and solemnly enjoined upon his followers that they were never to attempt miracles. More like Vivekananda, who, in spite of stupendous mental powers, never attempted any miraculous work of healing. Or Whitman, or Blake, or Tagore, or Gandhi. Men like these, men in considerable part of Jesus' purpose and caliber, simply do not do this kind of thing.

In any case, the miracles are not important. Jesus' stature, his divinity if you will, is not and cannot be evidenced by walking on water or healing of any sort whatever. It is evidenced in the profundity of his insight into the meaning of Life; the singleness of purpose and depth of devotion with which he is able to give up his family, the possibility of marriage, his security, his good name, even his influence; the strength by which he is able to stand up in the face of all the powers and authority of his age, absolutely alone, sure of his values and his course by a certainty he found only within himself. This is magnificent. But for me the

miracles would only spoil the picture. They really do not fit in. It is only they who do not have eyes or ears for Jesus who want *miracles*.

The first means of sifting the material in the Synoptics, therefore, is reason, and her handmaid, Higher Criticism.

My second method is one to which I got the cue from the opening chapter of Edmond Holmes' *The Creed Of Christ*.⁸ He says that the incomprehension and the opposed belief and weakness of ordinary human nature, in which any great man's life and teaching are immersed and by which they are followed, constitute in effect a wash of time, which tends to wear down and even to carry away all that lies in its path. And whenever a given boulder has been able to survive this wash and wear, it is the surest evidence that it belongs not to some sedimentary deposit but to the basic igneous work of the original teaching. Thus there were three classes of incidents and sayings that the early Christian community would have liked very much to get rid of, to wash out of their records and out of their memories. These were (a) the teachings that were beyond their comprehension and contrary to the tradition they had grown up on—such, for example, as Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom of God; (b) the sayings or evidence that did not fit in with the slowly forming orthodoxy about Jesus himself. A case in point is his reply to the man who said to him, "Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" His reply was, "Why do you call *me* good? None is good save one, even God." And this, of course, was contrary to the trend toward making Jesus divine and perfect. Likewise the genealogies, tracing his ancestry through Joseph, do not fit in with the growing desire to believe he had been born of a virgin. Finally, (c), we have all the "hard sayings," which struck right in the teeth of human nature. A psychologist whom I was reading fifteen years or more ago, whose name slips me, declared that Jesus' teaching virtually called for the sublimation of every one of our instincts. It strikes at the very root of the life of the ego, which for most people is life itself, the only life they can conceive of. And this everyone of us without exception, at least at the outset and for a while, resists with all the strength of these threatened instincts combined. If there were any parts of the record upon which the wash of two thousand years must have been harder than upon any other, any parts that a hundred generations have wanted and tried especially to get rid of, it must have been these "hard sayings." "Judge not," "condemn not," "forgive all men always," "no man can serve two masters," "be not anxious about what ye shall eat, but simply seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and all these things shall be yours in addition," "whosoever he be of you, if he does not part with all that he hath," "if any man comes unto me and does not hate his father and his mother, his wife and his children, and himself also, he belongs not with me." And yet it is precisely these sayings, which that weak blind human nature would like most to get rid of, that are most surely established as part of the original teaching by the mere fact that they still stand in the record.

In general, the tests by this second method fully confirm the results that I reach by reason and Higher Criticism, my first means of sifting, and no less those that I reach by my third, which is my spiritual insight.

Every theological seminary has men called exegetes, whose business it is to discover and to expound the true meaning of Holy Writ. With their heavy creaking critical apparatus they laboriously count up how many times Jesus used this word or that, and in what varying

contexts; they note the tense, the person, and the number, and an almost unbelievable amount of other minutiae, and at last they pronounce judgment: the passage under examination means so and so. Well, there is a place for all this in determining as nearly as possible the authentic text, or the like, but when it comes to sensing the spiritual meaning of a teaching, such as that of Jesus, these scholars are about the last men I care to refer to. I cannot remember that in all my three years in seminary I got a single insight that led me toward the step that I took in 1920, when I was 28 years old, at which time I feel that my real life began. Their methods are like those of a man who would try to catch light in a cage or weigh it on scales. They are the modern Scribes, the unimaginative, unintuitive men of scientific mind, the rationalists, the literalists, who squeeze the letter of the text until it is dry and dead. And I don't know whether I the more laugh at their presumption or hold in contempt their methods. They seem never to have heard the answer that George Fox, the founder of the Society of Friends, once gave to the clergy of England when they were trying to prove, by quoting Jesus and the prophets, that his teaching was all in error. Unable any longer to endure them, he turned upon them at last and said in effect, "Can you not understand that except you yourselves have had the same experience out of which Jesus and the prophets spoke, for all you use their words, you cannot understand what the words mean?"⁹

And it is just so. Without like experience, real understanding is impossible. With what signs will you dent the eyes of a deaf man to make him respond to a symphony? With what words will you batter the ears of a man born blind to make him sense the glory of a sunrise? What we have not somehow seen or heard or touched, or been touched by, remains for us as good as non-existent. It has not entered our world—and cannot. Jesus was essentially a man climbing a mountain. And every now and then he came out on some high open place commanding a wide sweep and a far horizon. And pausing to gaze and drink it all in, and noting the places where springs should lie or the passes where roads might be cut through, he makes observations and reflections. And these observations and reflections were his teaching, and such fragments of these as sympathetic bystanders happened to remember and as have come down to us, constitute the record as we have it. Now, if anyone is fully to understand these observations and reflections, he must himself have stood on the same high open places on which Jesus stood when these observations and reflections passed his lips.

In short, if you are going to understand Jesus, you must have his eyes, the eyes born of experience of an order like unto his own. Without insight the task is hopeless. With insight it is relatively simple. You can see, even through the fragmentary and mixed-up record, what Jesus was trying to say. You know, almost, what he must have been trying to say; and know also what else, for a man of his spiritual elevation, would have been *impossible* for him to say. The baffled and indignant authoritarian exclaims, "If you don't accept all of the record, you must throw it all away." And for him it is so, for he is blind. He is like a man who, without eyes, would undertake to gather the gold from a creek-bed: he could not tell gold dust from sand, or know nuggets from pebbles. Yet the man with eyes could tell at a glance. And thus it is with the teaching of Jesus.

So when I want to check the conclusions that I have reached by my insight and the internal evidence of authenticity that certain parts of the record bear in themselves, the last people I should choose to go to for any significant interpretation are the products of our modern

religion-factories, our professional interpreters and our professional religionists, our exegetes, and our clergymen, Scribes and Pharisees. They are not childlike enough. Their eyes have been too calloused by the touch of the dead hand of reason, and above all, too dulled by long glimpsing and not following. And their experience has been too circumscribed, too carefully kept within the narrowness and the shallowness of orthodoxy and convention. Instead, let me go to the unchurched free spirits of all lands and ages. Let me see what Kabir said about these things, and Vivekananda, and Whitman, and Thoreau, and Blake; and not least, Friedrich Nietzsche.

I must now undertake to sketch the outlines of my conception of what I sometimes call "Jesus the Anti-Christ." Yet it is not without hesitation that I approach this task. For there is no man, unless it be Nietzsche, to whom my debt is so deep; and as Jesus' influence began much earlier, it is possible that it has been the more determining.

The great thing about Jesus was his aliveness. He had found his center, the core of what he was, a God within himself; and to his fingertips he lived in obedience to the command of this, his innermost being. He knew what it was to be a house divided against itself, but he was such no longer. He knew what it was to be broken on a cross of divided purpose, torn between the demands of feeling and the demands of reason; but he had died, died unto himself, and he had come back a new and different kind of man. He had come back to celebrate within himself the "marriage of heaven and hell," the reconciling and integrating and coordinating of everything in him. He became an undivided whole. When his spirit sang, every neuron sang; and when he struck it was with all the weight and force in him, head and heart, blood and brain.

Jesus' whole determination was to live, to be what he really was, to make his outside match his inside, to let his God have his way with him, to obey his deepest impulse, to satisfy his own most inalienable and most unappeasable desire—describe it as one may, it all comes to the same thing. The great drive in him, like that in all unbroken life, was to live, to fulfill the demands of the innermost quick of his being, to satisfy something *in himself*. If to do that be selfish, then Jesus was the acme of selfishness. If, having found the pearl of great price, it be living for oneself to sell all that one has to possess it, then none ever lived for himself more than he. Certainly he did not leave anything out of his life, or put anything into it, in order to help other men. He might shape his words to the experience of his hearers, as must any sincere and earnest man who speaks not to show off or to hear himself talk, but in an effort to be understood and to communicate something. But his *life*, the rock from which he spoke, in that there was no accommodation at all. Before rich and poor, high and low, priests and outcasts, before the eyes that answered and those that did not light up at all, or glinted into hate, he himself remained the same, as real and unalterable as a mountain. There was no policy in him. He was what he was. His look, his walk, his way of living and of getting a living, came from the innermost core of his being, and *that* he would not change, and would not try to change, or, out of concern for consequences, try to dissemble. Men could understand or not understand, they could love him or they could hate him, but he would go the way that belonged to him. The world being what he knew it was, he would feel far safer, spiritually, when it cursed him than when it liked him. But, ultimately, it did not matter what the world made of him. He had only one master. He was too completely possessed by his vision.

Yes, by his vision. To see, ever to see more, to peer more deeply into the heart of all life. This is only to say again, in different terms, that his primary purpose was to live. For all life that has meaning and quality is a matter of seeing. What do you see, how much *am* you see, what are you able to see value in, and reality in? And how do you see yourself, and yourself in relation to other men, and to the universe? *Everything* hangs on this. For what you see, fully and surely *see*, you *will do*—you *must* do. You cannot help it. If you still go the way of the world after the new vision has come to you, it is only because you do not see, with indubitable clarity and beyond all question, that the world has nothing to offer that compares with this in realness and value. When the new vision, the new perception, at last comes to you thus, you will follow it, though it means parting with every last thing you have. “He whom a dream hath *possessed*”—what else shall he do? There may be a period of struggle, even a long and bitter struggle, while he is still testing out and making sure whether there is nothing offered him by father, mother, wife, child, wealth, power, influence, name, that means more to him than his vision—than being entirely what he really is. But if, at last, the Life that draws very near and speaks to him in the hour of his deepest stillness, is near and dear to him beyond all other nearness and dearness in the world, then he will give himself to it utterly. He will not profane it by trying to use it. Rather will he long that it may use him, that he may be hands and feet and eyes and tongue to it, his whole life a tongue for it to speak through. He will get down on his knees before it, with his face to the Earth.

With it, as a Hindu woman with her beloved and lord, will he seek to know the great marriage. With his devotion will he ever seek to burn away every division and every veil until at last there is no longer any fear or any resistance, but only the exultant cry of “His will is my will, and my will is His will,” only the freedom of being entirely possessed by what he really is, the radiant joy that comes with mastery, and the laughter, unlike all other laughter, that then gurgles up from his very depths.

To be the slave of this Life (which, of course, is to be wholly oneself, and this, the only freedom that matters), to step forth at last from the prison-house of all fear and to slip the holds of all the hands that would hold him, and to stand forth in the free air and under the high sun and to go his own way to the end, no matter where the way went and no matter what the cost or consequences or lack of consequences—to do this, was above all else the primary object of his existence. And then, along with this, as a kind of side partner to it, he sought to find at least a few others who were able to see and who also were willing to pay any price for their vision, men who meant to go far and to climb high, and to that end were ready to strip themselves light and to leave behind everything they had. With such a group, if he could find it, he would cut loose from the timid herd, and together they would blaze a trail into the wilderness as far as they had it in them to go. But if he could not find such a group, then he would cut loose and fare forth alone. He was not at all a reformer. He never talked about “advancing” the Kingdom of God, but undertook to live *in it then and there*, even though it was in the teeth of a world set dead against him. He never lowered the hurdles that those with short and wobbly legs might be able to get over. You got over the hurdles, and unaided at that, or you stayed behind. The price was all that you had, but you had to pay it in full or you could not be one of the inner circle. “They left *all* and followed him.” If there were only twelve who went with him all the way, it was because he could not find any more. Scholars have questioned whether there were even so many. Jesus—I say again—was *not* a reformer, nor anxious to keep the whole flock of weak little sheep at his heels. He was a

seer, a pioneer, a lone wolf, a lone eagle, a lone lover. And the group, small as it was, was enough to form a kind of suicide squad, a group of men pledged, though they died for it, to make a breach in the wall that shut out consciousness of the Kingdom of God.

The life Jesus lived under the drive of this purpose had little in common with the life we have seen ascribed to "the Christ." This whole orthodox theological conception of Jesus' life, I have had to sweep away as rubbish. In or out of wedlock Jesus was born in Nazareth of Mary and Joseph. The miracles really do not enter into my picture of him at all. His death did not effect any change whatever in any God, and was unnecessary to any such end. Even in the days when I had a theological or metaphysical God, there was no place for any "blood atonement." My God was no Shylock, who demanded the money on the counter before he delivered the goods of forgiveness. My God was like the sun. And while, if one would, one might turn away and walk with one's face in the shadow, one had only to turn again toward the sun and its light would flood all of one's being as though one had never turned away. Jesus' death, for me, was that of a martyr to all that he had lived for, the final witness with his last breath and last drop of blood that what he had said he had meant, and meant still: he had nothing to take back. By what he had stood for, he had created an impasse between himself and the Pharisees. And the Pharisees were the most morally earnest people of his day. But he had declared that their very goodness was not enough. "Except your righteousness *exceed* the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter the Kingdom of God." Their very Law he annulled and their authority he contradicted. The whole world they lived in, and lived on, rocked under his impact. It was he or they. There was no longer room for both on the same Earth. So they stepped on him—and thought that therewith they were through with him. But though it turned out that they were by no means through with him, yet the bleeding and broken body that was finally laid in the earth never again stood up and walked.

But while he lived, everything about him was real. His psychology was real. No one ever has felt that the struggle for which the "spirit drove him into the wilderness" was a perfunctory performance, acted out by rote in fulfillment of a memorized part.¹⁰ He went to the wilderness as many another man has gone—because for a while the struggle within him was so intense and so desperate that he was utterly incapacitated for carrying on the ordinary activities of life. Before he could go on, certain things must be decided. Who was right, he or his mother? He or the rabbis? He or Moses and the Prophets, whom they were always quoting? How far could he trust this Voice that spoke in the deep stillness of his being so nearly, so tangibly, and so insistently? It was so different from all that was thought and said and done by nearly everyone about him. If he dared to step out in obedience to it, what would become of him? Would he have even enough to eat? Enough to keep him warm? What would happen to the whole physical side of his existence? Or how could he ever expect many people to understand him and to go with him? And if they did not go, how could he ever bring relief to the people he loved, who labored in the toils of the Pharisees or who were broken under the heel of the Roman master? What good would it do to hold a course that lost him his following? And if he took a way that brought increased life only to a chosen few, to himself above all, what did it boil down to but self-gratification?

Ought he not to take a leaf from the reformers, who followed a middle course and counselled compromise and effected some immediate and tangible amelioration in conditions? Or might not the truth lie with the apostles of the sword?

How far could he trust this inner Voice? It already had shown itself capable of being severe. Was there nothing that it might command him to do that he must not obey? Suppose it were to order him to jump from the top of the Temple, or to go naked—like the birds. Was there no place where common sense could draw the line and say, Thus far but no farther? Must he be absolutely like a child before a father, like a soldier under orders, or a slave before a master? Now that this Voice had come to him, was the whole law of his life summed up in obedience to it?

After all, what was it? Where did it come from? *Was* it Life? In it *did* Life, all that really was Life, for him or for any other man, draw near and touch him most nearly and nakedly, and try through him to reach the hearts of other men? Was it possible that after all it was, as the priests had told him, only his own fears and self-seeking in disguise—a device by which to escape from grappling with the sordid evils about him, a means, by differing with the crowd and with constituted authority, of drawing attention to himself, and of lifting himself out of the ordinariness that really belonged to him, into a position of leadership—of a kind? Was it something to love or to hate, to throw himself at the feet of, or to trample down? Where *was* the truth? How could he be sure?

This inner Voice, this inner sense of necessity, this stern hand that he could not move from off his shoulder, how should he test it? He could not see it with his eyes, or hear it with his ears, or touch it with his hands, nor could he prove it with his reason. And yet, somehow, it seemed to him more real than all he *could* convince himself of with his senses or find rational proof of—yes, incredible as it might seem, nearer even than his own mother, and dearer, and (even more incredible) his obligation to it deeper than his obligation to her. It would break her heart. Every step this terrible Voice pointed out to him so remorselessly, would have to be taken on her broken hopes and dreams for him. It would set his whole family against him. His very foes, and his worst foes, would be “they of his own household.” Was he going mad? Who was he, anyway? What did he conceive himself to be, to imagine for a moment that he might have been singled out for such a life as sometimes limned forth out of his imagination as he let himself gaze down the years? After all, was he not the mere son of a village carpenter, without even the training of a village rabbi? Would he not do better to settle down to the practical life of a man like his father, or become a teacher, or in any case live a life that could have some meaning for the kind of people he had grown up among, rather than take a course that would leave far behind everyone, and turn against him the very priests he had grown up to revere? And maybe, in the end, all for nothing, all in pursuit of a mirage?

So his mind and soul went round and round the torturing wall of doubts and questions that hemmed him in, thrown back and forth across the circle from one poisoned spear point to another—until his brain swam and his agonized spirit fainted. But still he would not give in, nor buy peace by surrender to any half-god.

Until at last that happened which always happens if only one is strong enough to hold oneself together while the battle rages, if only one can make of one's very self a mat on which the contending forces within fight it out to a finish. There descends a sudden stillness, and in that stillness one sees that the answer is that there *is* no answer. Jesus suddenly realizes that there is *no* way to *prove* that he would not be making a mistake. He is sure—because he is sure, and there is no more to it. To undertake to test the Voice would be to doubt it and ultimately, to lose it. One's obedience to it must be out of one's unsupported instinctive recognition of its supreme reality and authority. One's obedience to it must remain a sheer venture of faith, a gamble perhaps to the very end, yet the only and final proof that one is really ready to live in the world out of which that Voice came.¹¹

And so, at the outset, the battle is won, and Jesus commits himself to go whithersoever the Voice tells him to go. And on the whole he is followed by a most impressive steadiness and certainty. He does indeed "speak with authority and not like the professional preachers." And yet there must have been moments when doubt again clutched at his heart, so that the so-called Temptation may be taken as a symbol, or as a sample, of the kind of struggle that more than once sprang upon him armed to the teeth and fought to bring him down. And apparently a measure of doubt shadowed him to the end. Gethsemane was perhaps his last hour of it, unless indeed it was when he cried "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

And did he not have reason thus to cry? For had he not staked everything on his faith that the Voice that spoke in him was the Voice of God, and that the thing which in the long run would count the most, even for the good of mankind, was for him simply to let his God do with him what he would? And what had it all come to? For the sake of his God he had broken his mother's heart, and sacrificed his friends, alienated his followers, and become an outlaw, and now was dying the death of a criminal. What had he accomplished? There was no book to survive him and keep his teaching alive after he was gone; and nothing was organized—there wasn't even one man standing by him as he hung there dying on the cross. Did he not have reason to cry, "My God, my God, why hast *thou* forsaken me?"

This, whatever else it be, is at least real. He had to find out who he was and what he was, and what he was to do, and to get strength to hold his course, in exactly the same sort of way as you, or I, or any other man. He started with no handicap—certainly with none in his favor, although, if he was illegitimate, he had to struggle with one against him.

But what *kind* of a man is it that we see behind all this struggle? As compared with the rather feminine character attributed to the "Christ," and which we see depicted fairly well in the Gospel of John, what is the character of Jesus as we see it in Matthew, Mark, and Luke?

Here Jesus is not sinless and perfect. Though, indeed, those words hardly seem to apply to anything alive, but only to some machined abstraction of the mind. Perhaps it was something of this sort that Jesus felt when he replied to the man who prefaced a question with the words, "Good Master." I feel the impatience that made Jesus almost cut the man short to exclaim, "Why do you call *me* good? None is good save one, even God." And if Jesus had *not* answered him thus, I should have no use for him. For it is absolutely essential to all really spiritual life, to all life that means quality, that our reach should exceed our grasp.

So long as there is any aspiration in us, we always feel that we fall short; we are always left at last feeling that we are—to use another of Jesus' phrases—"unprofitable servants." We never paint the picture as we have seen it, or sing the song as we have heard it, or do the thing quite as it was commanded us. We are always left, therefore, dissatisfied with ourselves, still reaching. If we are measured by our own standards (and it is the only way anyone should be measured), we can *never feel virtuous*. We never want to hear anyone refer to us as "good," for in our hearts we *know*, better than anyone else *can* know, that we are not good. And we should shrink from ourselves in horror if we ever came to the place where we did think ourselves good. For it is the very mark of spiritual deadness. "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst," but dead is everyone who has become content.¹² Climb as high as we may, there is no place where we dare pitch our tents and cry, "Now we have climbed high enough. Let us settle down here." Once we cease to reach, we start to die. Forwards or backwards: we never stand still. As in the growth of a tree, life pushes forward in us, or it ebbs. We can hold the gains we have made only by increasing them. Beware, therefore, lest for one moment you think yourself good. For,

"To be good only, is to be
A God or else—a Pharisee."

In any case, it is evident enough that Jesus did not live up to his own standards. He had taught one thing, and he did another. He had said, "Never be angry," "Resist not evil," "Condemn no man," "Love your enemies," but when he drove the money-changers out of the Temple (Mark 11: 15-16) and flayed the Pharisees (Matt. 25), his whole presence must have been like a scourge of fire. I like it—the picture of all this crew of proud and powerful men quailing before that lone figure with soul of flame and eyes like lightning. Yet it was a violation of his teaching. It is magnificent: maybe I value it more than I would any record of consistency, for it is evidence that he was alive, that he was real, that he was human. And this, after all the fiction that has been woven around Jesus, is very important. Yet, that it was a violation of his own standards for himself there seems no doubt.

And by all the ordinary standards of any age or land, can there be any question but that Jesus was a wicked man? Ask the Pharisees, who *were* "good" men! Had he not left his parents (Mark 3:31-35) and been responsible for other men's leaving even their wives and children (Mark 10:29)? Had he not become a penniless vagrant (Luke 10:1-8; 22:35), taking his living from the people without doing any work in return, but only stirring them up to discontent with, and rebellion against, constituted authority (Luke 19:48; 23:5)? Had he not protected the woman taken in adultery,¹³ and so turned the edge of God's moral law? Had he not declared that "the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath" (Mark 2:27, and the parallels in the other Gospels), and so made man of more importance than the "ordinances of God"? Had he not set himself up above Solomon, and above the Temple, and even gone so far as to say, "Moses and the Prophets taught you an eye for an eye, and many other things, but I teach you the direct opposite" (Matt. 5:21-22, 27-28, 33-34, 38-39, 43-44)? This man, they felt, was the very incarnation of wickedness. He was cutting the very ground out from under all morality and all law and order, and was setting up a blatant egotism in place of obedience to, and dependence upon, God. He must somehow be eliminated, or all was lost. "Then the Pharisees went out, and took counsel, how they might destroy him" (Matt. 12:14, Mark 3:6).¹⁴

And how about this conception of Jesus as all love, love all over? *Was* he so tender? Yes, he could be tender. "Not a sparrow falleth to the ground. . ." (Matt. 10:29); and "When he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted, and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd" (Matt. 9:36); and "Oh Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how oft would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not" (Matt. 23:37).

And yet, truly, I know not whether to think Jesus was more tender or more terrible. With Jesus there was no middle ground. You could not be lukewarm or indifferent. You loved him or you hated him; you must go with him or wish that he were dead, and maybe try to kill him.

Today it means absolutely nothing to be a follower of Jesus. The so-called Christian life, and the Church that is looked upon as at least the advance guard of the Kingdom of God, are conceived as fitting very comfortably into the life of the world. It is taken as a matter of course that a man can be one of Jesus' kind and yet be a soldier, or a banker, or win "success," or be popular in social or political circles. But with Jesus it was not so. He and the world were in head-on collision. The world must be changed, radically, drastically. And he meant to precipitate the issue. "I am come to bring down fire on the Earth, and how I wish it were kindled already! . . . Do you think I have come to bring peace to the Earth? Not peace, I tell you, but rather discord! For from now on if there are five people in a house, they will be divided three against two and two against three" (Luke 12:49-52).

And the most terrible words about family relations that have ever passed the lips of man came from the mouth of Jesus. He deliberately and definitely repudiated physical kinship as a basis for fellowship. Not she should be his mother who had borne him, nor they his brothers and sisters with whom he had grown up, but rather they who had the eyes and the ears and strength to enter and to live in the world that he lived in—inwardly (Mark 3:33-35). A woman stands up in the crowd, in appreciation of him and his mother, to cry, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the paps that gave thee suck," but he almost stops her to reply with such seeming heartlessness, "Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it." Physical kinship is nothing, spiritual unity everything. With these sayings he cut himself off from his family, completely and permanently. The breach was never healed. Mary was not at the cross. The tender scene in which Jesus entrusts his mother to one of his disciples, is to be found only in John. It did not take place. Every bit of evidence in the Synoptics points the other way.

And he was just as severe about family loyalties. "A man's foes shall be they of his own household." His *worst* foes, because the tenderness of his relations with them makes them the last ones into whose hearts he can press the sword of his integrity. He can stand any other suffering better than that of giving suffering to them. Yet the infliction of such suffering is almost inevitable and unavoidable whenever a young person undertakes to set free the God-in-him. For parents have hopes and dreams of conventional success. They make claims of filial obligation. And when a man attempts to free himself from all the bonds that would hold him, that he may be bound only to his God, his mother will fasten her arms about his neck and plead with him; and often the rest of the family will do likewise. And they

put around him what binds more than their arms, as with hoops of steel. And usually the man is not able to extricate himself from these toils, or to resist the appeal to his feelings. To spare pain he compromises, he consents to follow the Voice only so far as he can do so without causing pain, without causing too much pain. But hear the remorseless Jesus! "If any man comes unto me and does not *hate* his father and his mother, and his wife, and his children. . . , he cannot be my disciple" (Luke 14:26). Not, of course, that he wished any increase of hate in the world: his "judge not," "love your enemies," "forgive all men always," is evidence of that. But "no man *can* serve *two* masters." Love of one's family and love of one's Life cannot be equal. One must give way to the other. For trueness to one's innermost being, one must be willing to leave *everything*. Jesus' "hard sayings" were in a very real sense a sword (see Matt. 10:34) with which he undertook to cut men loose from all the ties that bound them fast to falseness and to death. In effect he said, "If you rise up in obedience to the Voice in you and start to strip yourself light that you may be free to climb high, and your loved ones draw near and lay entreating hands upon you to hold you, then—as gently and patiently and understandingly as you can, pry the fingers back. But if, again and again, you loosen their hold only to have them fasten upon you the more desperately, then—*cut them off. Let nothing hold you.*"

He was equally severe in his demands in regard to material things. "Whosoever he be of you, if he doth not part with all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple" (Luke 14:33). He himself was a penniless, property-less vagrant. The foxes had holes and the birds had nests, but he had no place of his own to lay his head (Matt. 8:20). He spent his time and himself going from place to place hunting for people who had eyes to see and ears to hear, and he ate and slept in the homes that were opened to him, or he slept in the fields (Luke 10: 1-8; Matt. 10: 5-14). It was not, to be sure, a life for all, not a life intended for all, nor indeed for many (and this needs to be made very clear and emphatic), but all those in the inner circle had gone to the same lengths as Jesus himself. It involved a complete break with the world's way of living and of getting a living. Such a break was of itself not enough to gain a man a place in that inner circle, but there was no admission to it without such a break.

With Jesus it was a matter of your all or nothing. He never stooped to gain a hearing or to hold a following. The tree that brought not forth good fruit was fit for nothing but to be cut down. The man who could not or would not see, and who could not or would not do what he saw, was useless from his point of view, an obstacle in his way. He who was not with him was against him. I know not whether he was more merciful or more merciless.

But was he not at least humble? Love and humility are perhaps the very core of the orthodox conception of Jesus. A lamb in his arms, and the face of a woman—soft rounded features, doe-like eyes, with drooping lids. Such a man would be utterly *incapable* of ever *blazing*. I do not forget that Jesus is alleged to have said, "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the Earth" (Matt. 5:5). But it may be that Jesus never said these words (they are found only in one Gospel), and in any case I do not know that the Greek word translated by our "meek" meant then what the word "meek" means to us, or whether that Greek word in turn was an adequate rendering of the Aramaic word actually used by Jesus.¹⁵ But certainly "meek" sounds far too much like "weak" to be to my liking.

However, I know that Jesus is alleged to have said also, "The kings of the gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority over them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so: but he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is chief as he that doth serve . . . For which is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? But I am in the midst of you as he that serveth" (Luke 22:25-27. Cp. Mark 10:42-45; Matt. 20:25-28). But this passage does not disturb me. After all, it was not said to the world, to everybody, but to Jesus' inner circle, to guide them in their own relations to one another: "among you" it shall be so and so. Let it be noted well that the passage has no bearing on a man's own estimate of himself, on his sense of his own worth, but only on his position in relation to others. And these "others" were by no means everybody. Jesus' remarks were addressed specifically to a small group of close friends and co-workers in a common cause, in which it was very important that their unity should not be broken by rivalry for first place. Let each be so identified with the cause that, if he can count for the most there, he will gladly find his place at the bottom of the group. But this—let me say it again, and with emphasis—is something very different from twenty-four-hours-a-day humility. It was not a teaching for universal application. It did not mean that one was to subordinate oneself to anyone and everyone. It had reference to relations within the inner circle. "Among you" there shall be no striving for position.

Perhaps some of my readers will think this interpretation hardly fair to the intention of the passage. But if so, if it be insisted that Jesus really was what is suggested to most people's minds by the world "humble," I must confess my total inability to fit in such a conception with the predominating tone and direction of his life as a whole. For what is humility?

According to the *New Standard Dictionary* (1930), "humble" means "having or expressing a sense of inferiority, dependence, unworthiness, or ill desert, as compared with others or with the standard of the divine law; meek; submissive. . ." *Webster's New International Dictionary* (1930) adds: "a modest estimate of one's own worth."

Somehow this does not sound like Jesus. As with all those who are most *alive*, his primary reference was not to the opinion of the world about him, but to the behest of the God within himself. To this last he ever sought to hold himself tender, open, listening, without the least resistance, as submissive as a child to a father or a slave to a master. Before this he did indeed always feel his unworthiness, for he always fell short. But what the world got was the hard edge and the unsparing light of his obedience to this inner command. "Thou art not yet humble enough for me. Humility hath the *hardest* skin," said That in Nietzsche's *Zarathustra* which "spoke unto (him) without voice." ¹⁶ And when he had humbled himself sufficiently unto the God within himself, then went he out to contradict Moses and the Prophets (Matt. 5:21-48), and to overthrow the whole ethical and religious system of the Pharisees, and to supplant it with a teaching of his own. And by what authority does he say and do these things? The answer that is implicit in his very bearing is, "Thus saith God to me"! He does not live secondhand. He does not lean on the experience of other men. He is sure not by anyone else's saying but his own seeing. His God is the God of the living, and is as alive in him as ever he was in Moses or Isaiah, and is *more* to be listened to in himself because there he is more sure of him and because there he speaks in closer reference to the situations actually before him. If he had been less humble before his God, he would have qualified his assertions with an "I think," or have quoted some authority. But it was when he

was *nothing* before his God, possessed by him and become one with him, that he cried, "Thus saith God to me" and declared himself "the Son of Man," "lord even of the Sabbath" (Mark 2:28).¹⁷

"Was Jesus humble? or did He
Give any proofs of humility? ...
If He had been Antichrist, Creeping Jesus,
He'd have done anything to please us —
Gone sneaking into Synagogues
And not us'd the Elders and Priests like dogs,
But humble as a Lamb or Ass
Obey'd Himself to Caiaphas.
God wants not Man to humble himself:
This is the trick of the Ancient Elf.
This is the Race that Jesus ran:
Humble to God, Haughty to Man,
Cursing the Rulers before the People
Even to the Temple's highest steeple;
And when He humbled himself to God,
Then descended the cruel rod.
If thou humblest thyself, thou humblest me;
Thou also dwell'st in Eternity.'" ¹⁸

I wish now to turn to the teaching of Jesus, to see whether we can come to the core of his understanding of life.

The heart of Jesus' teaching is contained in what he has to say about "the Kingdom of God." These sayings were little understood by those who listened to him; perhaps they are no more understood today, and perhaps understood least by those who set themselves up as professional expounders of their meaning.

The Kingdom of God was all a matter of *seeing*. It was all a matter of the way everything looked (oneself, one's neighbors, and the whole world of creation) when one looked out upon it through the eyes of one's own wholeness as it was centered in what Jesus called "my Father."

This was a radically different way of seeing from that of almost everybody in the world about him. The realms of meaning, of value, of beauty, of truth, which it opened to him, were as much closed to those who lacked it as is the glory of a sunrise to a man born blind. As I shall go into this whole question at some length in chapters V, VI and VII, I will confine myself here to what is essential for the point I wish to make about the teaching of Jesus.

While I cannot accept the thesis of Bucke's *Cosmic Consciousness* in its entirety,¹⁹ I believe he was absolutely right and made a contribution of great significance, in declaring that the cardinal fact in the experience of the great seers has been their possession of an entirely different *order of consciousness*. It was an order or kind of consciousness that lifted them as

much above those who had only the self-consciousness that today distinguishes the human, as those with *self*-consciousness are above the simple consciousness of the animal. Jesus had eyes and ears that most people lacked. That was why he was always looking for those who had “eyes to see” and “ears to hear,” that thus they might be able to enter the world he really lived in. He had, as it were, inner eyes and ears that they lacked, an added sensitiveness, a new faculty of perception, a sixth sense. Without this added sensitiveness they were as inexorably shut out from his outlook and experience as is an animal from the thoughts, purposes, and aspirations of a man. They could make no more of it than a cow can make of a Beethoven symphony, or a dog of a sunset. “Eyes have they, but they see not, ears have they but they hear not.” Maybe they hear the same sounds and see the same lines, but neither sounds nor lines have meaning, certainly not the meaning they have for the man with the added faculty. It was urgent, therefore, that he find people who *would* see and *would* hear. Without such understanding one can, right in the midst of people, be as alone as a man cut off in the midst of a polar waste, and feel one’s isolation more desperately. Such loneliness can drive a man mad, as it did Nietzsche. Moreover, much pressed to be done that could be done *only* by men who shared the same vision and purpose. And so in the pages of the Gospels we watch Jesus seeking out his own kind, trying to find those who had eyes for what he saw. But what was it he saw?

What distinguishes his kind of consciousness is wholeness. The characteristic of the usual self-consciousness, which is the mark of the human, is division.

The ordinary man is divided from all the rest of the universe. He is able to turn his eyes in on himself (as animals for the most part cannot), and, when he does so, seems to perceive himself apart from every other person and every other thing. Between himself and all the rest of creation there is an abyss. Even in his deepest and most intimate love he never quite becomes the other person. For sensitive souls this unescapable aloneness in the midst of a universe that defies one’s utmost efforts to overcome its strange otherness and to become one with it, has often had the effect of a nightmare. One remained afraid in it, and felt one must wall oneself in against it.

Moreover, this kind of consciousness has driven most men to look upon themselves as the thing of primary and supreme importance. Each for himself, and the devil take the rest. *My* mouth, *my* back, *my* family, *my* land, *my* business, *my* name, *my* influence—this is what each man cares about and seeks to get and to keep, or to make safe and enjoy, regardless of the corresponding but conflicting concerns of the other man. And this self-centeredness has doubtless done more than anything else to weaken and destroy that solidarity upon which every human society must depend, not only for its survival but also for the realization of its highest cultural potentialities.

But the man thus self-centered is divided not only from the world about him, but also within himself. He is not able to have only one God, for he has a hundred desires, and each one wants to go in a different direction. Each one is a potential rival of his God. And whenever that desire speaks which represents the gathering core of his being and holds the possibility of becoming his God, it is resisted by a large number of his other desires, the mutinous forces in his nature that wish to go in a direction altogether different, and that may sulk, or pluck at his heels when he tries to run, or fasten onto his arm just when he needs to draw his

sword, or all pitch into him at once like so many furies just when he is trying to compose himself in a stillness deep enough to allow him to hear his God. The result is that he is not able to make sure *what* his God says to him, and he is overcome by all the terrors of a little child lost in a thick woods at night. Or he fails to obey his God and is tortured with a sense of violating his deepest being, with a sense of sin and guilt. And in consequence he tends to view himself as a bloody battleground, with his body fighting on one side and his aspirations on the other. Thus he comes to fear and to despise his body, with its hunger for food and its need of sex, and he resists it and calls it evil, and tries to whip it into obedience to his spirit, which he calls good. And this division in himself is reflected in, and writes itself large all over, his view of the universe. The cleft in himself yawns apart in the conceptions of heaven and hell, and God and Devil. And man finds himself the victim on a rack that, in reality, is framed of his own misconceptions, and drawn and quartered by powers of his own creating. All his life he flees what he fears, and seeks to embrace what he loves—but he never fully escapes the one or overtakes the other. All his days are full of strain, guilt, frustration, and disillusion. There is no peace anywhere.

But the mark of *cosmic* consciousness, in contrast with self-consciousness, the mark of the seer's and Jesus' order of consciousness, is oneness, wholeness, and with this, peace, heightened capabilities, and joy.

Suddenly, and usually after a long period of desperate struggle has left a man in a seemingly dark blind impasse, the new consciousness supervenes. Suddenly, in an instant, the whole universe takes on a different aspect. The old sense of division is gone. The old exhausting struggle with one's God, against one's God, is no more. There is no longer the least vestige of resistance. One fears nothing. One feels there is nothing in all the universe to be afraid of. And at last there is only one will. Call it your own will—the impulse that emanates from the very core of your being, or call it your God: perhaps the names make little or no difference. He wills what you will; you will what he wills. There is now only one will. There is now only one life. "I and my Father are one." The last partition has gone down. There is no longer a body and a soul glaring at each other across the abyss in one's soul. Body and soul have known—the great marriage. They are clasped in each other's arms. Body is the soul made manifest. Soul is the body's exhalation and exaltation. They are not twain but one—a psychophysical unity, the same thing looked at from different levels, different aspects of what is really only one life. The man has become a living *whole*. And the gaze through which he looks out upon the world about him, upon the people in it and all the starry universe, is the gaze of his own wholeness. No more is it double, as from seeing with two eyes, two different eyes, but it is become single—at last, single and crystal clear.

And wherever he looks, the universe is become as whole as he, and he one with it. No more does it seem to him an alien, hostile, and monstrous thing—a deadly corral, in which he has been trapped, in which an invisible marksman picks off his victims, each in his turn, from whose deadly aim none can escape, the universe a deathtrap from which none shall get out alive, not one. Suddenly it is as if he awoke from a nightmare, and the universe, instead of being a deathtrap, is become a beautiful home, which a most loving father has made festive for the return of his long-lost son, which the bridegroom has prepared for the home-coming of his long-loved long-wooed bride. It is a place one can be unafraid in, relax in, feel at home in. All sense of sin and guilt is gone, and all fear and tension. Instead there is peace, the

peace which, in all soberness, the world cannot give (for it does not depend on anything the world has to offer), and which the world cannot take away (for there is nothing the world *can* take away that touches the source of it). Instead there is deep uncontainable joy. And this makes all life look different.

The foregoing paragraphs describe the essential features of what, despite the current taboo against not only the word but all it presently stands for, I should frankly call a mystical experience. To be sure, it is mystical experience of the highest order and of the most extreme power to transform a human life, and therefore very much of a rarity among men, but it differs only in degree, not in kind, from mystical experience of the more ordinary sort. However, lest my acceptance of the *word* mislead any reader about my attitude here, I must advise him in advance that in my chapters on what I have called "an added faculty of perception," he will see that I have examined all mystical experience, from the commonest to the highest, with an extremely unsparing eye and critical mind.²⁰

Here, however, let it suffice me to say that I do not claim that the universe actually is the way the seer sees it; or that the added sensitiveness that causes his experience could ever reveal to him the distance to the sun, the constitution of the atom, or how to grow garden peas. For that, a faculty of very different sort is required. But I do believe and do claim, nevertheless, that this inner eye is of the utmost value and of far-reaching significance. It may not add one iota to the store of our knowledge of the facts of the material universe. But it does enable him who has it to look upon all such facts, and everything else, from a new angle and from a new level. And from this angle and this level one may see meanings in them, and relations between them and between all of them and oneself, which can make all the difference between groping and seeing, between wallowing hopelessly in a bog and dancing in a dell, and between despair and death on the one hand, and life, peace, and joy on the other. From the point of view of *living*, the difference it makes in certainty, in direction, in content, and in quality, is no less than enormous.

Perhaps, to one who never has had such an experience, I can convey some sense of how great a difference it can make, by describing an experience, in quite another realm, that I once had many years ago. In the pitch dark of night I had lost my way among the Thousand Islands in the ten-mile-wide St. Lawrence, and was trying to find the island on which I was camping. A storm had come up and it was getting serious. By the direction that I had had when darkness overtook me, and which I had tried to maintain by the black of the shoreline against the sky, I knew that the island should present itself lengthwise. So as I rowed I peered and peered through the thick night, but *no* shape bore the least resemblance to my island. I was lost. Then, suddenly, somehow, I realized that I was facing, not the side of my island (as I had supposed), but its end. And in that instant it was as though the *whole universe* wrenched itself from its moorings in my consciousness and on some giant turntable ponderously whirled about until it locked itself fast in a position at right angles to where it had stood before. The whole universe seemed to turn. But as it clamped down in its new place, I knew where I was. I had my bearings. And in a few strokes I was home.

Meanings and values, which are one's spiritual bearing and direction, are just as real facts, and just as important facts, as the distance to the moon or the structure of the atom. Maybe they are far more important. After all, a little historical perspective on ourselves should

remind us that many another age, which knew very little of what our science has revealed to us, produced a culture beside which ours makes us look almost like barbarians.

To show the actual practical difference that such an experience may effect in a man's life, let me contrast its outlook with that of the ordinary man.

To begin with, the man to whom it comes is suddenly possessed with a sense of his worth, his dignity, his divinity. The *Lord* God has spoken to *him*. So, commonly, it has genuinely seemed. The Lord God has become one with him. The Lord God has lifted him up and laid upon him a command and given him a work to do. Henceforth he labors under a sense of necessity and destiny.

And everything is alive. Every stone is, and every stick and speck of dust. And there is no death. Death is only a change that we do not understand, a change that is *beyond* our understanding. But it is nothing to be feared.

And there is a strange and marvelous expansion of his sense of identity. What he is cannot be contained within his skin. What he is reaches out somehow to the uttermost limits of the universe. He is one with it all. Somehow it is he. Like the continents and the islands of the sea, what he is reaches down out of sight to where all run together in the ocean floor. There is some strange underlying life uniting his life with the life of all men; indeed, not only with the life of all men but with that of all animals as well, and with the grass and trees and flowers, and not least with the primordial mother Earth. It is not identity, or equality, or effacement of personality. As with the continents and the isles of the sea, so with human life: they are separate, and some are higher than others, and some are larger than others, yet they are necessary to one another and at bottom they are united. He who betrays himself, betrays mankind. He who is most unalterably true to the highest in himself, serves no less the highest life in all men. Our every look and whisper sends out ripples, large or small, to the ends of the universe. No man liveth unto himself, and no man dieth unto himself. No man can.

In all the length and breadth of the universe there is nothing to be feared. "I sit and look out," said Walt Whitman, one of the real seers, "upon all the sorrows of the world, and upon all oppression and shame," and after giving samples of sorrows and sufferings and injustices at their worst, he exclaims, "All these—all the meanness and agony without end I sitting look out upon, See, hear, and am silent." ²¹ And in "Song at Sunset," in one of its closing lines, he reveals *why*, in the face of all this, he *could* be silent. "For," he says, "I do not see one imperfection in the universe, And I do not see one cause or result, lamentable at last in the universe." ²² Everything is all right. Everything is in its place. The universe is beyond criticism. When one sees it from an elevation high enough, one's heart only overflows upon it in love and blessing. Nietzsche saw his Superman as "a transfigurer of existence," and his Zarathustra "comes back with love to the narrowest and smallest things—he blesses all his experiences and dies with a blessing on his lips." And yet again he says that for men of the highest elevation, "'The world is perfect'—that is what the instinct of the most intellectual says, the yea-saying instinct; 'imperfection, every kind of *inferiority* to us, distance, the pathos of distance, even the Chandala²³ belongs to this perfection.'" ²⁴ And Jesus' God also seems to have been singularly free from moral judgments. Did Jesus not say of him that "he maketh

his sun to rise *on the evil and the good*, and sendeth rain *on the just and the unjust*! It is not that this acceptance and love and blessing of things as they are means, necessarily, that we should do nothing about the oppression and injustice which, to another eye that we have, seem so monstrous. But what we do about it is itself a part of the perfection that will succeed the perfection in which we "sit and look out."

And it is strange how necessary dark seems to be to light, and evil to good. And strange how often, in any case, all the reforms of statesmen seem only to leave the evil piled up in a different place, with different names, but with the balance of good and evil little changed. Maybe the evil that we attribute to the world is only the result of our effort to apply to the universe a human yardstick that has no reference to the universe. Maybe the evils will yield, if they will yield at all, only to men's coming to a different way of seeing. If many men could come to see themselves somewhat as the seers do, and could thus see other men also and the universe in which their lot is so inscrutably cast, then, surely, they would make a different world. But *can* the majority of men, or even many men, ever come to see thus? Is there "progress," or is progress a delusion? Does the whole mass move forward, or do civilizations rise and fall like the waves of the sea, great minds and souls appearing in one age and vanishing in the next, leaving the heavy mass at the bottom mostly unmoved?

Be all that as it may, this order of consciousness, which has distinguished the seers in all lands, ages, and religions, came to Jesus. It came first in the experience of illumination that struck him at the time he went up to Jordan to cast in his lot with John the Baptist. Something John said to him precipitated the crisis that soon drove him into the wilderness for the most crucial struggle of his life (Mark 1:9-11, with parallels in the other Gospels). It came again (Mark 9:2-9) to confirm and to strengthen the initial experience, at the time of another crisis, when he was torn with the question of who he was, and what was the strange ineluctable destiny that hung over him, and what was the direction in which he must next turn his face.

And this experience alone largely explains the primary direction of Jesus' life and the content of his basic teaching. Without an understanding of this experience, any adequate understanding of Jesus is impossible. On the other hand, once this *is* understood his whole course at once becomes explicable and to a large extent almost inevitable. One can be pretty sure, beforehand, what he *must* have caught. There will be individual differences of cast, of tone, of emphasis—or it would be but a stereotype or an abstraction, but in the large it will be consonant with the experience of the seers of all lands and races. Seers differ as oaks differ, according to the climate in which they grew up and the ground they grew out of. Yet, as has often been remarked, "all mystics speak the same language."

The impulse that spoke out of this experience was Jesus' God. He called it his "Father." This Father was to be loved with a love that left no love for anything else. Or—to put the same thing in words less likely to cause misunderstanding—everyone and every thing was to be loved *through* him—that is, as seen in the light of this experience. It was in relation to this Father, and not to the world, that one was to be like a little child (Mark 10:15, and parallels)—like a child in one's implicit trust, and transparent sincerity, and utter simplicity. This was his authority, which he was so silent about, but which stands revealed in everything he said and did. And to this authority he was like a soldier under sealed orders, like a soldier

who, before he knows where the orders will require him to go, has written in his blood that he will obey them though they take him to his death. And all Jesus' hard sayings were only his effort to state the outlook on life that was natural and inevitable when one had reached a spiritual elevation like his, or so to stiffen the wills of those who'd had something of his experience that they would see their purpose through to the end, and be able to cause the necessary pain with clear conscience.

This means that to the great mass of the population Jesus' teaching does not apply. It was never meant to apply. It is preposterous on the face of it to expect, say, a policeman to "resist not evil" (Matt. 5:39), or a judge to "judge not" and "condemn not" (Matt. 7:1-5), or a business man to "give to everyone that asketh" or to avoid lending to them of whom they "hope to receive again as much" (Luke 6:30,34). Jesus' teaching was not meant for "the world," for those who intended to stay in the world and do the things that the life of the world requires—that is, for the great mass. It was addressed only to those who had begun to emerge from the mass's inertness, for those who were spiritually alive or struggling to become alive—in short, for the few in Jesus' inner circle or their like. Only for them.

Now, people of *that* sort, people who have become aware of stern inner imperatives, can grow (or even remain alive) only by obeying these imperatives. Thereafter, to go with the crowd because the crowd wills, or to shape your conduct in conformity to any external code, is to die. You can at most act *as if* you felt the way the moral rule calls upon you to act, you can only put an iron hand on the back of your neck and put yourself through the motions. But unless your heart is in it your action will be stiff and stilted, artificial, something put on, something put on with motives and for a purpose. Your real whole self will not be in it. Underneath the surface you will be seeking to give the impression of virtue, in circles where that kind of virtue counts, and so to climb toward one of the front seats in the church, and to gain the advantages that a name for virtue brings. But at bottom it will be but an unacknowledged effort to satisfy your will to power—a furtive, indirect, backstairs effort of a weak man who does not dare follow his heart, and of a dishonest man. If you did follow your heart, and to do so had to break most of the Ten Commandments, you would be more really alive, more alive spiritually, and more worthy of respect, than the man trying to sneak his way to virtue, to a mere name for virtue, when all the while, actually, his life in consequence was a pose, a pretense, a lie, and he grew every day more dead, more poisonous—a Pharisee, a hypocrite. It was precisely this kind of effort that *made* the Pharisee.

No, to *live* by any kind of rules is *impossible*. Blake was dead right when he exclaimed at the end of his "Marriage of Heaven and Hell," "I tell you, no virtue [i.e., no *real* virtue, no aliveness] can exist without *breaking* these ten commandments. Jesus was all virtue, and acted from impulse, not from rules." ²⁵ Every man must get the pattern for his conduct from within or from without, from his own heart or from some approved code. The only people who *can* get it from within are they who are able to know what it is to have a life of their own, to accept their difference from other people, and to bear the burden of their own integrity. These at best, however, are but few. They are the creators and the potential creators. The rest of the people are, more or less, sheep.

There must be government. He who cannot command himself must be commanded. If order, form, direction cannot come from within, they must be imposed from without. The thought of anarchy and chaos is intolerable. Where a man has not found within himself what can govern him, then by priests or by government, by instruction, seduction, or intimidation, or by all these put together, he must be made to accept a moral code and to follow it. Most people seem to be of this class. They are people of the undifferentiated mass-mind. They are sheep and require shepherds. They are easier within themselves when they are not asked to decide, but are told and expected to obey. And such obedience does them no injury because there is no stern and insistent imperative from within to which social conformity would make them untrue. Such people cannot have what the free spirit, the creator and the potential creator, would alone call life: they have only their existence, and they drag out their years. May they be as happy as possible!

The alive person, however, acts spontaneously. From the overflow of the heart the mouth speaketh when it speaketh genuinely: all else is lies. And this was why Jesus spent time with the publicans and harlots—not at all out of pity, because they were outcasts, but because they were less starched and collared in virtue.” They were more real, more honest. There was no pretense about them. Their knees had not stiffened into poses, nor were they everlastingly striking attitudes, and thinking how fine they were. They were at least *going somewhere*—maybe in a wrong direction, but at least going somewhere, and doing it openly and strongly. They were nearer reality than the “virtuous” ones who had got in the habit of living for appearances. They were nearer that insatiable hunger and thirst that must come before all great searches, than were those who thought they were good, good enough, better at any rate than other men. And they were not afraid to be different, to break conventions, to bear up under the leveled finger of self-righteous condemnation. And above all, they still had impulses, their hearts were able to leap, and to laugh, and to love, and were not dried up springs like the hearts of the Pharisees.

The essence of Jesus’ teaching, therefore, is in regard to that different way of seeing that he called the Kingdom of God. And life consisted not in striving to live up to some rule of conduct, or in effecting changes in other men or in social conditions, but in undertaking to act strictly in accord with one’s own way of seeing, even though it was flatly contrary to all the codes, traditions and practice of one’s day.

But this is difficult, costly, and dangerous. It requires an ability to make sure of one’s course and to hold it (if necessary, in the face of the whole world), from resources one finds entirely within oneself. The overwhelming majority of men simply do not desire such a thing. They cannot even conceive it as desirable. And at the mere thought of being called upon to stand so utterly alone, and to be sure and strong without anyone to lean on or to quote for authority, they are seized with panic.

In view of such considerations as we have just been presenting, it surely ought to go without saying, that Jesus’ teaching is not for everyone. It is ridiculous on the face of it to think of him as a man for the masses. They never have understood him. They did not in his own day; they don’t now. They are inherently incapable of understanding such a man.

There is evidence enough that Jesus did not attempt to make them understand. He was not trying to keep the sheep at his heels. He was not trying to get them somewhere. He was not trying to do *anything* with them. He had no use for sheep.²⁶ To live the life that he found laid upon him to live, he had to cut loose from all sheep, and to unlearn sheep ways, to get the sheep nature out of himself. Insofar as he went to sheep at all, it was to find among them those who were *not* sheep. There were those who were like young bull-calves, who knew not that they were different from the cows among which they had grown up, who needed once to hear a real bull bellow and to feel the vibration of that bellow in their very bones, before they could realize that they were not like the rest, not placid cows, but themselves bulls, bulls at least in the making. So that from that hour they were different, and lost to the way of the herd they had grown up with. When Jesus went to the crowd it was always with this purpose. He was combing the crowd for his own kind. His parables were choice bait. There was a concealed hook behind it, a big hook for big fish. The minnows might nibble at it, but there was never any danger that they would run away with it. It could be only those he was looking for, the big fish, who could attempt to bolt the bait whole, and so get the hook fastened in their very gut. As Jesus spoke, therefore, he was ever watching for the tell-tale signs of a catch, as a fisherman watches his bob. And his innermost teaching was ever reserved for those few who, by the light in their eyes, had made it manifest that they had some comprehension of what he was driving at.

This is implicit enough in the whole course of the record, but there is also explicit evidence in the same direction. Did not Jesus say, "Give not that which is holy to the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under feet, and turn again and rend you" (Matt. 7:6)? And quite in keeping with this warning I find also, "And seeing the multitudes [who were the crowd], he went up into a mountain [apart, where the crowd was not], and when he had sat down, his disciples [who were not the crowd, but the inner circle, the few who came nearest to understanding what it was all about] came unto him: and he opened his mouth and taught *them* [and *not* the crowd], saying. . ." (Matt. 5:1). So that, from gleanings like these and from the sheer impossibility that the masses could comprehend a man like Jesus, I have come to believe that in the beginning the whole teaching as we have it in the Gospels, was something reserved for the inner few, and that it was never intended to be given out to the world, as it is now, with the democratic indiscriminateness of a radio broadcast. Originally it was anything but a universal gospel, anything but a message for all and sundry. Certainly it was not for the inferior, and the broken, and those who suffered from their own botchedness. Jesus' motive was not pity. He did not stoop. He was looking for those who could see, those who could hear. Ability to see and hear was the test for admission to the inner circle. The heart of the teaching was reserved for those very few who had proved themselves possessed of the kind of seeing that belonged to the "Kingdom of God," and who were determined to live according to that way of seeing, even though it brought them into head-on collision with the whole world about them.

1939, 1971.

¹ See his *Twilight Of The Idols*, Authorized edition, London, 1911, pp. 51 and 227.

² This must not be misunderstood. It is no doctrine of “doing what one feels like.” The man who sets out to be true to himself must accept a discipline which, for all it comes from within, is of the severest and most exacting. ³ That is, in 1929, when I was 37.

⁴ For photographs of this performance, see the Picture Section of the *New York Times* for Sunday, Sept. 29, 1935.

⁵ The quotation is taken from the wrapper of my copy of Dr. Carrel’s *Man The Unknown*, Harper’s, 1935. But more important is this from p. 149 of the book itself.

“ . . . physiological laws oppose miracles. Such is still the attitude of most physiologists and physicians. However, in view of the facts observed during the last fifty years this attitude cannot be sustained. The most important cases of miraculous healing have been recorded by the Medical Bureau of Lourdes [in France]. Our present conception of the influence of prayer upon pathological lesions is based upon the observation of patients who have been cured almost instantaneously of various affections, such as peritoneal tuberculosis, . . . , lupus, cancer, etc. The process of healing changes little from one individual to another. Often, an acute pain. Then a sudden sensation of being cured. In a few seconds, a few minutes, at the most a few hours, wounds are cicatrized, pathological symptoms disappear, appetite returns. Sometimes functional disorders vanish before the anatomical lesions are repaired. . . . The miracle is chiefly characterized by an extreme acceleration of the process of organic repair. There is no doubt that the rate of cicatrization of the anatomical defects is much greater than the normal one. The only condition indispensable to the occurrence of the phenomenon is prayer. But there is no need for the patient himself to pray, or even to have any religious faith. It is sufficient that some one around him be in a state of prayer. Such facts are of profound significance.”

⁶ See Matt. 12:38-42: “Then certain of the Scribes and Pharisees answered him saying, ‘Master, we would see a sign of thee’ [meaning thereby, a miracle]. But he answered and said unto them, ‘An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of Jonah the prophet . . .’” Why “adulterous”? Because this desire for a “sign,” this dependence on some external appearance in the world of the senses as proof of a reality that belonged to the spiritual world, was evidence that one’s eye was not single—nor one’s love; that one still cast wanton sidelong glances at “the world” which one professed to have left but was loath and unable to leave entirely. One played back and forth from one love to the other. One had insights into the deeper meanings of things but waited to act upon them until one had evidence that they “worked,” or were advantageous, in the world of the five senses. But Jesus knew that the things of the world he lived in are not only spiritually discerned but have their own proof—which is of a different kind from that of science and “the world.”

⁷ See George Foot Moore—*History Of Religions*, Scribner’s, 1924, Vol. II, p. 396.

⁸ New York, 1906, p. 5ff.

⁹ See Thomas Hodgkin—*George Fox*, London, 1898, p. 71. Cp. p. 85.

¹⁰ Except P.D. Ouspensky. See his *New Model Of The Universe*, Knopf, 1934, pp. 27-28. His books as a whole have impressed me as profoundly penetrating and revealing, but the idea he expresses here, of Jesus' life (together with that of his disciples) as an acted part in a deliberately planned drama, seems to me most fantastic and stultifying.

¹¹ For long-considered and carefully stated counsel as to how one may today under similar circumstances avoid making mistakes in following one's inner Voice, see my second chapter on the mystical experience, *infra*.

¹² This was written in 1939. But in 1951, I added this comment: Since 1939 I have learned that, no matter how essential spiritual hunger may be, for a man's finding his own true way and getting started on it, that way certainly leads to a point where his further progress can take place without strain or struggle—as it were, while he remains at home, in serenity and peace, and with no shadow of doubt as to the outcome. One unfolds as surely and quietly as a tree. There is growth. And though occasions may arise when again for a time there is struggle, for the most part the inner growth of the man who has become whole is in deep repose.

¹³ This stands out, like a nugget of reality, embedded in the most unreal Gospel of John. See John 8:3-11.

¹⁴ The reader may find a similar presentation of Jesus' non-conformity in William Blake, *op. cit.*, pp. 136, 142, 202.

¹⁵ It may be noted that Luther translated the word into "die Sanftmutigen"—the tender-hearted, the gentle. Gerald Heard makes it to mean "trained," though it seems to me, after consulting a Greek lexicon, on very slender, if any foundation. See Gerald Heard—*Training For The Life Of The Spirit*, Harper, 1941, p. 6.

¹⁶ *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, Chap. XLIV, "The stillest Hour." The italics are mine.

¹⁷ According to the great German scholar Adolf Harnack (*Lehrbuch Der Dogmengeschichte*, English trans. of the 3rd ed., London, 1894-8), it is not possible in Aramaic (the language in which Jesus spoke) to distinguish between "son of man" and "man." So that in taking to himself the name which we have translated "Son of man," Jesus was only calling himself "man," "a man," with the intention only of declaring that he was an incarnation of what man really is, of archetypal man, or even of what Nietzsche meant by "Superman," the realization of the latent potentialities in the human being. And he may, therefore, have been asserting not that *he* was "lord of the Sabbath" but that *man* was, i.e., that man was more important than his institutions.

¹⁸ From "The Everlasting Gospel" by William Blake, *op. cit.*, pp. 136-138. In regard to humility Blake said also: "Humility is only doubt, And does the Sun and Moon blot out." And the immediately preceding line reads: "in doubt which is Self Contradiction." *Op. cit.*, p. 138.

¹⁹ Richard M. Bucke—*Cosmic Consciousness*, Dutton, 4th ed., 1923. For trenchant criticism, see P.D. Ouspensky—*Tertium Organum*, Knopf, 1922, p. 310 ff., more especially p. 325 ff.

²⁰ Chapters V-VIII. Let me here anticipate what I think that I shall there make quite unmistakable, that for me, in opposition to all the foolishness that a traditionally honorable word has been made to connote for most people today, “mystical” has nothing to do with magic, crystal gazing, trance, or the supernatural, and that it is at the farthest remove from any effort or desire to displace or bypass reason, or to build a fool’s paradise by dodging or falsifying any of the stern realities of earthly existence. But, as we shall see, it may be a fair question whether man’s more ordinary faculties may not today be showing a rather pressing need of being supplemented.

Also, at this point, let me call it to my reader’s attention that the great scientist and Nobel Prize laureate, Alexis Carrel declared flatly that mysticism “remains one of the essential human activities.” This, from a scientist of the stature of Dr. Carrel, is surely very significant. But as if this were not enough, he went on to say that the mystical experience, though “incomprehensible to philosophers and scientists, and inaccessible to them,” may be a means for reaching “the ultimate truth.” See his *Man The Unknown*, Harper, 1935, pp. 133-7, 147. Cp. p. 4.

²¹ *Larvas Of Grass*, “I Sit and Look Out,” Inclusive Edition, Doubleday, 1928, p. 232.

²² Walt Whitman, op. cit. p. 411.

²³ In Hindu society the Chandala is the outcaste, the man too low to belong to any caste, the Hindu “scum of the Earth.”

²⁴ Friedrich Nietzsche—*The Twilight Of The Idols*, Macmillan, 1911, pp. 218, 279, 281.

²⁵ William Blake, op. cit., p. 202. Emphasis mine.

²⁶ If at this point any reader objects and would remind me that toward the end of his life Jesus “wept over Jerusalem,” and cried: “How often would I have gathered thy children together, . . . but ye would not,” I would reply that his heart must indeed have gone out to them, yet his knowledge of men was too realistic to admit of his trying to make something out of men who had neither the ears to hear nor the eyes to see what he was talking about.

Chapter 3b.

Jesus in Retrospect (1950).

In the preceding section of this chapter, which I once entitled "Jesus the Anti-Christ," my reader has, almost completely unchanged, my attempt to paint the picture of Jesus that had slowly taken shape within me through years of searching and illuminating experience, close study, and quiet reflection. And as I gaze upon it now, after thirty-five years, I still find myself deeply stirred. Though, I will allow, it is possible that what I am most stirred by are chiefly those parts of it that reveal my own vision of what life is, and how it can be and should be lived.

Be that as it may, in the interval I have traveled a long way. I like to think it has been a period of constant climbing and that the point from which I look out upon life now, while certainly broader-based and firmer, is no less certainly higher than what served as my point of view then. And lest I leave the impression that this picture of Jesus that I have painted is my final view, or even my present one, I feel that I cannot pass on without trying to tell my reader how he looks to me now. But as I do so, let me assure my reader that there is no danger that I shall ever forget the long years when for me Jesus was a vision incarnate, a knowledge and a love made flesh. It was not primarily by his words that I was moved, though it is doubtful whether any other wisdom about life, unless it be in Nietzsche's *Zarathustra*, has ever had at its command such a wealth of perfect, gem-like similes and metaphors, so fresh, so vivid, so revealing of the ways-of-working of the human soul. But above all his teaching, there was the man himself, who was not mere talk, not mere theory, or mere hope and dream, but veritable attainment, a new kind and order of life actually walking the Earth. For me, through my Franciscan years, his very life moved through his days like a flame. He was so absolute, so concentrated, so unequivocal, so uncompromising, so headlong, so unsparing, so Yes or No. You must burn with him or be burned by him. And for long years I burned with him. I loved his impatience and abandon, and undertook to follow him.

At our distance, it is difficult to feel sure what it was that gave his life this fearful urgency. Perhaps, more than anything else, in view of his race, his religious background, the desperate plight confronting his people, and his own personal religious experience, it was the immoderation and excess that Ezra Pound found to be native to the Semitic soul. In any case, it would seem that he came to live in a constant expectation that "the end of the world" was at hand. (Certainly this formed the background of the earliest Christian communities.) In his mind the time was short. What was to be accomplished, must be accomplished soon. There was no place for long-range planning of any sort, eugenic, political, economic, or otherwise. Rather, let each man gird himself, and strip himself, and stake his all, to make the most of what opportunity was still left to him.

But the world did *not* come to an end. And today, in spite of any threat of extinction from atomic fission, we feel the need to face life and the world from a much wider angle, and to prepare for it in many more ways, than apparently Jesus ever thought necessary or sensible. And so, though very slowly and at first very reluctantly, I found Jesus' pull upon me and the

bond between us weakening. In fact, if a very earnest young man were to come to me now to ask how he might best find the way to the greatest fullness of life, it is doubtful if I should direct him to Jesus at all. So great a change in my valuing requires an explanation.

1. First of all, I must confess my conviction that Jesus lived too long ago. The only surviving records do not measure up to the tests that a historian would apply to evidence in general. What Jesus said and what he did is left so uncertain, so unverifiable, that for most people the sword of the spirit that he wielded has been left ineffectual. It is no longer a Damascus blade, but a piece of tin. It lacks edge and point. Wrangling over texts gets nowhere. Their ultimate meaning is too confused by irreconcilable contradictions among them; too hidden beneath the encrustations of centuries of false interpretation; too distorted and adulterated by their passage through the minds of followers and narrators whose comprehension Jesus left dumbfounded. Superior insight, even today, can perceive clearly enough why Jesus lived as he did, what he lived for, and what he was always trying to say. But there is no way whatever by which to *prove* what the actual Jesus was like, or what part of the record contains the heart of his message. Today, in our very churches, it is doubtful if one person in a thousand, perhaps even in a million, has a ghost of an idea what Jesus' teaching adds up to. The ministers and priests from their pulpits mumble words that contain enough dynamite to blast them and their pulpits to pieces, but they mumble on and their congregations go to sleep. No, for better or for worse, the actual Jesus is gone forever, quite beyond hope of recovery.

Moreover, even if we *could* know for a surety what he said and did, the world that he faced was too different from ours. There are too many problems, acute with us, which, as far as we know, he never so much as took into account. Indeed, in his day they did not exist. For this further reason, therefore, the edge of his words is often turned by an honest doubt about whether he would have the same teaching today, if he were confronted by the world that confronts us. It would seem the part of common sense, therefore, to make much less of Jesus. Life was not exhausted when she gave him birth. I venture to believe that if we woo her aright, she will in time bring forth men of a love no less than his, and of a wisdom much greater, who will lead us out of our present wilderness better than he ever could.

But there are yet other grounds on which I find Jesus inadequate.

2. The accepted religion of any people ought to be the chief guiding and sustaining power in their life *as a whole*, on *all levels*. This, as I repeatedly made clear in the preceding section of this chapter, is not true of the teaching of Jesus. To be sure, the Church has undertaken to meet the perduring and ineluctable needs of an institution to shepherd the mass of the population, but the Church has very little to do with Jesus; though it conjures with his name, it really ignores or almost completely nullifies his teaching. On the other hand, as we have already seen, how Jesus himself felt toward the element of the population that most needs shepherding—that is, all those of mass-mind, who are always most of the people—he made very clear when he exclaimed, "Give not that which is holy unto dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine" (Matt. 7:6). His teaching had meaning, and to this day it has had and can have meaning only for those of a spiritual percipience and a psychological makeup very much like his own.

But to say this is to admit a very serious defect—and this, despite any importance that may attach to the individuals of higher potentialities to whom he did address himself. Indeed, as we shall see in future chapters, such men cannot come into existence, or attain their destined heights, unless there be before them, and under and behind them, great masses of less gifted and even very ordinary men, whose lives are healthy and happy, have meaning and come to such fulfillment as they are capable of. Any religious teaching that is useful only to a fraction of the people, no matter how important that fraction may be, is inadequate.

Indeed, it may justly be charged that for the great mass of the people the teaching of Jesus is an actual hindrance, and the hindrance the greater the better the teaching is known and the more seriously it is taken. For in any society the great bulk of the population must, of necessity, be engaged in fulfilling the ordinary but essential functions upon which the very existence of any society depends. And Jesus' teaching, when it does not pronounce such participation evil, at least disparages it and calls men away from it. A moment's reflection upon some of the passages quoted in the first section of this chapter, to indicate his attitude in regard to owning property, to earning a living, and to the most ordinary commercial transactions, to sex and the family, and to the State, with its ruling, judging, and punishing, should make it quite clear what I mean. A man who remains "in the world" and who takes Jesus' teaching to heart, must often be left with a sick conscience in regard to his work and his accepted responsibilities. How must parents feel when they remember how Jesus repudiated his mother, rejected all family ties as a basis for kinship, and put celibacy above marriage? ¹ What becomes of our entire judicial system in the light of his teaching of unexceptional, unflinching forgiveness? How could any man stay in business who acted upon Jesus' injunctions to part with all one's possessions, to give freely—without selling, and to lend without asking even for repayment, let alone for interest? How must those feel whose duty it is, on occasion, to exert force in the interest of social order or national defense? Can the use of a night stick be reconciled with loving one's enemies and turning the other cheek?

Yet society is like an organism. That is to say: if it is to exist, a great many various and interdependent functions must be performed. Things must be grown and made, and then distributed; waste products must be eliminated, and worn-out cells replaced; means must be provided for sensing and avoiding danger, and for both resisting and making attack. Somehow it must be decided what a people wishes to shape itself into and where it wants to go; and it must discover and set up the necessary and appropriate means for reaching its goal. In other words, the very functions that Jesus rejected and condemned have to be performed if there is to be any society at all; and their performance involves the overwhelming majority of the entire population. What is needed, obviously, is a teaching that will give the people on each level of social function, a sense of the importance of the part they are called upon to take, and will support them in taking that part ably, honestly, devotedly, and proudly. But the teaching of Jesus *unfits* them. Martha is made ashamed of herself. And without Marthas the world simply cannot go on.

At best, to be the entirely satisfactory religion of any people, Jesus was too completely taken up with individuals. To this side of life, the life that consists of the individual struggles and the individual relationships of perhaps spiritually superior people, it may be only fair to concede that he made a valuable contribution. But this is by no means the whole of life. One can be so absorbed in tending a few choice plants that one allows the very soil out of which

they grow, and upon which all growth depends, to deteriorate. In the long run, it will prove as impossible to get great leaders and creators out of a sickly people as it is to get beautiful flowers or nutritious food out of diseased and sickly soil. And in the whole record of the teaching of Jesus, there is not so much as one word about conditioning and grooming the life of the people as a whole, not so much as a suggestion of any such social and racial hygiene as is contained, for instance, in the *Code of Manu* of the ancient Hindus. And the effect is writ large today all over the Western world, which resembles a garden that has been allowed to go to weeds. This deficiency is so great, and the consequences so utterly ruinous, that I believe no merit in the teaching otherwise can compensate for its deficiencies or warrant an effort to retain as our religion a regimen so faulty.

3. The deficiency becomes even more evident and serious the further we probe into the Gospel teaching. Nowhere is there any recognition whatever of the basic importance of the physical side of life—of man's relation to the Earth, from which he has been formed; of the state of the soil that supports the plant and animal life which supplies his food; of physical health in man himself, and of bodily beauty and a vigorous will to beget children as indications of it. On the contrary, the emphasis is exclusively spiritual—that is, psychological and devotional. The entire physical side of life is disparaged, when it is not entirely ignored. One may believe that this misrepresents the mind of Jesus, that the distortion is due to the refracting medium of the minds of his disciples through which his teaching has come down to us. But there is no proof of this. The record as we have it certainly indicates a very lopsided and unhealthy view of life. And it has left a blight wherever it has spread.

This is apparent in the light of the following considerations, which, in view of the space I shall give to their substantiation in subsequent chapters, I will here only state.

A human being is a psycho-physical unity. We have no experience of "body," "mind," or "soul" as separate entities. They are but the inextricable and interdependent parts of our being; or, yet more exactly, but different aspects of one organic whole. They never occur, and strictly should never be considered, apart from one another.

Thus the physical is seen to be the foundation, support, and indicator of the mind and spirit. Exceptions only prove the rule that a really healthy and wholesome outlook on life is not to be found in a person who was badly put together in the first place, and who is diseased and sickly to boot. In the long run, health of all kinds is largely dependent upon eating the right kind of food. And human food itself cannot contain the elements necessary to robust health if the very plants that men and animals eat, feed upon sickly soil. As to all this there is an increasingly authoritative consensus.

But the continuing disregard of the physical in yet other fields is leading to most vicious consequences. People need to know that health in the fullest and highest sense, of "body, mind and soul," cannot be maintained so long as the philosophy of "the melting pot" causes people to flout the Doctrine of the Thoroughbred, to violate all the known laws about breeding, and to plunge into an indiscriminate crossing of races, types, and classes. Moreover, physical beauty is not a temptation of the devil and a thing to fear, as our fathers believed; nor is it a thing to take little into account, as most people of our own generation are inclined to do. Rather, is it one of the most important marks and evidences of desirability

in man or woman, and an indication of both fitness and readiness to produce desirable offspring. All history shows, and all reason confirms, that no people can ever make anything of itself except as its reproductive instinct keeps it constantly reinforced with a steady stream of vigorous and gifted new life, which flows chiefly from the superior part of the population, and from which in one way or another sickness and defectiveness are early filtered out.

Consciously or unconsciously, deliberately or otherwise, the life of a people must conform to such basic physical necessities as these or it will go down to destruction. It may take time, but there seems to be time aplenty; and time will always work against the violator, fatally and inexorably. Sooner or later the population will no longer produce men of the caliber that seers look for, but for whose maintenance and increase they almost never make any provision. It will have become a race of cowed and spiritless fellaheen, whose gradual deterioration has at last left them the easy mark of an unspoiled and more masterful people, and from whom one wave of conquest after another has washed out all but the last traces of their original strength and manhood. They are finished, fit only for the dunghill.

Frankly, I think this is the fate to which any people exposes itself that follows Jesus, century after century, in his disregard of the physical, of the Earth, of diet, sex, beauty, breeding and the Doctrine of the Thoroughbred. It unfits them for survival. He was so set on the fruits that he forgot the roots, and in the end roots decide. Without healthy roots the best plants die. Jesus' exclusive emphasis on the so-called spiritual is pernicious and ruinous. This is revealed, and proved, far more than any but a very few people today realize, by the decadence so marked in this Western world of ours, which has longest and most closely been exposed to Jesus' teaching. We are marked for extinction.

4. The exclusiveness of Jesus' emphasis on the spiritual has had another disastrous effect. The minute you say that the only thing that matters is "the Kingdom of God," and that anyone may enter it who "does the will of God" or "has eyes to see and ears to hear," no matter how true the dictum may be within the range of the narrow angle from which Jesus viewed the matter, you immediately and necessarily undermine, if you do not destroy, the basis for all those distinctions and separations among men that are founded upon blood, which are essential to a people's healthy and meaningful existence. I think at once of the patriarchal family, hereditary monarchy (or aristocracy), and race. Jesus, to be sure, was perfectly logical and consistent in eliminating family life from the circle of his first and closest followers. And for that very small group, with its narrowly specialized function to fulfill, it may be argued that there was good reason why they should not have assumed family responsibilities. But the trouble with *our* following his example is that the people who created our civilization, in every homeland that they have made for themselves, have not merely founded their life on the family, but have usually reached their prime when the father was its undisputed head. I am one who confesses considerable doubt about whether we shall ever rival the record of our forebears until we cease to cast admiring glances at Jesus' ideal and return to theirs—which was that of the full-blooded family, with many children around the family table, and with the father at the head of it.

But Jesus' concentration on the spiritual, which really confined his attention to the spiritual individual, meant an indifference to, and a neglect of, physical relatedness in all its aspects—family kinship, gratitude and obligation to one's ancestors, identification with one's kind by

which one feels oneself differentiated from all other kinds of human beings, and under the pull and direction of which identity every member should undertake with the rest of his kind to preserve an indissoluble bond, so that in every hour of peril and crisis they should unite to form a solid fighting phalanx against every common foe. Jesus' neglect of every sort of physical relatedness left the soil quite untended against the invasion of the rank weed of the doctrine of human equality, as soon as a shift in the winds began to carry the seeds of it into lands taken over by Christianity. Our air is fairly filled with the floating seeds of this detestable doctrine: one man is as good as another; the differences that are hereditary, that are handed down from father to son, and that run in families—are of no consequence. "Why should we bow before the will of a king? What is an aristocracy but a useless and costly burden? Why should there not be the same law for the high as for the low, for the low as for the high? Why should there any longer be any 'high'? Should not we all, one as much as another, have the right to judge, to decide, and to rule? Should not he who rules, rule by our will, with our permission, as our servant and subject to our approval?" Thus men have said within themselves and to one another. And thus, certainly, it has worked out, and is working out more and more. The suffrage has been pushed down ever deeper into the social mass until now every ignoramus, nitwit and trifler can have his share in determining the direction of a people. Democracy we call it, and are proud thereof, and we even fancy ourselves its missionaries to all the world. But some of the better informed among us are convinced that Democracy is always a symptom of approaching dissolution. "The gospel of the 'lowly lovers,'" observed Nietzsche,² and every day we see his insight confirmed. As more and more power is yielded to the Mob, the national taste approaches the closer to the gutter, political corruption is the worst in our history, and our statesmanship is a contemptible fiasco when it is not downright treason. The Mob, unwilling to endure a real ruler, and unable to rule itself, lurches on like a drunken man toward the inevitable ditch. For men are *not* equal. And the best *should* rule. And when a people prevents their rule, the end is destruction.

I make all the allowances for Jesus that I can. He was expecting the end of the world; he was entirely absorbed in the problems of a special few; the record as we have it may have been very largely colored by the views of those who wrote it down. And the like. But the record as we have it, regardless of its origin, is precisely what has the influence. And the influence is and has been such that I must confess my conviction that any Aryan people surrenders itself to its direction only at very grave peril. Are we not compelled to wonder whether it would not have been far better for European men if they had never heard of Jesus of Nazareth, except as the great prophet of a Jewish sect?

5. I must recognize, finally, a steadily deepening sense within me that there is something unnatural, unhealthy, unbecoming, and indeed something shameful and ominous about our having taken our religion, or even professing and trying to take it, from Jesus. For a people's religion should come out of its own blood. It should be its own innermost soul made manifest, the elevation before its eyes of its own hopes and dreams, and of the lessons it has learned through its own immemorial experience. Only when this is so will the living instinct of the people say Amen to the command of its seers, and willingly bend to their bidding. And only so will they stand or fall, as they ought, by what intrinsically they are. This means that such a thing as a *universal* religion is an utter impossibility. The first business of any religion is to see to it that the people who believe in it survive, and not only survive but come to flower and to fulfillment. And so long as great blocks of human beings continue to

be so widely and deeply different as they are now, in their needs and in what seems to them true and beautiful, high and low, and worthy and worthwhile, it is inconceivable that any one religion can prove acceptable or wholesome for them all. This only becomes the more certain when one realizes that these differences in peoples commonly reflect the differences in their habitat, to which they are tied, and are registered in their very physical and mental constitution.

It takes only the reading of such a book as Professor Hans F.K. Guenther's *The Religious Attitudes of the Indo-Europeans*³ to make one realize that in the long run no people can flourish, or even long maintain itself, unless it lives with and by a religion that forms according to its own nature and to the ways of working of its own mind and soul. He opens one's eyes also to the fact that Christianity, basically, is not in accord with the instincts, values and traditions that have found expression in Aryan man's various religions, over a period of thousands of years, from the Indus to the Atlantic. And surely this is understandable enough. For it is at once obvious, if we but stop to think about it, that to us Jesus was an alien. Granted, that more can be made than I at first supposed possible, of the argument that by race Jesus was a gentile, and even that he may have been sprung from the same stock as the ancient Greek and Persian and the modern Nordic.⁴ Dr. Revilo P. Oliver, Professor of the Classics at the University of Illinois, and a scholar of international distinction, has recently declared: "It may be relevant that the *Epistula Lentuli*⁵ certifies Christ as unmistakably Nordic: tall, fair-skinned, with blonde hair and blue eyes,"⁶ but I must confess myself unimpressed by the evidence. In any case, no matter how blue his eyes or fair his skin, it is universally conceded, so far as I am aware, that by religion at least Jesus was a Jew, and therefore in his religion oriental. And it is with the effect upon us of his religion that we are here solely concerned. There is justice in the common pronouncement that he was the culmination of the Jewish prophets.

Indeed, there is even more than this to the Jewishness of his religion. It is now positively known that the Essenes—members of an ascetic and communistic order of mystics who, at some time of dire peril, undertook to preserve their teachings from destruction by inscribing them on parchment scrolls which they hid in desert caves in the Dead Sea valley—were in existence a century before Jesus and a century after him, and that during his lifetime they had their communities in every important town in Palestine. In the light of this fact it seems impossible to believe that Jesus did not know about them. And in the light of the extraordinary agreement between Jesus' teaching as it appears in the Synoptic Gospels and the teaching on the scrolls, it is at the least difficult to believe that he was not influenced by the Essene teaching. The agreement is really so striking as to require explanation. One has to wonder if he must not have spent some years in an Essene community as a novitiate, or even for some years have been one of its full-fledged members. And there is no denying that the religion of these Essenes, and the attitude toward life that they took and inculcated, was Jewish through and through, from the core out. Furthermore, if it is Christianity itself with which we are now concerned primarily, even more than with that residue of Jesus' teaching that furnished the initial impetus out of which Christianity grew, there is yet more Jewishness to be taken into account. Whatever worth there may have been in the religion of Jesus as he himself enunciated it, was, as we have seen, eviscerated and nullified by that Saul of Tarsus who has come down in history as the Apostle Paul. Indeed, to my mind, it is a real question whether what became Christianity wasn't more *his* religion than that of Jesus—a religion *about* Jesus rather than the religion *of* Jesus. And of course, no matter what may have been

the race of Jesus, Paul was certainly a Jew, a Jew by blood as well as by religion. He himself boasted that he began as a Pharisee of the Pharisees.

Of course, it will be pointed out, rightly enough, that all this amalgam of Jesus and Paul, in the course of centuries, became heavily encrusted and more or less deeply permeated with Aryan additions—a theology, a theocracy, an art, and eventually a Nordic feudalism. But at the bottom and heart of it all was the Jew—the instinct and nature and need of a breed of men that the Nordic felt alien to himself, and inferior to himself too. And what was all this philosophy, and art, social arrangement and organization, but the Nordic's subconscious acknowledgement of the lack he felt in the Jew's outlook on life and the world, and an effort to round out a view of the universe that would relieve this sense of lack, and, in keeping with this, to build social institutions in which he could feel both more at home and more secure?

But the structure as a whole was never fully integrated. As we shall see when I come to my concluding chapter on race, Jew and gentile, perhaps, most of all, Jew and Nordic gentile, belong to two different worlds. And never the twain shall meet. Never shall the two understand each other. Whatever of the Jew, therefore, got into Christianity, whether from Jesus or from Paul, is shot through with the substance and feeling of the religious experience of a race very different from the race that has chiefly made European civilization. These last, whether they came from ancient India, Persia, Greece and Rome, or from northern Italy, Spain, Germany, France, Britain or Scandinavia, have been predominantly Teutonic, Indo-European, or in any case, gentile. Christianity, therefore and inevitably, has been a contradiction among us. This alone is enough to account for the fact that it has been a religion that we have professed but rarely practiced. Or even worse, when we have practiced it, it often has been to our hurt. For it does not fit us.

Certainly it is significant that the movement that sprang from Jesus first took root and spread in old Rome's metropolitan Jewish ghettos. In the beginning it mostly consisted of Jews. And certainly it is as significant as it is undeniable that the teaching of Jesus has provided a strangely fertile soil for the seed of the very un-Germanic but thoroughly Jewish doctrine of Socialism and the Jewish-led and largely Jewish-manned movement of Communism, into which Socialism has proliferated and hardened. I have known Communists to argue in all seriousness that their movement is really the application to a society of the ethics of Jesus. From many angles, in view of what we positively know about the horrors and agony clamped down upon every people that Communism has overthrown, such a claim may seem fantastic and ridiculous. But more than once, as I have watched the mounting and mortal struggle of our Western soul in the grip of the Communist octopus, it has come over me that our very religion tends to weaken us, and often to paralyze us. For, say what one will, there is all too much in the Gospels that can be used to justify the overthrow of the institution of private property, and even that of the family—both of which were listed for destruction in the original Bolshevik program. Also, whether it be something in Jesus' teaching or the mere fact that he himself and every man he won as a disciple was apparently sprung from the lower orders, or that from one end of the Gospels to the other there is not a vestige of aristocratic taste or explicit recognition of a higher and a lower in men based on blood and breeding, no trace of acceptance and justification of the separation and distance between men that such disparity calls for—be the reason what it may, it remains a fact that for the most part the teaching of Jesus has made its way as the "gospel of

the lowly." Although he turned away from the multitude of mass-mind, and withheld his teaching from them, this has been the impact he has left upon the world. He was hardly dead before it was boasted that the ranks of his followers were marked by the *absence* of men of wisdom, distinction and good birth (I Cor. 1:26). All down through the centuries there have been recurring movements of "levelers," communistic movements of one sort and extremity or another—like that of the Anabaptists of the time of Luther, or our own Oneida Community of the last century, both of which set about to abolish marriage as well as private property, and both of which quoted Jesus for their authority. And many a man today, who takes the teaching of Jesus seriously, must feel that the like claim of the modern Communist is no less justified. Certain it is that the Church at the present time is honeycombed with people, even with ministers, who secretly or openly share much of the Communist ideology and sympathize with the Communist cause.

What is the final meaning of this presence of Communism in our midst with its unvarying herd ethics, its bitter antagonism to the individual, to private property and to marriage? The final meaning is that it is a cancer in our body, a poison in our veins. When I say "our," I mean the stock that has been long dominant in the countries of northwestern Europe, which, in one habitat or another, stretching through at least 3,000 years of history, has been the chief architect of European civilization. This people, in all its branches and at all stages of its career, has displayed a strong instinct to believe in the individual man and in the value of what might come out of him. It has expected him to stand on his own feet and to go his own way and gait. To this end it has given him room in which to turn around, something to work with, and it held him responsible. He owned enough property to maintain his independence, and he was head of his family and master of his house. Thus, and with other institutions shaped by the same spirit, he had the conditions for making something of himself, if he had it in him. And this people *believed* in the man who made something of himself, who had proved himself superior, and they looked to him for leadership. Such was the way that came out of the blood of those who first called themselves, and all those by blood descended from or related to them, "Aryan," which meant "noble" or "excellent," and by this path they climbed and fought their way to preeminence among the peoples of the Earth.

When, therefore, people of *this* blood begin to show symptoms of Communism, it can have only one meaning: somehow their resistance has been so lowered that they have become the victims of a virulent infection. And this is what I finally have to declare the influence of Jesus upon our life to be. Whether at its worst, as it comes from the Church, or at its best as it flows from his teaching itself, it is an alien, oriental, Jewish infection. All through the centuries it has meant our weakening, our sickening, our self-betrayal. Indeed, from the beginning it virtually implied and actually involved our gradual enslavement to values, to ideals and to means that violated our instincts. Invariably, and inevitably, if any people gives up the religion of its own creation to take up the religion of an alien people, it surrenders its independence and to a considerable extent its identity. For our people to have adopted Christianity was to yield up their life to the direction of Jews. Jesus was a Jew by adoption if not by blood. The Bible is Jewish from cover to cover. And century after century we have prostrated ourselves before the one, and by the other have undertaken to guide our own footsteps and those of our children and our grandchildren after us. Inevitably our history since the latter days of the Roman Empire might quite properly be called "the Jewification of

the West." With all too complete justice, a Jew of our own day might claim, as the Jew Marcus Eli Ravage actually has claimed, "We have been at the bottom not merely of the latest great war but of nearly all your wars: not only of the Russian but of every other major revolution in your history. Your religion, your education, your morals, your social, governmental and legal systems, are fundamentally of our making!" He speaks of the "proved control of your whole civilization by the Jewish Gospels," and concludes triumphantly, "No conquest in history can even remotely compare with this clean sweep of our conquest of you." ⁷

For a proud people, certainly at the least one of the strongest and most gifted of which we have historic record, thus to surrender its own soul and let its life pass into leading strings to another race, is a thing of supreme ignominy. And it is a thing of supreme peril. The longer I live, the more do I find myself outside of Christianity, and, moreover, alien and hostile to Christianity. A reading of Prof. Hans F.K. Guenther's *The Religious Attitudes of the Indo-Europeans* (London, 1967) reveals that we had a better religion, a religion truer to our own traditions and essential instincts, than is to be found in Christianity. And if in the end Aryan man, the supremely gifted and most masterful race known to history, should disappear from the Earth, the primary reason for it will be his having succumbed to the virus of Christianity. This has been the direst calamity in his entire history.

But I am not going to dwell on this negative aspect of the situation. On the contrary, no matter how disturbing this may be, for the present at least I intend to avoid dwelling on it. Our supreme need is for a *new religion*, a religion that is our own, consonant with all the best in our past, equal to all the exigencies of our present. But I am convinced that no amount of negative attack on the deficiencies of Christianity can ever of itself bring a better religion into being. And all my experience and all my thought, over a lifetime, completely and profoundly satisfy me that any real and final recovery of life, and the elevation and advance of life, can come only out of what is positive, out of some kind of gestation and birth. Let us count on the sun to put out the candle!

Yet how to come by the sun!

Our supreme need is indeed for a new religion, a new religion of our own. And certainly no amount of criticism of the old will of itself ever produce it. But it is no less certain that it is never going to appear because some man, or any number of men, stand up and cry, "Go to now, let us have a new religion!" It is not to be called forth by the magic of any incantation, however marvelous or importunate. Nor is it to be thought out in men's heads, put together deliberately, promoted by paid secretaries, and enthusiasm for it whipped up in regional conferences, supported by tons of printed matter. Not at all. Our day is all too familiar with mechanics and antics of this kind, and with their futility. Anything consciously worked up and artfully fabricated, with a view to an end, would be artificial, and as such, totally devoid of life. Any real religion, really new, really our own, if it comes at all, will have to come gradually and organically, for a long time almost without anyone's knowing of its existence, and taking a shape of its own, taking it silently and invisibly, mysteriously feeding on forces in the racial soul by which it has been conceived and within which it is moving toward birth.

In short, if such a religion comes—as I pray it finally may—it will have to *grow*—grow out of the living necessity of our people, out of their innermost mind and soul, as they are forced in mortal struggle to draw at last upon their ultimate resources, their own instincts, immemorial traditions and ideals—much as Jesus, perhaps, came out of the instincts and soul and accumulated tradition and gathering crisis of the Jewish people.

But this implies that it is not something for which we should wait, or dare wait, in the expectation that it will one day stand full-formed and among us. Rather, although for the most part unrecognized and inchoate, it is among us already, here and there and somewhat everywhere, a living, growing and moving force—long ago started, and quickened, and down through the centuries kept growing and moving by the daring efforts of one great mind of our blood after another. Even we may have a part in it—you, my reader, and I, and many another like us. More than we know, mayhap more than we dare dream, its final coming depends upon whether or not we faithfully do our part, however inconspicuously and unrecognized that part may be. For verily, everyone of us who undertakes to be, in the profoundest sense, true to himself, to recognize and to throw off alien influences, to plumb and to set free the innermost being of our race as it seeks to find expression and come to flower in him, will be making his sure contribution toward the final consummation. He will be adding his modicum of experience and of strength by which the new life will take shape and build up size and energy to do something titanic, beyond the power of the old forms to contain, so that it will at last burst forth a new comprehension of life, a new vision, a new faith, a new discipline for every side of our life, personal and social, for man and woman and child, from the top to the bottom, for the lowest and for the highest. Believe me, my friends, what I long lived for unconsciously and now knowingly give over my whole life to, even developing special eyes by which to detect each little sign of promise—that shall come. Out of the record of those men, and of those parts of their written works that prove the chief source of strength and guidance to our people through the fire and night that are ahead, we shall yet form our own Bible, our own Book of Life. Why should not the *Laus of Manu* or one or two of the books of Nietzsche be our Leviticus; Zoroaster or Aristotle our Moses; Homer and some of the Icelandic sagas our *Exodus* and *Judges*; Dante or Goethe's *Faust* take the place of *Job*, and Shakespeare take that of *Ecclesiastes*; the *Revelation of St. John* give way to William Blake, the *Psalms* to the *Songs of Kabir*; and the Gospels of Jesus be supplanted by Nietzsche's *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, or by the record of some man or men yet to be born, whose life and teaching prove to be the most satisfying and inspiring epitome of our racial soul?

First we must become conscious that we as a people *have* a soul, and that it can be lost; that in fact, it is now in terrible danger of being lost forever. But if and when we do become conscious of our soul at last, and behold what it contains of strength and beauty, and stand before it in mingled reverence and pride, our great ones shall mark out the path that belongs to us, and shape the disciplinary measures necessary to ensure that our feet shall follow it. And out of this will come our own, our Aryan, Nordic Bible—what else should I call it?—that will hold up before us our own ideals and traditions, the record of our supreme achievements and triumphs, the story of our saints and heroes, the admonitions of our great wise men and guides, the vision of our own hopes and dreams and purposes pushed deep into a distant future. It will be the Book of Life not of the poor or the weak or the meek, but of the strong and masterful, who by their mastery *over themselves* will shape their life into

something ever more beautiful, in soul and in body, until at last they deserve again that name with which they began, the proud, head-lifting name of "Aryan," "the noble ones." It will be their book of gratitude to Life, their book of rejoicing, their cradle-song and their battle-song and the mirror of their soul soaring over vast abysses and with eagle eye studying far horizons. It will be the supremely Yea-saying book of a people resolved at all costs to live on the heights, and to be itself, and that will rather perish than give place to any other, or serve his will.

1939, 1971

Of all the men I have mentioned as worthy to be included in the Aryan Book of Life, none has meant so much to me as Nietzsche. Having gone to some pains to say why Jesus is neither adequate to our present needs nor suited to our character as a people, I must try in my next chapter to reveal why, some forty years ago, Nietzsche came to mean so much to me. Doubtless it was the easier for me to turn to him because I discovered, astonishing as it may seem, that Jesus and he had much in common. But at bottom it was vastly more than that. For utter honesty, for absolutely fearless facing of the realities of human existence, for firm grasp of what our fundamental problems are, and for elevation of vision and purpose for humankind, in some sixty years of unremitting search and testing I have found no other man who is his match. Nietzsche so surely and clearly lays bare what life is, and the conditions under which all higher life can be realized, whether the life of the individual or the life of a people, that I think it not altogether fantastic, even now, to hope that he will ultimately prove to have been our Moses who got us out of the desert and into the Land of Promise.

1950, 1973

¹ On this last, see Matt. 19:12.

² *Twilight Of the Idols*, Authorized Edition, p. 187.

³ Clair Press, London, 1967.

⁴ See for instance Madison Grant—*The Passing Of The Great Race*, 4th Revised Ed., Scribner's 1932, p. 230, especially the Note thereon, p. 385ff; Ernst Haeckel—*The Riddle Of The Universe*, Harper, 1900, p. 326ff; Houston Stewart Chamberlain—*The Foundations Of The Nineteenth Century*, London, 1912, Vol. 1, p. 250ff; C.C. Campbell—*The Racial Antecedents of Jesus*, Peter Nevill, London, SW 7, 1953.

⁵ Madison Grant, who apparently would have liked to believe the *Letter of Lentulus* genuine, declared flatly that it "is certainly apocryphal," and gives his reasons for his verdict. The letter, he concludes, reflects Nordic predilections. See Madison Grant, op. cit. (see Note 1 supra), p. 386.

⁶ Revilo P. Oliver—*Christianity And The Survival Of The West*, Howard Allen Enterprises, Cape Canaveral, Florida, p. 21, note.

⁷ See *Century Magazine*, issue for January, 1928, article by Marcus Eli Ravage entitled "A Real Case Against the Jews," p. 347f.; issue for February, 1928, article by same author entitled "Commissary to the Gentiles," p. 476. It may be recalled that Nietzsche pronounced Christianity "the revenge of the Jews on the Gentiles."

Chapter 4.

The Meaning of Nietzsche for the Modern World.¹

Certainly Nietzsche was not a philosopher in the strict sense of the word. He is essentially a poet and a sociologist, and above all, a mystic. He stands in the direct line of European mysticism, and though less profound, speaks with the same voice as Blake and Whitman. These three might, indeed, be said to voice the religion of modern Europe—the religion of Idealistic Individualism.

The material about Nietzsche is so vast, and his thought bears on so many of the problems of the world in which we live, that perforce I must select. In general, I shall submit here what of Nietzsche has most deeply fed and formed my own life. And I can do this without apology because through all my reading of Nietzsche I was not thinking more about my own problems than about those of my fellows and about the whole sorry and desperate plight of Western Man. And what I felt most deeply for myself is precisely what I would urge upon the world, with the greatest conviction and urgency. And urgency is called for. The Western world must alter its course, and alter it soon, or it may forever be too late. And before such alteration is possible there must be men who have both the vision to perceive that we are fatally off course and a body of principles by which to lay out a truer and wiser one, and also, let us hope, the magnetism by which to gather our people together and lead them out of the deathtrap they are in.

Those who would prepare themselves for such an undertaking had better resolve from the start that they are not going to turn aside from what is difficult, disturbing, or costly and painful, in favor of what confirms them in their pet prejudices and most treasured assumptions, and allows them to go on giving first place to their own security and comfort and peace of mind. When we sit down to read Nietzsche we are confronted by a man whose hunger for truth, and for life at its highest and noblest, was so insatiable that he put aside every lure that might stand in the way of his quest—whether it was money, friends, wife, or influence. And he said of himself: "I am not a man, I am dynamite."² Let those, therefore, who think to find the truth we need in the old and usual places, or the answers to the problems that today threaten the very existence of our people, without having to strike tent and risk all the rigors and perils of a new climb—let all such skip this chapter, or better yet, close the book right now and forget it. Those who would learn from Nietzsche, and be his worthy companions and fellow warriors, no less than those who were moved to go with Jesus two thousand years ago, must be prepared from the outset to lay down all that they have and all that they are.

Let me begin by making it clear at once that Nietzsche undertook no less than a "transvaluation of all values"—that is, to stand off and from a different angle and elevation, and with at once critical and discerning eye, to judge anew the worth of all the values by which the Western world had lived for centuries—its religious beliefs, its moral and social ideals, its very virtues. He dared challenge man's assumptions that he knew what was good, and dared raise the question, as regards each belief, virtue, and ideal, "Who made it 'good'? For *whom* is it 'good', and for *what*?" His one concern, behind everything he said, was for

quality of human life. And if he attacked, it was because, for all a certain virtue or idea was hallowed in hoary tradition as "given of God," he discerned that actually it tended to weaken and to *lower* man. And if he pointed out new paths, it was because he believed that only by such could mankind ascend to the heights that he had in him the powers to attain.

This concern of Nietzsche's for human life I must put squarely in the forefront of all I have to say about him. For him it was never enough that mankind should merely go on: he must go up. Indeed, he longed that the life of man should reach an elevation theretofore not only unknown but almost undreamt. This was more than his supreme purpose: in all soberness one has to say it was his one passion. Never name, never woman, never wealth, but always that mankind might become something more than it had ever been before. He might well have said, "I am come that ye might have life, and that ye might have it *more exaltedly*." And for this purpose and in the flame of this passion he consumed himself.

In view of the glow with which this aspiration filled his soul, and the ardor and abandon with which he surrendered himself to its realization, it should hardly be a matter of surprise that when he turned to confront men as he found them on every side, he was often moved to contempt. He bore with difficulty the everlasting smallness and meanness of men. Mob values seemed in complete possession. "Mob at the top, mob at the bottom," he cried; and he spoke of "the power-rabble, the scribble-rabble, and the pleasure-rabble."³ Everywhere men's ideals seemed so low, their devotion so feeble, and their will so weak.

However, Nietzsche knew that this contempt was a feeling he must overcome. His Zarathustra, who in part was a personification of Nietzsche's own ideals for himself, is referred to as "the surmounter of the great disgust,"⁴ and he dies with love and blessing on his lips for all creatures.

Indeed, it is evident that this very contempt of Nietzsche's was born of his love. "Out of love alone," he cried, "shall my contempt and warning bird take wing; but not out of the swamp." And again, "What knoweth he of love who hath not been obliged to despise just what he loved?" And "to despise when we love and precisely when we love best" he declared to be "a higher and sublimer thing than loving one's enemies." For him "the great despisers" were ever "the great reverers," "the great adorers." No one who comes close to Nietzsche can doubt that his supreme concern was for life, and for life in other men as surely as for life in himself. "My soul also is the song of a loving one," he says wistfully. Like his Zarathustra, he also loved mankind.⁵

But for Nietzsche what was great in man was that he was "a bridge and not a goal," a bridge "between the animal and the Superman." The level that man had reached was not the end. His destiny, when realized, would place him as far above the mankind of today as this mankind is above the animal. But to Nietzsche, it seemed that in the modern world man's fate hung in the balance. He was like "a rope over an abyss, a dangerous crossing . . . a dangerous looking back, a dangerous trembling and halting." There were times when man seemed to doubt whether he had the requisite vision and strength to fulfill his potentialities. Nietzsche threw in his whole strength, his whole self, to give man courage to believe that his way was on and up. He set man's goal before him concrete and luminous; like a towering mountain peak whose snow-covered summit is bathed in the calm clear light of the rising

sun, he created his ideal of the Superman. This was Nietzsche's supreme absorption. "The Superman I have at heart; *that* is the first and only thing to me—and not man: not the neighbor, not the poorest, not the sorriest, not the best . . . What I can love in man is that he is an over-going and a down-going"—that is, one who seeks to create beyond himself, and to this end is willing that he himself should succumb.⁶

Nietzsche's idea of the Superman has been grossly misunderstood. It has been caricatured in comic sheets and held up for ridicule, but actually it was the rebirth in Nietzsche of a very ancient ideal.⁷ The word translated from the German original, really means, "the Beyond-Man," or that which will be above and beyond anything we know of as human now. "Ye lonesome ones of today, ye seceding ones, ye shall one day be a people: out of you who have chosen yourselves, shall a chosen people arise—and out of it the Superman." Zarathustra is the prefiguration and personification of the kind of being Nietzsche believed would walk the Earth when mankind had more nearly realized his possibilities. Nietzsche describes him as "the Roman Caesar with the soul of Christ"—the welding together in one man of the uttermost strength and the uttermost tenderness. He speaks of the Superman as displaying "the unity in power of the creator, the lover, and the knight of knowledge"—a man of the greatest serenity, wisdom, and kindness. He will come like "a perfectly Epicurean god," as a "transfigurer of existence," with "love for the smallest and narrowest things."

He will ever be one who perceives, under any and all circumstances, that "the heart of the Earth is of gold," that "all things are baptized at the font of eternity, and beyond good and evil," and out of the fullness of his Yea-saying instinct will declare that "the world is perfect."⁸

To this end Supermen must live much alone, very austere, apart from the mass of men, yet venerated by them and informing the whole of society with their wisdom. They are not at all men of brute force, conquerors or dictators. They are not even men who exercise rule. Force does not rest in their hands. They are more like the pilots on the bridge who determine the way the ship must go, while the actual handling of the crew and passengers is left to others. It is their function to discover and declare the way mankind must follow in order to realize its high destiny. They are the great value-creators, the great way-finders and way-showers.

For us, with the background of democracy and the tradition that all men are equal and that the direction of affairs should be in the hands of men elected by popular vote, this conception of the Superman may lack appeal, if it be not actually offensive. But as I have already observed, Harold Laski, Communist though he was, declared many years ago that democracy must ultimately go to ruin unless it could find some way in which to produce men of the greatest wisdom, set them apart from the life of the crowd in the most complete aloofness from its tawdry aspirations and petty concerns, and attach to them the utmost reverence and authority.

On the other hand, the picture of the Superman that I have presented, largely in Nietzsche's own words, may have struck some of my readers as so fanciful as to be little more than a myth. But I am by no means one to dismiss myth as a frail and useless thing. Rather, I incline to believe that before any people has become a great people, perhaps before any people has even come into being, it has been necessary that it hang over itself a star, a sense

of its destiny, some deeply rooted faith as to the meaning of its existence. Consider for a moment the significance for the ancient Jews of their belief in the Messiah. Remember how commonly through long centuries the prospective mother pondered whether it might be her privilege to give him birth. Or recall the Jews' belief that between themselves and Jehovah there was a covenant contract, and that from all the children of men they were his chosen people. It was not at all necessary that their beliefs have foundation in reality. As a matter of fact, I am convinced that they did not. The important thing was that this faith held them together, called forth their profoundest creative powers, and shaped and pointed them to one end. Except for this belief, which Jews have held through thousands of years, they would long ago have completely disappeared as a people.

In the light of Nietzsche's idea of the Superman, it is seen that the proper objective of any society was not "the greatest happiness of the greatest number" or the "green meadow happiness of the herd," as he styled the aim of Christianity and democracy. For Nietzsche the only proper, or certainly the primary, object of any society was the production of the largest possible number of superior men. With Walt Whitman he would have said, "Produce great persons: the rest follows." Produce great men and put them at the helm, and their wisdom will make your society stable, enduring and happy; and their creative powers, as seers, philosophers, artists and the like, will make your society significant and its name glorious.

But the goal that any people sets before itself more or less determines the means for reaching it. And so it was with Nietzsche. Let me now give some typical examples of the way he felt institutions must be shaped if a people was to produce Supermen.

To begin with, he believed that no people could lift itself by its bootstraps. They cannot escape what they stand on. And they stand on their legs. That is, he stressed the importance of the physical. Such a thing as a soul without a body was outside human experience. Physical, mental, and what we have come to call spiritual—each was but an artificial aspect of what in reality was one organic whole. And in a world that had long over-emphasized the "spiritual" Nietzsche found it necessary to emphasize the importance of sound vigorous instincts and bodily health and beauty, of diet, family, blood, and race. Inevitably, therefore, he emphasized the preponderant importance of breed, of heredity, in determining the development of the individual.

In consequence, the primary purpose of the family was to bring forth children who would be able to go farther and higher than their parents. Men and women whose marriage could not be expected to do this should not be entitled to marry. On the other hand, marriage between well-matched couples of a people's best youth should in every way be encouraged, and likewise the greatest possible reproduction from them that might be consistent with the health of the mother and the health and best rearing of the offspring. As to what constitutes "well-matched" in marriage, a unique and monumental study has been made by the Nietzschean sociologist Anthony M. Ludovici in his book *The Choice Of A Mate*.⁹

Again, Nietzsche stressed the importance of diet. Anyone who may be irked by the mere mention of this subject would do well to take a good look at Dr. Weston A. Price's *Nutrition and Physical Degeneration*,¹⁰ which, in measured words, was pronounced by Professor E. A.

Hooton of Harvard "a profoundly significant book." It reveals how the direst decadence, not only physical but mental and spiritual, can apparently be precipitated in a whole people with the most fatal certainty by little or nothing more than what they put in their mouths, or fail to put in their mouths. One reason that civilized man is the sickest animal on the face of the Earth is that he does not eat the right food. In fact, most people today do not know what right food is, and perhaps could not get it if they did. Even the great body of doctors are grossly ignorant. Medicine is negative and merely remedial, rather than positive and preventive. We hear too much of pills, X-ray and surgery. Almost nowhere are the people told that if they are ever to be well they have got to live right, and that an important part of living right is eating right. Verily we are paying a tragic price for our age-long tradition that the body does not matter. We have got so used to being sick that we do not realize how sick we are; and we are so unashamed of being sick that almost nothing can be said that will arouse people even to subject their diet to examination. Yet on our bodies is built our whole superstructure of character, intellect, spirit, and culture: when that goes, everything else goes with it. I simply do not believe—after the studies that I've made I cannot believe—that you can get great wisdom and enduring culture, or even plain healthy judgment about the values of life, from a people as shot through with disease as we are.

This is not the place to go specifically into the complex question of what "right food" is and how one can get it. During recent decades the matter has gradually come to be covered by some very well grounded and practical books, though it is doubtful whether even one percent of the people know of their existence. But the point that I wish to make at the moment is that the importance of diet, which is at last being recognized, was stressed by Nietzsche a hundred years ago. Similarly, I might write of the significance that Nietzsche assigned to physical beauty, as an index of desirability in a mate and of health and well-constitutedness in a people. Their sense of the beautiful and of the ugly was a deposit of their "most fundamental self-preservative values."¹¹ Such delight in bodily beauty has been the attitude among every great people of the past that I have studied. It has been only where the values of the ill-favored and the inferior have gained the upper hand that beauty has been contemned and neglected.

Nietzsche's thought on race furnishes further evidence of how important he considered the physical side of life. But since I shall touch upon this when I come to my chapter presenting my own conclusions about race, I shall remark here only that despite his emphasis on it he was a long way from being any "racist," and he wrote contemptuously of the "mendacious race-swindle" of those who talked over-confidently or arrogantly about "pure" race or pushed racial ideas beyond the limits set by strictly scientific knowledge.¹² And so far was he from being an "anti-Semite" that he almost broke with his own sister because she married one of Germany's anti-Semitic leaders. Any suspicions of Nietzsche's views on race should be set to rest once and for all by consideration of the well-known fact that the authorized English edition of his works was initiated and financed by Dr. Oscar Levy, and that many of the translations were made by fellow Jews. Indeed, everyone who has read him thoroughly must recall how often Jews come in for appreciation and even for open admiration.

With this brief mention of Nietzsche's views on race as sufficing for the moment, let me now pass on to a consideration of his attitude toward defectives.

Nietzsche died before the world had begun to hear of the experiments of the Austrian monk Johann Gregor Mendel, which were to lay the foundation for the science of genetics. Nevertheless, he was one of the forerunners of modern eugenics. He declared that any organism that fails to excrete its waste products, dies. And he said it pointing to the human world about him. We have allowed our religious superstition and our sentimental humanitarianism almost completely to frustrate the operation of natural selection. Blinded to the fact that human life is of very unequal worth, we actually sacrifice the more valuable to the less valuable. In our folly, we burden the sound and the capable among us with the support and care of a colossal load of human wreckage—millions of morons, feeble-minded, insane, criminals, and all sorts of the hopelessly incurable who can never come to anything whatever. Moreover, the feeble-minded are notoriously prolific. The cost of carrying all this load is prodigious, and it is growing. If we do not soon reverse the present process the land will at last be possessed by those unable even to take care of themselves. We are following the path of national and racial suicide.

The remedy is deliberately and with the greatest possible wisdom but also with unflinching firmness, to attempt to provide a substitute for the natural selection that we have suppressed. "The weak and the botched shall perish: first principle of our humanity. And they ought even to be helped to perish."¹³ The actual means to be considered for the purging of our breeding stock, however, I will leave now in the hope of giving it adequate treatment in a future chapter on eugenics. Here it must be enough to insist that the process should be pressed until the gross defectiveness characteristic of perhaps the lowest quarter of our entire population and turning up here and there on almost every level, has been eliminated. Doubtless, mistakes would be made, but I submit that no mistake we should be at all likely to make could be so serious as the truly fatal mistake that we are making now all the time by our merely leaving the problem untouched. The warning should be kept before the eyes of the entire nation: *Any organism that fails to excrete its waste products, dies.*

Such, then, were some of the conclusions about the physical side of life that Nietzsche believed mankind must draw if it would attain unto the Superman. In short, he stressed the importance of the biological—of breeding, diet, and eugenics. But he believed that this goal, no less inexorably, laid upon men certain requirements as to the organization of society. Every sound social structure, and in particular every social structure shaped to favor the development of the largest possible number of superior men, would take the form of a pyramid. It would be stratified according to capacity and corresponding function, would rest on a broad base of well-constituted mediocrity, and come to its apex in an aristocracy of character and wisdom. In a future chapter to be entitled "The Necessity of An Aristocracy," I shall give a full and careful description of such a society on all its levels, and I shall frankly examine the questions that its very proposal inevitably raises, and squarely face the obstacles that must be surmounted if ever any such society, assuming its desirability comes to be recognized, is to be brought about. Suffice now to remark, in fairness to Nietzsche, that he believed that in a society of such form and tone would inferiority of every kind most certainly settle to the bottom and be eliminated, and capacity most certainly be noted, be given the exceptional opportunities of which it alone could take advantage, and find outlet for its creative powers. Thus would the whole people move most surely and steadily toward the Superman.

Nietzsche's goal, determining the means by which it might be reached, also gave him a criterion by which to recognize obstacles in the way of its attainment. The greatest of these were Christianity and its offspring, democracy. Nietzsche hated with a profound hatred all the equalitarian doctrines, democracy along with socialism and communism. In his eyes they were the great levelers, the great enemies of all quality of life, and of all higher men. They leveled, and they leveled downward. Professedly, they conduced toward the welfare of the mass, but in fact they created conditions under which superior life appeared less and less, could not obtain the exceptional opportunities required for its development, or, if it did somehow come to great wisdom, was ignored in the process of counting noses. On Christianity he was hardest of all. Chiefly he condemned its morality, on the ground that it favored the wrong kind of life, inferior life, and tended to choke and kill out those of true intellectual and spiritual superiority, without whom no society could long even endure, let alone outstrip the entire record of the past and ascend to the heights of the Superman. However, I will say no more of Christianity here, since I must soon bring it up again in another connection.

Before I go further in the exposition of Nietzsche's thought, I must introduce a word to prevent misunderstanding. Though he could be, and at times was, exceedingly severe in his attack and his prescriptions, it was by no means because he lacked human feeling. All who know him well agree that though he had a mind like a rapier, he had a heart of down. He was no harsher than seemed necessary, if man was to be lifted to the heights. He was never vindictive. But having willed a goal, he had the strength to accept and to will also the necessary means thereto. Any man who does otherwise is nothing more than a visionary milksop. As we shall shortly see in some detail, condemning went against an element deep in Nietzsche's nature. He believed in holding to the positive. It was better to sow good seed than to pull up weeds. But apparently there are times when one must clear the ground that one would plant. And, even if at times Nietzsche becomes almost vitriolic, it is always to be remembered that he condemns or attacks *only out of his hunger for the Superman*.

The next side of his teaching of which I wish to write is his idea that all life is "will to power." We turn now from Nietzsche as sociologist to Nietzsche as psychologist. Here also he was a forerunner—in this case, of those in our time who have sought some principle or driving force by which to understand and to explain all human conduct. But whereas others have professed to find it in sex, or in the struggle for existence, or in a combination of the two, Nietzsche believed he had found it in will to power.

It is to be regretted that he did not live long enough to make it unmistakable what he meant by "power." But careful reflection on the passages in which the phrase "will to power" occurs, seems to leave his meaning reasonably clear.

In the first place, it may be said categorically, that it was most certainly not a glorification of *force*. Nietzsche despised his contemporary Bismarck and thought him "... strong, strong and mad. But not great." He deplored the growing feeling for a German empire that had begun to creep through the German people in the years following their triumph in the Franco-Prussian War. He penned the most severe indictment of the centralized octopus-state, declaring it no less than "the death of peoples," and adding that only "where the state ceaseth . . . commenceth the man who is not superfluous." ¹⁴

It may be said further that the *prerequisite* for “will to power” in the *ascending* forms of life was always great health, well-constitutedness, strength, and excess energy. Nietzsche would have rejoiced in William Blake’s assertion that “energy is eternal delight.”¹⁵ At its highest such excess energy lifts a man above all concern even for his existence. He exults in his strength and longs above all else simply to expend it. In his youth he springs upon his charger crying, “A short life in the saddle, Lord, not a long life by the fire!” He feels his great inner wealth, and longs to lavish it with free hand. He feels within him a love that fills and overfills him, until he longs only to let it pour itself out to the ends of the universe. He is a Blake or a Beethoven, possessed by a veritable fury of creative energy, which overcomes him, sweeps away all obstacles, and finally seizes upon great form in music or in a vision of the soul of man the like of which the world has never seen before.

But also, and always, in any and every kind of life, will to power means will *toward some kind of ascendancy, expansion, or mastery*. The quality of it, the object of it, the place on which its force is spent, may vary infinitely, but always there is the element of will to master something.

Nietzsche recognized that excess energy might run amuck. Indeed, there are passages in which he seems to glory in an expression of energy that was little more than a display of sheer animal vitality. But in the light of Nietzsche’s whole teaching, it is impossible to believe that he gloried in such as though it were in itself enough to make a Superman. He gloried because of his belief that only out of such strength could the Superman be created, and because of his further belief that the damage to be done by physical energy broken loose was less to be feared than the damming up, or the weakening and sickening, of great strength and creative power. “Better to seek for the Superman in a Caesar Borgia,” he declared, “than in a Parsifal.”¹⁶ He believed passionately that out of weakness could come no good whatever. Far better violence than the peace and the seeming virtue that were actually the expression of weariness, tamedness, sickness, and defeat.

Also, Nietzsche believed that in the last analysis all life lived at the cost of others. And, though slowly and reluctantly, I have become convinced that he was right. Within some limits, what takes place among us humans is not so unlike what we can witness among the seedlings carpeting the forest floor in their struggle for light and air. I cannot make an exception even of a life like that of Whitman, Thoreau, Tolstoy, or Jesus. Every eruption of great vital strength is a danger to the weak. Even Gandhi, despite his pacifism and philosophy of non-violence, was realist enough to recognize that all life necessarily preys upon other life. Doubtless what he had chiefly in mind was the cost of human life to the life of plants and animals: which indeed is obvious. But Nietzsche went further, though his words ought perhaps to be reserved for those having psychological penetration and considerable knowledge of the deductions that seem to follow unavoidably from our anthropologists’ conclusion that man is descended from a race of killer apes.¹⁷ He declared that “life is *essentially* (that is, in its cardinal functions) something that functions by injuring, oppressing, exploiting, and annihilating, and is absolutely inconceivable without such a character.”¹⁸ And again, “Here one must think profoundly to the very basis and resist all sentimental weakness: life itself is essentially appropriation, injury, conquest of the strong and weak, suppression, severity, obtrusion of peculiar forms, incorporation . . . ‘exploitation’ does not belong to a depraved, or imperfect and primitive society: it belongs to the *nature* of the living being as a primary organic function; it is a consequence of the intrinsic Will to

Power, which is precisely the Will to Life . . . the *fundamental fact* of all history. . .”¹⁹ That is, “Living consists in living at the cost of others [not only at the cost of animals, but of other humans as well. WGS]—he who has not grasped this fact, has not taken the first step toward truth to himself.”²⁰

Indeed, there is a further extreme of Nietzsche’s thought, in the same direction, which it seems best to state frankly, even though, without space to present it fully and to forestall likely objections, there is danger of giving false impressions. Throughout the full span of Nietzsche’s thinking, one finds a recognition that all real culture is necessarily built upon some kind of slavery. To be sure, Nietzsche used the word “slavery” in a broad sense: to his discriminating mind any man was essentially a slave whose life was not a “self-rolling wheel,” who served something outside himself, who did not follow a direction of his own, who did not both command and obey himself.²¹ Viewed from this angle, it is likely that the number of *really* (that is, *inwardly*) free men in any society has always been comparatively small. Among the slaves would have to be counted not only the usual soldier, farmer, and factory-hand, but also many a scientist, professional man, banker and statesman. Perhaps most men have their price, and perhaps a large part of the population is really, in one way or another, and even though not openly or directly, bought and sold. To one like Nietzsche, even our own society, which talks so much of freedom, would certainly have appeared to consist very largely of slaves. In other words, to a very considerable extent, for Nietzsche it was not a matter of *ordaining* slavery, but rather of recognizing that already most men are more or less of a slave nature; furthermore, that already most men serve the will of another, and have to, and thereby reveal that in reality they are slaves now; and further that, provided their needs are well cared for, they are better off, and their existence takes on a new and nobler meaning if they do serve the will of another, provided only it be the will of a man who is truly their superior, and especially if they come to serve such a will voluntarily and by choice.

In view of the obvious latitude of this conception, it might be questioned whether Nietzsche did not shoulder a quite unnecessary incubus of odium in sanctioning slavery. For much that he recognized as slavery passes with most people as something innocuous enough. And this question could be pressed with the more cogency when one learns that Nietzsche was never indifferent to the welfare of the mass of the population. He said in one of his latest books that “the workers²² should one day live as the bourgeois [that is, the middle class] do now—but above them, distinguishing themselves by the simplicity of their wants.”²³ Also, he warned repeatedly against contempt for the average man;²⁴ pointed out that “a strongly and soundly constituted mediocrity” was the “broad base” of the entire social pyramid;²⁵ remarked that “it is possible that even yet there is more *relative* nobility of taste, and more tact for reverence among peasants, than among the newspaper-reading *demi-monde* of intellect, the culture class;”²⁶ and called for a magnanimous consideration of the common man. “When the exceptional man,” he says in one place, “treats the mediocre with more tender care than he does himself or his equals, this is not mere courtesy of heart on his part—but simply his *duty*.”²⁷ On the other hand, the assumption implicit in our modern capitalism that a man has a right to direct and to exploit the labor of his fellowmen if only he has money, this he resented and rejected so strongly that he once exclaimed, “When an inferior man takes his foolish existence, his cattle-like stupid happiness as an end, he makes the onlooker indignant; and when he goes so far as to oppress and use up other men for ends of his own, he should be struck dead like a poisonous fly;”²⁸ Finally, it is evident

enough that Nietzsche's very first avowal of the necessity of slavery violated his instinctive humanity and gave him pain.²⁹

Nevertheless, Nietzsche did accept slavery even in the form in which it is repugnant to the modern conscience: he accepted it, and he approved it. It is necessary to understand the considerations that brought him to such a conclusion. Nietzsche felt that human existence really had no value except as it produced culture—philosophy, science, and art of all kinds—music, painting, sculpture, architecture, literature. But culture is the fruit of leisure, and without leisure it is impossible. Moreover, the leisure requisite for creative work is incompatible with “earning one's living.” Experience taught Emerson the same lesson. Anxious to support his opposition to slavery by act as well as by word, he undertook to tend his own garden, and wrote, “He who does his work frees a slave.” But gradually he discovered that the gardening hurt both his thinking and his writing; and in the end he declared that “the writer shall not dig.” And he observes that all the members of the Brook Farm experiment were “cured of their faith that scholarship and practical farming (I mean, with one's own hands) could be united.”³⁰ Emerson, however, continued to stand for the abolition of slavery, whereas this experience ought to have made him realize, as Nietzsche did without the experience, that great creative work and manual labor are incompatible, that freedom for great creative work can be built only upon someone else's doing more than his share of manual labor. That is to say, if there is to be a great culture, it is necessary that there be some kind of slavery in which many men, through being held to manual labor or menial tasks of one sort or another, will be prevented from reaching their full stature, in order that other men, of greater potentialities, may attain theirs. To put it at its baldest (as Salter does once³¹), “The higher ranges of human life exist by more or less despoiling the lower ranges.”

And what justification can be offered for a doctrine that is at first glance so repugnant? One can only repeat and amplify what I have already said. First, there is the stark fact (or what Nietzsche believed to be the stark fact) that otherwise culture is impossible, human existence is rendered meaningless and worthless, higher men are dragged down and smothered in the mass, palace and temple are as it were invaded by swine, and the mob takes possession of the Earth. Even slavery, especially if humanity and enlightenment determine its form, cannot be so abhorrent as the chaos and brutishness of universal mass-rule. Our age of equalitarian assumptions needs to be everlastingly reminded that the vaunted Athenian “democracy,” even of the age of Pericles, was built upon a huge substratum of slavery: only about one-tenth of the total population had political rights. Secondly, to very many men subjection to the will of another does not necessarily do any injury, or involve any degradation. For most men, perhaps, really have no ideas of their own anyway, have little aspiration to become more than they now are, and are happiest when they do not have to think and decide, but may surrender the direction of their lives to others, and then simply do as they are told. Indeed, if the men whose orders they obey are in fact their superiors, then mean and mediocre lives, through their very subjection, through the fact that they help to make higher men possible and to further their ends, may acquire a dignity, an elevation, and a significance that they could never know in any other way. But indeed happiness should not be the criterion by which the issue is decided. When it is a question of whether or not a people shall produce great men, and crown itself with the highest culture, it is not vitally important who is happy and who is not happy. In any case, it is doubtless higher men, those who face the severest tasks and must bear the heaviest responsibility, who always suffer most. But again,

when the issue is the whole meaning of human existence, suffering is really aside from the point. It is the price that often must be paid, which higher men will pay voluntarily and gladly, and which other men, when they are not ready to pay it voluntarily and gladly, must be made to pay. The law of sacrifice runs through all existence. Even in the evolution of an organism, whenever there has been a development of the whole or of special higher faculties, there has been some loss or diminution of importance in affected parts. Occasionally, the diminution has meant the complete elimination, the actual perishing, of affected parts. The lesser is sacrificed to the greater. And in society, if individuals sacrifice themselves to the ends of higher men, and especially if they make the sacrifice voluntarily and even with joy, as there is historic evidence that men have done, the sacrifice ennobles, if it does not even, as the word itself implies, make holy.³²

But now let me submit a few passages in which Nietzsche himself states his position.

In one of the earliest of his papers we find this: "Culture, which is chiefly a real need for art, rests upon a terrible foundation . . . In order that there may be a broad, deep, and fruitful soil for the development of art, the enormous majority must, in the service of a minority, be slavishly subjected to life's struggle, to a *greater* degree than their own wants necessitate . . . *Slavery is of the essence of culture.*" And again, "If it should be true that the Greeks perished through their slavery, then another fact is much more certain, that we shall perish through the *lack* of slavery."³³ And this position he confirmed, repeatedly, throughout his life. In *The Joyful Wisdom* we find, "Every strengthening and elevation of the type 'man' also involves a new form of slavery."³⁴ And still later we come upon this: "Every elevation of the type 'man' has hitherto been the work of an aristocratic society—and so will it always be—a society believing in a long scale of gradations of rank and difference of worth among human beings, and requiring slavery in some form or other."³⁵

The above paragraphs on Nietzsche's views in regard to slavery were in explication and application of his conviction that life was Will to Power, that as such it always involved a will to *master* something, a will to achieve some kind of expansion and ascendancy; that in operation *all* life was observed to live on other life, that human life could in no wise be excepted from the prevailing rule; that, in fact, it was precisely the highest human life that laid its levy upon other human life most heavily. We may or we may not like Nietzsche's idea at this point, but for the moment I am less concerned to win conviction than I am to make it clear what his idea was.

The idea carried with it far-reaching and very significant implications. Its shadow fell across Darwin's theory of evolution. This "one-sided doctrine" he undertook to correct. Darwin had said, "Life is struggle for existence." Nietzsche replied, in effect, "Not at all. What does not exist, cannot will. What does exist, cannot will to exist. It wills to power, to some sort of mastery."³⁶ Indeed, it was only the weak, clinging to life precariously, who were ever content to seek mere self-preservation. Wherever life was strong, with energy in abundance and to excess, it never aimed at mere self-maintenance, mere survival: it aimed at some extension of its power. ". . . In nature it is not the state of distress that *prevails*, but superfluity, even prodigality to the point of folly. The struggle for existence is only an exception, a temporary restriction of the will to live; the struggle, be it great or small, turns everywhere on predominance, on increase and expansion, on power, in conformity to the will to power,

which is the Will to live.”³⁷ “A living thing seeks above all to *discharge* its strength: ‘self-preservation’ is only one of the results thereof.”³⁸

This idea of Nietzsche’s that life was will to some kind of mastery has a no less negative bearing on several doctrines that are popular with equalitarians, pacifists, and psychiatrists. For instance, he was contemptuous of the prevalent democratic prejudice that would make environment a more determining influence than heredity.³⁹ Life was *not* to be explained as mere “adaptation” and “adjustment,” the result of giving in to environment, the fruit of what might be called a policy of appeasement. Certainly strong life—and it is strong life which alone is healthy and which alone, in the long run, matters—never conducts itself in any such fashion. Strong life masters its environment, finds ways to exploit it and to use it to its own advantage. Life remains—*will to power!*⁴⁰

The shadow of Nietzsche’s idea of life as will to power falls likewise across the significance of “mutual aid,” one of the strongholds of those who would fain see the world purged of conflict. In the lower orders of life, even the most casual observer is forced to recognize how ruthless the struggle for mastery is. Everywhere, through countless aeons, the weak have been pushed off the Earth by the strong. But as we rise in the scale of life, victory lies more and more with those who are strong in their cunning, strong less in body than in mind. Or, as Kropotkin pointed out in an exceedingly interesting book, it may be by mutual aid.⁴¹ But even mutual aid is only a means by which the members of a group, whether animal or human, increase their strength for combat. The necessity for struggle between individuals may thereby be reduced, the area within which strife is eliminated may thereby be somewhat widened, but always to the end that the strength of the *group* may be increased; and it is a strength that is used to fight enemies—and, if necessary, to kill them. Mutual aid is always a means to a group *mastery*. The issue remains a struggle for power—and in the struggle the weak succumb.

Finally, Nietzsche saw will to power determining the values of every people. Throughout all history, we witness the masterful conquering a given territory, setting up as hallowed standards of conduct (“given by the gods”) those values that through long experience they had come to believe essential, not only to their existence but to their greatness. They hallowed the means by which they had hewed out a place for themselves in the face of their environment and their enemies.⁴² Nietzsche felt that the needs *for life* behind a people’s will to power were a more determining force than any concern for abstract truth. “. . . what after all are man’s truths? They are his irrefutable errors.”⁴³ “Truth is that kind of error by which a particular species has been able to survive. The value for Life is ultimately decisive.”⁴⁴

But will to power interests us most as we detect it at work in the conduct of individuals and groups in our own world today. Here Nietzsche saw it operating without fail and without exception, continuously, in every individual, in every group. *What* a man undertakes to master, and on what plane he undertakes to master, may vary widely, but to Nietzsche’s way of thinking there were no exceptions. The object of your will to power may be a man, or a woman, or a group of men, or a whole nation of men; it may be a craft or a technique; you may try to gain a following by intimidating men, by convincing their minds or by winning their hearts; what you master may be yourself, an art, or the meaning of existence. But Nietzsche believed that while you lived at all, you must manifest will to power of some kind,

on some plane, over some thing. A mother laying down her life for her child, or Jesus going to the cross for mankind are as much examples of it as anyone else. If you deny that will to power holds for you, it means only that *through another philosophy* you have found—*your* way to power. For philosophy, too, is but an instrument in the hands of the will to power, a means by which a man undertakes, consciously or unconsciously, to increase his power over others, or to make himself feel more secure in the universe. Jesus said, "He who humbleth himself shall be exalted," but Nietzsche replied, mischievously, "He that humbleth himself *wants* to be exalted." ⁴⁵ That is why he humbled himself. It is easy to see that among people who value humility, a reputation for humility will be a means for climbing above others.

Once more—let me repeat, according to Nietzsche, so long as any man lives, he manifests will to power, and cannot do otherwise.

But there was one kind of people whose will to power came to be of peculiar interest to Nietzsche. As he looked abroad over Europe, he suddenly smelled a great smell, and upon investigation discovered that it arose from the morality of the decadent. Their *kind* of morality proved to be characteristic of the will to power of life in a state of decay.

The decadent, in Nietzsche's thought, are the weak and sickly, those who are badly put together, a hodgepodge of conflicting instincts. They are the botched and ill-favored, the exhausted and beaten.

In inferior people of every sort, the will to power is easily frustrated. They are not *able* to take their full natural shape. Consequently, in them the will to power seeks its ends through devious, underground ways, by burrowing, or by stealing up backstairs and climbing in back windows. Like all people they create that *kind* of morality that will serve *their* needs—in this case, the needs of the weak, sickly, and botched. Having no strength in themselves as individuals, they turn upside down all sound valuation of life, and pronounce the virtues of superior men evil, and turn their own weaknesses into virtues. On the one hand, out of envy and fear and hatred, they disparage and condemn those qualities of their masters that they do not possess and, because of the limits set by heredity, cannot acquire. They deprecate beauty, health, good birth, and great strength; and they deprecate self-reliance, independence, boldness, iron will, and prodigality. All the lion in man that might make him formidable, all that might lift him above them like a towering mountain peak, sources of storms, earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, they cry down and call evil. They would fain undermine his belief in and reverence toward himself, and thus disintegrate the forming core within him, which, if not nipped in time, might shape him into a powerful person, above their understanding and beyond their control. The "voice of God" is made to speak always in behalf of the "neighbor," the other man, the mass. They would thus achieve a collective strength great enough to overwhelm all superior men, and either prevent their appearance or drag them down to their own level. Thus the "herd virtues" come to the fore—"brotherly love," for example. The ideal now is "unselfishness." One must think first of others, regardless of what happens to oneself, even to one's deepest Self. The cry is, "Do everything for the benefit of others. To be true to oneself is evil: it might give somebody pain. Besides, it shows pride, a setting up of one's own will in defiance of God. To find life, to 'please God,' one must bend one's neck, deny oneself, forgive all injuries, love everybody, and show it by always 'doing good' and 'helping others.'" Why? To what end? That thus it may become

ever easier, more pleasant, more secure, for the kind of people who preach this doctrine—that is, for the weak, the sickly, and the mediocre—in short, for the ordinary man and the mass.

Nietzsche's supreme example of decadence was Christianity. It is historic fact that the Christian Church took root in the scum and ghetto of the decaying Roman Empire. We have already noted that the Apostle Paul himself once boasted that among the Christians there were none of great wisdom, of high social standing, or of good birth (I Cor. 1:26). C.G. Jung speaks of the "explosive spread of Christianity which, so to speak, sprang out of the sewers of Rome,"⁴⁶ and Gibbon's great history presents much the same picture. Houston Stewart Chamberlain says that "all the foundations for the structure of historical Christianity were laid and built up by this mongrel population."⁴⁷ Merejkowsky, in his *Death of The Gods*, makes one feel that the early Christians were veritable vermin. And such people cannot look out upon the wholesome things of life except through jaundiced eyes. Instinctively, they want to bring all beautiful things down to their own level. Nietzsche condemned Christianity. He linked it with alcoholism as one of "the two great European narcotics."⁴⁸ He condemned Christianity for exactly the same reason that Jesus condemned the Pharisees—as *an enemy of life*. He condemned it because it diverted attention from, and poisoned belief in, strong and beautiful life here and now on the Earth. But above all, he condemned it as a gospel by which the *wunk* shall inherit the Earth—the weak, the sickly, the mediocre. As confirmation of his insight, no matter where in the Western world one today turns one's gaze, one finds the Earth possessed by the mob. And in the hands of such people no nation, no culture, and no civilization, can long hold together. In the years since I first wrote these words I have come gradually to believe that *Christianity unfits any people for survival*. The malady, of which the whole White man's world is dying, is Christianity.⁴⁹

"With Nietzsche," it has been said, "the conscience of Europe awoke." Some people at least awoke to what had been happening. And wherever men awake to a realization of how Christianity has poisoned our whole life, there will be need to study the effort that Nietzsche made to point out the way by which mankind, or at least and certainly *our* kind, might get back onto the path to ever more exalted life. For accomplishing all this, nothing could be more important than the regimen and the new morality that Nietzsche prescribed for those strong, well-constituted and loving men who know not how to live at all except as "down-goers," who would fain lay down their lives, if only thereby they may help to build the path by which man may ascend to Superman. First, therefore, let me submit a few words about the social provision for such men.

Under ideal conditions, there would be throughout every level of the social order a constant alertness for any sign of emergent superiority. And superiority would at once be exempted from some of the ordinary duties and be given the privilege of every bit of educational opportunity by which it showed itself capable of benefiting. The cream of the youth would be given the cream of the teachers. The youthful elite of the whole land, gathered into small groups, would sit for years at the feet of the greatest minds and souls that the land afforded. Here they would be initiated into the wisdom of life, and under severe discipline specifically trained for the responsibilities that they would eventually assume.

The morality by which these young men would be shaped would be vastly different from that prescribed for the rank and file, or even for the rulers. Obviously it would be for the very few. Incidentally, as I have read the words that Nietzsche would address to them, I have been reminded at some points of Jesus' "Sermon on the Mount." But that such resemblances may be the more easily noted, though above all in the interest of general understanding, I must preface what I want to say with a few remarks about egoism.

Nietzsche believed that "altruism," in any strict sense, was "impossible," and called it "the most mendacious form of egoism."⁵⁰ He declared flatly that "the individual [does not study] the interests of the *species*, or of posterity, at the cost of his own advantage: all this is only apparent."⁵¹ It is, to be sure, possible to choose *the plane on which* you undertake to seek increase in your own life, as Jesus did when he set his face to go to Jerusalem, but to strip every motive of all concern for what, on one plane or another, *will benefit oneself*, is as utterly impossible as to remain alive without breathing. If we lost this sense of what, in one way or another, would mean increase of life in ourselves, we would not know our food from our poison. Here is the very core of the instinct for life. He who loses that has become decadent indeed.

Nietzsche went further and declared "the ego wholesome and holy, and selfishness blessed."⁵² But in an effort to prevent misunderstanding he added, "That *your* very Self be in your action, as the mother is in the child—let that be *your* formula of virtue!"⁵³ And while he thus sanctioned egoism, yet he was very careful not to include any and every ego. "Another selfishness is there," he said, "an all-too-poor and hungry kind, which would always steal—the selfishness of the sick, the sickly selfishness." He called this a "larcenous craving," and declared ". . . a horror to us is the degenerating sense which says 'all for myself.'"⁵⁴ It is easy to see why Nietzsche *had* thus to speak out in defense of what, for lack of a better word, he called "egoism." Life is in individual men and women, or it isn't anywhere. And yet, on every side, the actual life in men, all that could give their life any meaning, was being beguiled or beaten out of them in the name of some virtue or God that was ultimately nothing but an abstraction. The life of the whole world could be exalted only as the life in the individuals composing it was enriched and exalted. At all costs, therefore, men must be given new courage, in the face of all social pressures, to reverence and to trust and to obey their own impulses.

It is to be noted, however, and pondered well, that Nietzsche was not less discriminating than Jesus in regard to the impulses that he undertook to follow and told other men to follow. What is apt to confuse us is that he abandoned the metaphysical as a cobweb tissue of lies and cowardice, and undertook to confine himself to what he was sure of neither by tradition nor by speculation but by experience. And what Jesus called "God," when looked at from the standpoint of psychology, is exactly what Nietzsche called "Self." For Nietzsche, *both* what Jesus called "God," which it was life to love and obey, and what Jesus called "self" (with a small "s"), which he urged men to deny, *were impulses of one's own being*. That is to say, *you* were not to be identified with the smallness and weakness within you, and your life was not to be found by denying all this in the name of some other-than-yourself, however "divine" it may be. It was your own nature at its best that was divine, and what was to be sacrificed was *not yourself*, but only that side of yourself that stood in the way of your truest and highest.⁵⁵ In any realistic sense, therefore, there was no sacrifice. You only gave up your

lesser desires to get what you wanted most. And what you wanted most, that most inescapable, unalterable, and unappeasable wanting within you, the wanting which, satisfied, was Life, and unsatisfied, was at best but a living death, that very *core* of you, was what Jesus called God.

After this preface, I will now make bold to present Nietzsche's gospel for those higher men, those few most loving men, who would fain live as "bridges to Superman."

1. "Dare only to believe in thyself—in thyself and in thine inward parts! He who doth not believe in himself always lieth!"⁵⁶ "What saith thy Conscience?—"Thou shalt become *what thou art.*"⁵⁷ But over and over again Nietzsche stressed the difficulty of "finding oneself," of finding within one's own being a hallowed center of direction and a source of strength that would and could shape a man's entire life, put it under orders, give it a destiny, and be to it a god. The "way unto thyself" he pronounced "the way of thine affliction." Inevitable suffering and danger, even the danger of self-destruction, lurked about the path of the man who set out on *this* quest. It would be easy for him to miss the path, and, missing it, he might never find his way to the light, but instead spend all his days groping hopelessly through the black depths of a labyrinth. Or, to put the matter differently, he would for a while and maybe for a long while have to bear a constant and bitter struggle with all the refractory elements within himself, which refused to take orders from *any* god, which in fact would fain set up as gods themselves, and would at the least throw themselves across the path of obedience to any other. Worse yet, he would have to be equal to giving pain to those nearest to him, who could not understand or who disapproved: it might become necessary for him to cut off the hands of those dear ones who were determined to hold him back. Sooner or later, he would have to throw away, one by one, every crutch of dependence upon tradition, authority, and the experience of other men. He must be prepared, as the final price of his integrity, to endure the icy breath of an inner aloneness like that of the Polar wastes, or of a star projected into desert space.⁵⁸

Needless to say, therefore, it was something vastly different from the doctrine implied in the slogan "Be thyself" so airily held up by many today who really want only to throw off irksome restraints. The common lusting after freedom repelled Nietzsche. Before a man set out to find and follow the way unto himself, he demanded evidence that he had the strength for it, and the inner authority and necessity. "Free, dost thou call thyself? Thy ruling thought would I hear of, and not that thou hast escaped from a yoke. Art thou one *entitled* to escape from a yoke? Many a one hath cast away his final worth when he hath cast away his servitude. Free from what? What doth that matter to Zarathustra? Clearly, however, shall thine eye show unto me: free *for* what? Canst thou give unto thyself thy bad and thy good, and set up thy will as a law over thee? Canst thou be judge for thyself, and avenger of thy laws? Canst thou bear with and master all that may come upon thee on thy path?"⁵⁹

Words like these made it completely obvious that Nietzsche's doctrine was intended for very few; and he did his utmost to warn away all those who were not ready for it—as if it were fire, by which they might get burned, or dynamite, by which they might do damage to others.

2. Implicit throughout the foregoing is the next injunction that we must believe Nietzsche would press upon every man who would fain qualify as a "bridge to the Superman"—

namely, *Master thyself*. Nietzsche may have called men, or at least some men, to a life that was “beyond good and evil,” but though he may have called them away from the current morality and have styled himself “the amoralist” and a “free spirit,” yet he deeply believed, as must already be evident enough, that the life *to which* he called men required a morality more difficult and self-discipline more austere than any he rejected. He believed that before ever a man *could* become an organic whole, before he could *know what* he wanted most, and be able, without strain, to do it, he must first have put himself under stern and prolonged discipline. He who would *become* a free spirit must start *at the bottom* and advance from one stage of mastery to the next. “He who wisheth one day to fly, must learn standing and walking and running and climbing and dancing; one does not fly into flying.”⁶⁰ He declared that the kind of freedom in which he did *not* believe was what is often called “following one’s instincts.” “In an age like the present,” he said, “it simply adds to one’s perils to be left to one’s instincts. The instincts contradict, disturb and destroy each other . . . A reasonable system of education would insist upon at least one of these instinct systems’ being paralyzed under an iron pressure, in order to allow others to assert themselves, grow strong and dominate.”⁶¹ Elements in one’s nature that one could neither win nor persuade to voluntary subordination to one’s innermost being, one must be ready even to kill.⁶² He directed those who were qualified, to a life of moderate, voluntary poverty, of great simplicity, and of much solitude.

3. The third injunction that Nietzsche would lay upon all those who would be “bridges to the Superman,” who must undertake to create beyond themselves even though they go to pieces in the attempt, is: *Love thyself*. But he added, and emphasized, let it be “with great love,” “with great *contempt*.”⁶³ “Not, to be sure, with the love of the sick and infected, for with them stinketh even self-love! One must learn to love oneself—with a wholesome and healthy love, that one may endure to be with oneself, and not go roving about. Such roving about christeneth itself ‘brotherly love’; with these words hath there hitherto been the best lying and dissembling. . . And verily it is no commandment for today and tomorrow to *learn* to love oneself. Rather is it of all arts the finest, subtlest, last and patientest.”⁶⁴ And he cries, “Where is beauty? Where I *must will* with my whole Will; where I will love and perish, that an image may not remain merely an image. Loving and perishing; these have rhymed from eternity. Will to love: that is to be ready also for death.”⁶⁵ “Ready must thou be to burn thyself in thine own flame. How could thou become new if thou have not first become ashes?”⁶⁶ “Only where there are graves are there resurrections.”⁶⁷

4. But Nietzsche’s “Love thyself” had a corollary and counterpart that is homologous to the like injunction with which Jesus followed his primary teaching. Jesus had hinged everything on love to one’s God and one’s neighbor, but then, to avoid misunderstanding as to what this entailed, he said also, “If any man cometh unto me and doth not hate—his father, and mother, and wife and children . . . he can be no disciple of mine.” And in the same spirit Nietzsche enjoined, “Be not considerate of thy neighbor.”⁶⁸ And again, “My brethren, I advise you not to neighbor-love—I advise you to furthest love!—Let the future and the furthest be the motive of thy to-day; in thy friend shalt thou love the Superman as thy motive.”⁶⁹ That is, Nietzsche certainly, and perhaps Nietzsche and Jesus both, addressed themselves to a life in which they undertook to lift the eyes of mankind to a new elevation and a new destiny. This hope and this dream possessed them utterly. They gave themselves to it with a purity of devotion and an abandon such as humans are privileged to see only too seldom, and must hush into awed silence and profoundest reverence all who really

comprehend what it meant. They felt that the realization of mankind's highest hope hinged in some very real and terrible way upon their own utter fidelity. They could feel looking to them and depending on them, all those higher men about them and yet to come, some struggling to be born, some struggling to get on their feet and to find their way, others struggling to foreshadow in their own persons a new future for humankind and showing in their faces the distant light of the Great Noontide toward which their eyes were lifted and their feet set. That is, in the man who would prove worthy of so high a calling there must be something *undissuadable*, which will not allow him to betray himself and the higher mankind-to-come-for anything. He must beware lest the very tenderness and sympathy of his heart seduce him into infidelity.

But let me put Nietzsche's own words before you.

"Higher than love to your neighbour is love to the furthest and future ones; higher still than love to man is love to things and phantoms. The phantom that runneth on before thee, my brother, is fairer than thou; why dost thou not give unto it thy flesh and thy bones? But thou fearest, and runnest to thy neighbour."⁷⁰

"Woe unto all loving ones who have not an elevation which is above their pity' . . . All great love is above all its pity: for it seeketh to create what is loved! 'Myself do I offer unto my love, *and my neighbour as myself!* — such is the language of all creators. All creators, however, are hard!"⁷¹

And again:

"Who can attain to anything great if he does not feel in himself the force and will *to inflict* great pain? The ability to suffer is a small matter . . . But not to perish from internal distress and doubt when one inflicts great suffering and hears the cry of it—that is great, that belongs to greatness."⁷²

And yet again, this:

" 'Why so hard!' — said to the diamond one day the charcoal: 'are we then not near relatives?' —

"Why so soft? O my brethren; thus do I ask you: are ye then not — my brethren?

"Why so soft; so submissive and yielding? Why is there so much negation and abnegation in your hearts? Why is there so little fate in your looks?

"And if ye will not be fates and inexorable ones, how can ye one day — conquer with me?

"And if your hardness will not glance and cut and chip to pieces, how can ye one day — create with me?

"For the creators are hard. And blessedness must it seem to you to press your hand upon millenniums as upon wax, —

"Blessedness to write upon the will of millenniums as upon brass—harder than brass, nobler than brass. Entirely hard is only the noblest.

"This new table, O my brethren, put I up over you: *Become hard!* —"⁷³

5. But the end of all such hardness is that a man should *obey himself*. He who cannot obey himself will have to obey the will of another, or the Garden of the Lord would soon be trampled to ruin by runaway cattle and swine. But every potential creator, who would fain fulfill his destiny, and every man who would know the wholeness that waits upon the flowering and coordination of all his powers, must learn to *take his orders from that innermost core of what he is*. He must, in the profoundest sense, be true to himself.

That a man may learn to obey himself Nietzsche, like Blake, would have him ignore all moral rules, or codified standards of conduct, whether they be the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, the teaching of Jesus as a whole, or anything else whatever that can be made into an external, uniform moral deadhand. William Blake was completely right when he declared, "I tell you no virtue can exist but by breaking these Ten Commandments. Jesus was all virtue and lived by impulse, not by rules."⁷⁴ He who lives by rules can only become the Pharisee, the man who lacks the courage and the honesty to accept, and avow, and obey himself. There can be no *real* virtue, no personal worth that is vital and integral with one's own innermost being, something more than a mere "skin or a cloak," except as one's very Self be in one's action "as the mother is in the child." "Let that," Nietzsche urged, "be *your* formula of virtue!"⁷⁵ Let it be your whole virtue that your innermost being shows its face in your conduct.

6. One thing more is to be made explicit. I need not undertake to quote passages where the idea may be found. Perhaps indeed it is something that a man of insight senses in, and distills from, his memories of the whole body of Nietzsche's writing. It is this: In undertaking to obey thyself, *do not confuse the Self, which thou art to obey, with thy reason*.

But this admonition, though very definitely to be taken to heart by all intellectuals, is not for a moment to be misunderstood as any counsel to flout the rational faculty in favor of vagaries and willfulness. Those who have followed my story thus far must recognize the great respect that I pay to the scientific evidence on any issue, and the emphasis that I have placed on accumulating a sufficient body of knowledge to form a solid basis for any important decision. And through all my intense probing of the mystical experience, I have seen to it that reason and all that goes with it, facts, analysis, deduction, discrimination, and endorsement or veto, are given their day in court, where the invisible judge, the Self, which is the concentrated center of life (impulse, desire, and will), listens with its many ears, before it retires into its sanctum of inner stillness to review the matter in its entirety and to render a verdict. Reason is thus an indispensable check and aid. But reason of itself is not alive. Everything is dead and nothing stirs until impulse comes in. Nothing stirs until one or more of the moving powers that reside in the Self begin to assert themselves. And even reason's veto cannot be accepted as final. On occasion, under exceptional circumstances, the Self may decide to override reason's veto—on a basis of its own.

And there are other activities of the rational faculty against which the Self needs to be even more on its guard. It generally tends to become the servant of the little self, and very expert at pulling forth reasons for why a man ought to do what in fact he wants to do only for the sake of such paltry things as security, comfort, name, and influence, by which he is tied to his past, what he has been, instead of being lured and driven toward his future, what he has it in him to become, his destiny.

Anyone in whom life is a great expansive, propelling force, therefore, has need to beware of reason as a great restrainer and paralyzer, a potential strait jacket. Blake realized this as clearly as Nietzsche did. Near the beginning of his "The Marriage of Heaven and Hell" he has this famous passage:

"Those who restrain desire, do so because theirs is weak enough to be restrained; and the restrainer or reason usurps its place and governs the unwilling.

"And being restrained, it by degrees becomes passive, till it is only the shadow of desire."

Thus reason can become the great deadener, the great killer of the divine possibilities in men. He who is resolved to become what he is must early learn to free himself from all undue respect for precedent and from all concern for consistency. What one does today requires no reconciliation with what one did a year ago, or even yesterday. Each set of circumstances is new and must be faced as if it had never been faced before.

But perhaps the rational faculty is to be guarded against most of all, especially among intellectuals, for its tendency to shape, dress up, organize, and press upon our consciousness *patterns of conduct*, even a whole series of correlated patterns, as ideas, theories, and ideals, into which we try to force our living impulses and desires. But our living impulses and desires have their own form of expression, which belongs to them, and which they take spontaneously. And when we try to force them into the dead mold of any pattern preconceived by the mind, they die. Ideas and ideals are only abstractions. They have their place, but they are without roots in one's innermost being. And an attempt to *live* by them, to live not by what one deeply feels but by what one merely thinks, can be only withdrawal from life, an evasion and denial of life. It will always be artificial, forced, and in the last analysis false, a putting on of something one really is not. One could be surer of touching the springs of vitality if one undertook to "live by one's bowels" than if one allowed oneself to be put through motions by one's head!

But all this can be no more than general warning. In the last analysis the problem of each man who wants really to live, is individual and personal. He must find *his* way to the vital quick within him that is the core of himself, and live in the most intimate and instant obedience to it. As for Nietzsche himself, however, he said that his "most terrible mistress" was that which "spoke" unto him "without voice," in the hour of his abysmal stillness. Listen for *that* Word, and when it has been vouchsafed unto you, heed it.

Very evidently, however, this is an experience that very few men, in mankind's present stage of development, can ever know. Most of all it is alien to those whom Nietzsche called "the good and the just." For to have gained the social approval that these labels imply, they must have shaped their conduct to the external, stereotyped, and largely alien requirements of the prevailing moral codes and convictions. They must have made themselves compliant, submissive, and obedient. But—in Nietzsche's words, "he . . . who obeyeth [in the sense, that is, of conforming—WGS], *doth not listen to himself!*"⁷⁶ Nay, by having more and more turned away from the behest of his own soul, he has put his soul to sleep, and must in the end even put it to death, until in effect he has no soul, and his conduct is quite unilluminated and unguided by any light from an innermost being of his own.

Such are the people “who say and feel in their hearts: ‘We already know what is good and just, we possess it also; woe to those who still seek thereafter!’ ” And it was precisely these people whom Nietzsche pronounced “the greatest danger to the whole human future.” He declared, much as Jesus had before him, that “whatever harm the wicked may do, the harm of the good is the harmfulest harm! And whatever harm the world-maligners may do, the harm of the good is the harmfulest harm.”⁷⁷ For they are the Pharisees, and Pharisees must they be. Moreover, him who deviseth his *own* virtue, who goes a way of his own, which is unfolded from within himself, him must the Pharisees ever crucify. For he makes the very earth they stand on to rock by asking what *is* good, and breaks up the old tables and the old values by setting up a *new* good, which is above and beyond the old. Jesus had only to say, “Moses and the prophets told you so and so, but I tell you otherwise” and “Except your righteousness shall *exceed* the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, . . .”—and after that the “good and just” went out and put their heads together to destroy him. To them must such a man ever seem their most deadly foe and a veritable demon. And ever will they cry, “Give us Barabbas rather than this Jesus. Better the malefactor, who only *breaks* our law, than this innovator who not only breaks it but supplants it.”

And yet, asserted Nietzsche, “All that is called evil by the good, must come together in order that one truth may be born . . . The daring venture, the prolonged distrust, the cruel Nay, the tedium, the cutting-into-the-quick: how seldom do *these* come together? Out of such seed, however—is truth produced!”⁷⁸

7. There is yet one more body of counsel to be presented here, and with this I may well conclude my attempt to summarize Nietzsche’s admonitions to those who would fain become “bridges to Superman.” It might perhaps be epitomized in the three words: “Don’t resist evil.” Just what was the meaning that Jesus put into these same words, or the body of his experience that dictated their utterance, it is now impossible to know. In the context given to the injunction in the Gospel of Matthew it is a matter of turning the other cheek. But “overcoming evil with good” and heaping coals of fire on one’s enemy’s head, which it is commonly interpreted to mean, may be nothing but the most refined and exquisite revenge. And as there is considerable reason to believe that all such was at the utmost remove from Jesus’ spirit, it may be that the substance of his teaching at this point, and the motive behind it, were much closer to Nietzsche’s counsel than is at once apparent. But, at any rate, with Nietzsche the object was to help higher men to avoid allowing their creative powers to be diverted into, and frittered away and wasted by, mere negative resistance to evil. Necessary as it might be for other, non-creative men to attack evil with all the powers at their command, such struggle was something in which the truly creative man must see his very dire peril. Somehow he must prevent his being drawn into it. He must even seek an air, an altitude, and a fellowship in which the pressure of evil upon him will not so much as require his resistance. He must undertake to provide himself with every circumstance that will favor the happy fruition of his pregnancy, the fulfillment of his destiny.

But again, let Nietzsche speak for himself.

In his *Genealogy Of Morals*, written next to the last year of his real mental life, he notes how every sort of revengeful human misery presses into the consciousness of happy and healthy people and resists their right to be happy, even making them ashamed to be happy. In the

face of this and as a warning to all those of decidedly superior giftedness, that they should not allow themselves to make a virtue and a mission out of trying to alleviate the handicaps and miseries of the sick, the broken, the retarded, defective or disabled, Nietzsche exclaimed:

“But there could not possibly be a greater and more fatal misunderstanding than when the happy, the well-constituted, the strong in body and soul, begin in this way to doubt their *right to happiness*. Away with this ‘perverted world’! Away with this shameful enervation of feeling! That the sick should not make the healthy sick—and that is what such an enervation would come to—this ought to be our supreme object on Earth—but for this it is above all essential that the healthy should remain *separated* from the sick, that they should guard themselves even from the look of the sick, that they should not even associate with the sick. Or might it be, perchance, *their* mission to be nurses and doctors? But they could not in a worse way misunderstand and slander their mission—the higher *must* not degrade itself to be the tool of the lower, the pathos of distance *must* also to all eternity keep their missions separate. The right of the happy to existence, the prior right of bells with a full tone over the discordant cracked bells, is verily a thousand times greater: they alone are the *sureties* of the future, they alone are *under bounden duty* to the future of man. What they can, what they should do, that could the sick never do, and never should do. But *in order that* they may be able to do what *only* they ought to do,⁷⁹ how can they possibly be free to play the doctor, the comforter, the ‘saviour’ of the sick? . . . And therefore, good air! good air! and away, at any rate, from the neighborhood of all the madhouses and hospitals of culture! And therefore good company, *our own* company, or solitude, if it must be so! but at any rate, away from the evil fumes of inner corruption and the secret worm-eaten-ness of the sick!”⁸⁰

But there is yet another, even more illuminating passage, taken from one of his earlier books, which I consider to be one of the most profoundly wise and infinitely precious pieces of counsel that any creative man can lay to heart, especially in a day of decay like our own. It is entitled “Not to Be A Soldier of Culture Without Necessity,” and reads as follows:

“At last people are learning what it costs us so dear not to know in our youth—that we must first do superior actions and secondly seek the superior wherever and under whatever names it is to be found; that we must at once go out of the way of all badness and mediocrity *without fighting it*; and that even doubt as to the excellence of a thing (such as quickly arises in one of practised taste) should rank as an argument against it and a reason for completely avoiding it. We must not shrink from the danger of occasionally making a mistake and confounding the less accessible good with the bad and imperfect. *Only he who can do nothing better should attack the world’s evils as the soldier of culture.* (Emphasis added.) But those who should support culture and spread its teachings ruin themselves if they go about armed, and by precautions, nightwatches, and bad dreams turn the peace of their domestic and artistic life into sinister unrest.”⁸¹

But perhaps the following passage, from the New Year’s resolution with which Nietzsche entered upon the year 1882, when he was 38 years old, most fully reveals the entirely positive direction in which his spirit willed to move, and which he believed essential to the rearing of all higher men.

“. . . I also mean to tell what I have wished for myself to-day, and what thought first crossed my mind this year,—a thought which ought to be the basis, and pledge and sweetening of all my future life! I want more and more to perceive the necessary characters in things as the beautiful: —I shall thus be one of those who beautify things. *Amor fati*: let that henceforth be my love! I do not want to wage war with the ugly. I do not want to accuse, I do not want even to accuse the accusers. *Looking aside*, let that be my sole negation! And all in all, to sum up: I wish to be at any time hereafter only a yea-sayer!”⁸²

It may, of course, be pointed out, and with complete justice, that Nietzsche was a long way from holding to this resolution for the rest of his life. Nevertheless, it is certain that the resolution was not a pretty but passing notion that he merely toyed with. Rather, do we here touch the quick of his innermost being, one of the most poignant issues of his entire life. Behind this resolution was the persistent, inextinguishable yearning of his soul, one of those unfinished fights where to the end the tide of battle rolls now forward, now backward.

In his autobiography, Nietzsche confesses that “the loathing of mankind, of the rabble, was always my greatest danger.”⁸³ It may come as a shock, as utterly incongruous and impossible, that any man of real nobility could feel such an emotion as loathing, especially loathing toward other human beings. But Walter Pater once said, “The way to perfection is through a series of disgusts.” And must not he, who strives toward the stars, struggle long with a feeling of loathing for the swamp that denies him footing and constantly sucks him down? Is not this very loathing an expression of his will to free himself from his past, to break its hold upon him, and to rise above it? And Nietzsche did will to shake off his past and rise above it; to free himself from the chrysalis and take to wings. And he knew that this could not be accomplished until his disgust at man’s usual smallness and meanness had been left behind. As we have seen, his Zarathustra, who was so largely the projection of Nietzsche’s own soul, is described as one about whose mouth no loathing lurked,⁸⁴ as “the surmounter of the great disgust.”⁸⁵ And if it be true that a man is revealed less by what he is than by what he would be, then, I beg you, listen to what follows, for here is unveiled the pathos of Nietzsche’s very soul:

“All loathing did I once vow to renounce: then did ye (those whom he has referred to as his ‘enemies’) change my nigh ones and nearest ones into ulcerations. Ah, whither did my noblest vow then flee?”⁸⁶

The chapter from which this is taken, entitled “The Grave Song,” one of the most moving in all Zarathustra and one of the most intimately revealing of Nietzsche, should be read in its entirety. And again:

“I, however, am a blesser and a Yea-sayer, if thou but be around me, thou pure, thou luminous heaven! Thou abyss of light! — into all abysses do I then carry my beneficent Yea-saying.

“A blesser have I become and a Yea-sayer: and therefore strove I long and was a striver, that I might one day get my hands free for blessing.

“This, however, is my blessing: to stand above everything as its own heaven, its round roof, its azure bell and eternal security: and blessed is he who thus blesseth!

“For all things are baptized at the font of eternity, and beyond good and evil . . .”⁸⁷

Let the little critics have their point: much of the time, let us even say most of the time, Nietzsche did not hold to his resolution. Yet it is no less evident that Jesus also fell short of his avowed ideals and violated his own teaching. And indeed, who has not? Moreover, I might list extenuating circumstances, of which there were many. Poignant experience of my own has forced me to recognize, in the face of all theory and idealizing, that sometimes, in order to make oneself quite clear, it seems necessary to say No as well as Yes, to declare not only what one’s meaning is but also what is the denial of it, and to expose and attack its enemies. Often it seems that before one *can* very well hold oneself singly and severely to the positive and constructive, and build, it is necessary to raze the old, and to clear the ground, in order to get room for so much as one’s foundations.

But in my judgment it is better to attempt *no* defense. Let it be admitted that Nietzsche’s work would have been even greater than it was, and more of it of enduring value, if he could more steadily have lived up to his ideal for himself, and held to that New Year’s resolution. Or, if it must be conceded that what he did had to be done by somebody, and that he fulfilled his task with magnificent rectitude and strength, then let it be conceded also that he was but a Moses, who viewed the Promised Land from a mountain-top, but always from afar, and never entered in. Nietzsche himself—there is evidence of this—would have been very ready to admit as much. He was but a way-shower, a cry in the wilderness, a light in the night. He was building the *bridge* to Superman, aye, was a wayfarer *on* the bridge, but yet one that must at times falter and stumble. Superman he was not. That he knew full well. It was precisely because his reach exceeded his grasp, because he could see better than he could do and farther than he could go, that he created his Zarathustra, who thus became essentially the personification of his vision and the voice of his innermost soul, of his love, his dream, and his hope. There had thus far been no one, out of our entire human past, who in his eyes qualified as Superman.⁸⁸ The Superman was yet to come—not, however, as the Jews have waited for their Messiah, but to be the object of the concentrated search and struggle of the loftiest of human spirits. And Nietzsche, better than any other man that I have come upon, saw the way thereto, and made it clear—the stars to steer by, the pitfalls to be on one’s guard against, the regimen to be followed to acquire the requisite strength. And any of us who may have been gifted with creative powers, and who feels the necessity to set his own feet in the direction of Superman, for mankind’s sake as much as for his own, will do well, instead of reproaching Nietzsche that he fell short of his own ideal, to give close heed to his counsel. For it was the expression of a sensitiveness of insight, a range of vision, and a depth and integrity of experience such as has never before, perhaps, in like combination, been achieved. And one of the most precious parts of it all is this advice to go out of the way of all evil, lest that within us which was meant to be, and which could become a swelling river sweeping on to give life and power wherever it went, should lose itself in the desert sands of mere resistance.

With some such counsel as this, which I have ventured to conjure up before you, would Nietzsche have sketched the skeletal structure of the morality that he would give to the small

part of each oncoming generation who were to be reared to direct the ascending life of a healthy society. Let me briefly review it.

1. Learn to hear the Voice in which, out of thy deepest stillness, thine innermost Self would speak to thee; and when thou hast heard it, believe in it, trust it.
2. Through discipline, bring all the recalcitrant elements within thee to do the will of thine innermost Self, until thou hast become a holy Yea to Life, a new beginning, a self-rolling wheel, a creating one.
3. And love thy Self—with thine entire love, and with all the reverence thou hast in thee.
4. Love it and hold to it even when it commands thee to do what will give others pain, even when it may cause others injury. Thy love cannot be true, nor safe, until it is above all thy pity. Learn to be hard.
5. Obey thy Self. Make sure that it *is* thy Self, but then—simply accept it. Do not try to change it, or to improve it, but rest in it. Rest in what you are as men heretofore have been taught to rest in “the will of God.” Put aside all considerations of advantage or disadvantage, and likewise all the claims of “right” and “wrong” and those of reason.
6. Resist not evil. Go out of the way of all evil. Seek thee out circumstances in which thine innermost Self can unfold in thy life, in all its fullness, without having to struggle for breath in foul air or to meet the pressure of alien influences. Until at last thou becometh what thou art, and thy holy Yea to Life is spoken with full voice, and thou seemest to be “carved from one integral block, which is hard, sweet, and fragrant.”

It strikes me that any person of insight, upon reading these words, must often be reminded of the teaching of Jesus. For me this is not surprising, for I am inclined to think that where the two men's words relate to the same fields of experience, they may very largely agree. Unfortunately they are the two most misunderstood great men of whom I know. Consequently, it is in large part the falsification of Jesus that clashes with the misunderstanding and distortion of Nietzsche. To my mind, Jesus was as terrible as he was tender; and Nietzsche was not less tender than he was severe.

Perhaps you think that Jesus was more considerate of others than Nietzsche, but we must not forget Jesus' injunctions in regard to family loyalties, which seem to me the severest that have ever crossed the lips of man. On the other hand, perhaps I have never encountered consideration for the feelings of other people quite so exquisite as Nietzsche showed when he enjoined that we should avoid abashing anyone—that is, avoid causing any personal humiliation or loss of self-possession.⁸⁹ Or do you think that Jesus was more concerned for the masses? I can only ask: Where is your evidence? It seems to me he never slowed his pace for the weak or lowered his hurdles to make it easier for the sheep to enter his fold. He always went ahead as far as he could and as fast as he had it in him; let those come after him who were able. And as for those who had neither “ears to hear” nor “eyes to see”—that is, those who could not “bear fruit,” did he not at one time compare them to “swine” and “dogs,” and say of them again and again that they were like trees that were good only to be

cut down and burned? Apparently, as far as his purpose was concerned, they were only obstacles in the way.

And if anyone still thinks that Jesus was humble, I would ask him what evidence of it he can point to. I myself cannot recall one thing Jesus ever said or did that I should call humble. William Blake understood him aright, as shown in a passage from one of his poems that I quoted in my last chapter. Having raised the question: "Was Jesus humble?" he declared that the course Jesus followed was a matter of "humble to *God*, *haughty* to *man*," And he clinches the matter by making God pronounce: "If thou humblest thyself, thou humblest Me; Thou also dwell'st in eternity." And in "The stillest Hour," that deeply moving chapter in his *Zarathustra*, Nietzsche makes precisely the same point.⁹⁰

No, in their combination of tenderness and hardness, in their refusal to adjust their pace to the pace of the crowd, in the placing of their humility, and indeed (with due allowance for difference in terms) in their fundamental understanding of the inner life of man, I think the two men may have been very much the same. Moreover, both were mystics. That Nietzsche, for all he said against many kinds of mysticism, was essentially a mystic himself, seems to me beyond question. This was recognized, for instance, by my friend Miss Emily S. Hamblen, perhaps the first person in America to write on Nietzsche, and also by Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, one of the outstanding interpreters of the East to the West, and a man with wide knowledge of things mystical. In his *The Dance of Siva* he declares that "Nietzsche was in the direct line of European mysticism along with Blake and Whitman."⁹¹

Indeed, Nietzsche's mysticism is more congenial to me than what I can deduce concerning that of Jesus. As my reader will recall, the collapse of my Franciscan venture was followed by a period of disillusionment. I felt that I had been led into a dead-end by my obedience to that still small voice within me, which I had called God. As a result, my faith in that kind of leading had been shaken. I found it necessary to look behind the scenes. I said to myself, recollecting my past experience, "Something spoke within me. I *called* it God. But what *ground* had I for calling it God?" I came to believe that I had no ground. And though in time I was able to believe again in the validity of the mystical experience and once again undertook to devote myself to an obedience to my still small voice as implicit and literal as before, I thenceforward looked upon it from a psychological point of view. What spoke in me at any given time was a synthesis of all my highest perceptive faculties. It represented the highest wisdom, in regard to the situation then before me, that was able to reach my consciousness at that stage in my development. But I was no longer able to put behind it that omniscience, omnipotence, and the like, that most people connect with the idea of God. Indeed, from that day to this I have remained utterly agnostic about all absolutes and ultimates. I know nothing about a "moral order of the universe": I admit that I do not. I have no means by which to explore the universe or to get beyond the content of my own consciousness. I have come to feel that the belief in a metaphysical God (that is, the common belief in God) has no solid foundation. But I find within myself a wisdom and a strength by which I am able to walk without dependence upon these crutches that I once found so necessary. And likewise Nietzsche, in referring to his mystical experience, limits himself to what Professor Leuba referred to as its "raw stuff," and says only, "Then was there spoken unto me without voice . . ." ⁹² He holds himself close to what, if anything, he *knows*. For me this is solid ground. Here I am at home with Nietzsche, as I am not with Jesus.

Finally, and by no means least, Jesus and Nietzsche are alike in that both went to a kind of crucifixion. The suffering that Nietzsche bore during the last ten years of his thinking life, together with his final mental breakdown, in some ways constitutes a crucifixion more terrible than the more literal one of Jesus. In any case, I find in the price that both paid the final seal they put upon their conviction that the message they had delivered was true, and at the same time an evidence of the measure of their devotion to humankind. I know well that a man's willingness to suffer proves nothing as to the worth of his cause. And yet I confess—let it be written down as my weakness if that is what it be—that I am not moved to my depths until I have seen a man lay down his all. Blake, I believe, died singing, and therein I feel the triumph of his spirit. And yet I wonder if he would have had quite so much breath for singing if he had thrown himself with more abandon into the thick of the fight, or if he had made himself more fully one with the soul of struggling humanity. But Nietzsche wrote, "As deeply as man looketh into life, so deeply doth he look into suffering."⁹³ He cried to the potentially "higher men," whose ear he hoped to catch, "Ye do not yet suffer enough for me! For ye suffer from yourselves, ye have not yet suffered *from man!* Ye would lie if ye spake otherwise! None of you suffereth from what *I* have suffered."⁹⁴ He foresaw all the pressures that could be, and would be, brought to bear upon them to yield, but he called upon them that they should "rather despair than submit." "And verily, I love you, because ye know not to-day how to live, ye higher men! For thus do ye live—best!"⁹⁵ He knew that higher men must "always have it worse and harder. . . Thus only groweth man aloft to the height where the lightning striketh and shattereth him."⁹⁶ Like Jesus, Nietzsche knew that he was a "firstling," and that "a firstling is ever sacrificed."⁹⁷ He felt his long loneliness and the burden of his task breaking him—but he went on. He saw the lightning poised over his head—but he went on—until it struck.

All through his greatest book, his *Zarathustra*, runs the call to surrender oneself to one's highest love. "I love those who know not how to live except as down-goers, for they are the over-goers."⁹⁸ "What matter about thyself! Speak thy word, and succumb!"⁹⁹ "Loving and perishing: these have rhymed from eternity."¹⁰⁰ "Ready must thou be to burn thyself in thine own flame."¹⁰¹ "I love him who seeketh to create beyond himself, and thus succumbeth."¹⁰² "I love those who do not wish to preserve themselves, the down-going ones do I love with mine entire love."¹⁰³ "I love him whose soul is lavish, who wanteth no thanks and doth not give back: for he always bestoweth, and desireth not to keep for himself." "I love those who do not first seek a reason beyond the stars for going down and being sacrifices, but sacrifice themselves to the Earth, that the Earth of the Superman may hereafter arrive." "I love all who are like heavy drops falling one by one out of the dark cloud that lowereth over man: they herald the coming of the lightning, and succumb as heralds . . . the lightning, however, is the *Superman*."¹⁰⁴

And it is men of this kind that I love, too. To them goeth out my entire love. In my heart, I kneel before them, in long silence. But above all, before Nietzsche. Yes, I came at last to the place where I had to put Nietzsche before Jesus. As I maintained in my last chapter, Jesus lived too long ago. His force is now too largely lost in quibbles over his words, what they mean, whether he meant literally what he obviously said, whether he would say the same things if he were confronted by the world of today. Moreover, his "hard sayings"—and it is of them that we are in direst need—have so long been overgrown with an utterly false conception of Jesus that they are almost completely ignored. Most people do not even know

they exist. To be sure they are read, but that has only made it the worse, for their reading has usually been but a mumbling, utterly devoid of any comprehension of what the words mean. If only once in a while the words would explode in the reader's face! But they don't. The droning has gone on. Long ago, they became little better than dead duds. I doubt if anything can ever make them again the fire and sword and light and lightning that they were when Jesus spoke them.

But Nietzsche's words are still alive. They have not yet become buried or had their charge drawn. They cut, pierce, dig, blast, pry open windows and doors, flood whole landscapes with light, paint rainbows, and dance on sunbeams. No one can read them and forget them—or lightly set them aside. Moreover, his teaching is not so fragmentary as that of Jesus. It is no mere handful of sayings. The same problem is approached from many sides, and again and again, through sixteen volumes. The words pile up into arrows and ever-recurring road-signs, the direction of which no man with eyes in his head can mistake. Moreover, the world in which Nietzsche set up his signposts is a much larger one than that which Jesus seems to have wrestled with. Above all, it is our own world—a world of science, industrialism, organized labor, cities, banks, democracy, socialism, nationalism, the octopus state, mechanized war; a world of “evolution” and “progress,” of anthropology, genetics, psychology, sociology; of books, newspapers, and universities—all but radios, movies, and television. This is the world whose problems we must somehow solve, or perish. But for Jesus this world did not even exist. It had not come into being. Indeed, so far as I can see he did not concern himself even with “the world” that *uns* all about him—slavery, poverty, prostitution, a conquered Palestine, Caesar, war. There is no call to social reform. There is not a word about “advancing” the Kingdom of God.

Apparently he saw the world as a collection of individuals, and he confined himself to the inner life of individuals and their relations to one another. That the quality of life in our individual men and women must determine the health of our society, as the health of an organism must depend on the state of the cells that compose it, I will at once concede, and, at the same time, that it constitutes the very core of our problem. But I have become convinced that it is by no means our whole problem. It is possible for a people so to ignore the “differential birthrate” and the laws of genetics in general, that they breed out of existence the people of that capacity to think, to feel, and to aspire, who alone can make anything of the inner life of man. Of what conceivable use is any high teaching to a race of near-morons? Apparently, Jesus was so intent on his task with individuals, and with the present, that he never perceived this problem or reckoned with the future. Nietzsche, however, faced the whole range of modern problems with a completeness and a rigor unmatched, to my knowledge, in any other man. He not only gave an answer to the problems of the inner life of the superior individual (the chief problem that Jesus undertook to face), but he also pointed out with unmistakable clearness and moving earnestness what steps must be taken to make the appearance of such persons both possible and more frequent. Indeed, he at once pointed out how our vaunted “modernism” was but a steady slipping into decadence, and gave us a means by which the bedwarring and debauching of man might be arrested, and a whole people be taken in hand, disciplined, groomed, and set on its way to heights of strength, and beauty, and majesty never before known.

And there we must leave him. He staked his all on his conviction that his teaching contained the way to life, both for the individual and for society. What will come therefrom, it is yet too soon to say. He believed that it would, as he put it, "break history in half," even as Jesus broke it in half—that he was "the second one" (in point of time) as he recognized that Jesus was the first. But whether his foresight was as clear as his insight yet remains to be discovered. Sometimes, I fear that mob-mindedness has too largely possessed even the best of us—even those who must do most of our thinking and leading: we have become too smug, too comfortable, too soft and sentimental, to be equal to the stern measures that alone could arrest our descent and yet save us. Where shall we now find the necessary iron, the honesty, and the capacity both to suffer and to initiate measures that will bring suffering to others? But—more than any other man I know—Nietzsche has shown the way to Life. The chief question before us is: Do *we* have the *will thereto*?

1944, 1968.

¹ For those whose reading of this chapter may impel them to look into Nietzsche more thoroughly, I append the following short, select bibliography:

§ Salter, William M.—*Nietzsche The Thinker*, Holt, 1917. This exposition of Nietzsche's philosophy shows more sensitive insight than any other I know.

§ Morgan, George A., Jr.—*What Nietzsche Means*, Harvard University Press, 1941.

§ Ludovici, Anthony M.—*Who Is To Be Master Of The World?* Allen & Unwin, n.d. Best for Nietzsche's sociological teaching.

§ Foster, George Burman—*Friedrich Nietzsche*, Macmillan, 1931. Best introduction for those with a Christian background.

§ Halevy, Daniel—*Life Of Friedrich Nietzsche*, T. Fisher Unwin, London, 1914.

§ *Nietzsche In Seiner; Briefen Und Berichten Der Zeitgenossen, Die Lebensgeschichte in Dokumenten*, Edited by Alfred Baeumler, Kroner Verlag, 1932.

§ *Nietzsche Briefe*, Edited by Richard Oehler, Insel-Verlag, Leipzig, 1911.

§ Lichtenberger—*The Gospel Of Superman*. Translated from the French by J.M. Kennedy. T.N. Foulis, 1910.

² *Eae Homo*, Auth. English Ed., p. 131. All subsequent references, unless otherwise specified, will be to the same edition, published by Macmillan, under various dates. The individual works cited may be identified by the following abbreviations:

EGP—EARLY GREEK PHILOSOPHY

GM—GENEALOGY OF MORALS

DD—THE DAWN OF DAY

Z—THUS SPAKE ZARATHUSTRA

WP—THE WILL TO POWER

HH—HUMAN-ALL-TOO-HUMAN

BGE—BEYOND GOOD AND EVIL

JW—THE JOYFUL WISDOM

TI—THE TWILIGHT OF THE IDOLS
EH—ECCE HOMO

³ Z, Ch. XXVIII, p. 114.

⁴ Z, Ch. LXVIII, p. 328.

⁵ Z, Ch. LI, p. 216; Ch. XVII, p. 74; LVIII, p. 272; Prologue, Sec. 4, p. 9; Ch. XXXI, p. 124; Prologue, Sec. 2, p. 5. BGE, p. 160 (Aphorism 216).

⁶ Z, Ch. LXXIII, Sec. 3, p. 286; Ch. XVII, end, p. 74.

⁷ In regard to all this see "Superman," Chap. III in P.D. Ouspensky: *A New Model Of The Universe*, Knopf, 1934.

⁸ Z, Ch. XL, p. 159; Ch. XLVIII, p. 200 ff.; Ch. XXII, p. 89; W.toP., Vol. II, Aph. 983, p. 380; Aph, 1003, p. 388; TI, pp. 218, 280, 281.

⁹ John Lane, London, 1935.

¹⁰ Harper, 1939.

¹¹ WP, Vol. II, p. 246. Those responsive to this point of view would probably be enlightened and stimulated, as I was, by *Physical Beauty And Racial Betterment* by Knight Dunlap, for many years Professor of Experimental Psychology at Johns Hopkins University, C.V. Mosby, St. Louis, Mo., 1920.

¹² See Nietzsche's *Die Unschuld Des Werdens*, Kroners Taschenausgabe, Band 83, p. 433. "Maxime: Mit keinem Menschen umgehen, der an dem verlognen Rassen-Schwindel Anteil hat." (Have nothing to do with any man who takes part in the race-swindle.) In the Authorized English Edition (Macmillan), see Vol. XIII, *The Genealogy Of Morals*, p. 226. However, though he scoffed at the idea that there were in fact any "pure" races in Europe, it is amply evident from Aphorism No. 272 in *The Dawn Of Day* (p. 253) how much importance he attached to purity of race as an ideal. "Purified races," he says, "have always become stronger and more beautiful. The Greeks may serve us as a model of a purified race and culture, and it is to be hoped that some day a pure European race will arise." Racial purification, that is, was both desirable and possible.

¹³ TI, pp. 128, 131-2. Cp. Z, Ch. XXI, p. 83; Ch. LVI, Sec. 20, p. 255; WP, Vol. I, pp. 46-7, Vol. II, pp. 194, 368.

¹⁴ Z, p. 57 (Ch. XI).

¹⁵ *Poetry and Prose of William Blake*, Nonesuch, London, 1927, p. 191 ("The Marriage of Heaven and Hell.")

¹⁶ EH, p. 58.

¹⁷ See Robert Ardrey's recent books *African Genesis* (Artheneum, 1961) and *The Territorial Imperative* (Artheneum, 1966).

¹⁸ GM, p. 88.

¹⁹ BGE, pp. 226-7.

²⁰ WP, Vol. I, p. 294.

²¹ Cp. the dictum of Ezra Pound: "The slave is one who waits for someone else to free him." IMPACT, Regnery, 1960, p. 209.

²² For this translation, "the workers," see the German original, or Salter (op. cit.), p. 440. "Noblemen," as in the authorized English edition, is an error.

²³ WP, Vol. II, Aph. 764, p. 209.

²⁴ TI, pp. 219-220.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ BGE, Aph. 263 end, p. 239.

²⁷ TI, p. 220.

²⁸ Salter (op. cit.), p. 440, cites this from a German edition of Nietzsche's "Nachlass" (literary remains, published after his death) to which I do not have access.

²⁹ See EGP, p. 6 ff. Better, the entire chapter, pp. 3 to 18.

³⁰ Ralph Waldo Emerson, essay entitled *Wealth, in Conduct of Life*, Fireside Ed. 1909, Vol. VI, pp. 112-13. Cp. Salter, op. cit., pp. 72-3.

³¹ Salter, op. cit., p. 38.

³² To the thoughtful reader, who wishes to explore this matter further, I suggest a reading of the passages in Salter (op. cit.) listed in his Index under "Slavery," "Higher Individuals," and some of the passages indicated under "Sacrifice."

³³ EGP, pp. 6,7,9.

³⁴ P. 343 (Aph. 377).

³⁵ BGE, p. 223 (Aph. 257).

³⁶ Z, p. 137 (Ch. XXXIV).

³⁷ JW, 289f. (Aph. 349).

³⁸ WP, Vol. II, p. 128 (Aph. 650).

³⁹ This prejudice, as I have called it, is simply an uncritical and unfounded assumption, and nothing else. Carleton Putnam, in his *Race and Reality* (Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1967, p. 58) says, “. . . the answer [as to the relative importance of heredity and environment] was available in studies conducted with identical twins raised apart in radically different environments. Here the inheritance was the same—only the environment differed. The results had been published and as usual remained, uncontradicted by any scientific counter-facts. Although the effect varied somewhat with different traits, the over-all influence of heredity was found to exceed that of environment in a ratio of about 3 to 1.” A lengthy footnote to the same page cites extensive scientific authority in support of this position. The case is summarized in *Mankind Quarterly*, 1964, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 197-204.

⁴⁰ See WP, Vol. I, p. 62f. (Aph. 70). Cp. Vol. II, p. 127 (Aph. 647).

⁴¹ Prince Peter Kropotkin—*Mutual Aid*, Knopf, 1916.

⁴² See Z, Ch. XV, Cp. WP, Vol. I, pp. 50, 51; 212 (Aph. 254); 215 (Aph. 259); 372 (Aph. 455); Vol. II, p. 20 (Aph. 493); 26 (Aph. 507); 48 (Aph. 532, end), 49 (Aph. 534); 146 (Aph. 675).

⁴³ JW, p. 208 (Aph. 265).

⁴⁴ WP, Vol. II, p. 20 (Aph. 493).

⁴⁵ HH, Vol. I. p. 88. Emphasis added.

⁴⁶ C.G. Jung — *Contributions To Analytical Psychology*, Harcourt, 1928, p. 173.

⁴⁷ Houston Stewart Chamberlain — *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*, John Lane, 1913, Vol. I, p. 252.

⁴⁸ TI, p. 51.

⁴⁹ Recently, since writing this, I have happened upon the passage in Nietzsche's *Twilight of the Idols* (p. 48) where he declares Christianity “essentially an anti-Aryan religion . . . the transvaluation of all Aryan values . . . the general insurrection of all the down-trodden, the wretched, the bungled and the botched, against the ‘race,’—the immortal revenge of the Chandala as the religion of love.” And in like vein Karl Jung wrote: “But the Germans did not make their conquest of the Roman world without becoming infected by some of the diseases which flourished so unwholesomely in Rome during her last days. Foremost among them was an infection which the Romans themselves had caught during the first century, a consequence of their own conquest of the Levant. It had begun as an offshoot of Judaism, had established itself in Jerusalem and a few other spots in the eastern Mediterranean area, and had traveled to Rome with Jewish merchants and speculators, who had long found that

city an attractive center of operations. It eventually became known to the world as Christianity, but for more than two centuries it festered in the sewers and catacombs of Rome, along with dozens of other alien religious sects from the Orient; its first adherents were Rome's slaves, a cosmopolitan lot from all the lands conquered by the Romans. It was a religion designed to appeal to slaves: blessed are the poor, the meek, the wretched, the despised, it told them, for you shall inherit the Earth from the strong, the brave, the proud, and the mighty; there will be pie in the sky for all believers, and the rest will suffer eternal torment. It appealed directly to a sense of envy and resentment of the weak against the strong."

⁵⁰ WP, Vol. I, pp. 10 and 58.

⁵¹ WP, Vol. II, 153 (Aph. 680).

⁵² Z, Ch. LIV.

⁵³ Z, p. 112 (Ch. XXVII).

⁵⁴ Z, pp. 86-7 (Ch. XXII).

⁵⁵ This has been stated most succinctly by the Hindus as a matter of the sacrifice of the self, by the self, to the Self.

⁵⁶ Z, p. 147 (Ch. XXXVII).

⁵⁷ JW, p. 209 (Aph. 270). Emphasis added.

⁵⁸ See, for instance, Z, p. 47f. (Ch. VIII); pp. 70-74 (Ch. XVII).

⁵⁹ Z, p. 71f. (Ch. XVII).

⁶⁰ Z, p. 238 (Ch. M. Cp. Ch. VIII).

⁶¹ TI, p. 99f.

⁶² Z, p. 72 (Ch. XVII).

⁶³ Z, P. 208 (Ch. XLIX). Cp. Chs XVI and XVII (end).

⁶⁴ Z, p. 235 (Ch. LV).

⁶⁵ Z, p. 147 (Ch. XXXVII).

⁶⁶ Z, p. 73 (Ch. XVII, near end).

⁶⁷ Z, p. 134 (Ch. XXXIII, end).

⁶⁸ Z, p. 243 (Ch. LVI, Sec 4).

⁶⁹ Z, p. 70 (Ch. XVI, end).

⁷⁰ Z, p. 69 (Ch. XVI).

⁷¹ Z, p. 105 (Ch. XXV).

⁷² J.W., Aphorism No. 325.

⁷³ Z, p. 261f. (Ch. LVI, Sec 29).

⁷⁴ *Poetry and Prose of William Blake*, Nonesuch Press, London, I vol. ed., 1946, p. 191—in the last “Memorable Fancy” of “The Marriage of Heaven and Hell.”

⁷⁵ Z, pp. 110, 112 (Ch. XXVII).

⁷⁶ Z, p. 244 (Ch. LVI, Sec. 7).

⁷⁷ Z, p. 259 (Ch. LVI, Sec 26).

⁷⁸ Z, pp. 244, 259-260 (Chap. LVI, Sections 7 and 26).

⁷⁹ This rendering, which is mine, seems to me truer to the original than that in the authorized edition of Nietzsche’s works. ⁸⁰ GM, p. 160f. (*Third Essay*, Aph. 14).

⁸¹ HH, p. 98 (Aph. 183).

⁸² JW, p. 213 (Aph. 276).

⁸³ EH, p. 26.

⁸⁴ Z, p. 4 (Prologue, Sec. 2).

⁸⁵ Z, p. 328, Ch. LXVIII.

⁸⁶ Z, p. 132, Ch. XXXIII.

⁸⁷ Z, p. 200f., Ch. XLVIII: “Before Sunrise.”

⁸⁸ Z, p. 108, Ch. XXV, end.

⁸⁹ Z, p. 78, Ch. XIX; p. 102, Ch. XXV. Cp. JW, p. 209, Aph. 274.

⁹⁰ Z, p. 175ff. (Chap. XLIV).

⁹¹ Ananda K. Coomaraswamy—*The Dance of Siva*, Sunrise Turn, Inc., New York, 1924. Chapter entitled “A Cosmopolitan View of Nietzsche,” p. 115ff.

⁹² Z, p. 175. (Ch. XLIV).

⁹³ Z, p. 189 (Ch. XLVI).

⁹⁴ Z, p. 354 (Ch. LXXIII, Sec. 6).

⁹⁵ Z, p. 352 (Ch. LXXIII, Sec. 3).

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, Sec. 6.

⁹⁷ Z, p. 244 (Ch. LVI, Sec. 6).

⁹⁸ Z, p. 9 (Prologue, Sec. 4).

⁹⁹ Z., p. 176 (Ch. XL).

¹⁰⁰ Z, p. 147 (Ch. XXXVII).

¹⁰¹ Z, p. 73 (Ch. XVII).

¹⁰² Z, p. 74 (Ch. XVII).

¹⁰³ Z, p. 244 (Ch. LVI, Sec. 6).

¹⁰⁴ Z, pp. 9-11 (Prologue, Sec. 4).

Chapter 5.

An Added Faculty of Perception.

In the foregoing pages I have maintained not only that Jesus was a mystic, and that only mysticism could adequately explain both his life and his teaching, but also that Nietzsche, for all his rapier mind and his many attacks on mysticism, was nevertheless pretty much a mystic himself. And these two men have been my chief teachers and inspirers. Moreover, from at least 1920 until 1940, my life was centered and rooted in my mystical experience. Through all of twenty years, I picked my way through the most delicate, difficult and far-reaching decisions of my own life by an expansion of inner vision and an inner compelling force that I freely called mystical then and, even after years of the most searching skeptical scrutiny, freely call mystical still. It is time, therefore, that I make it clear what to me mysticism is.

This is all the more necessary because the mystic today is out of favor. The great bulk of the scientists, who so largely give our society its tone, quite evidently believe that the mystic's experience has little if any social value, and that his interpretation of his experience is as unsound as his generalizations on the basis of it are loose. And probably most other thinking men see in him a victim of self-deception running away from reality. Even organized religion looks at it coldly and suspiciously. The Catholic Church, to be sure, has preserved the tradition, but only in spots. And though the Quakers also have the tradition, they now generally keep their mystical experience so consistently and safely within the bounds of respectability, practicality, and general ordinariness, that one can hardly believe it any longer possesses much vitality or significance. For the most part, organized religion, like everything else in our Western world today, bows the knee only to Reason and Materialism.

Indeed, at my own hands too, mystics and the mystical have come in for a good deal of criticism. For example, much that is said against them in Prof. James H. Leuba's *Psychology Of Religious Mysticism*,¹ written from a strictly rationalistic and avowedly atheistic point of view, seems to me entirely justified, especially as regards that brand of them who were too frothy in their emotions or too morbid in their self-mortification, and those whose ecstasies, the women's with Jesus, the men's with the Virgin Mary, are only too obviously an etherealization of the very sexual instinct they abhorred and deluded themselves into thinking that they had escaped. But it is only fair to note (1) that most of the mystics whose experience Leuba examined were of precisely this neurotic, neurasthenic, and socially inconsequential and useless type, and (2) that the really great mystics received little or no attention.

There was a time, however, when I was as naïve as the rest of them. During the nine-year period when I lived the life of a free-lance Franciscan, what spoke within me (to be sure, under certain recognized and definite conditions) I accepted as, and frankly called, "the voice of God." And to this I tended to pass all responsibility. I myself was but a soldier under orders. As such, my whole obligation was to do faithfully what I had found myself commanded. If people did not like things I did, my inclination was to tell them that they should present their objections not to me but to God.

In the fall of 1929, however, this kind of life in me began to break up. There then intervened that period of devastating skepticism of which I have written in a previous chapter. It was a time of strong resurgence on the part of my reasoning mind. I doubted everything that I had once so firmly believed. I questioned even those assumptions on which had rested my sense of peace and security in the face of the universe, my certainty of direction in life, and all the position of influence among men that had come to me through nine years of strenuous experience. I asked what men knew, or ever had known, or could know, about this universe in which our lot is cast, about any ultimate reality or any absolutes. What reason was there to think that the yardstick of our human values had any reference to such things? Where was the evidence that the universe was rational, or had a purpose, or was guided and permeated by love—in particular, by any special love toward man? What was the evidence of the “moral order in the universe” that the preachers love to talk about? To be sure, for ages men have talked about these things as though they *were* sure, as though certainty were not only possible but actually achieved. They have even declared that “God” (by which I suppose, whatever else they mean, they mean “ultimate reality”) was “spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable, in his being wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth.”² They have talked about God, and to this day they talk about him, in the churches and everywhere, not only thus in general, but more in particular—about the “plan of God for salvation,” even about the “plan of God for the salvation of China.” They talk about him as though they had hobnobbed with him since they were schoolboys together, talk about him until I grow nauseated with the hearing of their talk. And now, when they begin, there commonly arises in my mind the picture of two bullfrogs pulling themselves at daybreak from the depths of their little pool, which was the only world they really knew, and lifting themselves up onto their hind legs and with an air of great wisdom discussing together why the sun comes up, and what it is, and whither it goes. As though they ever could know.

And what more can man know about ultimates and absolutes? These big words he uses to talk about them—“infinite,” “eternal,” “unchangeable,” “truth”—what are they but a means by which man hides, even from himself, the fact that he does not know about such things, and cannot know about them—that knowledge about such things simply is not given to man. Most men believe because without believing they could not live. They would go into a panic at the thought of undertaking, amidst uncertainty all around them, to make sure of their course in life by a certainty and a strength that they found only inside themselves. Their beliefs about ultimates are an unconscious device by which they hide the inscrutableness of existence from their own eyes, and hide from themselves, also, the fact that they are hiding, the fact that they are afraid and weak, and are running for cover.

But my search for reality was pitiless. I was willing, I thought, to pay any price. I wanted no fool’s paradise, nor any saint’s. I could not stand the thought of buying peace at the cost of honesty. My search might lead me to a region where life would be more austere and more stark. That I should not mind. But if there were, amid the shifting sands of human existence, any rock that so ran down into the very foundations of the universe that it could be counted on to withstand any storm that all the fury of the elements might hurl against it, then I wanted to find it. Was it to be found in the mystical experience?

So now this also came under my critical eye. I had read some psychology. I now read more. I was resolved that my mind should be free to examine and to criticize any side whatever of my total experience.

So now I gave it free rein with the mystical. I ventured to look behind the scenes. I undertook to separate the "raw stuff" of my experience from any interpretation that I might have put upon it. Admittedly there had long been that within me which, in the deepest stillness of my being, always spoke to me, and, in the face of any situation, told me very explicitly just what I should do. But I said to myself, "What is this that has spoken? If it is not God, what is it? And what value does it have? Or reliability? Or authority?"

Thus I asked myself. And this asking, and the thinking I did in consequence, had its effects. I suppose, for one thing, I am somewhat less of a mystic than I might have been. This thing of pulling up your roots to examine them is not entirely wholesome. But being the kind of man I was, and living in an age like ours in which every value, standard, and practice is being challenged, criticized, experimented with, and more or less widely rejected, until there is almost no certainty left, I simply could not afford to go on building my house without subjecting the soundness of my foundations to every test within the reach of my capacities and my resources. And this test I made. I had to make it. And I am glad that I made it.

I may be less of a mystic than I might have been. But my having made sure of the ground under me may enable another man to go farther than I can now. And, in any case, what mysticism I have, I am sure of. I may not be flying so high, but there is less chance of my being brought down altogether. I already have faced the worst. I have no reason to fear light—*any* light. There is nothing at which I am afraid to look, full and straight. Prove to me that what is commonly *called* "God" does not exist: ultimately, it would not disturb me. I believe that I am prepared at any time to cast all that I need to say about the mystical experience into terms of psychology. Moreover, let me add that even now I rather avoid using the *word* "God" for the simple reason that to different people it has such vastly different meanings that there could be no certainty about what people would be taking me to be saying. But let no reader of mine, on this account, take it into his head that I am any atheist. If he could but peer into my heart and sense the communion there between my innermost being and That-Which-Is-Beyond-All-Words, he would perhaps realize that I have within me the counterpart of all the God that any man ever has had as a matter of his own firsthand experience.

In short, if there was any one thing that came through the fires of my prolonged skepticism more unscathed than another, it was my mystical experience. I believe that in this a man comes the nearest to bedrock that human existence can reach. Here he can find what will *create* rock, and give him firm footing amidst, and through, any situation whatever. Where everything else is uncertain, he can be certain in himself. And, though my understanding of the experience is now quite different, and although I claim for what speaks in the deepest stillness of my being neither absoluteness nor infallibility, nevertheless what spoke to me before speaks to me still, and now as before I undertake to obey it as implicitly as a child. For reasons that I shall state in due time, I undertake to obey it as though it *were* both absolute and infallible, even though I definitely believe it to be neither. In short, the mystical experience remains the center of my life. For me, it is not a device by which to escape from

reality, but the best means by which a man may see quickly and surely what he should do in the world, so that he can do it with all his powers. I hold to it not for any agreeable feeling that may accompany the experience, but for the more sustained and consistent certainty that it brings, and for the greater wholeness that it leads toward. Even in its simpler manifestations, I see it as a means to personal integration, direction, and increased power.

It may be that my kind of mysticism will be acceptable neither to the mystics nor to the scientist. To the scientist, I am not scientific; and to the mystics I am hardly a mystic. Then so be it. I do not find it necessary to be acceptable to anybody. It is enough that it be acceptable to me. It has given me that by which I believe I am able really to live—which is a good deal more, perhaps, than can be said for most of the scientists with their science.

However, and be all that as it may, it is time now for me to try to state what I mean by the mystical, and what I do not mean.

I do not mean the psychic.

The psychic relates chiefly to the perception of phenomena essentially of a *sensory order*, even though without the aid of the senses. It may also relate to the non-sensory communication of thought. It brings us experiences that reach us ordinarily only through the five senses, and which are not beyond what could reach us and have reached us through these senses. Even when, as in so-called clairvoyance or clairaudience, a person is “seen” or “heard” who is known to be dead, the experience is of a face and a body or a voice that answers to our sensory experience of the person when he was alive. As such its significance is limited to that of our sensory apparatus, of which it might be considered an extension. The mystical, on the other hand, has to do with *relations* between things sensed, with *meanings, values, and discriminations between more real and less real*. In its simplest manifestations, it is an instrument in the service of *quality* of life. It is the subtlest and yet the most exact and surest instrument by which a man can effect a sound and masterful orientation both to the world in which he lives and to the universe. It is not at the service of the personal ego. It serves best the man who is willing to succumb in an effort to create beyond himself.

This leads directly to the other distinction I want to make here. The appearance of psychic powers is morally quite unconditioned. Clairvoyance, clairaudience, mental telepathy, mediumship, and the like, appear in people of no spiritual aspiration or moral earnestness whatever. The woman who, as a medium, wrote the book entitled *The Sorry Tale*, was, I am informed by a man who knew her, a mere social butterfly. The mystical, on the other hand, usually if not always (and without *any* exception in the case of the *best* exemplars) supervenes only upon a long moral struggle in which, at last, a man has so exhausted all his resources that unless he find the light and strength by which to effect a new synthesis on a higher level, he must go under. It is the necessary “more” for the man who already has faithfully used all his powers thus far developed. The psychic, on the other hand, may come to a man whose life has been without moral effort. It is morally and spiritually colorless. It comes neither as a sign that one has moral capacity, nor as a reward for having put one’s capacity to faithful use. From the point of view of *quality* of life it has no meaning whatever. The mystical, however, is the very quick of such life.

But though I would thus set the mystical sharply apart from the psychic, I would maintain that there is nothing worthy of the name spiritual or religious that does not have the mystical at its heart. A man may be ever so moral and idealistic, but if he is not at least somewhat mystical, I should deny that he could be really spiritual at all.³ And likewise of religious. We too readily forget, what after all is historically demonstrable, that every great religion has taken its departure from the mystical experience of some great man. And if we now use the word "religious" to apply to the manifold forms into which the burning eruption of his life has finally cooled and set, dead scoriae of ritual and ceremony, of meetings, readings, prayings, bendings of knee and head—then we should have some other word to apply to the experience of the great seers. For those forms belong to the life of those who do *not* have eyes, who do *not* have ears, who are incapable of what I should call *real* religion. What we should never forget is that the lion-hearted leaders and the pious-hearted sheep lived by totally different principles. But in any case, the mystical belongs to the experience of the leaders, the great spiritual originators, and no less to the experience of all those who undertake to press after them.

Large things are often claimed for the mystical experience of these great ones. Some of these I like; some I do not. Some of them I believe, and some I simply cannot. I do not believe that *any* mystic's experience, whether that of Jesus, Buddha, or any other, was ever a matter of a "conscious union with a living Absolute," to use a definition of Evelyn Underhill, a popular authority on mysticism; or that it was any "science of ultimates," to use another; or that in it the mystic "touched the substantial Being of Deity, not merely its manifestation in life," to use still a third. I believe it is not given to man to reach any absolutes or ultimates. The emotional tone of an experience is no necessary indication of its profundity. The "substantial Being of Deity" has never been experienced by any man. Every minute on every side, I presume that ultimate reality stares every man in the face, and this that we call stick, stone, star, and all the relations of things, are only the best that each man, according to his faculties, is able to make of this reality. But no man, not the greatest mystic in his deepest penetration, ever found himself face to face with "God," with the unveiled abysmal reality of the universe, but rather with appearances—indeed not the same appearances that flood the consciousness of the ordinary man, but nonetheless face to face with what in the last analysis was the phenomenal world: appearances. Beyond this, it never has been possible for man to go. Likely, to face reality nakedly would destroy us.

Again, I resist strenuously the talk common among mystics (Hindus and Moslem Sufis, for example) about the "absorption" of the individual in "God," in the Absolute, in the Universal-All, and the like. For them, individual existence is illusory, and the aim of one's life is to lose one's identity, to escape from individual existence. Even Walt Whitman talks about "merging" and seems fond of the phrase "*en masse*," though this was probably a survival from his reading of oriental literature, without his realizing the inconsistency of such phrases with the thoroughgoing individualism of his own make-up. Now it is one thing, and for me not only all right but even necessary for fulfillment and elevation of life, to have sympathy for other creatures, and at last a sense of unity in which one perceives that everything and everybody, without exception, in the whole universe is an extension of one's own self. I rejoice in a sense of unity that makes us feel one with all people and all things somewhat as the continents and mid-sea islands run deep down under the ocean and become one in the Earth. Yet this particular kind of unity does not alter the fact, or the recognition of the fact,

that some are big and others are little, that some are high while others are comparatively low. In this kind of unity, there is no loss of identity, no confusion of function, no illusion of equality. And only in this way can I apply the idea to humans. I am willing enough to become "one with God," if these "absorption" mystics want me to, and if by that they mean become at one with the source of all life, and especially if they mean integrated with the deepest springs of my own being. But if they begin trying to efface the "hard wiry line" (Blake) that determines, at least for practical purposes, where my individual personality begins and ends, even as my skin determines where my body begins and ends, then I am ready to fight, and to become as ugly as may prove necessary, in order to hold off this living death. And Blake and Nietzsche, at least, were two mystics who felt the same way. I should say that Jesus was another. What were all his "hard sayings" but the results of a struggle to keep other people, near and dear people (all the more because they were soft and softening, lending themselves easily to "merging"), from absorbing his life into theirs?

And yet I can assure my reader that I do not like any better a mysticism that involves a settled isolation from the world. For some few people, perhaps, this is all right. I do not like to dogmatize about life. And for many people for a period, while they seek to tap their deepest levels, yes. For "Great things are done when Men and Mountains meet; This is not done by jostling in the Street." (Blake) And it is said of Jesus, "the Spirit driveth him into the wilderness": for the time being, he was incapacitated for carrying on the ordinary work of life. Again and again, he retired to the solitary places for a breathing spell, for a chance to make sure of his bearings and his course, and to drink from the deeper springs within him. But, with all that accomplished, he went back to where the people were. For the place for the yeast is not on the pantry shelf, but in the dough. And the true seers are leaven—leaven, ferment, light, and flaming sword. Nearly always, they have to struggle to find some effective way to reach the life of the people. They speak, they write, they do. But they refuse to run away from life.

Nor, finally, do I like the "desirelessness" so often held up as the aim of the mystic's aspiration, especially perhaps among Hindus. For without desire *nothing moves*. One could not move even toward desirelessness except by desire. And when one reached desirelessness, one would not be far from dead. Desire for desirelessness is, at bottom, desire for death, and as such it is evidence of decadence, evidence that life is weary, beaten, poisoned, and has turned against itself. The aim should never be desirelessness but, rather, the recognition of one's dominant desire as the core of one's being, one's center of potential integration, and, with this, the effort to subordinate every other desire to that one. Desirelessness leads to a kind of general emaciation, whereas the effort to make one's dominant desire regnant leads to an integration of force and to an increase of effective power.

Having thus disposed of some of the current conceptions of the mystical that I find more or less unacceptable, I may now, on the positive side, attempt a definition of my own.

The mystical, for me, is a matter of an added sensitiveness to relations and values, such that one is suddenly aware of what a body of ascertained facts adds up to in the realm of truth, or of its significance in the world of values, whether for oneself or for society, or for both. Moreover, it is a means for integrating the truth that one has become aware of with life, with one's own life, a revelation of what one must *do* about the truth. Thereafter it becomes

impossible to be one who merely plays with ideas and bandies words about after the manner of the modern intellectual. Thought, moral imperatives and action are brought together to form a unified whole. One cannot stop short with thinking; one must do something about what one thinks. And thus one grows steadily into the independence and self-reliance, the sure vision, the inner harmony, and the quiet strength of the fully integrated personality.

If I am right in this, then anyone can see that the mystical, even in its more rudimentary manifestations, must commonly prove to be an inestimable aid to making sure of one's course in life and to finding strength to follow it. And on its higher levels (as we shall see in a later chapter), it may come to its consummation in what is no less than a *different order of consciousness*.

In its effects we may say that it is like the acquisition of a new faculty of perception. In its development, it is as though we were experiencing the evolution of an inner eye. At the beginning there is only, as it were, a sensitive spot, able to distinguish between night and day. But gradually, as we use this sensitiveness, we find that it increases, it becomes subtly sensitive not only (let us say) to a wider range of gradations of light, but to color, and to ever more exquisite shades of difference in color, and with ever-increasing sharpness of definition. The sensitive *spot* has become a full-grown and perfected eye. On its emotional side, the experience is accompanied from the very first appearance of this sensitiveness, even in its more elementary forms, with a feeling of elation, as over the recognition that the life within us is expanding, reaching, pushing out to the more effective mastery of our environment. And there is the wistful, more or less awe-filled apprehension that behind this sensitiveness lies life in new fullness and meaning, that this sensitiveness is to be trusted and followed, and that in some fateful way one's destiny is hinging on whether one does trust it or not. And if one does trust it there follows—I think, always, on any level at which this sensitiveness may make its appeal—a feeling of exaltation and of joy. This is due partly to the mastery of the fears and other weaknesses that have been holding one back; partly to the new feeling of freedom from division and the consequent greater inner ease and increased possibilities of concentrated force. But what the experience is treasured for is not the “good feeling” of it, but for the new light on one's way and for the new power to follow that way and do things on it. In fact, so determining has been the effect of the mystical experience of the world's greatest seers, with whom it has been no less than what I have called a new order of consciousness, that I am convinced that this alone can adequately explain their difficulties, their performance, their power, and their social significance.

This may become more obvious when I begin to examine the mystical experience in the light of psychology, but I think that probably, for many people, there is no way in which I can throw more light on its nature and on how it starts and on what it may lead to, than by telling how I myself, from rather rationalistic beginnings, came to be somewhat mystical. My own mystical experience had its origin in, and I think has always been chiefly, what perhaps might be called the pocket-compass variety. That is, it seems that with me it usually has had an immediate and practical bearing. It has been, first of all, a means of getting my bearings on a dark night, of knowing which way to go when the path forked, and of tapping undiscovered resources within me at times of crisis.

But my mystical bent was late in showing itself. I grew up in a Fundamentalist Presbyterian home, and the Presbyterians, of course, have always had a strongly rationalistic tradition. So it was natural, when at the age of twenty-eight I came to the drastic break I then made with my own past and current practice, that I did not trust myself to embark upon so momentous a venture until I had set down in black and white just what I was going to do and all my reasons for it. Throughout much of the following year I was very busy, Tolstoy-like, in providing a rational basis and justification for each of my departures from conventional ethics and practice.

But it happened that through this first year, which was one of ceaseless inner conflict, I was closely associated with a young Quakeress; and of course the Quakers have the opposed mystical tradition. One evening she said to me, "Bill, you go at things so hard. You sort of chew your way through everything. But I think there is a more natural way. Some time when you have a decision to make, why don't you try simply to be utterly still inside, and in that stillness absolutely willing to go *any* way, and see if you don't just *know* what you should do?" And so, a few nights later, having a small decision to make, and perhaps with all the more readiness because the decision was not of any great moment, I tried what she had said. And I found that it was even as she had assured me it would be. As soon as I was genuinely willing to go any way whatever, I somehow knew what I should do. And this way of getting a sense of direction was indeed so simple, and, by all the tests of subsequent experience proved so sound and satisfying, that I gradually got into the habit of making all my decisions thus. And there are two observations on my subsequent experience that I feel that I should make.

1. Through over twenty years of making decisions in this way,⁴ I believe that never once, when confronted with the necessity of a choice, have I become utterly still inside without being given a clear realization of what I should do. My emotions might be so beyond my control that it would take me months to reach that state of utter willingness, but once it was reached, there always came a crystal clear sense of what the answer for me was. I believe that the chief reason most people have difficulty in reaching a decision is in the strength of their uncoordinated emotions. They have a canny sense of where their deepest life wants to go, of where they would find themselves inwardly commanded to go if they stopped resisting, but the focus of the desires with which they have identified themselves does not want to go that way, is afraid to go that way, demands things that simply do not fit in with going that way. So this focus of desires with which they have identified themselves, this mutinous self, resists, fights, argues, refuses, and runs for its life. And yet if, finally, in one way or another, all these desires and fears are brought to stillness and if in all the depths of one's being one is no longer afraid of anything whatever, and is no longer hanging on to anything or trying to get anything for oneself, not security, nor anyone's respect or love or companionship, not influence or name or one's own peace, if at last one is genuinely and to one's very depths able to accept and to rest in what one really is, then there is always only one thing that one should do. I never have known it to fail.

2. The second observation that I want to make is this. In these twenty-odd years, I have had to make decisions that cut into the very bone, not only of my own life, but of the lives of other people very near and dear to me. But I feel, as I look back, that not once in all these years have I made a decision in this way that I now have reason to regret.⁵ And this, I submit, is a severe test. Not, of course, that everything I did, say ten years ago, I should do

still: I haven't lived ten years for nothing. But taking into account the fact that none of us can escape himself, that each of us, if he begins at all, must begin where he is; taking into account my whole past that lay before any particular decision—the kind of ancestors, parents, and home that I had, the kind of schools that I had gone to and the books that I had read, the whole course of the experience that had made me what I was at that moment, I feel that through this means I have been describing, I got the next steps for the day and the morrow and each other morrow as it followed, by which I might most quickly slough off all the extraneous elements that I had picked up in my past, and most quickly and surely come to the freeing of what I really was. Not that I have arrived. I have not. But despite all the handicaps and limitations under which I have had to live, it has brought me so much that if I were to die now, I should feel that life had been good, an eminently rich experience of growth and fulfillment, and could call heartily for its repetition.

As for those to whom the way I went brought pain, I cannot be so sure. But I was not the only one who saw the spirit in my father and mother so broadening and deepening that the time came when it seemed that there was nothing that I should probably ever have to do that would take me beyond the reach of their love. And the person who perhaps suffered most under the course that I followed once came to me, years afterward, and said, "Bill, I thank God for everything you have put me through. I see now that the way you have gone has meant increased life for me just as surely as for yourself." All this of course helped greatly to sustain my faith in that which spoke within me.

Such an attitude must be understood or one can have no patience with it. Let us suppose, therefore, that I am at this moment confronted with the necessity of a decision, and try to take my reader into it with me.

If it be a problem involving some situation in society (such as education, the problem of the Machine, the differential birthrate, or the consequences of crossing people of very different races), then it behooves me to gain just as full and accurate a knowledge of all the relevant facts as I am capable of getting. For that which speaks within me in my deepest stillness is not something that "speaks out of the blue." It is, rather, like a lantern that is passed over the field of my knowledge, and what it will reveal will depend in part upon what I know. It is important, therefore, that I know much. To this end, I must enlist every body of human knowledge that bears on my problem—biology, anthropology, sociology, history, and the like.⁶ Also, with what critical faculty I have, I will undertake to analyze the situation in which I must act, pick it to pieces, grasp the relation of its parts, and single out the different ways by which I might go from where I am. But when it comes to the actual choice of the way I shall go, then I try to stop thinking altogether. My whole task then is narrowed down to an effort to be willing to go any way whatever. I try to put my emotions quite aside, to prevent any least fear or desire from putting any cast in my eye. I try to stand outside myself and to look at the situation as though I were another man. I seek to watch which way the current of life in me presses, as coldly as I might look to see which way the tide is flowing.

Thus I produce within my consciousness, as it were, a blank sheet for life to write what it will. This utter willingness to go any way whatever creates within me a vast stillness, that settles down into my very depths, and in that stillness there is that within me that draws very near and speaks to me. It is not a voice that I can hear with my outer ears, but it is more real

and more commanding than any voice I ever did hear with my outer ears. And what it says to me is no abstraction or generalization. It is not a word that is equally for everybody. It is not even a word that is equally for all other times in my own life. It is a word that is spoken *to me for that one moment*. And what it says is very concrete and explicit. Seeming to take into account all the actualities of the situation before me, my father, mother, wife, child, security, name, influence, everything, it says to me, 'N-o-w y-o-u d-o t-h-i-s.' And from that moment the whole question of whether life in me increases or decreases, rises in quality or falls, moves toward integration or toward dissipation and dispersion, depends upon whether or not I can be child enough to obey.

One may wonder what would ever be able to reduce a person to such openness, willingness, and obedience. I believe there is nothing that will prove equal to it except love. But I do not mean that soft suffocating thing that I might call lovingness. Love, for me, must have direction and edge. In this case, it is love for *quality of life*, which is as much quality of life for all men as it is for oneself, in serving which one feels that one rises above one's own personal self and identifies one's own life with *the highest good of the race*. For this one is willing to live on, or to perish. And to this love, this utter devotion to advance in the life of the race, one is ready to sacrifice one's neighbor with oneself.

And yet I do not claim, for what may speak within a man, that it is anything either absolute or infallible. For me it represents only the greatest wisdom about life that is capable of reaching his consciousness at any one time. I regard it as being, in effect at least, a synthesis of all his highest perceptive faculties. There is no way open to him by which he can improve on the sense of direction that he gets thus.

But, though I believe that this core of what I am is neither absolute nor infallible, nor a metaphysical God, nor even the voice of such a God, still I would undertake to give it as implicit acceptance and obedience as if it were, verily, an absolute and infallible God, simply because these "felt interior commands," as Whitman called them, represent the only firm and solid ground by which we can crawl out of the quicksand in which we were born. They are the only footsteps to the sureness of oneself that alone offers a rock, rising impregnable above the rushing waters of human existence, upon which we can build a house that will stand. He who trifles with himself is lost. He who is true to himself only when it is safe, respectable, expedient, effective, or reasonable to do so, will find sooner or later that life has left him to go to one who will be more faithful. The old seers, many of them, may have lacked the psychological understanding of themselves on which we are prone to pride ourselves today, but their instinct for life did not betray them. Possibly we have more understanding than they did, but we are certainly less alive. The very touch of most of us is death. They knew that what spoke and moved within them in the deepest stillness of their being was *Life*, and that whether or not you called it God, it was a jealous master. In our moment of deepest stillness is delivered to us what we must do if we want really to live. And really to live means to become ever *more* alive. One can never stand still. You advance or you recede. You become more sensitive or you begin to harden and dry up. And somehow the flow of sap is stopped, the electric current is broken, if a man departs by so much as a hair's breadth from what he is commanded to do. Thus certainly it always has been with me. Probably this is because the very spirit of the thing, the circuit itself, is one's *attitude toward* the interior command. If you accept it and trust and obey it, like a child or like a soldier

under orders, then you are one with it, and the force flows all through you. But if you doubt, and talk back, and argue, and require reasons, and seek to improve on the commands by taking counsel from worldly wisdom, then your very doubt and resistance break the circuit. All my experience confirms this.

Perhaps there is no way in which I can so make people understand with what literalness I mean every word that I am saying, as by an incident out of my own life.

It was Christmas time in the winter of 1924. I was living in a small, hardly weatherproof shanty in the backyard of a Polish fellow whose house I had helped to build. I knew that in Central Europe, as a result of the dire poverty in which the people had been left by the War, there were thousands, even of women and children, who had to walk the ice and snow barefooted. All about me, warmly clad people were thronging the stores to buy mostly superfluous Christmas presents, and on Sundays were gathering in the churches to talk about God, and love, and brotherhood. But all I could see was the rich man who feasted while Lazarus died of hunger at his back gate.

Yet I do not recall that I had made any conscious problem of what I should do about the situation. It came to the last Sunday before Christmas. I was in my shanty, with some strange restlessness upon me—some pain of inner compression, as from something swollen within me that wanted to be born. In vain I tried to read or write. At last I put all such things aside and gave myself over to an effort to be inwardly quiet enough to find out what it meant. And then in the inner stillness that finally ensued, and to my utter consternation, a voice in me said, "Take off your shoes, and walk barefoot to the center of Passaic [about a mile and a half], and there cry to the people in the name of love."

There was a long pause. And then I replied, "I cannot." And my mind was quick to furnish me with reasons why I could not. "My feet will freeze, and they will develop gangrene, so that I shall lose them. And just how will that help anyone?" And I saw my mother, who "never heard voices like these." I foresaw all the anguish such a step would cause her. And I said again, "I cannot do it." And I saw too the effect that such a step would have on people's confidence in me. And I said, "If I do this, people will think I am crazy, and they will no longer take me seriously in regard to anything." This step looked to me dangerously near the irrational, and I was anxious to prove myself, for all my extremes in some directions, essentially well-balanced. Probably hours passed, the voice commanding and I resisting and arguing. Until, at last, I came to what I believed my final answer: "No, I cannot. I will not."

And yet I was left heart sick with that heart sickness that always overtook me whenever I had not done what I had been commanded to do. And I soon discovered that the struggle was not over. I had to leave town to fight it out. It was bitter, and there was no quarter. After some days, I knew that this step I *must take, or spiritually I would die*. So far, at least from 1920 on, when confronted with a crisis like this, I had never yet refused to obey. And I felt that this time also I must obey, or I would break my contact with Life.

At last I saw that what I was commanded to do was nothing impossible. To take off my shoes and walk in the snow the mile and a half to the center of Passaic, there to cry to the people in the name of love, was perfectly possible if only I could rise above my fear of the

consequences. And presently it came over me that, the situation in the world being what it was, and I being the kind of man that I was, there was something in me that even wanted to do it. And, finally, I knew that I was going to do it.

On the afternoon of the last day before New Year's I went back to my shanty to do what I had been commanded. I took off my shoes and socks, stepped quietly out of my shanty door into the snow, and with my eyes fixed on the ground all the way, walked the one-and-a-half miles to the center of Passaic and there cried to the people in the name of love. Within a few minutes, before I was through speaking, I was arrested on a charge of insanity. I saw the New Year begin behind cell bars. The next morning, in a very quiet courtroom, a judge listened to what I had to say, and to a few friends who had quickly rallied in my defense. At last, though I explained that I *would* not put on my shoes, and why, the judge said: "This is a very unusual case. I dismiss it." And I returned, barefooted, to my shanty.

"Well! and what do you think you accomplished by doing all that?!" the efficiency-minded American will be sure to ask. That, however, was not the primary question with me then, and it is not now. There are things in life that are worthwhile even though they have no practical utility whatever. And this was a step that I never could have taken had I not been able to accept the possibility that there would be no effects at all: the whole thing *might be* as irrational as it then seemed. But, in fact, the Reason which, just then, I had to leave behind—one of the few times in my life when I have—finally overtook me to give, in the end, the blessing that it had withheld in the beginning. The step did have its effect, albeit a small one, even for the suffering people of Europe.

Yet I am quite willing to concede that the effects of primary consequence were those that took place in myself—and about these there is no question. Renan, as I recall, says somewhere in his *Life Of Jesus*, that no man shall come to complete freedom of soul until he has attained a supreme indifference to what men think of him. And this was the more necessary in me because I cared too much for the good opinion of my fellows. But it was more than this that had to go under foot before I could do such a thing. My concern for my mother had to step down from any first place, and the desire of reason to dominate my life, likewise; and no less my fear of physical suffering, of what might even prove physically disastrous. If ever a man is to become a whole, so that wherever he goes all of him goes, and whenever he hits, he hits with every bit of strength he has, it is necessary that there should come to be in him just one recognized master, and that every recalcitrant element in him, every potentially mutinous center, should either have been passed under the yoke and taught to obey or else been so caught up under the spell of the master that it voluntarily enlists. There cannot be two masters. And this task of *getting one master* recognized may be a bloody business. For every one of these intransigent elements is alive and resists subjugation as every living thing resists death. It will fight like a man, like a woman, like a child, like an animal. It fights to win, and it will win any way it can. It has no principles, no scruples, and no heart. It will attack, it will argue, it will plead, it will seduce—any way that will work. So that a man's "one-ing" is one of the hugest tasks that he ever essays, and the victory here the greatest that he ever can win. And perhaps my reader will now see, without my saying any more about it, that before I could do this thing that was required of me, a good many of the most dangerous centers of rebellion in me had to surrender—at least for this one round! When I took this step, I went a long way toward becoming an undivided whole. I was nearer

than I ever had been before to having *one center from which I took orders*. And by this alone, even though the step had accomplished *nothing* for the sufferers abroad, I believe it was entirely justified.

But this realization came wholly in retrospect. At that time at least, to have done such a thing for the sake of my own “one-ing” would have been impossible. A step had to be “unselfish” to be justified. I did not then have enough psychological insight to appreciate that no man *can* do anything whatever except for the sake of *some* kind of increase in his own life.⁷ I did not have large enough comprehension to see that there is a holy and hallowing selfishness (men have blessed and sanctioned it by calling it “God”) that is as far removed from all the petty meanness of what ordinarily passes for selfishness as is day from night, and which, for all its impulses originate in the individual, is yet bent upon blessing mankind and will pursue that end though it destroy the individual from whose heart it sprang. Nor did I then have the strength to shoulder the full responsibility of doing everything avowedly for the sake of that kind of selfishness, that high and holy, blessing and blessed, kind. I did not then dare say, “I do this because, from the core of my being, I was made to do it, and I want to do it; and I pronounce this necessity to be a holy necessity and this wanting a holy wanting.” No, at the time, I took the step as an act of supreme devotion to my God. It was not I who wanted to go barefoot—in the winter, in the snow—not, at least, in my ordinary consciousness. I shrank from it as I might have shrunk from strangling. It was God’s will, not mine. I was taking this step for one reason: if I did not, I should have to part company with all that for me was God. To keep him, I should have to give up what then seemed to be everything I had. The price was high, but I had paid it before—parted with what, at an earlier time, had seemed my all, and I had rejoiced in the eventual results. There had proved to be no sacrifice about it. All my “giving up” had come to be only a making of room for the real things. What came to me in consequence was far more than all that I had parted with. God was fast becoming all in all to me. I could no more turn from him than a plant can turn from the sun. So, once again, I let him have his way with me. I took off my shoes and walked barefoot to the center of Passaic.

And that night, as 1925 came in, I sang there in the Passaic jail as I never had sung before. Softly, to be sure, but from a heart that danced in purest joy. For my love of my God had been tested—as it were, at the point of a leveled gun, and I had not recanted. Back in 1920, when I had begun my Franciscan venture, I had put my hand in his and vowed that come what might I never would withdraw it. I would go wherever he might lead. I would never turn back. I would draw no line beyond which I should refuse to go. I would stop at nothing. Though he slew me, yet would I trust him. So I had told him. And what I had said I had meant. I had been tested before and had not failed. But this time the test had been much more severe, but *still* I hadn’t failed. No wonder that my God that night was the nearest thing in all the world. I can well understand how Jesus, unconsciously interpreting his experience, could call that which spoke within him his “Father,” or Kabir call it his “Beloved.” I can understand that all of a sudden they could feel that the universe was a home, a place one could feel unafraid in, a place long prepared, through a long absence, for their eventual return. I can understand that day and night were for them the heartbeat of their Beloved, and year after year his deep rhythmic breathing, and the changes of season but the changes of vesture in which he came to court their love. I can understand their feeling that there was within them no more division, and therefore no more sense of sin. They no

longer resisted their destiny, or attempted to argue with their God. At last there was no longer left any least vestige of a partition between "my will" and "thy will." "I and my Father are one." The hour of the Great Marriage had come. "Amor fati" had arrived. The nucleus of the spiral nebula had gathered all the trailing elements into itself and become a sun. It was the time of the great one-ing.

On its lower levels, then—that is, in its commoner manifestations—the mystical experience is a matter of a new sensitiveness in regard to values and therefore to life-direction. If this sensitiveness is followed it tends to lead to mystical experience in its higher manifestations, where it amounts to a new order of consciousness, and admits those who possess it to whole realms of meaning, of beauty, of value, which to those who lack it are utterly closed. Of this last, however, I shall wait to write when I present the psychological significance of the mystical experience.

In my next chapter, I will present the checks by which I believe it is important to test the soundness of one's inner leadings, partly to avoid going off at a tangent or wasting one's life up blind alleys, partly to avoid, just as much as possible, bringing needless suffering into the lives of others. In Chapter VII, I will first develop the higher levels of mystical experience as a matter of the evolution of mankind through a new order of consciousness, and then appraise the whole experience from the point of history and science, particularly of psychology.

1944, 1970.

¹ Harcourt, 1925. Prof. Leuba was Professor of Psychology at Bryn Mawr College.

² This is from the definition of "God" in the *Presbyterian Westminster Shorter Catechism*.

³ Miss Emily S. Hamblen said to me in February 1949: "There is no spiritual life without vision. And vision is not an imaginative picture: it is an opening up of the inner being."

⁴ This was written in late 1944.

⁵ By 1954, nearly ten years after this writing, perhaps I could not have made this generalization quite so sweeping.

⁶ Understandably, therefore, my life took a decidedly different direction after my years of study of anthropology, genetics, etc., than it had before.

⁷ This point of view is presented more fully in my *Toward The Rising Sun*, p. 68ff.

Chapter 6.

Handbook for Explorers.

In this chapter, continuing my examination of the mystical experience (which I have called an added faculty of perception), I wish to present, and to discuss, the checks by which one may undertake to reduce to a minimum the possibility of error in following one's Inner Light.

At a small meeting that I had near Boston in the late Thirties, there was present a professor of psychiatry in a nearby graduate school who was also a practicing psychiatrist on the staff of a large Boston hospital. Having heard what I had said in my talk, during the question-period that followed, he addressed me thus: "But *how* can you be *sure enough* to do such things? An intelligent, responsible, loving person simply cannot break into the lives of other people and cause them possibly disastrous suffering except in the service of some very high end. Don't you have some means designed to eliminate the possibility of self-deception or other error?"

I welcomed the question. For I certainly have always wished to avoid encouraging anyone in an attitude of irresponsibility, and I have had no respect for acting on a snap judgment when the deepest welfare and happiness of other people are involved. I suppose that any responsible person who really cares about those whose lives he affects will be forced by his very love to exhaust every resource for making sure. In any case, I myself, who for years had so many decisions of this kind to make, had gradually arrived at five distinct ways of making sure of the soundness of my sense of direction.

My first check on the soundness of our insights, one already mentioned, is a rational one. If we must act, in a given situation, it behooves us to get the most complete grasp possible of what the situation is. Let us attempt, therefore, to grasp it with our minds. Let us get before us every important pertinent fact. Every field of human research and experience that bears upon our problem should be called in. With this done, we undertake to analyze the situation in which we must act—to grasp the relations of its parts, to single out the possible ways in which we might move from the place where we are, and anticipate what will be the likely results of following each of these ways. In short, we will start by letting our reasoning minds take us just as far as they have it in them to take us.

But when I come to the actual making of my decision, I am frank to confess that, in spite of all this mental work in preparation, I then try to stop thinking altogether. My whole effort is to free myself from any preference for one way over any other way, to be utterly willing to go any way whatever.

This brings me to my second check, which I must present at some length, since for me it is of primary and cardinal importance. This check is inner stillness, a state free of emotion, in which neither fear nor desire disturbs one's utter willingness to go any way one's deepest life may want to go; in which, as one is able, one prevents any idea, any word, or any picture from crossing the field of one's consciousness. Thus one creates an utter emptiness, a total

blank, and profound silence, in which one waits until one's deepest life draws near and speaks.

This is not a state that can be reached easily or quickly. Many people trifle with the requirements, and seem to think that the first impulse that comes to them after only a few minutes of stillness must be "the will of God." This is more likely to be only a most superficial whim or a rationalized fear. It is necessary to point out that we can be still, and more still, and to stress the importance of becoming utterly still. It is only when we plumb, as it were, to the ocean floor of our being that we contact a current that moves with the utmost vastness, steadiness, and power.

It follows from the utter surrender of the ego, which abysmal stillness involves, that we must face the commands of our deepest life with the uttermost reverence, loyalty, and devotion, without any restrictions from convention, from moral code, or from concern for precedent or for consequence. We must have no preconceived ideas as to ways in which our life must *not* go. We must leave our deepest life to flow free. It is not for us to try to keep our conduct within the moral stockade of what is commonly considered "good." Our part is to take orders, not to give them. The "good" is usually one of the worst enemies of potentially superior men. There are times when they must break through its stockade, or climb over it, or even burn it down. Jesus dared flatly to contradict Moses and the Prophets, who were to his day what he is to ours, and declared it necessary to go beyond the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees. And Nietzsche challenged all higher men to "break up, break up the tables of the good and just," whose "good" must ever be "the greatest danger to the whole human future." To be "good" one must live by rules, and whoever lives by rules cannot escape being false to himself. That is why "the good" *must* be Pharisees. That is why the man who would find the way unto himself, that strait and narrow way, narrow as a razor's edge, which leadeth him out he knoweth not whither, save that it be to something unique and unprecedented, must in a very real sense simply close his eyes and trust blindly, knowing nothing about "good" or "bad," knowing nothing about whither he should go or should not go. He must hold himself firmly and steadfastly limp in the hands of that life-in-him-deeper-than-his-consciousness, which alone gives him *his* good and *his* evil, and which step by step, unfolds to him the way unto his full stature and the fulfillment of his lifework.

From what I have said, it must be evident that the purpose for which I turn to this second check to "make sure," is by no means what anxious "good" people would call to "make safe"—that is, to hold within bounds, to render innocuous, to keep socially acceptable. With all of that, I have nothing to do. One of the very things the inner stillness that I counsel is intended to *remove*, is every vestige of concern as to what people may call what you do. Forget it. This has nothing to do with life. I wish to avoid disturbing people needlessly, but I would set myself as free from any fear of hurting them as I would from any desire for their approval.

Hurting people "needlessly"—what is behind that word? This is behind it: I wish to avoid causing the pain to loved ones and friends that would result from my mistaking myself and going off at a tangent to what I really am. I must know what is *necessary* in my life, in the sense that it belongs to me, comes out of the core of what I really am, roots in the depths of my being as my fingernails root in the quick of my bone and blood. What I really am, I will

put off for no man—and for no woman. It is my nature to be gentle. Indeed, my gentleness has been my very peril. Often, I have felt that I could not stand the pain that it gave me to give pain to those I loved. But I know now that (without losing this tenderness, which will come out where it can come out *without violating one's deepest life*) one must have the will and the iron to be remorselessly honest. It is in relation to one's God that one must make oneself humble even to nothingness; and in relation to the "still small voice" that one must "become as a little child." "Humility hath ever the hardest skin," said Nietzsche. One must not bilk the inner must. If one has *much* of a must, then I suppose that one cannot. Blessed is he who can not only recognize his fate, but can also, and even, love it!

My deepest life, the core of my being, what I really am. What is this? How am I to recognize it? *This* it is, above all else, that I must make sure of. For this making sure is the very heart of all meaningful human existence. But *how* can I make sure?

The core of my being manifests itself as my own deepest desire. I have become convinced that what religious people have long called God (insofar as it is, or ever has been, a matter of *experience*, and looked at through the eyes of psychology) is really each man's own life at its deepest; and what they have long called the will of God is actually what each man himself wants most. This calls for further definition. I mean *that* wanting in a man for the sake of which he is willing to let every other wanting go unsatisfied. If necessary, in order to have the highest, and holiest, and most unappeasable wanting in him satisfied, he is willing to go cold and hungry, unloved and unaccompanied, despised and ignored. People on every hand vaunt themselves on their monotheism, and regard as benighted and inferior those who believe in many gods. But it is only their profession and self-delusion that they believe in one God. The fact is, one has as many gods as one has desires. Most people satisfy these different conflicting desires, one after the other, each getting its turn, like a little boy going the rounds of the side shows at a circus. The only man who really has one god is the man who has one dominating ruling desire, who knows what that desire is, and who has subordinated to that desire every other desire in his make-up. But where can you find a man today who has only one desire?

Yes, what they have long called the will of God for a man is really what that man himself wants most. But it is not every man who *an really* say "I want," for he has no "I" worthy the name. His "I" is but a congeries and a welter of desires. He has no "I" in the sense of one primary, central, and ruling desire. But where a man does have such an "I" it is better, in my judgment, because more honest, more self-understanding, and more responsible, to say "I will," than to say "God wills." But in its content and direction the will will be exactly the same whether one avow it as one's own or attribute it to God. Today the herd virtues alone are holy. Traditional religion has made our "I" ashamed of itself. Everywhere it has crawled off to the edge of the camp with its tail between its legs, like a whipped dog, and sits there cowed and desolate. It must come sneaking into the world, and can "have face" only in the disguise of service to the crowd, helping others, and doing good. Yet the prevalent thinking about "unselfishness" is so shallow and sentimental that it is important to declare flatly, and again and again, that a purely unselfish act is a psychological impossibility. In one way or another, all actions are selfish.

I have made this statement before. As I fancy it may seem to fly in the very face of many people's best understanding of life, I must pause to try to make clear what I mean.

The ego, as I conceive it, is the life of the individual viewed as something apart from every other person or thing in the universe, and the needs and desires of which can be satisfied at the expense of other life. Now, that the desires of this ego can be denied, for one reason or another and to one end or another, I readily allow; and also that we need some word with which to cover this denial. The trouble, with using the word "unselfish" to cover it, is that it implies that the person who makes the denial gets nothing out of it and that it is done for the sake of something not himself. It provides ground for a feeling of virtue, one of the most corrupt and corrupting things in the world. It provides ground also for a feeling of self-sacrifice. Whereas, all the time, the fact is that, though one may have sacrificed one's ego (or that *part* of one's total and complete self thus far identified with one's ego), one has not at all sacrificed to some alien taskmaster, or in the name of some abstract virtue, or "for the sake of others." One has only sacrificed one side of one's own life to another side, a lower to a higher, a small closed-in, blind self to a larger, maturing, expanded self, which by love or by loyalty or by common purpose may have come to include other persons, and groups of people, or even all people and the whole universe. One does not give up one's ego "for others," but only to the desires of *one's own expanded self*, which one has *identified* with others. One has only emptied one's house of its rubbish to make room for real living. One has only denied old desires and impulses that, for all they were long cherished and thought to be essential to life itself, now prove to be but hobbles, which must be thrown off so that one's hands and feet may be free to do what one wants most to do. Viewed thus, there is no ground left for any feeling either of virtue or of sacrifice. From any balanced point of view there is no sacrifice about it. There are, most certainly, acts that are a denial of the little, narrow, in-turning, wholly self-absorbed, and always grabbing and taking ego. But to use the word "unselfish" for this is to *identify* our *life* with this *meanness*, and to obscure, if not wholly to conceal, the fact that the life we have realized through denying this meanness is our own, and that in yielding up our ego to the demands of our higher life we really get out of it far more than we give up. And above all, it is important never to forget that the motive for this giving up is always our desire for this increase in our own life. Otherwise, what in the world would there be to move us to it?

An illustration may serve to make this clearer. Perhaps as you have been reading my words, there has flashed through your mind the picture of a mother who, after shipwreck, has strapped her child fast to a life belt, which will not support them both, and pushed off to go down in the dark, so that her child may live. And triumphantly you may exclaim, "Does not *she* prove that one can be unselfish?" I do not think so, except in the sense that I have defined above. And I have given my reasons for why, to my mind, to call such an act "unselfish" is open to objection. Do you suppose that the mother gains nothing for herself in laying down her life for her child? Do we not know that her heart must have sung within her as she went down? Was she not satisfying her love, and her maternal instinct, the deepest instinct in her? Had not her love triumphed even over her fear of death? With her final breath may she not have brought her life to the very apex of a perfect fulfillment of her lifelong ideal of motherhood? Is it not obvious that, under the circumstances in which she was caught, there was no satisfaction left her that could be so exquisite, so infinitely sweet and pure? In the light of eternity, in which time is not, may she not have more really lived in

that one moment than in all the preceding years of her existence? And the same is true of the martyr. It was true of Jesus on the cross. Things being as they were, he *would* not have come down. The Pharisees, to be sure, had their reward; but he had his also. And he would never have set his face to go to Jerusalem if he had not been pretty sure of it. Do we not know that just to be able to look oneself full in the face may be enough to make it worthwhile to go to death?

No, I say again, to come back to the point where we digressed, not one of us can do *anything* except for the sake of *some* kind of gain to himself. It may be on a high plane or on a low, but it must be on some plane—on whatever plane we conceive it. To be otherwise would be to have lost one's very *instinct for life*, and the very means by which alone life could be maintained. The one thing needful is that man's selfishness should be the core of him incarnate, that it should be *what he really is*—in a look, a word, a movement of the finger, an act. Let only his *innermost self* be in his deed—as a mother is in her child—to use Nietzsche's simile, and then it will be perfect, no matter what it may be as judged by some moral code of conduct.

And indeed, before men have reached any such integration and even as a necessary means thereto, I think that they should learn to do what they really want and not what they have been taught they ought to want. Even though the actions seem ill-advised or extreme, still I should say, better these than a more rational, prudent, or effective act that is not one's own, that is a pretense, done with subservience, for ulterior ends. For so long as you do what you really want, you keep alive the impulses close to your innermost being, those that have potential significance for the growth of personality and for the development of creative power; whereas, when you subordinate them to your ideas of what is consistent or sensible, or even to some ideal or to duty or to the requirements of a moral code, whether that be the Ten Commandments or the "five little rules" that Tolstoy made of the Sermon on the Mount, you foster the impulses to please, to avoid conflict, to seek safety, the impulses that lack significance, that make people into sheep. At the same time, you take out of the impulses from which an integrity might be knit, not only the kick but the leap. They get stiff in the joints from sitting too long in unnatural forced positions. They grow weak and slow in their reflexes, and their muscles become soft and flabby from being kept too long out of use. Your impulses are becoming dead, and as they become dead, you become dead. These impulses are the only thing we have that can ever make us *move* in any direction. The task, ultimately, is not at all the suppression of desire, but rather the coordination of our desires, the subordination of all other desires to one central dominant and regnant desire. And we shall find out faster what this is by doing what we really want to do than by burying all this body of living, leaping desire under conformity to the demands of society. Even to be able to distinguish what we want more from what we want less, which desires make for increase of life and which for its thinning, weakening and sullyng, it is necessary for us to be able to subject our wanting to the test of experience—that is, to *do* what we want to do. Blake declared, in his "Proverbs of Hell," "If a fool would persist in his folly, he would become wise." And again, "The road to excess leads to the palace of wisdom." And yet again, "Sooner murder an infant in its cradle than nurse unacted desires." For the infant in the cradle of our souls is exactly what we do murder when we suppress our really vital impulses. If there be error in our impulses, we must be able, as it were, to give it a body by putting our error into action, before we can see it and recognize it for what it is, before we can realize

that it *is* error, and cast it off. The machine of our mind, with its logic and rules, can plane a person straight and smooth and efficient, but for beauty, for aliveness, for power to create, the better man is he whom no machine has been allowed thus to “improve,” but who has *grown*, as a tree grows, with crooks of its own, and unexpected turns and twists, by which you can know it even at a distance. “Improvement makes straight roads; but the crooked roads without improvement are roads of Genius” (William Blake).

“I should do what I want to do. But what *do* I want?”

Most people do not know very definitely or surely. Indeed, I have come to believe that the great majority of men are not capable of knowing. They are not capable of bearing the burden of their own integrity, and apart from this no man shall ever know. They do not dare trust themselves. They are afraid to be different. They cannot stand alone. They are happiest when they can feel the fur of another against their own. Their instincts are pre-eminently those of the sheep. The only way *they* can know is one given them from outside. They must be told. It is people of this sort who, regardless of their social position, constitute the ever-sucking abyss of unthinking, unaspiring, undifferentiated mass-man. For them, the Ten Commandments, or other codified standards and rules of conduct, set up by tradition and enforced by authority, are absolutely necessary. They are necessary for all men—probably the vast majority—who are not able to find a ruler within themselves and to bring every impulse of their nature under his sway. *He who cannot rule himself shall accept the rule of another.* This is to be remembered as something understood behind all that I say. I am not setting aside rules of conduct for everybody: by no means. My words are really addressed only to those who have it in them to find out what it is they really want and to bring their whole life into an ordered harmony under its direction.

And even these, when a newly awakened discontent first thrusts upon them the question of what it is they really want, are by no means sure. Probably most people, who had never given the matter much thought, would assume that to know what one wants is an easy thing. But I am convinced that it is *one of the subtlest, costliest, and last things we ever learn, and one of the rarest things among men.* We think that we know what we want. “I’d like lots of money”; “I’d like to have people admire me”; “I’d like to win the love of this woman”; “I’d like to be looked to as a leader toward a better world.” I’d like, I’d like, I’d like. But would we, now? And how much would we? Might we not find that the gratification of any one of these desires, or even of all of them and of many others like them, would leave us with an emptiness and an ache still in our hearts? Are we not, all of us—that is, all of us who have been awakened to a hunger and a thirst, even though we know not yet for what—like honey bees in search of the perfect nectar, and going from flower to flower in eager quest of it? And into this flower and into that one we plunge our proboscis deep, and suck out all the nectar it holds, and—it does not satisfy. So that we go on to another flower, to do the same thing. And we do it again, and again, and again. Most people spend all their days doing it, and die without ever having caught more than a suggestion of a taste of what they were really looking for. Is there not *some* way in which people can avoid wasting most of their lives in following desires that do not satisfy them, that do not get them anywhere?

It was precisely to meet this question that I started, some way back, to speak of the value of inner stillness as a means of making sure what our deepest life would do in the face of any

actual situation. It seems that once the desires in us stop their hullabaloo and clamor and no longer strain each to get ahead of the rest, and stand beside one another quietly, each in his own place, it is perfectly easy to see which stands first and tallest, the intended captain of the crew.

The whole heart of the matter is in this becoming still. It is of absolutely primary importance that one becomes really, completely, and profoundly still. One must become at last incapable of deceiving oneself about it, and to this end must have acquired means by which to detect any least move *toward* self-deception, and to avoid every danger of accepting as the *full* state of stillness, with its complete yielding up of every sort of will to determine the outcome, what is really but some *approach* thereto.

Out of long experience at trying to be still, commonly under conditions that made the stilling very difficult to attain, I discovered certain signs that will infallibly reveal to oneself that one is *not still yet*—that the stilling has to be carried yet further.

Let me try to make clear what these signs are.

If into the inner field that one is trying to make (and to keep) blank, empty, will-less, there comes any detectable pulling, holding, or fearing, one can then know of a surety that one's little self has not yet put aside its willing. It is still fighting to maintain itself. Its active presence is revealed in its subtle effort to get us onto one path rather than another; in its holding onto some position in the world or some special relationship with some person; or in its shrinking from certain foreseeable consequences of going one way rather than another. Once we have become entirely still, there is *no* pulling, no holding, and no fearing.

And yet again. The very heart of the difficulty of the most spiritually difficult decisions consists in the fact that our own personal desires are very deeply involved. There are things that we want—desperately, and there are things that we no less desperately wish to avoid. Every one of these, in every manner conceivable, strives as long as it can to get its way. And if at last our Deepest Life deigns to speak to us, and says to us, "Now you must do this," or "Go here" or "Go there," then our personal desires, insofar as they have not been really and completely silenced, will show relief and pleasure if the way commanded be such as to make possible their satisfaction, or wince and shrink and balk if the way commanded shuts them out. Thereby they reveal not only their presence but their continued active striving, and they prove to us that we have not yet reached the stillness of that profound reverence and that utter readiness to obey in which alone we can be most certain that what speaks within us is the voice of what we really are—most truly, most deeply, most ineluctably. But if, at such times, there is no least show either of gratification or of resistance, if all the impulses and faculties within us are so stilled that the words of the Command come to us as though we had no notion of what they meant, or as if they were addressed to some other man and not to us at all, so that they are received without any movement within us, whether for or against, then it may be assumed with reasonable confidence that we have at last become still enough to be spoken to, and that what speaks to us now is indeed the Voice of our Deepest Life.

Of all the means of making sure that I know, I consider this the most valuable—once a man has learned *how* to become still, and how he feels when he *is* still. I believe that this stillness can be counted upon to bring a man the soundest, the most revealing, and steadiest light upon the situation before him that is then capable of reaching his consciousness. It is not absolute, and probably it is not infallible, and yet there is one respect (and that of the utmost importance for life) in which, indeed, I am profoundly certain that this means of finding one's way will not fail a man. *If he brings himself to that depth of inner stillness in which he is utterly willing to go any/any/whatever*, then he may depend upon it that he will be given the next steps, for each day as it comes, by which he can most certainly and most quickly come to the knowing and the freeing of his deepest life. He may then feel sure not that his course will have social approval, or cause no one pain, or bring him security (it may rather bring him death; and death in order to advance quality of life among men is one of the things for which his utter willingness will have made him ready), but sure rather that his course is *necessary* for him. It belongs to him ineluctably. It comes out of him as oak leaves come out of an oak tree. It is what is absolutely required of him if that life, which is the core of him, is ever to come to fulfillment. It is what he must do or go to pieces. It is something he cannot give up or evade without surrendering the very meaning of his existence. To this, he must be true though he die for it. To this, he must be true, though he make someone else die for it. But if he does make someone else suffer, it will not be for the sake of some whim of his, or because he is "having his fling," everybody else be damned, or because he fails to see the suffering he causes and does not care—not at all; but only that, though he love his neighbor as himself, more than these he loves his hope of a new quality of life among men (which surely can never come except out of men of integrity), and to that end sacrifices his neighbor as he already has sacrificed himself.

I can cover more quickly my last three checks on the soundness of our insights. They all relate to experience of one sort or another. And I would remind my reader that it is from experience that human beings have learned everything they know. No divine voice has spoken out of the sky, and no divine finger has written on any tables of stone. The Ten Commandments, like the *Laus of Manu*, like every other set of moral rules, are a human crystallization of human experience. But this is not to disparage the human. Rather is it to exalt it. The *divine* is *within man*.

My third check, then, is the experience of other people whose insight we have found reason to trust. They may be older people—in any case, people of sincerity, and depth and elevation of spirit, and if possible, people who have known us long and intimately, people who know our weaknesses, who know the ways in which we are likely to try to fool ourselves. Let us go to them and lay before them our whole situation, freely and frankly. Say to them, "Here is my problem. In all the moments of my deepest stillness, the moments I instinctively recognize as my high moments, I always see this course as its answer. At such times, without any variation, I always find myself inwardly commanded to do thus or so. How does it seem to you?" And if, with the whole situation before them, and knowing us as well as they do, we find that they all agree with us that this or that would represent the truest and wisest course in the situation, then we may feel free to go ahead and follow what we believe to be our deepest impulse. But if there is even one who feels that in so doing we should be altogether unjustified and making a serious mistake, then we must return to our effort to open ourselves to further light. We must try to see ourselves and our situation as our critic sees it,

try to catch ourselves in the weakness that he suspects in us, in some subtle rationalization or in the clutch of an unrecognized fear or desire. But above all we must strive to become even more still than ever before, in the hope that in such deeper stillness there may be revealed to us a course truer to our deepest life. But if, come at it as we may, in all the moments that we instinctively recognize as our highest moments, we always see it the same way and always find ourselves commanded to do the same thing, then at last, even though in doing so we are unsupported by any human being on Earth, we must obey our still small voice. For this is our final authority, and our resort to our friends is in no sense to put their counsel ahead of this, but only to guard ourselves against mistaking something else for the real thing.

My fourth check is the experience of the race in the form of its greatest seers. These seers are like men who have been to the spring for whose waters we thirst. Inevitably, therefore, we shall seek them out and in effect say to them, "How did you get to the spring? What did you have to go through? What did the water taste like? Did you put up any signposts along the way? Aren't there some landmarks by which I can tell whether or not I am on the path that leads to my goal?"

Each one for himself must find those who can be guides and *inspirers* to him. Birds of a feather *should* flock together. But everything depends upon what kind of feather each man has. And that waits primarily upon his own recognition. But in any case, as he finds those who belong to him and to whom he belongs, it is very important that he should get to know these men well. Let him not trifle with them. If they are great enough to be his guides and inspirers, they are great enough to deserve his reverence and his closest study. Let him read all that they wrote, and not only all that they said, but also what they did about it, for a man's life is an exceedingly significant commentary on his teaching. Let him undertake as far as possible to live with such men, taking them into his thinking, his reading, his work, his play, even into his sleep. Let him search them thoroughly, holding them up in the white light of his soul, to see what they look like then; and turning their white light on his own insights, to find out how these insights stand up in it. No, *not*—I say in this case also—to substitute the authority of their experience for that of his own, but to serve as a mirror in which he may catch the lineaments of his own innermost countenance, and as an acid by which to test what in him is false and dross and what is the pure gold and his truest self. So that the light he finally gives himself to follow may be the beacon of the true lighthouse of his soul.

And my last check is one's own experience. The experience of trusted friends; the experience of the race in the person of its greatest seers; and—one's own experience. No matter which way one goes in life, one sows seed. And after a time, whether it be months or years, this seed comes up and bears fruit. And "by their fruit ye shall know them." And if, as we taste of the fruit of what we have done, we find that it tastes bitter in our mouths; or if, as we watch others eat of the fruit, we see them making very wry faces over it, or later turning sick and perhaps even dying, then we shall have to question whether there was not something wrong with that inner quiet of ours that it could ever have led to such results as these. We must try, in the light of this experience, to see wherein some "larcenous craving," some "sickly selfishness" theretofore unrecognized, had put a cast in our eye so that we failed to see straight and whole. That thus, as we come to face other decisions in the future, we may avoid repeating our mistake.

In short, when the results of our course have made it evident that we have been in error, we must be honest enough and fearless enough to say so, and to show it openly by correcting our course by the lessons of our own experience.

These are my five checks. And what others anyone could have for making sure, I do not know, and what other ways anyone should need, I cannot see. Absolute certainty that one is right, one can never have; and in the gravest crisis, when everything is at stake not only for us but for others in some way dependent upon us, it is our ultimate agony that *there is no proof*, that an element of lingering uncertainty must remain, that to the end our act must be our gamble, that whether we like it or not, if we are to live at all we must live by faith, and stake the lives of our loved ones with our own.

There is no other way. We must live by our own certainty or by another's. So long as we live by another's, we must remain his satellite and his slave. If we would ever become free men, if we would have a light to shine from within ourselves like the sun, and create like a god, then there is no help for us but to stake everything on a certainty that is our own. And all that my five checks are intended for is to provide a means of making that certainty as certain as possible.

My reader may be wondering whether I cannot designate the way a man must follow if he would come to such an inner experience as I have been talking about, and prescribe some practical methods or procedure by which it may be induced.

In answer to the first I think that I could hardly do better than to refer him to my book *Toward The Rising Sun*, and in particular to Chapter II entitled "The Way to One's Spring." That book is the distilled essence of my costliest experience over a period of some fifteen or twenty years. Anything that I may undertake to say now will have to be more or less a repetition of what I have already said there. Yet it seems best that I should at least throw up a skeletal bridge for this part of our journey together, so that my reader may be able to continue without interruption.

There is no *external* way to go that one man can set down for another. He who even attempts this invades that other man's holy of holies. The way that each man should go must come out of himself. His own soul has its sense of what he must do and what he must stop doing if he is to live, even as the kernel in an acorn has. Yet in an *inner* sense, there are two things upon which *all* approach to deep spiritual experience depends.

The first of these is hunger. Let a man beware (as I think Emerson says somewhere) what he sets his heart upon, for he may be certain that it will come to him. Our great loves become a molding thumb gradually shaping our whole life into the image of our desire. We become *like* what we *love most*. If therefore a man is seeking with desperateness to know the way he should go, he cannot fail to find it. Then will he become like a man who has been in the desert three days without drink, and who then, though he see gold or diamonds on the sand, will *not* see them or care about them until first he has found water. He becomes like the rainbird of India which, though it might quench its thirst on wayside puddles or brackish cisterns, will *die* rather than drink of anything but water fresh from the skies. Then everything in him becomes on edge for *one* thing. No matter where he goes or what he does,

underneath all his going and doing, there is that within him which has its feelers out in every direction for the word, the book, the person, the experience, that will give him what he feels he must find or die. To the fixed intent of such a man the darkness must finally yield, and what he needs to see he will see, and what he must find in order to live, he will find. So sure do I often feel that spiritual hunger alone is enough, that I wonder whether anything else need be said. Where a man's longing is sufficiently intense, though he must go through all Earth, hell and heaven, or have fairly to create it, what he needs will come to him without fail.

But there is one other thing that I will mention, though it is inevitable where there is such intensity. And that is trueness. Under the impulse to be true, a man constantly drives toward action. He is ever trying to *do* what he most sincerely thinks and feels. And thus he is constantly subjecting his innermost impulse or strongest conviction to the test of experience. And this experience sifts the true from the false. Let a man be mystical or not, but whatever he be, let him keep his feet upon the earth and constantly deal with the actual. Let him only stop the mere wishing, the theorizing, the talking and the writing that curse our reason-ridden generation, and begin resolutely to do what he most deeply believes, and sooner or later he will plant his feet on firm ground, and get his bearings, and find his star and his own stride and begin to get out of the woods and up onto the slopes that lead to the mountaintops. I agree entirely with Vivekannanda, that if only a man be sincere (and, of course, is genuinely *seeking*), he may start out in any direction whatever and he will not fail at last to find the path that is his own. It may be that his true course lies, as it were, straight north, and yet that the best light he is able to get now, because of the conditioning of his past, points him straight south. But if only he is not deterred from playing squarely with his own honest conviction and does today the best he knows today and goes south, the resulting experience will furnish a corrective by which his steps will be veered, as time goes by, more and more into the north. But, on the other hand, there is nothing under the sun more certain than that, if a man trifles with himself, he shall never know any profound certainty at all. Even the capacity that he once had, for making certain of his values, his goals, his course, will have become atrophied and unreliable. He will be, verily, like a ship without home port or even a compass or a rudder.

So much for the *inner* way a man must follow to find real life.

The other question, that in regard to methods, I can dispose of rather briefly. In general I do not have, and never have had, very much use for methods. To be sure, for a good many years, ending perhaps about the time I came to the farm in 1932 (when my skepticism was in full swing), I made it a rule to spend one to two hours a day "in quiet," and I was quite particular about such things as time, place, circumstances, position, and the like. But I was never instructed in methods of meditation by a yogi or other advanced mystic, and I suspect that it may be physically dangerous for an uninitiated person to experiment with such disciplines, without knowledge of how to adjust them to his specific make-up, experience, and condition. Also, I am loath to give space in these pages to a subject which, for many of my readers, may lack interest; and whatever I might have learned about these things, I should rather impart individually to those whom I know to be not only interested but very deeply in earnest. And even in the case of these, it may depend very much upon temperament whether any word about methods would be in order.

Some of the most mystical people I have known had no routine or methods. It would seem that William Blake, certainly one of the great mystics, had none. And if it happens to be one's nature to approach life as a lover and a poet, thought of methods may even prove offensive. Often those who have resorted to methods have made me think of one who would *pry open* the hand of his God. And if there be in or behind the use of methods any straining, any anxiousness, or desire to possess, this spirit will stand squarely in the way of what one seeks. Methods should be for no more than to make oneself open, to make oneself ready, to increase one's capacity to receive: there must be, neither in the use of them nor at any other time, the slightest effort to get. It has ever been my own experience that if I approached life with my heart entirely open, like a beggar with his bowl quite empty, asking for nothing, finding nothing itself precious if that were life's gift to me for the time, then what I really needed came to me when I needed it. So I have ever sought not to be impatient, or anxious, or afraid, but only to keep myself very open, and to wait, in sure quiet faith that everything necessary for my life would come to me as I needed it and as I was ready for it. But often it was not easy thus to wait, and during long days of darkness I used to find much comfort in the lines from Tagore's *Gitanjali* that run:

If thou speakest not I will fill my heart with thy silence and endure it.
I will keep still and wait like the night with starry vigil and its head bent low with patience.
The morning will surely come, the darkness will vanish, and thy voice pour down in golden streams breaking through the sky. Then thy words will take wing in songs from every one of my birds' nests, and thy melodies will break forth in flowers in all my forest groves.¹

It has been a long time since I daily spent an hour or two "in quiet." To be sure, it is my practice to resort to a period of inner stillness (perhaps extended over weeks) if I have a decision of moment to make, or perhaps during a period of spiritual malaise, but not in a long time have I had any regular routine of meditation. For thirty or forty years, I have been very largely absorbed in the pursuit of scientific and historical realities. But right now, in the year 1970, and at the age of 78, I am feeling a growing need and desire to renew and to deepen my exploration of the world that only the mystic can enter. And a daily period in which one turned one's attention and one's ear inward, should help.

On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that no regimen of "quiet" is any end in itself. One of the objects that it is designed to secure is a still place within, which one can keep no matter where one goes or what one does. At any time, under any circumstances, one should be able to pause for a moment and turn one's ear inward, as it were, to listen for the inner behest. And once one has so established this inner sanctum that it is always there for one to refer and to guide one's least move or word, there is that much the less need for any regular time of quiet.

And then, and fully as important as any regimen, it seems to me, is one's sensitiveness to the approach of one's moments of wistfulness and spiritual outreach, the moments when one's deepest life, the "Son of man," the "Bridegroom," one's expected lover (to use Jesus imagery), draweth nigh. These moments of wistfulness and spiritual outreach are commonly signs of the approach of some important new realization about one's own integrity, about the course that one should follow in relation to another person, or to the world, or about the meaning of life. And everything may depend upon what one does at such times. If one has

learned wisdom, or if one has the instinct that comes with intense hunger, then one will make any break that may be necessary to get alone, to lay oneself utterly open to what this hour may bring forth. Seek solitude as an animal seeks to be alone when it is about to give birth—for you also are pregnant, and you must know when your hour is at hand, and must seek the conditions under which the new life long unfolding within you may be safely born. Likely he who is sensitive enough, and strong enough, at such times to break loose from any engagement and from all the demands that society may have laid upon him, will find that such practice is quite enough without any regimen.

And finally, I don't like the thought of being like a horse in harness, or even in halter. I am suspicious of any regimen that makes people too *constantly* serious, too evidently shaped, groomed, disciplined, strait-jacketed by the conscious mind. I don't like people stiff in the joints. If they can't laugh, and laugh until it hurts, there's something wrong with them. And if they can't play, and dance on the green, and take wing like a bird and soar over vast abysses, there's something wrong with them. There must be freedom to act on impulse, to the quick flush of joy, on each fresh eager perception. I am for any regimen that can help people to be more spontaneous, more natural, more unself-conscious. But I should look upon any other kind as a horse eyes a bit. Ultimately, I'm not the least concerned about any regimen, but only about life, that it may become ever more beautiful, more strong, and more exalted.

In the next chapter, I shall consider the significance of the mystical experience in its higher reaches—as a new order of consciousness and as an aspect of human evolution. And, finally, I shall appraise it from the point of view of psychology, and examine the position in which it stands in relation to modern science in general.

1945, 1970.

¹ Rabindranath Tagore—*Gitanjali*, Macmillan, 1920, p. 15f.

Chapter 7.

The Added Faculty of Perception in the Light of Psychology and History.

In the last two chapters, I have dwelt on the mystical experience largely in its practical aspects, as though it were of value chiefly for its help in getting one's bearings and finding one's way through tangled undergrowth. Probably this was sound, however, partly because it is with such that I think the experience of the mystical most commonly begins, and partly because my own experience of the mystical has so largely been one of getting my inner life satisfactorily geared to the actualities of existence. But men have gone to the mystical for far more than light on their daily path. In that long, slow, deep-breathing stillness in which their consciousness is crossed by no word and by no picture, which is often called contemplation, they have opened themselves to, and have received, a light that illuminated every aspect of life, and so revolutionized their feeling toward themselves, toward mankind, and indeed toward the entire universe, that there is perhaps good ground for believing that thereby they had come into a *new order of perception or consciousness*. It is to the mystical in this aspect that I now wish to turn.

In 1901, some three generations ago, Dr. Richard Maurice Bucke published a psychological interpretation of the mystical experience¹ that has always seemed to me essentially sound even from a rationalistic point of view, but which, so far as I know, was entirely ignored by such scientific critics of mysticism as Professors James H. Leuba and Knight Dunlap.² Yet Bucke was himself not only a great admirer and close friend of Walt Whitman, one of the outstanding mystics, and indeed had one rather profound mystical experience of his own, but also was declared by H. B. Binns, one of Whitman's chief biographers, to have had exceptional endowments as well as professional experience for psychological understanding. Moreover, his book received the hearty endorsement of William James, then probably the foremost psychologist in America, who, in a letter to Bucke, wrote: "I believe you have brought this kind of consciousness 'home' to the attention of students of human nature in a way so definite and inescapable that it will be impossible henceforward to overlook it, or ignore it, or pooh-pooh it entirely away . . . your book is . . . an addition to psychology of first-rate importance." Even more significant was the fact that P. D. Ouspensky in his *Tertium Organum* (Knopf, 1922), in spite of some trenchant criticism (p. 321 ff.), gives Bucke's thesis his very evident endorsement and takes ten pages of his own book, in small type (pp. 310-320), to quote enough of Bucke to make it clear what the gist of his thesis was.

Bucke's thesis is essentially simple, and it is contained in the first eighty pages of his book. The rest of its nearly four hundred pages consists of material taken from the records of the lives and writings of outstanding mystics to support and illustrate its thesis. The mystics thus chosen for examination are chiefly Buddha, Jesus, Plotinus, Mohammed, Dante, the author of "Shakespeare," Boehme, Whitman, and Edward Carpenter—with a much longer list of such "lesser, imperfect, or doubtful instances" as Isaiah, Socrates, Spinoza, Wordsworth, Emerson, Thoreau, Tennyson, and Ramakrishna. It is Bucke's thesis that for at least some thousands of years, now, there has been going on in man and in man's prehuman

progenitors, an evolution of consciousness. This process began with simple consciousness, which is mere awareness, without any ability to turn one's eye in on oneself and to know the knower as something apart from the thing known. Roughly this may be taken as the kind of consciousness possessed by our pre-human ancestors for many hundreds of thousands of years, and still possessed by, say, "the upper half of the animal kingdom."

Then the time came when life, no longer able to maintain and extend itself satisfactorily in the individuals that possessed mere *simple* consciousness, broke through onto a higher level and appeared as self-consciousness, which, on the whole, is the mark of human life to this day. It is probably safe to assume, for reasons that Bucke gives, that this kind of consciousness appeared first in those individuals living on the plane of simple consciousness that had reached the highest development possible within the limits of simple consciousness, and at that stage in their individual development when they had come to the apex of their powers. Then takes place that leap to self-consciousness that "might well impress us as being as immense, as miraculous, and as divine as that from the inorganic to the organic" or "from the unconscious to the conscious" (Bucke, *op. cit.*, p. 20). And then gradually, over a long period of time, this new order of consciousness, namely self-consciousness, spread, until it was no longer the possession of only scattered individuals but became universal, the earmark of mankind, so that not to be self-conscious in some degree is not to be human.

In this kind of consciousness, the individual has lost the sense of oneness within himself and with everything about him that distinguishes simple consciousness. He is not only able to know himself as knower, apart from the thing he knows, but he may become fairly obsessed with the terrifying aloneness in which this dichotomy of his consciousness lands him. He seems a kind of Robinson Crusoe, hopelessly marooned on an isle eternally apart from all the rest of creation—out there, all that he knows and loves; and here, himself; and between, a bottomless and bridgeless abyss. Even in the deepest, most passionate love, the lover never quite *becomes* the one he loves.

It is only in consciousness of this kind that man experiences the division within himself that provides the foundation for the moral sense of right and wrong, or becomes hounded by a fear of death. The sub-human does not have it. Neither, as we shall see, does the super-human. It is only man in the in-between stage who is racked and bedeviled by it.

But—and this is Bucke's point—our present kind of consciousness is only a half-way station on the way to consciousness in a different and higher form. Self-consciousness is consciousness-in-transition, consciousness on its way to becoming what Bucke called "cosmic consciousness." Here, he says, without losing the types of awareness that mark the lower orders of consciousness, not by the course of a circle but by that of a spiral, a man regains that sense of unity within himself and with the world about him which his ancestors lost when they became self-conscious. Regardless of what the universe may actually *be*, he now perceives it as (it makes upon him the *impression* of) varying manifestations of one underlying reality. He *perceives* it "to consist not of dead matter governed by unconscious, rigid, and unintending law" but, on the contrary, to be "entirely immaterial, entirely spiritual, and entirely alive" (Bucke, *op. cit.*, p. 17). Moreover, he either feels that in some strange way it *is* himself, every thing and every creature in it, or at least, that he is at one with it. He feels at home in it and unafraid in it. And even within himself there is unity. There is no more

division between body and spirit, no more shame, or sense of sin, or fear of death. "The cosmic sense crushes the serpent's head." Good and evil, as things contrasted with and opposed to one another, disappear. All this has been replaced by a feeling of wholeness, elevation, and joy, and by a sense not so much that one shall have eternal life as that one has it, that one has now a sort of life that death cannot really touch.

Naturally, such an experience has its effects. These are chiefly integration of the personality, deepened moral sensitiveness and widened sense of social responsibility, new certainty and significance of life direction, and quickened and concentrated intellectual faculty. In short, "The Saviour of man is Cosmic Consciousness" (Bucke, *op. cit.*, p. 6).

And he who possesses it lives on a plane as far above that of the man who knows only self-consciousness as the latter lives above the realm of the highest animal. He is almost a new creature, a new *kind* or *species* of man, living in a world in which all those who lack his faculties are, to him, like men who though they have ears, hear not, or who have eyes, yet cannot see.

This sort of consciousness does not come until antecedent conditions have been fulfilled. In general, it may be said that it comes only to the man who has got as far as life *am* get in the individual possessing only self-consciousness. That is, it comes to the individual who in general has good health, a well-developed moral sense, and keen mental powers—in other words, to one who already is a superior personality. It may be expected, further, to break through onto a higher level at that period in such a man's individual development when his powers are at their height and before the decline incident to the approach of old age. Roughly speaking, this would be somewhere between the ages of thirty and forty—just the period in which it has happened in the great majority of cases. Generally it will be preceded by the individual's coming to an impasse,³ created perhaps by a head-on collision between his emotions and his reasons, or by his having followed his intuition into a situation in which all the powers he possesses are not enough, where he must tap deeper resources than he has ever tapped before, or else go to pieces. This is the hour of crisis. If then, in the desperateness of a life and death struggle, a man does not give in, still scorns *half*-gods even though they offer him powers miraculous or all the kingdoms of the world, *then*—the unfolding hard-pressing life within *may* crack the ego-shaped and ego-protecting shell that has so long held him in darkness and in prison, and allow him to step out into a new world of light and freedom and unprecedented powers. But there is no certainty about the emergence of cosmic consciousness even then. It was in illustration of this fact that Jesus told the parable of the labourers in the vineyard (Matt. 20). The same reward may go to the newcomer, arrived at the eleventh hour, as to those who have "borne the burden of the day and its scorching heat." Indeed it may be withheld from him who has struggled faithfully for many years, as, for instance, in the case of Gandhi, and be granted to another soon after he set foot to the quest. It seems not to be a thing that can be *earned* by any amount of moral earnestness or fidelity. Doubtless it depends not only on the exertions of the individual, but also on the selection and store of capacity garnered in his ancestry and on the extent to which this is represented in him. But in any case, the universe would seem to know no justice after the human way of measuring. Cosmic consciousness comes to him who is ready for it, and some seem born more nearly ready than others.

It was part of Bucke's thesis that, as in the case of self-consciousness, this further extension of vision would gradually spread throughout mankind until its possession would be as universal, and as much the mark of the human, as is self-consciousness today. He maintained that the frequency with which cosmic consciousness was appearing had demonstrably increased within historic times. And it seems incontestable, in any case, that such an interpretation of mystical experience no longer need rest on theory. What may well be called cosmic consciousness certainly has been occurring, off and on, for the last two or three thousand years. Men who could have had no knowledge of one another whatever, living in very different lands and ages and cradled in very different religions, have had experiences evidently so similar that, whether they were called "Nirvana,"⁴ or "Beatrice," or "Gabriel," or "the Kingdom of God," the men behind them must have been able to understand one another. As already remarked, it has become a common saying that "all mystics speak the same language." Behind differences in speech there is common perception. Thus Coomaraswamy was able to detect that even Nietzsche belonged with Blake and Whitman.

This, rather briefly, may be taken as representing Bucke's essential thesis. And in the large his generalization still seems to me both very sound and very important. The significance I see in it, however, was denied by Professor James H. Leuba, whose *Psychology Of Religious Mysticism* I have already mentioned. In a reply I had from him years ago in regard to Bucke's book (this must have been in the late Thirties or early Forties), he said that although he had not had it in hand for nearly twenty years, he "remembered vaguely that it appeared quite uncritical and without any real value, whatever James [the psychologist] may have said about it." And he added, "The one thing essential to do if one is interested in the *meaning* of anything regarded as a mystical experience is to separate what is actually the raw data of experience—and, therefore, incontestable—from its interpretation. James never did that completely. The mystic says 'I have experienced God' (or whatever he thinks he has experienced), whereas his only immediate, incontrovertible experience consists of sensations and emotions which he *interprets* as meaning God."

With the *principle* that Dr. Leuba here lays down, I find myself very much in accord, as must be evident from the whole tenor of my two preceding chapters. It was of the very essence of that skeptical examination of mystical experience that I had begun when I came here to my farm in 1932, that I tried to distinguish between the "raw stuff" of the mystic's experience and his interpretation of that experience. What had spoken within me I had called God, but I then began to investigate whether I had any good reason for so calling it. And similarly in regard to Jesus' experience. He talked constantly about "God," and "the will of God," and "my Father," presumably on the basis of what he had heard within him. But in thus labeling what had spoken within him, I felt that he had gone beyond what he knew. The actual content of his experience was probably much like what Nietzsche more simply and exactly described thus; "Then was there spoken unto me without voice. . ." (See the chapter entitled "The stillest Hour" in his *Zarathustra*.) All that Jesus knew was that within him there was that which spoke to him. The moment he *labeled* it "God" or "my Father," he went beyond what he *knew*, beyond what he had *experienced*, and put an interpretation on that experience. And in this interpretation he arrogated to his experience an omniscience, a wisdom, and therefore an authority that reason might attribute to the metaphysical abstraction "God" but which did not belong to this experience itself.

That such interpretation was natural I concede. The experience had made him feel utterly unafraid, as is a child in the presence of a most loving father; it had made the universe a place in which he suddenly felt at home, and a home rather calls for and presupposes a father. So, I say again, it was natural for Jesus to say, "My Father spoke to me," as it was natural also for Kabir to feel that in his mystical experience he had communed with his "Beloved," and to present the relations between the soul and that which spoke within him, in imagery borrowed from the relations of the Hindu wife and her husband, who is both her beloved and her lord. I say that it is natural, and, though I see clearly enough that it is interpretation and although at first I rejected it on that ground, I now prefer to accept it—*provided* that the use of the word "God" is ruled out, for the reason that "God" has moral, theological and metaphysical connotations for which I am unable to find any foundation, and which, for me, are therefore inadmissible in connection with this experience. But an interpretation that only brings in an element of poetry, as it were, I now prefer to accept. I think that I understand the need for it. Such names as "my Father," "my Beloved," or the like, and such imagery as they introduce, are *necessary* if one is to *convey to another* even some suggestion of the flavor and color of the experience, which are as much of its essence as is color or fragrance in a flower or taste in food.

Let us call these terms and this imagery interpretation, if we will; nevertheless the fact remains that the whole content of the mystic's experience is not contained in his "I heard this," or "I saw that," or "I felt the other." Though his outer eye sees the same earth, trees, birds, persons, sun and stars as before, he sees them differently, with a different quality and with a different relation to one another and to human beings. That is, he sees them as being alive and as knit together into a whole and as all one with himself. This perception is an experience so unique, presenting an aspect so different from what appears to someone who sees them as all separate, and matter as something dead, and death as stalking every organic thing in any way compounded of matter, that I do not believe there are any words capable of conveying the content of a mystical experience of this order. It cannot be described. And the reason for this is not that the mystics were so drunk with ecstasy that they could not think or talk straight. It is rather that words and ideas all originated within the range of experience limited to the five senses, and the mystical experience of the highest order is conditioned upon a development of inner power that takes the mystic beyond this. *What* its full content was he cannot communicate at all to one who has not had the same experience, any more than one can convey what the sun is like to one who was born blind and has never seen it. For the mystic to convey even some indication of it, he must be permitted to be more or less poetical, to resort to the use of imagery, to suggest what it was like by indicating what it meant to him. If the scientist is unable or unwilling to do this, it means only that this realm of experience will remain closed to him. He lingers behind with the mediocre. And another age, more alive than ours and with a healthier confidence in its vital instincts, less afraid to proceed without the scientist's blessing, will press on without him.

I cannot, therefore, agree with Leuba as regards the significance of Bucke's thesis. It may be true enough that Bucke did not, and did not even attempt to, separate the mystic's experience from his interpretation of that experience; this perhaps he could well afford to leave to the modern critical scientist who is so gifted at pulling things to pieces. The experience, then, did not mean "God," metaphysical deity, all that the word "God" means to most people. All right, so be it; this much I myself have asserted, repeatedly. But this, I

believe, does not prevent *our* making the differentiation and getting at what the mystic's experience itself actually was. But with this done, with the material for examination reduced to the bare content of what the mystic heard, saw, felt, I believe that Bucke's thesis is sustained. There *has* been an evolution of consciousness that so far, has culminated in the mystic's experience that the universe is alive, and is a whole, and is a home. It is not the ecstasy that may accompany the experience that I value; I doubt if the great mystics ever have valued it chiefly for this. One can be brought to ecstasy in many ways. The important thing was *what in their case caused the ecstasy, and the kind of living in which their ecstasy issued*. Their ecstasy is distinguished from all other ecstasy in that it sprang from a perception that the universe was a place in which they did not need to be afraid, afraid of anything; and issued in a living that *continued* to be free of fear, that was devoted to advancing and lifting the life of men, and that manifested an integration of all the mystic's powers, showing them whole, serene, exalted, penetrating, effective—radiant centers of light, energy, and love.

Nevertheless, before I take leave of Bucke's thesis, there are a few comments that I should like to make, some of them critical.

1. It would seem fairly certain that any further evolution man may make will be psychological rather than physiological. Probably his bodily form will not alter greatly, nor the acuteness of his five senses surpass that reached ages ago in the savage. His advance will be chiefly a matter of a heightened sensitiveness to values, the inclusion of all this in a new integration of personality, and a resulting increased masterfulness in all his relations with the universe and the world about him.

2. Bucke, however, was mistaken in his easy assumption that cosmic consciousness must spread until it became the consciousness of all men. In the first place, it is a question whether the great human sub-stratum is not hopelessly inert. I often think that the mass of men will have to remain what they are today and from time immemorial always have been—namely, mass-men, men incapable of finding their way and their authority from within themselves, incapable of bearing the burden of their integrity, of achieving and maintaining a differentiation from others—in short, men incapable of growth and doomed to remain mass-men.⁵

In the second place, and in any case, it was a crude popular misconception of evolution that there was ever anything inevitable about it. More species are known to have degenerated, or to have become altogether extinct, than to have survived or advanced. And loath though we may be to admit the fact, it would seem that man is no exception to the forces that operate in the rise and fall of other forms of life. Moreover—and this is never for a moment to be forgotten—even among those who *are* capable of cosmic consciousness or of growth in that direction, attainment, and the development upon which it is conditioned, will occur only as it is preceded by appreciation, and by aspiration, and by struggle, and by the deliberate cultivation of those powers upon which attainment depends. With complete justice Ouspensky observes that "if we take into consideration what an infinitesimal percentage of men think and are capable of thinking of their evolution (or their striving toward higher things), then we shall see that to talk about the *inevitability* of this evolution is at least naïve" (P.D. Ouspensky, *op. cit.*, p. 322).

3. I am no longer able to take the mystic's deliverances quite at their face value. Whitman declared, in his "Song of the Rolling Earth," "I swear the Earth shall surely be complete to him or her who shall be complete. The Earth remains jagged and broken only to him or her who remains jagged and broken." And this suggests, what in any case I have come to believe to be the fact, that each man's universe (the universe as it presents itself to his consciousness) is his own self writ large. When one gazes out upon the universe through the eyes of one's own wholeness, one *necessarily* sees it a whole and reads oneness there. But the unity one sees in the universe is really one's own unity read into it, one's own inner harmony imposed upon it. Nevertheless, *not* to see it as a whole, and *not* to feel at home in it and at peace with it, is evidence that one's own self "remains jagged and broken," fragmentary and a chaos; and to become an integrated whole is the greatest achievement that any life can attain.

I do not, therefore, say that the universe is as the mystic sees it. In fact, I believe it is not given to man to know *how* it is or *what* it is, ultimately. Absolutes are beyond the reach of any faculty that man has, or ever has had, or probably ever will have. The scientist who thinks that by some penetration of telescope or expansion of microscope or leap of higher mathematics he can finally solve the problem of ultimate reality only shows himself puerile. But it is equally true that the profoundest mystic—Jesus, Blake, Whitman, or any other—in his deepest experience, is still confronted by appearance.

That is, illusion is necessary. Man cannot by any means avoid it. "*Truth is that kind of error without which a certain species of living being cannot exist. The value for Life is ultimately decisive.*"⁶ That belief by which a given group has been able the better to maintain and extend itself has inevitably *appeared to its consciousness* as the truth. The mystical, as I see it, is another step forward, under the will to power (the driving force behind all life), by which man attempts to make his universe stable and manageable—to secure a better toe-hold in it, a freer breathing-space in it, even to shape within it a dance floor for his spirit or a take-off for its flights. That is, he presents it to himself in a way in which he can exist in it, and exist ever better. It reflects his growing masterfulness. Instead of its being a device of the escapist, by which the mystic attempts to avoid facing reality, I find in it one of the crowning achievements that enable those who possess it to walk the Earth more and more with the dignity, the self-possession, and the self-direction of a god. Like all other perception, the mystical is illusion (i.e., reality veiled, reality "seen through a glass darkly"), but illusion justifies itself, no matter how we come by it, whether by the mystical or by science, if only it enables life to triumph. Our only choice seems to lie between illusion that makes for higher life and illusion that makes for lower.

Yet the difference between the two is of supreme importance to the life of any society. It is the great divide, which perpetually determines whether the drop of water finds its way to the desert or to the sea, whether life merely goes on or goes up, perhaps indeed whether it wastes itself and finally ends in futility and ruin or comes to flower in a great culture. And because the fate of any society, as certainly as the fate of any man, is constantly being determined, and sometimes forever settled, by its choices, between right and wrong, or between wise and foolish, it is of supreme importance (as we shall see in Chapter XI) that a society have, as it were, some special organ composed of the men best able to discriminate between true and false, high and low, beautiful and ugly, and also empowered to hold the

society to a course that will ensure its life, preserve its health, and create conditions in which, at the same time, genius will flourish and the common people will sing at their work, sing because they want to sing and find cause for singing.

But, generally speaking, the scientist is not qualified to be among those who compose such an organ—an organ which is at once a nation's compass, and barometer, and conscience, and intuition. The difference between higher life and lower life is something with which science has never concerned itself. It has no taste. It has given no thought to quality of life. Values have been out of its field. It plainly has not mattered to science whether the inventions, to which its revelations have led, have strengthened and exalted life, or weakened and degraded it. It has been so absorbed in making its discoveries that it has not stopped to look where it was taking us. It has always been science's boast that it was "disinterested"—and from its own point of view, quite rightly so. But can anyone deny that its spirit is expressed in the cry "Fiat veritas, pereat vita"? (Let truth be established though life perish.) From which one surely might conclude that to science it was a matter of indifference whether it furthered life or finished it. Yet I think it would be fairer, at least to the best of our scientists, if we assumed rather that science has followed a path so detached because of a simple and largely unconscious faith that truth, or that approximation to reality that it called truth, was good necessarily, good at all times, in any quantity, and under all circumstances.

To some ears this may sound like an echo of the Christian's faith in a "good God," of which faith in fact it may be a survival, but I am satisfied that at least this faith of the scientist will not hold water. On the contrary, I am convinced that truths can be fed to men too fast, that there are truths for which very few men are ready, and that applications of scientific discoveries can be made in such a way as to be ruinous to human life.

It is not that I would question the great value of pure science. It certainly has proved itself one of the most valuable of our human approaches to reality. At bottom, it has been an effort to reach a coherent and integrated understanding of the way the universe is made and of the way it works. And since we must live in this universe, of which our world is a part, it surely is of the most vital consequence that we know—as soundly, as exactly, and as fully as possible—where we are and what we are up against and have to deal with. In short, the truth about it is of absolutely cardinal importance, and I believe that any increase in the store of such truth, from whatever source, must ultimately work to man's well-being—if *wisely used*. Doubtless one of the great measures of man's advance from the state of the ape has been the increase of his knowledge of himself and of the world in which he lives.

But I have given emphasis to the words "if wisely used." And, alas! it is all too manifest that the truth given us by science has *not* been wisely used. There would not be all the present alarm about over-population, pollution, and the widespread menace to our entire environment, if the discoveries of science had been applied to our world with some regard for human well-being. Granted, the damage has been due not so much to the discoveries of science as to the reckless way in which the discoveries have been exploited by inventors, advertisers, and all those who scramble for gain. About what the Machine has done to our men and women and our environment, and to our whole society, I shall have much to say in Chapter XV, but I will put myself on record now as completely endorsing the judgment of Alexis Carrel, one of the foremost scientists of our time, that "the enormous advance gained

by the sciences of inanimate matter over those of living things is one of the greatest catastrophes ever suffered by humanity." ⁷ Nor is this by any means the whole story. Perhaps it is not even the worst part of it.

Truth, of course, has proved itself over and over again, to be one of the most powerful of all forces in human experience. Especially a new truth may be so powerful that if it is not released upon the world gradually, and with wise and sympathetic understanding of the shortcomings and weaknesses of human beings at different levels and at different stages in their growth, it can do much damage. In educational circles, it is universally recognized that there are many things that you can tell an adult that it might well be ruinous to tell a child of ten or even a youth of twenty. And in my judgment a very large part of our society is composed of men and women who, regardless of the years they may have attained, have the mental simplicity and immaturity of children. They obviously do not have the background of knowledge, the mental capacity and training, or the independence and courage that are necessary if one is to keep one's feet, and set and hold a course, in the face of the storm of skepticism, relativism, and materialism that science has let loose upon our world. In consequence, these people have been hit as if by a tidal wave, which has torn them loose from all their moorings, drowned their bearings, and left them to struggle alone as if in mid-ocean, in water utterly beyond their depth and with no help at hand. And yet people wonder why our world is falling to pieces, why the generation gap, the breakdown of authority, the disintegration of the home, the sexual license, the rampant growth of illegitimacy, the collapse of law and order, the decay of patriotism. *But how could it be otherwise?* Modern science may have given us washing machines, automobiles, television, airplanes, and all the rest of it, but what is this compared to the blighting, paralyzing, demoralizing, shattering killing effect it has had on man's entire inner being—his basic values, his religion, his morals, his spiritual security, his certainty of direction, his peace of mind, upon which ultimately depend the solidity and stability of our entire society? To have deprived men and women of this in one fell swoop—which is virtually what it amounted to—was an act not only of incredible cruelty but of incredible folly. It virtually ensured the death of our society.

Again, the multitude of practical applications of scientific discoveries in the last fifty or sixty years has introduced change with a rapidity and infinite ramification such as no living thing can stand. It is not just common people who cannot stand it—it is all the people, people on all levels. Not even a plant can stand the constant change in its environment that follows being pulled up and transplanted every few days. Change has come to be almost the mark and pride of our society. Most people in the past have valued and loved the old—as we used to, because of its associations, because it had proved itself, because it was beautiful. But our people today fairly pant after the new. Any departure from the old, anything that can be puffed up as novelty, is assumed to be an improvement, an evidence of progress. The word "new" works like magic when it comes to selling anything—whether it be cigarettes, cars, toothpaste, or women's hats. It works equally well with the propagation of an idea or the promotion of a movement. And the acceptance of any change is eased if it can be advertised as "new." Thus the whole face, and pace, and tone of our life has undergone drastic change in the last fifty or sixty years. We have become a nation always on the move. More and more of our people actually choose houses on wheels for their homes. Our whole life has become fluid, restless, unstable. What the Chinese think of such people is implied in the name by which they used to refer to certain barbarian tribes on their borders; they called them the

“hither and yon” people, the people who were not fixed. I do not know whether the name implied amusement or contempt. But I am very certain that any people who are not rooted, rooted in a given piece of earth, are approaching a day when a storm will blow them away.

I must not take the space here to elaborate further. My point must be obvious. A science that is so absorbed in uncovering truth for us that it cannot see or does not care what it is doing to our life, is a very dubious blessing. Unless a people has quite hopelessly lost its vital instincts it must at last wake up to the fact that a curb must be put on science—not so much, however, on its pursuit of truth as on the use that is made of its discoveries, and on how and when information about them is given out. I do not see that this restriction should blight scientific investigation, but “science for the sake of science” is an absurdity. Everything, in the end, must give way to the needs and claims of life, and not only of life in the sense of mere survival but of life that is ascending, that reaches toward heights, quality, significance. And this means that science with its facts has got to be subordinated to values. I maintain that values, about which science knows nothing, and with which it never has concerned itself (even, let us say, *should* not concern itself), are *more important than its facts*. It matters more *where* we go than *that* we go. Until we are certain of our direction, it is even better that we stand still. If we use the increased powers with which science has equipped us only the more rapidly to go down when all the real meaning of our life requires that we go up, or to turn south when, if our existence is to be of any consequence, we must head north, where is the gain? Science, therefore, must be put in its place. It is enough that science provide us with our picks and shovels, our bricks and mortar and levels and lines. But the seer and the philosopher must again come to the fore to decide what kind of a temple we want to build, and hold up before us the values that will mirror our own souls, and lift our eyes to distant heights and fix them on stars by which we may keep firmly to our set course.

And now, before I bring this section to a close, I should like to summarize the more important conclusions and convictions to which my reflections on the mystical experience in relation to psychology, and to science and the reasoning mind in general, have brought me.

1. Knight Dunlap, Professor of Experimental Psychology at Johns Hopkins University, declared that mysticism’s entire claim on the attention and respect of mankind stands or falls with its ability to produce, in addition to “the knowledge of sense perceptions” and “the knowledge of inference or reason,” what he calls “a *third kind* of knowledge.”⁸ To me this position seems unwarranted, but at that it may be that the mystics will be able to meet his demand. Bucke, in his book already referred to, maintained that cosmic consciousness is a matter of intuitional knowledge, and that intuitions are concepts telescoped as concepts are percepts telescoped. They represent an abridgment, a quickening, a short-circuiting of the intellectual process by which one comes to the answer more quickly and, even more importantly, with less effort, so that one has more energy to grapple with those problems deeper than can be approached by the slower, heavier-footed faculties.

And this seems to me very plausible—partly because certain conclusions that the most advanced science is only now beginning to reach (I think of Einstein, J.A. Thompson, Eddington, Sir James Jeans), have been asserted by mystics again and again—conclusions, namely, that the universe is alive, that the distinction between matter and spirit is unreal, that everything is a manifestation of energy. This, of course, is by no means all that the mystic

has declared, but it confirms the significance of the mystic's experience to find the scientist admitting even a considerable part of what the mystic has asserted for so long.

In short, it is a conviction that has survived all my skepticism, that the mystical experience at its highest (and all the lower levels are steps on the way to this) is, in its effects, no less than a new faculty of perception, an inner eye, which opens up to those who possess it heights and depths and subtleties of reality that are utterly closed to those who lack it. Let the scientist make of it what he can; the seeing of this eye is just as real as that of the eye that sees the sun and the Earth, and it demands at least as much attention from the thinking mind. The one can no more be dismissed as hallucination than the other. And any complete science, as Alexis Carrel recognized, must take the mystical experience into account as "one of the essential human activities."⁹

I am not claiming that this is a matter of a *new kind* of knowledge. Even if it is not, the mystical experience has for me much the same significance as if it were. In any case, it opens up realms of meaning and value that, so far as I know, cannot be reached in any other way: and it presents the universe in an aspect, and establishes between it and the mystic a relationship, that belongs inevitably to the movement of the race toward quality of life, toward exaltedness, and masterfulness, and increased power to create.

2. In any case, also, life is more than a matter of satisfying the reasoning mind. I do not admire the bulging head stuck up on toothpick legs. Each one of us is a creature with instincts, and impulses, that feels and desires, and which, if it is to be healthy and satisfied, must do things and go somewhere. Our very hands will war against one another and our head against our heart and our heart against our head, unless we find some way to get all these different sides of us pulling together. And this end has to be effected in the midst of a concrete situation, among real people, on some spot on the Earth. In short, man needs some means by which to get himself working as an undivided whole. He has to live, and not just to think. Reason becomes almost a curse unless it be subordinated to life and become coordinated with the other sides of our make-up. And today reason is *not* thus subordinated. Everything has to be passed through the ponderous wheels of our minds. We are reason-ridden. We have lost not only our instincts but also our spontaneity. We have lost the lightness and quickness by which an animal knows what to do. We grope, and can no longer scent danger from afar. The very psychiatrist who stresses, and who knows the necessity of integration, has not—as a rule—effected it in himself. He attempts it in other people, but his patients usually make one think of the victims of plastic surgery: they did not *grow* that way. He has no means by which to put reason in leading-strings, no certainty as to whether reason ought to be put in leading strings, or *what* it ought to be placed in leading-strings *to*. He has not found within himself, as it were, a God. He has no inner sun, no center of life-energy that can compel every other force in him to swing around itself. In short, for all his talk and his little sets of patterns and techniques, he does not impress you as a man who has faced the fundamental problems of human existence, and mastered them.

I say this having chiefly in mind such psychiatrists as hang out their shingles in our cities. They have commonly taken up psychiatry, I fancy, as other men take up law or medicine or banking—as a profession, as an enjoyable way of making a good living. They may have clever and expert minds, and be the skilled craftsmen that specialists often are, but their craft

dwarfs their manhood. Yet I recognize there may be exceptions. I have always been minded to place Carl G. Jung in quite a different category. His *Psychology of the Unconscious*, at a critical time in my life in the early Thirties, helped to steady me in my obedience to the "leading" of my own Inner Light; and his *The Secret of the Golden Flower* (see especially the chapter entitled "The Fulfillment," p. 128 ff.) and *The Integration of the Personality* (see in particular the final chapter, No. VI, "The Development of Personality," p. 281 ff.) reveal how searchingly he wrestled with deep realities, with what open mind and sensitive insight he explored even the experience of some of the great mystics, even those of Asia, and that he had at heart—if I may say so—exactly what I myself have at heart. He too was concerned with men of an inner *wation*—men, that is, who heard an inner voice relentlessly *calling* them away from the attraction and domination of the human mass to follow a path of their own, to become what most deeply they really were. He wrote to strengthen men and to free men to take such a course, and to justify them in taking it and holding it in the face of all odds, all costs, and all consequences. He saw that the men who have most compelled the reverence and devotion of every sort of higher humanity—above all, its great religious leaders—have been men who did precisely this and nothing more: they let their God walk the Earth in them as he would. Men of supreme giftedness, they simply gave themselves without reserve as they were.

And yet—did Jung himself ever do this? I know next to nothing about his life, but I must confess that no book of his ever really took hold of me. I must doubt whether he did on himself what he preached on others. Was he himself the living and luminous *Thing Incarnate*, or was he just another thought-out book about it? Was it not once again—at bottom—Reason: not the real and living experience, but rational analysis of it, spiritual dissection? Was Jung a master in any grand sense, had he become a living whole, had he found Himself, a God within himself, who lifted even his daily living to some heights? Now I am a long way from claiming that even mysticism can do all this for every man. On the contrary, I must already have made it amply clear that in my estimate of humanity the vast majority of men simply do not have it in them to take even the first step toward the mystical experience. But I do believe that it offers the best means by which *some* men, in the aggregate even many men, indeed all men who can feel themselves attracted to it, can become (on whatever level each man's capacities make possible) an undivided whole. They can become what they are, and set the God in them free to walk the Earth as he will. What moves and speaks in the deepest stillness of each man's being is, at least in effect, a synthesis of all his highest perceptive faculties. It has seemed to me that behind every intuition lies a process something like this: it is as though our instincts, our reason, and our spiritual sensitiveness and aspiration retired into the dark secret recesses of our subconscious and there thrashed out their differences. Taking fully into account all the personalities and other actualities of the situation in which we must act, and also the limits set by our heredity and past experience, in the depths of our subconscious they thrash out their differences until they agree as to the thing that should be done. And then they send up a messenger to our conscious mind, and this messenger speaking for them all, speaking for our life forces as an undivided whole, says to us, "Now do this." I do not claim that this is the process: I am not psychologist enough to be sure about that. But I say that it is as if this is what takes place. And I do believe that if a man has reached this verdict by the means which I have described in a foregoing chapter, there is no way in which, by taking further thought or doing anything else further, he can at that moment reach a higher wisdom or a sounder sense of direction in regard to the situation before him. It is the verdict of his Center, or that in him that would fain become his Center.

And if any man will follow the discipline this Center lays down, it will not fail to bring him at last to a sure sense of direction in life, and to mastery, and poise, and a sense of fulfillment. It will bring him to what it has meant to people in the past to have a God.

Indeed, I value the mystical sensitiveness not merely as a means to integration, but because of all the expansion and elevation of life that this brings with it. Except life have quality it is no life at all. Except it have height, depth, color, danger, significance—and all this not as a past achievement but as something still living, unfolding, and increasing—I think that I should rather be dead. The fact is, the absence of this would mean that I really *was* dead—in a death far worse than that of the body. But it is the mystical faculty above all others that makes a man sensitive to values, and to values ever more profound, if he but remain true to its behest. It is able to open to him light-filled meanings anywhere he turns and in anything he gazes upon—in a sense literal and wondrous beyond aught the ordinary man could guess. As William Blake exclaimed:

To see a World in a Grain of Sand
And a Heaven in a Wild Flower,
Hold Infinity in the palm of your hand
And Eternity in an hour.

It will give a man a lonely trek to some kind of North Pole, or a beast-infested jungle to explore, or a buried treasure to hunt for and find, or a mission to go on for a prince, or a long and desperate campaign to fight to a finish, or a kingdom to rule over as a king, or an ecstasy to dance to naked on a granite knob in a downpour ripped by lightning, or now and then an hour in which he gazes long into the eyes of a deeply loved woman or into the yet deeper eyes of—*That Which cannot be named at all*, until his whole being seems like a deep mountain lake breathing long and slow under the full moon of a summer night. And such quality of life, such richness and significance, and the enormous integration without which it does not come, are contributions of enormous meaning whether or not the mystical experience can yield to Knight Dunlap his “third kind of knowledge.” Man is more than his thinking, however great that may be, and he must turn sickly and eventually perish if he sacrifices to reason that by which he is rooted in the earth, by which he keeps reaching toward the sky, and by which all parts of him are made to work together. Before men shall again live fully and strongly they must recover their instincts, they must recover a sureness that is without rational knowledge and beyond rational knowledge. They must become more mystical.

3. I have said that I do not wish to clash with science needlessly. But where we do clash, we had better have it out. And there is something about the scientific spirit that is deadly to the mystical faculty. This I long have felt, as did Blake, but now I have discovered why. The place where, for me, mysticism and science break worst of all is where science wants the mystic to *test* his God, to *prove* his God. This was the trial to which Jesus was put in the so-called Temptation experience; and it is the requirement of “the world” in all ages. But to test one’s God is to doubt him—and to doubt him is ultimately to lose him. “Doubt is Self Contradiction,” cried Blake, “And does the Sun and Moon blot out.” *The mystic is sure because he is sure*. There is an immediate intuitive recognition that a thing is real or beautiful. And

that's all there is about it. He must trust his eye. Upon this depends his keeping the eye by which alone he can enter the inner world. And trusting and testing do not go together.

As this is very important for me, I wish to make as sure as I can that I have left the matter clear. I am not beyond learning by experience. In fact, one's own experience is one of the checks that I have offered by which to sift the error from one's vision and conviction. And many things that I thought and did ten years ago, not to mention fifty years ago, it would be impossible for me to think or to do now. And yet it always made something in me squirm when, at the beginning of my Franciscan venture, back in the years following 1920, people referred to it as my "experiment." "Experiment" suggests that I had begun it to see what results it would effect, and that my continuance of it would depend upon these results' being in accord with what I thought to be practical, sensible, or significant. If it enabled me to get bread and butter, and maybe to have a home, but in any case to make people sit up and listen to me and to follow me, then I would continue it. But if it did not, then I would try something else.

But any such attitude was at the last remove from mine. The very purity of the inner vision by which I was brought to such a course *depended upon my entirely divesting myself of all concern for any effects whatever*. I had not launched forth upon it in order to gain a following or to make a name or to achieve any other preconceived results; nor would I cease to follow it if it did *not* let me have a home of my own or even give me bread and butter. The whole world of the five senses and all it could do to me or say about what I was attempting could go plumb to hell. I was doing what I was doing because my God told me to (or, if you like it any better, because deep, deep down in me I *wanted to*), and not for anything whatever that I could get out of it otherwise. And as long as he kept on telling me to go the way that I was going, I would struggle to be child enough and fool enough to obey him, even though I starved for it, even though I died for it, and even though to my last hour no one else did anything about it whatever. To the wisecracks and even to my own rational consciousness it might all be just a lot of "damn nonsense." All right, so be it. But I had some deep vital instinct in me even then, some unanswerable stubborn sureness, that was surer than my reason and sure in spite of my reason, that just then it was of life and death importance that I should not let anything in heaven or Earth or hell break my contact with my God. I had little or no psychology about it then, but I thank all the gods there be that through thick and thin I held on. For if the contact had been broken, I should have been broken. For that God on whom I held in the face of such pressure, pressures from within and from without, was the core of me. And everything that I have come to since, whatever it be, all hope of anything's coming out of me that was really of me, depended on my *keeping that contact, continuing to obey like a child*. Inwardly, therefore, I scorned and resented their "experiment" summarization and threw it back in their teeth. Experiment *for them* I might be, my whole life might be, but for me, who was in it, and of it, and it itself, it was anything *but* an experiment. It was my clear-eyed sight, it was the ineluctable faith that this vision gave me, it was my sheer devotion in which, scorning to *use* my God for ends of my own conscious scheming, I prostrated myself before him with my face to the earth, and, asking for nothing in return, poured out all that I was and all that I had. It was not my experiment; it was my venture of faith.

And this was right, and necessary. In *looking ahead, in facing a choice*, if one is to live truly there must be *no least vestige of concern for effect*. Any least thought of what we may get out of it will

put a cast in our eye so that we shall *not see quite straight*. We shall not keep our eye single. Our motives will be mixed, neither one thing nor another quite purely. We shall see what is true for us, but also be allowing ourselves glimpses, wanton sidelong glances, at our security, our comfort, our influence, our name. Etherealize and idealize it as we may, even into what we may call “doing good,” saving a loved one pain, “advancing the Kingdom of God,” and all the rest of it, yet will it vitiate our vision just as surely as though our longing instead were to satisfy our lust for money or for sex. We *an’t* serve *two* masters. We can’t keep our eye single and keep wanting two things at the same time. We just can’t, and can’t, and can’t. God or our effects: doing what we want simply because we are made that way, or scheming for what we can get out of it. Take your choice. It cannot be both.

As we face the future, therefore, if the real life in us is ever to be quite sound and regnant throughout all parts of us, and free to go its way, we must utterly divest ourselves of all concern for effects or for any other meretricious concomitants of the course that we choose. Let us put out our eyes, stop up our ears, harden our hearts, until we get by these sirens. It may well be *either* this, or *death*.

That is, we must be careful that we do not choose in the spirit of an experiment.

But as we face the *past*, with our course chosen, and deeds done and the fruit of them apparent, then we *must face* the effects of our course and any lessons that they may have to teach us. And these lessons of experience, taken through our minds into the total complex out of which our future choices must come, may thus affect our future choices even though *in choosing* (as always *when choosing*) we again strive to keep our vision as single as before and to *avoid any concern for effects*. But this, I fear, is alien to the scientific spirit, with its experimental method. And it is likely that this antagonism will remain.

It is not that science is materialistic. Indeed, though most scientists go on as though they were in sublime ignorance of what has taken place, advanced physics has cut the ground from under science’s towering edifice. Everything is reduced to energy. Matter is only a construction *put upon* energy by our minds. There is only one reality, infinite in its manifestations.

Nor is it that mysticism requires the religious trappings which science tends to strip off. As I have already remarked, I am able to cast all I say about the mystical experience into psychological terms—as I am sure many another can do.

And it is good that Carrel should have insisted that a complete science must take the mystical experience into account. And it is a source of satisfaction to have the most eminent physicists, like Einstein, reaching conclusions that provide room for the mystic’s world and, as it were, walking right up to the door of it. But this world itself the scientific spirit cannot enter. The inner stillness necessary for deep mystical experience requires the stilling, along with everything else, of the rational faculty. The inner eye can see only while our thinking processes cease to cut their capers before its gaze. We may walk right up to the door of the mystic’s world, but none shall enter it who cannot get beyond a supreme faith in the merely reasoning mind. None shall enter it who cannot reach a sureness without thinking, who does not know what it is to have something speak or move in the deepest stillness of his being,

which is instinct with a wisdom beyond his reason, and before the commands of which he is able to make himself as a little child—which he obeys not in the spirit of experimentation, to see if it will “work,” but as a venture of faith and an act of devotion. Right in the teeth of the self-satisfied, arrogant rationalism of this day, and all its intelligentsia, I declare that except they *get over* their rationalism, unless they get beyond their confidence in reason and their pride in ideas, they shall never know what it is really to live.

But whatever the place that may finally be conceded to mysticism by science, it would seem impossible to deny the significance it has had in history. Here the facts appear so incontestable that I need do little more than summarize them. 1. The hypothesis which, following Bucke, we have called cosmic consciousness, alone explains the great seers of all lands and ages. Given that, and all that they said and did at once becomes more or less intelligible and consistent, and largely necessary. It gives a rational explanation, too, to the fact often noted, that there is a large area of agreement between them, no matter what the land or the age or the religious background out of which they came.

2. Again, every great religion has originated in the mystical experience of one or more of these men. Confucianism, which may be thought an exception, is less a religion than an ethical and social system. Buddhism, however, and Hinduism, Zoroastrianism, Christianity, Mohammedanism, and other smaller or more recent movements, certainly had this origin. And these religious systems, to a very large extent, have given the civilized world the values on which its cultural life has been shaped. One has but to pass before one’s mind the names of such men as Buddha, Moses, Laotze, Isaiah, Jesus, Mohammed, Dante, “Shakespeare,” Boehme, Eckhart, Spinoza, Blake, Emerson, Thoreau, Ramakrishna, Vivekananda, Whitman, and Nietzsche, to realize how much would be lost to our life if the influence of these men were to be removed. Then let him add the part that men of this sort, though their very names are now lost, had in producing the culture of Egypt, which, through its influence on the Jews and the Greeks, some eminent historians believe to have determined our own cultural inheritance more decisively than any other, and we shall have some sense of the far-reaching significance of the great seers.

3. In fact, in these men we have the first appearance of a race of supermen, or bridges to supermen, who, from the ancient past, have largely shaped the development of our own culture, and who are destined, especially if they occur with increasing frequency and manifest mounting genius, to prove the primary agents in creating a culture nobler and richer than any the world has yet seen.

This age, of course, is exceedingly unfavorable to their appearance. The supremacy of science, with its hard rationalistic standards, lies upon all lovely life like a wide heavy plank under which even the green grass grows white and sickly; and the superior life amongst us is all but smothered in the gutter taste and weak will of populace.

But this scientific and democratic age will pass. Out of it in time will grow another, in which it will again be recognized that men are not equal, that some men are enormously superior to most others, and that these should be set apart, and looked up to, and revered, to a degree where obedience would hardly be a thing required. Their counsel or their judgment would be accepted as a child accepts the word of its father.

The difference between such men and the mass of the population is so great that the two ought no longer to be called by the same name. The men of such vision and stature as I have described are almost a new creature, a new kind of species. So much so, that, if *homo sapiens*, with ordinary self-consciousness, is to be called man, then the person possessed of cosmic consciousness should be called superman, god-man, titan, seer, or by some other name that carries with it a recognition of the colossal difference in moral and intellectual (which for me includes spiritual) stature that puts him at least head and shoulders above all those who lack his faculties.

There have been people of mystical experience who were neurotic and degenerate—mystics who put their mystical faculties to a perverted use. Most of those Leuba chose for his study seem to me to belong in that class. Nevertheless, mystical experience is essentially sound and fraught with great significance. Even in its more elementary manifestations, if one's use of it be guarded by such checks as I have suggested, it is the best means that years of earnest quest have yielded me for orienting one's whole self in the face of the total situation by which, at any given time, one may be confronted. Thus one can know most surely and most exactly what one's deepest life wants to do. It is an invaluable means for integration.

Moreover, even these more elementary practical manifestations are steps *on the way to* mystical experience in the fuller, even more significant, form of cosmic consciousness. On this level there is evidence of an increased masterfulness that is of as much value as the acquisition of a new faculty of perception. And this, practically, it is. Added to his outer, a man now has an inner eye. In the person of him who possesses it the social organism has evolved what in effect is a brain cell. And having evolved eyes and brains, it behooves the organism to heed their behests. In fact, sooner or later, it must. It must because, if it does not, it will perish. Our world today is dying, in large part, because for so long we either have not produced superior men or have not heeded them. The hour has come now, once more, when we must build as the ancients built: we must recognize that men are not equal, and set the god-men apart, and yield them reverence. This we must do for the sake of our very existence.

And more than existence matters, quality matters. And it is increase in quality of life that mystical sensitiveness is especially fitted to serve. For on all its levels, from the lowest to the highest, it is a sensitiveness to values, to meanings, and a longing to reach and to realize them. More than anything else in the whole range of human experience, it is what will ensure that the race not only goes on but goes up, that recurring groups of men will ever be creating new forms of beauty, and that, before it all ends, one race after another shall have realized some high destiny.

With this I rest. I am aware that in my development of the subject I have, perhaps, to some extent, been blazing a new trail, and am liable to the mistakes of one feeling his way. But no matter how great the defects my reader may find, I beg him to bear in mind one thing: the mystical experience itself is more than any explanation of it, and the experience is not to be invalidated by one's inability fully to understand it.

1945,1970.

¹ COSMIC CONSCIOUSNESS, Dutton, 4th edition, 1923.

² James H. Leuba, Professor of Psychology at Bryn Mawr College, was the author of *The Psychology of Religious Mysticism*, Harcourt, 1923. Knight Dunlap, Professor of Experimental Psychology at Johns Hopkins, was the author of *Mysticism, Freudianism and Scientific Psychology*, St. Louis, Mo., 1920. He also wrote a little book that I value highly, *Personal Beauty and Racial Betterment* (Mosby, St. Louis, Mo., 1920), but neither he nor Prof. Leuba made any mention of Bucke's *Cosmic Consciousness*.

³ Much of the rest of this paragraph, perhaps, represents my own thought rather than Bucke's.

⁴ For authoritative opinion that the meaning of this term as used by Buddha himself was something quite different from the idea of extinction that we in the West commonly ascribe to it, see T.W. Rhys Davids: *Buddhism*, Macmillan, 1920, p. 111ff; and *Buddhism, Its History and Literature*, Putnam, 1896, p. 150ff. Dr. Davids was Professor of Pali and Buddhist Literature at University College, London; and of Comparative Religion in Manchester University; Secretary and Librarian of the Royal Asiatic Society; etc., etc.

⁵ See in *The American Mercury* for August and October, 1938, the articles by Ralph Adams Cram entitled, respectively, "Why We Do Not Behave Like Human Beings" and "Mass-Man Takes Over." However, it would be possible by a policy of selective breeding, firmly maintained over centuries, gradually to eliminate the most sodden element of our human population.

⁶ Friedrich Nietzsche—*Will To Power*, Macmillan, 1920, Vol. 11, p. 20.

⁷ Alexis Carrel—*Man The Unknown*, Harper, 1935, p. 28.

⁸ Knight Dunlap—*Mysticism, Freudianism, And Scientific Psychology*, St. Louis, Mo., 1920, p. 14.

⁹ Alexis Carrel—*Man The Unknown*, Harper, 1935, p. 134. Cp. pp. 133-135.

Chapter 8.

Reorientation to Social Problems.

The mystic or moralist who excludes economic right and wrong from his scheme of things, is a shirker.

A religion is incomplete, and an organized religion decays, when it excludes from its domain any specific area of thought or action.

Ezra Pound: *Impact*

With this chapter, I wish to turn to several of the important problems arising from man's life in society. But first, I think it worthwhile to set before my readers the replies that I made to some of the critical responses that I received when my papers on the mystical experience were first published in my series of mimeographed papers of twenty-five years ago. Some of the most friendly of these showed serious misunderstanding, which needed to be removed, and two expressed sharp and vigorously hostile criticism, which called for an answer. The replies that I made then may help to meet difficulties experienced also by my present readers. This chapter, therefore, may be looked upon as one in which I first attempt to clear up the ground covered so far, and then turn to canvass the problems confronting me as I prepare to enter into new territory, all of them of a formidable and crucial character.

One of the most bellicose of my critics seemed to think that my doctrine would lead the individual to live as an end unto himself. He pointed out that each unit in society "should do its level best and live to its completest, but it should never labor under the delusion that it is the whole organism. Nor should it assume that it can live or function or evolve by itself. It must experience with and evolve with the others—the totality." He says that "a man is related to the human race in the same sense that the cells in my hand are related to the tissues that make up the hand. In the final test, it is the whole hand that counts."

With much of this I am in wholehearted agreement. I believe that each unit, in one way or another, is both dependent upon and essential to the welfare of the whole organism, so long as it is in a state of health. I believe that nothing I have said could support the construction that I made even the highest men to be ends unto themselves. On the other hand, I do not for a moment believe that either the limit of evolution or the rate of evolution of higher men is fixed by the capacity and rate of evolution of the crowd. On the contrary, I am satisfied that the exceptional man can make his richest contribution to the race only by going ahead as far as he has it in him to go, even though no one else goes with him. And I believe that all the real significance that attaches to human existence traces back to men who do precisely that.

And as for the simile with which this critic has chosen to illustrate his idea, except that I think it would be more apt if we likened the human units in a society to the cells in the body rather than to those merely in the hand, I cordially accept its implications. But I think the

simile really serves my thought better than his. The very basis of the structural organization of all the higher forms of life is *differentiation*. All cells serve the life of the whole organism, true, but they serve very different functions. The welfare of the whole depends upon each one's doing faithfully and efficiently and unquestioningly the task that has fallen to it, but whereas some have a part in serving the organism as eyes, ears, brain, and the like, others function in the process of elimination, and still others as feet, merely to carry the load of the organism, to get it hither or yon as its brain and instinct may direct. Each has the sense of worth that comes from knowing itself indispensable to the life of the whole, apart from which it could not exist, and each is provided for as essential to the whole, but, indisputably, some are high and some are low, some give orders and others obey them.

In support of this view, I must quote a passage from Goethe's *Zur Morphologie*, written in 1795, in which, in a very remarkable way, he anticipated the direction of scientific advance for years to come.

"The *more imperfect* a being is the more do its individual parts *resemble* each other, and the more do these parts *resemble the whole*. The *more perfect* the being is the *more dissimilar* are its parts. In the former case the parts are more or less a repetition of the whole; in the latter case they are totally unlike the whole.

"The more the parts resemble each other, the less subordination is there of one to the other. *Subordination of parts indicates high grade of organization.*" ¹ (The emphasis is Goethe's)

My pacifist critic was outraged by his belief that I had abandoned morality, and was counseling people to live "by their instincts," more like animals than intelligently. In reply, I urged him simply to read again what I had said. I had said—I believe very plainly—that those who could not live in obedience to a master within themselves must be made to follow some traditional moral code; and that those who did find a master within themselves, while they might live "beyond good and evil" in the sense that they disregarded traditional and conventional morality, would supplant it with a right and wrong of their own that would impose upon them a discipline more severe than any they rejected. Higher men may have a *different* morality than the mass of the population have, and a private one, but it is also one far more stern.

Perhaps in this connection as well as in any other I may say something that I have long been wanting to say. All that I have written about spiritual hunger, striving, remorseless honesty, and stern discipline, and the rest, I am at the farthest remove from wishing, or thinking, to thrust upon everyone. No one *can* struggle to be true until first he is aware of something within himself that he must be true *to*. For better or for worse, and be the reason for it what it may, this is something that most people never know. And I would not for anything thrust any struggle upon them without cause. One of my grievances against our modern science and democracy is that, together, they have caused to be thrown into all the maelstrom of modern skepticism, with its complete overthrow of the traditional beliefs, values, and goals, all sorts of people who had neither the intelligence, the training, nor the experience to qualify them to cope with the problems thus raised. As a result the masses of the people today are like sheep without a shepherd—lost—not knowing north from south, or hardly their right hand from their left. I would never add deliberately to their confusion, nor lay upon them

one burden that it is not necessary for them to bear. My severity is for the comparatively few higher men. As for the mass of the people, when a friend of mine, who grew up in China and was influenced by the Confucian way of life, wrote me that according to this ancient sage "the ideal system . . . was a middle way, peaceful, traditional, equable, the farmer playing the flute at nightfall after a day's work, his wife, concubines, sons, daughters, pigs, chickens, dogs, and goats around him to fill his heart with warm patriarchal satisfaction," my heart warmed in response. That, or the modern counterpart of that kind of life, is what I should like to see for the great mass of the people.

It was demanded by another of my critics, a Communist intellectual, formerly a university professor, that I define what I meant by "higher" and "lower" as regards human beings, and that I state "by what test" I "determine super and sub" or "by what authority" I "decide who is sub and who is super." This was a fair and pertinent question, and I made a preliminary attempt to answer it. The substance of this, I submit here even though I shall answer it much more fully in my chapters on Aristocracy and Eugenics.

It is a matter of common observation that men differ enormously in intelligence, in every sort of capacity, and in character. A dictum of some of the world's greatest geneticists is: Men are born unequal and remain unequal. But whether or not one grants the truth of this pronouncement, one has to face the critically important question: Whence does the manifest difference in human capacities arise? Does it spring primarily from something inborn, and hence is hopelessly beyond the leveling effect of any equalitarian social reform, or is it largely due to the giving or withholding of opportunity? Is it to be accounted for chiefly by birth and blood, that is by heredity, or by environment?

One cannot go far in the investigation of this question without discovering that it is a fiercely debated issue. And it seems to me that any fair-minded person must be constrained to recognize that each side is supported by men of distinction, and—moreover—contains some measure of the truth. One need not be a farmer to know that, while the best of seed will not grow on a concrete pavement, the worst of seed will not amount to anything even in the best of soil. In short, good growth is determined by *both* heredity *and* environment. But which is the weightier factor? This is the crux of the question.

I began to explore this crucial question very thoroughly over forty years ago, and through all the years since I have closely followed the pros and cons of the answers that have been pushed forward by one side or the other as the battle over it has raged. But before I sketch the conclusions to which the mounting mass of evidence has compelled me, let me make a few observations.

1. It must be obvious that the entire investigation of this question has to be carried on in the face of what today has become a dominant bias in favor of the importance of environment as against the importance of heredity. Though the popular belief in human equality may be largely lip service, it nevertheless creates an enormous democratic prejudice against any insurmountable *inequality*, such as would be contained in a recognition of heredity as the determining factor in the differences between men. And even the scientist most passionately devoted to the objectiveness of his scientific method, is by no means always above being

influenced by his initial prejudices, nor is he indifferent to the side which will best butter his bread.

2. This bias will be the more pronounced wherever an entire economic or political creed and propaganda depends upon a belief in equality. A Socialist or a Communist, or in fact almost any modern so-called "Liberal," is virtually bound to believe that environment is a factor more determinative of the differences in men than heredity. That is, though he may have to recognize that men are not equal today, he must be able to believe that by the removal of privileges and the granting of equal opportunities to all, men would *become* equal, or nearly equal.

3. The background of my own approach to this question (as Chapters I and II of this book must already have made very evident) was one in which I fully accepted the equality of men, as a matter both of conviction and of feeling. In fact, I actually carried my belief in equality farther and acted upon it with an immediate literalness that I have never known to be paralleled by any "Liberal" or Communist. That is to say, my bias was *on the equalitarian side*.

With this said, let me now state the conclusions that it has seemed to me the best evidence firmly supports.

How far an individual has it in him to go is almost entirely a matter of heredity. Conspicuous ability certainly runs in families. But the extent to which any individual actually realizes his possibilities depends very considerably on the degree to which his inborn capacity is given opportunity for growth. On the other hand, it is remarkable how commonly the "wellborn" son of innate capacity *musters* an unfavorable environment, turns handicap into advantage, and wrests opportunity from the grudging hand of fate. It is to be noted, too, that environment is almost completely *impotent* to *increase* the capacity that *anyone* is born with. "There is no known method of making superior intelligence out of poor hereditary material." ² That is, one's very ability to benefit by opportunity is rather strictly limited by one's heredity. Furthermore, it may be observed that this entire attitude is in line with the immemorial tradition among men of all ranks that "blood tells." And though our ancestors lacked the scientific method, they were not all fools. A tradition of thousands of years' standing is not lightly to be dismissed.

In writing the above, I have had intelligence chiefly in mind. But to my way of thinking the attribute "higher" is to be assigned to men less on the ground of superior intelligence—important as that is—than on the ground of superior character. What then are the essential features of the superior man's character?

The qualities that I should place absolutely first are those by which alone a man can climb up out of the seemingly changeless, ever-sucking abyss of unthinking, unaspiring, undifferentiated mass-man and attain unto a life of his own, inwardly rooted and inwardly directed. I do not entirely identify the inert mass with "working people," though doubtless they constitute a very large proportion of it. But to my mind a man of *any* class is, and must be, mass-man until he has learned to break his dependence on others. He must cease to be content to float like a cork on the current of life. His primary dissatisfaction must be not with others, not with his environment, not with an economic or political system, but—above

all—with himself. He must have come to a vision of life ahead of where he stands, and must want ever to outgrow what he is that he may give his bones and his flesh to his vision. He must, therefore, be one whose very nature it is to risk himself and to spend himself, even unto exhaustion, for the sake of what he most loves and believes in. He must have recognized and accepted the necessity of a stern discipline imposed on himself under the will of his leading bent. The required qualities, therefore, are an unflagging aspiration, a dominant coordinating will, profound self-reliance, a capacity for boundless loyalty and devotion, utter integrity, and with it the strength and the courage to bear the burden that his integrity imposes. The experience of living long under these directives gives a man taste, one of the most incommunicable things in the world and one most decisively marking off higher man from mass-man.

Needless to say, these qualities only denote the characteristics that distinguish these two large categories of mankind in a very general way. As the two approach one another, no sharp line can be drawn: those just beginning to show the qualities that make for differentiation still bear upon them many, even most, of the sheep-like qualities of the mass, while some of those still predominantly mass may be manifesting the first signs of what will, or may, eventually become aspiration and independence. Between the highest and the lowest there is an almost infinite range of gradation. Any society founded on a supreme regard for quality of life, that wills to “produce great persons”—as ours does *not*. How *can* a society whose heroes are mere “specialists in money-making,” with all that entails, really care about such things!—will always note the appearance of such promising individuals and will give them opportunities commensurate with their manifestation of capacity.

But my Communist critic went on to ask *by what test* I would declare some higher, and by what authority.

My test would be primarily the historic fact that such men alone have created all the significant culture of which we have record. Without them, human existence would have had little more value than that of an anthill.

My authority is the pronouncement of these “higher” men themselves. Obviously they are its only possible source. A higher man can always “place” a lower; a lower man, never a higher. Mass-man is inherently incapable of true appreciation of real greatness, for the simple reason that he has not experienced it. He can have no understanding of what a man of intellectual or moral elevation has had to go through to become what he is, or any way of measuring how far above himself higher man stands. He may vaguely sense something utterly beyond him, and therefore gape, or even paint a gilded halo, but he lacks hopelessly any experience upon which to base a sound evaluation. Higher men can be recognized only by other higher men; and doubtless the greatness of the highest, when his lot is cast in the midst of men of inferior gifts, can be estimated justly only by himself.

This is not arrogance. Upon quiet reflection it must be obvious to anyone of common sense. And certainly, though I may seem to talk a good deal about the highest ones, I do not in my own mind place myself among them.

As for the more practical problem of determining who actually belongs in a higher class and who in a lower, I shall have something to say in a later chapter.

My Communist reader objected to what he called my "substratum' doctrine," not only because he believed that there was no "reasonably sure test" by which mass-man and higher man could be separated (to which I trust I have given a sufficient answer), but also because he believed it "anti-evolutionary." Well, I believe in evolution, but he seemed to hold to a conception of it now repudiated by scientists of standing. Evolution means only the development of one form out of another: it may as well be downward as upward. And certainly about upward evolution there is nothing either automatic or inevitable, as I pointed out in my last chapter. There has been, and there *am be*, no evolution of the higher faculties in man that is unconscious and without striving. On the whole, the qualities that I listed as characteristic of higher men are the inexorable condition for the only kind of evolution that is any longer significant. Mass-man, by definition, is composed of the kind of human beings who do not manifest those qualities, who are therefore incapable of evolution. A study of history gives me no reason to think that the great mass of mankind today shows either intelligence or character superior to that of the mass many thousands of years ago. This is not pessimism. It is only, it would seem, what anyone must perceive who throws himself out of the sleep-walking in which romantic idealists tend to indulge, and who looks at facts with his eyes wide open. We cannot get anywhere by make-believe. I, too, have my ideals, my moral and social objectives, but I will choose such as I believe realizable on Earth, and I will not let them rest upon a need to prettify life or to pretend that it is something that I can see very clearly that it is not.

My severest critics were our pacifist ex-minister and our Communist ex-professor. The latter raised a number of good points. There is yet one more to which I felt that I must reply. He was indignant that I should, as he thought, lump together both the ruthless capitalist and the self-sacrificing mother as examples of selfishness. "Surely," he exclaimed, "you cannot class the two kinds of experience as identical. One is selfishness for self; the other is selfishness for others. By all ordinary usage the first is selfish; the second, altruistic. At best your argument is a semantic exercise. At worst it is intolerable verbalism and formalism." Let us see.

In the first place, I *do not by any means* "class the two kinds of experience as identical." This should have been clear from what I said on the subject the first time it came up. My reader should recall that I pointed out how Nietzsche despised and repudiated the "sickly selfishness" and declared a horror unto him the degenerate selfishness that cried "all for myself." It must have been evident enough to everyone of insight that I have never ignored, and never for one moment wished to depreciate, the vast difference in ethical quality that separates the devotion of the loving mother or the martyr to a high cause, from, let us say (to make the contrast extreme), the vampirism of some munitions manufacturer who coins mountains of gold out of the wars that he has deliberately fomented. The truth is that I am so acutely sensitive to the difference that I often find it difficult not to yield to my ingrained habit of thinking of such actions in terms of "selfish" and "unselfish." The trouble with this is that it is aside from the point that I have had primarily at heart in writing on this subject. There is no question about the value that I attach to ethical quality. It is of the greatest moment to me. But in what I have been writing about selfishness and unselfishness I have

been concerned, for the time, not with ethical quality but with the *correct psychological analysis of motive* in human conduct. At this particular point, I am interested in nailing down self, self-interest, self-advantage, of some kind, on some plane, as the source of every act whatever. "The one," protests my Communist critic, thinking of the exploiting capitalist, "is selfishness for self. The other," the devoted mother, "is selfishness for others." Granted. *But behind both is self seeking some kind of satisfaction.* I am absolutely at one with the verdict of the English jurist James Fitzjames Stephen when he declared that the assertion "that any human creature, ever, under any conceivable circumstances, acted otherwise than in obedience to that which for the time being was his strongest wish," was utterly "incredible" and "unmeaning."³ This—that behind every conceivable act is self-interest—is my point here, and I will neither let up my pressure on it, nor let anyone minimize its importance.

Acts *are* of very different ethical quality. And we need appropriate words to designate the value that we place upon them. Perhaps we shall have to coin words specially to our purpose. Perhaps—though I should not find it at all satisfactory—we might call "expansive" the acts in which the self finds joy in expending itself on others. Perhaps we might call "sour," "sickly," or "avaricious"—though I am sure we shall not!—the numbing, contracting satisfaction of the self when it turns inward and seeks to draw everything into itself. But "selfish," "unselfish," and "altruistic" are so misleading as to be absolutely unacceptable if we want to communicate any just meaning. "Selfish" carries with it an implicit blame and condemnation that are not necessarily warranted; and "unselfish" and "altruistic" carry with them an implicit recognition and awarding of virtue that may be equally undeserved. At bottom *no* act is unselfish, altruistic. Every act is done for the sake of some sort of advantage to the self.

"All right," perhaps my reader will exclaim, finally growing exasperated at hearing this said yet again, "but after all, what is so important about it that you must fairly din it into our ears? We're all selfish after a fashion, you say. Very well, then, we are. Nevertheless, though you would reject the words 'selfish' and 'unselfish,' you yourself still recognize the distinction that they are ordinarily used to cover. What is the point of your everlasting insistence?"

The point is, at the lowest and least, a matter of "psychological cleanliness"—if you can imagine what that is!—of calling things by their right names, of avoiding secret dishonesties to cover up nasty things. But I mention this only in passing.

The primary point is that the individual person is the very citadel of Life itself. If we are to have great strong beautiful life we have got to accept and hallow the self—in which, of course, is to be included all that native nobility within you, which is inextricably you however much you may have preferred to call it God. (See Chapter IV, p. 85, *supra*, paragraph beginning, "It is to be noted . . .") It is not selfishness we should strive to get rid of (if for no other reason because in the last analysis that is impossible), but rather the sour, maimed, sickly, avaricious selfishness, that of the self which has always looked out upon life from below, as it were from the windows of a cellar, which has always gazed upon all fullness and wealth of life through the envious, covetous, resentful eyes of its own impotence to acquire them. Out of such a self can come *little but* smallness, meanness, and all that is evil-smelling. Without a strong, well-knit, overflowing self there can be no greatness or beauty of life whatever, no towering, beneficent personalities, lighting up all time and space and pointing

out a path for mankind far down the centuries. Before ever anyone can know “the bestowing virtue” and find joy in spending himself for others, he must possess an inner wealth and fullness, and overfullness, out of which it is possible to be lavish of himself. Behind every great lover there stands a great self. Behind every great reformer there stands a great self. And likewise behind every great artist, composer, teacher, ruler, scientist, saint, or seer. Before there can ever be *any* great seeing, or saying, or doing, there must be the inner wealth, strength, and masterfulness of a powerful personality. Very true, as many people would be quick to reply, powerful personalities will sometimes run amuck. But if we are to have the one we shall have to accept the risk and pay the price of the other. To my notion a landscape is intolerable without mountains. And better that some prove volcanoes than that we settle down to the drabness of a plateau. No price is too high to pay for greatness.

Such doctrine has never been without meaning, or unpalatable, to those who themselves have possessed these qualities. But there has always been one very large aggregate of men to whom, at least since the time when their peace was poisoned by the preaching of equality, it has been utter anathema. I mean the sheeplike masses. Like all life they too have ever striven for mastery. They have wanted to oust all those large leonine natures who, looking down on them from above, have recognized their inferiority and held them—not necessarily by force—to a position of subordination. All such superior men have they wanted to put down, and with them all idea of superiority. They themselves would climb on top, and set up their flat, mean little utopia of security, safety, and happiness. No one would have to be inconvenienced by any struggle to change himself. There need be no pain of striving, no self-discipline, no burden of aloneness. Each one could go on being the same weak, meaningless, little man that he always had been. The change would be accomplished by means external to the soul of man—cheap, easy, and painless. There would simply be a *re-forming of society*, a rearrangement of its parts, called social organization—with all kinds of machinery—lots of gadgets.

And the weapon—what has been the chief weapon to this end? Oh, of course, when it was time for it, when it was deemed expedient, force has been used. But against the strong and the noble this was hardly the most effective weapon—for they were rarely to be daunted by threat of force. Besides, there was another weapon, which for use all year round, in time of peace as in time of war, was a weapon effective beyond all others, against any and every sort of person but especially against the strong and the noble. This was the poison contained in the little word “selfish.” If that could somehow be made palatable, perhaps by a very sweet coating of a sure “reward in heaven,” for “humility,” for “meekness,” perhaps the strong, noble man might be induced to take it, and having taken it, be slowly, almost imperceptibly, poisoned against himself and against his strong nature, until he was ashamed of it, and, striving to renounce it, for the sake of what was declared virtue and to escape the threatened pains of hell or the certain pains of present opprobrium, he would get down and walk through life on his knees, and thus make himself small—like the rest—like the herd.

This little word “selfish” has been the knotted lash by which the herd has undertaken to achieve mastery—on the whole, with fatal effectiveness. It was very natural that it should have been a Communist who pressed for the retention of this little Sunday School word: *he needs it*—to help turn all mankind into a herd (at last, of course, with himself as one of its masters). Just see how wonderfully it works! Because it would be “selfish” to give pain to his

parents, the young man of unfolding promise gives up the way that they had opposed, and he becomes ordinary—like them—like the rest. Because it would be “selfish” to jeopardize the security of his wife and family, the potential creator commonly violates the betrothal into which he entered before ever he met his wife, before ever, it seems, he even was born, and turns deaf ears and closed eyes to all that which, with unflinching entreaty, beckons and calls him to the work that he was meant to do. He betrays himself and all those who, unknown either to themselves or to him, would have looked to him for light, and remains in the embraces of his wife—a “respectable” man, a faithful husband and father, but a lost soul, hopelessly uncertain even of his bearings, haunted forever by the corroding sense that he has forfeited the entire meaning of his existence. And likewise with the strong potentially creative personality in all his relations with society as a whole: the more he has been conscientious, the more he has been forced by the authority and the pressing weight of the word “selfish” to narrow his range of choice to the “altruistic,” to what would be “for the good of others.” He adds one more cipher, one more nothing, to undifferentiated mass-man. This little word “selfish” has been like the gnawing grinding fringe of the sea, the tireless breakers, forever wearing at the very foundations of the citadel of all strong, superior life. Everything high they would bring down, and swallow up, until only sea remains, until everywhere all becomes mass. This has been going on with an ever-accelerating tempo for the past few hundred years. In my own lifetime, in the course of the past couple of generations, I have seen one vestige of nobility after another perish. Our giants are tied down by Lilliputians, suffocated under a mountain of feathers, paralyzed by the secret venomous sting of the mob. The entire Western world is now all but engulfed in mediocrity and vulgarity. And the change has been effected in great part by the power in the little word “selfish.”

It is therefore in the holy name of life, of that quality of life which alone can give human existence any significance or beauty, that I denounce this word “selfish,” and I denounce the way that it is used to turn all life of great promise against itself and its kind, and I cry unto all those who recognize within them the stir and call of a God, of their own God, of their own private personal destiny, to set at naught any and every means by which the mass may try to bring them down, and resolve at any cost and as their supreme gift to their fellows, to be true to themselves.

After this backward look over some of the ground that we have recently covered, I am ready to turn to the field with which I wish to concern myself in the rest of this book—namely, social problems.

This move on my part twenty-five years ago was viewed by some of my readers with as much misgiving and regret as others viewed it with eager interest and expectancy. One of them in particular, an old and once a very close friend and comrade, told me plainly that, although as a mystic, as one to arouse the sleeping divinity within men, I could and did speak with authority and with moving power, I simply did not have the experience, and more especially the training, for saying anything on social problems that could carry weight. In view of the loving kindness and the judicial temper with which this counsel was given to me, it was a matter of real regret that I had to set it aside. But in doing so, I felt that I was in duty bound to lay both before this friend and before the rest of my readers the considerations that had determined my decision.

It is true, I said, that I am not a specialist, and that I am venturing into fields in any one of which the more conscientious spirits among us today would likely feel that they must at least have a doctor's degree before they ever trusted themselves to express an opinion. But I found myself, I went on, in a predicament that I believe many of my readers must already have recognized as theirs also. I had intelligence enough to see that many of the problems, with which I was resolved to grapple, were of the utmost consequence for the future of mankind. And because they were so important, it was incumbent upon me as a man, and not less as a citizen who might at any time be called upon to register his opinion about them, that I make as careful an investigation of them as I could, bringing to the study the best qualifications that my intelligence, training, experience, and insight might give me. And this would be the more obligatory upon my readers also, if, like me, they happened to have an instinctive mistrust of the lop-sided myopic specialist who, while he may know all about the most infinitesimal minutiae of a subject, or some tiny fraction of a subject, is often little better than a barbarian and an ignoramus about most of the rest of life. He may be the world's foremost authority in his little field, and yet not command my admiration as a man. I know that he and his kind are much in vogue today. But I prefer the older ideal, which I venture to believe will someday come back, of the all-around, well-balanced, encyclopedic man. With Plato, though I am anything but a Platonist, I must seek "insight into the whole truth" and make a "study of reality in all its aspects."⁴ I like the man who, take him by surprise and as you will, is able under all conditions and in all weathers to keep his boat right side up.

It might be, I went on, that in the maelstrom of some of these problems, crossed and churned by so many fierce currents and counter currents, I should *not* be able to avert an upset, and that some of my readers might take secret pleasure in my discomfiture. But if so, I trusted that I, too, could laugh, and learn my lesson, and go on to the next. In any case, since—I had been told—I was out of my proper field, I would not expect my readers to take my deliverances too seriously. I was not arrogating to myself the authority of an oracle. Let what I wrote be set down as "Bill Simpson's opinions." But let them speak for themselves, and let each of my readers take from them what he wished to and could, be it much or little.

But there were two reasons for why, regardless of what my readers might make of my venture into the social field, I myself took it with very real seriousness.

The first is that mystics have commonly made the mistake, as I see it, of not leaving behind any guiding clues as to the way in which society might gradually be shaped into a good seed-bed for the kind of life that they believed it desirable to foster. Professor Ellsworth Huntington of Yale once said, "The seers have failed to realize that their teachings had a biological foundation. They thought men could be made pure and strong and wise merely by being taught." As a rule, they have entirely ignored society, as though it were of little or no importance, or had little or no bearing on their life-purpose. Except for Nietzsche, it is difficult to think of any of whom this was not true. Ramakrishna left "the world" to others, and the efforts to improve conditions in society made by his disciple Vivekananda, though they were intense and dedicated and tireless, were nevertheless, it strikes me, as superficial as the labor of a modern social service worker. As far as I can see, the same neglect is to be found in Jesus. Since I have already dwelt upon this at some length in an earlier chapter, I need not go over the ground again here. Jesus simply had nothing to say about the life of

men in an organized society: that is the plain fact of the matter. He completely failed to look upon the world as a garden that, through many generations, would need to be cultivated in a special way, in order to produce in larger numbers the kind of men he had spent all his life trying to find. No matter what reasons may be adduced for this, it is a sizable failure. And as far as the rest of the mystics are concerned, it may safely be said that their failure was less only as their gifts and their influence were smaller.

However narrow may be my influence, I do not want to make the same mistake. Just *because* I am concerned primarily about the inner life of man, I am concerned also about the problems affecting that inner life that arise from the fact that men live together in a society.

Finally, I find heart to hope that, at least for some of my readers, there may be a peculiar and distinct value in their expectation and their confidence that I shall bring to the examination of the problems before us very much of what has been the dominant concern of my life, and has marked it, for all of fifty years. As a scientist, as anthropologist or geneticist, or even as sociologist or psychologist, I am no specialist. But there is one thing in which I may justly claim that I am a specialist. I am a specialist in the inner life of man. I have studied it, as it were, from its first faint stir in the earth to its full-grown flower and fruit, and have noted well the marks of it, and the conditions for its growth and fulfillment. Since at least 1920, through whatever changes I may have made, it has been my prevailing passion that the life of man might be exalted. For this, above all else, I have lived. That I might ever cleave unto this, I have held myself ready, if need be, to leave all others. And I believe that it is not altogether nothing, nor a thing of little worth, to be able to bring to the consideration of these great problems, the insight, the values, and the concern for elevation of life that have been born of my experience. Perhaps it will give me a qualification that to some extent will make up for some lack of strictly scientific training. Because of the very fact that I do not get so lost in tracing the mechanics of heredity, for instance, I may the more clearly see what the evidence means, whither it all points. I may be the more aware of the woods because my eyes are not quite so close to the trees. And where authorities are flatly and almost fiercely opposed, as in some problems is the case, and one looks to authorities only to one's confusion, I may have in my intuition a sense of what will best serve to exalt the life of man, that may lead some of us, or at any rate me, out of the dilemma.

1945, 1970.

¹ *Zur Morphologie*, 1807 (written in 1795), *Werke*, XXXVI, p. 7. Quoted by G.H. Lewes in his *The Life and Work of Goethe*, chapter entitled "The Poet As A Man of Science," Everyman Edition, p. 367.

² Samuel J. Holmes—*Human Genetics And Its Social Import*, McGraw, 1936, p. 169. An excellent introduction to genetics and its bearing on a great variety of vital human problems.

³ See his *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*, London, 1873, p. 277.

⁴ Raphael Demos—*Plato, Selections*, New York, 1927, Intro. p.v.

Chapter 9.

The Inevitable Foundation of Any Sound Society.

Only that is good for a nation which comes from its own core and from its own seed, without aping of another. For what is beneficial to one people at a certain historical stage, may perhaps show itself as poison to another. All attempts to introduce foreign novelty to a people in whom a need for the same is not deep within its heart are foolish, and all devices with revolutionary intention are without success; for they are without God, who holds himself aloof from such blunderings.

Goethe—*Conversations with Eckermann*, Jan. 4, 1824

Before anyone can attempt to frame the principles upon which any enduring and culturally significant society must be built, he must decide what, in his view, should be the end that a given people, whether consciously or unconsciously, must ever hold before itself. What must it aim at?

This is a subject that I have been turning over in my mind, and often intensively studying, for the past forty years. For light on it, I have explored such fields most pertinent to it as religion, philosophy, genetics, eugenics, sociology, and—in particular—history, the comparative records of the different races and nations, and above all, the history of *periods* that by common consent tower above the rest by the significance of their culture. Against the reaches of anthropological time the record of human efforts to found satisfactory societies may seem very short, but he who has the insight to read it with understanding, can at the least learn from it what has worked most and best, and what has worked least and worst. And since human nature now seems to be essentially what it was thousands of years ago, it is doubtful whether any venture proposed for our future can be expected to work very well that is not integral with what has proved itself in our human past. It is under the guidance and inspiration of such basically conservative instincts and values that I shall make any proposals for the future that may seem to some of my readers too radical.

The only end worthy to be the primary object of any people's existence is, as I think, to produce the largest possible number of truly superior men—of robust health, overflowing energy, unspoiled instinct, mind powerful both to analyze and to create, and—above all—of that integrated, masterful personality and elevated spirit that ever characterizes the truly noble man. The reason that every great people has shown a will to give supreme place to its manifestly superior men is twofold; first, because great men and their works are its exceedingly great pride and glory, the justification of its existence and its highest fulfillment, in which each individual, even the lowest, feels himself lifted up, in that he knows he has taken some necessary part in making them possible; secondly, because such great men are its salvation: they alone can organize its life to make it generally satisfying, and therefore sound and enduring, and can steer it successfully past the perils that assail the life of every people, both from without and from within, or enable it to overcome them. The quality of its top

ten percent must constantly be maintained if it is ever to amount to anything, or even long to survive.

Those who remember the intensity with which I explored the inner life of man forty or fifty years ago, may be ready to assume that I shall even now make capacity for the mystical experience my primary criterion for distinguishing the superior. But I long ago outgrew any such narrowness that I might once have shown. Mystical experience of a certain order, for all its importance to me personally and indeed in the highest development of humanity generally, is only one of the means by which life may be integrated, shaped, and elevated. I recognize greatness of different orders and kinds, and rejoice in the infinite variety that seems to be as characteristic of human life as of life in field and forest. I should not like the stuffiness and stiffness of a society composed entirely of saints, whose "holiness" is usually based on a rejection of the Earth and the body, and is therefore offensive to my taste, nor even one composed largely of seers, since in every society there are many kinds of work to be done for which the seer is quite unfitted. Indeed, for all that my own insight and experience have revealed the superior power of mind and spirit over that of fist or sword or law, yet I confess that I take delight in the man of sheer action, who proves himself so able to keep his footing on the turning log of circumstance even as it is shot through the swiftest and most rock-strewn rapids, who is never at a loss to know what to do to meet the situation that confronts him. For all their turbulence, I *like* the heroes of Homeric epic and Norse saga, men like Hector, Achilles and Odysseus, Sigurd, Grettir, Gunnar and Njal. At least they reveal the rich elemental stuff out of which alone can be forged the purer metal of the culturally more significant men who come after. To my notion, Napoleon and William the Conqueror were great men, as well as Jesus and Kabir, or Michelangelo and Beethoven—even though of vastly different kind: and if Napoleon had been as successful in his efforts to unify Europe as was William the Conqueror in unifying England, Europe might have escaped the mounting horror of that endless internecine strife that has left her at last a bleeding and almost helpless victim in the maw of Russia. Surely, it is only the doctrinaire, anxious to make all men over in his own image, with outlook on life narrowed to the chink of his own little dogma and delighting to spin across it endless theories about how life might be or ought to be, who cannot accept and love life as it is, in its entirety, and recognize the greatness of such men and the part that they have played in forwarding human development.

Thus it is personal greatness, though greatness of every conceivable sort, that the sound society aims primarily to produce. To this end all institutions are shaped, all other considerations bent or sacrificed—that the men of exceptional inborn capacities and richest promise may have the special opportunities that they require to come to their full stature, and that they may have the room in which to do the works of which they alone are capable. Thus, more or less, has it ever been in the past. And thus would I make it in the future.

Let my reader note well that I do not make happiness the end of a people's existence as a society. I don't mean that there has not been happiness in the past, nor that there will not be in the future, but happiness is at its richest and most satisfying when it is not directly sought but comes as a by-product of expending one's energy in doing some piece of work well, or for the sake of achieving some other thing in which one deeply believes. In particular, I would not make the happiness of the greatest number the determining consideration, or the will of the majority, or even the well-being of the common people—in fact, quite the

contrary, for I am convinced that they are not capable of providing wisely even for their own good, let alone for achieving the higher social ends. When they seize the helm and undertake to steer affairs in their own interest, all they can do, all they ever have done, ultimately, is to run the ship aground, and be forced in the end to return the command to One or a Few. Democracy, that is, a government set up by the people as a whole and controlled, directly or indirectly, by the majority of the citizens—something our Founding Fathers were careful to see that we did not get, which probably we never have had and certainly do not have now—stands revealed in the light of history as the most fragile, the most corrupt, the most short-lived, and the least fruitful of all forms of government.¹ The simple well-being of the mass is provided for best, on the whole and within the limits of what is practicable under any system, as the concomitant of an effort to construct a society that will favor the emergence and dominance of truly superior men.

It may be, I concede, that, owing to the limitations of human wisdom and the supply of human goods, there will be, at least at times and perhaps always to some extent, a conflict and incompatibility between meeting the simple needs and desires of the great mass of common people, on the one hand, and on the other, of providing the exceptional opportunities required for the fullest development of the few of highest promise. I am perfectly clear, for instance, that any effort to afford really equal opportunity to all, will *tend, inevitably*, to make the opportunity afforded of such a kind and on a level so low that it will be within the appreciation and the reach of the most ordinary. That is, the effort to provide equal opportunity for all invariably means, more and more, the *denial* of opportunity to the superior *few*, the denial of those exceptional, rare, costly, and privileged opportunities without which the potentially greatest intellects and spirits cannot come to their fullest flower and fruition. On the other hand, it may well be that at times these choice and costly privileges could be afforded to the few of superior endowment only by some curtailment of the comfort or the opportunities of the mass of the population. When such a conflict or incompatibility occurs, between the interests of the many and the interests of the superior few, I am perfectly clear that it should be the interests of the many that should be sacrificed. For after all, even if given every opportunity in the world, the many could go but little farther than they go with their opportunities restricted; they lack the capacity to benefit by rare opportunity, they do not have it in them to go far. Thus there is but little loss if they stop somewhat short of the highest of which they are capable. On the other hand, upon its superior ten percent depends every people's entire cultural significance—and *even its very existence*. Moreover, wherever there is solidarity in a people, as there is in every true people, in every great people, the masses find a compensation for their limited circumstances in the achievements of their great men. Since they know that without their labor and devotion their great men could hardly have done their work, they feel, and feel justly, that the achievements of their great men are in substantial part their own achievements. Because they too "belong" because they know themselves to be indispensable, indeed to be the very foundation of the whole society, they also share the glory.

My point here is this: Where there is conflict of interest, where the well-being of one element of society must be sacrificed to that of another, it should always be the lesser value that is sacrificed for the sake of the greater. And value is not to be measured in terms of number.

With this much by way of preface and background, let me now proceed to submit the principles that, it seems to me, we must be prepared to accept and to maintain if we really want a society that will favor the emergence and the dominance of the truly superior man.

First of all, I place racial homogeneity. Every enduring society of the greatest cultural significance has been homogeneous. By its isolation on a peninsula, or on an island, or in a closed river valley, or by the will of its rulers, it has avoided mixing its blood with the blood of aliens. Moreover, the whole population has been held under the impress of the same values for centuries. This was the pattern followed in all the great cultures of the past. The result was a people very much one, in blood, traditions, values, and goals.

This thesis is not to be met by the confident reply, popular in one school of anthropology (and there, it would seem, a little bit *over*-confident), that "there is no such thing as 'pure' race." That much is conceded. Probably all peoples, at one time or another, have mixed their blood more or less with the blood of aliens. And an *occasional* cross with a people not too different may even be desirable. Nevertheless, I believe that both history and genetics support my contention that racial homogeneity is one of the most important factors in making a people stable and culturally significant. And homogeneity can be effected in any people at any time by three measures: (1) segregation; (2) inbreeding; and (3) subjection to the same values for a long period of time. Needless to say, the ultimate capability of any given stock will depend primarily on the potentiality of the stock thus inbred. Neither inbreeding nor any other regimen can make something out of nothing.

This is too important a point to leave without adducing, albeit most briefly, some supporting evidence. (I shall support it massively in following chapters.) One needs but a moment's reflection to be reminded forcibly of the peculiar geographical isolation of the great cultural centers of the ancient past—Egypt and Mesopotamia shut in by deserts and the sea; the empire of the Incas behind its rampart of mountains; Greece, Rome, and India on peninsulas; Crete, Britain, and Japan on islands. To achieve an isolation denied them by nature the Chinese built a cyclopean wall thousands of miles long, and the intrusion of the outsider had to be supported with a force beyond their means of resistance before they capitulated; and even then it was only to regard the foreigner and all his works, his railway trains included, with the utmost disdain.

Where nature did not lend herself to isolation, and usually even where she did, as an additional self-preservative measure people sought to maintain segregation by their very attitude toward all aliens. The ancient Hebrews, far from being isolated, were on the very highway of the nations, but the Old Testament abounds in evidence of how desperately their religious leaders, from the beginning to the end, struggled to prevent their intermarriage not only with the despised and hated gentiles but even with those of a Semitic blood very close to their own. It was not necessarily that they regarded themselves as the cultural superiors of those from whom they held themselves aloof: in this respect the Jews of the time of David, for instance, could hardly have counted themselves the superiors of their contemporary Egyptians, who had already built the pyramids, Thebes and Karnak. It was simply the attitude of a proud people already keenly aware of physical and spiritual treasures in their germ plasm, which they were unwilling to dissipate by "that most potent destroyer of instinct, indiscriminate cross-breeding." And the Egyptians, the Greeks, and every other

great people of antiquity, without exception took exactly the same attitude. In one form of speech or another, they all pronounced everything foreign as barbarian and abhorrent, and they held aloof from it as from something inferior and unclean. In more modern times, we find the Saxon showing the same feeling. The English, the latest of the peoples to whom we are most indebted for our culture, might at first glance be taken for an example opposed to my belief in the value of segregation. But this would be quite unfounded. Though the English may not have been, even at the zenith of their history, so haughty in their feeling of superiority as the ancient Greek, Hebrew, or Egyptian, yet they are not, and never have been, the mongrel race they are sometimes declared to be. True enough, there were long periods of constantly recurring invasion. But the Romans left practically no blood behind them, and the Angles, Saxons, Danes, Vikings, and Normans all represented but different branches of one Teutonic family: one might almost say they were cousins. So that what we really have, as Anthony M. Ludovici first brought to my attention, is one protracted crossing between an aboriginal stock and Teutonic invaders; and even this came almost to a complete stop with the Norman Conquest in 1066. From that time on, for nearly 900 years, there was very little infiltration of new blood. Instead there ensued many centuries of that inbreeding that does most to make a stock stable and to bring to flower any genius latent within it.

I do not forget that in the last fifteen or twenty years there has come to be a really massive colored invasion of England, which, viewed from a distance, it may seem that the English people are accepting with a quietness that belies my argument. But several things are to be noted.

(1) It is well known, even though not known generally, that this invasion was deliberately promoted by well-financed alien elements outside of Great Britain.

(2) The drive to *create* a race problem in England, where none had existed before, coincided with an obviously concerted world-wide drive to *enbitter and exploit racial antagonisms where they already existed*, notably in the United States by the 1954 decision of our Supreme Court against Segregation, and in South Africa by the threat of extreme sanctions if it did not abandon its policy of apartheid. Everywhere the all-too-evident purpose has been to tear countries to pieces preparatory to their overthrow.

(3) The admission of colored hordes into Britain was paralleled by an induced confusion and uncertainty of mind and instinct in the British people that has finally resulted in the loss of their Empire and in their total eclipse as a Great Power. In short, it has been only a sick England that has relaxed its attitude of aloofness toward the alien, an England beaten and shaken in its inner certainty about itself. It is likely, therefore, that the entire future of the once great, truly *great*, Britons will hinge on the outcome of the revolt now spreading in British hearts, which wills to restore Britain to the British people.

In the above, I have given a brief sketch of what seems to have been the strikingly similar attitude toward the alien taken by the great peoples of the past. Regardless of what may be the explanation of it in circumstance or in motive, the facts seem to be indisputable: they *all* held the markedly different and the alien in dislike, mistrust, and disdain—held them, more or less, at arm's length.

But Ludovici, Reibmayr,² and others whom I might mention, go far beyond a mere acknowledgment of the facts. They go on to maintain, (1) that no people has ever become a great people and produced a significant and durable culture except as it first took and long preserved precisely this attitude of aloofness that we have under discussion; and (2) that as soon as its exclusiveness was relaxed and it began to intermarry freely with aliens, it declined as a people and its culture withered. That these two things do stand together, it seems to me that a careful student of history can hardly deny. And that there are cogent reasons for believing that they stand together in a relation of cause and effect, I am firmly convinced. The subject is both large and of crucial importance, and it requires to be expanded at length. Such full treatment, I shall give it in a later chapter of this book. Here, however, I must hold myself to my immediate purpose to present certain fundamental principles upon which I believe any great people must found its life. The first that I have named is racial homogeneity, which is the result partly of segregation and inbreeding, and partly of cultural unity, of the sustained iron impress of the same values over long centuries.

Out of this total process comes at last social solidarity. The fabric that binds all the people together is close-knit. According to the measure of their comprehension and the strength of their character, all have the same ethic, the same religion, believe passionately in their greatness as a people, and understand and accept and uphold their social organization, their goals, their government, and their way of life as the most desirable on Earth. Every man, no matter what his position in the social scale, feels that he belongs. He walks with the dignity of one who knows himself important to a whole with which he is inextricably connected and which bears not only his security but the entire meaning of his existence. Beneath all surface differences and personal clashes, there is an underlying unity that, in a crisis, makes man stand with man, family with family, class with class, and all with the whole in a devotion that is unto death. Such a people may be crushed by a superior force, but they will never disintegrate. A good example of it is the Japanese. Another is the Jews.

Whenever a people wills to achieve solidarity and finds in its midst a body of aliens, I believe it must do one of two things with them: either they must be ejected, or else no matter what *cultural* relations with them may be allowed, they must as it were be encysted—that is, *kept intact as a foreign body and separate*, with intermarriage prohibited under the sternest penalties.

The institution that I believe to be basic to every well-constituted society is the family, the home. Certainly among Indo-European stocks it has proved itself so. Probably it is our oldest institution—older than the state, older even than the tribe, much older than the individual. In the ancient world the state was an aggregate not of individuals, as with us today, but of families. And I can but believe that for all the family may, from age to age, change to some extent in its form and constitution, it must yet ever remain at once the fundamental and the essential institution of every healthy society. Looked at unsentimentally it is our breeding institution. As such it is easy to see that it ensures first, that the life of a people is carried on into the future. But, wisely used, it can also ensure that the race not only goes on but also goes up. The outstanding individual, it is true, is the immediate means by which the life of a people is served and exalted. Without him the life of society would be left at a standstill.

But before and after the individual, and in and under and behind him, is the family. I cannot see how the individual can be made the basic unit. A society of individuals is an atomistic society, a pile of loosely-cemented sand. Its cohesive forces are weak. Under heavy strain it falls to pieces. And for me even the *great* individuals, the *great persons*, are not to be understood apart from the family. They are not men who live as an end unto themselves (unless, perhaps, in the ultimate reaches of genius), not the miraculous “sports” they often seem, not like certain comets that come we know neither whence nor why. These great persons are at bottom, and really, the flowering of the life of a family. Apart from the family, perhaps they could not come into existence. They are *not* individuals, properly so called: they are *family*-come-to-flowering in one or another of its sons, the fruiting tips of a family tree. Through many generations, perhaps even through centuries, a family, with a sense of its worth (and it may be a family on any level of society), has treasured its seed, improved it by wise marriage, and quietly and carefully garnered each gain—until at last the swollen family energy and capacity suddenly bursts its bonds and pours forth into a superior person. But even though this person breaks loose from the family, loose even from the law of society, and seems to follow only a law of his own nature, yet that inner voice and law of his own, which he obeys as the behest of his own private personal God, is ultimately, when regarded from a certain angle, but the instinct of his family, in him purified, tempered, pointed, and heavily charged with life. For all that the great innovator and creator, as we look upon him, seems to stand before us so supremely and self-sufficiently, nonetheless *in* and *under* and *behind* him, in a most realistic way (I say it again), is the family. The continuity of family life is the womb in which, through countless generations, the genius may be shaped. It is the wisely nurtured soil out of which he is sprung as its finest and final fruit. At his best he is the light and glory, the saviour and the maker, of a whole people. Yet it is the *family* that made *him*, and that will in time make others like him. The family remains basic. The family is not only the ground on which the life of a people rests, but the keystone of the entire social structure built upon it.

Yet the institution that is thus all-important is no such family as the dying vestige we see all about us today. The family, to be a real family, must be rooted in the earth. There must be a place whence it recognizes that it sprang, where it feels itself finally centered, whither its members repair on anniversary and festival occasions, to renew and to deepen their sense of family identity, family pride, and common devotion to one another and to the family name. I simply do not believe that any people can long maintain its stamina once it has lost its roots in the earth.

There must be a homestead. And a homestead is more than a mere house located in the country. It must be at least a house that a man securely owns, and in connection with which he owns also a shop or land enough to make of him and his holding a significant unit of production. The homestead must provide the means by which a man and those who follow him, generation after generation, are able, without worry or hurry, to make sure of their living, primarily by producing and making for themselves the things that they need. Often there have been laws—very wise ones—by which it was made almost impossible for the ancestral holdings to be alienated.³ The homestead thus became the citadel of a man’s life. Here he could hold off the pressures of the world. Here he had room to discover his own bent and to follow it, to try out his own ideas and to reap the fruit of acting upon them. Here he had room to become a person, not necessarily a great person, but a person, with a

shape and direction and force of his own. Though another man be greater than he, even much greater (for thus it is among humans), yet by his homestead he was given the freedom, not perhaps to vote (which is generally but an infrequent and trivial, and commonly even an utterly empty, expression of freedom), but to be something in and of himself, to be a man, all year round to be what he really was. The old English yeoman, with his life rooted somewhat thus, in the land, was known wherever he went, and far beyond where he went, for the strength of his character.

The great body of the people of a society thus constituted are established on the land, in the open country, in villages and towns. Also, their economic and political life is decentralized. Everything except matters of the most general concern is decided locally, by the people whose interests are immediately involved in the decision to be made, and who know the situation firsthand. Only so can policies be shaped for the true good of the people. Only so, when the administrative units are small, is it possible to keep alive in the smaller individuals a healthy sense of their worth and importance, to keep them from being crushed into a feeling of insignificance and impotence under the sheer mass weight of numbers and size.

But by this time I am sure that many of my readers, perhaps most of them, are laughing at me. I was fully aware, quite a way back, that some of you had already begun to do so. "What nonsense!" were you not saying to yourselves? "What an anachronism! What is it all but a defeated dreamer's desire to escape reality by turning back the hands of the clock?" Or, as a Communist intellectual demanded after reading the first draft of this paper twenty-five years ago, "What does this have to do with modern America?"

But possibly I am not quite such a fool as I may seem. At any rate, I myself am fully aware that our much-vaunted modern industrialism has already all but destroyed the economic foundation of the home. It has cut its roots. There is almost no more reason for the existence of homes. People might as well live in flats and apartments, and ever increasingly they do. The decline of family solidarity has been paced by the growth of insurance companies, which have so largely taken its place. In times of trouble people used to turn for help to other members of their families; now they turn to their insurance policies or to a bank. Our family life has largely been dissolved, leaving a lot of very loosely related individuals, each fending more or less for himself. We have become a rootless population, a nation on wheels, and ever more like a horde of wandering nomads. Most addresses are good only for a few years. Which is to say that the real life has long since passed out of the family institution. If we continue in the direction in which we are now plunging headlong, the family must become but a fond memory, an empty name, a dead shell. Yes, I am realist enough to recognize all this. Indeed, I recognize more. I recognize that we are going to continue our present headlong plunge. Whether or not we wish it, the clock is not going to be turned back. On the contrary, *we are going to follow our present path—to its end.*

"Well, what of it!" maybe you exclaim, "What's wrong with our path? The family belongs to the parochialism of the past, and we with our industrialism and all the other improvements the modern age has brought in, are headed for the broad high plains of internationalism and universal brotherhood." Nonsense. Nonsense, and blindness, and perfidy. I will tell you "what of it." No institution can long stand that is not more old than it is new, that does not run deep down into its people's past. All our vaunted modernism has done is to build a

world in which it is ever more apparent that we cannot *live*. On an ever-increasing scale we are turning our society into a human ant hill, and our people into faceless and all-but-nameless nothings, as alike as grains of sand. And those in whom the life force has not been tamed and beaten hate the meaninglessness of their existence—its boredom, its emptiness, its indignity. But society was made for man and not man for society. Any social arrangement that is in violation of man's deepest life is marked for dissolution. The handwriting is on the wall, and even he who runs—if he can read anything—can read that.⁴

Yet—think not that I am turned pessimist. My faith in man is as deep as ever it was, indeed even deeper, because it is now more securely founded. But in my farm high up in the Catskill Mountains, I have a kind of eagle's aerie, from the distance and elevation of which I can watch the great movements of men in the valley below, and perceive whither they tend—and perhaps even penetrate a bit beneath the surface of life to some of its inner secrets. I know there are some things no one can do—no one—not even the modern scientific miracle worker. If you cut off the roots of a plant, you can't keep it alive. And we have cut off our roots. We have been so stupid and so false to our deepest instincts as to allow the rampant growth of an alien institution to choke out the very life of the family. Thereby we have prepared the day when our whole civilization shall be—*plowed under*.

In all, I have been saying that the healthy society recognizes implicitly that human beings are very unequal. They are born so and they remain so. To begin with, the sexes are very unequal, or more accurately, very unlike. Taking each as a whole, they may be of equal value to society, but in their functions they are opposites. A woman's *primary* value (I do not say her only one, though in itself it is of quite immeasurable importance) is to bear and rear children, and to make a home. Man's function is to provide, to fight and to defend, to create values, to determine goals, and to devise means for reaching them. In this task women should have very little part. And men's fitness for it is very unequal. On every level of society's life the direction of affairs should be left to the superior few. For shaping the course of society as a whole, the great majority have no inherited or acquirable capacity. They will be happiest when, not having been deluded by notions of equality, they take their place as the well-shod feet of the organism.

Again, study both of history and of genetics has convinced me that capacity is born, not reared. It may, to be sure, lie dormant because of iniquitous malnutrition or lack of opportunity, but education can at most but bring out what was inborn. It follows, therefore, that educational opportunity should not be wasted on those who lack the capacity to benefit by it.

It follows, also, that the great majority of the population *cannot* be "lifted," even by the most strenuous and well-meaning efforts. Except by rigorous attention to breeding, and then only by steps almost imperceptible in a generation,⁵ they cannot be improved at all. On the whole they will remain, as they always have been, impervious to any real culture. They fully deserve a sense of their importance as the indispensable foundation of any society, and they ought to be well rewarded with complete security and the means for enjoying their simple pleasures, yet it must always be remembered that they are inherently incapable of providing soundly even for their own well-being and should be given part in the direction of society only in regard to what is immediate and practical and their personal concern.

Once again, I am firmly convinced that no people can reach or hold the heights of greatness except as they put themselves under the discipline of eugenics, whether or not it is so called. This must take two directions—the one positive, making for improvement and increase of the best breeding stock; the other negative, making for the reduction of the proportion of inferior stock and for the complete elimination of the worst.

The first is a problem, primarily, of human mating. I trust you will not be disturbed by my use of the words “mating” and “breeding” in connection with marriage. My reader may rest assured that I have no notion of proposing that the sexual relations of men and women be approximated to the “crossings” we read about on an animal stock-breeding farm. Now as much as ever, I believe that marriage can realize its utmost possibilities only as men and women enter it in the closest unity and with the deepest mutual love and reverence.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that marriage *is* our human breeding institution. Its *primary* object is not to make two lovers happy but to produce superior children, children who if possible will mark an advance over their parents. Moreover, we know now, with absolute certainty, that if human features, traits, and capacities are transmissible from parents to offspring at all (and indeed, most such are), they are transmitted by exactly the same hereditary mechanism that governs inheritance among animals.

Furthermore, though I believe the happiness of the husband and the wife in each other to be of great importance, if for no other reason because of what it may mean toward furthering the young life once it is born, yet I do firmly believe that the affectional and sentimental side of marriage must be subordinated to the requirements for producing superiority in the coming generation. Marriages should be contracted with a view to the resulting offspring. By this, I do not mean, let me say again, that they should be contracted cold-bloodedly, after a merely rational and scientific survey of the available marriageable stock. But I do mean that people should approach marriage with their emotions under control, and with an understanding and recognition of their own type, and clear ideas of what would constitute desirability and undesirability in any mate suitable for them. These ideas would then form a sort of ambit within the limits of which they would require of themselves that they restrict their choice. This does not mean that they would try to force themselves to love someone who merely filled, as it were, their bill of particulars, but it does assume that they would keep their feelings in hand and would refuse to *let* themselves marry anyone who did *not* meet their bill of requirements, who bore the plain indications of undesirability so far as marriage with them was concerned. The sure tendency, however, would be for one to fall naturally and really in love with one of the several persons who fulfilled one’s long-cherished conception of desirability. What I am saying, chiefly, in addition to my insistence that the primary purpose of marriage is to produce superior children, is that it is absolutely essential to have exact and intelligent ideas by which men and women may be brought together whose marriages will conduce to this end. What constitutes desirability, or undesirability in a mate, for you, for me, for any other particular man or woman?

This is a matter by attention to which not only a family but a whole people can gradually be made; or by neglect and error in which both can be slowly and perhaps irretrievably ruined. Yet it is a matter that our world has been content, for long now, to leave almost entirely to chance, and about which the great mass of the people are completely ignorant. For the most

part, we either have no ideas or our ideas are false and pernicious. It is generally assumed in this land where all are declared to be equal, that anyone may marry anybody. And it is not far from the truth that the farmer knows more about the marks of desirability in a cow than he does about the marks of desirability in a mate for his son or his daughter, and that he generally gives the mating of the former a good deal closer study than he does the marriage of the latter. And the rest of the population are as ignorant as he is.

Yet it has not always been so. More than one of the ancient peoples, notably the Hindus (a branch of our own most ancient stock), wrote even into their sacred scriptures descriptions of those who, in general, were to be preferred as mates, and who were to be shunned, and what the external, physical, visible marks of desirability and undesirability were. The Jews, that very wise race, with its almost uncanny instinct for life and for what will secure not only its survival but its dominance, has written similar prescriptions into more than one of its sacred books. Moreover, it would seem that every race in a state of health shows an instinct, in mating, to choose its own kind, its like. And among great families in all societies, there has been a stern rule that their sons and their daughters should marry into families of at least an equal status with their own. To “marry down” was a thing of shame, a disgrace and an injury felt by the entire family. All this has helped in a rough and ready way, but surely and immensely, at least to keep up the level of the breeding stock of any given people. But it has remained for Anthony M. Ludovici, for the first time, so far as I am aware, in the experience of man, to bring to bear upon this question the whole body of available historical and scientific knowledge. His book *The Choice of a Mate*, in The International Library of Sexology and Psychology (John Lane, London, 1935, 510 pages), is a compendium of, and an introduction to the whole recorded wisdom of man as it bears on the problem of marriage, regarded as the human breeding institution. In its field it is unique. In view of the prejudices of our age, it is not surprising that it long ago went out of print, but I am convinced that it will remain a monument to the vision, the learning, and the courage of its author, and that it points out clearly the path that every people must tread if it would not only live, but live long, and lift its life to the heights.

Eugenics, however, as I said at the outset, requires that we take measures not only to improve the best breeding stock, but also to increase the birthrate from it. Means must be devised whereby the best people will not only feel free to have, but actually will have, the largest average number of children per family in the entire society.

On the other hand, to come to negative eugenics, means also must be devised—indeed, to some extent, already have been devised and sooner or later must be rigorously applied—whereby the birth rate from stocks full of grave hereditary defectiveness shall be kept below the number of children necessary to perpetuate such stock, so that it will gradually die out. Professor Elmer Pendell, for instance, of Jacksonville State College, has proposed a “eugenic marriage law” designed to reduce the unfit drastically in a single generation.⁶ Those who cannot earn a living, those of very low IQ’s or less than four years of education, and those with a defect or a disease or an addiction that in case of offspring might lead to offspring of low quality, would be permitted to marry only if they first submitted to sterilization. And at somewhat higher levels, offspring would be permitted only at a stipulated limit, with the penalty of sterilization if the limit were exceeded. (I shall have more to say about this in my second chapter on eugenics.) At the very lowest levels, without any reference to marriage,

resort must be made—needless to say, with all due caution and with adequate safeguards—not only to sterilization but to euthanasia. Some such measures are a life and death necessity. If a people lacks strength to eliminate its waste products, then it is marked for inevitable decline. In the long run it matters less *how* it unloads them than *that* it unloads them. It must accomplish this *somehow—or die*.

Before I conclude this matter, I want to reply briefly to a criticism of eugenics that I received from one of my readers years ago. After saying how much he had liked my definition of what constitutes superiority among men, in which I had given to character a place even above intelligence, he then went on, as though intelligence had been entirely omitted from my definition, to tell me that when I came to eugenics I must confine myself to the means for breeding men of character, of which, he declared, there were no known tests. To this, and to all and sundry who may take a like position, I want to say, in anticipation of the supporting evidence that I may be able to produce later, that there is a correlation not only between character and intelligence, but even between character, on the one hand, and health and beauty, on the other, for all of which there *are* tests.⁷

I turn now to the last of the principles that I believe essential to the wise ordering of any society, namely, the pyramidal form and the “axiocratic” organization.

All the societies that have proved soundly established have been like an organism in their structure. There is differentiation of function. As an animal has eyes to see and to distinguish friend, foe, and food; brain to determine appropriate action in regard to each; fangs and claws for attack and defense; digestive system to make nutriment available, circulatory system to carry it where needed, and excretory system to dispose of the wastes; and finally feet to bear the whole load of the body wherever the brain or instinct wills it shall go, so in the sound human society there is a rough division of the population according to capability and function. Some grow or make, some distribute, some fight and rule, while a comparative few, above all the rest, inspire, guide, and direct. It is assumed (and, we now discover, on good genetic grounds, where the population is racially homogeneous—as ours is *not*) that as a rule the son will inherit capacities fitting him to carry on the role of his father, but provision is made by which an individual with a sustained record of superiority is advanced beyond the previous status of his family.

All this, obviously, is of the greatest importance, but as I can most suitably enlarge upon it in my next chapter, which is to be on Aristocracy, I will not encroach here upon what I must say there, but will content myself with a few overall observations.

Lest any of my readers feel uneasy at the thoughts that throng his mind at my mention of an “axiocratic” society, with its social distinctions based on a difference in men’s social worth, let me hasten to assure him that this does not at all foreshadow or call for the centralized state. So much should have been obvious from all that I have said about the family and the home as society’s basic unit. In a sound society, the actual direction of affairs is largely in the hands of the higher men *in each locality*. The centralized state is the *death* of a people. But indeed, it was not until the present means of communication and transportation had been perfected that full centralization of state control became possible. It is only modern man who has ever found himself in the grip of the state as an *octopus*.

The full necessity of the axiocratic, pyramidal organization of society, with a true aristocracy of profoundly and indubitably superior men at its apex, becomes evident only as we realize that all the significance attaching to human existence traces back to the minds and souls of great persons—great seers, artists, philosophers, poets, composers, scientists, rulers, inventors. These alone create culture.

Moreover, all the external changes in society swing, in the last analysis, on the invisible, intangible changes in men's ideas and values. Not he who changes the form of society renders the most valuable service, but he who most makes men think and aspire, who penetrates deepest beneath the surface of life and farthest into the future. The seer, the philosopher, and the artist in the long run have profounder influence than the statesman and the reformer.

Some of my readers may have noted, and regretted, the omission of any mention of religion as providing an essential part of the foundation of any well-ordered society. But this omission is only apparent. I believe that every culture is founded upon religion above all else. It is what ultimately shapes every people, giving them their goals and a regimen for reaching them. A religion, it is true, may be eugenic or dysgenic: it may instill values that make for higher life, or it may poison life and drag it down, to sickness, meanness, and death. But in all that I have projected in this chapter about social form, I believe that we have, as it were, the *body* that any profoundly healthy religion must shape for itself. It is only in what is ultimately a religion that such a society could find its origin, and only religion that could sustain it in life, and in health, and in growth.

That is why it is, precisely, that if any society is to maintain and to extend itself in the face of its environment and its enemies, and to attain the heights of cultural greatness, it must have at its helm those of its number who are of profoundest wisdom and of most exalted character, men of deep religious experience. Standing apart, freed from the narrow cares and anxieties and little duties that burden and fret the rest, and with disinterested and exalted motives, as it were from a conning tower, they scan the horizon, study the stars, and set the course of the ship. The fate of everybody on board rests on their wisdom, their love, and their strength.

1945,1970.

NOTE

In view of the current furor over "population explosion," this advocacy of a high birth rate from the best endowed part of the population will doubtless make many of my readers raise their eyebrows. But I must let it stand—for the following reasons:

1. *Reproduction on the part of those stocks that have a record of proven superior capacity, must be kept high in relation to the rest of the population, if those of superior endowment, who alone are able to create, to guide and to maintain any society of significance are not to be engulfed and gradually exterminated by the sheer numbers of the mass.* This is a fact, I believe, amply established by discriminating observation

and a discerning examination of the historic record, though I shall have more to say about it when I come to my chapters on eugenics. It is therefore disturbing to discover that the overall *effects* of the birth control movement to date, regardless of what may have been the intentions behind it, have proved *dysgenic*. Any open-minded investigation of the facts must make it clear that this is so. The only part of any population that has been moved to a general practice of contraception as a means of family limitation has been predominantly from those very stocks of greatest proven capacity from which many children are most needed; whereas the stocks less and least well-endowed, whose reproduction most desperately requires to be curtailed, have universally, in the United States as certainly as in India or China, been marked by a consistent rejection of birth control, and in consequence by a continued spawning of large families. Thus, as anyone must apprehend who has the mentality to visualize the situation, the actual results of the birth control movement have been to *worsen* the national imbalance of capacity. That is, the proportion of those ranging from superior to supremely gifted has been actually reduced in relation to the enormous numbers of those ranging from the ordinary and mediocre down through the moron and imbecile to the idiot, and including much of the criminal element as well. Moreover, it must never be forgotten that offspring of superior capacity are not born at all to the feeble-minded, and are born only now and then, at a low rate per thousand, in the mediocre ranges of the population, whereas such superiority is born at the highest rate, in the highest number per thousand marriages, in the stocks that have already proved their own superiority. From this it follows inevitably that if, as seems completely certain, every people is always and forever dependent, even for its very survival, on the quality of its top ten percent, then it is a matter of life and death importance—no less—that high reproduction of the top ten percent be ever maintained. And those who call for any reduction in it, no matter how imposing and plausible their professed aims, and whether or not they realize it, reveal themselves as enemies and traitors to their own kind.

At a time such as this (1969-70), when common sense and reason have been fairly hypnotized out of most people by the allegedly “authoritative” claims of equalitarian propaganda pounded out day and night by almost every available means of reaching the public mind, one must expect that there will be plenty of people to reply testily that “all this business about superior endowment” is so much bosh. It is commonly asserted, and it would seem even widely believed, that improvement in the environment, increase of opportunity, can be depended upon to yield all the men of superior quality that any society will ever need. Well, this is a discussion that I have been following for forty years; and in the beginning, let it be known, I had a bias in favor of the equalitarian side. *But I faced the evidence, pro and con*, and it did not take me many years to discover not only where the truth lay but also what was going on beneath the surface to keep the truth hidden! In another place, I shall have occasion to enlarge upon all this. Suffice it now to state categorically that, in my long and carefully weighed judgment, the manifest truth is that men are born unequal, and that no manipulation or change of environment or increase of opportunity has ever, anywhere, been able to equalize them. Those who oppose this position, I found, ignore evidence when it is against them, evade it, deny it, even falsify it, but real and substantial evidence of their own that men are equal or can be made so, evidence that will stand up and hold together when subjected to close scrutiny, they never submit. They do not because they cannot. It simply does not exist. That is my present conviction. Let those who dislike it investigate the facts for themselves, and see whether their own findings admit of any other conclusion. And as a

parting challenge let me throw in this: I have never yet known one "Liberal" intellectual—not one—who has had the courage and honesty to expose his precious equalitarian dogmas to the risks of such investigation.

I shall undertake to clinch this matter in future chapters.

2. It seems to me that a fear of world-wide famine, now being whipped up by talk of a "population explosion," is being deliberately promoted, as was fear of the atom bomb, with the *primary* objective of stampeding all the peoples of the world, but in particular the White peoples of the West, into the corral of world government. Do the facts about the world's food supply, or at least and especially about our own food supply, really warrant all the growing alarm about imminent starvation? At the moment, I am not ready to express a judgment. But for those who have the independence to take a look at a contrary view, I suggest the reading of an article entitled "Population—Propaganda for World Government" by Dr. Medford Evans, a former college professor and for eight years (1944-52) an administrative officer on the U.S. atomic energy project. (See *American Opinion*, May, 1969, pp. 33-40. Copy obtainable for \$1.00 from *American Opinion*, Belmont, Mass. 02178.) And I will add that, whatever may be the facts about the food supply, I know about the extent to which, beneath the surface of our life, stupendous forces have been marshaled and are being concentrated on driving the nations of the Earth into the Communist slave state envisaged by the United Nations Organization (the "UN"). But though I intend to uncover this matter, I cannot do it here.

3. All the current discussion of the "population explosion," together with the claim that worldwide famine has now become virtually inevitable, is vitiated, in my judgment, by two errors in approaching the problem.

a. All proposed solutions that I have seen, think only in terms of the total number of mouths to be fed, apparently without any recognition that some lives are vastly more worth saving than others. But anyone who has grasped the feeble-minded and generally botched condition of the lower levels of most modern civilized societies, and who is able to face the stark realities of the human struggle for existence on this Earth with completely clear eyes, must find himself forced to doubt whether the bottom ten percent of most populations are worth saving at all. Probably, most peoples would actually be better off if their bottom ten percent, and maybe even the bottom 20 percent, did perish. In any case, it must never be forgotten that *the proportion of superior people must be maintained if any society is long to survive.*

b. It is a mistake to think of the problem in terms of the world only—or even primarily. Awful as mass starvation is to contemplate—*anywhere*, even in places as remote from us as China, India, or Africa, it should nevertheless be of primary concern to us *who* starves. "Liberals" may continue to declare it more to be desired, more noble, or more Christian, to sacrifice oneself and even one's own children for those "less fortunate," but surely no people still guided by sound instincts and unweakened vitality, when actually put to the test, will ever think it just as good that some other people should eat as that their own children should eat, or that their own people should be the ones to starve as that starvation should come to others across the sea. I know well that every large-hearted and generous people, none more than our own, will always *want* to share all that they feel they can, yet they must, and they

will, balk at sharing to the jeopardy of their children's whole future and that of their children's children. They will resolve, rather, to *face up* to the painful choice as to *who is to survive*. And it looks as if we are rapidly approaching the day of reckoning.

¹ A fairly thorough examination of Democracy's record, basic assumptions, most insistent demands, and the like, I shall submit in the paper following this one.

² *Insucht Und Vermischung Beim Menschen*, Leipzig and Wien, 1897.

³ Dr. G.T. Wrench, in his book *The Restoration of the Peasantries*, C.W. Daniel, London, 1939, wrote of the peasants of Java as follows: "When, in the latter part of the century [the 19th], the [Dutch] Government itself ceased to trade, it realized objectively the value of the peasantry and secured the Javanese village system and its methods of cultivation by absolutely prohibiting the sale and purchase of land.

"Mr. Boys, of the Bengal Civil Service, visited Java in 1892. . . and wrote the following invaluable comment: ' . . . Under their present Government the Javans, according to our English ideas, ought to be the most miserable people. That they are not so, but that, on the contrary, they are the most prosperous of Oriental peasantry, is mainly due to one cause—the inability of the Javan to raise one single florin on the security of his fields, and the protection thus gained by him against the moneylender and himself . . . nothing would ultimately save him from the moneylender and from consequent eviction from his fields and his home if he were able to pledge the one or the other as a security for an advance.'

" . . . When there is debt on the security of land, there is no peasant freedom and the real government is not the Government, but the subsidiary one of the moneylenders. Through the legalization of moneylenders a Government, whatever be its public professions and maxims, keeps, without further effort, a peasantry in thrall." Pp. 59-60: Cp. p. 21. (Emphasis mine).

⁴ In a chapter to follow this shortly, entitled "Man and the Machine," I shall make a fairly comprehensive indictment of our whole technological and industrial system for its dire effects on human life. But in anticipation of this and as a word of caution to any who may think my ideas preposterous, I should like to call attention now to some observations and judgments, amply confirming mine, by one of the most distinguished scientists of this century, Dr. Alexis Carrel, a Nobel Prize winner in 1912 and "a biologist of world-famous attainments." In his *Man The Unknown* (Harper, 1935), which ran to at least 22 editions, he made such sobering pronouncements as the following: "The development of human personality is the ultimate purpose of civilization." P. 319 "The enormous advance gained by the sciences of inanimate matter over those of living things is one of the greatest catastrophes ever suffered by humanity." P. 28. "Today, the position of the proletarian is as low as that of the feudal serf . . . The white collar people lose their identity just as factory hands do. In fact, they become proletarians. It seems that modern business organization and mass production are incompatible with the full development of the human self. If such is the case, then industrial civilization . . . must go." P. 316. "We now have to reestablish, in the

fullness of his personality, the human being weakened and standardized by modern life. . . In order to reconstruct personality, we must break the frame of the school, factory and office, and reject the very principles of technological civilization." P. 314f. And when he came to write his Preface to a later edition of this book he asserted "the necessity, not only of mental, political, and social changes, but of the overthrow of industrial civilization and of the advent of another conception of human progress." P. XV.

This expressed the conclusion about the future of our industrialism that I myself had reached even before I quoted these passages from Alexis Carrel in 1945. It was very recently endorsed by "a team of British scientists and philosophers professionally involved in the study of global environmental problems." In a "Blueprint for Survival," published in *The Ecologist* (Vol. 2, No. 1, Jan. 1972, paragraph 110), they said: "The principal defect of the industrial way of life with its ethos of expansion is that it is not sustainable. [Emphasis added.] Its termination within the lifetime of someone born today is inevitable We can be certain . . . that sooner or later it will end." (Reprinted and circulated by Planned Parenthood in late 1973.) What it means is that Spengler's prediction about our vaunted industrialism is confirmed. The day will come, and now may not be far off, when it will lie junked and as dead as the ruins of Babylon.

⁵ I do not forget the alluring possibilities held out by the proponents of artificial insemination, but my imagination is quick to envisage serious practical obstacles to the success of such a program, and when I reflect upon the moral and mental level of most of the men, even most of the scientists, by whom it would have to be administered, I shiver. In view of the miserable immaturity of our present humanity, the perils of such an undertaking seem to me to outweigh its possibilities. Ultimately, I am certain, the answer to our fearsome human problems is not to be found in some new piece of mechanism, however ingenious, but in man's achieving a new mastery over himself. The necessity of this is something that the purveyors of our quack nostrums for social reform, never take into account.

⁶ See Elmer Pendell—*The Next Civilization*, Royal Publishing Co., Dallas, Texas, 1960, pp. 84-93. The book may be obtainable from the Noontide Press, Box 1248, Torrance, California 90505.

⁷ The whole problem that eugenics was designed to meet, and eugenics itself as a suitable and adequate means of meeting it, I shall discuss thoroughly in chapters yet to come.

Chapter 10.

The Fallacy and Failure of Popular Government.

Historically speaking, I believe there was no nation that could ever subsist on Democracy. This lesson will have to be learned under penalties. England will either have to learn it, or England will cease to exist among nations.

Thomas Carlyle

There were three principles promulgated by the Republicans [the French revolutionists] which to him were profound absurdities. The first was the doctrine of equality; not simply of quality in the eye of the law (that he accepted), but of absolute equality.

The second revolutionary principle was the doctrine of government by the people. He believed in no such governmental power. Even when you kill the king, he says, you do not know how to rule in his place. . . . He pointed to the fate of France as a lesson both to governors and the governed, but more even for the latter than the former. The rulers were destroyed, but who was there to protect the Many *against* the Many? The Mob became the tyrant. . . . What wonder then if he felt repulsion to all the *Apostles of Freedom*, when on close scrutiny he found they all sought nothing but license? . . .

The third revolutionary principle was, that political freedom is necessary to man . . . through life we find him insisting on the fact that no man *can* be free; the only freedom necessary is that which enables each to go about his business in security, to rear house and children, to move unconstrained in his small circle.

G. H. Lewes—*The Life and Works of Goethe*

In this chapter and the next I want to make it clear what I understand by democracy, on the one hand, and by aristocracy, on the other, and what are the considerations that slowly undermined and finally overthrew my belief in the former, and massed themselves in my mind in support of the latter. The lapse of another twenty-odd years since I first declared myself on this issue, together with the opportunities they brought me for further observation, study and reflection, has only clarified and more deeply entrenched my conviction that no people can make a great record except as it is guided by the aristocratic principle.

Many men would be inclined to ask, Why bother to write on this subject? And the question has considerable point if one believes not only that the issue is already decided against me, but that we are traveling *away* from everything aristocratic just as fast as the ever-quickenning tempo of "modern progress" can carry us. And indeed I am very much of that mind myself. Populace is unquestionably in the saddle. The article by Mr. B.F. Wilcox, "All Men Are

Created Equal," in *The Friend's Intelligencer* of November 29th, 1941,¹ only states, with the usual assortment of truths, half-truths, and ignorant lies, what is the almost universal persuasion not merely of the masses on the street, but as well of politicians and statesmen, of journalists, editors, playwrights and radio commentators, and even of preachers, poets and professors. All men are equal. And the inevitable fruit of this doctrine is that mass-man takes over.

Furthermore, even our children will not live to see a world in which men generally will again look for guidance to any aristocratic principles. Our scientists and engineers go on talking about the "bigger and better" things of all sorts with which their technics and industrialism are soon to favor us. But, in my judgment, little of their dreams will come to pass. Even if technics did fulfill its promise, what would it signify but the ascendancy of mechanism over man, bigger and better machines but ever smaller and meaner men, ever less capacity for that aspiration and stern self-discipline that form the root of the aristocratic—in short, the smothering of nobility under a rank growth of rabble values?

But for reasons that I shall undertake to set forth in a future chapter, I believe our technics is *not* going to fulfill itself. It is not, as everybody seems to take for granted, to go on and on to its ever greater marvels. The stark fact is that even we as a people, not to speak of our technics, are already very near the end of our run—not merely the United States but the whole White man's world, and the White man himself. The two world wars were a "roaring plunge into barbarism." We long ago moved into an era of mass-deception, wholesale betrayal, and naked brute force, in which aristocratic values will be regarded increasingly as a luxury few can afford. We shall soon be locked in a struggle for sheer survival, and shall hardly escape catastrophe. Perhaps Russia will continue to avoid direct open confrontation with us, but if so we shall only the more certainly be maneuvered into yet a third world war, in which the Communist-instigated and Communist-led colored hordes of virtually the entire Earth will press upon us from every side, and at the same time our defense will be sabotaged and paralyzed by Communist traitors planted at key points within our walls. Sooner or later, in one way or another, our gates will be forced and our city put to the torch and sword. Our civilization will go up in flames, and the proud White man who created it, who for long thought himself (and virtually was) invincible, will have to bend his neck to a yoke in order to live. Spengler foresaw with the eye of clairvoyance when he predicted starkly that our "machine-technics will end . . . and one day will lie in fragments, *forgotten*—our railways and steamships as dead as the Roman roads and the Chinese wall, our giant cities and skyscrapers in ruins like old Memphis and Babylon."

And lest anyone be minded to answer lightly that, if it came to the worst and were an issue of life or death, we could surely save ourselves by resort to the atom bomb, let me declare my conviction that the use of the atom bomb has always been under pretty firm control, and that those who control it can be depended upon to see that it is not used to destroy the world that they are determined to rule, and to enjoy the benefits of ruling by exploiting. For precisely this reason, I did not long share the general alarm over the prospects of a nuclear holocaust. I soon saw, rather, that *fear* of the bomb was being deliberately whipped up, to the point of hysteria, in order to stampede the sheep into the corral of world government. And today it is sheer fantasy to suppose that the bomb will ever be used to save *us*, the White

peoples, especially those of Europe and the U.S., who together form the last serious obstacle to the manipulators' advance to their goal, and who were long ago marked for destruction.

We are now about to pass into eclipse. The blackest hour in our history is almost upon us. But even in the hours of my darkest brooding over the onrushing tragedy I am sustained by a hope—perhaps even a faith—that no possible conquest of the White peoples will ever permanently break their strength. Into their humiliation and their agony they will carry their most ancient traditions, the glory of their past, and their memories of the days when their whole world was shaped by their deep instinctive belief in the superior man, and their destinies guided by the noblest and strongest among them. In time, thus, they will awake to a realization of the mistakes that brought them low, and at last see clearly that one of the most ruinous of these was the doctrine of human equality, and the practice of popular government that grew out of it. And as their vision clears and their faith returns, they will spit upon the doctrine of equality their contempt and disgust, and in their new-found strength rise up to grapple with their conqueror, and overthrow him. And then, as they once again lift their eyes to the heights, new heights, higher than they ever looked to before, and begin to cast about them to set their course, they will vow ever to search out the *best* men among them to be their leaders.

It is out of some such hope and faith as this that I have set myself to write this chapter and the next. But one may well doubt whether there is anything I can add concerning the respective merits of democracy and aristocracy that has not already been said by Aristotle, Plato, and Confucius—by Lecky, Arnold, Stephen, Maine, Carlyle, Ruskin, Burke, and Nietzsche; by Mairé, Cram, Irving Babbitt, Ortega y Gasset, and—not least—by Ludovici. Indeed, I shall hardly attempt to add anything new. It will be enough for me if I can hold up their arms in the struggle for a nobler man, if I can faithfully pass on the lighted torch that I have received at their hands. Aristotle remarked in the third century B.C. that “almost all things have already been found out.” But he added that “some have been neglected, and others which have been known have not been put in practice.” And verily it will suffice me if I, a man facing modern conditions, until near the middle of his life steeped in the democratic tradition and still as before devoted to the truest good of his fellows, may but bring again to light some of those ancient truths. They are truths that we democratic moderns, with our conceit of our superiority to all bygone ages, have looked down upon because they belonged to the past, and have neglected until we have lost memory of their existence and have almost lost power to comprehend and to apply them. We have slighted and ignored those truths to our great loss and to our exceeding bitter woe. Verily, it will suffice me well if I can but help to light again in the lighthouses of my kind the flame of that ancient wisdom, fueled from the deepest and oldest human experience, on which the greatest peoples in all parts of the world have ever placed their supreme reliance, to guide them safely past the rocks and shoals of life and bring them into port.

From this, let it be understood from the outset that I do not propose to take my readers on any spin through romantic heavens on the wings of high-flown theory. I have less and less respect for what can be woven only on the warp of idealism with the shuttle of speculation. All our efforts need to be guided by the lessons of actual human experience, the record of which we find in history. I have thus learned that any new institution, if it is to accomplish its end, must be mostly old. I cannot escape the conclusion that if any institution works well,

it is because it was founded on sound principles and serves its purpose. Thousands of years ago, Confucius noted that "if those in authority have not the confidence of the people, government of the people is impossible." And all history proves that no people will bear indefinitely a yoke that severely galls them. From which it would seem fair to conclude that the mere longevity of any society, the mere fact that it lasted a long time, is evidence that on the whole it met satisfactorily the basic needs of the people who lived in it. A necessary preliminary, therefore, for any approach to a just evaluation of the comparative merits and defects of democracy and aristocracy is a long perspective of historical knowledge. Those especially who have merely inherited their political philosophy as most people inherit their religious bias, have need to acquaint themselves not only with the thought of its outstanding critics, but with those arrangements by which the longest-lasting and culturally most significant societies have undertaken, in the period of their greatest health and creativeness, to meet those fundamental needs of men that are as old as time and as unalterable as the Earth we live on. For while it is true that history never repeats itself, "it is about equally true," as Irving Babbitt reminds us, "that history is always repeating itself." And from a study of history, we may discover that among the great peoples certain fundamental patterns of social organization consistently reappear. The reason for this becomes apparent as close and honest observation of ourselves and others, and a searching study of history and of psychology, lead us to a knowledge of human nature. It is on this, ultimately—on the texture, reaches, and limits of human nature—that I would found my entire position.

This is not, I say again, to be any gush of pretty theory. Least of all is it to be another "blueprint of an ideal society," such as many people like to play with. I see too clearly that no sound society comes into existence that way. It is not at all like a prefabricated house, which is made in a factory and put together by mechanics where and when you will. Rather, it grows out of the blood and nature of a particular people, rooted in a particular piece of ground, and perhaps reflecting the very climate that prevails there. To a degree, every society is unique. To a given people at a given time there is probably only one kind possible. Professor Edward A. Freeman said well that "neither the Greeks in any other land nor any other people in Greece could have been what the Greeks in Greece actually were." ² Neither race alone, nor its setting alone, can account for the outcome, but the two together in their interactions. And yet, running through the life of all the peoples who have left a great mark behind them, one finds certain perduring all-determining principles, which formed the scaffolding from which they worked to complete their tower, and without which no people can be expected to reach a like height of greatness. In this chapter, I wish to keep these principles, founded on human nature and confirmed in historical record, clearly before us.

Before any judgment can be rendered between the respective claims of democracy and aristocracy, it is necessary to settle in our minds what is the primary object of social organization, what are the primary responsibilities that any government must undertake to meet.

The primary end for which any people creates a government and social forms is to meet the needs of its life. It wills to preserve itself, and, like every healthy organism, to develop, to grow, and to expand. These are necessities inseparable from any living thing. But a people's will is not toward the preservation and increase of any abstract "existence," but rather of themselves, of their own kind, of the peculiar character and values by which they are

distinguished from other peoples, and apart from which they could not be aware of themselves as an entity or come into existence as a people. It is a will not only to live and to live more fully and largely, but to live in a particular way, their own way, the way that through long ages has proven itself the means best suited to their nature for attaining their ends. Their whole effort will be shot through with a determination to embody and to establish these characteristic ways of facing the universe, of maintaining and advancing themselves against their enemies, in social forms that will not only last long but be satisfying to their taste and instinct. Mere stability is often said to be the primary object of any people's social organization. But it seems to me this can never be enough. A healthy people will not only to last long, but to *be itself* a long time. In Ludovici's phrase, it wills to *preserve its identity*.

It is as a result of this attitude that we witness the well-attested and intense conservatism of the great majority of men. Every healthy people has hated, and feared, and resisted the constant readjustment necessitated by continual change. When change goes beyond a certain point it causes what has been well called "cultural shock." Even though it be sanctified as "progress," a people can no more thrive under it than can a tree that is planted one place today only to find itself dug up and planted somewhere else tomorrow. And since every people's distinctive character is rooted in its hereditary factors (that is, as we say, in its blood) as well as in its tradition, its resistance to change will inevitably erect barriers against the indiscriminate mixture of its blood with that of aliens. Yet will it encourage such controlled and well-considered change as may be required for the increase of its strength, provided always such change be kept within the limits set by its need to preserve its identity. For a people's sense of identity, the distinguishing something by which it knows itself as an entity apart from other peoples, is the secret inner spring of its existence, which at once gives that people its characteristic shape, and direction, and drive. Let it lose this, and, everything else regardless, it must fall to pieces. No people is left any choice about it. Either it must preserve its distinctive character, or it must cease to be a people.

From this, it should be clear that the primary object to be sought by every healthy society and to be conserved by every sound and responsible government is something very different from the materialistic absorption in raising the standard of living of the masses. To be sure, the welfare of the people is of the utmost vital importance and is sought inevitably, even though incidentally, in every society in a state of health, in its pursuit of the primary end of its existence. But this primary end is, ultimately, a spiritual thing. For the very ability to appreciate it and to serve it depends upon capacity to recognize the spiritual quality inherent in character, to choose it in preference to lower values, and to love it enough to be willing to sacrifice oneself for it.

It would seem that thus far we ought all to be in agreement. But it may be that some of my readers will reject my statement of the end for which any significant society must exist. If so, the difference between us might be traceable to our different reading of history, a difference that it might be mutually helpful to explore; but I suspect that it would spring rather from a difference of taste. And here is a gulf that cannot be bridged. He who can face either his own life or that of his kind without an ineluctable concern for quality, without an insatiable desire and a relentless demand that it ever go upward, by that one fact immediately places himself, to my way of thinking, in the class of "mass-man," of "mob," of those whose every word and very look and bearing reveal that they lust only after comfort and security and

pleasure, and who resent and ever ask to be excused from any demand upon them for self-discipline or for austerity of living. With such people there is no use in our attempting to make common cause. When one calls white what another calls black, it is time to part company.

But with those who find congenial my statement of the proper aims with which any healthy society must organize its life, I am now ready to take up the fundamental question underlying both this chapter and the next. That is: To whom should we with most confidence entrust the direction of affairs in society, and how should we go about finding such men and placing them at the helm? Democracy, under which control passes into the hands of common men, most men, and ultimately of "mass-man," is one answer. Aristocracy, with or without monarchy, which aims to entrust control and direction to men of superior character and ability, is another. Let us proceed first to examine the claims of the former.

"Democracy" is a term commonly used very loosely. Properly, it designates a particular form of government. In terms of Aristotle's famous threefold classification, it is a government of the state not by the One, nor by the Few, but by the Many³—that is, as usually conceived, by the majority of the entire people. It has been called "inverted Monarchy," which suggests a pyramid stood on its apex—with a rather precarious balance, one would suspect. More loosely, the term may even refer to a way of thinking or feeling favorable to the rule or the welfare of the common people, the "demos," the lower part of the nation as a whole. It has no necessary connection with representation, which is a modern device born of the attempt to extend democratic practice to states too large to admit of personal participation in government. But it assumes active interest, initiative, and responsibility on the part of the ordinary man.

The movement of the people to get the government into their own hands seems always to be connected with, and to follow upon the heels of, the failure of some aristocratic form of government to fulfill the function that was its traditional duty to fulfill and long had fulfilled. Until my next chapter I put off the question *which* form of aristocratic government is best calculated to care for the common people, and indeed to ensure the well-being of the entire nation. But let it be said immediately, that once *any* aristocracy, whether nobility or monarchy, has ceased to father the people and to be their protector, it has failed in one of its original, primary, and inalienable responsibilities, and has ceased to justify its existence.

Nowhere is this clearer than in the history of the democratic movement in England. The people lost faith in the lords as their protectors only when the lords began to identify themselves with the rising capitalist exploiters, and joined with them in draining the life out of the people. The main drive behind the people's move for political power lay in their sheer and desperate misery. Since it seemed that the lords would not provide for their welfare, they must needs undertake to provide for it themselves. It may be questioned whether their effort was according to wisdom, but it was certainly understandable and justifiable. And in view of our nearness to the undeniable and infamous failure of this aristocracy, *from which most of us have formed all the impression of aristocracy that we have*, it is easy to understand also the prevalence of the opinion that "though individuals may refrain from exploiting a privilege for their own advantage . . . no class ever does so for long." Yet history seems to challenge this

pronouncement. It is certain that some aristocracies have lasted for very long periods—that of Venice, for instance, nearly a thousand years; and that of Egypt perhaps three thousand. A Communist, with his one-track mind and narrow prepossessions, may be ready to explain all such as systems of exploitation maintained by the sword. But such a doctrine, however useful to revolutionary propaganda, is not supported either by the experience or the good sense of mankind. The truth is, to quote Ortega y Gasset, that “there is no ruling with janissaries. As Talleyrand said to Napoleon: ‘You can do everything with bayonets, Sire, except sit on them.’ And to rule is not the gesture of snatching at power, but the tranquil exercise of it. In a word, to rule is to sit down, be it on the throne, the curule chair, the front bench, or the bishop’s seat. The State, in fine, is the state of opinion, a position of equilibrium.” And thus we “arrive at a formula which is the well-known, venerable, forthright commonplace: there can be no rule in opposition to public opinion.” For in the long run, regardless of the form government takes, *it is the people who decide.*

If an aristocracy has lasted long, therefore, it is the natural and just inference that it enjoyed the confidence and loyalty of the people. It fulfilled a necessary and vital function in a way so satisfactory as to make the people secure and contented. On the other hand, history makes it no less evident that aristocracies have failed and given place to democracies. But does this, really, prove anything more than that aristocracies are like most everything else in that, with the lapse of time, they tend to wear out, or because of fatal mistakes finally break down? It surely does not prove aristocracies essentially unsound either in theory or in practice. On the contrary, history as I read it, supports my conviction that aristocracy is the form a great people’s life tends to take in its period of health, that it is under this form its greatness is achieved and longest maintained, that democracy appears only when its vitality has begun to break, and that the very advent of democracy therefore is a symptom of its sickness and a portent of its approaching dissolution.

That the people should attempt to take power into their own hands and themselves make provision for their own welfare, when their right and proper help has failed them and no other help is to hand, is, I repeat, understandable enough and even justifiable enough. But I am convinced that the mass of the people, being what they are, and for the most part can only remain, are incompetent even to make provision for their own welfare according to wisdom. Moreover, in their effort to center the entire organization of society around this end, they are likely to sacrifice the ultimate worth of their life as a people and even to open the gates to catastrophe. It may seem very clever of Bernard Shaw to say, “The great purpose of democracy is to prevent your being governed better than you want to be governed.” But a little thought shows this to be nothing but glib and dangerous nonsense. In reality, no people can be governed too well. They can be governed too much, but never too wisely. They can never afford to dispense with the very best government that they can get. Upon good government depends not only the health and happiness of the people, but also their historical significance. For lack of it, they may even be brought to extinction. If by some prescience it could be certainly known that only by the most gifted government could the suffering and humiliation of a national disaster be averted, then even the commonest of the common people would have the wit to choose to be ruled by those deemed most competent and most to be relied upon to ensure such government. And doubtless, it has been an instinct of this very sort, and nothing less, that has supported every true aristocracy that has ever existed. The people have believed that under their aristocracy they were better provided

for than they could ever provide for themselves. Nevertheless, the feeling that prevails today, be it sound or false, is that the vital and necessary ends for which social organization exists can be served best by the people themselves.

In the modern situation, there is one outstanding reason for this in addition to the breakdown of all healthy aristocracy. This is the fact, stressed by the eminent economist Werner Sombart, that after a very slow growth over a period of twelve hundred years, the population of Europe in the one century between 1800 and 1914, leaped from 180 to 460 millions!⁴ The figures given by Professor S. J. Holmes of the University of California, are in essential agreement, and add that in somewhat less than this time the population of the United States increased from 6 million to 77 million, twelve-and-a-half fold.⁵ The stage of civilization was thus filled and overfilled with a mass of newcomers who arrived with such suddenness that the cultural institutions of society were unable to assimilate them, and in such millions that their very numbers created a power pressure that has proved irresistible. They swarm everywhere and occupy places formerly belonging only to the elite (of one sort or another), not because of any superiority of character or intelligence, or even of mere training, but solely because of sheer mass weight. It has been what Rathenau called the "vertical invasion of the barbarians." Probably, it was a phenomenon unprecedented in history.

However, account for the modern democratic movement as we may, we must reckon with the fact. And we have now reached the point in this chapter when we must examine its claims. Let us begin by looking at democracy's record. The examples most commonly and confidently adduced are those of ancient Greece, and modern England, France, and the United States.

Yet the record need not detain us very long. In the case of Greece, it may be questioned whether the government of Athens, even in the days of Pericles, can justly be called a democracy at all. To be sure, enthusiasts make large and not unimpressive claims. T. R. Glover, for instance, in his *Democracy In The Ancient World*, says:

"It was a government of citizens met in an assembly, where, without Presidents, ministers, ambassadors or representatives, they themselves governed. They created a beautiful city and a law-abiding people; they united the Greek world or a large part of it; they defeated the Persian Empire in all its greatness and drove the Persian from the sea. They made an atmosphere where genius could grow, where it could be as happy as genius ever can, and where it flowered and bore the strange fruit that has enriched the world forever." ⁶

Elsewhere, he points out that the citizenry who did all this were a widely varied lot, of all kinds and grades; and yet that they carried democratic practice so far as to discard election in favor of choice by lot, and threw open the highest public office to all citizens alike excepting only quite unpropertied laborers; and the offices of lawmaker and judge, even to these.

To any sage statesman experienced in the ways of the multitude, such an achievement, as is here claimed for democracy, seems to border on the miraculous. But before we can render judgment we must look at the other side of the picture. All historians of the period, and even special pleaders like Glover and Agard, have to recognize that the entire democratic

superstructure was built upon a huge substratum of slavery; "Perhaps one-tenth of the total population had political rights," says Agard.⁷ And Glotz, an authority on the economic life of the period, concludes, "Greek democracy cannot dispense with slaves, and is never anything but a wider aristocracy." (This, though said justly enough as regards Athens and its slavery, reveals what, to my mind, is a gross misconception of aristocracy.)⁸ Moreover, the wealth to provide its citizens with leisure and to adorn its Acropolis with monuments of art, was largely drawn, after a method so contrary to democratic theory but so typical of democratic record, from the imperialism it established over the subject cities of the Aegean islands and the nearby Asiatic mainland. Yet for all this, the resulting democracy was so unstable, marked by such excesses and errors of judgment, that it was saved for a while from the disintegration and disaster that early overtook it, only by the fact that for over a generation it was guided by the statesman Pericles, who did not come from the common people but from an old family of the Athenian nobility. This was clear even to Thucydides, a contemporary, who remarked that "although in name a democracy" Athens "was virtually a government by its greatest citizen."⁹ Even with the help of Pericles' genius, its life was very brief—well under one hundred years. Its final ignominious failure was the precursor of the like failure of every similar attempt in the ancient world. The age closed with democracy completely discredited.

Such was the status of democracy in the eyes of thoughtful men on the eve of the French Revolution. For at least seventeen centuries there had been an all but universal movement toward kingship. Says Henry Sumner Maine, whose title to speak with authority could hardly be surpassed,

"... the opinion that Democracy was irresistible and inevitable, and probably perpetual, would... have appeared (in the late eighteenth century) a wild paradox. There had been more than 2,000 years of tolerably well-ascertained political history, and at its outset, Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy, were all plainly discernible. The result of a long experience was, that some Monarchies and some Aristocracies had shown themselves extremely tenacious of life... But the democracies which had risen and perished, or had fallen into extreme insignificance, seemed to show that this form of government was of rare occurrence in political history, and was characterized by an extreme fragility... Whenever government of the Many has been tried, it has ultimately produced monstrous and morbid forms of government by the One, or of government by the Few."

And even of the period that has *followed* the French Revolution, while he is not a little impressed by the United States as the single exception to an almost unbroken record of democratic failure, he says that since the days when the Roman Empire began to break down, "there has never been such insecurity of government as the world has seen since rulers became delegates of the community."¹⁰

There is one feature of Democracy's record that, in view of the modern situation, calls for more attention. It is commonly assumed that democracy is opposed to dictatorship. But nothing is farther from the facts. The history of democracy makes it unmistakable that some form of one-man tyranny is the end to which popular government has usually led. Athenian democracy is followed by Alexander; the French Republic, by Napoleon. As Christopher Dawson remarked, "The truth is, unpalatable though it may be to modern 'progressive'

thought, that democracy and dictatorship are not opposites or mortal enemies, but twin children of the great Revolution." Democracy's very ineptitude, its very failure to solve the host of problems that always pile up under its uncertain and wobbly hand, finally brings a nation, as our own U.S. in this 1973, to the point where it is threatened with a breakdown of all law and order and seems to stand on the very verge of dissolution. In such a fearsome extremity, a man on horseback is seen by the mass of the people, and welcomed, as the only means left of saving the country from disaster. Precisely this explains the rise of Hitler. I do not see how anyone can read such a book as Arthur Bryant's *Unfinished Victory*,¹¹ with its sympathetic apprehension of the German people's really desperate plight, and not come to recognize that some strong man or other, such as Adolf Hitler, was the only salvation left to her. One may not like totalitarianism—I myself hate it, but if one can put oneself in another's place and imagine what it means to have to find some way to keep afloat or *die*, then one is forced to face the stark fact that when it really is a matter of life or death, be it for a man or for a nation, almost *any* means will be seized upon if it promises life. Nevertheless, this has little to do with aristocracy as I conceive it. To become an acceptable dictator a man must bear upon him too many of the marks of populace. But I will allow that, after democracy, the emergence of a dictator may, in the end, prove to have been at least *a step toward* conditions in which the seeds of a genuine aristocracy could germinate and grow.

In this last, however, we have digressed a bit from the examination of democracy's record, to which we had addressed ourselves. This we must now continue.

There are two items in the record that might give the critic pause. One of these is the success of the United States. The other is French Revolutionary theory, which for the first time undertook to place its claims above the reach of any record and to found them on natural, inborn, abstract, and imprescriptible right. Each of these demands some further attention from us. First, let us examine the reputed success of our democracy. What substance is there in it? And how is it to be accounted for?

First of all, the government of the United States has lasted for nearly two hundred years. To be sure, this is not very long as compared with the length of life of many aristocracies and monarchies. And an experiment in government, especially one that is a departure from best-established precedent, can hardly be pronounced a success until it has, at the least, held together for several centuries. Despite our growth, therefore, and our wealth, our preeminence in industrialism and our hegemony (of a sort) in world affairs, I must hold that the country is still young and that no final judgment can yet be rendered. Nevertheless, let it be admitted, two hundred years is a sizable block of time. No other democratic government, certainly none confronting the complexity of problems arising in a modern country of great size, can equal it.

How are we to account for this unprecedented success of a popular government? First of all, by pointing out that it never has been truly popular. An Athenian citizen of the days of Pericles would have refused to allow that it was a democracy, since the ordinary American citizen does not directly participate in government at all. Indeed, it is a matter of common knowledge among historians that the founders of this country wished to prevent the people from having much to say in the direction of affairs. They wished the government to have a stability greater than they believed possible if it were too closely dependent on anything so

uninformed and so excitable and fickle as public opinion. They therefore created a strong executive, gave him the power to be a real ruler, and fixed his term of office long enough to make him independent of the changing moods of the popular mind. Stability was sought, likewise, in the age of senators, in their length of office, and in the power entrusted to them. Also, the whole electoral system made the ordinary citizen at least twice-removed from any actual participation in the government. He was given little to do but say Yes or No to each of several men put up for office by political machines.

And for final and completely conclusive evidence of "how far remote from anything like democracy our political system is," to quote Mr. Albert J. Nock, "one need only cite the Judiciary Act of 1789, which established judicial control over legislation. It vested the supreme political authority in a small oligarchy [the U.S. Supreme Court. W.G.S.]. The members of this oligarchy are not elected; they are appointed; the people have no semblance of choice in the matter. They are, moreover, appointed for life, and are wholly irresponsible; their acts cannot be brought under any kind of review. Excellent as this system may be, it is manifestly a long way from democratic."¹² The long and the short of it is that, if French revolutionary theory was the mother of our government, its father was hard-headed realistic English political experience. The resemblance of the American president to the English king has often been noted. Except for the fact that the American offices of president and senator were nonhereditary and their terms limited, the founders of the Constitution made their government as much as possible like the English government of the 18th century, a period when the English King and House of Lords still had real power.

That is to say, insofar as our American democracy has succeeded, perhaps it has been because it has not been very democratic.

But to what extent *has* it succeeded? To what extent has it actually met the needs for which, as we have seen, every healthy people organizes its life? It has held together a fairly long time, yes, but has it preserved the health and happiness of the people, has it preserved our distinctive character, has it enabled us as a people to achieve any true or lasting significance among the peoples of the Earth? Has it provided us with a statesmanship that gives promise of ensuring even any long-continued existence? My understanding of the facts compels me to answer No. Even a hundred years ago John Quincy Adams, who had every reason to wish to pronounce the American experiment a success, had to bemoan its failure.¹³ Though not fully a democracy, it was far too much a democracy to prove sound.

Almost from the start our fair country became *par excellence* the land of the quick return. It had been endowed with an unimaginable virgin wealth of natural resources. But it lay wide open to be raped by the hand of anyone who had an eye for gain, and whose cunning, energy, and daring for getting it out was not hampered by conscience or by any concern for the welfare of the country as a whole. What ensued was the plundering of a continent unparalleled in human history. The waste of natural resources was beyond the power of any mind to describe or even to conceive. The aim everywhere was to squeeze out of one's holding every ounce of profit possible, and then to move on to a place where one could squeeze again. Everything was shaped remorselessly to the advantage of those who could pile dollar upon dollar, regardless of how they were got. Gain became God, the great god Moloch, into whose cavernous maw of waste and destruction the priests of finance

ruthlessly shoveled the welfare of the entire people, both the fate of the living and the destiny of those yet to come.

Along about 1880, in order to multiply and to magnify the opportunities for quick and easy gain through the exploitation of cheap labor, the froth of the rising tide of populace in southeastern Europe was allowed to begin spilling over into America, and thus gradually to adulterate its blood, alter its character, break down its traditions, and clog the working of its vital institutions. The total drift of affairs in the nation generated destructive forces beyond the power of the people to resist or to avert. Gradually they were pried and torn off the land and herded into cities, and there were tied to desks and machines in jobs that have had little meaning for them and which they hate, and where, for all their steam-heated flats and pressed Sunday clothes, their multiplied gadgets and "conveniences," their cars and movies and television and the rest of it, their lot is in many ways more degrading than that of chattel slaves. The end result has been a measurable decline in stamina, in intelligence, in self-reliance, and generally in substantial character. Today we simply are not the same people, nor the same kind and caliber of people, as those who founded and early guided the country. The people generally have been debauched and besotted, and ground down into sand heaps of mean little nothings. At last, we too have a proletariat, like that of Rome in the period of the Empire, and like Rome we too have come to buying our rabble off from tearing our world to pieces, by resort to free bread and circuses. Only, we call it "welfare" and TV.

But money-making has gone on apace. Machines have multiplied apace. And the men who have made them and owned and controlled them have climbed higher and higher. The trader, the middle man, the commercial man, who uses his hands only to turn over deal after deal and out of each one to squeeze money—above all, the financiers and big bankers, whose aim is even to make money out of *nothing*, and who, as we shall see, have perfected means for doing precisely this on a colossal scale and doing it invisibly withal—these men, whom aristocratic societies have commonly placed low, if not at the very bottom, our democracy has allowed to come to the top. And whoever sits on top is inevitably looked up to, and emulated, until his example permeates the whole society. In consequence, the people are corrupted. Even our countryside has been fouled and infected by the spirit of the city. Everybody, like the financiers, pants after money, *easy* money, the "fast buck," a chance to get something for nothing. Men are measured by the amount of money that they have. It is the common assumption that a man without money must be a nobody. Almost every man, too, has his price, like every *thing*. Our whole living is saturated with money valuations: conversation, books, papers, radio talks, politics, statecraft, church work—everything. One can hardly sit in a city subway car without being forced to close one's eyes to keep them from being defiled and one's mind invaded by the lies and baseness of the advertisements that plaster the walls wherever one can look. This is what we have made of America under our democracy—to my mind, a spiritually loathsome place. No wonder that Arabs, met some years ago in conference, exclaimed that they "*did not want* the incredible American way of life."

Naturally, while all this was going on, we have produced little significant culture. Probably, it is safe to say that there is no cultural field in which we have not played second fiddle to Europe. It has been Europe, with its survivals of feudalism, that has ever been the source of original and fertile ideas. We have but imitated, and usually imitated but poorly. Even the

great centers of pure science have been chiefly Berlin, Vienna, Paris, and London. *Our* scientists have been mostly of the practical variety, hired, like the engineers, to serve the owners of the machines, the money-grabbers.

Indeed, our leaders have not even ensured our long existence. Our statesmen, for the most part, have been too amateurish, too untrained and inexperienced, and at the best have changed too frequently, to give us grasp and elevation of policy, or even to maintain its consistency and continuity. Indeed, again and again, in the events that determined our part in the Second World War, and unmistakably and at a breath-taking pace during the years since, we have been committed to paths that lead (and one must suspect, were intended to lead) to destruction. The predominance of some vengefulness in our councils, of some apparently alien and positively anti-American influence, has prevented the adoption of any policy that put the welfare of the U.S. firmly first. Instead, we look back over twenty-five years in which our country has been consistently *betrayed—from within*. Out of a desire utterly to blot out Germany, long the West's best bulwark against the East, we have steadily helped to build up Russia into a colossus whose tyranny (as those who are fully informed now know very well) is more brutal, and whose designs far more diabolical and ruinous, than any that ever were charged against Germany.

As an instance of the sort of betrayal that I have in mind, I may mention that after the war was over, American forces were deliberately withdrawn to the Elbe, and the Communist army thereby permitted to overrun all of Eastern Europe and fasten its grip on the throat of Berlin. Never in all history, not even at Tours in 732 or at Vienna in the 17th century, had Europe so fallen under the heel of the alien East. The primary treachery may have been Roosevelt's and that of his Communist adviser Alger Hiss, in the secret agreement that they made with Stalin at Yalta, but Truman surely shares their guilt for putting their treason into effect. And Eisenhower no less. It has been said in the latter's defense that, if he had refused to obey Truman's order, he would have made himself liable to court-martial. But Westbrook Pegler spoke truly, and like an American and a man, when he declared his doubt whether any court-martial could have been found to condemn him, and that in any case he might better have accepted execution at the hands of a firing squad than to have taken any part in such a monstrous and fatal betrayal of his country, and of all his own kind, in Europe.

As if this were not enough, within the next few years our agents (General Marshall among them) had completed a like betrayal of Chiang Kai Shek and a surrender of all China into the hands of its Communists. This was in sheer disregard of the warning to Western statesmen by the distinguished British geopolitician Sir Halford Mackinder, of a generation before, that he who ruled the East of Europe commanded the Heartland, that he who ruled the Heartland commanded the World-Island (i.e., the land block consisting of Europe, Asia and Africa), and that he who ruled the World-Island commanded the world.¹⁴ Mackinder's dictum was confirmed in Lenin's enunciation of major Communist policy in which he declared that the fate of the world would be decided, in the end, by the way China went. And this Communist capture, one after another, of the Earth's places of supreme strategic importance (there are, of course, others that I have not mentioned) begins to take on a really lurid prospect as we recall, first, the well-known Communist plan to inflame, to finance, to arm, and to direct the teeming colored millions of the world against the West; and, secondly, that our prevailing democracy, with its Money Power's consuming lust for gain, has been

leading us for the past fifty years into the monumental stupidity of opening the scientific and industrial secrets of our power to the backward peoples of the whole world, above all to the crowded millions of the Orient, who undeniably have the wit and the energy to copy us well. When at last they burst their boundaries and sweep down upon us like a prairie fire, they will come armed with our own weapons.

I could go on to give countless further instances in support of my charge that the United States has been consistently betrayed. And it is not too much to say that the chief instrument in the steady advance of the Communist Empire, since the close of the Second World War, has been our own Department of State.¹⁵ The inner meaning of it all, for the purposes of our present examination, is that democracy is seen to be exactly that political system which provides the best opportunities for alien enemies and traitors to encyst themselves in the entire body of our people, and there to work under cover for our destruction. It turns out that most of the efforts to run the traitors down, the really big traitors, lead to the door of the International Money Power. And, in the end, we are forced to the conclusion that the Money Power always proves to be any people's supreme enemy and, further, that democracy is totally lacking in the kind of power necessary to put the Money Power into shackles. *This stands, unalterably, as its supreme and final indictment.*

However, while I purpose to keep my eye on the major factors and to steer clear of details, I wish also to avoid picturing the situation as more simple than it really is. I know well that there is usually a tangled complex of forces and influences to be unraveled before one can say which factor is paramount. So far as historical explanation is concerned, I am ready to allow, for instance, that much of the evil I now have my finger on might be traced to the Puritanism which, according to Werner Sombart, had so large a part in creating the accursed high-finance capitalism that plagues and poisons every people it touches. But this Puritanism not only launched the rising class of British traders, industrialists and bankers on their wanton and ruinous rampage through "Merrie England" in quest of profit, it was also instrumental in overthrowing English monarchy, traditionally the guardian of the people's liberty and welfare. It was this change that Disraeli had in mind when he said, through the mouth of his hero in *Sybil*, "As the power of the Crown has diminished, the privileges of the People have disappeared; until at length the Sceptre has become a pageant, and its subject has degenerated again into a serf."¹⁶ I know, as a matter of established historical fact, that the most heartless indifference to the lot of the English wageworkers and their most ruinous exploitation came not during the long centuries when the English king really ruled, but *after* the day when belief in kingship had begun to die, after the victory of anti-monarchical forces had affirmed the doctrine that governments serve the community, after a succession of reverses to the aristocracy had made it clear that rule lay, and would lie increasingly, in the hands of "the people." The system of gain grew side by side with the system of parliamentary government. But, indeed, it is only the old story: in ancient Athens as in modern England and America, democracy is associated with the rise of the Money Power, and with slavery and imperialism. And it has led to disaster.

But after all, even if democracy had *not* proved so well suited to providing secure and comfortable accommodation for traitors, what good reason is there, on the very face of things, to expect that democracy could ever provide a people with really sound and elevated direction? Even if machinery had ever been devised for registering the judgment of the

people on any great issue, what would be the worth of the judgment after we had it? Said Carlyle, "Can it be proved that, since the beginning of the world, there was ever given a universal vote in favour of the worthiest man or thing? . . . The worthiest, if *he* appealed to universal suffrage, would have but a poor chance. John Milton, inquiring of universal England what the worth of *Paradise Lost* was, received for an answer, five pounds sterling . . . And when Jesus Christ asked the Jews what *he* deserved, was not the answer, death on the gallows?"

The most vital issues of the State, both foreign and domestic, require for their sound consideration an amount of background and detailed knowledge that is beyond the reach of all but a few. I believe that about such issues most men do not know anything, do not care anything and not only lack the intelligence requisite to find out anything, but lack also the discernment and the character to give their judgment any value. It is then a waste of time, and folly, to register their opinion or to give it much consideration. Nor do we better matters by accumulating the judgments of many such men. Witlessness remains witless whether multiplied by one or by a million. You do not get wisdom by counting numskulls. What you do get is a downward pull toward mediocrity, arising from the catering for the votes of commonplace people, in order to obtain office or to stay in it. Even the Communist Harold Laski, in his article on the necessity of an elite in a democratic society, to which I referred in a previous chapter, admits that "it is legitimate to doubt whether the kind of aristocracy we require can be discovered among elected persons." The tendency, rather, arising from the dependence of election on popular appeal, is to put into office a man who himself is but a varnished incarnation of populace. In such a man, the high ends of sound social organization are quite lost to sight. Even if he were aware what they are, he would not know how to go about achieving them. As a rule, he knows only the small, nearsighted, rule-of-thumb ambidexterity of the political schemer, the ambitious clamberer to power. It is not out of such men as this that we can get the wisdom and the rule to lift a people to heights of greatness, or even to maintain their existence, let alone to preserve that identity from which existence derives all its significance.

Moreover, the very machinery of democratic processes has opened the door to the manipulation and domination of society by a rich clique, which is what we have in America today. Even John Stuart Mill, for all his championship of democracy, recognized and admitted this evil. "Democracy thus constituted does not even attain its ostensible object, that of giving the powers of government in all cases to the numerical majority. It does something very different: it gives them to a majority of the majority, who may be, and often are, but a minority of the whole."¹⁷ And Egon Friedell remarks in his *Cultural History Of The Modern Age*, that this "fallacy of every democracy, clearly seen already in Herodotus when he said that the majority was taken as the whole, was elevated in Greece to an all-consuming delusion."¹⁸ But Athens was not more deceived by it or more certainly its victim than we are in America.

Furthermore, the practice of majority rule provides the basis for the worst sort of tyranny. From the will of the king or a body of nobles there can be an appeal to the people, but where the people themselves are conceived as the real government, and where there is belief that rightness attaches to mere numbers, then when numbers reach a majority there can be *no appeal*. And no limit can be set to the majority's power, or even to its right, to coerce the

minority. As a last resort, a ruling house or a body of lords can be thrown out by revolution, but this possibility is removed when a government knows that it has on its side not only legal authority but also irresistible force. "This is the reason," said Mr. Dermot Morrah, "why the tyranny of the few over the many is always subject to limits; that of the many over the few has none." ¹⁹ Indeed, it is this that makes democracy so superb a schooling for the dictatorship to which it always succumbs. The would-be tyrant has but to win a mass following, and the people will both accept and assist his most ruthless elimination of his opponents.

One of the most demoralizing results of democracy is its dissipation of responsibility. When a law derives from a king or an aristocracy, the king or the nobles have to stand for it before the nation. And their sense of this responsibility creates a restraining and steadying influence as inescapable as it is socially valuable. For they know that in the long run the very continuance of their position and their rule depends upon their providing such government as to command, at the least, the respect and the confidence of the people. But under the ballot system responsibility has been so comminuted and dispersed that there is hardly any of it left. The fragments of it are shifted so easily and plausibly from one man's shoulders to another's that it cannot successfully be laid on anyone. *But power without responsibility is ruinous to all good government.*

At this point, we may end our examination of democracy on the basis of its record, and turn now to study the claims of the French revolutionists. These claims they undertook so to establish on abstract, innate, imprescriptible right that the zealot minds that follow them are rendered nearly impervious to evidence that their theories have failed in practice and are contradicted by the record of human experience. In *disregard* of all reason and all evidence to the contrary, they only reply that men are *born equal and born free*, and that any social arrangement that denies their equality or takes away their freedom is necessarily and unalterably wrong. Their ideas may be false, and founded ultimately on nothing deeper or more solid than vanity, but that has not prevented their spread until they have unbalanced men's sense of values all over the Earth and have unhinged the hallowed and proved institutions by which men of all ages have made their societies secure.

Probably, the man most responsible for the spread of the idea that men are born free and equal was Rousseau. Lord Acton went so far as to declare that Rousseau produced more effect with his pen than Aristotle, or Cicero, or St. Augustine, or St. Thomas Aquinas, or any other man who ever lived. This may be overstatement, but I am inclined to think that the swollen idea of the worth and importance of the ordinary man, which is fast reducing our whole modern world to chaos, is not due so much to Jesus, as is commonly thought, but rather to Rousseau.

To me, Rousseau is disgusting and contemptible. But here I wish to deal not with the man but with his teaching. I must begin by repudiating completely the entire foundation on which his claims rest. It is nothing but a cobweb tissue of romantic fiction. I recognize *no* abstract or imprescriptible rights. As a distinguished biologist has said, men are born unequal²⁰ and they remain so; and he might well have added, they are born conditioned, and they must remain conditioned, limited both from within and from without. "No man shall escape from what is within himself," from what he has inherited from his ancestors; and no man can be a

part of human society without accepting and fulfilling certain responsibilities and duties. Moreover, there is no evidence that any man has ever enjoyed *any* rights except when, individually or in combination with others, he has developed some kind of power sufficient to *compel respect*. Religions, political systems and moral ideals struggle for dominance like other things. That is, under their battle flags groups of men struggle for dominance. And if in the end they acquire rights, it means only that under the standard of certain ideas as a rallying point, they have developed a power to compel other men to yield them what they have demanded. The cries for liberty and equality are to be understood in precisely the same way, or they will not be understood at all.

Let us look into each of these ideas—first, that of liberty. Whose face is it that we may discern behind the cry for freedom? What kind of man? What does he want to be free *from*? And what free to *do*?

As we have just seen, no man *can* escape from the limits imposed by his own heredity: he cannot do more than he has the capacity to do, nor in the long run act contrary to his nature. A hack horse cannot win a race, nor can a race horse be made safe for grandma to drive to town. Neither, if a man is to enjoy any social life at all, can he escape the give-and-take and the acceptance of obligations that life with his fellows imposes.

It must be pointed out, too, that freedom in any true and deep sense is something that very few men *can* know. Only those rare souls who have won an inner transcendence over outer circumstances are truly free, only saints and seers and real philosophers. And these have commonly felt themselves to be free at all times, and in all places, and even (incredible as it may seem) under all circumstances. Thoreau knew himself free in jail. And there have been souls who have given evidence of their essential freedom even amidst the flames that were consuming their bodies. Yet even these are not free to do or not to do, after the fancy of the ordinary prater about liberty. Without raising the question of the freedom of the will, we must remind ourselves that it is precisely men of the loftiest spirit and supreme creative powers who are *least* “free to do what they feel like.” For them, life has no meaning and grows stale in their mouths, except as they live *for* something, something rare and lofty and beyond themselves. Their bent, their mission, their destiny, their need to lift the life of mankind, is the sternest, most exacting and unrelenting master, and gives them the most straitened, narrowest, and steepest path to follow—in an inner sense (it might even be said) under pain of death. They are the slaves of their quest. Yet—such is their nature, so beyond the understanding of the ordinary man—they would not have it otherwise. Inwardly, day and night, they are on their knees before their vision of the truth or beauty that drives them on.

Theirs, as I conceive it, is the only real liberty—the liberty of the man who is most completely possessed by what he is. And they wait on no man and on no government to give it to them. They win it. They take it. And no man, nor all men put together, can take it away from them.

Needless to say, it is not liberty of this kind that people mean when they clamour for freedom. It comes only at a price that they are unwilling to pay, higher than they have it in them to pay. Very few men can give their all for anything. To the eye of the ordinary mortal, such a liberty is too fantastic and intangible, of too dubious a reality or value, to entice him

to any such complete devotion of himself. He passes it by in favor of a liberty that will promise more and cost less.

Probably, the object behind most of the clamor for liberty is political rights—the right to vote, the right to believe what one pleases, the right freely to express one's opinion. Let us therefore look into this belief of the common man that these "civil liberties" are a jewel of great price. Let us see what enjoyment of these rights amounts to, what it has led to, and what are the prospects it holds for the future.

The ballot represents such a comminution of political power, even to its vanishing point, that I can but hold it in contempt. In view of the control of the political machines by Wall Street or by some similar clique with interests quite contrary to the good of the country as a whole, and because, as a result of the total electoral process, the men put up for office are usually so mediocre that no man of wisdom and character would care to be "represented" by any one of them, I have gradually come to feel that voting is about as useful as casting a chip into a puddle. Disraeli spoke of "that fatal drollery called representative government." Certainly, to give people the idea that they are free because they have the ballot is nothing less than a fraud. Rather is the feeling of freedom thus engendered a means by which their essential slavery is hid from their eyes and the more securely fastened upon them. Behind this camouflage, a Plutocracy—one of the nastiest and basest of all forms of government—has been able to make the people its unwitting accomplice in their own degradation and in the most wanton and unprecedented exploitation of the natural resources upon which our entire future as a nation depends.

Nor do I feel differently about the right to "unlimited freedom of thought and discussion" that democracy stands for. But as background for what I want to say in reply, let me at this point interject a few observations.

The ever-increasing domination of our modern life by Science has created an obsession with the rational that has thrown our life quite out of balance. I surely do not need to argue here that I hold thought very important, but everlasting intellectual ferment and agitation is certainly not the end of human existence, nor is it of itself even a sign of a people's health and vitality. I strongly suspect that endless and absolutely free-ranging debate and discussion only reflect uncertainty and insecurity deep in a people's soul. It betrays weakness, division, and inner shakiness. Sound instinct and promise of destiny in a people always shows itself in unity and solidarity, and—let us remember this as absolutely fundamental—in a relentless drive toward what will ensure its survival, its close-knit growth, and the prolonged flowering of its own unique genius. And blessed will any people be which has leaders who clearly recognize that the surest means to such a state is racial homogeneity—likeness, compatibility, harmony, in all its constituent parts. Only by this can it acquire that thoroughly integrated unity, the seamless rock-hard solidarity and substance, that will enable it, in an hour of crisis, to stand up under the steady ruthless pounding of a powerful outside foe. And only by this, too, will it come to be filled in its domestic life with that sure faith in itself, that tranquillity of mind and heart, and that joy in existence, which are necessary for the richest pollination of its genius.

In prehistoric times, as my readers will doubtless recall, we found that the requisite homogeneity frequently came about in areas of natural isolation, such as islands, peninsulas, or closed river valleys: one thinks at once of Britain, Greece, Egypt and Mesopotamia. Here the geographical situation tended toward the exclusion of the alien. But no people became a great people without that homogeneity on which the achievement of greatness seems invariably to depend. Where Nature did not provide it by herself, it had to be achieved by human intervention and arrangement. To achieve it, the Chinese built their Great Wall, 20 to 30 feet high, 15 to 20 feet wide, and nearly fifteen hundred miles long! long enough to reach from the Atlantic to the Mississippi! And in the fifth century B.C., under the leadership of the religious reformer Ezra, the old Hebrews began to undertake to accomplish under the threat of death what the Prophets had undertaken in vain to accomplish by exhortation and invective. Mixed marriages with gentiles were ruthlessly broken up; and through all the centuries since then the orthodox Jewish community has treated as a leper, indeed has treated as dead, any Jew who married a gentile. Even to this day, in the state of Israel, marriage between Jew and gentile is not legally possible. In the case of a country like the United States, if the original stock and its values are to survive, then all aliens, such as Negroes, Jews, and Orientals, will have to be put out and kept out. Immigration will have to be strictly limited to stocks most closely related, by blood and by tradition, to the stocks by which the country was originally founded. And then, among a people of like instincts and values, and under the impress of religious and moral teaching as largely as possible unified, the questions of gravest importance would be largely a matter about which there was general and prevailing agreement.

Doubtless, there must come periods of transition, in which for a people's very life's sake and destiny's sake, its whole stock of ideas and its very foundations must be re-examined and reappraised. It was precisely such a task that Nietzsche set before himself in his *Will To Power*, the subtitle of which was "An Attempted Transvaluation of All Values." But though on occasion such a task must be undertaken, it is most emphatically not a task at which everyone should feel free to try his hand. It is for those few men who have not only the capacity and training to think, and behind them the experience and habit of responsibility, but also the strength of character and the spiritual stability to sustain intellectual skepticism. But when, as a result of the democratic dogma, it is believed that everything which is right for one is permissible for all, when everyone is encouraged to question freely, and does question even those beliefs upon which a people's very life has been founded, the notorious and inevitable result is that the great majority of minds are unhinged. They are left with no deep unshakable certainty on which to fasten and by which to steer, and in consequence fall into the demoralization in which the lack of any directing and sustaining certainty always ends. When a people as a whole no longer believes in anything, it falls to pieces. It must fall to pieces. For belief is the very foundation on which our life was built and the cement by which it is held together. Today we see the whole basis and cohesiveness of our life dissolving in skepticism. The democratic assertion of every man's right to think for himself contained an acid that most minds were not, and are not, strong enough to withstand.

The right to free expression has had similar consequences. There are many matters, among them the problems most vitally affecting the welfare of any nation, upon which most people have no right to be heard, for the simple reason that they are beyond any ordinary man's comprehension. And what people do not understand they should not talk about. They

should not be allowed to talk about. This is only good sense. And whenever any upstart, with overweening presumption, ventures to air his opinions, it would be better for all concerned, better in the end even for him, if a rod were laid across his back, as in the case of Homer's Thersites, or at least that he be laughed out of camp. But among us it is not so. Generations of belief in free speech and free press and of registering every man's opinion pro and con, even that of every dolt and pauper, have made every smalltown newspaper editor ready to set up as an oracle, and any farm- or factory-hand ready to diagnose the evils of an economic and political system, and to advise remedies. A college speaker will express convictions that have behind them his best thought and ripest experience over a period of thirty or forty years, and students not yet out of their teens, who have not given such ideas so much as half an hour's consideration in their entire lives, will forthwith stand up and contradict him to his face. The truth is, it strikes me, this cry for liberty has come to voice more than a demand for political rights: it reveals a strong disinclination to obey anybody or any thing. The past is disparaged as a time of darkness and unreasonable and unbearable restraint, in favor of the glorious present, in which each man may do what he feels like. "Why should we listen to the past? Is the present not more enlightened and advanced? Why should we listen to our great men? Who said there *were* any *great* men? Is not one as good as another? Why should we not, each of us, be a law unto himself?" Democracy, as I have come to see it, is always thus loose-tongued, loudmouthed, and weak-minded. It tends to produce a society of chattering magpies.

The results are twofold vicious. There is no more authority among us. And there is no reverence. Thus we cut ourselves off from all the light by which a people's life can be soundly guided. The wisdom of their long past, as voiced in tradition, is contemptuously dismissed and forgotten; and the wisdom of the present, which might find a voice in its great men, is drowned in the roar and babble of the crowd. But without tradition no people's life can be sound and stable. Most things vitally affecting their welfare cannot be everlastingly discussed. They must be done or avoided, as a rule—and until its leaders see good to modify the rules—for no better reason, in the mind of the common man, than that contained in the words "It is not done," or, "This is the way we do." And without the light on its path that can be shed only from its great men, any people must go on to disaster. Wisdom! Wisdom! Verily, for lack of wisdom the people walk in darkness, and must sooner or later walk into a trap, or over a cliff, or into a morass, or up a blind-alley. And in democracy the effort is to find light where it does not exist.

In all consideration of these political rights, it needs to be remembered that originally they were not *intended* for everybody. They were "won by aristocrats for aristocrats," as Dermot Morrah would remind us. Magna Charta was forced from the hand of King John chiefly by his barons, and its privileges were to be exercised only by them or by their like. Similarly, in the case of the Bill of Rights of 1688. Even Voltaire, for all that he was eventually claimed by the Jacobins, "when he talked of liberty . . . was thinking only of the upper ten thousand. Speaking of the people, he said, 'They will always remain stupid and barbarous; they are oxen who need a yoke, a whip, and hay.'" ²¹ But what was won by nobles for the nobility is now claimed for everybody. The proletariat, who have done nothing to create culture, who cannot appreciate either what it cost or what it means, and who could do nothing to reproduce it if it were destroyed, swarms right into the lighted salon of civilization, and even sits itself down where before have sat only knights and kings. It is one of the results of the

“inundation” of the masses for which democracy is so largely responsible. At last, the innermost meaning of all this cry for liberty stands revealed. It is the effort of the masses to possess the Earth for themselves.

The whole modern pressure for “liberty” needs to be met, to our way of thinking, by a recollection of three verities that are as lasting as human nature itself.

The first can hardly be stated better than it has been stated by Edmund Burke. “Society cannot exist,” he said, “unless a controlling power upon will and appetite be placed somewhere, and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without. *It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things, that men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters.*” [Emphasis added.] Freedom cannot be *given* by any system or by any government. Free men make themselves free. In the long run, the measure of freedom that they enjoy in the world will be proportioned to their mastery over themselves.

Next, the zealots for freedom have omitted from their demands one of the most important conditions for its realization. There can be no real or essential freedom, such as I am concerned about, without the private ownership of property, of such kind and in such quantity as to establish the individual owner in economic independence of society. Of this, I shall have more to say when I come to write about Aristocracy.

In the third place, liberty has been mistakenly conceived. I would have each man enjoy the utmost liberty in his *private* life, in relation to the things he is really concerned about and is competent to handle. I have in mind his home, his craft or other means of livelihood, local affairs, his friends, his church, and all the beauties of the world about him. But where he cannot measure up to responsibility he should not have privileges. In all matters relating to the welfare of society as a whole, he should be under the strictest direction from above.

Nor would this be any violation of the real essential freedom possible to him. Indeed, there would not necessarily result any loss of any freedom he feels or cares about, or any detriment to his health of body or contentment of mind and spirit, *if he were even personally bound to another man*, to obey his will and to serve him. I tell you this modern unwillingness to recognize another man as your superior grows out of nothing less than an unhealthy state of soul. It betrays the action of that poison which loosens all the tensions and bonds natural to men in their relation to one another. There are powers resident in some men that immediately impress me with their superiority and make it my very impulse to look up to them. He only reveals his spiritual poverty who declares that in his heart he bows down before no man—or else, a transcendent greatness such as comes only to the smallest fraction of men, only to a Zarathustra, who cannot *find* any greater than himself. Generally speaking, the healthy instinct is expressed by Carlyle when he declared, “No higher feeling than this admiration for one higher than himself dwells in the breast of man.” I agree heartily with Blake when he cried, “The worship of God is: Honouring his gifts in other men, each according to his genius, and loving the greatest men best: those who envy or calumniate great men hate God; for there is no other God.”²²

Our whole society is sick because we have unlearned to feel reverence, and because we no longer have men who *compel* our reverence and before whom it is our instinct to bow down

and whom we are proud to obey. Most men throw away their supreme worth and the deepest joy and satisfaction of which they are capable when they have no one greater than themselves to whom they can pledge a love and a loyalty unto death, and for whose sake they verily sacrifice themselves. Today, outside of friendship and the family, love and loyalty are almost unknown. We have only the cash-nexus of democracy, with everyone enjoying the "equal right" to exploit and to be exploited.

There is a passage in Ruskin's *Stones Of Venice* that so clinches this point that I cannot forbear to quote it. "I know not if a day is ever to come," he says,

"When the nature of right freedom will be understood, and when man will see that to obey another man, to labour for him, yield reverence to him or to his place, is not slavery. It is often the best kind of liberty—liberty from care. The man who says to one, Go, and he goeth, and to another, Come, and he cometh, has, in most cases, more sense of restraint and difficulty than the man who obeys him. The movements of the one are hindered by the burden on his shoulders; of the other, by the bridle on his lips: there is no way by which the burden may be lightened; but we need not suffer from the bridle if we do not champ at it. To yield reverence to another, to hold ourselves and our lives at his disposal, is not slavery; often it is the noblest state in which a man can live in this world. There is, indeed, a reverence which is servile, that is to say, irrational or selfish: but there is also noble reverence, that is to say, reasonable and loving; and a man is never so noble as when he is reverent in this kind; nay, even if the feeling pass the bounds of mere reason, so that it be loving, a man is raised by it . . . And therefore, in all ages and in all countries, reverence has been paid and sacrifice made by men to each other, not only without complaint, but rejoicingly; and famine, and peril, and sword, and all evil, and all shame, have been borne willingly in the cause of masters and kings; for all these gifts of the heart ennobled the men who gave, not less than the men who received them, and nature prompted, and God rewarded the sacrifice." ²³

Liberty, however, is not really the cardinal doctrine of democracy. And indeed, as Justice Stephen and Sir Henry Sumner Maine had the insight to discern almost a hundred years ago, liberty is incompatible with equality. Give men freedom, and straightway it becomes only too apparent how unequal they are. And when this incompatibility finally proved itself in fact and forced the Russian revolutionists to choose between liberty and equality, they revealed themselves as the Earthlings that Voltaire declared the masses to be. They raised no dramatic cry of "Give me liberty or give me death." Liberty meant less to them than their dinner pails. Above all they wanted security, even though it was to be realized only in the equality of state slaves. Let us now, therefore, look into the very heart of the revolutionist's cry, the cry for equality. What is in it and behind it?

"All men are born equal," is the cry. But are they? In what respect are they? On what grounds are they alleged to be? This assertion lunges desperately into the solid phalanx of all human experience. If we interpret the cry to mean equality of capacity, every one of us knows better. I have yet to meet a single man who did not deny any such belief in the practice of his everyday life. To be sure, the mind of the zealot will readily trace inequalities of wealth and education to injustice in the distribution of opportunities in youth, but there remain the bedrock inequalities of capacity due to age, sex, race and, above all, heredity. I

shall have much to say about most of these matters in chapters that we are now approaching but let me remark here that I know of no place in which these inequalities have been more carefully analyzed and weighed than in James Fitzjames Stephen's *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity*²⁴ and Ludovici's *False Assumptions Of 'Democracy'*.²⁵ In general, it needs to be reiterated that democracy, as was to be expected, has overemphasized the importance of environment, of the power of education and opportunity to improve. Justice Stephen remarks, trenchantly, "Society cannot make silk purses out of sows' ears, and there are plenty of ears in the world which no tanning can turn even into serviceable pigskin." He makes it very clear, too, what wrong and injury are done to woman, and what handicap is imposed upon her, by treating her in the struggle of life as though she were man's "equal." She is something other, and more, than man's *equal!*

Even the interpretation of the slogan to mean "equality of opportunity," when carefully taken to pieces, makes no sense. Inherited, inborn, and therefore inescapable inequality of capacity conditions everything—even the ability to *benefit* by opportunity. We are not dealing with the abstractions of mathematics but with the concrete actualities of human beings. What kind and degree of opportunity we should provide a feeble-minded individual, to help him most in his competition with one more gifted, no one can ever tell exactly. But this is certain: so long as the cry for "equality of opportunity" is raised in the faith that inequality among men can at last be smoothed out by improvement in the environment of those born botched or ill-favored, the *effort to provide* equality of opportunity will inevitably tend to create an injustice far more dangerous than denying it, because it will prove more socially costly—the injustice, namely, of failing to provide adequate opportunity to the comparatively *few rare men of greatest capacity upon whose kind the welfare of any people chiefly depends*.

The doctrine is sometimes interpreted as "equality before the law." But this seems to me only the last resort of men who are struggling to find *some* meaning that is still tenable. That competent legal service should be within the reach of the poorest and lowliest man in the land, and that no man should be able by his wealth or position to escape the punishment he deserves, goes without saying. Yet even here justice would not be done by treating the big man and the little man as though they were equal. Rather, would true justice thereby be frustrated. For the same offense, punishment ought to fall more heavily on the man of larger gifts and more responsible position than on the common man of meager intelligence and narrow opportunities.

In the end, my examination of the doctrine of equality forces me to the conclusion that at bottom it is nothing but the envious and resentful cry of the inferior man against the superior, the battle cry by which he would rally other inferior men to his standard, and not only overthrow the rule of the superior but abolish all recognition of superiority, and thus establish a world favorable to those who are now weak, ugly, dull, and generally botched. It is basically a cry of insurrection.

The menace of it is twofold. In the first place, it is a denial of the need of leadership. But without leadership, and leadership of high order, no people can long hold together. How far its insidious poison has already worked to undo the instincts of modern man is evident in the fact that this mass movement toward equality is today being supported by many of the most gifted among us, men backed with the best family blood and tradition. These people,

however sincere and well-intentioned, are actually blind and deluded traitors, not only to their own kind, but to the truest good of the whole people whose interest they profess to have at heart. They have betrayed the responsibility that they bear to maintain that some men are better than others, and that the best should rule—that the best *must* rule, or the whole people will hasten on to disaster.

In the second place, the doctrine of equality is essentially a repudiation of quality, for it is a denial of that differentiation apart from which quality cannot exist. The whole movement toward equality is part of the process by which the typical and normal texture and organic structure of a sound society breaks down into the mush of decay—loss of all distinctive size, shape, color, relationship, and function, into a meaningless mass. Thus it is a presage of the end. Yea, verily, in a way we have gone up among the nations of the world, as it were, in a day, like Assyria did. But like Assyria also we shall come down in a day. A scant one hundred and fifty years Assyria lasted. I can only doubt whether we shall last much longer. The pyramid *will not* stand on its head.

The evil results *chiefly* from the fact that the mere *idea* of equality was ever allowed to get abroad. Until Jacques' poor head was turned with the fatuous notion that he was as good as anybody, he was content to take his place and fill it. And, provided that there were corrections and reforms, which at times were most certainly and urgently needed, he was better off then than he has been since. Nature has set limits against which the most romantic propaganda can only inflame men's hopes and vanity in vain. The revolutionaries and liberals have only destroyed the traditional, just, and natural organization of society without accomplishing a jot. They have only turned everything upside down, and put on top those who belong on the bottom; and now those who formerly reposed on the bottom are approaching a very painful fall to the level on which they belong. For in the end, Nature will not be denied. Sooner or later gravitation will surely pull back the heavy mass to the bottom. But we cannot be sure that those who come to the top in any near future will be any nobility. Rather, shall we more likely have another one of those "monstrous and morbid forms of government by the One, or of government by the Few," in which, as you will remember, Sir Henry Maine observed that democracy has always ended.

The most generous judgment that can be made of democracy is that it has been based on "too favorable an estimate of human nature." That is to say, on an estimate too romantic, too unrealistic, and thus—too false. In short, democracy is a form of government that will not work and will not last *because it lacks the basic requisite of all sound government that it shall fit the nature of man.*

1945, 1969.

¹ A periodical of the most leftist branch of the Society of Friends (the Quakers).

² Edward A. Freeman, Regius Professor of Modern History, University of Oxford—*The Chief Periods of European History* (Macmillan), 1886, p. 6.

³ Henry Sumner Maine—*Popular Government*, Holt, 1886, p. 59.

⁴ Quoted by Ortega y Gasset in *The Revolt of the Masses*, Norton, 1932, p. 54.

⁵ Samuel J. Holmes—*Human Genetics and its Social Import*, McGraw, 1936, p. 293.

⁶ T.R. Glover—*Democracy in the Ancient World*, Macmillan, 1927. Reprinted, New York, 1966, p. 73.

⁷ Walter R. Agard—*What Democracy Meant to the Greeks*, U. of N.C. Press, 1942, p. 70. The context of the quotation reads as follows:

“. . . Political rights were enjoyed only by men over eighteen years of age, born of Athenian parents enrolled in the citizen class. This number in 430 B.C. [end of the Age of Pericles] was around 40,000. There were probably about 24,000 metics (resident aliens) who had settled in Athens for business, industrial, or professional purposes. If we add to these the women and children and upwards of 100,000 slaves (war-captives), who likewise had no part in public administration, it will appear that perhaps one-tenth of the total population had political rights. The reason for the restriction was the desire to have policies of the city decided by those who had knowledge based on experience and a permanent stake in its welfare. But this certainly seems to be a decidedly limited democracy.” Pp. 69-70.

⁸ Gustave Glotz—*Ancient Greece At Work*, Kegan Paul, 1926, p. 159.

⁹ Quoted by Agard, op. cit., P. 64.

¹⁰ Henry Sumner Maine—*Popular Government*, Holt, 1886, p. 70f.

¹¹ Published by Macmillan, 1939. Bryant was Professor of History at Oxford University. It was written in the hope that, even in the eleventh hour, war might be averted.

¹² Article entitled “Impostor-Terms” in *The Atlantic Monthly*, January, 1936.

¹³ See Brooks Adams—*The Degradation Of The Democratic Dogma*, Macmillan, 1919, p. 84ff. Brooks Adams was brother of Henry Adams and grandson of John Quincy. Here is what he has put on record:

“At this particular juncture of human affairs [1919] the tendency is very strong throughout the world to deify the democratic dogma, and to look to democracy to accomplish pretty promptly some approach to a millenium among men. “This form of belief was strong in my family a century ago, and found expression through my grandfather, John Quincy Adams, who made the realization thereof the work and ambition of his life and who, when he grew old, practically gave his life for the cause. As an apostle of this doctrine, I take it, he must always be one of the most commanding figures of our history. . . . But so far as he had watched, during a lifetime, the progress of the democrat toward perfection he had little to say in the way of hope.

"[He], in 1832, sadly admitted to himself how he had imagined 'this federative union was to last for ages. I now disbelieve its duration for twenty years, and doubt its continuance for five.' . . . Alike, from Mr. Adams' point of view or from ours, the test had been crucial. Democracy had failed to justify itself."

I submit that these collective results, being those drawn by one family from their experience and study throughout an entire century, and which have been reached under an environment the most favorable toward creating a belief in the great democratic dogma, had it been in any degree true, are at least worthy of the calm consideration of fair-minded persons.

¹⁴ Sir Halford Mackinder—*Democratic Ideals And Reality*, Holt, 1919.

¹⁵ Bryton Barron—*The State Department: Blunders or Treason?* Crestwood Books, Springfield, Va., 1965. After seventeen years as head of the treaty-making division of the Department of State, Bryton Barron resigned his position and thereby sacrificed his career, in order to free himself to make this revelation of the betrayals of the U.S. by its highest placed officials.

¹⁶ Benjamin Disraeli (Lord Beaconsfield)—*Sybil*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1934, p. 430.

¹⁷ John Stuart Mill—*Considerations On Representative Government*, Ch. VII, Sec. 4.

¹⁸ Knopf, 1931, Vol. II, p. 351.

¹⁹ "A Defense of Aristocracy," *Church Quarterly Review*, Oct.—Dec., 1939, p. 102.

²⁰ Prof. S. J. Holmes—*Human Genetics and Its Social Import*, McGraw-Hill, 1936, p. 1.

²¹ Egon Friedel—Op. cit., Vol. II, p. 205.

²² William Blake, op. cit., p. 202: "Marriage of Heaven and Hell," last "A Memorable Fancy."

²³ John Ruskin—*The Stones Of Venice*, George Allen, London, 1898, Vol. II, Ch. VI: "The Nature of Gothic," p. 161f.

²⁴ Smith Elder & Co., London, 1873.

²⁵ Heath Cranton, London, 1921.

Chapter 11.

The Necessity of an Aristocracy.

"I agree with you that there is a natural aristocracy among men. The grounds of this are virtue and talents . . . the natural aristocracy I consider the most precious gift of nature for the instruction, the trusts and the government of society . . . May we not say that form of government is the best which provides the most effectively for a pure election of these natural aristocrats into the office of government."

Thomas Jefferson, October 18, 1813, from "that illuminating correspondence between Jefferson and Adams in the last years of their lives."

The last chapter in its original substance, like this one, was part of a series of papers that, let me remind my reader, I wrote and sent out to a large circle of friends and acquaintances between 1944 and 1948. Some of the responses to what I had written about democracy were very sympathetic, but a few displayed resistance, and one confessed a "feeling" that I was "missing the essence somewhere." This led me, out of a desire to be altogether fair, to consider what there might be in democracy that was entitled to more weight than I had allowed it. Three things came to my mind: protection of minorities, equality of opportunity, and the worth of the common man.

Of the protection of minorities, Mr. Felix Morley, in contrasting democracy and Russian Communism, in an article that appeared in *Human Events* in the fall of 1945, made considerable point by including it in his definition of what democracy is. "Democracy," he said, "is simply a form of government in which the will of the majority controls while the rights of the minority are scrupulously protected." This last is, of course, very important. But according to Mr. Dermot Morrah, the protection of minorities is really an aristocratic tradition, and does not come out of democracy either by its nature or logically. He has a passage so pertinent that, although I have already quoted a sentence from it in my previous chapter, I must now submit it in its entirety.

Once you accept the position that the merit of a policy is to be judged by the number of people who can be induced to vote for it, irrespective of their qualifications to form an opinion, you are on the slippery slope that leads to tyranny—either in the Greek or in the English sense of the word. If you tell 60,000,000 people in a nation of 100,000,000 that because they hold the same opinion and are a majority they must be right and the 40,000,000 of the minority wrong, what is to restrain them from a ruthless persecution of the minority view? Only the recognition that minorities have rights, which the power of the state has no authority to invade. *But this . . . is an aristocratic doctrine.* (Italics added.) In countries where the aristocratic tradition has perished, such as Italy, Germany and Russia to-day, or France in the 1790's, the power of numbers is in fact used for the total suppression of an unpopular opinion or an unpopular race. I cannot believe that this persecution comes about merely because the supreme authority is vested in a single man. It is because that supreme legal

authority and the crushing weight of numbers are enlisted on the same side. So long as a regime has on its side not only law but also irresistible force—which is the situation characteristic of pure democracy—the possibilities of oppression are not limited even by the fear of revolution. This is the reason why the tyranny of the few over the many is always subject to limits; that of the many over the few has none.¹

This is to say that, though democracy may inherit and for a time honor the aristocratic tradition of protecting minorities, its *tendency*, as I have pointed out before, is to develop into mass domination (none the less actual because it comes to a head in a single man) in which all opposition is ruthlessly suppressed. Respect for and protection of minorities require a largeness and elevation of spirit that cannot be expected of the mass of men once control has passed completely and firmly into their hands.

In support of this let me submit two quotations, which I think deserve our thoughtful attention. C. G. Jung observed in *Contributions to Analytical Psychology*, that the East and the West “are fundamentally divorced, both racially and in their ideals. In the West there is as great political freedom as, personally, there is a lack of it.”² And Nikolai Berdyaev, in his *The Fate of Man in the Modern World*, declared:

From the sociological viewpoint it is very interesting that freedom is constantly diminishing in the world, not only in comparison with societies founded on liberal and democratic principles, but even in comparison with the old monarchical and aristocratic societies where, actually, there was more liberty, in spite of the fact that there was far greater unity in the matter of religious faith. In the older social forms, really great liberty was assured for fairly limited groups—liberty was an aristocratic privilege. When the circle was widened and society made uniform, instead of freedom being extended to all, it is non-freedom which becomes universal: all are equally subject to the state or to society. . . Freedom is an aristocratic rather than a democratic privilege.³

But it may be that the protagonist of democracy would lay even more stress on equality of opportunity, and believe that it can be secured more surely under democracy than under any other form of government. I paid some attention to this argument in my last chapter—as much as I think it deserves, but let us examine it again. It must surely be recognized at the outset that while the provision of equal opportunity is something that we may aim at, it can never be guaranteed or more than roughly approximated. There are so many variables that are quite beyond human control. As a rule a child’s basic character is determined more by the kind of home that he has in his earliest years than it is ever likely to be modified during the later years of his formal schooling. And some parents have minds and some are morons, some are noble and cultured and some are vicious and boors, some can make much out of little and others let everything that comes into their hands slip through their fingers. Youngsters who grow up in a home made by the former kind of parents have an advantage over their less favored competitors that can only with the greatest difficulty, if at all, be compensated by any advantages to come later.

To a large extent, the same “human element” carries over into the experience that comes *after* the home, and likewise frustrates any efforts to give all a really equal chance. Of two boys with the same intelligence rating and, as far as one can judge, of equally engaging and

promising personality and character, and, moreover, studying in the very same school, one falls to a born teacher, who understands him and likes him and inspires him, the other to a teacher who, because of his resemblance in some trifling particular to a father whom she hated, takes an unreasoning and unwarranted dislike to him and thwarts him at every turn. When they go out into the world, one happens to capture the imagination of a man who has the influence to give him the contacts he needs in order to enter most rapidly into his fullest possibilities. The other never meets anybody who has a like significance for his development; he always has to make his way against the current and alone. So much seems to depend on plain chance, or luck. We may resent the fact, it may offend our sense of justice and our belief that, if there is a God who orders the world, then it ought not to be so. But, unless I have been greatly mistaken in my observations and in my reading of history, this basic and initial inequality of opportunity is the way that things always have been, and I can see no means whatever, within the reach of man, by which they can be greatly altered. This fact alone frustrates, and must always frustrate, the best-intentioned efforts to provide really equal opportunity.

Let me come at the matter from yet another angle.

It is surely obvious on the face of it that if equality of opportunity is ever to bring things out even, between man and man, they must all be born with equal potentialities for benefiting by it. There never can be either point or sense in giving men opportunities that they lack the ability or the inclination to take advantage of. It thus becomes evident at once that the whole demand for equal opportunity must finally derive *from an initial assumption* that men *are* born equal, if not absolutely, at least in their potentialities. This is what the revolutionist really starts with, and it is what many an earnest Christian really starts with, too. In other words, what the demand rests on at bottom is nothing more, from the start, than assumption, predisposition, preconception, what in the last analysis stands revealed as sheer prejudice. They *want* to believe men equal. They *need* to believe men equal. Their need is so great that it can fairly be said they *must* believe men equal. The revolutionists need it as the very crux of their class war; they are set on leveling things to bring themselves up, and to this end they cry "equality" in order to bring their superiors down. The Christians need it (apart from their perhaps sharing the revolutionists' motives) because their religion, on which they rest their entire life, proclaims that God is love, and, figuring that the mind of their God must work like their own, they feel that he would stultify himself and not even be just, let alone loving, if he were to make men other than equal, if he turned men loose to run the race of life under insuperable handicaps. Probably, it is not too much to say that to many Christians the belief in human equality is more vital than God himself, that rather than give it up they would give up their God and face life without any God. To both revolutionists and many earnest Christians, the belief in equality is *so essential*, if life is to make any sense or to give them any satisfaction, that they feel themselves lifted into a sublime superiority to all reality and are ready to assert its reality in defiance of demonstrable facts! They stubbornly close their eyes to facts, ignore, evade or even falsify facts, and fasten fanatically on whatever will make what they want to believe seem valid. Nevertheless, at the bottom of it all, I say again, there is nothing more than need, and wish, and assumption, and assertion.

Certainly, the facts of life are completely contrary to it. By their very *nature* men are *unequal*. They are born unequal. No informed person in his senses, nor anyone who has gone

through life with his eyes open, can possibly believe anything else. Indeed, our whole theory of evolution is based on the scientific conclusion that men, like all other living creatures, were different from one another, and some better than others, if only in the sense of being better able to survive in a given environment. The most obvious feature of all life is its infinite diversity. No two of *any* living thing are just alike or equal. Furthermore, our genetic inheritance, what we are every one of us heir to, from our parents and ancestors, is absolutely inescapable. And further yet, top-ranking scientific authorities are rating this genetic inheritance as a factor approximately three times as determinative of every man's development as his environment, which is another name for opportunity.⁴

I am, of course, very much aware that this view of the matter is not universally accepted, that in fact the great mass of men, even of university professors, have come to, or been brought to, its direct opposite, to the essentially Communist view which disparages heredity in favor of environment. But I began nearly forty years ago to study this socially crucial problem of heredity *versus* environment, and I have followed the controversy that grew out of it ever since. And it gradually became apparent to me, as it has to others, that there was a movement on foot, stemming from Professor Franz Boas at Columbia University in the late Twenties, to establish the academic world of the United States on a foundation of Communist-slanted anthropology. This story needs to be told in full and given the widest possible publicity, but I need not take the space for it here, since it has already been told very objectively and with ample supporting evidence by Carleton Putnam in his *Race and Reason* (1961), especially perhaps in its first thirty-three pages, and in the first part of his more recent *Race and Reality* (1967).⁵ But in any case the story can be uncovered, together with the truth about the supreme importance of heredity as compared with environment, by any man of moderate intelligence who will stubbornly refuse to content himself with other men's interpretations of the evidence, however "authoritative," and will insist on examining the evidence for himself—thoroughly, honestly, independently, and fearlessly. My own investigation has satisfied me that respectable evidence of human equality simply does not exist. Accordingly, I must necessarily believe that no matter how men may theorize, dogmatize, and try to rearrange society on a contrary assumption—in spite of demonstrable facts—they will invariably find in the end that "the old sources of distinction," of difference and inequality, have once again made themselves manifest and proved utterly inescapable and invincible. If you try to weave a rug out of red wool, the rug will always come out red no matter what pattern you choose. Should we not show more sense, more reason, if we undertook to build a society on a frank recognition and acceptance of the basic fact that men are *unequal*?

But reason is not the foundation for this demand for equality. I have noticed that the talk is always about opportunity's being *given*, being *provided*. But it is not the healthy, or the beautiful, or the well-born, or the well-endowed from whose lips this cry arises. We may open the books of history and biography where we will, but it is always only to discover that those who were able to take did not wait or ask to be given. Rather, and obviously to him of fine ear, does this cry come from those who are poorly equipped for the race of life who, as they see others forging ahead of them, weakly whimper, "I could have shown myself as good a man as you *if I had been given a chance*." Here we have the source of this cry, in the heart of him who weakly blames on external circumstances an inferiority that is rooted in his own faulty make-up. At bottom, it is a cry of envy, and even of resentment and hatred toward all

superior ones. It is a cry by which the poorly endowed and ill-favored try to gather together other poorly endowed and ill-favored ones, until by their very numbers they can overthrow and oust all superior ones and create a world to the advantage of their own kind, of the masses, of the mob. It is *not honestly* an effort to ensure that capacity gets the opportunity it deserves. Rather, is it an effort to win for those who *lack* capacity, advantages and position that they do not deserve and cannot measure up to. The cry "equality of opportunity" is only a political trick, a piece of stratagem, to take in the unwary. Unsparingly laid bare, it is discovered to be the cry of the revolutionist, of the subversive, of him who would destroy that natural order apart from which no true society has ever existed or can exist, who would turn the pyramid upside down and put the bottom on top.

And what a weapon has been made of it! This is precisely what Christianity did to the old world of Rome. Superior individuals—superior in physical beauty and sound instinct, in intellect, wisdom, self-reliance and courage—were made to despise and to be ashamed of their superiority, and thus to deny and to neglect and to repudiate and *to lose* their superiority. In our own day, the same sort of solvent is being made of the democratic dogma that all men are equal. Thus, among us too, the truly superior are made to welcome and to embrace the means of their own undoing and overthrow. The masses are resolved to set up a world in which there are no men greater than themselves, and in which they themselves shall rule. And yet . . . Although I cannot come forward as one who would welcome and espouse an effort to give "all men equal opportunity," which in practice today is plainly resulting in a scandalous *waste* of opportunity and in failure to provide the *high degree* of opportunity required for the fulfillment of those *most gifted*, I would have you know that I would certainly, and ardently, stand for and work for a system designed to offer opportunity *on equal terms* to all.

The aim in this arrangement of things would be primarily to find and to increase *quality* of life throughout our whole society, and attention would be especially concentrated on those who showed the most promise of quality. Our cultural heritage on its lowest levels and in its most elementary forms, we might well begin by setting before all alike (after the very manner desired by the proponents of "equal opportunity"), but from the start teachers would be trained to look for those who *had responded to*, and *had made use of*, what they had already received. Thus opportunity would be offered as a challenge, as a test, as a prize, and as a reward, all in one, to those who had shown signs of that rare and precious stuff of which quality, superiority, is made. From the lowest grades on, the rule would be, as Jesus put it, "To him that *hath* shall be *given*." Let a youth first prove that he has taken advantage of what he has received, that he has thereby increased in mental and spiritual stature, before he is given any more! Thus will capability, and every manner of virtue, and every manner of genius, be lured out of young men and discovered not only to their teachers but to the young men themselves. Thus will they become aware of a life of their own taking shape within them, singling out a sure and definite direction, growing in vigor and sure-footedness, and making them increasingly conscious of a destiny. And the rare teacher will be at hand, the rare teacher for the rare youth, to feed him all that he can take. And for the youth who is one of the rarest of all, will be waiting one of the supreme teachers of the land.

Meanwhile the mass of the youth, at one level or another, will have come to the place where they seemed to stand still. Many may early have shown themselves bored or stumped or

purely disruptive forces, and thus have plainly indicated that further learning, or wisdom, or art, or great music were not for them—nor search, nor venture, nor responsibility, either. And so, one by one, at different levels and at different times, as they reached their limit, they will have been graduated out into the world to find some socially useful place that they are qualified to fill. But on a higher level, too, the time will come when most of those others, who have been smarter at their books, will likewise begin to drag their feet, as it is brought home to them that for further advance and the higher positions something more is required than mere brains. They must have a self-reliance, a dedication, a courage to be different from the crowd and to walk alone, a strength to bear responsibility and to suffer, which they know full well that they lack. They may desire enough education to ensure them a job that will mean security and social position, but beyond that they want to be free to play. And thus they will have betrayed the fact that, for all their academic achievements, they still want to run with the crowd and belong at last, as surely as most of those more moderately gifted, to the unambitious, undifferentiated mass of humanity that has been well called “mass-man,” and have thereby proved themselves unworthy of the supreme privileges that are reserved for those very few who are made of sterner stuff.

To be sure, all such grading will long be provisional and tentative. And for years yet to come, and on all levels, there will be eyes constantly looking for belated manifestations of superiority, which will yet reopen the way to advancement. But, as a rule, genetic inheritance working as it does, the family background and the very make-up of most of our youth will have led to their dropping out of school long before college, and made them content to remain in a position that we might call graded subordination, where many of them, though they take orders from above, nevertheless give orders to many who are below them. And in such a situation, there may well be a general contentment and peace of mind that goes with the recognition that most men have found their true level, a place suited to their capacities. Indeed, wherever the society is supercharged, from the top to the last man at the bottom, with a sense of its greatness and destiny, as a healthy, dynamic and driving society is, then its every member, even the lowest, will be lifted up and filled with pride because he knows himself to belong to it, because he has a place in it to fill and a responsibility to measure up to, which, if humbler than that of the leaders, is in the last analysis no less necessary. The coping stone shall not stand if the bricks on which it rests crumble. Thus even the commonest menial will walk with his head erect, as a man, as a man who exults in being part of so noble a whole. And he can therefore be depended upon to put into his work the best that he has in him, and to be faithful to his superiors because he respects them and trusts them and finds in their commands the voice of an organism with which his own well-being is intimately and completely united.

Looked at from this angle and used in this way, response to opportunity is seen to be invaluable and indispensable as an effective means of sifting each oncoming generation. Though *open to all on equal terms*, it is to be used with unflinching and unflinching discrimination, selectively, with the constant purpose of separating the more gifted from the less gifted—that is, from those less responsive to opportunity. Severely shall the rule be applied: To him that *hath* shall be given, to him who *has* what it *takes* to make the most of opportunity, to him who has *proved* that he has it—to him alone shall be given further, higher opportunity. Thus will oncoming youth be roughly graded and regraded, with an ever-closer approximation to justice, according to the function or type of service that each is best fitted to render to the

whole society. And thus will it be determined in what way available opportunity is to be apportioned.

Obviously, the very first purpose behind such a scheme of things will be to discover and to set apart the elite of every generation, and upon this elite to lavish the richest educational privileges that society has to offer. Under no circumstances shall these opportunities be curtailed in order to extend them, or some shadow of them, to the less gifted. Where sacrifice at some point becomes unavoidable, it shall always be of the less to the greater, of the mediocre to the superior, for—it cannot be said too often—every society is forever and absolutely dependent, for the achievement of any significance and even for its survival, upon the inspiration and superior direction of its top ten percent. Furthermore, it is constantly to be borne in mind that education, on all levels, whether it be access to the cultural heritage of the race or mere utilitarian training, is a *privilege*, the greatest privilege and the most precious gift that any society has to confer upon its children. It is the total stored treasure that has been amassed from the labor and blood and tears of the greatest men and women its past has produced—its seers, thinkers, artists, patriots, explorers, scientists, statesmen, heroes, and martyrs: and it can be made available to each oncoming generation only as the whole adult population of the time is shouldered with the burden of it, partly in the taxes that pay for it, partly in those many of its most gifted members who dedicate themselves to the transmission of it to the young. To waste it is like opening society's very arteries, to let its blood pour out upon the ground. It is a crime against life, a fearful betrayal of our human future, and he who commits it or is party to it should be served as a traitor.

This means, of course, and as we have already seen, that educational privilege, of any kind, should be suspended at that point where, and for so long as, a youth shows himself unable or disinclined to benefit by it and to appreciate it. No boy should be *held* in school until he is sixteen—or to any other age. When he persistently proves himself unresponsive, then it is time to take him away from books and place him in a school of manual training, or wherever else he can be taught to make the most of the capabilities that he has. Likewise, it goes without saying that the standards of our colleges and universities should never be lowered in order to bring the privileges of a higher education within the reach of the masses, of those who, however much they may be responsive to mere training (much as an animal may be), are essentially *ineducable*,^s in the sense of being really drawn to and able to assimilate the accumulated cultural treasure of their kind. Let such institutions, rather, be severely reserved as schools for the elite, for those few who, once they have come into contact with the manifold work of the giants of the past, can never thereafter rest until they have fed their growth on it, digested it, and made it as much their own as their own blood. Perhaps some few of them will even be among those fewest of all who will actually leave the treasure richer than they found it.

We are now in a position to size up the difference between the position of those who demand “equal opportunity for all” and that of those like myself who, to be sure, would make it available to all, but to all alike on a condition—on the *single* condition that those who receive it shall first have proved that they have it in them to make worthy, socially valuable use of it. The first are animated by what seems to be a well-intentioned but futile sympathy for what they call the underprivileged, or else by a rebellious determination to level (and thus in its ultimate effects, to degrade) all humanity into a universal equality. But they have been

led up a dead end by their quite unfounded notion that a favoring environment, to be achieved by a free squandering of opportunity, can ever make it up to a man for having been poorly born. The latter, on the contrary, realistically and frankly recognize that from heredity there is no escape, that men are born unequal, and unequal they must remain to the end of their days. And they would therefore apportion opportunity selectively and cautiously, with a view to determining who can inspire, create, and lead, and those others who, on one level or another, must follow and obey. On this latter basis, only those will be given opportunity who shall have first proved they have in them the stuff required to rework and to transform opportunity into that manifold meaning and beauty which is the ultimate flowering of human existence.⁷

But with this, we must now pass on to the third of the ingredients in the idea of democracy that I have imagined its protagonists to have most at heart. Along with the concern for the rights of minorities and a demand that opportunity be spread before all men equally, which we have just finished examining, I detect, in and behind all of the movements and philosophy that bear the democratic label, a basic solicitude for the well-being of the common, most ordinary man, and a quite exceptional estimate of his worth.

It is maintained that this concern and this faith must be traced, ultimately, to the leaven of Christianity, and I am not now interested in combating the argument. But I am inclined to trace it less to any teaching of Jesus than to the Church's metaphysical doctrine of the individual soul. As we have already seen, Jesus was certainly no proletarian revolutionist, such as Socialists commonly try to make him. And I find in his teaching no more belief that every man has infinite worth, as the Christians would have it, than that all men are equal. In fact, I find no signs of any such theorizing about men. Jesus came with something more than that. He loved men. But it is beyond dispute that he drew a sharp line between those who had "eyes to see" and those who did not, between those who had ears and heard with them and those whose blank faces showed all too plainly that they could not make a thing out of what he was saying. For him the latter were virtually as the dead. Indeed, he compared them to dogs and to swine, and he counseled his disciples not to spend time on them. He did not spend time on them himself. He concentrated on those few, those very few, most perceptive and responsive ones whom he had gathered about himself as disciples, and whom he was constantly calling to some quiet place apart where he might try to communicate to them the mysteries of his innermost and deepest experience. It is unmistakable that Jesus took men as he found them, and that for him they were anything but equal.

But in any case, and no matter where Jesus stands in the matter, this idea that every man has great worth and that society must be ordered in constant remembrance of it and slavish regard for it, is one of the doctrines that make Christianity the enemy, even the archenemy, of the highest end of man. It is romantic and dangerous nonsense. We shall not go forward, whether as a nation or as a race, until we have ceased to value a man in his relations to some metaphysical existence believed to be outside of or to follow after his life on Earth. Religious people who insist that "all men are equal in the sight of God," thereby plainly reveal their conviction that men ought to be treated as equals here and now. But so long as men continue to live, their first business is with what they can be and with what they can do on the Earth. And to try to treat men as if they were all equal and to set up human arrangements on the assumption that they *are* equal, when it is perfectly obvious that they are

nothing of the sort, is not only brazenly and impudently dishonest, and therefore spiritually degenerating, but it is actually to court the doom that must overtake any people so sunk in folly as to found its basic institutions and rest its life on a hollow delusion. We shall never advance as a society, or even build solidly and durably, except as we come to evaluate all men realistically in reference to what we may reasonably expect of them here on this Earth, as creators, as mates, as persons able to bear and to measure up to responsibility, and to fulfill some useful function. Any belief about a Hereafter or a Beyond that does not somehow exalt, enrich, and strengthen life here and now is our deadly poison. And any in our midst who are enticed by it and misled by it are our deadly foes. This is basic.

Such a pronouncement may wound the sensibilities of some of my most earnest readers. But if so, if any of you resent and resist some of the things that I have said, let me ask; just what is it that you really have at heart in the beliefs that I seem to have trampled on? Is not your desire for equality of opportunity (perhaps less for yourselves than for others) founded at bottom on a belief that, for the good of society as well as for the satisfaction and happiness of the individual, inborn capacity of such sort as will help to elevate man should come to fulfillment as often as possible? Well, I believe that too, and I want it. But I believe, in the first place, that real inborn capacity does not need quite the coddling and coaxing that some of us imagine. Real capacity is pretty well able to take care of itself, and to make its way even in the face of a stepmotherly society. We need to be on our guard lest, under the specious pretext of providing opportunity to those of capacity, we be seduced into supporting a *subversive* movement to secure advantages and position for those who *lack* capacity. Furthermore, I am persuaded that capacities of value to the highest ends of human life can come to flower and fruition better under an altogether different arrangement of society than under any that can be provided by democracy. . . . Or behind your concern for the common man, is not the thing that really matters to you, that matters most, a belief that somehow men are bound together in a common destiny, that we are members of one body, that therefore we ought to have a society that is what we might call organic, in which a man's life does, or may, count for the good of others, and in which therefore the life of even the common ordinary man, provided he is sound in body and mind, has a real value, a well-founded meaning, and a true satisfaction? Again, I agree. But again, also, I believe that these are things that cannot be realized under democracy, but only under quite another ideal and philosophy of social organization altogether. It is high time, therefore, that I present to you my conception of Aristocracy.

But at the very outset, let me warn you that this is to be no picture of a society organized as if all men were philosophers, saints, seers, or heroes. That were folly. Rather, it commends itself to one who, while appraising realistically the present possibilities of all men on all levels, is yet concerned that their collective life should be coordinated and stable, should preserve its distinctive identity, and should make a healthy growth upward into the fulfillment of its native endowment. It will not fail to recognize that every people, in order to become anything at all, must first prove able to establish and to maintain itself in the face of its enemies. The dissolution of the British Empire within the space of twenty-five years, and the reduction of Britain itself to a second-rate power, forced to accept the racial mongrelization of its stock and threatened with actual subjugation, should be sufficient evidence and warning of what a precarious life any nation or people lives.

At the outset, too, let me admit that this aristocratic view of mine will probably not look as fair in the supernal light that fills the eye of the visionary idealist as it does in mine. All I can say is: There is no perfection this side of Paradise. Every type of social order must have its drawbacks. It is enough—and this is important—if the dark places in a system but correspond to the ineradicable darknesses born into human nature itself. By nothing so superficial as a social form shall we escape the limitations in what we are. But surely it stands to reason that the social arrangement that will prove longest-lasting and most comfortable to the people as a whole, like a harness made to fit the horse that is to wear it, is the one that most fully and exactly conforms to the wide range of the actual, unidealized natures and capabilities of the people who are to live in it.

My advocacy of Aristocracy rests, fundamentally, on my recognition that men are not equal, that there are wide differences not only in the capabilities but no less in the characters of the men of whom any society is composed. These differences are not to be got rid of by argument, by inculcation in the schools, or by any change in the laws or in political arrangements. And in the large, even today, a man's status, whether high or low, is directly traceable to the accepted current value of the service that he renders to society. Alexis Carrel declared that "the separation of the population of a free country into different classes is not due to chance or to social conventions. It rests on a solid biological basis, the physiological and mental peculiarities of the individuals . . . Today, most of the members of the proletarian class owe their situation to the hereditary weakness of their organs and their mind. Likewise, the peasants [of Europe, descended from the Medieval serfs] . . . the backbone of the European nations, were, despite their great qualities, of a weaker organic and physiological constitution than the medieval barons who conquered the land and who defended it victoriously against all invaders." ⁸ Ortega y Gasset reveals an insight yet more penetrating and observes that "society has a structure of its own; which consists, from an objective point of view, and whether we like it or not, in a hierarchy of functions." And how basic this is to his whole conception of human society he reveals when he adds that "to ignore this fact would be as absurd as to wish to reform the solar system, or to refuse to recognize that a man has feet and a head . . . that a pyramid has a base and an apex." ⁹

When we look at things this way, we see plainly enough that it is idle to press theories about what society "ought to be." It may seem sometimes that there is very little difference between man and man, but, as Professor James' wise carpenter observed, that little difference is very important. In *any* society its members fall *naturally*, by virtue of their very character and capacities, into several classes. They are roughly *graded* by the caliber of their service to their society. Thus comes about what is often described as the *pyramidal form* of a people's life, but, as already set forth in Chapter IX, it is perhaps more accurately compared with a *living* organism, between whose parts there is a marked differentiation of function. Each has a necessary service to render to the whole, for which it is specially fitted.

In such a society, there is always an unfaltering recognition that the powers required to exercise some of its functions are more complex and delicate than those required for the exercise of the more common ones, and that these are higher and rarer and entail much greater responsibility. It has generally seemed the part of wisdom, for the well-being of the whole people, to entrust the direction and the ultimate destiny of the society to the men

possessing these qualities. In the last analysis, they may command, and the rest must obey their command.

Such a stratified pyramidal form, if I may revert to this description of it, with its broad base of solid mediocrity tapering to a narrow but towering apex of superiority, with an allocation of powers, rights and privileges according to capacity, function and responsibility, seems to be what Philippe Mairet has called the “typical morphology of social life.”¹⁰ Ortega y Gasset goes further and declares this to be the “immutable structure” that any people’s life *must* take before there can be said to be any real society at all.¹¹ That is, it requires a “hierarchy of functions,” “with a directing minority,” to *constitute* a society, to such an extent that a society exists or ceases to exist in proportion as it manifests these features. Departure from it is evidence either of immaturity or of social decay and approaching dissolution. In other words, “Every civilization is the creation of aristocrats.” “Human society *is* always, whether it will or not, aristocratic by its very essence, to the extreme that it is a society in the measure that it is aristocratic, and ceases to be such when it ceases to be aristocratic.” So long as you have any society worthy of the name, it is the creation of its superior men. And the truth of this only becomes the more apparent as that society advances in the level of its cultural attainment and significance.

We, with our democratic prejudices, reject the pyramidal form and resent the idea of class. But we overlook the fact that class is inherent not only in all social organization but above all in human nature itself, in the inborn and insurmountable differences between man and man. Our democracy has not prevented its emergence. Class is all around us—unmistakably. The trouble is that our classes are founded on a difference in the possession of money or of adroitness at money-making—surely one of the basest criteria by which men have ever been distinguished. Among us, those who rule are *not* superior men, and therefore—as every man of superior instinct *knows*—their control of affairs is unjustified. Neither has Russia, for all its loudly touted antagonism to class, prevented its re-emergence. We may as well reconcile ourselves to accept class. It is founded, unavoidably, on the differences in men’s characters and capacities, and in the corresponding differences in the social value of the functions that have to be filled, if we are to have any society at all. Moreover, it is thus not only natural and inevitable, but it is morally justified and right, *provided* it is generally true that the man with the greater power, rights and privileges is in fact the better man, the man of greater social worth.

Nowadays, any attempt to justify the power of one man over another makes the democrat bristle, and he is quick to retort with Lord Acton’s famous dictum: “Power tends to corrupt; and absolute power corrupts absolutely.” But he must be made to face up to three facts:

1. No society can exist unless power is entrusted to *somebody*.
2. It is of the most vital urgency that it be possible to *pin responsibility on some particular man*. In our democratic government, where decisions are made by committees and commissions and majority vote, responsibility is so divided, dispersed, and diminished that in the end it is virtually impossible to fix responsibility on anyone. From this, it has come about that large numbers of men, of very high position in our society, can be grossly delinquent and even downright traitors without having to answer for it.

3. If it be inseparable from government that power be entrusted somewhere, it seems the part of wisdom to entrust it where its tendency to corrupt him who wields it, is most likely to be resisted—that is, to men whose very character would make them scorn to misuse it, and whose very membership in a corporate elite known to visit the severest punishment, remorselessly, upon any of its number found guilty of dereliction, would deter even the boldest from yielding to temptation. Granted, the miscarriages of intention that accompany the actual operation of any system, there is nevertheless the fundamental belief, indeed the profound instinct, that if one man is to have power over another it should be only he who obviously is the *better man*, and that if he *is* the better man he *ought* to have the greater power, and with it the rights and privileges requisite for its proper use.

It may be pointed out here that the possession of supreme power by a ruling class, or by a king, does not mean that all other classes have no power at all, that their whole part is to take the orders of others. On the contrary, in a well-constituted aristocracy, power, though it come to an apex in the ruling class, is distributed all through the other classes, so that each is believed to have, and commonly and ideally does have, rights and dignities and powers proportioned and suited to the importance and nature of the functions that they must exercise in maintaining the well-being of the entire society.

Probably, one large reason that people today balk at the idea of aristocracy is that they have no true conception of what it is. The very idea is almost lost from amongst us. Our library catalogs reveal that for the last century and more the minds of even the most thoughtful have turned very little in this direction. People view the record of our human past too largely through the eyes of men whose vision is skewed with the democratic prejudice. Their estimate of the present is inflated with the prevalent but fatuous notion that the modern age represents the culmination of human achievement. Very few are able to visualize life as one may sense it in the aristocracies of ancient Egypt, Persia, India, Greece and Rome, or in medieval Japan, or here and there even in Europe. Almost universally today, men think of the aristocrat as a rich man, and, in particular, they suppose that the alternative to democracy is dictatorship. With democracy, they have what they believe to be freedom, and they assume that if they were to abandon that they would land in oppression. Whereas, in fact, the king has been looked upon as the protector of the people and the guardian of their liberty, and it was the spread of Democracy in Europe that finally made dictatorship inevitable and which is bringing us every day nearer to the very enslavement that we dread. A people is no more capable of governing itself than is an army or the crew of a ship. And when their efforts to be democratic have reduced the society to chaos and anarchy, the only way left to escape disaster is the man on horseback. I constantly come upon recognition of this. Men as different as Werner Jaeger, writing on the ideals of Greek culture, and the distinguished journalist Felix Morley, both remember the warning of Plato that Democracy is usually followed by tyranny. Mr. Jaeger observes that “subsequent history seems to justify him.” And Mr. Morley remarks, “As Plato long since pointed out, the constant tendency of democracy is to fertilize the mass mind for the reception of absolutism. That democracy is already far advanced in the United States.”

But let me emphasize that when I espouse the cause of Aristocracy, even of Monarchy, it does not mean that I have lost my concern for the fullest possible well-being of the common people. On the other hand, let me now say the worst that I must admit. *If it prove necessary*

that *some* group or stratum of society be sacrificed, it ought to be the lowest. This is only common sense, and surely the conclusion to which any honest thinker must find himself driven who earnestly desires that the life of man be exalted. Would not any of us rather sacrifice his finger or his foot than his head? At this point, I am ready to be as ruthless as the extremity of the circumstances may require. Wherever I have anything to say about it, the superior man (and the conditions for his appearance and optimum development) *shall not* be sacrificed to the lower. Nevertheless, I am utterly ingenuous when I declare that my belief in Aristocracy is rooted as well in a concern for the best good of the common man as in a concern for the fullest fruition of genius and spirit. And I believe that both of these ends can be ensured better under a sound Aristocracy than in any other way.

So much hinges on this that I must elaborate it. Surely, all men will agree that, if there is to be any society at all, the individual has to surrender some of his functions to others. Instead of each one's doing everything for himself, he lets others perform some of his vital functions for him. In the human body (if we may here find a helpful analogy), the cells that function for smell, taste, hearing, sight, and thought, are useless for locomotion, digestion, circulation, or reproduction. And vice versa. It is obvious that the high development of the body is absolutely conditioned upon this differentiation of function, but it is no less obvious that to the individual cell such differentiation means a measure of loss—at least of independence and self-sufficiency.

And let it be noted well that in the organism it is not true that no cell lives at the expense of another cell. To be sure, every cell in a state of health, without exception, contributes to the welfare of the whole. And if, in carrying over the analogy into human society, we can be content with the implications of this, well and good. But we must not overlook the fact that in the body, the brain and higher cells are carried by and live off the lower cells. I here sense empire. Differentiation of function came about only because some cells set themselves up, and qualified, to think, to see, to taste and smell, and in one way or another prevailed upon other cells to carry the load, to provide food, to bear away wastes, to produce offspring. I gladly admit, and indeed would even strongly stress, since it is an important part of my thesis, that each is necessary to the welfare of the whole—absolutely. But some, a few, are highly evolved and lead; and many, the mass, are less highly evolved, belong more to the organism's past, mark the way by which it came, and follow. The higher rule, and the rest obey. Upon this depends the animal's health, and all its future development and attainment.¹²

Before leaving this matter, lest anyone still balk at the idea of a man's being put below any other man, let me repeat that in a truly aristocratic society every man, even every man in the lowest order, feels himself necessary to the existence of a communal venture in which he believes, in whose every success and attainment he feels himself elevated. This gives the commonest laborer, as surely as the artist, philosopher or statesman, a sense of pride in "belonging," and therefore of personal worth and dignity.

Out of my own experience and my observation of the experience of mankind, ranged over thousands of years, I have come to the very firm conviction that some men are of vastly more worth than others, and that it is at once natural, expedient and advantageous that the best should rule. But this still leaves us with several very important questions. Who are the best? What are an aristocracy's chief functions? How is it constituted when best able to meet

the responsibilities entrusted to it? How is it possible to maintain the quality of its life upon which depend all its claims to superiority and all its right to rule? What becomes of freedom under Aristocracy? And finally, how does such an aristocracy come into existence? First of all: Who *are* the *best*? What constitutes “best”? What distinguishes it? What is there in it that determines all the conduct that we would call noble?

In view of what I have said many times in the foregoing pages, it hardly need be said again here, that Aristocracy has nothing to do with Plutocracy. The best are *not* the rich. Often, especially in a plutocracy, the best may rather be among the poorest. Neither is the aristocratic necessarily evidenced by pedigree. Families, like breeds of animals, run out. Descent from the Founding Fathers is no sure certificate of superiority. In the last analysis, a man’s worth shall be estimated not by the attainments of his ancestors or by the standing of his family (important as these are in themselves), but by his own present character and capacity. This is only just.

The question that I am raising, what constitutes “best” and distinguishes it, what there is in it that determines all the conduct that we would call noble, does not admit of an easy answer. But let me submit to my readers certain considerations that have come to my mind through years of reflection on the matter.

There are certain elements without which the truly aristocratic seems inconceivable. It is to be found only in natures gifted with beauty of form and feature,¹³ exuberant with strength, conscious of health and of the finally won wholeness that means absence of internal conflict. They are conscious, too, of an inner wealth, an inner giftedness, that makes it their constant impulse to bestow and to lavish, with no thought of gain or getting. And without any trace of conceit or presumption, and with a direct and simple knowledge that is peculiar to their kind and which we have conceived only the gods to possess, they know that *just in what they are they have everything*. They need not attempt to better it or add to it at all; they do not need to manifest it, or to justify it, or to prove it. What they must do is only what comes naturally out of what they are. And from their sense of what they are—something that only they and their equals can possibly estimate with justice—they can look about them only to look down, as from the peaks of a landscape: all others are below them, save for a few of their own kind, their peers. And they can look into themselves only to rejoice, to accept what they are with an utter trust, before it to do reverence, and to put implicit obedience to its behests above everything else on Earth. Truly kingly natures, as I conceive them, and as I am certain they have existed in the past (and shall again), may be doing no wrong even when they break our usual rules of conduct. Obedience to the higher and sterner laws of their own nature and to the dictates of their greater wisdom, which is an inexorable part of fidelity not only to themselves but to the people who look to them for fatherly protection and guidance, makes infraction of the traditional rules of conduct inevitable, more or less, sooner or later.

To the ear of the democrat, this may sound too much like arrogance, and to the ear of the Christian, too much like self-complacency. The trouble, I think, is at bottom that these very influences, Christianity and Democracy, have for so very long made us totally unfamiliar with the truly noble and the truly kingly, that we have no notion of what they look and act like, or of what are the necessary conditions for their existence. However, let it be said, with finality, that if one be truly exalted, it is not arrogance or presumption but only clear-eyed

perception to see what one is and to recognize one's worth. And likewise, though one accept and reverence oneself, it does not necessarily imply self-complacency or the absence of a spiritual life that continues to reach and to grow. For that seeking with which we are most familiar and which is enjoined upon us as the precursor and condition of all spiritual growth, is one that reveals inner division, lack and an inadequacy. And for a man spiritually sick or immature it is indeed necessary, for only the dissatisfaction implicit in it will lead him at last to his path and to himself. But there is also the seeking of the man who has found his path and has become whole. In this, however, there is nothing of the lack and inadequacy and sense of being lost that haunts the man who has not yet found his way. Yet it keeps him moving on and up, for a path is something to follow, not to sit down upon. But whereas the seeking of the former is full of restlessness and fever, of self-dissatisfaction and even of self-contempt, the seeking of the latter is serene and joyous, as of one who knows that he is on his own true path and is following it to the end to which it leads, to the doing of the work for which he was born, and to the fulfillment of his destiny. Above all else in the world, he loves and reverences and bows down before *That* within himself, which tells him from day to day which way he must go and what he must do.

The point is: All healthy life accepts itself and reverences itself, and does so with joy and elation. And everything else is sick—or immature. And the noblest life reverences itself most, and ought to; and obeys itself most sternly, and ought to. And it is right in seeing all other life below it.

This, surely, is the heart of the matter. And with this at the heart, we are quite prepared to find in the conduct of the truly noble nature integrity; fidelity; open-handed generosity; lion-hearted courage; luminous intelligence; artless frankness; the most gracious courtesy; divine self-reliance, and an equally divine freedom in the consideration and choice of expedients; masterfulness toward man, woman, and circumstance; unbreakable will and purpose; and that benignity and azure certainty which speak out of the hands, and face, and feet of the diorite statue of the Pharaoh Khefren,¹⁴ builder of the Second Pyramid, and the living incarnation of which for centuries hung over the Egyptian people a heaven of security and light.

The noble man is, of course, no aggregate of abstractions. All these qualities are but the varying facets of his nature, which is a living and organic whole. They are incarnate in him and manifest in his very person—speak out of his eyes, are written in the lines of his face, hide in his every feature. They are not therefore to be thought of as his ideal, the object of his aspiration, what he merely tries to be. Rather do they reveal what he already is, and consequently they come from him as naturally and inevitably as light from the sun, or lightning from the massed cloud, or fragrance from a flower. Doubtless all this naturalness, inevitableness, certainty and force *root* in the fact that the true aristocrat is always *a superior animal*. Disraeli's dictum that "the superiority of the animal man is an essential quality of aristocracy,"¹⁵ is echoed in H.S. Chamberlain's emphasis on "the physical constitution as the basis of all that ennobles,"¹⁶ and in Emerson's assertion that "in a good lord there must first be a good animal, at least to the extent of yielding the incomparable advantage of animal spirits."¹⁷ And there is the further fact that through a long heredity the true aristocrat's ancestors were developing and perfecting the admirable qualities he so plainly and naturally manifests, so that he entered into possession of the material for their full and natural growth.

They trace back to the days when, man for man, his ancestors were proving themselves the better fighters, and to the long days following when they were learning the art and acquiring the habit of ruling. It is all in his very blood. Indubitably, he is well put together. His digestion is good, his sex strong, his nerves sound. The high coordination of all his working parts is manifest in the grace of his movements, in the proportion and symmetry of his features, in the directness and swiftness of his act, in the fitness of his word, and the force of his blow. He need say nothing. His eyes can reveal all that he is. His mere presence can be such that one must (whether one will or not, one *must*) bend the knee.

And yet, despite his unfaltering acceptance of himself and his profound reverence before himself, no one in the realm has so little freedom as he for what we should call self-indulgence. For his very inner being is tied up with the well-being of his people and the realization of their destiny. Said Goethe: "To live as one likes is plebeian: the noble man aspires to law and order."¹⁸ Said Disraeli: ". . . power has only one duty—to secure the social welfare of the People."¹⁹ Down through all our centuries has come the tradition: *Noblesse oblige*—the noble man is *under obligation*. Upon his insight, his valuations, and his decisions must rest the welfare and perhaps the very existence of his people. He bears therefore a responsibility under the weight of which lesser men would collapse. To this, he must prove faithful even unto death.

But where do I get my conception that qualities such as these constitute the aristocratic? Perhaps I do not altogether know. But I am aware that it has very slowly been distilling into my consciousness through the past thirty-five or forty years. The chief influences have unquestionably been Nietzsche (almost in his entirety), the books of Ludovici on Aristocracy, Democracy, and Breeding (preeminently his *The Quest of Human Quality, How to Rear Leaders*²⁰), and, not least, my reading of the history and the great epics of the great races, especially those of my own race. I get the qualities that enter into my conception of the noble from the great hero-tales, from man's cherished memories of those who did stirring deeds, in the days, whether of peace or of war, when there was still room for individual prowess to count heavily. I find them in the *Mahabharata* of the Hindus, the *Firdusi* of the Persians, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* of the Greeks, in the sagas of the Norse, in the *Cuchulain* legends of the Celts, in the *Beowulf* and *King Arthur* of the English, in the lives of many of the great kings. These were men of a kind that I instinctively recognize as noble. The qualities that I have listed as aristocratic were simply the qualities that they themselves commonly embodied, and which, even when they did not fully embody them, they always pronounced noble, and good, and held up as their ideal. They were not the virtues of the populace, they often led to acts that would be held in abhorrence in any Sunday School, and they would generally be a handicap rather than an advantage in a bank, a laboratory, a parliament, or the market place. But they were qualities that produced men who were *something in themselves*, men who were masterful and able to keep on their feet at every turn. They were the qualities of men who had conquered, who were able to rule, to whom ruling had become a habit and an art.

You may be surprised that I did not hold up a single saint as an example of the aristocratic. And I may increase your surprise by confessing my conviction that to a considerable extent the qualities that I listed are not the qualities out of which saints are commonly formed. The truth is, I long ago came to dislike saints—those that go by the name. The fame of most of

them rests upon a rejection of the body and of the Earth. It was Stendhal who first called it to my attention that the saint is a phenomenon quite unknown except among people under the domination of some body-denying and sex-despising religion, such as Buddhism and Christianity, both of which took root in peoples in a state of decadence. Now, all such religions, and the saints who grow in the soil that they furnish, belong to the priestly. And the priest usually defiles many of the holiest things of life. Some years ago, I came upon impressive evidence of this in the work that the higher critics have done in disentangling the strands of tradition that compose the great and ancient Hindu epic, the *Mahabharata*. In the tradition that comes down from the day when the warrior class and its values were dominant, the Earth was accepted and a thing of rejoicing, sex was clean and men were frank about it, and woman was pure and had a high place and a large influence. But when the priest ousted the warrior and took his place, it is seen that woman came to be looked upon as a temptation and a snare, and that sex and the body were a delusion and to be denied.²¹ It strikes me that much the same change took place in Europe wherever the Church established its domination. The noble values of the warrior gave way to the diseased values of the priest. No—I admit—the priest fills me with distaste. In fact, not only with distaste, but with distrust as well. I find it hard to believe that any aristocracy would be sound in the hands of priests such as we know them. The priests of the Egyptians, apparently, were of a different order. Certainly they were of a very different religion.

On the other hand, it may be fairly questioned whether men trained in the tradition of the warrior, whatever the nobility of their character, can be expected in sufficient numbers to display the acumen necessary either to give their people the wisest rule or even to maintain the ascendancy of their class. Historically, the nobles have not always been remarkable for their sagacity. Time and again (if not always in the end), they have succumbed to the machinations of the priest, or of the merchant and the banker. And while the explanation may in part lie in the fact that their very openness and integrity handicapped them in dealing with the wiles and craftiness of others less honorable than themselves, I suspect that often they have simply been less intelligent than those who competed with them for social control. Like the dinosaur, they commonly carried around too much armor and baggage.

I freely grant that I rate character higher than intelligence. A man may be clever enough, and yet be nothing more than a scoundrel. It is only with the combination of the two that a man reaches the greatest heights. It seems to me, therefore, that in any aristocracy where the warrior element is dominant, it would prove a very rewarding policy if, for a while and perhaps at recurring periods, in their choice of mates they placed at least as much stress as a class, as have the Jews as a race, upon the importance of intelligence. Thus, if they would, they could *breed* the intelligence requisite to their function. Probably the most sage, enlightened, and beneficent rule could be expected from a very small, severely restricted class of seers and true philosophers. But where an aristocracy came to be thus constituted, I should be minded to urge strongly that every man in it (and the family from which he sprang, before him) should first have passed through the purifying, the tempering, and the realism of discipline in the warrior class, before ever he is entrusted with the responsibility of determining a people's values and shaping its destiny. That is to say, it should be recruited predominantly from the warrior class. Perhaps we could thus best ensure in the aristocracy a combination of nobility of character, perspicacity, and shrewdness in handling, practical affairs.

But what are the chief functions that any people may justly look to its aristocracy to fulfill? Three things stand out in my mind: leadership; protection; and the preservation of the people's entire welfare. Let us examine each of these in turn. The aristocratic position rests upon the flat rejection of the prevalent democratic theory that, in the words of Mr. Paul Elmer More, "if education is once leveled downwards, the whole body of men will themselves gradually raise the level to the higher range." To this the creed of Aristocracy replies (and it seems buttressed by history) that "elevation must come from leadership rather than from self-motivation of the mass."²² This much has been admitted by some of the most extreme champions of democracy. A notable example is John Stuart Mill, of whom Justice James Fitzjames Stephen wrote: "Nothing can exceed Mr. Mill's enthusiasm for individual greatness. The mass, he says, in all countries constitute collective mediocrity, except insofar as the sovereign many have let themselves be guided and influenced (which in their best times they always have done) by the counsels and influence of a more highly gifted or instructed one or few. The initiation of all wise or noble things comes and must come from individuals; generally at first from some one individual."²³

It has been out of a like understanding of the respective places of the gifted man and of the mass in the process of social evolution that Confucius ignored everything except the question of leadership: "The virtue of the leader is like unto wind," he said, "that of the people like unto grass. For it is the nature of the grass to bend when the wind blows upon it." Aristotle wrote to the same effect. W. H. Matlock in the last century declared that historical progress is produced by a struggle "not among the community generally, to live, but a struggle amongst a small section of the community to lead, to direct, and to employ, the majority in the best way." And in our own time Professor Thorndike, the psychologist, says, "The ability of a hundred of its most gifted representatives often counts more for a nation's or a race's welfare than the ability of a million of its mediocrities."

History is one long proof that "the equalitarian denial of the need of leadership" is sheer folly. Without leadership of a high order the people perish, as shall presently be witnessed in America. The first duty of an aristocracy is to be to its people all that Moses was to the children of Israel. It must be to them all that a father is to a child.

In particular, is it the duty of an aristocracy to hang stars over a people, and to lift up their eyes thereunto; to set high lands before them, and to lay out a path by which they may climb thither; to hold close to their heart the core and secret of their people's identity, and in all seasons and at all hazards to concern themselves with its preservation; to anticipate and to ward off attacks from without, and with quick keen eye to detect the first signs of decay from within, and with wise regimen to ensure its early healing—in short, to embody such an understanding of the whole need of man, of all kinds and conditions of men, that it can ensure the health, the fruitfulness, and the contentment of the people, and keep them moving steadily toward the goals that are set before them.

The first function of an aristocracy, then, is to provide a people with farsighted, enlightened, beneficent, and sagacious *leadership*.

Next, I would specify *protection*. I have in mind protection in general—the protection of the weak against the strong; protection against the corruption of the courts of justice; protection

against the misuse of the means of public entertainment and information to mislead and to debauch the people; protection of our wild life and our forests, our water, our soil, our food, our air, our resources, and perhaps above all the quality of our genes, our breeding stock, against waste, contamination, and destruction through the ignorance, the folly, or the greed of man. And protection against many other evils.

But in particular, I wish to stress the need of protection against a cancerous, all-enveloping growth of the Money Power, of International Finance, whose fierce and utterly ruthless passion for gain, and even more for power, lies at the root of so large a part of the disintegration, debauching, and threatened destruction of our country and our people. I am thinking not so much of the accumulation of vast wealth in the hands of a few (though certainly of that also) as of the peculiar development and expansion of High Finance in modern times that has enabled it to paralyze, to circumvent, to override, and in the end virtually to supplant each nation's values, will, and essential sovereignty. As long ago as 1935, Nikolai Berdyaev, perhaps the most distinguished modern philosopher to come out of the Orthodox Eastern Church, declared that "man is crushed by a vast shapeless, faceless and nameless power, money."²⁴ G. K. Chesterton had already said that he knew that money was what ruled modern politics.²⁵ And as long ago as the early Twenties, Professor Frederick Soddy, one of the most distinguished of modern scientists, declared that "there can be no doubt of the fact that finance has already more than half enslaved the world and few, if any, individuals, corporations, or even nations can afford to displease the monetary power." And to clinch his point, he quoted President Wilson's profoundly revealing statement in 1916, amidst the First World War and just when the Money Power was marshalling its forces to get the United States into it:

A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit is concentrated. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men. . . We have come to be one of the worst ruled, one of the most completely controlled and dominated Governments in the civilized world—no longer a Government by free opinion, no longer a Government by conviction and the vote of the majority, but a Government by the opinion and duress of small groups of dominant men.²⁶

This was nearly sixty years ago. Since then, the Money Power has made great advances. It gradually became more and more generally recognized as High Finance, International Finance, and as such there is no longer any nation on Earth, not even one of the erstwhile "Great Powers," that can stand up to it or refuse its most softly whispered demand. Around 1960, my exploration of another question brought me up against indisputable facts that made me suspect that the ever-tightening control of the Money Power was the most sinister and malignant force in the modern world. In the tenuous threads of its web this black spider has rolled up so much of the essential machinery and so many of the commanding figures of our entire society, political, industrial, educational, and cultural, that it can lead the people by the nose whither it will—even to their complete undoing and horrible destruction. And it can do it, moreover, without the people's so much as suspecting what is being done to them. We are held as if in chains, and yet so invisible and intangible is the net that has been woven around us, so anonymous and impersonal is it, that it almost completely escapes public notice, and if one wished to strike at it one might almost as well raise one's fist against the air

or try to lay hold on the night. And considerable evidence indicates that Moscow is as much under the control of the Money Power as is Washington, D.C.

The end aimed at is the overthrow of the nationhood of every country, one by one, and the herding of its people, like so many cattle, through the wide gate of the United Nations, into the corral of a world government, where they can be more surely, efficiently, and safely be milked. The chief organized agencies through which this end is being promoted seem to be, in Britain, the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House), and in the USA, the Council on Foreign Relations, commonly known as the "C.F.R." They were founded in Paris in 1919, largely through the agency of Colonel Edward Mandel House, famous as "roving ambassador for President Wilson," but chiefly significant as the very astute agent of the Rothschild-dominated Wall Street banking houses in New York City. The move followed upon the refusal of the United States to join the League of Nations, and was designed to compensate for this defeat. The purpose of the C.F.R., as of the similar institutions set up in other countries at about the same time, was to accomplish indirectly and clandestinely the same ends as those of the League. By the early Sixties, the C.F.R. comprised 1400 of the most powerful and influential men in this country—in the highest posts in government, diplomacy, finance, the news media, the universities, the tax-exempt foundations, and the like. It has long virtually run our State Department. "This is the group which created the basic structure of the United Nations and the post-war policies which lost free people to the Communist bloc at the average rate of one hundred million per year, for the seven years after the [Second World] war." Dr. Carroll Quigley, Professor of History at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., and an honored member of the cabal that has been directing all this conspiracy and is directing it now, in 1966 confided to the pages of a large book, in detail, with names, dates, places and exact quotations, the almost incredible tale of what it has been aiming at and accomplishing all over the world. The book is his two-volume, 1300-page *Tragedy and Hope—A History of the World in Our Time*, published by Macmillan. But there the tale might have remained safely buried but for Mr. W. Cleon Skousen, who dug out from it those parts that contain the most shocking and scandalous evidence of duplicity, treachery and treason, and in the 120 pages of his *The Naked Capitalist* nailed it, as it were, to a billboard on Main Street, where even he who runs can read it.²⁷ Yet for a full, searching, coherent and lucid account of what the International Money Power has been up to, these past 50 or 60 years, who finally controls it, how it operates, and how it stalks and brings down its victims one after another, I know of no book equal to *The New Unhappy Lords* by the great British journalist and patriot A.K. Chesterton.²⁸

The determining motive here is lust for power—let there be no mistake about that. What the Money Power is after is to destroy every nation's real sovereignty, to gain control over every important side of a nation's life, to give to its development a direction that will make for the profit of banks and bankers rather than for the well-being of the people. As the very knowledgeable Mr. Arthur Kitson observed in 1925, "Moneylending is a business run solely for the profit of the moneylenders." The utter ruin of humanity is a matter of indifference to it. Its choice of means is totally free of heart or moral scruple. It will be equally ready to deceive, to bribe, to strangle, to assassinate, or to crush. That it is treasonous goes without saying.

Such doings on the part of a money power are by no means new. Scholars have detected them as far back as the civilizations of the Tigris-Euphrates valley and that of Greece. Jeffrey Mark wrote that “what is needed today is an account of the rise and fall of civilizations as *episodes in the history of usury*” (emphasis mine): and he adds that, according to Guglielmo Ferrero’s monumental work *The Greatness and Decline of Rome*, it was usurers and usury that broke the Roman Empire.²⁹

It would take us much too far from the main point of our present discussion of Aristocracy to inquire at this point how the Money Power came into existence, and how it now operates as a means for subjugating the world; that I must reserve for a chapter yet to come. But on the assumption that my picture is essentially true to demonstrable facts, what must stand out from all that I have said is that man’s fate hinges on his ability to find some means by which to *break* the Money Power, put a bit in its mouth, with reins running back to firm hands in the driver’s seat. Until this has been accomplished, a nation’s sovereignty must be an illusion, and likewise, of course, its self-government and its freedom to maintain its identity and to realize its destiny. But *where* can man find a means to manacle the Money Power? Only those who fully appreciate the fearful damage already done to our world can adequately sense how crucial it is that we find an answer to this question. Under Democracy, of course, there isn’t any answer; Democracy is precisely the political form that the Enemy has chosen as affording the best field for his operations. And I must wonder whether even under Aristocracy there can be a concentration of power quite as great or as dependable as under Monarchy in a King, powerful enough to make it reasonably certain that, as a rule, the Money Power will be kept in its proper place.

These considerations were brought before me very clearly and persuasively by two books that I read about fifteen years ago. One, by Robert McNair Wilson, has the virtue of stating its principal thesis in its title: *Monarchy or Money Power*.³⁰ The other is *Monarchy, a Study of Louis XIV*, by the distinguished historian Hilaire Belloc.³¹ Both authors are convinced that the *only* means that the mind of man has yet evolved for keeping the Money Power in leash and for preventing its undermining a nation’s sovereignty, is a king, vested with supreme authority—and with the power to regulate and to coordinate, to the highest ends, the entire complex of forces of which any society is composed. Hilaire Belloc goes further and gives a practical example of what royal power can actually do—and, once at least, actually did.

When Louis XIV, not yet twenty-three years of age, came to the throne of France in 1661, his chief rival and the chief obstacle to his ruling as a real king was the Money Power, and this Money Power was incarnate in one named Nicolas Fouquet, who was not only the country’s Minister of Finance but “really representative and chief of all the credit-mongers, large and small, who at once battered on society and held by a hundred handles the machinery of state.” In his person was concentrated a wealth and a financial power like that of Rothschild in Europe a century later, or of Pierpont Morgan or John D. Rockefeller in our own country and our own time. Fouquet was a power that would destroy the King unless the King mastered it.

Louis moved swiftly. He had sure evidence that Fouquet had long been betraying the trust reposed in him by mishandling the State finances and by monstrous and brazen corruption. Louis had him arrested. The trial, after three years, ended in conviction, but the sentence

imposed by the court was mild—a matter of heavy fines and exile from the country. Louis thereupon invoked his royal prerogative and stepped in to commute the sentence—by making it more severe. “Louis ordered this man, the Money-Power in person, to be not exiled but imprisoned; to be imprisoned in a fortress and that the most distant and inaccessible of his fortresses; not only to be imprisoned but to be cut off from all communication. Thus only could a man who had relations with a whole web of secret espionage and intrigue within and without the kingdom be reduced to impotence.”

“The seclusion ordered was absolute.” Louis kept him virtually cut off from all contact with the life of France for the rest of his life—for nineteen years.

So ended Fouquet. His fate was not an example of cruelty, cruel though it was, . . . ; it was an example of true policy, of political sense. The Moneypower—centralized, backed by experience and supported by a whole network of interests and understandings woven through a course of years, become a habit of mind with a whole world of people in touch with each other at home and abroad, permanent, lucid, more elusive than any other kind of strength and ubiquitous as is no other kind of strength—the money power thus developed is almost invincible. The hydra can be destroyed only by one vigorous, throttling grasp at the common root of its manifold neck.

There was a parallel here between what Louis did in 1664 and what his ancestor, King Philip [the Fair] had done in 1307, when he crushed the Templars who had a banker’s grip upon all Europe [and thereby laid the foundation for the French monarchy]. Nothing short of what the King did would have served himself or the State. The threads were torn and the paralyzing conspiracy was at an end.

Of all the acts which Monarchy decided and effected in that long reign [of Louis XIV], this one coming at its outset was the most effective and was the foundation for all the rest.³²

I have not presented this historical episode with any thought or hope that in a king we can find the means to break the Money Power that in our day has the whole world hog-tied with debt. We have no kings, and nowhere any will to create them. My coldly realistic examination of our present predicament compels me to think that we have passed the point of no return, and shall have to suffer our way through the hideous fate planned for us. But this will in time run its course, for the seeds of the Money Power’s undoing are in itself, and they will bring forth a rebellion so universal and so fierce that in the end the usurping tyrants will be swept into the sea. And then, when the peoples of the Earth, freed at last from the vampire that has been living on their blood, address themselves to the task of building anew their several nationhoods and states, they will need to remember the historical evidence that their surest, oftenest tried and best proved protection against a renascent Money Power is a King, a King whose first duty shall be to see that no power, whether by hook or by crook, is ever allowed even to question, let alone to trespass upon, that right and power in which their sovereignty is concentrated—their right and their power to issue their own money free of all debt and obligation.

The last of the functions to be mentioned here, which I think belong to every true aristocracy, is indicated in the following quotation. Said Confucius, “With fear and trembling

take care of the heart of the people; that is the root of the matter in education—that is the highest education.” Said Charles the First, in commenting on the Petition of Right, “The King’s prerogative is to defend the people’s libertie.” And Lord Beaconsfield kept repeating, “Power has only one duty—to secure the social welfare of the people.” He declared “that, if this were not achieved, thrones and dominions, the pomp and power of courts and empires, were alike worthless.” This is to be understood as a solicitude for the good of the whole people, conceived in the very broadest terms. And here again, my survey and appraisal of all the pertinent considerations that I am able to bring under review constrains me to think that the whole people’s good would be served best by an aristocracy that came to a head in a king, not by an aristocratic oligarchy, but by a monarch, whose authority and power were supreme over all, commons and nobles alike. But that we desperately need the dominance and direction of *some* power of aristocratic quality, however it be constituted, seems to me inescapable.

We need it, as we have just seen, to keep the Money Power in its place. The story of its taming would go down in history with the legends of Hercules. Today no Government, of any party, dares challenge its sway. By stealth or by ravin it does what it will. No man could become a *real king* until he had broken its mastery. But we need a monarch for more than to put a bit in the mouth of the Money Power. Who is there today, for centuries who has there been, to keep a watchful eye upon the development of our whole life, to see that it conduces to the stability of the State, the entire health and happiness of the whole people, the flowering of their genius, the preservation and increase of all that will evidence their worth, prove their metal, and satisfy their pride? Who was there, in the early days of the Machine, with the prescience to anticipate its development and its results, with a deep concern for the good of the millions of people it must affect? Who had the insight and the power, once at least manifested by a Roman king, to decide whether or not industry should be released to follow its logical course in the service of men’s lust for power and wealth, or should be held in leash, and to what end? Who is there to review the whole history of the gasoline engine, and in particular that of the automobile and the airplane, all the ramifications of its uses and its effects on the life of man, in order to pass judgment as to whether it has not cursed more than it has blessed, and to determine what we shall do with it? In the once-furious debate over the health of the soil, upon which every civilization ultimately rests, who is there with the wisdom and the power to institute scientific research that will render an authoritative decision between those who would fertilize the earth with chemical compounds and those who present evidence that the use of such artificial fertilizers gradually destroys the health of the soil? Or again, in the similarly vital matter of diet, who is there to come to the aid of the ordinary layman, so confused by all the conflict of opinion among the authorities, who will give him a dependable pronouncement as to what he should eat and what he should avoid eating? Who has there been to set some limit to wealth, to ensure that every man and every family in the land shall have income enough at the least to maintain health, and to determine that the work of the world shall be done primarily not to make money for usurers, but to serve the life of man? Who is there to remove the dictation of the advertiser over the editors of our newspapers, and to provide that a book with a message of vital and urgent importance shall be published even though it may not promise through its sales to make money for the publisher? Who will see to it that no movie and no radio or television program, however great the profits it may be expected to pay, shall be released upon the public if it will tend to deceive the people, overstimulate their nerves, debauch their taste, or

weaken their morals? I might go on, but I have said enough, I think, to make clear the direction of my thought. Today, we are not *a society*. Appearance to the contrary notwithstanding, there is really no *organic order* among us, no sustained movement toward ripening any distinctive quality in our life. To the discerning eye, we are perilously near chaos. Europe is already far advanced in barbarism. Much of it is on the verge of anarchy. We ourselves are ever more like a garden without a gardener—all gone to weeds. We are ever more like a ship without a captain; no wonder we roll dangerously in the trough of the waves, and that a mutinous clique of drunken sailors has seized the helm and is driving us ever nearer the rocks.

My study of our present situation, viewed against a background of considerable historic fact, has led me gradually to believe that a people's best refuge from such a fate is a king, who rules under the tradition of looking after the welfare of his people like a father, and who is too secure in his position to be deterred by motives of personal loss or disadvantage from speaking the truth or from espousing an unpopular cause. We need to view our whole modern predicament in the light of the deepest-rooted, most generally satisfying and fruitful experience of our human past. And Hilaire Belloc, in the first two paragraphs of his *Life of Charles the First*, sums up one of the most important parts of it with this well considered judgment:

There is an institution as old as the world: Monarchy—Kingship. In most places and in most times men have agreed to be governed by Kings, having found in such government something consonant to their nature. In one man there seemed to stand incarnate all the men of the community and to be concentrated in him their common weal. He was the visible symbol of their unity.

Whether or not we too thus seek our salvation, it seems to me certain that if we are not to die, we must sooner or later have resort to *some* institution, some arrangement of our society, that will ensure that our whole life will be ordered with a view to its health and directed with a view to its increasing quality. That is to say, in one way or another we must ensure the rule of the aristocratic, of the best men we have. Mr. Wilson argues that the inevitable alternative to Monarchy is the Money-Octopus, with its tentacles fastened on every phase of our life. At any rate, I am satisfied that the alternative to Aristocracy is ultimate disaster.

I shall hardly have done justice to Aristocracy, especially if regarded in the light of history and with due attention to its importance as a practical form of government, without having paid some attention to the foundationary structure on which it may rest its strength. What I have at heart, I say again as I said at the outset, is not so much any particular social *form* as the dominance in a people's life of aristocratic taste, insight, caliber and will. And I recognize that in different peoples this dominance will come out in different ways, in each case suited to the instincts, character, tradition, and the entire ecological situation of the people concerned. The Chinese, for instance, for long centuries had an Examination System which, while it was democratic in that it was open to any young men of the nation, was rooted in the deep oriental belief in "the way of the superior man," and at the bottom was an effort to locate those out of the whole manhood of the people who were of highest character and intelligence, and to them to entrust the direction of affairs. But the "aristocracy" that those men composed was neither hereditary nor endowed; nor, as far as I am aware, did it have

any recognizable corporate existence. In contrast with this, there have been two features prominent in the usual aristocratic structure that I think it is worthwhile to dwell upon here. One of these is its adherence to the hereditary principle; the other is its foundation in landed wealth.

Mr. Ortega y Gasset, despite his radical and emphatic belief in aristocracy, comes out in opposition to its constitution on a hereditary basis. "The tragedy of the hereditary aristocrat" he declares to be this:

The aristocrat inherits, that is to say, he finds attributed to his person, conditions of life which he has not created, and which therefore, are not produced in organic union with his personal, individual existence. At birth he finds himself installed, suddenly and without knowing how, in the midst of his riches and his prerogatives. In his own self, he has nothing to do with them, because they do not come from him. They are the giant armour of some other person, some other being, his ancestor. And he has to live as an heir, that is to say, he has to wear the trappings of another existence. What does this bring us to? What life is the 'aristocrat' by inheritance going to lead, his own or that of his first noble ancestor? Neither one nor the other. He is condemned to *represent* the other man, consequently to *be* neither that other nor himself. Inevitably his life loses all authenticity, and is transformed into pure representation or fiction of another life. The abundance of resources that he is obliged to make use of gives him no chance to live out his personal destiny, his life is atrophied. *All life is the struggle, the effort to be itself.*³³

That last sentence might have been taken bodily out of my own *Toward The Rising Sun*. It may have been precisely this line of thought that determined Ortega y Gasset himself to step down from aristocratic privileges of his own. And for anyone who fain would, or under the compulsion of inner necessity must, live a life of his own, it is absolutely the only gospel. Indeed, it would certainly hold for such an aristocracy as I should most love to see—a small, severely restricted body of philosopher-seers, withdrawn from the common life of men, enjoying the freedom of voluntary moderate poverty, living like Greek gods under the azure sky of Olympus, though with a dignity *they* never knew, and with vision, thought, motives and pursuits quite beyond most men's furthest comprehension. For them, indeed, nothing would be inherited. Everything would be earned. And their whole position and influence would depend not at all on what they had, but only on what intrinsically they were. Then what we commonly *call* the Aristocracy (the nobility with the king at their head, descendants mostly, if not entirely, of men who in their own persons were warriors and conquerors) would become but the trained and high-minded strong arm fulfilling the will of the seers. But, alas! We are not so much as within eyeshot of any such world as this. And even though I do allow myself to write on Aristocracy amidst a world deliriously drunk on the delusion of Democracy, and perhaps on the very verge of extinction, yet I am not writing for the fun of writing. Let us, therefore, turn to something more nearly within our reach—for instance, to the aristocracy as it once existed in England, so nearly related to us, which for centuries did truly serve the life of the English people, even though, if I may quote from Mr. William Mallock's satirization, it "has now lost completely both its brains and eyes, and has nothing head-like left it except the mouth; and that cannot so much as speak—it can only eat and yawn." If you are interested to know *why* it has become so degenerate and renegade, I can but urge you to read Ludovici's review of its record as it appears in several chapters of his

The Defence of Aristocracy. It is enough, alone, to explain its collective loss of ruler quality that, from the time of Cromwell and the death of Charles the First, its blood has been enormously diluted and adulterated with the blood of men whose only entitlement to a position of honor and influence was that they have proved successful in the stock market, or amassed wealth as beer barons, or put their clever legal wits at the service of some temporarily dominant political party. But despite the deterioration that has inevitably followed, I still have to attribute mainly to the superiority of the English aristocracy (as compared with the rest of the population) the fact that social life in England, to this day, is far sounder and fairer than ours. In view of the whole record of this aristocracy, especially of the earlier part of it, what is there to be said in reply to Ortega y Gasset's objection, and for maintaining the hereditary principle?

In the first place, there are not many men, probably not many even in an aristocracy of this kind, who are cut out to be seers, or who labor under any inner compulsion to be true to themselves in that high and severe sense that Ortega y Gasset perhaps had in mind and of which I certainly wrote in my own book. Members of such an aristocracy are too tightly knit into the entire social fabric, by the tradition of their family and class, and by their sense of duty both to these and to the whole people.

Moreover, I am profoundly convinced that blood tells. And this has several consequences very pertinent to our discussion. For one thing, it means that where folly in marriage has not turned the hereditary factors of a given stock into a hodgepodge of conflicting and unequal capacities and impulses, even of bodily parts, the offspring of superior and distinguished parents *can be counted upon* not only to prove superior in far higher proportion than will be true of the offspring of inferior parents of no known repute, but to have character and capacities *in a direction like to those of their ancestors*. That is to say, they will *not*, as commonly as Ortega y Gasset seems to assume, feel that they must do violence to themselves in carrying on the family tradition, and be doomed to play the part of poseurs. They will not only be men of frame large enough to bear the weight of their inherited armor, but so built as to feel at home in it and to wear it with comfort and to their pleasure. They will find true satisfaction and fulfillment in a life and work very similar to that of their ancestors. The record of many distinguished families affords ample evidence of the justice of this claim.

From this it follows that when, for centuries, eminent families, sustained by pride and guided by sound instinct and tradition, have consistently contracted marriages in which *like mated with like*—like in every respect possible: in rank, in family background, in religion, in disposition, in tastes, in interests, and not least, in physical type—then it will follow, almost as day follows night, that the greatness of the ancestor will reappear in his descendants, generation after generation. In my second chapter on eugenics, I shall focus attention on the frequency with which this happened in ancient Egypt, where inbreeding, the marriage of like with like, was carried on for centuries in the closest degree possible. This is important for us, in our examination of Aristocracy, in two ways.

In the first place, sound practice in mating is absolutely essential if we are to keep up any quality of stock whatever. To maintain such practice is difficult enough under the especially favorable conditions that obtain in an aristocracy, but it certainly would be easier there, among a select group, where we should have pride, sound instinct and strong will working

with us, than in the population at large. And we may rest assured that once a sound tradition in regard to mating *is* established *there*, it will automatically spread throughout the people as a whole. For *whate'er* is the practice of those who rule and who are looked up to as the best, will always be imitated by those below.

But yet more. One of the most important problems confronting any people is to find those of its number who are of the largest promise, that it may provide them unstintingly with all the special opportunities necessary to their very fullest development. This is only good sense, and an investment that, on the average, will pay very rich dividends to the public good. But *finding* these men of highest potentiality at best takes much time and much effort. From my experience with growing plants, I know what a task it is, if one starts from scratch, to sift out superior seed from any general run. I have learned the value of a packet of certified seed in my hand. It will reward me well to give it the favored conditions of the very best soil in my garden. And that is what society has in any true aristocracy—a packet of certified seed of a certain kind and of proven quality. That there is other good seed in one or another of its seed bags goes without saying, and that it must seek diligently to find them. But in the meantime, without much question and without much sorting or any seeking, it has in its hand a packet of seed already proven. It will only be wise in its own interest, therefore, if without any previous deliberation it prepare to give youth born to this stock the privilege of special advantages of every sort.

But yet again. There is more value than we in a democracy are likely to recognize in mere continuity, in mere time (running into age), in mere names. A family can become as hoary and as much of a landmark to a people or in history as a boulder in a landscape, marking where the road makes a turn, or even as a mountain, to which from time immemorial men have lifted up their eyes in the morning. We are all of us creatures of habit. Most of us need something for the imagination to work upon. It would mean something to me—I wonder if it would also to you—to be able to look with loyalty and a love akin to reverence, to a leader bearing the same name which, in the person of another, was venerated by my father, and by his father before him. Much is to be said for an aristocracy *that has a body*, which, for all the changes death may make in its personnel, yet lives on, generation after generation, solid, definite, familiar even to your fathers before you: and proved and trusted by them as by you. Even if the pace set by the more fluid “aristocracy” brought together by some such system as that of the Chinese, were more rapid than that provided by a hereditary aristocracy, I am very positive that I should readily exchange the loss of speed for the greater solidity, stability, and serenity of life that have commonly obtained under the great hereditary aristocracies.

And there is yet one more advantage that I see here in the hereditary principle. It is excellence with the great art of governing, which is the outstanding function of an aristocracy, even as it is with any lesser art or any craft that for generations has run in a family. From lifetime to lifetime there is a slow accumulation of the lessons learned in the experience of governing, and the hereditary principle tends to ensure that these are handed down from father to son, generation after generation. From this derives not only wisdom and skill, but long-range continuity and consistency. The young politicians-elect that go up to Washington to take part in governing America, are commonly but newcomers and amateurs. Their hand is untried and untrained, and they have no rich store of family experience from which to draw and upon which to base their judgments and decisions. It is no wonder,

therefore, that the more the hereditary principle has weakened among a people, the more their political life has become unstable, inept, short-sighted and feeble—and consequently, short-lived. But there was another feature of the traditional aristocracy upon which I wish you to dwell with me for a few moments, and which to my mind is very essential to its health and to its highest social significance. This is its foundation on landed wealth. It is a means partly for securing the continuity of the family preeminence that we have been considering, partly for providing the members of the aristocracy with the special and—let us admit—privileged conditions that they require for the optimum development in youth and for their effective functioning as rulers in maturity.

If we expect that a certain young man is to become one of the group of leaders to whom we entrust our whole fate as a people, in things both domestic and foreign, it is the part of wisdom to see that his grooming for his task begins early and be of the very best available. Throughout his life, he should be free from any narrow concern about making a living or any worry about how he can do his work and yet have a large family. He should be surrounded, in the form of books, art, music, and the like, with the richest cultural heritage of the race. He should be put under the direction of some of the ablest teachers of youth, somewhat as Philip the Great secured the services of Aristotle for his son Alexander. He should be free to travel widely, both to broaden and to deepen his knowledge of his own and of other lands, and to make personal contact with men of wisdom and position—even as our Henry Adams did. This, of course, requires ample independent income. As has been well said, “The highest labor will never produce money, but generally requires it.” It would seem at once the simplest and most salutary means to this end, and that which would best support the stability and continuity of the aristocracy, which we have found so important, to have this income derive from the possession of inherited family lands.

But such economic foundation for the aristocratic class is of the utmost social value from yet another angle. All advance in culture and profoundly wise government depends upon a detachment, elevation, and general quality of valuation and choice such as can be possessed only by him who is free to sacrifice personal, obvious, and immediate gains in favor of those more intangible, more remote, and redounding to the good of the whole people. It is only the rarest mortal who will give up security and position, for himself and his family, rather than betray his convictions and his duty to his country. Granted, we cannot ensure that a man will faithfully serve the highest ends merely by making him economically secure, but by allowing him a source of adequate income that no one can cut off because of anything he may think or say or do, we certainly create one of the conditions for the fullest flowering of the human mind and spirit—including therein that beneficent rule in which a man devotes himself to free, elevated, long-range thought for the good of those entrusted to his care. Upon precisely such wise and beneficent rule, every people is always dependent if it is ever to fulfill its peculiar destiny or even for any length of time survive the manifold dangers that will certainly assail it no matter which way it sets its course. Such government must be recognized as one of the supreme and most difficult arts. And every people of sound instinct will not only, as an inescapable necessity, devise a means by which to set apart a group of highly superior men dedicated to it, but also provide them with the security and all the other conditions needed, for making it their full-time and life-long pursuit. Only so can a people get the skill and sagacity in government that its supreme importance requires. And of all the known means of providing an aristocracy with security, the best seems to me to be that of

endowing it with landed wealth. "But this is exploitation!" some of my readers may cry. Whether or not the institution deserves the condemnation that this word implies must depend in part upon what the word means. But I am entirely ready to grant that in paying the rents of the landed proprietor, people all over the country will be yielding up to him some part of what they have produced by their labor and may seem to get nothing tangible in return for it. But I believe that in good government, in wise and efficient provision for the people's entire health and happiness, any real aristocracy that is true to its tradition and to its avowed responsibilities, will more than pay for what it may cost a people to allow it economic security and ample means for the exceptional needs incidental to the fulfillment of its function. A people is as dependent upon an aristocracy for its fullest welfare as are the passengers and crew of a ship, upon the officers on the bridge.

But in reply to this charge of "exploitation," I will allow yet more. All culture depends upon the existence of a leisure class. I believe that it always has, and always must. No man can become a creator who is fighting from one day to the next for the bare essentials of existence. The romantics of modern democracy and Christianity, who will not face the facts or call things by their right names, who for their very peace of mind must run away from reality and hide from themselves even their self-deception, are very complacent over their "abolition of slavery" and the "superior lot of the modern worker" over that of his fellow of the past. But the stark fact is that slavery has never been abolished. It only has changed its form—and its name. In many ways, the "free" modern worker is more of a slave, and certainly worse off as a human being, than were many of the Negroes in the South before the Civil War. After all, there is not much difference between the worker who is free to change masters and the worker who is bound to one; it may even be in the favor of the one who is bound. Even between the Medieval serf and his lord, there was more or less of a human bond, which is almost completely and universally lacking between the modern "wage slave" and his capitalist employer.

Once again, let me state the simple fact: blink at it as we may, most men, by their very make-up, *cannot be free*. Wherever we have any society at all, we have the mass organized and ruled by a small number of men who are relatively superior. The higher we go in civilization, the more true this becomes. Whether the workers are *called* slave, serf, or free, really makes little difference; they will not *be* free. And there is no fiat of man that can make them free, for the simple reason that they are incapable of being master of themselves and of circumstance. And in any society he who cannot rule himself must be ruled. To make such people free to fend for themselves, as we did the Negro at the end of the Civil War, may be as cruel as to turn children into the jungle. Moreover, provided the rule is enlightened and benevolent, the lot of the ruled will be far better than the barbarism into which any society must relapse if the rule of its superior members is withdrawn. Even slavery, for all its odium in our nostrils, is relatively innocuous if the human worker is thought for and cared for with understanding and affection. Many a slave has chosen to die for his master, and has preferred to stay with his master when set free. But so far as I can see, or foresee, so long as man remains man, and so long as we have any society at all, especially any culture worthy of the name, we shall have most of the people subservient in one way or another to a comparatively small number of superior people. The form under which the rule is established, and by which it is maintained, may be this or that. It may be disguised or it may be out in plain sight, but it will be there and it will give the whole society its distinctive shape and tone. In other words, let it

be frankly and bluntly admitted, the leisure that the rulers turn into culture and into beneficent and sagacious rule will come out of the labor of the population. The aristocracy will be carried by the mass. If this is "exploitation," then make the most of it. The ultimate justification is that what the aristocracy gives to a people is worth at least all of its costs. When this ceases to be the case, it is commonly overthrown—and should be.

But some of you may object to aristocratic organization on the ground that "more of the gifted men in any society come from the mass of the people than from the aristocracy." In a limited sense, this claim is probably true. To be sure, out of every hundred children born to the aristocracy, the number that are of superior endowment is much higher than the number of children of superior endowment born *per hundred* to the population at large. But, owing to the fact that the population at large is ten or a hundred times as numerous as the aristocracy, the *total* number of gifted children born to the population in general may well be larger than the total born to the aristocracy. To this, I have two things to say.

In the first place, men who have rendered conspicuous social service, and especially families that have proved their worth over several generations, have commonly been advanced to a higher class, and at last even received into the aristocracy. This is not theory, but usual aristocratic practice. It obtained thousands of years B.C. in Egypt. The *New York Times* for May 16, 1937, had an account of an archaeological excavation in Egypt that revealed that a certain man, Ti, "of humble origin . . . rose to high rank. . . . He became a wealthy landowner and married a Princess and his sons had the title of Prince." Dr. G. T. Wrench states, on the authority of Maspero, that "the number of persons who so rose seems to have been very considerable." He speaks of the "ladder" provided in both Egypt and China to facilitate just this kind of advancement, and adds that in both countries "there seems to have been a peculiar capacity for detecting the genius that with opportunity becomes greatness."³⁴ Precisely such insight would be one of the qualities that any true aristocracy would take pains to develop in itself, not only for the good of the whole people but for the maintenance of its own position.

The other thing I would say is this: exceptional capacity in the population at large would be detected as widely as possible and at once given all the exceptional opportunity by which it showed evidence that it could benefit. This, as a matter of course. But that is no reason why the exceptional capacity already discovered, and already proven in more than one generation of ancestors, should not be kept apart and given the privileged advantages necessary for its optimum development.

But it may still be objected; "How is superior quality in an aristocracy to be maintained? Always, in time, it has deteriorated. Both its character and its capacity have decayed. At last, it has commonly lost even its sense of duty to the people, and taken to exploiting its privileges for its own advantage."

I reply that it is true. At least, though I am by no means convinced that aristocracy *must* decline, by any inherent necessity, any more than I believe it a matter of course that with time every people must decline, still I recognize that in the past all aristocracies have at last succumbed to decay. And whenever this does happen, the people are justified in throwing it out. But if they are wise, it will be not to set up any attempt at self-government, which is

almost certain to end in chaos and a dictator, but to authorize and to accept the rule of another aristocracy. For the advantages of life under a truly aristocratic rule are so obvious and so deep and far-reaching that no great people will rest content with anything less or other.³⁵

But though it would seem that aristocracy too, like other mortal things, may in time decay, there are several measures by which it may confidently undertake to maintain the quality of its life.

One, to which we have already given some attention, is that it should constantly be renewing and refreshing its strength with the best blood coming up from the ranks. But it should never relax an utmost strictness in its selection, nor allow such new blood to become preponderant. For, as Mr. Dermot Morrah has pointed out, "the qualities required for a man of humble origin to fight his way to the front are by no means those which are suitable to the delicate art of governing when he arrives there. When I learn that I am to be governed by a man who has had to fend for himself since he sold newspapers in the gutter, and has fought his way to the top, I have an instant suspicion that he will go on fending for himself rather than for me. I have much more confidence in a young man who has never had to fight for security but has always enjoyed it and so has had time to equip himself from childhood for the position of authority that it has always been foreseen he will enjoy."³⁶ It should be said, too, that an aristocracy should always itself decide whom it is to receive into its ranks, and not have to accept the promotions of unscrupulous political leaders, conferred upon men who may have rendered their country no service more valuable than making themselves useful to a political party. In England, as we have seen, such enforced adulteration of the aristocracy has been its ruination.

But perhaps the surest means by which an aristocracy may undertake to preserve the quality of its life must ever be its own *esprit de corps*. It should be very class-conscious, very much aware of its corporate existence, of who is in it and who not, very much apart from the rest of the population, marked by its dress, jealous of the honors at its disposal. But above all, it should be a group sworn, unto death, to the highest code of personal conduct, and tempered for this by the sternest life-long discipline. Any member of the aristocracy who fails in his duty or by other unworthiness tarnishes its honor, should be ruthlessly expelled. No man should be received into it who has not adequately and beyond question proved his fitness. Aristocracies thus composed and disciplined have certainly existed. As good an example as I know of is the Samurai of medieval Japan, of whom Mr. Inazo Nitobe declared that it was impossible for any unworthy man to retain his sword.³⁷ Probably a similar sternness of regimen had much to do with the longevity of the aristocracy of Venice, which lasted for nearly a thousand years "without a revolution and almost without a change." And the unparalleled stability of the aristocratic organization of ancient Egyptian life, which persisted for several thousand years, is inconceivable without it. This severity with themselves is of pivotal importance in the record of any aristocracy whatever.

But many of my readers may have been wondering what would become of individual liberty under an aristocracy. Well, after no little historical investigation, it is my considered judgment that a man may well have enjoyed more *essential* freedom, more freedom of a sort that really mattered to him, under the "despotic" Tudors, for instance, than is enjoyed by a

modern citizen of democratic America. This is a matter that would require much more space for its examination than I can give it here. Yet there are a few things that I feel that I must say about it.

I am inclined to think that freedom is a privilege, the nature and conditions for which have been generally misunderstood, and the stress upon which has destroyed people's state of innocence only to fill their heads with claims and desires that are utterly impossible of satisfaction. We have been led to think that we ought to have freedom to a degree much in excess of what is practicable until men have shown far more ability to restrain themselves in the interest of others. Under democracy men have been given more freedom than ordinary human nature will support—in no small part because the freedom given has been largely in the political realm, where they lack both the experience and the capacity to measure up to their responsibilities. Moreover, I question whether for most men it is freedom in this realm that really counts. If there were a body of men to whom with entire confidence they could leave the business of government, I suspect that it would be to their great relief to entrust it to them, and that they would be quite content with a freedom that consisted only of freedom from financial worry and freedom from undue interference in the doings and the relationships of which, from day to day, their lives are mostly and actually composed.

But over and above this, I am profoundly concerned that, wherever men have shown the requisite capacity to take care of themselves and to handle their own affairs, there should exist the economic basis for the development of a sturdy independence in the large middling part of the people, which is as surely its backbone as the aristocracy is its head. What would England have been in the Middle Ages without its yeomanry!

Such men should be able either to own, or at least to hold secure tenure of, enough land or the like to establish them in economic independence. To own a house is not enough. A man must own or securely hold, and, under definite conditions, be able even to pass on to his descendants, the means of making a living without being under any immediate master. Thus he would be free to follow his own bent, act on his own initiative, shoulder responsibility for his own choices, and learn the lessons of his own experience. It is only thus that men can lay the first foundation stones for a life of their own, manifest the first signs of that superiority for which an aristocratically inspired society is ever looking, and take the first steps up the ladder toward increased distinction and power. Any economic arrangement that does not make room for this, that does not make it possible for qualified men to become independent economic units of production, will mean not only slavery, as Hilaire Belloc so stoutly maintained,³⁸ but also oppression, and will certainly thwart the prime object for which aristocratic organization exists—that is, to ensure, by every means possible, not only that the best shall rule, but that superiority of every sort shall be constantly allowed, and encouraged, to rise to the top.

Any advocacy of aristocracy must, of course, raise one more question, and with my answer to this I will bring my discussion to a close. "How ever is an aristocracy to come into existence?" Let it be said, in the first place, that it is never "set up," especially not by writers and talkers, theorists and idealists, people full of mere ideas. It will be brought about by men who not only have ideas but are capable of prompt, heroic, and effective action. However, such action, when the time for it arrives, may be in no small part the result of, and directed

by, ideas that have long been germinating in the people. But I think it must be frankly admitted that in the *past*, as a *rule*, an aristocracy has been composed of warriors. It has rested on conquest. It has represented a superiority in character and capability displayed at the first in the use of force. The Children of Israel set covetous eyes on the "land of milk and honey" and, sword in hand, went up and took it. So the Achaeans with Greece, the Hindus with India, the Manchus with China, the Normans with England, and so on, over and over again, down through history. That the conqueror has had to bring with him more than his mere superiority in arms (though that alone is significant), goes without saying, or his conquest would soon have disappeared. But wherever it has endured, along with the conquerors' superiority in ideas, in culture (or perhaps, in their capacity to assimilate the superior culture of those whom they conquered), there has usually been, at the bottom of it all, a foundation of force.

Yet I said "usually," which implies my recognition that there have been, or may have been, exceptions. Ludovici, in his *The Quest of Quality*, in a section entitled "Who Selects the Aristocracy?" gives cogent reasons for believing that in the case of the aristocracy of ancient Egypt, the most impressive and longest-lasting of which we know, the nobles were elevated by the people themselves in spontaneous and overflowing gratitude for the benefits that they had derived from their rule and direction.³⁹ And I agree with him that no aristocracy could have an origin more auspicious. And in the special circumstances under which the First Dynasty, which united Upper and Lower Egypt under one crown, seems to have come into existence, I even find it easy to believe that the aristocracy appeared on the scene in just the way Ludovici imagines. Yet even here, it strikes me that before the lords-to-be could have been in any position to bestow the profound blessings that called forth the gratitude and veneration of the Egyptian people, they must first have established themselves by conquest, by force.

Perhaps from this, my reader may jump to the conclusion that I would glorify force, and even war. I would *glorify* neither—but an honest look into life has compelled me to recognize and to accept both. I have been unable to foresee the day when there will be no more war. The reasons for this, I may present in another place. In fact, as I have already said, under conditions in which individual courage, prowess and brain can be a determining factor in the battle, whether of individuals or of groups, I even think there is much to be said for war. Certainly, *under these conditions*, men manifest qualities profoundly admirable, which we have yet to find other equally good means for developing, and without which any nation tends to weaken and go to pieces. *Modern war*, however, what war has come to be under democracy, science, and industrialism, is quite another matter, which cannot be discussed here. But force, as an inseparable part of life, to which a place must be yielded in our philosophy, and which even confers benefits not to be obtained in any other way, I believe realistic and honest men must recognize and accept.

"But," a mocking critic may still persist, "just how is an aristocracy to get started?" In all frankness, I must allow that this question cannot be answered specifically. Inevitably, the way to it will vary with the people concerned and with the circumstances in which they find themselves. But where the need of an aristocracy is felt acutely enough, the way will always be found. Where, ever, has a dam sufficed to keep water from finding its way to the sea? If a

people of sound instinct comes to realize that it must find superior leadership or *die*, it will work miracles.

But as far as *we* are concerned, we Americans, we modern White men of Western civilization, among us it is not going to get started—not as any form of social organization—not in our day. *Our* chance to build *this* way has *gone*. The whole tradition has been thoroughly destroyed. *Our* way to a new aristocracy lies through chaos. We shall first have to become ashes before the phoenix of a new nobility shall arise in our midst. But if the world holds together, there will at last be those, a few, always a few, who will again start the old long climb toward the heights, and again lay out the road to a world in which superiority of every sort shall thrive.

In the meantime, there is work enough for us Aryan men to do. Despite all appearances to the contrary what has been and what shall be are not sundered. The Future shall be born out of the womb of the Past. To it, invisible arteries must carry the blood and the heartbeat of the Human Greatness that has been. Here, we must keep faith. We cannot, in a day like this, when everything is falling, hope to build a new aristocracy. But we can ourselves be noble, and we can undertake to nourish and foster all the spiritual treasure of the past, which shall sustain and guide the reaching life of Man when again it is time to build. Let us then love and reverence all that has made men great, and let it speak out in all that we think and say and feel and do—in the very look of us. Let us go down in death rather than ever lower our standard or bend the knee to the new all-conquering barbarian. Let us keep vigil through the night that is ahead—alone if we must, but better, if we can, with a group, close-knit with still other groups, all believing in Man, believing in what Man has done and in what Man shall yet do again, pledged to the end to keep alive the great tradition, which contains both the secret of what Man has been and the promise of Superman.

Of what we may do, I will write more concretely before I lay down my pen. But for the moment it is enough to remember this: If the world holds together the Dawn will come, my friends. And more than the Dawn—the Spring! Now we sow our seed in the winter, on the snow, and on the very verge of the dead of night. But there cometh the Spring! Shall we not, even now, let the thought of it burn in our hearts and warm them, the promise of it light our faces, and the call of it temper and inspire our lives?

1945, 1970.

¹ Dermot Morrah—“A Defence of Aristocracy” in *The Church Quarterly Review*, Oct.-Dec., 1939 (Vol. CXXIX, No. 257), pp. 101-102.

² Harcourt, 1928, p. 165.

³ Student Christian Movement Press, London, 1935, p. 69.

⁴ In support of this position, Carleton Putnam has assembled impressive scholarly opinion in his *Race And Reality*, Washington, D.C., 1967, footnote 29, p. 58. For a short summary, see *Mankind Quarterly*, 1964, Vol. IV, No. 4, pp. 197-204.

⁵ Both of these books are available in new editions from Howard Allen Enterprises, P.O. Box 76, Cape Canaveral, FL 32920. The former carried an Introduction signed by four eminent American and British scientists, in which they testify that their "professional interest lies in the scientific foundations on which Mr. Putnam rests his thesis. We are in complete accord with what he has to say concerning these foundations . . . The intrusion of political thought into the social and anthropological sciences which has occurred on a massive scale during this period ["the last thirty years"] has been a very great disservice to scientific investigation and to the guidance which scientific work and conclusions ought to be able to render to human society . . . The facts [in Mr. Putnam's work] cannot much longer be ignored. It probes to the core of an abscess, yet does so with a healing touch. There is logic and common sense in these pages; there is also inescapable scientific validity." In a supporting Foreword to the book Mr. T. R. Waring, one of the most respected of American journalists, concludes: "There can be no doubt that the endorsement of these men, taken together with the evidence of other scientists called as witnesses by the author in his text, guarantee the scientific integrity of *Race And Reason* and confirm the soundness of his premises." Furthermore, in its issue for June, 1962, the American Bar Association Journal honored the book with a leading review, which begins by saying, "This short treatise on the integration problem may well become one of the most important books of this generation," and concludes: "*Race And Reason* is commended to the Bar as deserving of its general reading to assist it, as leaders of thought, to learn not half truths, propagandized history nor pseudoscience, but 'the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.' " Mr. Putnam's later book, *Race And Reality*, published in 1967, completes his revelation of "a scientific fraud promoted by a hierarchy whose aim was not the search for truth but political propaganda," and clinches his case against equality with the utmost cogency.

⁶ See Albert J. Nock—*The Theory Of Education In The United States*, Harcourt, 1932. 2nd Ed., Regnery, 1949.

⁷ I shall adduce ample evidence in support of this when I come to my chapters on eugenics.

⁸ *Man the Unknown*, Harpers, 1935, p. 298.

⁹ *Invertebrate Spain*, Norton, 1937, p. 69.

¹⁰ Philippe Mairet—*Aristocracy and the Meaning of Class Rule*, London, 1931, p. 24.

¹¹ Op. cit., p. 70.

¹² See William M. Salter—*Nietzsche The Thinker*, Holt, 1917, pp. 197-200.

¹³ For a very illuminating revelation of the full significance of personal beauty as a mark of manifold superiority, see Knight Dunlap—*Personal Beauty and Racial Betterment*, Mosby Co., St.

Louis, Mo., 1920—in particular pages 10, 15, 40, 48-50. Dunlap was Professor of Experimental Psychology at Johns Hopkins.

¹⁴ The best picture of this that I have seen is in A.M. Ludovici's *Nietzsche and Art*, Constable, 1911, facing p. 216. But it may be seen also in J. A. Hammerton (editor)—*Wonders of the Past*, Putnam, 1923, Vol. I, facing p. 217.

¹⁵ *Sybil*, Oxford University Press, 1934, p. 108.

¹⁶ *Foundations of The Nineteenth Century*, John Lane, Vol. I, p. 317.

¹⁷ "Manners", in *Society And Solitude*.

¹⁸ Compare his account of how straitened and heavily burdened was the life of the Duke of Weimar, whom he served. See his *Conversations with Eckermann*, edited by George Bell, London 1898, pp.139f.

¹⁹ *Sybil*, op. cit., p. 278.

²⁰ Rider & Co., London, 1952.

²¹ This conclusion rests chiefly on my reading of Johann J. Meyer's *Sexual Life In Ancient India, A Study in the Comparative History of Indian Culture*, 2 vols., Dutton, New York, 1930.

²² Paul Elmer More—*Aristocracy And Justice*, Vol. IX of Shelburne Essays, Houghton Mifflin, 1915.

²³ James Fitzjames Stephen, op. cit., pp. 46-7.

²⁴ *The Fate of Man in the Modern World*, U. of Mich. Press, reprint, 1935, p. 80.

²⁵ *Autobiography*, Sheed, 1926, p. 120.

²⁶ Frederick Soddy, M.A., F.R.S.—*Wealth, Virtual Wealth and Debt*, Dutton, 1926, pp. 322-3. Soddy, Professor of Chemistry at Oxford University, because of his research work with Sir Ernest Rutherford, became known as "the father of nuclear power," and in 1921 was awarded the Nobel Prize for Chemistry. Early in the Twenties, he turned his scientific scrutiny to the study of economics and finance. Though this, of course, was not "in his field," it must be recognized that he brought to his task a very brilliant and thoroughly trained mind, and his conclusions as stated in the above-mentioned book call for the closest attention. He is a Fellow of the Royal Society, England's highest scientific honorary body.

²⁷ This might well be supplemented by a reading of Dan Smoot's *The Invisibile Government*, Dallas, Texas, 1962, and *America's Unelected Rulers* by Kent and Phoebe Courtney, New Orleans, La., 1962. Also, by "C.F.R.—Conspiracy to Rule the World," in *American Opinion*, April, 1969. Obtainable as a reprint from *American Opinion*, Belmont, Mass., 02178, \$1.00.

²⁸ Fourth edition, revised, 1972, Candour Publishing Co., Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants. England. New, revised and enlarged edition, Omni Pubs., Hawthorne, Calif. 90250.

²⁹ Jeffrey Mark—*The Modern Idolatry*, Chatto & Windus, London, 1934, p. 174.

³⁰ Eyre and Spottiswoode, London, 1934. Mr. Wilson has published two other very illuminating books that bear on the same subject, entitled respectively *Promise To Pay, An Inquiry into the Principles and Practice of...High Finance*, Routledge, 1934; and *The Mind of Napoleon*, Routledge, 1934.

³¹ Cassell, 1938.

³² For all the above quotations about Fouquet and Louis XIV see Hilaire Belloc, op. cit., pp. 76, 84-5. For further illuminating comment on the lessons to be drawn from the history of the struggle to find a means of mastering the Money Power, see R. McNair Wilson, op. cit., pp. IX, 30-31. See also W.H. Lewis—*Louis XIV, an Informal Portrait*, Harcourt, 1959, pp. 50-2; and Alfred Apsler—*The Sun King* Messner, 1965.

³³ *The Revolt of the Masses*, Norton, 1932, p. 109. New edition, 1957, p. 99.

³⁴ *The Mastery of Life*, New York, n.d., pp. 33, 35.

³⁵ Cp. Ortega y Gasset—*Invertebrate Spain*, W.W. Norton, 1937, p. 67:

“When the mass of the nation degenerates to that point [where the masses try to rule themselves], reasoning and prediction are useless. It is sick, and its illness makes it impervious to reason. It does not want to listen, it does not want to be influenced. The more you try to teach it, the more completely will its ears be sealed against you, and the greater will be the violence with which it will trample on those who try to preach to it. And it will not be cured until it suffers in its own flesh the results of its straying. This is what has always happened.

“Periods of decadence are those in which the directing minority of a people—their aristocracy—have lost the very qualities of excellence which raised them to the rank of leaders. Against this corrupt and ineffective aristocracy the masses rebel, and justly. But then they begin to argue from the particular to the general, and try to make of their rebellion a rule of life. Instead of replacing the decadent aristocracy with another group of leaders who are more virtuous, they try to do away with the whole aristocratic pattern. They believe that social existence is possible without a directing minority; even worse, they construct political and historical theories which offer as the ideal a society devoid of leaders. As such a thing is impossible, the nation goes faster and faster along its trajectory of decadence...”

³⁶ Article entitled “A Defence of Aristocracy” in *The Church Quarterly Review*, Oct.-Dec., 1939.

³⁷ See his *Bushido*, Putnam, 1905. In such a society, any Minister of the Crown who betrayed public trust, like the British Lord Lambton of recent international notoriety, would probably have been expelled from the nobility and either executed or brought to the point where his

only escape from ruinous disgrace would have been by way of harakiri. See Mr. A. K. Chesterton comment on the case in "Down Among the Prostitutes," *Candour*, June 1973, pp. 63-4.

³⁸ See his *The Restoration of Property*, Sheed, 1936, 12: "What I certainly know is that, failing such change [a restoration of property such as he envisaged], our industrial society must necessarily end in the restoration of slavery. The choice lies between property on the one hand and slavery, public or private, on the other. There is no third issue." Cp. Anthony M. Ludovici—*The Sanctity of Private Property*, Heath Cranton, London, 1932. To all this, I subscribe heartily—with one never-to-be-forgotten qualification. The doctrine of private ownership shall not be so interpreted as to give any man or group of men, or any corporation of men, any right to make such use of the land—or its rivers, waterfalls, lakes, forest and other natural resources—as will menace its wildlife or be a detriment to the ultimate public welfare.

³⁹ Rider, London, 1953, p. 196ff.

Chapter 12.

Toward an Understanding of Woman.

This chapter has grown out of the necessities of my own life. But the conclusions to which I have come, like most of those set forth in these pages, though fully supported by my own experience and observation, are based primarily on the immemorial experience of mankind.

Male and female are the opposite poles of creation. Man and Woman are an expression of this on the human plane. Life for each sex is fullest and richest, and the life of society most healthy, when these polar differences are maintained. But it is not a matter of equality or inequality. Women are greater in some ways, men greater in others. No man, for instance, can successfully rival a desirable specimen of womanhood in her field. But their capacities are largely different in kind and direction, calling for the exercise of totally different functions. The sexes are complementary. Each is indispensable to the other and to society, and each does something that the other is incapable of doing, so that in Nature's total economy together they round out a perfect whole. I do resist calling men and women equal, since I feel that those who do so tend to disregard, and wish to disregard and to minimize, the very great differences between the sexes; and because, further, I am convinced that the disregard of these differences is folly, a folly that is fast becoming ruinous to men and women alike, and to their children, to their homes, and to society as a whole. But as I compare Man and Woman, and attempt to estimate their value, in themselves and to society, it seems appropriate to speak of their *equivalence*. They are not equal, no—neither are they unequal. They are incommensurables. But they are equal—certainly, at least, they are comparable—in their *value*, their *importance*, their *significance*. I do not find it in me to put Man above Woman—not in the last analysis. I should betray life if I tried to, and prove false to my own experience. Certain women, beginning with my mother, have meant too much to me. Though I am filled with a sense of the greatness of the male creator, I can yield no greatness to Man that I should not match with an insistent claim for a corresponding greatness in Woman.

Until I was perhaps of middle age, when I spoke to mixed audiences, I had little or no question but that what I said to men was no less for women. But since then, I have found it more and more impossible to express the meaning of life to both at the same time. When I speak about the meaning of life to men, the women are largely in the position of mere listeners; they are to understand that what I address to the very souls of the men is to be received by them, for the most part, only as a contribution to their understanding of the other sex. And similarly, when I talk about the meaning of life to women, any man present must listen only that he may the better know what manner of creature a woman is, and what she looks to a man for and needs from him for her health and peace and fulfillment; and especially, that he may be the better prepared for the situation in which he will find himself when he has married.

There is, of course, a reason for why, in discussing the meaning of life, I can no longer talk satisfactorily to men and to women at the same time. The reason is that the meaning of life is different for men than what it is for women. Experience, observation, and studies that I

began some thirty-five years ago, have gradually forced upon me the conviction that men and women are fundamentally different creatures.¹ A woman's good is not a man's good, and to talk to her as though she were a man is apt to confuse her in her understanding of her own nature and to start her on trails that she can follow only against the grain of her instincts, and in the end, most likely, to her frustration and disillusionment.

But when I maintain, as I do, that men and women are fundamentally different creatures, there is no need, as I think my reader will agree by the time that I have finished, for women to bristle up and prepare to defend themselves against being put in a place below Man. For the point I am going to make is not against Woman as such, but if against women at all, only against those women who do not want to *be* women, those perverted women who have turned against their own nature and their own sex. In fact, my case is really not against Woman at all, but at bottom against the *degeneracy in Man in which the perversion in women had its origin*. For when Man has played his part, Woman has never failed to fill the part that belongs to her. So far indeed am I from being any detractor of Woman, that it seems to me, as I have already declared, that the place and the work of Woman are at least as important as the role of the male. I believe the facts will sustain Briffault when he says, "The material conditions of culture [in primitive times] . . . were mainly the achievements of women; they were not the products of organized industry and of male labour, but of the home-building and household avocations of Woman. Social organization itself—the associated group to which humanity owes its existence—was the expression of feminine functions. Those social sentiments, without which no aggregate of individuals can constitute a society, were the immediate derivatives of the feelings which bind the mother and offspring, and consisted originally of these, and of these alone. Upon them the super-structure of humanity, and the powers and possibilities of its development, ultimately rested."² And I agree with Brooks Adams when he says, in similar vein, that from the beginning civilization has rested on the family, that all our most important legal notions are derived from it, that "the family system is the creation of the woman more than that of the man," that whereas Man has been the warrior and wanderer, fighting, loving, and exploring, "the woman has lived at home and cared for the children," and so "has acted as the social cement," as the "center of cohesion," and "has sustained the arch on which the social fabric has rested."³ But let me urge again, that the sexes are incommensurables; they cannot be measured by the same yardstick of good and bad.⁴ And the need is great for an understanding of Woman that will end the prevalent tendency to equate the sexes, which has resulted in a confusion of function between them and which has gone on until a vast number of women are almost failing to function at all.

The importance of a sound understanding of Woman can hardly be overestimated. Needless to say, society depends upon it for its health, if not for its very existence. And there are few things that can so vitally affect the life of the men in any population as what they do in relation to women, and, in particular, what sort of relationship they establish with the women they marry. Women can never come to a sense of deep fulfillment, reach the end of life with the feeling that they have filled the place that belonged to them and justified their existence, if from the start they have misconceived their very nature and what the end of their existence was. And yet, generally speaking, almost the whole female sex today (and alas! not only the female sex) is a victim of an enormous *mis*understanding of the nature of Woman. Unfortunately, though quite understandably, this false conception has taken deepest root among the female intelligentsia, among those who, through teaching, writing or

speaking are able to have a wide influence. The result has been that everywhere young women have been made to think that they ought to want what they do not really want at all, to look down upon what in their hearts they long for most. In consequence, they are divided between their mistaken ideas and ambitions, on the one hand, and their deepest instincts, on the other. Will and impulse make them want to go in opposite directions at the same time. They must try to satisfy one at the expense of the other, or they try as best they can to satisfy both, only to find that they have fully satisfied neither. Observation forces me to the conclusion that today, in the great majority of cases, Woman does not know *where* she wants to go, and often *tries* to go where in reality she does *not want* to go. She has lost the sureness of her instincts, and for her food blindly chooses that which poisons her. Until at last, instead of being the stable one, the cement of society holding everything together, she has become the nervous one, more restless than Man, volatile and unstable to the point of acting upon society as a veritable dissolvent.

Apart from the primary responsibility in a failure on the part of the male portion of the population, to which I have already referred, the situation has its origin in that gross misunderstanding of a woman's nature known as Feminism. Today this view is almost universal. Every coeducational college (from the very fact that it makes little or no distinction between education for men and education for women) implicitly accepts the feminist position; and practically every idea relating to Woman that reaches us through books, the newspaper, the classroom, the cinema, the stage, radio and television, is actually, however unconsciously, feminist.⁵ Feminism is part of the very air we breathe, from our birth. Practically everyone has grown up with it, as I did, and assumes its soundness, as I did until well into middle age. But I now wish to try to turn this notion inside out in the hope that my readers, when they see what it actually contains, may take a stand against it and seek higher ground.

But let us first make clear what we are talking about, for there is evident disagreement as to what Feminism means. Thus Pearl Buck, in her article entitled "America's Medieval Women," disclaimed being a feminist yet took an attitude in regard to Woman that stamped her, according to my understanding, not only as an example of feminism but as almost its very type.⁶ Feminism is the theory and the movement which, beginning in the nations of the West almost a century ago, has today reached its consummation in what is commonly known as Women's Lib. Throughout this chapter, I shall continue to use the word "feminism" because thus I can best keep my emphasis on what throughout has been the germ and nucleus of the whole matter. Feminism has always declared that the differences between men and women are superficial, that fundamentally men and women are of the same nature, that on the whole they have the same instincts, the same desires, and the same capacities; and that if, as yet, women's achievements in the creative field have been less significant than man's (which is beyond question),⁷ it is not because she lacks equal gifts but because she has been denied equal opportunity.

The feminist woman is poisoned with the idea that to be a man is more desirable than to be a woman, and that to distinguish oneself in what has been man's field is more admirable and socially more important than to be a great mother and home-maker, or that power behind the throne which a wife can be in the life of a man. In any case, a life as wife, mother, and home-maker is—as Pearl Buck declared—"not enough." Often, she despises the very

instinct that makes her *want* to be a mother, and curses the fate that ever caused her to be born a female. In her heart she says to herself, "I would to God that I were a man." It is evident that deep down underneath she labors under an inferiority complex. For, given a bit of freedom (as for some generations now she has been given), the first thing she has done, as is usual with any erstwhile suppressed group, has been to take to imitating her former master.⁸ She also can wear pants, and smoke and drink; and she will take for *herself* the same sexual freedom that heretofore has been man's exclusive prerogative. She cannot actually become a man (worse luck!), but she will come as near to it as possible. She will have a job of her own, and her own income. She will support herself, and be independent of any and every man's control. She will have a career, and to it she will, if necessary, sacrifice her womanliness. She will rival Man, and show him that the difference between him and her is only physiological and superficial, that everything he can do she can do as well—she can write just as great poetry, prose, and music; she can attain the same distinction in law, in medicine, in teaching, in administration, in aviation, in everything. She will win recognition for herself, as a person, as a personality apart from any husband. No helpmate she! She will contend *against* Man for first place. She is not content to be the power *behind* the throne; she will sit on it herself. Or at least there shall be *two* thrones, and hers no whit lower than her husband's.⁹

The mark of the feminist woman is her envy—her secret unavowed envy of Man, and her resulting rivalry with him. Feminism is Woman doing her best to *be* a man. Feminism is Woman become ashamed of herself. Feminism is Woman's great—*unsexing*.

Furthermore, this infection has spread so far that practically every person in the United States is more or less contaminated with it. Men are its victims as well as women, and some of them are among feminism's most ardent and loud-spoken champions. Even women who are naturally normal and well constituted are perverted into feeling that they ought to be, and must at least try to be, what in their hearts and by the asseveration of their instincts they are not.

As might be expected, therefore, feminism has had some important and far-reaching consequences, and to these I should like now to turn your attention.

I will begin with the effect as regards children. The feminist woman looks down on the traditional role of mother. She resents it that to her has been assigned the heaviest part in the burden of procreation. And if one stresses the necessity of women's bearing children if the race is to go on at all, and of the best-endowed women's bearing *many* children if the life of the race is not to decline in quality, the feminist woman is likely to reply, with considerable heat, that she does not intend to let herself be turned into a cow for anybody or for any end. Such a woman would like to escape motherhood altogether; she does not want the interference of pregnancy and childbirth with her pursuit of her career, or perhaps even with her parties. Or, if she finds that she has to make some concession to her maternal instinct, she will make it as small as possible. She will have one child, or at most two. And she will make the nuisance of nursing her baby as brief as possible. In spite of the fact that breast-feeding is essential "both for the optimum development of the child and the welfare of the mother,"¹⁰ as soon as she can she will get her baby onto a bottle.

As a result, there has been a very serious falling-off in the birth rate, especially in that part of the population where it ought to be highest—namely, in the part that is of proven capacity. I shall go into this matter at some length in Chapter XVI, so, despite its very great importance, I will not dwell upon it further now, but must content myself with what I shall submit to my reader there.

I will readily concede that feminism is by no means the sole reason for the ominous differential birth rate. The higher standard of living among us, the tendency of college women to put off marriage (with the lowered fecundity that attends advance in age),¹¹ the greater difficulty of earning a livelihood, the feeling prevalent among the best families that if their children are to receive the highest opportunities, it is necessary that the children be few, together with the advent and spread of birth control, all have had a part in it. But the advance in Woman's age at the time of marriage, with diminished fecundity, and the ready acceptance and popularity of contraception, are themselves largely the result of the feminist woman's ambition for economic independence or a career and of her consequent aversion to motherhood and to homemaking. With all the allowances possible, an unbiased investigation compels one to recognize that much, if not most, of the blame for the ominous deterioration in the breeding-stock in America is exactly where men like Alexis Carrel, Brooks Adams, Ellsworth Huntington, and Anthony M. Ludovici have placed it—namely, in feminism.¹² This doctrine is luring aside the choicest young women in America, turning them against their own instincts, and injecting into their minds the poisoned ideas of the superiority for women of a "life of self-expression." The breath of this curse has blown upon the flower of our womanhood and left it withered and sterile. And all this in the name of the advancement of Woman! But what it evidently means is the disappearance of our *choicest* women on a scale that no race can stand. Underneath it all is Woman's betrayal of herself and of her kind.

I would call your attention, next, to the effect that feminism has on the atmosphere of the home. I believe that the home should be, in effect, a circle with a center. I agree with Professor Knight Dunlap of Johns Hopkins that in every family it is a simple necessity, beyond any argument, that there be one head, and that it is still best that this should be, as in the past, the man.¹³ But where the wife is a feminist, the home tends to cease to be a circle, with a center, and to become instead an ellipse with two rival foci, each contending for first place. This tension between the husband and the wife may be all the more deadly and disastrous when it is more or less underneath the surface, unrecognized, unconscious. It may be a long time before the couple discovers the rock on which their happiness together has come to grief. But where this tension exists, you have the woman's old envy of the male, to which I already have referred. She wants to have at least equal authority in the home. She does not want to learn any more from her husband than he has to admit that he learns from her: even in the intellectual realm, she would be at least his equal. And she wants equal recognition from the world. Such a woman is by no means "sacrificing" herself for her children, her husband, her home, or anything of the kind! She wants to develop herself, advance herself as a person in her own right, and demand and compel attention from the world.

A home with such a woman in it is apt to degenerate quickly into an arena where the two sexes fight out their mortal differences to the bitter end. Intelligent, earnest people are seriously disturbed today by the mounting divorce rate. Observation and reflection incline

me to think that the outstanding cause is feminism. True, modern industrialism has taken from the home its original economic foundation. Economically, more especially in the cities, it no longer has much reason for existence. In many homes, there really is not enough to keep an intelligent and self-respecting woman interested and occupied. This must be conceded.

Again, today, all the old values, standards and traditions are being freely challenged, criticized, experimented with—and commonly discarded altogether. What one authority (if it can truly be said that today we have *any* authorities) declares to be right, another of equal standing declares to be wrong. There is no certainty about anything, except almost universal *uncertainty* about everything. Religion once did, at least, hold up before men some sense of the unity of mankind, and it once upheld the absolute necessity, if one was really to live at all and if the race was to survive, of having something to live *for* and to *sacrificæ* oneself for. But religion has become a steadily diminishing factor in modern life, and it would be dishonest and cowardly not to admit it. Undoubtedly, there will in time be a renaissance of religion, even (as I think most likely) a new religion, for without religion no people can live. But it hasn't come yet, nor anything else that can truly take its place. The result is that for the present almost no one knows where he is going, or where he wants to go, or what life is all about. People do not even know what marriage is for. Is its object the happiness of the two lovers? Or is reproduction the object? And is it *merely* reproduction, or is to produce a goodly number of superior children, who will prove able to reach higher levels than their parents? There is no agreement on these things, and when a couple enters marriage without a common understanding as to the end of their venture, how hard, if not impossible, must it prove for them to pull together!

Moreover, with the loss of the sense of the unity of mankind, of something above and beyond oneself to live for and to die for, with the decay of the spirit of sacrifice and of the sense of its necessity, men become atomistic. With its cohesive forces relaxed, the organism falls into its component cells. No one will sacrifice himself for anything. Each one finds supreme importance in himself, and lives for himself, and fights against every other. Thus *every* institution threatens to fall to pieces. And it is inevitable that the family should begin to fall to pieces with the rest, and that an ever-increasing number of marital ventures break down in divorce.

The ultimate significance of these factors is that we live at the end of an age, in a period of decadence, in a civilization that is dying. But even with all these factors taken fully into account, I still feel that the most *immediate* cause of the prevalence of divorce (though it is itself a symptom of the universal degeneracy) is the prevalence of the envious rivalrous feminist woman. Our very education, which has been the same for girls as for boys, has largely prepared our women to do, or to aspire to do, the same work as men, and has left them with the idea that to be a wife and mother and homemaker is “not enough,” and consequently discontented unless they can successfully compete with Man.

Certainly, I do not think that the feminist wife makes a happy husband. He is the warrior—or at least he ought to be, though to think of the modern city man and suburbanite as a warrior is indeed to laugh. But even so, there are things he has to fight for, whether it is only to support his family, or, in the realm of thought and aspiration, to win a hearing for his idea

or acceptance of his art. And if even at home he cannot find peace, and rest, and healing, but even there must secretly match himself against a rival and feel pressure, then he will neither be happy nor be able to do his best work. Part of his strength, and perhaps his very best strength, will be used up before he goes out to the battle.

And, indeed, I confess to an increasing doubt whether many men value their wives greatly for their comradeship on the intellectual plane. I think that I can detect a change in this direction in my friends and classmates. In any case, I find myself responding heartily to Coomaraswamy when he says, "To one thing at least the greatest men have always been indifferent, that is, the amount of knowledge a woman may possess. It was not by her learning that Beatrice inspired Dante, or the washerwoman Chandidas. When Cuchullain [the Irish Achilles] chose a wife, it was Emer, because she had the six gifts of beauty, voice, sweet speech, needlework, wisdom, and charity. We know only of Helen that 'strangely like she was to some immortal spirit.' In other words, she was radiant. Radha's shining made the ground she stood on bright as gold. . . . It is this radiance in women, more than any other quality, that urges men to every sort of heroism, be it martial or poetic." ¹⁴ And Brooks Adams says flatly: ". . . society, as an organism, has little or no interest in Woman's reason, but its very existence is bound up in her instincts. Intellectually, Woman's reason has been a matter of indifference to men. As an intellectual competitor, she has never been formidable; but maternity is a monopoly." ¹⁵ And I agree with him entirely. For one thing, women *as a whole* always have been, and are, and always will be (because they simply must be, if the race is to go on—as I shall undertake to show later) intellectually less developed, even if not of a lower intellectual potentiality, than the male population as a whole.

But all this aside, and even if women in general are intellectually quite on a par with the general run of the male population, still it is not primarily for talk, or large ideas, or even fully to share their own large ideas, that men, even the best, the most creative of men, turn to women. Nor, when I say this, do I mean for a moment to suggest that men turn to women only for sex, though it is beyond question that the sexual relationship is a large and spiritually potent part of the life of any well-married couple. Yet I was thinking of something else. Whitman said:

I swear I begin to see little or nothing in audible words,
I swear I see what is better than to tell the best,
It is always better to leave the best untold.
The best of the Earth cannot be told anyhow.¹⁶

Ideas can be communicated only through words. But the best that a woman has to give to Man cannot be put into words at all. The sexes are opposite poles of creation, and mystic forces play between them. In other words, forces play between them that we feel, that we know to be enormously powerful, but that ultimately are very mysterious, that we do not really understand at all. But every man has an aura, and every woman has—an invisible emanation, or effulgence, or some other streaming of force from the center of his or her personality. Its content and power varies with the individual, is characteristic of the individual: I suspect that we could be identified by it as surely as by our faces. A wild animal senses it—even a domesticated dog, to some extent. For the most part it escapes humans, though I once knew a woman who said that every person she met she at once saw with a

certain color; and some men of unusual psychic development have claimed that every man's aura was visible to them. Doubtless, there have been times when the aura was so intensified (as in the case of Jesus on the so-called Mount of Transfiguration, or when the soldiers sent to take George Fox cringed and fled before the "light" in his face) that no one could fail entirely to sense it. Despite all the skepticism of our modern science we have it from no less than Alexis Carrel ". . . our surface is not our real frontier . . . We extend much farther beyond it. Beyond space and time. We know the individual's center, yet ignore where his outer limits are located . . . Perhaps they do not exist." ¹⁷

Each person, then, according to his development, has more or less of an aura—his aroma, his emanation, the exhalation and vibratory extension of what he is, or of what she is. And when two people meet, these emanations touch, and interfuse, and set up vibrations in each organism. When the right man and the right woman meet, the effects may be prodigious. An old man may become young, or a broken man well and strong, if he can be free to love this object of his adoration, and if he can go in and out breathing the air of her faith and devotion. But this effect is not to be produced through words. There is healing in the touch of a woman's hand, if she be the right woman, and if her hand be laid upon the man in just the right way and at just the right moment—and the right woman will know the way and the moment, though not by taking thought, but by instinct. There is power in the last deep, silent look into the right woman's eyes before a man goes out to battle, but what her eyes said to him she could never put into words, nor could he. Their emanations had fused and intermingled, and the eyes only reported the effect: that was all. There is peace for a man in the mere presence of such a woman; and to look out upon the world through the eyes of his adoration for her is to see all the world transfigured and everyone in it. But it is not his reasoning mind that all this reaches—but his feeling, his aspiration, his will. And it all disappears, like the shy shadows and virgin freshness of the early morning fields under the glare of the rising sun, if their life together comes to be dominated by the too clear, too hard, light of reason. Woman's power is in her instinct, her intuition, her feeling, her tenderness, her love. The very possibility of her being peace to a man, and healing, and reinforcement of his will depends upon her *not* being subjected to the severe rationalistic discipline that a man must have, and which she tends to get in any coeducational or feminist college. The possibility of having her greatest significance in the life of a man depends upon her remaining herself, on her being different, on her not being *like Man*. If, in order that she may have ideas about everything under the sun, and talk logically and anywhere with easy self-assurance, she loses her instincts, the sureness of her intuition, her feminineness, and becomes hard, self-reliant, and self-assertive, and masculine, then to whom shall a man go? There already are men aplenty, but where shall he find the touch of a real woman?

The economic and political effects of feminism I will not go into at any length. Suffice to say that Woman's entry into the working world¹⁸ as a competitor with the male has enormously aggravated the employment problem and has seriously disturbed and weakened the economic security of the male in his role as supporter of a family; and that the chief effect of Woman's success in obtaining the franchise has been even further to lower the intelligence of our electorate, which had been already alarmingly low, as I shall show in my chapter on eugenics. While I recognize that there are many women who, even intellectually, are the superiors of most men, still, if for no other reason, because of the fact that women are more easily moved by emotion, have less knowledge of the realities of the workaday world, and

cannot be depended upon to meet a crisis with the requisite resolution and firmness of will, I believe that the addition of Woman's voice to man's has contributed—not a thing. We are actually in a more perilous position than we were before. We have all the additional trouble and expense of registering her vote, for no gain whatever.

But nowhere is the effect of feminism more disastrous than on Woman herself. Let us begin with her health.

As we have seen, the feminist woman tends to avoid the responsibilities of reproduction as much as possible. She will have no children, or very few, and she will not be bothered with nursing them. But that Woman is a very great exception who can come to a sense of deep fulfillment without motherhood. The woman who bears no child, or only one or two as a sort of grudging sop to her reproductive instinct, or who puts off marriage too long, tends to become neurotic. She is restless, irritable, unstable, and not infrequently reaches a state of such inner disorder that she is forced to seek the assistance of a psychiatrist. And more than one psychiatrist has said to me that, again and again, he finds himself unable to straighten out the difficulties of such a woman simply because the one thing that would straighten her out he dare not prescribe. Nietzsche said, "Everything in Woman is a riddle, and everything in Woman hath one solution—it is called pregnancy."¹⁹ Doubtless this is an overstatement, for there is much else that must be right before there can be full peace in a woman's heart. But there is no denying that if pregnancy is denied her, it will as a rule be exceedingly difficult for her to come to a sense of deep fulfillment. Dr. Alexis Carrel went so far as to say that ". . . females, at any rate among mammals, seem only to attain their full development after one or more pregnancies. Women who have no children are not so well balanced and become more nervous than the others. . . The importance to her [Woman] of the generative function has not been sufficiently recognized. Such function is indispensable to her optimum development."²⁰ This also will be resisted as too sweeping, but at the least it focuses attention on facts that need very badly to be recognized and faced.

But the effects of feminism on a woman's health do not stop with her nervous system. Her organs are affected as well. The scope of this chapter will not permit me to go into the matter at length here, but if anyone wishes a comprehensive survey of the pertinent facts, I would urge him to read Ludovici's *The Truth About Childbirth*.²¹ It is fully and carefully documented, and enlists in its support many of the most eminent gynecologists in the world, male and female, English, European, and American. This book presents very convincing evidence of a correlation between childlessness and cancer in one or another part of the female reproductive system. In 1926, Dr. A. E. Giles, Senior Surgeon to the Chelsea Hospital for Women, London, declared that out of 881 cases of cancer of the uterus that had passed through his hands, half had borne no child at all, and the remaining half had averaged ten years since their last child.²² In the same year, Dr. Janet Lane-Clayton, M.D., D.Sc., in a report on cancer of the breast published by the British Ministry of Health, stated, "It has long been known that unmarried women suffer from cancer of the breast at a higher rate than married ones. It is now proved that among married women those who are less fertile are at a disadvantage."²³ And the recognition that there is a correlation between cancer of one or another part of the female reproductive system and a failure to use that part, has now gone so far as to appear even in the reports of the British Registrar-General. After observing that cancer of the ovaries is almost twice as common among single as

among married and widowed women, he says "This is only gradually developed as the child-bearing period passes without use of its opportunities."²⁴ In commenting on the high frequency of cancer of the vulva and vagina in unmarried women, he says, "Failure to function seems to predispose towards cancer as well as injury, and in this case . . . appears to be the dominant factor."²⁵ On the authority of Hastings Gilford,²⁶ Ludovici declares that "uterine fibroids also show a predilection for celibate and sterile women."²⁷ And the eminent gynecologist Dr. Frederick J. McCann maintains that "the proportion of sterile women with fibroids is 1 in 6, whilst 1 in 10 is believed to represent the amount of sterile marriages in the population generally. . . . Whether fibroids are the cause or the consequence of sterility is still a debated question, but the available evidence does favour the view that both sterility and diminished fecundity favour the growth of fibroid tumors."²⁸ The Registrar-General, remarking on the "recent spectacular rise in breast cancer," says, "Changes in the use of the organ may well affect the mortality, as this is much higher for single than for married women."²⁹ And Ludovici, through whom several of the above citations have come to my attention, concludes thus: "In this country [Great Britain], abounding in female celibates, and where only a third of the married mothers suckle their children, breast cancer is nine times as frequent as in Japan, where female celibacy is rare and breast-feeding and large families much more common."³⁰

And if in so many women failure to function actually results in organic disintegration, in cancer, then there must be a definite general physiological deterioration in all the rest of the women who do not keep their reproductive system in reasonable use. Increased difficulty in menstruation is only one instance of this that seems likely, if not definitely established.³¹

But alas! the physiological effects are not the end of the story. One must add the feminist woman's loss of womanliness. Indeed, so far and wide has the influence of feminism spread that today it is difficult to find many women who are truly feminine. Almost the whole female population has become more or less male-like. Pursuit of male studies, exposure to the hardening effects of earning a living and making one's way in the workaday world, and the secret regard for the male as the superior, all have had their effect in making the woman of today, as compared with women of other periods, hard, aggressive, self-absorbed, self-reliant, and self-assertive. As such, Woman has become, in the eyes of well-constituted men, cheap and common. She may have the vote, and hold jobs, and distinguish herself to some extent in many lines, but there is no denying the fact that Woman is no more looked up to as she once was, or revered. In her aping of Man, she can at best be but a poor imitation of the real thing, and no imitation commands even respect.³²

It is chiefly in countries where the home has retained its significance as the fundamental institution of society and where Woman has kept to her traditional role as mother and wife that, in spite of first and outward appearances to the contrary, she is recognized as perhaps the foremost influence in the land. Lin Yu Tang's *My Country And My People* was declared by Nathaniel Peffer, one of the best informed Americans on the Orient, to be "the best book on China in the English language," and by *The Christian Century* to be ". . . not just a great book about China but a great book about life . . . about individual life, about Woman's life and Man's life and family life and world life and, somehow, between the lines, about eternal life which encompasses them all." In this book, Lin Yu Tang says, "The more one knows Chinese life, the more one realizes that the so-called suppression of women is an Occidental

criticism that somehow is not borne out by a closer knowledge of Chinese life. That phrase certainly cannot apply to the Chinese mother and supreme arbiter of the household." ³³

Breasted says of the relations of the wife to her husband in ancient Egypt that "she was in every respect his equal, was always treated with the greatest consideration, and participated in the pleasures of her husband and her children; the affectionate relations existing between a noble and his wife are constantly and noticeably depicted on the monuments of the time." ³⁴

In regard to the position of Woman in ancient Greece (as contrasted with that in the age of Pericles), Dr. Paul Brandt, a recognized authority on the sexual life of that period, says, "It is hardly necessary nowadays to emphasize the fact that the assertion, one often heard, that the position of the Greek married woman was an unworthy one, is fundamentally wrong . . . no greater honour could be paid to Woman than the Greeks assigned to the mother type." And again, ". . . the foolishness of the talk about the unworthy position of the Greek woman is indisputably shown by the fact that in the oldest literary records marriage, and with it the woman, is described in a manner more interesting and charming than can be imagined. Where in all literature is the parting of a husband and wife represented with greater depth of feeling than in the famous scene in the Iliad (vi. 392-496), in which Hector takes leave of Andromache?" And later he speaks of the "universally high respect which Greek men had for their wives, and of which numerous indisputable instances have been handed down to us." ³⁵

The *Code of Manu*, which was to the ancient Hindu what Leviticus was to the Hebrew, says, "The teacher is ten times more venerable than a sub-teacher, the father a hundred times more than the teacher, but the mother a thousand times more than the father." ³⁶ According to Johannes Meyer, an authority on the sexual life of ancient India, the *Mahabharata*, the great Indian epic, declares that "above ten fathers or even the whole Earth in worth . . . stands the mother; there is no guru like the mother." ³⁷ And he continues, "Over and over again the wife is called the friend, the friend determined by fate, the best among friends, and so on . . . [He cites passages, and then continues.] No friend is like her: she is the best herb of healing for him that suffers . . . Without the wife, the house of one dwelling in it is utterly empty, even if it swarms all over with sons, grandsons, daughters-in-law, and servants. It is not the house that is called house, it is the mistress that is in the house . . . There is no kinsman like the wife, no comrade in the world like the wife." ³⁸ Further, he says, "It is the man's duty, stressed over and over again, to shelter the woman, to cherish and care for her (e.g., iv, 40-43; xiv, 90.45 ff). A gentle loving treatment of the woman is repeatedly enjoined . . . 'Towards women a man shall be without jealousy, but shall ward his wife, and to her be generous and kindly spoken, uttering tender, sweet words, but be not under thumb. . . ' (v, 38. 10, 11). Indian literature is rich in beautiful sayings on the loving treatment of the woman. 'Woman must on no account be chastised.' The man must quietly take their abusive words, and never dispute with them. Mbh., xii, 243. 14ff." ³⁹ In Asia, says Coomaraswamy, "the pregnant woman is auspicious,⁴⁰ and receives the highest respect; whereas in many industrial and secular Western societies she is an object of more or less open ridicule, she is ashamed to be seen abroad and tries to conceal her condition. . . That this was not the case in a more vital period of European civilization may be seen in all the literature and art of the Middle Ages, and particularly in the status of the Virgin Mary, whose motherhood endeared her to the folk so much more nearly than her virginity." And he continues. "It is about this

shy quiet being, a mystery to men, that the whole mediaeval world turns; . . . Like Uma and Sita, the Virgin Mary is the image of a perfect being:

For in this rose contained was
Heaven and Earth in litel space.

And for a little while, in poetry and in architecture, we glimpse an idealization of Woman and Woman's love akin to the praise of Radha [an Indian heroine and ideal]."⁴¹ But today Woman has lost faith in herself, in the holiness of her own nature, and anyone who is ashamed of himself must sooner or later become an object of pity. "From a faith in herself to a belief in votes, what a descent!" exclaims Coomaraswamy. From the central figure of society, the helpmeet of the great creators, the theme of the great art and literature, from the one to whom was entrusted the most significant and most intimate part in the great mystery of all life, to the envious scrambler for place, the poor and obvious imitation of Man—to such has the modern feminist woman fallen.

Nor, in the long run and as a rule, can she be sustained by any deep inner satisfaction to compensate for what she has lost. It is difficult to find a feminist woman whose face is quiet and serene. Poisoned into shame for her own nature, she has to pursue her career against the grain of her very instincts. And in the end, with perhaps a very rare exception here and there, she must admit herself frustrated. For, if for no other reason (and other very cogent reasons I shall shortly give), if the race is to go on at all, it is inescapable that the children must be borne by the women. And time and strength that go into the bearing and the rearing of children simply are not left to be put into significant creation in competition with males who do not labor under this hindrance. Inevitably, therefore, the feminist woman is as a rule doomed to frustration. She cannot successfully rival Man in man's own field.⁴² No wonder that the faces of modern women show such signs of strain, emptiness, and disillusionment. For one who, like Isadora Duncan, achieves a high place in the realm of creation (she brought interpretative dancing to its highest peak as an art), there will be a thousand who simply become withered disappointed spinsters. They have rejected suitors to try to win distinction as teachers, artists, writers, scientists, usually at best with very mediocre success, and now, when it is too late, when the suitors have all found mates elsewhere and their time to bear children has passed, they realize that they had their chance and missed it, they had their great opportunity to live and they betrayed it, so that the taste of themselves in their mouths is like gaff. It must often be that, like another great betrayer, they go out and in the darkness of their hearts "weep bitterly."

But for the sake of understanding, let me say again that in the last analysis it is not the woman whom I blame. A hundred years ago, Nietzsche saw whither the whole situation was tending and epitomized it thus: "Of Man there is little here: therefore do their women masculinize themselves. For only he who is man enough will *save the woman* in Woman."⁴³ The origin of our feminism is primarily in our men, in the fact that we have not had, and do not have today, in anything like adequate numbers, the sort of men who alone can inspire women's confidence, command their adoration, and provide a satisfying outlet for all that makes Woman womanly. In his very home, the man has shown himself infirm and unsure of himself. And he has been failing to make the world a fit place to bring children into. Man's hand on the tiller of state has become uncertain and feeble. In modern times, it has become

increasingly evident that he did not know where he wanted to go, and the further we have traveled under his direction, the more we find on every hand the portents of disaster. Woman, with her more subtle instinct, began to sense this a long time ago, as a herd senses an approaching storm. Living closer to the earth than Man, with her ear closer to the ground, and ever with a concern for all that will affect her offspring and the future of the race (for it is with this that she is primarily entrusted), she has become filled with a vague uneasiness, and losing all the confidence she once felt in the ability and worthiness of Man to lead, she has gradually pressed in to take the leadership away from Man, to try her own hand. And the result has been feminism. *But this is not the answer.* As I shall shortly make clear, for this task Woman is simply not qualified. The only answer is in a renaissance of real manliness in our male population. Any other alternative spells disaster. Unless we can again have men of vision, intellect, courage, decision, responsibility, will, endurance, resourcefulness, in short, of masterfulness, our feminism will get worse and worse. To have true women again, we must first have real men.⁴⁴

After this examination of feminism and the effects that it is having on the land and on the age that we live in, we must try to understand what the *unpoisoned*, well-constituted woman is like. For it is upon this, after all, that the value of our study must depend.

But at this announcement perhaps even the non-feminist woman may exclaim, "Well! who are you to set yourself up as an authority on Woman! Don't you know that Woman can be understood only by Woman?"

Doubtless it is true that the sexes are so different that they must always remain to a considerable extent incomprehensible to each other. And, certainly, I am in no sense dogmatizing as to the nature of Woman. I think that anyone would be a fool who ventured to say that Woman ought to be like this, or that men ought to be like that. The only sensible thing, surely, is to find out what we actually *are* like, men and women both, and then to shape our institutions to fit the creatures that have to live in them. Nevertheless, it is inevitable and desirable that we understand each other as well as we are able. Thus, some forty years ago, it became necessary for me to reexamine the understanding of Woman that, in one way or another, I had imbibed from the current thought of my day. I had begun to suspect that this was largely false. I started to reflect on my experience, and to watch women under all circumstances with a new eye. All kinds of women—old and young, American and foreign, educated and working-class, rich and poor, radical and conservative, feminist and old-fashioned. And sometimes, in unguarded moments, they would say very revealing things. Also, I began to study women of the past, especially women in periods that were very significant culturally and whose very longevity indicated that their institutions were built on a sound understanding of the make-up of the people who lived in them. Thus I investigated the life and nature of Woman as she appeared in ancient Egypt, India, China, Greece and Rome, in medieval Japan, and in our own Middle Ages in Europe.

Moreover, I discovered Isadora Duncan, after reaching the very pinnacle of feminist ambition, crying, as she thought of the birth of her little Deirdre, "Oh, women, what is the good of us learning to become lawyers, painters, or sculptors, when this miracle exists? Now I knew this tremendous love, surpassing the love of Man. . . . Life, life, life! Give me life! Oh, where was my Art? My Art or any *Art*? What did I care for Art! I felt I was a God, superior

to any artist!"⁴⁵ I came upon Dr. Arabella Keneally's *Feminism And Sex-Extinction*, in which she says, for instance, that the fact "that all women do not marry . . . is no reason for dissembling the truth that in wifehood and motherhood lie women's most vital and valuable roles. Nor is it a warrant for training the whole sex as though none were destined to fulfill this, their natural and noblest . . . vocation,"⁴⁶ And—of far more importance—I found Laura Marholm, a woman writing to women, and in her *Studies In The Psychology Of Woman* (New York, 1899 and 1906—alas! now out of print, but obtainable in some large libraries) making much the same case against feminism that Mr. Ludovici makes in his *Woman, A Vindication*, only, as a woman to women, for them perhaps writing even more persuasively and convincingly than he. So I began to submit my findings to women, and in their answers I began to find confirmation of what had first been brought to my attention by Nietzsche and Ludovici. Back in the late Thirties, in my eighth of nine addresses at a certain coeducational college in the Middle West, I spoke on Woman, presenting the same point of view that I am presenting here. And the next day, a student who was in a position to canvass the reaction of the women present (mostly students and faculty), told me that all but two of them had declared that what I had said at that meeting was what they had secretly waited for all their days. So, gradually, the evidence that I have found has all fitted together to form a picture of the nature of Woman, as she is and at bottom always has been, in all lands and in all ages. And, consequently, I feel a good deal of confidence in the soundness of what I shall now say concerning the nature of the well-constituted woman. May I not with some justice claim that it is Woman herself who has taught me?

The first thing the desirable and well-constituted woman wants is motherhood. The desire for a child at her breast is the deepest instinct in her.⁴⁷ For a while, to be sure, and especially before marriage, a woman's *conscious* desire may be largely concentrated on her love of the man; as is natural, since there is no way to the child but through his love. And it may even require a pregnancy to bring to the surface how primary her longing for the child is. But, in the last analysis and when subjected to test, her devotion to the child is deeper than her devotion to her husband. If she is forced to choose between them, she will choose the child, for, as Nietzsche pointed out in his *Zarathustra*, "Man is for Woman, a means: the purpose is always the child."⁴⁸ And Johannes Meyer says, "The man in sexual union really seeks only his pleasure, but the woman seeks the child, which rule will always be true."⁴⁹ Practically no woman can come to a deep sense of fulfillment without motherhood. Nature, in entrusting to Woman the chief part in carrying on the race, has taken no chances. She has implanted in her a will to conceive, a devotion to the child, and a readiness to sacrifice herself to the child's welfare, that are inescapable and very imperious.⁵⁰

And indeed, the well-constituted woman is not content with one child, or with two or three. Given adequate economic security and, no less important, emotional security in the love and devotion of her husband, she would generally be not only happier, but actually in a better state of physical and mental health, if she had a child every two or three years of her bearing life.⁵¹ Woman's very body is much more largely given over to the purposes of reproduction than is man's. One needs only to glance at her to see, as Ludovici points out, that she is "immersed . . . up to her shoulders in the business of Life and its multiplication."⁵² Nor can Nature have equipped her with a reproductive system that regularly, every month, gets her whole body ready for pregnancy throughout a period of thirty years or more, with the intention that she should make use of it only for some five or six years of that period. I feel

that a certain professor's wife, who had been greatly impressed by what she had heard me say about Woman, was only speaking for her whole sex when she said, in effect, "I was never so happy, and never so well, as when my child was coming. I never before had felt so deeply that I was in line with the great purposes of the universe for my life. And physically and mentally I have been in a state of rebellion ever since that I cannot go right on having children. Whether it is because our income is too low or our standards too artificial and false, we are not having any more. But without them life for me is an empty void, which I can find no way to fill, and I am left with a gnawing dissatisfaction all through my being, and a bitter ache in my heart."

In view of this drive in Woman toward the child, it should be pointed out that whatever birth-control may be as a solution of the sexual problem of the male, it can never be any solution for the female.⁵³ It could never even have gained consideration as a solution for the female except in a world where feminism was in the ascendant—in a world, that is, where there was a constant tendency and effort to equate the sexes, to gloss over their differences, to minimize the differences even in their sexuality. But, as we have seen, these differences *cannot* be ignored, and in the case of their sex the differences are radical and fundamental. This is evident enough from the examination of almost any authoritative work on the sexual characteristics of men and women, such as that of Iwan Bloch already quoted at length in my first footnote,⁵⁴ or that of August Forel,⁵⁵ or Havelock Ellis' *Man And Woman*,⁵⁶ but it seems to me that the most obvious, the most striking, and the most significant sexual difference between men and women is the one constantly stressed by Ludovici, though commonly overlooked entirely, that in the male the sexual instinct drives primarily, almost singly, toward intercourse, whereas in the female the sexual instinct requires for its fulfillment the completion of a whole *cycle* of experience (all of it essentially sexual), from intercourse and pregnancy, through bearing and delivering the child, to nursing the child at the breast. All of that, if she is well-constituted and in health, she wants and is capable of.⁵⁷ And to treat her as if her sexuality were like man's, to give her only endless experience of an intercourse that is always artificially prevented from leading to what her whole being longs for, namely, pregnancy and the child, is grossly to misunderstand her nature and to inflict upon her a degree of physiological frustration and disappointment that may be almost maddening. For a woman's holiest right, her first duty, and the most imperious command of her whole being, is that she bear and suckle and rear children.

The second thing that the well-constituted woman wants is a master. Of this also she may not be conscious, especially in maidenhood. Women rarely know why they do things: the reasons they give are rarely the real reasons. But that women want a master is something I have been told by women themselves. More than one has said to me, "I want to *serve* the man I love."⁵⁸ Not that they want a man who will order them around and lord it over them, but deep down in them somewhere they secretly long and wait for the coming of a man who, in their eyes at least, is strong enough, and noble enough, to compel them *inwardly*, who will stand before them as if with a halo around his head, and command their devotion and obedience. Their hearts rejoice when they find a man who provides an outlet for all the adoration they have in them, and for the impulse (so strong in Woman) to give themselves, to lavish themselves, even to do menial service for the man they love. They do not so much ask for anything as they ask to be allowed to give—everything they have. In their hearts, they do not really want to steer the ship: that is not their nature or their function. They are

secretly elated to find a man to whose hand on the helm they can with perfect confidence entrust both themselves and their children. The tragedy is that today degeneracy is advanced so far among us that it is not possible to find many men who *can* really command women by compelling their adoration. It was largely the cry of their whole sex that rang out in the bitter protest of two of the loveliest women whom I have known, in reply to what I was saying about women, when they exclaimed, "Yes! But I cannot *find* such men!" But it was significant that they evidently had *wanted* such men. And entirely consonant with their attitude are the findings of Hamilton and McGowan in their study of what is wrong with marriage. They report that "the men and women are happiest where the wives are wholly dependent financially." "The husbands whose wives earn nothing are far more content with their marriages than the husbands of wage-earners. Sixty-one percent of the husbands with dependent wives are satisfied, as against only 44 percent of the other husbands. *Ergo*, Man wants to keep women in subjection, and he is happiest when she hasn't the slightest shade of economic independence. . . . But what about the wives? With no regard whatever for feminist theory, they agree with the men—and even go them one better. Sixty-three percent of the dependent wives prove satisfied, while only 25 percent of the wage-earning women found their marriages distinctly comfortable." ⁵⁹ Consonant also was the purport of the debate, under the subject of "Are Men Mice?" between Alfred Uhler and Margaret Fishback, in the "Forum" for July, 1938. Uhler said that Man should rule, and Margaret Fishback declared that Woman wants him to.

But whether or not it be conceded that a master is something a woman deeply desires, I am convinced that a master is something she requires. "Woman is most desirable when least reliable," someone said years ago. "Every woman is available," a young secretary to a Quaker college president once said to a man of my acquaintance. Whether or not this is true (and personally I think it is not, entirely), it largely fits into the picture of ancient Woman as she appears in the *Mahabharata*, India's oldest epic. The following are typical of conclusions there set forth about her, as quoted by J. J. Meyer: " 'In love a man cannot overcome a woman; Woman is ever the very embodiment of sensuality (xii, 213, 9) . . . Instability is a matter of course in the woman (v, 36, 58); . . . we are taught in xii, 140, 26 that they [women] are to be enjoyed warily . . . but that to cling to them brings destruction.' " The "old woman" says to Ashtavakra, " 'Thou hast seen the fickleness of women. Even old women are plagued by the feverish longing for Man.' " Throughout the epic there is frequent evidence of "the ever hungering greed of sex in the woman, and of her polyandric passion." " 'Women are untrue,' so we read too in the Veda," says Meyer in summarizing the ancient Indian idea of the nature of Woman.⁶⁰ And even a generation and more ago it was obvious that this was quite in keeping with the course Woman was following once her newly-won freedom enabled her to follow her desires. A certain rector's daughter, home from her feminist co-ed college told me, in the presence of her mother, that estimates by the girls themselves as to how many of their number were still virgin, ranged from 14 to 50 percent: apparently no one thought that more than half of them were. Judge Ben Lindsey's *Revolt of Modern Youth* gave evidence that pointed in the same direction. And now (I am writing in 1970), after developments in the last few years, I am under the impression that most of our women's and co-educational colleges, except probably in the South, allow men to spend the night in the women's dormitories. The first college to adopt such a policy officially, as far as I know, was Bennington.

However, it is argued that these indications of the strength of Woman's sexuality, properly understood, are not to be held against her. If the burden of perpetuating the species has indeed been entrusted primarily to the female, it is only what has to be expected and no more than what is biologically necessary, and therefore right, that her instincts should be about their business very constantly and insistently. Their determination to find fulfillment is really evidence that a woman is well constituted for her task and, on the physical side at least, is a good specimen of her sex. But it most emphatically does not follow from this that young women, many of them not yet out of their teens, should be left free, and trusted to make decisions about their sexual life with discrimination and according to wisdom. She certainly should not be allowed to go out with a man unchaperoned and to stay out with him into the small hours of the morning. This way lies supreme folly, and inevitable disaster, as our forefathers evidently learned thousands of years ago—without doubt, by experience.

But as far as *blame* is concerned, the man of ancient India did not condemn the woman for what most people would call her lapses. The blame lay, rather, upon the man who was her warder. Of the woman herself, beautiful and generous sentiments were expressed. "According to Paracara, x.20, Woman is like the Earth, and can never become wholly unclean. Women, water, and pearls are never spoiled . . . Her mouth, that is, her kiss, is always clean, happen what may (*Manu*, v.130), and she herself during the pleasures of love (*Vasistha*, xxviii.8) Indeed, *Vasistha*, xviii.9, proclaims, 'Woman is pure in all her limbs . . .'"⁶¹ To some this may sound unduly sentimental. But I am inclined to find in it a disposition both generous and noble, like to that which created chivalry in our own Middle Ages. And this reminds me of something that needs to be said before I go any further—namely, that these Hindus, whose literature I have been quoting from a good deal, were not at all a race alien to ourselves, as the Chinese and the Jews are alien. Their ancestors, who conquered India some thousands of years ago and created one of the world's greatest religions, philosophies and social systems, were an early branch of our own stock, and were as much tall, blue-eyed blonds as the ancient Persians, Greeks, and Romans, or as any of our modern Germanic and Nordic peoples of Germany, Britain, or Scandinavia, including Iceland. And the knowledge of Woman that was distilled from their experience is likely to be so consonant with the instincts and experience of our nearer ancestors that we should do well to weigh carefully what they had to say. Indeed, in at least one respect, their social arrangements in regard to Woman were very much in line with what obtained, not only in Britain and on the Continent, but in our own country until the dawn of "the modern age," about fifty years ago.

To the demand for freedom on the part of the modern woman of America, and indeed of the entire world of the West, ancient India (according to Prajapati) would have answered that "Woman is not fit for independence." And Ashtavakra said, "In the three worlds is no woman capable of freedom. The father wards them in childhood, the husband in youth, the son in their old age: for Woman there is no freedom."⁶² And the *Code of Manu*, whose preeminent authority has been mentioned many times, in addition to stating that every woman must always be under the protection of some man, reads, "Day and night Woman must be kept in dependence by the males of their families."⁶³

And sooner or later, as a result of our painful and costly modern experience of freedom for women, we shall have to take essentially the same position. Woman must always have some

man she looks up to and, if necessary, obeys. This, primarily, because of herself she cannot be counted upon to keep her sexuality under control, and in order that one may know by whom she is bringing children into the world, but also because the effect the emancipated woman has when she attempts to put her hand to the reform of society, is weakening and pernicious when not actually disastrous. To the solution of the problems of economics and politics, and in general the problems of society at large, Woman has nothing to contribute. Society, its organization and reorganization and reform, is man's field. If Man fails to measure up to his responsibility and botches his undertaking, as he has been doing for centuries, the answer is not in an effort on Woman's part to take the task out of Man's hands and to perform it better herself. For this task, let me say it again, she has neither the necessary firmness and hardness nor mental grasp of the sort required, nor, if she is to remain desirable as a woman and to measure up to her responsibilities in the home, does she have the necessary experience. Without entirely limiting Woman's sphere to "Kinder, Küche, und Kirche," I do believe that these three words largely symbolize where Woman's sphere *centers*, namely around home and children. And if the modern emancipated woman has been so long at liberty to do as she pleases that she no longer recognizes that she wants or requires a master, it will become necessary for Man to come to grips with her. The refusal of women of the best stock to bear children constitutes a national peril of the utmost gravity, and the efforts of women of all sorts to interfere in social problems is softening and weakening our whole social structure. If women do not of their own accord recognize what their place is and take it, then men will have to *put* them there. And from all the signs, I suspect this is precisely what will be necessary. If the problem presented by modern women is to be solved, then men will simply have to take them in hand. The thought of this may make them "feel like spitting," as one of them once responded to me. Doubtless some of them will not stop with spitting, and many of them will find more effective ways to fight. To win the mastery man's strength, wisdom, and resourcefulness may be severely taxed. For, as Samuel Foote remarked, "Woman . . . is a microcosm, and rightly to rule her, requires as great talents as to rule a state." Tact and suasion will always be better than force, and best of all the inner but irresistible compulsion upon a woman's heart of her man's transcendent nobility, but rather than leave the issue undecided or allow the woman to hold the upper hand, I should counsel him, for the sake of every consideration involved, whether it be his own good, the good of their children, the good of society, or the good of the woman herself, to resort to any means that may be necessary to bring her into submission. He may then discover, perhaps to his amazement, as did a friend of mine when he knocked his wife down for her persistent insubordination, that she liked it! Woman will adore only the man who, whether or not he knocks her down, is her unquestioned master.

However, it must be said most emphatically, that this is no such simple matter as the mere assertion of a man's superior physical strength. Man can become truly master of Woman only as he first becomes master of himself, and displays an unmistakable mastery of life. And though the change must come first where men and women meet face to face, in their personal relations and in their home, it can never be complete or consolidated until Man has put through a reorganization and renovation of all society of a kind and on a scale that must command Woman's entire confidence and compel her respect. Included in this would have to be the re-establishment of the home as our fundamental institution, with an economic foundation that would give Woman's work in it a dignity, a satisfaction, and a significance that it rarely has now. But the day will come when all society will again recognize what has

been known from time immemorial to the heart of Woman, namely, the necessity and the blessedness of the true master.

We have maintained, now, that the first thing that the well-constituted woman wants is motherhood; and that a second thing she wants (or requires) is a man who has mastered her, inwardly by what he is if not outwardly by his strong arm—a man from whom she is happy to accept security, leadership, and, on occasion, authority. And now there is a third thing that I wish to say in regard to the well-constituted woman. As already has been perhaps more or less indicated, I believe that women as a whole (*and it is the more true the more desirable a woman is as a woman*) are unfitted for significant creation, which is another way of saying, unfitted for having a life of their own.

I am not alluding to the cost to the woman of maternity, though this alone is heavy and ineluctable. Strength and time that go into the bearing and rearing of, say, four to ten children (and it is precisely the women who are quickest or most likely to aspire to rival Man as creator from whom we need children in such numbers), simply are not left to go also into the pursuit of a career. Indeed, *whether or not women make any use of their reproductive equipment*, the mere fact that they have it and that periodically from early youth to late womanhood their whole being is more or less disturbed by its preparations for pregnancy, constitutes from the point of view of creativeness in competition with Man, a very formidable handicap. Says Iwan Bloch,

“Among the higher species of animals the males exhibit a stronger evolutionary tendency than the females, owing to the fact that their share in the work of reproduction has become less important. The more extensive organic expenditure demanded by the reproductive functions limits the feminine development to a notably greater extent than the masculine. In the human species this retardation of growth in the female is especially increased in consequence of menstruation, and this affords a striking example of the truth of Spencer’s law” [“of the antagonism between reproduction and the higher evolutionary tendency.”]

And then he quotes the “Würzburg anatomist, Oskar Schultze,” in part as follows:

“The sexually mature body of a woman has always during the intermenstrual period to make good the loss undergone during menstruation . . . thus continually, month after month, the vital undulation and the vital energy rises and falls. *The energy periodically expended in Woman’s principal function has for thousands of years ceased to be available for her own internal development.* The actual loss on each occasion is so trifling that numerous women hardly find it disagreeable. The effect depends upon summation. The earnings are almost immediately spent, *not for the purpose of her own domestic economy, but for the sake of another, and in the service of reproduction;* this comes first, for the species must be preserved. *To accumulate capital for her personal needs has been rendered more difficult for Woman than it is for Man.*”⁶⁴ (The italics occur in Bloch’s book.)

And Havelock Ellis, after calling attention to “those differences which are not artificial, and which no equalisation of social conditions can entirely remove, the natural character and predispositions which will always inevitably influence the sexual allotment of human activities,” sums up his position with the statement, already cited in one of my notes, that

“So long as women are unlike in the primary sexual characters and in reproductive function they can never be absolutely alike even in the highest psychic processes.”⁶⁵

But when I said above that women as a whole are unfitted for significant creation or for having a life of their own, I was thinking less of the cost to Woman of her maternity (whether actual or only potential) than of the derived effects of this on her psyche, i.e., on her character, her desires, her aptitudes.

For literally thousands of years the human male and female have been following very different roles in their sexual relations with each other. For thousands of years the male has been the positive aggressive one who pursued and courted and won or overpowered the female. In this effort, he had to meet and master his rivals for the female’s affections. Also it fell to him to defend his female and their offspring against every sort of enemy. The female, on the other hand, has been the negative, passive, selective one, who was pursued and in one way or another mastered, so that she became pregnant and dependent, and had to lean for support and learned to like to lean for support, and thus learned also to like to follow and to imitate.

Now, these roles are far apart, and in following them each of the sexes developed certain peculiar capacities and traits. For his role as the positive, aggressive, pursuing one, the male had to develop such qualities as initiative, resourcefulness, self-reliance, decision, boldness, and the love of being master. In his feuds with his rivals, he developed courage, strength, prowess. On the other hand, the female developed coyness, shyness, and submissiveness—a pleasure in surrendering herself, and in being cared for, and in accepting the way of her master. In the care of the young, she developed tenderness, personal devotion, and a readiness to sacrifice herself for her offspring.⁶⁶

And the effect of this age-long experience of the two sexes is registered in their very neurons. Dr. Carrel says, “Woman differs profoundly from Man. Every one of the cells of her body bears the mark of her sex. The same is true of her organs and, above all, of her nervous system. Physiological laws are as inexorable as those of the sidereal world. They cannot be replaced by human wishes. We are obliged to accept them just as they are. Women should develop their aptitudes in accordance with their own nature, without trying to imitate the males. . . . Between the two sexes there are irrevocable differences.”⁶⁷ Now these sexual differences, which in well-constituted women are unmistakable and to which Carrel gives such unequivocal and authoritative recognition, mean that the functions of the sexes are distinct and are absolutely *not interchangeable*. Man cannot do what Woman is meant to do. And Woman cannot successfully rival Man in his distinctive field, in the field of creation. She does not have the qualities for it. For significant creation it is necessary that one have, on occasion, an almost satanic faith in oneself, in the social value of one’s vision, one’s idea, one’s mission; one must have that boldness, that resourcefulness, that courage, endurance and hardness in the face of opposition that are exactly what man’s sexual differentiation has bred *into* his very bone and marrow, and which Woman’s sexual differentiation has bred *out* of her make-up. To attain distinction in the field of creation, therefore, the woman must force herself to act in a way she does not really feel. She has to hide her instinctive diffidence under a hard front of masculine self-reliance. Every step she takes is more or less against the grain of her very instincts, with a large part of her vital forces, therefore, hanging back, if not

actually working dead against her, liable at any moment to betray her. Inevitably, therefore, wherever this condition prevails—and it must prevail in most cases where women aspire to really significant creation, and that quite apart from whether or not there is any drain upon their vitality from children—women are simply not equipped to reach the stature of men in such fields as art, thought, statesmanship, seership, or heroic exploits in the service of mankind. The fatedness of women to bear children makes it impossible, in the long run, for them even to have a life of their own in the very limited sense of being economically independent. Woman *cannot* find a deeply satisfying life simply in obeying commands that come from within herself. Man can. He can get along without the child. He can get along without Woman, certainly without a wife. It may be difficult, but it can be done. Woman, however, requires the child, and the child means dependence both on the child and on a man.

It has sometimes been claimed, as a support for the feminist position, that primitive society was matriarchal. And if Woman ruled once, why should she not rule again, why should she not rule (or at least have an equal part in ruling) now? As feminists often undertake to make quite a point of this, it may be well to dispose of the question here. Perhaps I cannot do this better than by quoting passages from two eminent anthropologists, of recognized authority, who have studied the problem with great care, Sir James Frazer, best known as the author of *The Golden Bough*, and Dr. Robert Briffault, whose *The Mothers* is likewise a work of monumental learning.

Sir James Frazer states his conclusions as follows:

“But in order to dissipate misapprehensions which appear to be rife on this subject, it may be well to remind or inform the reader that the ancient and widespread custom of tracing descent and inheriting property through the mother alone does not by any means imply that the government of the tribes which observe the custom is in the hands of women; in short, it should always be borne in mind that mother-kin prevails most extensively among the lowest savages, with whom Woman, instead of being the ruler of Man is always his drudge and often little better than his slave.⁶⁸ Indeed, so far is the system from implying any social superiority of women that it probably took its rise from what we should regard as their deepest degradation, to wit, from the state of society in which the relations of the sexes were so loose and vague that children could not be fathered on any particular man. When we pass from the purely savage state to that higher plane of culture in which the accumulation of property, and especially of landed property has become a powerful instrument of social and political influence, we naturally find that whenever the ancient preference for the female line of descent has been retained, it tends to increase and enhance the dignity of Woman; and her aggrandisement is most marked in princely families, where she either herself holds royal authority as well as private property, or at least transmits them both to her consort or her children. But this social advance of women has never been carried so far as to place men as a whole in a position of political subordination to them. Even where the system of mother-kin in regard to descent and property has prevailed most fully the actual government has generally, if not invariably, remained in the hands of men. Exceptions have no doubt occurred; women have occasionally arisen who, by sheer force of character, have swayed for a time the destinies of their people. But such exceptions are rare and their effects transitory; they do not affect the truth of the general rule that human society has been governed in the

past and, human nature remaining the same, is likely to be governed in the future, mainly by masculine force and masculine intelligence." And he concludes, "The theory of gynaeocracy is in truth a dream of visionaries and pedants."⁶⁹

This is all very pertinent and unequivocal, and, of course, quite significant.

But at this point I can hear the feminist crying, "Yes, but Frazer is out of date. How about Robert Briffault's *The Mothers*?⁷⁰ You should see what *he* has to say." And Briffault, it is true, is more recent than Frazer. Besides, he is probably looked to by feminists as the bulwark of their position on this question. Indeed, I have had male college professors advise my reading of Briffault. So that to leave him unanswered would be to leave my case greatly weakened. But it turns out that there is no need to answer him. It would seem that the feminists must weary of their reading before they reach the end of the third tome of this large work, for here, where Briffault presents his conclusions, I find very little in which the feminists could take comfort or find support for their position today. He does make certain claims for the importance of Woman in *primitive* society, but he declares that this importance has rather little significance for the entirely different conditions of present-day life.⁷¹ He asserts, as I already have done myself, that Woman, with the feelings that bind together the mother and her young, is the very origin and foundation of society. But his final conclusions are flatly opposed to the feminists' position. In the end, the much-vaunted feminist authority proves to be an authority against them.

Perhaps I may fairly present Briffault's conclusions in three generalizations. That the passages of which they are a condensation may be readily available for the reader who would challenge my interpretations, and yet not burden the text for him who is not especially interested in this question, I will quote them in my notes at the end of the chapter. Briffault, then, in brief, seems to me to say this:

1. Conditions in primitive society were entirely different from those existing today in civilization. At that time there was no such thing as "rule." "Matriarchy" is a misnomer. It suggests rule by women as later there was rule by men. This never existed—or very rarely. Primitive society is "nothing if not equalitarian." The very ideas of domination and of authority are not understood. Frazer was mistaken in thinking such societies were ruled by men. But they are equally mistaken who think they were ruled by women. Women, it is true, do not labor under the disabilities under which we find them in patriarchal societies, but there is no "rule," as we know it, by anybody.⁷²
2. Society itself *originated* in Woman, in the feelings that bound together the mother and her young. And upon this foundation the whole superstructure of civilization has been built. In primitive society, also, the chief stimulus to the group-mind and toward culture came from the interests and activities of the female. Primitive society did not afford opportunities for the development of the distinctive, preeminently intellectual activities of the male. *On the level of primitive life*, if either sex is the more important it is the female.⁷³
3. But this does not affect Woman's inherent inability to rival Man intellectually under the conditions of civilization. Culture is primarily, if not exclusively, the creation of the male intellect. Even if, considered abstractly, apart from her functions, she be man's intellectual

equal, the development of her mental powers is impeded and curtailed by the fulfillment of her biological functions. If she is to procreate, as she must if the race is to go on, she cannot also create—not as the equal of Man.⁷⁴

With this, it seems to me, the feminist position collapses. We still have the feminist theory, the feminist faith, and not least the feminist temper, but on every side the battle—certainly insofar as it is a battle for the truth—is turning against them. They still man the ramparts (and “man” is the right word), but, whether or not they know it, their foundations have been shot out from under them. Men and women are fundamentally different creatures, and there must be no truce with any attempt to confuse, or to equate, their functions. Rule belongs to Man—rule, mastery, the direction of affairs. Woman, under Man, may be mistress of her home, but there her jurisdiction ends. *Civilized* society is the creation, primarily and predominantly, of the male.

I have read that many hundreds of years ago there was a belief in Europe that Woman had no soul. In the popular mind, this may have betrayed a degraded sense of Woman’s worth, but I have wondered whether it may not have had its origin in a recognition that Woman was not in herself so complete and self-sufficient as was Man in himself, that she was not made for having a life of her own. She must have the child, and must sacrifice herself to the child. She cannot think about her personality, about being a person in her own right, and all that: she is too much absorbed in the life of her children, in bringing that life into the world, and in feeding it physically, mentally, and spiritually. In fact, her personality becomes developed most fully and most richly when she thus most forgets about developing it. “He who would find his life must lose it.” If it is a man’s task to learn to sacrifice himself to the good of that larger family which is the nation, or the race, or even mankind, it is Woman’s life, and task, and fulfillment, to sacrifice herself to the good of that more immediate and personal family, her own offspring and husband.

Throughout the *Laus of Manu*, the ancient Hindu law, there runs the saying, varying in its wording but to the same general effect, “As a man to his God, so a woman to her husband.” As the saying stands, it is apt to be at least repellent—certainly to all those who share the prejudices common to our day. “Is a woman, then, to have no God!” exclaims someone in angry indignation. But the only God we know, the only God we can *experience*, is the highest and deepest life within our own selves, the highest and holiest wanting that arises inexorably from the inalienable core of our being. But in Woman it is precisely this, as we have seen, that commands her toward husband and children, and hence toward dependence and self-sacrifice. More than this, as has been frequently remarked, it seems to be in Woman’s very make-up that she must look to Man for the pattern of her own womanhood. She will be whatever Man wants her to be—as Jung declared and as Forel has said more than once. She cannot help it. D.H. Lawrence observed, “The real trouble about women is that they must always go on trying to adapt themselves to men’s theories of women, as they always have done. When a woman is thoroughly herself, she is being what her type of man wants her to be. . . Give me a pattern to follow! That will always be Woman’s cry”⁷⁵ Men as far apart as Milton and Nietzsche say the same thing in words that, if not less repellent than those of *Manu*, at least may make it clearer. Of Man and Woman, Milton said, “He for God only, she for God in him;” and he makes Eve say to Adam, “O thou! . . . without whom [I] am to no end, my guide and head . . . what thou bid’st unargued I obey; so God ordains, God is thy

Law, thou mine: to know no more is Woman's happiest knowledge, and her praise." ⁷⁶ And Nietzsche had it, "The happiness of Man is, 'I will.' The happiness of Woman is, 'He will.'" ⁷⁷ What it all means is that, inevitably, the lead, direction, rule, authority, are, and must be, left to the male. And this is right—right for just one reason: it is in accord, male and female, with the way we are made. And from that we cannot escape—either male or female.

From time and lands the most remote, the most ancient wisdom Man knows found symbols for this expression of its truth in its recognition of the polar differences between Man and Woman. From time immemorial Man was *sol*, sun, positive, light, fire, intellect, order, action; whereas Woman was *luna*, moon, negative, reflection, shadow, darkness, emotion, chaos, acted upon. They were respectively sky and earth, day and night—opposite charges,⁷⁸ with their differences highly developed and unmistakable, with the resulting electric tension between them strong. Sexual selection takes place best when it is so. This is the way it should be.⁷⁹

May it not be that ancient Woman, as we have seen her in certain cultures of the past, is not "primitive," or Medieval or Oriental Woman, "benighted" Woman, but, after all, just Woman, the well-constituted woman as she really is and always has been, Woman as she would be now if she got over her shame of herself, and recovered her instincts, and really followed her heart? My own observation and study all convince me that it is so. And I see that life shall have most meaning for us, men and women both, as we recognize and respect the differences running through our entire constitution and making us sharply distinct in body, temperament, capacities and function, while yet each of us is proud of his own sex and the part that it plays in the total of human life, in love with his own nature and true to it to the end.

And how significant Woman's part is, and how beautiful and necessary is her nature! Yes, Woman's place is in the home, but how much she will find there will depend entirely upon how much tradition or her own intelligence and insight have put there, and on the measure in which she spends herself in devotion to her children and to her husband. Conceived in its full potentialities, there is no work on Earth that is more important or more holy than Woman's work in the home. As I trust that I have already made amply clear, to this end the economic foundation of the home must be restored, and the home again become a place for all the domestic arts and crafts.⁸⁰ That even so Woman's life in the home would have its hours of weariness and drudgery, as does the creative life of any male, even the most outstanding, I should readily concede. Nevertheless, the home is the very foundation of any society in a state of health, and here Woman is the supreme influence.

Hers is the opportunity to bring into the world children who may be able to reach higher levels than she or her husband did. Hers is the privilege of being the one to make the home the cradle of personality, that most precious thing in the world, the meaning and the aim of millennia of human existence on the Earth. Apart from her, the tendency is toward the creche, the nursery, children cared for in droves, mass production even in children. In mass production and in herds personality does not count, does not appear, is obliterated when it does appear. But it is the mother's instinct and effort (and how often her effort succeeds even under most adverse conditions!) with her love to make for each child a nest, a sheltered place, where it has individual attention. She watches early for the first appearances of little

tender sprouts of capacity, promise of special ability, watches for opportunity to feed these, makes allowances for them, and provides room for them to grow. They have a chance to get rooted, to take some shape, and to become something that the child is conscious of before he has to face the world. Similarly, she helps him to outgrow weaknesses and faults that would prove stumbling-blocks in the way of his success. In the world, on the other hand, in the usual school, in the nursery, wherever in fact the group is a little too large for the individual to get personal attention and wherever love does not create the personal concern (which, after all, none can feel as a mother feels it for her own), the tendency is toward running life into molds, toward the uniformity and conformity that are the very death of personality. It is the mother's privilege, also, to be the one to bring to the unfolding life of her child, adapting it to his age and condition, the spiritual heritage of the race—its great myths, and epics, and art, and music, and something of the wisdom that has come down to us from the great seers.

The Catholic Church says well that if it may have the child through his eighth year, anyone may have him afterwards. Modern psychology places the decisive period even earlier. This means that a child's primary adjustment to life, the fixing of his characteristic way of meeting the world about him, and of going at things, is determined during the years when he is almost entirely in the hands of his mother. In this connection, perhaps it might be well to call to the reader's attention the fact that Mr. Ludovici (who, by the way, considers himself the champion of the true woman against her detractors and poisoners) declares that up to the time of her death his mother was his "best and dearest friend;" and in the entry under his name in the English *Who's Who*, it is stated that he was "educated by his mother." And when the Romans came to erect a monument to the Gracchi, so general was the recognition that the greatness of these heroes could be traced back to the influence of their mother, Cornelia, that they erected a monument also to her.

Such is the field that is open to women as mother. And here it may be pointed out that, after her children are off the nest, there will be all the years left her in which to pursue her personal interests more freely, to release all the intellectually creative powers she may have in her, and to benefit the larger community by the fruit of a life rich not in romantic theory but in actual experience. It would, for instance, mean an enormous advance in our educational institutions if the chits now teaching so many of our classes could be supplanted with seasoned mothers. Indeed, where means make it possible to employ competent and worthy help, some mothers may be able to do many of these things while bearing and rearing large families. And I can see no objection to their doing so *provided* that they always remain true to their primary function as mothers.

But as wife, also, Woman is of the utmost importance. She may not sit on the throne, nor even on a throne beside her husband. The great wife has not cared where she sat, or whether or not she sat at all. Maybe it would have given her joy to kneel before the throne. She has been quite content to be the inconspicuous one, the unnoticed one, and yet how often withal she has been the prepotent power behind the throne. It is a question whether a man can quite bring his life to its finest flower and fruitfulness if he never has known the great love of a woman. I do not mean only that, as his wife, she may be invaluable as his helpmeet, saving his time, guarding his quiet and his solitude, by her tender touch upon him healing him of the wounds that the world has dealt him by its slander and its misrepresentation; in the face

of its indifference and neglect sustaining his own faith in himself and in the worth of his cause by her faith in him, steady as the stars in their courses and boundless as the mighty deep, and by her last look deep into his eyes before he goes out to battle giving him the one thing that he needs to make him fight mightily as a lion. Such a wife keeps a man sweet and sane, and helps to make his powers effective and to last long. Such a wife, I have sometimes thought, might have averted for Nietzsche the mental collapse that too great loneliness and too great strain brought upon him so prematurely, and thus have spared him to complete his great work with calm balance to the end.

All of this a woman may mean to a man, and without any more, it is very much. And yet—I know that there is much more. Already I have tried to say what it is, but it is so important that I should like to say it again, and to dwell on it. There is something about each one of us, Man and Woman alike, that is more than we know, far more than we dream of, let alone understand. And between the sexes there is something electrical, magnetic. And when the right man and woman meet, the effect may be overwhelming, seemingly miraculous and almost past believing. As far as the man is concerned (and it is for the man that I wish to speak now), it is more, I believe, in his love for her than in her love for him. There is a heightening of sensitiveness and consciousness that almost takes him into a world of another dimension. Inwardly he stands transfixed before her, rapt as in a vision, and in the midst a sudden vast fathomless stillness that blots out time and space and the whole creation, and leaves only the two gazing long and long into each other's eyes. And still they gaze, and there is no strain. Her eyes, her entire being, are become for him a window into eternity. Her very flesh has been transmuted and transfigured,⁸¹ and when at length creation returns, and the usual men and things in it, he sees them also transfigured. They all seem to have fresh surfaces, somehow to have been washed clean; or maybe it is he, his interior, his eyes, his inner eyes, that have somehow been washed clean. For inside he is like the sun-lit earth after a long rain. And his breath comes long, and slow, and deep.

And something of this stillness and luminous translucency of all things returns whenever he pauses to gaze into this loved one's eyes . . . and it returns even though he *cannot* gaze into her eyes, even though he and she have been thousands of miles apart for years, whenever he pauses so much as to let the vision of her form rise before him.

And he knows now that sex can be, and is, a symbol. And the living experience of this convinces more than all the philosophy and argument of the Earth that spirit and matter are one; and the fact that he has been *able* to know this experience is a sign and seal that in himself the "marriage of heaven and hell" has taken place. He has become whole. And until a man has won the battle upon which this experience waits, not in his head but in the flesh, until he has emerged from the world of opposites, and passed beyond good and evil, and body and soul, he has not begun, and cannot begin, really to live.

That every woman cannot have this meaning for a man, I admit. Nor are there many men who could receive such an experience. It happens rarely enough nowadays when our emancipated women are to the fore. For the emancipated woman is a woman over-developed on her rational side, and such an experience does not happen where a man and a woman meet primarily on the mental plane. But it has happened, and it happens still, when the right man meets the right woman. I venture to believe that whenever the deep in a true

woman calleth unto the deep in a true man, he experiences some approximation to this experience—some increase in tenderness, some inner expansion and exaltation, some passing out of and beyond himself. And whenever this happens, the man will be more alive, and more potent for all that he must do.

And the woman? What does she get out of it? That, let the woman say, if she cares to. But indeed, is not that a question which true love never asks? All great love, it seems to me, wants only to give, ever spends itself, ever lavishes itself, and takes no thought about any return. The true wife and mother seeks not to spare herself, lest she grow old young. Her joy and her very life are in her devotion. But though she seeks no reward, yet she has it—in her children, in her husband spending himself for society as she spends herself on her family, and in the sense of fulfillment deep in her heart, and in the serenity there, and the peace. Though she says nothing, she knows the secret on the face of Mona Lisa.

1948,1971.

¹ Alexis Cartel said, "Man and Woman are profoundly different. While intimately united, they are separated by an abyss." And he spoke of "the physiological and mental disparities that are the essence of femaleness and maleness." (Art. "Married Love," *Reader's Digest*, July 1939, p. 13. See also his *Man The Unknown*, pp. 89-90.) And the eminent sexologist Iwan Bloch, though regarding himself as a champion of Woman, is even more unequivocal and emphatic. He declares that "the difference between the sexes is the *original cause* of the human sexual life, the primeval preliminary of all human civilization." He maintains that the amount of difference increases not only with advance of evolution but also with advance in civilization. The highest races have been differentiated most. He says further, "The unquestionably existing physical differences between the sexes respectively, correspond without question to existing *psychical* differences. Psychically, also, Man and Woman are completely *different* beings. We must employ the word 'psychical' . . . to relate . . . to the whole spiritual being—the spiritual habitus, emotional character, feelings, and will: we shall then immediately be convinced that masculine and feminine beings differ through and through, that they are heterogeneous, incomparable natures." And he concludes, "Sexual differences are ineradicable; civilization shows an unmistakable tendency to increase them." (See Iwan Bloch—*The Sexual Life Of Our Time*, New York, 1920, pp. 53, 55, 57, 69, 71-77.) He adds (p. 72). "Numerous exact, scientific, ethnological and psychological investigations concerning the sexes, among the most important of which we may mention those of Darwin, Allan, Münsterberg, C. Vogt, Ploss-Bartels, Jastrow, Lombroso, and Ferrero, Shaw, Havelock Ellis, and Helen Bradford Thompson, have confirmed the existence of these differences in the nature of the two sexes. Many individual points still remain obscure, but the above-mentioned sexual difference is everywhere recognizable, and can never be entirely eradicated, even by a higher psychical differentiation . . ." For Havelock Ellis' views, see his *Man And Woman*, London, 1914, p. 18. Cp. pp. xii, xiii. Cp. also C. G. Jung—*Contributions To Analytical Psychology*, Harcourt, 1928, pp. 164, 168-9. Drs. Marynia F. Farnham and Ferdinand Lundberg say: "Men and women are profoundly different, but neither sex is superior or inferior to the other." Art. "Men Have Lost Their Women," *Ladies Home Journal*, Nov., 1944.

Cp. their book *Modern Woman: The Lost Sex*, Harper, 1947—"Women cannot be regarded as any more similar to men than a spiral to a straight line."

² Robert Briffault—*The Mothers*, Macmillan, 1927, Vol. III, p. 508.

³ Brooks Adams—*The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma*, New York, 1919, p. 3.

⁴ Havelock Ellis—*Man And Woman*, London, 5th ed., p. x.

⁵ Conspicuous exceptions to this are the article and the book by Drs. Farnham and Lundberg referred to in Note 1. Both deserve a very wide reading.

⁶ *Harper's Magazine*, August, 1938—especially perhaps pp. 225-6. The following statements are significant:

"I am not a feminist, but I am an individualist. I do not believe that there is any important difference between men and women—certainly not as much as there may be between one woman and another or one man and another. . ." "Americans cannot seem to believe or understand that women—some women, any women, or as I believe, most women—are able to be good wives, ardent lovers, excellent mothers, and yet be themselves too. . ."

"It is evident that she wants women to have a career, some work outside the home, at least a job with its economic independence. She deplors that "the percentage of women in industry and the professions has increased from 14 p.c. only to 22 p.c." She declares, "No home offers scope enough today for the trained energies of an intelligent modern woman. Even children are not enough. She may want them, need them and have them, love them and enjoy them, but they are not enough for her, even during the short time they preoccupy her. Nor is her husband, however dear and congenial, enough for her. He may supply all her needs for human companionship, but there is still more to life than that. She must feel herself growing and becoming more and more complete as an individual, as well as wife and mother, before she can even be a good wife and mother."

⁷ Even Pearl Buck admits this. See her *Of Men and Women*, Day, 1941, p. 83.

⁸ Cp. Lin Yu Tang: "The idea of women trying to ape men in their manners is itself a sign of women's bondage." He then goes on to say: "Let women be proud of their own sex, for only in fulfillment of their sex and its grave responsibilities will they be truly great." *My Country And My People*, Day, 1935, p. 171.

⁹ For a similar understanding of feminism by one who was not an anti-feminist see Albert J. Nock, "A Word to Women," *Atlantic Monthly*, Nov. 1931, p. 549.

¹⁰ See the important article by Alexis Carrel, "Breast Feeding for Babies," *Reader's Digest*, June, 1939, p. 3. This eminent authority declared that "the leaders in medicine . . . are unanimous . . . that no perfect substitute for mother's milk has been found . . . that almost every woman is capable of nursing her young." He asserted that in suppressing breast-feeding "White women show still less intelligence than did Chinese women when they

prevented the normal growth of their feet." Yet "seven out of ten babies in maternity hospitals are weaned within two weeks." And as I recall either A. M. Ludovici in his *Truth About Childbirth* or Dr. Weston A. Price in his *Nutrition And Physical Degeneration* (at the moment I cannot check which) gave impressive evidence that breast-feeding was essential for optimum formation of a baby's dental arches.

¹¹ S. J. Holmes—*Studies In Evolution And Genetics*, New York, 1923, pp. 117-8. In his *Human Genetics and Its Social Imports*, McGraw, 1936, p. 197, he says, "The liability of a woman to conceive falls off rather rapidly with increase of age at marriage. Galton has estimated the fertility of women marrying at ages 17, 22, 27, and 32 as roughly in the ratio of 6, 5, 4, and 3 respectively. Any increase of the average age at marriage, therefore, would have a potent effect in lowering the birth rate."

¹² Alexis Carrel, op. cit., p. 299; Brooks Adams, op. cit., pp. 3-5, 111, 118; Ellsworth Huntington—*Builders Of America*, New York, 1927, pp. 145-9; and Anthony M. Ludovici—throughout his works.

¹³ Knight Dunlap—*Personal Beauty And Racial Betterment*, St. Louis, 1920, p. 27.

¹⁴ Ananda D. Coomaraswasny—*The Dance Of Siva*, New York, 1924, p. 99.

¹⁵ Brooks Adams—op. cit., p. 111.

¹⁶ Walt Whitman—*Leaves Of Grass*, Doubleday, 1928, p. 190.

¹⁷ Alexis Carrel—*Man The Unknown*, Harper, 1935, p. 266.

¹⁸ Ira S. Wile, M.D.—*Sex Life of the Unmarried Adult*, Vanguard, 1934, P. 39.

¹⁹ Friedrich Nietzsche—*Thus Spake Zarathustra*, authorized ed., London, p. 75.

²⁰ Alexis Carrel, op. cit., p. 92. Similarly Dr. Frederick J. McCann, Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, Senior Surgeon to the Samaritan Free Hospital for Women, and consulting gynaecologist to the West End Hospital for Diseases of the Nervous System (both hospitals in London), declares that "in pregnancy a woman attains her full physiological consumption, while the lack of this attainment favours the development of pathological changes in her sex organs." See his *Effect Of Contraceptive Practises on the Female Sexual Organs*, Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent, London, undated.

²¹ Anthony M. Ludovici—*The Truth about Childbirth*, Dutton, 1938.

²² See *Medical Views on Birth Control*, edited by Sir James Marchant, London, 1926, chapter by Dr. A. E. Giles, M.D., B.Sc., F.R.C.S., particularly pp. 87-8. As early as 1906, David Heron announced that "cancer alone of the undesirable physical conditions dealt with so far seems more prevalent in the prosperous and cultured districts and to be associated with a lower birth rate." David Heron—*On the Relation of Fertility in Man to Social Status*, London, 1906, p. 21.

- ²³ *Report On Public Health And Medical Subjects, "Cancer of the Breast,"* No. 32, pp. 131-2.
- ²⁴ *Statistical Review*, 1921, pp. 68-9.
- ²⁵ *Statistical Review*, 1921, p. 70.
- ²⁶ Hastings Gilford—*Tumors And Cancers*, London, 1925, pp. 382-4.
- ²⁷ A.M. Ludovici, op. cit., p. 115.
- ²⁸ Frederick McCann, op. cit. p. 14.
- ²⁹ *Statistical Review*, 1921, 70.
- ³⁰ A.M. Ludovici, Ludovici: *Truth About Childbirth*, p. 115f.
- ³¹ A.M. Ludovici, *ibid.*, p. 117ff—for evidence of this.
- ³² Cp. Havelock Ellis, op. cit., 5th ed., p. xi: "The sexes do not play their part in life by their freedom to imitate each other, even though they are entitled to possess that freedom, but by liberating their own native impulses, and in that way building up a richer and more joyous civilization than can ever be founded on the instincts of one sex alone."
- ³³ Lin Yu Tang, op. cit., p. 145.
- ³⁴ James H. Breasted—*History Of Egypt*, Scribner, 1912, p. 85.
- ³⁵ Paul Brandt—*Sexual Life In Ancient Greece*, London, 1932, pp. 18-9, 31.
- ³⁶ *Lacus Of Manu*, trans. by G. Buehler, Vol. XXV, *Sacred Books of the East*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1886, pp. 56-7, being Chapter ii, Section 145.
- ³⁷ *Mahabharata*, Book xiii, 105, 14. Cp. i, 196; xii, 342.18. Cited by Johannes Meyer—*Sexual Life In Ancient India*, Putnam, 1930, pp. 199, 204. But cp. xii, 297.2.
- ³⁸ Johannes Meyer, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 341-3.
- ³⁹ Johannes Meyer, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 486.
- ⁴⁰ Jean Temple—*Blue Ghost*, New York, 1931, p. 152.
- ⁴¹ Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, op. cit., p. 90.
- ⁴² I shall have more to say about this later. Now I will only quote a sentence or two from Havelock Ellis. Iwan Bloch (op. cit., p. 72) declares that Ellis' *Man And Woman* forms the foundation for later researches into "the Psychological differences between the sexes," and quotes him as saying on p. 21 of this work, "As long as women are distinguished from men

by primary sexual characters—as long, that is to say, as they conceive and bear—so long will they remain unequal to men in the highest Psychological processes.” I was unable to find this sentence on p. 21 or any other page of any edition of this work on which I could lay my hands, but a statement very similar in content, appearing on page 18 of every edition except the earliest, where it occurs on page 17, reads as follows: “So long as women are unlike in the primary sexual characters and in reproductive function they can never be absolutely alike even in the highest psychic processes.” Cp. Carl G. Jung, *op cit.*, pp. 169-170: “But no one can evade the fact that, in taking up a masculine calling, studying, and working in a man’s way, Woman is doing something not wholly in agreement with, if not directly injurious to, her feminine nature. . . . When I speak of injury, I do not mean physiological merely, but above all psychic injury. It is a woman’s outstanding characteristic that she can do everything for the love of a man. But those women who can achieve something important for the love of a thing are exceptional, because this does not really agree with their nature. The love of a thing is man’s prerogative.” A man should live as a man, and a woman as a woman.

⁴³ Friedrich Nietzsche—*Thus Spake Zarathustra*, authorized edition, p. 205.

⁴⁴ Cp. Anthony M. Ludovici—*Man An Indictment*, Constable, London, 1927, pp. xv, xvii, 138, 337.

⁴⁵ Isadora Duncan—*My Life*, New York, 1927, p. 196. Cp. Alexis Carrel in *Reader’s Digest*, June, 1939, pp. 6-7: Many women “do not understand that their primary duty is motherhood. Some years ago, a young mother pitied herself in *Parent’s Magazine* because doctors did not consider the price of breast milk ‘in terms of her own time and energy!’ No one has ever lamented about the infinite amount of time and energy spent in producing a masterpiece in art, science, engineering, or any other activity. No mother should complain of her hardships. Is not a healthy child the supreme masterpiece?”

⁴⁶ Arabella Keneally—*Feminism And Sex Extinction*, London, 1920, pp. 211-2.

⁴⁷ Cp. Johannes Meyer, *op. cit.*, 146, 155-6.

⁴⁸ Friedrich Nietzsche, *op cit.*, p. 75.

⁴⁹ Johannes Meyer, *op cit.*, Vol. I, p. 205.

⁵⁰ Schmalhausen’s “great discovery . . . that Woman wants sex love as men want it. . .” and “positively prefers to be sweetheart and mistress rather than wife and mother” (see V.F. Calverton and Samuel D. Schmalhausen—*Sex And Civilization*, New York, 1928, p. 406) it is simply impossible to take seriously. What would happen to the race if many women really did prefer sex *without motherhood*? One cannot believe that Nature, always so careful to provide amply for the perpetuation of the species, ever made the instinct of the human female so opposed to life at this point. Insofar as women can be found who actually do “want sex love *as men want it*,” i.e., women whose sexual impulse drives primarily and almost solely toward intercourse, they must surely be exceptional, and they must be looked upon as examples of perversion and as another sign of the degeneracy of this age. To attempt to

equate men and women in their sexuality is surely the extreme limit of folly to which feminism can carry its devotees.

⁵¹ Dr. Frederick J. McCann, the distinguished gynaecologist already quoted (see Note 20) says, "It is common knowledge that many women enjoy better health during pregnancy, and that after normal pregnancy this improvement is not only maintained but even increased indeed, to many women normal pregnancy brings the most rapid and efficient restoration to health that is known to science." And then, in reply to the largely feminist outcry about evils of "excessive child-bearing," he adds: "The proportion of such women [as have "a child every year"] in the female population is small, and even if it were not, it would not prove that pregnancy should be injurious to a woman. There is no reason why pregnancy or repeated pregnancy should be injurious to Woman if she has, as she should have, the advantages of efficient medical attendance. To say that a woman is exhausted by repeated child-bearing and therefore should prevent pregnancy is absurd, for if a woman be really exhausted by repeated child-bearing she ceases to bear children." And he says further, "It is well known that many women live to a ripe old age who have given birth to a large number of children. Thus to regard pregnancy, or still more repeated pregnancy, as a disease, is not only physiologically unsound, but is untrue. Pregnancy is a woman's greatest physiological function." "The metabolic changes and especially the effect on the internal secretions inaugurated by normal sexual union are maintained and perfected during pregnancy. The enlargement of the thyroid noted after sexual union, is continued and increased during pregnancy. Thus, although one pregnancy does tend to produce a more perfect correlation of the endocrine glands, yet this correlation may only be achieved after repeated pregnancy." Op. cit., pp. 13-14. Cp. Alexis Carrel—*Man The Unknown*, p. 92. Cp. "Fifteen Babies Aren't Enough" by Winifred D. Klosterman, *Reader's Digest*, Feb. 1947, p. 35ff. This article begins: "In 30 years of happy married life I have borne 16 children, none of them twins, and I haven't a grey hair in my head. Fifteen are living as charming and brilliant children as you could find. Every one is in perfect physical condition: there isn't a problem child among them. My nine girls and six boys are popular, they earn athletic and scholastic honors, the older ones have good jobs, four are happily married." It ends, "When I try to think of the things I have done for my children, I find myself thinking only of what they have done for me. I wish I had a dozen more like them—well, anyway, *one* more." And I may note here the account of a classmate of mine who spent eleven years in Mexico as a missionary, of a woman of the landed class there who, after bearing twenty-three children, was still at the age of 60 odd years, healthy, vivacious, and charming.

⁵² A. M. Ludovici—*Woman, A Vindication*, Knopf, 1925, p. 39.

⁵³ See Anthony M. Ludovici—*The Night-Hoers, or The Case against Birth Control and an Alternative*, London, 1928, especially p. 99ff. This is the completest and strongest case against the use of contraceptives that I know of, in print, though from my own point of view it needs to be supplemented somewhat. It is without any theological or ecclesiastical bias whatever.

⁵⁴ Iwan Bloch, op. cit., Chs. iv and v. Bloch, as citations in Note 1 have already shown, is very emphatic on this point. He declares that "Man and Woman are completely *different* beings" with "heterogeneous, incomparable natures." Pp. 89-90.

- ⁵⁵ August Forel—*The Sexual Question*, New York, 1925, Ch. iv. "The Sexual Appetite."
- ⁵⁶ Havelock, op. cit., 5th ed., pp. xii, xiii: ". . . We are beginning to learn that a woman is a woman because of her internal secretions . . . These secretions, which are many and emanate from various parts of the body, necessarily have different and even opposed functions in the two sexes." And he declares, on page x, that "Men and women are at every point different and at all points equivalent." See also Bloch's summary of the conclusions that Ellis reached from "a searching investigation into the nature of the sexual impulse in women." Op. cit., pp. 84-5.
- ⁵⁷ Anthony M. Ludovici—*Woman, A Vindication*, Knopf, 1928, pp. 79-81.
- ⁵⁸ For a contrary opinion on this see Knight Dunlap, op. cit., pp. 23-5.
- ⁵⁹ G. V. Hamilton and Kenneth McGowan: *What Is Wrong With Marriage*, New York, 1929, P. 80.
- ⁶⁰ J. J. Meyer, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 136; Vol. II, p. 500.
- ⁶¹ J. J. Meyer, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 227.
- ⁶² Quoted by J. J. Meyer, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 134-5.
- ⁶³ *Laus Of Manu*, op. cit., Ch. IX, pp. 2-3.
- ⁶⁴ I. Bloch, op. cit., pp. 55-6.
- ⁶⁵ Havelock Ellis, op. cit., p. 18.
- ⁶⁶ In support of this psychic difference between Man and Woman, see I. Bloch, op. cit., p. 71ff. He starts off by saying, "There can be no possible doubt that psychically Woman is a different creature from Man." On p. 69 he says "completely different." Especially pertinent as regards creativeness is the following: "In respect of *artistic endowment* the male sex is unquestionably superior to the female. . . Without doubt the differences in sexuality are the principal causes of this deficiency. The impetuous, aggressive character of the male sexual impulse also favours poetic endeavours, the transformation of sexual energy into higher plastic activity, as it fulfils itself in the moments of most exalted artistic conception. The greater variability of the male also serves to explain the greater frequency of male artists of the first rank." P. 75-6. Cp. Ludovici—*Man An Indictment*, London, 1927, Ch. II. See also Ch. 1.
- ⁶⁷ Alexis Carrel—*Man The Unknown*, p. 90.
- ⁶⁸ Robert Briffault—*The Mothers, The Matriarchal Theory of Social Origins*, Macmillan, 1931, pp. 189-190. Note that this is a different work from *The Mothers*.

“No labour of any kind is, in primitive society, other than voluntary, and no toil is ever undertaken by the women in obedience to an arbitrary order. The fanciful opinion that women are suppressed in savage societies was partly due to the complacency of civilized Man, and partly to the fact that the women are seen to work hard. Wherever women were seen engaged in laborious toil, their status was judged to be one of slavery and oppression. No misunderstanding could be more profound. Although the primitive division of labour between the sexes may throw the most continuous and onerous tasks upon the women, it is precisely that fact which excludes the possibility of masculine supremacy as it exists in patriarchal society. The state of things is the exact reverse; so long as Woman remained economically productive it was impossible for complete patriarchal supremacy to become established. The primitive woman is independent because, not in spite of, her labour.”

⁶⁹ Sir James Frazer—*Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, 2nd ed., 1907, being Part IV of the 3rd edition of *The Golden Bough*, pp. 390-1 Cp. Richard Wilhelm—*A Short History of Chinese Civilization*, Harrap, 1929, p. 79.

⁷⁰ Robert Biffault—*The Mothers*, 1927.

⁷¹ Robert Biffault—*The Mothers, The Matriarchal Theory of Social Origins*, 1931, p. 313f.

⁷² Robert Biffault—*The Mothers, The Matriarchal Theory of Social Origins*, p. 179ff. The full text should be read. I can quote only the following:

“‘Matriarchy’ literally means ‘rule by the mother,’ in the same manner as ‘patriarchy’ means ‘rule by the father,’ and suggests therefore that in a matriarchal type of society the women exercise a domination over the men similar or equivalent to that exercised by the men over the women in a patriarchal social order, the two types social organization thus differing merely in the sex which wields dominant power . . .

“But the constitution of matriarchal societies is not a matter of the domination of one sex over the other. It is convenient to use the term ‘matriarch’ which is established by usage, and although it is open to objection . . . But the domination or rule is no more the foundation of matriarchally constituted society, than ‘right,’ or the practice of matrilinear reckoning. In point of fact there is nothing in the lower phase of culture corresponding to the domination of one sex over the other which characterises patriarchal societies. There is nothing in the most primitive societies equivalent to the domination which, in advanced societies, is exercised by individuals, by classes, by rulers. The lower cultures are nothing if not equalitarian. The notion of domination is entirely foreign to primitive humanity; the conception of authority is simply not understood. The notion of privileged right has no place and no existence at those phases of culture. . .”

⁷³ Robert Biffault—*The Mothers*, p. 508—

“The inheritance which primitive society handed down is profoundly irrational. There was, in those conditions, none of the predominance of masculine intellectual qualities which marks the products of civilization. The division and distribution of labour afforded no room for the detached and leisured thinker or for the differentiated specialist; abstract conceptions

and generalizations could have no place where every relation of life was concrete. On a common level, the respective contributions of men and women to the growth of the social and traditional inheritance were not distinguished by any superior quality in the former. It was, on the contrary, from the women's sphere of interest and activity that the group mind derived its chief stimulus; it was by these that its features and contents were molded. . . The material conditions of culture were not the outcome of . . . masculine activity, but were mainly the achievements of women; they were not the products of organised industry and male labour, but of the home-building and household avocations of women. Social organisation itself . . . was the expression of the feminine functions. These social sentiments, without which no aggregate of individuals can constitute a society, were the immediate derivatives of these, and of these alone. Upon them the superstructure of humanity, and the powers and possibilities of its development, ultimately rest."

⁷⁴ Robert Briffault—*The Mothers*, pp. 507-8:

"Civilisation, as it presents itself in humanity's power of control over nature and over its own social conditions in the higher forms of knowledge and of culture, in the gradual elimination of errors and abuses, has developed within a relatively short period of time. Those achievements have been brought about chiefly, if not exclusively, through the operation of man's rational faculty. . . That process which has raised civilized humanity above savagery is fundamentally an intellectual process. It has been rendered possible by conditions that have bestowed security and leisure upon favoured classes and emancipated them from the hand-to-mouth organic struggle. These achievements which constitute what, in the best sense we term civilization, have taken place in societies organized on patriarchal principles. They are for the most part the work of men. Women have had very little direct share in them.

"Women are constitutionally deficient in the qualities that mark the masculine intellect. Where all values are relative, it is as irrelevant as it is invidious to speak of superiority and inferiority. Feminine differs from masculine intelligence in kind; it is concrete, not abstract; particularising, not generalising. The critical, analytical, and detached creative powers of the intellect are less developed in women than in men. That character arises in all probability from the subordination and sacrifice to maternal functions which limits the physical growth of the mammalian female. Women are more precocious than men, their maturing is reached earlier. There is in their growth the arrest of development, physical and mental, which goes with relative precocity. It has been said that a man learns nothing after forty; it may be said in the same broad sense that a woman learns nothing after twenty-five. At that age, when a man is often setting out on his career of intellectual advance and discipline, most women's intellectual outlook has been formed. Hence the innate conservatism of the feminine mind. The prolonged adaptability which constitutes the intellectual advantage of men in progressive societies is opposed to the natural constitution of women. The social conditions of settled material culture have not only enabled men to take over the productive work formerly carried out by female labour, and afforded to leisured ruling classes the opportunity of detaching themselves from the material struggle; they have opened the way for the exercise by men of their advantage over women. The intellectual structure of the higher forms of culture and organisation which constitute civilisation are masculine products, and are marked by the qualities and characteristics of the masculine intellect."

⁷⁵ D. H. Lawrence—*Assorted Artides*, London, 1932, pp. 37, 39.

⁷⁶ John Milton—*Paradise Lost*, Book IV, lines 299, 440, 635-8.

⁷⁷ Friedrich Nietzsche—*Thus Spake Zarathustra*, Chapter xviii.

⁷⁸ Elizabeth E. Goldsmith—*Life Symbols as Related to Sex Symbolism*, Putnam, 1924, pp. 16-7, 34,64.

⁷⁹ I do not forget that, according to genetics and psychology, the male is not all male, nor the female all female; the male has in him certain female qualities, and the female certain qualities of the male. Nevertheless, it is a healthy instinct that makes us recoil as from something unsound and unwholesome when we see a man who is womanish in voice or manner or movement, and likewise from a woman who has the look, the dress, the hardness and the self-assertiveness of the male. We instinctively dislike any person in whom maleness and femaleness are too nearly in a state of equal balance. The scale should always be loaded down positively with the male for men or with the female for women.

⁸⁰ For very constructive thought and emphasis on this see *The Interpreter*, edited by Ralph Borsodi, Brookville, Ohio. See also his *Flight From The City*.

⁸¹ Nietzsche saw this, and said it. See his *Will To Power*, auth. ed., 1924, Vol. II, p. 418: "It is probable that, in such perfect and well-constituted men [those who are whole], the most sensual functions are finally transfigured by a symbolic elatedness of the highest intellectuality; in themselves they feel a kind of deification of the body."

Chapter 13.

Woman and Marriage.

Forever should the mother with her child be for us the most moving of pictures, and a symbol that holds before us the perpetuation of humanity, the loving linking together of the successive generations, in the highest glorification. This ideal it is, which my brother viewed with the tenderest veneration and treated with the greatest reverence. He regarded it as a very grave danger if, as now appears to be the case, this ideal of the mother with her child, were no longer looked upon as the highest. He thought that with the present direction which the women's movement has taken, emphasis is laid so strongly upon the individual personality, with what is often its petty self-seeking and love of comfort, that no one thinks to answer the question: What drawbacks for the human race does the movement entail? He feared that under the influence of the unmarried, who usually stand at the head of the emancipation movement, an ideal might arise that would be damaging to the propagation and higher development of humanity and that thereby precisely the best women, the bravest and most high-souled, would come to look upon marriage with disgust.¹

Elizabeth Forster-Nietzsche: *The Lonely Nietzsche*.

I should like now to invite my readers' attention to the question of marriage. It will not, however, be marriage considered fully and from all sides, but rather those aspects of it that I think are of special importance for an understanding of woman, or for her best good, or for the most satisfactory fulfillment of her duty to the race. Inevitably, therefore, it will be marriage chiefly from the point of view of the female, but I believe that much I have to say will have meaning for both sexes.

For women the man is a means, the end is the child. And the child is the purpose of marriage. In the Orient, the social function of marriage has always been primary, and in this it has been wiser than the West, at least wiser than the West of the modern era. The primary purpose of marriage, certainly from the point of view of society, is to bring children into the world, and especially superior children—children endowed with higher capacities than those of their parents. And young people themselves should focus less of their expectation on marriage as romance. It never was intended to be only the means by which two people, lost in each other, should find happiness. They should never have been encouraged, or allowed, to think it was this. Marriage may prove a gateway to heaven, or it may not. Certainly it will not be *all* heaven. Bringing children into the world and rearing them properly is an arduous undertaking, and a heavy responsibility. It calls for intelligence, knowledge, training, and many of the virtues: notably devotion, patience, capacity for faithful and hard labor through long years, and much self-forgetting. As such, people should approach it with consecration, like that of a knight, or one taking holy orders.

Moreover, if the primary and most sacred purpose of marriage, the purpose of marriage for all noble and intelligent men and women except perhaps a rather exceptional few, is to bring

into the world superior children, as superior as possible, then it follows inevitably that eugenic considerations must be of the utmost importance. Scientific evidence, very largely that supplied by genetics, now makes it certain that both capacities and defects run in families, and that the lives of children are shaped more—even much more—by their heredity than by environment. Marriage must now be looked upon as essentially a matter of *bringing together two family stocks*. What has to be thoroughly examined, therefore, is not merely the specimens of humanity who propose to do the marrying, but the entire family background and record of each one, as far back as it can be ascertained. And no amount of love or “spiritual unity” between them should be allowed to sanction any marriage from which children are to be expected if their ancestries betray serious hereditary defects, weaknesses, or abnormalities of body or mind, or even—some would say—capacities and traits in the two records that are widely different. Marriage, to be justified, if it is to lead to children, must at the least have a sound physical and hereditary basis.

But of course such precautions, essential though I do hold them to be, can never of themselves be enough to ensure what I should consider a great and beautiful marriage. For the realization of this, the man and the woman must bring to their marriage, or in their marriage develop, certain emotional and spiritual qualities. These are even more essential than a rich intellectual endowment. There must be deep love between them, and mutual reverence, and—more important than agreement in ideas—their lives must be shaped by the same values and aims. The touch of each on the other must be quickening, vitalizing, exalting. And when it is so, then does their very sexual relationship cease to be an end in itself and become a symbol of the unity that they have found together, at once holy and hallowing. No matter how well the prospective mates may meet all the requirements as regards ancestry and the like, their marriage can hardly be expected to become one of the most beautiful and life-releasing unless they have found spiritual unity, or feel confident that they can grow into it in the course of time.

But here, too, let me confess my doubt whether “marrying for love” can be accepted as a reliable guide in this direction. When two young people are “in love,” are they not commonly so swept away in a flood of emotion that they are unable to make a sound appraisal of realities, or perhaps even to see them? The wart on the end of our loved one’s nose may then be glorified into a thing of beauty. Would not mates commonly be chosen more wisely, certainly from the point of view of eugenics and even from that of personal happiness, if a larger part in their choice were left to the parents, who are older, more experienced, more objective in their point of view, calmer and more realistic in their perception? They would *see* the wart—and other things. Perhaps couples coming together thus would often be less “in love” when they married than is commonly the case among us now, but might not their love last longer? Indeed, if young people were more often thus soundly mated, might not their love for one another be expected to grow deeper with the passing of the years? And, for myself, I like it best when there is only one marriage, lifelong, and when old age finds a couple nearer together at the end than they were at the beginning. Maybe then it would be more commonly a matter of *coming* to love each other. But nothing can last if sound foundation for it be lacking. The impression that I get from competent and seemingly unbiased observers is that marriages in the Orient, which are entered into more in this fashion than is customary with us, are not less happy. And certainly they are more stable. And they create a stabler social structure.

Above all, marriages entered upon thus would be more likely to produce desirable children. And, in all marrying, this is the consideration that we should strive to keep uppermost. Personal happiness should be subordinated to it, and when necessary, even be sacrificed to it. In support of the whole idea of giving parents a larger part in determining the selection of mates, Ellsworth Huntington said: "In an earlier stage of society the parents arranged the marriages. . . The eugenic effect of the old system appears to have been excellent. It tended to insure the marriage of all the young people of the better classes at an early age. It likewise promoted the union of families of similar grade, so that good stock was in less danger than at present of being diluted by poor." ² I am not urging that parents should do *all* the arranging, but certainly they should have a larger and accepted part in it. Perhaps the very legality of the marriage should depend upon its having their approval. At times, this would doubtless involve great hardship. But no system can be devised that will not at times press heavily upon someone. The best that we can do is to find a system that will most surely conduce to the increase of quality of life among us, and then pay the price of it loyally.

And, lest it seem to some of my readers that I am making the requirements for marriage too mechanical and rigid, and dismissing too lightly the happiness and contentment of the individual men and women who must decide whether or not to marry or whom to marry, let me point out several facts that may relieve this misgiving.

First of all, it is to be noted that if young people, and more especially the young people of our superior stocks, were brought up with a fairly definite idea of the sort of mate that sound eugenic considerations would in their case prescribe, it would generally determine the kind of man or woman they would look upon with admiration, and, as a rule, prevent their falling in love with any person quite unsuited. As a young friend of mine put it some years ago, he found that he tended to love the kind of girl who fitted the picture he had long had in his mind. In any case, if it did not have so positive an effect as this, a knowledge of the eugenic requirements would at least set limits, negatively, within which alone one would permit a love relationship to go so far as marriage.

But more than this, I recognize, and readily allow, that the difficulties and riskiness of a marital venture tend to increase with advance in the mental and spiritual development of the parties involved. It is one thing, and a comparatively easy thing, for a man and a woman of the peasant or laborer type to find satisfaction in marriage. Their rather lumpish natures can settle down side by side and without difficulty find their simple needs and desires satisfied. But a man or woman of highly developed personality has a sensitivity and bristles with points and angles of taste, conviction and imperious drive that make it exceedingly difficult to mesh his or her life comfortably and happily with the life of another. To some extent, the difficulty can be met by having the woman married early, while she is still plastic, to a man perhaps ten years her senior. She will then tend to learn from him, and to shape her life to fit into his. But even so, marriage will continue to be more of a gamble for those of the highly differentiated development that goes with personality and culture.

But even with all this granted, we must go on to acknowledge that more room for the relations of the sexes *is* needed, and *must be provided*. There has been too much effort to force them into one rigid, standardized mold. This situation probably had its origin, as does the difficulty of correcting it, in the widely diffused feeling that sex is at best a necessary evil, to

which our concessions should be reduced to a minimum, and in the further fact that our fetish of equality tends to lump all people together without any recognition of the diversity of psychological types and of sexual need that obtains throughout a population. On the one hand, we have saints and sages, like St. Francis and Nietzsche, who, at least in the creative period of their lives, seem to have required no overt sexual expression whatever. On the other hand, I think of the wife of a friend of mine who confided to an elderly lady of my acquaintance, that no one man could ever satisfy her.

And from observation and from the reading of biography, one gets the impression that there must be a considerable proportion of people, both married and unmarried, both men and women, though I suppose chiefly men and chiefly the unmarried, who apparently are unable, or perhaps are simply unwilling to try, to keep their sexual lives in the channels prescribed by convention. To a large extent, they are anything but depraved or vicious. Often they are people of the creative type: poets, painters, musicians, and the like. Men such as Burns, Tolstoy, Goethe, Heine, Shelley, Beethoven, and Walt Whitman must immediately come to the minds of all of us. And often their sexual relations, though frowned upon by society, are in themselves more beautiful than those of most duly married husbands and wives. Why should we not remove the stigma from such relationships and make room for them? We recognize our indebtedness to the creators for the art and thought with which they enrich our lives. Why should we so quickly forget that the freedom from conflicting responsibility that they require, in order to fulfill their creative impulses, often makes marriage impossible; and that the very energy that enables them to create, not uncommonly presses upon them a sexual need that cannot be kept within bounds? It is important to safeguard the essential features of our monogamous family system, yes, as I shall be at some pains to point out later, but I doubt that our whole institution would be in danger of collapse if we allowed that there were some people, often among our most valuable, whose nature or whose circumstances were not such as to enable them to come under its protection and to meet its requirements and responsibilities. We might do well to remember that the ancient Hindus had different *kinds* of marriage, and recognized different *purposes* in sexual relationships.³ While holding to the monogamous norm, they allowed exceptions. It was perfectly permissible, for instance, and I understand it still is, for a married woman, unblest with children, to go to a *rishi* (a Hindu holy sage) with the request that he impregnate her. There was the effort to see that each normal man and woman had the degree of sexual opportunity essential to health or to taking his or her part in the total task of perpetuating the species. In general, they allowed the largest amount of privilege to the more highly developed members of the upper classes. Apparently, a similar condition obtained in ancient China.⁴

From some quarters we are being reminded that our own early Celtic ancestors, Scottish and Irish, had a form of trial marriage, which could be terminated at the end of a year if it proved childless or for other reasons unsatisfactory. On the strength of such examples, it is being urged that it might actually conduce to the durability of our monogamous marriage today if we also allowed couples in the upper levels of our social strata, or perhaps in all levels, and where it was desired by both parties, to make their initial marriage contract for one year only. There would need to be an agreement about the support and rearing of the child, if there should be any. At the end of the year, if there were no pregnancy, the contract could either be terminated or confirmed for life, and duly hallowed as in our present marriage ceremony.⁵

This would give one's choice of a mate a basis in experience that is now commonly lacking, and that might help to make the final marriage more lasting.

But I confess that I am not prepared to advocate such an arrangement, and have brought myself to mention it only with hesitation. I cannot forget Dr. Arabella Keneally's conviction that every woman's soul remains indelibly imprinted with the memory of the first man to whom she completely gives herself. If she is right in this—and I think that she is, and if a woman's first sexual experience is with a man whom she does not really love, must not such a memory tend to come between her and any other man to whom she may afterwards wish to give herself, and thus prove an element of instability in what she would like to make her real marriage? Also, though it might work well enough for some women, especially those who were lacking in sensitiveness and idealism, I am very much afraid that, at least in an age of decadence like ours, cynicism and irresponsibility would often turn it into gross abuse. But the divorce rate among us has become so excessive, and indeed alarming, that almost any expedient must be given consideration that holds out reasonable hope of reducing it. Those who have made any study of broken homes must realize how grave a disturbance is commonly inflicted upon children when one of the parents moves out of the home. But I myself should be inclined to place supreme emphasis and rest my best hopes on taking the time and making the utmost effort to ensure that a man and a woman are right for each other and for their common task in the first place, and then making divorce allowable only in extreme or exceptional circumstances. But in any case and regardless of the various pros and cons of our discussion so far, let us keep to what after all is our main point. We must ever keep alive, and now as perhaps never before deepen, our consciousness that *marriage is our breeding institution*. And by what we breed we shall live or we shall die—as a nation and as a race. Even the quantity of our children, the average number per marriage, can be decisive. But everything hinges supremely on their quality. Without this there can be no escape from decay, disintegration, and ultimately death.

And with *this* eugenics comes into its own—as we shall see in due course.

At present, the shabbiest and worst elements in our stock are outbreeding our best. On average, the higher you go among those who have proved their intellectual caliber and their character, the smaller is the number of their children. This was brought to public attention at least fifty or sixty years ago. For the last couple of decades, Dr. Elmer Pendell has been pointing out that those who create social problems and burdens, those who are a problem by their very existence, are multiplying faster than those who alone can solve the problems. Yet our best stocks, instead of buckling down to having children in the needed number, have been led by scares of a world shortage of food into having only one or two, and are leaving it to all kinds of half-breeds and morons to have children by the half-dozen—even though most of them may be illegitimate and all of them become a charge on society. And this situation became confirmed and established among us by the absurd and utterly false notion that we are all equal, and that the having of children is every man and woman's inborn right.⁶

This idea has got to be scotched. It must be superseded by a universal recognition that the having of children is a *privilege*, and that the number of children permitted to any couple must always be adjusted to solid evidence as to the kind of children they can reasonably be expected to produce—evidence supplied by IQ tests, actual performance in school and in

life, and by the records of their families before them. The permission granted will range from "none" to "no limit." Those at the bottom of the scale will be granted a license to marry only on condition that they first submit to sterilization, which will make reproduction permanently impossible. Those a little higher will be allowed, say, one or two children, on average not enough to perpetuate their kind. And if they exceed the limit set, they will by law have to submit to sterilization, in order to bring their reproduction to a stop at that point. On the other hand, at the upper end of the scale, couples will not only be permitted to have children "without limit," but, if needed, will even be encouraged by subsidies to have children in the largest number possible. Already for generations, there has been a deadly atavistic trend among us toward undifferentiated mass-man, toward the preponderance and the predominance of those with the mind of the caveman. We have been hastening not only toward cultural suicide, but—vastly more ominous—toward national and racial suicide. If it is not reversed, we as a people shall die—and our civilization will die with us.

Thus fearfully does our destiny and our fate hinge on what we make of marriage as our breeding institution. We have now reached the point in our discussion where we must face the question, as difficult as it is important, of standards and practical criteria by which one may be guided toward the wise selection of a mate. What I have said about the necessity of a sound physical basis, in this and in my last chapter, I believe to be fundamental, but thus far it has been too general. We need at least to look into such questions as age at marriage, bodily evidence by which desirability or undesirability may be detected, and the like.

In this connection, I must remind you of what I already have said in Chapter IX about Mr. Ludovici's *The Choice of a Mate*.⁷ On this whole question, I know no other single book that even approaches it. Because of the fact that he had reason to anticipate opposition, the book is heavily loaded with controversial matter and footnotes. For the serious student, both are of the greatest value, but as there is acute need to have his point of view spread widely and take root firmly, especially among young people and their educators. I was long in great hope that eventually an abridgment would be published that would be somewhat easier to read, and yet give all the fundamental conclusions to which Mr. Ludovici was led by his very able and exhaustive research, and by his unusual insight and elevated point of view.

It may be objected by some that these conclusions too largely deal with the physical side of the problem. But if one believes, as I do, that we know nothing about spirit apart from the body, or about body apart from the spirit, that the state of the body has its effect on the spirit and that the quality of our mind and spirit betrays itself in physical marks and lineaments, that we are psycho-physical unities, then it is difficult to maintain this objection.

In any case, it is a matter of historic record that people among whom a feeling for quality of life was dominant, people with an aristocratic point of view, gave full recognition to the importance of physical marks as evidence of physical, mental, and spiritual health, soundness, and capacity. Ludovici, citing Dr. G. J. Witkowski,⁸ says that "before Henrietta Maria was finally chosen for Charles I [King of England], she was stripped and examined by a commission of English ladies to decide her fitness for motherhood." And he adds that "according to Froissart this was a common practice on the Continent during the Middle Ages and later."⁹ It is interesting that Sir Thomas Moore advocated it in his *Utopia*, and that Plato laid down a similar requirement in his *Latus* (VI, 771).¹⁰ No one needs to be reminded

of the place given to beauty among the ancient Greeks as long as they preserved their aristocracies; and those who remember their *Iliad* and *Odyssey* must recall in what words beautiful women are there pictured. Of the women of Thebes, which of all the Greek cities had retained the strongest Nordic strain, Sophocles said: "They are, through their height, their walk and their movements the most perfect of all the women in Greece."¹¹ Like all the gods and goddesses and heroes and heroines in Homer, they are tall, blue-eyed blonds, who were doubtless admired for the same reasons as the heroes and heroines in a Viking saga of pre-Christian Norway or Iceland. And, to turn to another people, Leviticus XXI: 16-24 records what was believed to be a divine decree that no man should be admitted to the priesthood "that hath any blemish (v. 17)," and gives a fairly long and specific list of what some of these blemishes were. The Hindu *Laus of Manu* and similar books of other great peoples went into these matters in considerable detail. A few samples of the rules and values of ancient aristocratic India must suffice. "A twice-born man shall marry a wife of equal caste who is endowed with auspicious bodily marks." "Let him carefully avoid the following ten families, be they ever so great, or rich in kine. . . or grain, or other property. . . one the members of which have thick hair on the body, those who are subject to hemorrhoids, phthisis, weakness of digestion, epilepsy, or . . . leprosy. Let him not marry a maiden . . . who has a redundant member, nor one who is sickly, nor one either with no hair on the body or too much, nor one who . . . has red eyes. Let him wed a female free from bodily defects, who has . . . the graceful gait of . . . an elephant, a moderate quantity of hair on the body and on the head, small teeth, and soft limbs."¹² And in the *Ramayana* Ravana says to Sita: "Of the right size, . . . , smooth, and white are thy teeth; thine eyes are wide and great, unblemished . . . ; . . . thy thighs are as elephant's trunks; thy two breasts have a fair, firm fullness, and are round, close-set to one another, bold, firm swelling, . . ." And later Sita says: "The body-marks as a result of which the unlucky women are doomed to widowhood, them do I not see on myself. . . my brows do not run together; my legs are rounded and not hairy; my teeth are close-set . . . and the hairs on my body are soft."¹³ Such passages with like details could be repeated and supplemented indefinitely not only from the *Ramayana* but from the *Mahabharata* as well.

But I mention them not because the marks they specify and describe are to be accepted as in themselves so revealing and significant that we should give them a like importance among ourselves today: modern science has enabled us to improve on their marks. I cite them as *evidence of an attitude*, and this attitude I do think not only healthy but, in the long run, essential to our very survival.

But when we turn our scrutiny upon our modern, democratic and Christian civilization, the contrast in attitude is at the least startling: to those who appreciate what it means, it can be nothing less than shocking. The values that ruled among our own forefathers in ancient times and lasted into our Middle Ages and even centuries later, are gone—completely forgotten. Among us today, anybody can marry anybody. Youngsters are brought up without the slightest formulation of *what* constitutes desirability in a mate, and the parents themselves are as ignorant as their children. Even among those few who do think for the future of their nation and their race, and even for the quality of their own family stocks and seek by wise marriages to enhance it, perhaps not one in a thousand takes into account the biological foundation on which all these things rest. As compared with spiritual and intellectual qualities, the body is looked upon as of little importance. It is not at all surprising, therefore,

that the author of *Precious Bane* (an otherwise beautiful tale) can bring her book to what she evidently considered a spiritually admirable consummation when she has her hero marry a girl with a hare-lip, who would certainly and unavoidably transmit her own tragic defect to the gene stock of any offspring she might have. And likewise, Dean Rusk's daughter can marry a Negro, without most people's thinking any less of either Dean Rusk or his daughter. In view of the prevalence of the values reflected in such monstrous performances, and of the evident tolerance of them shown by most people, it is all the more remarkable that Mr. Ludovici should have seen the folly of such thinking and set himself, almost singlehandedly, to fight for the adoption of a more healthy point of view. He has not only gathered together and correlated the ancient wisdom of past civilizations on this matter, but has supplemented that with a remarkable accumulation of the pertinent conclusions of modern science in all its branches. Now as never before, the human experience by which people may be guided in their choice of a mate is available. And it would seem as though it hardly needed argument that men and women should be at least as concerned about the "marks" of desirability and undesirability in their wives and husbands respectively as is a good farmer about the marks by which he can be reasonably sure of a desirable or undesirable horse or cow. It is to my regret that I feel unable, in the space at my disposal, to give even a digest or summary of the material on this point. I can only advise anyone who has been struck with the soundness and importance of what I have already said about it, to study Mr. Ludovici's book for himself.

Needless to say, as already pointed out earlier in this chapter, physical marks alone do not settle the whole question of choice. They are primary and fundamental, but also preliminary. One should reject as a mate anyone who cannot first meet the test that they impose, but from among those who do pass it, the final selection must be made by criteria more refined, subtle, and individual, determined by one's own personal experience, taste, character, convictions and purpose in life. Upon these latter, however, despite the fact that it is they that may finally determine one's choice, I will not dwell. I pass them by here partly because of the very great emphasis I placed upon them in my last chapter, and partly because *in those cases where marriage has been contracted with due seriousness, intellectual and spiritual qualities have been so stressed to the well-nigh complete exclusion of the physical, that young people have been exposed to the very great danger of discovering too late that they had built a home, not to say a palace and a temple, on sand.* Here, therefore, I wish, on the whole, to keep my emphasis on the physical requirements that must be met if marriage is not to fail of its truest end. With this in view, let me now submit a few conclusions as regards marrying to which experience and study have led me.

One of the most important general rules is marry your like.¹⁴ Valuable confirmation of this appeared in an article in *Reader's Digest* for July 1938 entitled "Finding A Mate In Modern Society." Its author was Joseph Kirk Folsom, Professor of Sociology at Vassar College. It was condensed from a book, edited by him, that bore the title *Plan For Marriage, An Intelligent Approach to Marriage and Parenthood Proposed by Members of the Staff of Vassar College.*¹⁵ The ideal mate should be one of the same color of eyes and hair as oneself, and (with sex taken into account) of corresponding size. He should be of the same national, religious, and cultural background. There is reason to believe that wisdom would even urge the choice of one in whose ancestry the same callings have been commonly followed as in one's own, or in which distinction has been in the same fields. This should increase the chances that more of the potentialities that make for distinction, or such potentialities with heightened vigor, would

appear in the offspring. Even where the physical inheritance of human capacities is still too uncertain to establish a case for this, and even though it be admitted that of acquired characteristics there is no physical inheritance whatever, still in every family that has distinguished itself repeatedly in the same field, there is a garnering of experience that can be transmitted to offspring by instruction and by something like apprenticeship, and which gives an invaluable advantage to the youth that is born into it. I am convinced that, whether from the point of view of physical heredity or cultural inheritance, or both, there is at least a considerable measure of sound ground for the position held in caste societies that a man and a woman from different castes (caste largely connoting difference in occupation) should not marry.

In this democratic society of ours, in which feeling for family, blood, race, tradition, level, rank, and difference has been almost entirely lost, there seems to be a general prejudice in favor of a person's marrying, not his like, but one who is *unlike* himself. Probably this is due, at least in part, to the feeling of personal inadequacy that is likely to be prevalent in a democracy. It shows itself in the desire for a mate who will complement oneself, to make up for one's own defects and deficiencies. Moreover, there is a very strong and ancient taboo against inbreeding, which is *very much* a matter of marrying one's own kind. To mention the word "incest" is enough to suggest what I mean. And yet, a very strict *interdict* against marriage with members of a *different race* was very common among the culturally most significant peoples of the ancient world. I shall go into this matter at length in my chapters on eugenics, which will follow this. We shall there discover the genetic basis for the popular taboo against inbreeding, but see that inbreeding is nevertheless the quickest and surest means known for purifying any stock, *on the condition that* any defectives that it produces will be eliminated. Professor F. A. E. Crew, one of the world's foremost genetic authorities, pronounced "incest between individuals of undoubtedly sound stock . . . a sound biological proposition"; and others of like distinction have declared that it may be a decidedly valuable means not more for eliminating defects and weaknesses from human stock than for conserving and concentrating superior qualities. Unquestionably, many generations of ignorance and disregard of all considerations of breeding in relation to marriage have left our stocks horribly overloaded with defectiveness of all sorts. Undoubtedly, too, while our Christian and democratic sentimentality continues to dominate the minds of men, it would be impossible to deal with the large crop of defectives that inbreeding would surely bring to the surface. That is to say, those most desperately in need of wisdom are the least able to recognize it or to act upon it when it is placed before them. For the present, therefore, it would seem that the most that can be done is for those of demonstrably sound ancestry to make it a rule to marry their like as much as they can. Among them, cousin marriages are not only safe but highly desirable. We can also undertake to disseminate the facts about inbreeding, and thus prepare for the day when our descendants may share the prejudice against marrying aliens that was so firmly rooted among all great peoples in all ages. History clearly indicates that the people who rise above false and sentimental humanitarianism and devise means to apply carefully and intelligently, but firmly, the established scientific facts about purifying and stabilizing their stocks, will in the long run, provided their initial stock be sufficiently gifted, lead the world.

Second, for your wife choose a woman who is beautiful.

There can be little doubt but that Edward Gibbon spoke the truth when he declared bodily beauty to be an outward gift that has seldom been despised, except by those to whom it had been refused. (See *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Harper, 1879, Vol. V, p. 101f.) But it has been the tragic fate of the peoples of the West to have their destiny largely taken over by Christianity before they had fairly got on their feet. And from its very beginning Christianity took root in the ghetto of the dying Roman Empire, and at once set its dregs to infecting, undermining and overthrowing all the old aristocratic values of the Nordic peoples by whom Rome, like Greece, had been largely founded. Thus we find ourselves the heirs of a tradition that has long despised the body and the physical, in which beauty has been, at times, even feared and condemned as a temptation of the devil to pride, to the lusts of the flesh, and in short to "sin," so that most of us have largely lost the natural instinct to regard beauty as a good sign, as evidence that the individual who possesses it is well-constituted, harmoniously put together, and filled with vigor and health.

Professor Knight Dunlap, who made a special study of this matter, said, ". . . whatever its importance for the individual, [beauty] is for the race and for civilization of such profound importance that no other fundamental consideration of human welfare and progress can be divorced from it." "Ugliness, it is true, is often skin deep, but beauty never. Beauty . . . is something which depends upon the whole organism." ¹⁶ After examining the foundations for this position he concludes as follows: "It is evident now that whether there are other considerations or not, the most important element in the beauty of any individual is the evidence of her (or his) fitness for the function of procreating healthy children of the highest type of efficiency, according to the standards of the race; and ability to protect these children." "The standard of beauty in complexion, whether light or dark, is that which goes with the full bloom of sexual vigor, when the human organism is at its perfect development for the perpetuation of the species." ¹⁷ "Human beauty . . . is a sign of fitness for parenthood; fitness to propagate children who shall be, in high degree, able to hold their own in the mental and physical struggle with nature and with their human competitors. It is the sign which is intuitively recognized by the race and upon which the process of sexual selection is based. It is therefore nothing superficial: it is the external appearance of the germinal possibility which is the most important of all things for society." ¹⁸ It would seem, then, in a word, that for any given people beauty is the sum of all those qualities which, through an immense stretch of time, they have become accustomed to observe in those of their own stock best fitted to perpetuate the species and to protect offspring. As such it is obviously a sign of absolutely primary importance for life.

And that other peoples, peoples of ancient times, better constituted and with sounder values than we, have given beauty much the place of importance that Dr. Dunlap ascribed to it, may be seen by the frequent references to it in the two great Indian epics, especially in the older of the two, the *Mahabharata*. Many passages from these are quoted in J. J. Meyer's *Sexual Life In Ancient India*, already so often referred to. Phrases like the following are constantly recurring: "Maiden with the lovely waist;" "the fair-hipped one;" "the maiden Pritha of the great eyes;" "thou maiden with faultless limbs;" "thou with the lovely smile . . . thou with the elephant's gait;" "the woman . . . of incomparable form" showing "by the build of her body that she . . . can give life to many sons;" "a splendid woman, shining with beauty like another Lakshmi, quite without blemish, with lovely teeth, divinely formed . . . shining like a lotus-flower cup;" "the slender, faultlessly-limbed Draupadi, from whom is

wafted a croca away a scent like that of the blue lotus;" and so on endlessly.¹⁹ Meyer concludes thus: "The frequently seen ideal of the Indian . . . is . . . of lovely women in the bloom of youth. . . with long lotus-eyes . . . rounded arms . . . swelling breasts. . . with great swelling hips, and thighs like banana-stems . . . lips red as the bimba-fruit."²⁰ And *Manu* says, "if the wife is not radiant with beauty she will not attract her husband; but if she has no attractions for him, no children will be born. If the wife is radiant with beauty, the whole house is bright; but if she is destitute of beauty, all will appear dismal."²¹

Doubtless, as Dunlap suggests, opinion as to what constituted beauty would vary "according to the standards of the race," which had been evolved in relation to the particular environment in the face of which each race had had to make its way. And there is no question but that there is need among us for criteria by which we can be guided in our judgment of whether or not a person is beautiful. To supply this lack, and guided by the remembrance that "the most important element in the beauty of any individual is the evidence of her (or his) fitness for procreating healthy children of the highest type of efficiency," I am going to follow the example of the ancient Hindus and other well-constituted peoples and venture to suggest some marks of desirability in a woman.

Bodily symmetry and fragrance, bloom of skin and a certain radiance about the face, especially light in the eyes, are all external evidence of inner harmony, signs that a woman has been well put together and is in good working order. An atmosphere of poise is invaluable as an "index of mental and spiritual potentiality" and of the effective integration of all her capacities.²² The feet should be well-arched and neither too large nor too small; the legs, shapely, full, and rounded. Dunlap says that "the percentage of women who would be even moderately presentable as barelegged dancers, regardless of dancing ability, is so low as to be shocking."²³ The hips should be wide apart, providing in the pelvis ample room for bearing and delivering the child. The frequency of the mention of the hips in the ancient Hindus' description of female beauty makes it very evident how instinctively they included pelvic breadth in their requirements. And I am convinced that it cannot be any accident that the very apparent modern admiration for the narrow hips, the slim form, the male-like figure in woman, on the one hand, and feminism with its secret envy of the male, contempt for the female, and aversion for child-bearing, on the other hand, have all appeared among us at the same time. Yet from the point of view of the race, preference for narrow hips in woman is the most obvious folly. It is a sign of degeneracy.

The breasts in a maiden should be well-filled and rounded, without being heavy or pendulous.²⁴ The body should be free from any excessive hairiness, especially from all coarse hair,²⁵ the head hair long and lustrous.²⁶ Bobbed hair in women is a shame. For ages her beautiful hair has been one of woman's glories; and inevitably much of its beauty is lost if it is cut short. The breath should be consistently sweet. Foul breath, besides being repulsive, is invariably a sure sign of bad teeth, bad digestion, or some form of uneliminated poison in the system, if not of actual disease. The hands should be shapely, full, and supple; the nails both shapely and free of defects in their surface. The ears should be properly formed, of the right size for the head, pink to pale red in color, set at a fairly close angle to the head, and neither too far forward nor too far back.²⁷ The chin should be well-developed, without being protrusive,²⁸ the mouth large rather than small, the lips full rather than thin, and naturally red, and turned up slightly at the corners. (I repeat—*naturally* red! The use of any kind of

make-up, if it does not belong to the arts of the prostitute, as I declared when I wrote the first version of this chapter years ago, certainly makes any woman who resorts to it a walking advertisement that she lacks what she pretends to have.) The eyes should be large, open, gentle in their expression, and full of light. The lengths of the principal parts of the body, trunk, arms, legs, and so on, should be in the right proportions.²⁹

For a good opportunity to give a woman's body searching scrutiny, let a man follow Ludovici's suggestion and take her to some beach where surf will remove all that does not belong to her and where he can see her in a modern bathing suit. This does not leave much hidden.

But if a man is to marry a wife who is beautiful, it is necessary that he marry her while she is young. For the perfect bloom by which Nature announces a maiden's readiness for motherhood comes while she is yet in her teens, and begins to wither before she is past them. But on other very important grounds as well, it is urgent that a girl marry before she is twenty. Such a pronouncement is likely to give offense to those who have their hearts set on a college education for girls before marriage; of that, I am fully aware. But before I attempt to reply, let me ask my reader to be patient with me and listen carefully to what I have to say in support of the proposition.

Ludovici has collected and analyzed "twenty-one reports, dating from 1883 to 1933," of cases of first child-birth. The reports were put forth by professors and doctors, most of them, apparently, obstetricians and gynecologists connected with large city hospitals on the Continent. The cases number "scores of thousands." Ludovici's analysis of these reports led him to the following conclusions: "The more closely they [the reports] approach the present age and the modern scientific view, . . . the more inevitably are we driven to the conclusion that labour before 20 is more favorable than after, and that the decline in efficiency is rapid after the twentieth year."³⁰

The reasons for why a first childbirth is best before the mother has reached the age of twenty are mainly biological. Before that time, the bones and muscles and joints of the pelvis are soft and flexible, and will remain so if the first of a succession of children has come in the mother's teens. Whereas' hardening, stiffening, and ossification set in rapidly after the twentieth year.³¹ The biological urgency that the first childbirth come early is so well presented by Dr. Hugo Sellheim, "that eminent authority,"³² in the following passage, that I feel that I must quote it at length. He says:

"This transient function [child-birth] in which an adequate passage has to be made for the foetus by stretching the muscles of the pelvic floor to the limit of their elasticity—i.e., without damage to their essential and permanent function of keeping the pelvic outlet closed—can be performed by the pelvic floor only in normal, healthy, and fully developed girls, in whom the muscles are still resilient. In older primiparae [women giving birth for the first time], not only is the extra tissue growth in the birth canal, necessary for the function, defective, but there is also imperfect resilience, and defective increase of elasticity at the critical moment. To compensate for the defects the tissues are stretched beyond the limit of their resilience, with tears and lacerations as the result. In the youthful elastic primiparae,

however, this extreme compensatory sacrifice is only exceptionally called for, and on a much smaller scale.

“Only female organisms just attained to full development seem capable of further bodily development during pregnancy. For this is precisely what is necessary to secure perfect functions in motherhood, more especially in forming the birth canal without damage. An organism, which has already waited a long time in the developed state, is no longer fit for this function and it seems to me, therefore, that the practice of allowing women to wait beyond their 20th year for marriage—a practice sanctioned even by doctors—amounts to no more than tranquillizing the public by glossing over our present-day social conditions which cause men to settle down late in life.” “He adds,” comments Ludovici, “that the marriage of a woman over 20 amounts to the ‘deliberate scouting of the most favourable conditions for child-birth.’ Further, ‘In the woman who has had her first child in youth, the pelvic floor retains its capacity to form the birth canal for later births without damage, because this capacity is acquired with her first birth, provided this occurs at the right time.’”³³

Moreover, easy labor, such as commonly attends youthful childbirth,³⁴ means greatly diminished risk of puerperal sepsis. *The Interim Report of the Departmental Committee on Maternal Mortality and Morbidity*³⁵ says, “Among the predisposing causes of sepsis the most important are undoubtedly injury to the tissues during labour, exhaustion, and haemorrhage,³⁶ which of course are chiefly attendant upon labor that is difficult and prolonged; and the digest of Nicola’s report on childbirth in girls between 13 and 17 states categorically that “puerperal fever and septicemia are extremely rare.” Prolapse of the uterus also seems to be associated with relative senility at the time of first childbirth. Dr. M. Fetzler, a pupil of Dr. Sellheim, remarking on 200 cases of this ailment observed at the Tubingen Clinic, says that “the chance of incurring this disability were almost three times greater in primiparae of 28 than in primiparae of 20, twelve times greater in primiparae of 30 than in primiparae of 19, and before 19 the chances were nil.”³⁷

In other words, from the point of view of the good of the mother, in order that her child-bearing be safe and easy, it is of the utmost importance that she have her first baby while she is young, preferably before she is twenty.

Indeed, the primary point of Mr. Ludovici’s whole book on childbirth is that it should be an experience the mother finds at least painless (as are all other functions in a healthy organism), and even enjoyable, and always profoundly satisfying. And he has gathered together a most impressive array of evidence from outstanding authorities, male and female, from every part of the civilized world, that childbirth of this sort actually occurs, that it should be taken as the normal experience, and may be expected to become common, if not universal, once women fulfill certain specific conditions,³⁸ and once we are purged of the degeneracy that now afflicts, more or less, all civilized people of the Western world, male and female alike. The position that he takes was largely supported by the testimony of Dr. Gertrude Nielsen of Oklahoma City at a symposium of the section on obstetrics and gynecology of the American Medical Association at its annual session on May 14th, 1936. This doctor, herself the mother of three children born without “twilight sleep,” rose up to protest against the move, or the tendency, to make the administration of anesthetics in childbirth a matter of routine. She declared that it was essential for the sake of some

satisfaction deep in a woman's psyche that she be fully conscious all the time that her baby was coming.³⁹ The report of what took place is eminently worth reading in full. That Dr. Nielsen's attack was no isolated protest is evident. Several of the country's outstanding obstetricians came to her support. Significant excerpts from the article read as follows:

"A dramatic attack on the use of 'twilight sleep' for painless child-birth was made here today by several of the country's leading obstetricians. . . A storm of protest broke loose after. . . [various doctors] had reported the development by them of what they declared to be the nearest to a perfect drug for painless childbirth yet found. . . . In nearly 90 percent of the cases they reported, the mother had no memory of the event, while at the same time the drug had proved to be completely harmless to the infants.

"The attack was led by a woman obstetrician, Dr. Gertrude Nielsen of Oklahoma City, herself the mother of three children who had been born without the use of painless methods. Several male obstetricians came to her support, including Dr. Joseph B. Delee and Dr. J.L. Baer of Chicago, Dr. Buford G. Hamilton of Kansas City and Dr. Nicholas J. Eastman of Baltimore. "One of the physicians stated that Dr. Nielsen had given expression to sentiments that many male obstetricians had been thinking for a long time but had not 'dared to speak up.' The discussion reached its climax when Dr. Rudolph Holmes of Chicago, who first introduced 'twilight sleep' into the United States from Germany, twenty years ago, rose and expressed regret for what he had done.

"I was the man who first brought scopolamine to America,' Dr. Holmes said. "I didn't know what I was doing. I have found out since.' 'We must protest vigorously,' he added, 'against making the human mother an animated mass without mentality.' "'Childbearing is so essential an experience for a woman,' said Dr. Nielsen, 'that the thwarting of its normal course by the excessive use of analgesics may cause great damage to her personality. If she be carried through delivery in an unconscious state, she is deprived of the experience of giving birth to her child and in some cases will pay for this escape from reality by nervous disorders. In my observation, no woman—whether intelligent or unintelligent—wants the birth of her baby a blank memory,' she said. 'Certainly, none will wish to be relieved of pain at the risk of harm to her baby.'

"Dr. Nielsen gave her opinion that the much discussed high maternal mortality rate in the United States was in large part a result of the great increase of the use of analgesics in childbirth. 'An analgesic that is perfectly safe for both mother and child has not been discovered,' she declared. 'The use of anything that deadens sensation distorts the natural process of childbirth and depresses the respiratory functions of the child.'

"Drugs delayed birth, she asserted, and psychoanalysis had shown that many of the nervous disorders of adult life in women could be traced to the psychological injuries of unnatural birth. "The pains of childbirth have been grossly exaggerated in the minds of American women, Dr. Nielsen said, so that they are in deadly fear of the approaching event, a fear which in itself was largely responsible for the actual pains suffered. The obstetrician, Dr. Nielsen stated, could allay the prospective mother's fear by explaining to her that the pain was largely in the minds of magazine writers. In doing this, she added, he might be largely

aided by trying to preserve in the mother the natural feeling of elation that is a concomitant of prospective motherhood.”

Believe me, I am not exactly one to rejoice in pain—for anyone. On the other hand, it is a question whether our ease-loving age has not developed a fear of pain that is almost psychopathic. It seems to me an essential condition of existence on this Earth that whoever would do anything of real consequence must expect to bear pain of one sort or another, physical or mental. I honor the spirit of the mother who wrote the article entitled “Painless Childbirth” in *The American Mercury* for June, 1939. After protesting against “mothers being unconscious when the greatest event of their lives takes place,” she goes on to declare that even if there be pain in it, “childbirth is pain that goes places and does things. There is even (and I am prepared for sneers) a certain ecstasy in it.⁴⁰ And it leaves no aching memory. . . Normal birth can be a relatively easy process. . . I am convinced that the ‘painless’ methods are often dangerous and cowardly. Women can enjoy the birth of their children to the full, physically, mentally, and emotionally.”

It would seem to me that the answer is to counsel women to bear, with the heroism sprung of love, whatever pain childbirth may bring, but at the same time strive to eliminate all the pain *that is not necessary*. The way to this last, however, is not to drug parturient women into unconsciousness, but to begin much further back. We must reform our mating customs. Like must marry like. Our women must marry young. Our wives must be brought up with an understanding of the absolute necessity of the particular regimen required for a healthful pregnancy, and of an all-around healthy life *before* pregnancy. Otherwise, childbirth will be the horror that it so evidently had been to the women who, in letters to the *New York Times*, sent up a wail of angry protest against the attitude of Dr. Nielsen. Instead of finding the trouble in themselves, in their own degenerate condition, where undoubtedly it lay, they would make agonized childbirth normal, and indignantly pleaded for anesthetics. The simple truth is that childbirth is likely to be not only safe for the mother, but an experience of joy, upon the fulfillment of certain conditions, one of the most important of which is that it come early in the mother’s life. But from the point of view of the child, also, it is urgently to be desired that he come into the world without too much difficulty. It is notorious that irremediable injury is often done to babies in instrumental deliveries. And Freud, I believe, maintains that a child carries with him through all his future days a subconscious memory of his birth experience, and that this memory conditions his whole future outlook on life. What measure of truth there be in such an idea, I do not know (though it seems to me rather plausible), but if it has any foundation in fact, it is again highly important that birth be easy. And this, as we have seen, means that, as rule, the first birth should come early in the life of the mother. Of course, everything that vitally affects the well-being of mothers and children is of supreme consequence to the race: a race literally stands or falls with its women and with the number and quality of their offspring. And therefore the race has a vital interest in early marriage and early childbirth from the point of view of woman’s fecundity. Prof. S. J. Holmes says that “the liability of women to conceive falls off quite rapidly after the twentieth year,”⁴¹ and also that “Galton has established the fertility of women marrying at the ages of 17, 22, 27, and 32 as roughly in the ratio of six, five, four, and three, respectively. An increase of the average age at marriage, therefore, would have a potent effect in lowering the birthrate.”⁴² And decline of the birthrate in the stock of proven capacity is something that no civilization can stand. That the birthrate *in this quarter* should somehow be raised has

become simply a matter of life or death—in the most literal sense. And the evidence shows that early marriage on the part of our best women would make this possible.

And finally, early marriage is so fully in accord with Nature's obvious intention and so largely solves the problem of sexual repression on the female side, that, *so far as biology is concerned*, it would seem difficult to find any grounds on which to base an intelligent objection. It certainly is a gross violation of Nature that a girl, whose sexuality develops at an age of thirteen or fourteen, should undertake to deny it all outlet for ten or fifteen years, as Puritanism, feminism, and industrialism combined require of our women today. Our sexuality is only one manifestation of the total measure of vigor and vitality with which we have been endowed, so that the better constituted a person is, the more desirable he is as a specimen of his sex, the more certain he is to have strong sexual desires.⁴³ And complete suppression of all this surging vitality for ten or fifteen years, as is presupposed in modern marriage, in the great majority of cases, simply is not possible—to either sex. I was not brought up to believe this, but slowly, through forty or fifty years, widening knowledge has convinced me that it is a fact.⁴⁴ Masturbation, neurotic disturbance, psychic distress, homosexuality, and pre-marital intercourse are the inevitable and almost universal concomitants of the attempt at complete suppression. Several studies of the sexual life of the unmarried woman,⁴⁵ reports of doctors and psychiatrists, and the revelations in such books as judge Ben Lindsay's *Revolt of Modern Youth* and the notorious "Kinsey Report"⁴⁶ long ago made this indubitable. Soon the talk among college students was indicating that pre-marital sexual relationships, even among the upper classes, were fast becoming majority practice. And now, in 1970, the official opening of women's college dormitories to men, day and night, suggests that it is well along toward becoming universal.

I find this exceedingly disturbing. If long continued, it must mark the end of our family system, and without the family, which has been the chief foundation of all civilized life for thousands of years, I believe that neither our nation and race, nor any other nation and race, can long survive. If the family is to be preserved, then it is essential that as largely as possible our women should come to marriage virgin. And this can be accomplished simply by establishing *the custom that our women marry early*. This alone would solve the whole problem of sexual repression on the female side. In short, there is absolutely no need that our young women, in the name of easing their sexual tension, should get into the way of giving themselves to one man after another, as will certainly tend to be the case, and thereby letting themselves be soiled by the touch of men who, in another day and age, would have gone to prostitutes. And if in their fanatical pursuit of equality with men, and by their thoughtless and headstrong determination to throw off all restraints and to do what they feel like doing, regardless of consequences, they thereby threaten to break up the foundations of all national existence and significance, then the day will certainly come when men, individually and collectively, will have to take them in hand, and, where necessary, by force put them in their place. The family, the home, and the cradle are essential to survival, and nothing that threatens their welfare can be tolerated. The ancient Hindus were dead right: every woman from birth to death should be under the ward of some man. If she is to fulfill her function properly, then she cannot be allowed independence.

But early marriage, marriage before twenty, would nowadays be frowned upon. "Child marriage!" we hear someone exclaim, "that's bad enough in India, but let's have nothing to

do with it in a civilized country like ours!" I presume that such an attitude would have the almost overwhelming support of any intelligent community of the Western world, and it would be especially ardent from all those who have their hearts set on a college education for women. But once again, before replying to this, let me ask my reader to hear out what I have to say for the proposition.

In our day, at least until very recently, marriage in which the bride is under twenty is commonly looked upon as hardly decent. And yet there is evidence aplenty that even in England (the land from which most of the original stock in this country was derived), throughout the Middle Ages (the period which Henry Adams and President Hutchins of the University of Chicago regard as the apex of our civilization), marriages were frequent in which the bride was not only 16, but 15, 14, 13, 12, 11, and even younger. This was true not only among the common people, but also and most certainly in the upper classes and in the royalty. Henry VII, one of England's greatest monarchs, was born of Margaret Beaufort when she was under fourteen, and many other of England's kings similarly.⁴⁷ Indeed, early marriage continued to be common in England down to the beginning of the last century.⁴⁸ And these were periods that showed in the population a greater vigor and vitality, a greater poise, stability and contentedness, and a far richer and more significant cultural creativeness than is to be found among us. We shall do well to remember, too, in passing, that "Napoleon's mother was only eighteen when the hero of Austerlitz was born," and that Goethe's mother "was married at seventeen, . . . and was only eighteen when the poet was born."⁴⁹

Indeed, down through history the general rule, in all ages and in all lands, has been for women to marry young.⁵⁰ And it is only our false prejudices, the perverted and degenerate ideas prevalent today about women and women's role, and our absurd conceit that we are above and in advance of other periods, which prevents early marriage among us. From the point of view of the best good of the race, there can hardly be any question but that, as a rule, the most desirable age for a woman at the time of marriage is between sixteen and eighteen. At that time, she stands at last in full flower, at the height of her desirability as a woman. It is as though all Nature conspired to say through the entire ensemble that she is, "I am ready." It gives me considerable satisfaction to be able to note here that nowhere have I found a more complete endorsement of this position than from Laura Marholm, whom I quoted in my last chapter. And because, being a woman, she may perhaps speak on this matter with more authority and with more understanding than I can, I am going to quote what she has to say at some length. Laura Marholm (really Mrs. Laura Mohr Hansson), a Swedish woman, wrote at the beginning of this century. Most of her books were addressed to, or were about, women. I have found her *Studies in the Psychology of Woman* so invaluable that I can but hope that it may someday be republished. For it is written beautifully, eloquently, and with such breadth of knowledge, with such depth of sympathy for women and with such understanding of their nature, that for any woman it ought to prove very moving and impressive. And here is what she says about a girl's age at the time of her marriage.⁵¹

"In the young girl of healthy vitality, the period between fifteen and seventeen is really her blossoming time. Everyone perceives the fragrance which hangs about her whole young being, making the insignificant charming, the homely engaging, and first revealing beauty.

The bloom of the skin, the sparkle of the eyes, the slender, graceful suppleness of the body,—everything is blooming health and elasticity. People imagine this is something purely physical, which changes so quickly on that very account; but how if it changes so quickly because it is more Psychological than physical,—an almost instant unfolding of all the expansive capacities for complete womanly feeling, in which there is yet no reflective thought? “Why does the blood come and go so quickly in her cheeks? Because she undergoes great bodily agitation? Or because presentiments, ideas which are knowledge, connections of sympathy not yet become thoughts, glide through the soul of the young girl at the slightest outward provocation? Why does she feel this loud, tumultuous heart-beating at the approach or greeting of a man, which becomes still louder because she fears it may be heard? Why does she so often drop her eyes and grow confused? Why are her slender hands so warm and moist that the crochet needle rusts in them? . . . Why does she often grow pale under a glance, so pale and so suddenly that one thinks her about to faint? Are these only physical appearances, without her knowledge?—or does she know only too well and blush or pale with double violence because she fears it can be read in her face? Many believe the former, and the mothers always say excusingly, ‘She is still so innocent, she is still quite childish.’ I believe that ‘she’ is perhaps never again in her life so little childish as then. The years when people no longer think her childish are quite frequently a great step backwards towards childishness. “In this short time of blossoming—and perhaps only then in fulness—everything in the young girl is readiness. There is readiness of soul and mind—a capacity for intuitive understanding, for unrestrained devotion, and unbroken instinct. Nothing is perverse in her, and she is still so pliant that nothing tears wounds in her.”

And if she does not marry and become pregnant while this bloom and invitation are yet upon her, the effects are plain to all who have eyes to see or the intelligence to know what they mean. Day by day and year by year, she withers. The bloom that was upon her slowly fades away, never to return and in its place comes—disappointment. Every month is a “mock confinement.” Throughout her whole body she gets ready to be a mother, and then—nothing comes of it. Frustration, and more frustration. Menstruation becomes more difficult, the pelvis hardens, the whole reproductive system is seized with a deterioration that in many cases becomes outright cancer. But perhaps it is again Laura Harholm who can reveal the situation best.

‘She [the young girl, to whom a man has not come] prefers to sit still and her eyes become dull and dreamy—languishing we call it, but it is not that, it is disappointment; so far as I understand it, it is the very deepest disappointment of her whole life, penetrating body and soul, for it springs from the feeling of a dissolving unity. The woman never again possess herself so completely; she is never again so susceptible mentally, so awake, so capable, never again so pliant bodily, so strong and ready.’⁵²

In any case, there is no question but that a girl is quite *able* to bear children within a few years of the onset of puberty (to state the facts conservatively). And it simply is not possible for a person of unbiased mind to believe that Nature, equipping a woman to bear children in her early teens, ever intended her to put off beginning for ten or fifteen years, until she was in her middle or late twenties, not to speak of her thirties.

In fact, I believe the only objection to this position will come from those who, consciously or unconsciously, are feminist. From them a loud wail will go up about the horrors of childbirth and the early aging of the mothers of many children. But the material that I already have presented makes it impossible to take this outcry very seriously or to listen to it with much patience. The facts of the matter seem to me to be as follows. Nature punishes us only for doing a thing *or* for *not* doing it—never for both. One or the other has her favor and is rewarded with health; and only the other is punished. And we already have seen how it is *failure* to make reasonable use of the female reproductive system that tends toward organic degeneration and actual cancerous organic disintegration. If, therefore, it is woman's primary function and the deepest instinct of her being to bear and to rear children (and about this no one can be more unequivocal than Laura Marholm⁵³), then it must follow that a well-constituted woman will have a deeper serenity and sense of fulfillment if her youth is guided by a sound regimen of diet, dress, healthful exercise that does not harden the pelvis (as male athleticism does), and if she marries, before the "first great turning point of a woman's life—her twentieth year,"⁵⁴ a man of her own kind and of corresponding size, from whom she receives both economic and emotional security, and if she follows a wise regimen during her pregnancies. Further, she will actually enjoy better health if she bears a child every second or third year of her bearing life. All this feminist wail about the cost of motherhood is only evidence of degeneracy, and it is the effort of the diseased and perverted to infect the healthy and well-constituted.

But probably the feminist protest against early marriage for women will wax most angry over the fact that it would make impossible the college education that the modern woman requires for the successful pursuit of a career. It is argued that even to make a good mother a woman must have more education than would be possible if she married before twenty. In any case, the feminists demand to be told how much education would be possible under the circumstances, and what kind would be desirable. This is not the place for an extended discussion of the question, but it can be answered in outline. A girl's education should be fundamentally different from that of a man. I would remind you that Dr. Carrel says, "The same intellectual and physical training, and the same ambitions, should not be given to young girls as to boys. Educators should pay very close attention to the organic and mental peculiarities of the male and the female, and to their natural functions. Between the two there are irrevocable differences."⁵⁵

A girl's education should center where her own deepest instinct and interest and capacity center—about the child, which means also about homemaking. She should be instructed as to her own physiology and know how to take care of herself, during pregnancy and at all times. She should learn how to take care of a baby, and understand the principles of sound diet and health, both for the child at different stages in its development and for the adult members of her family (so much depends upon this), and know how to treat simple ailments.⁵⁶ The art and the practice of making a home lovely and of creating an atmosphere expressive of herself and her husband, with definite regimen, rules and standards for such simple things as washing dishes and clothes, making a bed and cleaning a room, and doing it efficiently; the knowledge of how to plant and to grow vegetables and flowers, to set a table attractively, to prepare tasty and wholesome meals, to preserve foods of all kinds in various ways, to spin and to weave and to dye, to make clothes for herself and her family and to mend them, together with a knowledge of other handicrafts (for the day of handicrafts in the

home will come back in an age that is economically sounder than ours)—all this lies within her province. And not least, she should be prepared to bring to the unfolding mind and aspiration of her children the study of Nature and a love of the Earth, and also the folklore of her people, their great myths, their great epics, their great heroes, and the heart of their religion, their literature, their art, and their music. Indeed, it might often be the mother who would awaken in her children an interest in and a love for the art, and literatures, and music of the world.

Much of this, however, would require no formal schooling. To a considerable extent she would simply absorb the culture of the race and transmit it. A great deal of what young women need to know they would simply pick up from their mothers and from the life of their homes, as their children in turn would pick it up from them. With this, their girlhood reading, and a schooling shaped from the start to meet their future needs as mothers, they could be ready for marriage before they were twenty. And as a rule, at least until there was a child, study could be continued in the schools even after marriage. It must be remembered that there have been millions of admirable and notable wives and mothers who never had a college education. Indeed, I am strongly of the belief that four years of exposure to the severely rationalistic atmosphere of a place like Smith or Bennington College is enough to ruin a girl for life. I was convinced of this even thirty years ago. And today, in 1970, after the avalanche we have witnessed of feminism, coeducation, and the equalitarian dogma, and the general lifting of all obstacles to pre-marital sexual experience on the part of teenage girls, I do not at the moment know of any college in the land to which I should be willing to entrust the tender destiny of any daughter of mine. Prolonged exposure to such influences will make it difficult for any girl to be content and happy either as wife or as mother.

Moreover, girls' education (which, let me remind you, is not necessarily a matter solely of attending school) could continue after they were married. For a year or two at least, they should be able to find considerable leisure time in which to continue their preparation for motherhood and home-making. Inevitably, as their husbands (in order to support them, if for no other reason) would be considerably older than they (perhaps ten years on the average), their education after marriage would be largely molded by their husbands. The girl would be somewhat like a younger tree growing up close to another tree that had got an earlier start and already had its shape; she would shape herself to the life of her husband, and nestle into it. This comes naturally to the woman, and it makes for unity in the family, and for stability in the home.

But after all, a mother's most important task is to give her child something deeper than his "education"—something upon which all his formal education will have to be built and which will largely determine what he does, what he is *able* to do, with all the subsequent training that may come to him. It is hers to determine his fundamental attitudes on life, his characteristic ways of facing the world and of going after things. In the lingo of modern psychology, it is her part largely to determine his primary "behaviour patterns," the practically unalterable ground-plan of his whole life. Laura Marholm saw this so clearly and said it so beautifully that I cannot forbear to quote from her book yet again.

"Her children are the woman's productive work. In them becomes manifest what the innermost substance of the mother was, what her natural capital was worth. The productive

labor of the woman does not consist in educating her children, as people of this century have believed and upon which many women have exerted all their energies. Education is external work. But what is not in them cannot be brought out of them; at most only a simulation can be attained. The woman's productive work is not above all a thing wherein much can be achieved by will, intention, effort, design or training—the productive work of the woman is her inner nature, her inborn character, her warm soul, her good heart, her healthy blood, her unknown strength, her untiring energy, directness, buoyancy and freshness.

“When the mother does not rise like the sun over her child, warming so that every tiny limb stretches with pleasure, gladdening with her glance and smile like a peep into the bright morning waking and alluring forth all that is good and strong and happy and healthy, then she may have very many excellent qualities and her child may also have many excellent qualities, but qualified for life he will never quite be. He has been led astray and will lead astray in great things or small; he will be insatiable and insufficient, rough or dull, or if he is so constituted that he can overcome all that was unpleasant and diseased in his childhood, a thorn always remains in his side, and always a certain unskill in him. He could not suck himself full of healthy blood and warming sun.”⁵⁷

The feminist demand for more time for education seems to me the only intelligent objection to early marriage for women that can be raised, and when women's education is related to her primary function, and the opportunities for education *along with* early marriage fully canvassed, even this objection loses most of its weight and gives way to the urgency of the biological requirement that women begin to function sexually by the time they are twenty, or better still, even earlier. To be sure, it can hardly be expected that, as a rule, a teen-age girl will have had the experience, or will have attained the maturity of judgment, that are needed for making a wise choice of a mate. But an essential part of the proposal under examination is that in making the choice she will have the constant cooperation of, and be very largely guided by, her father and mother.

However, the point that I am stressing now is that everything relating to the young woman should be concentrated on motherhood and on home-making. And it is for this that she should be taught from early girlhood to dedicate herself and to prepare herself, as for her highest and holiest calling. And there is none on Earth more beautiful or more significant. Awe will be upon her at times as she wonders whether it may not be given to her to bring into the world a superman, some new great seer or hero, to hold him close at her breast and be the one to start his first footsteps out into the world. And to this high end, she will ever keep her body as a holy chalice, to be entrusted with something more precious to her than all the gold and jewels in the world. For the sake of this, she will eschew any form of sports that might impair her fitness for motherhood,⁵⁸ and will give up any male athleticism, no matter how enjoyable, that is hardening to the bones and muscles of the pelvis.⁵⁹ She will recoil from the very thought of ever polluting and profaning her body by drawing into her lungs, close to her very blood, the filthy stink and poison of tobacco smoke, especially of cigarette smoke.⁶⁰ And throughout her whole youth she will gladly subject herself to whatever regimen as to food, sleep, play, dress, and study that the accumulated wisdom of the race may lay upon her, in order that gradually her whole body may be shaped into the soft rounded contours of the lovely female form, filled with overflowing health that has put red

into her lips, a flush in her cheeks and light in her eyes,⁶¹ and energy into all that she does. And from the combination of theory and practice, of study on the one hand, and, on the other, of watching and helping her mother and having her mother's guidance and assistance even after she is married, she can be prepared to take care of her own first baby and to begin the creation of a home of her own by the time she is sixteen or seventeen. Before the flush of youth and readiness that is then upon her begins to wither (as it certainly and rapidly does), some time before she has reached the age of twenty, she and her parents together will have found her a suitable husband. And she will go forth, with him, "to create the one that is more than those who created it," which Nietzsche declared to be the condition for a *holy* marriage.⁶²

Before I bring this paper to a close, I wish to take a look at the problem of the *un*married woman.

Lin Yu Tang, in his *My Country And My People*, approaching this question from the point of view of China and the Orient, where motherhood always has been looked upon as a woman's most important function and one necessary to her fulfillment, declares that "in Chinese eyes the greatest sin of Western society is the large number of unmarried women, who, through no fault of their own are unable to express themselves."⁶³ And certainly no unmarried women are found among the Mahommedans (and, incidentally, "no class of working women, forced to earn their daily bread, either"),⁶⁴ or among the Hindus, where, as we have seen, it is considered one of the first duties of every father to obtain a husband for each of his daughters before she is three years past puberty. So much so that, if he fails to do this, the girl is at liberty to take the initiative and hunt for a husband for herself. This liberty, to be sure, is allowed our girls too, but I am frequently indignant over the way parents leave their daughters to shift for themselves in this matter, not making the least exertion even to bring their daughters into contact with men who would make them desirable husbands. Perhaps the problem of the unmarried woman has never been so great as it is in the West today.

And it is much larger and more acute than most people realize. Over twenty-five years ago, an article came out in *Collier's* entitled "Husband Shortage."⁶⁵ It began by saying that "America is headed toward a permanent surplus of from 6 to 8 million marriageable women who will have to do without husbands." "The situation is already so serious that *one out of every seven girls now seems headed for spinsterhood*. . . . This simple fact is social dynamite. It can rock the foundations of our social system and attitudes toward sex, . . ." The cause of this situation is more than we can go into here, though it obviously challenges our country to summon all its strength and wisdom to find a remedy. But here, I want only to call upon my readers to face with me the facts. Surely even a fool must see that if some legal and healthful way is not provided by which to prevent such grievous wrong and deprivation to such a multitude of women, then clandestine and demoralizing ways, often damaging alike to the women and to society, will be seized upon by the women themselves. Said Carl G. Jung in his *Contributions To Analytical Psychology* (pp. 172-3): "It is no longer a question of a dozen or so of voluntary or involuntary old maids here and there; it is a matter of millions. Our legal code and our social morality offer no answer to this question . . . There are decent women who want to marry, and if this is not possible, well—the next best thing. When it comes to

the question of love, ideas, institutions, and laws mean far less to women than ever before. If things cannot take a straight path, it will have to be a crooked one."

I caught an inkling of how acute the problem was becoming from an experience that I had thirty years ago. I had gone to speak at a certain university. Through a letter of introduction from one of my older friends, I found myself at dinner with an elderly lady and her unmarried daughter. In the course of the meal the former turned to me and blurted out, "What would you say to a young woman of thirty who had a good position as a nurse but recognized that the one thing she wanted above all else, was to become a mother—and yet knew no man whom she wanted to marry?" It was perfectly obvious that she was referring to her own daughter.

Taken by surprise, I did not at the moment know *what* to say. But from then on, I began to give the problem some thought and study, so that now, while I am not sure that much can be done to alleviate the plight of these women at the present time, I see quite clearly, and am prepared to state and to stand for, certain things which I believe can entirely remove the problem in the future.

To begin with, we must remember, and *engrave* upon our memories, that life is more important and more sacred than the institutions in which at any given time it finds expression. If it be true (and it is), as I have already insisted in these pages more than once, that "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," then it is true no less that the State was made for man and not man for the State, and likewise our systems of education, and economics, and politics—and *marriage*. When the unfolding life of the chick can no longer be contained within the eggshell, it breaks the shell. And when the forms drawn up by a previous age for the direction of the sexual relations of men and women no longer fit the actual life of today, when these forms thrust life into what for very large numbers is virtually a strait jacket or a torture-chamber, then these forms have got to give way to others that will allow life an outlet, and room to turn around in. Confucious said, "Truth does not depart from human nature. If what is regarded as truth departs from human nature, it may not be regarded as truth." ⁶⁶

To this end, so far as the unmarried woman is concerned, the following changes in principle or practice seem to me to be called for:

1. It must be universally recognized that, upon certain clearly stated, scientifically grounded and well-established conditions, motherhood is every mature, well-constituted woman's *right*. Lin Yu Tang⁶⁷ declares that "of all the rights of women, the greatest is to be a mother. Confucius spoke of the ideal society as the one in which there were 'no unmarried men or women,' and this, in China, has been achieved through a different conception of romance and marriage." And again, "To every girl born in China, a home of her own is provided. Society insists that even slave-girls should be married off at the proper age." I shall have more respect for the "Women's rights" movement when I see more women pressing for a recognition of their right to be mothers.

2. Society has a right to protect itself against having undesirable children thrust upon it. Any unmarried woman, therefore, who wished to have a child or children, would first have to

meet all the eugenic requirements as to sound ancestry and health, of body, of mind and of character, that any sensible society must make for marriage itself. And she would be required to show that she had the independent means or other source of dependable income by which she could, *without* a husband, provide the security so necessary for both mother and child. But with such conditions fully met she would be given permission to be inseminated, either naturally by the man of her choice, or artificially by quite impersonal scientific selection. (In either case, of course, the man who supplied the sperm would have to meet the same eugenic requirements as applied to the woman.) And no stigma whatever would attach either to her or to her offspring. Such a procedure would be one of the unusual but recognized ways of having children. It would be an arrangement not wholly desirable, but *less undesirable* than leaving so many women childless. With the required economic security (through independent income, family assistance, or the like), the woman would be no worse off than many a woman is today who *loses* her husband, say, through death. The inevitable influence of such a departure would be to induce society to make the changes that would enable every desirable woman to marry who wishes to. It would be especially good if the Church, or whatever religious institution may succeed the Church, were to make itself especially responsible for the welfare of such women and children, somewhat as the Catholic Church has for centuries done in the case of its nuns, giving them a form of marriage and a wedding ring, and thus status, and security and a spiritual comfort that would help the women enormously to carry through their undertaking faithfully and proudly. And perhaps the need of a father could, to a considerable extent, be met by reviving the institution of the godfather. In any case, all possible effort should be made to have every child grow up in close and warm relations with a suitable and responsible man in his or her life.

3. So long as the great excess of females over males persists (and this excess may even be enormously increased by another world war), we may find ourselves compelled to make sufficient relaxation of our monogamous standards to allow men who are financially able, to have more than one wife, or to introduce concubinage. To most people brought up in our Christian environment I presume this idea would be abhorrent—at least at first glance. But I suspect that prejudice has a good deal to do with this attitude. And if force of circumstances presses hard enough, people can be made to look their prejudices in the face, and even to rise above them. If the outstanding ecclesiastical body of the Church of England can go so far as to consider a resolution to allow a temporary polygamy to build up the population weakened by war's decimation of the males,⁶⁸ it ought not to be too much to ask that there be sufficient relaxation of the monogamous standard to give the millions of our women who today are doomed to spinsterhood, the opportunity to *live*. For again, though it be for the thousandth time, as a rule, for the well-constituted woman *life without motherhood is not life at all*.

This is said in behalf of justice and to some extent in the interest of eugenics; it is anything but a counsel to promiscuity or an excuse for laxity. I long ago came to a well-considered judgment against free sexual relations as any ideal. Many years of observation, experience, study and reflection have satisfied me that, on the whole and as a rule, the basically monogamous family is the form under which human life flourished best. But like the historian Lecky who, in his *History Of European Morals*, declared that "we have ample grounds for maintaining that the life-long union of one man and of one woman should be the normal or dominant type of intercourse between the sexes," I would go on with him to add, "It by

no means follows that because this should be the dominant type, that it should be the only one, or that the interests of society demand that all connexions should be forced into the same die.”⁶⁹ The author of the “Husband Shortage” article, from which I quoted a few pages back, as he searched about for an answer, observed (page 81), “When a shortage of men becomes the permanent situation, polygamy in one form or another has been resorted to by most people in the non-Christian countries as the simplest means of providing every woman with a mate, considered her fundamental right. And contrary to what is believed, women in many places are not only not averse to sharing a husband, but prefer the arrangement.”

One has only to let one’s eye rove freely over the world and down the pages of history, and indeed to penetrate beneath the surface of our own life, to discover plenty of precedent for some departure from a confinement of the sexual relations of each woman to one man, and of each man to one woman—that is, from monogamy in the strictest sense. Among the ancient Hindus are to be found not only the marriage of one woman to several men but that of one man to several women.⁷⁰ O.A. Wall reminds us that “among the early Hebrews monogamy was the general rule, although it was not very strict; later on polygamy and concubinage became prevalent.” “There are many references to concubines in the Old Testament.” Even at the present time, “In Mohammedan lands, there is no limit to the number of concubines a man may possess.”⁷¹ Concubinage is common in China. It existed in the Viking Age among the Scandinavian peoples. “In European lands, concubinage was general until quite recent times, and the position of the concubine was an honorable one.” “It also persists among the European nobility in the form of morganatic marriages which are entered upon from love, and when later official marriages must be contracted for state reasons. These ‘left-handed’ marriages are either discontinued, or maintained on the quiet, along with the official family, thus constituting polygamy. In such morganatic marriages the title or rank is not inherited by the children, but no disgrace attaches to this, or to the woman.”⁷² Even in our own country, we have today what Professor Ellsworth Huntington calls “consecutive polygamy”—that is, a “system whereby divorce is so easy and frequent that many people have several husbands or wives one after the other.”⁷³ I read recently that on the average one out of four American marriages ends in divorce; in the West, the average is three out of four. And no matter what may be our ideals or our laws, there simply is no question but that at least our male population is not strictly monogamous. O.A. Wall, though he declares his belief that “monogamy, *based on the equality of the woman with the man*, is the highest type of sexual relationship,” is forced, nevertheless, to recognize that “. . . man is polygamous by nature, and polygamy is therefore the prevailing type of sexual relationship throughout the world. It is the legally recognized relationship of the sexes among more than two-thirds of the inhabitants of the Earth, and it is practiced in some form or other by all nations on the globe. A strictly monogamous people does not exist, and strict monogamy in the individual man is as uncommon as strict celibacy, even among us.”⁷⁴ This last statement is fully confirmed by the “Kinsey Report” of 1948 and by common knowledge of what is going on today in our “open” college dormitories where men and women mix freely.

Furthermore, from the point of view of positive eugenics, as was first brought to my attention by Professor Ellsworth Huntington, there is a good deal to be said for polygamy.⁷⁵ The men who are able to support more than one wife (in any case, always comparatively few, so that in practice polygamy can never be very extensive) are men of capacity. On the

average, they rank high for their constitution, personality, and brains. They court and are usually able to win women who are as much above the average as they are themselves. The offspring that a man of this caliber might have by several such women could be counted upon to prove, as a rule, both numerous and superior. "Rameses II," Professor Huntington points out, "was one of the greatest kings of Egypt. He has the usual array of wives and concubines, and is said to have had about 160 children. . . King David is reported to have had 19 sons, 'besides the sons of his concubines,' while Harold Fairhair of Norway divided his kingdom among 'about 20' sons. . ." He also calls attention to "many other subsidiary conditions [which] tend to cause the children who are born with a high inheritance to be proportionately far more numerous than among us." ⁷⁶ And all this, of course, for anyone who cares about the increase of quality in human life, is of great importance.

Finally, I think that we who would defend the institution of monogamy, but especially all those who flatly oppose any modification of its standards or deviation from its rules, would do well to recognize the justice of the charge leveled against it by the critics, that its inseparable concomitant is prostitution or some other form of extra-marital sexual relationship.⁷⁷ On the one hand, the monogamous society undertakes to confine the sexual experience, at least of its women, to marriage. And this seems to me absolutely basic and indispensable. Except as there is a stable environment rooted in the definite and durable relations of a man and a woman, together with the certainty as to the paternity of her children, the institution of the home is impossible. I see the home as at once the core and the foundation of our whole life. It always has been. I cannot imagine the Indo-Germanic peoples' ever giving it up. Ludovici states the conclusions of James Corin as well as his own, when he says, "This sacrifice of the female's free-mating privilege is essential to our progress and the successful survival of our culture." ⁷⁸ All control of family lines and eugenic improvement depends upon it.

But let us look a little further into what the institution involves.

According to the avowed ideal, the sex of each woman is shut up within marriage, and thereby made inaccessible except to her husband. If she marries before twenty, as we have seen that she should, and if her husband is an adequate sexual partner, this will subject her to none of the painful and often injurious effects of prolonged repression. But with the males it is a different story. In order to complete their education and to lay the foundation for the support of a family, they have to put off marriage until they are from twenty-five to thirty, or even older. But my investigations have completely satisfied me that the male sexual instinct is such that most men, even those of the highest type, simply cannot keep it all bottled up for fifteen or twenty years. The proportion that find a fully satisfying outlet in sublimation is very small. The great majority go to prostitutes, make casual connections, find a mistress, or resort to masturbation.⁷⁹ Also, it is argued (to my mind, not without considerable cogency) that the very success of an eventual marriage may depend upon a young man's having had at least enough sexual experience beforehand to be qualified to initiate his bride.⁸⁰ Moreover, even after marriage, many men's work takes them from home often for weeks and even months at a time; and it is urged by some that during pregnancy a woman should not be disturbed with intercourse. Indeed, some women, as is certainly true of females in the animal world, simply refuse sexual relations. Apparently, too, as we have seen, many men experience a desire for sexual "change" that is beyond their powers of control. All the

authorities on the sexual problem that I have examined, notably Bloch and Forel, seem agreed that by instinct the human male is polygamous.

Well now, if all this is fact, as it seems to be, where is all this constantly surging sexual demand to go? It would certainly break into and destroy our monogamous homes (as it is now doing in our "open" college dormitories) if there were not a body of "free" women who in one way or another are set aside, or who set themselves aside, to satisfy it. So the pronouncement of Bertrand Russell seems justified that the "prostitute safeguards the virtues of wives and daughters."⁸¹ You don't like it. No, neither do I. Though before the coming of venereal disease some four hundred years ago, as for instance in "those beautiful times of the middle ages," the entire provision for this surging male sexuality would seem to have been something very different from, and very much less objectionable than, what we today know as prostitution."

I recall, too, a chapter in *Turms Der Unsterbliche* (*Turms the Immortal*, see Mika Waltari—*Turms Der Unsterbliche*, Paul Neff Verlag, Vienna, 1956), which I read some fifteen years ago. It is the very stirring tale of the odyssey of a young man who, in the days of the Athenian Empire, in the Fifth Century B.C., is buffeted by winds and fate from one side of the eastern end of the Mediterranean to the other. Eventually, he comes to the island of Sicily, where Athenian colonists had built an advanced culture, largely inspired by Athens. One evening, he climbs the hill above town that was crowned with a temple to Aphrodite, the goddess of love. Here he is received by one of the young and beautiful women who have dedicated themselves to the service of the goddess—perhaps by the priestess of the temple herself: I am not sure which; my recollections are vague. But in any case, she is a woman of evident culture, with whom he discusses life and art and philosophy before they retire for the night. The whole experience is recounted simply and casually, without any suggestion of the lascivious. In Turms' mind there was nothing exceptional about it; it was commonplace, completely out in the open, and it was in a temple. Supposedly, I must remark, the tale is based on historical realities, though I must allow that I have never followed up my reading of it to inquire about such institutions in ancient Greek life. But for our present purposes, let us assume that the tale is true to historical fact, and go on to appraise Turms' experience. I am afraid that the preconceptions, values and mood with which those ancient Greeks faced the realities of human existence were so far removed from ours that we cannot enter into them with any sympathy, or even imagine, let alone really fathom the moral and spiritual and social world that created such an arrangement as Turms described. I do not for a moment profess that I can. But from my reading of that chapter, I did carry away a lingering impression that whatever may have been the outward and inward reality of the institution of which Turms gave us a glimpse, it was the result of a reverent and honest attitude toward life, which made a deliberate effort to draw a veil of sanctity over the whole of the procreative instinct, even over its overflow into extra-marital channels. (With this may be compared what Abbe J. A. Dubois said about "dancers and prostitutes who are attached to the service of the temples" in Hindu India. See his *Hindu Manners, Customs And Ceremonies*, Oxford Press, 3rd ed., 1906, pp. 310, 585-7. They are called "servants of the gods." The institution is interwoven with the accepted social and religious life of India. The book has a preface by Max Mueller.) It certainly did not carry with it any taint of the shame and degradation that is brought to our minds today by mention of the word "prostitution." But I judge that before we peoples of the West could ever shape an institution anything like it, we should have to come under the

molding thumb of a religion very different from Christianity, and for a long time know a feeling, a need, a wish and a will that are quite far from us now. And in the meantime, though I certainly find our modern prostitution abhorrent, I would accept it rather than forfeit the monogamous family that seems to depend upon it for existence. And I should like to take this opportunity to point out that some of the deepest misery in the lot of the prostitute today is unnecessary, and results from the sheer hypocrisy that closes its eyes to her existence, and refuses to acknowledge that all society is profoundly indebted to her for what she does.⁸²

I have briefly reviewed the precedent that we have for some departure from the strict and logical requirements of our monogamous ideal. But little if any of this is incompatible with the essentials of our institution of monogamy itself. The recognized unit of the family, the concentration of responsibility in the two parents, the definite and more or less constant environment in which the children can be cared for and trained and, in detail, can learn the lessons necessary for later life in the larger world—such are the essential features of monogamous family life.⁸³ And, assuming love and capacity on the part of the parents, all these are possible—on two conditions: (1) that the sexual relations of the wife (or conceivably, in some few cases, of the wives) are strictly confined to the husband, so that he can be sure that the responsibilities he is called upon to meet are toward his own children; and (2) that the thought, devotion, and responsibility of the joint procreators unite in their children and in their home. The institution would not be essentially altered by the admission in some small proportion of the families of an extra woman or so, or by either pre-marital or extra-marital sexual experience on the part of the male. The institution does hinge, however, on sexual restriction in the case of the female.

My sense of the importance of this for society was considerably reinforced by my discovery years ago of the scholarly researches of J.D. Unwin. These he presented in his work *Sex and Culture*,⁸⁴ an abstract of which is to be found in an address entitled *Sexual Regulations and Cultural Behaviour*⁸⁵ (later published as a book), which he gave before the Medical Section of the British Psychological Society. His thesis is mainly that, on all levels, there is an unvarying correlation between culture and sexual restriction. The narrowing of sexual opportunity, especially in the female,⁸⁶ is always followed in about three generations (the time necessary for the results to take effect) by a rise in the cultural level. Apparently, the explanation is that when restraint is placed upon the sexual impulse of a population, there is a gradual accumulation of energy that finds an outlet in exploration, conquest of every sort, both material and spiritual, and every sort of cultural creativeness. He declares that whereas, on the one hand, "as soon as the absolutely polygamous tradition was inherited by a complete new generation, the energy of the society decreased" (he cites the Moors as an example), on the other hand, "there is no record case of a society reducing its opportunity to a minimum without displaying expansive energy." In conclusion he goes so far as to say, ". . . if the behaviour of a society depends on the amount of its energy; and if the amount of its energy is a reflection of the sexual opportunity it enjoys, it seems to follow that we can make a society behave in any manner we like if we are permitted to give it such sexual regulations as will produce the behaviour we desire."⁸⁷ At least, it should ensure its having energy, but energy alone would not of itself ensure its taking a desirable direction.

The stress that Mr. Unwin places upon sexual restriction may seem to be at odds with the changes that I have advocated in behalf of our very large number of unmarried women. But I believe that it is not. Needless to say, between the claims for restriction and the claims for expression there must be a certain balance. Complete restriction is impossible of attainment, and completely free expression would make for chaos and ruin. At a minimum there must be enough expression to perpetuate the species and to avoid the physical and psychic disturbances that follow upon too complete or too prolonged repression. There must be enough restriction to ensure that we have the accumulated energy to take us toward the goal which, as a people, we have set before us. Every single thing that I have advocated or defended, whether it be for the motherhood of those of our unmarried women who are qualified, or for the extra-nuptial sexual experience of our men, is intended the more fully to justify and to establish the *essential* features of our monogamous family system, and to facilitate its contented and fruitful operation. Monogamous marriage should remain our norm, and a single life-long union our ideal. But, let me say again, it is high time that the West unite with the East in a worldwide recognition that motherhood is every mature, desirable woman's right, and her deep organic and constitutional need. And such changes must be made both in our thinking and in our institutions as may prove necessary to provide her with opportunity for motherhood on the best basis possible.

It is time now to draw all the threads of this study of Woman together.

As we have seen, men and women are not equal. That is, it is impossible to make them out the same. All effort to gloss over their differences or to pretend that they can be alike in their functions is the most absurd folly, and most pernicious in its consequences. Wherever this false notion goes, it makes men and women alike renegade to their respective sex and to their respective obligations to society.

Nor yet is it a matter of saying that they are *unequal*. Equality is the wrong concept to introduce here. Men and women are incommensurables. They are fundamentally different creatures. Each is necessary to the other, and each has a part to play that is absolutely essential for the life of the race. But their roles are in different directions. And their meaning to one another and the fulfillment of their respective parts in the life of the race, indeed their very organic health, depends on each one's maintaining the difference that belongs to him or to her, a polar difference with a strong electric tension between. The deepest instinct in the woman is her mother-feeling. She mothers, or would mother, everything—her own children, her own husband, and all children, especially children that suffer or want loving care and fending for. Indeed, at her best, her sympathy and her tenderness make her to reach out her arms to all life that suffers, as though she would gather it to her breast and there warm and feed it. Man, on the other hand, at his best, is the maker, the shaper, the creator. He shapes everything. He is the idealist. Never contented with things as they are, he always is the one who struggles and sacrifices himself to shape them according to his thought and his vision. He shapes himself, his wife, his child, society, everything. He is the originator. Even the influence of the woman on the children is based on values and standards sprung from the intellect of man. As mother and center of the home, woman is the settled one, the stable one, the contented one, the one that holds all things together, tying together past, present, and future, the one that lives closest to the earth and to actuality. It is her part to ensure the continuity of the race. She brings the new life into the world and she provides the

atmosphere in which this new life gets started, gets footed, begins to find the shape that belongs to it. Man, on the other hand, is the one upon whom depends form, values, standards, goals—in short, the quality of the race.

Which part is the more important, the woman's or the man's? It is an idle question. Is it not apparent that neither can exist without the other? I do believe that without the function of the male the human race would degenerate, perhaps in time degenerate even to the point of barbarism. If all men became as concerned about reproduction as women are, and as tenderhearted, who would weed out the weaklings and defectives whom we must get rid of or perish? Who then would inflict the suffering that is necessary if a stable and desirable society is to be set up and maintained? Who then would be to the race the jab and the stab, the lure and the leaven, the light and the dynamite that men have been, ever declaring that this is no place to stop and pitch our tents and weakly cry in excuse, "We have gone far enough, high enough. Let us rest here." To all such weariness and defeatedness, it has been man's part, the true man's part, ever to declare and to insist that there is no place far enough or high enough, to stop, and to lie down, and to sleep. Man has a part in keeping the race going on, but his most important role is to keep it ever seeking a beyond, ever going farther, and climbing higher. Without this, if there were only the instinct of the female, we should have the tendency that we witness where the herd instinct (closely related to the female instinct) is dominant—the tendency toward the nation of well-fed cows. Personality and significance of all sorts would then be sacrificed to perpetuation and to security.

On the other hand, if it were not for the woman, man, this great shaper, would have nothing to shape. The danger would be that, with his star-gazing and star-grasping idealism, he would fly off the Earth altogether.

The part of each is necessary. The part of each is indispensable to that of the other. And it is best when the question as to which part is the more important is not even raised, but each of the sexes is so proud of its part, and so full of it, that it simply accepts it and fulfills it.

To a considerable extent, of course, the roles of the two sexes overlap and are shared. The man also, deeply and in the very highest sort of way, is devoted to the children and to the home. And the woman is so caught up and inspired by the concern for quality of life that she has seen incarnated in the men, with whom she has grown up or loved, father, brothers, husband, that she stands solidly behind them in all the nobility of their striving and will not infrequently be the one to drive them out to self-sacrifice and to death rather than see them live on in dishonor. Witness the magnificent burning speech with which the queenly Draupadi attempted to arouse her men, and the equally heroic Kunti, her son.⁸⁸

But lest there be any lingering suspicion that I am consigning woman to the lesser place, let me leave you with this: Nietzsche, who first confronted me with the problem that has occupied us in this chapter and in the last one, said many hard things about women (as, indeed, he did about men)—so much so that probably many women have been led to think of him as their enemy. And yet it was Nietzsche who said, among many other beautiful things, that: "The perfect woman is a higher type of humanity than the perfect man, and also something much rarer."⁸⁹

And while the two greatest influences that have entered my thinking life have been Jesus and Nietzsche, yet I question whether, in the last analysis, the debt I owe to either of them, or to both of them together, is so great as that which I owe to my Mother. I don't mean that it was she who gave me the great ideas, or who trained my mind. She gave me something more elemental, more necessary. She gave me that without which I could never really have seen such men as Jesus and Nietzsche, seen them for what they were, or been ready as I was to respond to them when I found them. So, I say again—my deepest debt is to my Mother.

1948, 1972.

¹ With this compare Oswald Spengler—*The Decline of the West*, Knopf, Vol. II, pp. 104-5, “When the ordinary thought of a highly cultivated people begins to regard ‘having children’ as a question of pro’s and con’s, the great turning-point has come. For Nature knows nothing of pro and con. Everywhere, wherever life is actual, reigns an inward organic logic, an ‘it,’ a drive, that is utterly independent of waking-being, with its causal linkages, and indeed not even observed by it. The abundant proliferation of primitive peoples is a natural phenomenon, which is not even thought about, still less judged as to its utility or the reverse. When reasons have to be put forward at all in a question of life, life itself has become questionable. At this point begins prudent limitations of the number of births. In the Classical world the practice was deplored by Polybius as the ruin of Greece, and yet even at his date it had long been established in the great cities; in subsequent Roman times it became appallingly general. At first explained by the economic misery of the times, very soon it ceased to explain itself at all. And at that point, too, in Buddhist India as in Babylon, in Rome as in our own cities, a man’s choice of a woman who is to be, not mother of his children as amongst peasants and primitives, but his own ‘companion for life,’ becomes a problem of mentalities. The Ibsen marriage appears, the ‘higher spiritual affinity’ in which both parties are free—free, that is, as intelligences, free from the plantlike urge of the blood to continue itself, and it becomes possible for a Shaw to say ‘that unless Woman repudiates her womanliness, her duty to her husband, to her children, to society, to the law, and to everyone but herself, she cannot emancipate herself.’ . . . The primary woman, the peasant woman is mother. The whole vocation towards which she has yearned from childhood is included in that one word. But now emerges the Ibsen woman, the comrade, the heroine of a whole megalopolitan literature from Northern drama to Parisian novel. Instead of child, she has soul-conflicts; marriage is a craft-art for the achievement of ‘mutual understanding.’ . . . they all belong to themselves and they are all unfruitful . . .”

² Ellsworth Huntington and Leon F. Whitney—*Builders of America*, Morrow, 1927, p. 120.

³ *Laus of Manu*, Oxford University Press, 1886, p. 79ff. (III, 20ff.). Cp. J. J. Meyer, op. cit., pp. 54-8.

⁴ Richard Wilhelm—*A Short History of China*, Harrap, 1929, p. 100ff.

⁵ Charles W. Armstrong—*The Mystery Of Existence*, London, 1920, pp. 187-8. Also, Judge Ben Lindsey—*The Companionate Marriage*.

- ⁶ Cp. Ralph Adams Cram—"The Mass Man Takes Over," *American Mercury*, Oct., 1938.
- ⁷ Anthony M. Ludovici—*The Choice of a Mate*, John Lane, 1935.
- ⁸ G.T. Witkowski—*Les Accouchements à la Cour*, Paris, 1890, pp. 13, 14.
- ⁹ Anthony M. Ludovici—*The Truth about Childbirth*, Dutton, 1938, p. 121. The passage from Froissart making this statement is quoted.
- ¹⁰ *Ideal Empires And Republics*, with Intro. by Prof. Charles M. Andrews of Bryn Mawr College, New York and London, 1901, p. 200.
- ¹¹ Hans F. K. Gunther—*The Racial Elements of European History*, Methuen, 1927, p. 161.
- ¹² *Laus of Manu*, op. cit., iii, 4, 6, 7, 8, 18.
- ¹³ *Ramayana*, iii, 46. 18ff; vi, 48, 7ff.
- ¹⁴ Cp. Knight Dunlap—*Personal Beauty and Racial Betterment*, St. Louis, 1920, pp. 74-5.
- ¹⁵ Joseph Kirk Folsom, Editor—*Plan for Marriage*, New York, 1938.
- ¹⁶ Knight Dunlap, op. cit., pp. 15-16.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 40-42.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, P. 55. Cp. Iwan Bloch—*The Sexual Life of Our Time*, New York, 1920, p. 65.
- ¹⁹ Johannes J. Meyer—*Sexual Life In Ancient India*, Putnam, 1930, pp. 15, 19, 25, 26, 31, 34, 40, 41, 49, 80, 94.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 280. Cp. pp. 430-1.
- ²¹ *Laus of Manu*, iii, 61-2.
- ²² Knight Dunlap, op. cit., 46-9.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, p. 84.
- ²⁴ Anthony M. Ludovici—*The Choice of a Mate*, p. 488.
- ²⁵ Knight Dunlap, op. cit., pp. 38-9.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 266.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 219-220.

²⁸ Knight Dunlap, *op. cit.*, p. 30 says, "That there is a preference on the part of both sexes, and in the consideration of both sexes, for a well-developed chin, is a matter of common knowledge." And he ventures an explanation. Cp. A. M. Ludovici, *The Choice of a Mate*, pp. 216-7, 323.

²⁹ On this matter see A.M. Ludovici—*The Choice of a Mate*, pp. 481-7.

³⁰ A. M. Ludovici—*The Truth about Childbirth*, Dutton, 1938, pp. 136-153. For an emphasis "from the standpoint of race welfare" upon the importance of early marriage for women, see S. J. Holmes—*Studies in Evolution and Genetics*, New York, 1923, pp. 17-8.

³¹ Authorities are cited and the question discussed in Ludovici—*The Truth about Childbirth*, pp. 76-8. Also, pp. 154ff. Cp. "Pregnancy and Parturition in Early Youth" by G. Nicola, in *Annali di Ostetricia e Ginecologia*, a digest of which is to be found in the *Jour. Amer. Med. Ass'n.*, 1938, p. 196. On the whole, this report fully confirms my position. For a reply to some of the features that seem not to support it, see Ludovici—*The Truth about Childbirth*, p. 130ff.

³² According to the German *Wer Ist's*, Berlin, 1935, Dr. Sellheim is Professor, Doctor of Medicine, Medical Adviser and Director of the Women's Clinic of Leipzig University.

³³ Hugo Sellheim—*Zeitschrift für Soziale Medizin*, Leipzig, 1910, Vol. V, Heft 1, pp. 128-130. Quoted by Ludovici in *Truth about Childbirth*, pp. 159-160.

³⁴ Nicola's study, mentioned above Note 31), fully confirms this. The digest of it referred to says: "Delivery is normal and of short duration. Surgical intervention in pregnancy, delivery or afterbirth are rarely necessary. The vertex presentation is the most frequent in deliveries at full term. Transverse and other abnormal presentations are unusual. Pelvic abnormalities are rare. The joints of the pelvis of young girls have a great mobility and the contractions of the uterus are energetic.

³⁵ London, 1930, p. 48.

³⁶ Ludovici—*Truth about Childbirth*, pp. 156-8.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 159-160.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 104-5. This book by Ludovici goes to the root of the matter much more thoroughly than, for instance, that by Dr. Grantly Dick Read—*Childbirth Without Fear*, Harper, 1944.

³⁹ *New York Times*, May 15, 1936, p. 1, cols. 4 and 5, p. 10, cols. 1 and 2.

⁴⁰ Cp. Ludovici—*Truth about Childbirth*, p. 52.

⁴¹ S. J. Holmes—*Studies in Evolution and Genetics*, New York, 1923, pp. 117-8.

- ⁴² S. J. Holmes—*Human Genetics and Its Social Import*, McGraw, 1936, p. 197. To the same effect see also *The Builders Of America*, (Morrow, 1927, P. 117-120) by Prof. Ellsworth Huntington and Leon F. Whitney. The farmer was a professor at Yale and the president of The American Genetics Society.
- ⁴³ Alexis Carrell, article "Married Love" in *Reader's Digest*, July, 1939, p. 15. Also, Rene Guyon—*Sex Love And Sex Ethics*, New York, 1933, pp. 13-4.
- ⁴⁴ W. S. Taylor—"A Critique of Sublimation in Males: A Study of Forty Superior Single Men," *Genetic Psych. Monographs*, Jan., 1933. Clark University, Worcester, Mass.
- ⁴⁵ Robert L. Dickinson and Lura Beam—*The Single Woman*, Baltimore, 1934, Chs. IX and X; Ira S. Wile, M.D., Editor—*The Sex Life of the Unmarried Adult*, New York, 1934, pp. 33f, 196-7; Katherine B. Davis—*Factors in the Sex Life of 2,200 Women*, New York, 1929, pp. 91, 97-9, 105, 247-8; Iwan Bloch, op. cit., p. 418.
- ⁴⁶ The so-called "Kinsey Report" is a book entitled *Sex Behavior Of American Males*, W.B. Saunders, New York, 1948, by Prof. Alfred C. Kinsey and associates. Reviews of it appeared in *Harpers* for Dec., 1947, *Time Magazine* for Jan. 5, 1948, and in *Life* for Aug. 2, 1948.
- ⁴⁷ A. M. Ludovici—*Truth about Childbirth*, pp. 120-1; C.G. Crump and E.F. Jacob, editors—*The Legacy of the Middle Ages*, Oxford U. Pr., 1932. (Eileen Power, author of the chapter on "The Position of Women," says: "The careful father would expect to arrange for his daughter's marriage and often to marry her before she was fourteen. . ." Page 414); Dorothy M. Stuart—*Men and Women of Plantagenet England*, New York, 1932, pp. 271, 277; Rene Guyon—*The Ethics of Sexual Acts*, Knopf, 1934, p. 46, says: "England, true to ancient Christian usage, until 1929 retained the marriage age at twelve for girls and fourteen for boys" and for girls it is still "fixed at twelve years in New Hampshire"; A. Abram—*English Life and Manners in The Later Middle Ages*, London, 1913, pp. 113-6.
- ⁴⁸ A. M. Ludovici—*Truth about Childbirth*, pp. 113, 127.
- ⁴⁹ G. H. Lewes—*Life and Works of Goethe*, Everyman Edition, p. 7.
- ⁵⁰ Rene Guyon, op. cit., p. 46.
- ⁵¹ Laura Marholm—*Studies In The Psychology of Woman*, New York, 1906, p. 330ff.
- ⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 334.
- ⁵³ Laura Marholm, op. cit., pp. 121, 320, 328, 336ff.
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 72.
- ⁵⁵ Alexis Carrel—*Man the Unknown*, Harper's, 1935, p. 92.

⁵⁶ In my recommendations here I must limit myself almost entirely to books on nutrition and its bearing on health. For guidance in this field I do not go to doctors. Astonishing though it be, it is widely recognized that medical schools do not require, or even provide, any thorough grounding in it. The most reliable and helpful books on the subject that I know about are: Adelle Davis—*Let's Eat Right To Keep Fit*, Harcourt, revised ed., 1970; *Cook Book*, Harcourt, 1970. This cook book is distinguished, quite apart from its good recipes, by the specific information that it gives for preparing foods in ways that will preserve their nutritive values. Roger J. Williams, M.D.—*Nutrition Against Disease*, Pitman Pub. Corp., 1971. (Bantam reprint, 1973); *Nutrition in a Nutshell*, Doubleday, 1962. Dr. Williams "is perhaps responsible for more original work in the field of vitamin research than any living scientist." He is a member of the National Academy of Scientists. Jean Bogert—*Nutrition And Physical Fitness*, Saunders, 8th ed., 1966.

⁵⁷ Laura Marholm, op. cit., pp. 336-7.

⁵⁸ A Wellesley graduate, who played on the college hockey team, told me the girls were expected to take part in scheduled matches without regard to their menstrual times.

⁵⁹ Cp. *Truth About Childbirth*, p. 166ff. Even modern ballroom dancing is condemned on this score.

⁶⁰ For that matter, quite frankly, I don't see how this dirty, wasteful, and injurious practice is possible to any man of high dedication. But in any case, so far as tobacco and pregnancy are concerned, the Fels Research Inst. for the study of prenatal and postnatal environment (located near Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio), remarks in one of its publications ("The Effect of Cigarette Smoke during Pregnancy upon the Fetal Heart Rate," pub. in *Amer. Jour. of Obstet. and Gynaec.*, Vol. 29, No. 1, p. 77, Jan. 1935) as follows: "The smoking of cigarettes during the later months of pregnancy was accompanied by a statistically reliable increase in the rate of the fetal heart. This heart-rate increase is considered to be evidence that the toxic products of tobacco smoke are capable of passing through the placental tissues and into the fetal circulation. This paper makes no statement that any injurious effect to the fetus results from smoking, although such an effect does not seem unlikely in view of the apparent sensitivity of fetal tissues to nicotine." And as regards smoking in relation to lactation, Alexis Carrel says: "While feeding their babies, mothers learn a great deal about how to live. Also about the ill effects of tobacco, alcohol, and coffee, which enter the blood and directly affect the child. They have to lose many bad habits." Art. "Breast Feeding for Babies," *Reader's Digest*, June 1939, p. 3. In this connection, a remark of Bloch's is interesting. He says: "Certain phenomena and aberrations of the movement for the emancipation of woman, such as the adoption of a masculine style of dress and the use of tobacco, are no more than relapses into a primitive condition [when, he says, the sexes were less differentiated], which among the common people has persisted unaltered to the present." Op. cit., p. 58. He calls the "man-woman of the modern woman's movement" an "atavism, retrogression to those long-past stages" (p. 59). Apparently the "progressive" smoking woman is really woman going backwards!

For further evidence as to the effects of smoking, both physical and mental, as established by scientific research, see Irving Fisher and Haven Emerson—*How to Live*, 20th ed., Funk,

1938, p. 76ff. See also the Index under "nicotine," "smoking" "tobacco." The evidence is extremely impressive. One of the best resumes of the evidence, pro and con, is in A.M. Ludovici's *The Four Pillars of Health*, Heath Cranton, London, 1945, pp. 68-82, with a conclusion that, in general, supports my contention.

⁶¹ It has always seemed to me that any girl or woman who will stoop to the arts of the prostitute (or at the least, of the actress), and by the aid of rouge, lipstick and what not, try to give the impression that she has what in reality she has not, must be lacking in sincerity, or pride, or else be very susceptible to the suggestion of majority practice.

⁶² Friedrich Nietzsche—*Thus Spake Zarathustra*, 1, 20: "Child and Marriage."

⁶³ Lin Yu Tang—*My Country and My People*, John Day, 1935, p. 152.

⁶⁴ Madame Hyacinthe Loyson—*To Jerusalem through the Lands of Islam*, Chicago, 1905, p. 322.

⁶⁵ *Collier's* (magazine), June 26, 1943, pp. 14, 15, 81.

⁶⁶ Quoted by Lin Yu Tang, *op. cit.*, as a legend prefacing his book.

⁶⁷ Lin Yu Tang—*op. cit.*, pp. 144, 152.

⁶⁸ Ira S. Wile, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

⁶⁹ William H. E. Lecky—*History Of European Morals*, quoted by Iwan Bloch, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

⁷⁰ J. J. Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 107, 471.

⁷¹ O.A. Wall—*Sex And Sex Worship*, Mosby, St. Louis, 1919, pp. 190, 202-4. Cp. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed., art. "Concubinage."

⁷² O.A. Wall, *op. cit.*, as above.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 192, 198.

⁷⁵ Ellsworth Huntington, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-4.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 114, 117ff.

⁷⁷ Bertrand Russell—*Marriage And Morals*, Liveright, 1929, Ch. XI, p. 145ff.

⁷⁸ Anthony M. Ludovici—*Enemies Of Women*, London, 1948, p. 129, Cp. p. 122ff. See also James Corin—*Mating, Marriage and the Status of Women*, London, 1910; J. D. Unwin in works listed under "84" and "85" *infra*.

⁷⁹ W. S. Taylor, op. cit.

⁸⁰ Ellis, Havelock—*Psychology of Sex*, New York, 1944, p. 334. So also Ludovici—probably in *Woman: A Vindication* or in *Man: An Indictment*.

⁸¹ Bertrand Russell, op. cit., p. 146.

⁸² Iwan Bloch, op. cit., p. 321. Also Ch. XIII.

⁸³ Anthony M. Ludovici—*Woman: A Vindication*, 1923, p. 127, where essential features are well summarized.

⁸⁴ J. D. Unwin—*Sex And Culture*, Oxford U. Press, 1934.

⁸⁵ J. D. Unwin—*Sexual Regulations And Cultural Behaviour*, Oxford U. Press, 1935.

⁸⁶ J. D. Unwin, 1935, pp. 12, 19. 87. Ibid., pp. 17, 20, 45.

⁸⁷ J. D. Unwin, Ibid.

⁸⁸ Johannes J. Meyer, op. cit., pp. 451-6; 460-2.

⁸⁹ Friedrich Nietzsche—*Human All-Too-Human*, London, 1924, Vol. I, p. 295. Cp. Iwan Bloch, op. cit., p. 56: "It would be fundamentally erroneous to decide from these considerations any inferiority or comparative inutility of woman. Rather, indeed, the nature of her bodily structure in relation to the purposes it has to fulfill, is comparatively nearer perfection: and this admirable adaptation has undergone an increase in the course of the evolution of civilization."

Chapter 14.

The Pacifist Position Re-Examined.

It may be mere chance that I have never met an honest pacifist. . . I have never heard of any pacifist organization that will face facts.

Ezra Pound: *Impact*.

At this point, before we go on to the difficult and thorny problems of the Machine, eugenics, and race, I should like to have my reader face with me squarely the truth about violence and the use of force in human life. The question is fundamental and ultimately inescapable by anyone who probes deeply into the realities of existence; and his decision about it will decisively affect the course that he takes in regard to almost any social problem he grapples with. Perhaps it will serve as a good introduction to our examination of the question if I submit to my readers the results of the thinking about the pacifist position that I began to do some twenty-five or thirty years ago, after having been, during the First World War and until about 1932, a pacifist myself.

If the eyes of any very conscientious pacifist were to fall upon the words of Ezra Pound, with which I have prefaced this chapter, they would probably arouse his indignation if not his ire. I doubt that there is any one thing about himself of which the average pacifist is more sure than his honesty. And in all fairness, it must be conceded that Pound did not deny that such a thing as an honest pacifist could exist or did exist, but only that he had never met one. I believe that there are some pacifists who are really honest both about the facts and with themselves—though I must add: I suspect that they are few. One of the most admirable pacifists that I have ever known once confessed to me, without any probing or prodding on my part, that as he had examined the thoughts and emotions out of which had come his decision to register as a conscientious objector, he found himself suspecting that he had been influenced, more than he had realized at the time, by fear. This certainly showed honesty—of no mean order, even though it did come after the danger he had shied away from had largely passed by. But it points up the conclusion to which my own reflections on pacifism have long inclined me—namely that, taking it as a whole, the pacifist position is commonly the result of a lack of honesty with oneself and of courage to face facts. The reasons for my conclusion will become apparent as I proceed with what I have to say. Perhaps my readers will listen with more attention if I begin by submitting the background of my own early ideals, convictions, and experience.

It is a matter of record that, in 1918, I had to give up my church, chiefly because of my opposition to the war that the United States had entered the year before. I was convinced then, as I am now, that it was quite impossible to reconcile the teaching of Jesus with any war-making. From that day to this, all attempts to reconcile them have remained, to my way of thinking, little better than intellectual and moral jugglery.¹ Between Jesus and war it is an

either-or. At the time, I chose Jesus, for up to that date, and for years yet to come, he was the highest that I had found.

And my pacifism was thoroughgoing. I never have been one to do things by halves. To what I have seen to be true, I have tended to give myself outright. And so for conscience's sake, I was willing to go to prison or—I hoped and believed—even to face death. Nor was this all. With Tolstoy and in loyalty to the logical consequences of my disbelief in violence, I rejected the State as “the mailed fist of the owning class,” and renounced all obligation and loyalty to it. Recognizing that all ownership depended, in the last analysis, on violence, I gave away everything that I had and refused to call anything my own. I renounced property. My action, to be sure, had other roots besides, but it must be allowed that these impulses were among them. I wished as far as possible to stop doing any violence to any human being, and even to any animal. I became, and for over twenty years remained, a strict vegetarian, admitting only such animal food (the dairy products) as I then supposed to have cost no animal its life.

And to this day, I have retained much of the sensitiveness that is here apparent. Friends have often told me that I am a fighter, but if so—and it may well be that it is so, I wonder if it is not mostly in the realm of the intellect and the spirit. I doubt that I would make a good soldier, if for no other reason (and there are at least several other reasons) because it takes too much out of me to inflict suffering on others. I have too vivid an imagination, I too readily identify myself with the other man, and I am only too able and too quick to put myself in his place. All this may make for breadth of outlook and largeness of sympathy, and dispose a man to understand and to love, but it hardly helps him to do the job of a soldier. Moreover, whatever courage I have is moral rather than physical. Many things in my life have called forth my fear. I have been able to do them only because my fear was finally swallowed up by my love and my will. But with all this complex and sensitive inner life I have often wondered whether I should have been able even to hold together if it had fallen to my lot to face the raw horror of a blitz attack or to “go over the top” in a bayonet charge against a masked machine-gun battery. I just do not know. I certainly am not surprised at the number of men who break under the strain of modern war. The wonder to me is that any highly organized nature can be exposed to the worst of it and *not* break.

Needless to say, I am not putting down these observations about myself as evidence of any strength. To the mind of my reader, they may even be evidence of weakness. Perhaps mine is the over-ripe sensitiveness of the decadent. About this, my reader may have his own opinions—as I have mine. But, probably, we should agree that these admissions are evidence that I belong to a kind of man that is not fitted for the work of a soldier. I make these admissions partly so that any pacifists among my readers may feel how much I have had, and still have, in common with them, and partly to nip off the bud of any suspicion that I now talk of war because—being 78—I run little risk of being called to go to war! The simple fact is that war is still abhorrent to me.

Perhaps the worst thing about it today is the means employed. With the spread of democracy and the development of the Machine, war is no more a profession; it has become a business, and an industry, and an obligation to fight ordinarily rests upon every male citizen. And it now involves, as permissible targets for destruction, not a few thousands, but entire populations. Nor can it any longer be argued that it is a substitute for natural selection,

a means by which the inferior are weeded out. On the contrary, it is the best who are selected for slaughter, and among these the superior individual hardly counts for a jot more than the inferior. Today, in war as in peace, the Machine counts for more than the man. One cannot even believe that war is a means by which the best *nation* necessarily wins. I frankly confess my doubt whether, man for man, the American people *are* the equal of the German, or even of the Japanese. You can finally bring any stag down if you get enough dogs at its throat. What won us the victory was not our superior manhood but our more advanced technology. We simply overwhelmed our foe with numbers and crushed him under sheer massed metal. Be that as it may, the slaughter, first of combatants and then of combatants and noncombatants alike, became appalling. In contrast, the wars of more "primitive" ages seem almost amusing. There were decisive battles in ancient Greece and in our Middle Ages in which there was almost no loss of life at all. Says G. G. Coulton, one of the recognized authorities on the Middle Ages, "At Tinchebrai (1106), which gave Henry I the whole duchy of Normandy, 'the knights were mostly admitted to quarter; only a few escaped; the rest, 400 in all, were taken prisoners. . . Not a single knight on Henry's side had been slain.' At the 'crushing defeat' of Brenville, three years later, '140 knights were captured, but only three slain in the battle.' At Bouvines, one of the greatest and most decisive battles of the Middle Ages (1214), even the vanquished lost only 170 knights out of 1500." Today, on the other hand, war has become a threat of complete extermination to entire peoples.

When, to the suicidal portent of this, is added the fact that *no* reasons or aims for war are presented that one does not have grounds to believe false, specious, intentionally misleading, mere decoys under cover of which grinning men accomplish their devilish machinations, I must admit that the wars that the United States has fought in my lifetime have left me very cold. I was cold to the Second World War, even though I was then only beginning to learn what baseness there was at the bottom of our side of it, and I am cold now to the war in Vietnam. I do not hear any war cry that rings true and stirs my devotion. I do not see a single war banner under which I should care to give my life. They all seem false to me.

What I have said thus far, if I may pause to point up this brief review of my own experience, is that for all of fifteen years I myself was a pacifist, primarily on the basis of the teaching of Jesus and my disbelief in violence; that I carried this to the point of objecting to any use even of coercion; and that into it went my very intense conviction. Perhaps I should add that until I could feel sure that I was not being somebody's dupe, and until wars are again fought with methods less suicidal, I think that it is possible that I too should refuse to serve in the armed forces.

This, no doubt, any pacifists among my readers will receive with satisfaction. It will be to their sorrow and disappointment, and perhaps beyond their comprehension, that I should now go on to confess that I no longer hold the pacifist position. But I only state a simple fact when I say that by the early Thirties, very slowly and very surely, my convictions as a pacifist proved unable to hold their ground against the pressure of certain carefully considered objections, which I must now try to present. But first let me ask my readers to note what I have already tried to make explicit: my present position does not so much involve an acceptance of war under modern conditions as it means a conviction that violence cannot be eliminated from human life. So far as modern war is concerned my difficulty in accepting it is rooted less in the fact that it is violent than in the manner and

extent of its violence. It is rooted, in the last analysis, in my rejection of the entire trend of the modern world, of which it is an expression. Almost everything the modern world does is contrary to my taste and goes against my grain. Forever since the Middle Ages, the primary and fundamental belief and the consequent aims of the Western world have been false. The nearer we come to the present time, the more I reject not only its war but also, by and large, its government, its art, its business, its science, and even its prevalent religion and philosophy. Sometimes I could say why, and sometimes I could not. But I have come to think it is not always important to have one's reasons at one's fingertips. I mistrust the man who is always glibly ready with his reasons. Often as not, it would seem, they are likely to be less reason than rationalization, a mere show of reason—to fool ourselves if nobody else. It is enough for me, here at any rate, to say that in my mouth the fruit of the modern age leaves a bad taste

But now let me try to present the considerations that gradually forced me out of the pacifist position that I held from about 1917 until—roughly—1932.

To begin with, I came to a realization that *foræ lies at the basis of all existence*. The idyllic Nature of Rousseau and his like is sheer romanticism, the dream-fiction of a man running away from actuality. The Nature revealed by the biologist, or which anyone of us can see for himself if he walks out into the fields and woods with his eyes open, is a Nature red in fang and claw. Life preys on life. Even Gandhi, for all his devotion to non-violence, had to admit the truth of this. The most earnest vegetarian, so long as he drinks his milk, has to acquiesce in the slaughter of practically all the male calves born to the cow from whose udder he draws his food. And if, in his effort to eliminate all violence, he presses yet further and undertakes to get along without the dairy products, he still has to face the revelations of the Indian scientist who, with exceedingly delicate electrical equipment, has given “proof positive” of the shock sustained by the cabbage plant, for instance, and of the “cry” that goes up from it, when you cut off its head!!² . . . There is no end to this—except death. Such sensitiveness is indeed the hypersensitiveness of the decadent, which, if a man humors it enough, will incapacitate him for existence. There is very impressive evidence that at least without some kind of animal food, be it only the dairy products, a people can only with difficulty maintain its health, its fertility, and the vigor and the endurance for any significant achievement. It is better here that a man squashes his sensitiveness and steels himself for whatever measure of life-taking may be necessary for his own highest fulfillment. After all, the life of a man is worth more than the life of an animal. If one or the other must be sacrificed, as seems to be the case, it goes without saying that it should be the life of the animal.

But after all, none of us is so concerned about the violence done to animals as about that done to humans. Here again, however, life shows itself—ultimately, if you watch it closely enough—a matter of conquest, appropriation, exploitation. I have never yet had a single instance out of history brought to my attention that proved a valid exception to this generalization. Very true, you may again and again have peoples forming organic societies, in which each man feels that he “belongs,” to which each man feels that he makes a significant contribution, and where each is the better for the work of the others. But such a society never appears, as it were, by spontaneous generation. Left to grow like Topsy, a group of human beings may beget offspring enough, and may thus become a population, a horde, but they never become a people or create a great culture. Before ever there is anything worthy to

be called society, a people is whipped into shape by the hand of some *master*. And when they have thus become a people, they do not go on meekly munching the grass where they happen to be. Precisely to the degree in which they believe in themselves and in their future, and sense the powers latent within them, they cast their eyes about for fairer and more fertile valleys, for an environment in which their life can flourish best: and if that is not where they already are, if they see a place they like better, and if they believe they are more than a match for the present holders, they will go up and try to seize it. As I said in one of my previous chapters, thus it has always been. At the beginning of every people's history we are confronted with—*conquest*. They occupied the land they are on because they were strong enough to take it. And no matter what they build later, this lies at the bottom of it.

That this is a fact, I see no way to deny. And if any of my readers thinks he does see a way to deny it, I should like to confront him squarely and ask him to tell me, in all honesty, what it is. According to my best thinking to date, this violence at the beginning and as the foundation of every people's life is a fact as unmistakable and as unalterable as a boulder in the middle of our road. There seem to me to be only two things that we can do about it. Either we run away from the reality of it and try to escape in some false philosophy or some illusory dream-world; or else, we try to be men enough to face the reality squarely, and adjust our living to it honestly and courageously. I feel now that in the days of my pacifism my stomach was not strong enough to lay hold on reality and to digest it.

I confess that I feel shame at the perfidy and the brutality with which the White man wrenched this fair continent from the Indians—and other lands from other primitive peoples. But surely there was a limit to what could be obtained by peaceful negotiation and agreement. And that limit must have been reached very soon, for with the Indians' way of getting their living, vast areas were required to support a small number of people. What the White man wanted must have collided with what the Red man needed for his very existence. What then? Except as he was broken in battle, the Indian would never have allowed himself to be shoved into out-of-the-way corners of this continent in order to give the White man room for his farms, his cities, and his railroads. But is there anyone who really believes that the millions of square miles of America, not to mention Australia, New Zealand, and Africa, should have been left to the use and enjoyment of a handful of primitive people? In the face of the White man's need of them for his own best development? If there is anyone in his right senses who would hold to such a proposition, I must ask him, on what grounds? So far as I can see, there could be none except the persuasion that the Indian was the White man's equal, that the culture that the European White man had created meant no more to the advance of higher life on Earth than the Stone Age culture of the Red man did.³ But anyone who will allow his zeal for equality to carry him to this point has so lost all judgment, sense of proportion, and recognition of reality, that discussion between us would be useless. The best we can do is to leave him, with his purposeful blindness to the boulder in the road, until he has driven into it enough times to be compelled, by the very hurt he has suffered, to recognize its existence and to learn to drive differently.

Indeed, my reading of history has forced it upon my consciousness that a people not only begins its history with violence, but continues it with violence. A healthy people is a growing people. You can no more restrict it to the limits of its past or confine it within a fixed area than you can keep an oak sapling in a flowerpot, or even in a greenhouse. The growing tree

will not rest, unless you cripple it, until it has taken its full spread of fifty or a hundred feet. And so with a strong people. While it remains in health it has a high birthrate. Soon it requires more room, and, if it has the strength, it takes it. It makes war and pushes out its boundaries. But the same excess energy that does this is at the same time pushing up great cathedrals, painting great pictures, pouring out great music and great literature. The expanded population and the widened frontiers, on the one hand, and cultural achievements, on the other, are over and over again seen to be concomitants. I do not say that one is the cause of the other. I say only that it seems they commonly go together, that you do not get the beautiful side without that other side, which strikes many of us as raw and even ugly. In short, both result from the occasional accumulation of excess energy in a people. If I am right in this, it means that any people that does differently has little worth. Any people that is *able* to restrain its energy does not *have* much; it is weak and sickly. It means, also, that any people that does not occasionally go to war is not going to do anything else either. It strikes me that it is with war as it is with water; if you would have the water that quenches thirst and cleanses all things, that drives power plants and forms the vast deep we love to look out upon under the soft light of a full moon, we must also be willing to accept blizzards, cloudbursts, occasional floods, and even tidal waves that sweep away the lives of thousands of men, women, and children. If we want the overflow of energy that alone is sufficient to create a great culture, then we must take the dark side that forms the reverse side of the picture, that goes with it and cannot be separated from it.

When put thus, and on the assumption that the light and the dark here are in fact bound together in the totality of actual life, surely the conclusion of any healthy man must be quick and certain; he will choose culture, even though it means the acceptance of violence and occasional war, rather than a peace that means a flabby manhood and the sacrifice of significance in a people's existence. Let me have the proud and fiery glance, the towering conception, and the demonic will to do and to endure, even though now and then, or even often, it makes war, rather than the sleepiness and stupor of a people too soft, too tired, too timid, too something, to strike any sparks from the flint of life, or to gamble their existence on a single throw of the dice of Fate.

But perhaps some of my readers are doubtful whether culture and the excess energy that occasionally makes for war *are* concomitants in fact or inevitably. And if so, I should most certainly not press them to take it on my word. Let them read history for themselves, and see whether they can reach a conclusion markedly different from that to which my reading turned me.

I cannot, however, pass on to my next point, without first mentioning what has been said, for instance by William James,⁴ about the compensations, and almost the indispensableness, of war from yet another side. Because of our past, especially the large part taken by warfare in our present make-up, it would seem that the manhood of no people can endure a long peace. After several generations in which most men know nothing more difficult or dangerous than to keep shop, to punch adding machines, to press levers, to turn buttons, to attend meetings, to make speeches, and to run for subway trains, they have declined too much both physically and psychically, in health, in stamina, and in caliber, to give the nation wise leadership, to form the bulwark of the national defense, or even to keep sexual selection in fit working order. Men are no longer worth much when a very large part of them can no

more command the deep and instinctive admiration and loyalty of the female sex. To keep up that strength without which no male is a man, each of us, at least for a period of his life, needs real physical hardship: cold, hunger, wet, sleep in open fields night after night, daily risk of his very life, or at the least an insecurity so great that he knows not what an hour may bring forth, is kept girded and on his toes every minute, and is tested to the breaking point in his ultimate reserves of endurance, ingenuity, courage, and devotion.

Let no one think that I am closing my eyes to all the debauchery that commonly results when war unleashes the passions of men, or to the crime waves that commonly follow in its wake; or that I fail to recognize what a difference it must make in the reactions within men whether they go as Cromwell's and Mazzini's soldiers went, because they are fired with enthusiasm for a cause and have enlisted, or, as in modern times, are herded into the army *en masse*, hate the whole business, go only because they think they must, and fear more the gun at the back of their heads than all the guns in front of them. Make all due allowance for this, and for everything else that can, and should, be placed on the other side of the ledger—against war, still I feel it must in fairness be admitted that to date, and for the general manhood of a nation, the discipline of war has served this salutary function better than anything else of which we know. It has stiffened men's backbones. It has lifted them, at least for a while, out of that other debauchery, perhaps in the long run more ruinous than that of drink, or lust, or killing—the debauchery of loving money and always seeking the softest seat. In many it even calls forth the truly heroic. To be sure, we should hardly like to *make up* wars in order to get these benefits—much as we dropped atomic bombs on the Japanese (so we were told) just to get some extra scientific data. What we need, James believed, was a regimen that would be as consistent with, and even stimulating to, men's spiritual welfare as war is to their physical being. We require a "moral equivalent of war." And for a select portion of the manhood of a people this might already have been found, he thought, in the rigors of a life of voluntary Franciscan poverty.⁵ But as this remains possible only for those of the requisite vision, devotion and will, necessarily but a few, it could not be anywhere near the whole answer to the problem. Exploration has doubtless met the need for a few more, though chiefly perhaps only on the physical side. A custom that all young men should spend a period of their lives at work in mines, on sailing ships, or at draining swamps, or the like, and during their vacations should undertake dangerous mountain-climbing—doubtless all this would greatly help, though chiefly on the physical side, but it is a question whether any or all of this together could keep up the stamina of a people's manhood, in fact call forth and temper the hardiness of the entire people, or so bind them together and purify them in the fires of self-sacrifice, as do the hardships and dangers of war.

And here as before, if the alternative to war is degeneration, which means decline in quality of life and in the end spells extinction, I must finally, and however reluctantly, cast my vote for war. And indeed, for the earlier periods of history, when the destruction and the actual loss of life were comparatively small, before war was fought with machines, it is even easier to feel the strength of the case for war than it is now, when the destruction of everything we value has become so appalling. But the time is approaching, and is perhaps nearer than most people would now think possible, when the fighting will again be done with simpler weapons, on a smaller scale, and perhaps with something of the chivalry and freemasonry that were at one time not uncommon. We must try not to allow the fearsomeness of the present prospect to destroy our perspective on the problem of war as a whole. We must

view it not only in the light of what it is, but also of what it has been, and, in a more healthy state of things, may again become.

But I should like now to pick up the main thread of our discussion and resume our examination of the violence that seems to me inherent in all existence. As my reader will remember, we found it in nature. We found it also in the origin of all human societies, and inextricably associated with the development of their culture.

But there is a particular aspect of this violence at the root of all human life, on which I wish to dwell: for perhaps there is no other fact that did so much to force me out of my pacifist position of thirty years ago. I refer to population pressure. Even Gerald Heard declared that "a pressure of births is in the end hardly to be distinguished from one of bayonets."⁶ Once when I raised this objection to pacifism, the lady with whom I was talking gave a snort of contempt and exclaimed, as though my objection were not worth five minutes' consideration, "Oh, I am not the least worried about the population problem. We can take care of that all right in one way or another." But I wondered whether she would still have felt the same way if she had spent even one day looking into the problem carefully and honestly.

Yet her attitude is probably typical of most intellectuals. "Oh yes, Malthus and the population problem! That *was* a terrible bogey a century ago—and with good reason. But we don't need to worry about that today, because now, you know, we have birth control!" Probably, most intellectuals the world over, and especially most of those who make an ideal of brotherhood and internationalism and who cherish the dream of an ultimately warless world, base their philosophy and their hope, perhaps more than they realize, on an extended use of contraception. And yet I am convinced that this supposed solution is by no means the remedy that it is cracked up to be. It calls for fuller treatment than I can give it here, but I must at least state a few of my most important conclusions about it, because of their bearing on the problem before us.

I may say that I was quick to sense the dubious aspects of birth control, and well over thirty years ago set myself to determine the truth about it. I began by discussing the problem with many people, not only with married couples but with psychiatrists and with doctors; and in 1937 I spent my best time for two weeks in the library of the New York Academy of Medicine investigating the facts about it. Most of the literature that I read was written by the recognized leaders on the two sides of the controversy or by eminent obstetricians on both sides of the Atlantic. I was careful to discount the opinion of anyone in whom I could detect the influence of taboo, in particular from the Catholic Church. The evidence that I came upon compelled me to draw three conclusions, none of which subsequent investigation has caused me to alter.

(1) My studies and my own experience led me to doubt that there was any form of artificial prevention of conception, as an accepted and normal part of marital sexual practice, that was not open to decided objection from the point of view both of physical and of emotional health. Of course, this was thirty years ago, and it is possible that the picture since has undergone some change. But there are good reasons for doubting that it has changed essentially. I suspect that almost universally birth control is seized upon simply because it

seems to offer a cheap and easy means of escaping from arduous discipline in self-control, and of enjoying the pleasures of sex while evading its natural consequences. And this course is entered upon and followed without the slightest preliminary investigation of what the results of such a drastic interference with one of the most vital of human instincts might be. To all persons who are highly sensitive and conscientious in regard to moral and spiritual values, I should strongly recommend such an investigation. They should make sure that their reading is not limited to books in which birth control is advocated. Since we have witnessed a veritable landslide of propaganda for birth control in the last forty or fifty years, it is to be expected that books that expose its dangers and drawbacks have by now been almost buried, and will have to be fairly *dug* up, probably in libraries whose literature on the subject is exceptionally full.

(2) My own experience and my impression of the experience of others have satisfied me that no people of unspoiled instinct will ever voluntarily adopt, or ever consent to be driven into, anything like a universal practice of birth control, whether to keep down the national population or for any other reason. Doubtless this is especially true of the lower levels of a population, where instinct has been least atrophied and is least repressed and delimited by all sorts of intellectual, moral, esthetic and spiritual refinements. But I suspect that it is a very dubious symptom if any married couple of the more *advanced* human types, who to unspoiled instinct have added spiritual discrimination and delicate and exacting taste, can ever make regular use of any of the artificial means of preventing conception without feeling inner revolt. Probably, I know all the methods in general use, and that is what I say. Birth control as preached today is a "signpost of biological despair." A people that accepts it and rejoices in it is in a state of decay. A really healthy people will always scorn and reject it.⁷

(3) My third objection to birth control bears on population pressure only indirectly, but it is of such crucial importance that I must allow myself to submit it, while I am on the subject of birth control, even though it must be somewhat in the nature of an aside.

There is a biological principle having pivotal significance in the destiny of any people, which I cannot too greatly stress. If those family stocks of proven superior capacity, which alone are able to create, to guide and to maintain any society of consequence, are not to be engulfed and gradually exterminated by the sheer numbers of the human mass, *reproduction on the part of those stocks must ever be kept high in relation to the rest of the population.* This, I believe, is a fact amply established by discriminating observation and a discerning examination of the historic record, and I shall have much more to say about it when I come to my chapters on eugenics. It is therefore highly disturbing to discover that the over-all effects of the birth control movement to date, regardless of what might have been, and might still be, the intentions behind it, have proved *dysgenic*. Any honest investigation of the facts must make it clear that this is so. The only part of any population that has been moved to a general practice of contraception as a means of family limitation has been predominantly from those very stocks of greatest proven capacity, from which children are most needed; whereas the stocks less and least well-endowed, whose reproduction most desperately requires to be curtailed, have for the most part, in the United States as certainly as in India or China, been marked by a consistent and determined rejection of birth control, and in consequence by a continued spawning of large families. Thus anyone with the mentality to visualize the situation must apprehend that the actual results of the birth control movement have been to

worsen the national imbalance of capacity. That is, the proportion of those ranging from superior to supremely gifted has been actually reduced in relation to the enormous numbers of those ranging from the ordinary and the mediocre down through the moron and imbecile to the idiot, and including much of the criminal element as well. Moreover, it must never be forgotten that offspring of superior capacity are not born at all to the feeble-minded, and are born only now and then, at a low rate per thousand, in the mediocre ranges of the population, whereas such superiority is born at the highest rate, in the highest number per thousand marriages, in the stocks that have already proved their own superiority. From this, it follows inevitably that since every people is always and forever dependent, even for its very survival, on the quality of its top ten percent, it is a matter of life and death importance—no less—that high reproduction of the top ten percent be ever, and at any cost, maintained. And those who advocate any movement that must lead to a reduction of it, no matter how imposing and plausible their professed aims, and whether or not they realize it, reveal themselves as enemies to their own kind.

At a time such as this (1970), when common sense and reason have been fairly hypnotized out of most people by the allegedly “authoritative” claims of equalitarian propaganda pounded out day and night by almost every available means of reaching the public mind, one must expect that there will be plenty of people to reply testily that “all this business about superior endowment” is so much bosh. It is commonly asserted, and it would seem even widely believed, that improvement in the environment, increase of opportunity, can be depended upon to yield all the men of superior quality that any society will ever need. And I will at once concede that many men of scientific eminence can be cited on this side of the argument. But I am not impressed. In fact, as the result of following the discussion for forty years, I am convinced that we have here what may be the greatest hoax of the century. I began my investigation, let it be known, with a pronounced bias in favor of the equalitarian side, but I began also by *looking for the evidence, pro and con, and honestly facing it*. And it did not take me many years to discover not only where the truth lay but also what was going on beneath the surface to keep the truth hidden! In another place, I shall have occasion to enlarge upon all this. For the present, it must suffice to state categorically that, in my carefully weighed judgment, the manifest truth is that men are born unequal, and that no manipulation or change of environment or increase of opportunity has ever, anywhere, been able to make them anything else. Those who oppose this position, I found, ignore evidence when it is against them, evade it, deny it, even falsify it, but real and substantial evidence of their own that men are equal or can be made so, evidence that will stand up and hold together when subjected to close scrutiny, they never submit. They do not because they cannot. It simply does not exist. That is my present conviction. Let those who dislike it investigate the facts. But let them see to it that they do not content themselves with what in the last analysis is but the assertions of puffed-up “authorities.” Let them insist on *facts*, on *irrefragable evidence*, and then determine whether their own findings admit of any other conclusion.

But now let us return to the question of population pressure and come to grips with it. Is there a threat of world famine? Undeniably there are those who say Yes, and others who say No. Let us listen to typical spokesmen from each side and then try to see which side the weight of evidence favors.

Twenty-five years ago, when I first wrote on this question, I began by quoting from *The Outline Of Sciencæ*, a work in four volumes and edited by Professor J. A. Thomson,⁸ recognized the world over at the time as one of the foremost of biological authorities. On page 1102 of Vol. IV, Thomas Huxley is quoted as saying, "The population question is the real riddle of the Sphinx, to which no political Oedipus has yet found an answer. In view of the ravages of the terrible monster, over-population, all other riddles shrink into insignificance." In *Inbreeding and Outbreeding*, Professors Edward M. East and D. F. Jones, then both at Connecticut State College of Agriculture,⁹ wrote as follows: "It is unfortunate, in view of the facts of the case, that many should still scoff at the conclusions of Malthus on the subject of population, reached a century ago. The impossibility of the food supply keeping pace with an unchecked natural increase of population is a truism which cannot be glossed over by pointing to the ingenuity of man in applying mechanics to agriculture. The truth is that the world is approaching a population limit faster than ever Malthus supposed, and the result of applying new methods to field culture is merely to exploit the natural fertility of the soil at a higher rate. [I shall greatly enlarge upon this aspect of the problem in my next chapter.] The supposed increase in the amount of food is illusory. In the United States, naturally the richest country on the globe, the *per capita* production of all the important meat animals and some of the great agricultural crops is *decreasing*." ¹⁰ A generation later S. J. Holmes, Professor of Zoology at the University of California, wrote to the same effect. "The basic limiting factor in population is food, and the possibilities of food production on this planet are strictly limited. Several countries in Europe do not, and some of them probably cannot, produce enough food for their own support. A good deal of Asia outside of Siberia is not very far from the same situation. Of course, with intensive cultivation production may be increased, but if our numbers continue to increase as in the past it will not be long before no amount of cultivation would yield enough to insure us against the possibility of going hungry during the lean years. Food-exporting countries, as our own has been, will soon require all their food for their own people. The world is rapidly filling up. . . whether the saturation point will be reached in fifty or one hundred, or even two hundred years does not invalidate the conclusion that we are drawing distinctly nearer the time when the food resources of the Earth will no longer suffice for further increase in numbers." ¹¹

There had been a wide-spread impression abroad that man had only to apply to the soil enough chemical fertilizer and yet further improved machines, and there need be almost no limit to the amount of food that he could grow. But gradually it happened that well-informed men, in positions to know what they were talking about, were warning that it was precisely this sort of "science," namely tractor and factory farming, "efficiency" farming, farming as a business rather than as a way of life, that was responsible for raising the spectre of famine even in America. I shall go into this matter much more thoroughly in my next chapter, on the effects of the Machine on our life, but I must say enough about it here to introduce the problem.

The alarm centered around erosion, which Viscount Lymington, writing in 1939, declared to be "the world's most serious problem." And he added, "In fifty years, an area probably fifty times the size of Britain has been destroyed or partially destroyed . . . as good food producing land." ¹² In their book *The Rape Of The Earth*, G.V. Jacks and R.O. Whyte,¹³ perhaps the world's foremost authorities on the state of the Earth's soil (G.V. Jacks was

Director of the Imperial Bureau of Soil Science), made such statements as the following: "Misapplied science has brought to the world's richest virgin lands a desolation compared with which the ravages of all the wars in history are negligible" (p. 83). "To-day, destruction of the Earth's thin living cover is proceeding at a rate and on a scale unequalled in history, and when that thin cover—the soil—is gone, the fertile regions where it formerly lay will be uninhabitable deserts. Already, indeed, probably nearly a million square miles of new desert have been formed, a far larger area is approaching desert conditions and throughout the New World erosion is taking its relentless toll of soil fertility with incredible and ever-increasing speed" (Ibid., p. 18). Despite all science's innovations and "improved" methods, "yet, taken the world over, the average output is falling." In the United States and South Africa (General Smuts supported their statement) "erosion has already assumed the proportions of a national disaster of the first magnitude, and has sapped their life blood to such a degree that only a tremendous and singleminded effort from a united nation can prevent further and irreparable decline" (Ibid., p. 21).

To some, these statements may seem needlessly alarming. But the following quotations revealed that some pretty level-headed reviewers and periodicals of high standing found them supported by very impressive evidence. Said the *Boston Transcript*: "This book [*The Rape Of The Earth*] may well become the spur which will prevent our great nation from becoming another poverty-stricken China." Said John Chamberlin in *The New Republic*: "This book packs a wallop that is as unsettling in its own way as a jab from the left hand of Joe Louis . . . If even half of what the Messrs. Whyte and Jacks have to say is true, then practically all our publicists, sociologists and economists are, if not moon-struck idiots, at least vain wanderers in the dark." Viscount Lymington's *Alternative To Death*,¹⁴ published in 1943, seemed to make it starkly evident that, even with the soundest management of the soil, the amount of food it can be made to yield is strictly limited. The notion that a threat of shortage was a matter over which it was needless and even ridiculous to worry, had become an exploded myth. The long and the short of it was that this problem of population pressure, which we have been considering, might suddenly be jerked down out of the realm of discussion and abstract theory sooner than most of us anticipated. And it might look different, even to our most conscientious idealists, when there just was not food enough to go around.

Thus things stood about twenty-five years ago, when I wrote the first version of this chapter. Then for a couple of decades the excitement died down, and the issue seemed to have been almost completely forgotten, until a year or so ago, in 1968, the word "ecology" was dropped upon the world nearly as much to its alarm as the bomb dropped upon Hiroshima in 1945, and Dr. Paul Ehrlich of Stanford University came out with his *The Population Bomb*, which almost in a day became a bestseller, and, with many other books and voices joining in, has awakened something like nation-wide, and perhaps even world-wide, consternation and alarm. Ecology, of course, is concerned with the whole range of problems growing out of the relations between living organisms, especially human beings, and their environment, and from these have come all the movements to stop "pollution." But these, however great their reality and their urgency, are more or less aside from the problem upon which, for the moment, our attention is primarily concentrated. Nevertheless, Dr. Paul Ehrlich and those working with him, including a group that goes by the name of Zero Population Growth, are making people's hair stand on end by declaring that "it is already too late to avoid famines

that will kill millions, possibly by 1975." Like the scientists whom I quoted from a period twenty-five years before him, he appears to be aroused by his recognition that the soil of the Earth is limited in the number of people that it can feed. But there is also a big difference between him and them. They were alarmed by the rate at which our prevalent methods of farming were ruining our soil and causing it to be washed wholesale into the sea; and in exerting themselves to correct this they were undertaking to put the solidest possible foundation under all human life on this planet. However, many of them, like Dr. Ehrlich now, did argue twenty-five years ago, that unless population growth were brought under control and stopped, parts of the world must be confronted, sooner or later, with famine.

But these latter were not only men of recognized scientific standing, but they wrote as true scientists do, with measured statements and supporting evidence, and they went at the problem from both ends, showing concern not only about the increase in births but also about the exhaustion and waste of the soil upon which all human life is dependent. Dr. Ehrlich and his crowd, on the other hand, have had little or nothing to say about erosion or soil exhaustion, or tractors, or chemical fertilizers and poisonous sprays, but from the start concentrated on merely stopping births. And they would stop births by almost any means: if the arguments and the methods approved and advocated by the Planned Parenthood Association failed to produce the desired result, some of them at least are ready to resort to an imposition of legal penalties upon every family birth beyond the second, and even to putting sterilizing chemicals in food and drinking water. Indeed, as I read Ehrlich's book, it struck me that he had been quick to sense in the snowballing population pressure an opportunity to intensify the drive for increased centralized-state control and ultimately for world government—much as fear of the atom bomb, a couple of decades earlier, had been seized upon and worked up to the same end. In short, Ehrlich's book appears to be rather thinly disguised propaganda for the surrender of national sovereignties and the erection of a world state. Indeed, it seems that many, if not most, of the outstanding proponents of this intensified drive for birth control on a worldwide scale are also tied up with organizations or movements that are working hard to break up nationality and national patriotism all over the Earth, and to divide up the entire globe, in defiance of existing and natural human affinities, affiliations and political structures, according to blueprints drawn up years ago by the United World Federalists and their confederates.

This did not long escape the attention of some of our more penetrating conservative patriots. The first of these to come to my attention was Dr. Medford Evans, a former college professor and one-time chief of security for the U.S. atomic energy project, writing in an issue of *American Opinion*, which I am unable, at the moment, to identify. A fuller and more recent article about it appeared in the issue of the same periodical for May, 1970. It is entitled "Ecology—Government Control of the Environment," by Gary Allen. But, in spite of my sympathy for some of what they say, the case of these men, and of others like them, is vitiated by their going on to argue that threat of famine is nothing but a fraud rigged up to serve political, and ultimately treasonous, ends. Gary Allen quotes a Professor Karl Brandt of Stanford University as actually saying that the United States would "not be overpopulated with 350,000,000 or many more people," and Professor Ansley Coale of Princeton as having declared that "even if our population rose to a billion, its average density would not be very high by European standards." He also quotes an announcement in the *Los Angeles Times* for February 12, 1970, from the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization, "that the

food problem facing the world in the near future is more likely to be surpluses than starvation.”

But in support of positions of this kind he shows that astonishing faith in the potentialities of modern technology, not least as applied to agriculture, which, though all but universal in the United States today, I find so utterly naïve and generally unconvincing.

I will leave it to my reader to decide for himself where the truth is. I believe that it was given by the scientists whom I quoted at the beginning of this discussion of population pressure: *there is, and must be*, a limit to the amount of food that the Earth can produce; and therefore *there is, and must be*, a limit to the number of people the Earth can support. And if that limit is passed, some people, maybe a vast lot of people, perhaps even millions of people, must die. I may remark that Arnold Toynbee has given this position his unequivocal support.¹⁵

But this raises a question of absolutely prime importance: *Who is going to do the dying?* Dr. Ehrlich, in his *The Population Bomb*, writes as if the pressure for food ought to be and could be equalized, like the pressure of steam on all sides within a boiler. Perhaps he foresees a UN as a Big Policeman who will take food from those who have a surplus and give it to those that lack, so that the hunger will be equally divided among all peoples, and each will do its share of the dying. But that is not the condition today, and it never will be as long as populations continue to stand in separate, independent blocs. Each nation now has its own potential for producing food, and its own potential for getting any necessities it may lack. If it has plenty, its people can, if they will, not only eat but eat well, while the people in another country, or in many other countries, hunger and starve. Could it be justified in so doing? Or it may be unable to grow all the food its people need, and unable also, for one reason or another, to produce other things that can be traded for food. What then?

The gravity of the problem was brought home to me very forcibly when I was in Japan in 1928. And Japan will serve me for an example as well as any other country I can think of. (Germany might be equally forceful, but her case is less simple and less clear-cut.) The Japanese were recognized as among the ablest truck-gardeners in the world. For all our machinery and artificial fertilizer they got far higher yields from an acre than we averaged. And the lengths to which they had gone to bring every possible square foot of their soil into use was painfully evident from the endless miles of stone retaining walls they had built, so to level up the land that they could grow rice even in the tiniest pockets far back between their hills. But Japan is in effect the exposed top of an almost submerged Himalayan mountain range, and only 18 percent of its surface is arable. Despite all their skill and their utmost labor they could grow food for only 59 million of their 60 million people. Nor could their factories make things which they could exchange for food, as Britain had done, unless they could somehow obtain the necessary coal and ore; and within the boundaries of Japan the necessary coal and ore did not exist. What then could she do?

What do you think you would do, my good reader? I mean especially, those of you who are pacifists. Suppose we were in this predicament—you and your loved ones, and I and mine, and all other Americans with us. Would you be willing to lie down and die—and let your loved ones lie down and die, rather than join with other Americans to take, if you could, the land that would mean life, whether through the food we could grow on it, or through the

coal and iron, and other resources that would feed our industry and thus enable us to make the things we might exchange for food? I believe that under these circumstances most pacifists would lose their pacifism. I am sorry if I must give offense, but I am frank to say that I should not *respect* any people whose instinct to live was so weak that they would hold to some moral rule that kept them from doing whatever they needed to do in order to live and to carry on toward the fulfillment of their destiny. Knowing as much as I did of the whole situation, it was impossible for me to withhold my sympathy for Japan in her seizure of Manchuria. I believe that she did only what any other nation of any worth would have done in like circumstances. And if a "Christian" cannot approve, it is only evidence of what I have so often said, that Christianity is the enemy of *life*.

"But," my reader may reply, "Japan did not stop with Manchuria. Once she got started she went right on grabbing, until, if she had not been stopped, she would have grabbed up the whole Orient." I know, and I will not try to defend the rape of Nanking, which simply seems totally out of character and completely unlike the Japanese that one reads about in history and as I met them in 1927. They called forth from me a love and an admiration such as I have felt for very few other people on Earth. One wonders a bit whether it may not have been something they learned under Western "tutelage." There is abundant evidence that inhumanity is contrary to their history in the period before Britain and America disturbed their peace. Professor Quincy Wright, in reviewing the war record of the chief nations during the past 460 years, found that while Britain topped the list as a war-maker, Japan stood at the bottom—interestingly enough, along with Germany! ¹⁶ And Harry Paxton Howard, with many reasons for not being friendly to the Japanese, nevertheless wrote in *The Christian Century* for May 2, 1945, "The Japan which we 'opened' in the 1850's was a completely isolationist country, living to itself and deliberately shutting out the wars and rivalries for empire among Western powers in the Far East. For more than two centuries Japan had been at peace, both at home and abroad. . . Japan had been in contact with its Chinese neighbors for some fifteen centuries, contacts disturbed by but three wars, in only one of which Japan was the aggressor. There are no two neighboring European countries—or even two separated by the English Channel—which have any comparable record." And he continued, "Townsend Harris, first American minister to Japan. . . informed the British envoy at Tokyo, to the latter's amazement, that he would prefer to see our new commercial and other privileges in Japan abandoned and Japan return to its former seclusion, rather than see the horrors of war inflicted upon this peaceful land and happy people."

But this last is somewhat an aside, which I have admitted as a word in defense of a brave and naturally noble people. But now let us come back to this allegation that, while Japan may have been justified in seizing Manchuria, she had no business to take more than was required for her existence.

The unrealism, the lack of imagination behind the implied accusation here, would seem to reflect the level of practical sagacity that one would expect to find at a Sunday School party or at an old ladies' tea. I know nothing about military strategy, but I have played football and have had plenty of experience in testing my ability to keep on my feet and manage my body in relation to a load or a thrust. And I know that if you want to hold, say, a given square foot of ground, and there are others who want to stand there, you cannot do it by merely standing on that spot—your two feet together. You have got to straddle it. That is, to *hold the*

foot, you must *occupy more than* the foot. Otherwise, you will very shortly be knocked off. And just how, pray tell me, and for how long, could Japan have expected to maintain her hold on Manchuria, with China every day becoming more industrialized—China with her 400 million people, Japan with her 60 million,¹⁷ unless she straddled it, held the approaches to it? If Britain believed, as she did, that she could not keep her power in the Orient without holding Singapore, Borneo, and the like, I wonder whether Japan could have hoped to hold Manchuria, hoped to hold her ground in the face of a rapidly rising Chinese colossus, not to speak of pressures from the rest of the world, if she did not hold also some of the Orient's most strategic bastions.

Probably, many of my readers know far more about Japan and the Japanese than I do. And I may have said some things that would be contradicted by every economist, historian, and geopolitician qualified to pronounce an opinion. And yet this would not necessarily shake my essential position in the slightest. My essential position is this: There is a limit to the amount of food that can be produced on the Earth. Make all possible allowance for the increase in production that can be effected by a truly sound science, still there is a limit to what the earth can be made to yield. But the limit here is not matched by any like limit in the production of human beings. The fertility of the earth is outstripped by the fecundity of the womb. And the problem is only intensified and a crisis hastened by the fact that science now enables people to live longer than ever before. Sooner or later, therefore, here or there, under one set of circumstances or another, if not in Japan or in Germany then somewhere else, there will appear more mouths than the available food can feed. And the people that have the vigor to produce such pressure of surplus population may well be the peoples whose surplus energy and mind and spirit and driving will have made them supreme creators, carriers and renewers of culture and civilization. What then? This is not at all a hypothetical situation. Over and over again, it has happened in the past, on a large scale or on a small scale, and in the not-too-distant future it is likely again to overtake much of the world. The pacifist has got to face this as an inescapable fact of life. What will he tell a nation confronted with starvation that it should do? When the only alternative to war is pusillanimous acceptance of death, must he not, however great his regret, give war his sanction? At least, that was my own answer. At this point, my pacifism came to a full stop.

Sir Arthur Keith, in his *Essays on Human Evolution*, adduced some impressive considerations that support such a position. His life-long study of human origins finally convinced him that all human evolution, which means all human advance, had depended, on the one hand, on the maintenance of the racial homogeneity and integrity of the group, and, on the other, on a competition and struggle with other groups in which the best tended to survive. Thus evolution has operated on, and required, *a dual code of morality*. For keeping the group intact (eventually the group became the nation), there was the "code of *amity*," which bound its members together, and made them collectively strong, effective, and creative. But when their vital interests and those of another nation collided, the "code of *enmity*" was called into play, which required aloofness, mistrust, hostility, competition, conflict, and, as a last resort, war itself, and even made virtues of the qualities that promised victory in war. The evidence satisfied Sir Arthur that the code that bound relations *within* the nation never has been, and *cannot* and *should* not be, binding upon the relations *between* nations. If it is to survive, then it must be ready and able to fight. And if, where its very existence is at stake, it fairly goes berserk in an all-out effort to save itself, it is ethically commendable.¹⁸

I find this argument unanswerable.

And while I am about it, I will go on to state my conclusions at their baldest and starkest. In my judgment, men like Dr. Paul Ehrlich reveal the sickly and weakened instinct so common today in the modern intellectual, when they state the problem of population pressure in terms of the world. Awful as mass starvation is to contemplate—*anywhere*, even in places as distant from us as China, India, or Africa, it should nevertheless be of primary concern to us, as to any other people, *who* starves. No people still guided by sound instincts and unweakened vitality will ever think it just as good that some other people should eat as that they themselves and their own children should eat, or that their own people should be the ones to starve as that starvation should come to others. As long as they can manage it, they will not resign themselves to starving at all. If they have a food surplus, they may choose to share it with people abroad, but they will not share it to the point where they themselves starve or become the victims of malnutrition. They will resolve, rather, not only to eat, but to have children in such numbers as will best advance their own position on the Earth; and if and when necessary, they will, as far as they are able, take whatever they have need of, whether food from the mouths of others or living space, that they and their children after them may not only survive, but survive in such a state and condition and numbers that they can have a future rich with meaning. It is with such eyes and such ideas that the hungry hordes of China and India are looking upon Australia and New Zealand and Africa at this moment—yes, and upon the United States too. People into whom the Christian doctrines of sympathy, pity and self-abnegation, and even self-effacement, have been dinned ever since they were born, have suffered such a weakening of their will to live that they will find it almost impossible to face up to such painful facts. But it looks to me as though we have now reached the day when such facts must be faced by the White peoples, and faced firmly and sternly, even grimly, if we are not to be among those to be swept away.

Probably some, and maybe many, of my readers are persuaded that a way out is to be found in internationalism. But the internationalism held up before us today is nothing more than an ivory tower for many idealists and a trap for the uniformed and unwary. Internationalism would break, or frustrate, or paralyze all the affinities and social structures by which individuals now band with others of their own kind for mutual defense against aggression, to ensure their security and independence, to shut out all human types they feel to be alien to themselves or inferior, and thus be free and able to work together toward the realization of their hopes, their dreams, and the destiny they feel stirring within them. By this means, *nationalism*, they preserve their identity as a people and gain the collective strength to make of their common life an expression of themselves, something deeply satisfying, something in which they can take pride, something full of meaning and promise.

All this may be looked at also from the point of view of biology. Every free and independent nation is what Sir Arthur Keith called a unique “gene pool.”¹⁹ This contains the potentialities of all that the nation has in itself to become, an identity that marks it off from the other peoples of the Earth, a distinctive character for which it is known and which the individuals who compose it may be depended upon, as a rule, to manifest; and an accumulating strength that will at the same time, here and there, now and then, throw up great leaders, teachers, creators, and also build into the rank and file the sturdy stuff that the leaders must have in their followers if the national destiny is to be realized.

But this can happen only if the gene pool is left undisturbed for a very long time—for centuries. The process is well known among scientists and is called segregation. I shall have much to say about this in Chapters XVI and XVII, but it is essential to present a few fundamentals of it here. If the breeding possibilities of the gene pool are to be realized, it must be held and kept sacrosanct and inviolable, and to this end any means may be resorted to, any severity or fierceness, that it may not be adulterated or contaminated by intermarriage with people that are alien.²⁰ A hundred years ago, Darwin declared that “free crossing obliterates characters.”²¹ But more than two thousand years before Darwin the old Hebrew prophets, though they could have known nothing about the laws of genetics, nevertheless inveighed against all intermarriage with the accursed *goyim* (Hebrew word for “gentiles,” for all non-Jews), and in the end committed their race to that severe and relentless policy of segregation, of marrying only with their own kind, which alone accounts for the fact that they did not, ages ago, follow the Ten Tribes of their brothers into oblivion, and which beyond any doubt accounts also for much of the modern Jew’s giftedness. He may be the leader in the concerted and worldwide effort to break down segregation among *other* peoples, but he certainly sticks to it doggedly for himself. In Israel, even today, marriage of Jews and gentiles is legally impossible; and in every orthodox Jewish congregation, any Jew who marries a gentile is marked off as dead. And in this, I am convinced that modern science and the verdict of history are solidly behind them. If they are not to be swallowed up and disappear, if they are to survive as a distinct people with the distinguishing traits and capabilities that have long marked them, they must at any and all cost preserve their gene pool. It is certain, therefore, that however much they may try to foist or force mixing and mongrelization upon other peoples, they will never tolerate it among themselves. Within their own ranks, every effort will be expended to prevent intermarriage with the outsider. For Darwin was absolutely right: “Free crossing obliterates characters.” And they know it.

But the drive of the internationalists is in a totally different direction. Under a world government, existing gene pools would be broken up, and people would lack the means of coming together in such a way as to form a gene pool, and would be deprived of all means of preserving it sacred and inviolable. Internationalism, as I see it, would *atomize* mankind. It would dissolve the cohesive forces that bind men together naturally and organically, and would break down nations and people into mountainous aggregates of drifting sand, hundreds of millions of helpless individuals, powerless to win or to defend any rights, raceless, nationless, faceless, and virtually nameless, spiritually eviscerated, nondescript nonentities. Out of this, nothing could come but a populace mishmash. Intermarriage would become universal practice. Anybody could marry anybody. And in the end, there would be only one race the Earth over, the result of mixing all races together. All men—except of course, the masters, who designed all this and forced it through—would become little more than slaves, fit only to labor under orders and to empty their pockets at the markets.

And exactly thus it is intended by the schemers for world government. The human being of the future is significantly and fittingly prefigured in the statue to Man that stands in the UN Building in New York City—without sex, muscle, or any facial feature, and his hands behind his buttocks—where they can be easily manacled. The real and ultimate object of the United World Federalists and affiliated movements has absolutely nothing to do with the welfare of humanity. To them, human beings are only sheep to be shorn. In saying this, I do not have in mind the bemused idealists who have too little realism and imagination to foresee what

world government must lead to, and who to the remorseless masters are simply expendable pawns. But the powerful men who are at the bottom of it all and behind it every inch of the way, know full well that what they are really driving for is to make the world safe for international bankers, giant industrial combines, and the mushrooming cartels of international hucksters and peddlars. Every land is to be opened up to chains of shopping plazas, every continent made readily accessible as a field for capital investment with high rates of return, and all humanity broken down into a homogenized mass of disarmed and castrated slaves held in bondage to do the work and—go shopping.

To my mind, it is the most dreary, insulting, and degrading conception for the ordering of human life that the mind of man has ever devised. Happily, I feel certain that it will never come to pass, or prove workable if it should. In the long run, it will prove impossible to induce or seduce the mass of humanity into embracing it, or for any length of time to cow them into enduring it. Ultimately, it must break down.

Twenty-five years ago, Dr. Einstein and President Hutchins lifted their voices to cry aloud to the world that after the atom bomb an international government was our only hope. Many other personages have since followed suit. But through it all I have found reason to believe, as already said, that fear of the atom bomb was deliberately worked up in order to stampede the peoples of the Earth into the corral of a world slave state where, like cows, they could most easily and safely be milked—and in due time slaughtered. Be that as it may, if an international government is in fact our only hope, then indeed is there no hope. Despite all the authority of these wonderful one-worlders, is it not on the face of it preposterous, is it not naïve, at a time when governments all over the world are driven to the verge of distraction and even to collapse by their inability to grapple successfully with the unprecedented problems arising within their own borders, to stake all one's hope for the future on the untried experiment of a super-government, to unload upon it all the unsolved problems of a world burning and divided with fears wilder and hates more venomous and universal than the Earth has witnessed since the beginning, and really to believe that the experiment has any chance of success? What is revealed here but modern man's childish and pathetic faith in the power of the Machine to work miracles? Behold here our internationalists on bended knee before their God, while the priests of progress cry to all, "Put your nickel in the slot, boys, press the lever, and presto—peace!" Gone is all belief in spirit. We are always running to mechanics to save us. If something goes wrong, is it not always our first move to open an office, to draw up a constitution, to hire a promoter, to write letters or despatch telegrams or pass laws? With us everything important is on the outside; the inside does not matter, or will duly fall into place once we get the outside working. And so, with governments everywhere failing under their own domestic load, we will launch another, *de novo*, load it with the problems of the whole world and expect it to walk away with the load, to work wonderfully. Fools! The only place it will work wonderfully is in our heads, in our imaginations, or in propagandistic fiction—only before we try to put it into operation, only while it is still but a government on paper, a government wrapped in cellophane. We had a chance to try out one of these wonderful international contraptions some fifty years ago; and he who will may see the upturned hulk of it rusting by the roadside where it was finally junked. The failure of this did not deter us from being tricked into trying out yet another at the end of the last World War. But today it is obvious that this is no less a failure than the first. And while we are in our senses, must we not realize that there is

nothing truly international or united about all this United Nations business? Can we not, by this time, see for ourselves that at bottom it is little better than an arrangement by which a few banditti can the more surely and safely and efficiently get their intended victims on their backs and rifle their pockets?

I have already revealed plainly enough my lack of faith that the time will ever come when an international government would work. Certainly it will never work until there has first come a profound *inner* change in the peoples of the Earth. There would have to be some genuine sense of unity, born of mutual appreciation, admiration, and trust, not to speak of affection and some sense of a common end. To think that we are ready for international government because of the purely physical fact that facility of communication and transportation has brought all people near to one another, is the grossest stupidity. This surely is to get the cart before the horse. To be brought near to one another before we are ready to be or want to be is only to aggravate and inflame the old antagonisms that have always so embittered national relations. We are so close now that there is no escape from our neighbor's smell, even though it makes us want to vomit. We are so close that no one can move without stepping on someone's toes. We are so close that our very existence has come to depend upon the solution of problems thousands of miles removed from us, about which we do not know anything and are too weary of it all to try to find out anything. We have become surfeited with problems and closeness and humanity, and we ask only to be let alone and given room in which to breathe and to turn around. Peace will never come out of a situation like this. No amount and no kind of governmental reforms, arrangements, rules, will ever suffice to hold in such universal seething discontent.

But is there any way in which it is likely, or possible, that the time for international government will arrive? Certainly no government, and nothing else either, will ever be able to exorcise that violence which, as we have seen, is an inextricable part of human existence. There always must be shiftings of one population at the expense of another. And when the peoples whose interests thus collide both happen to be strong, do you believe that either would give way to the other without a struggle? Would not both gather to themselves such supporters as they could muster and, rather than yield ground to the other, or rather than submit to "international law," bring down the entire structure upon their own heads?

But over and above this—or rather, in large part just because of it—is it in fact true that there is an underlying common purpose and identity of interest uniting all the peoples of Earth, of which they can be made conscious and which can be made to prevail? Frankly, I doubt it. Admiration of another people and appreciation of their culture may to a considerable extent be a good thing; certainly I felt it as I made my way around the world. But I wonder whether the creative health of any people must not set limits to it. I read that the very mental *processes* in the head of a Japanese or Chinese are different from ours. Dr. S. I. Hayakawa in his *Language in Action* declared that ". . . a person speaking a language of structure entirely different from that of English, such as Japanese, Chinese, or Turkish, does not even think the same thoughts as an English-speaking person."²² To my mind, every people of any worth is peculiar—peculiar by its very germ plasm and by the blood that courses in its veins, and which it can no more exchange for any other than it can jump out of its skin; peculiar by the distinct geographical area, with its climate, topography, fauna, soil, watercourses, and all the rest, out of which it is sprung and to which it is shaped, in which it

is rooted, and from which it can with difficulty, if at all, be transplanted. Each people, in consequence, has its own language of good and evil, and never shall they wholly understand one another. And in their efforts to cling to, maintain, and extend their own way, each will come into conflict with another. But therein is their *life*. They *could* not do our way, any more than we could do theirs. And if the most earnest, honest and powerful artist in America could feel that "Modern Art was (his) ruination," that he had saved himself only by waking up to the fact that its gods were "false gods, tin gods, clay gods, *no* gods," turning against it, hating it and cleansing himself from it to go a way of his own, I wonder whether any *people* is ever going to create anything that can be to it a joy forever, except as, for its own protection against disintegration and inner chaos, it holds the alien at a distance and resists to the death any effort of the alien to penetrate to its heart. With my entire being, I agree with Nikolai Berdyaev's pronouncement that "Culture always had national character and roots. An international culture is impossible." ²³ The Chinese were a great people, the Japanese were a great people, *before* the West forced their doors. We have felt flattered that the Japanese soon proved so avid for our industrialism, and have complimented the Chinese on arousing themselves at last from their long lethargy to a desire for both our machines and our "progressive" institutions. And when we began shoving our democracy down the throat of Japan we thought we were "liberating" her and fitting her to be a decent member of the family of nations. But a thousand years hence it may be very clear that all this was the ruin of China and Japan.

In any case, the continuous violence latent in all human existence is ever and again showing itself. There is always the fact that the increase of one means the decrease of another. To say that there is, or ever can be, "identity of interest" here is simply stupid and false. No matter what the ideal and the intention in the name of which it is spoken, it is untrue, and serves only to obscure the facts and to confuse the mind.

But maybe some of my readers will reply, as a pacifist of my acquaintance actually did some years ago. "It is precisely this sense of being distinct peoples that makes all the trouble. Internationalism may hasten the day when red, white, yellow, and black will have so intermingled and intermarried, that there will no more be Americans, or English, or Russians, or Negroes, or Japanese, or Jews, but only people, only human beings." Indeed, I am only too much afraid that right here we do, in fact, have the ultimate logic of the pacifist's philosophy and the ultimate tendency of his influence. Brock Chisolm of the United Nations World Health Organization began advocating this very thing years ago. But it is nothing less than the ultimate of degeneracy and shame. For what does it mean but that for a mere negative end, the mere absence of strife, or mere safety, the pacifist would be willing to sacrifice all that has given human existence any significance? He would be willing (I doubt that he would when it came to the test, but that is what his philosophy logically implies) to have men lose their distinctive features of mind, of character, and even of body (of eye, hair, head, color, form, height) and regress (yes, *revert*, even in the strict biological sense) to the undifferentiated human mass from which they have come. He would be willing to erase all the toe-holds in the mountain-side by which one people after another, each in its own way, its own time, and at the price of ages of infinite struggle and pain, has climbed out of the abyss into the sunlight, onto highlands where they danced superbly and in joy, and where they built grandly to their exceeding great pride.

That is to say, it is the logic of this ultimate pacifist argument, that it would sacrifice culture for peace. For, mark you, no culture ever came out of human hodgepodge, out of populations, but only out of peoples, races, nations, *differentiated* units. The whole meaning of evolution is contained in this word “differentiation.” All the gains achieved through millennia of costly development are registered in *differences*—spiritual, mental, physical—by which one people is *distinguished* from another. It is because I fear that internationalism—certainly while we are under the domination of modern ideas—must tend toward a reversion to a human hodgepodge, a human stew or pudding, with all ingredients dumped in and mixed up together, that I strongly mistrust all efforts in that direction. Internationalism or no internationalism, I know this: I want races and peoples and nations to *remain* races and peoples and nations, if anything even more sharply differentiated from one another than they are now. I want it for precisely the same reason that I want individuals to be ever more sharply differentiated into persons. The reason is, simply, that it is only in these distinguishing and character-giving differences, whether of individual or of nation or of race, that life can acquire and transmit any significance. I am glad, along with Robert Frost,²⁴ to have the festive board, and to have many gather there as friends—the more the better, but I would have each one that comes, and whether man or people, *to be something in and of himself or itself*, and bring to the common store of cultural wealth some unique contribution. But when, for the sake of peace or any other high-sounding aim, men begin to melt down their distinctive shape and to merge and mix their distinctive color into shapes and colors that are acceptable to all, it means only one thing: they are losing the instincts by which alone they are able to maintain themselves in life, in vigor, and in beauty anywhere. Damn cosmopolitanism! Damn internationalism! These are our poison. It is as though you would try to undo aeons of evolution and would reduce roses, snapdragons, hollyhocks and Devil’s paintbrushes—to one flower, reminiscent of each but preserving the beauty and fragrance of none. These are the seductions by which our sickly idealists, for the sake of a peace that will forever escape them, would lead life away from the Earth—and off it. Better, I say, yes far better, is war, than this bloodthinning and sickening of life.

Ah, this internationalism—how many look to it today as their one hope, and believe in it passionately. But in my mind so much stacks up *against* it. The apparent facts force my judgment to pronounce it unhealthy. Like socialism, democracy, and the Christianity from which, more or less, they sprang, it is the enemy of life as I cherish it and hope for it. Without it we may go on having wars, but I will far rather take war than the decadence of which internationalism, as we have it today, is a ripened symptom.

My mention of Christianity reminds me that my readers may want to know what I now make of the teaching of Jesus in relation to all this—the teaching of Jesus which, in 1917, had the primary part in making me a pacifist and so largely determined the next fifteen years of my life.

Much of my reply must be only to repeat what I said in earlier chapters.²⁵ No *society* can be founded or run on the basis of the teaching of Jesus. In every society, many things must be done for which any man would be handicapped, if not actually unfitted, by any practice of his teaching. In the beginning, it was never intended for everybody. There are indications, even in the Gospels themselves, that originally it was given only to the inner circle, composed of those who most nearly understood and shared Jesus’ vision of life and had

followed him in a complete rejection of "the world." Accordingly, I cannot conceive of it as any ethic for those on the bridge of the ship, responsible for getting it through troubled waters and dangerous storms to its destination: and it certainly was not for those on deck, or at the guns, or in the engine room, or down in the hold. Had not Jesus despaired of the world? For him was it not seduction, contamination, and frustration? Nowhere did he pronounce life good—life on this Earth, here and now. Nowhere did he call men to accept it, rejoice in it, love it and exalt it. One looks through the Gospels in vain for any rules or regimen by which a people might maintain themselves, any racial hygiene by which they might purge their stock of every manner of defect and ugliness, and set before themselves an ascending line that aimed at some heights. If he was not entirely concentrated on a "beyond," on a life after death for which life on Earth was set down as but a preparation and a condition, he certainly did call men to a kind of life for the sake of which they must repudiate, and as far as possible withdraw from, all earthly connections and responsibilities. And one thing certainly to be eschewed was violence.

Now there are those, of course, who like all this, and who look upon Jesus and his kind as one of the end products of a people's history, one of the crowning flowers of its achievement. But though we may, and certainly should, give them due honor for their love, their self-mastery, their dedication, and their comprehension and revelation of the inner being of man, nevertheless anyone of balanced and objective perception will see that all mystics of Jesus' kind must always, in a sense and to some degree, be orchids, parasitic on the stock that bore them. They counsel against violence, they themselves do no violence, yet they could never have come into existence except as others, long before them, by violence cleared the ground from which they sprang, and by violence keep in order and in condition the soil and the garden in which they grow. There must ever be those who keep the garden. Else would the garden soon go back to rabbits and jungle.

But I suspect that some of my readers have not liked the way in which I seem to take delight in deflating people's cherished hopes and dreams. But it is not because I take pleasure in disillusioning people, nor because I have become a cynic and no longer believe that there is any way out. Rather is it because I do not want to see people blowing so hard at balloons that will not fly, and driving down blind alleys for nothing. There is a way out, but it is not the way people would like to follow. The way is not to be found in any of this cheap and easy resort to mechanism, organization, the infinitely varied arrangement and rearrangement of external details—laws, red-tape, words on paper, tariffs, treaties, economic agreements, and all the rest. All these have their place, but they come *after*, and not *first*. Something else must come first. And for this there is absolutely no substitute. First, there must be those who have mastered the meaning of life, who have established their dominion as kings over a kingdom within themselves. And the men who cannot do this, or in any event have not yet accomplished it, must be brought under the will and direction of these kings. Then we shall be on our way to growing up as peoples. But now everything is upside down and inside out. Somehow, we have got into our hands the playthings of the gods, though we are still but children. It is utterly impossible for such as we to bear long our present knowledge of nature. The tempest is even now gathering on the horizon. Do you not hear the wind whining through the rigging? Presently the fury of the storm will break upon us. And that will be the end for a while of our machines, and of our science, and of all this facility of communication and transportation that have brought people far *too* close together, far too

long ahead of their readiness to have much to do with one another. We shall once more have a chance to learn the elemental lessons of life under primitive conditions. We shall be stripped of the grown-ups' clothes in which we have decked ourselves out and for a day fancied ourselves men. We shall be thrown back where we belong and an ABC primer thrust before our eyes and held there until we master its lessons. That, as I see it, is what is going to happen to us, what is going to happen to the world, especially to our part of the world.

And now, and while this cataclysm is working itself out, and as the largest contribution to a New Day for man, the best thing we can do—I, and any of my readers, and any others who may see it—is to wrestle with the everlasting and inescapable problems of human existence until they yield us their answer. The catastrophe no man can avert. But we can, if we will, do our part to see to it that it is not the end.

1946, 1970.

¹ Sir Arthur Keith made this very clear in his *Essays on Human Evolution*, London, 1946. It was written while the Second World War was raging.

² Dr. Jagadis Chunder Bose. See *Mentor*, May 1925, p. 56.

³ Needless to say, I am not now thinking of the Aztecs or Incas. There are those who regard the civilization of the Incas, at least, as the equal of anything in the Europe contemporary with it. Though, for that matter, Thor Heyerdahl has been producing evidence, which I find very impressive, that both of these cultures originated with invading White men. However, regardless of that, my question is whether any greatly creative people, no matter what their race, should be expected to spare very backward peoples in their enjoyment of choice parts of the Earth when these lands are needed for their own fullest development.

⁴ *Varieties of Religious Experience*, Modern Library Ed., pp. 357-9.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 359ff.

⁶ *The Ascent of Humanity*, 1929, p. 112.

⁷ I have it from a gynaecologist of repute that, in his judgment, the use of "the pill" is practically harmless. And apparently it is free of most of the effects or risks that have made other methods of preventing pregnancy most objectionable. Nevertheless, I must confess that as yet, until a longer time has elapsed for making sure about its possibly injurious side effects, I am unable to give it my sanction. I find in myself a stubborn doubt, perhaps rooted primarily in sheer instinct, whether Nature, which has entrusted the entire future of humankind to the fertility of the female, will long allow herself to be thwarted and blocked, without finally working her revenge on those who with impunity have dared to flout her most imperious commands.

⁸ *Outline of Science*, Putnam, 1935.

⁹ Prof. East, later, while at Harvard, attracted wide attention by the urgency and cogency of his books on eugenics.

¹⁰ *Inbreeding and Outbreeding*, Lippincott, 1919, p. 247.

¹¹ Holmes, S. J.—*Human Genetics and Its Social Import*, McGraw, 1936, p. 294.

¹² *The New Pioneer*, October, 1939.

¹³ G.V. Jacks and R.O. Whyte—*The Rape of the Earth*, Faber and Faber, 1939.

¹⁴ Faber and Faber, 1943.

¹⁵ See *Mankind Quarterly*, Spring 1964 (Vol. IV, No. 4), p. 244.

¹⁶ Quincy Wright—*A Study of War*, 2nd Edition, University of Chicago Press, 1965, p. 221, Note 7. Cp. Appendix XX, Table 44 (page 650). Ditto in first Edition, 1942.

¹⁷ These were the populations of the two countries when I was there in 1927-28.

¹⁸ The full cogency of Sir Arthur Keith's theory cannot, of course, be more than suggested in these few words of mine. For this, I must refer my reader to his books: *Essays On Human Evolution*, London, 1946, and especially *A New Theory of Human Evolution* (Philosophical Library, New York, 1949), where a summary of the theory is given in the first chapter. See also chapters II and IV, and pages 53, 60-3.

¹⁹ Sir Arthur Keith—*Essays on Human Evolution*, London, 1946.

²⁰ Sir Arthur Keith—*The Place of Prejudice in Modern Civilization*, London, 1931.

²¹ Charles Darwin—*Plants and Animals under Domestication*, Chs. XV and XIX.

²² S. I. Hayakawa—*Language in Action*, Harcourt, 1939, p. xi. And hear this from Prof. Revilo P. Oliver: we [White men of the West], whether Christians or atheists, have an instinct for truth, so that if we lie, we have physical reactions that can be detected by a . . . "lie detector." When officers of American military intelligence tried to use that device in the interrogation of prisoners during the Korean War, they discovered that Koreans and Chinese have no reaction that the instrument can detect, no matter how outrageous the lies they tell. We and they are differently constituted." See Revilo P. Oliver—*Christianity and the Survival of the West*, Sterling Enterprises, Sterling, Va., 1973, pp. 16-7.

²³ *Fate of Man in the Modern World*, London, 1935, p. 88.

²⁴ Robert Frost—*Collected Works*, Holt, 1939. See his poem beginning: "My friends all know I'm interpersonal."

²⁵ See in particular [Chapter 3b](#): "Jesus In Retrospect."

Chapter 15.

Man and the Machine: The Effect of Industrialization on Human Life.

We cap the climax by substituting for the ordinary method of animal locomotion the conveyance of a stinking mechanical contraption, which more than any other invention of modern civilization is responsible for bodily and mental atrophy, the breakdown of social organization, and the decay of public and private morals.

Earnest Albert Hooton, *The Atlantic Monthly*, October 1939

This indictment of the automobile appeared in a very arresting article entitled "The Wages of Biological Sin." Earnest Albert Hooton is a widely known Harvard professor of biology, whose views on most controversial issues were quite in line with current opinion. The learned Doctor's judgment may seem too sweeping and extreme, but it will bring to my reader's attention what a man highly trained, well-informed, and truly concerned for the good of his fellowmen, as Dr. Hooton certainly was, can come to think about one of the most assured and important triumphs of modern technics. It may serve to raise the question, to most of us unfamiliar, whether perhaps we have too readily taken for granted that the Machine has been a boon to man, the question of whether, when its effects on the life of man and on the world in which he lives have been estimated, it may not be seen to have cost more than it is worth. My purpose in this paper is to give a glimpse into what I myself, for well over a quarter of a century, have been thinking on this problem of the Machine—its origin, its nature, its effects on our life, and its possible future.

The problem has certainly been at least in the background of my mind ever since 1919, when I worked my way across the country, sometimes as a common laborer on the railroad or in mines and in lumber camps, but also in a steel mill, in Henry Ford's plant in Detroit, in tire factories, and the like. The readers at Macmillan's (and especially the chief editor, Mr. H. S. Latham, who later became its president) wanted very much to publish the journal that I kept during this experience, but it was finally rejected because the then-head of the company, on the advice of a Columbia professor of economics, decided that it was "too radical"—although, in fact, it was little more than a record of what I myself had seen, heard, and felt, together with my consequent reflections on my experience. These months in factories forced the problem of the Machine upon my attention. I learned to know, by observation, but chiefly by experience, what it means to be the mere attendant of the Machine, where there is subdivision of labor and mass production, where one works under the dictation of another and at a pace set by the Machine. I added vastly to my knowledge of how the working people lived, how they *had* to live, what was the reality of modern wage slavery, and the reason for it. But in the years since, I have also had the experience of being the owner of machines and of having *them* serve *me*, of setting them to work to help me in the attainment of my own ends. I have long had a car, a shop equipped with woodworking machines, and

until 1958, when I accepted service from a public utility, I had my own private generating plant. I have had machines partly for their usefulness, partly to observe their effect on me.

All the while, of course, through these fifty years, I have kept my eyes open as I have gone about the world, and have made observations that I thought had bearing on the Machine as a problem. And I have read a good many books that have been of considerable help; and yet I feel that my conclusions are due less to anything that I have deduced with my head than to what I have felt, as we say, in my bones.

I hope that my reader will not be deterred from reading further if I state bluntly at the very outset that my conclusions about the nature of the Machine in relation to the nature of Man, and about the effect that it has had upon our environment (in the broadest sense) and upon our life therein, are very largely adverse. And therefore, in some degree, I have been reluctant to put my views on paper. For I dislike being negative, and as a matter of major emphasis, disbelieve in it. But sometimes, in order to make it clear what one stands for, one has to make it clear what one stands against. Moreover, behind my every negative word is an ultimately positive and constructive purpose. Insofar as I say No to the Machine, it is because I wish to say Yes to life, because I wish to see life set free from a death grip that is strangling it, and ennobled by new vision and sure inner self-direction. I write on the Machine as I wrote on Democracy, not primarily to condemn it, but to disclose a symptom and thereby reveal a sickness, to disclose what Western man has done to himself (and to the world), and whither he is going. With such light on the situation as this may throw, and with such further light as each of us may obtain for himself, each man must decide what he is going to do about it, in which direction he is going to head, in which way lies life.

If one is even to grasp the problem of the Machine, it is necessary to divest oneself of the current prejudices about it. Its utility seems so obvious and so enormous that most people tend to be blind to the evils that it has caused, and to ignore and to discount these evils even when they are brought to their attention. I must ask my reader, however, to face with me the question of whether its supposed gains may not in reality be largely empty, or have come at a human price too high.

Also, most of us are all too ready to find in the perfection of our mechanical development the final and conclusive evidence of our cultural superiority to all those who have gone before us. We take it for granted that none have been our equals in the past because they lacked our machines; and equally, as regards the future, that all further cultural advance must be built upon the further extension of our own technics. It is beyond our comprehension that any people might produce a great culture who would not be *interested* in the Machine, or *care for* what it was peculiarly able to produce, or for its way of producing. And yet Lewis Spence declared that the ancient Mayas, Mexicans, and Aztecs, not only without our machines but even "without metal tools or weapons," "were more truly civilized than many peoples with higher pretensions existing at the present time, who could not approach them in the spheres of architecture or social polity." ¹ Of the Incas, Egon Friedell remarked, "it is probably no exaggeration to say that our own continent [i.e., Europe] has never produced a form of government of like wisdom, justice, and benevolence." ² Most of us are quite ignorant of the many respects in which even the lot of the workingman was better in thirteenth century medieval Europe, for instance—a period quite without anything we

should call machinery—than it is in our vaunted modern age; and no less unaware that in our own past there have been Roman emperors (for example, Tiberius and Vespasian) and English kings (notably the Tudors and the Stuarts) who, on the ground that a certain mechanical invention would injure the well-being of the people, actually forbade and prevented its introduction or development.

I cannot write about the Machine now as I wrote first, twenty-five years ago. Since then, the atomic bomb has exploded on open cities of Japan, and that fact alone has put the whole problem in the light of a new, lurid, and one might say desperate, urgency. Moreover, in early 1946, I read Spengler's *The Decline of the West* (a title that might better have been translated the "going down" or "foundering" of the West). This, for me, set the Machine in yet another new perspective. As early as 1921, with the League of Nations in full sight, I had declared another world war certain and began to divine that our civilization was dying, as Rome had died. Ten years later, I saw yet more clearly, and declared, that we were headed for catastrophe. But it was only then, after reading Spengler, that I began to sense fully the fatedness of our technics, of that combination of science and the Machine to which we have entrusted ourselves. Spengler deepened my recognition of the determining significance of the subconscious and irrational factors in the human make-up on which any attempt to achieve control of the Machine must depend. When our integrated industrialism and science, our whole technics, are seen to be a result and an expression of Western man's very way of conceiving and feeling toward the universe, space, and life itself, it becomes a question of whether he *can* approach the Machine from a really different angle than that from which he has been approaching all life for nearly a thousand years. It is a question of whether his present approach to it is not so integral to himself that he would first need to become a different man before a different view would be possible, that he would let his culture collapse and himself be destroyed rather than relax his grip to stand off and look at his problem with suspicion—especially with suspicion of himself. I fear that he is like a bulldog, which (I have been told), once he has fastened upon his prey, will let his jaws be broken before he will let go.

In any case, ever since Spengler, it has become even more impossible than before not to see that most proposals for alleviating the evils of the Machine are vitiated and rendered all but useless from the start, by the fact that the problem is considered artificially, academically, as though it were to be settled in a classroom instead of on a battlefield. One will understand nothing unless one understands that the Machine, as the greatest material force in the Western world, is an instrument and a weapon, and that he who controls it is the master of our society and of most of the people in it. Inevitably, therefore, between those who control it and are masters, and those who *seek* to control it and to *become* masters, it is the chief bone of contention. And it must be realized, accordingly, that *whoever controls it* will always, within certain limits of expediency, shape it and use it, not with any primary concern for general human welfare, or even for efficiency, but in whatever way promises the best to *ensure his mastery* and to further his ends. It will always take the form of a saber or a knout, with a handle at one end.

This should make it clear that to my mind the problem of the Machine is not at all a problem of who is going to own the Machine, as appears to be the idea of the capitalists in one camp, the Communists in another, and the champions of the cooperative movement in yet a third.

There is evidence aplenty that the evils of a society in which the Machine was owned, or controlled, by the workers (or "the masses") would if anything be even less endurable than they are in the United States today. Probably, a good deal might be said in extenuation of this. In fact, except as a highly industrialized people can find some non-military means of avoiding the menace to its very existence involved in modern power politics, it would seem that it must be driven inexorably straight into some form of totalitarianism. But despite all this and beneath it, I perceive that the real crux of our problem is not who is going to own the Machine but *in the Machine itself*. The question is whether the Machine is not of such a nature, and so alien to the real life of Man, that we could have a beautiful, culturally creative and worthy human society only as the Machine was vastly modified and curtailed, or perhaps entirely eliminated. But before we go any further, it is necessary that I make clear what I have in mind when I talk thus about "the Machine."

The best approach that I know to the basic distinction between a tool and a machine is in the definition of the English artist Eric Gill. "Anything is a tool," he said, "which you use to help yourself do anything. Anything is a machine insofar as you help it rather than it helps you." In this sense, the pieces of mechanism in my shop are tools, since they fit into my pace and serve my ends, not I into their pace or to serve the ends of another. But while this may meet the purposes of definition, it does not altogether satisfy me morally. For while the mechanical equipment in my shop may thus be looked upon as "tools" and I remain their master, I know perfectly well that this equipment is probably made, more or less of it, by methods of mass production that I abhor, and in plants too huge for an individual workman to own or control, in plants where every workman is not only virtually a slave but a dehumanized slave as well.

This mention of the size of much of our modern industrial establishment raises another point that is of importance for understanding the feeling that I have about the Machine. My objection increases in proportion as machines are so costly as to make it impossible for any individual craftsman (or, let us say, any dozen craftsmen together) to own them. When they go beyond what George Boyle calls "man size" and become corporation-size, enormous and subject to all sorts of impersonal and intangible controls, I instinctively sense something monstrous and alien menacing the life of men.

Yet again, my mistrust and antagonism mount directly as the Machine is made more and more automatic, able to run itself; directly as the increasing automation and division of labor, leading to the conveyer belt, make the part of the human worker subordinate, superfluous, insignificant, and degraded. By my deepest instincts, I resent and abhor everything in industry that reduces the human being to the status of a mere *tender* of the Machine, that in fact brings him ever nearer the place where he is not needed at all. The "magic eye" is wizardry, all right. It will, for instance, detect that a can has missed its label in the labeling machine, in order that it may be knocked out of line and returned to have the omission made good. It seems almost like the eye of a god, in that it is never weary and never fails. But when I think of all the set-up that lies behind it, that was necessary to make it possible, and of what it has done and threatens to do to the working life of human beings, I must say no.

Ultimately, I fear, I distrust and dislike to the point of hating, as a creeping death, the whole "technological complex" of our day. It seems that our intricately interrelated science, industry, finance and politics are a cancerous tissue that has worked its way all through and about our entire society, slowly strangling the real life of men. Any admiration that I might otherwise be inclined to feel for the triumphs of technics, even its radio, its airplanes or its great bridges, or its fantastic flights to the moon, is spoiled and turned into bitterness and foreboding when I think of what they are used for, or of the human price that we have been forced to pay for them. I dislike even the clock, the very symbol of our age, and perhaps it is more than any other thing the means by which has been made possible the coordination and centralization, and therewith the regimentation and enslavement of men, by which our age is distinguished. I suppose that I myself am as much ridden with a sense of time as most of my fellows. I know that I can be highly efficient in my work—at least in work with my hands. On occasion, and when the pressure is my own, I even enjoy a good race with the clock, so bending every energy to my task and making every little move count, that I reach some immediate goal by a certain hour. But I should hate to need to work at such a pace always, at the dictation of another, or under fear of losing my job. And surely, long before this, it must have struck every thoughtful man that there is something wrong that we, for all our "time-saving" machines, are more bedeviled with a sense of time and are more lacking in time, than any other people that has ever existed. In our cities, where the dominion of the clock is the most absolute, people fairly run panting from one place and from one appointment to the next. Have we never rebelled at the indignity of it? Have we never, in our weariness of it all, secretly longed for the assured security and the serener pace that men have always had, and have now, in every land that the Machine has not yet invaded? There are times when I feel that I should like to pack up every clock in the house and to live thereafter by the sun and by the seasons, and best of all in obedience to my own impulse.

But I lack the space, and moreover the competence, to examine with my readers the whole field of the "technological complex." Here, I must limit myself to the mechanical side of the problem, to the examination of those mechanical contrivances for which "you help it rather than it helps you" and which are of such a size or costliness, or of such a form, as to make individual personal responsibility, creativity, and dignity quite impossible. Let my reader note that, in defining the Machine thus, I am not at all giving it a meaning that is peculiar, exceptional, or in any way unwarranted by the facts. On the contrary, the Machine *in this form* so truly and certainly represents both the trend of mechanical development and the realization of the productive potentiality inherent in the Machine, that we may justly have precisely this in mind when I refer to "the Machine." Let us turn now to scrutinize some of the more striking effects that it has had on our life. In the course of this, it should become clear, if it is not already, what particular forms or applications of the Machine most arouse my antagonism.

It is important to note at the very outset that, throughout its entire history, the Machine has been developed as an instrument of power. Little consideration has been given to the fact that human beings would be needed to operate it and that human beings must live in the mechanized world that it was creating. Within the limits set by human capability and endurance, it has been developed almost solely in accord with the *abstract logical* demands of *technical efficiency*. Technics is an elaboration of ideas based primarily on an exploration of the nature of metal and the inanimate, and only incidentally making even any concession to the

entirely contrary nature of the organic and of man. Inevitably, therefore, wherever the human worker has become the mere tender of a machine, it has meant the imposition of the dead hand of a reason inherent in something alien to himself upon his living impulse. Even in the spiritual development of the individual, as I pointed out in a previous chapter, and where the reason one follows is one's own, the rational is a menace to the vitality of impulse upon which depends the vigor and the integrity of a man's whole life. If it is allowed to dominate, it *kills*. But the Machine is the very incarnation of the rationale of the inanimate, of cold steel, and of efficiency. As such, it has a rhythm and a pace that are utterly alien to all *organic* functioning, to all human way of working. It strikes at the very root of human life.

But the abstracting process has gone yet further. As the increasing size and complexity of the industrial plant have more and more put ownership of it beyond the reach of individuals, there has been a steady drift toward corporate ownership. But a corporation is a legal fiction. Though it is recognized as having the attributes of personality, yet it is impossible to point to any concrete man as the owner. It is something other than and more than all the individual stockholders added together. It can die, but its death is not caused by the death of the stockholders who together own it, nor does its life necessarily have any connection with their moral character. It is an abstraction, with no tangible actuality behind it. When a man is employed by a "company" or "corporation" he has to deal ultimately not with a man, not with a human owner or master, but with an "it." And this "it," even when one thinks of the human beings who collectively do the owning, is far removed from sight of the worker, of what he has to do as he tends the machines, and of how he lives at home. Gone is the corporate unity that bound together the apprentice and journeyman in a craft society in mutual understanding, and in a sense of cooperation and joint responsibility in a common enterprise. A device has now been perfected whereby our owning and ruling class, for the sake of its own wealth and power, can subject the working population dependent on it to a process that is inhuman and dehumanizing, and yet do it at such distance that it does not need to see what it does, can be blissfully unaware of the havoc that it works in the lives of its subjects, and therefore can put ever-increasing pressure on them without being disturbed by pangs of conscience. The totality of this set-up has created slavery in a form unique in history and peculiarly pernicious in its effects on human life.

In case my reader finds it difficult to see that the Machine does mean domination of the abstract and the rational, or that such domination is a menace to life, let me attempt a somewhat different approach.

The Machine's way of working is different from a man's. What is required to bring the Machine to the apex of its efficiency as a means of production may be (and I believe is) ultimately incompatible with what is required in the interest of human health and happiness. A machine knows no wearying, but a man must rest. A man rests best at night, and best on some one unvarying day like Sunday, that has religious or social significance and is therefore more than a day of rest for his body; but to a machine light and dark make no difference, and a regard both for its nature and for the investment involved in it dictates that it be kept running twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. A man's pace varies with his mood, his health, and his state of mind, but a machine can be set at a pace beyond human reach or endurance, and held to it for days on end without any balking or variation, with a regularity that no man could rival or long sustain. To the contentment of the human being, it is

absolutely essential that his hand be in meaningful relation to his head and heart. That is, if he is to have even the basic condition for anything worthy the name of freedom, his activity must originate within himself. If he is to have the satisfaction, even on an elemental level, of the deep human desire to make something, to give shape to some substance according to the idea and feeling within himself, he must more than see a purpose in what his hands do; he must be able to follow through from one operation to the next, or at least complete the whole of some significant part of the total process. But with the Machine it is not so. Always the idea is that of some other man, imposed on the worker from outside. And the total process of making any given product can be broken down into a number (in many cases, a huge number) of very simple operations, every one of which in itself may be utterly trivial and even meaningless. The Machine will repeat these simple motions endlessly, and not only will it show no resentment at the resulting monotony or any resistance to it, but it will thereby actually increase its immediate, on-the-spot productiveness. The human being, however, hates the task of tending such machines, where his best strength every day must be poured into an endless repetition of a few stupid motions, which in themselves have no more meaning for him than if his whole part in the building of a house were reduced to striking the second blow on every nail.

After the foregoing, my meaning should be clear when I say that the Machine, if it had been developed with a primary regard for the nature of Man and to meet the needs of Man, would be something very different from the Machine as we have it, developed with a primary view to its maximum potentiality as a source of wealth and as a means of power. And inevitably, one regulating aim or the other must prevail. Either the Machine is made in the image of Man and is required to serve him, or Man is forced into the image of the Machine, made to shape himself to its nature, made to become but a servant to it, an accessory to it, a cog in it, himself mechanical. That is, one or the other dominates and must dominate, either the nature of the Machine or the nature of Man, either the logical demands of mechanical efficiency or the human demands and needs arising from the fact that Man is a sentient creature, alive, organic, with emotions, thoughts, and aspirations. And where one dominates, the other must be sacrificed.

The thing that above all else makes modern industry so abhorrent to me, and so sinister in all that it portends, is that it represents the triumph of the Machine over Man. A man owned by another man, subject to the will of another human being, is not so degraded and dehumanized as a man geared to the Machine, an inanimate, inorganic, utterly alien thing of contrary nature and hostile rhythm. A man can serve it, that is, tend it, make himself useful to it, further its ends, only by renouncing his own needs, his own ends, his own nature, and shaping himself and his ways into the image and ways of the Machine. The Machine, the man-made creature, lords it over his creator. We throw into its maw whole human beings to sate its appetite for the mere eyes, and ears, and hands of a man, mere human functions, mere human parts. The methods of a piece-work, mass production factory break down human personality, they destroy the conditions under which alone personality can develop. For the sake of a thing no more significant than speed, we have allowed ourselves to be forced into a high-powered car, and now, with no one at the wheel (we might almost say), the throttle is thrown wide open, let the car go where it will, so long as it goes fast. Man has abdicated control. Man is not the end for which man has created the Machine, not the development of personality, not the creation of culture, not even human happiness or even

basic human health. It seems a madness fantastic beyond belief, yet the evidence is before every man's eyes. It is a world that an increasing number of independent thoughtful men are coming to believe has a deteriorating effect upon the very peoples who created it.

But we have dealt long enough in generalities. Let us turn now to see how my statements are borne out by the concrete facts in the world about us. I should like to begin with a brief survey of the effects of the Machine on the life of those who tend it.

I pass over the story of occupational disease, though it is an exceedingly nasty one, and the fact that more of our men are killed in industrial accidents than lost their lives in the Second World War, though it ought to be disturbing to every one of us. I pass over the fact, which is well-known but which outrages every human being jealous for the dignity of Man, that, with the advent of the Machine, human labor has tended increasingly to be looked upon and treated as a commodity, to be bought and sold like cattle, or coal, or cotton. I wish to dwell here on the unmistakable and undeniable tendency to make the Machine ever more nearly automatic and to drive it at an ever higher speed. It was all very well for Clair M. Cook, an ex-minister turned machinist, to cry, as he did in *The Christian Century* for August 30th, 1944, "The Machine has not enslaved me!" But as a machinist he was rather in the class, an already fast-disappearing class, of the skilled craftsman, and therefore exceptional and ever less representative of the type of worker who is more and more in demand as the mere tender of a machine. The undeviating trend is to make the human factor in production ever smaller and ever more insignificant. Piece-work minces the individual machine-tender's part ever tinier. The conveyer belt makes his work ever more like that of a horse in a treadmill. As though, after all, Man were master, it dutifully brings each piece he must touch to his hands, but reduces his touch upon it to insignificance and removes all personal responsibility utterly beyond his reach. One speed-up of the system or another forces the tempo at which he must work ever higher; for the eight hours of his "shift" he must keep an eye on more machines than ever before, or each minute insert more bolts in a hole or press a lever more often. I have seen men whose work consisted of the repetition of about four simple motions several thousand times in eight hours, day after day. I myself, in 1919, working a multiple-drill press at the Ford plant in Detroit, one of the less hateful forms of industrial work, found myself experiencing something that seemed like solitary confinement. The noise and the distance to the next machine were such that for the working day I could not communicate with anyone; I was walled up within myself. Nor even in this could I find any satisfaction; the endless repetition of my little set of operations was too stupid to hold the slightest interest for me after the first hour of employment, and yet it required just enough attention to make thought about anything else impossible.

Such work is maddening to a man of intelligence or the least creative capacity. Indeed, factories are coming to recognize that their mass production machines can often be tended best by workers who are not bothered by the possession of intelligence.

Again, I have watched girls in a shirt factory working at a pace and with a perfection of mechanical coordination that filled me with the fascination of an undefined horror. It was as though under some baleful witchcraft the human mind and soul had passed out of them, so that in reality they were no longer women at all, but only machines that looked like women. Such work does more than stupefy the mind, it disintegrates personality, destroys the very

roots of it. I declare flatly that such work is a violation of every decent instinct in every normal human being. And yet it is toward work of precisely such tension and boredom that the whole of mass production tends. This is the kind of working life that we are creating for an ever-increasing proportion of our population, a work that denies life, stifles life, stupefies it, sickens it, perverts it, poisons it, and destroys its meaning. No wonder that, during the entire six months when I was working my way across the country in 1919, I found only one man who said he liked his job. This attitude was amply confirmed during the two winters when I worked in industrial plants in 1944 and 1945. The prevailing feeling was that your job is not a thing that you are supposed to like. Your job is a thing that you do, and endure, for one reason only—for the sake of the money that you get out of it. It is appalling to think that the best time and energy of most of our people are going into something that they detest, or at best only endure. Indeed, the whole situation is abhorrent and highly dangerous, in the hatefulness of the insidious and well-hidden coercion by which the workers are driven, and in the unbridged and unbridgeable cleavage of economic interest that divides the owners and the workers into two bitterly hostile and really armed camps. But for the moment, I am thinking chiefly of the degradation of our common work and of the men and women and children who do the work—of having men work only for money, of having machines valued higher than men, of having human life fairly gutted of all its real and rightful meaning, of having human personality debauched and even dissolved, until men more and more are becoming nothing better than pawns, puppets, herds, masses, grains of sand, nothings.³

And if my observations noted above date back twenty and even fifty years, it is not therefore to be imagined that conditions have improved in the years since. On the contrary, the evil remains essentially the same, though in some respects it has spread and thus actually become worse. With the ever-increasing concentration of capital in huge interlocked agglomerations, even many high-placed executives and officials have now become only agents, underlings, whose jobs boil down finally to the demeaning task of merely carrying out the ideas and orders of a few dominant men at the top. And among the mass of common workers the jobs remain as hateful as ever. This came out clearly in a sort of symposium on the problem that was published in *U.S. News* a year ago (Dec. 25, 1972). It cited a recent report prepared by a panel of experts for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which stated that

“Job frustration is intensifying and is showing up in reduced productivity, the doubling of man-days lost per year through strikes, rising absenteeism, sabotage, high turnover rates and poor quality of work. . . Many of these symptoms have increased despite general improvement in the physical conditions and monetary rewards for work. . . Dull, repetitive, seemingly meaningless tasks, offering little challenge or autonomy, are causing discontent among workers on all occupational levels. . . Opportunities to be one’s own boss continue to diminish. . . A great part of the staggering national bill in the areas of crime and delinquency, mental and physical health, manpower and welfare are generated in our national policies and attitudes toward work.”

Mr. Richard Gerstenberg, Chairman of General Motors, contributed an article in which he attempted to justify the system, but I thought he was very effectively answered by Mr. Irving Bluestone, Vice President of the United Auto Workers, who declared that though all the big industries might indeed keep workers busy, that did not necessarily make them happy or their work satisfactory. He insisted that it was necessary to “take the boredom from routine

jobs. . . We must heighten pride of workmanship and—as far as is feasible—involve the employee personally in decisions that relate directly to his job.”

It is obvious, therefore, that the evils I observed and felt in my own person when I worked my way across the country fifty years ago, are still, in their essentials, quite unchanged. I suspect that they will never be changed, that they are such an inherent part of the system itself that they cannot be changed as long as the system lasts. Basically, inherently, the system is evil.

No wonder that men hate their work. And they do right to hate it. They may not know just where or how to lay their hands on the power that keeps them in slavery, for it is subtle and intangible, but they know well that it strikes at their very life. It is not that I wish, or am willing, to see the organized workers dominant, for I cannot believe that a society shaped by men of their taste, capacities and character would be a desirable society, or even prove viable. But I cannot blame them that they hate and fight the evidence of their degradation and the power that enslaves them. Even a rat in a trap bites at the rod that has pinned it down. But also I can only despise, and foresee the doom of, any society that lets wealth accumulate while men decay.

Those who have known me from away back may counter that I myself have sanctioned slavery. I have said, it is true, that I believe there never has been, and cannot be, any meaningful culture except as some men have the leisure out of which culture comes, and that to give some men leisure requires that other men will have to work more than would be necessary merely to support themselves. And behind that “have to” there will always be some form of coercion. But I do not *like* slavery. I want it kept to a minimum. I wish it always to be human and humane, and not the modern form of it, in which man is chained to something as monstrous as the modern Machine. And I should always require that those who have leisure prove themselves worthy of it by the value to society of the work that they do. I can have no respect for any group of rich parasites, who do nothing but spend money on themselves and their favorites, study how to make yet more money while they ease their consciences by “philanthropy,” and use their financial power, as in our tax-exempt foundations, to achieve and maintain a hidden and sinister control over an entire nation. If I approve any form of slavery at all, then it is only because I cannot see any alternative that would not, in the final evaluation of things, prove even less desirable.

But what I want—and I hope I have already made amply clear how much I want it—is that the largest possible number of men should have the most satisfying work that their capacities make possible. This matter of a man’s work is very important to me. I know from long experience what it means to make something with one’s own hands. To discover a need, to choose one’s material, and then to work at it, with patience, with honesty, with love, with unremitting allegiance to one’s standards of workmanship—until at last one’s dream has come true; there is nothing quite like it. This creation out of one’s own self is almost one’s child. The place here in the Catskill Mountains, which I have had since 1932, I feel to be almost the outermost extension of my own being. Think what it means to live in a house that you have built all yourself, to have lingered over it for years in dream, letting it take shape in your mind, then to have worked it out in scale drawings, and finally to have made it every bit yourself, to have laid every stone, lifted every rafter, fitted every shingle, driven

every nail. It may be nothing very elaborate, perhaps nothing surpassingly beautiful, but it will be you, and yours, and fit you, and suit you, and satisfy you as nothing else ever could. This experience alone will explain my dislike of the very thought of pre-fabricated houses. I don't want the slabs of any house that I live in made in a factory. I don't want on my house the mark of "Tom, Dick and Harry"—that is, of nobody in particular, of something impersonal and anonymous. I want to make it myself. And I don't want it to be a house that can easily be taken apart or moved. I want a house into which I have come to stay. I want it anchored—deep.

I can but think of what it has meant to a man in all ages to have a craft. Into his apprenticeship went years of exacting discipline, which not only strengthened and sharpened his intelligence, but formed and firmed his character. He came to have his own shop, he knew what he was making and what he was making it for. Into it went his own ideas, his own taste, his own integrity. With his own name upon it, he went before the world. Upon the quality he put into it depended his standing in his own community. There was every incentive to learn responsibility to take initiative, to develop resourcefulness. He had all the conditions for growing personality, for becoming something significant in and of himself. I remember meeting in a little fishing village of Scotland an 80-year-old shoemaker, who had grown up under conditions like these, who as a man, and even intellectually, would have put to shame most of the finished college graduates that I have known, and the like of whom I never met in any factory. England and Scotland were once full of such men, and this country, too, a hundred years and more ago. I believe that in the long run no people can stay on high ground except as men of such caliber predominate. In the final testing it will be found, after all, that machines are no substitute for manhood. We shall stand or fall by the kind of men we are.

But in contrast, see what our factories are doing to our men and to the work of their hands, and have been doing steadily for the past century and more. With the prevalence and under the pressure of the mob value of Money, quality has been more and more sacrificed to time-saving, and form sacrificed to efficiency; conscientiousness has been replaced with standardized inspections; and pride in one's work (indeed all possibility of even identifying one's work) has been lost in the utter impersonality of mass production. Men had time, or they took time, to make things beautiful until the "time-saving" Machine came along and made us all so time-conscious that we no longer have time for anything, and least of all for anything so superfluous as beauty. The result is not only, nor so much, that our cities have become wastes of abomination and breeding places of ugliness, but worse, that the common work of the world no longer affords the ordinary man any place in which he can make beautiful things.

The whole difference between our industrial civilization and a handicraft culture (and it is apparent even when the handicraft culture is at its last gasp) is symbolized in the difference between the mass production, white-enameled iron kettle-spoon that I have (or used to have) in my kitchen, and the handmade solid brass ladle I got in a bazaar in Calcutta in 1928. The former chips, and rusts, and could be twisted to pieces in one's hands, but the ladle, though it is only a kitchen utensil, could survive the use of a thousand years and is solid enough to brain a man, and yet is beautiful in its balance, its form, its finish, and its exceedingly chaste decoration—a thing of joy forever. Ruskin cried, "Industry without art is

brutality." And is it not so? And would we not see, if we could but for a moment set aside our usual conceit and complacency to look at ourselves, that for all our technics and the speed and the power it has given us, we industrialized peoples have been sinking deeper and deeper into barbarism for the past several hundred years? Is it not true, worst of all, that our very manhood, our physique, our intelligence, our character, have been decaying?

In an earlier age, even the common man was usually something individual and substantial, like my Scottish shoemaker, but the impersonal and utterly de-personalizing Machine has long been making men into little more than interchangeable units of production, like bolts and nuts and gears, resembling the standardized parts of a mass-produced car, which you can pick up quite alike in the supply depots of New York, Chicago, San Francisco or New Orleans, all bearing the mark not of Ford but of *anaille*, of mob, of rabble. And right here, to my mind, is the true measure of the final worth and reality of all our vaunted "progress." We may have gone farther than any people before us in our machines and in all that machines can produce, in outward things, in material things, in appearances, in all things that don't matter or matter only less, but in what matters most, in everything that finally matters at all, we have gone backward and down. Through the whole period in which we have thought we were advancing, our machines have been turning our men into rabble, masses, proletariat. They have been fairly harrowing individuality out of existence, dissolving personality in acid, and destroying the very basis of individuality and personality. The working people, who have been, and ought to be, and if any nation is long to exist, even must be, its very backbone, have become mean little nothings. Only collectively do they have any significance—only as mass, only as mob. But what shall it profit us that our airplanes scrape the very skies or that we even put men on the moon while we ourselves remain little more than mites and midgets? What shall profit all our printing presses, telephones and radio when nearly all we have to say to one another is drivel? All that matters to me ultimately is man, man himself, the individual man, including the so-called common man, the way he looks and bears himself, what he sees and is able to see, and thinks and feels and reaches toward. For the lack of human healthiness and nobility, there is absolutely no substitute. To my mind, whatever tends to unman Man himself must of necessity, from every sound point of view, and always and forever, remain accursed.

But before I turn to the effects that the Machine has had on the life of society in general, there is one more effect that it has had on the life of the working people, on which I wish to dwell. The Machine has produced unemployment, which has been pronounced (for instance, by Nikolai Berdyayev) the greatest evil of our day.⁴ The Luddites of 1811 who stormed machinery to destroy it really saw things straight: machines do take away men's work, and always have, and have thereby threatened their livelihood. When a machine has been introduced which, tended by one man, would do the work formerly done by ten, it has meant that the work of nine men was made unnecessary and was no longer done. It was possible to conceal this fact only so long as an expanding market, pushed whenever necessary even with bayonets and machine guns into the heart of China and India and the depths of the African jungle, would support an expanding production great enough to make work for all ten men. But many of the nine men, though not left without work entirely, were commonly thrown out of the jobs that they had done before and were compelled to take up work of a lower order, in which their lack of any specialized skill made them less sure of steady income and more completely at the mercy of the man who employed them. Thus they

swelled the ever-growing mass of the proletariat, those who had no means left of keeping alive but to sell their usefulness and themselves, unconditionally into the power and control of an employer. Nevertheless, for generations the expansion of the market and therefore of industry was at such a rate that the actual effect of the Machine on employment was not detected by most people. Apologists for industrialism could still with sober face and without being laughed out of court, argue that "the Machine makes jobs." The workers might find themselves less and less secure, and know a steadily increasing distaste for their work and a resentment against the conditions under which they worked, and there might always be a sizeable proportion of the working people who were out of jobs. Nevertheless, through this period of expansion, there was, on the whole, work of some sort for most of the people most of the time.

But that period has passed. All the foreign market that the whole Earth affords to the industrialized nations has now been penetrated and opened up. Moreover, much of the market area has itself begun to turn industrial. That is, the market for manufactured products is actually shrinking. At the same time, the competition for access to it on the part of the "great powers" has become so acute, and the maintenance of access to it so impossible without victory in war, which itself threatens the very existence of civilization, including our technics, that at least ever since the First World War it has not been possible to keep our industrial plant running at full speed. The home market was not big enough, was not paid high enough wages, to absorb the mountains of goods that it could produce; and the foreign market was too small to do so, or was too unstable or too dangerous. So the machines have often stood still, and men have been turned out to walk the streets. Unemployment has at times become enormous, it has become chronic, and it has come to stay. And the dole has come to stay. Men whose fathers were able, and proud, to stand on their own feet and to feed themselves, will henceforth feed out of the swill barrel of the state.

Most men are beginning now for the first time to see what the Machine has been doing from the start—namely, destroying men's work, destroying their means of security, their self-respect, their satisfaction in life.⁵

It will of course be replied that from the beginning it has in a sense been the very purpose of the Machine to destroy men's work—not, to be sure, in the sense of leaving them without work, or at least without income and security, but to *relieve* them in their work, to make much of it unnecessary, to give them more time for other things. All that is wrong, we are told, is that the benefits of the Machine naturally and justly accruing to society as a whole have been seized by those who owned it, and the workers have been left to toil about as long as they did before. There would be no unemployment and a new day would dawn, not only for the workers but for everybody else, and the Machine itself be seen in its true light as the saviour of mankind, if only the ownership and control of the Machine were taken over by the workers, or in the name of the workers by the State. Under these circumstances, we are assured, we should all work only until our reasonable needs had been met, and after that we should be free. With further "improvements" in the Machine and a more rational system of distribution, perhaps all the necessary work of production could be done in a daily average of three or four hours. The rest of the day would be our own, to play, to create, or otherwise to enjoy ourselves.

Unfortunately for the effect of these arguments on me, I know them through and through. I can hear them on my own lips, some forty years ago, when my own thinking was socialistic. They seemed very plausible then. But today all their appeal and force are gone. Let me briefly indicate why.

Democracy in industry or control of industry by the working class would prove impracticable, for the simple reason that the workers as a whole lack the intelligence and the vision to manage and direct it even for their own best good, let alone from the point of view of the stability of society as a whole and the elevation of its life. The undertaking would eventually fail, as it always has; and even if it succeeded it would be only to create a society of the flat and dull aspect that proletarian life always manifests.

Moreover, ownership and management by the State in the name of the workers would lead inevitably to the enslavement to the State of nearly the entire population—a fact of which we have had ample and increasing evidence and illustration in Soviet Russia ever since 1917. The argument of Mr. Hilaire Belloc, in his *The Restoration Of Property* and *The Servile State*, that there can be no freedom that really amounts to anything except as individuals own property of such kind and in such amount as to ensure their economic independence, seems to me absolutely irrefutable. “If we do not restore the Institution of Property,” he said, “we cannot escape restoring the Institution of Slavery; there is no third course.” I strongly believe that individual ownership should be guarded, as it is not now, against the irresponsibility that has made it in the eyes of many people one of the worst evils of the day, and that the rights thereof should be wedded to duty and service to society, which must be fulfilled if the right is to continue. Indeed, as I have maintained elsewhere, we are discovering anew in our modern world, that for any society that would endure and attain significance, there must always be some ever-watching eye and overruling power in its midst that will ensure that everything moves to compass the well-being of the whole people. It may be, therefore, that ownership should be *conditional*. It may even be that actual ownership is not essential. But what is absolutely essential is *assured use* of the means of production upon which economic independence can be built. Mr. Belloc is very clear and very emphatic that the ownership (or virtual ownership—ownership conditioned only upon the fulfillment of certain fixed obligations to society, as it was under Feudalism) must be economically significant and adequate. It is arguable, perhaps, that a society in which most people were slaves, well fed and cared for by a benevolent State, would be an improvement upon what Capitalism in its modern form has made of our world today, but I must confess that such a state fills me only with loathing, and that I cannot believe that the human mind and spirit would ever dance, or sing, or soar in the atmosphere that it would create.⁶

The defense of the Machine against the charge that it has caused unemployment is based, further, upon the assumption that the work necessary to maintain human existence is evil, that the Machine is a blessing and the saviour (at least of the working class) because it makes it possible to do this work most quickly, that the Machine should therefore be exploited to the full limit of its potentialities—that is, as heretofore, according to all the logic of technical efficiency with piecework, conveyer belt, speed-up, and every automatic feature attainable. Thus there would be no recognition of what to me is the evil of the Machine, nor any significant attempt to make attendance upon it more tolerable. Rather would the Machine be taken over essentially as it is in industry today, with its efficiency whipped up under

technicism to the highest pitch possible, even as we witness it in Soviet Russia, a State set up ostensibly in behalf of the workers. Any attempt at amelioration would be concentrated chiefly on a shortening of the hours of toil.

But this whole philosophy seems to me essentially fallacious—for at least two reasons. In the first place, my understanding of ordinary human nature satisfies me that most people would not know what in the world to do with themselves if they were left with something like twenty hours of leisure to dispose of every day. Provided that the work itself be wholesome, socially valuable, responsible, and under our own self-direction, and that it yield us an income adequate for health and for meeting the needs corresponding to our social status, I am convinced that it would be far better for most of us that economic necessity keep us at work for at least a daily eight hours. In the second place, an effort to get the work of society done in the shortest time possible would prove self-defeating. If the majority of the population were ever left with anything approaching twenty hours of leisure every day, the resulting surfeit of leisure and the boredom of existence would soon awaken in men the inborn and ineradicable instinct to make something, and articles useful or artistic would begin to flow from home workshops all over the land. Presently they would flood the market and thereby aggravate the problem of unemployment, forcing industry to shorten hours of work still further, and making still more acute the problem of what men are going to do with their leisure.⁷

If anyone requires evidence that the Machine has never been developed with any view to the good of Man, one needs only to study the history of the Machine in relation to unemployment. From the standpoint of human welfare, if that were the determining consideration, what would be the sense of our developing a Machine that threw men out of work, and then having to scratch around to find them work to take the place of the work it threw them out of—or else support them in idleness on a dole? We thus see that it was never the purpose of those who developed the Machine that it should make sense or improve the lot of Man, but rather and primarily that it should serve *its owners* and would-be masters, as a source of wealth and as a means of power. Probably, there has never been even any concession in the interest of human welfare, except to keep the workers and others who were galled by the Machine, from becoming too restive.

But those who have tended the Machine have not by any means been the only ones who have been injured by it. The case is cumulative. Let us turn to examine the effects that it has had on society as a whole.

First of all, the home. I believe deeply that this is our basic institution. But in an industrial society, I doubt very much that the home, in its essential features, can even survive. As I wrote in a previous chapter, the Machine has already destroyed its economic foundation, the economic reason for its existence. It is no longer a center of vital arts and crafts. What is made in the home today, or in the home shop, is of constantly diminishing economic significance. In passing, I may point out the effect that this has had on the well-being of the people whose life formerly centered in the home: of men, who now must sell themselves to fulfill the will of another, who before were creative and were their own masters; of women, for whom the removal from the home of all the varied and beautiful arts in which their grandmothers were happy and proud to manifest their skill, has left them mistress of a world

that has become empty and full of boredom; of children, for whose very education the schools must now set up artificial and limping imitations of the activities that formerly went on in the home naturally and as an essential part of the whole tissue of life; of old people, who now are stripped of all work suited to their strength by which they used to make their declining years useful, beautiful, and relatively happy. But my primary object here is to point out that the removal of practically all productive work to the factory has cut from under the home its economic foundation. The logical outcome is to be seen in Russia, that land which seems bent, in defiance of instinct, on subjecting all life to the rule of reason, where, at least for a while, there was a manifest determination to herd the working people into dormitories. Whether or not such an effort succeeds is in the long run unimportant. In America, without any such effort, something ominously similar is actually taking place: more and more people are coming to live in apartments, flats, hotels, trailer camps—which may or may not be dormitories, but they are certainly anything but homes. The explanation is that, with machine production, there is less and less need of homes, less and less reason for homes. I believe that the Machine and the institution of the home will not go on together. And when the Home goes, we go. It will be found—when it is too late—that the decay of the home is our own decay, a precursor of the death of our own culture.

But, again, let me remind my reader of the tendency of the Machine to force standardization upon all our life. It may be very convenient to be able to pick up in Los Angeles a part to repair a car made in Detroit and bought in New York. I grant it is. But if we were less blind to the price that we pay for this convenience, more aware of what the price really is, I believe that more of us would feel, as I do, that it comes too high. The universal standardization on which it depends is having its inevitable effect of destroying individuality both local and personal. When looked at closely from within, it reveals itself as yet another manifestation of the triumph of the dead rational over living instinct and impulse. The very mark of the living is individual difference. It is only logic that undertakes to machine everything into uniformity. Wherever the Machine has not gone you still have local color, different dialect, different customs, different beliefs and traditions, distinctive architecture, buildings shaped to the earth they rest upon and built of materials immediately to hand. But in industrialized America, for instance, especially in the urban areas, our buildings are a conglomeration of materials hauled from all over the Earth. Under the impact of the radio, movies, and television, the sectional and occupational differences in our speech are fast disappearing. Gone will soon be our delightful Southern accent; farmer and sailor will talk alike—and I suppose, in time, White and Negro also. Presently, from all over the country, there will be only one, flat, standardized type—American. It was announced long ago that the present trend must eventually wipe out even the difference between the speech of the American and that of the English. Indeed, it has long been wearing down not only the difference between man and man, but also that between man and woman. Mass-production is resulting not only in mass-slaughter of human bodies in war time, but in mass slaughter of character, of personality, of independent thought, in time of peace. We now have on a universal scale mass-education and mass-mind. Whether or not we think that all this is a change for the better may be looked upon as only a matter of taste. But any man who can view it without abhorrence is himself evidence of that decay of sound instinct, and therefore decay of sound life, which the Machine has helped to cause. Healthy life wants to enjoy the difference that belongs to it, and to see an equally characteristic difference in others.

This standardization, of course, is closely dependent upon the centralization and urbanization that have come in the wake of the Machine. To be sure, it is argued by some of its last-ditch defenders that centralization and urbanization are no necessary or inherent features of industrialism as we have it. And this may be true. Certainly, I can see that with the wider distribution of electrical power a good deal of production now done in large factories in large cities could be broken up into small units located in small towns or even in the open country. Borsodi went so far as to maintain that two-fifths of all the manufacture of clothing and the processing of food could be done more efficiently at home with machines perfected for home use than is done now in factories.⁸

This contention of the "Decentralists" in general I find very convincing. As one of them long ago pointed out, both capitalists and Marxists (and I might add, the Cooperative Movement as well⁹) "have entirely overlooked . . . the simple truth that mass production implies mass distribution, and that the savings made in mass production are largely lost in mass distribution. It merely makes money for the big producer." That is, the cost of merely getting tomatoes into a can may be lower in a factory than in a home kitchen, but by the time you have added to the factory cost the further and unavoidable costs of getting the tomatoes to the factory and the canned tomatoes sold to the consumer, your final cost is as high as, if not actually higher than, the whole cost of the canning in the kitchen, where the costs for transportation (from one's garden) and of distribution (to one's own table or a local market) are practically nothing. The railroads used to boast that in America the average potato travels 741.5 miles from field to table, but it must be doubted whether all this represented a gain to any one except the railroads.

To the whole plea of the Decentralists, you may be sure, I have listened with the greatest sympathy. Nevertheless, I must confess to the misgiving that a considerable portion of their philosophy rests upon wishful thinking. That some, and perhaps many industries, might be decentralized, or centralized in large part, I can readily believe; and likewise that there is a vast difference between the machines for mass production and those perfected for use in the home or in small shops, where the individual user might be owner and master. Yet the whole thing seems to me but a palliative or an alleviation, and no remedy. It might enable the workers to enjoy the benefits of living in the country, but much of the work would be essentially of the same sort they did in the city: there would still be piece-work, speed-up and automation, if not the conveyor belt. Moreover, though I am not engineer enough to be entirely certain about it, I am not yet convinced that the basic industrial plant which would lie underneath all these small units could be decentralized. Could mining, for instance, be decentralized? or smelting? or the rolling mill industry? or the systems of transportation that link them all together? And if it is impossible to decentralize such as these, must we not, as long as centralization remains here, have the whole country tied up in a web of coordination under central direction? That is, would not the basic evil remain unaltered?

But I find myself confronted with a difficulty deeper yet. Men say that industry could be decentralized. What do they mean by "could be"? How could it? By whom? They seem to assume that something is really accomplished by proving that decentralization is possible in theory, that decentralization would be economically more efficient, that decentralization would provide better conditions for the flowering of a higher type of human life. But in reality, nothing is accomplished by mere theorizing. Nothing is accomplished that leaves

unmoved those who finally control the Machine, who neither developed it nor maintain it for the sake of some theory, or with any primary regard either for efficiency or for the welfare of humanity. I am satisfied that we have the Machine in its present form—with centralization and all the rest—because it serves the purpose of the owners of the Machine to make of it the maximum source of wealth and power. If I am right in this, then reformers may cry out against the evils of centralization, of regimentation, and of megalopolis until they are blue in the face and expire of apoplexy, but we shall go on having centralization, and more and more of it and of all that goes with it—to its consummation in the totalitarian state. Not only will Texas remain a “colony of Wall Street,” but states at the ends of the Earth will be forced more and more into its orbit. The adult mind, while it works, while it rests, and even while it walks the street, will be told what it is to think and what it must do. The best blood and capacity of the countryside will go on being drawn into the city, until the country is sucked dry and left dying, while in the city children will be found first useless, then a nuisance, and at last will be—discontinued: especially by our stocks of proven best capacity. Thus the leadership essential to meet the problems created by our unprecedented way of living will be bred out and will disappear. The nation will become more and more like a helpless horde, and will move remorselessly on toward its inevitable fate. That is, unless something else happens first.

But let me go on to complete this bill of indictment against the Machine. I already have cited the effects of the Machine on the life of the working people, of the destruction of craftsmanship, and of the unemployment, now become chronic, that will shortly reach proportions quite unparalleled. I have begun to speak also of the effects of the Machine on the life of society as a whole, and thus far have called attention to the decay of the home, the deadliness of standardization, and the dubiousness of the possibility of getting rid of the centralization that is strangling us or of the urbanization through which our life is being corrupted and our best capacity siphoned off and evaporated. Let me now conclude this section as briefly as I can by calling attention to four more evils that I feel must be laid against the Machine.

Probably, our modern facility of transportation and travel is one of the changes brought by the Machine that are deemed most indubitably a boon. But those who know me at all are well aware that to my mind this is not an unmixed blessing. At the very least, the good of it is greatly overrated. I myself have done considerable traveling, but I am satisfied that generally how much one sees is in inverse proportion to the speed at which one moves and to the amount of ground that one covers. If one wants really to come close to a new people or countryside, the best way is to walk; the next best, to go on a bicycle. Thoreau struck a yet deeper note when he declared that he “traveled a long way in Concord”—that is, inwardly. And it may not be irrelevant to point out that we should save an incalculable amount of time and expense for transportation,¹⁰ and greatly improve our health, if people largely confined themselves for their food to what was grown nearby, and walked to their work. Of course, I am fully aware that little traveling today is done to *see anything*, or for the opening or maturing of anyone’s inner being, but rather to obtain relief from boredom or to make commercial or political or military gains of one sort or another; and I allow that it is very nice and at times even a great blessing that sick or injured people can be rushed in planes to hospitals, and that elderly people can step into jets which shortly, without pain or effort on their part, set them down among the palm trees of California or Hawaii. But I do confess to a profound mistrust

for the modern mania for speed, which seems to blind us both to costs and to consequences. Up to a certain point, it may have been good to go faster and more easily. But when, in order to cut two hours off the flying time to London, we are willing to accept an industrial system that builds up huge deposits of undisposable high-level nuclear wastes that threaten to finish the Earth as a human habitation, we show a recklessness and lack of balance that mark us as demented fools. Indeed, forty years ago, long before our mania for speed had begun to result in any such fearsome consequences, it was already producing some very dire evils. And, despite all the efforts made to reduce or to eliminate these, it is producing them still.

One of the most pernicious of these is the impetus it has given to miscegenation. As never before in the history of Man, people of every sort from all over the Earth are being brought into contact with one another. Unfortified and unguided by any sound principles in regard to the choice of a mate, it is inevitable that frequently they not only fall in love but, inside or outside of marriage, have children. The result is a vast increase of human hodgepodge. When the parents are of widely different racial stocks, types, capacities, temperaments, sizes, and the rest, they produce offspring whose very bodies may show malformation and dysfunction caused by the combination within them of incongruous parts separately inherited from very different ancestors. Their ill-assorted and even conflicting impulses and capacities may make it exceedingly difficult and often impossible to achieve the integrated wholeness so essential if a man is to be at peace with himself, well-balanced, and effective.

This, doubtless, is a moot point. In what I have said, I have only stated the conclusions to which my own studies have led me. But I have been pursuing the subject for well over thirty years, and the evidence in support of my position I believe incontrovertible. As I have watched what has been going on in the scientific world, even in the National Academy of Sciences, I have found myself forced to the conclusion that if there is still disagreement about miscegenation and its consequences, it is chiefly because most men, even those of the highest academic standing, avoid facing the facts, whether out of prejudice, or out of plain fear of what will happen to them if they do. But regardless of what may be one's attitude on this thorny question, it is simple and obvious fact that the Machine has been forcing upon us changes so numerous, so vast, so subtle, so sudden, and so unprecedented, that most people are literally quite unaware of what has happened to them. But the very rate and degree of change is itself a prodigious evil. No human life can stand the demand for great and incessant change. Inevitably, we get vertigo.

There is another evil connected with the facility of transportation brought in by the Machine, as to the misfortune of which competent students can hardly disagree. Fifty years ago, from all that I can learn, there were no serious insect pests or plant diseases that made annual inroads upon our crops. Nobody sprayed for anything. For the most part nobody needed to. But now our ships and trains have been carrying the pests and diseases of every locality to almost every other locality, until presently every grower will be plagued with the pests of the entire Earth. We have long had the corn borer from Europe, the bean beetle from Mexico, and another beetle from Japan—to mention only a few of the host that have come or are fast coming. An internationalism of insects is spreading faster than any internationalism of man. By our usual methods, at least, it has become quite impossible to grow food without what in the aggregate is an enormous expense for poisonous sprays and dusts, and for the equipment and time to apply them. Furthermore, all these poisons, though

aimed at the pests and the diseases, not only remain to kill our birds and our honey bees, which are an important source of food and one of the most valuable of our pollinators,¹¹ but all ultimately fall on the soil, where they are believed by many experts to be killing the earthworms and microorganisms upon which the vitality of the soil, the principal source of our human food supply, is absolutely dependent.

Before I finish my indictment, I shall have much more to say about the poisoning of our environment as a whole. But it is certain that a soil-sickness is spreading over the surface of the entire Earth, and that neither the plants that man and his livestock eat, nor man himself, can maintain health in the face of a steady loss of substance in the soil. In fact, it is certain that the poisons get into our very food. And it is no less certain that in the end all the noxious materials in our dusts and sprays drain into our streams, our lakes, our reservoirs, and finally into the ocean. Inevitably, poison gets into the water that we drink and use for cooking. Thus, in any one of many ways, poisons are becoming settled in our bodies and may well be the ultimate cause of any number of the mysterious diseases that are baffling our doctors.¹² And though scientists know how to purge our water of bacteria, I understand that they confess themselves completely at a loss when it comes to removing these poisons, or even detecting their presence.

While this menace, only the more deadly because it is so insidious, can by no means be blamed solely upon the use of poisonous dusts and sprays, there is ample reason to believe that the application of all this noxious material is an important factor.¹³ And the need of this poison can be traced in large part to the facility of transportation that has come with the Machine.

But the responsibility of the Machine can be established even more certainly and more easily in the evil that I want to dwell upon now. This is what has been called by Mr. G. V. Jacks, Director of the British Imperial Bureau of Soil Science, "the rape of the Earth."¹⁴ It is difficult to write on this subject without passion. In view of the ignorance both about what it is and of the catastrophe with which it threatens us, it is even more difficult to write what requires to be said without seeming sensational and unduly alarmist. I can do no more than try to limit myself severely to the pronouncements of men in positions of authority, who make it their business to know what the facts are and what they mean for human life. But I will try to hold in the foreground conditions as they obtain in our own great land of supposedly unlimited resources.

The foundation of any people's life and of any civilization is the soil, or more exactly the top soil, the thin film of delicate organic life that overlies the utterly barren rock and which is all that stands between man and death by starvation. If that top soil goes, everything built upon it goes with it. History affords more than one instance of a people who, in effect, were washed out to sea with their soil. North Africa, for example, with what is now the Sahara Desert, was once the granary of Carthage and Rome.¹⁵ In much of the Tigris-Euphrates valley, which was long the cradle of great civilizations, there is now to be found little more than the mounds of their ruins overtaken by creeping sands.

The despoliation of the earth that largely underlay such extinction of peoples in ancient times might have required thousands of years to work itself out. Today the same result can

be, and in many places actually has been, accomplished within generations, even within decades. "Of all the ruinous results of a materialistic view of reality, the destruction of the earth is the most fundamental and irreparable. In the few generations since man has been able, on a large scale, to level forests, strip plains, and mine minerals, he has done more to ruin the source of life and wealth than did the sum of all previous civilizations that have thus destroyed themselves."¹⁶ Over thirty years ago, men who indisputably were in a position to know the facts, were making such statements as the following: "The contagious disease of soil exhaustion . . . is creeping over the five continents [it is already acute throughout half the world] and making a world food shortage a very real possibility for the future."¹⁷ "Erosion is the world's most serious problem." "In fifty years, an area probably fifty times the size of Britain has been destroyed or partially destroyed as good food producing land."¹⁸ But it is in our own United States that has taken place "the greatest soil destruction in modern history." Here "an area three times the size of Great Britain [has been] turned into absolute desert, and an area three times that [i.e., nine times the area of Britain] turned into partial desert."¹⁹

According to the National Resources Board, the United States once possessed about 500 million acres of arable land. But within a few generations one-fifth of this was ruined beyond repair; another fifth had lost its best top soil and was threatened with complete ruin if we continued the methods of using it then being employed. On another fifth erosion had begun.²⁰ "A wasteland of 253 million acres—61 percent of the entire cropland of the United States is an imminent reality." Thus *Free America* for October, 1938, p. 6. It would seem that there could have been no question about the facts. To verify them, one only has to turn to such books as I list in a footnote.²¹ Indeed, those were most extreme who knew most about the situation. Dr. Ehrenfried Pfeiffer, "a leading European authority on biodynamics" (now settled in the U.S.), in an article entitled "America Deserta," published in *Free America* for May and June, 1938, "coldly predicted the death of American civilization unless we have a care for the biological health of our land . . . The land is going out from under us." Dr. W. H. Martin, Director of Research for the N. J. Agricultural Station, "reports that the soil conservation problem in his state [not in the middle or far West, but in New Jersey] has become an outright emergency. 'Already [he says] on many of our farms all of the top-soil has been washed away, on others fifty percent, and it takes four hundred years to build an inch of soil.'" According to G.V. Jacks one-third of the arable land of the United States, even thirty years ago, must already be accounted a total loss. Dr. Pfeiffer's estimate was almost as extreme. He said that "a third of the cultivated area of the United States of America is on the way to becoming useless."²² Even before the beginning of the Second World War, conditions were holding over those who knew the facts the spectre of nothing less than world famine. In June, 1939, Viscount Lymington wrote in *The New Pioneer* (p. 179) that in the United States "out of 800 million and more eroding acres only about 2 million have been so effectively dealt with that their future is secure. For a country that in a recent year has had actually to import food, this is a very dangerous situation."²³ Dr. Hugh H. Bennett, Chief of the U. S. Soil Conservation Service, found the situation in the United States so acute that unless the erosion and wasting of soil were stopped within the next fifteen years we should have lost forever all chance of recovering the foundation in the soil on which our whole life rests.

Such statements from men of such authority and positions of such responsibility made quite a stir when first published. But investigation as to how matters stood a year ago (in the

spring of 1969), after the lapse of thirty years, left me feeling that the great alarm had subsided, and amply confirmed my predictions that nothing adequate would be done to avert catastrophe. The national consciousness, on nearly all levels, from the farmer to the manufacturers of chemical fertilizers, from the banker to the politician and general public, is too full of complacency and too closely centered on the immediate advantages and pleasures of the day, to give much thought to the needs of those who will come after them or to submit to being harnessed for the stupendous effort to put the country's future on a solid foundation. The constant pressure of a host of problems following the Second World War—social disintegration, the ever-increasing burden of taxes and the ever-rising cost of living, the anxieties of the Korean War and then the war in Vietnam, together with the lure of the effort to be the first to put a man on the moon and launch a junket to Mars—all this made it nearly certain from the outset that some 300 million tons of top soil, with its precious humus and minerals, without which we cannot exist, will go on slipping quietly into the sea. At last the day will come when a famine, such as periodically strikes China, will strike us for the first time. Frantically, we shall struggle to push back the desert that had long been creeping in upon us, but which we had been prevented, in one way or another, from taking adequate steps to meet, while yet there was time. And then it will be too late.

In reply to the question of what the Machine has to do with this direful situation, I allow that it does not bear the whole responsibility. Nevertheless, the Machine has actually, in one way or another, been one of the most important agents of destruction. It would look to me as though the most obvious root cause has been the decay of our values—for the time being, I will leave unanswered the question as to what has caused that—in particular the growing domination of the entire population by the money-mindedness of the city-nomad, who has lost all his roots in the soil and who regards everything with a view to the profit that he can make from it. But as we have seen, it has been precisely this attitude that has largely determined the development that the Machine itself has followed. From this development has flowed a stream of consequences, which I will continue to sketch, even though scantily and inadequately.

With a lust for profits, and using the Machine as its instrument, within 300 years we have wiped out about three-quarters of our forests.²⁴ But the roots of trees hold the soil from sliding into the rivers, and the decaying spongy vegetation under the trees holds the water that otherwise rushes into the valleys to cause disastrous floods, and the same vegetation slowly forms the precious humus upon which all our earthly vegetation depends for its existence. Forests, moreover, attract rainfall. Upon their presence depends the water level of a whole region. When they disappear, the springs begin to dry up, as we are discovering here in our section of the Catskill Mountains, where, a hundred years ago, merely to supply what was then the largest tannery in the world with bark for its tanning, millions of trees, containing thousands of millions of board feet of potential lumber, were felled and left on the ground to rot. Mr. Jacks and Dr. Pfeiffer, whom we have quoted before, declare that the mountain forests of any country are one of its "key positions," and that a disturbance arising here by the slaughter of the forests, "can bring about an immeasurable destruction in the structure of a whole country." And it has been the Machine, I must remind you, that has made this destruction possible on so enormous a scale and in so short a time.

Again, the commercially minded profit-seeker of the city, with his advertising and through his extensive control of the press, radio and television (all of them, mark you, triumphs of technics), has sold to the farmer the totally new, and to the true farmer the utterly alien, idea of farming for profit, farming as a business rather than a way of living. Instead of farming with a view first of all to meeting the vital needs of himself and his family, thereby reducing his need of cash, and hence farming only in small part for the sake of any money income, he has learned to buy almost everything, and to farm in order to get the money to buy it. In this dairy country in the Catskills, most farmers get their butter from Chicago, and their cheese from—heaven knows where: *anywhere but* from their own cows. (Here, note again, the very market in which to buy all these things depends entirely upon innovations brought by the Machine—mechanized packaging and transportation, for example). There is an ever-increasing tendency toward the raising of one crop. In large sections, farmers abandon the traditional rotation by which the land is periodically given a rest and replenished with its necessary vital elements. Year after year, every field is forced to yield its utmost of corn, wheat, tobacco, cotton, or what not. Meanwhile, squeezed by the increasing pressure of the growing financial powers between the low prices in the market, where he must sell and the high prices in the market where he must buy, the farmer has been compelled to think more and more in terms of money.

At the same time, he has been led to believe that his profits would be increased as he was enabled by mechanization to cover more ground. The tractor and other power and large-scale machinery came in. This proved the ruin of the smaller farmer, and of farming in general. The farmer of small income could not afford the machinery. Without it, he was forced to work at a pace beyond his strength, and finally proved himself unable to compete, and was at last compelled to lose his farm. This has caused a great increase in tenancy: in some states more than half the farms are operated by tenants. It has even displaced the tenants, forcing them into the existence of migratory workers, which is utterly ruinous to all home life. Thus it has led to the joining of farm to farm to form huge collectives owned by absentee landlords who operate the farms solely as an investment, who buy the seasonal labor of a rural migratory proletariat, and employ the largest power machines available. But machines produce no manure. It became necessary to fertilize with inorganic chemicals. But these tend to kill the earthworms, “the most important humus-makers in cultivated land in Temperate Zones,”²⁵ and likewise the micro-organisms upon which the soil’s health and fertility depend. Yields can be maintained only by applications of chemical fertilizer in ever-increasing amounts. Finally, the soil will respond to no amount of artificial stimulation, it has been worked out, is “mined,” dead, ready to become the easy victim of erosion.

All the authorities who have made an exhaustive study of the soil as a living organism are agreed about this. W. J. Marx, for instance, says, “commercial one-crop farming destroys the soil and leaves behind a desert.”²⁶ Jacks and Whyte are emphatic that “the large tractor on the collective farms and the 2,000 acre wheat fields . . . are the agents most calculated to accelerate erosion.” They declare that “one of the chief causes of the evil is the fact that men think they can master the fields with the help of tractors and other fallacious applications of scientific inventions. The mistaken use of tractors is far more destructive than bombs dropped from an aeroplane.” “Misapplied science has brought to the world’s richest virgin lands a desolation compared with which the ravages of all the wars in history are negligible.” A critical article published in the *New Statesman and Nation* (London) in 1932 concludes, “We

are stimulating the earth and its products to the detriment of both. . . Agriculturist and horticulturist keep the earth in a state of feverish activity . . . It is impossible in the face of the evidence to avoid an uneasy feeling that the modern stimulus of production is accountable for the spread of disease in the vegetable, animal and human kingdom." (Quoted in *Free America*, June 1938, P. 3.) Pfeiffer even insists that "the hoe, spade, and the plough can never be substituted by an internal combustion engine." "The whole past teaches us that only a most intensive hand tilling of the soil preserves its fruitfulness. The human being maintains the fruitfulness of the earth in the sweat of his brow."

In China, not only is it normal for two and a half acres of land to support a family of twelve, plus a donkey, a cow and two pigs (something utterly impossible under mechanized agriculture), but by a "humus and compost economy carried on with almost religious zeal" the fertility of the soil has been maintained for thousands of years.²⁷ The more we study the whole problem, the more the question forces itself upon us as to whether, here, as we found to be the case in regard to the relation of the Machine to human nature in industry, there is not something inherent in the Machine that is incompatible with the very nature of the soil as a living organism. Pfeiffer expresses the need to "investigate what factors of a technical and mechanical agriculture harmonize with the natural laws of growth, and what factors arise out of man's desire of comfort, or out of spheres connected with the production of machines (factory profits, i.e., profits of invested capital, etc.), but not with agricultural impulses."²⁸ He feels that the Machine has maimed and commonly killed not only the traditions and customs that for centuries guided man in his relations with the earth, but even the secret sympathy between the earth and the man who works it. The "tiller mechanic" has had his roots in the soil destroyed. More and more the entire life of our whole people is being cut off from its origin. In the long run, this effect may prove the most ruinous of all. For the Earth is our home. For increasingly satisfying and meaningful life on it, our very bodies and minds, and our whole being, have been shaped for hundreds of thousands of years. We cannot alter it essentially. And to escape the conditions that it imposes on us or to set up life in any other world, even one as near as the moon or Mars, is utterly beyond our powers, and will forever remain so. The part given to Man is to love the Earth, to come to know it ever more intimately and reverently and gratefully, to treasure it and to cultivate it and thus be able to bequeath it to those who come after him ever more beautiful than he found it—ever more surely, the Garden of the Lord.

But we, with our criminally irresponsible and insatiable mania for every sort of short-term gain, regardless of consequences and indifferent to the fate of those who follow us, are not only plundering the garden of its treasures but desecrating and polluting it with our wastes. So much is now being said about the staggering problem of pollution that I need not take much space to elaborate on it here. Perhaps the most alarming aspect of it was very clearly and forcibly stated by the Cornell ecologist Dr. LaMont Cole in a recent dedicatory address at Bennington College (April 24, 1970). He is an advisor in very high circles on environmental problems. Among other things he said:

"According to the Food and Drug Administration we are now releasing into our environment between five and six hundred thousand different chemicals. This number is increasing. . . The ocean is the ultimate sink for all of these chemicals. . . This is very frightening. I don't think people appreciate the importance of our oceans. People don't

appreciate that this atmosphere is a biological product. Neglecting contaminants, 99% of our atmosphere consists of just two gases, nitrogen and oxygen, and both are present only because living things keep putting them there. . .

“The only reason there is oxygen in our atmosphere is that green plants keep putting it there, and by far the most important green plants in this connection are the microscopic free floating marine phytoplankton, algae in the ocean. . . If one of our half-million chemicals should turn out to be a deadly poison for the marine phytoplankton, the atmosphere would start running out of oxygen.” And he went on to quote a recent scientific report that “DDT at low concentrations, about a tenth of a part per million, was strongly inhibitory to the marine plankton, at least those from the Long Island Sound. If this should turn out to be a general phenomenon, we may already be in trouble, because if we stopped all use of DDT tomorrow, it would continue to wash into the ocean for several years, and most of it would go into the coastal regions which are much more productive of life than the open ocean.”²⁹

In like vein, he went on to declare that our very oceans are polluted. Fish are dying not only in the Great Lakes but in the sea. Recently “the entire Jack Mackerel catch from southern California was confiscated and destroyed as unfit for human consumption.” It is the same story when we come to examine the air, even the stratosphere, 65,000 feet above the Earth. It is currently predicted by Boeing and their French and British counterparts that we shall presently have a thousand super-sonic transports (the SST) flying around up there and releasing unburned hydrocarbons. And with this in prospect, Vincent Schaefer, “head of the atmospheric laboratory at the State University of New York at Albany (the man who introduced cloud-seeding as a technique for modifying weather in the first place), has predicted a global gloom which may settle over the entire Earth. . .” And it is still the same story when it comes to the disposal of high-level nuclear wastes down on the Earth. These wastes are “terribly poisonous materials.” The AEC [Atomic Energy commission] itself admits that [they] must be kept out of the environment for at least six hundred years. In Dr. Cole’s own judgment they should be kept of the environment for a minimum of a thousand years. “And yet the AEC’s own survey has shown five percent of the tanks, in which millions of gallons of this stuff are stored away, are leaking after only twenty years.” The obvious fact is that as yet there is absolutely no known way to prevent these terribly poisonous materials from escaping into our rivers, our lakes, our oceans—and ourselves. Moreover, there is disturbing evidence that the Atomic Energy Commission is actually trying to keep the facts from reaching the public, apparently out of fear lest the resulting alarm may stop the advance of technology! That is, stop the building of bigger and ever-faster planes, abandoning of the effort to plant a colony on the moon, and all the rest of it. But could anything more dramatically or luridly demonstrate the truth that our technology has become an introverted monster, that it has lost all perspective and exists for its own sake, that it isn’t looking where it is going, and in an utterly reckless attempt to realize its own full potentialities, is ready to see Man destroyed? And what a climax! That Man, who has called himself “the measure of all things,” and who in our great modern age of supreme triumphs, which has made Nature his servant, should see him use his vast powers—to put himself to sleep forever!

But if “misapplied science” and “the mistaken use of tractors” have proved to be a veritable scourge to the soil resources upon which all humankind depend for their very existence, and

if a technology on the loose, gone not only wild but stark mad, now threatens to give us a world in which we grope in an all-enveloping gloom, and gasp for breath, and are slowly poisoned to death, no less certain is it that television has struck the inner life of Man like a pestilence, and is shaping for us an inevitable and hideous destiny. I feel totally in sympathy with the disgust and anger at television expressed in a letter by Mr. B. M. Christiansen of Dallas, Texas, that was published in *The South African Observer* in June, 1969. He said,

“In the United States this idiot-box—this ‘electronic communist’—has brainwashed an entire nation. “Today Americans would not believe anything unless it first appeared on television.

“And this is the major cause of our downfall. Everything on television is anti-Christian, anti-White, anti-patriotic and communist orientated, whether it be slanted ‘news,’ distorted ‘entertainment,’ or advertising. On top of all this, it is aimed at low-grade morons.

“I believe television to be the fastest known way to bring down a nation. Don’t have it. Keep it out of your country at any cost.”

Like the insects and diseases in our gardens, which are able to establish themselves only in plants that are already sickly, this loathsome affliction could never have made any headway except among a people who had already lost all sense of the meaning and worth of their existence. Any human adults who will sit for hours before a TV screen betray the fact that they have no deep purpose in life, that in fact living bores them. Their minds and souls are empty. They are mere shells of life eaten out by years of existence in a mechanized society where their energies, from their youth, have been subjected to the wills of bosses, to the deadening prod of identical external stimuli, and been used up in serving ends quite outside themselves. Now they are tired. There is nothing that they want to do—nothing that reflects any thought, or will, or quest, or direction of their own. They seek only relief from their boredom. They want only to be entertained. Healthy people simply do not sit looking at TV. People who know what it is to have a life-of-their-own, as do all real persons, all real individuals, all really healthy people, have far too much that they want to be up and doing, to waste time watching other people do something. I cannot believe that TV could ever have taken hold among any people in a period when they were spiritually and mentally robust, awake, curious, conquering, exploring, achieving, creating. I doubt, for instance, if it could have made its way even among early New England’s carpenters and farmers. And among us today, the rush of almost everybody to get a TV set can be explained only on the ground that the overwhelming mass of our people were already sick, feeling needs and deficiencies that could have arisen only in a mechanized society that had always denied them meaningful and satisfying outlets for their deepest life instincts. And TV has worked with fearful speed to complete the decay that it came upon. What little was left of individual initiative, personal integrity in any real or meaningful sense, or independence and self-reliance, it has been bleeding out of the mass of men, turning them more and more into suggestible pawns, robots, rabble, needing only the wily agitator to whip them into a raging mob, or an adroit dictator to subdue them and to lead them like sheep wherever he will.

But lest this be dismissed as a mere outburst of unreasoning emotion, let me nail down what I have said with some solid considerations.

Like our entire industrial system (as I have already been at some pains to show), the media of mass communication have long been working to turn men into mindless, faceless nothings. But perhaps the most monstrous and sinister feature of the situation has been the gradual passing of the destiny of a whole nation into the hands of a few unelected and almost unknown men by whom the mass media have come to be owned and directed. A hundred years ago, Disraeli observed that social control had moved from representative assemblies, such as Parliament or our Congress, to the Press; and at about the same time another Jew, Baron Montefiori, was pressing it upon the leaders of his people that, for the moment, even the making of money was not so urgent as to get control of the Press into their hands. And since then, especially after the turn of the century, have come newspaper chains and their syndicated articles, which appear in a great number of papers all over the country at the same time: and then the movies, and the radio, and a few decades ago television, which is the most fearful instrument ever devised by the mind of man for turning a whole people into pawns and fools, actually unwitting agents of their own destruction.

To my mind, even worse than the fact that TV entices young children away from the outdoor play where fresh air and exercise and self-expression and association with their fellows would build into them the full health, the habits and lessons so essential to their proper functioning as future citizens; even more sinister than its breaking down of moral standards and the weakening of traditions and basic loyalties, upon the cohesive and unifying effect of which any people, in the long run, is dependent for its very existence; worse than all this is the now proven power of TV to take any people by the nose and *lead it—anywhere*. It is not too much to say that a whole generation can thus be given any shape, quality and direction whatever. It is estimated that children, in their most formative years, spend more time sitting enthralled before the TV screen than they spend in school and in church and at play combined. In them, can be made up any failure of TV to leave the desired mark on the adult population. Under its steady quiet pressure, children can be manipulated into men who believe anything willed upon them by a little group of figures, off stage, who own and control the whole show. Doubtless, they could be brought to believe that $2 + 2 = 5$! Have not their elders been brought to rejoice in, and fork over dollars by the billion to finance, these trips to the moon, where even fools ought to know that it is, and forever must remain, inherently impossible to establish anything like a self-supporting human colony?

And has any instrument in the whole arsenal of the conspiracy that has been operating among us for the past half century been so effective in stamping the mind of the mass of people with the utterly false and silly notion that all men are equal, that when obviously not equal they can be made equal by an improvement in their environment, that all races are of a like potential for creating, supporting and advancing a given civilization, and that there is no reason to continue the color bar or any other hindrance to free intermarriage, even between stocks that are radically different? The whole conception may be belied, and I am satisfied that it is belied, by incontestable racial records and by the best tested and really monumental scientific evidence to the contrary. Yet we discover to be based upon such a fallacy national policies, both foreign and domestic, that are destroying our school system, inflaming racial antagonisms to the point of explosion and anarchy and eventual open armed civil strife, and involving us in wars like the one in Vietnam which, if often enough repeated, must end in our destruction. And the control of all this is in the hands of a very few men about whom most people know absolutely nothing—not even their alien names. Perhaps many of my

present readers would find it worthwhile to inquire who these men are, whether the key men in the situation were even American-born, whether their basic alignments do not reveal loyalties that prove them hostile to our whole system of government and even to the continuance of our sovereign independence—that is, prove that at heart they are traitors. And yet our fate is largely in their hands. Reflection upon this situation has convinced me that until this central and alien and essentially treasonous control of TV has been utterly broken, changes of administration in Washington will not matter, and all talk of States' rights, of local government, or any thought that we have any real freedom, whether as persons or as a nation, is but chatter and a fools' paradise from which we are bound to awaken at last to find ourselves in Hell.

When I wrote the first version of this chapter, some twenty-five years ago, there were two other evils that I added to my indictment of the Machine—that is, of the combination of Democracy, Industrialism and Science that had made Technics. These evils were collectivism and war. As I saw it then, the worse of the two was war, the certainty of another world war, to be fought with atomic bombs. Western civilization was going up in flame. It would not rot down from inner decay, as did Rome, though it would do so if it were given time: it was going up in swift fierce fire. As Spengler had the insight to perceive, the end of Western man's drive into infinity and of his will to conquer space and time, to conquer everything and everybody in his way, was to be what his seers presaged from the beginning. His doom was to be the total destruction that he called Ragnarok.

But developments in the last twenty-five years have compelled me to revise my conclusions. I still see that war today is more ghastly than ever before, but also that what has *made* it so is chiefly modern technology. And I find no ground on which to challenge the well-nigh universal opinion that a world war with atomic bombs would put an end to all life on Earth. Also, I perceive that our industrial system, wherever it goes, turns out mountains of goods beyond the capacity of the home market to consume, and thereby it compels nations, often for their very existence, to seek and find and hold markets abroad; and that this competition for markets engenders the fears and suspicions and hates that pave the way to war, which indeed in the long run may make resort to war almost unavoidable. And all this, and much more that I cannot take the space to mention, serves to sustain a very widespread fear that through some slip, if not otherwise, the atom bomb will get loose and lead to universal catastrophe.

And yet, for reasons that may develop in a later chapter, I have come to doubt very much whether we shall have a world war with atom bombs. And even if the world *were* to go up in sudden fierce fire, owing chiefly to Western man's willful determination to master time and space and Nature, of which first science, and then modern technology and industrialism, and now the atom bomb and the reach to the moon and Mars and the stars are only manifestations—though it would indeed be the ultimate tragedy, would there not nevertheless be at least something about it to command our respect, something even Promethean and awe-inspiring?

But the fate that seems more likely to overtake us, to which indeed I fear we were doomed from the moment we abandoned ourselves to the spell and direction of modern technics, which has been working ever more deeply into our life, has none of the dignity of a majestic

failure, none of the awful sublimity that may imbue even a holocaust. Rather, is it a matter of supreme ignominy. Industrialized man is falling into a state of rot, into a comatose state so complete that he fails to notice his own stink and decay. Under the total impact of that complex of Democracy, Industrialism and Science which has made technics, Man is returning to the state of undifferentiated mass that preceded both the dawn of history and the development of personality that alone has made history. He is settling down without a struggle or a sigh into the primeval mud and slime, forever sucking at his feet, out of which through countless ages of superhuman striving he has again and again lifted himself to majestic heights. He is succumbing to degeneracy. He is turning his face backwards, abandoning his past and betraying his fathers. He is losing his sense of what a human being can be, and of what it takes to make a man in any full sense. He is unlearning to aspire. He is losing consciousness, memory, and tradition of the private, personal *daimon* that Socrates made so much of—of what it means to a man to have within his own breast a loving, revealing, relentless, driving god, who lays down a path for him to follow and tells him which way to go at every fork, and who makes him different from any other human being on Earth. The way we are going, men are becoming more and more collectivized, sodden, amorphous mass men. And for me, far better that Man become extinct than that he live on as a vast human anthill!

The two world wars epitomized and enormously advanced the process. There thus “appeared in the arena of history a series of human collectives, masses of men who have dropped out of the organized order and harmony of life, lost the religious sanctions for their lives and now demand obligatory organization as the sole means of avoiding final chaos and degeneration.”³⁰ Ever more rapidly, even in the course of my own lifetime, I have been able to see man being stripped of all supreme value, even (one might almost say) of any value. Instead of industrialism’s existing to serve Man, Man now exists to serve industry, to wait on machines. Machines are worth more than men, and men know it—and know what it means; they know it by their instincts even when they cannot put it into words. Likewise, instead of the State’s existing to protect Man and to further his welfare, Man now exists to serve the State. Indeed, abstraction though the State is, he can retain some shred, some shadow, of the former meaning of his life only by making himself a slave to it, being ready even to die for it.

Thus, on the human side has been prepared a soil full of the seeds of totalitarianism. And now, when on every side the shoots of this noxious weed are beginning to show their heads, men cry aloud against it—as though by crying out they could stop its growth, when the very soil of our time is full of the seeds of it! Why did not more men, like Nietzsche, have the prescience to see what men were sowing a hundred years ago, and what the sowing must lead to, and cry out against it *then*? Now totalitarianism has become inevitable.

And one of the seeds of it that we have not only been sowing, but sowing with pride and rejoicing, has been the Machine—or more exactly, that total complex that has made Technics. Of this, the most incisive judgment that I know about is that of Ortega y Gasset in his *The Revolt Of The Masses*.³¹ He says: “There can be no doubt that it is technicism—in combination with liberal democracy—which has engendered mass-man in the quantitative sense of the expression.” To this much must anyone agree, for it is well-known in all the schools that it was Europe’s technology and industrialism that enabled its population, after never exceeding 180 million for twelve hundred years, to jump, in little more than a century

after the appearance of the Machine (i.e., between 1800 and 1914), to 460 million. But he goes on to make the far more serious charge that it has been this same technicism that has engendered mass-man “also . . . in the qualitative and pejorative sense of the term.” He actually says that scientific man is himself the very “prototype of the mass-man,” that he is so for the simple reason that “science itself—the root of our civilization—automatically converts him into mass-man, makes of him a primitive, a modern barbarian.”

In an age that has set Science on the highest pedestal in the land and (perhaps it is not too much to say) given to the scientist the deference and authority yielded heretofore only to the priest, such a pronouncement must, offhand, seem to border on blasphemy, and even most of our more balanced minds would probably denounce it as at least a gross exaggeration, if not totally false. Left to stand by itself, therefore, the judgment must be generally unconvincing. And yet to do justice to Ortega y Gasset’s thesis in a few words is impossible. Nevertheless, I have decided to let the charge stand here if only because it is so arresting (all the more so in view of the distinction of its author) that it may lead some of my more disturbed readers to explore for themselves the exceedingly thought-provoking analysis of mass-man and his threat to our world, which Senor Ortega has presented in this book of his. In its entirety, it is a very somber and searching warning against the imminent menace to the entire cultural life of the West that he perceived to be latent in the domination of Europe by mass-man. “If that human type continues to be master in Europe,” he declared, “thirty years will suffice to send our continent back to barbarism.”³² And mass-man *has* continued his mastery, and extended it, and Europe has continued its steady “advance to barbarism.”³³

And as far as the influence of Technics’ darling, the Machine, is concerned, this judgment was anticipated by some startling observations that I came upon in 1931 in *The Experiment Of Bolshevism* by Arthur Feiler,³⁴ then-editor of the *Frankfurter Zeitung*. He had just returned from “a three-month’s journey of investigation” in Soviet Russia. With prophetic insight Feiler perceived that there was an evil that went even deeper than Bolshevism, and that was collectivism. But the Bolshevists replied in self-defense,

“It is not we who are collectivizing men, but machines are collectivizing him. The machine which hauls the peasant into the factory: collectivization; which amalgamates the small concerns in concentrated large-scale undertakings; which conglomerates individuals into masses in the towns: collectivization!. . . And the distinction between us and the West consists only in the fact that we are determined to promote and accelerate that which without us would come more slowly and to which the bourgeois ideology of the West is so fond of shutting its eyes in self-deception. Everywhere in the industrialized world man is becoming the collective man.”³⁵

And Feiler saw very clearly how this was working out.

“It begins with houses, which are no longer homes, but mere dormitories, whilst members of the families thus dissolved pass their lives in the common rooms of the houses, in the works, the clubs, the schools, etc. . . .

“It follows from this that the individual is never alone, but is always merged in the mass. The starting point of the system is the school. If the children want to play, they must play a

common game together. No one may play alone. And when the children learn, they must learn in groups collectively. . . , so that no individual should think thoughts peculiar to himself. They are organized in every conceivable kind of circles and groups, so that they are always together, always occupied, never alone. Thus they grow up collectively. And the process is intensified in the case of adults. On top of work, and when work is done, everybody has a number of functions to perform which are in the nature of obligatory services. There are meetings and discussions of all kinds of circles and groups to which he belongs, which occupy his time to such extent that he can never obtain any private leisure and is never left to himself at all.

“The collectivized man is a public being. There exists nothing but masses and thought itself has become standardized. Mass-thinking, uniform, stamped and approved, is inculcated by the teachers in the schools and the lecturers in the universities. They educate their pupils to such mass-thinking. . .”³⁶

“In reality . . . Europe is threatened from the direction of Bolshevism more than it suspects, threatened not so much practically, . . . the threat . . . goes very much deeper. It is directed against those things upon which for four centuries, ever since there has been a modern Europe and a new creative European spirit, this European spirit has set its highest value: it assails the right of personality and the personality value of the individual. The aim of Bolshevism is of a diametrically opposite character: a collectivized man, a collective man, living collectively a collectivized existence and collectively thinking, feeling, and aspiring. And Bolshevism has already made considerable progress in fashioning this collective.”³⁷

I have quoted these passages from Feiler at some length because it must strike my reader, as it did me when I first read them in 1931, that they described a development that was already far advanced among *us*.

With us, too, precisely those circumstances apart from which men cannot know a life of their own or become meaningful persons are *lacking*.

Today, most men have no room or time to be alone. More and more, they fairly live on top of one another. Nine-tenths of our population, lured by factory and office jobs, live or work in cities, where, as the great Nordic Fridtjof Nansen said so truly, “men incessantly rub against each other until they become round, smooth ciphers.”³⁸ With the growth of urbanization, an ever-increasing proportion of them, cooped up in flats and apartments, live like bees in a bee hive, or now, with the coming of the trailer camp, like ants in an ant hill. I sense that they are unlearning to be alone, and even to dread being alone. They actually fear to live with themselves. Consciousness of having a self to reckon with and to deal with means tension and responsibility; and the weaker side in them, their sheep nature, everything in them that makes them feel happier and more at ease in being like everybody else, actually welcomes the let-down and relief that comes from always being with others, of never having any self to be true to or any burden of a personal integrity to bear faithfully in the face of opposition.

In the city, too, wherever men are packed in together, their life is constantly, day and night, invaded by public noise—the patter and shuffle of passing feet, the rush and roar of cars and

trucks, the grind of gears, the blare of horns. This alone is, at least, a distraction, in which any man must think with difficulty, if he can really think at all. Moreover, it tends to break up and to dissipate any forming nucleus of that self-awareness and self-direction that must precede the dawn and existence of any meaningful personal life. And now our very countryside is being penetrated, little less than our cities, by the worst noise of all—the drivel and blather, and gutter taste, and marketplace morals, and the false, vicious and even treasonous propaganda of radio and TV. In the country, more than elsewhere, something like a real home can still be found now and then. But even here, freely, almost universally, and quite evidently without thinking or realizing what they are doing, men and women are now admitting those announcers with their soulless voices, and other strangers, strangers of unknown and dubious character, to profane the stillness of their firesides, to sit down and talk to them while they eat, or while they travel in their cars, or while they work. In the village garage and the country store, as well as in city offices, factories and chain stores, the radio or TV drones on until the doors are shut at closing time. And everywhere it drives men's own thoughts and judgments out of their heads, deprives them of the condition for getting any thoughts or judgments of their own, and subtly, stealthily, constantly slips into their empty, somnolent heads the thoughts and judgments of other men, perhaps alien men, even anti-American men, which tomorrow will come out, from New York to San Francisco, in the votes that men and women cast or in the opinions that they express, as if they were their own!

But socially ruinous as this monster is and must ever be (I lump radio and TV together), what I am immediately concerned with right now is not the degradation and disaster that it is working upon us as a nation, but rather the fact that it is proving itself one of the most powerful engines in our entire society for turning men into masses, for creating conditions in which individuality and personality in men cannot develop. Radio and TV are a means of ensuring that men are never relieved of their awareness of humanity, of other human beings all about them. It presses upon them as inescapably and as unremittingly as the air amidst which they walk. It is always "there," pulling upon everything in them that would fain be sheep-like, which enjoys the feeling of rubbing fur on fur, which above all else would avoid the pains and loneliness and penalties that are entailed in thinking for oneself, being different from the mass, and (in short) following the narrow and straitened path that leadeth unto ONE'S SELF. Radio and TV help to bring home to men the reality and closeness of the human mass surrounding them. In its strength they can feel a strength that is not in themselves. In the pleasure and reassurance that they find in merging themselves into it, most of them never become aware of the slow and silent withdrawal of their own souls from their lives. They have become mere empty shells, but few of them ever realize it.

And then, if I may briefly review my indictment of the Machine proper, of the factory system, we found vast aggregations of capital and productive plant, in which ownership and direction are vested in ever fewer hands, while ever more men are deprived of that independence that comes and can exist only with private ownership, and deprived also of that self-direction and responsibility upon which the development of personality depends. And thus deprived, they are forced to become hirelings, bought and sold like cement and ore, obedient ever to the will of another and to the external stimulus of some prod or signal from the production line. This condition stamps them as essentially slaves—in some ways worse off than Medieval serfs. It strips them of all the necessary conditions for becoming

something in themselves. Repetition, monotony, enforced, long-sustained, and unvarying subservience produce the conditions that must turn most men subjected to it into anonymous non-entities, empty nothings, the stuff of which nothing can be made but proletarians, rabble, empty ciphers that can have social meaning only as the figure of a dictator is placed in front of them. They *all* for a dictator, and sooner or later he always comes. I long ago named this *the great unmaking of man*.

I do not for a moment forget that the preponderant mass of men do not have it in them to become individuals, or strong, erect, independent and truly creative persons. They never have had it in them. In the foreseeable future, they never will. Nevertheless, the appearance of any durable and culturally significant society has always waited, and apparently always will wait, upon the appearance of great creative persons, with a large phalanx of less creative but solid, strong, self-reliant men behind them, men who in their own way and degree are themselves significant persons in their own right. And before leaders of such quality can come and backing of such substance be available, there must be the social conditions that give them the room to become aware of the Self that is in them, to collect themselves, and to seek the God within them until they find him. There is no alternative. Great shaping creative men come only out of a favoring soil. Their struggle has always been to extricate themselves from the swamp that is mass-man, to find themselves, to get on their own legs, and to do their creative work in spite of the downward pull that is ever sucking at their feet. Without them, such a thing as a society, in particular a durable and magnificent and forever memorable society, is inconceivable.

What Arthur Feiler discovered in Russia in 1929 was appalling. But more appalling was my own realization at the time that what had happened in Russia was going to happen to our whole Western world, the world of the White man; and this, not because we would become infected by Russia but because in fact we were the *first* to get the disease. We *began* to worship the Machine even before Russia did.

And I am satisfied that the fully technicized Machine inevitably and everywhere turns men into masses. If men are to grow in the likeness of kings, it is necessary that they establish their lordship over themselves and their sovereignty over every implement they use. They must have homes, real homes, well rooted in the earth, and well separated by thick walls or distance from every other home. They must have leisure, long hours of it, which they spend not in going to games or to movies, or at meetings or at parties, or in listening to radio or in watching television, but rather by themselves, often in silence, sitting at their own doors in the stillness of the evening hour, mulling over the events of the day, or their reading, listening to the musings of their own souls and thus acquiring a certain discrimination in ideas, in aspirations, and in judgments as to what is high and low, true and false, beautiful and ugly, by which gradually they come to a firm consciousness of what inextricably belongs to themselves, *and what does not*.

But if, on the contrary, for the sake of what it can be made to yield, they are going to subject themselves (or let themselves be subjected) to the Machine, as has been the case in the Western world ever-increasingly for the past hundred years, then it is inevitable that they will deteriorate, that great creative persons will disappear, that less and less shall we have men who are something in themselves, who are not of the crowd, who stand apart from the

crowd, who alone are able to give human existence all its significance, and to the shaping of human societies all wisdom of direction. We shall be left with the human swarm, the rabble—as I have said, the sodden, amorphous human mass. One or the other: we cannot have it both ways. If we will have our piece-work, our conveyor belts, and our automatized mass production in huge industrial combines, then as surely shall we have our industrialized nations turned into ant heaps. Russia only represents the logical end toward which our own civilization has long pointed and driven. We, too, shall have totalitarianism. Whether or not it is labeled “Communism” will make comparatively little difference. It will mean the dominion of the masses. That alone will mark the end of our culture. The swine will have taken possession of the parlor. They have broken in already. And we are in this plight because we have long allowed the spirit of the swine to make itself at home in our souls. With our faces to the earth we have long bowed down in servile subjection to the Machine.

When one views this situation with some perspective, one sees clearly that the Machine has become a boomerang. We have flattered ourselves that we had control of it. The truth is that if by “we” one means the American people, or the White race, or in particular that Nordic part of it that has done most, from ancient India to modern Europe, to lift the White man to the heights, then there is *nobody* in control—that is, nobody who is using control for our good. Control, as I shall presently show, is in the hands of aliens and traitors, and they are using it to ensure that we end in a ditch. They are using it with deadly effectiveness to produce a herd of fellaheen, bemused, stupefied, tamed cattle indeed, whom it will be easy for them to milk in the world-state corral that they now have nearly made ready to receive them.

Doubtless, this is about as stark as could be. Some of my readers may question whether I fully grasp the meaning of my own words. Some of my friends, after learning through the years what I saw ahead, have wondered how I could retain any faith in a human future. I reply that I am not in the habit of forcing the facts, or in my interpretation of them, to favor any personal theory or predilection, even my desire for the future of my own country, or, above all, of my own kind, of the White race or of the Nordic people that I am sprung from and passionately believe in. I will try to look things in the face no matter what they mean for my own hopes and dreams. But I think that I have now reached an elevation from which I can see beyond the catastrophe that must overtake my people—and envisage a great future for them (*at least as a possibility*). But first there must come a time of fearful humiliation and suffering, during which their eyes will be opened to the vast mistakes that they have made. Then, and only then, will they perceive how they must build more wisely in the future.

1946, 1970, 1973.

¹ *Problem Of Atlantis*, Brentano's, 1924, p. x.

² *A Cultural History of the Modern Age*, Knopf, 1930, Vol. I, p. 222.

³ Walter John Marx, in his *Mechanization and Culture* (Herder, St. Louis, 1941, p. 149f.), has this to say: “The first of the efficiency experts, Frederick Taylor, confessed candidly that ‘the

ideal of efficiency in industry is to simplify the work to such a degree that it can be done by a trained gorilla.' Stuart Chase agreed with Philips, that for 'many routine tasks it has been found that the feeble-minded make the best operatives.' He quotes Dr. Herman Frank to the effect that many industrial workers tend to be poorly developed mentally and deindividualized. 'Judgment, initiative, and native intelligence have been deliberately trained out.' Henry Ford confesses frankly that the work of the individual workmen must be repetitive and that some of the jobs in his factory are extremely monotonous."

Marx's whole chapter entitled "Machines and Human Work" is very illuminating and thought-provoking, pp. 126-182.

⁴ Stuart Chase, in his *Mexico, A Study of Two Americas* (Macmillan, 1931), makes it plain that wherever in Mexico a handicraft culture has survived, unemployment is unknown, and likewise destitution, recession and inflation.

⁵ A careful analysis of this problem, together with a helpful bibliography, may be found in Chapter I of *Mechanization and Culture* by Walter J. Marx, Herder, 1941. Let me also call attention to Friedrich Georg Juenger's *The Failure of Technology*, Regnery, 1956, for very sensitive insight into the innermost meaning of technology, and its ultimate and inevitable fate.

⁶ On this whole problem of private ownership, see "the careful, constructive synthesis of A. M. Ludovici in *The Sanctity of Private Property*," in which words Viscount Lynington acknowledged a special indebtedness. Published by Heath Cranton, London, 1932.

⁷ On this last, see A. M. Ludovici—*Creation Or Recreation*, London, 1934.

⁸ See his *This Ugly Civilization*, Simon and Schuster, 1929.

⁹ For the attitude of Consumer's Cooperation to the Machine see Raymond Scott: "Cooperation: A Means or An End," in *Free America*, October, 1938.

¹⁰ "By far the greater portion—possibly as much as ninety percent—of the mechanical power developed in this country, is employed in transportation of all types"—that is, in merely getting things or people from one place to another. Peter van Dresser in "Technics of Decentralization," in *Free America*, June 1938, p. 10.

¹¹ See Rachel Carson—*Silent Spring*, Boston, 1962; Frank Graham, Jr.—*Since Silent Spring*, Boston, 1970. Mr. Graham is Field Editor of *Audubon magazine*.

¹² See William Longgood—*The Poisons in Your Food*, Simon & Schuster, 1960, Pyramid paperback, revised and updated, 1969.

¹³ For an introduction to this whole subject, see Sir Albert Howard—*An Agricultural Testament*, Oxford University Press, 1940, *The Soil And Health*, Devin-Adair, 1947; Ehrenfried Pfeiffer—*Bio-Dynamic Farming And Gardening*, Anthroposophic Press, New York, N.Y., 1938, especially Ch. III; J. I. Rodale—*Pay Dirt*, Devin-Adair, 1945; Viscount Lynington—*Famine*

In England, Faber, *Alternative to Death*, Faber, 1943; Lionel J. Picton—*Nutrition and the Soil*, Devin-Adair, 1949; Weston A. Price—*Nutrition and Physical Degeneration*, Harper, 1939; Leonard Wickenden—*Our Daily Poison*, Devin-Adair, 1955. Also, Neil M. Clark—“Are We Starving to Death?” in the *Saturday Evening Post*, Sept. 1, 1945; H. Powell Spring—“Our Friend the Earth Worm” in *Free America*, Dec., 1938; cp. *Life*, Sept. 30, 1946; and not least the magazine *Organic Gardening*, edited by Mr. Robert Rodale, Emmaus, Pennsylvania, together with other literature from the same office, particularly its digest of the work on earthworms by Charles Darwin, and other papers on the same subject by other authorities.

¹⁴ See G.V. Jacks and R.O. Whyte: *The Rape of the Earth*, Faber, London, 1939.

¹⁵ See, for instance, E.A. Powell—*In Barbary: Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, and the Sahara*, Appleton, 1925, pp. 102, 115. Cited by Prof. Ellsworth Huntington in his *Mainsprings of Civilization*, Wiley, 1945, pp. 545-6. Also Ellen C. Sample—*The Geography of the Mediterranean Region*, Holt, 1931, p. 99f.

¹⁶ Editorial, *Free America*, May 1938, p. 2.

¹⁷ G.V. Jacks and R.O. Whyte, op. cit., 1939. Published in the U.S. by Doubleday, with the title *The Vanishing Land*.

¹⁸ Viscount Lynington in *The New Pioneer*, October 1939, p. 268.

¹⁹ See “Soil and Civilization” in *The New Pioneer*, March 1939, p. 103.

²⁰ This is taken from Walter J. Marx—*Mechanization and Culture*, Herder, St. Louis, 1941, p. 113. For supporting evidence he cites Stuart Chase—*Rich Land, Poor Land, A Study of Waste in the Natural Resources of America*, McGraw, 1936. Chase gives such evidence in plenty, and very vividly.

²¹ In addition to the books listed in footnote # 13, I suggest: *Soils And Men, 1938 Yearbook of the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture*; William Vogt—*Road To Survival*, Gollancz, London, 1949; Stuart Chase—*Rich Land, Poor Land*, McGraw, 1936; Herbert Agar—*Land Of The Free*, Houghton, 1935; Paul B. Sears—*Deserts On The March*, Univ. of Okla. Press, 1935; George Boyle—*Democracy's Second Chance*, Sheed, 1941; Fairfield Osborn—*Our Plundered Planet*, Little, 1948. One exceedingly valuable book that all students of the question should make themselves familiar with is F.H. King—*Farmers Of Forty Centuries*, with Preface by Dr. Liberty Hyde Bailey of Cornell, who observes that “the first condition of farming is to maintain fertility,” to control natural resources. Prof. King’s book is a profusely illustrated account of how the people of China, Japan and Korea have succeeded in doing just this, under the most difficult conditions, for 4,000 years. Republished, with minor corrections, by Organic Gardening Press, Emmaus, Pennsylvania.

²² Quotations in this paragraph not acknowledged otherwise will be found in *Free America*, May-December, 1938.

²³ Cp. Ehrenfried Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 7; Dan Smoot Report: "Planned Famine," Dallas, Texas, 1966; Dan P. Van Gorder: *Ill Fares The Land, The Famine Planned for America*, Western Islands, Belmont, Mass., 1966. Introduction by Tom Anderson. And for evidence that the evil and the menace continue, see *Reader's Digest* for December 1972 for an article entitled "The Nibbling Away of the West" by James Nathan Miller.

²⁴ See Walter John Marx, op. cit., p. 113. In 1932, a committee of the League of Nations reported "that the world cut [of timber] exceeded world growth by 50 percent." Cited by Viscount Lymington in *Alternative to Death*, p. 40.

²⁵ Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 28. For the work of the earthworm see Sir Albert Howard—*The Soil And Health*, Devin-Adair, 1947, pp. 26-29, 70, 74. He testified that "artificial [i.e., chemical fertilizers], sulphate of ammonia in particular, destroy the earthworm population wholesale" (p. 74). J. I. Rodale says that Darwin's "years of investigation as to the part earthworms play in nature's scheme of things" led him to conclude that "without the earthworm vegetation would degenerate close to the vanishing point." He adds that "there is no question that caustic fertilizers are responsible for the death of hundreds of billions of earthworms." *Pay Dirt*, Devin-Adair, 1947, pp. 8, 13. His fascinating chapter on the earthworm (p. 8ff.) tells how it "aerates and pulverizes the soil" and "actually produces topsoil." Darwin estimated that more than ten tons of dry earth per acre annually passed through [the] digestive systems [of earthworms], so that practically all topsoil was 'treated' by them every few years."

²⁶ Op. cit., p. 113.

²⁷ Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 10. And of course F. H. King's *Farmers of Forty Centuries*, is a veritable mine of information in support of this thesis.

²⁸ *Free America*, May 1938, p. 3.

²⁹ As a matter of fact, the use of DDT has not been stopped. The essential facts about the pesticide situation and the controversy about it were recently very well presented and brought up to date by Mr. Frank Graham, Jr., Field Editor of *Audubon* magazine, in *Since Silent Spring*, Houghton, 1970. From the Foreword to the Consumers Union edition of this book I quote: "The author describes the formidable pressures of chemical and agricultural interests against control of pesticides, the contradictory and ineffective policies of government agencies . . . Meanwhile, the pesticides—some far more toxic than DDT—continue to spread throughout the environment in ever-increasing quantities. . . DDT, ostensibly has been banned, except for so-called essential uses, by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. But six major manufacturers of DDT . . . have filed appeals, and so the limited ban has been stayed. . . additional appeals by manufacturers may delay implementation for years. Meanwhile, DDT, one of the most persistent and highly toxic of all pesticides, continues to be allowed to contaminate our environment for decades to come."

In the light of all this, it is well to remember the words of a recent Assistant Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, as quoted by Rachel Carson in *Silent Spring*. ". . . what makes these thoughts all the more disturbing is the knowledge that our fate could perhaps be sealed twenty or more years before the development of symptoms."

³⁰ Nikolai Berdyaev—*The Fate Of Man in The Modern World*, London, 1935, p. 16f.

³¹ Norton, 1935.

³² Ortega y Gasset, *ibid.*, pp. 56-7.

³³ The phrase in quotes is the title of a very revealing and disturbing book by the English jurist F. J. P. Veale, Devin-Adair, 1953.

³⁴ Allen & Unwin, 1930. There was also an American edition with somewhat different title.

³⁵ Arthur Feiler, *op. cit.*, p. 245f.

³⁶ Arthur Feiler, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-4.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 241f. Cp. Ortega y Gasset, *op. cit.*, chapter entitled: "The Increasing Menace of Society" (pp. 166-171).

³⁸ See "Norway's Nansen: One of the Giants," *Reader's Digest*, August 1953, p. 73.

Chapter 16.

The Necessity of Eugenics.

Your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the Twentieth Century as the Roman Empire was in the Fifth, with this difference; that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without and your Huns and Vandals will have been engendered within your own country, by your own institutions.

Lord Macaulay, addressing the USA in 1857

The human species is faced in the biologically immediate future with the possibility of genetic degeneration. . . . The inevitable result, unless steps are taken to prevent it, will be a gradual lowering of the average level of the genetic basis of all human qualities In the United States one-sixth of the population is producing one-half of the next generation: it is most unlikely that this fact has no differential genetic consequences Those with higher genetic intelligence have, on the whole, a lower reproductive rate than the less intelligent, and this must be dysgenic The geneticist. . . can point out the present dangers of degeneration as inescapable deductions from the established facts and principles of his science.

Sir Julian Huxley

The road to social deterioration runs by way of continued breeding from inferior stock Devastated cities may be rebuilt again by renewed labor and lost fortunes may be reestablished. But the powers of mind and character eliminated by bad breeding may hardly be restored.

Professor James C. Needham

The nation which takes most serious thought for its genetical future is . . . most likely to have a future.

Professor C. D. Darlington

In my last chapter, I made a study of the Machine and presented a picture of the devastating effect that it has had on the world in which we live. Many of my readers may have laid down the last page with the exclamation, "All too true, alas! But why do we have a world like this? And what can we do about it?"

This book may or may not answer the first question to my readers' satisfaction. But one thing is certain: we have the kind of world that we have because we have wanted the kind of things that make such a world. A people's economics and politics, and all its institutions, are only its own soul made manifest. No society can be better than the character and intelligence of the people who compose it. On most issues, I have come to differ with Tolstoy sharply, but his "Appeal to Social Reformers" contains a bit of real wisdom. He says that those who try to improve the world are usually like a man trying to build a fire with wet sticks. He lays them this way and he lays them that way, seeming to think that if only he can find the right arrangement of the sticks, the sticks will burn. Whereas the truth is that no matter how he arranges them the sticks will never burn until first he gets them in the right condition: dry.

I say still, as I said over fifty years ago, that we must have a new kind of man. But I see now that for a man to become different it is not enough that he be enjoined to will differently. Indeed, his very ability to will, and what he wills, and his power to carry out his will, depends upon his inheritance from his ancestors. Not only character and intelligence, but also taste and will and all the spiritual attributes of man have biological roots. No preaching or propaganda, nor any accumulation of factual knowledge, neither the spread of hygiene and medicine nor all the efforts at moral or economic reform and social renovation put together, essential as many of these things are, will ever themselves prove enough to make a people's life wholly healthy or enable them to attain the heights of which, at their best, they are inherently capable.¹ No people shall ever put its life on a sound basis, and keep it there, except as it looks to its breeding stock.

What is the substance in its manhood and womanhood?—that is the cardinal question. What are the indispensable requisites for being well-born? What principles should guide men and women in the choice of their mates? What stratum of the population is having the most children per marriage? What means have been devised by which to reduce the proportion of its inferior stocks, and to preserve and increase the proportion of its stocks that are most robust and most gifted? In the long run, the whole fate of any people hinges inexorably on what we do with all those who can only create problems for society and be a useless burden, and upon whether or not these are more than balanced by an adequate proportion of well-constituted and highly endowed persons who alone can not only solve society's problems but create the culture and civilization that are any people's supreme achievement. These are the problems of eugenics, which are to be the subject of this chapter and the next.

It may be, as is asserted by some authorities in the field, that man does not yet know enough to be sure what the right answer to some of these questions is. Indeed, it should be no matter for surprise if this is the case. Considering the magnitude and the complexity of the problems, eugenics is yet very young. Moreover, human beings cannot be subjected to experiment with the same freedom and ease as plants and animals. And an accumulation of test generations, which in the lower orders of life reveals its meaning within weeks or months, would require centuries among men and women. Also, the dogmas of democracy have been stacked in the path of any effort to discriminate between different sections or strata of the population in respect to their social value, and have resisted as unjust any disposition to give to one what was denied to another. In the massing ranks of class-conscious proletarians, there has been a steady distrust of eugenic proposals, as tending to divert attention from what they believe to be the root cause of their sufferings, which they

would like to find not in any innate defect in themselves but in the wrongs of their masters and in the iniquities of the capitalist system. Moreover, in all ranks, there has been a well-nigh universal resistance to any interference with the liberties of human beings in regard to their reproductive functions.

And so it is no wonder that we read in the words of Professor Ellsworth Huntington of Yale, writing in 1927, that “among the great agencies for human improvement, almost nothing has been so neglected as has eugenics. Our national government spends over \$300,000 per year to improve the genetic qualities of horses, cattle and pigs, but not a cent for the eugenic improvement of man. During the last few years, twenty-three of the most generous philanthropists have given approximately \$1,400,000 for the improvement of the education and environment of the human race, but scarcely anything for the improvement of human heredity.”² This was over forty years ago, and in the meantime matters have gone steadily from bad to worse. Every people’s significance and even its existence—let me repeat it again, though it be *ad nauseam*—must always depend upon its leadership class, those possessed of the character and the capabilities necessary to solve its social problems, to unite, to move and to lift the whole people to supreme dedication and every kind of heroism, and thus to meet every crisis in the nation’s life. Also, it is only its most richly endowed members who can create the distinctive culture in which the mind and the soul of the entire population will be brought to a focus and which will hold up before their eyes the enduring symbols of their conquests, their ideals and their dreams. Most emphatically, it is not too much to say that it is ever a matter of life and death, justifying every needful sacrifice, both to *improve the caliber* of this stock of leaders and creators and to *increase its numbers* to that point, in relation to the population as a whole, where it will be able to fulfill its responsibilities.

This is what is necessary for the sound constitution of any nation, and thus even for its survival. But for the past half-century, under the drive of a perhaps generally well-meaning but surely unthinking and unintelligent and for the most part almost maudlin concern for the poor, the botched, the defective and the retarded, or for the general “elevation of the masses” (a concern which has come to dominate our entire society from the bottom to the top), the United States has been pursuing policies by which both the quality and the quantity of the superior stock, which we once possessed, have actually been diminished.

By intelligent and watchful selective breeding (that is, by carefully and steadily weeding out the culls and by making wise use of the seed from the best), Western man has brought forth countless marvels in the way of improved strains of all his domestic animals, and likewise of every manner of grain, vegetable, fruit and flower. But in regard to himself, to his own kind, he has long followed, and is following now, a course directly opposite to all this. He has been like a gardener who would neglect his tallest, sturdiest, most luxuriant and fruitful specimens to nurse along and try to make something of his diseased, deformed and sterile runts. Instead of taking humane and practical measures to stop the multiplication of human life so botched and broken that it can never, by any agency known to man, come to have any value or meaning (and thus gradually eliminate such defectiveness altogether), we levy an absolutely enormous tax on all the rest of the nation to feed it, doctor it, nurse it, and try to “educate” what can only slowly catch on to the idea that 2 plus 2 equals 4. In fact, our whole welfare and social security program, intended primarily to raise the standard of living of the

masses, tends actually to increase the birth rate of the part of our population that at the best is only mediocre in its endowments, and whose procreation should be kept within limits. On the other hand, the tax to support all this falls so heavily on our most richly endowed stock that it is handicapped and crippled, and instead of having large families—which is what we need from them, even very large families—it commonly settles down to having one child or two, not enough even to perpetuate itself.

In short, our present social setup is steadily producing, and as long as it lasts cannot fail to produce, a literal degeneration of our kind, of the caliber of our national and racial stock. Our good and our best are being outbred by our mediocre and by our worst, and to be outbred means to be replaced, as surely as if they had been conquered by bombs and bayonets and then massacred. They are removed from the Earth. The masses multiply like rabbits, and our best—such best as we still have, though no longer the equal of our best of 50 or 100 years ago—are shoved into oblivion. We are steadily becoming a people of average lower intelligence, feebler character, and reduced stamina. What we are witnessing is retrogressive evolution, an evolution in reverse, backward and downward. But any people long subjected to such a process must sooner or later fall to pieces from internal weakness and decay, or become the victim of a foreign conqueror. This is precisely the fate that has removed one nation after another from the pages of history, *simply because it failed to give constant and intelligent heed to the quality and the state of its breeding stock.*

Surely, the prospect of such a fate must fill any man who loves his nation or his race with horror, and move him to find out at once what exactly the situation is, how great is the peril, and what can be done to alleviate it and ultimately to remove it.

But this is precisely the kind of problem with which eugenics is primarily concerned, and which those who developed it and have since espoused it have been profoundly concerned to solve. Let us now, therefore, take a look at what eugenics is, and what it aims to accomplish.

Eugenics, as such, was really founded by Francis Galton, half first-cousin of Charles Darwin, of whose book on natural selection it was the logical development. Yet his ideas were by no means wholly new. A like concern with the problems of population (even though one less systematic) was shown, for instance, among the ancient Greeks, by men as distinguished as Theognis, Plato, and Aristotle. Theocritus declared that “the fairest gift one can give to children is to be born of noble sires.” The *Iliad* (and even more, the *Mahabharata*, the corresponding monumental epic of the Hindus) is full of phrases and casual remarks that reveal the conception of what was most admirable in man and woman, and therefore, by implication, of what were the marks of desirability in a mate. The practice of “exposing” (i.e., allowing to die) weak and defective infants was certainly practiced by the old Norse peoples.³ It was common among both the Greeks and the Romans, and was recommended by Aristotle and Plato. The former, along with other eugenic proposals, counseled that “nothing imperfect or maimed be allowed to grow up.” And Plato worked out the most thoroughgoing scheme of eugenics ever devised, though most of it has always been regarded as too greatly at variance with parental instinct to be suitable for practical application. The “democratic,” “enlightened,” and spectacular Age of Pericles, an age in many ways not unlike our own, was significantly indifferent to matters of eugenics, and to a eugenicist it is

therefore not surprising that, within a few years after his famous Funeral Oration, the whole national structure was swept into oblivion. Some centuries later, Caesar Augustus, confronted with disquieting symptoms of decay in the Roman social order, framed his *Juliae rogationes* to stimulate the birthrate, especially in the upper classes. But no people of the past has shown itself more conscious of the importance of improving its breeding stock than the Jews, nor has any been more explicit in regard to mating and to the maintenance of health. The main substance of their accumulated wisdom in this field is to be found in the body of tradition known as the *Talmud*.⁴

However, despite what may be called the eugenic attitude, not only of great individuals of the past, but also among great peoples, Galton broke newer ground than most of us today realize. Even Darwin to the time of his death believed that the differences among men were far less a result of native endowment than of application and of industry. Whereas Galton, even in his first published papers, declared his belief that better men could be bred by deliberate selection, and he presented a very impressive array of evidence to support his conviction.

Nevertheless, it remained for Johann Gregor Mendel, with the results of his experiments in the crossing of garden peas, about the middle of the 19th century, to provide eugenics for the first time with the possibility of a thoroughly scientific basis. These results, ignored through his lifetime, and recognized for their truth and profound significance only after 1900, revealed the mechanism by which characteristics (or the hereditary potentialities of characteristics) are transmitted from one generation to the next. The recognition of Mendel's discoveries led quickly to the most searching experimentation on an enormous scale, with the result that more was learned about heredity in the next half century than had been learned in man's entire past.⁵ Out of all this research came the so-called chromosome theory of heredity, which has been confirmed by such an overwhelming mass of evidence, that "practically all the hard-headed and skeptical geneticists the world over have no hesitation in accepting it."⁶

Furthermore, it is agreed among geneticists in general, and conceded even by an environmentalist like Dr. Raymond Pearl, that "all the most critical evidence indicates that man is not different from other forms of life in respect to the mechanism by which his characters are inherited."⁷ For a variety of reasons, it must be admitted that we need to know far more about what human characteristics are hereditary, to what *extent* they are hereditary, and with which characteristics (if any) their inheritance is linked, but so far as I have discovered, all geneticists of standing recognize that the inheritance of characteristics among humans is in fundamental accord with the laws discovered by Mendel.

You may have noticed that I have used both the term genetics and the term eugenics. The distinction between them is that, whereas the geneticist concerns himself with the laws and methods of heredity in general, the scientific eugenist is a geneticist who *applies these laws and methods to the improvement of human beings*. It is his aim to increase the number of children, throughout the population, that are born with good heredity, and to diminish the proportion that are born with bad. Let me add the arresting observation of Professor Edward M. East of Harvard that "without overstepping fact, one may say that genetics, the science of descent, has been the most profitable branch of twentieth-century biology."⁸

Some of my readers may object that eugenics is defunct and no longer worth anyone's attention. And it is undeniable that in the past thirty or forty years eugenics, as a movement, or as a philosophy, or even as a point of view, has been well-nigh buried under the avalanche of equalitarian propaganda that has been let loose upon our country, and so suffocated therein that its voice, instead of guiding the counsels of the nation, is reduced to a mere squeak.

However, in full justice to the overall facts bearing upon all the forms of life upon which humankind is dependent for its existence, I must remind my readers that the development of every superior breed and variety, whether of grain, of fruit or vegetable, of horse, cow or dog, and their maintenance in health and vigor, has been the result of the application to plant and animal life of scientific principles and procedures that are completely in accord with what, in relation to human beings, we call eugenics. Nevertheless, I must record that, in 1961, a scientist of the stature of Garrett Hardin of the University of California actually set it down that the "eminent geneticist" J. H. Muller, in a speech before the Eugenics Society in New York in 1932, had brought eugenics to an "effective end." Interested readers can find what Muller had to say in support of his argument in Professor Hardin's *Nature and Man's Fate* (Mentor Book, 1961, pp. 200-1). And that what he had to say contains well-founded and significant facts, I readily concede. But these very facts are *part* of the dire evil that eugenics was intended to deal with, and instead of being a valid reason for why it should be depreciated and discarded, they really summon us to its revival on a vastly expanded scale, perhaps with some revision of its aims, but with a comprehensive and fittingly intensified program into which we throw ourselves with more concentration than we ever devoted to putting a man on the moon. For what I am concerned about in the last analysis, is not eugenics as such, or any theory whatever, but with biological realities that are absolutely inescapable and that threaten us with irreversible destruction. No one who sins against the laws of the universe ever escapes the consequences. And the law that I am particularly concerned about is this: *Any organism that fails to excrete its waste products DIE S.* And today we are allowing our human refuse to accumulate until it threatens to bury us. Eugenics or no eugenics, if we fail to get rid of this waste, and do it soon, we are finished.

As I have settled myself to the task of revising my material on eugenics, first written some twenty years ago, to bring it up to date for inclusion in this book, I marvel that I ever had the temerity to venture a word on the subject. And I have felt this only the more acutely as I have scanned some of the latest treatises on genetics and thus come to a sharpened sense of its present vast ramifications and bewildering complexities. But gradually I found myself steadied by several reflections. I have made no pretense of being any authority or even a specialist. I got into the exploration of genetics primarily because it was a profound necessity for the ordering of my own mind and for the direction of my own life, to ascertain what light it could throw on some of the most urgent problems of our present agitated, shattered, and obviously sick society. For the most part, I am not now trying to get the ear of the specialists, but there is a vast deal that the specialists have been saying, the gist and significance of which needs to be made very widely known. I am therefore addressing myself, in particular, to those exceptional laymen who have intelligence enough to realize the enormous import of biological realities for our whole human future, but whose efforts to fathom what eugenics has to say have left them confused and baffled by their inability to find any way to "lay hold of the critter." To such men, it may be a help to learn from my

experience that it is not necessary to know everything about genetics, that the oldest and best tested parts of it are those about which there is the fullest scientific consensus, and that a knowledge of these alone lays bare what is basically wrong with our society and what men of honesty and resolution must somehow manage to mend if our Western world is not to break down in rot and in irretrievable disaster.

I soon realized that the field of eugenics was much too large to be covered adequately in any such space as I could give to it. Moreover, with such books on the subject available as will appear in the notes and citations at the end of each chapter, such an attempt on my part becomes quite unnecessary. In these two chapters, therefore, I have decided to narrow my field to several points that are of particular importance for this book, and which, perhaps, must be of urgent interest to anyone who is concerned, as I am, with elevating the quality of human life. These points are:

- (1) The present condition of the White man's biological stock, especially as we find it in the United States;
- (2) The so-called "differential birthrate," and its meaning for the life of any people;
- (3) The fact of the inheritance of human characteristics (or the potentialities thereof), and its significance, in comparison with that of environment, as a factor in determining individual development;
- (4) Inbreeding and outbreeding, and their respective functions and relative merits. That is, on the one hand, mating with one's own, one's equal or one's like, and, on the other hand, mating with one's opposite, one's complement, or alien. I wish to examine this matter in relation both to individual marriages and to national and racial policy regarding miscegenation—more specifically, in regard to such marriages as those between Whites and Blacks, Whites and Yellows, and even, perhaps, between White Swede or English and, let us say, White Turk or Spaniard. Does the American policy of the "melting pot" or the exclusionist policy of the Chinese have the more solid foundation in genetics? The discussion of miscegenation in its national and racial aspects, however, seems best left to my first chapter on race, which will follow what I have to say about eugenics.
- 5) Eugenic proposals for actually improving the reproductive stock of any people, considered in the light of the dogma of democracy and the humanitarianism prevalent among us.

In this chapter, I shall carry my discussion of eugenics only through my third section, which will be devoted to a study of heredity. I will finish the matter in my next chapter. Throughout, I will undertake to avoid the technical lingo of genetics. The complexities of this science must be understood even to appreciate its astounding exactness, but he who would grapple with these would do well to study such an introduction to the subject as is to be found in *Human Genetics and Its Social Import* (pp. 29-111) by the distinguished geneticist Samuel J. Holmes, (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1936) or in *Genetics and Man* by the no less distinguished C.D. Darlington (Macmillan, 1964.)

I. THE PRESENT BIOLOGICAL CONDITION OF OUR HUMAN STOCK.

I should like to begin by presenting a picture of the state of the human stock that we have today in America. It will give us from the start some conception of the enormity of the biological problem with which we are confronted. I allow that much of it has other than a hereditary origin, and that therefore our attempts at solution must be by other than solely eugenic means. On the other hand, more of the evil than is generally recognized is known to have a hereditary basis.

Statistics are contrary to my taste, and I have often wished that I could follow the advice of Thoreau and eschew statistics altogether! To a considerable extent, I mistrust them, as doubtless do many of my readers. I know that they are the easy resort of the special pleader, and that men of deft fingers and easy conscience can manipulate them to support almost any sort of prejudice or preconceived idea. But I have found myself constrained both to recognize the honest and elevated intent of the men who have submitted the statistics that I shall quote; and also to trust their acumen and skill in detecting and correcting the errors that statistics often conceal even when least intended. Moreover, as one discovers statistics prepared by one body of experts making the same general point as those prepared by other such bodies working independently, one finds it increasingly difficult to dismiss them. In any case, I know of no other way in which so quickly and effectively to present a picture of the present state of the human stock in this country than to quote the figures and statements of outstanding authorities. For the sake of readability, however, I may sometimes recast their statements in my own words; and the citations, which I shall always give, will appear at the end of the chapter.

I was shocked when I read, thirty-five years ago, on excellent authority, that in England one person out of every ten was "too dull or sickly to earn a living unaided." That is, he was constitutionally unable to carry his own load and was perforce a burden on the rest of society.⁹ But this was followed in 1947 by a report of the Royal Commission on Population, headed by Sir Cyril Burt, one of Britain's foremost psychologists, that the average level of intelligence of the British people was declining at a disquieting rate, and that if this deterioration continued at its then-estimated pace, in just over 50 years the number of pupils of 'scholarship' ability would be approximately halved and the number of feeble-minded almost doubled.¹⁰

In the meantime, however, I was discovering that the situation in our own country was even worse. In 1935, Dr. Donald A. Laird, of the Riverside Psychological Research Laboratory associated with Colgate University, in an article entitled "The Tail That Wags the Nation," published in the *Review of Reviews* (92:44), wrote as follows: "The country's average level of general ability sinks lower with each generation. Should the ballot be restricted to citizens, able to take care of themselves? *One out of four cannot.* . . The tail is wagging Washington, and Wall Street and LaSalle Street. Each generation has seen some lowering of the American average level of general ability" (italics added). Such a statement may seem beyond all reason until we remember the well-known fact that during the Second World War "a total of forty percent of the nation's manpower in the military age groups was lost to the draft because the men were below standard, physically, mentally, psychically. . . More than one million draftees had to be weeded out as psycho-neurotics here at home, while another 300,000 had to be

weeded out for the same reason along the battle-fronts.”¹¹ This is in line with the figures and the conclusions deduced therefrom in 1967 by Robert H. Felix in his *Mental Illness, Progress and Prospects*: “For every 100 rejections for all causes, neuropsychiatric rejections accounted for 39.1 for the years 1942 through 1945.”¹² All this pertained to “the flower of our manhood.” For the nation as a whole, “at least one study projected the figure of one American in ten who needed psychiatric help of some kind.”¹³

Something of the condition that lies behind these figures may dawn upon our consciousness if we read with imagination, and ponder upon, the summary drawn by Dr. Weston A. Price in his *Nutrition and Physical Degeneration*, which Professor Hooton of Harvard, in measured words, pronounced “a profoundly significant book.” Dr. Price declared that of every hundred pregnancies in this country today, one-quarter are not sound enough to come to birth, and that of this quarter over half are so badly deformed as to be grouped as monsters. Of the seventy-five children born alive, over one-third, about 28, prove to be failures within fifteen years, due in large part to the development of degenerative diseases.¹⁴ This would seem to mean that of every seventy-five persons born alive, every third one comes to be carried more or less on the backs of the others, upon whom falls the chief responsibility of conducting business, making homes, teaching school, providing soldiers—in short, of maintaining the whole life of a nation. These deductions are all the more disquieting when we reflect that of two-fifths of the males were adjudged by the Army Tests in 1943-45 to be unfit for military service. This rate of rejection was 10 percent higher than in 1918, even though it had become necessary to reduce the physical standards in order to get the number of men deemed essential. By the Korean War, 52 percent were rejected for physical and mental defects, an increase of 11 percent over the figures for the Second World War, and this in spite of the fact that by then the standards had been so lowered that “the figures for rejections during the Korean conflict are of no value in determining the general health of the draftees.” In plainer words, the figures do not reveal *how bad* the draftees’ state of health actually was.¹⁵ And doubtless, through all this period, the corresponding health of the females of like age was not a whit better. Yet these young men and women of recognized mental and physical inadequacy were, for the most part, left as free as the very best-endowed among us to become the fathers and mothers of our future generations.

These statements are staggering. At first glance, at least, I simply could not bring myself to believe them. In considerable part, they seem belied by what we see of the concrete men and women all about us. Nevertheless, they come from men who have made it their business, and who have been trained, to ascertain what the facts actually are. And the researches of Dr. Laird, at least, were looked to by hard-headed business men who have millions of dollars to invest in employing labor. Moreover, the further that we ourselves probe beneath the surface, the more we find our own conclusions compelled to move in the direction of these statements. Let us, therefore, press this examination closer. Let us pass in quick review the state of the nation, first as regards its physical health, then as regards its health of mind, and finally as regards its record for crime.

According to the *Journal of the American Medical Association* in 1937, the preceding year saw an “all-time high” in the record of hospitalization. “One person in fifteen . . . [was] admitted to the country’s 6,189 registered hospitals,” and the patients made an average stay of 13 days.¹⁶ Dr. T. Parran, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, reported in 1938 that

“every day one out of twenty people is too sick to go to school or work, or attend his customary activities.” That is, “six million [are] sick every day.” “Every man, woman and child (on the average) . . . suffers ten days of incapacity annually. The average youngster is sick in bed seven days of the year, the average oldster 35 days.”¹⁷ The distinguished scientist Dr. Alexis Carrel wrote in 1935 to the same effect. “Eleven hundred thousand persons have to attend the medical needs of 12,000,000 other persons. Every year among this population of the United States there are about 100,000,000 illnesses, serious or slight. In the hospitals, 700,000 beds are occupied every day of the year.” Annually, he said, medicine costs about three-quarters of a billion dollars, and medical care in all its forms, no less than three and one-half billions.¹⁸

But however disturbing these figures may have been in 1935, they have been increasing steadily ever since. In 1963, Lerner and Anderson, basing their estimate on the annual surveys by the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association, stated that “the 1960 total [of hospital beds in the United States] was 9.2 beds per 1,000 of population,” and that “American consumers today are spending more money on medical care [hospitals, drugs, doctors, appliances, etc.] than ever before in their history.” “In 1929, Americans disbursed almost \$3 billion as aggregate personal expenditures for medical care. By 1960, the total had reached almost \$20 billion, more than six times as high as in 1929. The increase in medical spending per capita was substantial [i.e., it was not to be accounted for merely by inflation] and represented a ‘real’ increase in quantity of services purchased. The figure rose from \$32.86 in 1929 to \$70.87 in 1960 (both in 1947-49 prices), or more than double.”¹⁹ In fact, a current issue of *U.S. News & World Report* (December 13, 1971, p. 12), gives the “health spending per person” in 1960 as \$142, “for a total of \$26 billions, or 5.2 percent of the nation’s production,” and adds that “latest Government figures show Americans are spending an average of \$385 *each* on health care *this* year—75 billion dollars total, 7.4 percent of the nation’s total output.”

Dr. Carrel was especially perturbed by the increase in degenerative diseases, such as heart trouble, hardening of the arteries, cancer, rheumatism, diabetes, and diseases of the nervous system. “Modern man is delicate,” he declared. He has been so protected by modern medicine and hygiene that “the number of deaths from infectious diseases has greatly diminished,” but the human “organism seems to have become more susceptible to the degenerative diseases.” Through coddling, fewer babies die and on the average people live longer, but our civilized human stock has lost the soundness of constitution of more primitive man.²⁰ More recent reports confirm this. Dr. Norman Joliffe, in charge of nutrition for the Department of Health of New York City, wrote in 1955: “Although in America today life expectancy at birth is near the best of any civilized country in the world . . . at the age of 40 life expectancy is near the bottom.”²¹ And again: “Whereas coronary artery disease was a rarity prior to 1920, it has now become the number one cause of death in the 45-to-64 age group,” and it is “especially significant” that it has begun to invade the ranks of the “younger and middle-aged males.”²² Miss Adelle Davis, writing in 1965, quotes Dr. Ancel Keys of the University of Minnesota as saying that one no longer asks who has heart disease but merely “How severe is your heart disease?”²³ Indeed, surveying the whole situation, Mr. William Longgood, in a chapter entitled “The Nation’s Health,” declares that “more than half the population—babies included—is said to be suffering from some form of chronic illness today,” and reported that “organized medicine, for all its successes in combating

agents of acute infection, recognized that it thus far has lost in the battle against degenerative diseases.”²⁴ But to my mind degeneration suggests that the very citadel of a man’s being is in a state of decay. He is falling to pieces *inside*.

Nothing that I have yet said, however, has indicated adequately how I feel about this matter of health. I suppose that one’s standard for it must ever be largely a matter of one’s taste, perhaps even of one’s very instinct. Health is no mere negative thing, no mere absence of ailment. At its full and its best, it shows itself in bloom and aroma (as surely as does a freshly picked apple), in symmetry of bodily parts and grace of movement, in vigor, in spirit, in endurance, in bearing. I subscribe without reservation to the thesis of Dr. Knight Dunlap, Professor of Experimental Psychology at Johns Hopkins, that the finally convincing sign and seal of health, of one’s physical fitness for life and for passing on one’s life to offspring—is beauty.²⁵ That we cannot all be beautiful goes without saying, but most emphatically it is possible for a population in general to become so well-constituted as to present a very superior appearance. I learned this early one frosty morning in 1937 (as I have already related elsewhere) when I was walking briskly down a thronging thoroughfare in Stockholm, studying the faces and figures of the men and women whom I passed. Suddenly it came over me, “Never before in all my life have I seen so many beautiful women in one place.” Whereas, concerning us, Dr. Dunlap is constrained to say, “The percentage of women who would be even moderately presentable as barelegged dancers, regardless of dancing ability, is so low as to be shocking.”²⁶

The tragedy of it is that his pronouncement is absolutely true. And our men are no better. On any bathing beach they show up just as miserably, with their flabby muscles, slouched shoulders, pasty complexions, paunch bellies, and jumble of ill-assorted parts and types. In posture and in gait, they show what they have within them—and what they do *not* have. But the greater tragedy is that most of us can look day after day upon this spectacle of obviously botched and sickly humanity without being overcome again and again by feelings of disgust and of dismay. The most disquieting symptom is the fact that we can look upon it and not really see it, or can see it and not care. We cannot all be beautiful, true enough and alas, but where is gone our love and longing for beauty? Where is the acuteness of our sense of what the beautiful is? Where is gone our eye and admiration for the thoroughbred? Our civilization is sick, primarily because our people themselves are sick, all up and down the land. But how, I pray you, shall health ever increase among us except as beauty is loved and sought, and all the marks of health and of the thoroughbred noted and refined and required and spread throughout all the population, even to the bottom of it, as a standard? Only so shall all sickness and all ugliness come to be looked upon as a sign of danger and as a thing of shame, and measures be taken to eliminate them. More justly alarming and more ominous for the future of our country than even the prevalence of disease and ugliness in our midst is our *indifference* to them.

But some of you may have been saying to yourselves, “Why all this bother about disease and ugliness in a paper on eugenics, which is primarily concerned about improvements that can be reached through heredity?” I had hoped to anticipate such an objection by the allowance that I made at the beginning of this section. I know full well that bad health is to a very large extent the result of bad environment—principally, perhaps, of faulty diet: over-eating, under-eating due to poverty, or a wrong and vicious eating that is commonly due no more to

poverty than to ignorance or lack of self-control. Nevertheless, though science has yet a long way to go to determine exactly where and to what extent hereditary factors do enter in to produce physical disease, that heredity must be involved largely would seem certain from the well-known fact that a bodily predisposition to one disease or another, which will actually lead to that disease if the environmental conditions favor it, is very often a matter of inheritance. I may quote the pronouncements of two of our most authoritative geneticists, one an American, the other English. Dr. S. J. Holmes said that "even a brief description of all the inherited defects of human beings which handicap individuals more or less seriously would fill a large volume."²⁷ And Dr. F. A. E. Crew says, "The tendency to develop cancer or the capacity to resist cancer is unquestionably influenced by organic inheritance. . . . Moreover, not only was the incidence of cancer influenced by organic inheritance but so also were the site and the character of the cancer." And again he says, "Evidence is slowly accumulating, which tends to show that immunities, like susceptibilities, are transmitted as genetic characters."²⁸ And surely it is no more than a matter of common sense (even though science may have scanty—perhaps all too scanty!—respect for such judgments) that a population of sound organic inheritance would never be so ridden and riddled with disease as we are, and no less that we shall never have the immunities to disease, or the savor, vigor, and harmony of parts characteristic of health and beauty, until these are established in our hereditary constitution as something that can be passed on from parent to child.

However, let us turn now to examine the *mental* health of our population.

At the close of the World Population Congress in Paris in 1937, Dr. H. M. Pollock, statistician of the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene, stated that "if important discoveries in the field of prevention are not made, mental disease will soon supersede physical disease as the paramount health problem in the United States." In New York State "one person in twenty may be expected to undergo hospital treatment for mental disease at some period in his life."²⁹ According to Professor Ellsworth Huntington, "one family out of every seven is represented" in the lists of the insane.³⁰ In 1932, and throughout the United States as a whole, the state hospitals housed some 340,000 insane, but it was estimated that there were "probably an equal or greater number outside."³¹ Dr. C. Floyd Haviland, formerly director of the Manhattan State Hospital, and State Commissioner of Health, estimated that there were "five or six times as many mentally diseased persons outside asylums as in them."³² According to Dr. Alexis Carrel, "In certain states, the multitude of the insane confined in the asylums exceeds that of the patients in all other hospitals," but he adds that, if the present rate of increase continues, about one million of our young people now in school will sooner or later land in asylums.³³ And according to Dr. Pollock, quoted above, the economic loss to the United States on account of mental disease is nearly one billion dollars a year.³⁴ That was in the Thirties. The picture had not changed much by the year 1950, of which Robert H. Felix, writing in 1967, gives the following report: The "population of patients in public mental hospitals" rose from "183.6 per 100,000 of the general population" in 1904 to 412.6 in 1960. In 1950, "out of every 1000 males born that year, 48.2 could be expected to be admitted to a mental hospital before the entire group had died out." This was nearly one out of every 20. Females averaged about the same. "Some 750,000 mentally ill and retarded patients were in hospitals on any given day, and 47 percent of the hospital beds in the nation were occupied by mental patients." "The direct economic cost of mental illnesses to the taxpayers of the nation, including pensions to veterans with

psychiatric disabilities, was over one billion dollars a year and had been increasing at a rate of one million dollars a year.”³⁵

By the end of another decade, the incidence of mental ailment had doubled. In 1960, Mike Gorman, executive director of the National Committee on Mental Health, was estimating that “one out of ten” of our whole population would spend part of his life in a mental hospital. “And it’s getting worse,” he added, “We’re in more trouble than we thought.” In the words of Mr. William Longgood, “He described mental disease in the United States as ‘an epidemic sweeping the land.’ By calling it an epidemic he said he meant ‘our inability to stop it . . . the way it sweeps in its path all kinds of people . . . the increasing numbers of people affected . . . particularly among children.” A bulletin of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company noted that one-tenth of all the patients in mental institutions were under the age of twenty-five.³⁶

Moreover, there seems to be a consensus among authorities that a great deal of insanity has a hereditary foundation. The idea that “most of our insane come from our ‘best’ stock” (as one of my friends once wrote me) has been proved totally unsupported by the facts, as has the prevalent idea that there is any correlation between insanity and genius. In refutation of the opinion that “there is hardly ever a man of genius who has not insanity or nervous disorder of some form in his family,” Dr. Weston A. Price pointed out that “Havelock Ellis, one of the leading psychologists and psychiatrists of our day, has shown that the percentage of cases substantiating this doctrine is less than 2 percent and less than half that proportion found in the population at large, which in a tested group he found to be 4.2 percent. East of Harvard in discussing this problem states, after reviewing the evidence pro and con: ‘Thus it is seen that where one collates the work of the most competent investigators on the possibility of relation between insanity and genius the conclusion is unavoidable that none exists.’”³⁷ Insanity is not common in distinguished families.³⁸ On the other hand, Professor Edward M. East says that probably somewhere near half of our insanity shows traces of hereditary influence.³⁹ The results of the studies of identical twins, each of which is developed from the same ovum and nearly always has precisely the same hereditary constitution, are rather conclusive on this point.⁴⁰ This does not mean that there is any “organic hereditary continuity with past and with future generations” (Crew). A person does not directly “inherit” dementia praecox, for instance. What he does inherit is an instability and a tendency, which may or may not develop into actual dementia praecox, according to whether or not his environment places him under great mental and emotional strain. To a layman, this may seem a distinction without much of a difference, though it is one that the geneticist Dr. Raymond Pearl once went out of his way to emphasize at great length and with considerable animus. So I adhere to the distinction. But the pertinent fact of outstanding practical importance is simply stated in the plain words of Dr. Alexis Carrel, to the effect that a very large part of insanity surely has an ancestral cause.⁴¹

However, the problem of the insane is less disturbing than the problem of the feeble-minded. Feeble-mindedness is a matter of a mind’s failing to develop, whereas insanity is a matter of a mind’s developing abnormally. There are several grades of mental defectiveness. The idiot has the intelligence of an average child of 2 to 4 years, and can learn to do only the simplest tasks. The imbecile, with the intelligence of a child of 3 to 7, is unable to earn himself a living. The moron has a mental age of 7 to 12, and under direction can be more or

less self-supporting and a humbly useful member of society. These three grades occur in about the proportions of 3, 15, and 82 percent respectively of the defective population. Above this entire group comes the yet larger number of the border-line and dull normal people, who in many ways constitute the greatest danger of all, for the reason that, though they have a grade of intelligence little above that of children, they cannot be treated as children or be put under supervision, but on the contrary are endowed with citizenship and a degree of responsibility they are quite unqualified to bear.

Thirty years ago, there were in the United States only about 60,000 feeble-minded enjoying the benefits of institutional care. But E. R. Johnson, while superintendent of a large institution in New Jersey, declared that no state provided adequately for more than 10 percent of its mental defectives. This would seem well within the facts as appraised by the White House Conference of 1930, which estimated that approximately two percent of the entire population is definitely feeble-minded.⁴² This would mean that about two and one-half million feeble-minded in this country called for institutional care. Moreover, on the basis of the Army tests of 1917 and other lines of perhaps even more reliable evidence, Professors East and Huntington, of Harvard and Yale respectively, made estimates to the following effect:

We had about 60 persons per thousand who lacked the intelligence to go through primary school, people commonly unable even to write their names. Our proportion of such people was thirty times that of Germany and Scandinavia, and considerably greater than that of either England, Scotland, Holland, France or Switzerland. At the time the estimate was made (1935), they probably aggregated about seven million.

Besides these, we had some 20 to 25 millions "whose intellects will not carry them through the grammar school, even with hard driving," who are "fitted for nothing above the position of common laborers. These are people who are poor because they are unintelligent as well as 'poor because they are ignorant.' In great proportion, they could never rise far beyond their present condition because of their heredity."⁴³

We are likely to come nearer to appreciating the actual situation if we face the summary of the facts as made by Professor East in 1935. "The Army tests showed that 25 percent of the adult population of the United States is unable to read and understand newspapers and write letters home." "On the basis of intelligence returns from the draft, judges whose qualifications make their opinions worthy of respect have estimated that 25 percent of the population are inherently unqualified to pass beyond elementary [i.e., "primary"] school, that 40 percent cannot finish the grammar school, that 60 percent cannot perform high school work satisfactorily, and that 80 percent cannot carry out work of college grade." The figures indicated that at least one-sixth of our entire population had "nervous systems too defective for them to appreciate what is demanded of them in modern society." And this quota of irresponsibilities were in this condition because of their heredity.⁴⁴

Moreover, the feeble-minded are notoriously prolific; the heritability of their mental condition is widely recognized.⁴⁵ They commonly mate together, and, as would be expected from the known mechanism of heredity, there is almost no record of two feeble-minded parents' giving birth to any other than feeble-minded children.⁴⁶ The problem is made all the

more serious and difficult because it is certain that a great many people, who themselves are not feeble-minded, may nevertheless be carriers of the factors that make for feeble-mindedness and will, therefore, produce feeble-minded children whenever mating brings these hereditary determinants in one person into combination with the same determinants in another.⁴⁷ As only a few are segregated in institutions, most of them are free to reproduce their kind, which they are doing at a rate 1.5 to two times that of the superior classes. It was the growing evidence of this fact, the fact that the mentally least well-endowed members of our society were outbreeding and therefore gradually replacing our most gifted and normal, that alarmed Nobel laureate Dr. William Shockley of Stanford University a few years ago, and eventually led him to step outside his special field in an effort to alert his fellow scientists and the general public to a creeping degeneration that inevitably meant our extinction unless it could be arrested and the trend given a totally contrary direction. I shall have more to say about this when we come to the next section of this chapter.

The financial burden imposed upon the well-constituted by the care of the feeble-minded is hard to estimate exactly, although it is “known to be enormous”—far more enormous than the citizens of any State have as yet been willing to shoulder. “To the cost of maintaining the hospitals must be added the loss of the earnings of the inmates.”⁴⁸ Huntington stated that in 1924 all the states of the Union put 9 percent of their total budgets into the care of mental defectives, New York State 23 percent. But he adds that “all the states ought to have spent five or six times as much if the mentally defective were to be cared for in such a way as to eliminate the danger that hereditary mental defects would be transmitted to posterity.”⁴⁹ It was stated in *Time* for June 17, 1940 that “Detroit spends \$287 a year to educate a subnormal child, \$58 for a smart one” (which, by the way, hardly looks like our much-vaunted “equality of opportunity”). On a single feeble-minded family, the notorious Jukes, New York State is known to have “spent upwards of \$2,000,000.” Yet in 1915, out of 1200 or more Jukes still living in the State, only three were in institutions. “The original Max Juke or his wife or his two sons and three sisters with whom they consorted, could have been sterilized for about \$250, or segregated for life at a cost of \$25,000.” Instead, they were left at large to perpetuate their kind, and to pile up their record of theft, murder, rape and disease, at a cost to society beyond all calculation.⁵⁰ I allow that this is a very extreme case, but there are only too many others that more or less resemble it.⁵¹

Before we leave this picture of the general defectiveness in our population, let us glance for a moment at particular groups to see how they are affected by mental deficiency. At least half of the paupers in our almshouses are believed to be feeble-minded. The same is true of our prostitutes. Feeble-mindedness is believed to account for a good deal of our alcoholism.⁵² As for crime, Dr. Huntington estimated that “one in every ten or twelve of the men” in the United States “commits a crime worthy of a jail sentence at some time in his life.” He could hardly believe his own figures, but the evidence before him seemed unmistakable.⁵³ Dr. John M. Radzinski, writing in 1959, said: “The sad truth is that in crime the USA stands far ahead of the west European countries. According to the FBI reports, major crimes in this country in 1957 totaled 2,756,000 or approximately one crime per 62 persons—the highest in our history . . . the homicide rate in the USA is [close to the highest in the world]. It is more than 6 times the rate of England.”⁵⁴ But this by no means marked the limit. In the decade of the 1960s, the crime rate soared. It would not be far from the truth to say that crime got out of hand. In 1970, *U.S. News and World Report*, drawing upon data supplied by the Government,

the FBI and industry, reported that, whereas between 1960 and 1969 the population of the United States had increased by 13 percent, crimes of violence (such as murder, forcible rape, robbery and aggravated assault) were up by 10 times that—to 131 percent, and serious crime in general by 11 times—to 148 percent. (See issues for 3.16.70, p.17; 10.26.70, p. 32.) “Fear,” it said, “has become a part of life for millions of Americans. Crime, spreading, is increasingly vicious.” In August of 1970, it reported that though the rate of crime increase was slower, it was still rising. (Issue for 8.24.70, p. 48.)

Of course, it is uncertain how much of crime is due to the hereditary make-up of the criminal. Lombroso’s theory that there is an “anthropological criminal type” is now commonly rejected, though Professor Hooton, after a ten-year study of the subject, said: “I am beginning to suspect that Lombroso. . . was right,” and declared himself “convinced” that, while “there is a marked positive association between bodily health and mental health . . . there is an even stronger correlation between mental and social inadequacy and biological inferiority.”⁵⁵ In any case, Professor S. J. Holmes confirmed a verdict that “at least 25 percent of the inmates of our penal institutions are feeble-minded.”⁵⁶

When it comes to the social cost of crime, the calculations run so high one can scarcely hope that most people will either believe them or comprehend what they mean. Even forty years ago, it was highly alarming. “In the *Manufacturers’ Record* for February 24, 1927, Mr. Mark C. Prentiss, who organized the National Crime Commission in 1925 . . . [estimated that], directly and indirectly, crime costs this country an economic loss of at least \$13,000,000,000 a year. [Thirteen billion dollars!] Even this estimate is forced to leave out of account many items which . . . would carry the total \$3,000,000,000 higher. In other words, the economic cost of crime to this country exceeds the total of the” First World War.⁵⁷

But these figures are completely dwarfed by reports from recent years. In its issue for October 26, 1970 (p. 30ff), *U.S. News and World Report*, basing its estimates on official sources, reported that “the crime burden in the nation has now reached 51 billion dollars a year, equal to more than 5 percent of the gross national product.” “Organized crime,” it went on, which makes business enterprises out of such activities as narcotics peddling, illegal gambling, hijacking and ‘loan sharking,’ is costing the nation 19.7 billion dollars a year. Business and property crimes, ranging from embezzlement to shoplifting and vandalism, are draining off another 13 billion dollars from the nation’s economy. Together, these two types of activity account for more than \$3 of every \$5 of the annual crime bill in the United States today.” Crimes against property and business (excluding organized crime) come to 13.1 billion dollars. And then there are the law-enforcing costs, for police, the courts and penal systems, totaling yet another \$8.6 billion, and the private crime-fighting costs adding still another \$5.5 billion. The grand total, with everything figured in, is estimated at 51 billion dollars.

I cannot conclude this brief close-up examination of the state of our population in regard to such particulars as physical sickness and disease, insanity and feeble-mindedness, and crime in its many ramifications, without bringing it home to my reader what all this means. *It all has to be paid for.* Or at least, as things stand now, it all *is being paid for.* In one way or another, directly or indirectly, and whether they know it or not, the well-constituted throughout this land of ours, parents, children and children’s children, are being taxed and handicapped to

pay the bill for the care of this mass of largely worthless humanity. The inroads this makes upon each taxpayer's income must be enormous. Perhaps the day will come when he will balk. And then perhaps the nation may face up to the problem of its defectives and delinquents in a more sensible way.

I wish now to call my reader's attention to one feature that marks our population as a whole, and for which we stand out above all other nations in the world.

In an earlier chapter entitled "The Foundations of A Sound Society," the very first principle that I submitted as essential to making any people stable and culturally significant was—*racial homogeneity*. At some length, I showed how strenuously and even fanatically the great creative peoples of the past strove to protect themselves against any intermarriage with those whom they considered alien and inferior. At the same time the whole population was held for centuries under the impress of the same values, so that eventually they became very much one—in blood, in ideals, in tradition, in aims and ambitions, and—not least—in *feeling*. If it is not clear in my reader's mind what I said about this, I suggest that he pause here to turn back to Chapter IX to refresh his memory. He will then the better comprehend why I hold racial homogeneity to be so crucial to a nation's whole existence. The degree of racial homogeneity of a people is beyond doubt the underlying biological factor that determines the extent of its harmony in social relations. But it means more than this, more at least than these words seem to say. Upon a people's many-sided homogeneity will depend also its drive and strength to create, its ability to find deep and satisfying meaning in life, and therefore any cultural significance that it can attain. Indeed, upon it will depend its solidarity, the sureness and firmness and bull-dog determination with which its members close ranks, feel themselves to be one, and hold together under the fiercest blows of fate and in every time of stress and danger. Every nation is ever surrounded by enemies who constantly watch and wait for its hour of weakness, when they may pounce upon it to tear it to pieces. Today there is no place where they lurk more dangerously than in the ranks of those who talk peace, and disarmament, and world government. Upon a people's homogeneity, therefore, may depend its very existence.

The theory of the United States as the world's "melting pot" was not only false but suicidal, and those who worked so sedulously to foist it upon our people and to implement it by lax and indiscriminating immigration regulations were, consciously or unconsciously, nothing other than traitors. Dr. John M. Radzinski pointed out a decade ago, in his *The American Melting Pot: Its Meaning To Us*, that "the United States has . . . the greatest assortment of ethnic stocks in the world and probably in history." This came about because after 1880 our bars were let down, to obtain cheap labor, and "there flowed across the Atlantic an endless stream of immigrants mostly from the lowest social strata of Europe. . . In a period of less than two generations, the numbers of these newcomers had reached 27 million. One in ten of them came from the British Isles, while two thirds came from Austria-Hungary, Italy and Russia [i.e., from countries of very largely different ethnic stock and cultural traditions from those of the countries of northwestern Europe from which most of the early American colonists were recruited.] These newcomers mingled with the already extremely heterogeneous population of Whites, Negroes, Mexicans, Indians and Asians. Today, [he repeats] the United States has the greatest diversity of racial and ethnic stocks in the world . . . Thus Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev are peopled exclusively by Whites—there is no city in

USA of comparable size that is not a mixture of two or more racial stocks and many ethnic groups" (pages 35, 1-3).

There can be no question but that our American society is sick. It shows, as we have seen, in our major crime rate, which is "the highest in our history" and "far ahead of the west European countries." It shows also in the millions of grown men and women who are not only willing to accept, but will resort to any kind of crookedness to get, all the free aid they can wangle out of their befuddled and sentimental fellow citizens. But it shows worst of all in the extent and ferocity of our internal dissension. Disraeli observed a century ago how serious a symptom it is when the various sections or elements of a society begin to turn on one another. Edward Carpenter remarked that in pre-revolutionary China there were whole provinces where there was no such thing as a policeman, where apparently no man with a gun, or even a club, was needed. But with us the cohesive forces of loyalty, devotion and responsibility, which in a homogeneous society serve to hold everything together and to integrate all parts in a harmonious and smoothly working whole, have so atrophied, or even failed to develop, that our society, in the eyes of the most superficial observer, must often seem to be little better than a welter of strife. And our police force, instead of being superfluous, has become indispensable, and our government's police power is all that is left to keep us from falling to pieces in anarchy and disintegration, our last refuge against murder, rape, arson, pillage and insurrection.

Dr. Radzinski, in seeking the causes of our plight, reviewed the consequences of ethnic mingling among the peoples of Europe, and came to the conclusion that mingling, so long as it stopped short of fusion (i.e., assimilation), was always associated with cultural dislocation and decline (Ch. II, p. 10ff, and p. 35.) This, of course, is fully in keeping with the thesis: stated over and over again in this book, that *racial homogeneity is essential to any people's contentment, internal harmony, and national security.*

But today we have no homogeneity. No one can say *what* it means to be an "American." It is only by looseness in the use of words that we can be called a people. We are *not* a people in the same sense that the Scots, the Germans, and the Japanese and the Chinese are peoples. We are a human stew, a hodgepodge of every conceivable sort of face, build, color, mentality, character, taste, standards, religious beliefs and ideals. For some of us, it has become difficult, when we walk our city streets, to feel any longer that we are in America. It is not only that so many of the faces look evil, brutish, slack, stupid and dirty, but they are foreign, they look alien, and they are alien to one another. Nor is it only the lower elements of our population that are foreign. Many of our most influential public figures bear foreign names—writers, editors, news commentators, teachers, clergymen, bankers, heads of corporations, judges, even judges of our Supreme Court, advisers to our Presidents, and the like. Great numbers of them were not even born here. The graves of their fathers are overseas. The word "America" does not really stir their hearts. They are in no sense rooted in it, inescapably identified with it. To them, the U.S. is "the land of opportunity." They "came over" for what they could get out of it, to better themselves, to breathe the intoxicating air of "liberty, equality and fraternity," to throw off uncomfortable restraints and burdensome responsibilities, to be free to do what they felt like.

And these people themselves, too frequently, do not really feel at home in America. To satisfy their gregarious instincts and increase their security and their influence they flock together. Whole districts of our large cities are given over to blocks of Poles, Russians, Italians, Jews and Negroes. In some cases, by the mass weight of their numbers or else by their wealth and organization, they become very powerful—so powerful that political candidates for office tumble over themselves and over one another to woo their vote. Personal pledges are made and political platforms are shaped to satisfy mere minorities, and thus it can come about, and has come about, that the will of minorities actually frustrates the will of most of the people, and lords it over them. Minorities write the law of the land. Minorities of aliens, multitudes of them, grow fat and rule, while the bulk of the people, many of them descendants of those who founded and built the country, who love it and would die for it, are turned into patient, befuddled suckers, who foot the bills to finance their own destruction.

Some of these minorities are so inassimilable and so manifestly and dangerously anti-American that I shall need to give them particular attention when I come to my chapters on race. But here, my point is only that there is no power, or principle, or emotion in our country that is precious or compelling enough to weld us into a unity. We are like a man whose vital parts have gone on strike, each for itself. His head wars against his feet, one hand against another. His right leg would take a road that his left leg refuses. His eyes contradict his ears, and his voice balks at obeying either his mind or his heart. He is forced first to stand still, then to sit down, and finally to lie down. Soon disease overcomes him and he collapses in death.

No people can become a nation, or amount to anything, without a high degree of unity. Whether it came about by accident of nature or was willed and arduously achieved, it had to come about or else a people remained a dud, mere material to be ingested and eventually assimilated to feed the growth of another people who had enough common mind and will and concentrated strength to master its enemies and thus make its way toward significant nationhood.

The United States is now in the midst of a decline—every kind of decline. It is falling to pieces. It is impossible for it to have any significant future, probably even impossible to escape foreign conquest, unless it finds some way to shape itself into an organic whole, and do it quickly. We have taken upon our stomachs vastly more than we can digest. What we can't assimilate will poison us unless we expel it somehow. We shall either vomit it up and spit it out, or we shall die. The choice must be fearfully painful. It is likely that we are already too weakened to make it. But to avoid it is absolutely impossible.

II. THE DIFFERENTIAL BIRTH RATE

Up to this point, my readers may have felt that they were more among those sinned against than sinning. But in turning now, as I must, to the second problem that we have set before ourselves for discussion in this chapter, namely the differential birth rate, I shall not only present an aspect of our population problem, which is of the utmost gravity, but in so doing I shall bring out a shoe that will pinch most of us.

The differential birth rate is the difference in the birth rates of different strata and groups of the population. The people in each of the classified occupations have a certain average birth rate. There is one for unskilled laborers, another for skilled laborers, still other rates, respectively, for farmers, college graduates, the professional classes, and the like. Native Americans of old stock have a certain rate; new immigrants have a certain rate; each nationality of immigrants likewise; and Negroes, also. These birth rates have been studied and calculated so many times, and the calculations have so confirmed one another, that there can be no question about the facts. Nor can there be any question that the entire constitutional balance of a population can be profoundly altered in the course of a few generations. In 1810, the Germans and Latins of Europe together outnumbered the Slavs by 2 to 1. But by 1960, merely by their larger birth rate, it was expected that the Slavs would surpass the combined populations of the Latins and Germans.⁵⁸

How one regards the rise or decline of any nation, or of different groups or strata within a nation, will depend upon one's philosophy and patriotism and upon the value one attaches to any given element. But to most eugenicists, to men who strive that the level of human life may be exalted, who believe that any people, for its significance and even for its existence, is forever dependent upon the leadership of its most gifted men, who are convinced that capacity is something that is very largely inherited and therefore "runs in families," the most disturbing feature of the population problem is the fact that the largest number of children per marriage is born to human riffraff, while the men who can most surely be counted upon to produce capacity in their children are not even perpetuating themselves. The best available evidence indicates that the stocks of proven capacity in this country are all dying out. The land is being slowly handed over to the masses. To the eugenicist this process, if allowed to proceed unaltered, means inescapable and irretrievable catastrophe. Dr. Elmer Pendell, in his *Sex And Civilization*,⁵⁹ has spelled out very clearly what the issue is. Every nation has a proportion of people who, by their very existence and as long as they live, can do nothing but cause problems and be a burden on the backs of the rest of society. On the other hand, at the upper end of the scale, each nation has a certain proportion of people who alone have the brains and the energy and the courage to solve problems, as well as to produce the culture and the civilization that are every people's supreme glory. And the ultimate fate of every nation depends upon the balance between the *problem-makers* and the *problem-solvers*. If the former are allowed to multiply to the point where they create problems so multitudinous and so complex that the problem-solvers cannot handle them and resolve them, then the nation is stuck, and its end is only a matter of time. Precisely such a development is believed to have been one of the major factors in the decay and final collapse of more than one great people in the past. But this fate can seem inevitable, as it does to the eugenicist, only to those who share his fundamental principles—in particular, the inequality of men, the necessity of the leadership of the more gifted men, and the genetic inheritance of capacity. I purpose to examine these matters in my next section. But first, and regardless of the meaning that we may attach to them, I wish to submit the facts in regard to the differential birth rate. It has been repeatedly established by unimpeachable statistics that even to perpetuate a given family stock, even to maintain a bare equilibrium therein, an average of nearly four children per marriage is necessary. Such was the celebrated pronouncement of Theodore Roosevelt. Dr. Louis I. Dublin, statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, and pre-eminent as an authority on vital statistics, in a personal letter to me, placed the figure at "3.4 or 3.5" children per marriage. The reason that the

figure has to be thus high is that some children do not live, some do not marry, and some who marry have no children. To maintain the reproductive level of the family stock, therefore—I say again—those who marry must average nearly four children per completed family.⁶⁰ Bearing this in mind, let us now examine the analyses that have been made of the birth rates in the different strata and groups of our population.

There is a well-established correlation between occupation and fecundity. Many studies have been made by authorities of unquestioned competence, in England and Wales, on the Continent, and in America, and they all point to the same thing: the lower the IQ, the larger the family. The largest families are those with more than one defective.⁶¹ It was said by A. J. Balfour in 1915, "High authorities, I believe, hold that at this moment we have so managed matters that congenital idiots increase faster than any other class of population."⁶² It shocks us to have the facts put thus nakedly. But they are no better here. It points in the same direction that, the lower down you go in the occupation scale, the lower is the intelligence quotient of the offspring and the larger is the average size of the completed family; the higher up you go in the occupation scale, the higher is the tested intelligence of the children and the smaller is the average size of the families.⁶³ The difference in the birth rates cuts so deeply that, on the basis of computations of Professor Huntington, in five generations 200 brain-workers and 200 unskilled laborers (equal numbers of each) will have been replaced, respectively, by 28 brain-workers and 472 unskilled laborers. That is, in the course of about a century nearly 17 workers of the capacity of the common laborer may be expected to have taken the place of each brain-worker.⁶⁴ The groups in between those of highest and lowest capacity have a birth rate in between, but, to quote Dr. Holmes again, "inadequate reproduction is not confined to the relatively small number of distinguished people. It reaches rather far down in the upper levels of humanity and includes most of the stocks from which people of distinction arise." "The really prolific belt consists of those occupying a position between mediocrity and the very lowest mental levels. Out of this group come relatively few people of intellectual distinction. On the other hand, it is the great source of the hopelessly inferior types of humanity."⁶⁵

But let us examine a little more closely the birth rate in those strata from which a high level of capacity may be expected. Since the present craze for "going to college" took possession of the country, academic standards have been so lowered that even youngsters of very mediocre capacities can gain admittance to some college somewhere—and even worse, can graduate, but thirty or forty years ago, and normally, a college diploma was valid evidence of superior intelligence. But even then college graduates were not having children enough to replace themselves. Numerous studies made this certain. The birth rate is especially low among the graduates of women's colleges, owing largely to the fact that a high proportion of them went in for careers (as they still do) and did not marry—as we have already seen in my chapter on Woman. Professor William E. Castle, Harvard's most distinguished geneticist, quotes Professor J. M. Cattell to the effect that "a Harvard graduate has on the average three-fourths of a son and a Vassar graduate one-half of a daughter," and he remarks that "if this continues, college graduates may look forward to the early extinction of their line as an element in the American population."⁶⁶ Dr. Elmer Pendell in his *The Next Civilization* (1960) brought the figures more nearly up to date. He reported that a statistical investigation showed that 1000 White women with less than eight years in school produce 2186 offspring, while the same number who have had four years or more in college produce only 991.

Furthermore Dr. Holmes made studies indicating that “even the stratum of people who send students to college fall somewhat short of being a self-perpetuating group.”⁶⁷

Dr. Cattell also made a study of the families of American men of science, which has been widely cited ever since. He found that they averaged 1.88 children per completed family. This means, he computed, that 1,000 scientists of distinction will be replaced by only 350 grandchildren. In other words, “the kind of heredity which these stocks represent is being lost to the race.”⁶⁸

It is the same story when we come to the men and women in *Who's Who*. In a rough way, the inclusion of their names in this compilation is evidence of their proved capability and justified distinction. Taking the men and women together, the families of people in *Who's Who* average but little over two children. Of the women, Professor Huntington found that over one-third do not marry at all, and those who do marry average only about one child apiece. In other words, if their present reproductive rate is continued, 1,000 women in *Who's Who* will be replaced by only 187 grandchildren, and by the end of two centuries their descendants will number only 6. In other words, both the men and the women in *Who's Who* represent a stock that is fast disappearing.⁶⁹

We find essentially the same trend wherever we turn among the professional and intellectual classes. Lawyers, ministers, professors, engineers, inventors, bankers, artists, military men, writers, business men—all represent stock that is yielding ground reproductively (and in the end that means actually) to the inferior stocks that make up the masses of our nation. These facts can be verified by anyone who will go to the trouble to investigate them. They can be found in any genetic study of the differential birth rate. Dr. Dublin only sums them up when he says, “It is one of the most striking facts in our social life that the persons upon whom the public opinion and constructive effort of our country depend are raising families of less than four children . . . There is only one conclusion to be drawn: these groups are not reproducing themselves. These people and their stocks are quickly dying out and their place is being taken by a new generation who are the offspring of our fertile immigrants . . . We are now making the stock out of which the new America will arise . . . Whether we like it or not, the people of America will look different, act differently, and be different from those who made our country great. And all this because of the facts of reproduction and heredity.”

70

There can be no question about the facts. The only question is what the facts mean. To the eugenist they are, in the words of Professor Frank H. Hankins of Smith College, “probably the most momentous factor in American life today.” And he continues, “The lessened rate of reproduction among the successful classes constitutes a real danger for the future of Western culture . . . There seems little ground for doubting that it carries with it a reduction in the proportion of individuals of the higher grade of ability.” “It is this threatening reduction of the proportion of individuals born with endowments of superior abilities that is by all odds the most important relation of the differential fertility of the social classes to cultural progress.” Prof. Terman [Genetics Studies: Vol. 1, pp. 57-8] has shown that a reduction of the average IQ of the population to 10 percent below its present level would reduce by 90 percent the number of individuals with an IQ of 140 or better . . . It should be added that any such reduction—even to one-half that amount—would not only reduce the proportion of ordinary leaders, directors and organizers, but eliminate altogether those rare

men of the first rank who constitute the real genius of a people.”⁷¹ A like calculation was made in 1963 by Sir Julian Huxley, who estimated that, if human intelligence is polygenically determined, a decline of only 1.5 percent in average intelligence would result in a decline of 50 percent in the number of people with IQs of 160 and over. In other words, it would cut in half the number of people with the intellectual powers necessary for leadership and all kinds of creativity in a society such as our own. [Julian Huxley: *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, VI, 2 (Winter 1963), p. 165. Summarized by Nathaniel Weyl in *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. XI, No. 3 (Jan.-March, 1971), pp. 140-1. Cp. N. Weyl—*The Geography Of Intellect*, Regnery, 1963, pp. 154-5.]

Dr. Alexis Carrel found “in the decrease in the birth rate” “the strongest evidence of the deterioration of civilized man. This phenomenon [is] very striking . . . in the upper third of the population of this country [and] is an essential characteristic of this age. This tendency toward spontaneous extinction, observed in the best strains of the White races, is of profound significance.”⁷² From what he says elsewhere, it is evident he was deeply concerned about the White man’s whole future in the face of other peoples. Dr. Richard Ashman of Louisiana State University, in the *Journal of Heredity* for April, 1945, found it “pertinent to inquire whether our civilization can long endure.” It has become a question of “how long shall we have a sufficient supply of educable material? No amount of social and economic reform, however desirable and necessary these may be, can prevail against a downward trend, even though moderate.” We need to have dinned into our ears everlastingly the ominous warning of Sir Arthur Keith that “the process of evolution permits no balking of the reproductive instincts; the infertile groups are rigorously eliminated, and the fertile perpetuated.”⁷³

Such is the meaning the Differential Birth Rate has to the eugenicist, or to anyone who holds his principles. But anyone who does *not* hold such principles may find in it no cause for concern whatever. Some months ago, a man who once was one of my close friends, wrote me a letter in which he expressed his very confident conviction that if the lowly workers in one of our worst industrial districts here in the East were but given a chance, higher wages, better food, shelter and clothing, and more education, many of them would produce just as much creative and constructive genius as any of our stocks of proven capacity. This fruit of the doctrine of equality has come straight down from Rousseau and the French Revolution, and in many circles in our own country today it has determining influence on thought and action. This is notably true among class-conscious proletarians and Marxists of all descriptions, among Socialists and Communists, and among their sympathizers and supporters in the ranks of the intellectuals who are to be found in the schools and colleges, among our writers, and in our government itself—and even among our scientists. For them, environment has more part in determining the development of the individual than heredity. For them, the “spontaneous extinction” of our best-endowed stocks is no cause for grief or alarm, for their place will promptly be taken by men of equal, or even greater, capacity coming up from the ranks of the masses. We cannot go further, therefore, without coming to grips with this question of heredity, and of its place in relation to environment as a factor determining individual development.

III. HEREDITY VERSUS ENVIRONMENT

On November 29th, 1941, the *Friends Intelligencer*, a Quaker weekly, published an article entitled "All Men Are Equal" by Bertram F. Wilcox, a New York lawyer. It is so full of gross and dangerous perversions of the facts about genetics that I hate to give it the distinction of paying any attention to it. But evidently it commanded the respect of the young professor who sent me a copy of it, and it must have been deemed not only sound but important by the Quaker editors who went out of their way to bring it to the attention of their readers by reprinting it from *Common Sense* where it was first published. Moreover, it is typical of that flattery of the masses which, in this day of catering to populace, has ready access to every paper and, in the guise of science, is spread before the devouring eyes of our nobodies. As samples, therefore, of the kind of misconceptions that have gained a hold even upon the more intelligent part of our people, and as a background, against which I should like to set in contrast what I believe to be the truth, I choose to quote a few of Mr. Wilcox's statements that strike me as either totally false or viciously misleading. He says that "the permanence of the gene-stuff (he refers to the hereditary factors in the germ-plasm) does not mean that child is like parent." In fact, on the basis of the calculation that the possible different combinations of the hereditary factors of any two parents approach 300 trillion, he implies that the probability of a child's being like its parent is infinitesimal. He goes so far as to claim that the "facts show that 'good stock' in humankind may spring from almost anything . . . From any pair of gifted parents . . . the actual children may vary from genius to the dunce. From any pair of inferior, or stupid, parents, a no less varied dispersion of offspring may result . . . The great majority of the gifted men and women of tomorrow must always be born of the commonplace people of today. A fundamental error of conventional eugenics is its assumption that from ability alone ability springs . . . The mass of voters in a democracy should be a favorable soil for growth of the idea that their own children will include some of the ablest persons of the next generation."

Without much further reference to these statements, but in a contrast to them that my readers may mark for themselves and with such weight as I may be able to command, I should like now to present the conclusions that I long ago reached in regard to human equality, human heredity, and the relative importance of heredity and environment.

First, then, as regards equality. In previous chapters, we already have seen that the idea is nothing but the figment of the romantic and fevered imagination of men like Rousseau, and it is a weapon of the envious class-conscious proletariat lusting for power. In a question of this kind, it would seem that it ought to be enough merely to appeal to the common observation and common sense of mankind. No one dealing with men realistically and looking out upon them soberly would ever dream of pronouncing them equal—no teacher, no commander, no social worker, no employer. Indeed, I simply cannot make myself believe that there is *any* man, with eyes in his head and wit behind them, who thinks that men are equal. To my mind, anyone who would argue seriously that Shakespeare and a moron are equal, or of equal value to society, or that an idiot is of any value whatever, is either himself feeble-minded—in which case I would have to be feeble-minded, too, if I wasted time in talking with him—or he is a sentimental fool, in which case, no less, I would waste my time in taking him seriously; or else, finally, he is a subversive knave bent on bringing down all elevation among men to the mediocrity of the masses, in which case I will fight him to the death. Ezra Pound surely stated the consensus of all sensible men from time immemorial when he said flatly, "There is no more equality between men than between animals." ⁷⁴ But if

the geneticists' answer is required, I am glad to be able to report that it is both unequivocal and emphatic. On many things they may differ, and on some differ sharply, but on this they are agreed. I will let two of them speak for them all. Professor F. A. E. Crew of the University of Edinburgh, writing in 1927, said: "All men are not created free and equal, but handicapped and unequal. This is the doctrine of the biologist."⁷⁵ And Dr. Curt Stern, Professor of Genetics at the University of California, writing in 1952, said: "Men are born genetically unequal. This is a fact of nature, and quite independent of the conclusions which may result from its political and sociological interpretations."⁷⁶

How true this is, and how inexorable and inescapable, will become ever more apparent as we press our investigation of human heredity. Probably, however, what most equalitarians really believe is not that men are equal actually, but that they are equal potentially, that they would become equal if they were all given an equal chance. But here also, I must tell my reader, there is little support from genetics. There is a point, I judge, at which geneticists begin to divide, but thus far they are of one mind. Again, let me call upon Professor Crew to speak for them. "One fact, clearly established," he says, "has emerged from the study of the phenomena of inheritance, viz., that in the main the future characterization of the individual is predetermined in the fertilized egg in which the individual had its origin, by the contributions of the so-called germ-plasm received by way of the egg and the sperm. The main characteristics of the species, of the race, of the family, and of the individual—of every living thing—are unalterably fixed by organic inheritance. By the shuffle and deal of the hereditary factors during the formation of the reproductive cells of the parents and by the chance union of two of these cells in fertilization, the hereditary constitution of the individual is forever decided; all the possibilities of the individual are fixed."⁷⁷

In this pronouncement, in which I find internal evidence that every word was weighed, I believe that Professor Crew meant exactly what he said. But what he said is not quite so sweeping as it may seem on first reading. His full meaning becomes evident from what he says elsewhere.⁷⁸ The elucidation that is essential to a balanced judgment on this question will appear in the course of the rest of this chapter. For the time being, we shall let the words of Professor Crew stand as the answer of the great majority of the geneticists to the thinking of the equalitarians that all men would prove themselves of approximately equal human worth if they were given equal opportunity. This hope has no genetic foundation. Before passing on to our investigation of the facts in regard to the inheritance of capacity, let us pause for a critical look at intelligence tests as a means of detecting and measuring the differences and inequalities in men. Doubtless, my readers know as well as I do that increasingly, and not only in schools and in colleges but also in industry and in the Armed Forces, intelligence and aptitude tests have long been used to grade and to sort human beings, in order to discover the approximate limits of their capacity, and even, to a considerable extent, the direction of their bent. But the reliability of such tests has been challenged, particularly when they indicate a lack of capacity in the lowlier walks of life. It is argued that the capability that an individual manifests may be less than his inborn potential, which may have been suppressed by an unfavorable environment or obscured by other factors. But today the importance of environment is recognized by all geneticists, and steady progress has been made in refining the techniques used, freeing them from "cultural bias," and equating the backgrounds of groups being compared.

To anyone who is unacquainted with the aims and methods of intelligence testing, I should strongly recommend the reading of Chapter VII in *The Geography of Intellect* by Nathaniel Weyl and Stefan Possony (Regnery, 1963), pp. 151-158. It is brief, lucid, illuminating, up-to-date, and reliable—and it removes objections. Let me quote a few passages.

“Intelligence testing, one of the many new disciplines originated by Sir Francis Galton, gave social scientists a new and powerful instrument which could be brought to bear on the problems of ethno-psychological differences. The intelligence tests are objective, as contrasted to subjective, measuring devices. They yield quantitative results. Their administration entails the use of standard operating procedures which any competent technician can repeat. Accordingly, the personal peculiarities, predilections and prejudices of the tester cannot influence results. Like all scientific experiments, the intelligence test provides answers that can be verified or refuted by retesting” (page 151).

The authors define terms commonly used in stating test results. IQ, which stands for “intelligence quotient,” “is the ratio of a subject’s test score to the average test score at his age-level expressed as a percentage. The IQ, accordingly, makes allowance for the normal development of brain-power with growth and maturation. The normal situation is for an individual’s IQ to remain fairly constant until he reaches the age at which his mental faculties begin to deteriorate.” Marked variations of the IQ from the norm may be caused by brain damage, disease, a repressive environment, or simply an abnormal growth pattern (p. 152). What is called “overlap” tells “what percentage of population A equals the average score of population B. Where the psychometric intelligence of the two populations is equal, the overlap should be 50% (p. 153).

The authors make a few comments that I think it important to bring to my readers’ attention, but I will do so in my own words.

1. The first concerns the significance of even small differences between the average IQs of various populations, whether these concern race, nation, class, or education. Even small differences in average intelligence are associated with very great differences in the very high IQ ranges. Specifically, “A decline in average psychometric intelligence of only a few points will mean a much smaller population of gifted individuals,” and it is this small elite of highly gifted and supremely gifted individuals that does most of the world’s creative work, which shapes entire civilizations, and determines whether nations endure and rise or fall (p. 154).

2. Admittedly, the Stanford-Binet sort of intelligence tests puts emphasis on reasoning capacity, and it is therefore not “culture free.” They have come out of the thought processes and conditions peculiar to Western civilization, and necessary to its maintenance and advancement (p. 155). But I find nothing in this for which we need apologize. In giving the tests we are not concerned with ascertaining whether an individual or group is capable of taking part satisfactorily in one of the “emergent nations” of Africa, but with ascertaining fittedness for life in our own civilization. This is a White man’s world. We created it; it is an expression of our values, our instincts, our needs, and our aims. Upon us primarily rests the responsibility for keeping it alive, and for bringing it to meaningful and satisfying fruition. And therefore we have not only the right but the duty to neutralize, to remove or to destroy any element in our midst that threatens us with destruction.

3. Finally, let it be said, in support of the validity and significance of mental testing, that new techniques have been devised that not only diminish the effects of environment on IQ scores but are remarkably "culture free," and thus make it possible to come ever closer to the determination of innate mental ability (p. 157).

Altogether, it was with justice that Professor S. J. Holmes, in appraising the situation even *before* the latest improvements were devised, declared mental tests to have "proved very useful in grading human beings according to their different levels of intelligence. There are several ways of testing the tests, and the results show that many tests have a high degree of validity. As an index of a student's future scholastic performance, or an applicant's probable success in a given occupation, a mental test is often as safe a test as any other kind of examination. What is particularly significant is that the different tests of ability show a considerable degree of agreement." ⁷⁹

We are now ready to look into this problem of heredity. The question of whether mental ability is or is not transmitted from parents to offspring is crucial for eugenics. I should like first to discuss genetics in general, then to show what geneticists seem to be agreed about and to indicate where they differ, and finally to submit the evidence on the basis of which the great majority of outstanding geneticists believe mental ability to be inherited.

The science of genetics is occupied primarily with heredity, with the means by which characteristics are conserved and passed on from parents to offspring, though it deals also with the variations of one sort or another by which such characteristics are modified. Strictly, "characteristics" is not the right word. It is now generally agreed that in large part characteristics (or characters), whether of body or of mind, are not inherited as units, as wholes. Intelligence *as such* is not inherited. What is inherited is certain material in the germ-plasm of the two parents that will tend to *produce* a certain character, and *will* produce it unless unfavorable environmental conditions are so strong as to suppress its development. In the case of the humble fruit fly, for instance, on which Professor Thomas Hunt Morgan conducted his prolonged and very significant experiments, it has been found that about fifty different hereditary factors must work together to produce a single feature such as red eye. And the hereditary constitution of the fruit fly is very simple in comparison with that of man.

To throw a little light on this matter, in case there be many of my readers to whom it is not already clear, I should try to explain the most elementary features of the hereditary mechanism. "Mechanism" has connotations that we dislike to associate with any process of life, but in the light of the observed facts, at least as they now appear to the rational faculty, there is no other word that answers as well. Indeed, it is almost with a sense of awe that we note the minuteness and exactness with which this mechanism works.

Genetics is based on the laws discovered by Mendel. The heart of the matter is the chromosome theory that has been developed to account for the operation of these laws. The body cells of every living organism contains a characteristic number of thread-like chromosomes, which can be seen under the microscope. In the fruit fly, it is eight; in man, it is forty-six. In the formation of the *sex* cells, however, the number of chromosomes is cut in half. That is, the ovum and the sperm each contains only twenty-three chromosomes. But

when the ovum is impregnated by the sperm, "each chromosome, drawn by what subtle affinity we do not know, somehow finds its predestined mate," making two of each, and thus the fertilized ovum, with which a new life begins, starts off with the characteristically human number of chromosomes, namely forty-six. The significance of this process is that it provides a means by which both parents can contribute to the inheritance of their offspring.

But this is not all. There is overwhelming evidence that each chromosome is in effect a string of so-called genes. These genes, otherwise known as hereditary factors, are the sole active agents which, alone or in combination with other genes, work to bring it about that some feature or trait in the offspring resembles corresponding features or traits in the parents or in some individual in their ancestry. The genes are resident in or borne upon the chromosomes, each chromosome has a certain association of genes, and each gene has its own peculiar place upon a particular chromosome. It is possible to indicate a particular point upon a particular chromosome of an individual, and to state that there, at this point, is the gene for a particular character.⁸⁰ For years, geneticists have been thus "mapping out" the chromosomes, so that now, in the case, for instance, of the fruit fly (which, for various reasons, is easy to study), it is possible to designate well over one hundred points on the four microscopic chromosomes of its sex cells, at each of which the appearance or non-appearance of a gene will tell whether or not the individual cell being examined carries the determinants for a certain feature. There are many complications, but we need not go into them here.

One thing more, however, it is important to point out. Each sex cell has one, and only one, factor for a particular character. In the fertilized ovum, however, there are two factors for every such character, and these two will be similar for this character or dissimilar according as the inheritance from the two parents in respect to this character was alike or different. If the two are alike, the character will appear in the offspring. If unlike, one of the two that acts as though it were the stronger and is called a dominant, will—as a rule—determine the character in the offspring. The other factor, the one overborne as it were, is known as a recessive. But this recessive, though it will not manifest itself in the immediate offspring, may at any time appear in the offspring's sex cells, and if in the formation of his offspring it meets with a like recessive from his mate, their offspring will bear this recessive character. Still further complications might be traced here, but even in the complications there are developments that only illustrate the more impressively the mathematical, and predictable, and almost uncanny exactness that runs through a large part of the mechanism by which organic inheritance takes place.

A very important exception to this mechanical connectedness (or at least, at the present time apparently so) is mutation. This is defined by Professor Carleton S. Coon as "a heritable, spontaneous, and within certain limits random change in the chemical composition of a . . . gene or gene locus." He pronounces it "the primary element in evolution." Working over many thousands of years, along with recombination, selection and isolation, it was the chief factor in the differentiation of the various human races.⁸¹ Nevertheless, though it is now known how to produce mutations artificially, they occur at random, most of them are deleterious, and many are lethal. And the causes of mutations under *natural* conditions, in life and in history, are still unknown. And Professor David C. Rife, formerly Professor of Genetics at Ohio State University, concludes that "directed mutations cannot be produced in

man, and there is no foreseeable prospect for so doing.”⁸² On the whole, therefore, considering the limited purposes of my present chapter, it seems best to dismiss mutation without further mention and to return to our examination of Mendelian inheritance.

On what I have presented thus far, I believe all geneticists are agreed. No one questions that physical features in plants and animals are to be accounted for in this way. Indeed, I know of no geneticist who does not find in the hereditary mechanism a satisfactory explanation of most of the physical features even in man. Gates says, “Almost every conceivable and many unbelievable abnormalities of an anatomical nature are known to be inherited. Some of these are deficiencies of the skeletal development as a whole or of certain parts of it. Others refer to particular organs which may be absent or malformed. . . . Probably more abnormalities are known of the hands than of any other part of the body except the eye. There are also certain inherited differences in shape and structure of the hands and feet which are in no sense abnormalities.”⁸³ Studies of tuberculosis in fraternal and so-called identical twins have yielded significant results. As I shall shortly explain more fully, identical twins generally have precisely the same genetic inheritance. This fact furnished Holmes the foundation for his observation that “the striking differences in the incidence of tuberculosis in identical and fraternal twins furnishes strong evidence for a hereditary diathesis [i.e., congenital predisposition] to this disease.” In the case of one pair of identical twins, each individual not only developed tuberculosis, but developed it at the same time and at the same spot, namely in the heel.⁸⁴ And Crew states, “There is no doubt whatsoever that there is a definite and close connection between the average longevity of parents and that of children. Also, children born of long-lived parents not only, on the average, live long themselves, but survive their first five years of life at a rate at least double that of children in general.”⁸⁵

In regard to this sort of thing, all scientists of any standing, it is pretty safe to say, speak with one voice. The first important and wide divergence appears in regard to the inheritance of less tangible characters, though, interestingly enough, it is generally agreed that musical ability runs in families, as was impressively exhibited in the well-known history of the Bach family. Scheinfeld concedes that musical giftedness is hereditary, and Gates believes that even the manner of its inheritance could be fruitfully discussed. Hurst believes it to be a Mendelian recessive.⁸⁶ But when it comes to the more crucial matter of the inheritance of general mental ability, a few anthropologists (for instance, Raymond Pearl and Franz Boas, together with the latter’s pupils and disciples, such as Herskovits, Dobzhansky, Klineberg, Benedict and Weltfish) minimize the role of heredity, while the rest emphasize it. For a long time, such a discrepancy in the conclusions of men of scientific eminence was explained and excused on the alleged ground that our knowledge of inheritance in man was very incomplete and inadequate, that experiments cannot be made with humans as they can with plants and animals, and that evidence accumulates slowly in regard to man whose generations average 20 to 25 years, whereas those of the fruit fly, for instance, are counted in weeks. But in opposition to this Professor C.D. Darlington of Oxford, certainly one of the outstanding living geneticists, wrote in 1964: “Notwithstanding that we cannot make experiments with human beings, we have now got to know heredity in man as well as if he were an experimental animal. Pedigrees and populations, chromosomes and twins, the copious records of history and geography, of crime, education and medicine, have told us *more than is known of any other organism.*”⁸⁷ (Emphasis added.) It would seem, therefore, that such a disagreement in the scientific ranks, on a matter of such vital and vast importance,

should no longer be tolerated, and that the issue should be pressed to a definitive conclusion, as Professor Arthur R. Jensen of the University of California pressed it two years ago by his article in the *Harvard Educational Review* entitled "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?"⁸⁸ (which made a worldwide stir), and as Nobel laureate Professor William Shockley of Stanford University has pressed it for three consecutive years before the National Academy of Sciences, only every time to have this illustrious body of scientists refuse to face the issue.⁸⁹

I shall have much more to say about the doings of the equalitarians when I come to write about race, but in the meantime let me confess to a very strong impression, from much reading in the literature of the field, that the physical anthropologists are all but unanimous in subscribing to the Mendelian inheritance of mental characters as well as physical. They are thorough in their genetics, and their conclusions are founded on observable realities. Those who are causing the confusion—and it is a vast and ominous confusion—are the so-called *social* anthropologists and those who are not anthropologists at all, those who, it seems, must have been socialists or near-socialists before they became scientists, who are not primarily seekers of truth but propagators of a doctrine, who are dominated by the essentially Communist doctrine that all men are equal and that apparent inequalities can be ironed out by a favorable environment. Also, they subscribe to the Communist precept that even science should be used as an instrument of political warfare, that it is justifiable to conceal truth, deny truth, and twist truth to serve expediency, and who therefore pursue their ends not by submitting evidence but by mere concentrated, reiterated, dogmatic assertion. The obvious bias of these men, their ulterior motives, unprincipled tactics, and often venomous persecution of all those who disagree with them, long ago destroyed my confidence in them and my respect for their pronouncements.⁹⁰

In such a situation, each of us must submit his judgment to the evidence adduced, and have the courage and independence to decide for himself which side masses the more convincing array of facts in its support. This I myself have been undertaking to do. Indications of my reasons for believing that the scales incline the more heavily in favor of the genetic inheritance of mental capacity will be found in the remaining pages of this chapter. If they leave my reader unconvinced, I can only hope—and urge, for the matter is of critical importance—that he investigate the problem for himself. I would only remind him that, for a balanced judgment, he should not confine his reading to one side.

The evidence that I can submit here is, of course, only a sampling, but it is cumulative, and it can be supplemented almost without limit.

1. A very significant observation, growing out of the mass of mental testing that has been done in this country, is that mental development runs very closely parallel to physical development. Mental power, in contrast with mere acquisition of information, does not increase perceptibly after the age of 16 to 18. The old idea that the mind was built up through an accumulation and organization of experiences has had to be abandoned. The evidence indicates that "the factors responsible for the intellect, like those causing the growth of the body, are largely internal." The only reasonable explanation of the fact that the development of mental power stops at about the same time as the development of the body, is that both are the results of the inherited constitution of the individual. Variations of the

body are known to be due to the genes, as we have just seen; the growth of the body and mind run so closely parallel that when the body stops growing the mind does also. It would seem only reasonable, then, to conclude that the genes have a determining effect on the growth of the mind as well.⁹¹This is in line with the results of the investigations of Karl Pearson and his collaborators, which showed that mental traits are inherited to about the same degree as physical traits.”⁹²

2. We turn next to the body of evidence that has resulted from observations of “identical” twins, whom Dr. F.A.E. Crew pronounced “the only satisfactory material of the study of heredity in the human subject.”⁹³ Darlington concurs. He says, “A vast field of inquiry will be opened to us when the opportunities offered by twins for studying the genetic determination of individuality come to be recognized.”⁹⁴ Thus modern genetics confirms the conclusion of Galton in 1875 that the “history [of twins] affords a means of distinguishing between the effects of tendencies received at birth and those that were imposed by the circumstances of their after lives, in other words between the effects of nature and of nurture.” His conclusions, he said, had “resulted in proving the vastly preponderating effects of nature over nurture . . . the very foundation and outcome of the human mind is dependent on race.”⁹⁵ East declared: “There is no escape from the conclusion that nature prevails enormously over nurture when the differences of nurture do not exceed what is commonly to be found among persons of the same rank society and in the same country.”⁹⁶

The reason the study of “identical” twins is of such great importance for the study of heredity in man is obvious. To begin with, the amount of material for study is vast. Darlington states that in Britain, for instance, “three out of a thousand births are of one-egg twins,” and that out of a million or so twins in Britain, at the present day, probably a quarter of a million . . . are members of one-egg pairs.” And it is these one-egg twins that are of the greatest significance for our study. For whereas two-egg twins are “just as different as ordinary brothers and sisters,” and may be of either sex, “one-egg twins, on the other hand, have the same heredity, or as nearly the same as two individuals can have. And they are always of the same sex.”⁹⁷ Moreover, they are so extremely alike in so many different respects that often their own parents have difficulty in distinguishing them. These consequences are all traceable to the fact that, whereas in the case of fraternal twins each individual develops from a different ovum impregnated by a different sperm (and therefore, very probably, from a very different combination of genes), identical or one-egg twins both come from a single fertilized ovum, and therefore, except for some possible but rare and abnormal development,⁹⁸ have precisely the same heredity. They begin life with exactly the same arrangement of genes in their germ plasm.

Twin-testing has been going on for a very long time, by methods of constantly increasing delicacy and exactness. It has proved especially important to examine many cases of identical twins brought up separately under very different cultural conditions. Crew reported in 1927: “There has been adduced considerable evidence which shows that intelligence tests applied to adult identical twins, reared apart from the age of two weeks, yielded scores very significantly alike, despite the fact that these twins had endured great differences in the amounts and kinds of formal schooling.”⁹⁹ East, writing in 1935, reported on a case of identical twins that had been “studied in the greatest detail.” “Fed, housed, educated in wholly different manners,” they were so alike as to be mistaken for each other, had the same

mental development, almost identical physical illnesses, and showed a strong community of interests. In the Army Alpha Intelligence test and the Otis advanced intelligence test, they scored 156 and 153 respectively in the former, and 64 and 62 in the latter. East remarks, "These scores are so high that unless these tests have genetic significance, the chances are over 300 to 1 against there being such a coincidence in scores." Moreover, the higher rating was made by the twin who had had the less favorable opportunities.¹⁰⁰ Cases of identical twins might easily be multiplied. The great bulk of these cases points in the same direction.¹⁰¹ One of the most striking cases, described by Gesell, is reported thus by Holmes:

"Both girls began to talk and to walk when eleven months old. Before they were four years old they were able to read in English, French, and Esperanto. Formal arithmetic was begun at six and in less than a year they were solving mentally problems in fractions and percentage. At the age of nine both were doing junior High School work. They speak French fluently, and have made progress in Italian and have embarked upon Russian. They are much alike in tastes and dispositions. Their mental tests and their vocabulary tests give almost the same score.' Physically they are very similar in many ways, including the presence in both of a small pigmented mole a little above the outer corner of the mouth. That the pronounced mental superiority of these twins is due to heredity is indicated not only by their close similarity but also by their ancestry, in that 'scientific and linguistic ability of a high order and physical energy are some of the traits which are found in the two immediate generations. Doubtless these twins enjoyed unusual educational opportunities, but it is evident that ordinary children would not have profited by these opportunities to nearly so great an extent.'" ¹⁰² Holmes also furnishes data on mental defect among identical twins that clearly bear on the inheritance of mental capacity. In one study, in which Luxenburger summarized the data on mental deficiency in identical twins up to 1930, out of eleven cases in which there was mental defect "both twins were defective in ten cases and showed a similar type of defect." Among fraternal twins, on the other hand, there was not a single case in which both were affected. In another study, of 32 pairs of identical twins in which defectiveness occurred, in all but one case both twins were affected, and in all but two cases the defect was of the same kind; whereas out of 32 pairs of like-sexed fraternal twins both were feeble-minded in only 14 cases, five were mentally defective in different ways, and in the 13 remaining cases one in each pair was normal and the other feeble-minded. By way of summary of the results of a study of dementia praecox, Holmes says, "If we take the percentage of cases in which both twins are affected, we find that it is 68.3 percent in the identicals and 14.9 percent in the fraternal." ¹⁰³

For cogent reasons, which he states, Darlington finds that of all the ways of gathering the significance of twin records for human heredity, the most fruitful is that of studying twin criminals. He submits the tabulated results of a careful investigation by a German scientist who examined thirty pairs of twins for their criminal records. Twelve were one-egg twins, 16 were two-egg, and two were doubtful. "The two-egg twins are of interest only in showing just the same amount of similarity that any brothers or sisters . . . of the same sex, are expected to show. For the only pair where both have a crime record, the record is widely different in quantity and quality: one began earlier and became habitual, the other began late and did not become habitual." On the other hand, of the twelve one-egg twins, ten became criminals. But "what strikes us first about the pairs [of one-egg twins] that agree in both having criminal records is that they mostly agree so closely. (He explains the two discordant

pairs. In one of these pairs injury at birth, in the other a head injury was held to be responsible for the changed character of the criminal member of the pair. A violent accident had altered the normal expression of heredity.) They agree in their early history, in the age of their first conviction, and in the type of crime.¹⁰⁴

In summing up the similarities of one-egg twins, Darlington says: "Their physical resemblance is notorious and few are unaware that it can extend to identical multiples such as those which are so frequently photographed in the popular Press. Beyond this, however, the resemblance is much more precise. Their susceptibility to specific diseases extends to a similarity in time and place of infection in tuberculosis. Their blood groups are identical, and their capacity for mutual transplantation of skin is unique among human beings. But most critical and significant of all is their outstanding similarity in those emotional and intellectual properties that determine their social character and behaviour."¹⁰⁵

On the whole, the results of the study of identical twins seem to admit of no reasonable explanation except through the operation of the mechanism of heredity. And the mechanism that works in the case of twins works no less surely, though less obviously, in the case of everybody else. Darlington says, "From what these things [about twins] have taught us, we can now enlarge the catalogue of properties described so forcefully by Darwin as inherited, or rather genetically controlled and determined." And he then proceeds to give a list of specifications showing the absolutely astonishing extent to which the whole make-up of every individual, mental and emotional no less than physical, is "limited and prescribed in the fertilized egg . . . inherent in almost every cell of our bodies . . . and carried in them from conception to dissolution."¹⁰⁶ What we are *at bottom*, what we *must* be if an adverse environment does not prevent, and what we *cannot* be, *can never become* even with all the help of a most favorable environment, is determined in every one of us at conception.

In sum, Dr. Darlington says: the force of heredity is vastly greater than the founders of genetics thought."¹⁰⁷ Indeed, although Garrett, Gates and Holmes, for instance, have long estimated the potency of heredity in determining development at something like four times that of environment, Garrett says that not only Darlington but also Burt (two of Britain's foremost living scientists in the fields, respectively, of genetics and psychology) attribute no less than 90 percent of "ability differences" to heredity.¹⁰⁸

Moreover, Darlington goes on in the same paragraph to add this very significant observation: "The environment has a fluctuating role. Only its highest value achieved in a plant (and in an individual, not a population) enables us to describe the result of development as due to a simple reaction of genotype and environment. In all animals the genotype [i.e., the organism in its genetic constitution] itself chooses the environment. And in man, the genotype *can create the environment*." (Emphasis added.) Professor Henry E. Garrett, in endorsing the idea, declared: "Man's genetic constitution determines his environment. The egg still comes before the chicken."¹⁰⁹ (Professor Garrett, Ph.D., Sc.D., was for 16 years head of the Dept. of Psychology at Columbia University, Past President of the Eastern Psychological Association, the Psychometric Society, and the American Psychological Association. He is a fellow of the A.A.S., and a former member of the National Research Council; author of many books, articles and monographs; a member of

the editorial board of *Psychometrika*, and for ten years was general editor of the *American Psychology Series*.)

And Charles C. Josey elaborated the idea in an article entitled "Who Makes the Environment?" in which he stresses "the fact that the individual does a great deal to fashion his environment and that his heredity is an important determinant of how he fashions it." "Does anyone believe," he continues, "that an area of a city inhabited by 100,000 Jews or Chinese would ever become a slum, reeking with poverty, crime and immorality? . . . environment itself is in no small way the creation of the persons who dwell in it." ¹¹⁰ An environment that might crush or smother one man, to another will be a challenge, which he faces, and masters, and shapes to his own ends. And in the process he shapes himself also. No wonder that, when all the factors and facets in the problem are taken fully and justly into the accounting, men like Burt and Darlington have concluded that the significance of heredity outweighs environment by something like 9 to 1.

3. I would have you look with me, next, at some of the evidence that seems to support the saying so common among eugenicists that "ability runs in families." Galton in 1869 was perhaps the first to attempt to make a case to this effect. And Holmes remarks that his conclusions were "so firmly established by impartial statistical methods that even the most captious critic has had to admit the cogency of the evidence." ¹¹¹ We shall look at the evidence under two heads: (a) the correlation between the IQs of children and the occupations of their parents; and (b) the blood relatedness to be found among distinguished people.

a. What I have to say about a correlation between the IQs of children and the occupations of their parents depends upon first establishing a correlation between occupation and intelligence. This correlation may not be exact, there may be numerous individuals with whom it does not hold good, but it is inevitable that it should exist, especially in a country where education is compulsory and everyone is more or less free to move up or down the social scale. In any case, the existence of such a correlation, according to Holmes, is "supported by practically all the available evidence that bears upon the problem . . . Unless one goes so far as to contend that our measures of intelligence are not worth anything at all, he can scarcely fail to admit that people tend to decrease in intelligence as we pass from the higher occupations to the more unskilled pursuits." ¹¹² Numbers of very extensive and searching investigations of the origins of great men have unvaryingly revealed that the highest proportion of them spring from the learned professions, a smaller proportion from such ranks as those of the successful businessman, and that only rarely do any at all come up from the ranks of common labor. Indeed, according to Huntington and Whitney, Vischer's studies of the parentage of people included in the American *Who's Who* indicated that whereas one out of every 7 sons of Unitarian clergymen becomes distinguished, one out of every 20 sons of clergymen in general, one out of every 52 lawyers, one out of every 104 doctors, one out of every 690 farmers, and one out of every 1600 skilled laborers, in the case of the sons of the *unskilled* laborers only one out of every 48,000 becomes distinguished. "In other words, the child of the average clergyman . . . is about 35 times as likely to be a conspicuous leader as is the child of a farmer, 80 times as likely as the child of a skilled artisan, and 2400 times as likely as the child of an unskilled laborer." ¹¹³

The validity of the correlation between intelligence and occupation is attacked from some quarters on the ground that many men of humble status may have abilities that have been kept dormant by an unfavorable environment. My reply to this contention will come later. At this point, it must be enough to remark that it seems difficult to believe that, in the large, such great differences of intellectual yield do not have behind them very considerable differences in innate mental ability.

For the moment, then, accepting the correlation between intelligence and occupation as well established, let us see what correlation seems to exist between the intelligence of parents and the intelligence of their children. The investigations of Dr. Lewis Terman of Stanford University, who is recognized very widely as an authority on the measurement of intelligence, has shown that "gifted children, those with IQs which place them in a superior category and to whom the future must look for its leaders, are usually the offspring of parents who are in the professional and higher occupational groups."¹¹⁴ These results were confirmed in a very striking way by a study made by Haggerty and Nash of over 8,000 school children in the State of New York, and in other investigations. It has been observed, too, and "it is very significant," remarks Dr. Holmes, "that the intelligence scores of even very young children show very much the same relation to the occupations of their parents as is found in children of school age."¹¹⁵

In an effort to reduce the influence of environment as a factor in the recognized correlation, studies were directed to children who did not grow up with their parents. In one there were 380 illegitimate children who were given up by their mothers when they were less than one year old, and had practically no contact with their fathers. The environmental conditions were favorable and uniform. Later, "the IQs of the children were found to have much the same relation to the father's occupation as was shown by children in the public schools." Like results were obtained from a similar study of orphan children, and from a study of foster children who were placed in homes before they were six months of age. "Mental tests taken later showed that the intelligence of the children correlated closely with the occupational grouping of the parents and but slightly with the intelligence of the foster parents. The influence of the parents who supplied the heredity was more potent than the influence of the parents who constituted an important factor of the environment." Holmes concludes: "The various investigators who have studied the familial distribution of intelligence are in substantial agreement. They show that according to all measures of intellectual superiority in our possession, like tends to produce like to a very considerable degree."¹¹⁶

b. Before we conclude this part of our investigation we must look into the alleged interrelatedness of distinguished people. To what extent is it a fact? Galton found that in England half the distinguished men had distinguished near relatives. But as success there might be due in large part to the influence of family, which in England is strong, Frederick Adams Woods chose to make a study of the distinguished men in America, where innate capacity is supposed to have a freer hand. The biographical dictionaries supplied him with the names of 3,500 persons, selected, it would seem, by a sufficiently unbiased standard. On the assumption that the average person of any sort has as many as twenty close relatives, it will be found by computation that only one person out of five hundred in the United States will be closely related to any one of the 3,500 men of distinction—*provided* that the

relationship is determined solely by chance. Investigation revealed some startling facts. The 3,500 eminent men were found to be related to one another not as one in 500, but as one in five. The more outstanding among the 3,500 were related in a yet higher degree: one in three of them had a near relative who is likewise distinguished. If we narrow the examination to those elevated to a place in the Hall of Fame, we find that nearly three-fifths of them had close distinguished relatives. "If all the eminent relatives of those in the Hall of Fame are counted, they average more than one apiece. Therefore, they are from 500 to 1,000 times as much related to distinguished people as the ordinary mortal is." This means that "something like one percent of the population is as likely to produce a man of genius as all the rest of the population put together."¹¹⁷

But even in the United States, family name, family environment, family influence might unduly account for success, and so explain the interrelatedness of distinguished people. In an effort to eliminate, or at least to reduce, the effect of this factor, Dr. Woods addressed himself to a study of mental and moral heredity in royalty. It was assumed that here the influence of environment would be comparatively uniform—uniformly good, that at least no member of royalty would suffer from lack of opportunity. If then some stocks stood out as consistently superior to the rest of royalty, it would be safe to conclude that their superiority was due to heredity and not to environment. Or if environment weighed heavily, it would seem fair to expect that achievements of the heir to a throne, who would naturally enjoy the largest opportunity of all, would surpass those of his younger brothers. To appreciate to the full the value of this study it must be examined in detail. Here it must suffice merely to summarize a few of the outstanding results that are pertinent to our discussion.

In the first place, it was found that, despite the uniformly good environment, "the geniuses in royalty are not scattered over the surface of the pedigree chart, but form isolated little groups of closely related individuals. One centers in Frederick the Great, another in Queen Isabella of Spain, a third in William the Silent, and a fourth in Gustavus Adolphus. Careful study of the circumstances shows nothing in the environment that would produce this group of genius, while it is exactly what a knowledge of heredity leads one to expect." Moreover, in the classification of the members of royalty that Woods devised, grading from 1 up to 10, a classification he was at pains to make impartial, he found precisely the same kind of interrelatedness with others of like distinction that he had found among the men of distinction in America: the higher the grade of distinction the greater the extent of relatedness to others of like caliber. Dr. Holmes comments: "The results obtained by Woods are in striking agreement with those of Pearson, Schuster and Elderton and other investigators, the agreement being all the more noteworthy since the material investigated differs so much from that of other studies."¹¹⁸ It may be of interest to add that Dr. Terman, in an exceptionally thorough and prolonged examination of 1,000 children in California schools who made a grade of 140 or better in intelligence tests, discovered that "one-fourth of the names in the Hall of Fame were found in the ancestry of this group."¹¹⁹

Dr. Carrel, writing in 1935, and from his scientific eminence in a position to survey and to assess the entire literature bearing on the origin of distinction among men, seems to express a generally recognized fact when he says, "It is known that children born in families of superior people are more likely to be of a superior type than those born in an inferior family."¹²⁰ And Professor Crew, from a like eminence as a specialist in genetics, concludes

thus: "At present, no really satisfactory intelligence test is available. But using such as are available, there is no difficulty in showing that ability of this grade [the genius] is a family affair, that relatively clever children have had relatively clever parents who invariably belong to the higher social grades and trades and professions. A rigid caste system runs right through the most democratic of states." ¹²¹

To all this the environmentalists have had a reply, of course. They have claimed, for instance, that with the amelioration of unfavorable conditions there was an advance in the IQ. And minor gains of this sort have proved possible, more particularly where the grade of mentality concerned is not of the lowest. But even in this chapter we have seen again and again that experiments conducted by the most highly trained and experienced authorities, who were at special pains to select for their material children whose environmental influences had been largely neutralized, still showed wide differences in ability that not only correlated with the intelligence of their parents but admitted of explanation *only by heredity*. Constantly, we find in the reports of the investigators words to the effect that "if the reasoning ability is absent there seems to be no way of training it in" or that "if home and other environmental influences account for something like 20 percent of a child's development, heredity accounts for 75 or 80 percent." ¹²² Dr. Holmes observes that "there is not a shred of good evidence that any kind of treatment can greatly increase mental power. It is possible to raise the IQ of a child somewhat by special training, but as a rule the gains are of a very modest order." And he concludes his examination of the matter by saying, "The environmentalist has never shown that the product of intelligence of this order [a high IQ] is even possible. When it can be shown that the moron of moron parentage can be made into an individual with an IQ of 140, and that this sort of thing can happen right along whenever conditions are propitious, I shall consider seriously joining hands with the egalitarians. As the evidence accumulates, the position of the extreme environmentalists becomes more and more untenable." ¹²³

This was in 1933, and it would seem definitive enough. Nevertheless, ever since then, for some thirty-five years, the egalitarians have been fairly turning themselves inside out, and meanwhile tearing the country's educational system to pieces, in a frantic and determined effort to demonstrate, and thus to prove, that one of us is as good as another, that all that makes the difference between man and man is environment. But what it all finally amounted to was zeal and noise and propaganda, ultimately signifying nothing, and this was plainly revealed in the monumental article by Dr. Arthur R. Jensen of the University of California at Berkeley, entitled "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" to which the *Harvard Educational Review* devoted almost its entire Winter 1969 issue. *U.S. News and World Report*, in reviewing the article and the "shock waves . . . rolling through the U.S. educational community" in reaction to it (issues for March 10 and June 2, 1969), referred to Dr. Jensen as a "top authority" and a "noted professor of educational psychology." In replying to the distinguished scholars who had been invited to criticize his article, Dr. Jensen himself observed: "Seldom in my experience . . . have I seen the discussants of a supposedly 'controversial' article so much in agreement with all the main points of the article they were asked to criticize." Perhaps the conclusions about it on the part of the world's informed and thinking laymen were well summarized in the words of editorials that appeared in two of the West's leading newspapers. In the *London Sunday Telegraph* for March 23, 1969, we find: "It is noticeable . . . that none of the criticisms which have emerged so far have contradicted Dr.

Jensen's claim that genetic factors are paramount in determining intelligence." "He says flatly that . . . intelligence can be measured objectively since it is as much objective reality as height." And in the *Washington Post* for March 12th, 1969, Joseph Alsop wrote: "The unspeakable has been spoken." It "seems unlikely" that Dr. Jensen's data can be successfully challenged.¹²⁴

It seems ever more certain that, as far as the word of all genuine science is concerned, it is now, in 1971, as it was in the beginning: Men are *born unequal*, and *must remain so*.

But the environmentalists are a wily crowd. If they can't pull a rabbit out of the hat in one way, they are always ready to try another. At the Fifth International Conference on Genetics in 1927, Dr. Raymond Pearl launched a bitter attack on some eugenists who may have been careless and extravagant in their claims for heredity. In the course of it, he undertook to disprove the evidence of Galton, Woods, and others, that greatness runs in families, that great men in much higher degree than ordinary men are related to other men of distinction. For his group of men to be studied, he chose all those philosophers, poets, and scientific men (as representing "persons whose distinction is almost wholly attributable to their own personal superiority") to whom the 11th edition of the *Britannica* devoted a minimum of one page. They came to 214. Then he investigated their parentage. His conclusions he stated thus:

"Taking the most distinguished philosophers, poets and scientific men the world has known, 214 of them in all, we find that only 10 of them were born of parents of whom there is any definitely recorded, objective evidence of either distinction or superiority. In short, 95 percent of these greatest men were produced by people who were, in their own right, phenotypically [i.e., to all appearances] mediocre or inferior."¹²⁵

I must confess that I found his argument unconvincing. To begin with, I think his test of superiority for the parents, namely "mention in the *Britannica*," was unfair both historically and to the claims of the hereditarians. The father of Aristotle, for example, as compared with his own contemporaries, may have been a rather highly distinguished man, but to ask that memory of him should survive the lapse of 2,000 years would require that he should have been almost in Aristotle's own class. And this is more than hereditarians claim. They know that greatness of the order of genius is the result of a peculiarly happy combination of the *components* of genius that it is difficult enough to account for on any basis. They never have claimed that the distinguished kin to whom they *have* found a great man so commonly related are necessarily or predominantly parents. But they have subscribed with little reservation to the proposition that Mr. Bertram Wilcox, whom we introduced in this chapter at the beginning of our Section III on heredity versus environment, so superciliously rejected—namely, that "from ability alone ability springs." But the ability is one to be looked for in its components and as distributed throughout the entire ancestry from which it must be combed, rather than as concentrated solely in the parents. Indeed, as every eugenicist constantly insists, and as Dr. Pearl himself realized perfectly well, the parents should really be looked upon chiefly as the points of contact by which two *family stocks* are brought together. The traits that appear in the children may resemble those of the parents, and that they commonly do to a remarkable degree, is a matter of such universal observation that a man only makes himself ridiculous when he argues seriously to the contrary. Indeed, on the

basis of known hereditary facts, children on the average must resemble their parents to the extent of about 50 percent. On the other hand, it is quite true, their traits do *not* always resemble those of their parents; very often in large part they do *not* resemble them. But this is certain, if they cannot be traced to the children's parents, they trace back to some one or others in the ancestral past. In no man, from moron to genius, can components of capacity come together that are not hidden somewhere in his heredity. You can "whirr the lottery wheels" all you like, to use Mr. Wilcox's metaphor, but even though the possible combinations of hereditary factors may run into the billions, you will never get *any* combination that spells dunce unless the components of duncehood are hanging somewhere from your family tree.

The chances that parents from long-distinguished *families* will get even one dunce are extremely slight. Even a stock of simple good, solid standing, in which no dunce has appeared for a hundred years or more, is very likely to go on maintaining its sturdy integrity, unless it allows its germ plasm to be adulterated by some marital folly. As a rule, dunces are born to those who are dunces themselves, who were born of dunces before them. It is almost totally false that "'good stock' in humankind may spring from almost anything."

The evidence is almost solid that *from ability alone ability springs*. If it is in the family germ plasm, transmitted from generation to generation, but has skipped a great man's father, it may come out in his brothers or sisters, or in his uncles or aunts or cousins. Eugenists have claimed only that great men were related to other people of distinction to a degree far above that to which ordinary people are thus related. And even cousins are near kin. Dr. Pearl, therefore, should not have stopped with the parents of his great men, but should have tried to ascertain whether there was distinction among others of their close relatives.

Again, I think his measure of the distinction of parents is unfairly severe. In the 18th century, a Dr. Harry Spen, to take a random example, was the author of a translation of Plato which, after the lapse of two centuries, was selected for inclusion in the Everyman Library, and in his own day he was elevated to the position of head of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. But he is not mentioned in the *Britannica*. If, therefore, some great man whom the *Britannica* honored with a whole page or more, happened to have the Reverend Dr. Spen for uncle or cousin, Dr. Pearl would have found no "definitely recorded, or objective evidence" of it. But I submit that he would not, on this ground, be warranted in concluding that all the near kin of the great man in question were "phenotypically mediocre or inferior." In fact, on the basis of Dr. Pearl's own showing as to the caliber he found even in the parents of his great men, I should be inclined to judge that something like 113, instead of his 10, were at least markedly above average.

But there is yet one more angle from which I think Dr. Pearl's deductions must bear our critical scrutiny. It is not so much that what he says is untrue as that what he says is misleading. On the basis of his study, he declares that "phenotypically ordinary people have produced 19 times as many of the greatest human beings ever known as have people phenotypically distinguished." As I have just been trying to show, there is ground for questioning whether this pronouncement is founded on a valid appraisal of the facts. It is not unlikely that there was considerably more relatedness to distinguished people than he was able to find, and much of his "phenotypical ordinariness" may have been considerably

above what most competent judges would call average or inferior. But suppose we are generous with Dr. Pearl, allowing him every benefit of the doubt, and accept his figures as he gives them. Yet, even so, they do not constitute the overwhelming case against the hereditarians that he very evidently wanted to make and imagined that he would make. His figures are like a two-edged sword, and can be made to cut two ways. He has shown how they cut one way: ordinary people have produced nineteen-twentieths of all the greatest men of recorded history. But now let us see how they cut the other way: 20 people, the fathers and mothers of 10 of his great ones whom he acknowledges to have had distinguished parents, produced one-twentieth as many distinguished men as all the countless millions who have walked the Earth since the birth of the first man on his list. Without seeming to realize it, he was perhaps conceding more than the most enthusiastic eugenist has ever claimed. At this point, eugenists have never, I think, claimed more than two things. In the first place, they have claimed, because repeated investigations seemed conclusively to have proved, that a son who would become distinguished was far more *likely* to be born to a man who himself was distinguished, than to the general run of the population. Did not Professor Huntington, who confesses himself inclined by training and conviction to stress the importance of environment, report and emphasize the results of a study showing that the son of a Unitarian minister in this country had, on the average, some 4,800 times as much chance of becoming distinguished himself as had the son of an unskilled laborer?

The other claim the eugenists have made is this: that distinguished men have distinguished offspring in far higher *proportion* than ordinary men. That is, *if you take equal numbers* of distinguished and undistinguished people, the distinguished ones will produce far more distinguished offspring than the others. They will produce more *per man*. But whereas the great men in any country are numbered by thousands (at most), the rest of the population is numbered in millions. Moreover, it is known that the *components* of greatness are scattered through the upper part of the population, even though thinly. It stands to reason, therefore, not only that these components should now and then, here and there, by what seems but a happy throw of chance, come together to produce a great man, but also, since the mass outnumbers the elite by at least a thousand to one and has the larger families, that the total number of great men born to the mass should exceed the total number born to the elite. This, however, does not alter the fact that the richest and surest breeding ground for distinction that humanity possesses is the small patch that has already produced *proportionately* the largest share of its choicest flowers. No informed man who is deeply devoted to the elevation of human life will ever belittle its value or ever cease to favor it as a farmer would favor his most fertile field.

We have now reached the point where we must venture to adjudicate the respective and to some extent conflicting claims of the hereditarians and the environmentalists. After acquiring some familiarity with the literature on both sides, it seems to me that the difference is largely one of emphasis. I doubt that there is any hereditarian who does not recognize that environment is very important, or many environmentalists who would not yield some weight to heredity. Both are known to be essential if there is to be any life at all. But which is the more important? I allow that some times environment lies upon an individual so heavily that the best he has inherited cannot break through. Here environment plainly determines. But in the large, which is of the farther-reaching importance?

The question presses. More than most of us realize, our life as a people may hang on the answer. To some extent, authorities have been found to differ, though it seems ever more apparent that among those best qualified to appraise the situation, namely the geneticists and the *physical* anthropologists, there is now something like a complete consensus. But in any case, "Where experts and specialists disagree free men must decide."¹²⁶ I have tried to face the evidence like an inwardly free man, and like an inwardly free man to let my judgment form. What my answer is, I have made no attempt to conceal. But let me now sum up where I stand.

1. Environment can, of course, be a very potent factor in the life history of any individual. At one extreme, it is possible to make environment so overwhelming as to prevent the development of mind to any degree compatible with the maintenance of life. It is to be remembered, however, that German children, after prolonged and severe malnutrition during the First World War, showed no lowering of their IQs. Nevertheless, many people, perhaps most people, especially the less gifted and less masterful, are very dependent for their optimum growth on their having opportunity provided them. Doubtless, it would make for the maximum health and creativeness of a whole people if an earnest and sustained effort were made to give everybody just as much opportunity as he showed himself able to benefit by. At this point, however, it should stop. And with very many people the ability to benefit by opportunity is very limited.

2. The equalization of opportunity has shown no tendency to make men equal. On the contrary, it only brings out how different and unequal they are. Their differences and their inequalities are primarily the result of heredity. Their very educability, their capacity to take advantage of opportunity, is inherited.

3. Different people react to a given environment very differently—each in a way determined by his inherent inborn nature. The weak man yields to it, is shaped by it and is dominated by it. It might be said that in the case of such the environment acts *on* the *man*. But among those of superior endowment, it is the man who acts on the environment. Our prevailing philosophy and national policy today are largely the result of an obsession of weak men, of man shaped by and shaping himself to his environment. The strong man takes hold of it and molds it or chisels it to his will.

4. Environment is completely impotent to increase the intelligence of an individual to any significant degree. It may often determine whether or not what was born into a man will come out in his life, but it is powerless to put any brains into him. The positive factor is heredity; environment is merely negative. There is no aid to be derived from environment, or from education, or from any other sort of opportunity, that can produce greatness out of mediocrity or even decently average ability out of inborn dullness. Either you are born with brains or you must do the best you can without them. The evidence for this seems to me conclusive.

5. Galton and others may to some extent have underestimated the influence of environment, but no environmentalist has ever yet, on the basis of environment, given a plausible explanation either of the extraordinary resemblances between identical twins, or of the striking tendency of distinguished people to have distinguished near relatives.

6. With the whole body of evidence that is before me, as I am able to survey it in the light of my studies of the past forty years, I find it impossible not to believe that heredity is fundamental. Concede all we may as to the importance of environment—and much is gladly to be conceded, it still seems very clear that, if I may use Crew's words, "to a very considerable degree mental characters, particularly those involving general ability and capacity, are primarily based on heredity." In further statement of his conclusion he says, "There can be no doubt that the environment is not of paramount importance in determining the characters of individuals, of societies, or of races."¹²⁷ But this was in the early days of investigation, and it is now seen to have been very cautious and conservative, as very likely became the state of the pertinent scientific knowledge in the late Twenties. But with further research, as we have seen, outstanding geneticists, physical anthropologists and psychologists, such as Gates, Holmes and Garrett, began to publish their conclusion that heredity outweighed environment by 3 or 4 to 1; and most recently of all, within the last decade, Sir Cyril Burt and C. D. Darlington have been making it even 9 to 1. Indeed, much of environment itself is seen to be explicable in terms of heredity. On the whole, what men are in very large part determines what kind of environment they live in: they themselves make it.

Moreover, such pronouncements do not represent the judgment of a few isolated scatterbrains. They come from men as eminent in their respective fields as any in the world. And at least to the extent that heredity is certainly the preponderating factor in determining individual development, their judgment, as far as I have been able to determine, is supported by the great majority of our other outstanding physical anthropologists and geneticists—men such as Morgan, Pearson, Davenport, Lundborg, Lundman, Castle, East, Cattell, Hooton, Baur, Fischer, Lenz, Darlington, Coon, Hofmeyr, Gedda, Rife, Robert Kuttner, and C. P. Oliver. Also, they have the support of other men of distinguished ability and accomplishment who, though they may not be geneticists or physical anthropologists, have given the problem before us their thorough study—men such as Ludovici, Havelock Ellis, Hankins, Wiggam, Huntington, Popenoe, A. James Gregor, Corrado Gini, Frank McGurk, and S.D. Porteus.

7. In view of the preponderance of evidence that I have found in favor of heredity, it is doubtless quite understandable that environmentalists—Socialists, Communists, and even "Liberals"—should not only sometimes show much heat in trying to maintain and to propagate a dogma whose principal tenets simply will not stand close examination, but should commonly practice any and every sort of evasion and deception in regard to demonstrable facts. I have been forced to suspect that some of the scientists in our own midst have been no more successful in their efforts to be impartial than were many of the saints in their efforts to be unselfish. Or perhaps it is that they do not really try. One has to wonder if some devotion to the democratic dogma or some need to defend their own origins (which may have been plebeian) has not put a cast in their eyes and biased their judgment.

To what lengths such prejudice can carry men was revealed strikingly in 1925 in the case of Professor Paul Kammerer, an Austrian zoologist. On the eve of his promotion to a position of high scientific responsibility in Moscow, it was proved by a visiting American on the staff of our Museum of Natural History that he had been guilty of fraud in a long series of experiments supposed to show the determining influence of environment, and welcomed by

the Soviet Government as supporting its doctrine that the permanent betterment of any people waits only upon improvement in economic conditions. When his dishonesty was discovered and published, Kammerer went up on a hill outside of Vienna and blew out his brains.¹²⁸

But the men who are driving the Communist juggernaut toward its goal are ready to go to extremes far beyond the deception practiced by any individual. In the 1930's, when it was discovered that Binet intelligence tests of children in the Moscow schools showed that "workers' children scored markedly lower than the children of intellectuals and that this class gap widened with age," it was first proposed to doctor the tests so that this difference would not show, and then, in 1936, mental testing was abolished by a proclamation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. And it seems this ban against mental tests is still in effect. I remember, too, that the Soviet Government cancelled the Seventh International Congress on Genetics that was to have been held in Moscow in 1937, for no discoverable reason except a fear that the discussions of genetics that it would stage before the eyes of the world, and the expected pronouncements of some of her own scientists, would tend to undermine the Marxist dogma of equality, with its collateral dogma of environmentalism.¹²⁹ Indeed, so determined has been the Soviet dictatorship to suppress every vestige of knowledge that militated against the universal acceptance of this dogma, that it actually liquidated (i.e., murdered) some half dozen of its outstanding geneticists who, like Galileo, stubbornly refused to betray what they knew to be the truth. The final move came in August, 1948, when, under the guidance of Academician Trofim Lysenko, "the Praesidium of the Soviet Academy of Sciences took the necessary step of bringing to an end the teaching of genetics, and of dissolving the institutes and removing the personnel concerned with research in genetics, in the Soviet Union."¹³⁰ With such methods espoused and sanctioned by the supreme directing authorities of international Communism, what must we not be prepared to find in our own scientists of definite Communist sympathies and connections?

I have reviewed these historical facts because, for one thing, they reveal how much men's judgment can be swayed by preconceived ideas, especially if it is not realized that they are preconceived. This is almost universally the case with "Liberals", for instance. But more than that, they demonstrate in a conclusive form that the pronouncements on issues of human equality by scientists who are committed to, or, even strongly attracted to, the Communist cause of world conquest and social revolution, are absolutely untrustworthy. In the light of such survey of the evidence as I have been able to make, I find it virtually impossible, except on the assumption of some secret commitment to the creed of equality, to understand how any scientist, with the evidence before his eyes, can fail to be profoundly impressed with the power of heredity to determine not only the visible features of man's body but also the quality and capacity of his mind. When I see an anthropologist, even a social anthropologist, supporting environmentalism, and moreover showing heat about it, I must suspect that he is a zealot before he is a scientist, that his science is largely his weapon, and that in him I am witnessing the intrusion of the class war into the field of science.

1946, 1970, 1971.

¹ R.R. Gates—*Heredity in Man*, Constable, London, 1929, p. 1. Dr. Gates, recently deceased, was a geneticist of worldwide repute. Prof. of Botany in the University of London, and head of the Dept. of Botany at King's College. F.A.E. Crew—*Heredity*, London, 1928, p. 70f. Prof. Crew was Lecturer in Genetics and Director of the Animal Breeding Research Dept. of the Univ. of Edinburgh. M.D., D.Sc., Ph.D. E.A. Hooton—"The Wages of Biological Sin," *Atlantic Monthly*, Oct. 1939. He was Professor of Anthropology at Harvard University.

² Ellsworth Huntington and E. F. Whitney—*Builders of America*, Morrow, 1927, p. 316.

³ See Mary Wilhelmina Williams—*Social Scandinavia in the Viking Age*, Macmillan, 1920, p. 57f. Also, Johannes Brondsted—*The Vikings*, Penguin Books, 1965, pp. 24, 42.

⁴ See the *Pesadim*, fol. 49, quoted by Huntington and Whitney, 1927, op. cit., p. 316. Also, *Unity* (Chicago), Feb. 4, 1935, p. 233, for the article entitled "Religion and Sterilization" by Dr. Louis L. Mann, rabbi of the Chicago Sinai Congregation, professor in the Dept. of Oriental Languages, Univ. Of Chicago. Also, the age-old eugenic practices of the Jews are ably reviewed by Nathaniel Weyl in the early pages of his *The Jew in American Politics*, Arlington House, 1968.

⁵ Samuel J. Holmes—*Human Genetics and Its Social Import*, McGraw, 1936, p. 30. Holmes was Prof. of Zoology in the Univ. of Calif., and one of the most widely cited of geneticists.

⁶ S. J. Holmes, 1936, op. p. 71.

⁷ F.A.E. Crew—*Organic Inheritance in Man*, London, 1927, p. 3. Cp. Crew, 1928, op. cit., p. 70f. Also, S. J. Holmes, 1936, op. cit., p. 72; Edward M. East—*Heredity and Human Affairs*, Scribner's, 1935, p. 48; Edward M. East and D.F. Jones—*Inbreeding and Outbreeding*, Lippincott, 1919, p. 229; Raymond Pearl—*Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Genetics*, Berlin, 1927, p. 266.

⁸ Edward M. East, 1935, op. cit., p. 18.

⁹ Mr. C. J. Bond, a member of the Medical Consultative Council of the Ministry of Health and of the Industrial Health Research Board, speaking at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Insurance Committees on October 17, 1931, said: "Today one in every ten of our people is too dull or sickly to earn a living unaided, one in every two hundred is, or has been, mentally afflicted, and one in every one hundred is feeble-minded. The fact is . . . we are heading not for national well-being, but for racial decay." Quoted by A.M. Ludovici in his *Health and Education through Self-Mastery*, London, 1933, p. xi.

¹⁰ See *Washington Post*, Jan. 2, 1947. This decline continued a trend that had been marked from early in the century. Charles W. Armstrong in his *The Survival Of The Unfittest*, London, 1927, p. 18, wrote as follows: "Dr. Tredgold, medical expert of the Royal Commission on the feeble-minded, says: 'My inquiries have convinced me that mental defect is but one manifestation of disease which is slowly but surely eating its way into the heart of the nation.' . . . Mr. Eldon Moore, writing in the *Eugenics Review*, has shown good reason for estimating defectives, exclusive of those in madhouses, but inclusive of idiots and imbeciles

under care, at 155,833. If we add to these the 133,883 notified insane, according to the report of the Board of Control for 1926, we get a grand total of 289,716. . . 19 years ago [i.e., in 1907] the Board of Control estimated the total number at 150,000 i.e., an increase, in less than 20 years, of over 75 percent." He added (p. 20) that "in the elementary schools of England and Wales a million children are so defective physically or mentally retarded, defective, or diseased, as to be unable to derive reasonable benefit from the education provided by the State." On page 19 he said that "all authorities are agreed that defectives breed and multiply much more rapidly than normal people. Dr. Gibbons, gynaecologist to the Grosvenor Hospital for Women, says from two to six times as fast. . . most authorities believe mental defect to be increasingly rapidly."

¹¹ Heinrich Hauser—*The German Talks Back*, 1945, p. 180.

¹² Columbia University Press, 1967, pp. 28-9. Cp. p. 2 of *What are the Facts about Mental Illness In New York State?* 1968, New York Commission Against Mental Illness.

¹³ William Menninger—*Psychiatry in a Troubled World*, Macmillan, 1948.

¹⁴ Weston A. Price—*Nutrition and Physical Degeneration*, Harper, enlarged edition of 1946. There is a mistake here in the number of the page set down in my notes, and I cannot take more time trying to correct it. Material in large part supporting my statements is to be found on p. 376, where Dr. Price quotes a passage from F. P. Mall's article entitled "On the frequency of localized anomalies in the human embryos and infants at birth," taken from the *Amer. Jr. of Anatomy*, 22: 49, 1917. It reads as follows: "He estimated from the records of 100,000 pregnancies that there were 80,572 normal births, 11,765 abortions of normal embryos and early monsters and 615 monsters born at term. Thus, at term, 1 child in 132 is born with some anatomical defect. For each such case appearing at term, 12 others died and were aborted during pregnancy." But I let my statements stand as made, because I am certain that I would never have entered them in my manuscript if I had not found supporting evidence for them somewhere in Dr. Price's book.

¹⁵ Dr. W. Coda Martin, former Chief of Geriatrics Clinic, Metropolitan Hospital, and Visiting Physician in Geriatrics for the Bird S. Coler Memorial Hospital, New York City, as quoted by William Longwood—*The Poisons In Your Food*, Chap. 11: "The Nation's Health," Simon & Schuster, 1960, Pyramid Books reprint, 1969, pp. 33-4.

¹⁶ Report in *New York Times*, March 25, 1937.

¹⁷ Report in *Time*, 31:22, 1938.

¹⁸ Alexis Carrel—*Man The Unknown*, Harper, 1935, p. 114.

¹⁹ Monroe Lerner and Odin W. Anderson—*Health Progress in the U.S. 1900-1960*. This was a report of the Health Information Foundation, University of Chicago Press, 1963, pp. 237, 295.

²⁰ Alexis Carrel, op. cit., pp. 114-6. Cp. pp. xiii, 275.

- ²¹ *New York State Medical Journal*, Sept. 15, 1955.
- ²² See William Longgood, op. cit., 1969, p. 35.
- ²³ Adelle Davis—*Let's Get Well*, Harcourt, 1965, p. 3.
- ²⁴ William Longgood, op. cit., 1969, p. 32.
- ²⁵ Knight Dunlap—*Personal Beauty and Racial Betterment*, Mosby, St. Louis, 1920, pp. 15, 16, 40, 42, 49-50, 55. Dunlap was Professor of Experimental Psychology at Johns Hopkins University.
- ²⁶ Knight Dunlap, 1920, op. cit., p. 84.
- ²⁷ S. J. Holmes—*The Eugenic Predicament*, Harcourt, 1933, p. 14.
- ²⁸ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, op. cit., pp. 170, 162.
- ²⁹ Report in the *N.Y. Times*, Aug. 2, 1937.
- ³⁰ Huntington and Whitney, 1927, op. cit., p. 77.
- ³¹ Alexis Carrel, 1935, op. cit., p. 154. Cp. S. J. Holmes, 1936, op. cit., p. 370.
- ³² Cited in Huntington and Whitney, 1927, op. cit., p. 77.
- ³³ Alexis Carrel, 1935, op. cit., pp. 20, 154.
- ³⁴ Report in *N.Y. Times*, Aug. 2, 1937.
- ³⁵ Robert H. Felix—*Mental Illness, Progress and Prospects*, Columbia University Press, 1967, pp. 31, 59.
- ³⁶ William Longgood, op. cit., 1969, p. 38.
- ³⁷ Weston A. Price, 1946, op. cit., p. 396.
- ³⁸ Edward M. East—*The Trend of the Race*, Harcourt, 1921, p. 113ff. Cp. Paul Popenoe and Roswell H. Johnson—*Applied Eugenics*, revised and largely rewritten edition, Macmillan, 1935, p. 156.
- ³⁹ Edward M. East—*Mankind at the Cross Roads*, Scribner's, 1923, p. 313.
- ⁴⁰ See S. J. Holmes, 1936, op. cit., p. 126ff. (Chapter XI).
- ⁴¹ Alexis Carrel, 1935, op. cit., p. 268, cp. p. 157. Also, S. J. Holmes, 1921, op. cit., p. 98; 1933, op. cit., p. 186ff.; 1936, op. cit., p. 142.

⁴² S. J. Holmes, 1936, op. cit., p. 370. Cp. Paul Popenoe and R.H. Johnson, 1935, op. cit., pp. 128-9.

⁴³ For the gist of these figures and statements see E.M. East, 1923, op. cit., p. 315; Huntington and Whitney, 1927, op. cit., p. 78, but *passim* in Holmes, 1936, Popenoe and Johnson, 1935, and in almost any of the outstanding writers on human genetics.

⁴⁴ E.M. East, 1935, op. cit., p. 299f., 237f.

⁴⁵ R.R. Gates says: "The evidence clearly favours the interpretation of feeble-mindedness as a simple recessive." 1929, op. cit., p. 268. S. J. Holmes and others doubt that the matter is so simple.

⁴⁶ S. J. Holmes, 1933, op. cit., p. 97; R.R. Gates, 1929, op. cit., p. 267.

⁴⁷ Prof. East says that "every tenth or at least fifteenth normal person carries mental defectiveness in half of his or her germ-cells, available for the production of an ament [mental defective] whenever chance brings an egg and a sperm of like quality together." 1935, op. cit., p. 235.

⁴⁸ S. J. Holmes, 1933, op. cit., p. 152.

⁴⁹ Huntington and Whitney, op. cit., p. 78.

⁵⁰ Huntington and Whitney, op. cit. p. 86.

⁵¹ See S. J. Holmes, 1936, p. 183ff.

⁵² R.R. Gates, 1929, p. 267; E.M. East, 1923, p. 313.

⁵³ Huntington and Whitney, op. cit., p. 108.

⁵⁴ Article: "The American Melting Pot: Its Meaning to Us," p. 25f. Originally published in the *American Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 115, No. 10, April, 1959. My quotation is taken from the reprint published by the International Association for Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics, P.O. Box 3495, Grand Central Station, New York City 10017.

⁵⁵ E.A. Hooton—*Apes, Men and Morons*, Putnam, 1937, p. 40.

⁵⁶ S. J. Holmes, 1936, p. 173.

⁵⁷ Huntington and Whitney, op. cit., p. 103. Cp. Alexis Carrel, op. cit., p. 75.

⁵⁸ S. J. Holmes, 1936, p. 302.

⁵⁹ Elmer Pendell—*Sex and Civilization*, Noontide, 1967.

⁶⁰ Louis I. Dublin, address entitled "Birth Control," reprinted in *Social Hygiene*, 1920. Cp. S. J. Holmes, 1936, p. 217.

⁶¹ S. J. Holmes, 1933, p. 207ff. Cp. F.A.E. Crew, 1928, p. 74.

⁶² A. J. Balfour—*Theism and Humanism*, 1915, P. 109.

⁶³ S. J. Holmes, 1936, p. 221ff. Cp. Holmes, 1933, pp. 488-9. Also, Genevieve Parkhurst, article: "Shall Marrying Be Subsidized?" *Harper's Magazine*, November 1937, p. 570ff.

⁶⁴ Huntington and Whitney, op. cit., p. 39.

⁶⁵ S. J. Holmes, 1933, pp. 144-5.

⁶⁶ William E. Castle—*Genetics and Eugenics*, Harvard University Press, 1925, p. 361. Cp. S. J. Holmes, 1936, 217f.

⁶⁷ S. J. Holmes, 1936, p. 220.

⁶⁸ J. McKeen Cattell—"Families of American Men of Science," *Pop. Sc. Monthly*, 86: 504-515 (1915). S. J. Holmes, 1936, p. 219.

⁶⁹ Huntington and Whitney, op. cit., p. 145. Cp. S. J. Holmes, 1936, p. 218.

⁷⁰ Louis I. Dublin, op. cit., p. 8.

⁷¹ Frank H. Hankins—*The Racial Basis of Civilization*, Knopf, 1926, pp. 346-7, 247-8, 364. The full citation for Terman is Lewis M. Terman, Ed.—*Genetic Studies of Genius*, Vol. I: "Mental and Physical Traits of a Thousand Gifted Children," 2nd ed., Stanford University Press, 1926.

"Sir Julian Huxley estimated that a population with a mean IQ 10 points below the national average would produce proportionately only about one-tenth as many very superior individuals (those with IQs of 160+) as the nation as a whole."

See Nathaniel Weyl—*The Jew In American Politics*, Arlington House 1968, p. 271, where he cites "Eugenics in Evolutionary Perspective," *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, Univ. of Chicago, Vol. VI, No. 2 (Winter 1963), footnote pp. 165-6. Weyl and Possony draw much the same conclusion in their *The Geography of Intellect*, Regnery, 1962, p. 154f.

⁷² Alexis Carrel—correspondence columns in *American Mercury*, August, 1939.

⁷³ Sir Arthur Keith—*A New Theory of Human Evolution*, New York, 1949, p. 98.

⁷⁴ Ezra Pound—*Impact, Essays on Ignorance and the Decline of American Civilization*, Regnery, 1960, p. 9.

- ⁷⁵ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, p. 173. Cp. S. J. Holmes, 1933, p. 120.
- ⁷⁶ Curt Stern—"Genetics and the World Today" in *The Scientist Looks at our World*, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1952.
- ⁷⁷ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, pp. 173-4. Cp. F.A.E. Crew—*Heredity*, London, 1930, p. 107.
- ⁷⁸ F.A.E. Crew—*Heredity*, 1930, pp. 107, 111f., 175f.
- ⁷⁹ S. J. Holmes, 1933, p. 68.
- ⁸⁰ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, p. 22.
- ⁸¹ Carleton S. Coon—*The Origin of Races*, Knopf, 1962, p. 21f.
- ⁸² David G. Rife in *Race and Modern Science*, edited by Professor Robert E. Kuttner, Social Science Press, 1967, p. 142f.
- ⁸³ R.R. Gates, 1929. p. 140.
- ⁸⁴ S. J. Holmes, 1936, p. 120. Cp. S. J. Holmes, 1933, p. 184f.
- ⁸⁵ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, p. 127. Cp. S. J. Holmes, 1936, p. 255.
- ⁸⁶ R.R. Gates, 1929, pp. 134, 265, 287, 290. Cp. Amram Scheinfeld—*You and Heredity*, Stokes, 1939, pp. 276-7; F.A.E. Crew, 1927, p. 134; C.D. Darlington—*Genetics and Man*, Macmillan, 1964, p. 244.
- ⁸⁷ C.D. Darlington—*Genetics and Man*, op. cit., p. 240.
- ⁸⁸ This was reprinted, along with the replies of authorities invited to criticize, under the title: "Environment, Heredity and Intelligence."
- ⁸⁹ See "Genetic Race Differences, The Findings of Dr. William Shockley," published by the National Putnam Letters Committee, P.O. Box 734, Kilmarnock, Va., 22482. Also, *New York Post*, Dec. 19, 1969, and the letter by Dr. Shockley published in *Scientific American*, Jan. 1971.
- ⁹⁰ For a very impressive picture of what is going on, see article entitled "The New Fanatics" by William A. Massey, first published in *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. IV, No. 2, Fall 1963. Since, reprinted by the National Putnam Letters Committee (see Note 83). In my judgment, as far as strict and honest science is concerned, there is no longer any question what the truth is. The only question now is whether the truth can be suppressed.
- ⁹¹ S. J. Holmes, 1933, pp. 69-70; S. J. Holmes, 1936, pp. 150-1.
- ⁹² S. J. Holmes, 1933, p. 65. Cp. Sir Cyril Burt: "The Inheritance of Mental Ability," *American Psychologist*, Jan. 1958.

- ⁹³ F.A.E. Crew, 1928, p. 72.
- ⁹⁴ C.D. Darlington, 1964, op. cit., p. 239.
- ⁹⁵ Quoted by C.D. Darlington, 1964, op. cit., pp. 226-7.
- ⁹⁶ Edward M. East, 1935, op. cit., p. 133.
- ⁹⁷ C.D. Darlington, 1964, p. 228. Cp. S. J. Holmes, 1936, op. cit., pp. 117-120 (and consult "Twins" in the Index).
- ⁹⁸ C.D. Darlington, 1964, op. cit., p. 230f.
- ⁹⁹ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, op. cit., pp. 112-3.
- ¹⁰⁰ Edward M. East, 1935, op. cit., pp. 135-6.
- ¹⁰¹ S. J. Holmes, 1936, p. 165: Amram Scheinfeld, op. cit., Ch. XIX (p. 107ff.), C.D. Darlington, 1964, op. cit., p. 232ff.
- ¹⁰² S. J. Holmes, 1936, op. cit., pp. 167-8.
- ¹⁰³ S. J. Holmes, 1936, op. cit., pp. 136, 143. Cp. F.A.E. Crew, 1927, op. cit., P. 136.
- ¹⁰⁴ C.D. Darlington, 1964, op. cit., p. 233-6.
- ¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 232.
- ¹⁰⁶ Ibid., pp. 240-2.
- ¹⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 352.
- ¹⁰⁸ Henry E. Garrett—*Heredity, The Cause of Racial Differences in Intelligence*, Patrick Henry Press, Kilmarnock, Va., 1971, p. 6. In support of this statement Garrett cites Sir Cyril Burt—"The Relative Influence of Heredity and Environment on the Assessment of Intelligence," 1957, *British Jour. Stat. Psych.*, Vol. 10, Pt. 2; and C.D. Darlington—*Genetics and Man*, Macmillan, 1964.
- ¹⁰⁹ See *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. VI, No. 4 (Spring, 1966), p. 239.
- ¹¹⁰ See *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. V. No. 2 (Fall 1964), P. 104; Vol. VII, No. 2, p. 115.
- ¹¹¹ S. J. Holmes, 1933, p. 61.
- ¹¹² Ibid. p. 90.
- ¹¹³ Huntington and Whitney, 1927, op. cit., p. 24. Cp. E.M. East, 1935, p. 258.

- ¹¹⁴ Genevieve Parkhurst, "Shall Marriage Be Subsidized?" *Harpers Magazine*, Nov. 1937, p. 575.
- ¹¹⁵ S. J. Holmes, 1936, op. cit., pp. 203-5.
- ¹¹⁶ S. J. Holmes, 1933, op. cit., p. 139. Cp. Holmes, 1936, pp. 162ff., 203-5.
- ¹¹⁷ Frederick Adams Woods: "Heredity and the Hall of Fame." *Popular Science Monthly*, May, 1913.
- ¹¹⁸ Frederick Adams Woods—*Mental and Moral Heredity in Royalty*, New York, 1906. Cp. Popenoe and Johnson, 1935, op. cit., p. 14; S. J. Holmes, 1921, op. cit., 108-9.
- ¹¹⁹ Cited by S. J. Holmes, 1936, pp. 158-9, from L.M. Terman: *Genetic Studies Of Genius*, Vol. I: "Mental and Physical Traits of A Thousand Gifted Children," Stanford University Press, 1925.
- ¹²⁰ Alexis Carrel, 1935, p. 253.
- ¹²¹ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, op. cit., p. 135.
- ¹²² See, for example, S. J. Holmes, 1933, op. cit., p. 71; 1936, op. cit., pp. 160-1.
- ¹²³ S. J. Holmes, 1933, op. cit., pp. 76, 78.
- ¹²⁴ Editorials reprinted in *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 3, p. 173f., Vol. XI, No. 2, p. 115f.
- ¹²⁵ Raymond Pearl, *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Genetics*, Berlin, 1927, I: pp. 261-282.
- ¹²⁶ From "Program of St. John's College," Annapolis, Md., May, 1946.
- ¹²⁷ F.A.E. Crew, 1928, pp. 72-3; 1930, pp. 106-107.
- ¹²⁸ Popenoe and Johnson, 1935, op. cit., pp. 26-8. Cp. S. J. Holmes, 1936, op. cit., p. 26; but especially, C.D. Darlington, 1964, op. cit., pp. 204-7.
- ¹²⁹ Report in the *New York Times*, Dec. 14, 1936.
- ¹³⁰ C.D. Darlington, 1964, op. cit., pp. 207-215; Garrett Hardin—*Nature and Man's Fate*, Farrar, Rinehart and Winston, 1959. Mentor Book reprint (1961), pp. 204-5.

Chapter 17.

The Doctrine of the Thoroughbred.

Free crossing obliterates characters.

Darwin

Material prosperity encourages the preservation, pampering, and reproduction of the biologically inferior elements which are parasitical upon rich civilizations. Then some cleaner-blooded and culturally crude stock crashes in and wipes clean the slate. . . We can either prune off our own rotten branches or submit to a ruthless cutting down and thinning out by more vigorous conquering stocks.

Earnest A. Hooton

In my last chapter, we began a discussion of eugenics. We noted the appalling state of the physical and mental health of the American population. At least one out of every ten persons, to put it very conservatively and safely, has to be carried by the rest of us. We discovered, also, that on every level, through the operation of what is called the differential birth rate, the less capable are outbreeding the more capable, and in consequence slowly but surely taking their place. Those qualified to give the country firm and deeply wise leadership, or to give such leadership the solid backing essential to its ascendancy are gradually disappearing, and, year by year, the people approach ever nearer to the state of a confused and helpless horde. Finally, we searched diligently and unsparingly to determine the truth about the relative importance of heredity and environment in the development of the individual. And we found that, while both are important, heredity is much the more so. In general, it may be said that environment is only the negative, limiting factor: it creates no capacity, but only may decide whether or not innate capacity shall be developed. Potentiality, how far a man *has it in him to go* (environment not preventing) is something a man gets from his ancestors, is born with or forever goes without. In reviewing the evidence, Professor East of Harvard said, "Summing up all the genetic experiments where the inheritance was constant and the environment variable, it would hardly be an exaggeration to say that the resulting dissimilarity of product is negligible." ¹

We will now continue our discussion of eugenics, carrying it on, first, into an investigation of the facts in regard to inbreeding and outbreeding (the fourth point in my presentation); and, finally, undertaking to draw up a list of some of the more important and feasible measures by which a people might avail itself of the hereditary factor in human reproduction, not only to prevent the decline of its breeding stock, but even to improve its quality.

To avoid the risk of having to contend throughout the following presentation, with a suspicion in the minds of my readers that I am trying adroitly to build up a case for breeding

human beings like animals, let me say before I begin that I have no such intention. That the principles of inbreeding have bearing on my concern that the life of man should be exalted, I readily allow, and what this is I shall make clear in due course, but you may be sure that I shall not use them crudely. Nevertheless, it must be courageously faced and honestly admitted that, however much eugenic measures may be decently cloaked out of regard for human sensibilities, an improvement of our human breeding stock will need to be in essential agreement with the principles and practices to which we owe the extraordinary improvement in our grains, vegetables, fruits, flowers, livestock, horses and dogs. This is inescapable.

IV. INBREEDING AND OUTBREEDING

Lest there be any misunderstanding as to what we are talking about, I will begin with definitions. Ordinarily, inbreeding refers to the mating of close relatives, such as parent and offspring or brother and sister; while outbreeding has to do with matings less close, as between individuals comparatively unrelated or related only distantly; and cross-breeding to matings between individuals not known to have any blood relationship whatever, as between members of different breeds or varieties or races.² One can see at a glance that in dealing with such variable quantities it is difficult to be altogether precise. Some of the geneticists themselves who have made special study of consanguineous matings (for example, Professor E.M. East and Professor Raymond Pearl) advise the use of the word inbreeding "in a relative sense only." The reason is obvious. At one end of the scale of inbreeding we have *self*-fertilization, where the male and female cells are taken from the same individual plant, as in the case of maize (or corn, as we commonly call it). At the other end, we have endogamy, which Webster's dictionary calls inbreeding, although the matings here may be close only in the sense that they are within the tribe or race, and are yet distant enough so that in the definitions above they might often fall under the head of outbreeding. Marrying one to whom you were only distantly related would be out-breeding as compared with marrying, say, your cousin, but it would take on the color of inbreeding and might often very properly be called inbreeding as compared with marrying altogether outside your race, as with a Negro or a Japanese. It seems best, therefore, to make our definitions fairly flexible. Except when referring to self-fertilizing organisms, where its meaning is obvious, we shall always use *inbreeding* to refer to matings by which the network of the lines of hereditary characteristics they bring together is *narrowed*, and *outbreeding* to refer to matings by which this network is *widened*.³

Unless I am greatly mistaken, the prevalent attitude in regard to these two kinds of breeding, not only in our populace at large but also among our intellectuals and leaders in general, is one of well-nigh complete certainty that out- or cross-breeding represents the course that we as a nation wish to follow in our human matings. In any case, it represents the course we have followed for at least the past four or five generations. All kinds of people have flocked here from all parts of the Earth, and once here have been free to marry, and have married, into the established stocks of the land. And being a very vain people, feeling very much pleased with ourselves when we look into the mirror of history, we tend—not unnaturally—to confirm and extol the means by which we have come to be what we are. There is in America a veritable cult of the mongrel, of the hybrid. The idea of pure blood, as of the thoroughbred, is ridiculed. It is widely believed that the American type, which is assumed to

be the best in the world, in large part owes its superiority to the fact that its blood is mixed. Cross-breeding, it is asserted, yields offspring of superior size, stamina, energy, and fertility.

On the other hand, when one says the word "inbreeding" people think at once of the "Hillbillies" of our southern mountains, among whom there is a high rate of defectiveness, feeble-mindedness, and sterility. Moreover, this attitude has been confirmed in legal enactment. "Many of our states prohibit cousin marriages, and Oklahoma even prohibits the marriage of second cousins,"⁴ the idea being apparently, that cousin marriages are likely to lead to very undesirable results in the offspring. And when one speaks the word "incest," one touches a taboo before which most men stand horrified. Incest is sexual intercourse between people closely related. It is pronounced a crime by the law, and by the Church a monstrous sin. Even cousin marriages are commonly included in the prohibitions of the taboo.

And yet as long ago as Darwin, it was recognized that the taboo did not have a firm scientific foundation. In 1870, in a letter to Sir John Lubbock, then in Parliament, Darwin wrote, "In England and many parts of Europe the marriages of cousins are objected to from their supposed injurious consequences; but this belief rests on no direct evidence. It is therefore manifestly desirable that the belief should either be proved false, or should be confirmed."⁵ And he called for an investigation instituted by Parliament, to settle the matter.

Nevertheless, though the taboo against the mating of close relatives might lack really scientific support, it has long been known with great certainty, both to animal breeders and to observers of human life, that close inbreeding was often followed by very undesirable offspring. Doubt, however, arose from the fact that the offspring from close matings were not *always* defective: indeed, though the taboo against incest is one of the oldest and most widespread of all human prohibitions, it was yet recognized that *some* cousin marriages at least yielded decidedly desirable offspring, and that some degree of inbreeding, however risky and uncertain in its outcome, offered the only known path to a superior breed of animals. The trouble was that no one had discovered *why* the same procedure at one time led to good results and at another time to bad. Indeed, the answer to the problem could never have been reached by such an investigation as Darwin called for, even if it had been authorized. The right answer had to wait until men had learned to appreciate and apply the discoveries of Mendel.

Meanwhile, there came to be a considerable, and growing, body of knowledge that was very definitely at odds with the prevailing and powerful prejudice against incest.

For one thing, it was a matter of common observation, as Dr. Robert Briffault pointed out, in reviewing the situation, that "all animal species propagate without regard to the closest inbreeding."⁶ A collie bitch, belonging to a friend of mine, once had a litter of pups, and subsequently mated with one of her own sons, then full-grown, and by him had another litter of pups, all sound and saleable. Many of my readers must have observed like results of close inbreeding of animals.

Moreover, as already remarked, *some* cousin marriages were known to have had very happy results. A notable instance was the marriage of Charles Darwin himself with his first cousin,

Emma Wedgwood, both of whom belonged to families of sound and already distinguished stock. According to Professor S. J. Holmes, so often quoted in my last chapter, "All of Darwin's sons became celebrated for their intellectual achievements and are noteworthy for being unusually able and normal types of men." ⁷

Again, despite all the taboo against inbreeding within certain specified degrees of closeness, there was a very significant amount of inbreeding among many ancient peoples. "Among the Persians," for instance, according to O.A. Wall, "the logical wives are considered to be the cousins on the father's side." ⁸ Sir Richard F. Burton declared that "the kings of Persia intermarried with their sisters." ⁹ And Professor East said that "Zoroaster appears not only to have permitted cousin marriages but to have recommended and blessed them above all others." ¹⁰

Inbreeding went even further among the Greeks. According to Professors E.M. East and D.F. Jones, "Galton concluded the ablest race in history was that built up in Attica between 530 and 430 B.C., when from 45,000 free-born males surviving the age of 50 there came fourteen of the most illustrious men of all time." After attempting to explain this, in part, by the cultural environment of the day, they go on, "Further, there can be little question but that in this little settlement [Attica] there was much selective breeding. Had we the data, would we not find the Athenians all more or less related to one another? Had they not built up somewhat of a superstock by inbreeding? Endogamy was their custom (Westermarck, 1901). Marriage with half-sisters was allowable, and if an Athenian lived as husband or wife with an alien, he or she was liable to be sold as a slave and have all property confiscated." ¹¹ Again, during the period in which inbreeding was closest, the Spartans were the greatest race physically of which we have any record. The fall came after the original customs had been relaxed." ¹²

Like claims are made for inbreeding among the ancient Hebrews. Hastings' *Dictionary Of The Bible* says that "the Hebrews [of the Old Testament] were strongly endogamous, marrying within the nation." Moreover, Abraham is said to have "married his half-sister [Sarah]" (Gen. 20:12), and Jacob to have married his first cousins Rachel and Leah (Gen. 24). But it is doubtful that much should be made of this, since many scholars are inclined to believe that the stories of the Patriarchs are only personalized records of traditions as to the origins of the Hebrew tribes. More convincing evidence of incestuous practice among the people is to be found in 2 Sam. 13:13 and Ezek. 22:11. It is not improbable that when, centuries later, the priests came to edit the old historic records, they colored them with their own bitter antagonism to marriages with the hated gentiles (non-Hebrews), as in Gen. 25:34, 27:46 to 28:1ff. Yet from very early times, there was strong and sustained opposition, conceived as enjoined by Jehovah, to all marriages with aliens. (Cp. Gen. 24 and 34; Numb. 12:1 and Ch. 25.) The point of view in Judges 14:3 is that the best marriage is with a woman taken from "among the daughters of thy brethren." Hostility to marriage with outsiders was intensified during the subsequent period of priestly domination. (But the evidence that I have submitted shows that this hostility was *not* then *initiated*, but, contrary to what Dr. Oscar Levy undertook to maintain in letters to me during the last year of his life, dated back to very early times.) Jubilees 30 forbade them absolutely: they were "fornication." Jewish strictness in this respect was notorious. (Tacitus—*History* V.5, Acts 10:28.) It is interesting to note that, according to Westermarck, even "now the proportion of mixed to pure marriages among the

Jews is about 1 to 500.”¹³ We may remark in passing, too, that according to Hastings, “Cousin marriages among the Jews are said to occur now three times more often than among other civilized people.”¹⁴ Sir Richard Burton says that similar customs have always prevailed among the Arabs.¹⁵

The most interesting and startling record of inbreeding, however, comes from the Incas and the ancient Egyptians, and here it reached the closest degrees possible—father with daughter, son with mother, brother with sister. Professor East conjectures that the object was to prevent the debasement of the royal line with ignoble blood,¹⁶ but probably the real object will never be surely known. The facts, however, are “certain and indisputable.” Maspero says, “A union of father and daughter . . . was perhaps not wholly forbidden, and that of brother and sister seems to have been regarded as perfectly right and natural; the words *brother* and *sister* possessing in Egyptian love-songs the same significance as lover and mistress with us.”¹⁷ Sir James Frazer speaks of “the marriage of full brothers with full sisters” as the “most remarkable feature in the social system of the ancient Egyptians,” and adds that in the eyes of the Egyptians “marriage between brother and sister was the best of marriages, and it acquired an ineffable degree of sanctity when the brother and sister who contracted it were themselves born of a brother and sister, who had in their turn also sprung from a union of the same sort.”¹⁸ And Miss R.E. White, writing on woman in Ptolemaic Egypt, says that the principle did not “apply only to gods and kings: the common people acted on it in their daily life. They regarded marriages between brother and sister as the most natural and reasonable of all . . . such unions were the rule, not the exception, in ancient Egypt, and . . . continued to form the majority of marriages long after the Romans had obtained a firm footing in the country.”¹⁹ As far as I have discovered all the recognized authorities on ancient Egypt are agreed about these incestuous marriages.²⁰

The fullest summary of the facts is to be found in Ludovici’s *The Choicæ Of A Mate*²¹ and in an article entitled “Should Cousins Marry?” by the well known eugenist Paul P. Popenoe.²² Marriages of royal brother and sister are found at least as far back as the Fourth Dynasty, and they are known to have occurred in the XIIth and XIIIth dynasties, and in every dynasty from the XVIIth through the XXIst. Popenoe says, “The eighteenth dynasty, which ruled Egypt in the sixteenth, fifteenth and fourteenth centuries before Christ, probably represented as high a point as the power of the country ever reached.” It was marked not only by the consolidation of the state and the extension of empire, but also by a great development of the pursuits of peace, including the fine arts. In this period we have no less than seven cases of brother-sister marriages on the part of rulers. One of them resulted in Egypt’s greatest queen. From another sprang Thutmose III, of whom Breasted says,

“His character stands forth with more color and individuality than that of any king of early Egypt except Ikhnoton. We see the man of a tireless energy unknown in any Pharaoh before or since. . . His reign marks an epoch not only in Egypt but in the whole east as we know it in his age. Never before in history had a single brain wielded the resources of so great a nation and wrought them into such centralized, permanent and at the same time mobile efficiency. . . He built the first real empire, and is thus the first character possessed of universal aspects, the first world hero.”²³

And yet, according to Popenoe, this man of such versatile genius and stupendous energy “was the product of five unbroken generations of brother-sister marriages.”²⁴

Sir Marc Armand Ruffer concludes his study of the physical effects of consanguineous marriages in the royal families of Egypt in the XVIIIth dynasty in these words:

“There is no evidence to show that idiocy, deaf-mutism, or other diseases generally attributed to consanguineous marriages, ever occurred among the members of this dynasty, and as far as can be ascertained from mummified bodies, masks and statues, the features of both men and women were fine, distinguished and handsome . . . The result of this inquiry is that a royal family, in which consanguineous marriage was the rule, produced nine distinguished rulers . . . There is no evidence that the physical characteristics or mental power of the family were unfavourably influenced by the repeated consanguineous marriages.”²⁵

In the XIXth and XXth dynasties, which Briffault calls “the golden age of the Egyptian monarchy,” he says that “every king of the former [married] his sister as the lawful mother of the heir to the throne.” And he concludes, “Yet the race that produced Seti and Ramses affords no evidence of degeneration, nor does there exist in the age-long records of by far the longest line of kings in the world’s history, among whom not mere inbreeding, but actual incest was a fundamental and immemorial principle, any fact that can lend support to the doctrine of the evil results of inbreeding.”²⁶

Popenoe and Ludovici carry the story through the Ptolemies, down to the time of Julius Caesar. And Briffault agrees with them that though the Ptolemies may have been profligate and monstrous, they certainly were not lacking in physical and mental energy, and that they were no more degenerate than many of the great characters of the magnificent Italian Renaissance.²⁷ This record of the Egyptians is of the utmost significance, since it is universally recognized that they produced one of the greatest and longest-lasting cultures known, and some authorities have even believed that all the other cultures of the entire Earth had their origin in, and spread from, Egypt.²⁸

From this brief survey of the historic record in regard to human inbreeding, more especially as it affects our own cultural past, let us turn now to see what science has discovered that will explain these well-established facts. The problem really did not admit of any solution until approached with a thorough equipment of Mendelian genetics. Then, however, this refractory block fell apart, so openly revealing its long-locked secrets that there is now (so far as I have been able to ascertain) practically universal agreement as to the principles involved.²⁹ This very significant result was reached about 1915.³⁰ Several thorough experiments had been pointing to the eventual resolution of the problem. “The work of Castle and his pupils on the fruit fly *Drosophila* showed that brother and sister matings could be carried on for 59 generations without loss of fertility. . . Moenkhaus found that within a closely inbred strain of *Drosophila*, fertility could be increased as well as decreased by selective breeding. Some of the lines were inbred (brother and sister) for 75 generations without loss of fertility or vigor.” The experiments of Shultze, Copeman, and Parsons on mice, and of Castle on rats, yielded the same results. A more thorough investigation by Miss H.D. King, with albino rats, disclosing “several sources of error that have to be guarded

against in a study of inbreeding and which not improbably misled some previous investigators of the subject," showed that "twenty-five generations of such close inbreeding as brother and sister matings did not produce any loss in the vigor, growth, or fertility of the inbred strains as compared with the controls."³¹

The most extensive investigation of inbreeding, however, and apparently the one that proved conclusive, was the series of experiments with maize that was begun by Professor East in 1905 at the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station and that was still being carried on by Professor D.F. Jones in 1919. They chose maize because, being self-fertilizing, it admitted of inbreeding even closer than that represented by the mating of parent and offspring or brother and sister in animals or humans. The object they set before themselves was to determine "whether inbreeding is injurious merely by reason of the consanguinity." The significance of this experiment requires that it be described in some detail.³²

Professors East and Jones began by self-pollinating individual plants from different varieties of all the principal types of maize. The seed from these pollinations yielded plants of the greatest diversity. For instance, they bore ears of every sort of size, shape, and condition. Some were incapable of producing seed, or of producing seed that would germinate. Moreover, for some reason apparently more or less peculiar to maize,³³ there was even great reduction both in size of plant and in yield. (Though it should at once be added that the rate of reduction diminished as the inbreeding was continued, until it finally ceased altogether; and that the original size and vigor could at any time be recovered, and often even exceeded, by a single crossing of inbred plants.) If judgment had been passed at this time, therefore, it would have been necessary to say that the results of inbreeding were most emphatically injurious, not to say disastrous. But the experimenters persisted, repeating the self-pollination of individual plants for twelve generations. It is to be noted well, however, for it is highly important, that beginning with the first generation and continuing to the end, they always threw away the seed of the defective plants and used only the best. It was soon observed that the proportion of defectives was growing smaller and smaller with each generation, until at the last they had seed, every grain of which from every plant was free from any sort of abnormality, and could be counted upon to breed true to type. In commenting on the results of their experiments the authors state that they wish to "emphasize" the fact that the inbred plants "are normal and healthy. No actual degeneration has occurred. The monstrosities that are common in every field of maize, such as the occurrence of seeds in the tassels, anthers in the ears, dwarf plants, completely sterile plants, and other similar anomalies [such as misshapen ears with crooked rows] . . . no longer occur in these inbred strains."³⁴

We now come to the interpretation and significance of these results. Professors East and Jones are unequivocal about the answer to the inquiry that they set before themselves: inbreeding is positively not injurious "by reason of the consanguinity." "The only injury proceeding from inbreeding," they say, "comes from the inheritance received. . . If undesirable characters are shown after inbreeding, it is only because they already existed in the stock and were able to persist for generations under the protection of more favorable characters which dominated them and kept them out of sight. . . If the evil is brought to light, inbreeding is no more to be blamed than the detective who unearths a crime. Instead of being condemned, it should be commended. After continued inbreeding [with the

discarding of undesirables] a cross-bred stock has been purified and rid of abnormalities, monstrosities, and serious weakness of all kinds. Only those characters can remain which either are favorable or at least are not definitely harmful to the organism.”³⁵

They say further, “When linked with Mendelian phenomena it was clearly recognized for the first time that one and the same principle was involved in the effects of inbreeding and the directly opposite effects of outbreeding. Inbreeding was not a process of continuous degeneration. Injurious results, if present, were due to the segregation of characters.”³⁶ That is, if defectiveness was inherent in the stocks of which male and female were brought together, inbreeding would bring it out. It would bring it out because when individuals of like hereditary endowment are brought together (as happens in inbreeding), you tend to get a double dose of whatever hereditary determinants came down out of the ancestry, and this double dose tends to force them into manifestation, whether it be of defectiveness or of superiority. If the individuals mated are of identical hereditary endowment, they are *bound* to get such a double dose. In the case of outbreeding, however, where they are of unlike hereditary constitution, a determinant (or gene) of defectiveness from one parent is much more likely to be combined with a determinant from the other parent which is against defectiveness; and if the latter is a dominant it will prevent the defectiveness from making an appearance, even though the offspring may *carry* this recessive determinant in his germ plasm and transmit it to *his* offspring. So that if, when this offspring marries, this determinant for defectiveness finds a like recessive for defectiveness in his mate, the double dose will cause it to appear in *their* offspring even though it may not have appeared in either of the parents. *Inbreeding only tends to isolate, to bring out in individual offspring, and thus to uncover, whatever qualities and capacities are latent in the ancestry.* If defectiveness is not in the stock, inbreeding *cannot* bring it out.³⁷ If the stock is marked by superiority, inbreeding must tend to result in individuals in whom superiority is concentrated. “It is not to be wondered, therefore,” East and Jones comment “that examination of the pedigree records of one family led to one conclusion, and of another family to exactly the opposite.”

This verdict is confirmed by every qualified investigator of inbreeding that I have come across. Some of these I cannot forbear to quote, partly for their authority, partly for their illumination of the subject.

Dr. Knight Dunlap of Johns Hopkins and Dr. Robert Briffault are unequivocal.^{38,39} Dr. Crew says, “Inbreeding is only disastrous if the ingredients of disaster are already in the stock.”⁴⁰ And again, “The records of the breeds of domesticated animals show that close inbreeding of a sound stock, *if associated with intelligent elimination of the weakly and abnormal*, can be practiced for many generations without any undesirable consequences.”⁴¹ (Emphasis added.) Professor Castle says, “Continuous crossing only tends to hide inherent defects, not to exterminate them, and inbreeding only tends to bring them to the surface, not to create them.”⁴² Professor Samuel J. Holmes writes, “If the parents are free from recessive defects, inbreeding produces no bad results.”⁴³ And again, “Inbreeding does not cause defect; it simply brings out latent defect when it occurs in both parents. Whether or not inbreeding is followed by inferior progeny depends, therefore, upon the composition of the germ plasm of the inbred stock. If the stock is good it not only produces no degeneracy, but affords a means of perpetuating valuable qualities, and it becomes especially useful when the desired qualities are recessive.”⁴⁴ He adds that studies have shown that “in no one instance could

healthy consanguinity be regarded as a cause of idiocy, epilepsy, or insanity.”⁴⁵ Even Otto Klineberg says, “If a brother and a sister have absolutely no flaws in their genetic constitution, there is no reason why they should not have perfectly normal, healthy offspring.”⁴⁶

Quotations from authorities might easily be multiplied, but enough have been submitted to make it clear that scientific investigation of inbreeding has so completely altered its position that it can no longer be regarded by intelligent and informed people as the bogey it was to all men for long centuries. It is now known beyond question that in itself it is harmless in its effects on offspring, that it does not add any evil to the evil in the ancestry, and that the taboo against it is without rational foundation.

It is important, next, that we inquire what may be the practical value of inbreeding. To a considerable extent the answer to this question has been implicit, if not plainly stated, in the material already presented. But it will be worthwhile to have it restated and sharpened.

Inbreeding is of value to him who is concerned about quality of life, whether it be in plant, animal, or man. Darwin, of course, had no help from genetics, but he was very much interested in the problem of inbreeding and was a very acute observer, so that it is of considerable significance that, despite all the uncertainty and drawbacks under which in his time inbreeding was supposed to operate, he should nevertheless have said, “It should . . . be clearly understood that the advantage of close inbreeding, *as far as the retention of character is concerned*, is indispensable and often outweighs the evil of a slight loss in constitutional vigor.”⁴⁷ (Emphasis added)

Inbreeding serves to improve character or quality in two ways: negatively and positively. Negatively, *it is the quickest and surest means known for bringing all latent defects to the surface, and so providing the opportunity for their detection and elimination*. It must, however, be clearly recognized, *and very strongly emphasized*, that *upon this elimination of defectives the negative value of inbreeding absolutely depends*. As Ludovici points out so unequivocally, “All inbreeding . . . , to be successful, must be attended with the most ruthless selection.”⁴⁸

As to the positive side, we may again quote East and Jones, who say, “The value of inbreeding in plant and animal improvement in the past may be summed up in the statement that it is the greatest single agency in bringing about uniformity and the concentration of desired qualities”;⁴⁹ or Dr. Crew, who declares that “some degree of ‘narrow’ breeding is essential for progressive improvement leading to production of a uniform and true-breeding stock.”⁵⁰ Dr. Popenoe reminds us that “every great breed of livestock has been built up on continued and intensive inbreeding, the mating of brother and sister, of father and daughter, of father and granddaughter. Thus the desired qualities came to be more and more concentrated.”⁵¹ Again, “the principle of the pure line has been firmly established by an ever-increasing body of evidence, and is of the utmost importance in a proper understanding of the facts involved in inbreeding and outbreeding.”⁵² Even to reap the fruits of cross-breeding, this principle is of the highest importance, for, as we shall see later, cross-breeding yields its most significant results only when the stocks to be crossed have previously been purified by inbreeding.

It is worthwhile to quote the summary of Ludovici, who so constantly weighs everything for its value to human life. "Inbreeding," he says, "canalizes and isolates health and other desirable qualities, just as it canalizes and isolates ill-health and other undesirable qualities. It stabilizes the germ plasm, and this causes hereditary factors to be calculable. It therefore makes appearance a guide to the individual's hereditary equipment. . . . it acts as a purifier of a stock or family."⁵³

That inbreeding has its limitations and drawbacks, let it be allowed. It has no power of itself to create any qualities, good or bad. It can at most only bring out and intensify the qualities already inherent in the two hereditary endowments it brings together. To be of the greatest value, these endowments must have been enriched with a genetic diversity (or range and variety of qualities and capacities) such as can be obtained only by a measure of judicious crossing. Also, I think it should be recognized that some of the foremost authorities seem to maintain that one of "the principal effects of inbreeding both in animals and plants [is] . . . a usual, but not inevitable, decline in general vigor." This is from Dr. Crew, in his compendium on genetics entitled *Heredity*.⁵⁴ It would seem, however, that this needs to be amplified by what he says on pages 94 and 95 of his *Organic Inheritance In Man*.⁵⁵ Here we find that "it has been demonstrated" that inbreeding of rats, mated brother to sister for twenty-five generations, with rigorous selection, "does not necessarily produce any adverse effects." On the other hand, another experiment "involving about 30,000 guinea-pigs" and carried on for "23 generations of the closest inbreeding," "revealed that the average effect of inbreeding was the production of a decline in all elements of vigour." At first glance this looks bad for inbreeding, and seems to contradict his preceding statement. But as one reads on, one discovers that in the former experiment the results were gauged after "rigorous selection," whereas the observation on the second experience rated the "average" result—i.e., *without* selection. Most of the lines in the second experiment, Dr. Crew says, were so full of determinants unfavorable to health and even to life, that, when inbred, they soon became extinct. But there were one or two that "compared very favourably indeed with the original stock." For to the original vigor of the stock had been added the genetic dependability and concentration of capacity that resulted from inbreeding. And thus is laid the foundation for the considered conclusion of East and Jones that "homozygosity [a like hereditary endowment, such as is produced by inbreeding when accompanied with rigorous elimination of defectives], when obtained with the combination of all the most favorable characters, is the most effective condition for the purpose of growth and reproduction,"⁵⁶ and for that of Dr. Fritz Lenz that "the healthy offspring of parents who are related have therefore far better hereditary prospects than the offspring of unrelated parents."⁵⁷

But we must now examine the facts in regard to outbreeding or cross-breeding, though this need not detain us as long, since it has been less misunderstood.

What outbreeding is, we already have seen. The values that are claimed for it are chiefly two. In the first place, it is a means by which to widen and enrich the hereditary endowment of character combinations, which later inbreeding may be called upon to isolate.⁵⁸ Needless to say, this is a matter of primary importance. What inbreeding will be able to concentrate, to stabilize, and to bring out must depend upon what outbreeding has put in.

In the second place, we must consider the phenomenon known as heterosis, or hybrid vigor. This is a phenomenon due to the pooling of the hereditary resources of the two parents. Any deficiencies in one parent may be offset and cancelled out by the excellencies in the other; and the good in one may be intensified by a like good in the other. Hybrid vigor is based on the unlike hereditary endowment brought together in a cross.⁵⁹

Very early in the history of animal husbandry, breeders discovered that the *first* crosses of purebred farm animals commonly exhibited a superiority over either of their parents in strength, fecundity, and general constitutional vigor, and in size above the *average* of the parents but not always above that of both parents. Crossing in plants showed like results.⁶⁰ Because of the advantage of size in animals to be raised for meat, steers intended for the butcher are usually crossbred. It must be noted well, however, that this hybrid vigor does not by any means follow upon any and every cross. But the fact that it happens often is probably responsible for the superstition in favor of crossbreeding that has taken root and made a rank growth in the midst of our mongrel-admiring populace. Because crossing has been found advantageous to the producers of animals for meat, it has been assumed that science had issued a mandate for the indiscriminate mixing of human stocks. The truth is, scientific research has proved as damaging to this prejudice as it has to the taboo against inbreeding. Certain facts are now established. A few quotations should make these clear.

1. Hybrid vigor is a phenomenon only of crosses between *inbred* stocks. "In order to obtain it in any degree, it is essential that the two parents shall be unrelated, purebred. . . that the individuals used for the production of the first cross shall be as excellent as may be and that the good qualities of the two shall be, as far as possible, complementary." "Without the purebred, there cannot be the cross-bred of any worth." "Since for the production of hybrid vigour the qualities of the two parties must be compensatory and complementary, it follows that all matings cannot be expected to yield it and that some may end in disaster." This, I would advise you, is from Dr. Crew, who, among other things, was Director of the Animal Breeding Research Department of the University of Edinburgh.⁶¹ But Dr. Crew has more to say on this subject.

2. "Hybrid vigour," when it does occur, "is the peculiar possession of the first cross." "Further crossing of these hybrids results in a manifest decrease of vigour in subsequent generations. The second crosses are not so vigorous as their hybrid parents." ⁶² To recover hybrid vigor you have to begin again, with another cross of pure-breds. That is, "The first cross, deliberately bred for a definite commercial purpose, must not be used for further breeding." It cannot pass on even its own size and vigor, let alone the particular excellencies concentrated and stabilized in its parents. For breeding it is worthless. The most successful animal breeders knew this even in Darwin's time.⁶³

3. "Hybrid vigour, as great as that which results from the crossing of different species or breeds, can follow the crossing of individuals from different families or strains of one and the same variety or breed. The breeder who keeps his family lines distinct can, by appropriate matings, secure all the hybrid vigour he seeks, without calling on the aid of other stocks." ⁶⁴ This would seem just about to reduce outbreeding to a function of inbreeding.

But outbreeding is subject to other dangers and limitations. I can take the space, however, to mention only two. One of these is reversion. Ludovici calls attention to the fact that in many different species, such as pigeons, ducks, horses, rabbits, cattle, pigs, and the like, outbreeding often leads to reversion, that "the crossing of cultivated stocks invariably produces throw-backs to a stage much earlier in the history of the race." He bases this on well-known experiments with pigeons made by Darwin, who took individuals from two long-established varieties that usually bred true, and crossed them. All of the young showed the "characters of the wild rock pigeon, the common ancestor of all pigeons." They had lost many of the distinctive characters of both their parents. Other experiments of Darwin and the later experiments of more recent investigators showed similar phenomena of reversion, that is, of degeneration, the loss of the specific differentiations by which all superiority is marked and maintained. It is evolution *in reverse*.⁶⁵

The last danger implicit in outbreeding to which I shall call my reader's attention here, is the anatomic and functional disharmonies likely to appear in hybrids. This is based upon the apparent fact that different parts of the bodies of different individuals vary considerably in size, and that hereditary factors determining the size of each bodily part are transmitted to the offspring independently. In consequence, the offspring may, for example, get a body with a heart or other organs too small to do the work forced upon them, or legs or arms that are either too long or too short for the trunk to which they are attached. The result is an organism that can only with difficulty function as a whole. At the least, health is impaired, efficiency diminished, and beauty, which is largely a matter of symmetry, plus vigor and ease of function, is lost.

As yet, we must allow, there is not a complete consensus among first-rank geneticists in regard to this matter. Castle, for instance, on the basis of an experiment that he made with rabbits, is much quoted for his inability to find "certain evidence of factors independently influencing the size of particular organs." Other men, however, have an answer to Castle. And we are left with a not unimpressive array of some of the foremost authorities who posit the independent inheritance of bodily parts as established fact. I think particularly of Crew, Gates, Mjoen, Davenport, Lundborg, and Holmes.⁶⁶ It is necessary to quote some of their pronouncements.

Gates says, "Physical disharmonies result [from crossing], such as the fitting of large teeth into small jaws, or serious malocclusion of the upper and lower jaw; of, as Davenport points out, large men with small internal organs or inadequate circulatory systems, or other disharmonies, which tax the adjustability of the organism or may lead to early death."⁶⁷ (Dr. Gates' reply to Dr. Castle may be found in the same work from which this passage is quoted, p. 329. The reply of Dr. Holmes will be found in his *Human Genetics And Its Social Import*, p. 351ff.)

Professor Charles B. Davenport concluded, on the basis of the study that he and Dr. Morris Steggerda made of race crossing in Jamaica, "That there is evidence of physical, mental and instinct disorders in hybrids."⁶⁸

Dr. Holmes, who is characteristically cautious on this point, goes so far as to say,

"It seems probable, *a priori*, that, on account of the Mendelian segregation in the second and subsequent generations, the mingling of very distinct races would result in many inharmonious combinations. Each race may be assumed to have evolved in the course of time a fairly well adjusted combination of organs. If the members are tall or short, the proportions between the lengths of legs, arms, breadths of shoulders and sizes of other parts would be much the same in each race. Insofar as these traits are inherited as Mendelian units, one might find in the second generation combinations of long legs and short arms, or various other associations of parts which would detract from the general effectiveness of the whole. . . 'Nothing is more striking,' says Davenport, 'than the regular dental arcades commonly seen in the skulls of inbred native races and the irregular dentitions of many children of the tremendously hybridized Americans.' In Davenport's opinion, 'A hybridized people are a badly put together people.' " In conclusion, Holmes says, "The fact that Mendelian segregation is expressed somatically at all would seem to make it very probable that it would sometimes lead to unfavorable combinations of characteristics." ⁶⁹

I will add the word of one more authority, one of the greatest, whom we already have had occasion to quote so often. Dr. Crew says,

"The fact that there are inherited differences in the size of the organs and parts is of profound significance when it is remembered that it involves the inevitable sequel that racial and other crossing can lead to serious disharmony. That orthodontia is now a well-developed and important branch of dentistry is an indication that such disharmony exists, and there is every reason to hold that this is the result of the mating of different true-breeding types. Disharmony between teeth and jaws, between size of body and size of some important organ or organs, disharmony among the various components of the endocrine chain, this can result from ill-advised interracial crossing. Such a disharmony is commonly displayed in difficult labour caused by disproportion in the sizes of the passenger and of the maternal passages. The Nordics have the broadest pelves, the Negroid races the smallest, and though in the same race the sizes of the foetal head and of the pelvic outlet are in harmony one with the other, in racial crosses this harmony is disturbed." ⁷⁰

Dr. Weston A. Price, in his *Nutrition And Physical Degeneration*,⁷¹ dismisses race-crossing as a cause of malocclusion of the jaws and other abnormalities, and undertakes to explain them all by malnutrition. But though I, too, am convinced that such abnormalities may result from the prolonged eating of food that lacks the elements essential to growth and to the maintenance of health, I am nevertheless forced to believe that they are caused as well by unwise racial crosses.

Ludovici has brought to my attention a paragraph from Herbert Spencer, which, though written in 1874, may fittingly conclude what I have to say as to the dangers of indiscriminate cross-breeding. "An unmixed constitution," he says "is one in which all the organs are exactly fitted to each other—are perfectly balanced: the system as a whole is in stable equilibrium. A mixed constitution, on the contrary, being made up of organs belonging to separate sets, cannot have them in exact fitness—cannot have them perfectly balanced; and a system in comparatively unstable equilibrium results . . . the offspring of two organisms not identical in constitution is a heterogeneous mixture of the two, and not a homogeneous mean between them." ⁷²

In a country like ours, whose matings are greatly influenced by the belief in indiscriminate crossing, the cult of the mongrel, marriage must result in a very large proportion of offspring with such a confused, divided, discordant genetic constitution as Spencer describes. One can but wonder whether this condition must not to a considerable extent account for the jumble of ill-assorted bodily parts so manifest about us, and also for many of the obscure elusive ailments of body and mind with which our population is plagued.

We have come now to the point where we need to evaluate inbreeding and outbreeding as means for elevating the life of man. Much of the data that we have gathered thus far has been drawn from experiments with plants and animals, but from the beginning our own primary concern has been with man, and, as we know, "the laws of inheritance. . . apply with equal force to all kinds of living things."⁷³ Conclusions based on observation of other organisms must have considerable bearing on human life as well. If we now try to gather together and hold before our minds all the factual knowledge, scientific and historical, which I have passed in review in this chapter, what are we constrained to think in regard to inbreeding and outbreeding as agencies for advancing the life of man?

In the first place, we must recognize that both are necessary, that each has a place. But with a view both to the most robust health of the individual and to the attainment of that homogeneity of a people upon which, in the fiery test of a desperate crisis, its very life may ultimately depend, I believe that the *rule* should be: *Inbreed*, but occasionally freshen and broaden the base of your stock by a cross with a stock not too dissimilar.

This certainly seems to be the course to be followed with animals. Crew says, "The secret of successful breeding is to keep on improving the pure breeds by selection, and, in order to achieve certain results, to cross but only with discretion."⁷⁴

Ludovici, whose work *The Choice of a Mate* is the most monumental and impressive presentation of this subject of which I know,⁷⁵ has drawn a like conclusion for humans. He stresses the necessity to inbreed. His cry to us is: *Marry your like*.

This may not fly as much in the face of our tradition and usual practice as at first we may think. There is reason to believe that it is a law of Nature for like to choose like. In any case, there is impressive evidence that, to a considerable extent, like *does* choose like. Dr. Holmes says that "all studies of the way in which marriage selection works out in practice show that, contrary to a frequently expressed opinion, like tends to marry like. Pearson has shown that the tall tends to mate with the tall, the short with the short, the intellectual with the intellectual, and even the tuberculous with the tuberculous."⁷⁶

Moreover, Ludovici does not stand alone in advocating, for the sake of the highest life both of individuals and of a people, that like should marry like. Many of the authorities seem not to have committed themselves publicly, but some of the foremost among them stand with him unequivocally, and in so doing they only follow the path indicated by the scientific findings to which all of them subscribe.

For instance, Professors East and Jones have said, "Inbreeding is the surest means of establishing families which as a whole are of high value to the community."⁷⁷

Dr. Fritz Lenz has said, "Really healthy and efficient families are too valuable to be mixed with the sick and morbid; they ought, therefore, as far as possible, to intermarry among themselves, as ought also the less desirable." ⁷⁸

Professor Knight Dunlap has said, "It is now well known that inbreeding has in itself no evil effects . . . Instead of inbreeding being a racial evil, it may be a distinctly valuable means of progress. Strong strains are thereby conserved, and weaknesses in other strains are brought to the surface, so that they may be recognized and eliminated . . . For the welfare of the race therefore, like should be encouraged to mate with like, especially insofar as weaknesses are concerned, and inbreeding, insofar as there is no encouragement to incest, should have the ban against it removed . . . there is little reason, in America, in discouraging the marriage of first cousins." ⁷⁹ Dr. Popenoe has declared that "laws prohibiting cousin marriage . . . are not scientifically well based. They are not needed, and should be removed from the statute books." ⁸⁰

Dr. Crew has gone so far as to say, "Inbreeding is only disastrous if the ingredients of disaster are already in the stock. Inbreeding will purify a stock but the process may be most expensive. It would seem to be a fact, sufficiently secure for the foundation of sociological practice, that incest between individuals of undoubtedly sound stock . . . is a sound biological proposition." But he stresses the necessity of "full and accurate knowledge of the hereditary constitutions of the individuals concerned," before any given marriage is contracted or approved.⁸¹

I know full well that the general current of modern thought is *against* the judgment of these authorities. Nevertheless, after years of fairly thorough study of this problem, with careful weighing of pros and cons, I anticipate that gradually, as scientists gather the courage to apply their own findings to human life, and as men of all sorts increase in their knowledge of the means by which this can best be done, there must come to be a consensus in which scientists, philosophers, statesmen, and men of that ultimate wisdom about life, which we hardly know today, but whom we might call seers, shall unite in impressing upon the whole people the necessity of marrying their like.

That the advocacy of inbreeding among men raises problems of the utmost gravity, I should be among the first to allow. But as far as I can see, these are only the problems, in a sharpened form, with which any people has got to come to grips if it is not to surrender itself to degeneration and disaster. To my mind, the sooner we get at it the better. These problems, however, I wish to leave for discussion in my next, and final, section.

Inbreeding also bears upon the problem of race-crossing. But I wish to leave this to my chapter on race, which will follow this. For the present, I limit myself to the problems of human mating without this complication.

We are now ready to turn to our next section, which will be devoted to an investigation of the reasonable and practical measures imposed upon any people that would lift its life to the heights. I do not mean to imply that these alone would suffice. They would need to be supplemented with a firm and consistent environmental influence by which the people

would be impressed, over a long period, with the same values. But they could not be omitted. There can be no superstructure without a sound biological foundation.

V. MEANS

The attainment of any great end in life imposes stern limitations. This is no more true for a man than it is for a nation. The ultimate test of any people is whether or not it has the health, and the excess and reserve and peculiar strength, necessary to achieve greatness. But the *primary* test that it must face is whether it is strong enough to survive. And even the minimal goal fixes narrow necessities. For its very existence, there are certain things that a people must do, and there are certain other things that it must *not* do.

“The one searing human question which needs immediate answer,” cried Dr. Hooton on the first page of his *Apes, Men and Morons*,⁸² “is . . . What is the matter with man? All the social doctors are fussing with the irrelevant secondary symptoms of an undiagnosed human degeneracy.” He does not say this with the whole world in mind. He says it with Western Europe in mind, and with the United States in mind. He says it having in mind the state of America as indicated in my last chapter—the staggering burden of physical, mental, and moral defectives; and the differential birth rate by which the country is fast becoming a mob, and rule passing into the hands of mediocrities. We are *sick*. And we are sick at a time when peoples of unspoiled vitality, who hate the White man, and have reason for hating him, are pressing upon us from every side. We have taught them our technics, and they have the numerical strength and are fast acquiring the skill, to drive what are really our own weapons harder and farther and deeper than we can. We are in this plight—that is, we are degenerate, in great part because we have neglected the biological foundations without which no people’s life can long be maintained.

Some people may smile at this, and exclaim, “Extremist! Alarmist! Are not we the richest, comfortablest, and strongest people on Earth—at least, we in the United States? Is not our infant death rate decreasing and our average span of life lengthening? Do not our planes start on time and all our push buttons work marvels? Where is our decadence?” But their very complacency is evidence of their decadence. Failure to sense danger in things that menace our life is unmistakable evidence of decadence, evidence that our racial force has ebbed, that if we go on as we are, we are fated to go under in that struggle for a place in the sun that is inescapable, unremitting, and relentless. And if we refuse to recognize such struggle as necessary, as an inextricable feature of life itself, and fancy in time to reform it, then we only reveal our decadence from yet another angle. We reveal that we lack the stamina to take life as it is. We bury our heads under our “ideals” and from this cover whisper pretty words. But in reality we are beaten. The stuff has gone out of us. And presently the whirlwind of life will pick us up and blow us away.

I have said that if a people is to climb the heights of greatness, if it is even to survive, then there are certain things that it must do, and there are certain things that it must *not* do. I should like to take up the negative first.

What I want to say from the negative side can be summed up in the single word *selection*. With any great end in view it is quite impossible to regard all one’s material as of equal

worth. No one could get anything fit to be called a garden who tried to save every plant that came up. The weeds have to be cut down, and even of the plants in our rows we must thin out all but the best. Again, every organism sifts the elements that it takes in as food. Whatever will make for growth and health is distributed throughout the body to meet its need. But what cannot be assimilated is rejected and thrown out. And *every organism that fails to excrete its waste products, dies!* This is not a law of man, but a law of Nature. And biological sin is never forgiven, and no organism is excepted. It holds for every individual, for every species, for man as surely as for animal, and even for what we may think of as the body of a society, of a people. In the wild the waste products of every species, its deformed and defective ones, are soon struck down by Nature, with rough and bloody hand. But under the conditions of our modern civilization, natural selection tends to be frustrated. Those whom Nature would mercilessly strike down, we dutifully load upon our backs, by the million, and feed them, clothe them, house them, and doctor and nurse them, until they die. And we think highly of ourselves for so doing. We pronounce ourselves enlightened, humane, and civilized. But Nature looks at our performance with a different eye. The whole system of our society, and every organ and every cell in it, she sees clogged, overtaxed and poisoned by the long accumulating festering mass of our uneliminated human waste products. She does not say anything. She makes no plea. Apparently, it is nothing to her if it is not discovered in time what she is up to. But those who have observed her at her work, wherever there is any life, know what is in her heart. *Any living thing that does not excrete its waste products dies.* There is no argument here. The only question is whether we are to leave the selection to Nature or undertake it ourselves. It is my own conviction that if we undertake it ourselves, we can accomplish the same end, but more humanely, less wastefully, and with more certainty of reaching a humanly desirable goal.

In a country like the United States, any such proposal could count on plenty of opposition. There would be those who would deem its severity unnecessary, assuming that defective stock was susceptible of improvement. But there is no way known by which hereditarily defective stock can be improved by changes in environment, such as better food, or housing, or education.⁸³ It can be improved only by getting rid of the defective genes, and that means preventing reproduction on the part of those who carry these genes in their germ-plasm. On the other hand, the very existence of our defective stock in our midst is a burden and a menace to all superior stock, steadily depressing its birthrate by the load it has to carry. And when superior stock begins to die out, as is happening today, we no more know how to replace the superior than we know how to lift the inferior. Ineluctably, one lives at the expense of the other. When seen in this light, there can be no doubt about our answer. Shall the whole be sacrificed to the part, or the higher to the lower? Any man of sound mind and clear insight knows that this *must not be*.

More emotional elements would leap to the fight against any serious effort to get rid of our defectives. The church people would be there, with their belief that all men, however broken, are reflections of God, and that therefore everything that can breathe is of infinite worth. The champions of democracy would be there, with their belief in equality and their fierce rejection of any effort to discriminate against some in favor of others. The humanitarians would be there, with their "Blessed are the merciful," with their doctrine that the strong should bear the burdens of the weak, and that the highest morality and the most beautiful life is that of him who makes himself equal with the lowest and does unto others as

he would have them do unto him. Viewed in this light, the individual man, regardless of who or what he is, becomes of such absolute importance that he believes that he should not be sacrificed for anybody or for anything. No matter how defective, or vicious, or misshapen or crazed, his vanity has become so swollen by our altruism and by all our talk of equality that, if he can think at all, he thinks that he has as much right to life as anyone else: and if he cannot carry his own load he expects the well-constituted to carry him, and to wait upon him, until he dies. Worst of all, it is precisely the "good man" among us, precisely the man who feels that he is "following the Master," who is looked up to everywhere as an example and sets the pace for the adoring throng.

There is an answer to every one of the claims and arguments of all these humanitarians and protagonists of Christianity and democracy. And if there were space and if I were in a different mood, then I might undertake to give it, point for point. Some of the claims advanced may be sincere enough, but even when sincere they are evidence of *decadence*. And often they are not even sincere. Our vaunted belief in the infinite value of each individual life, for instance, vanishes into thin air when we develop a delight in driving our man-killing automobiles with their 120-mile-an-hour speedometers fastened to the dashboards of the cheapest of them, or support the strategy of massacring Germans by the cityful, or choose to drop atomic bombs on the unsuspecting men, women and children of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Indeed, it has been laid against us that "we have grown so callous to such things that . . . the only taking of life to which Americans object is that which is done by judicial process."⁸⁴

But my evaluation of all these claims and arguments compels me to give them short shrift. In any elevated perspective upon the situation that we are considering, a man of balanced mind can see clearly that there is one thing that stands out above all else; *our human wreckage must go*. It is an Either-Or. Either our wreckage goes, or quality of life among us goes, and then we ourselves go, as our society decays towards its inevitable death. In the interest of life, some must be sacrificed. An easy-going indulgence toward all is stupidity or weakness. The absolute necessity of sacrifice exists in any society and in any age. In the light of this stark fact, we perceive that all those who would resist firm measures at this point, whether they know it or not, and whether or not they so intend, are the enemies of life. The cry of equality, as we have seen before this, is but a decoy by which to ensnare all strong, noble, masterful men to their ruin and thus to make the world a happy hunting ground for the mediocre. And any morality, no matter what its religious sanction, that would exalt pity for the botched, and preach the duty and the beauty of loving them, of serving them, of self-effacement before them, in such a way as to paralyze the hand that would cut this gangrene from the body of society, is in actuality an *inversion* of all morality. For any system of values that consistently weakens, or poisons, or frustrates *life*, by that single token is seen to be in fact the supreme *immorality*. To betray ascending life, the purpose of which is ever to surpass itself, ever to give birth to that which is beyond itself, *that* is the supreme crime—worse than embezzlement, worse than treason, worse than adultery or rape, worse than murder. This is what I think of any religion, or morality, or political doctrine that would sacrifice the whole to the part, and betray the higher to the lower.

Something must be done. But I don't get much encouragement when I turn to the eugenicists themselves. Professor Hankins saw the country so in the grip of ingrained "humanitarian

sentiment, uplift complexes, and the religion of democracy," along with a belief in the possibilities of social reform, that he was in despair over accomplishing anything.⁸⁵ The American Eugenics Society, until it was virtually smothered out of existence by the rising tide of equalitarianism, which in the last forty years has gradually engulfed the entire country, had its recommendations, but what it called for was—on the basis of the eugenists' own findings—*not enough*. In general, though they knew what must be done, they seemed not to dare say it. And today, except for a few men like Dr. Elmer Pendell,⁸⁶ the voice of eugenics has been stilled. There must be many men who in their hearts know what must be done, but they keep very silent. Perhaps they shrink from the infamy under which they would be buried if they blurted out the truth. Or perhaps they have become so imbued with the caution and professional detachment that are characteristic of science, that they hesitate to commit themselves until they can see their way clear to the end of any course that they would counsel. They fear to make mistakes. But in a thing like this no one can beforehand see his way clear to the end. And mistakes are bound to be made. But though wisdom perceives the necessity of the utmost intelligence and care, it perceives also that no mistake that could be made would be as serious as the mistake that we now make all the time merely by doing nothing, which if continued much longer must prove fatal. Among the few outstanding scientists in whom I have felt something like a due sense of urgency and responsibility are Dr. William Shockley, Dr. Crew, and Dr. Alexis Carrel. Dr. Shockley, in a letter recently published in *Scientific American* (January, 1971), said, "If what I fear is true, our society is being profoundly irresponsible. Our nobly intended welfare programs may be encouraging . . . retrogressive evolution through disproportionate reproduction of the genetically disadvantaged. . . The consequences may be extremes of racism and agony for both Blacks and Whites." Dr. Crew pointed out that while men argue over whether or not feeble-mindedness is inherited, or how it is inherited, the feeble-minded reproduce their kind. "Today," he declared, "most attention must be given to the condition and not to the cause, for the matter is urgent."⁸⁷ "The reproduction of all stocks exhibiting characteristics admittedly undesirable and known to be inherited should be prevented."⁸⁸ But Dr. Carrel was the boldest of the lot. He was unequivocal that "the propagation of the insane and the feeble-minded . . . must be prevented." But he went on to place a question mark against the very existence of "the immense number of defectives and criminals." "Why do we preserve these useless and harmful beings?" he asked. "The abnormal prevent the development of the normal. This fact must be squarely faced." He recognized that "we are not capable of judging men." And indeed moral judgment is not involved. It is simply a matter of the community's right to "be protected against troublesome and dangerous elements." "Modern society should not hesitate to organize itself with reference to the normal individual." He questioned the wisdom of prisons, on more grounds than one. For certain of the most vicious offenders, he advised "small euthanasic institutions supplied with proper gases."⁸⁹

It is very good to have one of the most distinguished scientists of our time speak out thus plainly and bluntly. Though anyone who knows about American life today is forced to doubt whether any program calculated to deal adequately with the problem of our botched and broken humanity can hope to receive more than the merest passing consideration. Nevertheless, whether it be with the United States in mind or some other perhaps sounder and wiser people, of our own day or of the future, I believe that some of us, at least, ought to come squarely to grips with the sort of steps that *any* people, of *any* age, must take, for its

very life's sake, to purge itself of its waste products. Let us therefore pass in review the most important of the various measures that have been advocated.

1. One of the instruments of which we must most certainly avail ourselves, is sterilization. Its cost to society would be as much less than that of segregation in institutions as its humanity to its victims would be greater. It is necessary to correct false impressions as to what sterilization is. It "does not call for unsexing . . . or desexing an individual; it is not castration; it is not emasculation; it is not mutilation; it does not interfere with sex functions in any way, except in the ability to reproduce one's kind." Sterilization in the male is a trifling operation, involving only the severance of the seminal ducts; and while in the female it is a major operation, requiring the cutting of the oviducts, five thousand cases "showed only three deaths and these due to other causes."⁹⁰

A sterilization law has been upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in a decision in which Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes remarked that if at times "the public welfare may call upon the best citizens for their lives, it would be strange if it could not call upon those who already sap the strength of the state for these lesser sacrifices." And he said in conclusion, "Three generations of imbeciles are enough." In California, "most of the feeble-minded and a considerable proportion of the insane who have been committed to institutions are sterilized before they are released. The great majority of the persons sterilized either welcome the operation or make no objection to having it performed."⁹¹ "The percentage of sexual delinquency attributable to sterilization is relatively very small, about one in a thousand." "Many of [those sterilized] marry, and . . . such marriages have turned out as successfully as could reasonably be expected. Marriage acts as a stabilizing influence, and apparently contributes to the welfare of both parties."⁹² Sterilization is much less cruel than segregating the sexes in institutions—and vastly less expensive to society.

There would, of course, be special Eugenics Courts, guided by competent medical and psychiatric counsel, and every effort should be made to see that both the judges and the doctors were men of high character, above subservience to any clique, and free of economic dependence on anyone. Professor Dunlap thought the likelihood of ethical lapses at this point to be so great that sterilization "must be emphatically rejected"—at least, under present conditions. And yet I am satisfied that we *dare* not reject it. Better sterilization, with the risks and even the consequences of occasional injustice, than the spreading degeneration that seems to be the inescapable alternative.

At this point, I must set down the testimony put on record by Dr. Lothrop Stoddard in 1940, after a day spent in attendance upon a session of the High Eugenics Court of Germany. The cases under review came under Germany's Sterilization Law. What Stoddard saw and heard indicates how successfully a great modern nation of the West can administer a thoroughgoing and resolute effort to purge and regenerate its breeding stock. The current denunciation of the Nazi regime in Germany affords no valid ground on which to ignore the obvious wisdom of its eugenic policy.

Stoddard reported that the entire day was spent on four cases. He was impressed by "the meticulous care with which these cases had already been considered by the lower tribunals. The dossier of each case was voluminous, containing a complete life-history of the subject,

reports of specialists and clinics, and also exhaustive researches into the subject's family history. In reaching its decision, the High Court not only consulted the records of the case but also personally examined the living subjects themselves."

All four cases had been recommended for sterilization, but in all four the Court concluded that sterilization had not been proven mandatory," and they were sent back "for further investigation."

Stoddard remarked in conclusion that all the cases he observed that day were "conducted in the same painstaking, methodical fashion." "I came away," he said, "convinced that the law was being administered with strict regard for its provisions and that, if anything, judgments were almost too conservative. On the evidence of that one visit, at least, the Sterilization Law is weeding out the worst strains in the German stock in a scientific and truly humanitarian way."⁹³

It is, however, a big question *who* should be sterilized. The most that is usually advocated is those whose mental defect, whether feeble-mindedness or insanity, is known to be hereditary. Dr. Crew says "confirmed criminals, imbeciles, and rapists."⁹⁴ The German Law to Prevent Transmission of Hereditary Disease of July, 1933, provided for the sterilization of people with "congenital feeble-mindedness, certain mental diseases such as schizophrenia and manic depression, hereditary epilepsy, blindness, deaf-mutism, and severe malformations."⁹⁵ Dr. Holmes submits carefully stated reasons for believing that a given hereditary defect might be reduced by at least 17 percent in a single generation, with a reduced rate of elimination subsequently. But he is dubious "whether measures coming under the head of negative eugenics will be sufficient to prevent the race from being perpetuated by people of . . . subnormal quality. Certainly the segregation or sterilization of the small percentage of persons who are defective enough to warrant official commitment cannot be expected to contribute much toward this end."⁹⁶ The trouble is that the sum total of those whom there is any thought of sterilizing constitutes only "a small fraction of the hereditary defectives who in the interest of the race should not procreate their kind."⁹⁷ For one thing, there is the large number of morons and borderline cases, whom Dr. Holmes pronounces "the most serious problem." But the supremely difficult aspect of the situation is the fact that many people are "carriers" of recessive hereditary defects that they themselves do not display, and the further fact that such carriers are probably more numerous than the manifest defectives. What should be done with these people? There is usually no ground on which to commit them for sterilization, and yet if two of them mate, any offspring they have are bound to be defective. This fact has often caused eugenicists to despair of accomplishing anything by sterilization.

But the situation is hopeless only to those who lack the firmness of mind both to apply proven purgative measures and to deal with their consequences. Dr. Crew would "encourage celibacy and chastity on the part of all the near relatives of a feeble-minded person,"⁹⁸ but, however desirable this might be, it seems to me folly to hope for any such self-restraint on the part of those genetically near the moron. The usual prescription is that the feeble-minded be prohibited from marrying the feeble-minded, and possible carriers from marrying into families where there is any history of feeble-mindedness.⁹⁹ But if they are above a condition requiring segregation or sterilization, whom are they to marry? What does this mean but that

the feeble-minded and the carriers of feeble-mindedness should be encouraged to marry those whose genetic record is clear? But on the geneticists' own findings is not this precisely what they should *not* do? What would be the inevitable result but that the contamination would be spread into sound stocks, and hidden there, and the difficulty of locating and eradicating it actually increased? Have not all the multitudinous experiments with inbreeding proved beyond question that if we want really to uncover all the hidden defectiveness lurking in our midst, so that we can get at it to deal with it, all that we must do is to follow a course exactly opposite to that usually recommended? By encouraging or even requiring, that the feeble-minded (if allowed to marry at all), and the morons, and the possible carriers of defects, shall marry others in a state like unto their own, any people could without question cleanse its stock effectively and in a comparatively short time. The geneticists all know this. Why then do they not urge it? So far as I can ascertain, for only one reason. Such a procedure would produce a number of defectives that would overwhelm us, unless in one way or another we got rid of them; and under existing conditions they believe it would be utterly impossible to obtain legal authorization to get rid of them effectively. Because of the domination of false and sentimental church and democratic values, doubtless they are right. But all peoples are not so weakened and blinded by such values as we are. There have been, there may be now, in any case there may be in the future, people capable of applying to themselves such a cathartic. And the first people to do this will place its feet on the way that leads to soundness and greatness.

Further objection to sterilization has been made on the ground that we should run the risk of depriving society of the offspring of a man like Steinmetz. It is sufficient answer to this to point out (1) that Steinmetz was hardly of the order of man to be chosen for sterilization; (2) that the amount of genius hidden in the stock of the grossly deformed, the feeble-minded, or the hereditarily insane is negligible; and (3) that the loss to society to be sustained by the elimination of our whole stock of defectives would be infinitesimal as compared with the loss inflicted upon society now by having our most gifted stocks overburdened, and their birth rate curtailed, by their support of our almost completely worthless human waste products.

The foregoing pages will have served to introduce the general idea of sterilization, and to present the objections and the difficulties that have stood in the way of its acceptance.

But only a few months ago (in the summer of 1971), I came upon a proposal that seems to me so largely to by-pass or to cut through the obstacles that have loomed most formidably in people's minds or in the way of actually applying sterilization, that it impresses me as being of really vast importance, if ever we are to achieve that eugenic hygiene that has become essential to our survival.

But before presenting the proposal itself, I must submit a few ideas that seem to me essential to a sympathetic approach to it.

There is no such thing as an inborn or inalienable right. Certainly, merely being alive gives no man or woman any right to have a child. Children should come by permission of the community of which they will become a part; and permission should be given, or granted within specified limits, or altogether withheld, according to whether or not suitable physical

and mental tests and examinations, and the individual and family records of the persons in question, satisfy competent authorities that they are *qualified* to have a child that will be a contribution to the genetic improvement of the nation, or at the very least, not be a drag upon it. Thus, having children would become a privilege, and an outstanding mark not only of a married couple's social status but of society's confidence that they could be trusted with one of the greatest of social responsibilities—the responsibility of taking a part in bringing a new generation into the world and adequately preparing it for life. And thus there would tend to be emulation among the best family stocks for the honor of being allowed an exceptionally large family.

From these preliminary remarks, let us now turn to the proposal itself. It originated with Professor Elmer Pendell of Jacksonville State College in Alabama, and is entitled "A Eugenic Marriage Law." He presented a paper on the subject at the Fifth International Conference on Planned Parenthood in Tokyo in October, 1955. In my judgment, the elaboration of this proposal is a monument to Dr. Pendell's bold originality, practical ingenuity, insight into human nature, and, not least, his profound concern over the dire genetic plight in which our people now find themselves. A copy of his proposed marriage law may be found on pages 87 to 92 of his *The Next Civilization*. (This book was originally published in 1960 by the Royal Publishing Company of Dallas, Texas. It is now out of print, but a copy of it may be obtainable from University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106. Also, Dr. Pendell is now preparing a new edition.)

The law would provide for officers, employed by the community or the state on a salary basis, to collect information, to grant licenses, and to keep records.

In general, under the proposed law, almost any couple free of venereal disease or other disease of a serious nature, would be permitted to marry, but—in case of those who fell in certain specified categories a license would be withheld until they had submitted to sterilization. These categories, roughly, would be (1) those who were unable to earn a living; (2) those of very low IQ or less than four years of satisfactory schooling; and (3) those with a defect, disease, addiction, or evidence of degraded character that would be likely to result in offspring of low quality. As can easily be understood, the desire for marriage in such cases would provide society with a very valuable means, hitherto not so readily available, of inducing persons of gross physical and mental defects to accept sterilization. This provision seems to hold out the possibility of a society's purging itself of a vast amount of defectiveness within a relatively short time, and at that, on a largely voluntary basis.

Moreover, on each marriage license permitting a couple to have children, it would be specified *how many children* their health and general genetic constitution entitled them to have. For example, Article 14 states that "couples complying with other legal requirements are to be authorized for reproduction according to the following scale," in which the number of children allowed begins at one, for a couple whose completed school work averages at least as high as fourth grade (with corresponding IQ)—one child per completed marriage is so low as to ensure that, on the average, the couple's stock will not be perpetuated; almost four children per completed marriage are necessary to ensure perpetuation. The scale rises incrementally to four children, for a couple who have stood in the top two-fifths of their class in high school or in college (with corresponding IQ). It increases to "no limit," for a

couple who have stood in the top fifth of their class in high school or in college (again, with corresponding IQ). It is provided in the proposed law, too, that any couple who overstep the limit of children permitted them will be required to submit to sterilization that will make further pregnancies impossible.

Before turning to my next prophylactic measure, I must take a moment to bring my reader's attention to a proposal advanced in April, 1971, by Professor William Shockley of Stanford University, a Nobel Prize laureate, which I consider very practical and promising. "To reduce dysgenic agonies both for the genetically disadvantaged and the overburdened taxpayer" he would encourage "voluntary sterilization. . . by bonuses weighted for genetic disadvantages, perhaps \$1,000 for each point below 100 IQ." This would sweeten the pill of sterilization, and the cost to society, even at the most, would be small compared to that of caring for patients for years in institutions, or paying for the consequences of leaving them free to spread the genes of their defectiveness throughout the entire nation.

2. Another measure commonly advocated as a means of racial hygiene is birth control. Having already, in my chapter on Pacifism, discussed the disturbing evidence of definitely injurious effects on the individuals who make habitual use of contraception, I will confine myself here to the objections that bear more immediately on our problem. These all support the conclusion that the cure is worse than the disease.

a. Wherever birth control has gone, the birth rate has fallen. In some Western countries more people are dying than are being born. The population is actually on the decline. But this, as Dr. Carrel remarked in a letter to the *American Mercury* years ago, is a symptom of race suicide. It must never be forgotten that the primary test that every people must face is whether it is strong enough to survive. Its fate may well be decided by war, and the issue of a war may hinge simply on how many men it can mass on its side of the struggle. In this light, birth control is seen to be the knife by which civilized White man is cutting his own throat. The fact stressed by Sir Arthur Keith should be burned into the consciousness of all our youth: "The process of evolution permits no balking of the reproductive instincts; the infertile groups are rigorously eliminated, and the fertile perpetuated."¹⁰⁰

b. Birth control is not only reducing populations quantitatively to the danger point, but it has disturbed adversely the balance that must obtain between the better and the worse portions of the population. It is conceded that birth control has not, to any eugenically satisfactory degree, taken root among those of inferior constitution, whose fecundity it is so highly important to limit, but on the contrary has found its greatest vogue among those of proven capacity, where it has cut down the families of six, eight, or ten that the better classes commonly had up until a hundred years ago, to families of one or two—not enough even to perpetuate their stock. In other words, it is recognized by those who know the facts that birth control is directly responsible for the differential birth rate that, in my last chapter, we found to be so direly menacing.¹⁰¹ Furthermore, since effective use of birth control requires a degree of intelligence and self-control usually lacking in the most defective classes, it stands to reason that it will never become an important factor in reducing the least desirable part of our population.

c. But birth control has not only, in actual application, been a very large factor in debasing the genetic quality of Western peoples by decimating the ranks of the superior, from whom alone leadership can come in the necessary quantity, but it tends to reduce quality *wherever* it goes. Selecting one's offspring by means of birth control, Ludovici has pointed out,¹⁰² is like hoeing one's garden *in the dark*. You cannot see whether you are cutting down the weeds or the flowers. It would be wiser to make our selection after our children are born, as did the ancient Greeks, and the old Norse as well,¹⁰³ eliminating those we *know* to be unfit by what we can see with our eyes.

In much the same vein, Dr. K. A. Wieth-Knudsen, in his valuable book *Understanding Women*,¹⁰⁴ points out another dysgenic aspect of birth control, the seriousness of which has otherwise, so far as I am aware, never been duly stressed. He reminds us that apparently Nature's efforts to ensure anything like quality in any of her living creatures is limited to a constant prodigality in her production of life. Out of the ensuing struggle of one with another for room to develop, in an environment where opportunities are more or less limited, comes all that we call biological and racial progress. Among all healthy peoples, Nature usually causes the sex instinct to produce twice as many children as are needed merely to maintain the population. It would seem that she brings into the world an excess of human beings in order thereby to gain the opportunity to make a selection, to pick out her lucky strokes from her botches and culls, electing the former to survive and leaving the latter to fall by the wayside. But birth control tends to frustrate all this. What human selection is made in the act of contraception itself is, in the first place, as we have seen, made blindly, as it were in the dark, and therefore it is fully as likely to prevent the birth of the best as it is to prevent the birth of the worst. Moreover, this human curtailment of Nature's prodigality so limits the population that the struggle for existence is greatly eased. This means, looking at the matter from another angle, that the conditions of life are improved to such an extent that almost the whole offspring, including all deficient types, grow to maturity. Most people would fancy this a highly desirable state of affairs. But it has been precisely *this* condition (among animals at least), and *not only* in periods when competition was too great or the external conditions too difficult, that has *proved the precursor of extinction*. "The reason probably was," says Dr. Wieth-Knudsen, "that the whole race was thereby weakened for want of sufficient selection (which in Nature usually means a high birth-rate and a high mortality), so that at the next turning in the line of evolution it collapsed at the first assault of more difficult conditions, which are bound to come, in the case of both men and animals." He then asks, "May not the meaning of this be that the Frenchman Bertillot (the elder) was right in saying: *Pour avoir la qualite il faut avoir la quantite?* [In order to have quality it is necessary to have quantity.] But if this be the case, the two children system will quickly ruin the race, not only quantitatively but also qualitatively."¹⁰⁵

3. The next, and last, measure that we must consider under negative eugenics is euthanasia—that is, elimination by some form of painless death, decreed in the interest of social welfare. The need for this instrument arises from the fact that there is, in the aggregate, a considerable body of human life that is so hopelessly deformed or deficient that it can never come to anything or that is so incorrigibly vicious as constantly to menace other people with grave injury. And such life imposes upon society a burden, the expense of which tends directly to discourage reproduction in our best stocks.¹⁰⁶ "The surest, the simplest, the kindest, and most humane means for preventing reproduction" among such as we have just

mentioned and whom we deem unworthy of the high privilege of reproducing their kind, "is a gentle, painless death . . . administered not as a punishment, but as an expression of enlightened pity for the victims . . . and as a duty toward the community and toward our own offspring." ¹⁰⁷

These are the words of Dr. W. D. McKim, so far as I know the first man in modern times to undertake a serious case for euthanasia. Dr. Holmes lists his book *Heredity and Human Progress*¹⁰⁸ in one of his bibliographies and pronounces its proposal "ably defended." ¹⁰⁹ Dr. McKim suggested for elimination "all idiots . . . and of imbeciles by far the greater number, and especially those who, while intelligent, gave indication of *moral* imbecility. . . the great majority of epileptics. Respecting habitual drunkards . . . the essential question being the degree to which the man might be dangerous to society. . . In the case of criminals, we should need to exercise much discrimination." ¹¹⁰ One thinks at once, too, of the botched infant life, which can never be anything but a misery to itself and a useless burden to its parents. Our sentimentality about "life" has run to such lengths that we now feel that we must exhaust every resource "to preserve and grow to adolescence every runt that comes out of a woman's womb." ¹¹¹ Some of us may remember the case of five-weeks-old Helaine Colan of Chicago, "suffering from a rare disease which seemed to offer only the single choice between total blindness and death," who held center stage for the whole nation while medical science fairly turned itself inside out in an effort to save her life. But, despite the long editorial in the *New York Times* eulogizing this effort and acclaiming "the right to live which the tiniest, blindest organism has," ¹¹² we must turn thumbs down, pronounce both the effort and the editorial mere maudlin sentimentality, and wish that there were in the country a little more of the discrimination and the iron of the old Greeks, whose feeling for life was expressed in Aristotle's judgment that "nothing imperfect or maimed [should] be allowed to grow up."

Dr. McKim recognized that "an idea so radical and so replete with practical difficulties cannot at first be shaped into any great degree of definiteness. Indeed, no one individual is competent; but I believe that the task is not too grave for the aggregate wisdom of society" (op. cit., p. 189). At the end of the section of his book given over to meeting probable opposition, he makes an observation that will bear considerable reflection. "There is an objection which, so far at least as our own republic is concerned, seems to me the strongest of all. The adoption of this plan would throw a great increase of power into the hands of those who represent the State, and there would be the great risk that the men charged with the administration of it, however intelligent and honorable at first, might become the corrupt tool of some political ring. . . The objection is a very grave one, but its force is a dishonor to our people rather than an intrinsic defect in the plan. If we, as a nation, approve a measure but dare not entrust its administration to the officials whom we select to execute our will, then are we, indeed, far gone on the downward path of degeneracy" (op. cit., pp. 252-3).

It may be worthwhile to remind my readers that this idea received the endorsement of a scientist so distinguished as Dr. Alexis Carrel. It would seem, too, that Dr. S. J. Holmes, in his heart of hearts, would have liked to endorse the proposal, but was forced to recognize that "there is not the slightest chance of its being adopted," and so—passed it by.¹¹³ Some of you who know me may find yourselves astounded that I, with all my natural instinct toward gentleness, could ever bring myself to support a proposition such as this. And I must admit

that it would be exceedingly difficult for me to take any practical part in such a program. On the other hand, when I have set an end before myself, I never have been a man to falter at the necessary means for reaching it. And in all my thought about the immense number of our utterly useless hereditary defectives, which every competent authority recognizes to be a menace to our very existence, I am forever brought back to the terrible but inescapable biological fact that *any organism that fails to excrete its waste products dies*. To this, there is only one answer. Certainly, it is not a matter with which any people of sound instinct and in full possession of its wits will ever dare to dillydally. If there is any other method as effective as euthanasia and at once more humane and less repugnant, I certainly should be very open to it. Doubtless, there are many plausible objections that can be raised against a proposal so radical, and doubtless many practical difficulties would arise in any attempt to put it into operation. But Dr. McKim, who recognized all this, leaves us with the final reminder "that, as Dr. Johnson observed, 'so many objections might be made to everything, that nothing could overcome them but the necessity of doing something,' and that objections often disappear marvelously when a plan has been set in motion. In law, as in morals, that 'can be done which ought to be done' " (op. cit., p. 253). He might have added, That can be done which *must* be done—*lest we die*. And if we should elect rather to die than to arouse ourselves to decree and to carry out the purging necessary to life and to health, then indeed we *ought* to die, and the world would be well rid of us, since such a decision would prove us a craven people, fit only for the dunghill.

But negative eugenics can never by itself be enough. Getting rid of our worst stocks will not of itself increase the numbers of those from whom alone leadership comes, nor will it improve the general quality and solid strength in that large body of the population upon which the leaders must depend for support. It is absolutely essential, therefore, as Dr. Carrel reiterates, that we "turn our attention toward promoting the optimum growth of the fit. By making the strong still stronger, we could effectively help the weak. For the herd always profits by the ideas and inventions of the elite." ¹¹⁴ Dr. John M. Radzinski declared that "the sum total of significant creativity and leadership for all mankind, at least in recorded times, has been the work of probably less than 100,000 persons among the many billions who have made their brief and undistinguished sojourn on this Earth." (See "The American Melting Pot: Its Meaning to Us" in *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, April, 1959, Vol. 115, No. 10, p. 8.) But for them, the whole human race might still be at the level of the cave man. There is absolutely no substitute for an improvement in the quality of the upper strata of our population, and an increase in their birth rate. We must now, therefore, turn to the consideration of positive eugenics, and with this I shall bring our present study to a head and to a conclusion.

Positive eugenics, at least for the present, is not at all, as I had better assure my readers at the outset, a matter of deliberate breeding for any particular quality or qualities, or for any particular kind of man or woman. One is permitted to believe that the time for this may come. In fact, as long ago as 1937, Dr. Hooton declared that something like a "manual on the technique of breeding" for genius "is by no means impossible for the future." ¹¹⁵ And at about the same time (1939), a panel of scientists very distinguished in the field of genetics, in what is known as "The Geneticists' Manifesto," announced that as far as "purely genetic considerations are concerned," it was already "physically possible within a comparatively small number of generations" (say, a century or two) to "raise the level of the average of the

population nearly to that of the highest now existing in isolated individuals," as respects such matters as "physical well-being, intelligence and temperamental qualities." ¹¹⁶ And the ever-existing and ever-beckoning possibility of such a miraculous transformation of human life and of all its present problems, must constantly be held before our eyes, it seems to me, as a beacon of hope and as our guiding pole star.

But Dr. Hooton, at least, was emphatic that until, for a considerable period, we have given fully as much attention to the genetic improvement of man as we now give to that of animals, our proposals must be more moderate. Just as it is the purpose of negative eugenics to cleanse our reproductive stock of such genes as prevent the appearance of good qualities of every sort, so it is the primary purpose of positive eugenics to encourage the growth, and to ensure the proportional dominance in the population, of good sound stock of every sort, out of which will come not only many kinds of genius but also the sound substantial mediocrity that is every people's backbone. Anyone interested in the general recommendations to this end can find them readily in a number of books to which I have made frequent reference. In the rest of this chapter, I should like to dwell upon such measures or principles that may promise, especially, to increase the proportion of our already superior stock and still further to improve its quality.

1. *Marry your like.* I have already stressed this in my chapter "Woman and Marriage," but it is important enough to deserve reiteration here. Indeed, it would be wise to elevate it into a general rule as to mating for the entire population. But it would be most natural to, and most proper for, our best-endowed stock, those of superior ancestry, beauty, health, character and mind. Such as they know not the mongrel's instinct to seek in his mate complement and correction for his own defects, but know rather wherein they are superior to the mass, and are proud of it, and in their mates seek confirmation and concentration of the very qualities by which they feel themselves to be distinguished.

To this end, it would be well to extend the likeness to every point in regard to which likeness is possible—color of eyes and hair, proportional height (the woman should be somewhat shorter), facial type and bodily build, race, ancestry (including similarities of occupation and achievement), social status, religion, intellect, education, temperament, energy, interests, friends, and so on. It would promise well for the future if a "brother and sister likeness" were to be remarked in a couple about to be married, as once happened in the case of a couple of my acquaintance. Where the stock is surely known to be completely sound on both sides, it would usually be good to marry one's cousin, though marrying a person who is markedly one's like may come genetically pretty close to this. In either case, however, since today we must deal with the mishmash resulting from much mixed marrying, it would always be wise to see whether the likeness to oneself that one observes in one's proposed mate is corroborated by what one sees in his or her brothers and sisters, father and mother, and grandparents and other relatives.

It may be questioned whether one can learn to love, as it were, "on order." But if, through one's youth, one has gradually been impressed with a conception of the kind of person that one should marry, those who do not come within the purview of this conception are simply not looked at. There would, of course, be times when instinct bolted, but as a rule it would stay in harness if it had been well trained during its formative period. Dr. Carrel pointed out

that, despite the common view that love is hopelessly erratic, “many young men fall in love with rich girls, and vice versa.”¹¹⁷ If desire for a girl with money can make a man fall in love with one who has it, then a desire for a girl like oneself will go far toward ensuring that when he finds her he will love her. Some years ago, a young friend of mine fully confirmed my conviction.

It would, of course, be ground for heartiest congratulation for a man to find a woman who was almost completely the counterpart of himself. Often, however, he would have to accept the best approximation available. Also, though the highest possible degree of mutual likeness is always important, as promising stability and happiness in the prospective marriage, it is less important in marriages from which no issue is expected, where convenience or companionship are more to be considered than the possibility of children.

2. The remainder of my proposals narrow down to various means for increasing the birth rate from superior stock of all sorts. It should be borne in mind that negative eugenics alone would make, indirectly, a very great contribution to this end. As we have seen, the cost of the maintenance and care of the defective classes runs into scores of billions of dollars each year, and this burden falls very largely on the shoulders of the best-endowed stock that we have. If this burden were lifted, or even greatly lightened, there is good reason to believe that the birth rate among the more gifted strata of the population would automatically rise. But the matter goes deeper than this. Mere removal of an obstacle is not enough, especially if there is no push behind the obstacle. It is absolutely undeniable that “family survival . . . depends most upon the wish and the will of individuals,” and “that we need to regard the possession of an ardent desire for offspring and the equally ardent wish to perpetuate one’s own strain as an essential trait in the human species . . . a trait which is essential to race survival.”¹¹⁸ When that begins to go, a people itself has begun to go. It has begun to die at the heart. If somehow the old instinct and strength by which it once hewed out a place for itself, cannot be revived, so that once again the best people have the largest families, then the day will come when a people of unspoiled vigor will press upon it until it breaks, and the place that knew, it will know it no more. I do not say that it can be done. When everything is taken into account, the odds against it seem hopeless. But that is the task—greatly to increase the birth rate in the best stocks. What might help to this end? I can give here only the veriest sketch of some of the most important proposals.

a. It is necessary to foster feeling for family and for family pride, and to make it a matter of family pride to have many children. Ten or twelve is by no means too many. And better, in order to have the family large, that some of the children have to work for the advantages they get, than that the number should be curtailed. And they, in their turn, should be brought up to understand the vital necessity to the nation to which they belong, of having a large and steady stream of offspring from the best family stocks. They should grow up believing that they can be relieved of this duty to contribute offspring to society only if they have a contribution to make that is of even greater value than children and which makes the normal contribution of children impossible.¹¹⁹ Their fathers and mothers should so pass on to them the family history that they have grounds on which to base an estimate of their own genetic constitution, and so be the better prepared to select a mate bearing similar potentialities. They should learn to think of their marriages as marriages *between families*. And marriages between families with comparable records of achievement in a given field are

advisable and valuable not only for the capacity they tend to concentrate and to stabilize in the resulting offspring, but also in order to keep intact the body of tradition that comes down in such families, as to how best to do things, whether it be in regard to teaching, painting, writing, ruling, managing a household and rearing children, or in regard to farming, weaving, house-building, cabinet-making, or running a business. Partly through their years of close association, partly by deliberate instruction, parents should teach their children the general importance of marrying their like; advise them of the established correlation between intelligence and character,¹²⁰ impress upon them, in all their consideration of a mate, to make of full health an absolute requirement, to place a premium on beauty as a sign of health and fitness for procreation, and to find in *poise* an indication of that sound integrative function which is the foundation of sound mental life.¹²¹ Parents should teach their children not to believe in “spiritual” substitutes or compensations for obvious bodily defects. They should caution them against giving any promise to marry before they have had the opportunity to observe their prospective mate in a modern bathing suit. And they should instruct them in all the lore of outward and visible “marks” of desirability, in which *all* desirability, mental and spiritual as well as physical, ultimately manifests itself. (The outstanding book on this subject is Ludovici’s *The Choice Of A Mate*, London, 1935.) With a background of some such training as this (on the *genetic* side, which is what we are now examining), a young man or woman should be able to approach marriage with the knowledge that they have thereby met one of the solid requirements, not only for finding fulfillment for themselves, but for maintaining their family tradition and for making to the breeding stock of their race the richest contribution of which they are capable.

b. But to have large families it is necessary that young people marry early. How vitally urgent it is, at once for the good of the woman, her children, and of society, that women marry much earlier than on the average they do now, I have already undertaken to show in a previous chapter. Here, I wish to deal with the problem presented in the fact that many young men do not feel themselves well enough established in their lifework to take on the support of a family, until they are well along in their thirties. To make it easier for such men to add perhaps ten years to the length of their married lives, it has been advocated that, where parents are in a position to do so, they offer to subsidize their sons during the years while they are getting on their feet financially. This help should be certain, regular, and as long as needed. While care should be exercised that it did not lead to idleness, it should be given ungrudgingly and unconditionally, the young people being left free to spend the money as they saw fit. It should be given less as any kindness to one’s children than as a duty to society. Something on this order seems to have been very generally in operation in France for a long time.¹²²

Other proposals have been made to a like end. Dr. William E. McDougall, in his *Is America Safe For Democracy?* suggested that “every family that has any good claim to belong to what might be called ‘the selected classes’ should know that the addition of each child should automatically bring with it an increase of income sufficient to meet the expenses normally incurred in the bringing up of that child. He advised that this increase be “not less than one-tenth of the earned income and might well be rather more.” He believed that the “eugenic effect” of this assurance “would be very good, far surpassing in this direction the effects of any other eugenic measure that has been proposed.” It is worthy of note that such an arrangement actually has been in operation in Roberts College in Constantinople, in the

American University at Beirut, in the London School of Economics, and in Yale University; and also among the missionaries of the Baptist and Congregational Churches, and the ministers of the Methodist Church of England.¹²³ It is claimed that the arrangement has obviously been effective in raising the birth rate in these occupational groups.

c. Since, on the average, people of superior attainments have children who average superior to the children of the rest of the population, it has been recommended that parents who meet certain requirements as to ancestral history, and as to personal health and ability, be offered free education for their children through university and professional school. This would certainly encourage many parents of superior stock to increase the size of their families.¹²⁴

d. One of the most important proposals for increasing the birth rate from the upper portion of society, in the large, is that of marriage loans without interest. A substantial sum of money would be advanced by the community or by the State at the time of marriage, one-quarter of which would be cancelled at the time of the birth of each child. The births of four children, enough, on the average, to perpetuate the stock of the parents, would leave the couple debt-free. Such an offer, however, would be made only to a carefully selected body of young people. Requirements could vary somewhat, but in general should include, at a minimum, evidence that the family health-history was free of organic disorders and hereditary defects, ability to pass an exacting intelligence test, and satisfactory attendance upon a course in marriage education.¹²⁵ According to Dr. Holmes, the system of this sort that was in operation in Germany before the Second World War resulted in "a conspicuous rise" in her birth rate, "while that of most other European countries has continued to fall."¹²⁶

e. From the eugenic point of view, it would doubtless be profitable to effect a measure of relaxation in the strictness of our monogamic standard. Since I wrote about this matter at some length in my chapter "Woman and Marriage," I will here only briefly review what I said there. It might well prove considerable gain to the public welfare if those men most conspicuously gifted, who were so inclined and who were able to afford the responsibilities, were to contribute to society the greatly increased number of offspring that they could sire if they were husband to more than one wife. There is, of course, a very strong prejudice among us against any such arrangement, though I am not at all sure that this could sustain close examination. A further consideration in its favor is that thereby we might take up into marriage a considerable portion of the very large number of young women who are now, by the mere fact that our women outnumber our men by some millions, deprived of the marriage and motherhood which, for the great majority of them, must constitute the very fulfillment of their lives. Society's indifference to the fate of these young women almost passes belief. It might help to puncture our prevalent assumption of superiority if it were known that among Mohammedans no marriageable woman is left without a husband. It should be remembered that the fearful losses of men in the First World War led the Anglican Conference of Anglican bishops to consider relaxing the monogamic standard until the balance of the sexes had been recovered.¹²⁷ This much we may as well face: the present condition in which our young women find themselves will not continue indefinitely. In marriage or out of it, legally or illegally, a large number of them are going to have at least the experience of sex, whether or not they have the courage to let it lead to motherhood. But eugenically, of course, this is no gain at all. How much better it would be if we recognized

that the just requirements of life come above the preservation of our forms, and made humane provision for all this crying need in one of two ways: either (1) by making it legal and entirely respectable, even though unusual, for a man to have more than one wife, or else (2) by expressly recognizing and sanctioning the right of any woman who could meet certain requirements, to take steps toward pregnancy, either by intercourse with a man of her choice or through artificial insemination by sperm known to be genetically superior. The requirements should be the ability to show herself possessed of superior qualifications for motherhood, and evidence of financial means or backing sufficient to maintain herself and her offspring.

f. Still another proposal is that we concentrate our intelligence on locating and notifying to receive special opportunities, any conspicuously gifted young men and women, in any part of our entire population, who give promise of becoming good breeding stock. Such young people could be given scholarships that would assure them free education as far as they wished to carry it. Others might be adopted by married couples who would afford them the same opportunities they gave their own children. In the cases of gifted young people whose environment was so vicious as to call for their removal from it, and where no home proved open to receive them, they could be taken into special boarding schools or other institutions that would attempt to provide both a homelike environment and exceptional opportunities. Some of this material might turn up in very unexpected places. Dr. Carrel, who advocated such an effort to find and to develop the high capacity hidden away in our population, reminds us that the great criminals (not the vicious ones) may have offspring of imagination, courage, and judgment. No possible source should be overlooked.¹²⁸ It is of interest that the Civic Club of the City of Pittsburgh made a start in locating valuable youth. The outstanding students from the graduating classes of all the high schools are assembled for special testing. The group consists of those who have stood highest, whether scholastically, in mental tests, or in the estimation of the teachers. The object is to provide with the privilege of higher education any of this youth that might otherwise have to leave school prematurely.¹²⁹ If this sort of work were taken up all over the country, and greatly extended, it should help substantially to increase the birth rate from our better stock, and to ensure that much of the giftedness that is now often smothered for lack of opportunity would both come to fulfillment and be passed on to equally gifted posterity.

g. But I have yet to mention the proposal that is the most original and revolutionary, and which, if it can be put into operation in even a small and scattered way, holds out by far the most favorable prospect of effecting great and sudden improvement in our genetic stock on the highest levels. Perhaps the idea ultimately traces back to John Humphrey Noyes, of some one hundred years ago, who in his Oneida Community (located between Syracuse and Utica, N.Y.), made the first deliberate and intelligent attempt in modern times to improve the human breeding stock by selective mating. He called it "stirpiculture." As a community, the venture finally failed, but Dr. Robert L. Dickinson, who forty years ago was one of the foremost gynecologists in the country and greatly interested in problems affecting our human breed, told me personally that the venture had nevertheless been remarkably successful in its primary purpose: the youngsters born and reared in that community had had an exceptionally high record of average achievement.

But, by this time, its idea might have been quite forgotten but for two men. One of them, the older, was Dr. Horace Dutton Taft, a brother of President Taft and an uncle of Senator Robert Taft, founder and for many years headmaster of the Taft School at Watertown, Connecticut. The other, whom I have already introduced to my readers, was Dr. Elmer Pendell. From 1934, when they were brought together by Dr. Ellsworth Huntington of the American Eugenics Society (and a professor at Yale), until Dr. Taft's death in 1943, the two men collaborated on the development of their great idea. Those who wish to learn about it in its variant forms as sponsored by each—known in the one case as the Taft Plan, and in that of Dr. Pendell as Heredity Corporations, will find everything set forth in some detail, together with some excerpts from the correspondence between the two men, in Dr. Pendell's *The Next Civilization*, Chapters V, VI, and VII (pages 101-140). But for reasons of space, and further because as yet the "stirpiculture" idea has never, anywhere, taken hold of the American mind in such a way as to make it of *present practical* importance, I will confine myself here to those essentials that the various forms of the proposal have in common.

First of all, let it be understood that there never has been any thought of displacing marriage. The intention has been primarily to meet a crisis in the genetic constitution of our breeding stock that threatens us with a creeping catastrophe of greater enormity and more irretrievable than defeat in any major war. It is to be looked upon primarily, therefore, as a temporary expedient, a provisional supplement to marriage, and at most as a venture that is never likely to attract more than a very small, though always superior, portion of our population.

The purpose would be to effect a wide and sudden dispersion of the highest potentialities of genius among us by means of artificial insemination. Ventures of this sort would be made by separate, though related, communities, which would be given the most substantial foundation, to cover the members with adequate insurance, and to provide against sickness, unemployment, disability, and old age, and for all the needs of their children.

There would be modifications of the general community idea designed to suit the interests, tastes, and circumstances of the sort of people likely to be attracted. The plan envisages communities of from 100 to 200 adults, in which as a rule women would predominate—perhaps by as much as three to one. These adults would be marked by their deep concern over the calamitous state of the nation's breeding stock, and by their desire to dedicate themselves, as part of their principal mission in life, to do their utmost to improve it. They themselves would be selected as the most outstanding specimens obtainable of every sort of significant human superiority—as judged by the records of their family history, by their own robustness, beauty, intelligence, creativeness, emotional balance and charm, and by their profound interest in the rearing of young lives.

Commonly each male member would be allowed one corporation supported child by a woman member of the community, and they could marry if they wished. But if not, and the woman consented, suitable arrangements would be made for artificial insemination. Taking into account the quality of their parents and of their parents' lineage, the consequent offspring of such "unions" would certainly tend to be superior themselves. But the improvement that would accrue to the national breeding stock would certainly be greatest and most rapid if all the women of the group from the start and throughout their bearing

periods, were to be impregnated artificially by sperm donated by men from outside the community who had been very judiciously selected as representative of the supreme genius of the entire country. Each woman might thus bring into the world a total of six to a dozen children of the highest potentialities. And if any considerable part of the girls among these children eventually decided to follow in the path of their mothers, it is obvious that the resulting enrichment and strengthening of our leadership class would be spectacular.

I must leave further details for interested parties to dig out for themselves. But I will permit myself two general observations.

On the one hand, it seems to me that anyone of intelligence and capable of a reasonable degree of detachment from conventional mores, must recognize at a glance what possibilities for the rejuvenation and elevation of our human breeding stock are held out in such a controlled and well-thought-out undertaking with artificial insemination. My hesitation or reservations center, in the first place, around the profound and pivotal importance of marriage—especially whenever children are involved—and, in the second place, to the instinctive uneasiness that I feel at the thought of anything that approaches, or might easily lead to, children's being brought up *en masse*. As much as is humanly possible, I want each single child to know the securing warmth of his own mother's love and her sedulous attention to his fullest development. I should not be willing to see any mother in a Heredity Corporation become a mere "baby tender" to her own children. If she does not want to give them the first place in her life, let her give up motherhood and go find herself a job!

The seven proposals that I have submitted do not by any means exhaust the possibilities. The mind of man is still fertile to invent means to further his progress in whatever direction he sets his face. From the eugenic point of view, the real problem is not so much in the means as in the aim. How to get people *remade*—which is, in the end, what it comes to—so that they *will want quality enough to pay the price for it!* Where are the statesmen—or the prophets—who can get them to move toward being remade *before* they are remade?

We have now reached the point where I must tie up a few loose ends and then say my closing words.

It must have occurred to many of my readers that in America almost every proposal that I made, under negative and even positive eugenics, must fall on rather deaf ears. Christianity and democracy have conditioned our people *against* such ideas. I was only too painfully conscious of this while I wrote. In all soberness, I know of no other great Power in the world that seems to me genetically in so desperate a plight as the United States. As if there were not already enough false prophets to lead her astray and to seal her fate, there are so many like Amram Scheinfeld, with his *You and Heredity*, who seem to give even biological justification to the American cult of the mongrel, and thus the further to lull the people to sleep. Whereas I see, with terrifying clearness, that somehow she must be aroused soon, or it will forever be too late. I am convinced to the very marrow of my bones that except our country speedily *reverses* the whole course she has long been following, unless she begins to *select severely*, and learns to look up to the thoroughbred, and pays the price, no matter how high it comes, for increasing the proportion of her most gifted children—we shall go under. The hour hand moves on. The time still left us in which to act grows ever shorter.

Perhaps America and the Western world will never awake, but be struck down like a man walking in his dreams. That possibility, too, we must face. And what then? Well, what we have written remains the truth. The future belongs to the people of whatever race, who first begin to breed for quality.¹³⁰ And the very religion that shapes any great people in the days to come will have in its table of holy commandments the precepts and prohibitions of eugenics. But I yearn over our people, and over the people of Britain and Western Europe, and their stock wherever they have gone all over the world. Even though today they are sick, and debased, and threatened with destruction, yet are they *my* people, bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh. But I cannot forget—I know—that Nature at least has no sentiment and knows no mercy. Her law is: “Obey my commandments or die. Weed out your culls, or I shall give your place to a people that do.” Who will heed in time, few men would venture to predict. Maybe it will yet be one of our own peoples.

It may be asked—though after all that I have said, there should be no need to ask—what all this about the body, and sex, and genes, and heredity and offspring has to do with the *spiritual* life of man, with which I was once and for long almost completely preoccupied. Professor Knight Dunlap has given the answer about as concisely as can be. “Only the race which is physically and mentally fit can survive and flourish long enough to develop and put in practice moral ideals. The problem after all is not one of choice between two ideals, but of having such regard for the primary ideal that it may help us to the attainment of ultimate ideals.”¹³¹ When all is said and done, genetics is a matter of the stuff a people has in it. And on the health, quality and giftedness of this stuff, everything else is built—literature, art, philosophy, science, religion, saintliness, everything. Those seers and mystics who, by the narrowness of their absorption in their own pursuits and final vision, tend to forget or to ignore their own origins and to deny the primary importance of the body and of sound genetic constitution, only help to breed their own kind out of existence, to further the growth of a population to whom their teaching is nothing but meaningless gibberish. Culture of every sort is an end product of the life of a people. It may reach to the sun, and manifest the most marvelous forms and variety of color, and seem to swing in the air almost free, like a flower. But except, like the flower, it was rooted from the beginning in the deep dark earth of elemental realities, it could never have come into existence; and except it remain so rooted it must soon wither and die.

We live in a world inexorably limited on all sides. Always we can have what we want, but always to have it we must give up something else. Everything comes at a price. Every beauty has its dark side. Always, therefore, we must choose. The supreme question before us is: What kind of man do we want? For myself I am committed—forever and forever—to quality. If we cannot be noble, if we cannot do great and beautiful things that will linger on the mouths of men for centuries, if there cannot be those among us who walk the Earth like gods, whom the rest of us know to be like gods, and look up to as gods, and love to listen to, and reach after, and follow as gods, then I should rather that I, and mine, and my people should pass into oblivion.

Where do *you* stand? The question is put to us about as compellingly as it can be, in a letter Ruskin wrote “to the workmen and labourers of Great Britain,” in 1872. “My friends,” he said, “the follies of modern Liberalism, many and great though they be, are practically summed in this denial or neglect of the quality and intrinsic value of things. Its

benevolences—theology of universal indulgence, and jurisprudence which will hang no rogues—mean, one and all of them, in the root, incapacity of discerning, or refusal to discern, worth and unworth in anything, and least of all in man; whereas Nature and Heaven command you, at your peril, to discern worth from unworth in everything, and most of all in man. Your main problem is that ancient and trite one, ‘Who is best man?’ and the Fates forgive much—forgive the wildest, fiercest, cruelest experiments—if fairly made for the determination of that.”¹³²

1947, 1970, 1971

¹ Edward M. East—*Heredity and Human Affairs*, Scribner’s, 1935, p. 128.

² F.A.E. Crew—*Heredity*, London, 1928, p. 64.

³ See E.M. East and D.F. Jones—*Inbreeding and Outbreeding*, Lippincott, 1919, p. 80.

⁴ Samuel J. Holmes—*Human Genetics and Its Social Import*, McGraw, 1936, p. 350.

⁵ Francis Darwin—*Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Appleton, 1911, Vol. II, p. 309.

⁶ Robert Briffault—*The Mothers, The Matriarchal Theory of Social Origins*, Macmillan, 1931, p. 73.

⁷ S. J. Holmes—*The Trend of the Race*, Harcourt, 1921, p. 247.

⁸ O.A. Wall—*Sex and Sex Worship*, St. Louis, 1919, p. 190.

⁹ Sir Richard Francis Burton—*The Jew, the Gypsy, and El Islam*, Hutchinson, London, 1898, p. 7.

¹⁰ E.M. East, op. cit., p. 143.

¹¹ E.M. East and D.F. Jones, op. cit., pp. 237-8.

¹² E.M. East, 1935, op., cit., pp. 143-4.

¹³ Edward Westermarck—*History of Human Marriage*, New York, 1922, p. 375.

¹⁴ James Hastings, Editor—*Dictionary of the Bible* (one volume), Scribner’s 1909, article “Marriage,” p. 584.

¹⁵ Cp. E.M. East, 1935, op. cit., p. 144; A.M. Ludovici—*The Choice of a Mate*, John Lane, London, 1935, pp. 83-84.

¹⁶ E.M. East, 1935, op. cit., pp. 7, 143.

- ¹⁷ Gaston C. H. Maspero—*History of Egypt*, Vol. I, pp. 63-64.
- ¹⁸ James G. Frazer—*The Golden Bough*, Part IV, pp. 396-8.
- ¹⁹ *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, VIII, p. 244.
- ²⁰ James H. Breasted—*A History of Egypt*, Scribner's, 1912, p. 85.
- ²¹ Anthony M. Ludovici—*The Choice of a Mate*, John Lane, 1935, pp. 72-80. This book is in The International Library of Sexology and Psychology.
- ²² Paul Popenoe—"Should Cousins Marry?" Reprinted from *Hygeia*. Copyrighted by American Medical Association, obtainable from American Institute of Family Relations, 607 S. Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
- ²³ James H. Breasted, op. cit., pp. 319-320.
- ²⁴ Paul Popenoe, op. cit., p. 4.
- ²⁵ Marc Armand Ruffer—"On the Physical Effects of Consanguineous Marriages in the Royal Families of Egypt." *Proceedings of Royal Society of Medicine*, 1919, XII. *Suppl. Sect. Hist. Med.* p. 148.
- ²⁶ Robert Briffault, op. cit., p. 78.
- ²⁷ Robert Briffault, op. cit., pp. 77-8; A.M. Ludovici, op. cit., p. 77-80; Paul Popenoe, op. cit. pp. 4-5.
- ²⁸ G. Elliott Smith—*In the Beginning*, London, 1932, presenting the "diffusionists" view.
- ²⁹ F.A.E. Crew—*Organic Inheritance in Man*, London, 1927, p. 94.
- ³⁰ E.M. East, 1935, op. cit., p. 140. Cp. E.M. East and D.F. Jones, op. cit., p. 168.
- ³¹ S. J. Holmes, 1921, pp. 240-1.
- ³² E.M. East and D.F. Jones, op. cit., p. 121ff.
- ³³ *Ibid.*, p. 139.
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 123, 126-7, 139-140, 216f., 134.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 139-140.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 186.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 137.

- ³⁸ Knight Dunlap—*Personal Beauty and Racial Betterment*, St. Louis, 1920, p. 72.
- ³⁹ Robert Briffault, 1931, op. cit., p. 73ff.
- ⁴⁰ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, p. 97.
- ⁴¹ Ibid., p. 93
- ⁴² W.E. Castle—*Genetics and Eugenics*, Harvard Univ. Pr., 1930, 4th Ed., Ch. 32.
- ⁴³ S. J. Holmes, 1936, p. 350.
- ⁴⁴ S. J. Holmes, 1921, op. cit., p. 242.
- ⁴⁵ S. J. Holmes, 1921, p. 244. Cp. August Forel, M.D., Ph.D., LL.D.—*The Sexual Question*, New York, 1925, pp. 167-8. "Formerly Prof. of Psychology at, and Director of, Insane Asylum, Zurich."
- ⁴⁶ Otto Klineberg—*Race Differences*, Harper, 1933, p. 215.
- ⁴⁷ Charles Darwin—*Animals and Plants under Domestiation*. Quoted by East and Jones, 1919, p. 147.
- ⁴⁸ A.M. Ludovici, 1935, pp. 71-2.
- ⁴⁹ East and Jones, 1919, p. 215. Cp. p. 212.
- ⁵⁰ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, p. 93.
- ⁵¹ Paul Popenoe, 1937, p. 5. Cp. F.A.E. Crew, 1928. p. 64.
- ⁵² East and Jones, 1919, p. 167.
- ⁵³ A.M. Ludovici, 1935, pp. 71-2.
- ⁵⁴ F.A.E. Crew, 1928, p. 66.
- ⁵⁵ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, pp. 94-95.
- ⁵⁶ East and Jones, 1919, p. 187.
- ⁵⁷ Fritz Lenz—*Menschliche Auslese Und Rassenhygiene*, Munich, 1931, p. 471. Quoted by A.M. Ludovici, 1935, p. 71.
- ⁵⁸ East and Jones, op. cit., p. 212. Cp. A.M. Ludovici, 1935, p. 149.
- ⁵⁹ F.A.E. Crew, 1928, p. 69.

- ⁶⁰ East and Jones, 1919, pp. 141, 154, 158-9. Cp. F.A.E. Crew, 1928, pp. 66-7.
- ⁶¹ F.A.E. Crew, 1928, pp. 68-70; East and Jones, 1919, p. 158.
- ⁶² F.A.E. Crew, 1928, p. 68; East and Jones, 1919, pp. 158, 160f.
- ⁶³ Charles Darwin, op. cit., 2nd Ed., 1885, p. 102.
- ⁶⁴ F.A.E. Crew, 1928, pp. 69-70.
- ⁶⁵ A.M. Ludovici, 1935, pp. 135-7.
- ⁶⁶ F.A.E. Crew—*Organic Inheritance in Man*, London, 1927, p. 125. R. Ruggles Gates—*Heredity in Man*, London, 1929, p. 329. S. J. Holmes—*Human Genetics and Its Social Import*, McGraw, 1936, p. 351ff. C.B. Davenport and M. Steggerda—*Race Crossing in Jamaica*, Publ. Carnegie Inst., No. 395, Washington, D.C., 1929. J.A. Mjoen—"Biological Consequences Of Race Crossing" Jr. Hered., 17:175-185, 1926. H. Lundborg—*Die Rassennischung Beim Menschen* (reprinted from *Bibliographica Genetica*, VIII, 1931. The Hague. M. Nyhoff.
- ⁶⁷ R. Ruggles Gates, 1929, p. 329.
- ⁶⁸ See Note 66, Davenport and Steggerda, p. 470.
- ⁶⁹ S. J. Holmes, 1936, pp. 351-2.
- ⁷⁰ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, p. 125.
- ⁷¹ Weston A. Price—*Nutrition and Physical Degeneration*, Harper, 1939, p. 6.
- ⁷² Herbert Spencer—"Personal Beauty." In *Essays, Scientific, Political and Speculative*, London, 1901, Vol. 11, pp. 397-8. Quoted by Ludovici, 1935, pp. 138-9.
- ⁷³ F.A.E. Crew, 1928, p. 70.
- ⁷⁴ F.A.E. Crew, 1928, p. 68.
- ⁷⁵ A.M. Ludovici, 1935, see especially pp. 1-150.
- ⁷⁶ S. J. Holmes—*The Eugenic Predicament*, Harcourt, 1933, pp. 82-3. Cp. his *Trend of the Race*, 1921, pp. 229-231. Also, Paul Popenoe, *Modern Marriage*, New York, 1927, pp. 38-40.
- ⁷⁷ East and Jones, 1919, p. 244.
- ⁷⁸ Fritz Lenz, op. cit., p. 476. Quoted by A.M. Ludovici, 1935, p. 147.
- ⁷⁹ Knight Dunlap, op. cit., pp. 74-5. Cp. Irving Fisher and E.L. Fisk—*How To Live*, Funk, 1927, p. 48.

⁸⁰ Paul Popenoe and R.H. Johnson—*Applied Eugenics*, revised ed., Macmillan, 1935, p. 188. Cp. Paul Popenoe—“Should Cousins Marry?” 1937, p. 8.

⁸¹ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, p. 100.

⁸² Earnest A. Hooton—*Apes, Men, and Morons*, Putnam, 1937, p. 3.

⁸³ Knight Dunlap, op. cit., pp. 56-7. Cp. S. J. Holmes, 1936, Ch. II, pp. 19-27.

⁸⁴ W.D. McKim—*Heredity and Human Progress*, Putnam, 1900, p. 220. Cp. pp. 214-221.

⁸⁵ Frank Hankins—*Racial Basis of Civilization*, Knopf, 1926, pp. 346-7.

⁸⁶ Elmer Pendell—*Sex and Civilization*, 1967, Noontide Press, Los Angeles, Calif.

⁸⁷ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, pp. 152-3.

⁸⁸ F.A.E. Crew, Ch. IV of *More Medical Views on Birth Control*, edited by Dr. Norman Haire, pp. 108-9.

⁸⁹ Alexis Carrel—*Man the Unknown*, Harper, 1935, pp. 300, 318-9.

⁹⁰ Louis L. Mann: “Religion and Human Sterilization,” article in *Unity* (John Haynes Holmes, Ed.—not the *New Thought* publication) for Feb. 4, 1935, p. 233. Dr. Mann was Rabbi of Chicago Sinai Congregation and a professor in the Univ. of Chicago. Cp. S. J. Holmes, 1936, p. 371.

⁹¹ Louis L. Mann, *ibid.*

⁹² S. J. Holmes, 1936, pp. 372-3. I may add, from pages 373-4: “The largest number of operations have been carried out in Germany under the recent sterilization law. During the first year of its operation sterilizations were performed upon 56,244 persons adjudged to be hereditarily defective by the High Courts of Eugenics—over twice as many sterilizations in one year as the total number performed in the United States.

“In no country do the number of individuals sterilized constitute more than a small fraction of the hereditary defectives who in the interests of the race should not procreate their kind. Even if all defectives were sterilized there would be a continuous supply from the reservoir of carriers.”

⁹³ Lothrop Stoddard—*Into the Darkness*, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1940, pp. 192-6. Indeed, I should strongly recommend a reading of pp. 187-200. The spirit and aim that prompted the Sterilization Law are well revealed in the “Ten Commandments for the Choice of a Mate,” to be found on pp. 198-9.

⁹⁴ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, p. 179.

- ⁹⁵ A.M. Ludovici. See his article in *English Review*, July-Sept., 1936. Cp. S. J. Holmes, 1936, p. 73f.
- ⁹⁶ S. J. Holmes, 1936, pp. 374-5.
- ⁹⁷ *Ibid.* p. 374.
- ⁹⁸ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, pp. 152-4.
- ⁹⁹ F.A.E. Crew, 1927, pp. 153-4.
- ¹⁰⁰ Sir Arthur Keith—*A New Theory of Human Evolution*, New York, 1949, p. 98.
- ¹⁰¹ E.A. Hooton, 1937, *op. cit.*, p. 231; Popenoe and Johnson, *op. cit.*, 1935, p. 178; S. J. Holmes, 1933, pp. 174-7, 206-7; C.G. Campbell—*Bio-Social Implications of Contraception* (reprinted from *Proceedings of 2nd International Congress for Sex Research*), 1930, pp. 579f., 583f.
- ¹⁰² Anthony M. Ludovici—*The Night-Hoers*, London, 1928.
- ¹⁰³ Viking saga: *Gunnlaug The Worm-Tongue, in Three Northern Love Stories*, translated by William Morris and E. Magnusson, Longmans, 1901, p. 9.
- ¹⁰⁴ Elliot Holt, New York, n.d.
- ¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 285-296, espec. pp. 289, 293.
- ¹⁰⁶ Knight Dunlap, *op. cit.*, p. 78.
- ¹⁰⁷ W.D. McKim, *op. cit.*, p. 188.
- ¹⁰⁸ Putnam, 1900.
- ¹⁰⁹ S. J. Holmes, 1933, pp. 9, 153-4.
- ¹¹⁰ W.D. McKim, p. 189.
- ¹¹¹ George F. Scott—*The Truth about Birth Control*, p. 153.
- ¹¹² *New York Times*, May 11, 1938.
- ¹¹³ S. J. Holmes, 1933, p. 154.
- ¹¹⁴ Alexis Carrel, 1935, p. 296.
- ¹¹⁵ E.A. Hooton, 1937, p. 10.

- ¹¹⁶ See *Man kind Quarterly*, Vol. V, No. 4 (Spring 1965), pp. 244-5, where its editor, Dr. R. Gayre of Gayre reviews *Studies In Eugenics* by Professor H.J. Muller, Indiana Univ. Press, 1962. Dr. Muller was one of the signatories of "The Geneticists' Manifesto."
- ¹¹⁷ Alexis Carrel, 1935, p. 300.
- ¹¹⁸ Knight Dunlap, op. cit., p. 78.
- ¹¹⁹ C.G. Campbell, op. cit., p. 583.
- ¹²⁰ Albert E. Wiggam: "Do Brains and Character Go Together?" *Reader's Digest*, November 1941.
- ¹²¹ Knight Dunlap, op. cit., pp. 46-9, 15, 16, 40, 42, 49-50, 55.
- ¹²² Genevieve Parkhurst: "Shall Marriage Be Subsidized?" in *Harper's Magazine*, Nov. 1937.
- ¹²³ S. J. Holmes, 1933, pp. 170-4; 1936, pp. 378, 381.
- ¹²⁴ Bertrand Russell—*Marriage and Morals*, Liveright, 1929, p. 262.
- ¹²⁵ A.M. Ludovici in *English Review*, July-Sept. 1936; Genevieve Parkhurst, see Note 122 (supra), p. 577.
- ¹²⁶ S. J. Holmes, 1936, p. 380.
- ¹²⁷ Ira S. Wile—*Sex Life of the Unmarried Adult*, Vanguard, 1934, p. 51.
- ¹²⁸ Alexis Carrel, 1935, p. 297.
- ¹²⁹ Popenoe and Johnson, 1935, pp. 72, 314.
- ¹³⁰ Charles W. Armstrong—*The Survival of the Unfittest*, London, 1927, p. 31.
- ¹³¹ Knight Dunlap, op. cit., pp. 50-1.
- ¹³² John Ruskin—*Fors Clavigera*, London, 1872, Vol. I. pp. 271-8.

Chapter 18.

The Everlasting Truth about Race.

In view of the terrifying chaos which prevails in the wake of present day applications of current racial theories, both in America and elsewhere around the world, it has become morally mandatory that the still uninvolved men of good intentions and normal intelligence overcome their aversion and re-assume responsibility for their own society. The obvious place to begin their new involvement will be with a re-examination of those theories being thus applied to the practical situations of man's relationship with man.

William Flax

The confusion, conflict and frustration in our management of minority problems derives largely from a refusal to face and discuss certain facts and realities on which intellectual progress toward a workable solution depends.

George A. Lundberg

A solution to these problems must be found, but it will never be obtained from falsification of the facts of heredity and racial history.

Robert Gayre of Gayre

The truth, to be sure, is sometimes hard to grasp, but it is never so elusive as when it is not wanted.

Herman H. Dinsmore

In this chapter we come to grips with what many men of informed and earnest mind and magnanimous sentiments consider one of the most crucial questions not only of our time, but of all times—of all human existence. What is race? What is its significance? What does it require of us?

Winter before last, a one-time very close friend of mine, long the head of the Department of Philosophy at one of the best New England colleges, wrote me that in his judgment what he called "racism" was "more socially vicious than prostitution, or stealing of property, or . . ." several other kinds of odious behavior. I never got him to define just what he meant by "racism," but from what he did say, and from the temper that he displayed, I understood him to believe that brains and character were distributed among men without regard to race, as much in one race as in another, and that it was no less than a crime, and one of great

enormity, to give to race any weight whatever in estimating either a man's worth or his capabilities, his suitability for citizenship in our country, or for marrying one of our daughters.

Nor is such an attitude in any way unusual in our day. The Reverend Eugene Carson Blake, while head of the National Council of Churches a few years ago, went so far as to declare that today segregation, as maintained for instance in our South, was the worst sin that man could commit.¹ And this spirit and this judgment have had the full support of our press, radio, schools, colleges and learned societies, the pundits of our science and the preachers of our churches, and not least, of all our television networks. For the past generation and more, they have been working together in a concentrated effort to build up in the minds of our people a unanimous opinion that race is virtually non-existent, is at the most of no consequence, and that anyone who attaches importance to it, and especially anyone who would make it decisive in answering all sorts of social questions, is nothing better than an ignoramus, a bigot, and a hater of human kind, deserving of universal contempt and condemnation, if not of the whip.

And, yet, only about a hundred years ago, Benjamin Disraeli, prime minister of Great Britain in the reign of Queen Victoria, actually wrote: "All is race; there is no other truth. It is the key to history. And every race must fall which carelessly suffers its blood to become mixed."² And perhaps it would take only a little historical investigation to reveal that such an attitude was strikingly typical of all the great peoples of the past in precisely those periods in their careers that marked the apex of their political and cultural significance, and their ascent to it.

The contrast between these two positions forces upon us the questions: What can have happened to bring about such a great change? And where lies the truth?

In fairness to myself and to my reader, I must remind him that I approached this question, forty years ago, very definitely from the equalitarian side. In my student days, and for the nine years of my Franciscan venture that followed, with a belief in "universal love" and an outlook on life very like that of St. Francis of Assisi, I quite ignored race, and discounted it. Wherever I went, in our South as in our North, in the Orient as in my own country and among my own kind, I met men as I found them, and valued them for the worth that I sensed in them as individuals, without regard to their race, their nation, their family, class, or any other feature having to do with their origin or their associations. Provided that there was health of body and mind on both sides, I even openly declared my readiness to sanction racial intermarriage.

But it was my Christian tradition and my ignorance that spoke thus. I had ventured thus to declare myself without ever having really looked into the matter. And if, when I did look into the matter, I gradually had to surrender my previous position, it was only in the light of values and considerations that had previously failed to catch my attention or been too hastily dismissed, and before the weight of evidence whose pertinence and cogency I could neither deny nor resist. Also, I must add, I have tried to be completely fair, to give each side of the question ample opportunity to speak for itself, and, moreover, I invariably aimed to be thorough. I began my investigation by devoting a couple of months in 1930 to close study of the question in the library at Yale University, and race has been one of the subjects that I

have followed most assiduously ever since. My approach was at first exclusively, and to date has remained predominantly, scientific and historical. Finally, let me say, I have not been trying to maintain a position or to win an argument. I have been searching for the truth, and have always followed wherever I was led by the best evidence that I could find.

- Part 1. Is Race a Reality?
 - Part 2. The Equalitarian Propagandists
 - Part 3. Definitions
 - Part 4. The Origin of Races
 - Part 5. The Inequality of Races
 - Part 6. Race-Crossing
 - Footnotes to Chapter 18
-

1. Is Race a Reality?

“Liberalism is a disease whose first symptom is an inability to believe in conspiracies.”
Friedrich Wilhelm IV (1795-1861)

To many otherwise well-informed people, it may today come as something of a revelation to discover that the views of race now so prevalent, do not enjoy anything like a monopoly of scientific support. The *appearance* of monopoly, as I shall show, has been largely engineered. But anyone who will make an open-minded and fearless investigation will soon find out that views sharply opposed to the racial propaganda of the day not only can show evidence of being rationally well grounded, but have the endorsement of scientific authorities as eminent as any in the world, and of spirits quite obviously distinguished by their devotion to the ennobling of human life.

And such investigation is all that I should ask. I am quite content to have people differ with me provided they first have made an honest examination of the matter. But most people really have *no right to an opinion* on race. They have made no searching investigation into the facts, they have done no independent thinking, and they commonly show precious little concern for the fate of man or even of their own kind. For the most part, they are too sluggish to question or too cowardly to accept the consequences of breaking with prevalent opinion. They take over the views handed out to them with almost as little thought as they do their names, just drift with the crowd, and hope to conceal their own very obvious prejudice by the rancor and vituperation under which they attempt to smother all those who oppose them.

To reply that one has no time to investigate the problem of race is no answer. If indeed most people have neither time, nor inclination, for the study not only of this question but of many

another of great difficulty, then the least they can do is to refrain from expressing opinions about them, and from abusing and condemning those who, whatever be their conclusions, have at least given these problems very honest and thorough study. But it is doubtful whether any society can long endure in which problems of such gravity are decided by citizens who have little knowledge of the facts, and where the atmosphere for a fair and full hearing of all sides of the issue is lacking. It is exceedingly unlikely that a people will ever *stumble* upon the right answers!

In the interest of understanding, let me first clear up some minor preliminaries, and then examine the opinions of a number of well known scientists who have declared their position on race. It is necessary also to take fully into account the climate of opinion in which the investigation of racial questions has to be carried on.

Let me assure my reader at the outset that I am not altogether a fanatic for "pure race." I do not quite fall on my face before Gobineau.³ I have not forgotten that Nietzsche spoke of the "pure race swindle." By this time it has been dinned into my ears sufficiently that today all people are more or less mixed. Indeed, even ancient peoples, such as the Greeks, though their isolation and their aloofness from all that was alien ("barbarian," they called it), in time produced a high degree of genetic homogeneity as compared, say, with the general run of modern Americans. Yet was the racial composition with which their history begins a mixture of different elements. For ages, peoples have moved, even when they could move only on foot; and wherever they have gone they have mated, more or less, with those whom they met on their way. But it is doubtful that any modern scientist anywhere in the world has held any such conception of "pure race" as the antagonists of the race-idea have fulminated against.⁴

And I am very ready to concede all that can be made from the fact of human variability. I should agree with Otto Klineberg that "there is no homogeneity [at least, no *complete* homogeneity] within each race, and no sharp line between one race and another."⁵ The tallest pygmy is taller than the shortest White man and the stupidest White man has far less mind than the most intelligent pure-blooded Negro. And it should perhaps be conceded with Professor Frank Hankins, that where there has been considerable racial crossing, the racial types set up as standards for comparison become little more than "the abstraction of traits from existing individuals and their recombination into a generalized or ideal type represented by few or no individuals."⁶

On the other hand, let me point out that though some measure of racial crossing can be found almost anywhere that history or science may turn its telescope, it is quite undeniable that again and again, through the inbreeding that attends physical isolation or proud and unbending aloofness, a people has produced a striking degree of homogeneity even out of the mixed and disparate elements with which it began. Sir Arthur Keith, speaking of "Mongolian peoples," observed that though they are "so different individually," they are nevertheless "so alike in the mass that they are unmistakable to the trained eye."⁷ Let anyone look into a book of ethnology such as Hans F. K. Guenther's *The Racial Elements of European History* (London, 1927), and note well the pictures of sculptured figures that have come down to us from ancient times. Here we have none of the abstractions that Klineberg scoffs at. The artist chiseled from life. When he was not, as it were, painting a portrait of an

individual, he was depicting what he knew to be representative of a distinct and identifiable people, as in the case of "The Dying Persian," where one can see at a glance not only the vast difference between Persian and Assyrian, Arab, Jew or Negro, but also that the ancient Persian and Greek were like enough to be cousins and obviously were sprung from the same Nordic and Aryan stock. Nor are we limited to antiquity for examples of this. We have the same sort of thing maintaining itself conspicuously right down into our present day in the English, in the Japanese, and in the Scandinavian.

Certainly, after forty years of pursuing the question, I must declare, most emphatically, that I cannot subscribe to the views of the school that would make race a delusion. And it is now time that we inquire how it has come about that today so many people, even intelligent people, seem to believe just this.

2. The Equalitarian Propagandists

In 1942, a man now known as Ashley Montagu (originally, Israel Ehrenberg, born in England), of Columbia University and later head of the Department of Anthropology at Rutgers, brought out a book entitled *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*. It received from *The Christian Century* the endorsement of a very favorable review, in which it was remarked: "There are, to be sure, five or six recognizable types of men—Mongolian, Caucasian, Negro, etc.—but the minglings have been many, the borders between them are broad and vague, the mixtures often biologically better than either parent, and the essential differences are not socially significant."⁸ Montagu's view, which was pretty much that of the whole Boas school (of which, more anon), was given a popular summary in a booklet entitled *The Races of Mankind* by Ruth Benedict and Gene Weltfish, in collaboration with Otto Klineberg and L.C. Dunn (all professors at Columbia University), and published in 1946 by the Public Affairs Committee in New York, whose editor had been editor of a Communist organ in Moscow and had some fifty citations against him for Communist activities and connections in the United States. From some quarter, a very determined and by no means altogether unsuccessful effort was made during the Second World War to place a copy of this pamphlet in the hands of every man in the armed services. Evidently, therefore, somebody rated it very important.

Its argument is that all human blood is essentially the same. All race feeling is prejudice known only to modern times and incidental to the effort of the more powerful nations to exploit the weaker (p. 25). The ideal is to be found in Soviet Russia, where racial discrimination has been outlawed. Inherited racial differences are of no consequence. "All the peoples of the Earth are a single family and have a common origin" (p. 3). "The races of mankind are what the Bible says they are—brothers. In their bodies is the record of their brotherhood" (p. 5). The great cultural inequality in the contributions of the various races is to be accounted for by the fact that the more advanced enjoyed "an unusual collection of fortunate circumstances" (p. 21). That is to say, no race comes to the top because it is more gifted or more masterful, but because it has "better luck" (p. 18). It does not win its way, but somehow is given a "more favorable environment." Moreover, there is nothing in the race of any person that should stand in the way of his uniting his genes with those of a person of any other race (p. 14). As far as race itself is concerned, one is as good as another. For marriage, all that matters is the health of body and mind that a man and a woman can bring

to it as individuals. Provided these are found in both, a man of one race may take his wife from any other. Race is but a fallacy, a snare and a delusion, which no one can make any account of, except with evil intentions.⁹

In his *Race Differences*, Professor Otto Klineberg gave the matter a more scientific guise, but his pronouncements were the same. While admitting evidence of inequality, he explained it away; intelligence tests he called into question; while not denying that "racial differences in mentality" might exist, he denied that there is any scientific proof of it; and in conclusion he declared: "The notion that one race is more primitive than another has no acceptable foundation." "Every single one of the arguments in order to prove the inferiority of other races has amounted to nothing."¹⁰

Those who hold such views are often referred to in academic circles as the "Franz Boas school." This school calls for close examination. Mr. Carleton Putnam, with degrees in law and science from Princeton and Columbia, in his *Race And Reality* (Public Affairs Press, 1967), has given a succinct and objective but very arresting account of its background, aims and accomplishments.

Franz Boas was born in Germany in 1858 of radical socialist Jewish parents. His education included no study of anthropology, and how he got his Ph.D. appears to be something of a mystery. Nevertheless, by 1899 he became Professor of Anthropology at Columbia University, where for nearly forty years he trained a great many students in his doctrine of so-called social or "cultural" anthropology, which breaks with physical anthropology (and with all past wisdom on the subject) in its teaching that the long-observed racial differences in feature, capability and character are due primarily to environment rather than to heredity. Selected pupils of Boas, given an aureole of authority with Ph.D. degrees, were placed decades ago at the head of anthropology departments in leading universities, and given the concerted backing of press, radio and, later, TV, which freely published their pronouncements and refused a hearing to those who wanted to answer them. Thus, with the students whom they in turn raised up to become heads of university departments, they have constituted that "cohesive propaganda group" which has been responsible, more than anything else, for putting almost the entire academic and intellectual life of the United States, and now ever increasingly, the political, economic, social and religious life of the country as well, on an equalitarian foundation, with what the great mass of people take to be solid scientific backing.¹¹

In confirmation of these representations, let me quote from the biography of Franz Boas by Professor Melville Herskovits, one of the outstanding members of the Boas school:

"The four decades of the tenure of his [Boas'] professorship at Columbia gave a continuity to his teaching that permitted him to develop students who eventually made up the greater part of the significant professional core of American anthropologists, and who came to man and direct most of the major departments of anthropology in the United States. In their turn they trained the students who, with the increase in general interest in the subject and the recognition of the contribution it can make to human knowledge and human welfare, have continued in the tradition in which their teachers were trained. . ."¹²

The above is something like an admission from within the equalitarians' own ranks. It was fully confirmed and somewhat amplified from "the other side" by Professor Henry E. Garrett in a letter "To the Editor of the *New York Times*" published October 24, 1962 (p. 38C). As head of the Department of Psychology at Columbia University, he had many years of opportunity to observe Boas' doings and those of his "school," both there and in the country at large. But as I shall shortly have occasion to quote his observations in another connection, let me here content myself with the following from Carleton S. Coon, Professor of Anthropology at Harvard and at the University of Pennsylvania, curator of ethnology at the University Museum in Philadelphia, past President of the American Association of Physical Anthropology, and easily "one of the most eminent living anthropologists in the world today." In the course of writing his *The Story of Man*, which has been translated into at least eight languages, he said:

"More serious are the activities of the academic debunkers and soft-pedalers who operate inside anthropology itself. Basing their ideas on the concept of the brotherhood of man, certain writers, who are mostly social anthropologists, consider it immoral to study race, and produce book after book exposing it as a 'myth.' Their argument is that because the study of race once gave ammunition to racial fascists, we should pretend that races do not exist... These writers are not physical anthropologists, but the public does not know the difference."

13

That the "scientific" foundation claimed by the Boas school for its rejection of race is indeed specious,¹⁴ one begins to suspect as one discovers, little by little, what has long been going on behind the scenes. On a very large scale, champions of "the new orthodoxy" about race have been cowering their opponents into silence by persecution and by thinly veiled threats, or accomplishing the same end by holding out to them the prospect of professional advancement on the condition that, at least before the public eye, they keep in line. One discovers, too, how shifty, underhanded and dishonest they have been, and are being, in carrying on controversy. Facts presented by their adversaries they ignore, evade, deny, or falsify, and instead of submitting documented facts of their own they content themselves with making pompous pronouncements, which are picked up and loudly praised by other "authorities" lined up on their side, while all this hue and cry and hullabaloo is noisily echoed as by a loudspeaker over every large news medium in the land.

One thinks, for instance, of the 1950 UNESCO Statement on Race (of the United Nations), which was so flimsily thrown together and so promptly repudiated by outstanding biologists, physical anthropologists and geneticists from all over the world, that it had to be replaced the very next year with a modified, but still unsatisfactory, substitute statement, whose departures from the previous version plainly served to acknowledge and "emphasize not only the undocumented nature of the original assertions, but their actual fallacy."¹⁵ Dr. Stefan Possony of Stanford University, in a minute and searching analysis of the Statement and those that succeeded it, laid bare an intention to mislead the uninformed by what must have been conscious and deliberate dishonesty. The subtitle of his article reads: "A Study in Intellectual Oppression."¹⁶ Carleton Putnam described the original manifesto as "a propaganda device of the most flagrant kind."¹⁷

To be sure, under heavy fire from many distinguished scientists, UNESCO did, in its 1952 Statement, acknowledge that "races are 'real' and not mere artifacts of classification." It

reads: "We were careful to avoid saying that, because races were variable and many of them graded into each other, therefore, races did not exist. The physical anthropologist and the man in the street both know that races exist." Yet—be it noted—what UNESCO subsequently went on to propagate, *as if no such admission of the reality of race had been made*, was mainly the 1950 text that it was supposed to have corrected, so that what has got into numerous books was rather the original denial of race than the acknowledgment of its existence and its reality. Dr. Possony remarked that "there was a transparent attempt to assign the 1952 corrective to a 'memory-hole.'" And evidently the attempt was successful. For the social anthropologists and the ethnic psychologists, for the most part, have gone on with their muttered evasions of racial differences. UNESCO followed up with its pronouncement of 1964 that "no biological justification exists" for opposing racial intermarriage, the general public has been led to think that racial differences, if they exist, are of no consequence and can be ignored, and more and more often we see a fair young maiden walking down Main Street hand in hand with a jet black Negro.

One thinks, too, of all the chicanery that is now known to have lain behind the Supreme Court's 1954 decision against Segregation, as brought to light seven years later in the confession of Dr. Alfred H. Kelly before the annual meeting of the American Historical Association in December, 1961. Dr. Kelly, Professor of History at Wayne University (Detroit), was one of the experts on Constitutional history employed by the NAACP to develop the historical phase of the 14th Amendment in arguing the desegregation case. In his address before the Historical Association, he described their purpose and conduct before the Supreme Court in these words:

"The problem we faced was not the historian's discovery of the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth; the problem instead was the formulation of an adequate gloss on the fateful events of 1866 sufficient to convince the Court that we had something of a historical case. . . . It is not that we were engaged in formulating lies: there was nothing as crude and naive as that. But we were using facts, emphasizing facts, bearing down on facts, sliding off facts, quietly ignoring facts and above all interpreting facts in a way to do what [Thurgood] Marshall [then chief counsel for the NAACP] said we had to do—'get by those boys down there.'" ¹⁸

It looks as though it was pretty much the same story when it comes to those experiments with white and black dolls of Professor Kenneth B. Clark, the Negroes' chief witness in the Segregation case, in which Professor Clark represented that the piteous reactions of the colored children proved that "segregating inflicts injuries upon the Negro." The justices were moved. In defending their decision, they declared that the damage of segregation to Negro children might "affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."

Ernest van den Haag, Professor of Social Philosophy at New York University and lecturer on social philosophy at the New School for Social Research, tore this to pieces in an article published in the *Villanova Law Review* (VI, 1960, p. 177). After reviewing the performance he said:

"I am forced to the conclusion that Professor Clark misled the Court. Whether it be granted that his tests show psychological damage to Negro children, the comparison between the

responses of Negro children in segregated and in non-segregated schools shows that 'they do not differ' except that *Negro children in segregated schools 'are less pronounced in their preference for the white dolls' and more often think of the colored dolls as 'nice' or identify with them.* In short, if Professor Clark's tests do demonstrate damage to Negro children, then they demonstrate that the damage is less with segregation and greater with congregation [that is, 'integration']. Yet, Professor Clark told the Court he was proving that 'segregation inflicts injuries upon the Negro' by the very tests which, if they prove anything—which is doubtful—prove the opposite! “. . . Did Professor Clark know that his own previous tests indicate that according to his own criteria Negro children are less damaged by segregation than by congregation? That, in short, the conclusions he testified to were inconsistent with his own 'previous results,' although he testified that they were 'consistent'? If he did, he deceived the Court deliberately. . . .” “From Professor Clark's experiments, his testimony and, finally, the essay to which I am replying, the best conclusion that can be drawn is that he did not know what he was doing; and the worst, that he did.”¹⁹

In conclusion, I may call attention to the fact that Professor Henry E. Garrett, for sixteen years head of the department of psychology at Columbia, and Professor Wesley C. George, Professor emeritus of Histology and Embryology of the University of North Carolina Medical School, have witnessed that the Supreme Court's 1954 decision “was based on weak and unconvincing sociological data.” No opposing scientific evidence was reviewed by the Court. Carleton Putnam has said 90 percent of the relevant evidence was ignored.

And then one discovers—if I may give yet another example—that in an effort to gain for their cause the weight of such men as Lincoln and Jefferson, the equalitarians quote dishonestly. The views of Lincoln in regard to the Negro, which he stated repeatedly, publicly and unequivocally, are to be found in any complete edition of his works.” Though I shall give numerous other excerpts from his published speeches and statements in my footnotes,²⁰ his position was consistent from 1852 until the day of his death, and is largely summed up in the following from debates with Judge Douglas on August 21, 1858 and September 16, 1859:

“I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and black races. . . I am not, nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, or intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race . . . I give . . . the most solemn pledge that I will to the very last stand by the law of the State, which forbids the marrying of white people with negroes.”²¹

Like Jefferson, Madison and Clay before him, he believed that the only sure solution of the race problem in our country was colonization, the complete removal of the Negro from our soil. He conceived a plan for it during the Civil War, and Congress was persuaded to make the necessary initial appropriations. He also proposed an amendment to the Federal

Constitution that would have authorized Congress to put his ideal of full repatriation into effect.

Such facts about Lincoln, though commonly unknown, it is impossible to deny. But our "Liberals" do the best they can to keep them unknown by ignoring them and quoting what little they can to the contrary.

It is the same story when it comes to Jefferson's attitude toward the Negro. Typical of the equalitarians' dishonesty is the quotation carved on the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, of that *half* of one of Jefferson's statements, which favored their position, while omitting its other half which nullified it. What is carved on the tablet, read by everyone who passes (and widely quoted), reads: "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these peoples [the Negroes] are to be free." But the statement being quoted ends not with a period but with a semicolon, and the rest of the sentence, which they omitted, continues: "nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live under the same government." And in its context it is followed by:

"Nature, habit, opinion have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them. It is still in our power to direct the process of emancipation and deportation, peaceably, and in such slow degree, as that the evil will wear off insensibly, and their place be, 'pari passu,' filled up by free white laborers. If, on the contrary, it is left to force itself on, human nature must shudder at the prospect held up."

Instances of this sort could be multiplied indefinitely. Far graver and more flagrant than any I have yet mentioned was the way the Boas school and the equalitarians generally met the evidence submitted by eminent scientists in the legal case of *Stell vs. Savannah Board of Education* eight years ago. These were reviewed very lucidly in Putnam's *Race and Reality*, Chapters IV and V. Perhaps the climax in the trial was reached in the evidence submitted by distinguished authorities which laid the axe to the very root of the Supreme Court's anti-segregation decision of 1954. It clearly indicated the Negro's inferiority to the White man, average against average, in many ways, but in no way more significantly than in size and weight of brain, especially in the measurements of the brain's frontal cortex and its supra-granular layer, which are concerned with will, intellect, self-control, etc. Upon all this a man's capacity to create, participate in and maintain a civilization such as ours, absolutely hinges. But evidence was submitted, further, that with the existing handicap in mental capacity it had actually proved a *disadvantage*, not only to the general run of Negro children, but to the exceptionally gifted ones as well, to be dissociated from their own kind and thrown into classroom competition with White children, where their inability to hold up their end inevitably left them with a sense of inferiority, frustration, and consequent bitterness, resentment, and antagonism. *The evidence indicated that integration actually injures the Negro more than segregation.*

In reference to this last Mr. Putnam quotes comments of the court in the *Evers* case as follows:

"Apart from any differences in learning aptitude between white and Negro pupils, the evidence showed without contradiction that effective learning can only occur under

conditions in which the individual's attention can be given to study without unnatural distractions. Such receptivity occurs only when the learner is in a group with which he has an empathic relation, such as with his family, his kind, his neighbors of like interests, or other groups with which he identifies himself as an individual and in which, because of his similarity of characteristic, he is an accepted group member."

"It does not appear that this identification is caused either by school or society but rather arises primarily from a natural biological selection mechanism which plays a part in maintaining evolutionary diversity of type and is described scientifically as ethnocentrism. . .

"In the classroom, the intermingling of two groups, each having a high degree of self-identity, causes a heightening of consciousness of group, a result which grows as the number of contacts between them is increased. Compulsory intermixing therefore exaggerates rather than diminishes any divisive forces which exist."

Carleton Putnam—*Race And Reality*, op. cit., 1967, pp. 122-3.

The evidence, in its totality, laid the Supreme Court's 1954 segregation decision wide open to question, and obviously demanded a complete review of the entire case. Nevertheless, it went altogether unchallenged by the legal representatives of the NAACP in court: no cross-examination was attempted, and no counter evidence was submitted! "Thus into the record, under oath, unchallenged and uncontradicted either by counsel or by opposing witnesses, went the heart of the *Stell* case"—which the court decided *against integration*.

But for all its significance, no meaningful discussion of the case appeared in any newspaper of national influence, and the appeal court, *ignoring the evidence entirely*, reversed the decision on the ostensible ground that an inferior federal court could not "refrain from acting as required [by the 1954 segregation decision of the Supreme Court] even if such a court should conclude that the Supreme Court erred either as to its facts or as to the law." That is, it shifted all responsibility onto the shoulders of the Supreme Court. And the Supreme Court finally decided, without a word of comment, that it would not review the evidence or rehear the case.

Perhaps my reader, nonplussed by this extraordinary recital, has been casting about in his mind for some explanation. And a reasonably full explanation I will give in my next chapter. Here, however, I can only throw out a few hints.

The story that I have sketched is a record of achievement that would hardly have been possible but for the carefully and skillfully engineered organization and propaganda that emanated from the Boas school of anthropologists. In this connection, let me quote from a letter to Mr. Carleton Putnam in which Professor Henry E. Garrett of Columbia reported his observations of the doings of Franz Boas and his disciples to the day of Boas' death.

"I knew Franz Boas personally. I was able to observe his influence as founder of the science of anthropology in America. I was also able to observe the increasing degree of control exercised by the [Boas] cult over students and younger professors until fear of loss of jobs or status became common in the field of anthropology unless conformity to the racial equality

dogma was maintained. I can testify from repeated personal observation to the intimidation and to the pall of suppression that has fallen upon the academic world in the area of which I speak. It encompasses not only anthropology but certain related sciences.”²²

Mr. Putnam brings out very tersely the significance of Professor van den Haag’s testimony before Judge Frank M. Scarlett’s court (Southern District of Georgia) in the 1963 case of *Stell vs. Savannah*, as follows:

“... in these words van den Haag drew a thumbnail sketch of a worldwide condition. And he confirmed a prescription for the hypnosis of millions. Indoctrinate a controlling group of scientists in a politically oriented, environmentalist dogma over a period of two generations; make a moral issue out of something immoral; persecute and suppress any dissenters; infiltrate the mass media, and finally persuade the courts by introducing only falsified evidence. Thereafter rely solely, in those courts, on the ‘majority’ view. Never again permit the truth to come to life if you can help it. Thus before my eyes at this trial had unrolled the pattern I had found everywhere else in our national life in almost exact duplication.”²³

In support of these views let me submit some items from my own, personal study and observation:

(1) The heart of the Boas doctrine, tied up with the bald assertion that environment is more determining of human development than heredity, is this—that, at least potentially, all men are equal.

(2) The conviction that all men are equal was the driving force behind the French Revolution, and it has been the driving force behind every social revolution (or attempt at social revolution) since then. It is of critical importance that this be understood, for it is the very essence of the acid that Communism pours upon every society that it sets itself to destroy. The doctrine of equality will literally *dissolve* any society to which it is rigorously applied, for all social structure and soundness depend upon the recognition that men are *not* equal, that direction and leadership, without which a society can neither come into existence nor long endure, must come and can come only, from the few possessed of superior brains and personality.

(3) As the most outstanding members of the Boas school, aside from Boas himself, I must mention Ashley Montagu, Raymond Pearl, Melville Herskovitz, Herbert Seligman, Otto Klineberg, Gene Weltfish, Amram Scheinfeld, Ruth Benedict, L.C. Dunn, Isador Chein, and Margaret Mead. It is to be noted, of course that a considerable number of these people were foreign-born, and where not foreign-born are of foreign origin. Bluntly, a very high proportion of them are obviously Jews. And the connection between the leaders of World Jewry and Communism is thoroughly documented and absolutely incontrovertible. Karl Marx was a Jew. The Russian Revolution of 1917 was made possible only by massive subsidy from Jewish international finance, notably some 20 million dollars put up by Jacob Schiff of Kuhn-Loeb in New York City. Ninety-five percent of its leadership was composed of Jewish revolutionists (Trotsky among them) trained in the United States and thence imported into Russia to overthrow the Czar’s government. And most Communist spies, and most of the outstanding leaders of the Communist Party everywhere, have been and are Jews. The

present reports of official Soviet “anti-Semitism”—in my judgment—are little more than State-directed propaganda designed to deceive the gentile world as to *how Jewish* both Communism and the Russian Government are, as I shall show in my next chapter.

Of course, Jewish origin does not prove Communist connections, or even sympathy with the Communist cause. But in view of the whole record—which is a very long one—it does give ground for uneasiness. Moreover, in the matter before us, a good proportion of the outstanding members of the Boas school, not only the Jewish but the gentile as well, have (or until they died, did have) Communist connections. Boas himself was cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities for no less than 46 Communist-front affiliations. And the subversive record of Ruth Benedict, Gene Weltfish, Theodosius Dobzhansky, Melville Herskovitz, and especially Ashley Montagu does not make pleasant reading for Americans who love their country.

(4) Devotion to Communism is placed above loyalty to truth. It is unequivocally avowed in Communists’ statements of their basic strategy that any and all means are permitted, that science itself is to be used as an instrument of political warfare, that what is to be accepted as truth is what serves to advance the cause of world revolution. What does not serve world revolution is not to be considered either scientific or truth. To twist truth, to conceal truth, to deny truth, in order to further the ends of Communism is highly commendable.²⁴ The Oxford scientist Professor John R. Baker, in his *Science and the Planned State*, records that the Russian Academician T. D. Lysenko declared that science must be made to support Communist theory and propaganda, that the now completely established chromosome theory of heredity must be suppressed because “from its conceptions [it] leads to reactionary ideas, to the race theory,” and that “it is possible to defend the false bases of Mendelism only by lies.”²⁵ Indeed, not content with denunciation and vituperation, the Soviet Government’s demand for conformity finally reached the point where it sentenced intransigent geneticists first to labor camps, then to Siberia, and finally to death. Over half a dozen of the most distinguished are known “with a considerable degree of probability” to have been executed. Many others simply disappeared. And the American professor Herman J. Muller, who had gone to Russia to accept a position as senior geneticist at the Institute of Genetics of the Academy of Sciences, was so disgusted by this betrayal of science that he returned to his native land and eventually resigned his corresponding membership in the Academy. To this action the Academy replied:

“The development of society is subject not to biological laws but to higher social laws. Attempts to spread to humanity the laws of the animal kingdom are an attempt to lower the human being to the level of beasts.”

Thus, it is evident that “the scientist’s faith in truth is not shared by the true Communist of our time.”²⁶

After this record one has to wonder how far some of our own equalitarians, so vociferous in our midst, may have twisted their “science” to serve their cause.²⁷

(5) All informed persons know that “Communism,” which is actually far more dangerous now in what emanates, for example, from our own Council on Foreign Relations in New

York City or our Department of State in Washington, than in anything that comes out of Soviet Russia or the Communist Party, is today concentrated on the overthrow of the United States.²⁸ They know also that at the momentous Communist gathering at Bridgman, Michigan, as long ago as 1928, the latent racial antagonism between Whites and Blacks in this country was seized upon as the greatest weakness in the American armor, and therefore the point at which to drive in their wedge to split the country apart. And to implement this, it was decided at the same time to press the infiltration and saturation of all our intellectual life and our entire educational system with the equalitarian dogma, as part of their basic strategy.

What all this adds up to is that, as a rule, *before* the anthropologists of the Boas school are scientists, they are zealots and crusaders. They are conspirators and soldiers fighting unscrupulously and ruthlessly in an undeclared holy war. For purposes of their own, they *want* all men to be equal, they may even have a conviction that they *ought* to be equal, and they intend to find means by which, if they are not equal now, they can be made equal by being "given a chance." With this end in view, they mean to bury whatever facts militate against them. In their hearts, they may realize that all branches of all honest, worthy, aboveboard and fearless science are steadily approaching a consensus that race *is* a reality, that there *are* readily distinguishable races of men, and that these races are not only manifestly and undeniably different but *radically unequal* in their capacity for creating and maintaining any great culture and civilization. But any growing apprehension that this is the case only goads these zealots to redoubled and extreme measures to keep such facts from the public eye, to foist upon the people on every level ideas about race that these facts plainly belie. As a last resort, if in their movement toward revolution they find in their way a man of exceptional courage and inflexible honesty, who both knows the truth and can tell it in a way to command attention even in the highest circles, then, in order to remove such an awkward obstacle from their path, they will pounce upon him as if he were a felon, perhaps threaten reprisals upon his family, raise against him a veritable hue and cry of vicious defamation, and literally stop at nothing to break him down, destroy his name, his influence, and above all his work.²⁹ Some such attempt was made even upon so eminent a scientist as Dr. Carleton Coon, author of some dozen books, at least two or three of which are of monumental scientific significance. (The books are, namely, *The Story of Man*, 2nd Edition, 1962, translated into eight languages; *The Origin of Races*, 1962; and *The Living Races of Man*, 1965. All are published by Knopf. Nathaniel Weyl hailed *The Origin of Races* as "a major turning point in physical anthropology" in *National Review*, Jan. 15, 1963, p. 33.)

In fact, though Dr. Coon made it very plain that he wished to be excused from taking part in controversy and asked only to be allowed to search for the truth in scientific seclusion, the witch hunt was pressed upon him so relentlessly by mail and by telephone that for a while he actually considered leaving the country to get away from his persecutors.³⁰ Dr. Robert Gayre has said that the world has witnessed nothing to compare with contemporary intolerance and persecution since Galileo. All this was to the end that people may be deceived into accepting changes in their traditions, values, and institutions, in the name of equality, that will reduce them to such a state of chaos and spiritual rot as we now witness all about us on every hand, and thus make them helpless victims against the day of a "Communist" take-over.

In my judgment, the Boas school really has no case that can stand the light of day and close, expert scrutiny. They themselves acknowledge this by the very extremes to which they go to keep their opponents from being heard. But it must be allowed that they have achieved, and keep up, a remarkable *appearance* of a case. The essential means for accomplishing their extraordinary results have been deception, obfuscation, intimidation, a vast web of all-gripping organization, and—*money*. The set-up has been so effective that today our younger generation are as if mesmerized: eyes have they, but they see not. In regard to all racial issues they are like sleepwalkers in a dream that all men are equal. And, indeed, older persons are also commonly quite taken in by what at bottom is nothing more than a stupendous hoax—one of the most sinister parts of the supreme hoax of this century.

This, surely, is a tale as sordid as it must be alarming to all who can grasp its sinister meaning. I have felt compelled to tell it, as background to this chapter, in order to give my readers a glimpse into the machinations that have been going on in our country for all of two generations, to make even science a tool of political propaganda and revolution. Thus will they have some conception of how difficult, and how personally costly, and even how hazardous it has become for anybody, but especially for top-ranking scientists, to investigate, and to think and to write about—calmly and honestly—any problem vitally related to race. But as far as the *truth* about race is concerned—if that is what anyone is determined to ascertain, I am completely satisfied that full, honest, and fearless investigation can lead to only one answer. And that answer rests simply on finding out *what are the demonstrable facts*. At bottom, it is not a moral issue—any more than it is a moral or religious issue whether the Earth goes around the sun, or water freezes at the temperature of 32 degrees Fahrenheit, or whether a building is forty feet long or fifty, or painted white or green. The first thing to be determined is the facts of the matter. After this is settled, morals and religion may tell us what we should do about them, but they have nothing whatever to do with determining what the facts are. If morals and religion are not to lose all human value, they must invariably and unflinching face up to the facts of life and prove themselves reliable guides in a world of realities. And how real race is in the eyes of those who are supremely trained to determine and to appraise the facts about it, namely our physical anthropologists and geneticists, is perfectly manifest in the following authoritative words from Professor Carleton S. Coon, writing in 1962:

“I am making these statements not for any political or social purpose but merely to show that, were it not for the mechanisms cited above, men would not be black, white, yellow, or brown. We would all be light khaki, for there has been enough gene flow over the clinal regions of the world during the last half million years to have homogenized us all had that been the evolutionary scheme of things, and had it not been advantageous to each of the geographical races for it to retain, for we most part, the adaptive elements in its genetic *status quo*. (A “cline” is defined as “a region of racial transition, a frontier-in-depth within which a subspecies [or what is commonly called a race] grades into another through intermediate forms.)

“This status quo entails not only the variations in bones and teeth that are evident in fossil man, and those of the surface features of living men, like skin, hair, lips, and ears, by which we can distinguish races almost at a glance, but also subtler differences seen only on the dissecting table or through the eyepieces of microscopes. Races differ in the extent and

manner in which the fine subcutaneous muscles of the lips and cheeks have become differentiated from the parent mammalian muscle body; in the chemical composition of hair and of bodily secretions, including milk; in the ways in which different muscles are attached to bones; in the sizes and probable secretion rates of different endocrines; in certain details of the nervous system, as, for example, how far down in the lumbar vertebrae the neural canal extends; and in the capacity of individuals to tolerate crowding and stress.

“In studying racial differences in living men, physical anthropologists are now relying less and less on anthropometry and more and more on research in blood groups, hemoglobins, and other biochemical features. This is all to the good because the inheritance of these newly discovered characteristics can be accurately determined. In them, racial differences have been found, differences just as great as the better known and much more conspicuous anatomical variations. Being invisible to the naked eye, they are much less controversial than the latter in an increasingly race-conscious world. To me, at least, it is encouraging to know that *biochemistry divides us into the same subspecies that we have long recognized on the basis of other criteria.*” (Emphasis added.)³¹

Sir Arthur Keith had put it more succinctly: “Races of men are differentiated in the same way as well-marked species of animals.”

After this, I feel that I can safely proceed with this chapter on the assumption that what we have under examination is no phantasm but a solid reality. Whether or not it should be, or can be, rated one of the supreme realities of human existence, which no one can ignore, trifle with, or defy except at his very great peril, may become apparent as I continue what I have to say.

I purpose now to discuss several racial problems that seem to be of the most crucial consequence for my people, and to do it with the same complete forthrightness with which I have written all my other chapters. These problems are (1) the origin of races; (2) racial equality; (3) miscegenation (or race-crossing); (4) the plight of our own race; and (5) the relations of our race to some other races in particular. I shall cover the first three of these in my present chapter, covering the last two in my next. Let me begin by saying exactly what I mean by race, and by a few other terms which it may clear up some questions merely to define.

3. Definitions

A race is a major division of the human species. Its members, though differing from one another in many minor respects, are nevertheless, as a whole, distinguished by a particular combination of features, principally non-adaptive, which they have inherited from ancestors as alike as they are themselves. These distinguishing features are most apparent in body, where they are both structural and measurable, but manifest themselves also in “innate capacity for intellectual and emotional development,” temperament and character. With this we may compare Professor Bertil Lundman’s definition: “Race . . . is a term that can be applied only to a reasonably homogeneous human group that has preserved its hereditary characteristics almost unchanged through a long succession of generations.”³²

What then is a “racist”? For all of forty years, there has been acute need of honest and fearless inquiry about what race is, and an atmosphere of free discussion out of which might have come something like a scientific consensus as to whether or not racial differences are real, and if so, how much attention they require. But “racist” is a term of opprobrium that was invented by the equalitarians to *prevent* such investigation and discussion. Their purpose has been to smear and intimidate and thus to smother into silence all those who so much as recognized race as something real, even though their victims were scientists of the highest integrity and distinction. That they have been able to work such havoc with it is, in large part, a mark of the ignorance, stupidity and cowardice of the general run of our population. Most men do not know, or they are so thoughtless as to forget, that for thousands of years all human wisdom, among all the peoples who have left any real mark upon history, from China to Iceland, recognized, acknowledged, and acted upon the realities of race. They are ignorant of the fact that the very scientists out of whose discoveries anthropology was developed, from Darwin on down, not only took race into full account but based fundamental discriminations upon it. They are ignorant, also, that at least among physical anthropologists, there must today be something like a complete consensus that would agree with the pronouncement of the great geneticist Professor R. Ruggles Gates that “races or ethnic groups exist and . . . are in fact the raw material by means of which human evolution has taken place.”³³

And indeed, even *without* such knowledge, any upstanding man with eyes in his head and enough faculty to put two and two together, should have mocked at any science, no matter how much begowned and aureoled with degrees, that pontificated that there was no difference, no critically important difference, between a Chinese, a hairy Ainu of Japan, a swarthy pygmy of the Congo, and a six-foot, blond, blue-eyed Swede. Racial differences among men are certainly, and at least, as real as the differences that distinguish the outstanding breeds of cows, horses, and dogs. All the equalitarians’ parade of scientific impartiality does not hide from me the fact that they are juggling with facts and concealing the truth—often doing it knowingly. The unvaryingly negative conclusions from their innumerable investigations *cannot* make race *nothing*. *Race is something*. If there were no other foundation for certainty, I should sooner trust my common sense and my intuition than their “science,” which flies in the face of universal human experience, without presenting any incontrovertible evidence to support their denial. The Boas school should have been laughed out of court *from the start*, and never allowed to get on its feet. Carleton Putnam, with delightful sarcasm, in an address to the Washington Putnam Letters Club [on February 12, 1963, published in *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. IV, No. I (Summer 1963), pp. 12-27; see p. 19], put it about right when he said: “If a man acknowledges the facts of race, he is a racist. I suppose if he acknowledges the facts of sex he is a sexist.” And Tom Anderson, editor of the largest farm paper in the country, with his solid common sense and a sly touch of his characteristic humor, once retorted, “A racist is a man who believes in history, genetics, and his eyes.”³⁴ Perhaps this would be as good a definition as any to carry around in one’s pocket.

Since the words race, people, nation, and nationalism are often used loosely, with consequent confusion of thought, let me undertake to differentiate them. *Race* is primarily a biological term. Men are of the same race when they have a like hereditary constitution as regards certain essential and distinctive features.

The term *People*, on the other hand, is primarily sociological of historical. A group becomes a People, regardless of its racial composition, whenever it is possessed by a deep and constant sense of "we." Racially the Germans, for instance, are mixed, but all the disparate elements of which they are composed, whether Nordic, Alpine, or Mediterranean, are indubitably welded into a whole by their strong sense of being a people apart.

Culturally, however, a People remains in the foetal, gestative stage until it becomes a *Nation*. Nation is the organic and self-conscious form that any people's life seems inevitably to take *when it is ready to do something creative*. Its sense of "we" has become highly sharpened, its latent energy has accumulated to the bursting point, and it adds to a general sense of its power a sense of something particular that those who belong to it can do, want to do, and know how to do well. As already said elsewhere, I agree heartily with Berdyaev that "culture always [has] had national character and roots. An international culture is impossible."³⁵ Culture has too many biological roots. It comes out of the blood of a people as surely as does their hair or their skin color. You can no more grow the Chinese manner of painting everywhere on Earth than you can grow violets everywhere, or chestnuts or wheat or cotton. Nietzsche said truly, As soon expect a man to keep his feet when you pull the ground from under him.

According to my way of thinking, therefore, not only have we always, from the beginning of significant history, had nations, but we always shall have them as long as men continue to do anything of enduring worth. Until a People becomes a Nation its inner life remains nebulous, dormant, asleep, dreaming, and as formless as a foetus in its early stages. As yet its life has no meaning. As yet no great all-uniting and all-quickening Idea has come to place an arrow in its hand, and to lift the point of that arrow to the stars. It has no sense of destiny, of necessity. Moreover, until it builds itself into a Nation, it lacks, as it were, the skeletal structure by which actually to lift itself from the earth, and the differentiation and coordination of parts by which to realize its full strength and to throw itself most effectively into a venture or a struggle. Also, to look at the matter from the point of view of biology, it is only by the sense of identity that goes with a strong sense of nationhood that a people can protect its gene pool from invasion by the alien. The Jews, with perhaps the strongest nation sense known to history, have been able to accomplish this up until recent times without possessing any national land at all. The nation, therefore, is not only an inevitable thing, but a good thing.

Nationalism is more open to question. All the facts needed for a true understanding and a just judgment of this phenomenon are by no means easy to come by. But after some years of contemplating it from the elevation of my mountain top, it seems to me that Nationalism is the modern industrial nation *in extremis*. It is the nation desperate. It is the nation backed into a corner and fighting for its very existence. The nation may be completely surrounded by enemies as remorseless as a pack of hyenas, waiting to close in on their victim. And it may at the same time have been overtaken by a breakdown of law and order and every sort of moral decay, so that it has begun to fall to pieces. And commonly its efforts to save itself from destruction are being frustrated by the grip upon its whole life of the octopus of International Finance. This Money Power now has its system of centralized banking saddled on every country of the White man's world (and not *only* of the White man's world); and it operates by getting each one into debt and seeing to it that its national debt gets ever bigger. No matter how fair the appearances otherwise, *this always means enslavement*. The lender always

has the whip hand. The debtor cannot be free. A nation that cannot break the strangle hold of the Money Power must remain a nation *in parva*. In this crisis, its only hope is to consolidate all its resources under centralized control, and organize them with a single view to maximum efficiency. Temporarily, until victory is won and the menace broken, everything else is subordinated and sacrificed to striking power. Is it a good thing or a bad thing? Here, I submit, ordinary moral valuations hardly apply. I abominate the centralized octopus State, as by this time all my readers must know, and no less a technology that only drives on like a demon, and a factory system that must ever break and desecrate human beings. But there come circumstances and crises in a people's life that it would seem impossible to meet without seizing upon everything that either the one or the other has to offer, in order merely to avoid going down in crushing defeat. Those who assail Nationalism are under obligation to present some practical alternative by which a people can realize a satisfying existence, or else to show how enslavement to another power might in the long run prove less disastrous to a people's life than to embrace totalitarianism, at least as a temporary expedient. It is easy to criticize Hitler and the Nazis (quite apart from all the lies about them that we have been told), but as yet no one has pointed out how else the crushed German people could have got on their feet. American critics of Nationalism may regard it in a very different light when it comes our turn to be the nation desperate.

Having thus distinguished what I mean by race from what I mean, respectively, by people, nation, and nationalism, let us go on to examine the problems that I have set before my readers. The first of these is the origin of races.

4. The Origin of Races

Anthropologists who undertake to describe how human races came into being, commonly write in terms that might strike the layman as little better than evolutionary mechanics. But anyone who acquires some knowledge of the facts and can interpret them with realistic imagination must soon recognize that such a view would be quite unfounded. Nothing alive is mechanical.

To get the gist of the matter in the shortest space, the ordinary reader can hardly do better than to study the article by Donald A. Swan entitled "The Biological Processes of Race Formation," published in *Man and Quarterly* in the autumn of 1964, pp. 110-116, whose purpose was "briefly to survey and summarize contemporary thought on the biological processes of race formation in man." This is consonant with Dr. Carleton S. Coon's monumental work *The Origin of Races* (700 pages, Knopf, 1967), in which, on page 21, he lists four factors as principally operative in race formation. These are mutation, recombination, selection, and isolation. Of these, I wish to dwell chiefly on the first and the last. The place of selection has come to be so well understood through the exposition of the idea of evolution that it hardly needs amplification from me here. (Besides *The Origin of Races*, I would suggest, also, the chapter entitled "Race and Heredity" by Professor David C. Rife in *Race And Modern Science*, edited by Dr. Robert E. Kuttner, Social Science Press, 1967, pp. 141-168. See my "Who's Who" chapter footnote, No. 85, under "Coon, Carleton S.")

Dr. Coon declares that "the primary element in evolution" has been mutation (p. 21). Professor C.D. Darlington concurs: "Without it evolutionary change could never have

occurred.”³⁶ And Dr. Coon defines mutation as “heritable, spontaneous, and within certain limits random change in the chemical composition of a molecular segment of a chromosome known as a gene or gene locus.” It is a sudden change in the genes by which a brand new one, *without being inherited* (as is the *almost* invariable rule), gets into the gene pool, as if from nowhere, and is thereafter inherited with the same inevitability by which the transmission of other genes is regulated. Most mutations are at best useless, if not positively pernicious to the organisms in which they take place, and therefore are not perpetuated. Selection, with which nature in the raw is so ruthless, weeds them out, and they take no part in species formation. But now and then there is a mutation that gives to him who possesses it, and to those to whom he transmits it, such a survival and mastery advantage over those who lack it, that in the course of time those who lack it are so generally displaced that at least the leadership element, if not the group as a whole, comes to be distinguished by its possession, as the group goes forth to face the ordeal of battle with any and all other competing groups that cross its path. But no matter what the *why* by which genetic diversity came about, whether by mutations or by miscegenation, *it had to come about somehow before* any people could develop into the nucleus of a race. Its gene pool had to be full of superior and inheritable capacities of many kinds, not only for survival but for mastery.

This is basic. Genetic diversification and enrichment were essential. There is no magic by which something can be made out of nothing. No process can bring out what is not already latent and potential in the gene pool. Before a people could begin to amount to anything, it must somehow have got into its genetic constitution the components that were necessary for maintaining itself in the territory that it had won and believed to be its own, for robbing others of territory that it came in time to think more desirable, and always and at all costs, in the face of any and every kind of attack from its enemies, to survive and, ultimately, to conquer. And the chief agency for getting the necessary stuff into the various competing human groups is now believed to have been *mutation*.

The other factor that I want to dwell upon is isolation. In regard to this, Dr. Coon says: “Isolation is necessary for the rise of new species because, unless a breeding population is self-contained, natural selection may be unable to eliminate old, unfavorable genes from its pool. A constant gene flow from neighboring populations [by intermating] may renew old genes as fast as they are being lost” (p. 22). But let me supplement this with the following from Donald Swan in the aforementioned article. He says:

“Isolation, whether geographical or socio-cultural, is the means whereby a particular population unit or gene pool is subjected to the differential selective forces of its own unique climatic and cultural milieu. Genetic variations and differences which arise in one population group are preserved and become ‘characteristic’ of the group (i.e., elements of a ‘race type’) through restriction of mating to group members. Continued isolation and inbreeding amongst members of the population thus perpetuates and stabilizes group differences” (pp. 111-2).

Other authorities give isolation (i.e., in more common parlance, segregation) a place of no less importance. Dr. R.R. Gates, for instance, at the time of his death in 1962 “probably the world’s most experienced and distinguished physical anthropologist and human geneticist,” said: “Isolation has been the great factor, or at any rate, an essential factor, in the

differentiation of races.”³⁷ The same position was taken by Professor Edward M. East of Harvard,³⁸ Professor Hans F. K. Guenther of the University of Berlin, and by Sir Arthur Keith, the dean of British anthropologists, whose culminating work, *A New Theory of Human Evolution*, “the harvest of a lifetime,” he devoted to its exposition.³⁹ In isolation, segregation, and inbreeding, Sir Arthur finds the very key to understanding the origin of races. (For more on Dr. Gates and Sir Keith, see footnote 85.)

These men stood on the solid ground of human realities. Once a people has come into possession of a superior gene pool, it is crucial—if it is to have any future—that they hold it sacrosanct and be ready to fight, as against death itself, to preserve it from adulteration and contamination with the genes of any people alien to themselves. For their collective pool of genes contains their very identity as a people. If the character and capacity in it are degraded or weakened, in a very real sense they cease to exist. It may well lead even to their overthrow and enslavement, the disintegration of their sense of destiny, and their complete disappearance from history. All Jews today, mindful of the fate that overtook the Ten Tribes of their compatriots *who mixed*, know that if ever they begin to intermarry freely with gentiles, they are *finished, as a people*.

And there is yet more to the urgency of this matter of segregation. It needs once again (as in my last chapter on eugenics) to be emphasized that inbreeding can be depended upon to bring out in a strongly marked form whatever virtues or survival assets a gene pool may have in it, and thus to improve the chances for survival of the people that possesses that pool. On the other hand and at the same time, it will no less certainly isolate and bring out the hereditary defects and weaknesses long hidden in the pool; and in primitive society, which knows not our coddling of the weakling, the puny and the defective are promptly and ruthlessly eliminated. By this double process, of forming and deepening a people’s character and purging them of their handicapping inborn weaknesses, they not only increase their strength but come to be marked by their homogeneity. They become a people of similar appearance, of like values, of like aims and ways of going about things. Thus a people grooms itself to fulfill its growing sense of its worth and even of its destiny.

But whatever is thus brought out and comes to be firmly settled and established will, as said above, have to prove itself in remorseless struggle with neighboring peoples of perhaps very different gene pools. Thousands of incipient “races,” of competing gene pools, must have gone under in this struggle for food and for a place in the sun. Those who succumbed went down because they lacked the will, the courage, the stamina, the fecundity, the sagacity, the solidarity or the self-sacrifice upon which survival depends, or because they so constantly mixed their genes with those of aliens that they never *became* a people. The weaker or inferior were weeded out. The stronger mastered and grew, by a high birthrate or by mastering and ultimately assimilating other groups. And the end result has been—“the major races of mankind,” sometimes given as three, sometimes as five.

In regard to each of these, we may say that the specific differences that mark them must have made their appearance and have become established only where the habitat of each imposed the pressures of a distinctive environment and where the adaptations, the successful mutations, and in general the values: the traditions, and the effective *modus vivendi* worked out in each, became fixed in the hereditary constitution, *undisturbed by the injection of alien genes* from

outside. And if isolation can thus so largely account for the more conspicuous, largely physical differences that distinguish the major divisions of mankind, it no less accounts for the more subtle, less tangible differences associated with them and perhaps even linked with them—the differences in character, temperament, emotion, and capacity for thought of various kinds.

There is one other apparent fact about the origin of races that I must bring to my readers' attention. I judge that it is steadily gaining acceptance by the foremost investigators and thinkers in the field of ethnic origins. Though of vast significance, the essence of it can be presented briefly.

For a very long time it was believed among Darwinists that there was one direct line of descent from the manlike apes to the various sub-species, or races, of man. *Homo sapiens* was supposed to have made his first appearance a few thousand years ago, and all our present different racial stocks to have evolved subsequently from this common ancestry. But in the view of men like Franz Weidenreich, Robert Gayre, R.R. Gates and Carleton S. Coon, there are impressive obstacles to retaining this theory. On an early page of his *The Origin of Races*, Dr. Coon said:

“All the evidence available from comparative ethnology, linguistics, and prehistoric archaeology indicates a long separation of the principal races of man. This is contrary to the current idea that *Homo sapiens* arose in Europe or west-Asia about 35,000 B.C., fully formed as from the brow of Zeus, and spread over the world at that time, while the archaic species of men who had preceded him became conveniently extinct. Actually, the *homines sapientes* in question were morphologically the same as living Europeans. To derive an Australian aborigine or a Congo Pygmy from European ancestors of modern type would be biologically impossible.”⁴⁰

About thirty years ago, therefore, it began to be one of the chief questions before modern anthropology, when and in what manner mankind came to be divided into races. Franz Weidenreich, after unearthing in 1939 the fossil remains at Choukoutien (near Peking) to which he gave the name *Sinanthropus* and which were dated about 360,000 B.C., advanced the argument that our present races might be descended from different fossil men—the Chinese and other Mongols, for instance, from “Peking man” (*Sinanthropus*), and the Negroes from the creatures that once animated the fossil remains in Africa known as “Rhodesian man.” A. H. Schulz pointed out that great apes show as much difference in color and structure as do human races. From his findings he argued that “the early human forms must have possessed the capacities for these same variations, some of which can therefore be very ancient, and can go back to the earlier evolutionary stages. In other words, a Negro may have become black before he became a man, a Nordic's ancestor blond and blue-eyed while his brain was still half its present cortical size.”⁴¹ A little before this, Dr. R.R. Gates brought out his *Human Ancestry, From a Genetical Point of View* (Harvard University Press, 1948), in which he advanced the theory of “parallel evolution,” a phenomenon to be observed “plentifully in whatever direction we look,” “not only in mammals but in some groups of vertebrates” (page 3). Writing in 1958, he “stressed that the concept of race involves a fourth dimension, time, so that there is a need to recognize ‘levels or grades of

human development.' The primary races of man 'have developed independently from an early common ancestry, but are not necessarily even of the same age.'" ⁴²

This implied the idea of "pre-*sapiens* riation"—the idea, that is, that the branch of ape-dom which was on its way to becoming human, and which scientists call by the name of *Homo erectus*, began to divide into distinguishable races not tens of thousands but hundreds of thousands of years ago. Dr. Coon says that "certain racial features appear as early as the time of *Sinanthropus*," ⁴³ that is, about 360,000 B.C. The division occurred after they had got out of the trees and onto their feet and had begun to use their hands, but before they had gone far in the acquisition of intelligence.

The different races, then, are related only through their very remote ancestors, and have behind them very different evolutionary records. Some of them developed earlier than others, and in consequence have developed much farther than others. Gates, on page 56 of his *Human Ancestry*, has a sketch in the form of a tree which graphically depicts this branching of the hominoid stock *before* it had reached the *sapiens* level, *and the parallel and independent development of the major branches since that time.*

As it was of very far-reaching consequence, both theoretical and practical, whether such a view was sound, Dr. Coon set himself to reach a definitive answer to the question. His findings he eventually submitted in his *The Origin Of Races*.

"My aim in this book," he says, "is to trace how far back in prehistoric antiquity these human racial groups can be traced. Did they all branch off a common stem recently, that is, within a few tens of thousands of years, after mankind had evolved as a single unit to the evolutionary state of the most primitive living peoples? Or did their moment of separation lie lower down on the time scale, when long-extinct types like the so-called ape men of Java and China were still alive? If the second is true, much of the evolution of the different existing races may have taken place separately and in parallel fashion over a period of hundreds, rather than tens, of thousands of years. The first hypothesis is the one more commonly held, but it presents some impressive stumbling blocks.

"If all races had a recent common origin, how does it happen that some peoples, like the Tasmanians and many of the Australian aborigines, were still living during the nineteenth century in a manner comparable to that of Europeans of over 100,000 years ago? Either the common ancestors of the Tasmanians cum Australians and of the Europeans parted company in remote Pleistocene antiquity, or else the Australians and Tasmanians have done some rapid cultural backsliding, which archaeological evidence disproves." ⁴⁴

In attempting to answer the question "how long ago the ancestors of the human subspecies [that is, races] parted company" Dr. Coon assembled massive evidence from many fields of critical importance—not only genetics, but zoo-geography, anatomy, physiology, comparative dentition, linguistics and archaeology. Included was the evidence from some 300 bone-bearing sites that have preserved the record of fossil man. The effect is to put pre-*sapiens* riation on a very solid foundation. Professor David C. Rife, Chairman of The Institute of Genetics of Ohio State University, in reviewing Dr. Coon's *Origin*, recognizes that "many competent scientists will honestly disagree with its main thesis but he justly adds

that Dr. Coon's "unassailable reputation as a scholar . . . carries with it the assurance that this new concept of human evolution cannot be ridiculed or ignored, but that it constitutes a challenge which must be confirmed or disproven."⁴⁵ I am under the impression that his subsequent book, *The Living Races of Man* (Knopf, 1967) went a long way to confirm it in the scientific world. Certainly it confirmed it with me. Let us therefore see what pre-*sapiens* riation means.

All the evidence indicates that our pre-human ancestors evolved into *Homo erectus* (that is, got onto their feet and began to use their hands and make tools) somewhere in Africa. While in this condition and in this stage of their evolution, as *Hominis erecti*, many of them migrated north and east and spread out over Europe and Asia, and there, in the struggle for survival and mastery in the face of the rigors of a northern climate (not very far from retreating icecaps), developed separately, independently, and at different times, into the two most advanced branches of *Homo sapiens*, Caucasoid man and Mongoloid man. Those who remained behind in Africa—those whom Dr. Coon calls the Congoids (Negroes) and the Capoids (Bushmen, etc.), and the Australoids of Australia (apparently a backwash from the migrations), all eventually developed sufficiently to be rated as *sapiens*, as definitely human, as direct ancestors of presently existing human races, but they did so very much later and to this day have remained on a very much lower level of intelligence.

In other words, the division into what became the five principal races of mankind took place *before* man had gone far in his acquisition of intelligence, *before* he had become *sapiens*, while he was still in the *erectus* stage of his development—perhaps 500,000 years ago. In Dr. Coon's words, "from the start of the Middle Pleistocene [some half million years ago] the Old World [Africa, Asia, and Europe], in which man arose, was divided into five breeding grounds sufficiently separated from one another by physical and climatic barriers to permit a human subspecies to evolve, almost but not quite independently of its neighbors." And then, with a slowness in which time seems almost to have stood still, *Homo erectus* evolved into *Homo sapiens* not once but five different times, in five different places and at very different rates, as each subspecies living in its own territory passed a critical threshold from a more brutal to a more sapient state.⁴⁶

For any adequate idea of the evidence that Dr. Coon amasses in support of his thesis, one must turn to his books, in particular *The Origin of Races* and *The Living Races of Man*.⁴⁷ But perhaps the most decisive part of it rests on the following facts that I shall now submit to my readers.

Examination of the oldest fossil remains of primitive man shows that the Caucasoids crossed the threshold into *sapiens* first. The Swanscombe skull from England and the Steinheim skull from Germany "establish the existence of *Homo sapiens* in Europe a quarter of a million years ago. No *sapiens* skulls of equal antiquity have been found elsewhere." The Mongoloids followed about 100,000 years later—that is, 150,000 years ago. But no *sapiens* specimens of the Congoid (Negro) race have been found that date back even 10,000 years ago.⁴⁸ This is in line with the fact that although the use of fire (picked up, doubtless, from volcanoes or forest fires) was known to the Mongoloids (then in the *erectus* stage of their development) some 360,000 years ago, and to the Caucasoids (already *sapiens*) some 100,000 years later, evidence of fire in Africa south of the Sahara is not found at all until 40,000 years

ago.⁴⁹ To this should be added the fact that the critically important knowledge of how to *make* fire (not just to use it but to call it forth when and as one wanted and needed it) was first achieved (according to all existing evidence) not in China but in Europe—about 100,000 years ago.⁵⁰

With us today fire is such a commonplace that, unless we pause to think about it, we shall almost certainly fail to realize its vast importance in the evolution of human beings. Dr. Coon enlarges upon this in his *The Story of Man* (pp. 60-3), but he summarizes the matter in his *Origin of Races* (pp. 90-1), where he points out that fire served to advance primitive man in four basic ways: (1) it provided him with security against beasts of prey and thus enabled him for the first time to enjoy the shelter of caves; (2) it kept him warm and dry; (3) it enabled him to cook his food, and thus to “cut down his eating time to two hours a day,” whereas before, like the apes, he had spent most of his time chewing! The rest of his day was thus set free for hunting, for improvement of his weapons, for talk with his kin and for passing on his skills to his children; (4) it provided “a spatial nucleus or center for the home territory of a group of people.” Here, after dark, they could gather around the fire, in security and comfort, to tell tales, discuss group difficulties and make group plans, or for dancing and ceremonies. It thus opened the way to every sort of exploration and gradually to mastery of their environment, to improved speech and social relations, and ultimately to all that we mean by technology, science, politics, art, culture, and religion.

The discovery of fire, therefore, and especially of how to *make* fire, was one of the greatest milestones in human evolution.” Without fire, Dr. Coon says, “it is difficult to see how . . . human society could have risen above the level of that of baboons.” “Without fire it is unlikely that *Homo erectus* could have evolved into *sapiens*.”

And he makes this trenchant observation:

“If it can be shown that some geographical races got fire before others did, the implication will be that those who had it first were also the first to receive its evolutionary benefits, and that those who obtained it last must have been correspondingly retarded.” “Only in Africa is there evidence that fire arrived late, as late as 40,000 years ago. In the earlier habitation sites such as Olorogesailie in Kenya, where layer after layer of hand axes, cleavers and meat bones have been excavated with the most meticulous care, not a trace of charcoal or charred bone has been found. “Both Louis Leakey and Desmond Clark, who are among the most painstaking and observant excavators in the world, have stated their conviction that in East Africa the entire hand-axe period was fireless almost to the end. If future excavations confirm this erudite opinion, we shall have one explanation of the extraordinarily slow pace that human evolution followed, in the Middle and late Pleistocene, in Africa south of the equator, and perhaps also south of the Sahara.”⁵¹

The question naturally arises, How has it been possible to distinguish the remains of *Homo sapiens* from those of *Homo erectus*? Dr. Coon answers emphatically, “Not by the bones of his body from the neck down. . . Human behavior has its control tower in the brain, stimulated and tempered by the glands. While little is known of his glands, we have the shell of his brain, the skull. In it differences between the two species are found.” The skulls of *erectus* and *sapiens* differ in shape and size. Those of *erectus* resemble “a shallow, narrow dishpan turned

upside down," whereas those of *sapiens* are "like an inverted, rimless bowl, with flush handles." In capacity those of *erectus* range from 775 cubic centimeters to 1225 cubic centimeters, those of *sapiens* from below 1100 cc. to over 1800 cc. "In general, too, the teeth of *Homo erectus* are larger than those of *Homo sapiens*," but "what is more critical than tooth size is the ratio between brain size and palate size. This ratio forms a steady progression from the *Australopithecines* to *Homo erectus* to *Homo sapiens*. By using a combination of skull shape, brain size, brain shape, and the brain-to-palate ratio, we can usually tell whether a skull was *erectus* or *sapiens*."⁵² Brain complexity does not come into the picture, for this does not manifest itself adequately in fossil remains. But "several Dutch neurologists who have done much research on the problem have come to the conclusion that the brains of mammals have evolved by a repetitive process of doubling the number of their gray cells." In general, it may be said that "it is the size, rather than the shape of man's brain, both absolutely and in relation to his body bulk, that makes it unique."⁵³

In short, to Dr. Coon as to most other physical anthropologists the evolution of primitive man from *erectus* into the bloom and creativeness of *sapiens* and the fully human is registered and measured by increase in the size and complexity of the brain.

While keeping all of the foregoing in mind, let me now ask my readers to weigh soberly the following reflections of Dr. Coon, with which I will close this section of my present chapter—on the origin of races:

"Wherever *Homo* arose, and Africa is at present the likeliest continent, he soon dispersed, in a very primitive form, throughout the warm regions of the Old World. Three of the five human subspecies [races] crossed the *sapiens* line elsewhere. If Africa was the cradle of mankind, it was only an indifferent kindergarten. Europe and Asia were our principal schools."⁵⁴

"As far as we know now, the Congoid line started on the same evolutionary level as the Eurasiatic ones in the Early Middle Pleistocene and then stood still for half a million years, after which Negroes and Pygmies appeared as if out of nowhere."⁵⁵ "Like Java, Central and South Africa were regions of evolutionary lag during most of the latter half of the Pleistocene. The survival of *Homo erectus* in these antipodal Edens was not disturbed until no earlier than about thirty thousand years ago, almost a quarter of a million years after the first appearance of *Homo sapiens* nearer the center of evolutionary activity."⁵⁶

"Though 'blood groups of fossil bones cannot be determined' and 'dead men cannot take intelligence tests,' it is a fair inference that fossil men now extinct were less gifted than their descendants who have larger brains, that the subspecies which crossed the evolutionary threshold into the category of *Homo sapiens* the earliest have evolved the most, and that the obvious correlation between the length of time a subspecies has been in the *sapiens* state and the levels of civilization attained by some of its populations may be related phenomena."⁵⁷

With this much as background, let us turn now to look into the next question that we have set before us. I began by asking whether or not race is a reality, and having found it to be very much of a reality, and one of vast importance, I undertook both to define it and to differentiate it from certain related terms such as "racism," "nation," and "nationalism." And

in Section 4, I have just finished submitting to my readers the thesis that, in my judgment, best accounts for the origin of race, and which at once goes farther than any other of which I know toward solving many anthropological problems and leaves us with a highly illuminating picture of how our present humanity, in all its ramifications and variations, came into existence. With this behind us, let us turn now, in Section 5, to face the question: Are all the races of men equal? Or, more exactly and perhaps less offensively, are they equally fitted for creating and for maintaining a given kind of social order and culture in a particular environment, or are they marked, and therefore distinguished, by great differences?

5. The Inequality of Races

Section a.	The Most Crucial Issue of Our Age
Section b.	Physical Differences
Section c.	Mental Differences
Section d.	Differences in White and Negro Brains
Section e.	The Negro Record

Part 5a

The Most Crucial Issue Of Our Age

“Whatever may be the sociological value of the legal fiction that ‘all men are born free and equal,’ there can be no doubt that . . . in its biological application, at any rate, this statement is one of the most stupendous falsehoods ever uttered by man through his misbegotten gift of articulate speech.”

These words are from the pen of Earnest A. Hooton, long Professor of Anthropology at Harvard University.⁵⁸ They are, of course, in head-on collision with established U.S. policy, both foreign and domestic. And yet Dr. Hooton was a man of undeniable competence, and he was writing about a problem on which he had spent much of his life. Moreover, as we have already seen, he was by no means the only eminent authority from the world of anthropology who has flatly rejected the doctrine of equality. Would it not, then, be the part of wisdom for the most intelligent and responsible citizens of the U.S. to begin examining whether our all-governing policy, which is applied in all fields, is based on fact or on fantasy, on truth or on wishful thinking and make-believe? Must not every sensible man doubt whether any nation will long hold together if it steers its course in blind and wanton disregard of the rocks of reality?

Doubtless there are many people in the United States who sincerely feel that the doctrine of human equality ought not even to be questioned, that mistaken or not we are committed by our Declaration of Independence which asserts that “all men are created equal.” But *are* we thus committed? If so, it must be by the Constitution and not by the Declaration of Independence; and as all informed men know, the Constitution says nothing whatever about all men’s being equal. Moreover, the Declaration came from the hand of Thomas Jefferson,

and was cannily composed as an instrument of political warfare, to rally his fellow citizens to the cause of rebellion and to serve notice thereof on the King of England and his subjects. "It referred to *equality of rights* as between two groups of Anglo-Saxons and it could scarcely have occurred to Jefferson and his contemporaries that future generations would strain these words to refer to *equality of innate capacity* among different races." ⁵⁹ Jefferson's published writings prove that he believed the Negro to be grossly inferior to Whites both in their mentality and in their character. Like Lincoln he would have denied them citizenship and gradually deported them from the country. In any case, as the historian W. E. Woodward long ago pointed out, Jefferson's words "created equal" certainly had no reference to Negroes or slaves, who "were property and as such, had no 'inalienable rights.'" "As to inalienable rights," Woodward adds, "man has none. . . There are no natural rights. Out of universal anarchy human society has been artificially created. Society exists because a large number of natural inclinations have been suppressed." ⁶⁰ But lest these words give rise to misunderstanding, let me follow them immediately with the assurance that, most emphatically, they do not imply any denial of the Negro's equality before the law as long as he remains a citizen.

However, in this matter of race we are confronted with the most crucial and menacing issue of our age. It is no time to allow ourselves to feel tied to the judgments of even the most enlightened men of two hundred years ago. Facts of decisive importance are known today that then were not even dreamt of. And what the facts are should not be decided, either, by philosophy, or morals, or religion. When it comes to race, there is an all-too-widespread disposition, even among college graduates, to think that facts can be ignored. I may already have remarked in another connection that the wife of a university professor of philosophy once told me, in effect, that she knew the mind of God and therefore knew that men *could* not have been created other than ultimately equal. To most people, such an answer may seem not only preposterous but a matter for merrymaking, yet I would point out that in essence it is not different from that assumed by most of those who in our time have dignified themselves with the noble name of "Liberal." I have known this gentry long and intimately, and I have yet to find a single one of them who would examine the foundations of his own position and with me face the facts about race. He prefers to assume and to deduce and to theorize and to pontificate and to hug his precious ideals to his bosom—and pour out his abuse on those who fail to be impressed!

But I wish to avoid being misunderstood. I have a very high regard for philosophy, and ethics, and religion. Perhaps no one in the world would give a higher place to religion than I. In the last analysis *everything depends* upon a people's *values*: what it calls right and wrong, high and low, beautiful and ugly. And therefore, in the end, it must above all be our religion that will decide for us *what we shall do* about the facts of race *after they have been determined*, but *first*—let me say it again—*we must find out what the facts are*. First we must ascertain, as exactly, fully, and indisputably as we can, what we are up against, what we have to deal with. Our whole future, whether we are even to have any future, hinges on our developing and maintaining social attitudes and institutions, educational principles, and foreign policy that are *founded on truth*. To do otherwise is to build on sand, and everything in the entire experience of our kind warns us that he who builds on sand can only pile up one evil after another until catastrophe finally brings him down and drags him back to face at last what he might have faced far

better in the beginning. For every sensible man among us must know in his heart that it would mean far less agony and far less cost to face the facts about race now.

And the facts are best determined by history and by science. As we approach the issue of equality we find that for us, here in the United States, it really narrows down to Whites versus Blacks. And in our pursuit of the truth it is necessary to point out how impossible it is to avoid making comparisons. And those scientists who have been trained in order to make these comparisons meaningful, have learned that if the comparisons are to be just, and to have real social significance, they must adhere invariably to certain rules of procedure. No one would attempt to deny, for instance that some Negroes with no admixture of blood from either White men or Yellow men, are the mental superiors of some Nordics or Chinese, but this proves nothing that affects the issue. Meaningful results are obtained only when the *average* of one race or group is compared with the *average* of another group; or else, truly representative samples of the two, when set side by side, must as far as possible be equalized for socio-economic status and the like. Racial differences as regards a particular trait or feature, are a matter of determining which race displays this trait or feature most frequently or in the fullest development.

Such comparisons are likely to prove invidious, and to be resented. It is a matter for profound regret that the drive to use Negro elements in our midst to do the dirty work of overthrowing our entire society, has forced such comparisons upon us. Only with great reluctance will any gentleman wound another person's feeling. It is understandable, therefore, that a trend has developed in the ranks of those scientists who reject the equalitarian dogma, to avoid using the words "unequal" or "inferior" in comparing the traits and capabilities of Whites and Negroes, and to speak instead of racial "differences," or of the racial "immaturity" or "youth" of one race as compared with another. And, in general, I am much in sympathy with this. But at the same time, it is important not to mince matters. It is not always possible to press the pursuit of truth to its end without hurting some people's feelings. Lincoln, confronted in his office with the deputation of outstanding Negroes just before his death, said what he believed had to be said about the Negro presence in our country. In the long run, a firm adherence to the truth is certain to prove the truest kindness.

And so I must confess to a certain impatience with the current trend to make much of comparative testing that is "culture-free" or "culture-fair"—that is, without test elements that assume cultural advantages that Negroes commonly lack. Certainly, I want to be fair to the Negro. I am as determined to be fair to him as I am disgusted and indignant at all the current disposition to coddle him, to give him positions and status he has not earned, to interpret "civil rights" to justify movements that would push him up while pulling the White man down. But more than this, I hold that it is *not the purpose* of all our testing and comparing to grade relative aptitudes and abilities on some universal or absolute scale. Admittedly our primary concern is, and I believe of right ought to be, to determine whether or not the abilities of any given element in our population, whether racial or other, qualify it to take its part in our society. It is perfectly true that Negroes often outdo all White competitors in certain forms of athletics. It is even more certain that the African Negro displays faculties of observation and geometric-sense, necessary for survival in a Congo jungle, which make us White men marvel.⁶¹ But what does all this have to do with our problem? We are not now concerned with what may be necessary in tropical Africa. Our society is a White man's world

in the Temperate Zone. It was created by White men, it is overwhelmingly White in its human composition, and upon us as White men devolves the responsibility and the duty of maintaining our society in health and advancing it to new heights. We are therefore unavoidably confronted with this question: Is the Negro equal to shouldering this responsibility with us, or is he not equal to it? If not, the truth of the situation is not adequately expressed by pointing out wherein he is merely "different." The bald fact is that he is then *not equal* to what we must require of him, and in this context it is better to acknowledge to ourselves and to one another and to *say* that *he is not our equal*.

And to press the issue yet further it is necessary to raise another question, which cuts even deeper and is even more critically urgent: Is it possible for us to measure up to our own responsibility and to save our country from destruction with 22 million alien and more or less disaffected Negroes in our midst, many of them ready to wage guerilla warfare against us?

After having put these considerations, reflections and cautions before my readers, with a view to clarifying what the problem before us is and what is my own approach to it, I wish now to make such selection from the really massive evidence of significant racial differences as I think will be necessary, and yet sufficient, to be convincing. Bodily differences, of course, are the most conspicuous, but I intend to dwell rather on those of mind and character, as being decisive. Nevertheless, I should like to begin by paying some attention to a few physical phenomena which, though perhaps not yet widely known to the general public, and some of them less tangible than many others, are exceedingly interesting and very evidently of far-reaching consequence. They have the advantage, too, of by-passing those more manifest morphological features which, however obvious, have been subjected to the most acrimonious debate.

Part 5b

Physical Differences

I will begin with embryological differences. Dr. Arnold Gesell of Yale, one of the most renowned students of child development in the world," has said:

"Infants are individuals. They are individuals from the moment of birth. Indeed, many of their individual characteristics are laid down long before birth. . . Physical measurements may show which of three body types a child will most closely approximate as an adult. . . There is similar diversity in temperaments, corresponding to differences in physique, and in biochemical and physiological peculiarities . . .

*"Such classifications are much too simple to do justice to the infinite diversity of human individuality, but they serve to remind us that there are primary individual differences more basic than the differences acquired through acculturation. . . "There is no evidence, . . . , that infants are not individuals to the same degree that adults are individuals. . . Every child is born with a *naturel* which colors and structures his experiences. . . He has constitutional traits*

and tendencies largely inborn, which determine how, what, and to some extent even when he will learn. These traits are both racial and familial.”⁶²

In a later book he wrote:

“Racial differences are recognizable by the fourth fetal month. The musculature of the Negro fetus is more compact and coarsely bundled than that of the white fetus of similar age. . . . There were genuinely individual differences, already prophetic of the diversity that distinguishes the human family.” “The child comes by his psychic constitution through embryological processes.”⁶³

I turn next to the evidence set before us by biochemistry and endocrinology.

By this time, through what we have heard about blood transfusions, most of us have become aware of the fact that all human blood belongs to one or another of four distinct “blood groups,” all of which are hereditary—that is, are genetically determined. They are commonly designated A, B, AB, and O, respectively. The discovery of these was of critical importance for blood transfusion because the blood of some groups causes the agglutination or clumping of the red corpuscles when introduced into the blood of other groups. This results in death. Some equalitarians have asserted—but without any supporting evidence—that these differences in blood have no racial significance,⁶⁴ but I discovered in some of my earliest reading in genetics that this was belied by the evidence submitted by some of our foremost geneticists, notably by Professors Gates and Crew, whom I have so often had occasion to mention in earlier chapters. Gates, for instance, said:

“These blood differences have since been shown to be inherited, and more recently the proportions in which the agglutinating substances are present in a population are found to be a racial characteristic.” “The Hirzfelds . . . working on [soldiers of different nationalities during the war] found that all human races present some A and some B, but there is a preponderance of A in European, and of B in Asiatic and African races.” From these facts the inference is drawn “that the human races originally possessed neither A nor B, that B arose on the central Asian plateaus as a mutation in prehistoric times, while A appeared in Northern Europe. The present mixtures would then be due to subsequent migrations and intermingling of races.”⁶⁵

Crew wrote to the same effect:

“Within each race there occur definite and characteristic proportions of the four groups. These characters, based upon the presence and action of two dominant mutant genes, and capable of being studied biochemically afford a means of investigating racial origins and relationships . . . It is quite simple to foretell what the blood group of the offspring of the mating of any two of these individuals will be. It is equally simple to diagnose the blood groups of the parents from an examination of the reactions of the offspring. . . It is certainly possible in certain cases to state that a particular individual could not have been the parent of a certain child. . .” [Even more significant for our present study, he goes on to say.] “It is claimed that the Manoilov test can be employed successfully for the identification of race. Jew has been distinguished from Russian thereby and in mixed marriages the influence of

the two races upon the offspring can be detected . . . [In the test] Jewish blood gives a paler colour than does Russian." ⁶⁶

Gates says that by a like test Poles have been differentiated from Japanese, and Russians from Chinese.⁶⁷

I have retained the above quotations in my manuscript because, though they date some decades back, the statements are not only arresting but more intelligible to the layman than much of the more recent literature in the same field. Moreover, they came from two of the most authoritative of our geneticists at the time of their writing, and it would seem that their findings have been confirmed by subsequent investigation. Professor Bertil Lundman, "one of the foremost anthropologists in the Scandinavian countries," writing a few years ago said:

"There are several physiological group differences which have come to light mostly during the last few decades. The most important of these characteristics is the distribution of so-called 'blood groups,' such as the *ABO* system. This system has the advantage of being easily determined, even with large numbers of subjects. Its mode of inheritance is very accurately known and it is practically mutation proof." ⁶⁸ Further, he observes that "all types [of American Indians] . . . seem to be exclusively of blood group O. This peculiarity sets [them] apart from all other human groups." ⁶⁹

Professor David C. Rife, former Professor of Genetics at Ohio State University, writes:

"All four of the *ABO* blood groups are present in the majority of populations throughout the world, but there are a few exceptions. Pure Peruvian Indians are all of blood group O. Some tribes of Australian aborigines lack blood groups A and AB, indicating the complete absence of antigen B." ⁷⁰ Again, "our present-day knowledge of the simple inheritance of the various blood groups, hemoglobins and many biochemical differences, and the growing appreciation of dermatoglyphics as a genetic tool in evaluating quantitative inheritance have greatly supplemented the old anthropometric criteria, such as anthropometric variations, pigmentation and hair form." ⁷¹

And the following, also from Dr. Rife, gives evidence of "gene migration," and thus supplies anthropologists with an additional clue by which to trace racial origins and track racial movements from one continent to another:

"The bulk of the evidence strongly indicates that the ancestors of the American Indians were East Asians. Blood group B is rare among all tribes of American Indians, but occurs in a fourth to a third of East Asians. The frequency of blood group B gradually increases from western Europe to Eastern Asia." ⁷²

When it comes to the practical consequences of all this about the differences in blood groups, Dr. Robert Gayre issues a warning that the incompatibilities these reveal "are highly significant and have a very direct bearing on the well-being of society. It suggests that in racial crossing, for instance, we may expect a high degree of personal tragedies for the White partners in such matings." ⁷³ In this connection, it may be noted, with both Dr. Gayre and Dr. Rife, that "sickle cell anemia is another simply inherited variation which occurs in some

populations, and is completely absent from others. It results from the homozygous condition of the cell sickling gene, and is thus recessive. . . . It occurs almost exclusively among Negroes, or people who have some Negro ancestry.”⁷⁴

When all these facts are put together, it is not surprising that by 1960 it had come to be firmly recognized that the racial factor in blood transfusion was of such practical importance that Dr. John Scudder—a very distinguished surgeon, a blood specialist, a medical school professor, a head of hospitals and a director of blood banks in various parts of the world, and a blood-bank advisor not only to our own government but to several foreign governments as well—in laying down rules for the selection of blood donors, went so far as to specify that they should be “of the patient’s own race,” and preferably “of the same ethnic group as the patient’s.”⁷⁵ All of which, needless to say, is explicit recognition that blood differs from race to race, and that these differences are genetically inherited.

Finally, in conclusion of what I want to say here on the physical differences that mark one race from another, let me quote some passages from three of the most distinguished of our anthropologists on the racial significance of our endocrine glands, Sir Arthur Keith, R.R. Gates and Carleton Coon.

As early as 1920, Sir Arthur Keith, in his presidential address to the Anthropological Section of the British Association, discussed the basis on which mankind had been differentiated into racial types, and showed that in all probability the characteristic racial differences are connected with the differences in the secretions of the endocrine glands. He advanced this idea in his *A New Theory of Human Evolution*, from which I cull the following.

“The discovery of hormones and of their action threw a new light on the origin of racial characters.” [Increasingly, with each year that has since passed, he said,] “it became clear that the racial characterization of the human body is under the control of hormone action.” “In this way anthropologists of the twentieth century were given a clue to the origin of racial characters.”⁷⁶

Somewhat anticipating Sir Arthur’s last book, Dr. Gates wrote some very arresting pages on the endocrine glands in 1929, from which I must quote, but briefly:

“In seeking further for the genetic bases of racial differences, we soon realise that the . . . visible external characters are not necessarily each directly controlled by a different genetic factor. Rather there appears to intervene between the germinal elements in the chromosomes and the ‘finished’ characters a set of intermediary substances (hormones) secreted from the endocrine or ductless glands, each of these secretions affecting various parts of the body. We must assume that many racial differences are determined by differences either in the quantity or quality of these secretions, and that the latter differences are the inherited units determined by the genes. Probably the racial characters so controlled are chiefly matters of skin color, stature, head form (in part), and various facial features. . . . How the genetic differences in the intelligence of races may be determined is unknown, but presumably they depend upon differences in the structure of the forebrain.

"The endocrine glands, at least twelve of which are now recognised, are thus probably of great importance in racial analysis. They pour directly into the blood minute quantities of hormones which, acting as catalysts, influence and control directly the activities, and probably to some extent the development, of various organs. They also form a system of checks and counterchecks to each other, and so constitute as it were an interlocking directorate, exercising the most complete control over the bodily activities as a whole through the medium of the substances which they discharge in minute traces into the blood." ⁷⁷

The final word we will give to Dr. Coon, writing forty years later, in 1962, on the endocrine glands as determiners of temperament:

"As everyone who has bred or even worked with dogs knows, different breeds vary greatly in temperament. A terrier behaves differently from a bulldog, and setters and retrievers have special behavior patterns of their own. We know by experience that these specific breed temperaments are inherited, because the breeds were selected on that basis. Elaborate experiments have shown that learning has little to do with them, except insofar as capacities to learn certain aspects of behavior are inherited. Furthermore, and this is particularly pertinent at this point, differences in temperament between breeds are accompanied by differences in the size, form, and histological structures of the endocrines, particularly the pituitary, thyroid, parathyroids, and adrenals.

"Human beings also differ in temperament. It is a common observation among anthropologists who have worked in many parts of the world in intimate contact with people of different races, that racial differences in temperament also exist and can be predicted. Races also differ in the size and weight of endocrine glands, and in the substances carried in the urine. The study of these variations has just begun; and many readers who believe in the current dogma that all behavioral differences are due to man's unique capacity for learning will find this unpalatable, but the burden of proof is on them. If such differences are not related to the endocrine system, then man is indeed a unique animal." ⁷⁸

In summing up this whole side of our inquiry, I cannot do better than to repeat the passage already quoted from Dr. Coon in which he concludes his book on racial origins:

"In studying racial differences in living men, physical anthropologists are now relying less and less on anthropometry and more and more on research in blood groups, hemoglobins, and other biochemical features. This is all to the good because the inheritance of these newly discovered characteristics can be accurately determined. In them, racial differences have been found, differences just as great as the better known and much more conspicuous anatomical variations. Being invisible to the naked eye, they are much less controversial than the latter in an increasingly race-conscious world. To me, at least, it is encouraging to know that biochemistry divides us into the same subspecies that we have long recognized on the basis of other criteria." ⁷⁹

Part 5c

Mental Differences

But as significant as these results are in determining that all human beings are not equals beneath the skin, and that, however much they be brothers otherwise, they are certainly *not brothers by blood*, I wish, as I have said, to dwell rather on the differences between races in point of mental capacity and character. Doubtless, everyone would agree that it is on its intellectual caliber and moral fiber that any race's capability to create and sustain a civilization such as ours, must hinge.

The issue before us really raises *two* questions: (1) Are mental capacities inherited, genetically determined at the time of conception, as physical traits and features are now known to be? (2) Do these capabilities differ from race to race? In the first of my two chapters on eugenics, I already have given at least considerable indication of how massive and conclusive the evidence has come to be, that mental traits are inherited as are physical ones. But for review and summary of this evidence, let us listen to what a few of our qualified anthropologists have recently said about the matter—first, Dr. Gates, “author of our principal reference work on human genetics”:

“All those who have any respect for the facts will agree that men differ in their mentality at least as widely as in their physique,” and he gives evidence for his conclusion that “those who study dispassionately the inheritance of mental differences, normal or pathologic, must conclude, I believe, that these differences are inherited in the same way as are physical (bodily) differences.”⁸⁰

Donald A. Swan, summarizing the evidence in 1964, said:

“Comparisons of identical and fraternal twins have indicated that genetic factors account for 50 to 75 percent of the variance in general intelligence, special mental abilities and temperament.”⁸¹

And even Nobel laureate Professor Herman J. Muller, who back in the Thirties was well over on the equalitarian side, by 1962, after about thirty years of further investigation and experience, in a chapter entitled “Mental Traits and Heredity,” called “attention to the fact that from the evidence of one pair of identical twins studied intensively, it was clear that intelligence tests showed a marked correlation with heredity.”⁸² (For corroboration let me suggest that my reader turn to passages on the results of twin studies as presented by Professor C.D. Darlington in my first chapter on eugenics.) He has also said, elsewhere, that we should eventually be able to produce *whatever kind* of giftedness in children we wish, by simply choosing the genes, which determine their development from the embryo to full manhood.

We are prepared, then, to understand with what justice Dr. Robert E. Kuttner, Assistant Editor of *Mankind Quarterly*, writing late in 1971, while acknowledging that in some areas it is

still “incredibly difficult” to explore precisely how mental characters are transmitted, can nevertheless say in conclusion:

“We may expect that the mystery of how intelligence is inherited will ultimately be unveiled. We already know enough from these studies on nature’s accidents [which he has described] to be certain that mental capacities are as definitely inherited as are the physical parts of the body. The extreme Environmentalists and the Neo-Lysenkoists are plainly refuted and completely out-of-date in the light of these chromosomal discoveries.”⁸³

All right. So be it. Intelligence is inherited—the same as head form, color of skin and eyes, finger prints, blood groups, and all the other physical features. But the crucial question remains to be answered: To what extent are the mental capabilities, or the mental potentialities, which are manifested by the different races, equal?

It is over this question of racial equality that scientists are chiefly and most sharply divided. The so-called “social” anthropologists, under the socialistic leadership of Franz Boas, set up camp in The American Anthropological Association and promptly ran up a flag bearing the slogan, “Environment is more determining than Heredity.” With this assertion of the primary importance of the social factor in human development they were able, as we have seen, to champion the socialist doctrine that potentially and ultimately, if not presently, all men are equal. But to do this they had to ignore and suppress not only the genetic factor, but also differential brain size, brain structure, complexity and texture of brain tissue, and the like, all of which is basic to the scientists in The American Association of Physical Anthropologists (founded in 1930). That is to say, they had to ignore and suppress the really massive evidence, submitted by the physical anthropologists, that all the most decisive racial differences, not only the physical but also the mental, temperamental and emotional as well, are transmitted from parents to offspring by precisely the same gene-chromosome mechanism that is now universally accepted as applying to reproduction in the animal kingdom, and that these differences, thus inherited, cannot be significantly affected by variations in environment. In other words, it was by skullduggery they cleared the way for their assertion that the potential in all men is the same, that one race is as good as any other, that in the long run, whether for the individual or for the race, everything depends upon “being given a chance,” having “favorable circumstances” laid at one’s feet.⁸⁴ [I would urge my reader to make it a point to read footnote 84.]

But no matter what may be said about the methods the equalitarians have used, all informed men must acknowledge that they have made enormous progress toward their goal of an equalitarian world. That which thirty years ago appeared only in books and papers is now preached, taught, proclaimed, accepted, ordered and enforced everywhere. The extremity, the boldness, and the self-assurance of their present pronouncements may be gauged by the assertion (quoted in a previous chapter) which was issued by our own Government’s Department of Labor and Office of Education a couple of years ago: “There is absolutely no question of any genetic differential: Intelligence potential is distributed among Negro infants in the same proportion and pattern as among Icelanders or Chinese or any other group.” Perhaps the truth of the matter may be that the equalitarians are becoming panicky with a secret awareness that the battle is turning against them, and that they can make up for their more and more obvious inability to support their claims with facts only by an increase in

their impudence, by their audacity, and by using their superior position for drowning their opponents in noise. But regardless of how flimsy their propaganda may be scientifically, no informed person can deny that, so far as racial equality is concerned, they do indeed now hold the mind of the West almost as in a vise. And I think of no more conclusive recognition of the range of their triumph, even though basically it is only a triumph of their propaganda supported by vast amounts of money, than the following paragraph from *The Sunday Telegraph*, London, April 6, 1969:

“There can be no question that the assumption that blacks are potentially the equals of whites has become a fundamental dogma of the West. Every other theory can be questioned but not this. It forms the ethical basis of the *United Nations Charter* and of the foreign policies of all the Western powers, and it is implicit in every attempt to integrate one race with another within each national unit.”

The time has now come when I must give the other side, the anti-equalitarian side, a chance to be heard. I have not pretended that I am in doubt as to where the truth lies: before I had written two pages of this book, I had revealed my mind as to that. But I have revealed also that there were long years, away back in the early Thirties, when I was uncertain indeed, when I was ardently reading both sides, all sides, and relentlessly pressing my inquiry.

And it is just such an examination and facing of the evidence that I would now urge upon my readers. I am not inviting them to witness a tournament. Rather am I summoning them and challenging them to *make their own investigation of the facts and their own test of the authorities*. Before I finish this chapter and its sequel, I hope to make it starkly clear that the whole future, and even the continued existence of our country, our race, and our entire culture of the West, may depend upon a great many people's doing just this. Let me therefore suggest that my readers get acquainted with a lot of these men, on both sides, give them and their records very close scrutiny and study, read their books, note well what they say and how they say it, and how they treat those who differ with them on the issues of race and human equality. Decide for yourselves on which side you find the more genuinely and unvaryingly scientific spirit, marked by complete openness of mind to all relevant evidence and a willingness to let evidence make its own way, with no pressure but its own cogency. On which side is it more manifest that it has no axe to grind, no preconceived ideas, no dogma or orthodoxy to establish, but only a will to ascertain and to speak the truth?

The “silence treatment” that the equalitarians are able to mete out, and do mete out, to those who distinguish themselves by their evidence or their argument that men are *not equal*, has brought it about that most of these men are not only completely unknown to the general public but are seldom if ever mentioned even in college classrooms. Therefore, my readers might like to have me introduce a select lot of them with a few words about the status and accomplishments of each. I estimate the group as a whole to be as eminent in their respective fields as any in the world. My readers will find what I have to say about them collected in Note 85 at the end of this chapter. I list them in alphabetical order, and include even those already introduced in foregoing pages.

But before calling upon contemporary science for its testimony, I should like to submit several well-considered judgments, from very different sources, that commanded high

respect in the White man's world up to the time when the equalitarian dogmatists launched their campaign to befuddle our thinking about racial equality. Perhaps these will help to set our current equalitarian notions in proper and needed perspective.

I think, first, of the very distinguished scientist, Sir Francis Galton, first cousin of Charles Darwin, who not only founded and developed the science of eugenics but, as a famed African explorer, accumulated the vast amount of firsthand observation that lay behind his estimate of the Negro. In a letter to the *London Times* in 1873, Galton wrote that "the average negroes possess too little intellect, self-reliance and self-control to make it possible for them to sustain the burden of any respectable form of civilization without a large measure of external guidance and support." In his *Hereditary Genius*, he also said of the Negro:

"There is a most unusual unanimity in respect to the cause of incapacity of savages [sic] for civilization among writers (who have traveled among these people) . . . They tell us that the labour of such men is neither constant nor steady; that the love of a wandering, independent life prevents their settling anywhere to work, except for a short time, when urged by want and encouraged by kind treatments." ⁸⁶

Or my mind turns to Dr. Albert Schweitzer, whom many contemporary Christians look upon as very much of a saint. Out of his devotion to Jesus as he conceived him and compelled by the depth of his compassion for the underdog and the sufferer, he renounced a great career in Germany as theologian, organist, and authority on the music of Bach, to plunge into blackest Africa as a missionary. But years of experience taught even him that one must look upon the Negro not as one's equal but as a child—"and with children," he said, "nothing can be done without the use of authority. . . The combination of friendliness with authority is therefore the great secret of successful intercourse with the Negro." ⁸⁷ Mr. H. B. Isherwood records that

"No western-trained Negroid doctor volunteered to help [Dr. Schweitzer], and his experience so convinced him of the lack of potential in respect of mental standards and character in the pure Negro that he never felt it worthwhile training Negroes to assume the higher responsibilities in his jungle hospital. One can hardly question his deep Christian affection for the Negro, and his evaluation should accordingly be treated with respect." ⁸⁸

Or I reach yet further back, to Meredith Townsend, a much traveled man of very catholic sympathies and deep understanding, who, in the 1860's, was co-editor of the *London Spectator* (one of the most highly respected of British journals), and, in 1903, out of a well-ripened maturity, published his *Asia and Europe*.⁸⁹ This book greatly impressed me for its wide yet intimate knowledge of many peoples, its sure insight, and its balanced judgment on various matters of worldwide significance, including the Yellow man and the Black man. His whole chapter entitled "The Future of the Negro" (p. 354ff) is worth much quiet reflection, as are his remarks about the meaning of "colour" (pp. 91-3). At one point, after observing that the effect of various pressures "now pervading all teaching and all literature, has been to make Englishmen forget some of the plainest facts of history," he goes on:

"What colour may be I do not pretend to know. . . ; but it is past question that it is an indication of differences physical, intellectual, and moral of the most radical and

imperishable kind. . . None of the black races . . . have shown within historic time the capacity to develop civilization. They have never passed the boundaries of their own habitat as conquerors, and never exercised the smallest influences over peoples not black. They have never founded a stone city, have never built a ship, have never produced a literature, have never suggested a creed . . . they hold some of the world's most fertile lands; they sit on some of its most magnificent rivers—everything the Egyptians on the Nile had, the Negro on the Quorra or the Congo also had—and they have never advanced out of the foulest savagery." There is no evidence whatever that if Africa were left to itself for ten thousand years it would progress in the smallest degree; and this evidence against it, that, when liberated from the pressure of the white man's brain, the Negro, as in Hayti and, I fear, Liberia, rapidly recedes. Blackness of skin may not be—indeed cannot be—the cause of this stagnation or imbecility—for it is imbecility; but blackness of skin is the most visible evidence of the aggregate of incapacities manifested throughout the history of the black race."

(For scientific evidence that "skin colour . . . is based upon the same kind of genetic inheritance as any other traits in plants and animals . . . and that it may be genetically linked with other characters by which the races are distinguished," see Robert Gayre: "The Application of Genetics to Ethnology," *Man and Quarterly*, Vol. I, No. 2, pp. 110-111.) I shall reply to the "evidence of great Negro civilizations" that is being conjured up today in "Black Studies" all over the land. (See Section e: "The Black Record," *infra*.) For the present I would call attention to the fact that Townsend, like Galton, in describing the Negro, uses the word "savagery"—in fact, "foulest savagery." Townsend confirms his appraisal on pp. 356-7 of his book, where he says:

"Through its whole course, in the old world as in the modern one, under the most extreme variety of circumstances, no Negro of the full blood has ever risen to first-class eminence among mankind. Not only has there been no Negro philosopher, or inventor, or artist or builder; but there has been no Negro conqueror . . . There seems to be no reason for this except race. People talk of the seclusion of the Negro; but he has always been in contact on the Nile with the Egyptian, or the Greek, or the Roman, in South America with the Spaniard, and in North America with the English-speaking Teuton, and he has learned very little."

For full and recent confirmation of the above, I must quote part of a letter that Prof. Henry E. Garrett received not long ago from a missionary who had spent the previous fourteen years among the Zulu. "This nation of Zulus, which grew up without towels, handkerchiefs and toilet paper, has never discovered the principle of the wheel, terraces or bridges; has never used an animal for draught or as a beast of burden. . . Believe me, the Negroid nations will forever be a liability and must be 'looked after.' . . . It is a crime that U.N. scientists have artificially created non-existent talents for African natives. This may well lead to their own destruction and to the peril of the white race." Quoted in Dr. Garrett's contribution to "The Anatomy Of A Controversy," Part III (Feb. 1964), p. 13. Published by *Man and Quarterly*.

And on page 358 of *Asia and Europe*, Meredith Townsend makes this remarkable observation:

“The history of the race remains to us an insoluble puzzle, except upon the theory that there are breeds of mankind in whom that strangest of all phenomena, the arrestment of development, occurs at a very early stage.”

I have called this observation “remarkable” because therein Mr. Townsend anticipated by many decades—before the dawn of modern anthropology, genetics and psychology—a fundamental conclusion about the Negro to which investigation of the facts has forced some of the most eminent men in modern science and education. This conclusion, as may already have occurred to my reader, is in line with Schweitzer’s observation that the Negro (of course we now refer to the “pure-blooded” Negro, or any Negro in whom Black genes preponderate) is in a certain sense a child, that though adult in years he is nevertheless immature in a special and hopeless way. His capacity for mental development becomes fixed (that is, it *stops*) at an early age and at a low level. (I shall presently submit substantial evidence of this.) It is becoming ever more certain that the Negro’s handicap, when he is compared with the White or Yellow race, is the result of what Dr. Coon calls an “evolutionary lag.” Massive empirical evidence shows ever more unanswerably that while the White and Yellow races, in arduous and painful struggle against the rigors of a northern climate, were achieving their present development of mind and character, the Negro, in the languor of the African tropics, was *virtually standing still*—Dr. Coon says, standing still *for more than two hundred thousand years!* And for anyone with understanding of evolutionary processes, it should go without saying that a lag of such enormous length means an incapacity that cannot be remedied by “welfare” or by exposure to good schooling or by any of the other benefits of an advanced civilization, and is even less to be made up for by argument, or exhortation, or legislation, in a decade or two, or even in a few centuries. And as the Negro’s place in our society, which is a White man’s society, is probably going to be decided in the present decade—that is, before 1980, should we not be wise to reckon with his present reality, and face up to what it means to have twenty-two million Negroes in our population?

But it is essential that we make it unmistakable what we mean here by “Negro.” We commonly apply the word to anyone—from the darkest to the lightest—who shows any evidence of Negro genes. And I believe that in this we do right. But when we come to discuss racial differences between Whites and Blacks, we certainly need to take it into account that, from a genetic point of view, *some* “Negroes,” like Adam Clayton Powell, Ralph Bunche, or Thurgood Marshall, are far less Black than they are White. And it is ever to be remembered that it is almost exclusively Negroes of this sort, mulattoes, Negroes with White genes in them, who achieve any important degree of distinction. In a study of gifted Negroes that was made in Chicago, four-fifths of them “reported some White ancestry.”⁹⁰ This fits in with the often observed fact that a pure-blooded Negro of outstanding achievement, is almost totally unknown. From which, it is reasonable to deduce that what really enables any Negro to attain prominence is the White genes he has in him.

Also, it is no less to be borne in mind how extensively race-mixing has taken place in the United States, and what this involves. In 1958, Dr. Curt Stern, Professor of Genetics at the University of California, after careful investigation and study, reported his estimate that one-quarter of the genes in our average Negro come from White people, and three-quarters from Africa.⁹¹ This is important in two different ways. On the one hand, it must follow that to make valid tests of the mental differences between Whites and Blacks, we must select

Negroes who are pure-blooded—that is, Negroes in whose ancestry no evidence of mixing with Whites can be found. If the Negroes tested are not thus selected and the factor of White genes thus weeded out, allowance must be made for the likelihood that their White genes, to a greater or less extent, will boost their test scores beyond the Negroes' real level. There is no other way of estimating Negro mental potentialities that is as reliable as observing and testing him in his native habitat, in the African jungle where he evolved—and to this, I shall shortly come.

The proportion of White genes in appraising the results of the tests of Negro intelligence is very important. According to Nobel Prize Laureate Prof. William Shockley of Stanford University, as reported in *Newsweek* for May 10, 1971, IQ tests of Negroes in the U.S. indicated that "Negroes are more intelligent in direct proportion to the amount of white genes they carry." The available evidence "suggests that the average IQ of Negro populations increases by about 1 IQ point for each 1 percent of Caucasian genes."

On the other hand, as we discover what the nature and the mental qualities of the *pure* Negro are (that is, of course, *relatively* pure), the estimate of Dr. Curt Stern that our average American Negro gets three-quarters of his genes direct from this pure Negro of Africa, takes on a somber and sinister significance. For it means that in a great body of our Negro population (in some more, in some less) there lurks beneath a certain amount of veneer they have taken over from our civilization, that raw savagery that both Galton and Townsend noted in the natives of the African jungles from which the ancestors of our own slaves were torn, and which, as I shall presently show, marks the African Negro to this day. The Black genes that every one of our Negroes has in him, to a degree, like the genes in *any* man, must finally determine what he can do and what he cannot do, whether or not he will prove himself a responsible parent, citizen and worker, and whether, when confronted with a crisis, he will show himself self-controlled, able to reason and willing to listen to reason's counsels, or will prove the easy game of the Communist agitator and rush to sabotage, riots, raping, and the torch. The African genes, as we have seen, and shall shortly see again, are the genes of men perhaps closer to the beast than any others on Earth. And therefore, this matter of making racial comparisons is no mere academic exercise. On the conclusions to which they lead us may depend our lives—and even more than our lives.

After the last few pages as a preface, I am now ready to begin submitting the results of tests and comparisons that reveal mental differences between the White and Black races. It is a striking but undeniable fact, that all the strictly scientific studies of the Negro mind, from the earliest to the most recent, are so fully in agreement. The question of racial equality has been approached through many disciplines, but whether it be history, anthropology, genetics, anatomy, psychology, ethnology, or even "the usually corrupted field of sociology," the answer is always the same.⁹² No evidence from any one discipline can be so fully convincing as the agreement among them all. For reasons of space, I intend to concentrate on the results obtained by intelligence tests, brain anatomy and histology, and records of performance.

After what I said about intelligence tests in my first chapter on eugenics, I think nothing really need be added to justify them as a valuable means for comparing racial capabilities. Equalitarians like to dismiss them by picking flaws, and thus declaring them unfair and

unreliable. But it may be pointed out that though the findings from such tests are not infallible, they do provide such significant indications of intelligence, or the lack of it, that modern society has made very wide use of them for the past fifty years. Moreover, many new kinds of tests have been devised, such as the "maze test" of Professor S.D. Porteus, the purpose of which has been to eliminate inequalities in the environmental factor and thus to put all the individuals tested on the same footing. And then, too, it was discovered that there were ways by which the tests could be made to test the tests themselves.

Their primary aim, let me remind my reader, is—or should be—to determine whether or not a given individual is qualified for doing his part in maintaining and advancing our civilization, a civilization created by White men for White men. All in all, the following pronouncement of Dr. Stefan Possony in 1968 may be taken as expressing the consensus of modern science:

"The invention of intelligence testing by Binet has resulted in one of the great discoveries of history. This is so regardless of the past and present imperfections of the testing instrument. . . We should make the most of these discoveries." ⁹³

I will call attention, first, to one of the older tests of the comparative capacity of Whites and Blacks, which attracted considerable attention at the time it was made, and has often been referred to since. It was made by Dr. C.B. Davenport and Dr. Morris Steggerda around 1930 in Jamaica, on pure Whites, pure Blacks, and mulattoes, keeping all three separate. In commenting on it, Dr. R.R. Gates observed that the experiments were "free from the objections commonly urged against work of this kind. Most of the individuals belonged to a farming population, all spoke English, and the Negroes were rather better educated than the whites." ⁹⁴ The results of this study are pertinent to the problem now before us. There were points in which the Blacks were superior to the Whites: for instance, in ability to make sensory discriminations, or in simple arithmetic. But when it came to those capacities required to produce and maintain a culture, such as imagination, critical faculty, ability to learn from experience, power to plan, construct, and put some operation through, the Blacks, on the average, were characterized by a marked inferiority. "It seems," the authors said, "the outcome of the present studies is so clear as to warrant the conclusion that they put the burden of proof on the shoulders of those who would deny fundamental differences, on the average, in the mental capacities of Gold Coast negroes and Europeans." ⁹⁵

In passing on to the results of intelligence testing as viewed by outstanding scientists of our own day, I will remark here on the conclusions of several other authorities who belonged to the same period as Davenport and Steggerda, or to the decades immediately following, and who of course were thoroughly conversant with the testing that was going on in their day. There was Edward M. East, Professor of Genetics at Harvard, author of the widely read *Man kind at the Crossroads* and *Heredity and Human Affairs*, who said:

"Intelligence tests show, as did the work of Galton, that variability in mental capacity is quite on a par with variability in size or weight or any other physical characteristic. They show that races have average differences, levels of intelligence. One who makes a thorough study of the available evidence . . . cannot avoid concluding that the intelligence level of the negro is far below that of the white." "To-day psychological and genetical tests place the

matter of mental inequality beyond doubt as far as the white race and the black race are concerned.”⁹⁶

Also, there was Frank H. Hankins, Professor of Sociology at Smith College, who concluded a comparison of White and Negro mentality by saying:

“We thus see that there is considerable difference in the average and range of distribution of negro and white intelligence. These differences . . . mean that there are certain levels of mental power attained by the white man which are never attained by the negro and that the proportion of whites potentially able to achieve any of the higher grades of intellectual activity greatly exceeds the proportion of negroes similarly gifted. We have sought, using the negro-white comparison, to prove beyond peradventure of doubt that the races are unequal in mental equipment with consequent differences in cultural powers.”⁹⁷

These conclusions, which were those of trained and competent scientists, outstanding in their time, have been fully confirmed by the mass of tests that have been made since. Professor Henry E. Garrett has said:

“Abstract intelligence is the *sine qua non* for the existence of a civilized society. Fifty years of research with mental tests in the U.S.A. have revealed regular, persistent and statistically significant mean differences between Negroes and Whites.”⁹⁸

The entire accumulation of these tests showing the comparative standing of American Whites and Negroes was brilliantly and definitively reviewed in *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*,⁹⁹ a monumental work by Professor Audrey M. Shuey, Chairman of the Department of Psychology at Randolph-Macon College. Dr. Robert Gayre said of it: “This is a work that will stand as the most profound one in this field of investigation.” Covering the last fifty years, it comprises no less than 382 comparisons, in which eighty-one different kinds of tests were employed. And the number of Negroes runs to hundreds of thousands. Charles C. Josey observed that “the results are impressively consistent. Negroes, whether they are children, adolescents or adults, whether they are literate or illiterate, whether they are professional men or unskilled workers, make lower scores than comparable groups of Whites.” “The tests are designed to measure the kind of mental ability necessary to do well in an urban, highly literate civilization.”¹⁰⁰

Dr. Shuey reviews her own findings in the last two pages of her book. These are ably summarized by Dr. Henry E. Garrett as follows:

- “1. IQs of American Negroes are from 15 to 20 points, on the average, below those of American whites.
2. Negro overlap of the white median IQs ranges from 10% to 25% (equality would require 50%).
3. About six times as many Negroes as whites fall below IQ 70, that is, in the feeble-minded group.
4. About six times as many whites as Negroes fall in the ‘gifted child’ category.
5. Negro-white differences in mean test score occur in all types of intelligence tests, but Negro lag is greatest in tests of an abstract nature, for example, problems involving

reasoning, deduction, comprehension and the like.

6. Negro-white differences increase with age, the gap in performance being greatest in high school and college.

7. Large and significant differences in favour of whites appear even when the socio-economic factors have been equated.”¹⁰¹

Weyl and Possony call particular attention to the fact that the Negroes' lag behind Whites increases rapidly with age and the complexity of the tests: it is least in pre-school children, much greater at the high school level, and greatest among college students. And this holds despite the fact that among Negro college students, as compared with the rest of their kind, there has been a disproportionately large admixture of White genes. Even so, at Howard University, probably the Negroes' best school of higher education, only 15 to 20 per cent of the students came up to the nationwide college average.¹⁰²

Garrett confirms this on the basis of two of the latest studies: (1) the Georgia Study of Elementary Negro and White Children in Reading and Arithmetic (1962), and (2) the Virginia Study (1963). Both show that the Negro lag in mental age in comparison with White children increases from two years in the lower grades to three years in the tenth.¹⁰³ With these he reports and correlates the findings from the Florida Study (1963), the research for which was supported through an agency of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The most significant of the findings are as follows: The average IQ of the White and Negro children are 20 points apart. In the "High-Average and Superior" groups White children find a place in a proportion nearly thirty times that of Negro children. Negro children fall in the "Borderline and Defective Groups" at a rate more than six times that of the Whites. "The average Negro pupil (whose IQ is 80.7) cannot go beyond a national-standard Seventh Grade curriculum; for half the Negro group, the Fifth Grade is the maximum." "Only one per cent (110 IQ and above) of the Negroes are intellectually equipped to do acceptable college work. Thirty per cent of the Whites are so equipped." ¹⁰⁴

And any disposition to dismiss the Georgia, Florida and Virginia studies on the ground that, though "typical of the South," their results would not hold for the North, is completely silenced by the Coleman Report (1966). This was supported by the Federal Government at a cost of \$1,000,000 and covered 600,000 children in grades ranging from the First through the Twelfth in 4,000 schools in all parts of the country, selected to be representative of the country as a whole. "On the various tests, Negroes were significantly below the average of Whites. In order, they stood—Whites, Orientals, Indians, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and Negroes. About 15 per cent of Negro children equaled or exceeded the White average; 85 per cent fell below the average. This is the usual finding." ¹⁰⁵

The results of these tests have, of course, been challenged. Otto Klineberg in his chapter in the UNESCO Symposium, *The Race Question in Modern Science* (1956) would attribute racial differences in psychological tests to social and cultural factors, and suggests that racial groups "should be compared with both linguistic and performance tests." But R. Travis Osborne, writing in 1964, reported that:

"At least five psychologists working independently have published findings which not only challenge Dr. Klineberg's claims of a cultural bias of verbal test items, but on the contrary,

suggest that in the case of the Negro it is the non-verbal or performance item which handicaps him and lowers his over-all test intelligence." ¹⁰⁶

The Armed Forces tests, which have been administered to Negro and White recruits since the beginning of the First World War have been widely criticized. And there is no denying that in 1917 psychological testing was still in its infancy and something of an experiment. But Dr. Garrett has pointed out that from the available "data from the Army General Classification Test administered to 12,000,000 soldiers from the Second World War, . . . it appears that the Negro did no better relative to the white in 1941-45 than in 1917-18" and that the "results from the latest Army testing (1966) are remarkably in accord with results for children" as shown by the "Florida Study" mentioned above.¹⁰⁷

Few scientists any longer deny that psychometric tests show up test score differences between racial groups. But equalitarians have been resourceful in seeking ways to invalidate them. For a while much was heard of what Carleton Putnam has dubbed "the Klineberg Twist"! "What Klineberg did was to take the four Southern states where the White averages were *lowest* and compare them with the four Northern states where the Negro averages were *highest*." But, naturally, an adverse environment will retard Whites as well as Blacks. In all fairness, comparison should have been made between Whites and Blacks from the same part of the country, where both had had approximately the same schooling and other advantages. When Negroes were compared with Whites from the same state as themselves, it was found that they lagged behind the Whites to about the same degree as they did throughout the country as a whole.¹⁰⁸ Let me point out also that neither by Klineberg nor in the Army tests, nor in any of the tests just reported from the South and in the Coleman Study, was any allowance made for the White genes in a large proportion of the Negroes.

But then both Klineberg and Ashley Montagu came up with the idea of the "culture hypothesis." The essence of this theory, according to Professor Frank McGurk, is that "what we call observable race differences are really social differences and not biological differences, and that these differences, since they are caused by differences in cultural advantages, will disappear when the differences in cultural advantages disappear." ¹⁰⁹

But it is found that the facts just do not support the theory. During the Civil War some thousands of Negroes escaped to Canada by the "underground railway." Here their descendants have lived ever since without the handicaps of racial discrimination. But their mental test scores are in accord with those of their brethren in the United States. Also, Walter Arnold has pointed out that "in Ethiopia and other lands the freeing of Negro slaves has never resulted in the Negro moving into higher social classes even though he lived in a society of black-skinned people." ¹¹⁰

But it was left to Professor McGurk to give the "cultural hypothesis" its knock-out. He pointed out that since 1918 "the cultural position of the Negro has certainly improved. This improvement has not been sudden, but has been in progress for at least two generations. The Negro has achieved more and more of the social and economic opportunities that were once reserved for the White man, and to say that the cultural status of the Negro has not improved is to deny the objective evidence." And then he asks: "What has happened to the

relationship between the psychological test scores of Negroes and Whites while this cultural change has been taking place? . . . Do the available data support the cultural hypothesis?" ¹¹¹

In reply to his own question he examines the large number of articles—about 140 of them—that were published in the scientific literature of psychology dealing with the question of Negro-White test score differences. "Only sixty-three of [these] presented statistical data." And of these "only six submitted sufficient material to permit comparisons with the World War I period." These six he then carefully examines—the Tanser Study (1939), the Bruce Study (1940), the Shuey Study (1942), the Brown Study (1944), and the Rhoads Study (1945)—and adds his own, made in 1951. These studies "covered a wide range of years, a variety of age groups, different grade groups, and different psychological tests. Because they were spaced over a range of years, they covered a variety of cultural opportunities. Also, they were written by six different investigators." *And none of the studies supported the cultural hypothesis.* In fact, they showed that as cultural opportunities improve for each racial group, the mean psychological test score differences *increase*.

In Dr. McGurk's own words. "There is no question about the cultural superiority of the Negroes in 1951 over the Negroes in 1918. Yet this did not improve the Negro's test performance at all. Thus, in the sixteen years between 1935 and 1950, a period of unquestioned cultural advancement for the Negro (compared with the period of the First World War), there can be found no factual evidence to support the claim that equalizing the cultural opportunities of the two races results in equalizing their psychological test scores, or even reducing the racial test score difference. On the basis of the only studies available for this comparison, it must be concluded that the culture hypothesis must be rejected." ¹¹² Dr. McGurk concludes with this trenchant observation:

"The available objective evidence does not support the culture hypothesis as an explanation for Negro-White differences in psychological test performance. In spite of this, there are many among the social scientists who persist in citing the culture hypothesis as if it were an objectively demonstrated fact.

"This places these social scientists in a unique position among scientists. They are in the position of having accepted a hypothesis for which there is not the slightest shred of supporting evidence. Moreover, aside from their speculative argument, these social scientists are making no attempt to gather the required evidence. In other sciences, to do such a thing would mean the inevitable loss of status for the scientist attempting it." ¹¹³

Since it will be part of my purpose in my next chapter to show that the continuance of the Negro in our midst must, inevitably, in the long run, mean the complete amalgamation of the two races and the virtual disappearance of both in one, it is of the most critical importance to establish here what is the real mental quality of the Negro genes that our White genes would be mixed with. It must never be forgotten that *all American Negroes have in them the genes their ancestors brought from Africa*. It behooves us, therefore to take a look at the intelligence of the native African Negro, to see what kind of brains we would be putting into our posterity for ever after.

In 1953 Dr. J. C. Carothers, out of his "great experience as a physician with Negroes in Africa," brought out his "path-breaking work" *The African Mind in Health and Disease*. It was published by the World Health Organization of U.N. as No 17 in its Monograph Series. I can do little more here than report his observation of the many qualities that unfit the Negro for participating in our Western civilization, but excerpts from what he had to say can be found in *The Biology of the Race Problem* by Dr. Wesley C. George, himself a scientist of considerable standing.¹¹⁴ And Mr. Nathaniel Weyl gives it as Dr. Carothers' "central thesis" that "African Negro mentality is comparable to that of the lobotomized European [that is, a European with the frontal lobes of his brain removed] and reflects 'frontal idleness.'" ¹¹⁵

This impression is confirmed and amplified by Dr. Gerard Wintringer in his article "The Intelligence of the African Negro." He reports on a series of carefully controlled investigations of the intelligence of their Negro populations in their African colonies that were sponsored by the French, Belgian, Spanish and Portuguese governments or various scientific institutes or universities. Most of these were made since the Second World War. The tests used were adjusted to native cultural environments. Dr. Wintringer declared it "incontestable that the methods and means used to test the intelligence of the African Negro contain ample safeguards which permit us to accept the recorded results with confidence." The populations covered ranged from the Belgian Congo in the west to Kenya in the east, from the Sudan in the north to Portuguese East Africa in the south. For a detailed description of the tests and analysis of the results, I must refer my reader to his article in *Man and Quarterly* for the Summer of 1964, pp. 35-44. Here I can take space only to record some of Dr. Wintringer's observations. He notes that there was little difference in the IQs from the different tribes and territories. The test results showed "an extremely small number of subjects with normal mentality, and a high percentage of mentally retarded Negro males and females." Maistraux, investigating the intelligence of Congo natives, reached the result that the average grown-up, living in the bush, "had the mental age of a normal five year old." Dr. Wintringer remarked that a comparison of the test results from two of the investigations showed that "the mental age did not exceed 10.9 years in any of the age groups of the Negro sample [although their chronological age ranged from 15 to 20]. It also tended to decrease with the increase in chronological age. The same was also true of the intelligence quotients of the Negroes, which declined from 81 at 15 years to 59 at 20 years of age." ¹¹⁶

This would seem to be another way of saying, with Dr. Carothers, that "African Negro mentality is comparable to that of the lobotomized European"—that is, a European stripped of the part of his brain that has created Western civilization.

The evidence of Negro mental backwardness that I have submitted in this section has really, I think, not only knocked the bottom out of the equalitarians' "cultural hypothesis," but also shown up the hollowness of their cry that this backwardness is all due to the retardative effects of slavery, which the White man with his "segregation" (declared to be genocidal and inhuman in its intent) is charged with trying to perpetuate, and that the Negro will show what is in him as soon as he is given an "equal chance." On the basis of this unsubstantiated claim, the White man is called upon to get down on his knees in repentance "for the sins of his fathers," and told that nothing he can give the Negro today can be enough to atone for the injury that was done him in the past. But the plain truth is, as Mr. Carleton Putnam has baldly stated and as must be evident to anyone of objective judgment, that the Negro has

been vastly better off in the United States, even when he was a slave, than those of his kind who were left behind in Africa, and that "he owes the White man a greater debt than he can ever repay." (See "A Reply to Dwight Ingle"—*Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. IV, No. 1, Summer 1963, p. 47.)

We have now reached the point where I must submit the evidence that I believe finally clinches the case against the equalitarians. This relates to the differences in White and Negro brains—their comparative size, weight, structure, substance, and the rate of maturation. These are essentially physical differences, but as they are specially concerned with the brain, the seat of intelligence, I have seen fit to give my examination of them a separate section.

Part 5d

Differences in White and Negro Brains

It is a fact well known to those who have studied markedly different animals, that the characters that distinguish them are related to specific physical structures, and that the evolutionary development of these has been associated with an equally striking development of those parts of the central nervous system that control them. Birds of prey, for instance, for which balance and a fine coordination of keenness of vision and muscular response are of prime importance, show exceptional development of the related cerebellum of the brain and the optic centers. Whereas in the mole, which has no use for eyes and is guided largely by smell, the cerebellum is correspondingly small, and it is the olfactory centers that are well developed. And the beginnings of all these differences appear in the embryos.

In comparing creatures less different than moles and birds of prey, and more nearly related (such, for example, as the different races of men), the dissimilarities in brain structure are less manifest and can be detected and interpreted in a reliable and meaningful way only by trained and experienced specialists in anatomy and histology. Probably few of my readers would thank me if I undertook to drag them through all the intricacies of these men's discussion of the question—assuming that I were able to do so! But the issue is of vast importance, and I believe that the steady trend toward a consensus, and also what that consensus is, can be made clear enough to any man of good intelligence and a fair amount of education who will fully open his mind to the evidence.

By way of introduction let me quote the observation of the distinguished psychologist Professor Henry E. Garrett, already well known to my readers that "there is every reason for believing that the correlation between brain and intellect is high."¹¹⁷ We find this fully borne out as we examine the facts.

First, then, let us look at brain weight. I will quote Dr. Robert Gayre, whose book *Ethnological Elements of Africa* is so valuable for a knowledge of what is going on in the Dark Continent today and for an understanding of the ancestral background of the American Negro:

“In all evolutionary and zoological studies the size of brain relative to size or weight [of body] is of crucial importance in placing each species or sub-species in its proper place in tables of advanced or less advanced stocks. I see no reason why . . . these principles should be abandoned when we come to man. If that is so then the evidence in regard to Caucasoid and Negroid brain sizes and weights is of importance. The fact is that according to the various investigators [such as Bean, Mail and C. J. Connolly] there is an average difference in weight. . . . Even Mail has shown that the average brain of the Negro differs in weight, being 100 grams or thereabouts less than the average of the Caucasoid. . . It is quite impossible to maintain that the brains are the same when we find a distinct difference of this kind.”¹¹⁸

Carleton Putnam observes that numerous studies of the comparative brain weight of Negroes and Whites have shown that they all fall “within the range of about 8-12 per cent lower weight for the Negro brain.” He mentions published studies by Robert Bennett Bean (1906), Raymond Pearl (1934), T. Wingate Todd, G. von Bonin (1964), and others, and concludes that the lighter weight of the Negro brain indicates a “lower average level of intelligence and a retarded evolution.”¹¹⁹

And from Professor C. Judson Herrick, to whom Dr. Wesley C. George has referred as “one of the world’s greatest neurologists,” we have this:

“It is obvious from simple inspection that the relative mass of the cerebral cortex corresponds in a general way with the grade of learning capacity and intelligent behavior. This is graphically illustrated by the difference in the relative size of the cerebral hemispheres of a man and a kangaroo of about equal body weights. . . It is clear that learning capacity increases progressively from lower to higher animals and that this increase is dependent upon enlargement and especially upon differentiation of the cortex.” “[K.] Brodman has pointed out that the prefrontal area which constitutes 3.4 percent of the cat brain, makes up 16.9 percent of the chimpanzee’s and 29 percent of man’s.”¹²⁰

It is to be noted that Professor Herrick stresses the importance not only of size and weight, but also of differentiation, that is, of complexity—as does Dr. Carleton Coon in the following:

“Among living populations absolute brain size is generally, although not necessarily individually, related to achievement.”¹²¹

In a later work he elaborates on this:

“The size of the human brain is related to a capacity for performance in thinking, planning, communicating, and behaving in groups, as leader, follower, or both. . . In living individuals and populations, differences are found in the relative size of the lobes and in the surface areas of the cortex; the size of the surface area varies with the complexity and depths of the folds on the inner and outer surfaces of the hemispheres. The larger a brain is, the greater the cortical surface area, both proportionately and absolutely.”¹²²

From all this, it is apparent that what is of vastly greater significance than the gross difference of size or weight is this development in particular *parts* of the brain that both Dr.

Herrick and Dr. Coon refer to—in the frontal lobes and in the cortex, the layer of gray matter that covers most of the brain. In this connection, I must again quote Dr. Herrick. In his *Brains of Rats and Men*²³ he says “there is evidence in the higher mammals that the frontal lobes have a unique significance in the learning process” (p. 177), and he then goes on to remark the enormous increase in the size and complexity of the cortex to be observed when comparing the highest living brutes and the lowest surviving races of men (p. 220). He continues:

“The process of cortical differentiation culminates in the human brain, where upward of fifty cortical areas can be distinguished by differences in anatomical structure” (p. 236). “There is unquestionably mosaic localization of certain physiological functions in the human cerebral cortex. . . . The projection centers . . . are definitely localized in mosaic patterns. Surrounding each of the sensory projection areas is a zone of associational cortex in whose activities the functions of the contiguous centers are dominant” (p. 249). “The enormous increase in the size of the human cortex is chiefly in the associational fields. Here, then, is to be sought the structural organization upon which depend human culture and the progress of civilization” (p. 265).

The anatomy of all this may or may not be intelligible (depending upon the reader!), but the words in which Dr. Herrick states his conclusion of the matter are clear and unmistakable:

“We can now say that the human cerebral cortex is the specific organ of civilization, and whether this civilization is beneficent or malevolent is determined (in part) by the bodily organization of its component individuals, and in particular of their cortical organization. Foresight, purpose, and the ideals toward which we strive as individuals and as nations are functions of this same cortical gray matter” (p. 20).

But it is Wilder Penfield and Theodore Rasmussen who have put the matter in the most dramatic light. Penfield is a brain specialist and Professor of Neurology and Neuro-Surgery at McGill University, commonly rated at the top of his profession. He says:

“The whole anterior frontal area, on one or both sides, may be removed without loss of consciousness. During the amputation the individual may continue to talk, unaware of the fact that he is being deprived of that area which most distinguishes his brain from that of the chimpanzee. After its removal, there will be a defect, but he may well not appreciate it himself. The defect will be in his ability to plan and take initiative. . . , although he may still be able to answer the questions of others as accurately as ever.”¹²⁴

Dr. Penfield’s own sister underwent this operation, and subsequently he had the opportunity to “watch her in her home, supervising her six children, talking and laughing at the dinner table, perfectly normally, as she would have done ten years earlier. She had not forgotten how to cook, but she had lost the capacity of planning and preparing a meal alone.”¹²⁵ After this, it would seem indicated quite plainly enough that the significance of the difference in White and Negro brains must be concentrated most of all in the comparative development of their cortex.

Dr. George calls attention to K. Brodmann's "estimate that no less than 64 percent of the total surface of the human cerebral hemisphere is hidden in the fissures [of the cortex] as against 7 percent in the lowest monkey." And he himself adds: "Since sulcification is the result of fissural folding, the degree of sulcification may be taken as one measure of evolutionary development."¹²⁶ ["Sulcification" is from the Latin "sulcus," a furrow, and is the anatomist's term for furrowing, fissuring, wrinkling.]

Here, it seems, we come to the crux of the matter. Nathaniel Weyl says that what we are primarily concerned about is not so much the total weight or capacity of the brain (though even in this the Negro averages 10 to 12 per cent less than the White), but rather in "the area of the flattened-out cerebral cortex."¹²⁷ We wish we could spread it out, this layered gray envelope of the brain, as we would a crumpled up newspaper, to see just what its spread comes to. This, unfortunately, we cannot do. But we already know that the weight of the cortex relative to that of the total brain, and above all how much of its total area is tucked into the folds of its fissures, is a decisive indication of the state of evolutionary development—that is, of intelligence.

In 1934, F. W. Vint, of the Medical Research Laboratory, Kenya, Africa, published the results of microscopic "examination of the cerebral cortex of 100 representative adult native brains (not including any cases from prisons or mental hospitals)," which he compared with European brains. He found that the supragranular layer of the Negro cortex was about 14 percent thinner than that of the Whites.¹²⁸ Dr. George comments: "What significance is there in the reduced thickness . . . of the supragranular layer of the Negro cortex? Strong and Elwyn state that the supragranular layer, 'which includes layers II and III [of Brodmann], is the latest to arise, most highly differentiated and most extensive in man. The fibers which they receive or send out are chiefly associate in character.'"¹²⁹ And in a letter to Carleton Putnam he wrote:

"In this connection it seems very significant to me that the cells of the infragranular layer have extensive primary connections with the lower brain centers while the connections of the cells of the supragranular layer are largely intracortical. This is powerful evidence of their primary participation in the special functions of the cortex—the organ of civilization."¹³⁰

The significance of this, for our investigation of White and Negro brain differences, is well summarized by Mr. Putnam:

"Thus the thickness of the supragranular layers, which increases as one moves up the scale from animals to man, could be said to be another measure of evolutionary development. The supragranular layers in the dog are one-half the thickness of those in the ape, and the thickness of the ape's only three-fourths the thickness in man. In the case of the Negro their relative thinness again suggested his position on the evolutionary scale."¹³¹

Vint also reported significant differences in the architecture of the cells composing the frontal cortex of Whites and Negroes. He found a dearth of large pyramidal neurons and an excess of small primitive cells in this area of Kenya natives.¹³²

Practically no effort has been made to discredit the results of Vint's investigation, and no more recent study has been made. So we may say that his findings stand. Our sense of their significance is increased when we read in *Quain's Anatomy*.

"Hammarburg found that a comparatively small diminution in the development of the cortical cells was sufficient to reduce the intelligence to moderate imbecility. As the total weight of these cells is relatively so small, their moderate diminution would not reduce the brain weight beyond a very moderate range of variation" (p. 344).¹³³

From this, it is at once manifest how much the mental capacity of Negroes must be lowered by their lack of development in the supragranular layers of the cortex.

While there has been no serious effort to invalidate Vint's conclusions, there have been some developments that corroborate them in a decisive and very significant way. With the presentation of these, I will conclude what I wish to submit in regard to biological differences in White and Negro brains.

What I am about to say has to do with comparative maturation rates. In the late Fifties, in some cases under the auspices of the U.N., a number of such studies were made of the native African child. These were exceedingly well reviewed by Mr. Nathaniel Weyl in 1967 in an article entitled "Enigmas of Native African Intelligence," published in *ManKind Quarterly*, Vol. VII, No. 4.¹³⁴ In 1957, in the distinguished British medical journal *The Lancet*, Dr. Marcelle Geber and Dr. R.F.A. Dean published the results of investigations showing that the kinesthetic maturation rate of native African infants was two or three times that of European children. (The "Kinesthetic maturation rate" has to do with the rate at which control is gained over bodily movements.) They said:

"These tests measured such developmental milestones in infancy as following moving objects with the eyes, raising the head, propping torso on arms, keeping the trunk straight while in a sitting position, and so on. Ninety of the 107 Uganda neonates [newborn children] studied showed head control and ability to straighten the back when seated, at the age of four days. These muscular controls are generally acquired by European children between the eighth and twelfth week" (pp. 221-2).

Mr. Weyl quotes the authors as saying:

"There seems to be no doubt that these African children had been born at a more advanced stage of development, judging by the method used, than the normal European children. . . The results of examination were so consistent and the degree of advance so great, that there was little room for uncertainty."

For a full decade, Dr. Geber continued her investigation, concentrating on the development of the African child's mind. The tests that were being made at the same time in Senegal, the Cameroons, and so on, were in substantial agreement with those of Dr. Geber in Uganda.

"The native African neonate displays a pace of psychomotor development which is markedly faster than his European counterpart. The precocity of the African child lasts until the 18th

to 20th month, according to Geber, and until the 18th to 24th month, according to Falade [who worked in Senegal]. After this there is retardation [as noted, my reader may recall, by Meredith Townsend at the end of the last century] and, from the third year on, the African child falls significantly behind the White child" (p. 223).

Weyl speaks of the "tortoise-like mental development of the African infant after the second year." (See article cited in Note 134, *infra*.)

The reason for the more rapid kinesthetic maturation of the African infant is that minds that will not go far can finish with growing quickly. The more advanced and complex the mental development is ultimately to be, the longer the growing period is protracted. This is a fundamental biological rule manifest in nearly all comparisons of different species. In support of this judgment, Mr. Weyl quotes Dr. J. C. Carothers, already introduced to my readers as a distinguished authority in this field, who says:

"The difficulty of early learning is mainly one of cerebral complexity, and it is the rule in all mammalian life for full mental stature to develop early in direct relation with cerebral simplicity. The rat, for instance, is fully competent to deal with his relevant environment within three months of birth, whereas the chimpanzee takes several years. . ."

In conclusion of the matter, Mr. Weyl observes:

"One hypothesis which might be brought forward is that the more prolonged the infancy, when one genus is compared with another, the higher the eventual attainment in terms of human intellectual functioning. The hierarchy would appear to be *Homo sapiens*, chimpanzee and gorilla." [It seems likely, he adds, that] "the fundamental reason for the much more rapid motor development of African Negro than of European White neonates is the more complex brain structure and greater potential of the latter. Thus, a functional analysis would serve to reinforce the work of F.W. Vint and others on comparative Negro-White brain histology."

I have now completed my presentation of samplings of typical significant evidence, from a number of very different sources, that Negroes, on the average, and especially when they lack the lift and the drive of added White genes, are lacking in the qualities and capacities necessary for maintaining and advancing the White man's Western civilization. We have examined the physical differences—not those that are most obvious, such as skin color, hair form and odor, but rather differences in blood, and in the endocrine glands, which determine temperament and other racial characters.

We have looked even more closely into mental differences, and we noted some significant appraisals of the native African by highly qualified observers of fifty to one hundred years ago. We compared these with the considered judgments of some of our most outstanding anthropologists and sociologists. And then we got down to examining the results of hundreds of intelligence tests, ranging over fifty years, tests of all kinds, of ever-increasing exactness and reliability, and from all parts of the country. We noted that even the really vast improvement in the Negro's environment, education, and opportunities of every sort, has not had the least effect on his intelligence scores. And, finally, we studied the differences in

brain weight, brain structure, the size and substance of especially significant brain parts, such as the frontal lobes and the supragranular layers of the cortex; and—not least important—we have noted the rapid rate at which Negro mentality develops, indicative, as in all creatures, of a low grade of mental capacity, and found this confirmed by the early age and in the low level at which the Negro's brain growth stops. We found him to be like a "lobotomized European," or a European child at the age of ten. This strange phenomenon waited to be explained by Dr. Carleton Coon only a few years ago. As I have already called to my reader's attention, he submits evidence which, he says, shows clearly that while the White man and the Yellow man, having migrated into regions farther north, were struggling painfully into the fullness of sapient humanity, the Negro, sunk in the warmth and torpor of the African tropics, was standing still—"for half a million years"! In consequence, in the development of the Negro mind and emotions there has been an "evolutionary lag" (according to Dr. Coon) that puts him *two hundred thousand years behind* the Yellow man and the White man.

As one turns over in one's mind this entire accumulation of evidence that we have reviewed, perhaps the most striking thing about it is the fact that no matter what the angle from which the question of the Negro's fitness is approached, and no matter which of the various scientific disciplines submits the evidence, the answer is always the same. The agreement among them makes the case against equality overwhelming. Certainly, it prepares us for what we find when we think of Negro performance in our society in recent years, and for what unfolds before us when we open the history books that give us his historic record. And this, a brief sketch of his present performance and of his past record, may impress most American lay readers even more than the testimony of science. The facts, as I have gradually established them for myself over many years, are essentially as I shall now submit them.

Part 5e

The Negro Record

1. Left to himself, the Negro has never produced a significant culture, anywhere, at any time. This is the plain, irrefutable truth. The observations of Meredith Townsend recorded early in this chapter, were amply confirmed in 1948 by Dr. Arnold Toynbee in his *The Study of History*. He said:

"It will be seen that when we classify mankind by colour the only one of the primary races, given by this classification, which has not made a creative contribution to any one of our twenty-one civilizations is the Black race."¹³⁵

Walter Arnold, writing in 1969, said:

"In most if not all of the newly independent Black nations of Africa, little if anything during the past 5000 or more years can be pointed to as having made a contribution that in any way enhances the life of man."¹³⁶

Of course, right now, we are in the midst of a very assiduous, not to say frenzied, drive to puff up the Negro's achievements, and to make out that the truth about them has been suppressed and the Negro denied his due. This, however, is no more than what we should expect in a world where equalitarian scientists have declared even science to be an instrument of political warfare, and where historians and journalists and TV tycoons of the same persuasion must be equally ready to falsify history to serve their cause. But what it all amounts to is no more than a bubble, which any searching investigation of the facts must soon collapse. Dr. Robert Gayre punctured it very effectively a few years ago in an article entitled "Negrophile Falsification of Racial History."¹³⁷ One Julian Hartt, on the staff of the *Los Angeles Times*, had advanced big claims:

"In the beginning, in the pre-Christian era, there was a golden age of Negro history. Various peoples of the eastern Mediterranean basin looked to black Africans for skills, leadership, trade. It is largely unknown except to Biblical scholars."

In reply Dr. Gayre said:

"This is one of the most outrageous untruths ever put on paper. In the ancient world the Negroes—even when their existence was known, which was seldom—were nowhere regarded as anything other than barbarous slaves, and all those advocates of the Negro Golden Age can safely be challenged to produce their evidence."

Hartt, in fact, made further big claims—of Negro literacy, of iron's being worked by the Negro "perhaps 2000 years before it was in Europe," of "great black empires." Dr. Gayre answered him with hard established facts and cogent argument—and his facts are those of a recognized authority on African ethnography.

"The failure to record important facts [which had been admitted] would be very surprising among a literate people, but the suggestion is outrageous when we realise that the Negroes were never literate at any time in the course of their evolution until the White peoples took them the means of writing.

"How much greater can falsification of history become? Let them show us the evidence for the Negroid literacy in this great Golden Age prior to 1500 A.D. It simply does not exist. There is not one case among a truly Negroid people of a script based on characters and linguistics of Negroid origin—and the creation of a syllabary in the nineteenth century under European missionary influence does not invalidate my point" (p. 137).

In reply to Hartt's claims that "black Africans skipped the copper and bronze ages, going directly from stone to iron"(!), Dr. Gayre simply reviews the known and accepted evidence for the origin of metalworking as established by archaeology (p. 139f).

And as for "great black empires," after summarizing the known historic facts he says: "It is clear that these ancient 'Negro' kingdoms were founded by conquering Hamitic Berbers and Semitic Arabs—all Caucasoids. The only Negroes in the populations were the slaves" (p. 141).

Claims are made that the walled town of Zimbabwe in southern Rhodesia and related structural complexes nearby are evidence of an advanced Negro culture. Dr. Gayre made a visit to the area and carefully examined the remains. He brought to his investigation his discipline and experience not only as an ethnologist but also as "an archaeologist first trained under the late Professor V. Gordon Childe, who was . . . one of our greatest pre-historians." On the basis of this investigation, in 1965, he wrote a fascinating article entitled "Zimbabwe," which is illustrated with pictures. In his article he both answers the claim that Zimbabwe was of Negro origin and gives very cogent evidence to support his carefully weighed case that it was, rather, the fortified terminal point in a chain of posts by which one or another sea-borne mercantile power from the north, probably Arab, over a period of many centuries, dating as far back as the 4th century A.D. and even further, protected the transport route by which it carried the gold and other riches of interior Africa to the seaport on the east coast, from which they were shipped either to its home base or to foreign merchants, some of whom were as remote as China. Here, as usual, the Negro was only a beast of burden, or at best an enslaved mercenary.¹³⁸ In the main, this conclusion is fully in line with that presented by Paul Hermann in his *Conquest by Man* (Harper, 1954, pp. 69-72). This contains a map of the region and a picture of a reconstructed model of the Zimbabwe fortifications, which together are quite illuminating. (To get the full setting, one should read the pages by which this account is preceded: 51 to 69.)

In sum, I have yet to see impressive factual evidence of any real Negro cultural contribution to the life of man in all our human past. Professor Henry Garrett states the bald fact when he says:

"Despite glowing accounts of ancient African achievements, over the past 5,000 years the history of Black Africa is a cultural blank. South of the Sahara Desert, until the arrival of other races, there was *no literate civilization*."¹³⁹

And Tom Anderson, in his usual terse style, sums up what seem to me the incontrovertible facts, and details what Dr. Garrett meant, when he says:

"Despite what you've been told, Negro history has not been obliterated. There wasn't any. During the past 5,000 years the history of Black Africa is blank. Not just here. Everywhere. It's blank in Africa too. Until other races arrived, there was no literate civilization south of the Sahara Desert. The Black African had not invented a plow or a wheel, domesticated an animal or a crop. He had no written language [and therefore, of course, no literature whatever], no numerals, no calendar or system of measurement."¹⁴⁰

In the spirit of Meredith Townsend, he might well have added: He never produced a great religious leader or a philosopher; never constructed a road, erected a stone building, framed a ship, or even learned how to tack and sail a boat against the wind until he learned from Europeans. All this fuss and fury in our schools and everywhere else about "Black Studies" and Black genius is only part of a gigantic trick for making fools of White people and softening them up for their final overthrow and destruction.

2. We go on now to our second point in the statement of the Negro's record. When brought into contact with a great culture produced by others, he has never shown any such ability to

take it over and develop it independently, as have the Japanese and the Jews. And the difference in the record, in his disfavor, cannot be adequately accounted for either by social repression or by climatic handicap. Professor Frank Hankins observed that "although the negro has on many occasions lived in contact with centers of advanced culture, or even in the midst of them, he has generally lagged behind the general level of such cultures, while his contributions to them have been few and of a secondary order."¹⁴¹ Mr. T.E. Schumann, writing in *Mankind Quarterly* remarked:

"What cannot be too often and too forcefully stressed . . . is that all developments such as roads, railways, bridges, irrigation schemes, mines, factories, schools, hospitals and so on in Africa south of the Sahara have been solely due to the initiative of Europeans. The still largely primitive Africans have not as yet acquired the necessary skill merely to maintain the legacy left by the Whites, let alone to organise further developments."¹⁴²

3. Practically no pure-blooded Negroes in our society have produced anything of cultural significance. Those who have done so (and I repeat, they are very few) have had more or less White blood in their veins. Professor R.R. Gates said: "Mulattoes sometimes display high intellectual ability, but never pure negroes, as far as is known."¹⁴³ According to Hankins, "Prof. E.B. Reuter, who has made extensive studies of the mulatto in the United States. . . , found that 'of the 246 persons, presumably the most successful and best known men the Negro race has produced, at least thirteen-fourteenths are men of mixed blood.' Also, as a rule, 'the higher the standard of success, the lower the percentage of full-blooded negroes.'"¹⁴⁴ A full and judicial review of this whole question, but one too long to be quoted here, is to be found in Professor S. J. Holmes' *The Trend of the Race*, pages 261-4.¹⁴⁵ It amply supports my statement that practically no pure-blooded Negroes have produced anything of cultural significance.

4. And then there is the Negro's current performance in our own country.

As far as race relations in the United States are concerned, the most significant feature has been the steadily increased acceptance of the equalitarian-environmentalist dogma everywhere—by the state and federal governments, by the courts, legislators, preachers, university professors, the news media—and, naturally, the mass of the people. It has been the era of increased integration (accepted or forced), mammoth "social welfare" programs, and an opening of the doors of opportunity wider to Negro youth than to White youth. And yet, between 1930 and 1960, the Negro crime rate, in comparison with that of Whites, increased by about fifty percent. Since then, it has reached absolutely scandalous proportions. But I shall refrain from painting any lurid pictures: they are unnecessary. We all have vivid memories of the raging colored mobs that rampaged through our city streets, putting whole blocks to the torch, looting, terrorizing and murdering. Those who have already forgotten can refresh their memories by such reports as appeared in *U.S. News & World Report* for August 7, 1967, under the title: "Looting, Burning—now Guerilla War." But for my present purpose it will suffice to report the Negro record for crime, and I shall do it in the plain but stark and eloquent figures of statistics, from very reliable sources—most of them from the FBI's annual "Uniform Crime Reports."

More than one-quarter of the children of Negroes are born out of wedlock. Per capita, their illegitimacy rate is ten times that of Whites. One is forced to suspect that this reflects an attitude toward sex relations that the Negro brought with him from Africa, which is so deeply rooted in his very nature that centuries of contact with the traditions and ideals of our White civilization have never induced him or enabled him to extirpate it.

Moreover, the rate at which he commits murder is 13 times that of Whites; robbery, 6 times that of Whites; rapes and assaults, 10 times.

These figures, as given in FBI reports, vary somewhat from year to year, but they fairly represent the general trend for the past decade.¹⁴⁶

In addition to the crime itself, there are the losses it entails and the cost of law-enforcement. A special report in *U.S. News* of October 26, 1970, stated that "the crime burden in the nation has now reached 51 billion dollars a year, equal to more than 5 per cent of the gross national product." Of course, all this is not to be attributed to the Negro, but with the rate at which he commits crime 6 to 13 times that of White people, it is certain that he is responsible for a very disproportionate share of it. And sooner or later the White taxpayer, easy mark though he all too obviously is, will balk at carrying the burden.

The situation tends to force upon one's attention two questions: (1) Does not the Negro represent a quite indigestible load on our stomach? (2) Though we have signally failed to bring him up to our level, does not his presence in our midst tend to drag us down to his?

Perhaps we shall the better understand the Negro's performance in our country if we take a close look at his various attempts to set up and maintain a government of his own, and at the native life in the Africa from which he came.

5. There is no denying that the Negro has never anywhere produced a respectable State. Nor has anything of much consequence come out of those parts of the world where White-Negro crosses predominate. The story of Haiti, the only completely Negro republic in the Americas, is tersely summarized by Carleton Putnam as follows:

"After the Negroes massacred the last of the White population in 1804, Haiti remained a part of Santo Domingo until 1844 when it became a separate 'republic.' Between 1844 and 1915 only one Haitian President completed his term of office. Fourteen were ousted by armed uprisings, one was blown up, one was poisoned and another was hacked to pieces by a mob.

"Between 1908 and 1915 the revolutions and assassinations increased so rapidly that a United States military occupation was needed to restore order. This lasted from 1915 to 1934. Thereafter followed twelve years of rule by a mulatto elite which ended in the resumption of control by the black military in 1946. Since then wholesale corruption and political murder have been the rule."¹⁴⁷

The distinguished psychiatrist August Forel, after making studies of the Negro in the West Indies, declared that as soon as he is left to himself he everywhere falls back into the “most absolute primitive African savagery.”

Nor is there indication that anything better can be expected of the “emergent nations” of pure Blacks in Africa. Of the failure of Negro “governments” in Africa, Carleton Putnam, writing in 1967, reported:

“The deterioration had approached the ludicrous. During the sixty days prior to January 1, 1966, five ‘democratic’ African governments—Upper Volta, the Central African Republic, Dahomey, Nigeria and the Congo—were overthrown by force. Since 1960 there had been at least 24 African rebellions, mutinies, assassinations or attempted assassinations, and coup d’etats. Under such circumstances it was not surprising that while the crime rate was rising in the United States cannibalism and human sacrifice were increasing in Africa.”¹⁴⁸

What all this reveals is not only lack of intelligence and long experience in civilized living, but inflammable emotions, absence of self-control and self-discipline, and raw instincts that border on those of the beast. If any of my readers think this pronouncement too extreme, then I suggest that he familiarize himself with some of the well-substantiated reports that have reached us in recent years. I think, for a starter, of the “official report” of the “oathing ceremonies” of the murderous pre-independence Mau Mau organization that eventually lifted Jomo Kenyatta to power in Kenya. This was published by Mr. A.K. Chesterton, editor of *Candour*, *The British Views Letter*, as a special *Candour* supplement, on July 22nd, 1960. The warning with which Mr. Chesterton prefaced it reads thus, in capital letters, covering its entire front page:

“ON NO ACCOUNT SHOULD THIS SUPPLEMENT BE ALLOWED TO FALL INTO THE HANDS OF CHILDREN OR ADOLESCENTS.

“IT SHOULD NOT BE READ BY SUBSCRIBERS, ESPECIALLY WOMEN SUBSCRIBERS, WHO LACK STRONG NERVES AND TOUGH MINDS.

“WHAT IS PUBLISHED HERE IS A TERRIFYING DOCUMENT, A HORRIFYING DOCUMENT, AN OBSCENE DOCUMENT, BUT AN OFFICIAL DOCUMENT.

“IF ‘INDEPENDENCE’ IS TO BE GIVEN TO KENYA, NYASALAND AND PERHAPS NORTHERN RHODESIA, THEN AT LEAST LET THE BRITISH PEOPLE KNOW WHAT THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT IS DOING AND THE KIND OF MENTALITY TO WHICH THEIR KITH AND KIN IN THOSE TERRITORIES MAY BE SACRIFICED.”

What follows, I will confess, reveals a depth of bestiality and degradation that I myself could never have imagined. The report must be read in all its hideous details before one can believe them.

But, alas! loathsome as these details are, they cannot compare with the revolting atrocities committed by drunken African mobs on the rampage as recorded in such books as Michael

Hoare's Congo Mercenary (1967) and Bernardo Teixeira's *Fabric of Terror* (1965), as well as many notable magazine articles.¹⁴⁹ Arson, raping, disemboweling, beheading, skinning alive, eyes dug out with knives, victims bound to boards and run lengthwise through rotary saws. Walter Arnold reported "the raping and beating to death of White nuns, the massacre of White civilians, the killing of parents before the eyes of their children and then tossing the parents' bodies to crocodiles, the slaughtering and eating of Catholic priests, and the forcing of the Black enemy to drink gasoline so their bellies could be slit open and set on fire."¹⁵⁰ The Book-of-the-Month Club edition of *Fabric Of Terror* contained many confirmatory pictures. And their like were published by the Portuguese-American Committee on Foreign Affairs, Boston, Mass., in a brochure entitled *On The Morning Of March 15* [1961]. From its prefatory remarks, I take the following:

"This is a factual account of some of the tragic events which recently occurred in the morning of a single day in northern Angola. Over 200 Europeans and 300 innocent Africans and mulattoes lost their lives on that day. They were tortured, butchered and mutilated with a degree of bestiality that is not condonable on any terms. These few extracts, taken from official sources, tell only a part of the whole ghastly story. Over 50 widely-separate places along a 400-mile front were attacked on the morning of March 15th. These attacks were not just sporadic acts of isolated violence, but part of a carefully prepared plan, instigated and organized outside Angola, and aimed at terrorizing the Portuguese from the country. . ."

James Burnham, an editor of *National Review* and an author of distinction, wrote an Afterword to *The Fabric of Terror* in which he reviews and summarizes the whole episode. In its concluding section, after pointing out that the propaganda that had backed this uprising had managed to keep knowledge of its horrors from reaching the larger American public, he asks the question: "Can these horrors that Bernardo Teixeira recounts really be true? Can they possibly be true? Is it conceivable that human beings actually ran other humans through rotary saws and played football with the hacked off limbs of babies?" And then he replies:

"Alas for mankind, not only are these things true, but these things are not the worst of what Holden Roberto's squads did and have done; of some things it is simply not possible to write. A very brief study of the evidence removes any rational doubt. There are the photographs, hundreds of them. There are the carefully checked and collated eye-witness reports. Journalists and diplomatic representatives from many countries, of all political views, went into Angola to find out for themselves, and have verified the atrocities. Though all but two of the authors of the book published by the British Institute of Race Relations, from which I have quoted, are anti-Portuguese, none of them questions the facts.

"Nor do Holden Roberto and his associates deny the horrors." And though there were Portuguese atrocities in retaliation, "the army soon brought the rogue settlers back under control. 'I found overwhelming evidence,' Mr. Hugh Kay states in the report which I have cited, 'to clear the good name of the Portuguese army.'" ¹⁵¹

Dr. R.R. Gates observed, long before this happened, that "many native African and other tribes have scarcely emerged from the Neolithic period, so far as their culture is concerned, and it cannot be expected that their mentality has advanced beyond that period." ¹⁵²

It will, of course, be replied, by some people, that this is the Negro in Africa, and we are now concerned primarily with the Negro in the United States. I know—but I know also that precisely what we have above is an accurate picture of what the Negro was when he was brought here as a slave in the early centuries of our history. I would remind my readers of the passage from Sir Francis Galton quoted some pages back in which he refers to the native African as a “savage,” and to the passage from Meredith Townsend in which he declared that the Negroes “have never advanced out of the foulest savagery.” When these observations of a century ago are placed side by side with the records of monstrous African savagery within the past decade, and we recall the inevitable genetic sequences that bind generations together, we know that to the extent *to which any Negro today, in the United States, carries in him the genes that trace back to his savage African forebears*, we must expect that, sooner or later, here or there, under provocation or without provocation, *the beast in him will come out*. How it came out, in the bloody axes of “The Preacher” and his followers in Nat Turner’s Rebellion, thirty years before our Civil War, the historian Clifford Dowdey tells in his illuminating and very moving book *The Land They Fought For*.¹⁵³ The horror of it clamped fear on the heart of every man and woman in our South, and it has never left. Let every White man and every White woman ever remember that by the average three-quarters Black genes he has in him, the American Negro, the Negro who is with us and all about us, *still has one foot in Africa*.

Surely, it is quite a record! It’s a record not only of mental backwardness but of mental fixation at a low level, a record not only of mental limitations but of the lack of that all-directing character which, if anything, is even more essential than brains for the creation, maintenance and advancement of any great culture and civilization. The evidence that I have submitted, weighty and firmly established though it is, was necessarily, for reasons of space, cut to the bone, and must be accepted as little more than a sketch, an assembly of trenchant indications, suggestions and clues, which the reader must be left to examine and explore for himself. But even in what I have said, if my reader will allow himself to review it and to reflect upon it quietly, he will find solid ground for the ultimate conviction of such men as Jefferson and Lincoln that, as Jefferson put it, “the two races [the White and the Black], equally free, cannot live under the same government.” Certainly it is no less than an insult to human intelligence to be asked to believe that all men are equal, or that there is any means by which they can be made so.

Indeed, I am finding some signs nowadays that the censorship that for so many years has almost completely smothered free examination of the equalitarian dogma and all open opposition to it, may at last have been broken through.

On April 24, 1968, Dr. William Shockley of Stanford University, Nobel laureate and one of the most distinguished members of the National Academy of Sciences, in a speech he addressed to the Academy, spoke in part as follows:

“During the past two years of my part-time investigations I have come to accept as facts, not yet perhaps facts at the level of pure mathematics or physics, but nonetheless facts that I now consider so unassailable that I present them before fellow members of the National Academy of Sciences with a clear scientific conscience. The basic facts are these: Man is a mammal and subject to the same biological laws as other animals. All animals, including

man, have inheritable behavioral traits. The concept of complete environmental plasticity of human intelligence is a nonsensical, wishful-thinking illusion . . .

“The most dangerous illusion . . . facing humanity today is the belief most scientists lack the courage to doubt, at least for the record, typified by the expressions of our government through its Department of Labor and echoed by the Office of Education. I quote: “There is absolutely no question of any genetic differential: Intelligence potential is distributed among Negro infants in the same proportion and pattern as among Icelanders or Chinese or any other group.’ [This is the pronouncement of Daniel P. Moynihan that I submitted to my readers when writing on Eugenics. And here is Dr. Shockley’s reply.] The only reason that I do not characterize this statement as a lie, and in my opinion a damnably evil lie, is that I have no way to apprise the intellectual acumen of its authors. They may actually believe it.” [And then followed this trenchant conclusion:] “An objective examination of relevant data leads me inescapably to the opinion that the major deficit in Negro intellectual performance must be primarily of hereditary origin and thus relatively irremediable by practical improvements in environment.”¹⁵⁴

And then, shortly after, came the article “How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?” by Arthur R. Jensen, Professor of Educational Psychology and a research psychologist at the Institute of Human Learning at the University of California, Berkeley. As already remarked in my first chapter on Eugenics, it virtually filled the entire issue of *The Harvard Educational Review* for the winter of 1969, and has since been reissued as a book. The academic world was rocked by its “frank and startling reappraisal of differences in classroom performance between Whites and Negroes.” Of course, violence broke out on his campus, his secretary quit in fear, mud was thrown at him from all parts of the nation, and a panel of scientists was appointed to reply to him.¹⁵⁵

Perhaps as significant as all this furor was the conclusion about Jensen’s findings to which some of our big newspapers finally settled down. On March 23, 1969, the *London Sunday Telegraph* said:

“In a study which has occupied most of the ‘Harvard Educational Review,’ a leading educational psychologist, Dr. Arthur Jensen, stated bluntly that genetic factors are responsible for low intelligence among Negroes.

“In other words, people are born the way they are, and, generally speaking, improved environment and compensatory schooling aimed at raising intelligence quotients can have only a marginal effect. . .

“It is noticeable, however, that none of the criticisms which have emerged so far have contradicted Dr. Jensen’s claim that genetic factors are paramount in determining intelligence. . .

“His study is more narrowly concerned with whether the ‘compensatory’ educational programmes aimed largely at Negroes are having the effect of helping them play a part in society which steadily increases the demand on the intellect.

"He finds they are not and asks what has gone wrong.

"In other fields, when bridges do not stand, when aircraft do not fly, when machines do not work, when treatments do not cure, despite all conscientious efforts on the part of many persons to make them do so, one begins to question the basic assumptions, principles, theories and hypotheses that guide one's efforts.' . . .

"He says flatly that despite the arguments to the contrary, intelligence can be measured objectively, since it has as much 'biological reality' as height. . .

"Dr. Jensen quotes one survey which shows that even Negro children in the *top* social group average 2.6 IQ points less than White children in the *lowest* social group. (Emphasis added.) "Combatting the argument that environment is a major contribution to the Negroes' poor showing, Dr. Jensen says that the worst-off minority group in the United States, the Indians, are some seven points higher up in the IQ scale than are the Negroes."

Perhaps even more significant were the reactions in two of our own newspapers, the *Washington Evening Star* and the *Washington Post*. The article of March 12, 1969 in the latter, which has always been a staunch supporter of the equalitarian dogma, was by Joseph Alsop. I cull from it a few meaningful passages:

"The unspeakable has been spoken.

"Arthur R. Jensen has frontally attacked the general belief that the ghetto environment is the sole cause of the poor performance of the children in ghetto schools. Nor has he stopped there.

"He has gone on to say, with a vast mass of figures, seeming to prove his claim, that on average, the IQs of Black Americans are about 15 points lower than the IQs of White Americans. . . Then follow two paragraphs quoting test-scores that showed the mental differences between the races were *not correlated* with "social-economic status."

"This makes grim reading unless someone can disprove . . . all . . . the . . . factual data Dr. Jensen quotes. . . .

"Yet there is no use being mealy-mouthed about it. Dr. Jensen is really saying that in addition to the handicaps wickedly imposed by prejudice and discrimination, the average Black American begins the race of life with a detectable genetic gap. And for the unduly large group of Black Americans with IQs below 75, this handicap is grave enough to constitute a really massive problem in a high-technical society.

"If Dr. Jensen's data cannot be successfully challenged (which seems unlikely. . ."

But perhaps the clearest indication as to the way which the wind has begun to blow is to be found in the fact that even our scientists are showing fear to have the foundations of their predominantly equalitarian position subjected to thorough, searching scientific examination—in some sense, as it were, under the public eye. In 1967, at a meeting of the

National Academy of Sciences, our country's foremost scientific body, Dr. Shockley submitted a proposal that the Academy make or promote a study of heredity in "our national human quality." He was concerned "that the U.S. may be undergoing serious 'down-breeding' by high, largely illegitimate birth rates among Negroes of low inborn intelligence, as well as an increasing though lower illegitimate birth rate among inferior whites; and that blacks on the average are born mentally inferior to whites, and that educational methods ought to take this into account."

His proposal was turned down, and it was turned down again in 1968 and in 1969. On December 19, 1969 the *New York Post* reported that "The National Academy of Sciences . . . has overwhelmingly refused even to consider the view that millions of genetically inferior children, primarily black, were being produced in the U.S."

The Academy's President came out with an excuse to cover up its members' pusillanimity and their betrayal of the true scientific spirit. But pusillanimity and betrayal it was. They knew all too well that their equalitarian position and all the conspiracy of deception by which they have supported it, could not stand the light of day. I am by no means sure that history supports the idea that truth will "always out," or that it always "outs" in time to avoid catastrophe. But I surely am convinced that race is one of the most potent of realities, and that the races are *not equal*. I am only the more sure because I have never run away from evidence that they are equal. On the contrary, I have searched for it. And I am ready to face all the evidence for equality that anyone can bring to my attention. But in the meantime, our country has to decide social issues of the most fateful consequence, and I must bring to bear on them the whole truth as I see it today. It is reassuring to reflect that the truth, as I see it, is in line with the longest matured thought about race of our human past.

6. Race-Crossing

"How important a restriction of mixture must be follows from the Mendelian principle that one act of crossing can undo the work of a hundred generations of faithful inbreeding."

C.D. Darlington

"I can conceive of no greater calamity than the assimilation of the Negro into our social and political life as our equal."

Abraham Lincoln

With the foregoing pages of my section on racial equality as background, I now invite my readers to join me in an examination of the vexed question of race-crossing. Here in the United States at the present time this is primarily the very urgent question of whether or not the mating of Whites and Blacks should be permitted. Throughout all that I am now about

to say, this will be the chief problem in the back of my mind. Nevertheless, I believe our conclusions will be more firmly based if I approach the question by first looking at it more generally. In the case of the Negro, race-crossing is a matter of our mating with a people who, as a whole and on the average—as the evidence that I have already submitted conclusively shows—are many thousands of years behind us in evolutionary development. For intelligence, the pure Negro tests even lower than our Indians—as one of the most mentally backward peoples on Earth. But there are peoples who, for all their differences from us in color, build, character, and historic record, are by no means demonstrably our inferiors, whom many men very well-informed about racial matters, would unhesitatingly pronounce our peers and in some respects our superiors. I think especially of the Chinese and Japanese. One might be able to submit extremely impressive grounds for opposing the marriage of Whites and Blacks, but how about the marriage of Whites with Mongolians? In recent decades, we have heard a great deal about “hybrid vigor” (resulting, for instance, from the crossing of pure lines of farm or garden seeds, or of cattle), and about the risk that loss of fertility will attend inbreeding. From this point of view alone, might there not, after all, be something to be said for mating outside one’s own race? Because of the extreme urgency of this question, I trust my reader to bear with me while I review the essential facts of the matter already presented in previous chapters.

It is generally recognized that the greatness that any stock can display (whether it be of race, nation or family) will always depend primarily upon the range and wealth of potentialities that it contains in its gene pool. Thus, in the selection that takes place in mating, Nature is given a wide variety from which to choose the combination of traits and capacities that make up her lucky strokes, her conspicuously great men.¹⁵⁶ In the case of the races, most of such gain in potentialities came about by mutations through the course of perhaps hundreds of thousands of years. But doubtless there were also sporadic additions to the gene pools through some measure of crossing, especially where the peripheries of the gene pools met; and some times, by one means or another, gene pools as a whole coalesced, a big one swallowing up a smaller one to form a larger unit. But—be it carefully noted—all the time this was going on, selection of the most ruthless kind (as is the way with Nature) was working incessantly to weed out the carriers of those genes that did not make for survival; and both physical isolation and an intensifying antagonism to everything outside the group, were gradually shaking down and settling the residue into a striking homogeneity. In this, each individual tended to inherit and therefore to bear the features, traits and capacities by which his race was distinguished. Thus, though it is true that none of the major races was “pure” in the sense that it had come to be what it was without “crossing” it is true also that the evolutionary process as a whole had worked each one into a homogeneity that made it a pure type of its kind, and in the case of the Caucasoids and Mongoloids stocked each homogeneity richly with the potentialities for survival, for mastery, and for intellectual and spiritual creativeness.

It is perhaps doubtful that either of these races, the White and the Yellow, needed any further crossing. But Lin Yu Tang did express the belief that the stamina and culture of the Chinese were saved from degeneration by the periodic injection of Mongolian blood brought in about once in every 800 years by Tartar conquerors from the north.”¹⁵⁷ And Professor Edward M. East was inclined to account for the more frequent appearance of genius and general intellectual superiority among the English than among the racially

somewhat purer Scandinavians, on the ground that the great amount of blood-mixing which took place in England before the Conquest and immediately after it, gave the English a larger genetic diversity from which the components of greatness could be selected.¹⁵⁸ In any case, any stock to have got into its gene pool such elements as to make it of any worth or promise, must almost certainly, at one time or another, have undergone more or less crossing, even though it was in the very remote past.

On the other hand, as I have brought out in Section IV ("Inbreeding and Outbreeding") of my second chapter on eugenics, if racial crossing is allowed to go on continuously for a long time, and too indiscriminately, it will inevitably produce nothing but a genetic hodgepodge, the end of which is disintegration. Animal breeders had learned by practical experience long before their observations were explained and confirmed by Mendel's experiments and modern genetics, that while an *occasional* cross with a stock *not too different* might yield very beneficial results, it must always be followed by a long period of inbreeding, in order to strengthen and to stabilize its outstanding traits and to produce an efficiently functioning animal. Among humans also this has been confirmed. Looking the world over we note that the greatest, strongest, toughest, best integrated and solidest peoples are those who, though they have crossed, did not keep on crossing, and usually did not cross with stocks very different from themselves. The above-mentioned Chinese did not cross constantly; their crossing was with the Tartars, a variant of the main race of Mongols; and for many centuries since crossing took place, they have very stubbornly held all foreigners at arm's length. And in the case of the English, it is the same story. The Romans, who occupied Britain for some centuries and doubtless left some of their blood behind, were Caucasoids like the earlier Celt invaders whom they conquered; and subsequent invaders, some centuries later, Angles, Saxons, Danes and the like, were essentially but slight variations of a single racial stock, the Teutonic, and all closely related not only to the Celt but to the Roman. In other words, it might fairly be said that all the crossings finally boiled down to one—the crossing of the aborigines with various branches of Caucasoids. And then, with the battle of Hastings in 1066, the invasions and the mixing virtually stopped entirely, and for 900 years the people of Britain mated only with one another. They are still one of the most inbred people in existence.

And there is no evidence that the process has led either to loss of stamina and vigor or to diminished fertility. In fact, quite the contrary.

This is fully in line with what came out in my chapter "The Doctrine of the Thoroughbred." We found that inbreeding, even when the lines crossed are extremely close, will do no harm whatever, *provided only both lines are completely sound in body and mind*. Rather, is it the surest and quickest way to strengthen, to stabilize, and to isolate whatever potentialities the two stocks may contain. The fact that any defects or weaknesses which may be hidden in the stock, can be isolated and made visible in the resulting offspring, provides a means by which, through selection, it can purge itself of its inferior elements and thus purify and strengthen itself. Incidentally, though admittedly there is no such thing as a fully pure race, inbreeding is a means by which, given time, something like a pure race can be *produced*—as surely as animal breeders have produced pure lines of horses, cattle, and dogs.

When it comes to the popular idea that “hybrid vigor” is a result to be obtained by a random and haphazard crossing of two different lines or stocks, such as makes common street curs, this can be summarily dismissed in a few words. As already set forth in my second chapter on Eugenics, it is universally recognized in scientific circles that hybrid vigor is stringently conditioned. “In order to obtain it in any degree, it is essential that the two parents shall be unrelated, purebred . . . that the individuals used for the production of the first cross shall be as excellent as may be and that the good qualities of the two shall be, as far as possible, complementary.” “Without the purebred, there cannot be the cross-bred of any worth.” Thus spake Professor F.A.E. Crew, long one of Britain’s most distinguished geneticists, and the Director of the Animal Breeding Department of the University of Edinburgh. And others of a like authority have declared themselves in the same vein. Also, though the judicious crossing of two lines of *purebreds* may result in hybrid vigor in the *first generation* (the F1 generation, as it is called), “further crossing of these hybrids results in a manifest decrease of vigour in subsequent generations.”¹⁵⁹ Finally, even those hybrids that do show hybrid vigor are useless for further breeding. Among cattle, for instance, a purebred Holstein cow is remarkable for the *quantity* of milk it will produce; a purebred Jersey, for milk of *high butter-fat content*. But if the two lines are crossed, none of the immediate offspring can be depended upon, in any offspring they may have, to perpetuate the distinctive superiorities of either line. For further breeding the points of excellence of both breeds have been thrown away. Indeed, as I shall presently show, the offspring of some crossings, even when of the purest lines, commonly manifest crippling handicaps and defects that are striking evidence of how injurious unwise crossing can be.

All this has bearing, of course, on the crossing of humans. Since it is generally admitted that no purebred human races exist, it follows that no hybrid vigor can be obtained from crossing any of them. Moreover, so far as the outstanding races are concerned, enough crossing has already taken place to provide all the genetic diversity required. Even Dr. Crew and Professor Otto Klineberg, for instance, neither of whom found anything objectionable in race-crossing as such, were explicit on this point. Klineberg said: “It is not necessary to go outside the confines of any one race to find a mate with sufficiently diverse genetic lines to insure healthy offspring.”¹⁶⁰ And Crew said: “There is so much variability within the pure stocks [i.e., relatively pure] already existing that there is no reason to think that anything more than careful selection among these stocks will ever be required.”¹⁶¹

But all that I have written above, pertinent to our examination though I believe it to be, does not come to grips with what some men make the heart of the problem. I have before me a letter that I received two years ago from the professor of philosophy mentioned in the beginning of this chapter. In it, he disclaimed any belief that races were either equal or unequal. Race was not the issue. Race was irrelevant. “I deal with individual men,” he said, “and not with groups badly defined.” And he went on to tell about some Negroes of his acquaintance “who are superior to most white men in capacities. One represented the United States a few years ago as exchange professor of American history at Oxford University. He has been my guest and is a charming personality. One is on the Supreme Court today. Another is in the Court in Philadelphia . . . in the highest federal court next to the Supreme Court.”

Whether or not the appointment of these men to high position was part of our Federal Government's present fanatical determination to push Negroes ahead, even ahead of Whites of far greater ability, is a question that I shall not allow to detain me. Doubtless, we can all think of "Negroes" of the caliber of our professor's friends. Almost invariably they are men or women whose very skin betrays the fact that they are far less Black than White. But now and then, by one of the recognized quirks of Mendelian inheritance known as "segregation," a Negro whose skin is very dark, thereby concealing how largely he is White, will display undeniable giftedness and charm—indeed, charm enough, first to attract, and finally to win the love of a young White woman of a charm and giftedness like unto his own. So much so that they want to marry. And at this point my philosophy professor would exclaim, "Why should they *not* marry? What is there to stand in the way but miserable prejudice and antiquated taboo?"

It is this attitude that I take to contain the very essence of the "Liberal" approach to the race question in our country. At its heart, as is at once obvious, there is a denial that race is a reality, which is set up in arrogant defiance of demonstrable facts. And as we shall shortly see, it contains even more that is dubious—to say the least. Nevertheless, it is what I have been hearing from my "Liberal" friends for the past thirty or forty years, and more and more it is seen to reflect the prevailing sentiment of our entire nation. The question therefore must be faced: *Is there any valid reason why the more advanced members of the Negro race should not marry into the White race?*

Long study of the problem, and quiet reflection on it, have satisfied me that there are indeed valid reasons, supremely vital reasons, why White people should refuse to tolerate any kind of relationships between Whites and Negroes that include (or even open the way to) sexual intercourse. I must now submit what these reasons are.

I will begin with what many people may rate the weakest consideration against race-crossing that I have to submit—instinct. Among the sophisticates of our highly rationalized civilization, who incline to believe only in what can be given an explanation of the mind, we must expect to find a disposition to dismiss instinct lightly, along with whatever may be built upon it. Yet all men well grounded in science must know, as I would remind my readers, that instinct (whether with or without rational explanation) is a wisdom distilled in the subconscious mind out of hundreds of thousands of years of successful existence. And perhaps we moderns, with all the refinements of our artificial way of living, need to beware lest, in throwing out our instincts or even allowing them to become in any way weakened, we commit ourselves to a course that can end in our utter destruction.

But now let me submit some examples of White people's instincts about race-crossing.

Probably, all normal White people feel a measure of repugnance at the thought of any physical intimacy with a Black person—some more, some less. Professor John M. Mecklin, himself born in our South, who nevertheless became head of the Department of Sociology at Dartmouth College, declared in his *Democracy and Race Friction* that he had known people who felt abhorrence against so much as touching the black skin of a Negro.¹⁶² Doubtless, this is quite exceptional. But I wonder whether most White parents, even those who had supposed themselves quite emancipated about racial relations, would not recoil at the

thought of their daughter's marrying a Negro, whether they would not close their doors against her if she did marry one or be absolutely sick with revulsion at the prospect of her coming home with her darky children. And I greatly doubt whether any White man whom I could respect would be able to look at pictures that I have seen of seemingly lovely young White women in the arms of Negro males without feeling his gorge rise until he almost choked with disgust, contempt, and anger. (For such pictures see the article entitled "Interracial Marriage, etc.," by Bob Weems, in *The Citizen*, February 1972, pp. 4-12.)

Doubtless such sentiment would make our Communists sneer or laugh. And certainly our sober professor of philosophy would call it "racism," and damn it as "more socially vicious than prostitution, or stealing" etc.

Perhaps he would now go even further. He defined racism as "the deliberate cutting off of people from the opportunity to grow into the fulfillment of their capacities." And might not sexual relations with White women be necessary to the Negro male's development of his potentialities and to his ambition to rise in the social scale? And to our benevolent professor might it not seem that to deny the Negro such opportunity for the fulfillment of his capacities was a kind of—yes, of murder—something perhaps even worse than mere physical murder, a murdering of the "Divine Image" in the Negro?!!

I can at least concede this much—that White people's common aversion for physical intimacy with Negroes, compounded of a sense of superiority and a desire for distance, is emotional. It may be rooted in instinct and as such be a distillation of profound racial experience, but probably only in exceptional cases has it been examined critically and really thought out. Usually, therefore, in the most literal sense, it is prejudice—pre-judgment—a judgment that those who show it have formed prior to and without any examination of the relevant facts. It is largely something simply handed down from generation to generation, and accepted with as little pause or circumspection as a baby accepts its milk from its mother's breast. On the other hand, it is only fair to point out that in this respect the White race is no different from any other of the principal races of men. They have all manifested a strong inclination to segregate, to hold aloof from people alien to themselves. Therein they seem to have reflected a subconscious realization that the individual by himself, as a mere atom in a humanity broken down into its separate cells (such as the world government that the U.N. would produce), is a helpless nothing, a cipher. By a feeling that penetrates his very bones he knows that in every hour of crisis or great effort he must have those to whom he can rally, who can be counted on to stand with him as he stands with them; and that he will feel surest and strongest when he stands and works and fights with those of his own kind. With a sense that pervades his entire being (far deeper than anything he could merely think), he is aware that by a common past, by bonds of like blood and like make-up, he is a member of a collectivity, that for his very existence and his ability to share in a culture congenial to his own nature, he is indebted to this collectivity, to the fact that the whole body of ancestors of his present kind, by their triumphs over their enemies and in the face of their accepted habitat, were able to maintain their existence and their culture into the present hour.

All the main races of mankind have shown this disposition. It has been most marked among those races that are most advanced on the evolutionary scale. None has shown it more

markedly than the Mongolians. Professor Walter Arnold points out that “the Japanese of California. . . have not, except in rare instances, married inter-racially for over three generations.” Again: “There are said to be fifteen to twenty million Chinese who are living outside Mainland China and have done so for three or more generations. In hardly any instance have they inter-married with other races. The Chinese in the United States maintain their own living areas and customs by choice.” The repugnance felt has been strongest toward the Negro. “For example, during the occupation of Japan by the United States Armed Forces, there occurred pregnancies resulting from associations between American Negro soldiers and Japanese women. These children are rejected by the Japanese society to such a degree that acceptable means to remove them from the country are being sought.” A similar attitude has been shown in Germany toward the children of Negro soldiers of the U.S. Army and German women.¹⁶³

But if all this is to be traced back to mere instinct, is it on that account to be dismissed as nothing more than a fertile seedbed for benighted superstition and evil taboo? Before we acknowledge ourselves reduced to such a pass, let us give instinct another good look or two.

Many years ago, in reading Benjamin Kidd's *Science of Power* (Putnam, 1918), I was indelibly impressed by a story that he told of his experience with a nest of wild ducklings shortly after they had hatched. Now the wild duck is more afraid of man than of any other creature on Earth—and has reason to be. Always in the past, when Dr. Kidd had come upon its young, they had been agitated with the most desperate terror. But this time, coming upon them as he did before any other human had drawn near and when the mother was absent, they showed so little fear that they uttered no cry and actually allowed him to pick them up in his hand. The next time he stole to the nest, however, the mother was there. And when she let out the most piteous cries and shook all over with fear, her terror was communicated to her young as if by electricity. They were convulsed with it. And from that hour he was never again able to get anywhere near the ducklings.

Was this an exhibition of instinct? I don't know what the scientist would call it. Certainly, it was unreasoned. Apparently, the little ducklings were born without it. Obviously, it was something communicated to them by their mother. Communicated, my critics may say, in much the same way that the White man's repugnance for what is humanly alien to him, especially for the Negro, is communicated to his children.

But does this necessarily invalidate it? Is it not obvious that fear of man was what enabled the wild duck to survive, and that this fear had to be got into its offspring if they were not to perish, that the survival of their species depended on keeping this fear alive, very ready and terrible? And must it not be conceded that though the fear itself was not an instinct, since it was not inborn, the mother duck's urgency about getting fear into her ducklings was instinct, being tied up with her dumb sense of its absolute life-and-death necessity for the survival of her species? And may there not be something quite like this, bred into the blood and bone and brain of every living race of men, which made them “know” (ages before the dawn of ratiocination) that there was something about crossing that threatened them with destruction, and that therefore their very survival as an entity, and their survival's having significance, depended upon their restricting their breeding to their own kind?

Let us now see what science has to say about it.

Sir Arthur Keith, in 1931 and 1949, respectively, published two books that are of great importance for the examination of the question before us. The first was entitled *The Place of Prejudice in Modern Civilization*; the second, *A New Theory of Human Evolution*. The fundamental idea in both is that “race consciousness or instinct in all its degrees—incipient, imperfect, and specific—is an essential part of Nature’s evolutionary machinery.” Like Professor Edward M. East, and later Professors R.R. Gates and Carleton S. Coon and others (as already noted in an earlier page of this chapter), he held that isolation, segregation, and consequent inbreeding (i.e., marrying one’s like, one’s own kind, and avoiding marriage with outsiders and aliens) had been an essential factor in the origin of all races. And if segregation and inbreeding were essential to their origin, it was essential also to their maintenance. A race’s gene pool is its supreme treasure. Here is not only a record of all its achievements, but the store of all its potentialities—not only its distinguishing head form, build, color of skin and eyes, and color and form of hair, but the size and weight and complexity of structure and normal maturation-rate of its brain, and also “the size, form, and histological structures of the endocrines, particularly the pituitary, thyroid, parathyroids, and adrenals” (Coon)—the control-system that has so much to do with determining the racial characteristics of emotion and temperament. A race can be decimated by war or plague, its culture can be destroyed, but there is a possibility of its rising from its own ashes so long as it has kept its gene pool uncontaminated by the inferior or incompatible genes of aliens and outsiders, and free from the degeneration that inevitably follows if its inferior stocks outbreed its best. Instinct, the built-in “prejudice” against race-crossing, is one of the supreme guardians of every people’s gene pool. Ignorance may overtake a people, reason may for a day go to sleep, but this sentinel, day and night, in season and out, year after year, stands ever vigilant to ward off every assault on the race’s holiest of holies.

I have yet to approach the question of race-crossing from still another angle—this time, one somewhat more practical. In 1892, Herbert Spencer wrote a letter to one of Japan’s Elder Statesmen in reply to the latter’s inquiry as to whether or not he would approve intermarriage of Japanese and foreigners to preserve Japanese independence. The letter was written confidentially and by Spencer’s request was not published until the year after his death. Though it dates back eighty years, it is so clear, so obviously makes sense, and while free of modern scientific jargon is yet so in line with the judgments of scientific authorities whom I intend to quote, that it will serve me well as an introduction. In this letter Spencer stressed the necessity to “keep other races at arm’s length as much as possible.” After outlining three other measures to this end, he comes to the passage I find pertinent to our present inquiry:

“To your remaining question respecting the intermarriage of foreigners and Japanese, which you say is ‘now very much agitated among our scholars and politicians,’ . . . my reply is that . . . it should be positively forbidden. It is not at root a question of social philosophy. It is at root a question of biology. There is abundant proof, alike furnished by the intermarriages of human races and by the interbreeding of animals, that when the varieties mingled diverge beyond a certain slight degree *the result is inevitably a bad one* in the long run. I have myself been in the habit of looking at the evidence bearing on this matter for many years past, and my conviction is based on numerous facts derived from numerous sources. This conviction I

have within the last half hour verified, for I happen to be staying in the country with a gentleman who is well known and has had much experience respecting the interbreeding of cattle; and he has just, on inquiry, fully confirmed my belief that when, say of the different varieties of sheep, there is an interbreeding of those which are widely unlike, the result, especially in the second generation, is a bad one—there arise an incalculable mixture of traits, and what may be called a chaotic constitution. And the same thing happens among human beings—the Eurasians in India, the half-breeds in America, show this. The physiological basis of this experience appears to be that any one variety of creature in the course of many generations acquires a certain constitutional adaptation to its particular form of life, and every other variety similarly acquires its own special adaptation. The consequence of this is that, if you mix the constitution of two widely divergent varieties which have severally become adapted to widely divergent modes of life, you get a constitution which is adapted to the mode of life of neither—a constitution which will not work properly, because it is not fitted for any set of conditions whatever. By all means, therefore, peremptorily interdict marriages of Japanese with foreigners.”¹⁶⁴

That is to say—if Spencer’s own words have not already made it clear enough, through countless ages every markedly different variety of humans has worked out its characteristic way of maintaining itself in the face of its enemies and its environment, and the requisite instincts and impulses to determine action along that line. And when you cross individuals whose characteristic way is very different, you tend to get in their offspring individuals who want to go the different, and not unlikely the opposed, ways of both parents at one and the same time. The result is division, inner conflict, psychic instability, lack of firm and definite character. One has only to cast one’s eye over the map of the world to note where the people, both as individuals and as national groups, are least clear-cut and stable. It strikes me it is where the mixing of racial stocks has been most extreme and most extensive, and has gone on longest—as in Spain, Sicily, in the Balkans, in Latin America, in Hawaii. In Sicily, where aborigines, Phoenicians, Greeks, Romans, Arabs, Negroes and Nordic Vikings have mixed for centuries, and in Brazil, where to this day there is no color line and Whites, Negroes and Indians have intermarried freely, the resulting populations are not only notoriously shiftless, irresponsible, and untrustworthy, but remarkable for their dearth of artistic and intellectually creative minds. Whereas, those populations are most substantial and durable where race-crossing has been least extreme and least extensive—as in England, Scotland, Scandinavia, China and Japan.

My reader may have remarked that Spencer did not deprecate all crossing but only crossing between stocks that “diverge beyond a certain slight degree.” The representatives of two races might be “equal” enough, as for example the Chinese and English, or the Japanese and French, and yet their offspring might be thoroughly undesirable from the point of view of either race. As he pointed out, they would tend to be unable, spontaneously and with undivided force, to be efficient and effective either in the Yellow man’s way or the White man’s way.

Anyone opposed to Spencer’s attitude in this matter would, of course and very naturally, be quick to point out that this letter of his I have quoted was written at a time when the science of genetics was not yet born. Nevertheless, Spencer was no fool. Indeed, he was so perspicacious as to anticipate the conclusions of some of our most competent and judicious

scientists by fifty years. Moreover, it seems to me that he gets to the heart of the matter more directly than a lot of our moderns; and it is indubitable that he has the support of a school of anthropologists and geneticists as fully equipped with the latest techniques and composed of men individually as able, as the school that would oppose him. Let me quote what a few of them have to say.

R. Ruggles Gates begins his very valuable chapter on race-crossing with this significant paragraph:

“Very important advances in our knowledge of racial crossing have taken place in the last five years, and they have resulted entirely from the application of analytical Mendelian methods to this subject. The methods of mass statistics [which, according to the statements of his own disciples, were precisely those favored by Dr. Boas] and anthropo-metrical measurements have produced very little in the way of positive conclusions when applied to racial crossings. It is only by the study of individual pedigrees in racial crossing, as in the inheritance of single differences, that valuable advances can be made. . . . Mere mass statistics, unless collected and analyzed with the greatest care, are worse than useless, and in any case cannot approach in analytical value the results to be obtained from the intensive study of a few hybrid families.”¹⁶⁵

Further on in the same chapter he says: “The question whether segregation occurs in racial crosses has long been disputed, and only now can it be quite definitely answered in the affirmative.”¹⁶⁶ That is, many characters are now known to be inherited as persistently independent units, through uncounted generations maintaining their individual distinctness and appearing or disappearing according to the seemingly devious but really extraordinarily exact laws established by Mendel. Gates gives numerous cases of such segregation. One must suffice here. He says:

“From carefully analyzed measurements of several hundred Sioux Indians of pure and mixed blood, Sullivan . . . has shown that in those of mixed descent the curve of variation for facial width is bimodal or two-peaked, an intermediate type rarely occurring. This is excellent evidence of dominance and segregation as regards the broad face of the Indian and the narrow faces of the white races with which they crossed.”¹⁶⁷

The words “dominance” and “segregation,” along with “linkage” in the next quotation, refer to various aspects of the process by which traits, capabilities and defects are transmitted from parents to offspring in accord with the accepted principles of Mendelian genetics. Since I cannot interrupt the development of my present thought to explain them here, I must refer my uninitiated reader to such an introduction to genetics as he will find in Prof. Samuel J. Holmes’ *Human Genetics and Its Social Import*, McGraw, 1936.

With this setting, we may the more easily understand several important paragraphs to be found in the chapter entitled “The Intermingling of Races” in *Inbreeding and Outbreeding* by Professors Edward M. East and D. F. Jones. In regard to the genetics of crosses between races wide apart, they say:

“The races differ by so many transmissible factors, factors which are probably linked in various ways, that there is, practically speaking, no reasonable chance of such breaks in linkage occurring as would bring together only the most desirable features, even supposing conscious selection could be made. And selection is not conscious. Breeding for the most part is at random. The real result of such a wide racial cross, therefore, is to break apart those compatible physical and mental qualities which have established a smoothly operating whole in each race by hundreds of years of natural selection.¹⁶⁸ [We now know that instead of “hundreds of years,” they would more accurately have said “tens of thousands of years.”]

“If the two races possessed equivalent physical characteristics and mental capacities, there would still be this valid genetical objection to crossing, as one may readily see. But in reality the negro is inferior to the white. This is not hypothesis or supposition: it is a crude statement of actual fact.” [They go on to give evidence in support of this last statement, and then conclude.] “It seems an unnecessary accompaniment to humane treatment, an illogical extension of altruism. . . . to seek to elevate the black race at the cost of lowering the white.”

169

Likewise, though they speak highly of the Chinese and Japanese, calling the latter “a wonderful people,” they find them and the White peoples too “far apart in descent” to approve crosses between them. They state this general conclusion in a paragraph quoted by Professor J.A. Thomson in the chapter on Eugenics in his *Outline of Science*. He renders a “decision against the union of races having markedly different characteristics—particularly when one is decidedly the inferior. Through the operation of the laws of heredity such unions tend to break apart series of character complexes which through years of selection have proved to be compatible with each other and with the persistence of the race under the environment to which it has been subjected. Because of the transmission of factors in linked groups, the low probability of obtaining a single recombination equal or superior to the average of the better race does not warrant the production of multitudes of racial mediocrities which such a mixture entails.”¹⁷⁰

By way of illustration of the results of such crosses, Gates reports several very interesting studies. First, one of race-crossing in Hawaii.

“In these islands,” he says, “intermarriages of Portuguese, Spanish, Hawaiian, Chinese, Japanese, Americans, English, and other Europeans are taking place. From a decade of observation of this microscopic melting-pot, the conclusion is reached that such racial intermingling is usually undesirable in its results. Most of the Hawaiian-white hybrids seem to combine the least desirable traits of both parents, and intermarriages of North European and American stocks with dark-skinned races are considered biologically wasteful.

“Similarly Lundborg, from a study of Swedish conditions, concludes that the crossing of races degenerates the constitution and increases degradation. . . Frequently in crosses between Lapps and Norwegians, especially when Alpine blood was also present, a mentally unstable type was produced, the lack of balance being shown by stealing, lying, and drinking. . . The writer concludes that as regards these matings [Lapp or American Indian with Nordic], the pure races have the advantage in every way. . . .

“. . . Even after a thousand years of intermarriage, separate racial traits may still be traceable in the modern Englishman. The blend is only a blend when considered *en masse*. Alternative inheritance, and more or less complex segregation, still appear as regards single characters. . . . Although innumerable racial unions have taken place in the history of mankind, yet the elements distinguishing the original races appear to retain their separate identity and independent transmission in inheritance. The resulting racial cross, considered as population will be a blend of the original races, yet, for a long period at least, the elemental differences continue to be separately inherited. Whether, ultimately, a real blend occurs is uncertain, but if it ever does this may be only after a thousand years or so of interbreeding within the hybrid race. In any case the racial elements of the more primitive stock will dilute and weaken the better elements of the more progressive stock, with a retarding and degrading effect on the progressive stock as a whole. It is, therefore, clear that miscegenation between, for example, the white race and African races—which for ages have been undergoing separate evolution which must have been at very different rates, assuming that both are descendants from the same original stock—is wholly undesirable from a eugenic or any other reasonable point of view.”¹⁷¹

“As regards world eugenics, then, it would appear that intermixture of unrelated races is from every point of view undesirable, at least as regards race combinations involving one primitive and one advanced race.”¹⁷²

Even Ilse Schwidetsky, Professor of Anthropology in the University of Mainz, although she seems inclined to minimize the importance of race crossing in effecting the decay of peoples, does nevertheless concede it to be indisputable that the greater the genetic distance between breeding groups the more serious the developmental difficulty of their progeny.¹⁷³

Spencer’s idea that a “mixed constitution” tends to produce people of unstable equilibrium” is further fortified by the observation of some of our foremost scientists, that many of the bodily parts of parents are inherited independently, so that the offspring of crosses between widely different races are likely to be jumbles of ill-assorted features, which were never developed to work together and consequently do not work together well. We have in such hybrids an anatomical and functional disharmony that makes them weak structural material for any people to depend upon.

I have already presented considerations in support of such conclusions in my second chapter on Eugenics, but because of the importance of the matter I will go into it further here. It may be allowed that finality about it may be slow in arriving. This is due, in part, to the fact that human beings can hardly be subjected to the exact and rigid controls essential for scientific investigation; in part because of the 20 to 25 years required for the lapse of a single human generation; but chiefly because of the enveloping censorship which, as we have seen, effectively prevents any fair and full hearing of the evidence against the equalitarian position. Nevertheless, a good deal of light is thrown on the subject by the results of a series of experiments on dogs that Professor Wesley C. George, in his *The Biology of the Race Problem*, declares to be “almost as valuable as if done on humans.”¹⁷⁴ He adds that these results “are of primary concern in understanding many human problems, including the race problem” (p. 37).

Dr. George's pages that describe these experiments (37-45) and the observations based upon them, make fascinating reading. The material for them was taken from *The Genetic And Endocrine Basis For Differences In Form And Behavior* by Dr. Charles R. Stockard, anatomist-biologist at the Cornell University Medical School.¹⁷⁵ Of his three medical school associates who assisted in the experiments, one was a histologist, another an endocrinologist, and the third a psychologist. For the details, I must refer my reader to this book, or for some of the highlights to the book by Dr. George. Here I must be brief.

Dr. Stockard observes (p. 9) that "no other species of mammals represents such wide diversities in structural type and general behavior as are shown among the breeds of domestic dogs." He points out that differences in behavior are associated with differences in breed. Different breeds do things and go after things in markedly different ways. It is obvious, therefore, that their characteristic manner of behavior depends very much upon the influence of hereditary genetic factors that are tied up with bodily form and build.

Dr. Stockard's method was to cross different pure breed dogs, and watch the results in the first (or F1) generation; and then to cross individuals of this F1 generation, and again note the results.

One of the crosses was of the German shepherd with the basset hound, breeds that differ widely in behavior and are quite opposite in physical form. The resulting offspring were all mixed up. "Some characters of the shepherd were dominant, some of the basset hound, some blended." The offspring were mixed up not only in their fur and color, their legs, and ears, and tail, but in their way of hunting. The peculiar features that distinguished each of the parents and make it valuable in its own way, were lost in the offspring, or were so combined with incongruous features that the dog was frustrated.

Dr. J. T. James, the psychologist of the group, stated the conclusion based on the results of the experiment, that "hybrids resulting from crossing strongly contrasting breeds often show physical and behavioral disharmonies."

Likewise, as reported by Dr. George (p. 43, Note 66), Dr. William C. Dilger, Professor of Ornithology at Cornell, "discovered and recorded examples of dramatic disharmonies in contrasted behavior-traits in birds." "There are nine recognized species of the African parrot (lovebird). Four species are known to carry nest-building materials thrust amidst the feathers. Four others carry material only in the bill. . . . [Crosses between these four] show intermediate behavior and neither parental method is utilized efficiently although the only successful carries are made with material in the bill. The hybrids almost always attempt to tuck before carrying in the bill. They are never successful at carrying in this fashion. . . Their success did not increase after they were given the opportunity to learn from both parental types."

Dilger observes further: "Hybrid lovebird inherits patterns for two different ways of carrying nest-building materials . . . When the hybrid first begins to build a nest, it acts completely confused . . . It takes three years before the bird perfects its bill-carrying behavior, and even then it makes efforts to tuck its nest materials in its feathers."¹⁷⁶

This, surely, is strikingly consonant with the following pronouncement of Professor R. Ruggles Gates:

“In the newer countries, such as North and South America and parts of Africa, the cross-bred races which have sprung up through miscegenation between Europeans and more primitive peoples are at a disadvantage from every point of view. Besides the social failure of adjustment, physical disharmonies result, such as the fitting of large teeth into small jaws, or serious malocclusion of the upper and lower jaw; or . . . large men with small internal organs or inadequate circulatory systems, or other disharmonies which tax the adjustability of the organism and may lead to early death. Segregation of characters thus results in a motley assortment of types, with some primitive—and some advanced mental, moral, or physical qualities in place of the original more or less blended condition in the first generation of the cross.”¹⁷⁷

Thus far, I have discussed chiefly the inner disorganization, division, confusion and frustration, the “chaotic constitution,” that tends to appear in the offspring of racial crossing when the racial elements brought together are widely different. Obviously, this objection would hold no less certainly for the mating of Whites with Mongolians, where, as far as intelligence is concerned, the two might be virtually equal, than for the mating of Whites with Negroes. But, in the case of the Negro, there is an added objection that is more decisive than his differences from us physically. This is his inborn low order of brains. As Mr. Nathaniel Weyl has well observed, “The inevitable result, if this process [of racial crossing] is more or less random, is a massive reduction in the proportion of intelligent offspring.”¹⁷⁸ In support of this appraisal, he takes up a hypothetical case, in regard to which his conclusions are based on calculations by the distinguished British geneticist Sir Julian Huxley. He says:

“Assume the Negroes, constituting 11 per cent of the United States population, have average IQs of 85 against a White mean of 100. [The trend of all the test scores is to give the negro an average of 80 to 85. In crediting him with 85 Mr. Weyl is being generous.] What would happen if both races interbred on the basis of total random mate selection? The result would be that the next generation of Americans would have an average IQ of 98.46. ‘Merely a decline of 1.5 percent,’ one can hear some ill-informed scientist exclaiming. ‘What a small price to pay for equality!’ Yet this decline of 1.5 per cent in average intelligence would cause a decline of 50 per cent in the number of people with IQs of 160 and over. In short, it would halve the production of people with the intellectual powers requisite for leadership and creative effort in advanced societies. To this must be added the massive negative effect caused by the shift from assortive to random breeding in terms of intelligence.

“Thus, large-scale miscegenation between Caucasians and Negroes spells genetic catastrophe. One has only to observe the dearth of scientists, artists, inventors and executives of first-class ability in such Afro-European populations as that of Brazil or the West Indies to realize the extent to which talent is thus genetically suffocated.”¹⁷⁹

(In a footnote, Mr. Weyl says: “The calculation was made by Huxley on the assumption that human intelligence is polygenically determined. Sir Julian Huxley, ‘Eugenics in Evolutionary Perspective,’ *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, VI, 2, Winter 1963, 165.”)

In the light of the evidence and the reflections that I have submitted, one has to wonder who could have been responsible for foisting upon us the idea of America as a "melting pot," a place for mixing people of every conceivable sort of past history, feature and capacity. But however abhorrent it may be to think of letting our gene pool be adulterated and degraded with genes from the human dregs of the White world, must we not fairly choke at the prospect of absorbing our twenty-two million Negroes? One in every nine human beings in the United States is now Negro. To bring home what this must mean, let me give a brief resume of what the Negro is, as already set forth more fully in earlier pages.

To begin with, to the extent to which any American Negro is pure Black, his genes are those of his African ancestors, who were simply savages. The African Negro is one of the few most primitive and backward races on Earth. Dr. Carleton Coon, whose claims on pre-eminence among anthropologists I have presented, states that while the White and Yellow races were toilsomely evolving, the Negro in Africa "stood still"—"stood still for half a million years." The Negro is *behind* the advanced races by an "evolutionary lag" of 200,000 years. There is nothing that can be given to the Negro that will compensate for this—neither welfare checks, "head start" programs for his children, theories of equality, or cultural opportunities. All such, at the most, can but cover him with a thin veneer of our civilization; it cannot alter what he is. At bottom, it is not a matter of color. Color itself is significant only as external visible indication and evidence of a lack in brain capacity and in qualities of character and disposition that are essential to participation in a White society. To be more specific, the Negro's brain is smaller and lighter, less complicated, less developed, especially in those areas that are peculiarly the organ that has built civilizations and cultures. The primitiveness of his brain betrays itself in the very speed with which it develops after birth, and then suddenly stops, leaving him like a "lobotomized European," a White man with the frontal lobes of his brain removed, like a White child aged ten. This is confirmed by the unanimous testimony of every kind of intelligence test for the past 50 years. In this period, the Negro's access to the opportunities of our civilization has been vastly increased, so much so that today, because of the prevalence of the desire to help him get ahead, it is actually easier for a Negro student to get into college and be accorded a certain grade than it is for a White student who tests mentally higher. The Negroes' efforts to set up a civilized society anywhere, even when they were completely on their own, have been a complete and dismal failure. And authoritative reports have shown consistently, for years, that their crime rates, which range up to 16 times those of Whites, prove them unfitted and unqualified to take a responsible part in any society such as ours. Everywhere they have gone, even in a colored society such as Ethiopia, they have always been at the bottom of the social pyramid. Lincoln showed considerable insight when he declared, at the very time he was signing his Emancipation Proclamation that set them free, "I can conceive no greater calamity than the assimilation of the Negro into our social and political life as our equal."

But at this point I can imagine our "liberal" professor's interposing: "I object to your assumptions. Crossing on a racial scale is not what we Liberals are pressing for. In general, like takes to like, and therefore we believe it improbable that complete freedom of Whites and Blacks to intermarry will ever lead to racial amalgamation. We are only concerned that laws and prejudice and taboos about color should not stand in the way of individuals' marrying if they want to—if they need it for the fulfillment of their personal development. If that happens now and then, and especially if the White person concerned marries a Negro of

the better sort, perhaps one who is even more White than Black, what harm can it do?" (See *U.S. News*, Jan. 1, 1973, pp. 48-52 for an article entitled "On Campus: An Iceberg of Government Intervention" by Dr. George C. Roche III, President of Hillsdale College in Michigan.)

At first thought, this may seem very plausible. But it simply will not hold water, and to my mind it comes as something inexcusably unrealistic from one so intelligent as our Herr Professor. What quality of offspring could be expected from such an occasional marriage as he is prepared to permit, I need not dwell upon, though the evidence and the considerations that I have already adduced afford precious little ground for expecting anything in which the White party in such a union could take pride or even find comfort and satisfaction. But it is not the individual marriage itself that should give us most concern. *It is the effect it inevitably tends to have on our society.*

Permit the marriage of Whites and Negroes, and though actual marriage happens at first only now and then, it will prove to be the trickle that, unstopped, at last washes away the whole dike and lets in the deluge.

All history proves it. Over and over again, for the past 4,000 years, our people, White people, commonly blue-eyed, golden-haired blonds, have invaded one country after another to create cultures and civilizations—in India, Persia, Greece, Rome, and elsewhere. The Spanish took possession of Mexico and Peru, and the Spanish and Portuguese together occupied all South America. But everywhere, for one reason or another, in the course of centuries, living side by side with those whom they had conquered or enslaved, or with other later aliens who overcame them, they settled down at last to accept marriage with them—and then, as a people, disappeared.

In India, the original Aryan conquerors created one of the great civilizations of the world, unique for its religion, philosophy, literature, and social organization. Out of a stern and determined will to prevent the mixing of their blood with that of the black, flat-nosed people whom they had subdued, they went so far as to impose the death penalty for sexual relations that crossed the color line. But today the casual observer of the population of India, from one end of the land to the other, would need to be told that the creator of Hindu civilization was White. And Spengler rated the people of modern India, along with those of modern Egypt, as fellaheen. Both were at one time among the glories of the world, but by now they have been so often beaten, broken, kneaded and worked over by alien conquerors, that he believed their future hopeless. A recovery and a renaissance have become impossible.

Much the same thing happened to the Persians. They gave birth to one of the greatest religions known to mankind, and there was a day when their kings could proudly call themselves the rulers of the world. But then came the Mohammedan conquest, and then the Mongols broke over them, and though a stiff-necked lot of them fled to India and Bombay and there have sustained a segregated and distinguished community as Parsees, those who stayed behind gradually settled down to mix with their conquerors, and their descendants today constitute a third-rate power. The stuff they are made of is a long way removed from that of their ancestors who had ruled from Egypt and Thrace to northwest India. The

original blue-eyed, golden-haired White man is gone, his genes dissipated and drowned in a sea of color.

And the Greeks? They too, like the Aryans of India and the Iranians of Persia, of ancient Iran, conceived of their gods in their own image, as blue-eyed and blond. And there were years, a few centuries, during which a single one of their cities, Athens, with a population of only some 40,000 free men, created a culture and civilization which, for original thought and power of artistic expression, in art, architecture and literature, has never been surpassed anywhere. Its handful of citizens produced some twenty-five of the greatest figures of all time. But the day dawned when they were become democratic, and cosmopolitan, and liberal, when commercial men from outside set up in Athens, and gradually the stringency that for so long had held all foreigners at arm's length, calling them "barbarians," was relaxed, and—again it is a long story—in the end the Whites went down in a sea of color. Today no one would guess, by their appearance, that a modern Greek is descended from the men who once so proudly walked the streets of Athens, Sparta, Thebes and Corinth; and Greece as a whole is remarkable today for its *dearth* of great men.

When it comes to Rome, it is only to tell the same story over again. Here the story is very long, but though it took something like a thousand years for Rome to run its course, the day came when men of the Empire, from the Euphrates to Britain, could become citizens, the old Roman peasantry was used up and broken and largely supplanted by hordes of imported slaves, the nobility ceased to have enough children to perpetuate their stock, the old standards and restrictions were relaxed, until in Rome itself "the Roman blood must have been diluted almost past recognition." "In Nero's time Lucan said that Rome was not peopled by its own citizens but filled with the scourgings of the world." "It is almost impossible for us to realize the extraordinarily motley character of the Roman mob." And Rome "set an example for the provinces also."¹⁸⁰ And though it cannot quite be said in this case that the White man disappeared, it is certain that the modern Italian is a long way from being the equal of the old Roman of the days of the Republic.

And in Mexico and South America, a few Spaniards or Portuguese, without their women, went in as conquerors, and almost from the start mated with the natives or the Negro slaves they soon imported. Again, though the original White man's face may still show through, the population of these countries, in general, is a mishmash, ineffective, decidedly lacking in what is needed to produce anything of lasting or world-wide significance.

This—what Walther Rathenau, a Jew, pronounced "the tragedy of the Aryan race"—is what has been happening over and over again for thousands of years. "A blond and marvelous people arises in the north. In overflowing fertility it sends wave upon wave into the southern world. Each migration becomes a conquest, each conquest a source of character and civilization." And then—in one way or another—a horde of alien peoples close in on it, and it is swallowed up in a swamp of mud.¹⁸¹

And yet today, here in the United States, we are told by our self-appointed pundits that we can follow the same course as our numerous ill-starred forebears without coming to the same dead end as they. Such a faith flies in the face of history and experience. We come nearer the truth of the situation that confronts us in our present-day drive for integration

when we hear Professor E.A. Hooton of Harvard declare: "Social intercourse always implies sexual intercourse."¹⁸² And my old professor of psychology already mentioned, John M. Mecklin, who became head of the Department of Sociology at Dartmouth, stated it even better, thus: "When society permits the free social intercourse of two young persons of similar training and interests, it tacitly gives its consent to the possible legitimate results of such relations, namely, marriage."¹⁸³ To be sure, our benevolent professor, whose specialty is ideas rather than facts, and who has all his anthropology secondhand, is very certain that removal of the color bar will not lead to increased intermarriage between Whites and Negroes, to the ultimate amalgamation of the two races into one. At most it would be only sporadic, he thinks, since both Whites and Blacks prefer to marry their own kind.

And we will concede that there is a measure of truth in his contention. Certainly, it has long been recognized that in every sort of marriage a tendency has been discerned for like to marry like. This holds even between races, even when the races are believed to be equal. But Whites and Blacks are not equal: in every human society of which the Negro has formed a part he has always been at the bottom of the social pyramid; and consequently ambitious Black males have long manifested a strong desire to advance their position by breaking into White society by way of marriage. However, many almost insurmountable obstacles have stood in the way. Until recent times, intermarriage of Whites and Blacks was generally forbidden by State law; White women who married Negroes or entered into amours with them were virtually thrown out of White society; and many crippling and painful handicaps attached also to the half-bred offspring of Black-White crosses. (This has been a sound instinctive reaction, for it is only through our women that alien genes can invade our White gene pool.) Consequently, miscegenation by marriage was largely prevented. Yet Professor Curt Stern, geneticist at the University of California, has estimated (as we already have seen) that, on the average, one-quarter of the genes in our Negro population are White. It would seem that all the obstacles and penalties combined have not prevented mixing from going quite a long way toward amalgamation. And so far as our genes are concerned, it does not matter whether the mixing takes place within marriage or outside it.

And now that the barriers are being broken down and the penalties removed, we are confronted with a very different situation and climate. The National Council of Churches has declared "segregation" (such as was long maintained in our South) to be the worst of sins against God. Preachers, professors, publicists, and our principal political spokesmen have united to declare all men equal, even Whites and Blacks. Unrelenting propaganda has brought it about that any racial discrimination against Negroes is now almost universally looked upon as a sign of ignorance, and evidence of moral and spiritual benightedness and degeneracy. Befuddled and spiritless Whites have come to fear it as a kind of disgrace, of which they are at pains and always in haste to clear themselves. Hollywood, for decades, has been putting on an endless succession of plays in which the Negro males make love to White women—openly giving the impression that such relations are permissible, and even that they are now "quite the thing." Television brazenly pictures comely, young, blond White women in the embraces of the blackest and most devilish-looking Negroes, who have the appearance more of apes than of men. This tends to give our women the impression not only that we are in a new moral world, where virtually anything is permitted, but—moreover—that affairs with Negroes are the vogue, and that thereby their social status can actually be improved. Negro men make the most satisfying sexual partners, they are led to

believe, and since relations with them have ceased to be shameful and need no longer be clandestine, they may with good reason be welcomed and even invited. Despite the Negro's inferior intelligence and his origin in what every civilized society in the world looks down upon as its lowest class, amours and even marriage with him serve as a means by which a White woman can demonstrate to the world that she belongs to the intellectual avant garde of the new age, that she is emancipated from conventions and champions the brotherhood of man.

This change makes the women of the White race open game for Negro males.

It has long been recognized that among Negroes on the rise the rule has been: "Marry white—or as light as you can." Lightness of skin in a wife was a badge of a Negro's achievement and advance in status. But now the Negro has lifted his sights. He is after more than status: he seeks revenge. His invasion of the White man's sanctuary is planned as an assault on the seat of his power and the citadel of his greatness—his gene pool. Mr. Robert Weems, writing in *The Citizen* for February 1972 (p. 12—it is the official journal of the Citizens Council of America, published at 254 East Griffith Street, Jackson, Mississippi, 39202), quotes President Sukarno as saying in his autobiography:

"I was very much attracted to Dutch girls [who are mostly very blond]. I wanted desperately to make love to them. It was the only way I knew to exert some form of superiority over the white race and make it bend to my will. *That's always the aim, isn't it? For a brown-skinned man to overpower the white man.*" (Emphasis added by Weems.)

And Weems goes on to comment:

"Overpowering a white girl is to overpower *the* white man. That is what Sukarno says. It is something every white man should remember when he sees any colored man with a white woman.

"White women should remember it, too, for once the status of the white race is lowered, the individual women may well lose their glamour and be contemptuously discarded by the black lovers who were once so proud to attain them.

"The notorious black militant Eldridge Cleaver, in the book attributed to him, *Soul on Ice*, says of the white women he admittedly raped:

"I did this consciously, deliberately, willfully, methodically. . . It delighted me that I was defying and trampling upon the white man's law, upon his system of values, and that I was defiling his women.'

"And black athlete and movie star Jim Brown, who made love to white Raquel Welch in the film '100 Rifles,' later told *Ebony* magazine, 'I think she has the idea that I ought to be grateful. . . . If that's what she thinks, she can go to hell.'" ¹⁸⁴

So now White women are indeed open season to Negro hunters, and the hunters will take the keenest satisfaction in bringing down a lot of victims, each one raped and each one

married being another feather with which to plume their hats, another scalp to hang about their waists.

And yet most White people today are so befuddled that apparently they believe that all this breaking down of barriers can go on without its ending in the virtual disappearance of their kind in a botched breed of fifth-rate mongrels; or else they are too stupid to have any conception of what such a fate would mean, or too devoid of feeling for their race to care. But among informed and intelligent men, there can be no doubt what our present course is leading to. I have recounted what has happened to our people over and over again in other lands and times, and how in our own country, even in the face of great obstacles and severe penalties, there has been so much sexual intercourse between Blacks and Whites that today our Negro population is one-quarter White. And now the tables are completely turned. All the authority and force and machinery of the White man's world, which ought to operate for our own well-being and to save us, seems to be in the hands of those who seek our destruction. There is a fierce determination abroad to trample under foot and to stamp out the freedom to choose one's own associates that always marks any really free society, and to break the last vestiges of the will to segregate by which our people have striven to preserve their gene pool from adulteration and degradation. One of the Warburgs told a committee of Congress some years ago that we were going to have world government whether we wanted it or not. And there is manifestly an enormous power in our society that is determined to ram integration down the throats of White people though it break their very necks in the process.

Most of our people have been too absorbed in their various occupations and too off-guard to notice what has been going on. But as early as 1928, a congress of Communists meeting in Michigan decided to break down every attitude, tradition, institution or law that stood in the way of accepting Negroes as the equals of Whites. And year after year has seen them accomplishing their ends. Soon, the National Council of Churches was declaring that there were no valid objections to the intermarriage of Whites and Negroes. As early as 1958, the NAACP was reported in the press as having said through one of its officials, "Once the two races are integrated, intermarriage is the natural consequence." In 1961, Dr. David R. Mace, a marriage counselor on the faculty of the Medical School of the University of Pennsylvania, at a White House Conference on Children and Youth, committed himself thus: "Racial integration, whatever anyone says to the contrary, will lead inevitably to intermarriage."¹⁸⁵ Every paper and organization authorized to speak for the American Jewish community as a whole is driving for that integration which leads inevitably to intermarriage. In 1962, Norman Podhoretz, one of the leading Jewish intellectuals in the United States and editor of *Commentary*, recognized as one of the most influential Jewish magazines in the world, went yet further and wrote as follows:

"What does the American Negro have that might correspond to [the Jews' memory of past glory and a dream of imminent redemption]? His past is a stigma, his color is a stigma, and his vision of the future is the hope of erasing the stigma by making color irrelevant, by making it disappear as a fact of consciousness.

"I share this hope, but I cannot see how it will ever be realized unless color does in fact disappear: and that means not integration, it means assimilation, it means—let the brutal

word come out—miscegenation. I believe that the wholesale merging of the two races is the most desirable alternative for everyone concerned. . . in my opinion the Negro problem can be solved in this country in no other way.”¹⁸⁶

Such a pronouncement from a man of Mr. Podhoretz' position requires examination. When, in order to relieve the anguish in the soul of the Negro and as a solution of the race problem in our country, he accepts, endorses, and even recommends a course that can lead only to the degradation and deterioration of the nation that has given him and his people citizenship and harborage, it can mean only one of two things: either he knows as little of anthropology as our fulminating professor, or else he is wittingly adding his sanction and the weight of his influence to that policy by which World Jewry, everywhere, seeks the genetic gutting of the White race by race-mixing, and thus to overwhelm it with a catastrophe from which recovery, if not altogether impossible, must at least be most uncertain, difficult, and long delayed. In the Jewish community generally, and nowhere more manifestly or more determinedly than in Israel, race-mixing the marriage of a Jew with a gentile, is positively forbidden and anathema. In fact, in Israel it has been made legally impossible. But when it comes to gentiles, it is quite another story. What Jews have learned by experience would mean death to them is being forced upon us with all the power at their command. And that power is enormous.

This, however, is not the time to enlarge upon the doings of World Jewry to overthrow and to enslave the White race in all parts of the world. That must wait a bit. My point is that if our Negro population could become, on average, one-quarter White in the face of all the obstacles and penalties long lined up against it, how utterly fatuous is it to think that complete amalgamation can be escaped with the overwhelming power and disposition of the country today that is bent on accomplishing it!

Indeed, much study and reflection on the problem led me years ago to my conviction, now hard as granite, that if the White man in our country settles down to live side by side with the Negro, *on any terms*, it can be only a matter of time, and not a long time, until as a race he will cease to exist. This would be true even if the Negro still labored under his old disabilities, and if all the old barriers to miscegenation were still in effect. It would take longer, but it would inevitably happen. Segregation could somewhat delay the catastrophe; it could never suffice to prevent it. And as things are now—with the way to integration and to race-mixing laid wide open, made smooth and easy, and pleasant and even profitable, and with White people behaving like a drove of stupid sheep, being tricked, kicked, goaded and whipped into accepting and following it, the disaster must come swiftly. And it was the prospect of exactly this fate that made Jefferson shudder and Lincoln appalled.¹⁸⁷

In the face of the tragedy seemingly already upon us, I too stand appalled and shudder. All the more so because, when one stops to cast about for some practical means of averting the tragedy and solving the racial problem, the situation seems hopeless. Yet our will to live and our love of our kind bids us hold on to hope even though we can discover little ground on which to base it. And always my searching mind has found itself illumined, as by a zigzag flash of lightning out of the black and lowering fury of a thundercloud, with a clear sense of what the one possible solution of the problem is. I must wait to state it in my next chapter, where I shall come to grips with our racial problems as a whole and with what we must do

about them if we are not to die. But I will point out now that we cannot make a society satisfactory either to the White race or to the Negro race if we try to make one satisfactory to both. That is utterly impossible, and the sooner we face it and all that it means, the better for all concerned, for the Negro as surely as for ourselves. This should at least prepare my reader for what I perceive to be the only course that can bring *any real solution, for anybody*. And lest my reader should stiffen in expectation that I am going to urge that we “ride herd” over our opponents of every stripe in a fanatical determination to cut through to our goal, let me assure him that my heart feels for the Negro just as surely as for my own kind—even though less deeply. After all, the tragedy is one that engulfs Black and White alike. I have Negro friends, at least largely Black, whom I honor and for whom I feel affection. With them in my mind, and in my heart, I think that it can be depended upon that I shall never forget that “the Negroes too are human beings.” But I am too realistic to think for a moment that any way out can be found that will not give great pain, and even bring injury, to many people. That can only be accepted. But, at the least, we can ever struggle to keep this to whatever minimum may be compatible with the operation required. Also, I shall not forget our magnanimous professor who in his eagerness to lay out rich opportunities to enable promising individuals to make the most of themselves, seems to forget that every society has to do this kind of thing with discrimination, that it can never afford to indulge the individual to the point where its own existence is thereby jeopardized.

The title of this chapter implied that I thought that I knew what “the everlasting truth about race” is, and I must not close this chapter without giving my answer to the question that I have raised. In doing so, I shall at once sum up and state what in my judgment is the essence of the entire matter.

The everlasting truth about race is that *breed* is everything. Or, to put it more in the terms of the scientist, the gene pool of a people is its supreme treasure, as surely as the gene pool in a man, as inherited from his parents and, further back, from his ancestors, is his supreme treasure. A race’s gene pool is more important than its religion, for it will determine how much place it can and will give to religion, and what kinds of religion it will create. It is more determining than its philosophy, for it will decide which outlook upon life and the universe is the natural and true expression of its innermost being. Similarly, stored up in its gene pool is its capacity for creating art, music, literature, political institutions, education, and—perhaps above all else—what it will make of the home. Everything that a given race has produced in the past can be destroyed, and it can create it over again, perhaps even create more greatly than ever before. But let its gene pool be altered, adulterated, mixed up, and degraded, and it is finished. The day of its creating is then past beyond redemption, except as means are found or devised by which to infuse it with new life. Disraeli, therefore, did not by a word overstate the truth when he said: “All is race. It is the key of history.” But the truth is stated more exactly, and in terms more fully consonant with the mind of our age, if we say “breed is everything.” And the first right under heaven, the right before which every other right must give way, is that a race should fight—with its every and uttermost resource—to keep its gene pool holy, unsullied and inviolable. And this means that fearful penalties shall fall on any alien man who touches one of our women, and on any of our women who suffers herself to be touched. 1972, 1974

Footnotes

1. In fact, in 1954 the World Council of Churches, meeting at Evanston, Ill., declared in an official pronouncement:

“Segregation on the grounds of race, color, ethnical origin in all its forms is contrary to the will of God and is in conflict with the Gospel and must be regarded as irreconcilable with Christian teachings about man and the essence of the Church of Christ. . . There can be no objection in principle to intermarriage . . . No state has the right to prohibit mixed marriages.”

And in like vein, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, President-designate of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church, said:

“You do not segregate those you love. When we cease to love, we sin. The segregation issue is as simple as that, and as significant as that. Segregation is sin.”

2. This epigram, thus often quoted, is in fact made up of two sentences taken from two different books of Disraeli's. They read as follows:

“All is race; there is no other truth.” *Tancred*, Frederick Warne, London, 1868, p. 106. “No man will treat with indifference the principle of race. It is the key of history, and why history is often so confused is that it has been written by men who were ignorant of this principle and all the knowledge it involves . . . Language and religion do not make a race—there is only one thing which makes a race, and that is blood.” *Endymion*, Longmans, London, New Edition, no date, pp. 249-250.

3. Arthur de Gobineau—*The Inequality Of Human Races*, Putnam, 1915, pp. xiv, 25, 33f. In all fairness to Gobineau, however, let me add the verdict of Professors E. Bauer, Eugen Fischer and E. Lenz, that “notwithstanding manifold errors, this is an inspired work whose fundamental ideas remain incontrovertible. It stands unrivalled as a pioneer book on the racial problem.” See the work by these authors entitled *Human Heredity*, Macmillan, 1931, p. 706.

4. Dr. T.U.H. Ellinger, Professor of Zoology at Howard University, the Negroes' foremost school of higher learning, and himself one who, in considering racial crosses, makes difference in race a matter of minor consequence, has said: “I know of no single geneticist anywhere, not even in Nazi Germany, who holds the opinions refuted with so much eloquence.” (In an address before the Baltimore Interracial Fellowship, Nov. 5, 1946.) In

justice to the Nazis, I will add, what by now is known to well-informed people, that neither the German scientists nor the Nazi political leaders ever held such ideas of German racial purity as their enemies were at pains to attribute to them.

5. Otto Klineberg—*Racial Differences*, Harper, 1933, pp. 18-9.

6. Frank H. Hankins—*The Racial Basis of Civilization*, Knopf, 1926, pp. 269-270.

7. Sir Arthur Keith—*A New Theory of Human Evolution*, Philosophical Library, 1949, p. 256f.

8. *The Christian Century*, Oct. 14, 1942, p. 1257, W.E. Garrison reviewing.

9. Cp. Prof. Otto Klineberg, op. cit., p. 219:

“Miscegenation as such is biologically neither good nor bad; its effects depend entirely upon the health and vigor of the individuals who enter into the mixture. The observed effects of race crossing appear to depend very much more on social than on biological factors.” Cp. p. 222.

10. Otto Klineberg op. cit., pp. 5, 153ff., 182-3, 189, 343, 345-6, 349. Cp. p. vii.

11. See Carleton Putnam—*Race and Reality*, Public Affairs Press, 1967, Ch. 11. Mr. Putnam is of an old and distinguished New England family. He had an outstanding career as an airline executive, in which he became chairman of the board of Delta Airlines. For further information about Mr. Putnam and about his books see my Note 85, under “Putnam, Carleton.”

12. Melville Herskovitz—*Franz Boas*, New York, 1953, p. 65. See also Wesley C. George—*The Biology Of The Race Problem*, 1962, pp. 78-87; *New York Times*, Oct. 24, 1962, p. 38C.

13. Carleton S. Coon—*The Story of Man*, Knopf, 2nd Ed., 1962, p. 187f.

14. What Henry Pratt Fairchild, Prof. Emeritus of Sociology, New York University, thought of the Boas' thesis, is revealed in his chapter entitled "Anti-Racism" in his book *Race and Nationality*, New York, 1947. I permit myself to quote several pertinent passages:

"Two careful scholars, G.M. Morant and Otto Samson, have made an exhaustive study of the Boas report and related material, and their conclusions with respect to the Boas study are summarized as follows: 'In our opinion the data collected for the Immigration Commission are not capable of leading to definite proofs of these or alternative hypotheses of the same kind. . . . Our general conclusion is that considerably larger divergencies would have to be found in order to establish the theory that head-form, as estimated by the cephalic index, is modified directly by the environment'" (p. 105).

"Boas apparently is expecting his reader to accept this one study as of sufficient weight to offset not only the conclusions of dozens of able anthropologists, but also the commonplace observations of the layman in such cases, for example, as the pure-blooded American Negro where there has been no obvious modification of many basic traits after several generations of residence in the American environment" (p. 104).

15. Carleton Putnam, 1967, op. cit., p. 27. Also, pp. 26-30.

16. Stefan Possony—"UNESCO and Race, A study in Intellectual Oppression," *Mankind Quarterly* Vol. VIII, No. 3, pp. 115-146—a minute, searching and very revealing analysis. Dr. Possony has been a director of the Hoover Institute on War, Revolution and Peace, and an associate at the Foreign Policy Research Institute. He is a graduate of the Institute of Advance Study at Princeton, and has taught international politics at Georgetown University and at the University of Pennsylvania.

17. For a revelation of Klineberg's lack of scientific scrupulousness see the article by Prof. Henry E. Garrett: "Klineberg's Chapter on Race and Psychology," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. I, No. 1, (July, 1960), pp. 15-22. Klineberg's chapter had appeared in UNESCO'S 1956 symposium entitled *The Race Question In Modern Science*. For an analysis of an even sloppier piece of work, see Prof. A. James Gregor: "Comas' Chapter on Racial Myths," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. II, No. 1 (Fall, 1961), pp. 30-4. The "Comas' Chapter" referred to is one of the UNESCO work mentioned above, which was republished in 1961 by the Columbia Univ. Press, with the title *Race And Science*. Donald A. Swan also went to work on Juan Comas in *Mankind Quarterly* monograph No. VI, entitled *The Anatomy Of A Controversy*, Part

III, pp. 24-36. See also Wilmot Robertson—*The Dispossessed Majority*, Howard Allen, 1972, p. 15.

18. Quoted in the lead review in the *American Bar Association Journal*, June, 1962. The review, which begins by saying “this . . . may well become one of the most important books of this generation,” is of Carleton Putnam’s *Race and Reason*, Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 1961. Cp. Carleton Putnam—*Race and Reality*, op. cit., 1967, p. 71f.

19. Ernest van den Haag: “Social Science Testimony in the Desegregation Cases—A Reply to Prof. Kenneth Clark,” reprinted by the International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics (I.A.A.E.E.), P.O. Box 3495, Grand Central Station, New York City 10017, last 6 pages. Cp. “Legal Testimony and Scientific Evidence: A Contrast” by C.P. Armstrong, G.S. Crutchfield, W.E. Hoy, and R.E. Kuttner, *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. IV, No. 2 (Fall, 1963), p. 105ff. For very effective review and analysis of Prof. Kenneth B. Clark’s testimony and the Supreme Court’s 1954 decision, see Prof. A. James Gregor: “Science and Social Change,” *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. III, No. 4, pp. 229-237.

20. The most complete, scholarly, and up-to-date edition is *The Collected Works Of Abraham Lincoln*, edited by Roy P. Basler, Rutgers University Press, 1953. All the citations in the following quotations refer to this edition.

In a speech at Peoria, Ill., October 16, 1854:

“Free them [the Negroes], and make them politically and socially, our equals? My own feelings will not admit of this; and if mine would, we well know that those of the great mass of white people will not. Whether this accords with justice and sound judgment, is not the sole question, if indeed, it is any part of it. A universal feeling, whether well or ill-founded can not be safely disregarded.” Vol II, p. 256.

In an address at Springfield, Ill., June 26, 1857:

“A separation of the races is the only perfect preventive of amalgamation, but as immediate separation is impossible the next best thing is to keep them apart where they are not already together. . . . Such separation, if ever effected at all, must be effected by colonization. . . . The enterprise is a difficult one, but ‘where there is a will there is a way;’ and what colonization needs now is a hearty will. Will springs from the two elements of moral sense and self-interest. Let us be brought to believe it is morally right, and, at the same time, favorable to, or at least not against, our interest, to transfer the African to his native clime, and we shall find a way to do it, however great the task may be.” Vol. II, pp. 408-9.

In a debate with Stephen Douglas at Ottawa, Ill., August 21, 1858:

"I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and black races. There is a physical difference between the two which in my judgment, will forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality; and inasmuch as it becomes necessary that there must be a difference, I am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position." Vol. III, p. 16.

In an address on September 16th, 1859, Lincoln repeated what he had said in the excerpt given above under date of August 21, 1858, and then added the passage quoted in my text. Vol. III, pp. 402-3.

On August 14, 1862 (after he became President), in recommending colonization to a "Deputation of Free Negroes" who called on him at the White House, he said:

"You and we are different races. We have between us a broader difference than exists between almost any other races. Whether it be right or wrong I need not discuss; but this physical difference is a great disadvantage to us both, as I think. Your race suffer very greatly, many of them, by living among us, while ours suffer from your presence. In a word, we suffer on each side. If this is admitted, it affords a reason at least why we should be separated. . .

". . . Your race are suffering, in my judgment, the greatest wrong inflicted on any people. But even when you cease to be slaves, you are yet far removed from being placed on an equality with the white race. . . On this broad continent, not a single man of your race is made the equal of a single man of ours. Go where you are treated the best, and the ban is still upon you.

". . . I cannot alter it if I would. I need not recount to you the effects upon white men, growing out of the institution of Slavery. See our present condition—the country engaged in war!—our white men cutting one another's throats, none knowing how far it will extend; and then consider what we know to be the truth. But for your race among us there would be no war, although many men engaged on either side do not care for you one way or the other. . . It is better for us both, therefore, to be separated." Vol. V., pp. 371-5.

On August 15, 1862, a law was passed appropriating \$100,000 for freed Negroes in the District of Columbia, and \$500,000 for freed slaves in the hands of the Army. This was for "colonization." Vol. V, p. 370.

When Lincoln signed the *Emancipation Proclamation*, he said:

"I have urged the colonization of the negroes, and I shall continue.

"My Emancipation Proclamation was linked with this plan. There is no room for two distinct races of white men in America, much less for two distinct races of whites and blacks.

"I can conceive of no greater calamity than the assimilation of the negro into our social and political life as our equal . . .

"Within twenty years we can peacefully colonize the negro and give him our language, literature, religion, and system of government under conditions in which he can rise to the full measure of manhood. This he can never do here. We can never attain the ideal union our fathers dreamed, with millions of an alien, inferior race among us, whose assimilation is neither possible nor desirable." Vol. V, pp. 371-5.

The best exposition of Lincoln's Negro policy that I know of, is the small book entitled *Lincoln's Negro Policy* by Earnest Sevier Cox, available in an attractive reprint 1968 edition from Noontide Press, P.O. Box 1248, Torrance, California 90505.

For a very impartial summary of the known facts about Lincoln's attitude on the Negro Question, see the *Washington Post* for a letter it published by Ludwell H. Johnson, Associate Professor of History at William and Mary College. The date of the letter, or perhaps the date of its publication, is given as March 3, 1964. Quoted in part in Carleton Putnam's *Race and Reality*, pp. 134-6.

21. *The Collected Works Of Abraham Lincoln*, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 402-3.

22. Carleton Putnam, 1967, op. cit., p. 41.

23. Ibid. p. 88.

24. See Prof. A. James Gregor's review of *Diccionario De Filosofia Y Sociologia Marxista*, 1959, an Argentinian translation from an originally Russian work by P. Judin and M. Rosenthal, which "gives access to a significant statement of the predispositions of contemporary Soviet thought." The following passages are taken from this review, published in *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. II, No. 4 (Spring 1962), pp. 295-6:

"Perhaps the single most important consideration, for our purposes, is the fact that a rather explicit statement concerning the nature of scientific inquiry is provided. Science is conceived as an element of 'social consciousness,' . . . The forms in which social consciousness articulates itself (politics, science, religion, morality, etc.) always express economic class interest (p. 54). There is no 'independent' social consciousness (cf. p. 100); ideologies arise 'as a reflection of the conditions prevailing in the material life of society and of the interests of a determinate class (54).

"We have then, not only a class politics and philosophy (cf. p. 38) but a class science, as well! What this means, literally, is that at least one critically important measure of the worth of a scientific theory is its serviceability as a weapon in class warfare (cf. pp. 62ff).

“Marxist morality is ‘subordinate to the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat’ . . . ‘At the basis of communist morality is consideration of the consolidation and realization of communism (Lenin)’ (p. 87; cf. also Lenin, *On Socialist Ideology And Culture*, Moscow, Foreign Languages, n.d., p. 53). This constitutes the rationale for what Marxists are pleased to call the ‘partisan character of science.’

“We know something of the effects of this kind of partisanship in science. Genetics, as a science, has all but been abolished in the Soviet Union (cf. Huxley, *Soviet Genetics And World Science: Lysenko and the Meaning of Heredity*, London, Chatto and Windus, 1949) . . . All in the service of Proletarian revolution.

“While it would not be legitimate simply to dismiss the work of Marxist scholars—a substantial amount of circumspection, it would seem, is required in assessing their work. . . For Marxists are self-confessed partisans, their ‘science’ subordinate to an extrascientific commitment which can hardly do less than make askew their analysis, weight their data, hinder free inquiry, and distort their conclusions.”

See also Gustav Wetter—*Dialectical Materialism: A Historical and Systematic Survey of Philosophy in the Soviet Union*, Praeger, New York, 1958. Prof. A. James Gregor, in reviewing it, declared this to be “the most competent work dedicated to a systematic exposition of the philosophy of contemporary Marxism.” He continues:

“The author’s documented account of the ‘partisan character of philosophy’ (pp. 268-274) is of particular significance. Soviet philosophy is characterized by ‘the demand for partisanship . . . for the exercise of party spirit in philosophy activity’ (p. 268) . . . The ‘party spirit’ casts its malevolent shadow over disciplines as diverse as quantum physics (pp. 406-415), chemistry (pp. 432-436), biology (pp. 451-469), and anthropology and psychology (469-487).”

Dr. Robert Gayre, writing in *Mankind Quarterly*, of which he is editor, in an article entitled “The Dilemma of Interracial Relationships” (Vol. VI, No. 4, Spring 1966), said (pp. 188-9):

“No matter how eminent a scientist may otherwise be, his theories cannot be accepted if he subscribes to a doctrine which denies the application of science to man and so prevents him from giving true and unbiased testimony—as is the case with communists and communist sympathizers. It is therefore relevant to know if the expert witnesses in any scientific inquiry subscribe to doctrines which prevent or are likely to prevent them from applying purely scientific genetic principles to man unfettered by considerations of political dogma. For this reason such widely publicized people as Ruth Benedict, Franz Boas, Leslie C. Dunn and Otto Klineberg, who have all been contributors to the *Daily Worker* and have participated in other activities generally considered favourable to the Communist ideology, and Theodosius Dobzhansky, a supporter of the American Council on Soviet Relations and an executive committee member of the American-Soviet Science Society, cannot be considered unbiased authorities on racial differences in man.”

To these dubious scientific characters, Dr. Gayre might well have added, for instance, the names of Gunnar Myrdal and Prof. Kenneth B. Clark, whose testimony played so crucial a part in the 1954 Anti-Segregation decision of the US Supreme Court.

25. John R. Baker—*Science and the Planned State*, Macmillan, 1945, pp. 71-5, though the entire chapter entitled "Science Under Totalitarianism" is eminently worth reading.

26. See Garrett Hardin—*Nature And Man's Fate*, Rinehart and Winston, 1959. Mentor Book edition, 1961, pp. 204-5. The entire chapter (No. 11), "Liberalism and the Specter of Competition," is very illuminating.

27. At this point, I would call attention to Note 24 (*supra*), in particular to the quotation from Dr. Gayre with which the note ends, and to the two paragraphs from Dr. A. James Gregor the first of which begins, "We know something of the effects of this kind of partisanship in science."

Some of my readers may wish to remind me that I myself, in one connection or another, in this book or elsewhere, have already spoken out strongly against putting Truth above Life, or making Science an end in itself. And I am not shifting my ground now. But that I myself am a truth-loving man, I have the record of my life to prove. Again and again, at substantial cost, I have let go what seemed less true for what seemed more true. And that I place a high value on scientific research must surely have become evident from the constant and respectful use of its findings that I have made in this book. I recognize what we owe to the scientific method, and I honor the scientific spirit in men who have really struggled to get themselves out of the way so that the light might shine upon the workings of the universe in which we live. But, fundamentally, the reason we of the West put truth so high is that by well-studied experience we have learned that truth, when rightly arrived at, and carefully weighed and integrated, gives us the most reliable idea available to us of the way the universe is put together, and thus of so ordering our lives and our affairs, whether personal or national and racial, that we can have the universe working with us and not against us, and thus in the end be able to live most fully, to live well, and to live meaningfully and even magnificently. Truth thus viewed, and thus used, is (as it should be) subordinate to Life, serves Life, and fully exalts Life. And when Communists and other equalitarians, or for that matter, men of any stripe, try to evade truth, twist truth or falsify truth, we are forced to suspect, and in the end to conclude, that they are trying to induce us to make a surrender of truth that will lead to our ruin—as sooner or later we may believe it will lead also to their own undoing. For what does not square with the way the universe is made, and does not work with it, must finally break down. In the long run what is not true must lead to futility and frustration. This conviction thousands of years of experience and reflection have built into the very make-up of both our minds and our very souls.

28. The easiest and quickest way to document this is with Mr. W. Cleon Skousen's *The Naked Capitalist*, published in 1970 by the author, 2197 Berkeley Street, Salt Lake City, Utah. This is essentially, as Mr. Skousen declared it to be, "a review and commentary on Dr. Carrot Quigley's book *Tragedy And Hope—A History of the World in our Time*," published in two volumes by Macmillan in 1966. What makes Mr. Skousen's book most valuable is his very numerous and very extensive quotations from Dr. Quigley. For Dr. Quigley is not only Professor of History at the Foreign Service School of Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., after teaching at Harvard and Princeton, but he writes as one who has long been on the inside of the world-wide conspiracy of the international bankers, whose aims he baldly states and whose achievements he brazenly boasts. It has been Mr. Skousen's great service to have dug these out of the recesses of this huge work, where otherwise, they might have remained virtually buried, and to have nailed them, as it were, to a billboard on Main Street, where now anyone, almost, can read them even as he runs. Skousen's book does, however, give a totally misleading impression in regard to what, in my judgment, is the most critically important feature of the whole conspiracy, but I cannot undertake to correct this here.

29. See Carleton Putnam, 1967, op. cit., pp. 39-41.

30. The basis for this statement is, partly, a letter that Dr. Coon wrote to an acquaintance of mine in which he likened the persecution he was undergoing to that of Galileo, when all he asked was to be let alone to pursue the truth; partly, a statement by Carleton Putnam in "A Reply to Dwight Ingle" in *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. IV, No. 1 (Fall 1963), p. 43.

31. Carleton S. Coon—*The Origin of Races*, 2nd Edition, Knopf, 1962, p. 662.

32. Bertil Lundman—in his chapter "Race and Anthropology" in *Race And Modern Science* (Robert E. Kuttner, Editor), Social Science Press, 1967, p. 3. The quotation in the previous sentence is from Sir Ronald Fisher, Professor of Genetics, Cambridge University.

33. See R.R. Gates—"The Emergence of Racial Genetics" in *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. I, No. 1 (July 1960), p. 11. For information in regard to Dr. Gates, see my Note 85 under "Gates, R.R."

34. Article: "Tom Anderson's Straight Talk on Equality and Race," *The Citizen*, Jackson, Mississippi, June, 1970.

35. N. Berdyaev—*The Fate of Man in the Modern World*, London, 1935, p. 88. See the excellent development of this idea by John H. Harvey in his Henry Yevele, *The Life of an English Architect*, B.T. Batsford, London, 1944, p. 77.

36. *Genetics and Man*, Macmillan, 1964, p. 351.

37. R.R. Gates—*Heredity in Man*, Constable, London, 1929, p. 295.

38. Edward M. East with Dr. F. Jones—*Inbreeding and Outbreeding*, Lippincott, 1919, p. 246.

39. Philosophical Library, New York, 1949. See in my Note 85, "Keith, Sir Arthur."

40. Carleton S. Coon—*Origin of Races*, 2nd Ed., 1962, p. 5.

41. Thus summarized by Dr. Coon in 1953. Quoted by Nathaniel Weyl and Stefan Possony—*The Geography of Intellect*, Regnery, 1963, p. 36, Note 2.

42. R.R. Gates—"Race Crossing," in Instituto Gregorio Mendel, 1958, p. 139. Quoted by Donald A. Swan, *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. VII, No. 2 (Fall 1964), p. 115.

43. Carleton S. Coon—*The Story of Man*, op. cit., p. 33.

44. Carleton C. Coon—*The Origin of Races*, op. cit., p. 4. A footnote cites W.W. Howells, Jr.—*Mankind in the Making*, Doubleday, 1959, especially p. 236; and C.S. Coon's review of same in *Science*, Vol. 130, No. 3386 (1959), pp. 1399-1400.

45. *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. III, No. 3 (Spring 1963), p. 193.

46. Carleton S. Coon—*The Origin of Races*, op. cit., pp. 369, 657.

47. Published respectively in 1962 and 1967, both by Knopf.

48. C.S. Coon—*The Story of Man*, op. cit., pp. 36-8.

49. *Ibid.*, pp. 60-1.

50. *Ibid.*, p. 61.

51. C.S. Coon—*The Origin of Races*, op. cit., p. 332.

52. C.S. Coon—*The Story of Man*, op. cit., pp. 29-31.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 16.

54. C.S. Coon—*The Origin of Races*, op. cit., p. 656.

55. *Ibid.*, p. 658.

56. C.S. Coon—*The Story of Man*, op. cit., p. 35.

57. C.S. Coon—*The Origin of Races*, op. cit., pp. ix-x.

58. E.A. Hooton—*Crime and the Man*, Harvard Univ. Press, 1939, p. 342. More recently the noted British anthropologist L.S.B. Leakey, in his *The Progress and Evolution of Man in Africa* (Oxford Univ. Press), 1961, has stated:

“As a social anthropologist, I naturally accept and even stress the fact that there are major differences, both mental and psychological, which separate the different races of mankind. Indeed, I would be inclined to suggest that however great may be the physical differences between such races as the European and the Negro, the mental and psychological differences are greater still.”

59. Nathaniel Weyl and Stefan Possony—*The Geography of Intellect*, Regnery, 1963, p. 276, where Weyl gives a brief but excellent answer to this common misunderstanding. For a fuller and even better answer, see Carleton Putnam’s *Race and Reason*, op. cit., pp. 60-62, where he quotes the following passage from a speech by Judge Stephan A. Douglas in one of his famous debates with Lincoln in 1858:

“Now, I say to you, my fellow-citizens, that in my opinion the signers of the Declaration [of Independence] had no reference to the Negro whatever, when they declared all men to be created equal. They desired to express by that phrase white men, men of European birth and European descent, and had no reference either to the Negro, the savage Indians, the Fiji or the Malay. . . One great evidence that such was their understanding is to be found in the fact that at that time every one of the thirteen colonies was a slaveholding colony, every signer of the Declaration represented a slaveholding constituency, and we know that no one of them emancipated his slaves, much less offered citizenship to them, when they signed the Declaration; and yet, if they intended to declare that the Negro was the equal of the white man, and entitled by divine right to any equality with him, they were bound, as honest men, that day and hour to have put their Negroes on an equality with themselves. . .”

See also *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. IV, No. 4 (Spring 1964), p. 224f.

60. W.E. Woodward—*A New American History*, Farrar & Rinehart, 1936, pp. 160-1.

61. For illustrative details see article by Corrado Gini: "The Testing of Negro Intelligence," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. I, No. 2, pp. 123-4.

62. Arnold Gesell and Frances L. Ilg—*Infant and Child in the Culture of Today*, Harper, 1943, pp. 39-40. Quoted by Dr. Wesley C. George—*The Biology Of The Race Problem*, a report prepared by commission of the Governor of Alabama, 1962, pp. 4-5.

63. *Ibid.*, pp. 172, 167.

64. Ruth Benedict and Gene Weltfish—*The Races of Mankind*, *op. cit.*, 1964 ed., pp. 8-9.

65. R.R. Gates—*Heredity in Man*, *op. cit.*, pp. 188, 198.

66. F.A.E. Crew—*Organic Inheritance in Man*, London, 1927, pp. 128-131.

67. R.R. Gates—*Heredity in Man*, *op. cit.*, pp. 200-1.

68. Bertil J. Lundman—in his chapter "Race and Anthropology" in *Race and Modern Science*, (Robert E. Kuttner, Ed.), Social Science Press, 1967.

69. *Ibid.*, p. 15.

70. David C. Rife—in his chapter "Race and Heredity" in *Race and Modern Science* (R.E. Kuttner, Ed.), p. 144.

71. *Ibid.*, p. 150.

72. Ibid., p. 157.

73. *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 2 (Fall 1969), p. 60 in article: "Practical Considerations Which Are Fundamental in Bantu Affairs in Rhodesia and for An Understanding of Negroid-Caucasoid Problems Generally."

74. David C. Rife in chapter: "Race and Heredity" in *Race and Modern Science* (R.E. Kuttner, Ed.), op. cit., 1967, p. 145.

75. See John Scudder, Shivagi B. Bhonslay, Aaron Himmelstein and John G. Gorman: "Sensitizing Antigens as Factors in Blood Transfusions" in *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. I, No. 2 (October 1960), pp. 89, 100. For a biographical note re Dr. Scudder see p. 125.

76. Sir Arthur Keith—*A New Theory of Human Evolution*, Philosophical Library, 1949, pp. 188-9. Cp. pp. 2, 178, 197.

77. R.R. Gates—*Heredity in Man*, op. cit., pp. 304-6.

78. C.S. Coon—*The Origin of Races*, op. cit., pp. 115-6.

79. Ibid., p. 662.

80. Chapter XVIII: "Genetics and Mental Health" in *The Biology of Mental Health and Disease*, Hoesber, New York, 1952, p. 277. Quoted by Dr. Wesley C. George in his *Race, Heredity and Civilization*, Alliance, Inc., N.Y.C., 1963, p. 11.

81. Donald A. Swan. "Human Genetics and Psychological Differences" in *Man kind Quarterly*, Vol. IV, No. 4 (Spring 1964), p. 201. See also his "Race, Selection and Psychical Traits" in *Man kind Quarterly*, Vol. V, No. 4, (Spring 1965), p. 207.

82. See *Man kind Quarterly*, Vol. V, No. 4 (Spring 1965), p. 244, where Dr. Robert Gayre thus reports Prof. Muller's conclusions in reviewing his *Studies in Genetics*, Indiana Univ. Press, 1962. Perhaps my reader would do well to go on to ponder the pronouncements of "The Geneticists' Manifesto," extracts from which are quoted in the review. This contains an explicit repudiation of "the Lamarckian doctrine, according to which the children of parents who have had better opportunities for physical and mental development inherit these improvements, biologically."

83. Robert E. Kuttner: "Chromosomes and Intelligence," *Man kind Quarterly*, Vol. XII, No. 1 (Summer 1971), pp. 7, 11.

84. Of course it needs to be pointed out at once that this whole position is rendered suspect from the start by our historical knowledge that all the races that have left any significant and lasting mark on this Earth have never waited or asked to be given anything. That fraction of *Homo erectus* that left the lush life of the African homeland where food could be had for the picking, to press north and east into the unknown, could have remained behind with the remnant that became the Negroes and Pygmies. And when the icecaps advanced again and again, no one was at hand to put a coat on their backs, or teach them how to make fire, or preserve food through the winter. With their own courage and resourcefulness they have wrested opportunity from a harsh and niggardly Nature, and in the last resort, rather than supinely submit to adverse circumstances, they have risen up with their courage, their brains, and their strength to take what they needed, in order to obtain an environment that was to their liking and conducive to the kind of development they wanted to achieve. Of this, I think, Dr. Coon himself needed to be reminded when he was writing the very last page of his *Origin of Races* (p. 663). He allows that Mongoloids and Caucasoids "have achieved the highest levels of civilization yet known," but goes on to say that "they achieved all this because their ancestors occupied the most favorable of the earth's zoological regions," as if such occupations were a matter of accident! This strikes me as manifestly unjust, and to ignore one of the most widely accepted facts of evolution, which is competition, struggle, warfare. That there may have been an element of accident is undoubtedly true, but the more important fact is that the Caucasoids and Mongoloids had the wit in the first place to perceive the desirability of the lands in which they finally established themselves, and then invaded them, fought for them, and finally made them their own. Ortega y Gasset in his *Invertebrate Spain* argued that the Visigoths who conquered Spain proved that they were not a race of the highest order simply because they were willing to settle for a land that was one of Europe's poorest.

Furthermore, to go back to my main point—I must remind my readers yet again that the entire equalitarian camp of anthropologists is packed with people of foreign origin, often actually foreign-born, very largely Jewish, and almost to a man related, in one way or another, to the Communist conspiracy to overthrow our government and to destroy our whole social order. The high proportion of Jews in the equalitarian camp is especially suspicious, for in all human history there has been no other race that believed in its own superiority so fanatically as the Jews. I have estimated that, in proportion to their whole number in this country, the Jews have contributed ten times as many equalitarian anthropologists as all the rest of the United States put together. A Jew in the camp of the equalitarians really calls for explanation, and since no Jew has offered us any, they should not blame us if we do some explaining of our own. I suggest two possibilities, either or both of which may apply.

1. The Jew is very conscious that his exceptional abilities commonly make him conspicuous. And as he is deeper in the business of subversion than any other people on Earth, and on a very large scale is using his commanding position in many of the highest seats of power—in our economy, our educational system, in all our media of communication, and in our government—to work our undoing, it is imperative that his being a Jew and therefore a man of doubtful loyalty to our country, should not attract too much attention. Secrecy works best in anonymity. And Jewishness tends to fade out of the picture in a climate of opinion where race is believed to be unreal, of no consequence, and therefore to be safely ignored.

2. I am in possession of a vast amount of what I believe to be quite incontrovertible evidence that a hard core of men within World Jewry (although by no means all Jews) is bent upon the overthrow of Western man and the complete destruction of his culture and civilization—with a view to supplanting it. Furthermore, these Jews believe that in integration, race-mixing, mongrelization, they have a means by which our people, if they can be made to accept it, will be overtaken by a ruin from which there can be no recovery. It is for this reason that we have witnessed, in the past ten years, such a concerted drive in all the bastions of the White man's dominion to break down segregation, to remove the last remnant of a color bar, to spread abroad the idea that all races are equal, one as good as another, and that therefore Whites and Blacks should be encouraged, and even forced, to intermingle, to the end that more and more they will intermarry freely. Hence we have so many Jewish anthropologists throwing the weight of their opinion in favor of this policy. But—let it be well noted—this is absolutely a policy for gentiles only! Jews know one another. They know that for over two thousand years they themselves have been history's supreme example of segregation—and have proved its wisdom. They know that when Jewish anthropologists declare all races to be equal, they are holding out a poisoned bait that they themselves must carefully pass by, but help to press to the lips of gentiles.

**A *WHO'S WHO* OF DISTINGUISHED
SCIENTISTS
85. WHO REJECT THE EQUALITARIAN DOGMA.**

BAKER, JOHN R.—Professor of biology, Oxford University, Fellow of the Royal Society, author of *Race* (Oxford University Press, 1974), which was reviewed in the *London Sunday Times* of Feb. 17, 1974, by Prof. C.D. Darlington (see “Darlington” in this Who’s Who), from which I herewith quote a few passages:

“Dr. Baker’s work is a cool, detached survey of the differences between races. It encompasses everything relevant to the idea of race with thoroughness, seriousness and honesty.

“The idea of race has long been systematically avoided and deprecated for political reasons, and the lesson Dr. Baker brings home to us is that racial differences lie at the root of civilisation. You can’t talk them away. You can’t teach and preach them away. You can’t even vote them away.”

BAUR (ERWIN), FISCHER (EUGEN) and LENZ (FRITZ)—*Human Heredity*, first published in English by Macmillan in 1931—before the day of the Nazis. Erwin Baur was Professor of Heredity at the Agricultural Academy in Berlin; Eugen Fischer, Professor of Anatomy and Director of the Anatomical Institute at the University of Freiburg-in-Breslau; Fritz Lenz, Professor of Racial Hygiene at the University of Munich.

BURT, CYRIL, D.Sc., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A., Prof. of Psychology at University College, and perhaps today the foremost psychologist in Britain. He has held positions of great public responsibility, and has published over 300 papers and some ten books.

COON, CARLETON S.—Prof. of Anthropology at Harvard; later, Curator of Ethnology and Prof. of Anthropology at the University Museum, Philadelphia. Past President of the American Association of Physical Anthropologists. His field work, his academic position, and a succession of outstanding books have made him easily “one of the most distinguished living men in the field of anthropology.” His *The Story of Man* has been translated into at least eight languages. It was followed by *The Origin of Races*, 1962, and *The Living Races of Man*, 1965. Nathaniel Weyl, himself a man of no mean achievement in the scientific world, hailed *The Origin of Races* as “a major turning point in physical anthropology” (*National Review*, Jan. 15, 1963, p. 33). For Weyl’s review of *The Living Races of Man* see *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. VI, No. 3 (Spring 1966), pp. 167-170.

CREW, F.A.E., M.D., D.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.S.E.—Lecturer in Genetics, and Director of the Animal Breeding Research Dept., University of Edinburgh. Author of several authoritative works in the field of genetics.

DARLINGTON, C.D., M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.—Prof. of Botany, Oxford University since 1953. His writings “encompass almost the whole range of biological studies.” He “is internationally known for his contributions to the sciences of cytology, genetics and evolutionary theory.” He is “the author of numerous articles and scientific papers which have been published in English, French, German, Italian, Spanish and Japanese,” and is the author of a dozen books.

EAST, EDWARD M., Ph.D., LL.D.—Prof. of Genetics, Harvard. Author of *Mankind at the Crossroads*, 1923; *Heredity and Human Affairs*, 1927. With Dr. F. Jones, author of *Inbreeding and Outbreeding*, Lippincott, 1919.

HENRY PRATT FAIRCHILD, Ph.D.—Prof. of Sociology, New York University; Past President, American Sociological Society.

GARRETT, HENRY E., Ph.D., D.Sc.—For 16 years, head of the Dept. of Psychology at Columbia University, Past President of the American Psychology Ass'n., Eastern Psychological Ass'n., Psychometric Society, and of the N.Y. State Ass'n. of Applied Psychology. Fellow of the American Ass'n for the Advancement of Science, member of the editorial board of *Psychometrika*, and for 20 years general editor of the *American Psychology Series*.

GATES, R.R., Ph.D., D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S. (1882-1962)—Certainly “one of the most experienced and distinguished human geneticists, as well as an all-round anthropologist and ethnologist.” He gained a “world-wide reputation by his many original contributions to the fields of botany, cytology, genetics, and anthropology.” His brilliant work spanned more than half a century. At the time of his death, he was Emeritus Prof. of Botany at the University of London. He early displayed the ability and originality that were to bring him international renown. Awarded the Mendel Medal in 1911. His monumental two-volume *Human Genetics*, published in 1946 by Macmillan, is recognized as the most comprehensive survey ever made of normal and abnormal inheritance. He devoted his later years mostly to anthropological research, with special emphasis upon the application of genetic principles to anthropology. From 1928 until his death, he traveled to many parts of the world to study the races of man and their racial hybrids. In addition to his work in racial genetics, he devoted himself to research in racial origins. Following in the tradition of Sir Arthur Keith and Franz Weidenreich (and later followed in turn by Prof. Carleton S. Coon), he concluded that the major racial stocks had long been differentiated and had evolved separately and at times in parallel directions, but at different rates of speed, from different subsapiens ancestors. He was the author of more than 400 articles and 11 books and monographs.

GAYRE, ROBERT, M.A., D.Phil., Pol.D.Sc., D.Sc.—Editor of *Mankind Quarterly*, formerly Prof. of Anthropology and head of the Dept. of Anthro-Geography at the University of Saugor, India. He has travelled extensively in Africa, and has written very illuminating articles on ethnological problems of that continent. Author of *Ethnological Elements Of Africa*, Edinburgh, c. 1968.

GEDDA, LUIGI, M.D.—Prof. of Medical Genetics at the University of Rome, and Director of the Gregor Mendel Institute of Medical Genetics and Twin Studies in Rome. He is one of the world's foremost authorities on twin studies, which are an essential method in the science of human genetics for determining the relative influence of heredity and environment.

GEORGE, WESLEY CRITZ, M.A., Ph.D.—Prof. of Anatomy at the Univ. of North Carolina since 1924, and for ten years head of the Dept. of Anatomy of the Univ. of N.C. Medical School, Prof. emeritus of Histology and Embryology, Univ. of N.C. Author of *The*

Biology of the Race Problem, 1962, which has been acclaimed "the most important document yet published on the scientific aspect of the race question." (Obtainable from the Patrick Henry Press, Kilmarnock, Va.) Also, author of *Race, Heredity And Civilization*, Alliance, Inc., New York, N.Y., 1963; and *Race Problems and Human Progress*, Probe Research Pubs., West Sayville, N.Y. (11796), 1967.

GINI, CORRADO, Dr. Jr., E. Econ., D.Sc.—One of Italy's leading sociologists, was Prof. emeritus of the Univ. of Rome at the time of his death in 1963. He was the recipient of a number of distinguished awards for his work in sociology, honorary President of the Latin-American Sociological Assn., and President of the International Institute of Sociology. He was the author of over 70 volumes, 700 articles and 400 reviews.

GRANT, MADISON—Chairman, New York Zoological Society; Trustee, American Museum of Natural History, etc. Author of *The Conquest of a Continent*, 1933, and *The Passing of the Great Race*, 4th revised edition, 1932. Both were published by Scribner's. Both are loudly decried by equalitarians, but from the very efforts that have been made to destroy these books and vilify their author, there is good reason to believe that they are very important for our country and for the White race. To most White people whose outlook has not been twisted by propoganda, they should be at once revelation, inspiration, warning, and challenge. *The Passing of the Great Race* has Prefaces by Henry Fairfield Osborn, Research Prof. of Zoology, Columbia University.

GREGOR, A. JAMES, M.A., Ph.D.—Associate Prof. of Social and Political Philosophy, Univ. of Kentucky, regional secretary of the Institute Internationale de Sociologie and co-editor of *Revue Internationale Sociologie*, and a member of many professional societies. He has conducted psychological and sociological field studies in Central Australia and among the Venda and Zulu Bantu in South Africa, and among the indigenous tribes of South West Africa. He is the author of numerous articles and several monographs, as well as of the book *A Survey of Marxism: Problems in Philosophy and the Theory of History*, Random House, 1965.

GUENTHER, HANS F.K.—Professor in the University of Berlin. Author of *Rassenkunde Europas*, Munich, 1927, 2nd ed. Also, of *Rassenkunde Des Deutschen Volkes*, Munich. 11th ed., 1927, which Erwin Baur, Eugen Fischer and Fritz Lenz (in their *Human Heredity*, Macmillan, 1931, p. 703) pronounce "a brilliant account of German ethnology," and add that "his book gives a vigorous and substantially accurate picture of the various races out of which our people is composed." I think that the facts presented in his *The Racial Elements Of European History*, London, 1931 (the English translation of the first work mentioned above) are quite indispensable for any White man, and especially any Nordic White man, who would become conscious of his racial affinities and come to a sense of who and what "we" are and have behind us in the way of a racial record. A reading of Guenther's *Religious Attitudes of the Indo-Europeans* (Clair Press, London, 1967) would contribute to this.

HOLMES, SAMUEL J., Ph.D.—Prof. of Zoology in the Univ. of California (Berkeley), President of the American Society of Zoologists. Author of *The Trend of the Race*, Harcourt, 1921; *The Eugenic Predicament*, Harcourt 1933; *Human Genetics and Its Social Import*, McGraw, 1936. This last book, I rate as one of the very best introductions to the whole range of genetic problems.

HOOTON, E. A., Ph.D.—Prof. of Anthropology, Harvard University. An arresting popularizer of eugenic and racial problems. Author of *Up from the Ape*, Macmillan, 1931; *Apes, Men and Morons*, Putnam, 1937; *Twilight of Man*, Putnam, 1939; *Crime and the Man*, Harvard Univ. Press, 1939.

JENSEN, ARTHUR R., Ph.D.—Prof. of Educational Psychology and a research psychologist at the Institute of Human Learning, University of California at Berkeley. He is Vice-President of the American Educational Research Assn. He created something like a worldwide furor by his article: "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" to which the *Harvard Educational Review* devoted nearly its entire issue for Winter 1969.

KEITH, SIR ARTHUR, M.D.—Rector of the Univ. of Edinburgh, Curator of the Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons in England, former President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, etc., easily one of the greatest anthropologists of this century. I would call special attention to his *Essays on Human Evolution*, London, 1946; *A New Theory of Human Evolution*, New York, 1949; and *The Place of Prejudice in Modern Civilization*, London, 1931. Dr. E.A. Hooton, in dedication to him his *Twilight of Man*, referred to him as "a student of human evolution unsurpassed in knowledge, courage, tolerance, and modesty." Characteristic of Sir Arthur (as of any scientist worthy of the name) is the attitude shown on p. 214 of his *A New Theory of Human Evolution*, where he says, in answer to a question he has raised: "The evidence, as it stands to-day, favours . . ."—so and so. In other words he stood ready to change his mind tomorrow if the evidence called for it. With him there was no dogma. He was always ready listen to significant evidence and to reason.

KUTTNER, ROBERT E., M.A., Ph.D.—Dept. of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Chicago. More recently, working on a research project with Dr. William Shockley at Stanford University. Formerly, a Research Associate in Biochemistry at Creighton University in Nebraska. A contributing editor of *Man and Quarterly*, author of many articles and reviews, and editor of *Race and Modern Science*, Social Science Press, 1967, which carried out an idea and plan of Dr. R.R. Gates, to which some of the world's foremost scientists contributed chapters, Dr. Kuttner among them.

LEAKEY, L.S.B.—World-famous for his anthropological excavations at Olduvai Gorge, Tanganyika, where he unearthed some of the oldest evidence that we have in regard to our pre-human ancestors. (See "Leakey, L.S.B." in the Index to C.S. Coon's *The Origin of Races*, 1967.) Author of *The Progress and Evolution of Man in Africa*, Oxford University Press, 1961, in which, on page 15, he subscribes to the idea that "however great may be the physical differences between such races as the European and the Negro, the mental and psychological differences are greater still."

LUNDBERG, GEORGE A., M.A., Ph.D., LL.D.—Prof. Emeritus of Sociology at the University of Washington, where he served as chairman of the Department for nearly 20 years. Past President of the American Sociological Society, etc., etc. Author of more than 80 articles and monographs and six books.

LUNDMAN, BERTIL J., Ph.D.—Professor of Physical Anthropology at the Univ. of Uppsala (Sweden), one of the foremost of Scandinavian anthropologists. He has conducted

extensive field studies of the physical anthropology of central Sweden and other provinces. He is an honorary member of various scientific societies not only in Sweden, but in Germany, Italy, and the United States. He is the author of more than 150 articles and monographs and many books.

McGURK, FRANK C.J., M.A., Ph.D.—Associate Prof. of Psychology at Alabama and Lehigh Univ., and consulting psychologist at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Author of two books and articles in many leading scientific journals.

PORTEUS, S.D., D.Sc.—Prof. Emeritus of Clinical Psychology at the University of Hawaii. “Inventor of the famous Porteus Maze Test, a pioneer work in the development of intelligence tests for use with primitive and non-literate peoples. He has made many original contributions to the science of race psychology. His research on the various racial and national groups in Hawaii, which combined the approaches of physical anthropology, comparative anatomy, psychology, sociology and history, was one of the first interdisciplinary studies of racial differences in intelligence and temperament. The results of this study were published in his classic work, *Temperament And Race* (1926). He is the author of more than 80 articles and monographs and 14 books.”

PUTNAM, CARLETON—For a brief biographical sketch see “Who Is Carleton Putnam?” in *The Citizen*, Jackson, Miss., November 1961, pp. 9-11. Mr. Putnam has a degree in law from Columbia and in science from Princeton. Of his two grandfathers one was a justice of the N.Y. Supreme Court, the other a New York publisher. He is not a professional scientist, but since 1958 he has been making a heroic effort to alert, first our government in Washington, and then the most intelligent and responsible part of the American public, to the grave injuries, no less certainly to Negroes than to White people, that must follow from the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court and the amalgamation of the races to which it must lead.

His two books, *Race and Reason* (1961) and *Race and Reality* (1967) are the best brief introduction that I know to the whole racial controversy. They are written incisively, brilliantly, with wide command of the relevant literature, and with rare understanding and patience. The first of these, *Race and Reason*, contained a Preface of unanimous endorsement by four distinguished scientists, Drs. R.R. Gates, Henry E. Garrett, R. Gayre of Gayre, and Wesley C. George, in which they said:

“We do not believe that there is anything to be drawn from the sciences in which we work which supports the view that all races of men, all types of men, or all ethnic groups are equal and alike, or likely to become alike, in anything approaching the foreseeable future. We believe on the contrary that there are vast areas of difference within mankind not only in physical appearance, but in such matters as adaptability to varying environments, and in deep psychological and emotional qualities, as well as in mental ability and capacity for development. The facts in this book cannot much longer be ignored. It probes to the core of an abscess, yet does so with a healing touch. There is logic and common sense in these pages; there is also inescapable scientific validity.”

The lead review that the *American Bar Association Journal* gave to it, began by saying: "This short treatise on the integration problem may well become one of the most important books of this generation," and concluded thus: "*Race and Reason* is commended to the Bar as deserving of its general reading and to assist it, as leaders of thought, to learn not half truths, propagandized history nor pseudo science, but 'the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.'"

Mr. Putnam's sequel to this, *Race and Reality, A Search for Solutions*, is a perfect supplement to it and completion of it, and is no less impressive. It was reviewed in *Markind Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, No. 2 (Fall 1967), p. 106ff.

RIFE, DAVID C., M.A. Ph.D.—Former Professor of Genetics at Ohio State University, now engaged in lecturing and writing on the subject. He is the author of numerous articles and several books, including *Heredity and Human Nature* (1959) and *Hybrids* (1965).

SHOCKLEY, WILLIAM—Noble laureate and co-discoverer of the transistor, is one of the most distinguished members of our scientific establishment. After an already remarkable career he became Poniatoff Prof. of Engineering at Stanford Univ. In recent years, he has become so aware of the sinister eugenic predicament by which our country is confronted, and alarmed over it, that he stepped outside his own chosen field, which is physics, to try, among other things, to prod the National Academy of Sciences into making its own race studies which, he believed, could lead within ten years to definitive conclusions about the comparative importance of heredity and environment, on which our country could found its foreign policy and the principles to be followed in our educational establishment. To date the Academy has invariably backed away from the challenge.

SHUEY, AUDREY M., B.A. M.A., Ph.D.—Head of the dept. of psychology, Randolph-Macon Woman's College. Formerly on the faculty of Northern Illinois University and New York University. Author of *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*, with a Foreword by Prof. Henry E. Garrett, Social Science Press, 2nd edition, 1966. It was reviewed in *Markind Quarterly*, Vol. VII, No. 2, pp. 114-115. The book provides a compendious summary of the hundreds of comparisons of the intelligence test scores of Negroes and Whites during the past fifty years. "The results are impressively consistent. Negroes, whether they are rural or urban, whether they live in the North or the South, whether they are literate or illiterate, whether they are professional or unskilled workers, make lower scores than comparable groups of Whites." See my Notes 99 and 100.

Dr. Corrado Gini, late President of the International Institute of Sociology, and a leading European scientist, wrote: ". . . because of the abundance of material collected and objectively reported, the volume constitutes a milestone in this area. After its publication, the burden of proof rests upon those who reject its conclusions."

86. See *Markind Quarterly*, Vol. V, No. 4 (Spring 1965), p. 204; Francis Galton *Hereditary Genius*, Macmillan, 1914, p. 334.

87. Albert Schweitzer—*On the Edge of the Primeval Forest*, London, 1924, pp. 130-1. The following also is pertinent: "A great scholar and thinker, Albert Schweitzer, who has devoted his whole life to welfare of the blacks, aroused sudden consternation among ethical Europeans and above all among Americans when he boldly declared that the Congo would not be ripe for independence even in fifty years." (Quoted from Boven de 40, Amsterdam-Z, Holland, 15.8.63.)

88. H.B. Isherwood—*Racial Contours*, Times Longbooks, Isle of Man, England, 1965, p. 290.

89. Meredith Townsend—*Asia and Europe*, Constable, London, 2nd ed., 1903; preferably the edition of 1911, with a new Preface and an additional chapter.

90. Paul Witty—"Research on the American Negro," 1940, *39th Year Book*, National Society for the Study of Education, pp. 261-9. Quoted in Putnam, 1967, p. 121.

91. See *U.S. News & World Report*, Sept. 19, 1958, pp. 81-2. Cp. Prof. Curt Stern: "The Biology of the Negro," *Scientific American*, CXCVIII, No. 8 (1954). Also Nathaniel Weyl—*The Negro in American Civilization*, 1960, p. 241; Melville J. Herskovitz—*The Anthropometry of the American Negro*, Columbia University Press, 1930, pp. 15, 177.

92. William Flax: "Environmentalism: Scientific 'Achilles Heel' of Collectivist Totalitarianism," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. VI, No. 2 (Fall 1965). pp. 90-2.

93. Stefan T. Possony: "UNESCO and Race: A study in Intellectual Oppression," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, No. 3 (Jan.-March 1968), p. 146.

94. R. R. Gates—*Heredity in Man*, 1929, pp. 266, 354.

95. C. B. Davenport and Morris Steggerda—*Race Crossing in Jamaica*, Carnegie Institute, Washington, D.C., 1909, p. 469.

96. Edward M. East—*Heredity and Human Affairs*, Scribner's, 1935, pp. 176-7; *Mankind at the Cross-Roads*, Scribner's, 1923, p. 126.

97. Frank H. Hankins—*Racial Basis of Civilization*, Knopf, revised 1931, pp. 321-2.

98. *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. VI, No. 4 (Spring 1966), p. 240.

99. Published by Social Science Press, 2nd ed., 1966, 578 pages. For appraisal by Dr. Robert Gayre, see *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 2 (Fall 1969), p. 67. Dr. Henry E. Garrett remarks, in a parenthesis, that "it is significant of the power and lack of tolerance of the equalitarians that not one of the university presses to which this book was submitted was willing to publish it." *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. I, No. 4 (Spring 1960), p. 255.

100. In a review of Dr. Shuey's book in *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. VII, No. 2, p. 114, Dr. R.S. Woodworth, Prof. of Psychology, Columbia University, and often called the "dean of American psychologists," said of this book: "I hope it will have the wide distribution it deserves. It is an extraordinarily comprehensive report of the tests results on the intelligence of the American Negro."

101. See Henry E. Garrett: "The Equalitarian Dogma," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. I, No. 4 (April 1961), p. 255.

102. Nathaniel Weyl and Stefan Possony—*Geography of Intellect*, Regnery, 1963, pp. 175-6.

103. Henry E. Garrett—*Children: Black and White*, Patrick Henry Press, Kilmarnock, Va., 1968, pp. 9-10; H.E. Garrett: "IQ and School Achievement of Negro and White Children of Comparable Age and School Status" in *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. V, No. 1 (Summer 1964), pp.

45-49. Cp. R. Travis Osborne: "Racial Differences in School Achievement," *Mankind Quarterly*, Monograph No. 3, 1962.

104. Henry E. Garrett—*Children: Black and White*, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

105. *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

106. See R. Travis Osborne: "Cultural Bias of Psychological Test Items," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. IV, No. 3, pp. 134-7. For a more general reply to Klineberg see H.E. Garrett: "Klineberg's Chapter on Race and Psychology," I.A.A.E.E. Reprint No. 1.

107. Henry E. Garrett: *Mankind Quarterly Monograph No. VI*, Part 3, p. 12; *Children: Black And White*, 1968, p. 17f. For a thorough review and appraisal of the Armed Forces Tests see Garrett: "Relative Intelligence of Whites and Negroes: The United States Armed Forces Tests," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, No. 2 (Winter 1968), pp. 64-79.

108. H.E. Garrett: "Anatomy of A Controversy," op. cit., p. 11. Also, Carleton Putnam: "These Are the Guilty," p. 12f. This was an address given by Mr. Putnam before the Washington Putnam Letters Club, Feb. 12, 1963.

109. Frank C. McGurk, in his chapter "The Culture Hypothesis and Psychological Tests" in *Race and Modern Science* (R.E. Kettner, Ed.), 1967, p. 367. Dr. McGurk is Associate Prof. of Psychology at Alabama College.

110. Walter Arnold in *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 2 (Fall 1969), p. 79.

111. Frank C. McGurk in chapter cited in Note 109, pp. 369-370.

112. Ibid., pp. 370, 374. It would be best to read the entire chapter—pp. 367-381. The concluding pages, especially, should be pondered not only by our social scientists but by our preachers and philosophers.

113. Ibid., p. 380.

114. W.C. George—*The Biology of the Race Problem*, 1962, op. cit., pp. 17-8.

115. See *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. VII, No. 3, p. 181f.

116. Gerard Wintringer: "The Intelligence of the African Negro," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol V, No. I (Summer 1964), pp. 35, 38, 41, 44. Well reviewed by Nathaniel Weyl in his *Negro in American Civilization*, Public Affairs Press, 1960, pp. 155-6.

117. *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. VI, No. 4. p. 239.

118. Robert Gayre: "Practical Considerations Which Are Fundamental in Bantu Affairs in Rhodesia and for An Understanding of Negroid-Caucasoid Problems Generally," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 2 (Fall 1969), p. 64.

119. Carleton Putnam—*Race and Reality*, 1967, op. cit., p. 52, and footnotes 17, 18.

120. C. Hudson Herrick—*The Evolution of Human Nature*, University of Texas Press, 1956, p. 385, quoted by W.C. George in his *The Biology of the Race Problem*, op. cit., p. 28 and Note 44.

121. Carleton Coon: "Race and Ecology in Man," *Cold Spring Harbor Symposia on Quantitative Biology*, 1960, Vol. 24, p. 156.

122. Carleton S. Coon—*The Origin of Races*, op. cit., p. 339.

123. C. Judson Herrick—*Brains of Rats and Men*, University of Texas Press, 1926.

124. Wilder Penfield and Theodore Rasmussen—*The Cerebral Cortex of Man*, Macmillan, 1957, p. 226.

125. Ibid., p. 193.

126. See Wesley C. George, 1962, op. cit., p. 31, Note 51.

127. Nathaniel Weyl: "Racial Differences in the Range of Brain Capacity," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. XI, No. 4 (Spring 1971), p. 216.

128. F.W. Vint: "The Brain of the Kenya Native," 1934, *Journal of Anatomy*, Vol. 68, pp. 216-223.

129. Wesley C. George, 1962, op. cit., p. 33; Oliver S. Strong and Adolph Elwyn—*Human Neuroanatomy*, Williams and Wilkins, Baltimore, 1953, p. 405.

130. Carleton Putnam, 1967, op. cit., p. 51.

131. Ibid., p. 51. For further elucidation of this, see his very illuminating explanation on pp. 98-9.

132. F.W. Vint, op. cit. See also R.R. Gates—*Human Genetics*, Macmillan, 1946, Vol. II, p. 1138.

133. Quoted in Wesley C. George, 1962, op. cit., p. 34.

134. Nathaniel Weyl: "Enigmas of Native African Intelligence," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. VII, No. 4 (Spring 1967), pp. 221-6. Even more fully reviewed in his *The Negro in American Civilization*, 1960, op. cit., the chapter entitled "The African Heritage," p. 142ff. Cp. Carleton Putnam, 1967, op. cit., p. 97f.

135. Arnold Toynbee—*The Study of History*, Vol. I, p. 233.

136. Walter Arnold: "The Evolution of Man in Relation to That of the Earth," Part V, *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 2 (Oct.-Dec. 1969), p. 78.

137. *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. VII, No. 3 (Jan.-March 1967), pp. 131-143. Cp. Ethelred Nevin: "The Black Brainwash in America," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. VII, No. 4 (Spring 1967), p. 233.

138. "Zimbabwean," *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. V, No. 4 (Spring 1965), pp. 212-243. See also Dr. Gayre's *The Origin of the Zimbabwean Civilization*, Galaxie Press, Salisbury, Rhodesia, 1973. About \$14.00.

139. Henry E. Garrett—*Heredity: The Cause of Racial Differences in Intelligence*, Patrick Henry Press, 1971, p. 13.

140. *The Citizen*, Jackson, Miss., June, 1970, pp. 6-7.

141. Frank H. Hankins—*The Racial Basis of Civilization*, op. cit., 1931, p. 306f. The significance of Professor Hankin's words is very powerfully brought home to the American White man of today in an article entitled "The Vardaman Idea" that was published in *The Saturday Evening Post*, April 27th, 1907. The author, Harris Dickson, tracing the lapse of 60 centuries,

shows how the rise and fall of one great civilization after another brought no change in the Negro, even though he was in close contact with it.

“The Negro’s jungle was still a jungle. He had no government, no cities, no learning; he had no clothing, no arts, no aspirations. He had dreamed no dreams, hoped no hopes, indulged in no visions. He had desired nothing, planned nothing, executed nothing in any wise more intellectual than the accomplishments of the gorilla—except . . . a form of serpent worship which no white intelligence has ever yet been able to understand. . .”

“Throughout these sixty turbulent centuries history knew nothing of the negro, and the negro knew nothing of history. He had contributed nothing to the onward march, and gained nothing from it. All the peoples of the world had blazoned their names upon the great book of the world’s events—all save one”—the Negro.

For extensive quotations from this article see *Candour*, “The Negro Down the Ages,” in its issue for May 1, 1959.

142. T.E. Schumann: “The Unpreparedness of Civilized Countries for the Twentieth Century Racial Revolution,” *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. VIII, No. 2 (Fall 1960), p. 91.

143. R.R. Gates—*Heredity in Man*, op., p. 314.

144. Frank H. Hankins, op. cit., pp. 320-1.

145. Samuel J. Holmes—*The Trend of the Race*, Harcourt, 1921, pp. 261-4.

146. See, for instance, the summary of such FBI reports in *U.S. News*, Sept. 12, 1966, p. 108. It is revealing to compare our situation with that which has developed in England since the colored immigration began 15 to 20 years ago. “In November 1964 the former Labour Mayor of Shoreditch estimated that ‘51 per cent of illegitimate children are born to mothers who have come to Britain from overseas, that 20 per cent of all women in British prisons are from overseas, and that 33 percent of Britain’s juvenile delinquents are the children of parents from overseas.’ ” See H.B. Isherwood—*Racial Integration: The Rising Tide of Colour*, Britons Publishing Co., London, 1966, pp. 55-6.

147. Carleton Putnam—*Race and Reality*, 1967, pp. 46-7, including footnote 4.

148. Ibid. p. 2.

149. Michael Hoare—*Congo Mercenary*, London, 1967; Bernardo Teixeira—*Fabric of Terror*, Devin-Adair, 1965 (Mentor Book reprint, 1970). To these, I will add the following, most of which are somewhat older:

Raoul Allier—*The Mind of the Savage*, Harcourt, 1929; Daniel Thwaite—*The Seething African Pot, 1882-1935, A Study in Black Nationalism*, Negro Universities Press, Westport, Conn., 1970—especially Chap. III: "Secret Societies of Central Africa"; William W. Baldwin—*Mau Mau Man Hunt*, Dutton, 1957; Stuart Cloete—*The African Giant*, Collins, London, 1957.

Also, the following magazine articles: (1) in *National Review* "All the King's Horses...", Feb. 25, 1960; "Grand Guignol", Aug. 27, 1960; "The Untold Story" [of events in the Congo] by Senator Thomas Dodd, August 28, 1962; and an editorial in its issue of Aug. 27, 1960, in the opening sentence of which it called attention to the fact that "in the reporting of Congolese events there is a notable contrast between the European press and our own. The account presented to us by our journalists is so inadequate in both quantity and quality that it gives a badly distorted idea of the reality . . . so little of the truth that the overall picture is quite false." (2) *South African Observer*: "Congo Republic: Beach Head for Subversion," August 1960, p. 1. Its issue of Nov. 1960 reprinted excerpts from an article in the *Wall Street Journal* entitled "Future of Self-Governing Africa Doesn't Look So Good."

150. Walter Arnold, in *Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 2, p. 83.

151. Bernardo Teixeira—*The Fabric of Terror*, 1965, op. cit. (Mentor reprint, p. 138.)

152. R.R. Gates—*Heredity in Man*, op. cit., p. 330.

153. Clifford Dowdey—*The Land They Fought For*, Doubleday, 1955, pp. 14-24.

154. Quoted in "Genetic Differences, The Findings of Dr. William Shockley" by Carleton Putnam, National Putnam Letters Committee, Kilmarnock, Va. 22482.

155. See *U.S. News & World Report*, March 10, 1969 and June 2, 1969.

156. E.M. East and D.F. Jones, 1919, op. cit., pp. 252-264. Cp. Edward M. East, 1935, p. 165; F.A.E. Crew, 1927, op. cit., p. 63f.; Frank H. Hankins, 1926, op. cit., p. 344.

157. Lin Yu Tang—*My Country and My People*, John Day, 1935, pp. 27-8.

158. Edward M. East, 1935, op. cit., p. 163. On the other hand, it is worth noting that Wilhjalmur Stefansson, as opposed to East, largely on the authority of Ellsworth Huntington, "geographer and historian of human cultures," declared that in proportion to their population the Icelanders, one of the racially purest peoples left, may almost claim to have contributed more to human progress than any other people except those of ancient Greece and Palestine. And Viscount Bryce, he says, held that "of pre-Renaissance literatures the Icelandic is in quantity and quality second only to the classic Greek"—above that of Palestine or Rome.

159. F.A.E. Crew—*Heredity*, London, 1928, pp. 68-70; East and Jones, 1919, op. cit., pp. 158, 160f.

160. Otto Klineberg, 1933, op. cit., p. 219.

161. F.A.E. Crew, 1927, op. cit., p. 105.

162. John M. Mecklin—*Democracy and Race Friction*, Macmillan, 1913, p. 129.

163. For the preceding quotations, see Walter Arnold: "The Preference for Racial Segregation: Is It An Instinct?" *South African Observer*, Jan. 1972, pp. 11, 12.

164. Lafcadio Hearn—*Japan: An Attempt at an Interpretation*, Grosset & Dunlap, 1907, Appendix.

165. Gates, 1928, op. cit., p. 294ff.

166. R.R. Gates, 1928, op. cit., p. 336.

167. Ibid., p. 343.

168. E.M. East & D.F. Jones, 1919, op. cit., p. 245ff.

169. Ibid., pp. 252-4.

170. Ibid., p. 254.

171. R.R. Gates, 1928, op. cit., pp. 334-6.

172. R.R. Gates, 1928, op. cit., p. 335.

173. See *Race and Modern Science* (Robert Kuttner, Ed.), Social Science Press, 1967, p. 109. Her chapter is entitled "Race and the Biological History of Peoples."

174. Wesley C. George—*The Biology of the Race Problem*, a report prepared by commission of the Governor of Alabama, 1962, p. 37.

175. Published by Wistar Institute of Anatomy and Biology, Philadelphia, Pa., 1941.

176. William C. Dilger: "Nest Material Carrying Behavior of Hybrids between *Agapornis fisheri* and *A. roseicollis*," *Anatomical Record*, Vol. 134, p. 554, 1959; and "The Behavior of Lovebirds," *Scientific American*, January, 1962, pp. 89-98.

177. R.R. Gates—*Heredity in Man*, London, 1928, p. 329.

178. Nathaniel Weyl—"Reflections on Negro-White Miscegenation," *Mankind Quarterly*, XI, No. 3 (Jan.-March 1971), p. 140.

179. *Ibid.*, pp. 140-1.

180. See Martin P. Nilsson—*Imperial Rome*, Schocken, 1962, Chapter entitled "Population" pp. 317-363: in particular, pp. 343-4; "The Race Problem in the Roman Empire," *Hereditas*, 1921, ii, pp. 370-390.

181. See Harry Kessler—*Walther Rathenau*, Harcourt, 1930, p. 37.

182. E. A. Hooton—*Up from the Ape*, Macmillan, 1931, p. 583.

183. John M. Mecklin, 1913, p. 147.

184. Bob Weems: "Interracial Marriage, etc.," *The Citizen*, Feb. 1972, p. 4.

185. Ibid.

186. *Commentary*, Vol. 35, No. 2 (Feb. 1963), p. 64.

187. In support of my entire thesis here see Earnest Sevier Cox—*White America, White America Society*, Richmond, Va. 1923. A paperback reprint is now available from Noontide Press, P.O. Box 76062, Los Angeles, California. The last page of his book ends with these words:

“The negro problem is to be settled by the separation of the races or by the amalgamation of the races. Repatriation is possible! It is necessary! If we do not remove the negro, our civilization is to decay. If we do remove the negro, our civilization is to increase and our future belongs to God.”

Chapter 19.

The Fateful Crisis Confronting Western Man.

It is a basic axiom of biology that the struggle for existence cannot be escaped.

Garret Hardin—*Nature and Man's Fate*

The primary issue before Western civilization today, and before its member nations, is survival.

James Burnham—*The Suicide of The West*

Nowhere can one discern the slightest indication that in the great majority of our people the racial instinct of self-preservation has not been lost. The question remains unanswered, however, for we cannot yet determine whether the instinct has been extinguished or is merely in abeyance while our people are in a kind of cataleptic trance from which they may be aroused by physical suffering and acute privation when the time comes, as it assuredly will in a few years. We are born into this time, and there is no escape from it save in death. Our situation is desperate, and we can afford no illusions, no retreat into a land of dreams. Now, more than ever, *optimism is cowardice*.

Revalo P. Oliver

[Our people are too apathetic, or spiritless, or cowardly, to stand up and fight for what they believe in, or even to avert their own destruction.] Some wait for tenure, some for retirement, some for safer times, but all wait for doom. Dead races do not come back. Those that wait are the pallbearers of civilization.

Robert E. Kuttner

In this chapter, on the basis of facts and principles already firmly established in the foregoing pages of this book, I purpose to grapple in a realistic way with the three problems that especially threaten our very existence—the Negro, the Jew, and—first and last and always—ourselves. I might add that the Mongolians, with their total population of something like a billion people, who, if we continue to give them our technology, will certainly, sooner or later, drive fiercely and recklessly for increased *Lebensraum*, but it seems to me likely that if White men will but put their own houses in order, recover the realism and robustness that have commonly distinguished them in days past, and if they will also achieve a united front, they should be able to dissipate any Yellow Peril.

In any case, in the United States, these three racial problems—the Negro, the Jew, and ourselves—come first. Of the three, what is finally basic and all-determining is ourselves. If we are in deep racial trouble today, it is primarily our own fault. Every problem we may have with other races could have been avoided if we had been wise, or could have been resolved and removed if we had been not only wise but resolute enough to carry through the directives that wisdom would have given us, and to punish summarily and severely all the traitors in our midst and even in our own ranks, who have worked to destroy us. No matter what I may say about other races in the following pages, let it always be remembered that I said this: the very heart of our racial problem is ourselves. History shows that everything hinges on breed, and science teaches that all progress comes through the studied and tireless improvement of the breed. When that is neglected everything goes to the dogs. If we bring out the best that is in us, and stop wasting our strength in wars with one another, we shall be irresistible. But in our present state, before we *can* live up to our best, we have got to face and solve the problem of the Negro and the problem of the Jew.

Let me frankly declare that my dominant concern is with the future of my own kind—the White man of the West. But though my concern embraces the White race as a whole, it is concentrated upon that blond, long-headed, Aryan, Teutonic, Nordic element of it which, as it seems to me, from ancient India, Persia, Greece and Rome, to modern Germany and north Italy, Holland, England, Scotland, Viking Ireland, Iceland and all Scandinavia, and wherever it has gone abroad, has been the supreme exploring, searching, inventing, organizing, creating and ruling power in the Western world.¹ It is this element that has been chiefly responsible for whatever shape and size and character the life of Western man has taken on, whether in Europe or in its numerous colonies, and for whatever significance it has achieved in human history.

Part A. Present Plight of the White Race

Part B. The Negro in Our Midst

Part C. The Jews

----- Footnotes to Chapter 19

Appendix 1. For Research into the Deception in Our Money System

Appendix 2. For Introduction to the Jewish Question

Appendix 3. From the English paper *The Week*, May 17, 1933

Appendix 4. Alleged Soviet Anti-Semitism

Appendix 5. In Reply to Dr. Antony Sutton's Rejection of the Idea of a Jewish Conspiracy

Appendix 6. The Abandonment of the Code of civilized Warfare

Appendix 7. The Lie of the Six Million

A. Present Plight of the White Race

But it can hardly be denied that the White man today is in a desperate plight. Catastrophe hangs over us. For those who have eyes to see, the danger signs are everywhere. But it is not of complete human extinction I am thinking; so complete a catastrophe, whether by pollution, disease, famine, or atomic fission, seems to me unlikely. The catastrophe that now weighs upon me day and night is one that most deeply, immediately, and especially hangs over Western man, the Nordic White man. And, even here, I see it not as a menace of extinction but as something ultimately worse—not so much the menace manifested in the deterioration of the White man's societies and of his status among the nations of the world (which, after all, is only a symptom), but rather in what is ultimately at the bottom of it all—the sickness, the shakiness, and the disintegration—of the White man's own innermost being.

But let us begin with the external symptoms.

Those Nordics who have been keeping a watchful and increasingly anxious eye on the trend of events began to note the storm petrels in the air very long ago. Spengler's *The Decline of The West*² and Lothrop Stoddard's *The Rising Tide of Color* and *The Revolt against Civilization*³ appeared early in the century. But by the nineteen-sixties the signs of warning began to be more and more alarming. In July 1960 a front-page article appeared in the *Deutsche Wochen-Zeitung* which (in translation) said:

"It is one of the riddles of our time why the White man, lord of the Earth from pole to pole, should in the short space of a single human generation renounce his rule, draw back wearily from a position of world-wide power, so that today he is in panic-stricken flight where yesterday he still governed inviolably."⁴

And one had only to look about the Earth to see what had occasioned the comment. Every well-informed and thoughtful man, reflecting upon the series of cataclysms and revolutionary changes that have overtaken humanity in this century, or upon the general course of events for the past sixty years or so, must have been struck by the steady downward trend in the Western world of the White man. Prior to the First World War, and even for the preceding 500 years, his affairs had been in the ascendant. In large part, his very empires reflected his self-confidence, his boldness in every sort of exploration, his will to rule, and his accepted authority. But after the shattering and devastating effects of two world-convulsing White civil wars, all this became changed. Everywhere the White man's world has been sickening and dying. In a single generation his empires have withered and disappeared almost as if an evil genie had passed a magic wand over them. The British, the French, the Dutch and the Belgians have fairly fallen over themselves in hasting to disavow their empires and withdraw from all parts of the world. This is especially astonishing in the British, founders of the largest and most civilizing empire ever created by the genius of man, who seem to accept almost supinely their "being reduced from [their] imperial splendor to the rank of a minor power."⁵

Or if any man thinks that as Americans our concern should be concentrated on the United States, which, in the eyes of most of our people, still retains its position as the dominant

power in the world, it should be brought to his attention that as recently as 1968 Mr. Arthur Krock, veteran journalist of the *New York Times*, concluded his autobiography by saying that “as an eyewitness of governmental and other public action throughout these years [of 1933 to 1967: he speaks of revolutionary political and social changes], I formed the opinion that the U.S. merits the dubious distinction of having discarded its past and its meaning in one of the briefest spans of modern history. . . And from my personal assessments of the consequences . . . I have contracted a visceral fear . . . that the tenure of the United States as the first power in the world may be one of the briefest in history.”⁶

However, I know of no one who has shown so much alarm over the situation as Mr. James Burnham in his book published in 1964 with the ominous title *The Suicide Of The West*.⁷ With Mr. Burnham one can always be sure not only of quite exceptional penetration of mind and acute powers for both analysis and synthesis, but also that he will never fail to face reality as he sees it with honesty and courage. One thing he always recognizes, without quibbling or equivocation, is that “in all human societies of any magnitude—states, nations, empires, federations, whatever they may be called—force is an inevitable, therefore normal and natural, ingredient; inevitable both for the preservation of internal order and for defense against external threats” (p. 292).

In his opening chapter he sketches the rise and growth of the Western White man’s civilization, and observes that in “A.D. 1914 the domain of Western man’s civilization was, or very nearly was, the world,” that “at the start of the First World War, the planet, water and land, . . . belonged to the West” (p. 15). At the beginning of this century, the West held “in fact every key strategic post on Earth outside the inner Asiatic heartland.” It was so situated and circumstanced that “there was no possibility that a purely external challenger could pose a serious direct threat,” thus compelling the conclusion that if there was to be any deterioration in the White man’s status, it must be brought about by a change in his *internal* condition.

But with the outbreak of the First World War, a vast change set in. “The trend [toward contraction] . . . is unmistakable, has not in fact been reversed since it started in 1917, and has already [i.e., in 1964] resulted in a world power shift of vast proportions” (p. 298). Even ten years ago, nearly all the strategic posts the West held securely in 1914 had been surrendered or abandoned (pp. 271-2, 276-7, 299). “It may be objected that civilization is not a matter of military bases, strategic posts and soldiers. True enough, certainly; but without the bases and posts and soldiers, there can be no civilization, there is nothing” (pp. 298-300). And even more to our disquieting he adds: “From precedents and analogues we learn that the process of shrinking, when once it unmistakably sets in, is seldom if ever reversed. . . . We are therefore compelled to think it probable that the West, in shrinking, is also dying” (p. 20). “If the process continues over the next several decades more or less as it has gone on during the several decades just past, *then* . . . the West will be finished; Western civilization, Western societies and nations in any significant and recognizable sense, will just not be there any more” (pp. 24-5). “The primary issue before Western civilization today, and before its member nations, is survival” (p. 280).

These words must have been written about ten years ago. So one of Mr. Burnham’s “several” decades, in his view so crucial for our destiny, has already passed, and any

intelligent man aware of the facts must admit that as yet there has been no change in the process which for over half a century has been steadily and remorselessly pushing the White man into an ever-tighter corner.

His plight is only the more desperate because knowledge of the facts—and even more, awareness of the significance of the facts—has been suppressed. Indeed, we have been led to believe that humanity has now reached such a point of brotherly love and mutual trust that we can best ensure our security by surrendering our own national strength to build up the strength of a super-government over the entire world. In any case, the people of the United States, straddling a continent, protected by two oceans, and possessed of the greatest wealth and power in the history of mankind, have been left with a feeling of security that is fairly childish and have today become almost completely off-guard. For the most part, they long ago became so taken up with sucking all the pleasure that they could out of their fantastic standard of living and all the comfortableness that it has brought them, that they have failed to notice who or what has been creeping up to destroy them. They refuse to heed any of the cries of alarm that penetrate their sodden complacency. Nothing can disturb their confidence that the United States is invincible, that any enemy who might assail their walls would be repulsed, and therefore they don't have even the shadow of a suspicion that the enemy who is most likely to destroy them has long been deeply entrenched inside their own defenses.

But the vast drop in the White man's prestige and status in the modern world is by no means the whole story, nor the most disturbing and ominous part of it. When, in casting about for the causes of the enormous decline in the White man's dominance, we turn our scrutiny inwards, we discover that his own societies are obviously racked with dissension and shaken with some hidden feebleness that has left them unable to take themselves in hand. Often, they seem to be fairly rotting down and on the verge of falling to pieces. It hardly needs to be argued that Britain, Scandinavia, France and even Germany are sick, though in no country of the White man's world is the sickness so obvious or dissolution so far advanced as in the United States.

Merely to list the acknowledged symptoms should be enough to establish the seriousness of our condition. One thinks of the rapid and enormous increase in lawlessness and crime, particularly crimes of violence, and not only among Blacks but among Whites as well; the deterioration and near-breakdown of our entire system of education, not only in our public schools but in our colleges and universities; the increase of pornography and drug addiction; the deterioration of the family as women *en masse* abandon their traditional role and responsibility as mothers and home-makers and turn over what youngsters they have to be bandied about in day-nurseries, while they seek the limelight and independence of jobs and careers; the general flabbiness of wishy-washy men who, bemused by the doctrines of equality and freedom that television has drilled into their stupid heads, abdicate their authority as head of the home and settle down to letting their wives and their children do as they please, until gradually an attitude of permissiveness, toward anything and everything, has spread over the entire country. Often it seems that nowhere is there now left any iron strength that can and will draw a hard sharp line and bring the weakness, defiance, and virtual treason to a dead stop.

The desperateness of the situation only grows upon us as we witness the universal turmoil and tension that pervade the country, turning one class or segment of the population against another, until it sometimes seems we may be on the verge of tearing ourselves to pieces in a universal, free-for-all civil war, in which each part of the population throws to the winds all concern for the general welfare in a struggle to establish its own dominance and promote its own interests. Working-class employees are locked in a dreary, endless and often paralyzing struggle with their employers. Inflamed and disaffected Blacks are summoning all their strength for guerilla warfare on the White man's society in a determination to destroy it. Woman is in revolt against Man, and youth against age and authority. A breakdown of discipline has invaded even the Armed Forces, in which the nation finds its last resort for holding its world together. The effort to integrate Whites and Blacks in the Army and Navy has led to racial riots; fear of Negroes' insubordination has led to rulings that they may wear their hair as they like and even replace the traditional salute with the clenched fist of the Communist. The evident shakiness of authority and feebleness of discipline are living witness that those who figure as our rulers are no longer sure of themselves, sure even of a solid national backing. They hear, and feel, the rumbling under their feet, and they act in fear. The country is torn with dissension. Nowhere is there that solidarity, that common faith, that agreement on basic essentials, that unfailing spirit of working together for the common good in mutual respect and confidence, which alone can call forth and unify and direct a people's ultimate reserves of strength, and upon which in the last analysis depend both its survival and its entire significance.

What this reveals, at bottom, is a disintegration of the White man's own inner being. And—let there be no mistake about it—this means primarily a disintegration of the inner being of *Nordic* man, for it has been Nordic man who has been the supreme determinant of the history and culture of the nations of northwestern Europe, both in their homelands and wherever they have gone.

This calls for an explanation. But first let me prepare my reader for what I am about to say, by introducing some preliminary remarks.

(1) In searching for the causes of our desperate plight (and I do not in the least exaggerate when I use these words), I very soon found myself persuaded that in so vast a phenomenon as the decay of a civilization and the dying of the people who created it, we must expect to find the causes not only complex but varying from case to case. I have tried, therefore, to hold at arm's length any temptation toward over-simplification, and to make due allowance for all the critical factors that may be involved.

(2) I am by no means one who thinks he *has* all the answers. I merely make bold to set down such answers as seem to me, after some thirty years of investigation and reflection, to make most sense. If others have answers very different, which seem to them to make out a case more coherent and plausible, I shall be very ready to listen to them and evaluate honestly what they say.

(3) At the same time, in all fairness to my readers, I will warn them that what I have been looking for is *solutions*, not mere alleviation, not any palliatives that would only ease our grounds for alarm, not mere delay of the blow that will certainly fall upon us if real solutions

are not found and put into effect. And for well-nigh hopeless illness, which can as surely come to human societies as to the physical bodies of men, we must be prepared to recognize that sometimes the last hope left us may be in drastic surgery. A cancer may have to be cut out. Here wringing of the hands accomplishes absolutely nothing. I was resolved, therefore, from the very beginning, to follow whatever impressed my collective faculties as the truth, regardless of whither it took me or what it called for. If I saw clearly that we could overcome the malady that threatened our very existence only by cutting it out, I would face it and say so. When it becomes as stern and simple as *Do it or die*, can there be any question?

After these few words about my own approach to our problem, let me now go on to submit two factors that must be grasped if anyone is to understand what our problem is.

CONFLICT AND STRUGGLE THE BASIC FACT OF LIFE

To escape conflict and struggle is impossible. *It must be faced*. Those who close their eyes to it or try to evade it will only be run down by it. All significant human development has been the result of rising to meet some challenge. And, though it may begin as rivalry and more or less peaceful competition, sooner or later it leads to war. I have already stated the grounds on which I base this position in my Chapter XIV, where my re-examination of the pacifist argument forced me to reject it as a falsification or an evasion of the facts of human existence. Humane and enlightened people may avoid war by every means short of accepting chronic hunger for their population, grown too large for their land to support, but issues *will* develop, and sooner or later *will* develop, in which the arbitration of war is the only means left by which it can be decided which of two contending parties is to survive and be left free to pursue its destiny, and which is to go under.

Even cooperation and mutual aid have always been to the end of group survival. Always between groups it has been war, or a warlike attitude and preparedness for war. As we have seen before this, but cannot remind ourselves too often, every emergent human group has had to struggle with all other competing groups that challenged it—in the beginning, for instance, for the best hunting grounds. Those whose birthrate gave them superior numbers, whose brains gave them superior tools, weapons and organization, and whose courage, discipline, group loyalty and self-sacrifice enabled them to throw into the struggle everything they had, through thousands and thousands of years, have been the ones who survived—and in the end, surviving has meant some degree of mastering, of conquering. If today we have only three outstanding and obviously distinguishable races, it is because all the rest have gone down before these three. The selecting hand—where it has not been isolation, segregation—has been war, and all that goes into making war successfully. Those who could not fight, or who would not, have been remorselessly driven off the Earth or enslaved, or shoved aside as pitiable remnants of backward peoples into bleak or out-of-the-way corners. A like fate has ever shadowed all those who for any reason became overly confident, relaxed their vigilance, and allowed their sentinels to sleep. It still shadows them. Nature does not abhor a vacuum more than Power does. As soon as the White man retires from or relaxes his hold on Africa, or Indonesia, or shows an inability or indisposition to maintain control of his own homelands, “Communism” presses in, or China’s 800 million people panting for breathing room press in—to *stay*, and to supplant the White man’s rule with a harsher rule of their own. While all our scramble from responsibility was taking place, Russia, on the

contrary, was amassing quite an empire out of the subjugated states of eastern Europe, and pressing into Africa to step into the shoes of Western man as fast as he stepped out—in fact, crowding hard on his heels. And the Chinese are following suit. Having provided the engineers and laborers to build a modern railway from the eastern coast of Africa to the heart of its mineral wealth, they have remained, and can be expected to push the poor savage Black peoples to the wall without remorse. The Mongolians in general have long had their eyes fixed on Africa, Australia, and New Zealand, and perhaps even on the United States.

Surely, to fancy for a moment that this is any time for the White man to lay aside his sword is sheer insanity. The record of the big wars of this century has been one of mounting ferocity, to a point that now surpasses anything known of the beasts, and which is quite without parallel in human history since the days of Genghis Khan in the Thirteenth Century.⁸ If the last war was ferocious, the next will be more ferocious still.

Nor is any way out of the grim impasse to be found in the United Nations. The UN is a booby trap. That becomes clear as soon as one learns *who* first sponsored the idea of world government, who wrote the UN Charter, who were the men entrusted with the responsibility at the San Francisco Conference for putting it on its feet and getting it moving, and who have dominated it ever since. Apparently, very few people are aware that (in accord with a secret agreement at San Francisco between the Russian Molotov and Alger Hiss, our most influential representative), the key post in the UN, that of the Secretary of the Security Council, has always been, and always must be, a Communist.⁹ This has meant, for instance, that in the Korean War the orders that the UN issued to General MacArthur were doubtless known to the strategists on the Communist side before they were communicated to General MacArthur himself. No wonder that General George Stratemeyer, head of our Air Force in Korea, later told a Senate committee: “We were required to lose the Korean War.” And MacArthur said that we were “not allowed to win.”¹⁰ In short, by the deliberate intention of its authors and framers, the UN is and always has been primarily an instrument and a dodge by which *one* race among the children of men thinks it can the more surely and speedily establish its dominion over all the rest.¹¹ The UN can accomplish the purpose for which it was created only as the sovereignty of every constituent nation is destroyed. The UN is an instrument for the *enslavement* of mankind. Its every move, therefore, and every proposal it puts before the world (whether it be disarmament, the Genocide Treaty, or anything else similarly high-sounding) must be looked upon as an act of presumable treachery. Whenever either the UN or Soviet Russia talks “peace,” let us instantly recall that Dmitri L. Manuilski, who later became Russia’s delegate to the UN, in addressing the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow in 1930, said:

“War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 to 30 years. To win, we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we will smash them with our clenched fist.”¹²

This necessity that I have been stressing—to achieve strength, to grow in intelligence, to be ever on guard, in order to make itself master, or at the least to hold its own—has moulded all life that has appeared on this Earth. And it is the outcome of such struggle that explains both the life history of all species, and the rise and fall of nations and of races and of all human empires. No matter whether we like it or dislike it, or how ardently and desperately we may stack against it our moral indignation and against our most treasured hopes and ideals, *it operates*—constantly, quietly, without making any exception, without fail, without pity, inexorably. And any nation, or any race, that is seized with the fancy that a day has now dawned when it can relax its vigilance and lay down its arms, and introduce innovations in which the way of struggle and combat will be superseded by a reign of universal love and brotherhood and peace, will in the end be roughly awakened to the realization that it has lost its grip, and perhaps its last chance, and is being swept ruthlessly toward oblivion.

Such is the world in which, viewed from the perspective of history and anthropology, some nations or races, at any given time, are rising to an ascendancy, while others are being eclipsed and forced into accepting a secondary place, perhaps a place bordering on extinction. It is in the midst of such stern, inflexible circumstances that the modern White man of the West, like every other nation and race from the beginning of time, must today find a way to swim—or else *sink*.

With this I come to the second outstanding factor in the White man's present critical predicament, to which I wish to call special attention.

THE WHITE MAN'S SHAKINESS ABOUT HIMSELF, AND ITS CAUSES

It is precisely in this remorseless situation, when he is most desperately in need of getting his bearings, of ascertaining where he is, and how he can pull himself together to move with firm foot and with all the strength there is in him—it is precisely now, as never before in his history, that he finds himself most confused and shaky, about right and wrong, high and low, and even about himself, about his past, and about his worth as compared with the rest of humanity.

To get at the cause of this, we must reach some understanding of how it has come about.

At first glance, the factors involved must seem multitudinous. If my reader will pause once again to reflect, it may strike him that this book he is now reading, from its very beginning, has been pulling out from the melee one after another of the colossal mistakes we have made, and nailing them down for close examination. But to list these here for even the most cursory review would require space I cannot spare, and it would too long delay my coming to grips with the principal problems that I have set before myself in this chapter. Moreover, many of these causative factors are so related that, in the end, we may find that a considerable number of the mistakes that we have made boil down to a few enormous ones. I will confine myself to these.

1. His Rejection of the Law of His Being Implicit in the Dual Code

I have been saying that the primary fact of life is conflict and struggle. All significant human development has been the result of rising to meet some challenge. However, men very early learned to relieve the pressure of the struggle on the individual and to increase his security and well-being by the formation of groups of individuals—of like blood and experience (i.e., of the same gene pool and a common tradition), of like mind and interests, and united by allegiance to a dual code. *Within* the group the rule was mutual trust, loyalty and cooperation—in short, *amity*. This, in due time, produced homogeneity and a solidarity in which was massed a strength vastly beyond anything within the reach of the individual standing alone. Fortified with this strength the group faced outsiders, all those who did not belong to it—and this is the other side of the dual code—with indifference, suspicion, antagonism, and readiness for war. *Here the rule was enmity*.¹³

This dual code—amity within the group, enmity toward those outside it (as already mentioned in an earlier chapter)—served several socially valuable purposes. And even though it involves some repetition, I must point out what these were, and stress their significance.

(a) The dual code amounted to segregation, and this protected the gene pool of the group against adulteration by the genes of aliens. This resulted in a fine-grained homogeneity and a close-knit solidarity, which, as set forth in my Chapter IX, is essential to any people's stability, long-term survival, or meaningful record. And this solidarity, let it be realized, embraced more than all the fellow members of one's own society. It was rooted in their common ancestry, and in the traditions in which their ancestors had set down the wisdom that thousands of years of a widely varied experience of living had stamped upon their consciousness; and it found expression in the responsibility each man acknowledged to perpetuate his kind in many children, each one of whom he would undertake, by his faithful nurture, so to bring to the threshold of responsible manhood that he could be trusted to conduct himself in a way worthy of his forebears. Past, Present, and Future were all tied together. The soil, the living plant, and its seed, each after its own kind, were all taken duly into account.

(b) The dual code increased the group's total strength and thus multiplied its chances for survival and mastery in its struggle with its enemies. Because of its potency in these two particulars alone Sir Arthur Keith pointed out that the dual code had been one of the principal factors in the very origin of races, and in the record that each of them had made for itself. Without it, no race could have come into existence, and without it no race could have long held together or had any chance of ever coming out in the lead. It had been the instrument of all human development, of all that we call human evolution.

(c) The psychological by-products of this process must be specifically and carefully noted. The dual code equipped man, who from his very beginning has been a gregarious creature, with one of the "first requirements of his moral health, the security provided by a sense of community . . . of belonging, which is something he has never been able to find . . . [anywhere or at any time] except in some circumscribed group or community made up of individuals much the same as himself."¹⁴ An integral part and further consequence of this was the moral certainty it gave the individual as to how he should act to meet the most vital issues in his life. He knew at once that what was essentially alien to him contained a potential

enemy, against whom he must ever be on guard. Here he was never confused. Against what struck at his life, he was always ready and quick to shut himself off, as from a leper, and no less quick to close ranks with his fellows to fight it, whether it was in the form of a person or of an idea that was incompatible with his racial traditions and ideals. And he could do this without qualms or hesitation because of his certainty that all those about him, being of his own kind, shared what he felt. And he could throw into the fight all he had in him, even his life, because he had learned that the welfare of each was best ensured by their all standing together, solid as a block of granite, in mutual understanding, trust, and helpfulness. And this attitude, in the course of a natural selection that went on for hundreds of thousands of years, came to be built into the very cells of each man's body and brain, into his very subconscious. So much so that, even to this day, any change that strikes at the individual's sense of security in those about him, whether it comes through new and alien ideas instilled into him in school or by propaganda, or through the altered complexion and bearing of the very people he meets on the streets, will be profoundly disturbing to his peace of mind, to his certainty of himself, and to the whole efficiency of his innermost being, even though it be so subtle as to escape his consciousness.

Homogeneity, let me hasten to add, is not a matter of uniformity—such as may be obtained by regimentation or indoctrination. There has to be change, and change is even to be welcomed provided there is a power in society, essentially aristocratic—wise and generous, which will keep change under control and give it a direction that conduces to the welfare of the whole people. Moreover, it must be recognized that free men, of a like intelligence and integrity confronted with a given issue, must be expected to reach conclusions which, within limits, are different. But all this does not disturb the essential homogeneity of the society so long as issues are faced and decided in a spirit and in the light of principles that are consonant with the people's entire past tradition and with their present distinguishing character. But real and essential homogeneity, together with the solidarity that results from it and the dual moral code required to bring homogeneity into being and to maintain it, for the White race as much as for any other race, is and always has been and ever must be, a vital and ineluctable necessity for its moral and spiritual health, and for the surefootedness and consistency of its political life.

But the condition that we now find ourselves in stands in absolute contrast to all this. Instead of that homogeneity which has proved so essential to any nation's significance and ultimately even to its very existence, the population of the United States has become an utter hodgepodge. Let me now review how this came to pass, and how in the course of the last hundred years we have simply ceased to be the same people, ceased to be a people of the same kind and quality that we were in the beginning.¹⁵

2. Acceptance Into His Midst of Millions of Aliens

The founders of the original thirteen colonies that developed into the Federal Union were remarkably alike in their racial origins. They came predominantly from the nations of northwestern Europe. But soon after Lincoln's efforts to hold off the international bankers had ended in his assassination and the country was more and more given over to the looters, the ever-growing demand for cheap labor led to our opening our gates to almost anyone who had a pair of hands to work with. In the forty years following 1880, we took in over 23

million immigrants, who, with their many offspring, by 1920 helped to bring our total population to something over 105 million.¹⁶ This was an enormous chunk of humanity for any nation of our size at that time to attempt to assimilate, even if the chunk had been of the same kind and quality as itself. But it was *not* of the same quality or even of the same kind. The newcomers were largely from the nations of southeastern Europe, from those of its peoples most alien to our original stock in blood, in values, in traditions and in institutions, and often were dredged from their poorhouses and even from their homes for the feebleminded.¹⁷ Since then, we have dumped additional millions of foreigners upon ourselves, from all parts of the Earth—Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Hawaiians, Japanese, Chinese—and, of course, from the very beginning of our country, a steady influx of Jews, who by now have thoroughly honeycombed our society from top to bottom. The most gifted of all this non-Nordic immigration, the Jews and the Mongolians, have in any case, been so determined to maintain their racial identity as to make assimilation virtually impossible: they have simply become encysted as a foreign organism in our body politic.

But probably most of the immigration from 1880 on, even when it had as much in common with us as did the White stocks from southeastern Europe, and certainly all the rest of it even when it was highly endowed, should never have been granted admission to our shores, for the simple reason that it was *too alien* to us in its traditions, experience, values and standards. But it *was* admitted, along with the numerous progeny it begot (in which it commonly surpassed our own birthrate), and thus all this vast conglomeration of alienness was added to the great body of alienness that inheres in the 22 million Negroes in our midst. In consequence, the full-blooded Nordic man today often feels himself fairly swamped in alienness. He has lost his country. It has passed out of his hands. In effect, he has been dispossessed and is now living in what has become a land of foreigners.¹⁸ He cannot escape the fact. It strikes him wherever he turns—in the faces on television, in the names that appear on storefronts, in the newspapers and on the covers of books, in the lists of university professors and on the boards of directors of banks and corporations. And just let my reader recall all the foreign names that now appear among our mayors, congressmen and judges, and that have long marked the advisers to our Presidents, from Bernard Baruch, who was adviser to five Presidents in succession and was sometimes referred to as our “unofficial President,” right down to Henry Kissinger at the present hour, the very thickness of whose speech betrays his foreign birth, but who yet has such power behind him that he is entrusted with the destiny of the nation.

All this has had its consequences. Of these, the less obvious have been the most deadly, for they struck to the very root of Nordic man’s being. Once he is disturbed in his sureness of himself and his footing, he can no longer strike with telling force, he is shorn of his strength and reduced to something approaching impotence. And he *cannot* maintain his sureness of himself, once he can no longer look out upon those about him, confident that what he himself thinks and feels and fears and honors and holds sacred and strives to live by and is willing to die for, is matched in his neighbors, his fellow townsmen, all of them, the entire citizenry of his country. Once this solidarity is lost, he can no more feel entirely sure in himself and strong with a sense that his country is himself multiplied a millionfold—a hundred-millionfold.

At the same time that this disturbing change was taking place in the complexion and in the genetic substance of the American population, the White man's awareness of who and what he is and of what he has behind him, was being undermined and shaken in yet another way. For all of two generations a very skillful, highly financed, and steadily intensified campaign has been concentrated on so messing up his insides, his basic conceptions, his emotions and his loyalties, as to render him confused, divided, frustrated, and finally powerless, even as the wasp first paralyzes the victim that it intends as food for its young. Slowly, the very foundations of the White man's belief in himself have been undermined. Into his hands has been thrust a new book of right and wrong, whose commandments he does not understand. Ideals have been put into his head and emotions kindled in his breast that come into head-on collision with the inherited values, the treasured traditions, and the very inborn instincts that have made him what he is. Though he was born to conquer and has an immemorial record of conquering behind him, "conquest" has been made a discredited word, almost a "dirty" word, and the thing itself, a crime. Thus the White man has been left not only split and confused but frustrated and even ashamed of himself—ashamed of his mastery, ashamed of his empires, ashamed even of the very ancestors *to whom he is supremely indebted for all that he is and for all that he has*. He, the White man, sprung from one of the greatest warrior races of history, instead of leaping to assert himself, and to defend himself, and to press firmly for what he needs for his survival and for the realization of the greatness that is in him, sits in a corner, and hesitates, and mopes, and apologizes not only for being what he is but for what his ancestors were, and dutifully tries to put on the mincing manners of the one-worlder and the Christian pacifist, which his would-be subverters enjoin upon him.

I cannot begin even to list the ways and the crucial areas of our life in which, for decades, this campaign to paralyze us, to castrate us, and I might well say to disembowel us, has gone on. But I have to doubt if any instrument has been so virulent and deadly as the doctrine of human equality.

3. His Betrayal of Himself By His Acceptance of the Doctrine of Equality

As pointed out in my last chapter, no such idea is to be found in our Federal Constitution, and such assertion of it as came from the mouths of our Founding Fathers was little more than a backwash from the effervescent extravagances that made the French Revolution. Most emphatically they were not contemplating any society of White men that included even Chinese, however admirable Chinese in themselves might be, let alone Stone Age Indians, and least of all Negroes from savage Africa, who at that time had no place whatever in American society except as chattel property and slaves. Any equality they ascribed to "all men" was certainly limited to all men of their own kind. And even here, the men with whom the country really had its origin, who had the courage, dedication and self-reliance to take the lead and dare death for the sake of freedom, whose thought, energy and determination finally gave the country its form and direction, not only put nothing about equality into the Constitution but, on the contrary, lost no time in making sure that no share in the control of the country got into the hands of the mass of the people. Despite upheavals like Shay's Rebellion in Massachusetts and Dorr's Rebellion in Connecticut, it was soon firmly settled that the vote was to be limited to males who could meet certain qualifications. Generally, these requirements were evidence of that character and ability which, at that time, commonly inhered in the ownership of a specified minimum of private property. James Oneal, in his

The Workers In American History, by numerous quotations from recognized historical authorities, shows that "all the colonies and later the states, withheld the franchise from those not possessing a certain amount of property." ¹⁹ In early Virginia (1670), it was recognized that the possession of estate, real and personal, gave men "interest enough to tye them to the endeavor of the publique good." ²⁰ McMaster says that "the *DedARATION of Independence* and the triumph of the Revolution brought few changes in the property qualifications for the franchise." ²¹ Woodrow Wilson, in his *History of the American People*, declared that "there were probably not more than 120,000 men who had the right to vote out of all the four million inhabitants enumerated in the first census (1790)." ²²

And all this seems in keeping with the historic fact that Aryan-Nordic men already had behind them thousands of years of aristocracy and kingship, under which they had reached the greatest heights in their history. And the institutions of aristocracy and kingship imply, and absolutely rest on, a belief in "the superior man," on a belief that men are *born unequal*, born with unequal and even *vastly* unequal potentialities, which no mere evening of environmental differences can ever iron out.

Doubtless, however, it was to have been expected of men who had just gained the freedom to launch their own government by winning a revolt against the King of England, that a feeling against all aristocracy and kingship should run high. Certainly the germs of an inflated notion of equality had been incubated and scattered far and wide by the French Revolution and, after inflaming the American colonists to a general revolt against King George III, had left behind, even in the heart of the most loutish ne'er-do-well, a residual fever of envious resentment and resistance against recognizing that any man can be the superior of any other. And this belief that all men are finally equal smoldered on to create, and gradually to put through, a demand that the requirements for the suffrage be relaxed, and at last that they be entirely annulled. Today virtually any man, even though he has no more head than enough to wear a hat, is allowed to vote, and his vote is seriously counted and weighed as though his judgment on crucial national issues were, or ever could be, of any such worth as that of a man of ten or perhaps a hundred times his education, range of experience, and proven capacity and responsibility.

Thus we ceased to be a republic, under which the intention was to keep the control and direction of the country in the hands of those best qualified to ensure its welfare, and degenerated into a pure democracy—into what Alexander Solzhenitsyn has called "democracy run riot." This opened the dikes and let in a flood that lifted the masses to dominion. All wisdom and far-ranging vision in Government was lost in a sordid scramble for the votes of a motley collection of people, most of whom had no concern about the nation's crucial problems and no wit to grapple with them even if they did, who indeed were ready to sacrifice the long-term welfare of the nation as a whole for their own personal advantage, whether it was bigger profits, higher wages, more "welfare," more speed, more gadgets, or more pleasure, comfort, security or ease. Inevitably, the country drifted ever nearer to the misrule and lack of rule of the sodden mob. All overseeing and aristocratic direction of our national life was thrown away. As always in a democracy, there was no one left to look where we were going, to provide the people with protection against soulless exploitation and ruination, or to anticipate and to steer us away from all the desecration of the earth, the wasting of our resources, the pollution of our environment, and a differential

birthrate in which those who had the brains and character to solve problems were swamped by those who created problems. The land was left wide open and without much obstacle in the path of those whose consuming lust for gain made them want to turn the country, first of all, into a rich field for lucrative financial investment, and more and more open also, as time passed, to conscious traitors who stealthily worked and wheedled and pushed it toward the surrender of its sovereignty and its meek acceptance of that place in a world slave state that the Communists (and even more, those *behind* Communism) have long planned for us. In the course of such a mad and drunken career, many things to our hurt as a people have happened almost automatically. To consolidate their gains, to mask their purpose, and to give all possible appearance of political and scientific validity to their sustained and intensive drive to accomplish it, they whom I shall shortly name as our supreme enemy, some forty years ago launched a concerted, incessant, and relentless drive to stamp the mind of our whole people, from the cradle to the grave, with the idea that all men are equal. This has finally got behind it, as briefly reviewed in my last chapter, in order to bribe and to tempt the weak and to break the intractable, such control and skill of propaganda for insinuating suggestions into almost any mind, and such perfected and all-embracing organization for involving almost everybody, that they have been able to put the whole life of our country—personal, social, educational, religious, scientific, and political—on what almost everybody now takes to be a sound equalitarian foundation. Belief in equality has become the one orthodoxy that it is considered positively shameful and disreputable to question, and anyone who dares to challenge it will soon have all the New Inquisition bearing down on him to cow him into submission, or even to destroy him.

While all this change in our national life was taking place—it need hardly be argued—the best of our people, the descendants of the men who had formed the leadership class in Colonial days, who had shaped the ship of state in their minds, and built and launched it, men of knowledge, vision, judgment and responsibility, must have shivered as they witnessed all the folly to which the nation was being committed, year after year, and thought of the decay, the breakdown, the overthrow, the dictatorship, and the general catastrophe to which such a succession and accumulation of follies must inevitably lead. All their knowledge of history and the record of their own kind, and their very horse sense, must have told them that the whole conception of human equality was humbug, an asinine lie. They were aware that all political experience has driven home the lesson that no society can afford to be lavish or careless in handing out freedom and rights to its citizens. No man should have freedom who cannot be depended upon to balance it with a sense of responsibility, or have rights until he has learned to measure up to the duties that they impose. Any state that ignores this lesson not only invites disaster, but ensures it.

Indeed, all men who know anything at all, and who will stop to think, know that *any* society of some complexity, by the simple fact of its existence, is the very *denial* of equality. Not only is it true that free men are never equal, and that “equal” men (as under Communism) are not and cannot be free, but even more important, where men are assumed to be equal and seriously treated as if they were equal, whereas in fact they are nothing of the sort, any such thing as a society begins to break down. For in every society there has to be some measure of organization to ensure not only that the functions necessary to its existence get performed, but on the whole, get performed by those best qualified to perform them. And in the screening required to find those qualified, it soon stands out unavoidably, on every level,

that a few men are able to be leaders or builders, and the rest fall naturally into the category of the followers or the hodcarriers. And here any people of sound instinct and good common sense must soon realize that pretense and make-believe are disastrous. Assume all you like that sand is solid, if you build a house on it your house will fall. And a society that sets up a policy of making its generals out of corporals chosen at random will soon lose its battles and presently its life.

Not only is a man's sense of inner security threatened when he finds himself in a sea of alienness, with men all about him of different appearance, traditions, standards and historical records—as I pointed out a few pages back—but all this present effort to reshape the entire life of our country to an arbitrary concept of equality, to an assumption that all men should, and by law that all men shall, enjoy equal rights, without any invidious discriminations, could only *deepen* the White man's sense of insecurity. And this consequence was forced to the limit, and to a crisis, when the manipulators of mankind went on to assert and to insist that *racē* is of no consequence, that in fact no such thing as race exists, and that in any case all men have the same potentialities, without regard to what they look like, where they came from, or what record (or lack of record) they have behind them. In the last few decades, virtually all race consciousness has been drilled out of the heads of White people everywhere and almost entirely scared or shamed out of their hearts. In our orchestrated society, with the prostitute, traitorous professor beating time from his podium, and the politicians, publicists, playwrights and preachers, news commentators and labor leaders playing principal parts, our people as a whole—even our grown-up men—have learned, with the docility of children and the meekness and weakness of slaves, to chant in unison, as if hypnotized or under the spell of an African tom-tom, "All men are equal. All men are brothers." Dissent is smothered. Anyone who dares to change the tune, or the key, or the words, is forcibly thrown out and branded a pariah, a moral leper. Not only must every man subscribe to the doctrine, but he who fails to treat all other men as his equals proves himself mentally retarded and spiritually depraved, a creature hateful and contemptible.

Nevertheless, it would be interesting to know to what extent the White men, and especially Nordic White men, *beneath the surface*, have felt any inner resistance to all this indoctrination, this hounding and brandishing of the whip. A reliable poll on the matter might turn up some very significant revelations. But in any case, the indoctrination must inevitably have driven a cleft into the very root of White men's inner being. For it alienated them from their past, from their identification with their own kind and the record of their kind from time immemorial. It clashed with their pride in their ancestors, who had not only *felt* and *asserted* their *superiority*, but in the civilizations that they had created, one after another for literally thousands of years, they had *demonstrated* their superiority to the general run of humanity. Thereby they had proved in living and irrefragable fact the imbecility of the whole equality idea. Moreover, it clashed with their sense of truth, and with their daily experience of the worth of one man as compared with that of another, and often collided head-on with their very instincts and intuitions, those subtle forces that in all well-constituted men and women are at once so forceful, so intractable, and so unamenable to instruction and indoctrination. Repeatedly, in unguarded moments, it may suddenly have come over them, no matter how much they might have *tried* to feel as they had been told they ought to feel, that that was not at all the way they *did* feel. In fact, now and then, they had felt their gorge rising as they saw, on a TV screen or in a movie, a beautiful blond young woman, the potential mother of

equally beautiful children, depicted in the arms of a cocky young Negro. And then perhaps their thoughts have turned to the Negro birthrate, by which Blacks are steadily gaining upon the Whites by their sheer numbers, or to the enormously disproportionate rate at which indolent Negroes settle themselves on "welfare," whom White taxpayers have to carry, and in order to do so go without children of their own. White men may be naturally easygoing, kindhearted and generous: they like to lend a hand to a man in trouble. But actual close-up experience of the Negro may force them to observations that make them increasingly skeptical of the whole idea of equality. As we saw in my last chapter, the more Negroes are made "free" and "equal" and "given a chance," the more it seems that they stab, and rob, and rape, and riot, and murder, and have illegitimate children, and run off and leave their families—at a rate 10 to 15 times that of White men. Their average record in school is consistently miserable, and falls far below the average record of White children. And even after fifty years of enjoying increased opportunities and a vast general improvement in their environment, they still make a shambles of model apartment houses especially provided for their benefit²³ and show no increase whatever in their average intelligence.²⁴ And when all this suddenly comes over White people, as sometimes it must, perhaps they find themselves bursting out in a loud laugh, a laugh full of disgust and contempt, as it occurs to them that Communists and Liberals and Church people are still claiming that Negroes, out of the darkest of savage Africa, where on their own they have never produced a written language, or a book, or a ship, or a bridge,²⁵ given a few years of exposure to the same cultural opportunities as are commonly enjoyed by White people, they will produce their full share of Homers, Raphaels, Shakespeares, Newtons, and Bachs! And whenever an awareness of this hideous nonsense dawns on White men, they recognize, with grim finality, that only an ignoramus, a Negrophile zealot, or a scheming enemy of the White man can talk of *equality!* Surely, to believe in such nonsense is to reach the height of imbecility.

But if, now and then, one of the more vigorous and intelligent of White men does thus suddenly find himself in the grip of a great disgust, an indignation and an anger which he cannot control, and is moved to rise up and fight the smothering sense of blackness that has settled down upon him and all he loves, and try to arouse others of his own kind to fight it with him, in most cases it proves to be little more than steam, a passing emotion, which soon subsides.

There are two reasons for this. One is that cleft, already referred to, which has been created in the White man's mind and soul. His traditions, his record, his instincts, his respect for his own thought processes and his own judgment as to what is true and false, right and wrong, have come to be shaken by the conflicting indoctrination he has undergone, by the prestige and the apparent authority of those who declare with an air of absolute certainty and moral superiority, that his instincts are untrustworthy, belong to the past, and must be repudiated and stepped on—or better yet, torn out by the roots. The inevitable result in the White man's soul tends to be indecision, doubt, moral paralysis, inability to make a firm judgment or to take any stand, a surrender to a disposition to drift, to go with the crowd, to avoid any fight over what, after all, may be an uncertainty. Such a man has in effect been knocked out. He may be one of "the dispossessed majority," who have let their country pass out of their hands into the control of aliens and enemies, but rarely will he be able to rouse himself to do anything about it.

The other thing that keeps him from acting upon his disgust, his indignation and anger when they seize upon him, is the fact that he does not know where or how to lay his hand, with any certainty, on those who are of his own kind, his own race, who could be counted on to stand with him. Actual effort to find them may only batter it into his consciousness that not one Nordic man in a thousand has even any awareness that he so much as constitutes a distinct biological type, or what the features are that distinguish this type from all others. And if they meet an exceptionally noble specimen of their own type—tall, long-headed, with hair like burnished gold and eyes as clear and blue as the cloudless sky, nothing so much as stirs within them. Or if something did stir, and pride made their hearts to beat faster, would they not stifle the feeling? Has it not been drilled into their heads, and most of the way even into their hearts, that race is nothing, that feeling for race and pride in race are a mark of degeneracy and to be ashamed of? Very few indeed have any glowing knowledge of how supremely glorious the Aryan-Nordic record is, or any sense of themselves as heirs and trustees of a rich and wonderful heritage, or any vital realization of a flesh and blood bond with those who created it. They never think of themselves as connecting links between a great past and the possibility of an even greater future, which waits upon them for its fulfillment. Yet *without* such knowledge, such memories, such awareness and feeling, how *can* any Nordic man, having suddenly become aware of the catastrophe that hangs over his people, find a way to call them to arms? There is no flint left from which to strike fire, no memory, no pride, no vital quick to be touched. There is no consciousness of a single identity and a common welfare, universally understood and acknowledged wherever Nordics go, no consciousness of the same ideals, traditions, memories, standards binding them all together in a passionate mutual loyalty, devotion, and readiness both to strive and even to die for the common good. Without such solidarity, there is no way by which, in an hour of supreme peril, the strength of one can suddenly be multiplied into the strength of millions. There is no means, in fact, by which they can even find one another in a crowd. They have been gradually broken down into a loose collection of separate units each pretty much fending for himself, and often, it seems, virtually lost in a motley mass of humanity.

But such a condition cannot fail to make any people shaky with an instinctive sense of their weakness. In truth, without a strong, pulsing sense of race to hold them all together as solid as granite and to give meaning and direction and drive to their existence, no people can long hold together. It must be only a matter of time until some astute enemy, alive to the realities of history and to the make-up of the human psyche, will exploit the fact that the destruction of a people's consciousness of its race is *one of the surest ways to prepare it for its slaughter*. Has it never occurred to any of my readers that it is for precisely this reason that today all race consciousness, all recognition of the significance of racial differences and even of race itself as a reality, has been made taboo among us?

My reader must now realize how literally desperate, in my view, the plight of the White man, and in a special sense Nordic White man, is. In what I have been saying, I felt no concern, and no need, to fit my conclusions into the theories of Spengler, or Toynbee, or James Burnham, or anybody else. I have not been trying to form any general interpretation of history. I am confronted with a body of indisputable facts. Something has gone wrong with the White man's world, and with the White man himself. He is sick, and his world is falling to pieces. And my primary concern has been to find out what is at the bottom of it all, and what we can do to pull things together and save ourselves. I have felt this concern from the

beginning of this book, and in every chapter of it that I have written. Much of what seems to me to have gone wrong, I have already laid bare. It remains now to try to go to the bottom of our principal *racial* problems. The problems of the Negro, of the Jew, and *within ourselves* are absolutely crucial. In wrestling with them, as already plainly stated, I have not been looking for, and can have no patience with, any mere palliatives or alleviations. I am too much the realist to be very confident that our people, in their confused and spiritless state, will still have the strength to impose on themselves the measures necessary to their salvation, or even that they will have time to carry out such measures before the direst of catastrophes will sweep them into subjugation and slavery. But whether it be for action within the time still left us, or for the later time when we may have broken our chains and are struggling to accomplish a resurgence, it will be of absolutely crucial importance that we have completely realistic understanding of those basic racial problems which have played so large a part in our present undoing. And surely our people, as long as there is any hope left in them, *once they have realized that if they do not find a real solution they must die*, will find a solution—and put it into effect.

B. The Negro in Our Midst

If the Negro is not removed from the United States, the future American will be a mongrel, such as the peoples of Egypt, India, and certain of the Latin American countries . . .

When two races come into contact, one will expel the other from the commonly occupied or desired territory, or the races will adjust their differences through a process of inter-race breeding, creating a mongrel race differing from the parent races but with a tendency to eliminate the specialized characters of the parent races.

This result follows from the expression of biological laws and cannot be altered by educational program, legislative decree, or any amount of philanthropic interest. The characters of the higher race will tend to be obliterated in the mongrels.

Earnest Sevier Cox—*White America*

Our most obvious, glaring, and inescapable racial problem consists in the 22 million Negroes in our midst. Since they are human beings, perhaps in most cases with sensibilities like unto our own, I want to see it handled not only with all possible understanding and patience, but also with generosity. Let us begin, therefore, by honestly studying the welfare of the Negro people.

The Negroes—Side of the Problem

I realize full well that, after a fashion, they have rooted themselves in our land and in American society, but I believe it to be undeniable fact, which remains fact no matter how much anyone may regret it, that there can be no satisfying future for our Negroes in our midst. For in our midst, in the first place, they will never feel that freedom to relax and be themselves which is so essential to all self-realization. Moreover, here, as long as they are

assumed to be on a plane of equal capability with us, they are brought into a direct competition with White men in which, in the White man's technological society, it is utterly impossible for them to hold their own. This is true on all levels and in all categories, but of course it hits hardest those who have no White blood in them. They are being pushed into our colleges, and even into our professional schools, and given degrees, but the whole wretched business is made possible only by lowering the requirements and standards for Negroes, almost to the point of abolishing them. And the Negroes must know it, and know too what it means.

This inferiority is first brought home to them in our integrated public schools, and it virtually condemns them to a permanently inferior position. "The result is that the majority of them are . . . psychologically injured in a very serious manner. In fact, the racial hate welling up from the Negroes who are victims of this integration policy is evidence of the great damage which is being done."²⁶ What this means is that those who put ambitions into the heads of Negroes, which they are inherently incapable of measuring up to, are inflicting a monstrous cruelty upon them.²⁷ That Negroes feel this acutely is evidenced by the fact that millions of them, as I shall presently relate, have repeatedly sought an opportunity to escape from the frustration, humiliation, and pain of it all.

We must conclude, therefore, that there is no place for the Negro in our society—no place that, in the long run, can prove satisfying or desirable even to him.²⁸

The Side of the Whites

And as far as we White people are concerned, the Negro presence in our midst must ever-increasingly prove a torment, a crushing burden, and a most fearsome peril. I know that our people are naturally lenient and indulgent. But they can get their backs up, too, and the way things are going, it is possible they will do so soon. When they discover that the more the Negro is "given opportunity," and excused and pampered and favored even above Whites, the more he runs amok, ruins neighborhoods where White men have made their homes, corrupts their children on school buses, drags down our entire system of education, ambushes and murders our police, and plans to use the tactics of guerilla warfare that he learned in Vietnam to bring down our whole social order—at this our White people's patience may wear thin, and they may balk against footing the bill.

But I won't dwell upon this further, for the simple reason that to do so would, I fear, be a waste of time. The fact is that the United States long ago passed out of the control of its citizens. Our fate now is almost entirely in the hands of alien masters. And however much the presence of the Negro may come to gall us, however much we may balk at carrying taxes piled ever higher to meet the costs of Negro backwardness, shiftlessness, illegitimacy and crime, and however much our alarm may mount as we learn of his determination to stab us in the back, perhaps in an hour of mortal crisis, I must remind my readers that masters have always been ready to resort to sterner means when milder ones failed. Have we not seen, at Little Rock, at Oxford, Mississippi,²⁹ and at many other places, what "our own" soldiers, under the orders of our alien masters, can do with guns and bayonets? Our Negroes, from the beginning, have been deliberately incited, trained, organized and financed in order to serve as the battering ram to level the walls of our society, and, after the revolution has been

accomplished, to beat all remaining opposition into a pulp. And having already got so far toward accomplishing what all along has been their aim, it is hardly likely that our masters are going to relieve their pressure upon us because we find it painful.

Let us therefore dismiss all such considerations and get on to what after all is the crux of the matter.

Mongrelization the Inevitable Result of Close Association

The crux of the problem is that if Blacks and Whites go on living side by side, it can be only a matter of time until the White race is virtually swallowed up in the Black through miscegenation.

I will not labor the point by adding substantially to the evidence in support of my position that I submitted in my last chapter. In the long run, segregation has never, anywhere, sufficed to prevent amalgamation—not even in India, where the Hindus went so far as to impose the death penalty on those who allowed their sexual relations to cross the color line. It has obviously failed in our South. Regardless of how sexual relations were induced, they have come about so largely that today competent geneticists estimate our Negro population, taken as a whole, to be one-quarter White. And now the obstacles set up by segregation have been swept aside, and “the law of the land” actually works *for integration*. Indeed, moral respectability, propaganda, and the massed powers of Government, both State and Federal, are being mobilized to jam integration through. The aim is to have the Negro accepted into our White man’s society as if race were nothing, as if racial differences were non-existent, as if the Negro were in fact simply a White man with a dark skin. Completely ignored is the fact that by three-quarters of his genes the average Negro, and the pure-blooded Negro by all his genes, still carries the same factors that only two or three hundred years ago made his direct ancestors unable to rise above the black abysses and stark horrors of plain savagery.

And the drive for integration is working exceedingly fast. The National Council of Churches has openly given intermarriage its full sanction. Norman Podhoretz, one of Jewry’s leading intellectuals, editor of *Commentary*, one of its most influential journals, has given it as his conclusion that amalgamation, miscegenation, is the only solution of our Negro problem, and the best one.³⁰ And Senior judge William H. Hastie of the U.S. Court of Appeals has said:

“During the last 25 years, we have succeeded in outlawing the entire complex of legal requirements and prohibitions which imposed racial discrimination in almost every aspect of community life: in the armed services, in voting, in public education, in travel, in access to places of public accommodation, in access to housing . . . The elimination of black ghettos during the next 25 years should be no more difficult than the elimination of racial laws during the last 25 years, if enough people work diligently and purposefully to that end.”³¹

The full significance of this prediction can be appreciated only by those who realize that it is confirmed by the most powerful voices and forces in the nation. Nothing is now left to prevent the establishment of the Negro in our midst as one of our own except the White man’s instinct, his race “prejudice,” his “racism”—and for decades every effort has been

concentrated on expunging this from his consciousness as something false, benighted, and shameful. Moreover, as yet there is little evidence that these "spiritual" forces of the White man are going to stand up under the relentless pressure. Bit by bit, the White majority, even the Nordic majority, are being eased, argued, tricked, cowed, and shamed into accepting integration—the acceptance of the Negro into our society as if he were, or could eventually become, our equal, and equal to taking his full part in our White society.

White men have become so used to living with such a prospect, though completely unaware of the developments that would inevitably lie beyond it, that I feel compelled to warn my readers, once again, of the fearful disaster and tragedy that it must lead to. There is scientific testimony of the highest order that "large-scale miscegenation between Caucasians and Negroes spells genetic catastrophe." It would mean the destruction by one-half of that leadership class without which no high civilization can survive.³²

We need, therefore, to pause to look where we are going, and to weigh carefully, as responsible citizens, whether where we are headed is where we want to go. As it happens, history provides us with an extremely vivid and instructive object lesson, not from the remote past but from almost under our noses. In the history of modern Portugal, with which our country has been running a close parallel, we can see with our own eyes what integration must soon bring us to in the United States. Let me review Portugal's record, taken largely from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th Edition.

The Lesson of Portugal

Racially the Portuguese had much the same background as Spain. But from rather obscure beginnings she "rose in four centuries to be the greatest maritime, commercial and colonial power in Europe."³³ She carried on the work of exploration of the Middle Ages, and by about 1550 had risen to a position similar to that of the U.S. today. She was the wealthiest and most powerful country in the world. She had a large empire and colonies in Asia, Africa, and America. By 1500, she had penetrated as far as Greenland. Her people were a race of highly civilized, intelligent and daring men. "This influx of wealth furnished the economic basis for a sudden development of literary and artistic activity. . . The 16th century was the golden age of Portuguese literature. . . palaces, fortresses, cathedrals, monasteries were built on a scale never before attempted in Portugal. . . Oriental splendour and Renaissance culture combined to render social life in Lisbon hardly less brilliant than in Rome or Venice."³⁴

But at the same time, in contrast with England, Scotland, Ireland, and the countries of Europe generally, Portugal had a large and rapidly growing Negro population. And its White population was being drained by emigration to the colonies in America, Africa and Asia, and in all likelihood, by a lower birthrate as well. Portugal began to import Negro slaves in 1441, and continued at such a rate that by 1550 one-tenth of its people were Blacks. (Let it be remembered that the Negro population in the U.S. today counts up to 11 percent of our total.)

At the same time, as is rapidly coming to be the case with us too, there was no law and no taboo against sexual relations with the Negro. In consequence, it was not long until the Negro blood was so thoroughly absorbed by the White population that it virtually

disappeared. *The New York Times Encyclopedic Almanac* for 1971 states that “the present population [of Portugal] is one of the most homogeneous in Europe, with no national minorities.” Mr. Ray Irving Peterson, in an article entitled “The Negroes’ Gift to Portugal,” published by the National Youth Alliance in 1972, says:

“What you can see in Portugal today is the product of a uniform nonselective mixing of 10% negroes and 90% whites into one homogeneous whole. In effect it is a new race—a race that has stagnated in apathy and produced virtually nothing in the past 400 years. The *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th ed., 1911, in its article on Portugal states: ‘The Portuguese intermarried freely with their slaves, and this infusion of alien blood profoundly modified the character and physique of the nation. *It may be said without exaggeration that the Portuguese of the “age of discoveries” and the Portuguese of the 17th and later centuries were two different races.*’ (Emphasis added)

“The contribution of this new race to civilization in terms of literature, art, music, philosophy, science, etc., has been practically zero. Portugal today is the most backward country in Europe. 32% of the people are illiterate. . . The infant mortality rate in Portugal is 59.2 per 1,000 births [as against 20.7 in the U.S., 12.9 in Sweden, and 28 in the Soviet Union]. The workers’ wages are the lowest in Western Europe. . .

“Portugal is a forgotten land—bypassed by tourists and shunned by scholars. It is a sad country, known mainly for its plaintive . . . nostalgic music that looks to the past and sees no future.”³⁵

Doubtless there were other causes that contributed to Portugal’s downfall, but there was one that seems obvious and was outstanding: her people mixed their genes with those of Negroes. And as Carleton Putnam has justly observed: “There has been no case in history where whites and blacks have integrated without destruction of the white civilization.”³⁶ Or as Earnest Sevier Cox put it: “Sixty centuries of race history have proved that the white man has at no time or place remained white when in prolonged contact with colored races.”³⁷

Thus it is suddenly brought home to us where we White men of the West really stand. To a foreign-born Jew such as Norman Podhoretz, whose primary loyalty may be to Israel and the fulfillment of a dream that will make Jews the masters of the world, integration may naturally enough seem “the best” and in any case “the only” solution of our Negro problem. Likewise the washed-out “Liberal,” who has no roots anywhere, and to whom therefore it is a matter of indifference what becomes of his own race so long as some collection of human beings survive to carry on “culture,” is quite ready to settle for any resolution of our Negro problem that will most certainly save him from unpleasantness and strenuous exertion. But for every White man who truly and deeply loves his country and his kind, who feels that racial integration has pulled the very earth out from under him, amalgamation is no solution at all. It is and can be nothing but a sentence of death. But is there any solution? And if so, what is it?

The Only Real Solution

I have studied and weighed this question very carefully for many years. And it is my considered judgment that the only course in which we can find *any real solution* is the return

of the Negro to Africa.³⁸ Every other road, as we have seen, must lead ultimately to amalgamation, and amalgamation would mean our death, whether as a nation or as a race. It must be the only solution also for any other country of Nordic men, such as England, which now has a sizable Negro problem on its hands, and likewise for Germany, Australia, New Zealand, and even South Africa and Rhodesia.

Moreover, any objective study of the problem must reveal that *if* the repatriation of the Negro *would* be accomplished (of course, in as humane a way as possible), it would indeed be the best for all concerned.

For the Negro it would mean his removal from a competition with Whites in which, whether it be in school or on the job, he must constantly be defeated and humiliated, and thus permanently embittered. Only when he is back in the habitat to which he was adapted by thousands of years of natural selection, can he come fully into his own and be in a position to show what he has in him.

And for the Whites, the removal of the Negro would mean relief from a burden of taxation that is becoming more and more insufferable, and also from the deterioration of our entire society and the menace to our very existence that results from having 22 million more or less disaffected Negroes in our midst.

The Back-to-Africa idea is nothing new. It was implicit in Jefferson's declaration that "the two races [Whites and Negroes], equally free, cannot live in the same government," and in Lincoln's pronouncement in 1858 "that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality."³⁹

From this Lincoln went on to an espousal of Negro repatriation, or colonization. In his view, if the United States was to remain White the Negro must be altogether removed from our soil.⁴⁰ Even while the Civil War was still raging he conceived a plan for colonization and proposed an amendment to the Federal Constitution that would have authorized Congress to carry it out. In fact, on August 15, 1862, Congress did appropriate over half a million dollars for colonizing freed slaves, and some thousands of Negroes had actually been repatriated when he was shot.

Nor were Lincoln and Jefferson alone in their idea. Earnest Sevier Cox, that great and very dedicated student of the Negro problem, who probed it with so much understanding and sympathy and yet so deeply, and faced it so unflinchingly, records that many other great Americans, both before and after the Civil War, shared their conviction that the Negro must be completely removed from American soil—notably, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Clay, Webster, Douglas and Grant.⁴¹

Even outstanding Negroes have undertaken to launch a movement for the return of their people to Africa. The most famous of these was Marcus Garvey, "destined to be the greatest advocate of race progress, race integrity, and race nationality, that the Negro race has produced."⁴² "His efforts to revive Abraham Lincoln's Back-to-Africa program left such a deep impression in Congress that the program is better known [there] than among the

general public.”⁴³ To facilitate the return of Negroes to Africa he organized the Black Star steamship line. His Universal Negro Improvement Association is said to have enrolled more than six million members.⁴⁴ And to this day Garvey “remains the patron saint of Black nationalism.”⁴⁵

Even as recently as July 17, 1956, I had a letter from Mr. Benjamin Gibbons, President of the Universal African Nationalist Movement, in which he said:

“It is a fact, there were 2,000,000 Americans of African stock signed a petition in 1938 requesting the Federal government to aid them to go to Africa (the Republic of Liberia, West Africa) to live. The record of those signatures is on file in Washington, D.C. right now.

..

“Another fact is that at this very time there are more than two million African-Americans in this country who want to go to Africa to live . . . our expressed wishes to go to live in Liberia are motivated by the urge to do something to help ourselves, economically and socially. . .”

Unfortunately the American general public got little wind of this. Those who control the mass media have seen to that. And it must be allowed that the N.A.A.C.P. opposed the movement. Mr. Gibbons, however, in his letter, went on to explain this: the N.A.A.C.P. has always been controlled by Jews.⁴⁶ And it is used by them as an instrument for the furtherance of their basic policy. They are not in the least concerned with any betterment of the Negro’s future that might result from his return to Africa. They value him only for the part he can play in tearing the U.S. to pieces, and in doing the dirty work of the mass terror when the day for revolution arrives.

But even when allowance has been made for all this, it is certain that today the very suggestion of returning the Negro to Africa would immediately be met with three objections: (1) As a result of the Civil War citizenship was given to Negroes born in the U.S., and they now have as much right to remain here as the Whites; (2) it would be monstrous cruelty to the Negroes to uproot and expel them; and (3) in any case the expense would be absolutely prohibitive.

In reply to the first, I would call attention to the incontrovertible fact that the Fourteenth Amendment, which is supposed to have given citizenship to our Negroes, was never legally ratified by three-fourths of the States of the Union, as required by the Constitution itself. David Lawrence, in an editorial entitled “The Worst Scandal In Our History,” published in *U.S. News*, Sept. 27, 1957 and republished Jan. 26, 1970, declared this fact to be established by “the undisputed record, attested by official journals, and the unanimous writings of historians.” He succinctly laid bare what the record was and quoted the judgment in regard to it as expressed by a number of historians in particular, conservative, “liberal,” distinguished and authoritative—W.E. Woodward, Morison and Commager, James Truslow Adams and Andrew McLaughlin. It would seem, therefore, that though today our Negroes are universally accepted as our fellow citizens, the plain fact is that, by the Constitution, legally and of right, they are not citizens, and that though it would still be possible to confer citizenship upon them, it is certainly the right of those who are citizens now to make their

own welfare and that of our country the matter of paramount importance, and in the light of this to count our Negroes as aliens and to remove them from our shores, if we wish.

In reply to the second objection, I would ask whether the really great and ruinous cruelty to the Negro might not be his forced continuance here, where he can have no future worthy the name except as we accept free and full intermarriage with him, which in turn must destroy our own race, as it has every other that has ever tried the experiment. And then, why should it be looked upon as so cruel when so many millions of Negroes have manifested an eagerness to go to Africa?

The Negro Must Go or the White Man Dies

In any case, the White man in the U.S. is confronted with the grim dilemma: *Remove the Negro or die!* From this, there can be no escape. And no greater right is known to man than the right to save his own breed and his own civilization from destruction. In fact, the Jewish Moscow government, though neither the existence of that government nor the existence of the Communist movement was at stake, nevertheless, for the mere furtherance of both, not only moved millions of people from Sudetenland, the Baltic States, the Balkans, and other countries—to replace them with other human beings of totally different stock, but actually murdered, starved or otherwise killed a total of from 25 to 45 million people.⁴⁷ Professor Carleton S. Coon, who is strictly a scientist, one of the greatest anthropologists living, and most emphatically not a propagandist, has said of the Russian Soviet Government:

“After the Germans had withdrawn from the Caucasus in World War II, several whole nations were killed off or deported, including the Volga Germans, the Chechen and Ingush in the Caucasus, the Crimean Tatars, and the Kalmucks.”

This, he says, was in furtherance of a policy of replacing “tribes and nations [which] were not becoming good soviets as rapidly as had been hoped,” and in order to “obliterate the native cultures where they conflicted with the Communist idea.”⁴⁸ *Mankind Quarterly* for October 1960 (p. 730) records that “the Soviet Government ordered the deportation of entire helpless minorities in southern European Russia.” The English jurist F.J.P. Veale, in his unanswered and unanswerable *Advance To Barbarism*, explains Soviet policy thus:

“The *raison d’être* of a Communist government, according to Karl Marx, is to build up a proletarian system of society. When persons or classes of persons are found who cannot be fitted into such a society, they are ‘liquidated,’ that is to say, put to death. No more question of justice enters into the matter than when, for example, a botanist who is trying to establish a new variety of flower. . . by selecting specimens possessing the desired qualities, ruthlessly throws aside those specimens lacking those qualities. . . In this entirely passionless spirit, Lenin and Dzerzhinsky had eliminated the aristocratic and plutocratic classes of Czarist Russia together with tens of thousands of Orthodox bishops and priests after the Revolution of 1917. . . The great majority perished [simply] because they could not be assimilated by the new proletarian state then being created.”⁴⁹

These millions of people were murdered, with torture and by bullets in the back of the head, by firing squads, by mass starvation deliberately contrived. They were moved in unheated

box cars in the dead of winter, or were forced onto the open roads with all their possessions abandoned except what they could carry on their backs. Thousands—even millions—of old and young and sick perished by the wayside.

In contrast to all this, such moving of Negroes as we propose, though to be sure, where necessary, it would have to be enforced, would be carried out with all possible humanity. Their way would be paid by our Government, they would be well fed and warmly housed, and be given a sizable lump sum of money to start them off on their new venture. That there would be hardship, especially emotional hardship, one must expect: millions of Negroes might feel that they were being torn from what had become their homeland, or at least, the home of their adoption. But however often we turn away from carrying out such a policy, we are always confronted with the awful warning: *Do This Or Die*.

Nevertheless, we find ourselves pursued by the tormenting reflection that though as a nation, and as a large division of the White race, we must die if we do not remove the Negroes from our soil, the expense would be absolutely beyond our means. The sheer cost of it would be prohibitive.

But I must raise the question whether such a notion will stand up under close rational examination. It seems undeniable that we have always had enough money for a war, even though in no war we have ever entered, has the whole quality and future of our life, let alone our very existence, been so at stake as it must be so long as the Negro remains in our midst. It is to be remembered, too, that the expense would be greatly mitigated by the fact that, at the same time, our tax bill for Negro "welfare," "relief," crime, and the like, would undergo a vast reduction. Also, the expense, whatever it might come to, would not fall upon us all at once but be spread out over at least twenty years. At the worst, therefore, the whole undertaking would certainly cost less than the billions of taxpayers' money we have squandered on Foreign Aid, and probably even less than on our space program. A recent report in the *U.S. News* stated that in the past fifteen years our outlay for this last has come to 48 billion dollars.⁵⁰ A like sum, divided among our five million Negro families (representing our 22 million Negro population), would provide about \$11,000 per family, or \$2,200 per individual. Spread out over 20 or 25 years, the allowance could be increased much beyond this. It would seem, therefore, that if we can afford billions to put a man or two on the moon, we could afford as much to ensure the most favorable conditions for the life of our entire people on the Earth, which after all is our natural, inescapable, and proper home.

That the obstacles to carrying out a policy of repatriation are indeed formidable, even to the point of being awesome, I am ready enough to allow. In fact, I am so aware of the befuddled and flabby state to which the American people have been reduced, that I am by no means optimistic that they will have the awareness and the realism to grasp the situation, or the firmness of mind and dogged determination necessary for mastering it. All I can do is to warn them—once again—that *if we fail* to remove all Negroes from our country—be the means what they may—*it will be our death*.

Our most glaring racial problem is the Negro. But our most critical racial problem is the Jew. Unless we master the Jew, he will see to it that we do not solve our problem with the Negro, for the simple reason that the evil the Negro can do is precisely one of the chief means the

Jew has chosen, and is depending upon, to accomplish our destruction and remove us from his path. We must at last, therefore, come to grips with the Jew.

C. The Jews

“The question of the Jews and their influence on the world past and present, cuts to the root of all things, and should be discussed by every honest thinker, however bristling with difficulties it is, however complex the subject as well as the individuals of this race may be . . .

“We who have posed as the saviours of the world, we who have even boasted of having given it ‘the’ Saviour, we are today nothing else than the world’s seducers, its destroyers, its incendiaries, its executioners.”

Dr. Oscar Levy

Because of the peculiar nature of the problem with which the Jews confront us, I must begin with a somewhat extended explanation.

The presence of the Jew in our society, like that of the Negro, is open to objection simply because his alienness destroys the homogeneity and the solidarity that are so essential to our survival, and even to our welfare as a people and to our historical significance. But the objection goes further than this. It is concentrated in the Jews’ peculiar psychology and character, and the place they have come to occupy in modern power politics.

How many Jews there are in the United States does not immediately concern me. It has never been by their numbers that the Jews have become a problem. But that they do constitute a problem of extreme gravity for our people was first brought to my attention about forty years ago by two of the most distinguished and high-minded men it has ever been my privilege to know. One of them was American, the other English. My talks with them, which proved so disturbing, came four years apart. This was away back in the Thirties. Yet for something like ten years I did nothing about the matter—largely, I think, because I did not know where or how to find reliable information about it. But gradually, as the years wore into the Forties and we lived through the Second World War, very disturbing allegations from seemingly authoritative sources reached me in such quantity that I felt compelled, as a responsible citizen, to put other work aside until, by unbiased, fearless and thorough investigation, I could decide whether all the fuss about a Jewish peril was only the bigoted and contemptible “anti-Semitism” that the Jews charged us with, or whether there was in fact something to it, and if so, how much. In consequence, the exploration of the Jewish question became my chief occupation for some years, and for a quarter of a century it has never ceased to be one of my most anxious concerns. In the early Fifties, I began to set down my findings, which I have since many times revised and expanded. It now constitutes quite a mass of material.

This array of facts, naturally, is not to be presented in any chapter. All I can do here is to sketch the conclusions that they have compelled me to draw, with enough supporting evidence, I hope, to disturb my reader into making an investigation of his own. However, though I cannot here present my supporting evidence in full, I can assure my reader that I have it ready. And in [Appendix II](#) to this chapter, I will supply a select list of books on the Jewish Question, the open-minded reading of which, I believe, should convince any intelligent, responsible White gentile that this is a matter that he dare not ignore.

- Section 1. Is There A Jewish Race?
- Section 2. The Jewish Money System
- Section 3. Control of a Nation's Money Should Be in the Hands of Its Government
- Section 4. The Bank "of England"
- Section 5. The Federal Reserve System
- Section 6. Depressions Deliberately Created to Plunder the People
- Section 7. What the Federal Reserve is Ultimately Driving At
- Section 8. The Only Sound "Backing" for a Money System
- Section 9. The Origin of the Hoax of the Gold Standard
- Section 10. Debt as a Means of Enslavement
- Section 11. An Outline of a Money System at Once Honest and Workable
- Section 12. Jewish Control of the Means for Shaping Public Opinion
- Section 13. Jewish Limitations: Everlastingly They are but Middlemen
- Section 14. The Doubtful Loyalty of the Jews
- Section 15. The Talmud, Full of Hate for Gentiles, the Admitted Basis of All Jewish Life
- Section 16. "The Jews Have Muzzled the Non-Jew Press"
- Section 17. The Jews—the Supreme Masters of the "Big Lie Technique"
- Section 18. The Jews' Record—from the Mouths of Jews
- Section 19. The Jews' Record—from the Gentile Point of View
- Section 20. The Author's Own Conclusions about the Jews' Record
- Section 21. The English Revolution
- Section 22. The French Revolution
- Section 23. The Rise of the House of Rothschild
- Section 24. The Industrial Revolution
- Section 25. The American Civil War
- Section 26. The First World War
- Section 27. The Balfour Declaration
- Section 28. The Russian Revolution of November, 1917
- Section 29. The Second World War
- Section 30. Hitler's Purpose—the Regeneration of his People
- Section 31. Hitler's Record
- Section 32. The International Money Power Declares War on Hitler
- Section 33. The Jews' Part in the War
- Section 34. The Aftermath
- Section 35. The Hoax of "The Cold War"
- Section 36. Our Invisible Government
- Section 37. The Line-Up of Forces in the Near East

Section 38.	The Solution of the Jewish Problem
Section 39.	The Problem of Ourselves
Section 40.	Our Hour of Deadly Peril
Section 41.	The Crucial Importance of Race
Section 42.	“Pure Race” is Something That Can Be and Must Be Created
-----	Footnotes to Chapter 19

Part C, Section 1

Is there a Jewish Race?

I will not haggle over the question of whether there is such a thing as a Jewish “race.” I am quite aware, of course, that for the most part the German Jews and those from eastern Europe are not even descended from the ancient Hebrew stock, but ethnically trace back to the Khazars, a warlike gentile nation of southern Russia who were converted to the Jewish religion in the eighth or ninth century.⁵¹ I am aware, too, that it was this branch of the Jewish nation that formed the terrorist gangs and did most of the dirty work of wresting Palestine from the Arabs. But in spite of this, and in spite of the evidence of other miscegenation that has entered into the making of the modern Jew—a matter which was objectively and thoroughly explored by “Cobbet” in the first chapter of his *Jews, And The Jews In England*,⁵² I incline to accept the agreement which seems to exist among some of the most outstanding modern scientists⁵³ and numerous Jewish spokesmen of the highest authority, that the Jews are not only a religious community but, even before Israel was launched in Palestine and when they possessed no homeland of their own, nevertheless did in fact also constitute a nation and a race. To meet the recognized realities of genetics and of history, as well as for all practical purposes, there seems to be no other acceptable answer.⁵⁴

Perhaps what the Jews themselves think about their “race” is of even more consequence for us than the pronouncements of the scientists. It is easy to show that, regardless of how the world may look upon them, they are in their own view a race, an identifiable entity, a people apart from all others, very closely knit, extremely self-conscious and exclusive, thoroughly organized and regimented, and very ably led. A few quotations will suffice. Theodor Herzl, the Father of Zionism, declared flatly, “We are a people—one people.”⁵⁵ *The Jewish World* (England) for Dec. 14, 1922, is more explicit:

“A Jew remains a Jew even though he changes his religion; a Christian who would adopt the Jewish religion would not become a Jew, because the quality of a Jew is not in the religion but in the race.”

Mr. Arthur D. Lewishof of the West London Zionist Association is more explicit still:

“If a Jew is baptized, no one will believe that he is no longer a Jew. His blood, temperament and intellectual characteristics have not been changed.”

Mr. Louis D. Brandeis, an adviser to President Wilson, a one-time Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and one of Zionism's chief promoters in this country, declared in 1919:

"No race ever defied assimilation so stubbornly and so successfully. . . Probably no important European race is so pure." And again: "Let us all recognize that we Jews are a distinct nationality of which every Jew, whatever his country, his station, or shade of belief, is necessarily a member. . . Organize, organize, organize, until every Jew must stand up and be counted—counted with us, or prove himself, wittingly or unwittingly, of the few who are against their own people." ⁵⁶

Of a like authority, and perhaps even more explicit, was the pronouncement of Leo N. Levi, President of B'nai B'rith (1900-1904):

"The distinctive character of the Jew does not arise solely from his religion. It is true that his race and religion are indissolubly connected . . . but whatever be the sense of this junction of the race idea with the religion, it is very certain that the religion alone does not constitute the people. A believer in the Jewish faith does not by reason of that fact become a Jew. On the other hand, however, a Jew by birth remains a Jew, even though he abjures his religion." ⁵⁷

From all this, it would seem obvious that whether or not *we* look upon the Jews as a distinct entity, and in one sense or another as a race, it is certain that *they* do so. In fact, I think that the only time that Jews try to evade acknowledgment of their race and insist that they constitute no more than a religious community, is when they fear that some discrimination based on race will stand in the way of their aims,⁵⁸ or when they want to divert us from thinking in terms of benefit to our own race. Right down through history, for all of 2,500 years, ever since the fifth century B.C., when Ezra and Nehemiah undertook, with the utmost severity, to break up and to prohibit all mixed marriages with gentiles,⁵⁹ at which point it may be said that the making of "the Jews" began, they have been marked by the most extreme and adamant exclusiveness toward all non-Jewish peoples. Indeed, there has been no other people on Earth that has been so ready not only to admit but to assert its race, or that has so arrogantly declared itself superior to all others, and so persistently and courageously, not to say fanatically, maintained itself separate. To this day, the law in the State of Israel will not permit the marriage of any Jew to a gentile. And in the eyes of any orthodox synagogue, a Jew who marries a gentile is set down as one who has died. Indeed, in the last analysis such an attitude on the part of the Jews is understandable. For only by such severity have they been able, a small minority, without a homeland, through the vicissitudes of centuries, to escape the fate that overtook the Ten Tribes of their co-racials *who were ready to mix*. They fear assimilation and integration as they fear death itself.

To be sure, this extreme devotion to their race, which causes them to give top priority to the promotion of Jewish interests, has rendered their loyalty to the countries of their adoption very dubious. In fact, it has led to a record of repeated *betrayal*, down through the centuries, of the very people who have taken them in. Cobbett cites several instances of this,⁶⁰ and in pages that will shortly follow, it will be recurring so constantly as to stand out as one of the most marked features of the modern Jewish character. And because it has so much bearing on the place the Jew should be allowed in a gentile society, I shall have occasion to enlarge upon it.

But there is another feature of the Jewish character that is of such crucial consequence for gentile understanding of the part that Jews have long been playing in the modern world, that I must call it to my readers' attention.

As we have seen, all peoples strive to better themselves, and universally this leads to a struggle for power.

But, naturally, each people chooses the weapons for its struggle that are best suited to the circumstances in which it finds itself, and which have proved most effective for getting what it wants. William Blake observed that those who are unable to make their way by strength tend to strive for mastery by turning to cunning.⁶¹

These few words of Blake almost sum up the modern history of the Jews. With what, it must be allowed, was exceptional intelligence (of a kind), a *hard core within* world Jewry (which, though only a small minority, has found ways to regiment virtually *all* Jews) long ago set itself to gain control of all the nations of Europe, and eventually of all the other nations of the entire Earth. (Evidence of this will begin to appear in later pages of this chapter.) Just because they have always been numerically small and yet were driven by a fierce will to dominate, they soon learned to make an art as well as a science of the hidden routes to power—by secrecy, by deception, by every sort of indirection, and by a complete lack of compassion or moral compunction. They learned, as it were, to break into houses by cellar windows and backstairs. They acquired skill at working under cover, in darkness. They became habituated to wearing masks, to putting on different faces for different occasions, and to talking out of both sides of their mouths at once. They studied to dissect the minds and souls of their intended victims, to discover their weaknesses that they might prey upon and seduce them, and their strong points that they might finally overcome them by instigating needless and useless wars in which their manhood and their treasure would be wasted for naught. Acting like the spirochetes of syphilis, they have worked and wormed their way into all the nerve centers of a social organism, and finally into its heart and into its brain, with a view to its destruction. All of this—let it be said openly and plainly—implies hostility, even what in the end may amount to murderous warfare. And it may mean more than a purpose to defeat and to overthrow. Ultimately, it may aim to bring a people to utter and irretrievable ruin.

The results that can be accomplished by this kind of warfare have proved to be literally devastating and earth-shaking, and yet the modes of its operation are so insidious that exceedingly few of our people have any awareness of what has been going on, and of what, in consequence, hangs over them. For one thing, they have lived in a false sense of security growing out of their very numbers. But more than that, it is a kind of warfare very contrary to their traditions and their instincts, and largely outside their experience. If a man clouts us on the head, as it were, we can pretty well be counted on to square off against him. But when we fight a man, we will do it openly. We are not looking for sneak attacks. We despise hitting below the belt. No matter what incidents may be told of Nordic men to the contrary, there is no denying that, from the days of the first Aryans in India and Persia down to the modern Scandinavians and British, the legends and sagas of our forefathers have held up before our people the ideals of honor, courage, truthfulness, and straightforward dealing.⁶² In consequence, when an enemy comes against us with poison bait, traps, lies, hypnotism, and

plausible suggestions, we tend to fall an easy victim. We have never learned to be on our guard against an enemy (especially an enemy within our gates) who has devoted the sharpening of his intellect to make him sly and wily, and thus we have left ourselves without adequate protection. Hence our people's need today to be alerted to the almost invisible siege that was long ago laid against them.

If anyone wishes to reach some understanding of what has been going on, he must begin by reaching back in time at least to the period just before the French Revolution (which for the first time set the Jew free to move without hindrance throughout our entire society), and by spreading out before himself the largest assemblage he can of relevant and incontrovertible facts. To this end, he must be willing to tread on forbidden ground, and to look into hidden and out-of-the-way corners. But with this done, if he will then allow his mind to rest, quietly and openly, upon the course of events for the past few hundred years (which has been marked by the steady advance of Jewry to a position of world-wide power, even to being within grasp of making itself the dominant world power), then he may suddenly discern that, for the realization of their aims, the Jews have worked by several different but coordinated means, all of which, for their successful operation, have required a great deal of stealth, of working in the dark or under cover.

Part C, Section 2

The Jewish Money System

One of these means is concentrated in the world of finance.⁶³ It has not been primarily a matter of manifesting a genius for making money or for actually amassing it in colossal amounts, though of course this of itself has weighed heavily. But primarily it has been a matter of setting up a money *system*, which the entire economic life of each nation was dependent upon, and which developed a power so vast and irresistible that it placed itself beyond all effective governmental interference, and thereby became in fact a power *above* government, a power that could bring even governments to their knees. A bird's-eye view of what Jewry has accomplished by this instrument I will leave, for the most part, until I come to sketch the Jewish historic record. Now I wish to concentrate attention on the instrument itself—especially on its significance as a means of power.⁶⁴

A friendly critic, after reading the first draft of my present chapter, told me that, in his judgment, this section should be omitted. But I have found it quite impossible to follow his advice. To begin with, money, in the largest sense, is the lever by which, above all else, Jewry has edged, and wedged, and pried the world of the White man into its present shape and condition, and into accepting its present aim and direction. By resort to this in every hour of crisis—as, for example, when the partitioning of Palestine was before the UN—they have consistently succeeded in forcing their will upon our people, to *their* great advantage and *our* great hurt. In short, to write about modern Jewry without setting forth the facts of their money power, would be like trying to present Shakespeare's *Hamlet* with Hamlet himself, its principal character, left out. Moreover, as I shall soon try to make evident, this power now hangs over us such a fearsome threat to the soundness of our whole life, and even to our very existence, that I could never feel that I had discharged my responsibility to my people

unless I brought the present peril home to them with all the force and vividness at my command.

However, I do not for a moment forget that when I attempt to write about the Money System, some of my readers may try to dismiss what I say on the ground that I am stepping outside the field that properly belongs to me—or, more bluntly, that I lack the training and the experience either to make a justifiable indictment of our present system or to submit a better alternative to take its place. And on this point perhaps I can, to a degree, meet them half way. At least, I will freely allow that in all my life I have never felt the slightest interest in the acquisition of money, or in all the mechanics of banking and the intricacies and ramifications of financial operations. To this day, the thought of such things leaves me absolutely cold. There is a sense, therefore, in which they are right who would charge that, in attempting to lay bare the Money System, I am out of my proper field.

But there is another side to the matter. The day came when, little by little, I began to be aware that the Money System had moral and spiritual implications. I discovered deliberate deception and betrayal and a purpose to ruin and to enslave. I discovered that for centuries it had had a steadily growing power of enormous significance in sidetracking and ditching the normal and natural development of the Western world, doing monstrous wrong and causing fathomless suffering. It was only then that I began to be aroused. And I should contend that if I now level my lance against the *evil* of our Money System, against the injury to our *life* it has caused, I am no more out of my proper place than I was in holding up the injury and menace of our unbalanced birth rate, or of our industrial system, or of the dogma of racial equality. Indeed, in matters of this kind, I should hold that every informed citizen, who has a conscience and is loyal to his people, has an inescapable duty to speak out and to act. There are evils so great that if any man knows about them and yet fails to cry aloud against them, he himself, by his very silence, becomes the accomplice of those who began them, and maintain them, and batten on them. And so, regardless of what anyone may say against it, I am resolved to speak out, to put before my reader what I have learned, to declare what I see and see ahead.

In view of the dominant importance that I attach to the moral and social implications of our Money System, it must follow that I have no intention of dragging my readers through the *mechanics* of its operations. What I am primarily concerned with is the *principles* that underlie it as a whole. Of course the system, any accepted system, as a going concern, whether it be the one we have or one to take its place, *must work*, must meet all the varied economic and financial necessities of our national life. But the matter of basic importance, the matter that must be settled first, is whether the whole thing operates to serve the welfare of our entire people, or to exploit and to ruin and finally to enslave them. Once it is firmly ensured that it exists primarily to serve the welfare of the people, it should be a relatively simple task for men of the requisite practical experience to work out an efficient and reliable machine for accomplishing this purpose.⁶⁵

Let me stress, too, that years of study and reflection have satisfied me that far too much is made of the argument that Money and the Money System are too complex for the layman's understanding. It is my impression that, as a rule, it is precisely to these relatively unimportant details—what I have called the mechanics of the System—that its powerful

founders, hangers-on, beneficiaries and defenders, with their subsidized books and college courses, deliberately turn attention, *with the purpose of discouraging investigation*, and thus *preventing* investigation and thought from discovering whose money it is, what is its purpose, and what injury it has done. By this course, also, they diminish the danger that, in the course of his investigation, the inquirer will discover what the essence of a *sound* and *honest* money system is, and how simple it is, and also how far removed it is from what we have. Professor Frederick Soddy (whom I introduce in Note 65) observed that “the mystery of money . . . has never been so carefully fostered as it is today.”⁶⁶

In fact, it was precisely such deliberate deception and obfuscation with which Ezra Pound expressly charged the System. In his characteristically blunt and pungent way he declared:

“Misunderstandings about money have been, and continue to be intentional. They derive neither from the nature of money nor from any natural stupidity of the public.” “The international usurocracy . . . aims at preserving intact the public ignorance of the usurocratic system and its workings.” (The “usurocracy” he defined as “the rule of the big usurers combined in conspiracy.”) “University textbooks, throughout the whole century of usury, known as the nineteenth, were written to maintain the domination of money, and to keep professors in their chairs.”⁶⁷

And Jeffrey Mark writes in the same vein. He argues cogently that the need is “imperative”

“For an impartial study of the [Money] system, based on an independent estimate of the available facts and discoverable processes, and carried out, as far as possible, without any reference to the standard textbooks of the professional economists. . . For it is, without doubt, largely through the agency of such textbooks and treatises that this circular hypnosis among the economists themselves, as well as among the working members of the banking and accountancy professions, is imposed and maintained. The majority of the textbooks are read almost entirely for examination purposes, in which an ‘unorthodox’ opinion (i.e., a common-sense reaction to obvious fallacies) would certainly disqualify the student and fatally jeopardize his chances of success in his profession. Some of these students, of course, eventually become the examiners of the next generation of gullibles, the orthodox succession is maintained, and so the vast fiction is perpetuated.”⁶⁸

“But what, after all,” my reader may exclaim, “did Ezra Pound know about our Money System, and who is this Jeffrey Mark, that we should pay any attention to what he says? And above all, just what reason has there been for the kingpins of our Money System to try to maintain any orthodoxy about it or to keep the public in the dark about what they are doing?”

My answer to the first question, which is certainly fair enough, I will put off for the moment, but as a preface to my answer to the second I would observe that it surely is in accord with universal human experience that any sustained and sedulous effort to hide something almost always implies a fear of having it uncovered, and with the fear, a *reason* for fearing. And in this case the efforts to maintain secrecy have been enormous, and my own inquiries into the reason for this have proved the consequent suspicion justified to the hilt. Without keeping my readers any longer in suspense I will tell them in advance what conclusion my

accumulation of evidence, carefully sifted through many years, finally forced upon me. I could find no way out of recognizing that our present Money System is the most fantastic, the most morally monstrous, the most treasonous and alarming affair in the history of mankind.⁶⁹

And if this brings a flush of hot anger to my reader's face let me only ask him to bear with me long enough to listen to the evidence that I am now on the point of submitting to him. And let him listen also to a few words that I want first to say about my sources of information.

All conspirators find it necessary to work in the deepest darkness of secrecy. All successful criminals become experts at hiding their tracks. And when the conspirator is the greatest power in the world, it acquires also a great array of means for discouraging investigation, and for stopping it. At this point, lest I seem unduly sensational, I will not mention the most extreme means. But from what I have revealed in previous chapters as to the means employed to keep the opponents of the equalitarian dogma from getting a hearing, to frustrate them and to wear them out, with a view to silencing them altogether, one can at least get an idea of the more immediate obstacles that confront any man who attempts to bring the evils of our Money System to the attention of the thinking public. Probably none of the publishers of greatest repute will even look at anything he writes. He may have to publish at his own expense. Thus he may be reduced to writing pamphlets instead of books. And when what he has to say is finished, be it in book or in pamphlet, he will likely lack both the facilities and the further money required for promoting its sale. It should not be a matter for surprise, therefore, if books on Money produced by minds independent of the hawk-eyed and ever-lowering Orthodoxy, are not very numerous. Knowledge of them, too, may be smothered out by damaging reviews by boot-licking editors and hacks. Their authors are likely to find themselves pounced upon and summarily dismissed—without any regard for truth or justice—as ignoramuses, crackpots, alarmists, or fevered enthusiasts. And such books are not the most likely to get into public libraries where investigators can easily have access to them. In consequence, he who would find out the truth about the Money System may have to turn himself into something like a sleuth. He must learn to look into dark, hidden, unlikely and perhaps forbidden corners, and ever to keep his eyes open for chance "leaks" of revealing facts that were meant to be kept tight secret. And not least, he must learn to recognize when a writer shows the signs and gives the evidence that he speaks the truth even when he comes without the cachet of authority—such signs and evidence as stand out in manifest earnestness, integrity, courage, and dedication. And he must also learn to note well when several writers, unknown to one another, bear essentially the same witness.

If this seems like apologizing for my sources, let me hasten to add that such is by no means the case. Among them are works by men of great distinction indeed, ranging over the past century. One cannot say that they did not know what they were talking about, for often they were men who had spent most of their lives as big industrialists, commercial promoters, or actually inside the banking system itself and helping to run it, or as incumbents of high political office where they were in a position to observe what was going on. Nor can one say that they lacked brains, for their writing commonly shows full and analyzed knowledge of

significant facts, and both their criticisms and their proposals make sense; they hang together, and they actually illuminate.

And then, beginning in the early Thirties, the suffering and indignation and thought incident to the fearful depression following upon 1929 brought forth quite a spate of books on the Money Question. A goodly proportion of them were designed to show up, in simple terms, what was wrong with our present system, and even to start a movement to replace this system with another more simple, more honest, and better calculated to serve the public good. Those whom I shall have occasion to quote or cite most often, I want to introduce to my readers, with their credentials, before I begin my story. But I have decided to put this introduction in [Appendix I](#) at the end of this chapter. There, I hope my reader will at least run through my notes about the sources on whom I shall chiefly depend, before he returns to follow me in my effort to lay bare before him here what our money system amounts to.

Though the matter goes further back, perhaps we may as well begin my story with the period following close upon the French Revolution—around 1800—when Meyer Amschel Rothschild was charting the course for the new banking venture he was launching upon the troubled waters of Europe. To his masthead he nailed the motto: “Permit me to issue and control the money of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws.”⁷⁰ Even at first glance, it is manifest that this is a highly cynical and essentially treasonous formula for circumventing, bypassing, and finally supplanting any legitimate government. It is not too much to say that therewith he and his five sons put out to sea as pirates, and that their chief banking centers—Frankfurt, Vienna, Naples, Paris and London—became something little better than corsairs’ hideouts. Their prey was the wealth of Europe, and they were to prove themselves the enemy of every one of its nations, and ultimately of the world. Within fifty years, according to Werner Sombart,

“It was no exaggeration to assert that in many a land the minister of finance who could not come to an agreement with this firm might as well close the doors of his exchequer. ‘There is only one power in Europe,’ was a dictum well-known about the middle of the 19th century, ‘and that is Rothschild.’”⁷¹

Part C, Section 3

Control of a Nation’s Money Should Be in the Hands of Its Government

From time immemorial it had been recognized that national “sovereignty inheres in the power to issue money and to determine the value thereof.”⁷² The prime prerogative of any free government is to issue money (that is, to create money, whether by minting coins or engraving bills, and to put it into circulation) in such amounts as may be necessary to pay for any work or cover any purchases that may be needed in the public interest.⁷³ So much is the issuing of money a mark of a government’s sovereignty, that whenever it is surrendered the government ceases to be the real ruler, ceases to be free, and becomes little better than a puppet in the hands of a power greater than itself, which it is forced to obey.⁷⁴ There can be no doubt therefore, that “the original intention in the Constitution of every nation was that

the control over the issue (and therefore the ownership) of the medium of exchange should be in the hands of their respective Emperors, Kings and Governments.”⁷⁵ Thus, for centuries, money actually *had* been issued by kings, debt-free; and thus, in our own country, where there was no king, the Constitution (Art. I, Sec. 8, Part 5) gave to Congress the power to coin money and to regulate its value (*to the end that the price level should remain stable, even from generation to generation*). And thus Lincoln, at the height of the Civil War, took the Constitution at its word, which, he declared, “gave to the people of this Republic the greatest blessing they ever had—their own paper to pay their own debts.”⁷⁶ He had Congress issue money, paper money, \$150,000,000 of it, backed by nothing but the wealth, the productive capacity, and the credit of the Northern States. It was full legal tender, good for all purposes for which money was used, and it was accepted and circulated then, and it has circulated ever since, completely debt-free. And thus were American taxpayers saved the interest payments that, even on such a small amount of money *issued as a loan*, would by now (February 1973) have amounted to about 20 billion dollars.

This matter of how money comes into existence is of enormous consequence for the American people and indeed for all our kind throughout the world. The question is whether money should be created as debt to the bankers, secured on the solvency of the entire people, or whether it should be created by the government, acting as the people’s agent, debt-free. What the difference is, and the practical consequences one way or the other, for the security and fortunes of every man, woman and child in the United States, and indeed for the future and fate of all mankind, are of such vast and critical significance that I must throw all the light that I can on the whole matter. Nowhere have I found it reduced to more simple terms than in an interview with Thomas A. Edison some forty years ago, at the time the financing of the Muscle Shoals project was under consideration in Congress. (The interview was published in the *New York Times*.) From this, I herewith quote what seems to me the most relevant and meaningful parts of his observations. Let my reader bear in mind that neither Mr. Edison nor Mr. Henry Ford, whom he cites in support of his views, was primarily a social theorist. Both were men of practical affairs, who had a great deal to do with our industrial development, who could speak from personal experience, and who were animated by a deep loyalty to the American people.

“Now, here is Ford proposing to finance Muscle Shoals by an issue of currency. Very well, let us suppose for a moment that Congress follows his proposal. Personally, I don’t think Congress has imagination enough to do it, but let us suppose that it does. The required sum is authorized—say \$30,000,000. The bills are issued directly by the government, as all money ought to be. When the workmen are paid off they receive these United States bills. When the material is bought it is paid for in these United States bills . . . they will be the same as any other currency put out by the government; that is, *they will be money*. They will be based on the public wealth already in Muscle Shoals; they will be retired by the earnings of the power dam. That is, the people of the United States will have all that they put into Muscle Shoals and all that they can take out for centuries—the endless wealth-making water power of that great Tennessee river—with *no tax and no increase of the national debt*.

“‘But suppose Congress does not see this, what then?’ Mr. Edison was asked.

"The Congress must fall back on the old way of doing business. It must authorize an issue of bonds. That is, it must go out to the money brokers and borrow enough of our own national currency to complete great national resources, and *we must pay interest to the money brokers for the use of our own money.*

"That is to say, under the old way, any time we wish to add to the national wealth we are compelled to add to the national debt.

"Now, that is what Henry Ford wants to prevent. He thinks it is stupid, and so do I, that for the loan of \$30,000,000 of their own money the people of the United States should be compelled to pay \$66,000,000—that is what it amounts to, with interest. *People who will not turn a shovelful of dirt nor contribute a pound of material will collect more money from the United States than all the people who supply the material and do the work.* That is the terrible thing about interest. In all our great bond issues the interest is always greater than the principal. All of the great public works cost more than twice the actual cost, on that account. Under the present system of doing business *we simply add 120 to 150 per cent to the stated cost.*

"But here is the point: *If our nation can issue a dollar bond it can issue a dollar bill.* The element that makes the bond good, makes the bill good, also. The difference between the bond and the bill is that the bond lets the money brokers collect twice the amount of the bond and an additional 20 per cent, whereas the currency pays nobody but those who directly contribute to Muscle Shoals in some useful way.

"If the government issues bonds it simply induces the money brokers to draw \$30,000,000 out of the other channels of trade and turn it into Muscle Shoals; if the government issues currency, it provides itself with enough money to increase the national wealth at Muscle Shoals without disturbing the business of the country. And in doing this it increases its income without adding a penny to its debt.

"It is absurd to say that our country can issue \$30,000,000 in bonds and not \$30,000,000 in currency. Both are promises to pay; but one promise fattens the Usurer, and the other helps the people. If the currency issued by the government were no good, then the bonds issued would be no good either. It is a terrible situation when the government to increase the national wealth, must go into debt and submit to ruinous interest charges at the hands of men who control the fictitious values of gold.

"Look at it another way. If the government issues bonds, the brokers will sell them. Why? Because the government is behind them, but who is behind the government? The people. Therefore it is the people who constitute the basis of government credit. Why then cannot the people have the benefit of their own gilt-edged credit by receiving non-interest bearing currency on Muscle Shoals, instead of the bankers receiving the benefit of the people's credit in interest bearing bonds? "The people must pay anyway, why should they be compelled to pay twice, as the bond system compels them to pay? The people of the United States always accept their government's currency. If the United States government will adopt this policy of increasing its national wealth without contributing to the interest collector—*for the whole national debt is made up of interest charges—then you will see an era of progress and prosperity in this country such as could never have come otherwise.*"

Part C, Section 4

The Bank of England

But all this, from the beginning, has been diametrically opposed to the aim of the money system designed by the big Jewish bankers. In their drive for power they have known full well where the crux of their problem lay, and have aimed at this as straight as a bullet goes to its target. Unvaryingly and relentlessly their purpose has been, by any and every means (commonly involving not only deliberate deception but downright treason), to induce the people of each nation in its turn to *surrender* the issuing of its money to *them*. They worked on the people's fears and innocence or ignorance: only money of the bankers' issuing, they claimed, would "have any backing"—meaning, would have any gold behind it. People simply would not trust government issued money not backed by gold, would not accept in payment for work done or goods sold unless it had intrinsic worth, or (in the case of paper) could be *redeemed* in something of intrinsic worth. Money, they went on, *could* not be "created." It could come into existence only as a loan from those who had it to lend, preferably a large and substantial institution like a bank, which could provide the security of really solid "backing" in gold or silver. Money that thus came into existence as a loan would, of course, like all loans, be subject to interest payments, and the interest payments, moreover, would be secured (that is, made sure of collection) on the taxation and solvency of the entire people. In short, the loans and the interest on them would be made as secure as the very existence of the nation itself. And always there was remorseless pressure that "the bank" should be the Jewish banking system, and always this has meant that the system be centralized in what was called a "national" bank.

This brings us to the very heart of the falseness behind the would-be money-masters' drive.

To begin with, as Thomas Jefferson said, "No one has natural right to be moneylender save him who has it to lend."⁷⁸ And the would-be money-masters did not have it to lend, or more exactly, they didn't begin to have as much as they lent. The bald fact is that most of our modern money, issued by a national bank as a debt against a whole people, does not even exist: as Soddy has put it, it "is imagined to exist and lent to borrowers as though it existed, for the purpose of bearing interest."⁷⁹ This has been the case ever since the founding of the "Bank of England." The background of this bank is revealing. In 1292, the Jews were expelled from England, and for almost 400 years were forbidden to set foot on English soil. But under Cromwell, shortly after the execution of King Charles the First in 1649, whose overthrow it would seem they largely financed, they were readmitted, and straightway swarmed in, especially from Holland, to replace Amsterdam with London as the financial capital of the world. In forty years, says Sir Esme Wingfield Stratford in his *History Of British Civilization*, they became the dominant financial power in the land.⁸⁰ This brings us to about 1690, and in 1694 came the founding of the "Bank of England." And in the manifesto addressed to prospective share-holders at that time, it was baldly stated that the Bank was to have the "benefit of all moneys which *it creates out of nothing*."⁸¹ (Emphasis added.) Christopher Hollis, in his *The Breakdown of Money*, gives some of the details:

"In 1694, the Government of William III [who had come in from Holland with the Jews] was in sore straits for money. A company of rich men under the leadership of one William Paterson [or was he, rather, merely their front?] offered to lend William £1,200,000 at 8 percent on the condition that 'the Governor and Company of the Bank of England,' as they called themselves, should have the right to issue notes to the full extent of its capital. That is to say, the Bank got the right to collect £1,200,000 in gold and silver and to turn it into £2,400,000 [that is, double it], lending £1,200,000, the gold and silver to the Government, and using the other £1,200,000, the banknotes, themselves. Paterson was quite right about it that this privilege which had been given to the Bank was a privilege to make up money. . . In practice, they did not keep a cash reserve of nearly two or three hundred thousand pounds. By 1696 [i.e., within two years], we find them circulating £1,750,000 worth of notes against a cash reserve of £36,000." That is, with a "backing" of only about 2 percent of what they issued and drew interest on.⁸²

But there is more to be noted about this "national" Bank of England. To begin with, its name itself was a deliberate misnomer. That is to say, it was a hoax, designed to create in people a confidence, which from the very first it was the bankers' intention to betray. This so-called "Bank of England" (and likewise the "Bank of Germany," the Federal Reserve Bank "of the United States," and all others modeled on the English original) are and always have been private institutions run for the private profit of their stockholders. The respective governments of the nations in which these "national" banks have operated have had virtually no control over them. The policy of each one has always been determined by what amounts to the absolute dictatorship of its own Governor and Board, it makes no public report of its operations or its profits, the list of its stockholders is not open to examination by any outsider, not even by any representative of the national government; and it may include on its Governing Board members who not only were foreign-born but actually still owe their primary allegiance to a foreign government.⁸³ A Warburg or a Rothschild, sworn citizen of Germany or France, may be members of the Governing Board of the "national" bank in Britain or in the United States. This certainly creates the possibility that the bank, whether it be the Bank of England, our own Federal Reserve, or some other, will be controlled in the interest of the enemies of the country in which it is located.

Furthermore, every one of the "national" banks was centralized. This was necessary, it was argued (as when the Federal Reserve was being foisted upon the American people back in 1913), in order to keep the value of money (the price level) unchanging from generation to generation.

Part C, Section 5

The Federal Reserve System

The idea of centralization, naturally, appealed to the American people, who were exceedingly anxious to have protection against the recurrence of those alternating booms and calamitous "busts" that had harrowed the nation for many decades,⁸⁴ and who believed that centralization could be effective in preventing them. But what the bankers wanted from centralization (and what in the end they got) was something totally different. What the

bankers wanted was not a banking system that would protect the people against the hazards and horrors of monetary instability, but rather one that would ensure their ability to produce just such horrors at will—their ability to change the value of money in whatever way would be to their own advantage,⁸⁵ and not only to rob the people but to control the entire nation, and ultimately all the nations.⁸⁶

It took a lot of exceedingly secret and skillful scheming by Paul Warburg, the foreign-born Rothschild agent who was sent across to hogtie the United States with the Federal Reserve, and most shameless and scandalous deception and planned treachery on the part of all those who took part in the conspiracy,⁸⁷ but the Federal Bill as passed placed the value of all the money of the country henceforth under the control of, and therefore the entire population at the mercy of, a mere handful of men at the center of a web. And many of these men, especially the dominant figures among them, as already said, may be devoid of any loyalty to this country whatever, may today even be using their influence in the Federal Reserve to pursue ends that would destroy this country. The people of the United States have no way of ascertaining what their loyalties or their primary purposes really are. But in any case and at the least, it is beyond question that these men whom the Federal Reserve Act placed at the center of the web are in a position to pull off a depression and precipitate a panic and widespread ruin almost as easily as any one of us can plunge a house into pitch darkness by pulling a switch. They can sit and wait, like spiders, until the country is well loaded with personal debt, such as time payments, and then, by suddenly calling in loans and making money scarce, they can bring widespread hardship and suffering and even utter ruin to everybody in the land who cannot meet his payments. They not only can do it, but they have done it—repeatedly. From the very beginning they planned to do it. It was because of their desire and determination to do it that they drove so relentlessly and unscrupulously to saddle the United States with the Federal Reserve. With that accomplished they would be able to precipitate depressions and panics at will, whenever it would be most to their own advantage, and then, catching people short, would foreclose and shovel the wealth of the country into their coffers by the carload. And I am told by financial experts that our country is in perfect condition for another such strike now (1973).

For support of my statement that the nation's price level and the purchasing value of money can be deliberately manipulated by the Federal Reserve, and that they have been deliberately manipulated over and over again to produce runaway inflations or fearfully ruinous depressions and panics, I refer my readers to Gertrude M. Coogan's *Money Creators*, pp. 42ff., and—especially—pp. 60-3. But I want also to quote from the evidence submitted to the House Banking and Currency Committee on March 18, 1932, by Senator Robert L. Owen, whose status in the financial life of the nation I have already presented:

“The panic of 1907 was caused by the deliberate contraction of currency and credit; the panics of 1920-21 and 1929-31 were due to the same identical cause. There can be no doubt about that; the record fully shows it; and those behind it went so far that they openly disclosed to the country the plan and purpose which forever put the plan upon the public records. It can never be erased.”⁸⁸

Part C, Section 6

Depressions Deliberately Created to Plunder the People

Mr. Owen revealed that there was a public document (Document 310, 67th Congress, 4th Session) recording the minutes of a secret Federal Reserve conference in May 1920, ordering a contraction of credit and resulting in the disastrous depression of that time. He made it evident, too, that it was the contraction of brokers' loans by Federal Reserve operations in the week ending October 30, 1929, which marked the beginning of the world slump. In that week, over two billion dollars of brokers' loans on account of out-of-town banks were withdrawn, and within the next three months twice that sum was withdrawn. In consequence, the value of all stocks and bonds fell from a third to one-hundredth of their former value, production was widely stopped, and 8,300,000 people thrown out of employment.⁸⁹ "You have got to deal with and prevent those who know how to destabilize credit for profit," said Mr. Owen.⁹⁰ But the most scathing exposure of the operations of the Federal Reserve, and the most unsparing denunciation of those responsible for them, came from Mr. Louis T. McFadden, whom I have already introduced in a recent note. Speaking in Congress on January 13, 1932, in the midst of the Great Depression, he said:

"It was in 1924 or 1925, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, during hearings, that I first discovered what our bankers were doing to this country, and I began an intensive study, from that time on up to the present time."

With the result that, five months later, on June 10th, 1932, he addressed Congress in the following fashion:

"We have in this country one of the most corrupt institutions the world has ever known. I refer to the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks. The Federal Reserve Board . . . has cheated the Government of the United States and the people of the United States out of enough money to pay the national debt. The depredations and iniquities of the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks acting together have cost this country enough money to pay the national debt several times over. . .

"Some people think the Federal Reserve banks are United States Government institutions. They are not Government institutions. They are private credit monopolies that prey upon the people of the United States for the benefit of themselves and their foreign customers; foreign and domestic speculators and swindlers; and rich and predatory moneylenders. In that dark crew of financial pirates there are those who would cut a man's throat to get a dollar out of his pocket; there are those who send money into states to buy votes to control our legislation; and there are those who maintain an international propaganda for the purpose of deceiving us and of wheedling us into the granting of new concessions which will permit them to cover up their past misdeeds and set again in motion their gigantic train of crime. . .

"On account of [the Federal Reserve's operations] we ourselves are in the midst of the greatest depression we have ever known. From the Atlantic to the Pacific our country has

been ravaged and laid waste by the evil practices of the Federal Reserve and the Federal Reserve banks and the interests that control them. At no time in our history has the general welfare of the people of the United States been of a lower level or the mind of the people so filled with despair.

“Recently in one of our states 60,000 dwelling houses and farms were brought under the hammer in a single day. . . 71,000 houses and farms in Oakland County, Mich., have been sold and their erstwhile owners dispossessed. Similar occurrences have probably taken place in every county in the United States. The people who have thus been driven out . . . are the victims of the dishonest and unscrupulous Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve banks. Their children are the new slaves of the auction block in the revival here of the institution of human slavery. . .

“Mr. Chairman . . . the man who deceives the people is a traitor to the United States. The man who knows or suspects that a crime has been committed and who conceals or covers up that crime is an accessory to it. Mr. Speaker, it is a monstrous thing for this great Nation of people to have its destinies presided over by a traitorous government board acting in secret concert with international usurers. Every effort has been made by the Federal Reserve Board to conceal its power, but the truth is the Federal Reserve Board has usurped the Government of the United States. It controls everything here and it controls all our foreign relations. It makes and breaks governments at will.”⁹¹

Part C, Section 7

What the Federal Reserve is Ultimately Driving At

Naturally, such an enormous concentration of power could be turned to much larger ends than the mere plundering of a whole people’s wealth. And Mr. McFadden did not stop short of specifying some of the ways in which it has been used to meddle in the affairs of other nations to the hurt of our own. He called members of the Federal Reserve by name, and in a long bill of particulars charged them with treason. He said:

“These twelve private credit monopolies [the member banks of the Federal Reserve] were deceitfully and disloyally foisted upon this country by the bankers who came here from Europe and repaid us our hospitality by undermining our American institutions. Those bankers took money out of this country to finance Japan in a war with Russia. They created a reign of terror in Russia with our money in order to help that war along. They instigated the separate peace between Germany and Russia and thus drove a wedge between the allies in the World War. They financed Trotsky’s mass meetings of discontent and rebellion in New York. They paid Trotsky’s passage from New York to Russia so that he might assist in the destruction of the Russian Empire. They fomented and instigated the Russian revolution and they placed a large sum of money in one of their branch banks in Sweden so that through him Russian homes might be thoroughly broken up and Russian children flung far and wide from their natural protectors.”⁹²

When anyone learns of these facts alleged by Mr. McFadden, now well established, one finds oneself wondering, as some fully informed men of acute mind and high position began to wonder even fifty years ago, what the Jews were driving at. I say "Jews," for though Mr. McFadden, like Dr. Quigley, rarely gave a plainly racial complexion to his charges, and though Mr. Skousen goes out of his way to repudiate the very idea of a Jewish conspiracy and would perhaps even deny the existence of a Jewish monopoly of international finance, it is nevertheless patent that the preponderance of Jewish names in all their discussions of finance stands out like a Jewish nose. Rothschild, Warburg, Kuhn-Loeb, Schiff, Lazard, Erlanger, Schroder, Seligman, Guggenheim. . . One may think of Morgan as an exception, but *The House of Morgan* by Lewis Corey (1930) and my examination of a report of the U.S. Government Resources Commission entitled *Structure Of The American Economy*, dated June 1939, gave me grounds for thinking that the Morgan dynasty was so interlocked with Kuhn, Loeb, the Guggenheims and the Warburgs, all leading finally to the House of Rothschild, that probably it too has long been a part of the Rothschild dynasty, which Professor Quigley (op. cit., p. 51) pronounces the greatest of them all. And as far as the Rockefellers are concerned, Gary Allen reports ("The Bankers," op. cit., p.9) that "the Rockefeller Chase Bank was later merged with the Warburgs' Manhattan Bank to form Chase Manhattan." And it is well known that at least for most of this century the Warburgs have always stood for the Rothschild power in our country. In consequence, it would seem inevitable that in any crucial issue, the Rockefellers too would have to bow to the general will of the Jewish international Money Power as enunciated by the House of Rothschild. Even in 1922, half a century ago, Hilaire Belloc observed that there was "already something like a Jewish monopoly in high finance." ⁹³

And what the ultimate aim of this essentially Jewish Money Power comes to, has been explicitly stated by Professor Quigley, himself "one of the elite 'insiders'." It is, he bluntly states on page 324 of his book:

" . . . Nothing less than to create a world system of financial control in private hands able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole."

In short, its aim has been, and is now, nothing less than world government, involving the destruction of the sovereignty of the U.S. and of every other nation on Earth. Mr. Skousen, in his commentary on Quigley's book, remarks that

"It is all the more disturbing because the facts in this part of his book fit perfectly with the world of reality in which we find ourselves. . . There is a growing volume of evidence that the highest centers of political and economic power have been forcing the entire human race toward a global, socialist, dictatorial-oriented society. . . In a nutshell, Dr. Quigley has undertaken to expose what every insider himself has known all along—that the world hierarchy of the dynastic super-rich is out to take over the entire planet, doing it—with Socialistic legislation where possible, but having no reluctance to use Communist revolution where necessary." ⁹⁴

And this fits in very well with the following observation of Jeffrey Mark:

“The struggle against finance, which is now working up to a stupendous climax in the United States, is essentially the same as that in which Abraham Lincoln joined and died. And as Seward knew then, so America should know now. The clash is not ‘accidental, unnecessary, or the work of fanatical agitators and therefore ephemeral.’ It is the beginning of another ‘irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces’ which may finally engulf not only the American continent but the whole of Western civilization.”⁹⁵

Mr. Mark wrote these words forty years ago. Since then the would-be masters of the world have taken firm and enormous strides toward their goal. The crisis and the denouement are now at hand. And in the light of what I have been saying about the power of Money, the Jewish money *system*, one may find oneself wondering whether a lot of portentous events of this century, which had long seemed unrelated and without adequate explanation, do not begin to fall in line as links in a chain of coordinated events deliberately planned. One may find it necessary to review the outstanding developments of one’s lifetime anew, and with a skeptical, questioning mind. What *uns* the *real* cause of the First World War? and of the Second? Who wanted them, and precipitated them; and how did it come about that the American people, manifestly against their will, were brought first into the one and then into the other? Who precipitated, manned, and financed the Russian Revolution of November 1917? How did the Jews get the promise of Palestine as a mere “*homeland*” and yet manage in the end to force a million Arabs into the desert and turn their “*homeland*” into the political state of Israel? How, in the negotiations at Versailles were they able to compel the seemingly almighty Woodrow Wilson to knuckle under to their demands and to accept in the Peace Treaty provisions that would make another world war inevitable? And how and why did it come about that the British Empire, the mightiest known to history, in the short span of some twenty years was reduced to impotence and virtually dissolved?

These, and other matters of like importance, I intend to examine more closely further on. But for the moment I let them stand as questions, and turn to what is the very crux of the problem we have under examination.

Part C, Section 8

The Only Sound Backing for a Money System

Everything about a money system hinges on credit. And this finally comes down, as the word itself implies, to trust. What must there be about one money, more than another, to make it *worthy* of a people’s trust, that can as a practical matter inspire them to do work or part with goods in order to get it?

The Jews, and the gentile hangers-on or converts to their system, have argued, as already said, that money, to be “*sound*,”⁹⁶ to be worthy of trust, had to be backed with gold. But, although this has a good ring, it is in fact false, and no one has known better that it was false than the goldsmiths themselves, the entire big-banking crowd. And at once to conceal their deception, and also to obtain the leverage that was implicit in their hoax, the bankers have developed all sorts of manipulations, of gold and movings of gold from one country to another in hours of crisis, which have been employed to work fearful injury to the nations of

the White man's world.⁹⁷ But I do not feel the need to go into all these manipulations and maneuvers, for the simple reason that I have some facts to reveal which I believe undercut the whole system and make it unnecessary to foot away one's time on trying to understand all its crooked workings and devious ramifications.

Part C, Section 9

The Origin of the Hoax of the Gold Standard

Students of the origins of the money system of the West, which in the final analysis is demonstrably a Jewish system, have made some interesting and very significant discoveries. The belief in the necessity of money's being backed with gold grew out of a tradition that traces back to the very different conditions of moneylending 500 years ago, in our Middle Ages, when Jews were virtually the only moneylenders in existence.

In those days gold itself was the tangible symbol of accumulated wealth, and it was common practice both for businessmen and for private persons to entrust their gold to goldsmiths for safekeeping. The goldsmith gave a signed receipt, an I.O.U., a promise-to-pay-on-demand, for the amount of gold deposited with him, and charged a fee for this service. In the course of time these goldsmiths' receipts, since they were easier to carry about and settle accounts with, came to be passed from hand to hand in payment of debts, and thus were really the first steps toward the modern bank note. Upon presentation to the goldsmith who had issued them, they had to be met with delivery of the amount of gold each one specified.

Up to this point, everything was on a sound enough basis. For every receipt or promissory note in circulation there was a deposit of gold in like amount in the goldsmith's vault, and consequently all the notes could be redeemed in gold even if all of them in circulation were presented the same day.

In practice, however, it was gradually discovered that these paper goldsmiths' receipts, because of their very convenience, were more and more commonly used as currency until they were worn out, passing from hand to hand exactly as a dollar bill passes now, and were only occasionally used for the original purpose of calling upon the goldsmith for redemption in gold. Thus most of the gold deposited with the goldsmith lay in his vault untouched. In fact, he gradually learned, by consistent experience over a period of years, that at least nine-tenths of it was never called for. Not unnaturally, therefore, it eventually occurred to him that since he was under nobody's surveillance, it would be safe for him to do as he chose with the whole of this nine-tenths, as if it belonged to him. Furthermore, when men came to him wanting to borrow, he could give them his promises-to-pay in any amount up to nine times the value of the gold he actually had in his vault. And on these promises to pay gold that he did not have, he could charge interest at 5 percent, 10 percent, perhaps more, in times of pinch maybe even much more. It would be a breach of trust, all right, but probably no one would ever discover his deception. It would be charging interest for the implied lending of gold that in fact did not even exist, and would he then be any better than a counterfeiter and a swindler? But it would be immensely profitable. He could get large borrowers even to turn over to him for security the title-papers to their homes, or their

businesses, and if at any time they could not meet their interest payments when due, he could foreclose and become owner in their stead. He might soon stand as the richest and most powerful man in the whole country. In the end, he yielded to the temptation.

And so “timidly . . . and with great caution, our owner of the strong room went into the business of lending promises to pay what he did not possess.”⁹⁸ And his notes thus issued were used by borrowers to settle their debts and accounts, exactly like the promissory notes issued on the original deposits of actual gold. In time, they too passed into circulation and served all the purposes of money. And thus he was able to maintain the illusion that the whole of his note circulation was “backed by gold.”

Mr. Jeffrey Mark, in his extremely illuminating book *The Modern Idolatry*, whose Chapter VII, “The Genesis of the Moneylender,” I have been largely following in the above exposition, goes on to point out some of the extraordinary consequences of this development.

“By virtue of the illusory gold-backing to his notes. . . the goldsmith has created 90 units of currency, which were not in existence before, *which he claims as his property*, which therefore must be repaid to him, and on which he will charge interest, say at 5 per cent, until such time as they are repaid to him.

“If we suppose him to charge a similar rate to his original depositors for this ‘safe custody’ of their gold, the fact emerges that there are now 100 units of currency in circulation; 10 the property of the depositors and 90 the property of the goldsmith, with a fixed yearly charge owing to the latter on every unit.

“It should be remembered that, at the beginning of this proceeding, the goldsmith owned nothing whatsoever (if he did, he could and would generate a similar cycle of debt-creation, based on his own gold). At the end of the transaction, the original depositors still own the same number of currency units as they did at he beginning. . . *Whereas the goldsmith now owns, and therefore controls 90 units of currency*, his total yearly receipts for both service charge and interest (over and above the ownership of the created currency) being 5 units of currency, i.e., half the value of the original gold deposits—the whole of this extraordinary creation and appropriation of interest-bearing currency being based *on other people’s money* deposited with him for ‘safe custody.’

“If we add to this the fact that these ‘fictitious loans’ (to borrow a convenient phrase from Professor Soddy) were only granted against evidence of tangible security deposited with the goldsmith in an amount always in excess of the loan, and that this security was confiscated by the goldsmith if these ‘loans’ were not ‘repaid’ when called, we have an accurate picture in miniature of the modern financial system. . . Modern finance, even in the complicated medley of bugaboo that is carried on under the high-sounding titles of High Finance and International Finance, is simply a vast elaboration and mystification based absolutely on these simple but monstrous principles. . .

“Since the time of the goldsmiths, these moneylending principles have been extended to the exclusion of all other methods of creating money. Whereas, in medieval times, the moneylender functioned side by side with the authorized issuers of the ‘coin of the realm,’ the

majority control has gradually passed from the latter to the former, until to-day, the moneylenders of the world are incorporated under a legalized system, known as the banking system, which is so organized, nationally and internationally, that 98 per cent of the money in and out of circulation belongs to them, while all new money is created as a debt in their favour." 99

Perhaps I can best bring home the full meaning of the bank-creation of money if I ask my reader to look closely at what is involved when a private citizen (such as any one of us) takes out a bank loan. In very large part the bank simply writes the amount of his loan in his bankbook and gives him the privilege of drawing upon this by check. In making such loans, the banks as a rule hand out very little actual money from their "covering" reserves. By experience they have learned, as just revealed, that *on the average* not more than one-tenth of the loan will have to be paid out in cash. Furthermore, in the case of our Federal Reserve System, since the individual bank can draw upon the reserves of real cash in *other* member banks if the drain upon its own reserve should occasionally exceed this average one-tenth, the individual bank may issue loans of up to 25 or 30 times the amount of real money it has on hand. And yet all this loan money, the great bulk of which had no existence until it was "created" by being written down as deposits in borrowers' bankbooks, which cost the issuing bank no more than a little paper and ink, this fictitious money that is merely pretended to be in existence for the sake of the gain to be got from it, has to be repaid *as if it were real money*, with money that the borrower as a rule has to earn by some kind of hard work. And on top of this there is the interest at 5 or 6 percent, or maybe on occasion even 20 percent, until the bank's claim is satisfied in full.

Verily, this is a fabulous formula for some people's getting rich fast and easy! And yet, though the whole thing is based on utterly shameless deception and a lie, and though it works as an actual criminal embezzling of the entire community within which it operates, it is nevertheless, in the large and with some obvious simplification, a true picture of the part actually played by the Federal Reserve System in our nation. On the fraudulent pretense of "gold backing" and in sheer usurpation of the financial rights assigned by the Constitution to our Government, the Federal Reserve has issued thousands of billions of dollars of debt, thousands of billions of dollars that could and should have been issued debt-free, thousands of billions of dollars the mere interest on which, every year, now comes to something like one-third of the nation's total annual product—the whole, interest and principal, payable to the private stockholders of the Federal Reserve, whose very names are unknown to the public and who give absolutely no accounting of the way this colossal sum is spent! Very possibly it is now being spent, and for decades has been spent, to destroy the nation's sovereignty as a necessary preliminary to dragooning the American people, willy nilly, into the slave state of a world government.

Part C, Section 10

Debt as a Means of Enslavement

In short, all this about the necessity of a money's having a backing of gold (or for that matter, of anything of intrinsic value) is and always has been sheer hoax. Hidden behind it is

the purpose of the masters of our present money system to cheat and plunder whole populations, and at the same time to coerce and dragoon governments, even the most powerful governments, into submission to their will. Ezra Pound put it right and in a nutshell when he declared: "A nation that will not get itself into debt drives the usurers to fury."¹⁰⁰ The method has been to "put the squeeze" on nations by getting them into debt, seeing to it that the debts become ever greater until the nations are bound by debt hand and foot, hogtied with debt, and by constantly extending the range over which the squeeze of debt can be applied. To complete the stranglehold, it is necessary to get the cord of debt around the neck of every nation on Earth.¹⁰¹ Soviet Russia has known from the beginning who was its master.¹⁰² It remains to tighten the cords on the nations of the Far East. Probably, this was the primary reason for Kissinger's recent trips to Peking and Hanoi. (I am writing this in February 1973.)

And the masters of usury have been completely without compunction in the means that they have chosen for piling up debts in their favor. Perhaps none of these has been more common or more significant than their deliberate instigation of wars, even civil wars and world wars. Sombart was completely right when he said that "the Jews fish in troubled waters" and that "wars are the Jews' harvests." Mr. C. H. Douglas called attention to the "key statement" of P.E.P., which spearheaded the Fabians' drive to turn Britain into a socialist state, that "only in war, or under threat of war, will a British Government embark on large scale planning."¹⁰³ This would seem to be a frank avowal, only thinly veiled, that wars, and war scares, would have to be worked up and deliberately instigated if they were to effect the changes in Britain's social and political life that they desired.

As my reader will shortly discover, I am not making these charges loosely. But for the present, I content myself with once more quoting Ezra Pound, one of the most penetrating diagnosticians of our money system whom I have encountered. He declared, for instance, "Usurocracy makes wars in succession. It makes them according to a pre-established plan for the purpose of creating debts." And again: "Not the gun merchant, but the traffickers in money itself have . . . made wars in succession for centuries, at their own pleasure, to create debts so that they may enjoy the interest on them, to create debts when money is cheap in order to demand payment when money is dear." And yet once more: "War is the highest form of sabotage, the most atrocious form of sabotage. Usurers provoke wars to impose monopolies in their own interests, so that they can get the world by the throat."¹⁰⁴ Perhaps there has not been a single important war since the French Revolution that did not have hog-tying-with-debt somewhere at or near the bottom of it. "Brooks Adams wrote that after Waterloo no power had been able to resist the force of the usurers."¹⁰⁵ And now, as the consummation of it all,

We have in "the rise of finance to an unprecedented position of internationally coordinated power," "the most sinister development in this century. It is as if the powers of usury, consciously or unconsciously, had long ago anticipated the situation that has now arisen, and had been marshalling their vast forces to meet it. Since the war [of 1939-1945], twenty-six new central banks have been founded. Each one of these contains in its constitution an article especially placing it outside the control of the government of the country in which it is situated. . . . the former president of the Reichsbank [of Germany], Dr. Hans Luther, was secured in his position by a clause in the constitution of the Reich, that he could not be

removed *without his own consent* and a majority vote of the board of the Bank for International Settlements. It took a Nazi revolution to abrogate this clause." "It will be seen that finance is here deliberately attempting to set up a central body which will acknowledge no authority above it on this planet." ¹⁰⁶

And it looks as if they now have their objective within their grasp.

"Of the absolute authority of Finance to-day there can be no question. To those who still cling to an illusion that politicians, bishops, military authorities, judges and educators, or some combination of any two, three, four or all five of them, have the fate of nations and the world in their hands, it should be unnecessary to submit evidence to the contrary—for that evidence is everywhere—and because the ultimate authority must, in the very nature of the case, be with Finance. "Seeing that all things are produced through the agency of money, and that all money now comes into existence as a debt to the banking systems of the world, this simply means, as Major Douglas has said, that our now internationally organized moneylenders 'are the actual or potential owners of everything produced in the world.'" ¹⁰⁷

Nevertheless, though the International Money Power moves steadily and remorselessly ahead, with seemingly irresistible power, toward a fateful realization of its goal of world government, which will be a Jewish tyranny and a slave state for gentiles, the system on which its power rests—let me declare it again—is sheer swindle.

For the moment, I simply state this as my own very firm persuasion. But, lest my reader too hastily assume that my conclusion is of no consequence, because of the fact that, admittedly, I lack the status to speak with any authority of my own, let me ask him to give due weight to the following considerations:

1. Some twenty years or more ago, I began to discover, as perhaps already intimated plainly enough, that a very impressive body of men, far too eminent in their respective fields to be dismissed lightly, have been declaring for the past forty or fifty years, that our whole money system was based on what at bottom was nothing better than a fiction, that it operated as a monstrous confidence game, to the profound hurt of all people who come under it, and that there could be no end to the unrest, the upheavals and wars between nations, so long as this system was left to dominate our economic life. In [Appendix I](#) at the end of this chapter, I have shown that among these men were great industrialists, statesmen and government officials, even high-placed and experienced bankers (all of whom knew the system more or less from the inside), as well as scientists of exceptional acumen, trained specialists in financial analysis, journalists of a wide command of world events, and men of letters who felt a profound concern over the disintegration of our civilization.

The consensus of all these authoritative voices was clearly and succinctly stated by Professor Soddy, as already quoted more than once: our "money system" is nothing better than a "confidence trick." But if only for the support that it gives to what I am about to say, I must add the further conclusion with which he approached the end of his book *Wealth, Virtual Wealth And Debt*:

“It is very widely believed that there has been something akin to an actual conspiracy to enslave the world.¹⁰⁸ . . . Conspiracy or not, there can be little question that the power [inherent in the hoax I have been discussing] these discoveries have put into the hands of financiers will, if not controlled, enable them in their own time and choice effectively to conquer the world.

“But conscious conspiracy or not, and whether one race rather than another is responsible, there can be no doubt of the fact that finance has already [this was written 40 years ago, in 1933] more than half enslaved the world and few, if any, individuals, corporations, or even nations can afford to displease the monetary power.”¹⁰⁹

2. Furthermore, what all these men said, one way or another, compelled my attention by its very urgency. They not only compelled my attention but they encouraged me to make my own investigation. They declared that the essentials of a sound economics, or a sound system of money, were simple, simple enough for any man of average intelligence and some education to understand. In consequence, I began to read—for a starter, perhaps some thirty books, books in this direction and that, to which they called my attention. And I found that what they claimed held good: the essentials of a sound, aboveboard and honest money system, as they outlined them, *were* simple. There was no mystery or obfuscation about it. Everything made sense, all parts fitted together, and were obviously necessary to meet the facts of economic realities and the best good of the whole people.

And the more I read, and observed, and reflected, the more it came over me that what we are confronted with is something vastly more than any need to get the answer to a mere academic puzzle. Undeniably, the Jewish money system *is* a hoax and a swindle, but it is a *deliberate* hoax and swindle, which has been developed into a weapon of absolutely fearsome power aimed at the heart of our people and our civilization, with a view (as I shall presently show) to the ultimate destruction of both. It is a revelation of hatred and a secret undeclared war against us.

And therefore any effort to set up and maintain a central bank that is beyond the control of the legitimate government is an act of treason, the penalty for which, from time immemorial, has been death.¹¹⁰

Furthermore, the chief reason that we have had such fearful wars, beginning at least with our Civil War and continuing ever since, has been that the Jewish international bankers wanted them, instigated them, and made prodigious profits out of them, with which they could the more surely accomplish our destruction.

And I saw that there could be no solution of the world's problems until the usurped power to create money was broken, and all governments had recovered their natural and rightful prerogative to issue money debt-free, and thus gained such control over the volume of money in circulation as to be able to maintain a stable price level year after year, decade after decade. Viewed thus, the Jewish money system is seen fully to deserve the judgment that I pronounced upon it at the beginning of this discussion, as the most fantastic, the most morally monstrous, and the most socially pernicious and alarming affair that has ever occurred in the history of mankind. Until it is broken, the world will be driven relentlessly

toward the state of something like an inferno, in which human beings will become so exhausted, terrorized, and cut loose from every source of light and hope and guidance, so reduced to a collection of helpless unrelated ciphers, that in their utter despair most of them will at last be willing to accept any promise of order that the World Government may offer them, even the order of a world slave state, provided only that it give them peace.¹¹¹

I have been analyzing the Jews' money system as one of the main instruments by which they have achieved their mastery over us, and very likely some of my readers may feel no little desire to know what *alternatize* system I would present as more in accord with our own sense of honesty and justice, and more conducive to our welfare as a nation and a race. Indeed, my friendly critic, already mentioned, has insisted at this point that if I fail to do just this I shall default my obligation. But in reply to this I would ask: Is a doctor to be charged with delinquency because, though he has rightly diagnosed a patient's disease and announced it, he is not himself qualified to perform the operation that his diagnosis calls for? Or was Paul Revere to be reproached because he aroused the countryside with his cry "The British are coming," although he had drawn up no strategy for a war and did not have under his direct command a body of troops by which the immediate British advance might be stopped? Or, to return to the field now under examination, must it not be allowed that though our present system has been analyzed, exposed, and denounced in scathing terms by a considerable body of undeniably able, experienced, competent, eminent, and manifestly high-minded men, few of them have undertaken to outline a new system *in all its necessary details*? Indeed, though there is now a *school* of economic thought, which goes by the name of The New Economics,¹¹² it would seem that there are disagreements even among the adherents of this school that still need ironing out, and that perhaps the disagreements are not altogether confined to details. However, I do gather—in fairness to them, let me add—that they all act on the conviction, first, that before a new and better system can come into being, the public must become aware of the evil in the one we have. It must become aware that the money system now running our country is not only morally monstrous and viciously treasonous, but also that it is inherently so ruinous and the ultimate catastrophe it threatens us with so imminent and all-engulfing, that if we don't throw it out very soon it must destroy the whole civilization of the Western world.¹¹³ In a situation so urgent as this, merely to "cry wolf," when the wolf is as *real* as *this* one, must of itself be a great service. Indeed, a lot of thinking people have *got* to cry "wolf, wolf" before any movement toward a new and better system can be got under way.

But despite any minor disagreements, I gather that the adherents of The New Economics are united in a second conviction—namely, that the more honest, just, and efficient money system they all aim at, is not something that is likely to arrive full-blown from the brain of any one man. Rather will it have to be something shaped on the anvil of discussion, hot, under the hammers of the criticisms and proposals of many men, many highly qualified men, all animated by a supreme concern for the public good.

In short, if I am right in all this, the movement toward a new money system has not yet reached the point where *anyone* is quite ready to sketch it out in all its details. At this point, therefore, it surely is obvious that it would be a great mistake for one who is still relatively new at the game, like me, to allow himself to be prodded into the presumptuousness of trying his hand at what hardly any other man in the world has yet attempted. In any case, the

great need now is that ever more earnest and thoughtful men be aroused to study the present system, to think about it as if their very life depended on it (as I believe the life of the nations literally does depend upon it), and, if they thus become convinced that it is indeed of such moral enormity and such dire menace as I have indicated, then to *do* something about it. It is primarily the need of *this* that has moved me to write these pages on our money system.¹¹⁴

At the same time, rather than leave myself open to the charge of having been purely negative, and to be as fair as I can both to the expectations of my readers and to the acumen and creative vision of the men who have headed The New Economics movement, I will now venture to present, very briefly, the essential *principles* of a better system, in regard to which, I take it, there is general agreement.

Part C, Section 11

An Outline of a Money System at Once Honest and Workable

The primary function of money (there are those who would say its *only* function) should be to serve as a means to the exchange, and therefore to the distribution, of goods and services. In such case, obviously, it would lop off the function that money has commonly served in the past as a store of value. Silvio Gesell, whose name may stand out above all others when the money system of the future is worked out, not only maintained that this was necessary if we are to solve the money problem, but even attached a feature to his system that would make the hoarding of money impossible.¹¹⁵ Yet it goes without saying that a store of value somewhere—for exceptional undertakings, for rainy days and for old age—must be provided. Happily, doing so should present no difficulty. Albert Einstein, for instance, in reviewing the question, said that if the accepted money system abandoned the function of providing the needed store of value, it would simply “lead to the accumulation of property in other, more substantial form.” Gesell himself has suggestions along this line.¹¹⁶

Money regarded simply as a medium of exchange has been rightly defined as a certificate of work done, “a measured title or claim,”¹¹⁷ specific in its amount, against the wealth of the entire community or nation. It is transferable from one man to another, and differs from a railway or theatre ticket only in the fact that while the latter are exchangeable solely for a seat in a train for a given distance or a seat in a particular theatre at a specified time, money is exchangeable for any sort of goods or services that the market may have to offer at any time. As such, money need have, and should have, little more intrinsic value than a railroad ticket or a postage stamp.

Next, money should be issued by the national Government, acting as the authorized agent for the whole citizenry, to pay for all its expenditures that may be necessary in the public interest. “Insofar as that new money is to be spent by the Government for public purposes, the Government should have the use of it interest-free.” “Insofar as it is lent to producers, the Government should have the interest on the loan, the banker merely his agent’s commission.”¹¹⁸

At bottom, the credit needed to give solid backing to any sound and honest money system is a “*social* phenomenon.” Spelled out, this means that credit is not something that a nation is forced to procure, and can procure only, from an institution or authority outside itself, or from a specialized part of itself—as a service for which it has to pay. Nor does it need backing from anything of intrinsic value, whether gold or silver or any other commodity. Credit is something that a nation possesses by the very fact of its existence, and which is so inseparable from its existence that it must continue so long as the nation itself holds together. It is a matter of the citizens’ sense that they all stand firm in their collective faith in their country as a going concern, their faith in the potential wealth of its fields, forests, mines and rivers, and in their ability to meet the total aggregate of their needs by transforming this potential wealth into real wealth through the application of their brains and their labor. It is expressed by their confidence in their Government, that it is honestly concerned with their welfare and working efficiently to ensure and to promote it, and by their consequent readiness and will to meet any obligations and commitments their Government may assume. Thus credit comes to rest finally on the individual man’s faith that if he gives his labor or parts with goods in order to get money, money that has his Government behind it, this money will in turn be accepted by any other citizen of his nation.

The Government would issue the money by engraving bills, in whatever denominations might be called for,¹¹⁹ or by drawing on the public credit to write checks. The bills might look very much like the bills that we use now. The bills and checks would be paid into circulation for materials, wages, salaries (to individual persons or any manner of business concerns), to enable the Government to carry out all its authorized functions. And these in turn, whether it was individuals or businesses, from the smallest to the largest, would pass on the bills to meet their own obligations. Those in charge of handling Governmental expenditures and the issuing of money would have the responsibility of keeping a constant eye on the price-level, and of so regulating the issue of new money that the price-level would be kept stable, even from generation to generation. For it is universally recognized that the price-level automatically rises or falls according as the amount of money in circulation is increased or diminished. An increase in the supply of money on the market always tends to create inflation.

Money thus issued would not incur debt by one cent. Indeed, as long as all the essential materials and know-how required for any nation’s existence and well-being are to be found within the nation’s own boundaries, there never has been any legitimate reason why any people should have gone into debt. Nations have been led to believe that fearsome emergencies, or colossal undertakings of any sort, could be met only by borrowing money, and consequently they have accepted their being saddled with debt and the payment of enormous sums of money to meet the interest charges on such debt. But this has been only a deceitful trick for robbing the people. To be sure, any vast undertaking has always called for exceptionally strenuous and united exertion on the part of the whole nation, but there has never been, on this account, any reason for their being saddled with enormous debt. But lest I be charged with artificially and unfairly simplifying the problem, let me first acknowledge that with the rise of the fantastically varied and crucial demands of modern technology, there are today few nations that do have within their borders all the materials and know-how essential to their existence and to their well-being. These they must somehow procure or go under in their struggle for survival. And to get them, must they not go into

debt, even into enormous debt, and thus have to submit to paying enormous interest charges on the debt? How one great nation, even in recent times, was able to answer this question we shall shortly see. But to begin with, let us hold to the simpler condition in which a nation does find (or in our own past did find and may be imagined to find even today) all the essentials for its existence within its own domain.

It has been proved that the proposed way of issuing money (government issued, debt-free) works wonderfully well, on the scale both of the microcosm and of the macrocosm, both in the very small, in the case of towns and villages, and in the case of a great modern nation.

Irving Fisher, Professor of Economics at Yale, writing when the great depression of the early Thirties was at its worst, described how it had been resorted to first in the German mining town Schwanenkirchen and in Woergl, a town of some 4,000 in Austria. And in both cases it worked no less than a miracle. The fame of its fantastic success in actually bringing about an extraordinary prosperity, even amidst the crushing and ruinous depression which gripped the rest of Germany and Austria, caused it to be taken up in many other places, and even created a demand that the money system of the entire land be modeled after it! As this would have meant the end of the Jewish system of debt, drastic measures were taken to stamp it out. Legal action was brought against those who had introduced it, an emergency law proscribed it, and thus, wrote an informed observer, "Schwanenkirchen and other towns where [the Woergl idea] provided the life blood of economic activity are on the dole again." And the orthodox system resumed its squeezing of the life-blood out of the German and Austrian people.¹²⁰ (Please be sure to read this note.)

Nevertheless, the tales of the fantastic success of the Woergl idea led Professor Fisher to send a personal representative to the scene to observe firsthand what was going on, and to verify the facts whose fame had leapt across the Atlantic. Here, in the U.S., to those caught in the throes and literally desperate horrors of the Depression, which was leading to hundreds of thousands of bankruptcies, losses of homes, hunger, misery, and countless suicides, the word of its success and of the simplicity of its operation led to its spreading like wildfire. Some score or more towns were trying to save themselves by following in the footsteps of Woergl and Sonnenkirchen. Many more were preparing to follow suit, even "several large cities." In fact, Professor Fisher's correspondence and other sources of information revealed that "four or five hundred communities in every state of the Union" (sic) were taking "a definite turn toward the Woergl or dated type of Stamp Scrip." It was to promote this movement and to guide it that Professor Fisher wrote his book *Stamp Scrip*. Perhaps it is not without significance that this book received no notice from the *Book Review Digest*, has long been out of print, and is now difficult to find.

But before the movement died out, or was stamped out, the idea it grew out of had amply proved its soundness.

But the opponents of the idea, the supporters and hangers-on of the orthodox, Jewish money system, would be quick to argue that though it might work very well as an emergency measure, and on the small scale, for towns and villages and even perhaps for some cities, it would never do as the money system for a nation, especially, a large and highly industrialized

nation. And in particular, how could debt be avoided when a nation did not have within its borders all the resources and know-how essential to its existence?

Interestingly enough, and, I submit, very significantly, the antagonists of the idea, in defining the nation where they believe it could *not* work, have rather exactly described a nation in which, there's no denying, it did work. The nation I have in mind is Nazi Germany. Hitler began his rule by breaking with the international bankers. He believed that Germany could never be a sovereign and really independent state so long as she had to live on borrowed money. Instead of going to the bankers for money to buy what she had to procure from abroad, she bartered (that is, swapped) some of her surplus to obtain what she needed from the surplus of other nations—without debt being incurred on either side. And with this approach Germany was soon crowding out all competitors. Moreover, for the money required to finance her vast programs for a complete regeneration of the life of the German people and for making Germany the most powerful state in Europe, he simply issued what money was needed, on the authority of the German Government, and based it not on gold, of which he had none, but on the productive wealth of the land within German confines, combined with the productivity inherent in German brains and German labor.

And it proved sound. It worked. In less than ten years, Germany became easily the most powerful state in Europe. It worked so magically and magnificently that it sounded the death knell of the entire Jewish money system. World Jewry knew that they had to destroy Hitler's system, by whatever means might prove necessary, or their own would necessarily die. And if it died, with it must die their dream and their hope of making themselves masters of the world. The primary issue over which the Second World War was fought was to determine which money system was to survive. At bottom, it was *not* a war between Germany and the so-called Allies. Primarily, it was a war to the death between Germany and the International Money Power. In this war, Germany fought for Europe, the racial homeland of Nordic White men and the cradle of Western civilization, while Britain, France and the United States were deliberately tricked into betraying their own kind and joining hands with their Jewish enemies to make the International Money Power the master of the world. The plain consequence was that we fought to fasten the manacles of slavery on our own wrists, and we probably sealed the White man's doom.

I greatly doubt that any intelligent man can make a thorough investigation of the facts without being forced to this conclusion. Whether or not he will then have the courage to acknowledge his conclusion, and act on it, is another matter. But there can be little question about the facts themselves.

The story of the Jewish Money Power is, for me, the nastiest, ugliest, basest chapter in human history. Doubtless the Jew will reply that this is only the way it looks to Aryans. And perhaps his reply is just enough. Certainly, I doubt that Jews (at least, Khazar Jews, "German" Jews) will ever come to understand our sense of honor. And the lamb will lie down with the lion long before such Jews and Nordics come to understand one another or make any genuine peace.

The Jewish money system, as we have seen, has become a well-nigh irresistible instrument not only for bulldozing the nations of the world this way and that, but also for fleecing

peoples of their money to finance their own destruction. It has enabled the Jews also to put a fearsome amount of muscle behind every other instrument that they have shaped to their purpose.

Part C, Section 12

Jewish Control of the Means for Shaping Public Opinion

One of the means that has most distinguished Jewry's drive to maintain itself and to expand its power in and over the gentile world might be called propaganda, conceived as a means of penetrating and shaping the human mind with a view to its control. Integrated by an all-embracing organization, and backed with a vast amount of money and a censorship enforced under threat of dire penalties—in our mass media, in our universities, in our churches and in our scientific societies—the Jews got their hands on the nation's levers of power, and have thus been able, gradually, to give the nation's whole life a direction, and turn it into a condition, which has favored the aggrandizement of the minority that controls it, even while it keeps the nation itself headed for destruction. Obviously, with such uncontested and almost unnoticed manipulation of the public mind, they can make an oncoming generation and even an entire people into almost anything, and take them anywhere they want to. Moreover, the outcome of "elections" can thus be most certainly controlled, the difference between the dominant political parties reduced to the vanishing point, and voting turned into a monstrous and insulting farce. Thus also full protective covering can be given to traitors carefully placed in key positions throughout the nation's political, economic and educational system, who can be depended upon to undermine its institutions, to weaken its defenses, and to open its gates to the enemy in the final crisis. In the process, this treacherous minority may totally pervert the nation's foreign policy, exacerbate its relations with other powers, and actually instigate wars that will as certainly strengthen the controlling minority as they keep the nation moving toward disintegration and destruction. Properly, of course, such operations should be viewed as an act of war, as a means for deceiving, misleading, and ultimately ruining or destroying an intended victim. When thus applied it is, in fact, often referred to as "psychological warfare."

This new kind of warfare is only a particular refinement of the instruments for struggle that is especially suited to the needs and ambitions of a group that is smart but numerically small. Some of its features should be noted.

Though perhaps immediately and obviously effective, it may seem bloodless, and on this account the fact that it is nevertheless an instrument of war, just as surely as a gun or a bayonet or a bombing plane, tends to be overlooked. By means of it, a people can indeed be bamboozled, befuddled, blinded, drugged, and finally bound hand and foot, without any manifest shedding of blood. Nevertheless, it may all lead to an enslavement where mastery will be consolidated in a veritable ocean of blood. We have only to think of the subjugation of Czechoslovakia, in which "not a shot was fired." And all of us can recall the reigns of terror and the wholesale purges, one after another, by which "Communism" has established its tyranny in every country that it has taken over.

The Jews have certainly been remarkable for the cunning and skill with which, anticipating each modern improvement in the means of reaching the public mind, they have established themselves in control of it. First, a hundred years ago, it was newspapers and the publishing houses. Then radio was added. And now it is television.

Around the middle of the last century, Benjamin Disraeli, twice Prime Minister under Queen Victoria, remarked that the actual rule of a country was no longer in the hands of representative assemblies such as Parliament, but had passed to the newspapers. In his novel *Coningsby*, he makes his dominant character Sidonia to say:

“The printing press is a political element unknown to classic or feudal times. It absorbs in a great degree the duties of the sovereign, the priest, the parliament; it controls, it educates, it discusses.”

And again:

“Opinion is now supreme, and opinion speaks in print. The representation of the press is far more complete than the representation of parliament.”¹²¹

It is not surprising, therefore, to learn that at about the same time, Baron Moses Montefiori, a Jewish world-leader and a partner of the Rothschilds, exclaimed to his fellow Jews:

“What are you driveling about? As long as we have not got control of the Press, all your chatter is useless. You can do no good whatsoever with your societies, loans, bankruptcies and that sort of thing. As long as we cannot make use of the Press in order to stultify and delude the world, our efforts will be of no avail, and our domination will remain a will-o'-the-wisp.”¹²²

And Isaac-Adolphe Cremieux, another Jewish leader of world-wide importance, who in 1860 founded the subversive Alliance Israelite Universelle, sent forth the following trumpet call to his people:

“Consider the governmental and public offices as nothing. Look upon all honours as upon nonsense. Do not pay attention for the time being to money itself. Capture the Press! Through it everything will come to you in the natural course of events.”¹²³

Apparently these directives were heeded. Shortly before the First World War, Cecil Spring-Rice, British Ambassador to the U.S., recorded that “one by one, Jews are capturing the principal newspapers.”¹²⁴ Today the few newspapers and newspaper chains which most effectively shape the substance and determine the direction of the public mind in the U.S., as of our national leaders, are consolidated in the hands of Jews. These are preeminently the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*. And those not so owned are for the most part kept in line by fear of the retaliation of their advertisers, who again are overwhelmingly Jewish. Jews exercise similar control over news magazines, especially those concentrated on the formation of opinion. The same grip is manifest when it comes to the prevalence of Jewish editors, reporters, reviewers and interpreters, and even in the principal agencies by which books and magazines are distributed. It includes the Book of the Month

Club, which in forty years has sold almost a quarter of a billion books.¹²⁵ It would seem that Ezra Pound was well within the facts when he declared: "We have passed from parliamentary government to newspaper government."¹²⁶

And television, which, as an instrument for molding the entire life of a nation, is absolutely without parallel in the history of man, we have left entirely in the hands of Leonard Goldenson, William S. Paley, and Robert Sarnoff, heads respectively of American Broadcasting Corporation (ABC), Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS), and National Broadcasting Company (NBC). Together with their four chief executives, Martin Rubenstein, Avram Westin, Richard S. Salant, and Herbert S. Schlosser, they dictate what 210 million Americans are to be told, every day in the year, as to what is happening in the nation and in the world!¹²⁷ And all seven of them are Jews, who as such must be expected to give their primary loyalty to Israel rather than to the United States. Television programming, also, is largely a Jewish monopoly. And though the chief interest of all these Jews seems to be to herd every White man into the corral of a Jewish world slave-state by way of the UN, not one American in a thousand is aware of this fact, or of what is being done, quietly but steadily and relentlessly, to ruin him and his children, and to destroy his country.

From TV, it is only a short jump to the movies and the theatre, and here again we find that "Hollywood from its inception has been overwhelmingly Jewish," and that the overrepresentation of the Jews, in all parts and on all levels of our stage business, is "almost fantastic."¹²⁸ And perhaps nothing has more largely dominated this line of Jewish activity than an unrelenting aim to *inflame* the race consciousness of our *minorities*, and to *kill ours*. In any case, whether it has been the publishing of books and magazines, or television, or the movies and the stage, which have not only provided entertainment but also supplied news, ideas and opinion, everything has been consistently slanted, whether by innuendo, emphasis, suppression or distortion, in such a way as to improve Jewish prestige and status, and to increase Jewish influence and power. The overall effect of it is to push the Jew up and to pull the gentile down.

Part C, Section 13

Jewish Limitations: Everlastingly They are but Middlemen

It is a commonplace that Jews generally consider themselves smarter than anybody else. And as their *Talmud*, for many centuries, has been urging their successful men to breed for intelligence, it is not surprising that today they test as high for sheer rationality as any lot of gentiles to be found!¹²⁹—unless it be the Scots!¹³⁰ They certainly have a quick eye for the main chance, when it comes to advancing themselves or fellow Jews. But gentiles need to be reminded that this sort of intellectuality, this ability to do well with words and books and mathematical abstractions, is by no means the only desideratum by which to appraise a candidate for citizenship in a gentile society. At best it is but a tool, and how it is used and what it is used for will be determined very largely by the values and consequently the aims of the man behind it. And the values of the Jews and those of Western White men are very largely opposed. Superior smartness on the part of Jews may only give their gentile hosts the

more reason to keep all Jewish activities in suspicion and under close and constant surveillance. It is ever to be borne in mind that the Jews have been deeper in profoundly studied machinations for the destruction of the gentile world than any other people in history.

Moreover, it is of very great significance, as was pointed out long ago by "Cobbett," that though the Jews are a smart lot after a *fashion*, they have never yet produced what can be called a great civilization or a great culture.¹³¹ Even about their religion, founded mostly on their *Talmud*, there is nothing very elevated or inspiring; and as Breasted long ago pointed out, they were little more than transmitters of what they had picked up during their long sojourns among the Egyptians and the Babylonians.

In the cultural realm, they simply are not a great creative people. Here, as surely as in finance and in commerce, they are primarily middlemen. They got their start, thousands of years ago by battenning on the traffic that plied through Palestine between the two great civilizations of the Nile and Mesopotamia. And they have remained middlemen ever since. They know how to pick a profit from whatever passes through their hands. Though they may make outstanding reviewers, critics and analysts, and even great musical artists (i.e., performers), it is to be observed that here again they are but middlemen, interpreters of the music, but not creators of the music itself. They have produced no composers who can stand comparison with Bach, Mozart, Haydn, Beethoven, Brahms and Schubert.¹³²

And then, when it comes to the interpretation of our culture, whether it be art, music, architecture, history, literature or science, I should greatly prefer those who have in them the same blood as the men by whom this culture was created. They are more likely to penetrate its depths and its nuances, and to sense and faithfully transmit to us its innermost significance than any people of a genius so alien to our own as that of the Jews. It is to be remembered that gentile societies have never done better than when there were no Jews around. Witness all the development that took place in England during the four centuries from 1292 to 1655, during which the Jews were forbidden to set foot on English Soil.¹³³

Part C, Section 14

The Doubtful Loyalty of the Jews

And then there is always the doubtful loyalty of the Jew. From the outstanding Jewish periodicals of the world and from the mouths of their acknowledged spokesmen, I can establish this by numerous unequivocal statements, of which the following are but a sample:

"Let us take the mask off. . . A Jew can only recognize one fatherland—Palestine."¹³⁴

"The patriotism of the Jew is simply a cloak he assumes to please the Englishman. Jews who pretend that they can at once be patriotic Englishmen and good Jews are simply living lies."

And then, on August 29, 1897, at the First Zionist Congress at Basel, Switzerland, Chaim Weizmann, later to become the first President of Israel, declared:

“There are no English, French, German or American Jews, but only Jews living in England, France, Germany or America.”¹³⁶

In the *Sunday Chronicle* (Manchester, England) for Sept. 26, 1917 (p. 4), one who signed himself “Zionist” declared:

“We are, whether born here or naturalized here, not really British at all. We are National Jews, Jews by race and faith—and not Englishmen.”

And to come closer home, to our own land and our own time, we have the following statement from Rabbi Stephen Wise, ardent Zionist and long-time head of the American Jewish community:

I am not an American Citizen of Jewish faith. I am a Jew. I have been a Jew for four thousand years. Hitler was right—we are a people.”¹³⁷

Countless gentiles, I am sure, would like to dismiss such evidence of Jewish disloyalty to the countries of their adoption, and I have reason to believe that there are Jews who would not be guilty of it. But perhaps no people in history have been indoctrinated and regimented into such remarkable homogeneity and solidarity by their leaders as the Jews have been; and there is no denying that their leaders are convinced that a primary loyalty to Jewry is absolutely essential to Jewish survival. Moreover, there is historic record that repeatedly, at critical junctures in their racial experience, the Jews actually have betrayed the countries of their adoption, countries that had given them kindly and generous harborage. In consequence, there is no way by which to make sure whether a given Jew will prove loyal or disloyal.

Furthermore—and to climax the indictment—there is no denying the Jewish record of hatred for gentiles. I pass by the vehement protestations of Mohammed and Luther, and the more measured words of Pope Pius VIII in 1592. But we have the testimony of the great Roman historian Tacitus in the first century, who referred to the “inveterate hatred” of the Jews “for all mankind.”¹³⁸ And Edward Gibbon, in his *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, records “the horrid cruelties which they committed in the cities of Egypt, of Cyprus, and of Cyrene, where they dwelt in treacherous friendship with the unsuspecting natives,” of whom, in a sudden uprising, they massacred 460,000, besides “a very great multitude” in Egypt. He declared it was their very religion that “seemed to render them the implacable enemies not only of the Roman government, but of human kind.”¹³⁹ Voltaire, too, at the dawn of our own era, spoke of their “inextinguishable hatred of all peoples.”¹⁴⁰ Even Disraeli, himself a Jew, put it on record that “the people of God wish to destroy that ungrateful Christendom which owes to them even its name, and whose tyranny they can no longer endure.”¹⁴¹ And Sir Richard Burton, an ethnologist and a responsible and distinguished British diplomat, was forced to conclude, on the basis of unusually extensive and intimate observation and experience, that “from the earliest ages to these modern days, and not in one place, but all the world over, the hatred of the Jew against the non-Jew has been of the fiercest.”¹⁴²

Part C, Section 15

The *Talmud*, Full of Hate for Gentiles, the Admitted Basis of All Jewish Life

And then there is the *Talmud*. It is this book above all others upon which, by Jewish consensus, Judaism has always been based, and is based now. It is a collection of legal, ethical and historical writings of the ancient rabbis, edited five centuries after Christ, which provides the very foundation of all Jewish life, including its religion.¹⁴³ Though its very name, and even more its contents, are almost completely unknown to the general run of gentiles, it nevertheless gives a full revelation and the perfect explanation of what has been the prevailing Jewish attitude toward gentiles, in all lands, down through the centuries.

There can be no question about its dominant position in Jewish thought and life. Dr. Michael Rodkinson, "the leading authority on the *Talmud*" and the author of one of its recent and official translations, declared that "the modern Jew is the product of the *Talmud*."¹⁴⁴ "It still dominates the mind of a whole people, who venerate its contents as divine truth."¹⁴⁵ In 1952, the American Jewish Committee (the A.J.C.), self-styled "Vatican of Judaism" and certainly one of the most powerful organizations of Jewry in the entire world, stated that the *Talmud* "is the legal code which forms the basis of Jewish religious law, and it is the textbook used in the training of rabbis."¹⁴⁶ Indeed, on May 20, 1954, the *New York Times* announced that two professorships, endowed with half a million dollars, were being set up in the two leading Jewish theological seminaries—for the study of the *Talmud*.

It is this book, the *Talmud*, and not the Old Testament (as most gentiles suppose), by which the minds of Jewish rabbis are shaped and trained, and with the spirit of which the consciousness of the Jewish laity, in its synagogues and in its hours of prayer, is saturated. And neither the *Talmud*, nor what it stands for, has ever, anywhere, been repudiated by official Jewry. It therefore behooves all gentiles, and especially all responsible leaders in gentile societies, to have some conception of the Jewish attitude toward gentiles as the *Talmud* reveals it. And in investigating this, it is essential to have access to an edition that has not been expurgated for gentile consumption.¹⁴⁷

The most objective, dignified and scholarly discussion of the *Talmud* that I know of, for its bearing on the relations of Jews and gentiles, is Sir Richard Francis Burton's *The Jew, The Gypsy And El Islam* (already referred to), in his chapters entitled "The Jew and the *Talmud*" and "The Continuity of Tradition" (pp. 72-129), but the origin, content and authoritative status of the *Talmud* are reviewed most fully and most recently in *Facts Are Facts* by the influential anti-Zionist American Jew Benjamin Freedman, published in 1955.¹⁴⁸ Burton and Freedman are in agreement as to what the Jewish attitude is, and quote passages from the *Talmud* text. Many of them can only be described as rabidly racist, full of the fiercest hatred of gentiles. It is asserted that the Jews alone are the children of God,¹⁴⁹ that they alone are men, human beings, that gentiles are only a higher order of cattle meant to be milked by Jews, that they exist to be the tools and slaves of Jews, that a Jew is under no moral obligation whatever to a gentile: he may lie to him, make promises and give pledges to him that he has no intention of keeping, may cheat him, rob him, and even murder him—and

morally it is all right, all right even before his God. One of the teachings reads; "Slay thou the best among the gentiles, and of the best of serpents bruise the head." ¹⁵⁰ Deeply embedded in the *Talmud*, and therefore in all modern Judaism, is the conviction that the Jews, as the only children of God, must ultimately rule the world. Probably this is in the blood, and the consciousness, and the dreams of every Jew born of woman. The form that this faith and determination have taken in our time is Zionism and the imperialistic expansion of Israel towards world empire.¹⁵¹

Perhaps no part of the *Talmud* is more relevant to the ordinary gentile's daily life than Kol Nidre, a Jewish "prayer to absolve all vows," which is a part of the Day of Atonement services in Orthodox synagogues, where it is normally chanted three times. By this means, Jews can, in advance, relieve themselves of all obligation to fulfill any vows, oaths, promises or pledges that they may give or contract in the year ahead. This means that the testimony of orthodox Jews (which is most Jews) is likely to be worthless in any of our courts, and likewise any oaths of allegiance that they may take when they become American citizens or assume public office in our political system.¹⁵²

My reader may have begun to ask himself what all this revelation of hatred and consequent readiness for treachery has to do with our examination of propaganda as an instrument for the achievement of Jewish designs. The point is to reveal organized Jewry as a world power entrenched in every country of the White man's world, operating freely across every nation's frontiers, and engaged in a ruthless war for the destruction of them all. The point is to uncover the animus that must be expected to drive and to direct every lever of Jewish power, whether it be propaganda or, greatest of them all, its money system.

The setup has operated both positively and negatively. On the one hand and primarily, it has been used to reduce us to whatever condition would make us most amenable to Jewish designs. We have therefore been slowly drugged into an unconsciousness of the change that was being worked in us.

We have been poisoned against ourselves and our kind, we have been blinded and stupefied and numbed, and so paralyzed with sedatives that now we could hardly move even if we were somehow awakened to the job of dismemberment that our masters are about to begin on us. We have become a Gulliver staked down hand and foot by Lilliputians.

On the other hand, while this was going on, the Jewish powers did not neglect to block and to silence every effort to alert our people to the effect of their propaganda. How ruthless and crushing these powers can be is illustrated in several specific instances.

Part C, Section 16

□The Jews Have Muzzled the Non-Jew Press□

Some fifteen years ago, I sat for several hours in the Broadway office of Mr. Boris Brasol, who is my authority for some of the more vivid details in the following story. He had been sent to New York early in 1917, to try to negotiate an Anglo-American loan in behalf of the

Czar's Government. While here, the November 1917 Revolution broke out in Russia and, knowing that he could return only to be murdered, he stayed in the United States and became an American citizen. He was an international jurist of distinction. He had annotated and translated Dostoevsky's *The Diary Of A Writer* in two volumes, published by Scribner's.

In 1919, Small, Maynard & Co. of Boston, "a million dollar corporation," published his *The World at the Crossroads*. The same year G.P. Putnam, of New York and London, had agreed to publish *The Protocols and World Revolution*, but under threats from the Jewish banking house of Kuhn, Loeb in the person of Mr. Louis Marshall, Putnam backed out of its contract.¹⁵³ And when the publication of the book was taken up by Small, Maynard, three powerful Jews, again headed by Mr. Louis Marshall, appeared before the head of the firm, a Colonel White, and said to him:

"Last year you published Boris Brasol's *The World at the Crossroads*."

"Yes," replied Colonel White.

"And now we understand you are about to publish *The Protocols and World Revolution*."

"Yes."

"Well, if you publish that book we'll put you out of business."

Whereupon Colonel White, being an old-fashioned Yankee, told them they could go plumb to Hell. He had agreed to publish it, and publish it he would. And publish it he did. And within a month there wasn't a bank in the U.S.A. from which he could borrow as much as one thousand dollars. Small, Maynard was forced into bankruptcy, and within six months Colonel White was dead.¹⁵⁴

In 1933, Scribner's published Madison Grant's *The Conquest of a Continent*. The book spoke with considerable scientific authority. It appeared with a Foreword by Professor Henry Fairfield Osborn of Columbia University, who heartily endorsed it as "the first attempt to give an authentic racial history of our country, based on the scientific interpretation of race as distinguished from language and from geographic distribution." "The theme of the present work is that America was made by Protestants of Nordic origin and that their ideas about what makes true greatness should be perpetuated." Grant urged Americans to stop the indiscriminate racial mixing that had been going on in this country for more than half a century, and in which he discerned a portent of "the passing of the great [Nordic] race."

On Dec. 13th of the same year, the director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (the latter being the all-Jewish lodge of the Masonic Order) sent out a letter addressed "To the Publishers of Anglo-Jewish Periodicals."¹⁵⁵ Apparently with no concern for what might make for the best good of the American people who had taken them in, it was written solely from the point of view of Jews. It declared Grant's book "extremely antagonistic to Jewish interests."

“Emphasized throughout is the ‘Nordic superiority’ theory, and the utter negation of any ‘melting pot’ philosophy with regard to America. . . We are interested in stifling the sales of this book. We believe this can be best accomplished by refusing to be stampeded into giving it publicity. Every review or public criticism of a book of this character brings it to the attention of many who would otherwise know nothing of it. . . We therefore appeal to you to refrain from comment on this book. . . [And then this touch of threat. W.G.S.] It is our conviction that a general compliance with this request will sound the warning to other publishing houses against engaging in this type of venture.”

This attempt to “kill” Grant’s book by the “silence treatment” was so successful that I had spent some ten years thoroughly studying the racial question before I learned of its existence. But probably the fate of Small, Maynard dealt such a blow to the independence of American publishers that the incident of Grant’s book served only as its finishing stroke. More recent incidents fully confirm this. On February 14, 1950, for example, Professor Harry Elmer Barnes, in writing to urge me to procure a copy of Peter Nicoll’s *Britain’s Blunder*,¹⁵⁶ pronounced it “a most cogent brief account of the essential facts about World War II.”¹⁵⁷ But when writing me again two months later (4/28), he said: “You will be interested to know that what Nicoll said about the boys in whom we are interested [by this he meant “the Jews”], though perhaps inadequate [as I had declared it to be], has been sufficient to make it impossible to find any publisher who will even remotely consider an American edition of the book.” Today, I am satisfied that there is not a single outstanding publisher in the land who would dare to take on any book that might antagonize all-powerful Jewish interests. The claim of the Jewish Chicago lawyer Bernard J. Brown, in his *From Pharaoh To Hitler*, has proved itself to the hilt: “The Jews have muzzled the non-Jew press.”¹⁵⁸ Today, it is doubtful that the Press in the United States, in matters of much consequence, is any freer than it is in Soviet Russia.

Part C, Section 17

The Jews □ the Supreme Masters of the □ Big Lie □

Having got their opponents thus neatly sewed up in a bag, the Jews were in a position to tell the world almost anything they wished, without fear of effective contradiction. If some alarmed patriot did manage to get out a squeak to arouse his people, he was promptly so misrepresented and defamed that his compatriots dismissed what he had to say as the words of a crackpot or a dangerous agitator. Thus Joseph McCarthy was brought to ruin, and Charles Lindbergh and Douglas MacArthur to the verge of it, and many another true and dedicated patriot likewise. Indeed, when necessary to attain their ends, the Jews, with their monopoly of publicity and propaganda, have not hesitated even to pile up plain lies, the most shameless and infamous lies, a veritable mountain of lies—indeed, the bigger the lies the better. “The big lie technique” it came to be called. Adolf Hitler, in his *Mein Kampf*, pointed out that “the foremost connoisseurs in the use of falsehood and slander have always been the Jews”—and he supplied evidence in support of his charge. He also revealed with how deep a disgust their “bottomless falsehood” inspired him. But in replying, the Jews had the effrontery and the cunning so to twist what he said that the very words *in which he charged them* with inventing and perfecting the “big lie technique” were spread before the world as

evidence that he himself had been the first one to espouse it, and was proudly advocating its use in his own drive for power!¹⁵⁹

They could make such a charge with impunity and, as we say, “get away with it,” simply because, even by that time, they had pretty much brought the news media of the whole world under their own control: there was no way in which their lies could be exposed. And so they went on lying, with ever greater audacity and with ever more disastrous consequences. To this day, “the big lie technique” is almost universally believed to be an invention not of the Jews, but of Hitler, and when they came forth with their most monstrous and infamous lie of all, that “the Nazis killed six million Jews” (which can easily¹⁶⁰ be proved a lie), the whole world swallowed it. Even the Second World War (which the Jews declared against Germany in August, 1933, six years before overt war broke out) was actually instigated and finally precipitated not only by a financial stranglehold, but by a world-wide campaign of inflammatory misrepresentation and vicious slander against Hitler and the Nazis,¹⁶¹ who were pictured as maniacs, villains and our enemies incessantly and with a coordination that only an underlying conspiracy can explain. In fact, the National Socialists’ policy was based on a heroic and very enlightened purpose to save the core of our race from destruction, to pull the shattered and sundered parts of it together, to keep at least Britain and Germany from ever again being drawn onto opposite sides in what in effect was another White civil war, and to take the lead in launching our people on a long-range program of racial regeneration and ennoblement. To be sure, their policy was also addressed to frustrating Jewish designs for the subjugating and enslavement of the world, and as such naturally aroused in Jews the most intense fear and fanatical hatred, and an all-out drive to destroy it. But in my considered judgment, now, after the lapse of more than thirty years of inquiry and reflection, the movement, more than ever, seems to me to have held vast promise. But it was perforce abandoned when the entire strength of the German nation had to be concentrated on holding off an attack of almost the whole world, which had been whipped up by false propaganda to join in what an outstanding Jewish spokesman called a “holy war in the cause of humanity in which we are embarked,” “to destroy medieval Hitler land.”¹⁶² Thus, for a second time within little more than a generation, the whole life and civilization of Western man were shattered by a cataclysm, by what in effect was a civil war of Whites against Whites, from which it has never recovered. And—let it be well understood—all this about “the cause of humanity” was nothing more than a decoy and hogwash. The cataclysm was *deliberately precipitated*—that is certain, and the purpose, ultimately, was the shattering of the White man’s world to clear the way for the advance of World Jewry toward the mastery of the Earth. Yet so complete has been the Jewish control of the American mind that to this day very few of our citizens so much as suspect that we were thus lead to fear and to hate and finally to fight the Germans, when, so far as the well-being of the White man was concerned, or even the well-being of the world, it would have been far better if we had made common cause with them.¹⁶³

In the face of such unawareness, I must expect that to most of my readers the generalizations that I have been making will seem offensively dogmatic and too sweeping. For the moment, the best that I can do is to assure them that I should never have ventured to state such views if, as I have already said, they were not supported by an impressive body of evidence that I find incontrovertible. I hope to have the space to submit a significant part of this before I finish this chapter. But at this point, I am trying merely to focus my readers’

attention on destructive forces working behind the scenes in the White man's world—in Europe for more than two centuries, and in the United States since before our War of Secession.

A certain amount of corroboration and admission of this is to be found even on the lips of Jews, and with this I will preface my own review of the Jewish record, which will follow.

Part C, Section 18

The Jews' Record from the Mouths of Jews

Let me begin with a quotation from Dr. Oscar Levy, with whom I corresponded during the last years of his life (he died in 1946), and whom Mr. A.K. Chesterton, in a letter to me of Feb. 22, 1972, referred to as "intellectually the most honest Jew of our time." He was a figure of international repute, well-known in English literary circles, and earned the world's gratitude by being chiefly responsible, both editorially and financially, for the authorized English edition of the works of Nietzsche in seventeen volumes. In 1920, he wrote a letter to Professor George Pitt-Rivers of Oxford University, which was used as the preface to the latter's book entitled *The World Significance of the Russian Revolution*. In this Preface are to be found the following lines:

"The question of the Jews and their influence on the world past and present, cuts to the root of all things, and should be discussed by every honest thinker, however bristling with difficulties it is, however complex the subject as well as the individuals of this race may be . . .

"If you are anti-Semite [this was addressed to Dr. Pitt-Rivers], I, the Semite, am an anti-Semite too, and a much more fervent one than even you are. . . We [Jews] have erred, my friend, we have most grievously erred. And if there was truth in our error 3,000, 2,000, nay even 100 years ago, there is now nothing but falsehood and madness, a madness that will produce an even greater misery and an even wider anarchy. I confess it to you, openly and sincerely, and with a sorrow whose depth and pain an ancient Psalmist, and only he, could moan into this burning universe of ours. . . We who have posed as the saviours of the world, we who have boasted of having given it 'the' Saviour, we are today nothing else but the world's seducers, its destroyers, its incendiaries, its executioners . . ."

But there is an even more significant admission, what in fact is less a confession than a boast, to be found in the words of a Roumanian-born Jew who went by the name of Marcus Eli Ravage. After twenty-seven years in our country and graduating from several American universities, he wrote two articles that were published in *Century Magazine* for January and February, 1928.¹⁶⁴ In the first of these he refers to "the unquestionable historical conspiracy which we [Jews] have carried out, which we have never denied because you [gentiles] never had the courage to charge us with it, and of which the whole record is extant for anybody to read." And he continues:

“You have not begun to appreciate the real depth of our guilt. We are intruders. We are disturbers. We *are* subverters. [Emphasis in the original.] We have taken your natural world, your ideals, your destiny, and played havoc with them. We have been at the bottom not merely of the latest great war but of nearly all your wars, not only of the Russian but of every other major revolution in your history. We have brought discord and confusion and frustration into your personal and public life. We are still doing it. No one can tell how long we shall go on doing it.”

After briefly reviewing the history of our culture he concludes:

“Who knows what great and glorious destiny might have been yours if we had left you alone?

“But we did not leave you alone. We took you in hand [sic] and pulled down the beautiful and generous structure you had reared, and changed the whole course of your history. We conquered you as no empire of yours ever subjugated Africa or Asia. And we did it all without armies, without bullets, without blood or turmoil, without force of any kind. We did it solely by the irresistible might of our spirit, with ideals, with propaganda.”¹⁶⁵

Perhaps most Americans, after reading these words of Mr. Ravage, and of Dr. Levy, would be inclined to dismiss them as pieces of typical Jewish extravagance—in the one case of pathetic breast-beating, and in the other of noisy cockcrowing. And at the moment, I am not disposed to argue with them. I would only point out that I did not quote these words as final proof of anything. But I would submit that such a confession as Dr. Levy's, and such an arrogant boast as that of Mr. Ravage, coming from within the Jewish community, and from men who were in a position to know what they were talking about, the one by its very intensity, the other by its very sweep and extremity, must be admitted to substantiate what I have been saying about Jewish operations within the whole world of the White man.¹⁶⁶

But in any case, there are many other statements by Jews that are of a like portent and of an even greater authority. For instance, Karl Marx observed:

“The Jew has already emancipated himself in Jewish fashion. The Jew who in Vienna, for example, is only tolerated, determines by his financial power the fate of the whole Empire. The Jew who may be deprived of rights in the smallest German State, determines the fate of Europe.”¹⁶⁷

In his *Coningsby*, Disraeli put into the mouth of Sidonia the following words, long since become famous: “. . . the world is governed by very different personages to what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes.”¹⁶⁸ And he went on to point out that, in country after country of Europe, the actual direction of affairs was in the hands of a Jew.

Theodor Herzl, “the father of Zionism,” in his *The Jewish State*, referred to the Jews’ “terrible power of the purse.”¹⁶⁹ Shortly before the First World War, Walter Rathenau, one of Germany's most powerful financiers, who later became the German Minister of Foreign Affairs, remarked: “Three hundred men, all acquainted with each other, control the economic destiny of the Continent.”¹⁷⁰

And 20 years later, in 1931, Jean Izoulet, a prominent member of the Jewish Alliance Israelite Universelle, declared: "The meaning of the history of the last century is that today 300 Jewish financiers, all Masters of Lodges, rule the world." ¹⁷¹ And the *Jewish Encyclopedia* claims that Jews have been preeminent in international finance since the beginning of the 18th century.

Or, lest my reader by this time may have forgotten, let me remind him of the declaration of James Paul Warburg before a select committee of Congress in 1950: "We shall have World Government whether or not we like it. . . whether by consent or conquest." This, from a man who held no office whatever in our government, whose family had been in this country only about 40 years, who was united by the closest of family ties with other Warburg bankers (affiliates of the Rothschild Dynasty) in Frankfurt, Germany, who really had no roots in our country, and who belonged to a people who have proved unassimilable and who, among themselves, agree that their primary loyalty is and always must be to Zionism and to the State of Israel! Perhaps even more significant was the report by Comte de Saint-Aulaire, Ambassador of France to Great Britain in 1920-1924, of the talk of a Jew who had "become director of a great New York bank," shortly after the First World War, at a banquet, when overmuch drink had loosened his tongue.

"A fellow guest had asked him how it was possible for high finance to protect Bolshevism, a system hostile to that movable property whose existence is necessary for the banking industry, and also to those riches which are represented by land and buildings, not less a necessity for banking."

I quote the most significant passages from his reply:

"Those who are astonished at our alliance with the Soviets forget that the nation of Israel is the most nationalist of all peoples. . .

"We are in communion with Marxism in its purest form in the International, in other words with our religion, because it is the weapon of our nationalism, in turn defensive and offensive, buckler and sword. You will say that Marxism is the very antithesis of capitalism that is equally sacred to us. It is precisely for the reason that they are direct opposites to one another, that they put into our hands the two poles of this planet and allow us to be its axis. These two contraries, like Bolshevism and ourselves, find their identity in the International. These opposites which are at the antipodes to one another in society and in their doctrines meet again in the identity of their purpose and end, *the remaking of the world from above by the control of riches, and from below by revolution* . . . (Emphasis added.)

"Revolution is never anything but the displacement of privileges which arise from wealth. . . The more frequently wealth changes hands, the more of it remains in our hands. We are the brokers who receive commissions on all exchanges." ¹⁷²

And then there is Bernard Baruch, one of the long succession of Jews who have been "advisers" to our Presidents from Woodrow Wilson to Richard Nixon¹⁷³—men such as Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis, Felix Frankfurter, "Colonel" Edward Mandel House (whom Wilson long called his "other self" and whose "hidden master" was the foreign-born Jew

Jacob Schiff of Kuhn, Loeb & Co.),¹⁷⁴ and then Arthur Burns, and now Henry Kissinger, who, like others before him, is often referred to as the “unofficial President.” The unbroken succession of Jewish advisers suggests not so much that better and more dependable advisers were not to be found among our 200 million gentiles, as that in one way or another Jewry always got the Presidents, probably even while yet candidates, under a pressure from which they could not escape.

But to return to Baruch. Before a select committee of Congress he said: “I probably had more power than perhaps any other man did in the war [the First World War]; doubtless that is true.”

To realize what this meant, Mr. Baruch’s words need to be given their proper setting. I will supply this by excerpts from an article that appeared in Mr. Henry Ford’s *Dearborn Independent* of November 27, 1920, which read as follows:

In saying what he did, Mr. Baruch “did not overstate the case. He did have more power. It was not all legal power, this much he admitted. It reached into every home and store and factory and bank and railway and mine. It touched armies and governments. It touched the recruiting boards. It made and unmade men without a word. It was power without responsibility and without limit. It was such a power as compelled the gentile population to lay bare every secret before this man and his Jewish associates, giving them a knowledge and an advantage that billions of gold could not buy.”¹⁷⁵

Under President Roosevelt’s Council of Defense, consisting of six Cabinet Ministers, was an advisory commission of seven members, of whom three were Jews. Beneath the advisory committee were hundreds of men and scores of committees. Among them was the War Industries Board, and, continues the Ford journal:

“It was this War Industries Board which became ‘the whole thing’ later on, and it was Mr. Baruch who became ‘the whole thing’ in that board. . . he became the chief pillar of the war administration. The records show it, he himself admits it.”¹⁷⁶

“The President did exactly what Baruch wanted in a thousand matters, and what Baruch apparently wanted most of all was a ruling hand upon productive America. And that he got. He got it in a larger measure than even Lenin ever got in Russia.

“Before Mr. Baruch got through, he was the head and center of a system of control such as the United States Government itself never possessed and never will possess until it changes its character as a free government.”

The facts which now follow “are not of a hearsay origin nor the product of a biased point of view; they are the fruits of an inquiry by the lawful officials of the United States and they are forever spread upon the records of the United States.”¹⁷⁷

In the course of the hearing before the Congressional Committee, the following exchange took place between Mr. Jefferis, a member of the committee, and Mr. Baruch:

“Mr. Jefferis: ‘In other words, you determined what anybody could have?’

“Mr. Baruch: ‘Exactly, there is no question about that. I assumed that responsibility, sir, and that final determination rested within me.’

“Mr. Jefferis: ‘What?’

“Mr. Baruch: ‘That final determination, as the President said, rested within me; *the determination of whether the Army or Navy should have it rested with me; the determination of whether the Railroad Administration could have it, or the Allies, or whether General Allenby should have locomotives, or whether they should be used in Russia, or used in France!*’

“Mr. Jefferis: ‘You had considerable power?’

“Mr. Baruch: ‘Indeed I did, sir. . . .’

“Mr. Jefferis: ‘And all those different lines, really, ultimately, centered in you, so far as power was concerned?’

“Mr. Baruch: ‘Yes, sir, it did. I probably had more power than perhaps any other man in the war; doubtless that is true.’”¹⁷⁸

Mr. A.N. Field picks up the story and continues as follows:

“If the foregoing statements correctly represent the position, it would appear that during the portion of the war in which the Allies were largely dependent upon supplies from the United States, the Allied Commanders-in-Chief, and the Allied Governments behind them, had to conform in their plans of campaign to what it suited Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, Jewish war dictator of the United States, to permit them to have in the way of war supplies.”¹⁷⁹

And as part of the sequel to the unlimited responsibility to which Mr. Baruch confessed, we need to know, among other things, of the “many complaints of defective ammunition being supplied from the United States and going into the colossal war bill presented to Britain.” According to Brigadier General C.D. Baker-Carr:

“Millions upon millions of rounds of small arms ammunition sent from America were absolutely useless, as proved to be the case later with a large proportion of the shells. [‘With disastrous results.’] I never heard, however, that the money paid for these munitions was ever refunded.”¹⁸⁰ Colonel A.H. Lane reported that after the war an “investigating committee” was appointed, with a Jewish chairman, “to try and stop the many ugly stories and rumours which were circulated . . . but the preliminary evidence was so damning that in a few weeks” the investigation “was shut down and no report issued except ‘that it was not in the public interests,’ etc., that a report should be made.”¹⁸¹

An even more serious sequel is reported by Mr. A.K. Chesterton in his *The New Unhappy Lords*:

What was at stake was “the over-running of Malaya and Singapore by the Japanese. The defense of these countries was entrusted to an R.A.F. [Royal Air Force] Command. . . By the time the Japanese struck the British aircraft industry was turning out fighters and bombers in spate. Why were these modern planes not sent to defend British possessions in Malaya? The answer is that most of them were being flown to Russia to reinforce the Red Army. The United States [i.e., Baruch] had now assumed the dominant role in the planning of allied war production and distribution, and it was the U.S. order of priorities which had to be observed. As a consequence, when Churchill sent H.M.S. Repulse and H.M.S. Prince of Wales to Malayan waters there were no fighter planes to provide adequate air cover, with the result that these two mighty men-o’-war were sunk—and with them, for all practical purposes, was sunk our Empire in the East.”¹⁸²

Thus is revealed anew, and thus proved to the hilt, what C.H. Douglas called “the suicidal folly of allowing unassimilated minorities of any description to attain substantial influence.”¹⁸³ No people in history has proved *so* almost *totally* unassimilable as the Jews, and yet it is by them that every important Government of the West is effectively controlled. Everywhere they hold the levers of supreme power.¹⁸⁴

Part C, Section 19

The Jews—Record— from the Gentile Point of View

Before commencing my own review of the Jewish record of the past two hundred years or so, as my own investigation of the facts has forced me to see it, I wish to submit the conclusions of a few other gentiles, men of undeniable competence, which they published after examination of at least considerable part of the available evidence. Means have been found to prevent these conclusions from coming to the knowledge of the general gentile public.

In April 1919, the British Government issued a White Paper which contained a report received by Lord Balfour on Sept. 10, 1918, from Mr. Oudendyke, the Netherlands Minister in Petrograd who was in charge of British interests there. From this I extract the following:

“I consider that the immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue now before the world, not even excluding the war which is still raging, and unless Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately it is bound to spread in one form or another over Europe, and the whole world, as it is organized and worked by Jews, who have no nationality, and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things.”¹⁸⁵

On November 5, 1919, two years after the Russian Revolution and at the time when the world furor about it was perhaps at its height, Winston Churchill made a speech before the House of Commons, in which he said:

“Certainly I dispute the title of the Bolsheviks to represent Russia. . . They despise such commonplaces as nationality. . . No sooner did Lenin arrive than he began by beckoning a finger here and a finger there to obscure persons in sheltered retreats in New York, in

Glasgow, in Berne, and other countries, and he gathered together the leading spirits of a formidable sect, the most formidable sect in the world, of which he was the high priest and chief. With these spirits around him he set to work with demoniacal ability to tear to pieces every institution on which the Russian State depended. Russia was laid low.”¹⁸⁶

A few months later, in a front-page article published in the *Illustrated Sunday Herald* (London), February 8, 1920, he wrote to the same effect but went into greater detail.

“This movement among the Jews [the Russian Revolution of 1917] is not new. From the days of Spartacus-Weishaupt to those of Karl Marx, and down to Trotsky (Russia), Bela Kuhn [Cohen] (Hungary), Rosa Luxembourg (Germany), and Emma Goldman (United States), this world-wide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilization and for the reconstruction of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence, and impossible equality, has been steadily growing. It played, as a modern writer, Mrs. Webster (author of *World Revolution*)¹⁸⁷ has so ably shown, a definitely recognisable part in the tragedy of the French Revolution. It has been the mainspring of every subversive movement during the Nineteenth Century; and now at last this band of extraordinary personalities from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America have gripped the Russian people by the hair of their heads and have become practically the undisputed masters of that enormous empire. “There is no need to exaggerate the part played in the creation of Bolshevism and in the actual bringing about of the Russian Revolution by these international and for the most part atheistical Jews. It is certainly a very great one; it probably outweighs all others. . . the majority of the leading figures are Jews. Moreover, the principal inspiration and driving power comes from the Jewish leaders.”¹⁸⁸

It is to be noted that this “formidable sect” Churchill referred to, what he called “the most formidable sect in the world,” was a power outside both Russia and Germany, an international power, and that it had the strength in the end, to bring down not only the Russian Government but that of Germany and the royal House of Hohenzollern as well.

Mr. Churchill’s observation is reminiscent of a passage in the *Memoirs Of Jacobinism*¹⁸⁹ by the Abbe Barruel, written shortly after the French Revolution, of which he undertook to trace the origin. It became the center of a great controversy now long since forgotten. In it we read:

“You thought the Revolution ended in France, and the Revolution in France was only the first attempt of the Jacobins. In the desires of a formidable sect, you have only reached the first stage of the plans it has formed for that general Revolution which is to overthrow all thrones, all altars, annihilate all property, efface all law, and end by dissolving all society.”

This passage from Barruel is to be found in Chapter I (pp. 35-6) of *The Cause Of World Unrest*, published in London in 1920. This latter book consists of a series of some sixteen articles which first appeared in the columns of the *London Morning Post*, one of the world’s great newspapers. In republishing the articles as a book its editor, Mr. H.A. Gwynne, contributed an Introduction, in which he said:

“In earlier history . . . kings, princes, governors stood between the masses and their exploiters . . . roughly speaking, the people were prevented by established authority from being victimized. To-day all that is changed, and we now live in an age which will be known, perhaps, in history as the age of the exploitation of the people. . .

“The pages of this book will trace the threads of a conspiracy engineered by people whose main object has been to destroy utterly anything—kings, governments, or institutions—which might stand between them and the people they would exploit. . . “The main outline of the contents of this book is, in brief, that there has been for centuries a hidden conspiracy, chiefly Jewish, whose objects have been and are to produce revolution, communism and anarchy, by means of which they hope to arrive at the hegemony of the world by establishing some sort of despotic rule.”¹⁹⁰

And as far as *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* are concerned (referred to by Professor Soddy, as quoted in my section on the Money Question), Mr. Gwynne went on to say: “Their chief interest lies in the fact that, while the book which contains them was published in 1905, the Jewish Bolsheviks are to-day carrying out almost to the letter the programme outlined in the *Protocols*.”¹⁹¹

Significantly, this is exactly what Henry Ford observed about *The Protocols*, as reported in the *New York World* for January 17, 1921.

More significantly still, it is only what must strike any gentile today, if he has any wit in his head, when he compares this blueprint (as I might call it) for the subjugation of the gentile world, with what has been going on, ever-increasingly, all over the world, for the past fifty-five years, ever since the Russian Revolution.

Jewry has always attacked the book furiously—one feels a little too furiously. Theirs is not the dignified disavowal of one who knows himself innocent, but rather the anxious denial of one who knows full well that his tracks will not stand exposure to the light. It has been desperately important for the Jews to keep the gentile world from discovering *how* Jewish the Russian Revolution was, and even more, from even glimpsing their program for further revolutions, one after another, until the whole world lies prostrate under the heel of its Jewish master. One therefore understands at once why, in the early days of the Revolution, anyone in Russia who was caught with a copy of *The Protocols* on his person was summarily shot.¹⁹² And all the efforts to prove it a forgery are understandable likewise. But at bottom it does not really matter who did the writing of *The Protocols*, whether it came from within the Jewish community itself and by accident got into the “wrong” hands, or whether it was written by an enemy entirely outside who wished to expose what the Jews were up to. All this about its authenticity only diverts attention from the one thing that matters. What matters is the agreement between the outlines, aims and predictions in *The Protocols* and what, without the slightest reference to *The Protocols*, can be proved against the Jews by objective evidence. It is my long and carefully considered judgment that a fearless, unbiased correlation and appraisal of the pertinent, irrefutable, objective evidence (what informed men know is going on, and has been going on for almost 200 years) hardly admits of any adequate and plausible explanation other than a Jewish conspiracy of very long standing—the very thing ostensibly laid bare in the pages of *The Protocols*. This, it seems to me, together

with the total absence of any official Jewish repudiation of the specific aims and means set forth in *The Protocols*, is the most effective refutation of all Jewish disavowals. In this fact, it may fairly be claimed, they virtually set their signature to the work and acknowledge it as theirs.¹⁹³

My reader may recall Winston Churchill's tribute to the importance of Mrs. Nesta Webster as a historian in his article of February 8, 1920, quoted a few pages back. More recently, Dr. Revilo P. Oliver, one of the world's outstanding scholars, pronounced her "a woman of great learning and penetrating mind."¹⁹⁴ Her investigation of subversive movements has ranged from the early centuries of the Christian era down almost to the present time. Throughout, it is marked by open-mindedness, honesty, courage, thoroughness, and a severe devotion to the truth. If her exposures had not aroused the antagonism of powerful persons and vested interests, she would certainly have won an even greater reputation than has come to her. Even as it is, her *French Revolution* (Dutton, 1919) is the most illuminating and convincing treatise on this subject of which I know. What Lord Acton observed in his famous paragraph about characters behind the scenes who obviously maneuvered events,¹⁹⁵ she spelled out, word by word. Her *World Revolution*, it seems plain, largely formed the foundation for Mr. Churchill's judgments as to the race and character and antecedents of the principal actors in the Russian Revolution of 1917. Anyone who knows what kind of person Mrs. Webster was, and the range and penetration of her work, will know how to evaluate her sober appraisal of the forces that have been working in and under our society for its destruction, even before the French Revolution, and at an ever-accelerating pace and fury ever since, into our own time. He will know, too, that every word in the passage that I am now about to quote from the Foreword to the first edition of her *World Revolution*, terrible as it is, must have been carefully measured:

"The truth is that for the last 145 years [it is now, in 1973, just about 200 years] the fire of revolution has smoldered steadily beneath the ancient structure of civilization, and already at moments has burst out into flame threatening to destroy to its very foundations that social edifice which eighteen centuries have been spent in constructing. . . The revolution through which we are now passing is not local but universal, it is not political but social, and its causes must be sought not in popular discontent, but in a deep-laid conspiracy that uses the people to their own undoing.

". . . The object of this book is therefore to describe not only the evolution of Socialist and Anarchist ideas and their effects in succeeding revolutionary outbreaks, but at the same time to follow the working of that occult force, terrible, unchanging, relentless, and wholly destructive, which constitutes the greatest menace that has ever confronted the human race."

Mrs. Webster's appraisal of the part of the Jews in all this was stated with admirable objectivity twenty-five years later in the closing chapter of *Secret Societies And Subversive Movements*, and nowhere is her primary devotion to truth more evident. She has to allow that "the conception of the Jews as the Chosen People who must eventually rule the world forms indeed the basis of Rabbinical Judaism," and even that "a concerted attempt . . . to achieve world domination" "has existed among the Jews in the past" (p. 369). She recognizes the cruelty and fierce hatred of the Jew toward the gentile as manifested in the *Talmud* (pp. 369-80). She knows that "Jews are playing a part in all subversive movements" (p. 393), that the

guiding forces in all the revolutions that have followed the Russian have been overwhelmingly Jewish (pp. 384-5), and that the body known as 'International Finance' is mainly, though not exclusively, Jewish" (p. 391). But her loyalty to the truth as she surveyed the body of facts known to her made her stop short of declaring that "there is a united and organized body of Jews working for the destruction of Christianity and the existing social system" (p. 382). Nevertheless, the facts did compel her to recognize that, whether as principals or agents, and "whether . . . the Jewish power is unified or not, Jews are to be found cooperating with, if not directing, all the five powers [which she had listed as most actively engaged in subversion] of which the existence is known" (pp. 382-3).

But this was twenty-five years and more ago, and in that time much has happened to clarify the picture. For this, and for the last of the gentile witnesses that I shall summon to testify to a Jewish conspiracy for world dominion, I turn to Mr. A.K. Chesterton, whom I rate as the greatest journalist in the world. He seems to carry continuously in his mind a grasp of what is going on all over the Earth—the various interests and movements, the principal actors, whom he knows by name, even down to the little ones, whence they came, the ramifications of their connections, so that at a glance he can relate what is happening here with what is happening there, and on this basis can make fairly long-range predictions, which have had an uncanny way of coming true.

And while I hold Mrs. Webster in high honor and believe she has made a very valuable contribution to what gentiles of all the nations of the West need to be alerted to in this hour of darkening crisis, she remains very largely, in comparison with Mr. Chesterton, something like the cloistered scholar. But he, the man of affairs and in the thick of the fray, and knowing full well that if there is a Jewish conspiracy to achieve world dominion, it must inevitably come to power politics, has paid special and very penetrating attention to the manipulation of whole nations with a view to their removal from the path of Jewish advance to world mastery. For a revelation of this, his book *The New Unhappy Lords*, now in its revised and enlarged 4th edition, is without a peer.¹⁹⁶

And writing in April 1973, with death close upon him and as if with his last breath he wanted to reaffirm his conclusion based upon a lifetime of observation and study, he backed up the basic underlying thesis of Gary Allen's best-seller *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*,¹⁹⁷ by bluntly entitling his article "We Dare Call It Conspiracy," with emphasis on the "we." In the Foreword to his book, he makes allowance for the difficulty, inherent in the investigation of any conspiracy, of ascertaining the facts.

"As a conspiracy by its very nature is secret, it is not often possible to bring against it a direct case, as distinct from a case based on circumstantial evidence. When a conspiracy has been active for many years, however, there are bound to be occasions when it reveals its existence, and these self-exposures have to be used as pointers to its overall plan. What provides the main proof is that, the policy objective having become known, there has been continuity of the policy pursued to achieve it in one country after another, with no turning aside during the course of several decades. Whether or not one takes a deterministic view of human life, multitudinous events have the appearance of being accidental. Even so, where policies all over the world are shaped to the attainment of one end, the explanation that they can be traced to a large number of accidents or coincidences places a greater strain on credulity than

does the belief that they have been deliberately contrived, especially when the mass of circumstantial evidence is examined. Any belief that the present drive for political monopoly derives from a universal fear of further wars can scarcely survive the evidence produced in this book of the actual use for which the various internationalist agencies have been employed. The fear undoubtedly exists, but my thesis is intended to make clear beyond doubt that it has been and is being shamelessly exploited for the setting up of a world tyranny.”

“. . . In recent years several excellent American books, devoted to an exposure of traitors on that side of the Atlantic, and of their powerful protectors, have been published, and if their authors care to study the facts here made available, and the deductions drawn from them, they may conclude, as I have done, that the conspiracy in their midst, so far from having a purely American significance, is global and aims at securing as far as possible control over the whole world. They will certainly perceive that the techniques employed to bring about the subjugation of mankind are very much the same as, and sometimes identical with, the techniques used for the furtherance of traitorous policies in the United States” (pp. 10, 9).

To this, I will add a few paragraphs from Mr. Chesterton’s pamphlet *The Learned Elders And The B.B.C.*,¹⁹⁸ which perhaps may be taken as a sufficiently suggestive summary of Mr. Chesterton’s position as it develops in his book.

“It is, with submission, impossible for any intelligent person, aware of what is happening in the world, to read . . . the *Protocols* . . . without being astounded by their prophetic insight, their knowledge of the weaknesses in gentile society, their proposed techniques for exploiting those weaknesses, and their adumbration of the methods of securing policy objectives which have either been achieved or are on the eve of achievement. I write ‘adumbration,’ because although the spirit animating the *Protocols* survives intact, the actual mechanisms at the disposal of the policymakers have progressed far beyond the imaginations of the ‘Elders of Zion, whoever they may have been.’”

In the course of his article, Mr. Chesterton quotes a paragraph from *The Protocols* (from the end of Section V), and then comments on it. The passage quoted reads as follows (the italicized sentences are italicized in the original):

“By all these means we shall so wear down the goyim [gentiles. WGS] that they will be compelled to offer us international power of a nature that will enable us without any violence gradually to absorb all the State forces of the world and to form a Super-Government. In place of the rulers of to-day we shall set up a bogey which will be called the Super-Government Administration. Its hand will reach out in all directions like nippers and its organization will be of such colossal dimensions that it cannot fail to subdue all the nations of the world.”

Mr. Chesterton comments:

“There it is—World Government. What are the Common Market, Euratom, the Coal and Steel Community, Nato, Seato, the Soviet empires, the United Nations, if they are not either steps or alternative lines of approach to One World—a Jew-dominated world?”

He continues:

“In truth, however, we do not need the *Protocols* . . . to tell us of these things, which form part of what is now declared policy, furthered by pressures no longer altogether concealed. I have never based any part of *Candour’s* case on the *Protocols*, for the simple reason that I know nothing of their origin and care less. What interests me, and what calls for my own fighting spirit, is what I have discerned of the organized use of evil to subvert Western civilization and bring our traditional values crashing to the ground so that a totally different, a blood-chilling and hateful, influence may henceforth dominate the world. The *Protocols* may be a fake, a fabrication, call them what you will. But they are not . . . mad, in the sense of being divorced from the realities of subversion and revolution. Lacking though they be in authority, they yet march in step with the unfolding modern conspiracy of which they are a prophetic utterance.

“Statesmen like Churchill and Lloyd George, writers like Belloc and Wickham Steed, editors like H.A. Gwynne, Jews themselves of the calibre of Disraeli and Oscar Levy, have all contributed their testimony to the facts of Jewish power, of which there is now a vast accumulation of evidence . . . Jewish power is real.”

Part C, Section 20

The Author’s Own Conclusions about the Jews’ Record

I have now reached the point where I must sketch the highlights of the Jewish record that stand out when I review the facts of the last few hundred years. Some testimony in support of my appraisal, from both Jews and gentiles, and such a selection of evidence as I could find space for, I have already submitted. No one could be more ready than I to allow that making my case completely conclusive would require at least a book. And indeed, in fairness to myself, I must assure my reader that I would hardly have ventured to publish an opinion on the Jewish Question if I had not first made thorough investigation of it. But I have pursued it for 25 years—against the grain of my own preconceived ideas, and in the face of the loss not only of close Jewish friends, but also of the closest and dearest friends of my youth, who looked upon a word against the Jews as evidence of bigotry and spiritual decay. For long stretches, I pursued the investigation to the exclusion of almost everything else, and from it I gradually accumulated a massive body of evidence that finally compelled my present conclusions. And I may add that no one who has read my resulting manuscript, even university professors who were bitterly hostile to everything that I had to say, has ever made the slightest move to refute my evidence.¹⁹⁹ And so I shall be quite content if, in what now follows, I shall have impressed my readers enough so that they will want to make their own investigation—something that every responsible man of independent mind will, once he has been alerted to the peril, surely want to do. And the select list of books that I am supplying in [Appendix II](#) at the end of this chapter should be enough to enable anyone to make a start.

In the space of about two centuries, between the last years of the Middle Ages and the first of the Modern Age, the Jews were expelled from all the most important countries of Europe, from England in 1292 and from Spain in 1492.²⁰⁰ Gentiles have been led to believe

that this was due to gentile bigotry and persecution, but the idea will not wash. Free investigation will show that the Jews alone, of all the peoples of the Earth, wherever they have firmly established themselves, have come at last to be feared and resented, and then resisted and hated. Jesse H. Holmes, long a professor of philosophy at Swarthmore College, with the usual "liberal" Quaker traditions, had an article published in *The American Hebrew* in which he said:

"It can hardly be an accident that antagonism directed against the Jews is to be found pretty much everywhere in the world where Jews and non-Jews are associated. And as the Jews are the common element of the situation it would seem probable, on the face of it, that the cause will be found in them rather than in the widely varying groups which feel this antagonism."²⁰¹

Even Sir Richard Francis Burton, already quoted, who was definitely not an "anti-Semite," was forced to conclude that the antagonism in which Jewish relations with gentiles have commonly ended, was basically a reaction to the injuries inflicted on gentiles by Jews.²⁰² Though there certainly have been what any fair-minded man would call terrible wrongs on both sides, the evidence indicates that the wrong most often began with the Jews, and that at bottom "anti-Semitism" has commonly been *the effort of gentiles to defend themselves against Jewish injury*—against Jewish invasion, usurpation, moral contamination, financial oppression, double dealing and treasonable intrigue. Certainly in this generous, open-hearted country of ours, antagonism to Jews never began to mount seriously until after gentiles had discovered how grossly Jews were betraying our trust and exploiting the liberties and opportunities we gave them, to work our undoing.

Part C, Section 21

The English Revolution

In the reign of Charles I, King of England from 1625 until he was beheaded in 1649, the Jews had already been outlawed from English shores for about 350 years. Driven out of Spain by Ferdinand and Isabella in 1492, many of them swarmed into Holland, where they soon made Amsterdam the financial capital of the world. Meanwhile England, without any Jews, had prospered mightily, had come to be known as "Merrie England," had produced Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Age, and had destroyed the Spanish Armada; and by the time of Charles the First was showing signs of that expanding vitality that was to make her the greatest empire-builder in all history. This caused the Dutch Jews to lust for readmission to English soil, inasmuch as no animal makes so desirable a host for parasites as one that is healthy and growing. Cromwell came into a collision with the king that developed into a civil war.

He required money and all things needful for his army. The Jews agreed to be the suppliers on condition that, should he come out on top, he would have the ban against them lifted. In a few years the king's head rolled, and Jews, mostly from Holland, swarmed in. Within two generations, they became the dominant financial power in the land and, as we have already seen, the Bank "of England" was set up, which, with its acknowledged privilege of enjoying

“the interest on all moneys which it creates out of nothing” became the model for all the central banking systems with which the Western world was gradually saddled.

Part C, Section 22

The French Revolution

From England we jump to France. It is the fifty years before the Revolution of 1789.

Ever since then, the minds of men have been sedulously saturated with the idea that the French Revolution was a righteous and beneficent thing, a spontaneous upheaval of oppressed and outraged humanity against a king, a nobility and a clergy who battered on them, and that its triumph opened the way to the better world of modern times. That is what I learned in school. But studies that I began years ago²⁰³ opened my eyes to the fact that, on the contrary, the French Revolution may have marked the beginning of the *disintegration* of the Western world, the world of the White man. Certain it is that there is another side to the story. Certain it is that the Revolution was no spontaneous upheaval from below. Certain it is that though, admittedly, there were grievous wrongs that needed to be righted, they could have been righted, and probably would have been righted by orderly and peaceful processes, if the situation had not been exploited by forces set on using violence to overthrow, all at once, the Monarchy, the Aristocracy, and the Church, and thus to tear France loose from her tried traditions and moorings, and to launch her upon a reckless drive in a new and dubious direction.

What is *very* certain is that the French Revolution, like all revolutions since, was deliberately engineered from above—incited by men of brains and cunning, financed and directed by men of wealth and social position.

All Europe at the time had long seethed with the ideas that came to be known as Illuminism. In 1776, Adam Weishaupt (not a Jew) came out with his perfected plans for destroying the social and political order of any country. To what extent his mentors were Jewish is uncertain, though “the Jewish connexions of certain other Illuminati [notably Mirabeau] cannot be disputed.”²⁰⁴ The ideas of “liberty, equality, and fraternity,” which finally produced the Revolution, were fermenting in the Illuminist Jacobin clubs scattered all over France.²⁰⁵ The clubs were antecedents of modern Communist cells. Their leading members belonged to the Masonic Order, which in its European form of Grand Orient Masonry, has always been, and has always boasted of being, highly subversive.²⁰⁶ More explicitly, they have been out to destroy royalty, aristocracy, religion, nationhood, and all government. And the control of the Masonic Order in the France of that time was in the hands of the Jews,²⁰⁷ as it has been ever since.²⁰⁸ Leading Masons have boasted, at official Masonic gatherings, that the French Revolution was their achievement, and likewise other revolutions since then.²⁰⁹

Marcus Eli Ravage, my readers may recall, boasted that Jews have been at the bottom of *all* our revolutions. Perhaps, if that be true, we can the better understand *why* when we discover that they have always come out of them well. Gradually, as the air clears, we may perceive that they were the people who gained most by the French Revolution. Its “success” removed

the restrictions under which they had commonly labored for centuries, and marked the beginning of their acceptance onto that plane of equality with other peoples that they have subsequently enjoyed in the Western world. Ever since then, they have been increasingly free to work and to worm their way into every sort of position of trust, influence, and power in gentile society. But for the gentile world, the French Revolution was a bomb that tore out a huge corner of their social structure. For the second time, the head of a king rolled in the dust. By now there are no real kings left. Worse yet, all belief in kings has died. Indeed, with the passing of our belief in kings has passed also our belief in great men, noble men, even superior men. Today, the very word “noble” has almost dropped out of the English language, and especially out of English speech. Mention of it is made with a lifting of the eyebrows and a smirk; and the ordinary American does not so much as know what the word “honor” means, and even less what honor, the thing itself, is. This fact alone reveals how the springs of our moral and spiritual life have been fouled. And the deterioration is ominous. We have entered into a world which, more and more, is all mob—as Nietzsche put it, mob at the top as well as mob at the bottom.

Part C, Section 23

The Rise of the House of Rothschild

While the French Revolution was running its course, Meyer Amschel Rothschild, as we have seen, was getting his banking house established in Germany, and, under his five sons, in all the principal capitals of Europe. Using finance as a weapon, they waged a secret war on the gentile world. The relations between nations were deliberately embittered and inflamed, so that out of the consequent wars they might reap colossal profits by supplying and financing both sides, by battering on the agony and loss of both sides.²¹⁰ Nations rose and fell, thrones wobbled and toppled, and heads fell, under the touch of the magic wand of Rothschild. Napoleon struggled against the same trickery, snares and pitfalls that Lincoln and Hitler were to struggle against later.²¹¹ But, let my reader remember, Brooks Adams wrote that after Waterloo no power was able to stand up against the forces of the usurers.²¹² By mid-century, as Sombart remarked (p. 99), it was a well-known saying that “there is only one power in Europe, and that is Rothschild.”²¹³ And at the same time (in 1851) this was confirmed by Rabbi Moses Margoliuth, who observed:

“The name of Rothschild thus became ubiquitous, and it was well remarked that the house [of Rothschild] ‘was spread like a network over the nations’; and it is no wonder that its operations upon the money-market should at length have been felt by every cabinet in Europe.”²¹⁴

About this time the Jews had begun to whisper to one another, “We must fill gentile minds with a belief in Democracy. Thus will they most surely come into our power. For what runs Democracy is money, and all the money, in a final showdown, is in our hands.”²¹⁵ And so, gradually, Democracy, and with it the dogma of equality, carried even to the point of one-man one-vote, has become the basis of both domestic and foreign policy in even the most powerful countries of the White man’s world, and the people, as Mr. H.A. Gwynne

observed, have been stripped of the protectors who once stood guard over them in the form of kings and nobility.

Part C, Section 24

The Industrial Revolution

But when Marcus Eli Ravage boasted that the Jews had been “at the bottom of all your revolutions,” I am not sure that he had in mind only those of a political nature. As I have turned things over in my mind through the years, I have found myself wondering increasingly whether the Jews may not have been primarily responsible for the way our industrial system and our technology have developed—into something not altogether to be proud of, and certainly not in accord with the basic instincts, values, and traditions of Nordic man. Let my reader bear in mind the statement in *The American Hebrew*, some fifty years ago, that it was the Jew who “organized capitalism, and its instrumentality the banking system.”²¹⁶ Indeed, this much could hardly be denied, for Werner Sombart, in his *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, a book at once exceedingly revealing and authoritative, had already gone even farther and pointed out essential, crucial, and distinctive features of the capitalist system for which a Jewish origin is certain.

But I wonder whether there isn't more to be said than this. I doubt that anyone of British nobility, direct and legitimate heirs to the old Norse ethic of courage and code of honor, and before beer barons and masters of the stock exchange had found ways to buy or to force their way into the House of Lords, would ever have chosen a career for England that would turn her into a “nation of shopkeepers” and the marketplace of the world. We know that the Industrial Revolution began in England about 1760, long before the Jews with their Bank “of England” had become the dominant financial power in the land. We know that either in obedience to their universal inborn instincts, or in accord with the injunctions in their *Talmud*, they were everlastingly looking upon every invention, development or event for the opportunity it afforded for the making of money. We know, too, that nowhere have they felt any deep bond to the soil, to the land, or to the people among whom they have dwelt, and that gentiles, again on the commands of their *Talmud*, were to be looked upon as cattle to be milked, with a total lack of concern for the long-range welfare of the people who have been their hosts. And does not such an attitude provide the perfect setting for that utterly heartless and soulless expropriation and exploitation of the English people, which called forth so many anguished cries of protest during the period when the Industrial Revolution was taking on its distinctive form and setting its decisive direction? And does it not explain, as nothing else can, the fact that our whole industrial system, and the technology that steered its development, has driven remorselessly toward an economy of mad, reckless profit-seeking, of sheer pillage, rape, and desecration, utterly without regard for what might be its effect on Man himself, on the Earth entrusted to his care, or on those who must come after him?²¹⁷ “Who knows,” jeered Ravage, “what great and glorious destiny might have been yours if we had left you alone?” Aye, who knows how much of the beauty, and elevation, and order, and justice, and stability that Nordic man built into our Middle Ages, might have been improved upon, in the centuries since, to create the most admirable society the Earth has ever seen, *if the Jews had not*, as Ravage says, “taken (us) in hand, and pulled down the

beautiful and generous structure (we) had reared, and changed the whole course of (our) history”?

I must largely pass by our “Revolution” of 1776 (better called our War of Independence), though here again it would seem beyond question, despite the silence of most of our historians, that what our forefathers revolted against was the effort of England (that is, of the *Bank* “of England,” which, as we have seen, was a *private* instrument of *exploitation*) to prevent the colonists from issuing their own paper money debt-free, which had brought prosperity to the Colonies until it was suppressed.²¹⁸

Part C, Section 25

The American Civil War

I pass on to our Civil War, or the War of Secession.

European bankers, looking on from afar, saw what a rich harvest they could reap if only the growing tension between the North and the South could be brought to open conflict. And Miss Coogan records that “the American Civil War was planned in London in 1857”—four years before the first guns were fired.²¹⁹ “Certain bankers,” she continues, “made an agreement that the Paris branch of one group would support and finance the South, and the British branch of the same group would take the similar role for the North.” Behind both was the House of Rothschild. In the North, it was represented by a Jew known to history as “August Belmont”;²²⁰ in the South by his uncle Senator John Slidell of Louisiana, a New Yorker who was Jewish on his father’s side. His financial partner was Judah Benjamin, Secretary of the Confederacy during the War, another Jew and a close friend of Disraeli. According to the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* (Vol. III, p. 30) Benjamin “was generally described as ‘the brains of the Confederacy,’ ” though it adds “particularly during his incumbency of the secretaryship of War, he was extremely unpopular.” Both Benjamin and Slidell “were agents of the Rothschilds and obtained Rothschild Bloc funds for the South during the Civil War (via the d’Erlanger banks).”²²¹ Propaganda pushed the issue of slavery to the fore, but the actual purpose behind it all was to get both sides loaded down with a mountain of debt, and to exploit the desperate exigencies which must arise in the struggle, to drive both sides to accept the same money system that the House of Rothschild had already fastened on England and the Continent. The creation and issuing of money would then be given to a “national” bank, and money, instead of being issued free, on the credit of the whole country, would be issued, every cent of it, as a national debt, secured on the taxes and solvency of the entire people, and yielding interest forever until the day it was paid. That is, the purpose of the bankers was to bleed the vast productivity of the whole American people.²²²

Lincoln, however, saw through their game. He realized that the worst enemy was not the South, but the Jewish bankers of Europe. Their maneuvers²²³ filled him with the greatest anxiety for his country that he had ever known.²²⁴ He was convinced that the Constitution “gave to the people of this Republic the greatest blessing they ever had—their own paper to pay their own debts.” He said:

“Government possessing power to create and issue currency and credit as money and enjoying the right to withdraw currency and credit from circulation by taxation and otherwise, need not and should not borrow capital at interest, as the means of financing Governmental work and public enterprise. The Government should create, issue and circulate all currency and credit needed to satisfy the spending power of the Government and the buying power of consumers. The privilege of creating and issuing money is . . . the supreme prerogative of Government. . .”²²⁵

He meant what he said. Under his initiative Congress actually issued 150 million dollars in paper greenbacks, good for paying all debts public and private. And they have circulated ever since, debt-free.²²⁶

Lincoln thus placed himself squarely across the bankers’ path and cut at the very root of their power. Accordingly it was decided to get him out of the way. And nothing was easier than to find a dupe to shoot him down.²²⁷

There is a mass of evidence to prove that the assassin Booth was no “loner,” but, as his mother often said of him, “the tool of men higher up,” the operative end of a conspiracy of long standing, which had taken him not only on frequent trips to the Confederate “Secret Cabinet” in Canada, but once also even to London and Paris, and related him by cipher code to Judah Benjamin, Confederate Jewish Secretary of State, a friend of Benjamin Disraeli, who had already made his cryptic remark about the world’s being “governed by very different personages to what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes.”²²⁸

The upshot of it all, Ezra Pound summed up bluntly in the words: “The United States were sold to the Rothschilds in 1863.”²²⁹ But the deal was certainly not consummated until 1913, when Paul Warburg, sent over for the express purpose, finally succeeded in saddling the country with the Federal Reserve Bank. By that time, it would seem, the Jews were ready at last to move boldly onto the world stage with plans, matured and tested through centuries, to make themselves at last masters of the Earth. It is to be noted, *and noted well*, that the First World War was not precipitated until *after* the United States, like Europe, had been saddled and bridled with the financial control by which to direct the war toward the achievement of Jewish objectives.²³⁰

From here on, this drive of the Jews for world dominion with their capital in Palestine, must be kept constantly in mind. To this end, it was of vital importance that sooner or later they get a foothold in Palestine, economically the most valuable spot in the whole world and one of the most strategic;²³¹ and likewise that they establish a solid beachhead in some country that would serve as a suitable base for their aboveboard operations and as a nucleus from which their empire could be expanded. It is virtually certain that from the beginning they had their eye on Russia. But what was absolutely essential was a tremendous European civil war that would shatter the White man’s whole world, throw up a host of desperate emergencies (which the Jews know so well how to exploit for their own enrichment), and by the weakening of every European nation clear the road for their own advance. Thus, in the course of the cataclysm, they might come upon opportunities to seize the beachhead, and also to get a hold on Palestine.

Part C, Section 26

The First World War

The pros and cons of how the First World War got started it is manifestly impossible to discuss here in any detail. But it may be categorically stated that among competent historians who have had access to the latest evidence, the idea that Germany was guilty of wanting the war, planning for it or starting it, is completely discredited.²³² Professor Sidney B. Fay, head of the Department of History at Smith College and later one of Roosevelt's "Court Historians," attaches critical importance to the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand of Austria, with which the war began. Without that, war might have been completely avoided.

"The murder of the Archduke," he says, "ignited material which would not otherwise have taken fire as it did, or perhaps at all. It is, therefore, of importance to trace the origins of the plot in which he fell a victim and to determine the responsibility for the deed which was to have such awful and world-racking consequences."²³³

For a background for one's investigation, one needs to bear in mind the statement of Walter Rathenau, five years before the war broke out, that a self-perpetuating body of three hundred men, all known to one another, controlled the destiny of Europe. It would seem that with all this power, they could have prevented war if they had wished to. Perhaps, indeed, war was what they wanted.²³⁴ One remembers again Disraeli's cryptic remark about the course of events' being manipulated from behind the scenes—and his observation that at that time Jews were at the helm of every important country of Europe. So that one has to wonder whether, offstage, *behind* the statesmen who stood in the limelight, there were not other men, perhaps of Jewish race, who, for purposes of their own, worked up and worked upon old international jealousies, fears, and antagonisms; slipped ideas into the minds of figurehead statesmen; and at critical moments were at their elbows to bait and to bribe, to threaten and to coerce. And there are, also, the *not* very cryptic words in speeches by two very powerful Jews, on momentous occasions, in which one of them, fifteen years before the event, predicted the war which would bring forth the promise of Palestine;²³⁵ and in which the other, in reviewing the assassination, the war, and the hold on Palestine they got out of the war, represented these events as the achievement of Jewish power and intrigue.²³⁶

But lest this seem too cloak-and-daggerish, and too full of mere suggestion and suspicion, let me now proceed to set down known facts.

Everything is ready. The U.S., with the Federal Reserve firmly fastened upon it, has been yoked for the decisive part it is to play. And Europe itself, beneath its surface, is a fierce welter of fears and hates and murderous passions. The long-standing conspiracy between France and Russia for the destruction of Germany has done its work: they know each other.²³⁷ It has long been recognized that the Balkans are "the powder keg of Europe." Serbia in particular is the readied percussion cap, needing only to be struck to set off an earth-rocking explosion. And plans have been laid to have it struck. In 1912, the *Revue internationale des sociétés secrètes* (i.e., *The International Review of Secret Societies*) published a few prophetic words by a high Swiss Freemason in regard to Franz Ferdinand, heir to the throne

of Austria, to which Serbia was subject: "He is a remarkable man; it is a pity that he is condemned, he will die on the steps of his throne." ²³⁸ Within two years the Archduke and his wife were assassinated by several Serbian Freemasons. The fatal shots were fired by one Princip, a Jew.²³⁹ This assassination "served as the spark which lit the conflagration in Europe." ²⁴⁰

Professor Fay reviews the shorthand record of the trial of the young assassins in November 1914, which he declared "a fascinating human document" and pronounced "full and fair." ²⁴¹ One of them testified that "the Freemasons had already condemned to death the heir to the throne two years ago," and again, "In Freemasonry it is permitted to kill." ²⁴² He describes the "Black Hand" terrorist organization for achieving the freedom of Serbia. Machinery was already installed by which Freemasons, plotting in Belgrade, under secret orders from unidentified Masons yet higher up in Vienna (or for that matter, in Paris or St. Petersburg) could step in and *use* the Serbian feud with Austria to start a world war for ends of their own.

He recounts the formation of the conspiracy. But the plot was actually hatched in France, at Toulouse, where three of the terrorists met in January 1914. Here one of them "came into direct touch with various Russian revolutionists, including Trotsky." ²⁴³ The purpose in going to France was—it would seem manifest—to meet the men "higher up" who would decide who was to be killed, and when and where, and who would provide the necessary money and arms.

What I have been implying is that I believe the Jews started the war. And after the evidence that I have already submitted, perhaps this will not strike my readers as too farfetched. But I will add that Henry Ford put it on record that some "very prominent" Jews insisted, in conversation with him, that it was their own people who contrived the war, precipitated it, and so controlled it that it would stop only when they wanted it stopped.²⁴⁴

In view of the profits accruing to the financiers, it is understandable why they should have pushed the nations into it and done their best to keep it going. Mr. A.K. Chesterton, writing in his *The New Pioneer* in June 1939, stated that Britain's Board of Inland Revenue "estimated that 340,000 [persons] made £2,846,000 out of the war and 3620 made £707,000,000, bringing their total wealth up to £1,995,000,000."

In any case, the war got started and ran its course.

By 1916, it seemed to have reached a stalemate. Both sides were desperate. Germany's submarines had brought Britain to the point where her people were only two weeks ahead of their food supply. And the Allied encirclement of the Central Powers had forced them to fight on more fronts than they could effectively man. Out of the common desperation, the Jews were able to achieve two of their chief objectives. In what follows, it must be remembered that, as always, the Jews in all countries communicated and cooperated freely across all national boundaries. Few gentiles were aware that while Paul Warburg (with his Kuhn, Loeb & Co.) was dominating the situation here, his blood brother Max had the Kaiser under his thumb in Germany.

Part C, Section 27

The Balfour Declaration

Britain was desperate to get the United States into the war on the Allied side. Zionist Jews in England commenced negotiations with representatives of the British Government, and Zionist Jews in America intensified their pressure upon President Wilson, whom Justice Brandeis and others had already softened up with Zionist indoctrination and who was completely in their power both by his financial indebtedness to them for his office and by the blackmail they held over him.²⁴⁵ The outcome was a *quid pro quo* contract, a “necessarily secret gentlemen’s agreement,” that if the Jews put the United States into the war on the Allied side, Britain would throw her weight into establishing a Jewish “national home” in Palestine.²⁴⁶ The famous Balfour Declaration was only the public confirmation of the deal.²⁴⁷ Thus the war was the means by which the Jews realized the first of their great objectives, a hold on Palestine. But it was the Americans who paid the price of it: they were dragged into the war manifestly against their will, and laid down their lives and paid out their money in support of a transaction from which no one gained but the Jews. Indeed, “the First World War headed the United States and the World toward international disaster.”²⁴⁸

Part C, Section 28

The Russian Revolution of November, 1917

Meanwhile, Germany was in as critical a predicament as the Allies. She found herself unable to hold off the enemy on two fronts. Somehow Russia must be knocked out of the war, so that she could concentrate all her forces in the West. In this dire situation, the Kaiser’s Government began to listen to Jewish urging that a pack of trained Communist revolutionists be spirited into Russia to overthrow the Czar.

It has been said, even by General Ludendorff²⁴⁹ and by Winston Churchill²⁵⁰ that it was the German “Government” which saw the opportunity to paralyze the Russian war effort, already tottering, by shipping across the border some hundreds of trained revolutionists. But it appears that throughout the reign of Kaiser Wilhelm II the *real rulers* of Germany were the Jews.²⁵¹ The country swarmed with Jews, very powerful Jews, who were all in touch not only with one another but with fellow Jews in Russia, the Balkans, England, Sweden, and of course the United States, and all were working together not for the good of the countries to which they had sworn allegiance, but for the advancement of World Jewry.²⁵² There is some evidence that Bethmann-Hollweg, the German Chancellor, was a Jew.²⁵³ But more important than he by far, were such immensely powerful Jews as the Rothschilds, Max Warburg, Walter Rathenau, Felix Deutsch and Albert Ballin. Working together, they were able to move anything.²⁵⁴

From the start, it was expected and intended that in Russia the war would result in revolution, and plans for it were being made and financial backing guaranteed.²⁵⁵ Lenin was in Switzerland, and Trotsky on the East Side in New York training revolutionists,²⁵⁶ some

scores of them veterans of the abortive Russian revolution of 1905. At a secret meeting in New York in February of 1916, it was revealed that reports just received described the situation as ripe for a great revolution. And unequivocal assurances were forthcoming that all the money needed for carrying out their plans would be provided. "In this connection the name of Jacob Schiff was repeatedly mentioned." ²⁵⁷

It has become impossible for me to doubt that Jewish International Finance was at the bottom of the Revolution, wanted the Revolution, and alone made it possible. M. le Comte Saint-Aulaire, French Ambassador to Britain from 1920 to 1924, declared: "The preponderant part played by the great Jewish bankers in the Russian revolution need not be demonstrated. They let it loose upon the world in conjunction with Germany whence they came and where they had their associates." ²⁵⁸

And it simply will not do to argue that the backing that International Finance gave to revolution was given only to Kerensky—in *Mardi* of 1917, and that it "never contributed so much as a dime" in support of the Bolshevism of Lenin and Trotsky, which made "the real revolution" the following November, or of the Soviet Government after the decrees of Lenin went into effect. The truth is just the opposite. However great the paradox, and however much it may test one's acumen and imagination to comprehend that the international finance of *Capitalism* instigated and supported revolutionary *Communism*, supposedly its mortal enemy, a mass of unanswerable evidence has established that the Revolution, whether the preliminary one of Kerensky or the decisive one of Lenin and Trotsky, would never have gotten started, or, having been started, would never have been able to stay on its feet and grow for more than five decades, if it had not been for the machinations and the massive backing of International Finance. Furthermore, in the light of the whole body of available evidence, it seems to me certain that this International Finance has been predominantly Jewish.

To close students of the matter, this over-all truth has been known for a long time. It was the Jewish Money Power that planted Lenin and Trotsky in Moscow. Nesta Webster, writing 40 years ago, in *The Surrender of an Empire* (pp. 78-9), submitted evidence that "as early as March 2, 1917 . . . the German Imperial Bank notified its agents in Switzerland to honour all demands by Lenin, Trotsky and their associates for propaganda purposes in Russia." She cited the *London Times* of February 9, 1918, for "a remarkable article entitled 'German Gold for Lenin,' quoting documentary evidence produced by the *Petit Parisien* to show that Lenin, Trotsky and other Bolshevist stalwarts 'have been and are in German pay.'" ²⁵⁹ (Of course, from the known dominance of Jewish financial power everywhere—in every country of Europe as in the United States, and from the proven interconnectedness of the Jewish Money Power in any *one* country *with that in all others* [of which she gives substantial evidence], "in German pay" meant simply "in Jewish pay"!)²⁶⁰

In confirmation of the charge that "German" money was being funneled to the Bolsheviks in Russia she cites the declaration of "the German-Jewish Socialist Edward Bernstein, who exposed the whole plot in January 1921 . . . that he had irrefutable evidence of Lenin's work for the German Government and of the millions he had received." This "Lenin himself had already admitted." And she quotes the words of his admission, made "at a meeting of . . . the Russian Cabinet at the end of October 1918." At this time, "according to Bernstein, no less

than £2,500,000 [the equivalent of perhaps 12 or 13 million dollars] was supplied to him by the German Imperial Bank.”²⁶¹ And the names of the principal negotiators and go-betweens seem to be mostly such as Olaf Aschberg, Jacob Fuerstenberg (alias Ganetsky), Israel Lazarevitch Helphand (alias Alexander Israel Helphand; also Parvus)—all Jews, together with J. P. Morgan and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., both known to represent the House of Rothschild in the United States.

Until recently, I would have added the testimony of the famous “Sisson Documents,” published in October 1918 by President Wilson’s Committee on Public Information. The *London Times* in summarizing this report on October 18, 1918, “told how certain Jewish international bankers, affiliated with the Warburgs and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., helped finance Lenin and Trotsky to power.” But, according to Professor Antony C. Sutton, whom I take to be an exceptionally careful and scrupulous scholar, it is now generally agreed that the Sisson Documents were “almost all forgeries.” Nevertheless he concedes that “those who forged them certainly had access to some unusually good information” and that “in general” they are “based partly on generally authentic information.” For instance, he cites the fact, well-known on other grounds, that “the Nya Banken in Stockholm served as the conduit for Bolshevik funds from Germany,” and that the Jew Aschberg, “director of the Nya Banken in 1917” was the “Bolshevik Banker,” and that “both were central to Bolshevik funding.”²⁶²

In any case, and regardless of the Sisson Documents, we know that the Jewish Communal Register of 1917-18, published by the Kehillah [Jewish Community] of New York (p. 1019), praised Jacob Schiff, head of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., for financing the Russian Revolution. Schiff himself eventually acknowledged this. And John M. Schiff estimated in 1949 that his grandfather Jacob had put up about 20 million dollars for the final triumph of Bolshevism in Russia.²⁶³ The same journal quoted above (1917 edition) actually stated that Jacob “financed the enemies of Autocratic Russia from the money market of the United States.” Which is exactly what Congressman McFadden charged in his scathing speech before the House on June 10, 1932—that our Federal Reserve had “taken money out of [the United States],” and had drawn upon the credit of the American Government, to prepare for the Revolution in Russia, to create a reign of terror in Russia, to instigate a separate peace between Germany and Russia, to foment and instigate the Revolution, and to “place a large fund of American dollars at Trotsky’s disposal in one of the branch banks in Sweden.”²⁶⁴

Finally, let me add the witness of Mr. Boris Brasol, who, as we saw some pages back, was an international jurist of distinction and of very responsible position. Writing in 1919, he declared:

“The full history of the interlocking participation of the Imperial German Government and international finance in the destruction of the Russian Empire is not yet written.

“It is not a mere coincidence that at the notorious meeting held at Stockholm in 1916, between the former Russian Minister of the Interior . . . and the German agents, the German Foreign Office was represented by Mr. Warburg, whose two brothers were members of the international banking firm Kuhn, Loeb & Co., of which the later Mr. Jacob Schiff was a senior member. . . . Indeed, this was more than a German plot; it was a world-conspiracy,

first against Russia and next against Christian civilization at large. The following two documents throw a peculiar sidelight upon the nature of this sinister enterprise.”

And then are quoted two documents showing that large sums of money had been made available at large banking houses for the use of Trotsky and Lenin. Mr. Brasol remarks that “the documents quoted were never repudiated” by the banks involved—the Disconto-Gesellschaft and the Rheinisch-Westphalian Syndicate. He continues:

“The documents above quoted reveal the active participation of international banking organizations in the ‘undertaking of Comrade Trotsky.’ The Disconto-Gesellschaft, the Rheinisch-Westphalian Syndicate, the international banking firm of Warburgs, the various subsidiary institutions in Scandinavia, such as the Nye Banken, all of them were working in harmonious accord with the red generals of the world-revolution.”²⁶⁵

All this evidence is fully in line with a great deal of other evidence already submitted in one connection or another; and, especially when appraised in its entirety, I confess that I find it very impressive. Furthermore, as far as the primary responsibility of International Finance for launching and backing Bolshevist Communism is concerned, this has now been proved to the hilt by the massive and rock-hard evidence which Professor Antony C. Sutton has very recently published in his *National Suicide, Military Aid to the Soviet Union* and in *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*.²⁶⁶ Dr. Sutton, after some years as a Professor of Economics at the University of California at Los Angeles, became a Research Fellow at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University. He is “an internationally known academic researcher” with three books published at Stanford University, one by the U.S. Naval Institute, and now the two just mentioned. These last are of critical importance for understanding what has been going on in the world, beneath the surface, for most of this century, and for alerting the American people to what they have got to do if they are to avert catastrophe in the near future. The former of these, *National Suicide*, which I shall greatly enlarge upon a little later, proves unanswerably that there is no such thing as Soviet technology, that there is only American and Allied technology on Soviet soil, that the “enemy” we annually spend some 80 billion dollars to defend ourselves against, we have ourselves created and maintained, that our help began in 1917 and has continued without interruption ever since—down to the present moment [1977].

His other book, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, published only a few months ago, dwells particularly on the part played by International Finance in instigating and financing the Bolshevik Revolution that first put “Communism” on its feet as a dread force in world affairs. His evidence is taken largely from State Department documents that were released only recently from the tight secrecy in which they had been kept for over fifty years; but also from personal papers of key Wall Street magnates, biographies and authoritative histories. He proves, indisputably, that there has been “an enthusiastic alliance of Wall Street and Marxist socialism” dating back even to some years *before* the Bolshevik Revolution, that “there has been a continuing, albeit concealed, alliance between international political capitalists and international revolutionary socialists—to their mutual benefit.” Variantly, he states that the “partnership” has been “between international *monopoly* capitalism and international revolutionary socialism for their mutual benefit.” And he offers an explanation to resolve the paradox, which I find very plausible.²⁶⁷

But at the moment we are not so much concerned with resolving the paradox as with the fact, and what the fact means. If international Communism, driving for world dominion, was actually the child of International Finance, if International Finance deliberately brought it to birth, and since its birth has sedulously fed it and coddled it and made it to grow, must it not be looked upon as a deliberately chosen *instrument* of International Finance? And if so, and if International Finance in the final analysis is a *Jewish* monopoly, then it is an instrument, and perhaps even the supreme instrument, by which International Jewry drives toward world mastery, toward world government.²⁶⁸

Thus with all the maneuvering, wire-pulling, secrecy, and heavy outlay of millions, we see that everything was prepared, and even distant aims firmly set, well in advance. And when at last the great day arrived in April 1917, Lenin and some 200 of his fellow conspirators, almost 80 percent of them Jews,²⁶⁹ were shipped in a sealed train across Germany from Switzerland into Russia. And in a like way and at about the same time Trotsky arrived, with a mysterious \$10,000 in his pocket, and along with over 300 Jews from the East Side of New York, where all of them had been trained in the murderous tactics of revolution.²⁷⁰ The provision for all the expense involved in getting such a number of men transported such a distance, for the manipulations required to spirit them, without passports, across the boundaries of nations at war with one another,²⁷¹ and for the further expense for keep, arms, organization and propaganda after they were established in Russia, could have been accomplished only by the enormous power and hidden influence of Jewish international finance. As Nesta Webster concludes her account of the matter, "It was only owing to the powerful influence behind [the Bolsheviks] that this minority party was able to seize the reins of power, and, having seized them, to retain their hold of them up to the present day."²⁷² Moreover, that the crucial Bolshevik 1917 revolution was in fact Jewish is manifest from the very high proportion of Jews in the key positions of the initial Bolshevik Government. Mr. H.A. Gwynne, in *The Cause of World Unrest* made it to be 95 percent.²⁷³ Mr. Robert Wilton, "the chief British newspaper representative in Russia," for many years Special Correspondent of the *London Times*, made it at least 90 percent.²⁷⁴ Victor E. Marsden, correspondent of the *London Morning Post* at the same time, "compiled a list of 545 principal early Bolshevik officials. Of these 454 were Jews and only 23 genuine Russians," the balance being odds and ends.²⁷⁵ All these lists tabulate the officials by name, with their aliases and the office each held. But no one has gone into this matter more thoroughly or produced more solid evidence than Dr. Denis Fahey in his *The Rulers of Russia*, which I have already cited in another connection.²⁷⁶ Testimony before our Senate Overman Committee in 1919 put it on record that

"In December, 1919 . . . under the Presidency of a man known as Apfelbaum (Zinovieff), . . . out of the 388 members [of the Bolshevik central government] only 16 happened to be real Russians, and all the rest [with the exception of a Negro from the U.S.] were Jews."²⁷⁷

As late as 1936, of 59 members of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in Moscow, 56 were Jews,²⁷⁸ and all but one of the Bolshevik ambassadors or ministers to foreign countries were Jews.²⁷⁹ And in 1935 Douglas Reed, for many years the distinguished European correspondent of the *London Times*, wrote:

“The censorship department, and that means the whole machine for controlling the home and muzzling the foreign press, was entirely staffed by Jews, . . . There seemed not to be a single non-Jewish official in the whole outfit.”²⁸⁰

To all these figures is to be added the fact that the Russian Revolution was widely acclaimed and endorsed by Jews as a Jewish achievement and the realization of Jewish aims and ideals.²⁸¹ It is to be noted also that “anti-Semitism” was immediately made a capital offense, and that, in the slaughter attending the Revolution, the synagogues and the rabbis were spared.

Thus it is obvious that the so-called “Russian” Revolution was Russian only in the sense that it took place in Russia. It was anything but a spontaneous uprising on the part of the Russian people. From beginning to end, it was the expression of a Jewish idea, and was Jew-financed, Jew-led and Jew-executed. In short, it was the subjugation of some 180 million gentiles by a handful of utterly alien Jews.

In the face of such evidence as I have submitted, it seems quite impossible to make out a case that the Jewish Money Power never gave its backing to Bolshevism, to that revolution of 1917 which was set up and directed by Lenin and Trotsky. What seems plain is that it was *precisely this kind* of revolution, revolution aimed at the subversion of the entire world and the ultimate dominion of Jews, to which Jewish finance gave its backing most of all. “Communism,” conceived by Jews, set up by Jews, and directed and supported by Jews, has from the beginning been regarded by Jews as one of their two most powerful instruments for world conquest. Let us not forget that the Comte de Saint-Aulaire, French Ambassador to Britain from 1920 to 1924, quoted a Jewish “director of a great New York Bank” as explaining to a gathering of dignitaries in Europe after the war, that international finance and Bolshevism, though they were seeming opposites, were in fact not only Jew-controlled but ultimately one in their purpose and end—namely, “the remaking of the world from above by the control of riches, and from below by revolution.”²⁸²

Nor can it be maintained that the Jewish support of Communism came to an end with Lenin—or with Stalin either, for that matter. There is a mass of evidence, which I find conclusive, that it has never seriously wavered or failed to come to its rescue at critical moments. A substantial part of this evidence, as I have already said, it is best to submit in another connection further along in this chapter. It absolutely proves, beyond any possibility of refutation, that while posing as the enemy of Communists, and in particular of Russia as Communism’s chief stronghold, it has been precisely the Jew-controlled nations of the West, above all the United States, that for decades have clandestinely created her whole technology for her and built her up to be the formidable antagonist that she now is.²⁸³ For the moment, however, I will go further back in history and thus provide even more of a setting for what is to follow. It must never be forgotten that when the terms of settlement at the end of the First World War were being decided, it was Jewish International Finance that spearheaded the drive for recognition of the Bolshevist Government, which was precisely the government that Lenin had set up and still headed. The greatly respected journalist H. Wickham Steed, who by the time of the Versailles Peace Conference had become the *London Times’* Editor-in-Chief, has put on record some clandestine negotiations that went on there.

“Potent international interests were at work in favour of the immediate recognition of the Bolsheviks [sic]. Those influences had been largely responsible for the Anglo-American proposal in January to call Bolshevik representatives to Paris at the beginning of the Peace Conference. The well-known American Jewish banker, Mr. Jacob Schiff, was known to be anxious to secure recognition for the Bolsheviks, among whom Jewish influence was predominant; and Tschitcherin, the Bolshevik Commissary for Foreign Affairs, had revealed the meaning of the January proposal by offering extensive commercial and economic concessions in return for recognition at a moment when the Bolsheviks were doing their utmost to spread revolution throughout Europe and when the Allies were supposed to be making peace in the name of high moral principles, a policy of recognizing them as the price of commercial concessions, would have wrecked the whole Peace Conference and Europe with it.” On the following page Mr. Steed records that, in a tense discussion with Colonel House (who was pushing for recognition), he said to Colonel House: “I insisted that . . . the prime movers were Jacob Schiff, Warburg, and other international financiers, who wished all to bolster up the Jewish Bolsheviks in order to secure a field for German and Jewish exploitation of Russia.”²⁸⁴

This, to be sure, was away back in 1919. But the evidence will not admit of the conclusion that World Jewry with its Money Power has ever abandoned the monster it created and did so much to keep on its feet and to nourish. In view of what I am to say later, I need no more than mention here a few of the most infamous and calamitous of the manipulations and deals by which F.D.R. and Churchill, and military men such as Eisenhower, betrayed their people and surrendered themselves (if they didn't sell themselves) to be tools of the machinations of vengeful Jews for the destruction of the White man's world and its removal from their path to world dominion.²⁸⁵ I think of the trap that they helped set to get the war started in 1939 (the guarantee of Poland's independence, which they knew perfectly well in advance they could never make good);²⁸⁶ the treachery by which they dragged the American people into the war (the insufferably arrogant and infuriating terms that Roosevelt imposed on Japan, which were *intended and expected* to bring forth the attack on Pearl Harbor, to which the commanders at Pearl Harbor were never alerted even when Roosevelt knew that the attack was on its way);²⁸⁷ the baseness to which they stooped to ensure that the destruction and the loss of life would be as shattering and as irreparable as possible (the demand for “unconditional surrender,” coupled with the deliberate adoption of mass obliteration bombing of German civilian areas);²⁸⁸ the agreements that they made with Stalin by which, when the Germans at last were down, Eisenhower withdrew his victorious army and thus admitted the Russian hordes into the very heartland of the White man's world, all eastern Europe was abandoned to the horrors of Communist despotism, and the whole holocaust was finally brought to a close by a series of infamies. Of these, I will mention only the orgies of Jewish vengefulness that culminated in the piece of savagery known as the Nuremberg Trials. These trials made an utter mockery of justice, in which the very principles on which the White man had founded his civilization were abandoned. Thus the White man's honor was dragged in the dirt before the eyes of the whole world, while the Jews, at least to one another, crowed their triumph.

As a final touch to this matter that we now have under examination, let me call attention to certain events of the past fifty years that reveal how, in a way typical of the Jew, he has often been able to use gentiles as his agents to accomplish his ends without showing his hand.

There are things that White men, and especially Nordic Americans, need to know about the House of Rockefeller.

There is some evidence that the Rockefellers are Jews. In 1961, the Jewish-owned firm Harper & Row published, in only 350 copies, *The Grandees, America's Sephardic Elite* by Stephen Birmingham, recognized by Jewry as an expert on Jewish history. In this book, reference is made to a very rare book "for Jews only" by the Jewish historian Malcolm H. Stern and entitled *Americans of Jewish Descent*, which submits the ancestry of the Rockefeller family and shows it to have been Jewish.

In any case, whether the Rockefellers are Jews or gentiles, they have always been affiliated with the great Jewish bankers. "Since the time of their grandfather" [the original "John D."] they "have worked hand-in-glove with the Rothschilds"—the most powerful banking house in the world, and of course Jewish. Moreover, it is never to be forgotten that in the United States the Rothschilds have always had their principal representatives and agents in the Warburgs. Obviously, therefore, the eventual merger of the Rockefellers' Chase Bank with the Warburgs' Bank of Manhattan, revealed the deep underlying affinity uniting them all, and was essentially a marriage of the Rockefellers to the Rothschilds. From this time on, it may fairly be assumed that these two mammoth banking houses had common aims, and that all they did advanced World Jewry.

And thus we perceive that some facts, recently featured in a lead article in the *South African Observer* in regard to the operations of the Rockefellers,²⁸⁹ very plainly reflect the Jews' desire to have Communism take possession of the Earth. For instance, General Walter Bedell Smith, Director of the C.I.A., declared to President Eisenhower his judgment that "Nelson Rockefeller is a Communist."²⁹⁰ Also, at the 1945 organizational meeting of the UN in San Francisco, of which Alger Hiss was Secretary General, Nelson withheld evidence given him by the FBI that Hiss was a Communist agent. If this information had been made public it would have stopped Hiss dead in his tracks and thus have stymied his drive to set up the UN for the further advance of Communism.²⁹¹ Again, in 1949, it was the Rockefellers' putting their immense wealth behind the subversive Institute of Pacific Relations that enabled the Communists to take over all China, with the enormous weight of its 800 million people.²⁹² In 1957, it was again Nelson Rockefeller, according to Mr. Brown, who instituted arrangements which resulted in our giving away well over 4 billion dollars' worth of Uranium-235, of which enough went to Russia to make some 550 atom bombs. And so it has gone on ever since the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. After reviewing the Rockefellers' enormous services to the "Communist" cause over the years, Mr. Brown thus sums up the plain truth as far as Russia is concerned:

"For five decades the Communists have based their propaganda on the theme that they were going to destroy the Rockefellers and the super-rich capitalists of the West. Yet for five decades the Rockefellers have been involved in building the strength of the Soviets. Their involvement dates right back to the Bolshevik Revolution, and paid off handsome dividends in 1973, when their Chase Manhattan Bank was allowed to set up shop openly in Moscow and became the American bankers for the Soviet Union."

Or, as Dr. Sutton has it, in 1970 Governor Nelson Rockefeller was photographed in an embrace with Khrushchev,²⁹³ the incarnation of Communism, who had deliberately murdered some 6 million Ukrainian kulaks simply because they resisted Communist orders to collectivize their farms; and “in May 1973, Chase Manhattan Bank (chairman, David Rockefeller) opened its Moscow office at 1 Karl Marx Square, Moscow.”²⁹⁴ If, at this point, we now pause to look back over the way by which we have come, we can see that by means of the war the Jews achieved all three of their principal objectives: (1) The White man and his civilization had been fearfully shattered by the ghastly catastrophe; (2) by remorselessly exploiting the desperate exigencies that the war had created, they had been able to extort from the British the pledge of Palestine “for a homeland”; and (3) by demolishing the tottering Government of the Czar with a revolution, they had been able to get the beachhead for their empire-to-be—a beachhead in Russia, strategically placed in the vast Eurasian land mass for easy access both to the industrialized nations of Europe and to the boundless resources of the rest of the continent. “Russia,” Dr. Sutton observes, “was then—and is today—the largest untapped market in the world.”²⁹⁵

Nevertheless, the war fell somewhat short of its intended purpose. Even though it “headed the United States and the world toward international disaster”;²⁹⁶ even though “over thirty-seven million people [mostly gentiles] suffered death or mutilation, other unrecorded millions disappeared, six million died from civil strife and forty million from consequent epidemics, and hundreds of millions suffered indescribable sorrows and anxiety”²⁹⁷—still, it was not enough altogether to remove the obstacle which the White man presented to the Jewish advance toward world dominion. For that another White civil war would be necessary. And the First World War had not yet been settled when World Jewry set itself once again to ensure that another such war would take place.

This was well within its power. M. Comte de Saint-Aulaire remarked “that scandalous partiality in favour of Bolshevism” which President Wilson, “the godfather and the father, at any rate by adoption²⁹⁸ of the League of Nations, forced upon the Supreme Council.” He added that “in 1920, even if Wilson had quitted the political scene, the same hidden power of which he was the instrument still protected the Soviets.”²⁹⁹ Mr. Lloyd George in his *War Memoirs*, when writing about the part of the international bankers in the Versailles Conference, sized up the actual situation vividly in the following unforgettable words:

“They swept statesmen, politicians, jurists and journalists all on one side and issued their orders with an imperiousness of absolute monarchs who knew that there was no appeal from their ruthless decrees.”³⁰⁰

A few arresting but undeniable facts bear this out. All the great plenipotentiaries (Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau, etc.) had Jewish secretaries eminent in the Jewish world, who knew far more about the crucial issues than the plenipotentiaries themselves did.³⁰¹ It was the New York journalist Walter Lippman who drafted, at least in large part, President Wilson’s Fourteen Points for the terms of peace with Germany, which in the first instance, however, were drawn up by European Freemasonry.³⁰² And President Wilson, overnight, before the eyes of the whole world, reversed his stand in regard to five of those points at the dictation of a cablegram from Jacob Schiff of Kuhn, Loeb and five of his Jewish financial associates.³⁰³ But Dr. E. J. Dillon, “whose knowledge of the inside story of the intrigue at the Peace

Conference is so profound,"³⁰⁴ perhaps looked even deeper beneath the surface than Lloyd George, and in any case pointed out its ultimate significance for the White man more plainly and more sententiously. Quietly watching what went on, he noted that, though to all appearances the Treaty was written by the great Anglo-Saxon powers, it was commonly observed that what guided the pen was primarily a concern for Jewish aggrandizement and the Jewish will to ultimate world dominion. I must quote some sentences from his conclusions, as stated only five or six pages from the end of his remarkable book *The Inside Story Of The Peace Conference*:

"Most of [Mr. Wilson's colleagues] believed that a pretext was being sought to enable the leading Powers to intervene in the domestic concerns of all the other states, so as to keep them firmly in hand, and use them as means to their own ends. And these ends were looked upon as anything but disinterested.... It may seem amazing to some readers, but it is nonetheless a fact that a considerable number of delegates believed that the real influences behind the Anglo-Saxon people were Semitic.

". . . And they concluded that the sequence of expedients framed and enforced in this direction were inspired by the Jews, assembled in Paris for the purpose of realizing their carefully thought-out program, which they succeeded in having executed. . . The formula into which this policy was thrown by the members of the Conference, whose countries it affected, and who regarded it as fatal to the peace of eastern Europe, was this: 'Henceforth the world will be governed by the Anglo-Saxon peoples, who, in turn, are swayed by their Jewish elements.'" ³⁰⁵

Many men might be quoted, men of the highest position and authority, who viewed the results of the Peace Treaty with vast alarm. Francesco Nitti, Prime Minister of Italy, for instance, who "was intimately concerned in the making of the peace," declared:

"It will remain forever a terrible precedent in modern history that, against all pledges, all precedents and all traditions, the representatives of Germany were never even heard, nothing was left to them but to sign a treaty at a moment when famine and exhaustion and threat of revolution made it impossible not to sign it."

And again:

"I believe that Europe is threatened with decadence more owing to the Peace Treaties than as a result of the war. She is in a state of daily increasing decline, and the causes of dissatisfactions are growing apace." ³⁰⁶

And some thirty years later, after the passions had all subsided, Professor Charles Callan Transill wrote:

"In Germany, numerous persons could not forget the fact that the Treaty of Versailles was the cornerstone of a structure that had been built upon the dubious sands of betrayal. Lloyd George and Clemenceau had reluctantly agreed to a pre-Armistice contract that bound them to fashion the treaty of peace along the lines of the Fourteen Points. The Treaty of Versailles

was a deliberate violation of the contract. In the dark soil of this breach of promise, the seeds of another world war were deeply sown.”³⁰⁷

In short, the Treaty was written and its terms enforced in such a way as to make another world war inevitable. Peter Nicoll wrote in 1948:

“Practically every thoughtful and intelligent and experienced writer in England up to the year 1938 has in one way or another testified that the Treaty of Versailles, by what it did and by what it failed to do, contained the seeds of another war. . . . But let Mr. Lansing, Secretary [of State] under President Wilson, sum up this particular cause of the inevitable Second World War. He wrote, after 1919, ‘War will follow these treaties as surely as night follows day.’”³⁰⁸

Part C, Section 29

The Second World War

The terms of the Versailles Peace Treaty produced Hitler. In view of the evidence, it is not too much to say they were intended to produce Hitler—or more exactly, someone like Hitler. If there was to be another war, Germany had to be got back on her feet enough so that she could fight, and *would* fight.³⁰⁹

But the years between 1919 and the coming of Hitler, for the German people, were years of desperation and despair.³¹⁰ I judge that very few men know much of the story. For those who want to take a look at the German side of it let me recommend *Unfinished Victory* by Professor Arthur Bryant,³¹¹ who tells it with remarkable understanding, very objectively, and on the whole, justly. I think, also, that every gentile should know Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* firsthand, and in a complete and unexpurgated edition.³¹² His leadership may have been “emotional,” as Jeffrey Mark recognized, but I think he was right in declaring it, nevertheless, to have been “intensely sincere.”³¹³ I have listened to arguments to the contrary, and for years was in doubt, but gradually I have come to think that Lloyd George and Churchill were just in saying of him, when he first came to the fore in Germany, that they only hoped that if Britain were ever reduced to such desperate straits as Germany had been in, she might be blessed with a leader as courageous, and as able, and as dedicated as he.³¹⁴

Part C, Section 30

Hitler’s Purpose □ the Regeneration of his People

Hitler’s dominant purpose was the redemption of his country. Unknown and alone, he set himself to bring his people, 80 million of them, broken by defeat and desperate with unemployment, starvation, and an utterly devastating inflation, to what can only be called a renaissance. Germany was to be reborn, washed clean, and made beautiful. At bottom, her people were among the greatest of all time. Her art, her philosophy, her literature, her music, her science, even her ability to fight a war, all proved it. But if a new Germany was to be

born, the life that was in her people must be freed from outside dictation, and purged internally of such alien, unassimilable, and even treacherous elements as the Jews, whom he regarded as “purveyors of moral pestilence.” It must be purged, too, from its own inner decay—its own hopeless morons and imbeciles, and all those victims of hereditary disease and defectiveness who could only be a misery to themselves and a useless burden upon a society struggling to reach hitherto unknown heights. At the same time the whole people must be put under the strictest discipline.³¹⁵ Only thus could a country encircled by hostile powers and lacking all natural barriers of sea or mountain hope to hold off a constant threat of foreign invasion. And not least, they must be stirred and lifted to a point of readiness to sacrifice life itself for the sake of the Fatherland.

Yet in his *Mein Kampf*, Hitler was unequivocal that “the State is not an end in itself but the means to an end. . . The State is only . . . the vessel and the race is what it contains. The vessel serves its purpose only if it safeguards and preserves its contents.” In other words, even the individual would have no life worth the living unless the whole people had a State strong enough to hold off its enemies.

A people’s supreme treasure was its race, the whole collection of genes that made it something distinctive, and determined what it could be, and must be, and thus shaped its future. Professor Arthur Bryant says, in an effort to put Hitler’s philosophy into a nutshell,

“Nature taught that all progress came through the physical improvement of the breed. Men were not disembodied and denationalised intelligences, operating without relation either to their forebears or their posterity. All natural evolution had been effected through certain races: so long as they kept their virility unimpaired, human achievement remained cumulative. But once the purity of the blood and capacity for healthful breeding of a people were impaired, whether through unhealthy conditions or miscegenation, the race deteriorated and the quality of the individual declined with it.”³¹⁶

To accomplish his objectives Hitler had to create his party. He began with six or seven members. As they grew, Communists undertook to break up their meetings by force. Since the radio and press were closed to them, they eventually had to take to the streets to win a hearing. Here also murderous gangs of Communists attacked them. “There were districts in the capital and the industrial areas where it was suicide for a supporter of Hitler to show his face without the protection of his fellows. Three hundred of their numbers were killed and 25,000 wounded.”³¹⁷ But after thirteen years of struggle, Hitler had won the support of the overwhelming majority of the German people, and on January 30, 1933 was invited by President Hindenburg to form a Government.

Part C, Section 31

Hitler’s Record

What followed is a matter of history. Hitler took over the reins at the time of the Great Depression. There were 6,000,000 unemployed in Germany (about 30 percent of the working population) and 11,000,000 unemployed in the United States. But “within two years

[Hitler's] schemes for the regeneration of the German people astonished everyone. While the Ship of State in America was lumbering rudderless in stormy seas, Hitler was steering his bark into comparatively calm water at home. Never was such a feat excelled, and he drew from Churchill and many others praise never before given to a European politician." ³¹⁸

The transformation really seemed miraculous. Industry was booming. Unemployment was wiped out. Savings began to climb. The German peasant, who had been on the verge of utter ruin, was given an honored status as the source of the nation's food supply, his land was released from the grip of the Jewish usurer and measures taken to ensure that it should "remain permanently in the possession of one family, handed down from father to son." ³¹⁹ The sterilization of the unfit was begun, under the supervision of eugenics courts, to whose competence and conscientiousness Lothrop Stoddard witnessed in his *Into the Darkness*.³²⁰ Improvement of the German people's genetic stock was fostered by marriage loans to couples who had graded high in selective tests, one quarter of which was cancelled for each child they brought into the world. And this is only to mention some of the most important undertakings that were launched, reaching, it was planned, far into Germany's future.

But, economically, all this was founded on moves that were detestable to the international bankers. Instead of basing Germany's recovery on enormous loans from their banks, as they had counted on his doing, he realized that—to say it again—the hand that lends is always stronger than the hand that receives, and that therefore Germany could never be free to choose her course and to shape her life according to her own will, or even to achieve a recovery that was real and to build an economy that would prove solid and lasting, *if she went into debt to the international bankers*. He therefore worked out a temporary expedient of barter, by which he could get much of what he needed by exchanging German surplus for the surplus of other countries—in common parlance, by swapping.

But of much farther-reaching significance than this, and to the bankers more horrifying and infuriating, was his growing realization—like that of Lincoln during our Civil War—that the credit of a nation is a social product and requires no backing of bankers' gold. The sound basis of it is "the abundance of the productive capacity of nature taken together with the responsibility of the whole people." It therefore "belongs to the nation, and there is not the slightest reason why the nation should have to pay for its own credit." To demand that it do so is as preposterous as it would be to try to force a man to pay rent for the use of his own house. What Lincoln gave the American people, Hitler gave the people of Germany—"their own paper to pay their own debts." ³²¹

The almost immediate result, in the world of international commerce, was a great burst of prosperity and florescence. Germany began to crowd out all competitors, not only in the nearby Balkans, but even in South America. "By means of barter trade, Germany was able to sweep the South American markets until 1936, by which time her export trade had doubled and [Britain's] and that of the United States had declined. . . . Between 1936 and 1937, Hitler's four year plan was well on the way to success, but then came an ultimatum from the financiers that Germany must return to the Gold Standard as the only method which could so regulate international trade as to prevent war." ³²²

But the truth was something very different. The truth was that Hitler's money system—not the mere theory of it, but its practical soundness and its actual widespread success both at home³²³ and abroad, a soundness and a success that were being demonstrated before the eyes of the whole world—laid the axe to the very root of the international bankers' power and to their dream of world dominion. Gold unnecessary to make a currency sound and trustworthy! Money that could be issued in any necessary quantity without going into debt for it!³²⁴ No wonder the bankers stood aghast at the prospect and decided that Hitler had to be destroyed. Probably Viscount Lymington hit the nail exactly on the head when he declared in his *The New Pioneer* for May 1939:

"If we have a period of peace for only three years, the financial system of Messrs. Frankfurter, Warburg and Baruch and most of Wall Street, will topple of its own accord."

Part C, Section 32

The International Money Power Declares War on Hitler

But probably the Jewish High Command itself was the first to realize that the time Fate allowed them was short, that they must crush the Hitler menace quickly or lose forever. And this perhaps lends credibility to the charge, quoted from the English monthly *The Word*, that "Martinet Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board and Montagu Norman of the Bank of England agreed not later than 1935 on the joint policy of killing Hitler's financial experiment by all methods, including war, if necessary. Norman's job was to engineer Hitler into the dilemma of having to reverse his financial policy or commit an act of war."³²⁵ In any case, we know that the invasion of Czechoslovakia or the sovereignty of Poland had little to do with the origin of the war.³²⁶ All my inquiry into the matter has left me very certain that the primary issue, over which the war was precipitated and fought, was Germany's rejection of the Gold Standard and the bankers' realization that Hitler's system, if not overthrown by force, would spread all over the world and be the utter ruination of their parasitic system based on the creation of debt. U.S. Ambassador Bullitt said to the American newspaper correspondent Paul von Wiegand in Paris in the spring of 1939: "The war had been decided upon long before the Polish Corridor question turned up."³²⁷ And Mr. C. C. Veith records that for eight months during the period of the "phony war" (1939-1940) "lengthy negotiations were conducted by the British Foreign Office and Mr. Chamberlain, and the German Foreign Office and Hitler," in which the British (who of course were under the thumb of the Bank "of England") offered to stop the war if Germany would again agree to submit to the Gold Standard and to International Usury, while Germany offered to stop the war if [the British] would agree to allow her to develop her barter-trade system and give her back some of her colonies."³²⁸

Also, for what it may be worth, we have the testimony of General Robert E. Wood before a U.S. Senate Committee, that in November 1936 Winston Churchill said to him: "Germany is getting too strong and we must smash her," and the testimony of General George Marshall that in 1938 Bernard Baruch said to him: "We are going to lick that fellow Hitler. He isn't going to get away with it."³²⁹ Baruch revealed the real end for which international finance was preparing to use the U.S., when he said in an interview with Roosevelt that the aim

would be to destroy "Germany's barter system." ³³⁰ What seems manifest is that the international bankers were not long in realizing that the success of Hitler's system would be the ruin of theirs. And theirs was what they were chiefly dependent upon for achieving world dominion.

Yet the plotters were put to it for an honest reason for attacking Hitler that they dared put before the world. For Hitler "had offered to the powers the most comprehensive scheme for peace in Europe that had ever been devised." ³³¹ And in a speech before the Reichstag on May 17th, only a few months after he came into power, he said:

"... Germany will be perfectly ready to disband her entire military establishment and destroy the small amount of arms remaining to her, if the neighbouring countries will do the same thing with equal thoroughness.

"... Germany is entirely ready to renounce aggressive weapons of every sort if the armed nations, on their part, will destroy their aggressive weapons within a specified period, and if their use is forbidden by an international convention.

"... Germany is prepared to agree to any solemn pact of non-aggression because it does not think of attacking anybody but only of acquiring security." ³³²

The truth is, Hitler did not want war. It has long been my conviction that his whole life, from his early manhood, was the result of a profound devotion to the German people. He was ever dreaming of a Germany lifted at last from the exhaustion and shame of defeat, a Germany regenerated in body, mind and soul, her whole life remolded on lines sounder and more noble than we were ever allowed to learn of. And all those of German blood living in adjacent lands were to be gathered in to form an expanded, reunited and consolidated German Reich, which would at last enter into the fulfillment of the destiny to which their inherent greatness has always pointed.

That is, Hitler's first and dominant aim was positive and constructive. For this he needed and wanted peace. Admittedly, he was willing to use the threat of war, and did use it, to gain concessions essential to the realization of his aims. And this of course was hazardous. But all the other nations involved—Britain, France, Poland, Austria and Russia—used this threat also, just so far as they dared. Let all those, therefore, who would lay all the blame on Hitler that he used it more daringly than anyone else, *point out what other means there was* for the accomplishment of his purpose. The tigers of Europe that had already torn Germany to pieces and left her little more than a bleeding corpse still stalked every foot of the road he must get Germany to travel if she was ever to recover the place that by the very greatness of her genius and her spirit belonged to her.

But my reading of the exceptionally authoritative *Origins of the Second World War* by the Oxford historian Professor A.J.P. Taylor (Atheneum, 1961) confirmed my impression that Hitler did not want war. Doubtless, he had to be willing to accept the risk of a small, limited war, here or there, a war he was sure he could easily and quickly win. But it is now certain he never made plans even for the conquest of England, potentially Germany's most formidable enemy, let alone that of the Continent or—as so commonly believed—of the world. In

particular, he wished to avoid war with Britain. He greatly admired the British Empire and wished to see it preserved. Apparently, he had communicated this feeling to the German people. Professor Stephen H. Roberts of the University of Sydney, Australia, records in his *The House that Hitler Built*, his observation made while actually living in Germany in 1935 and 1936, during which he “visited every German province but one,” that he “found everywhere a striking eagerness for friendship with Great Britain.” Indeed, what Hitler wanted was an alliance with Britain, *measures that would ensure that Britain and Germany would never again be on opposite sides in a war*. And on August 27th, 1939, when Europe stood on the very verge of hostilities, he delivered to the British Government a proposal under which Germany would not only “sign a pact of alliance with Britain,” but “pledge to ‘defend the British Empire with the German Wehrmacht [armed forces] wherever it might be attacked.’”³³³ And already three years before this, on March 31, 1936, “he set forth the most comprehensive non-aggression pact ever to be drawn up.” The specifications of this must be read in their details if one is to appreciate how sweeping and far-reaching in their significance they were, or sense the intense desire for peace it revealed.³³⁴ The depths of Hitler’s conviction that war could bring nothing but universal ruin to every nation that it might involve found utterance also in one of the closing lines of the “remarkable appeal [he] addressed to the Powers” nearly a year before that—on May 21st, 1935, in which he declared: “Whoever lights the torch of war in Europe can wish for nothing but chaos.”³³⁵ Hanson Baldwin, the greatly respected military correspondent of the *New York Times*, in its issue of May 8, 1948, reviewed a comprehensive official study and report prepared for the Secretary of the Army, published in October 1947 under the title “Foreign Logistical Organizations and Method.” The report revealed, Baldwin said, that in 1938, and no less even in 1939, the year that war broke out, German production of aircraft of all types, combat, noncombat and trainer, lagged far behind that of Britain alone, not to mention that of France or other countries. The words in which Baldwin summarizes what the report revealed are startling:

“Germany was not prepared in 1939—contrary to democratic assumption—for a long war or for total war; her economic and industrial effort was by no means fully harnessed: her factories were not producing war material at anything like top capacity.”³³⁶

Hitler did not want war, and in the face of snubs and sneers and deliberate misrepresentation, he persisted in his efforts to avert it. And after it broke out, he did his best to save all the peoples of Europe from its most awful horrors. But the international bankers did not *dare* accept peace. They knew full well that if they did not destroy Hitler’s financial system they were finished. Inevitably, therefore, they were determined, by hook or by crook, and no matter what might be the depths of perfidy and duplicity to which they would have to descend in pursuit of their purpose, to have war. And they had the power to take all the nations, except those of the Axis, whithersoever they would. They held all the rest—and none more than France, Britain and the United States—as in a vise. They controlled all the important means for reaching the public mind, and hence for shaping and directing public opinion.

The rest followed. It took a lot of work, and lying, and absolutely soulless scheming, and a few years, but—as we shall shortly see—given the conditions as they were, the outcome was virtually inevitable from the beginning.

Indeed, the whole of international Jewry showed violent hostility to Hitler even before he came to power. They had of course read his *Mein Kampf* and read his speeches, and doubtless it had become a foregone conclusion that in a short time the German people were going to make Hitler their leader. Without waiting, therefore, the Jews declared war on him. On January 2nd, 1933, six years before Germany began fighting, the *London Sunday Chronicle* printed in an enlarged caption "500,000,000 Pound Fighting Fund For The Jews" (equal, roughly, to two-and-a-half billion dollars); and on March 24, 1933, the *London Daily Express* spread across its front page: "Judea Declares War On Germany."³³⁷ And as it became evident, after Hitler took over the reins of government on January 30th, that he was going to do exactly what he had said he would do, they called their International Jewish Boycott Conference, to meet in Amsterdam, Holland, the following July. And there they moved to tighten the cords of economic boycott and financial encirclement around Germany to the strangling point, and with a mass of vicious lies to whip up a "holy crusade" to destroy him and all his works.

The cry was first raised by Samuel Untermyer, who had presided over the Amsterdam Conference and had come home authorized to act as its official spokesman. On August 7, 1933, immediately after his arrival in New York, he made a speech which was addressed to, and broadcast to, the whole world. The call was to a universal "economic boycott against all German goods, shipping and services." Its purpose was to destroy the export trade of the German people "on which their very existence depends." The ostensible reason for the war was to rescue Germany's "600,000 Jews"³³⁸ from the "slaughter, starvation and annihilation" being visited upon them by Hitler's Government, from "the fiendish torture, cruelty and persecution . . . so fearful in its barbarous cruelty that the hell of war and the alleged Belgian atrocities will pale into insignificance as compared to this devilishly, deliberately, cold bloodedly planned and already partially executed campaign for the extermination of a proud, gentle, loyal, law-abiding people."³³⁹

This representation of Hitler's treatment of the Jews was almost totally false. Judge John Payne, chairman of the American Red Cross and of the League of Red Cross Societies, received a report from the German Red Cross, which said:

"The reports of atrocities which have been spread abroad for reasons of political propaganda are in no way in accordance with the facts. Arbitrary and unauthorized acts, a few of which occurred in the first days of the national revolution, have been effectively stopped by energetic measures on the part of the government."

But in truth, even before Untermyer made his speech, the Central Union of German Citizens of Jewish Faith had issued a long statement, dated March 25, 1933, denouncing the stories that were already filling our news reports, as false:

"All such reports are pure inventions. The Central Union states emphatically that German Jewry cannot be held responsible for these inexcusable distortions, which deserve the severest condemnation."³⁴⁰

Nevertheless, the stories continued to be persistently and everlastingly circulated, and the Jewish virtual monopoly of the press and radio made it impossible to silence them with the truth. And all the while organized world Jewry kept working feverishly to bring about war.

Vladimir Jabotinsky bore witness to this. Jabotinsky was the Communist Jew who in 1923 at the French Zionist Congress had said: "If England does not give Palestine to the Jews, we will be the dynamite that will blow the British Empire to smithereens,"³⁴¹ and who had organized and trained the terrorist Haganah to do most of the dirty work—the bombings, assassinations and massacres—by which Palestine was transformed from a Jewish "homeland" into the Jewish State of Israel. Writing in *Natsha Retdi* in January 1932, he declared:

"The fight against Germany has been carried on for months by every Jewish community, conference, congress, trade organization, by every Jew in the world. There is reason to believe that our part in this struggle will be of general value. We shall let loose a spiritual and material war of the whole world against Germany. Germany's ambition is to become a great nation again, to reconquer her lost territories and colonies. Our Jewish interests on the other hand demand the complete destruction of Germany. The German nation is collectively and individually a danger to us Jews."

And this statement takes on pretty sinister significance in the light of further remarks he made in a speech in New York City four years later:

"There is only one power that really counts, and that is the power of political pressure. We are the mightiest nation in the world because we possess that power and know how to use it. Revisionist Zion does not take 'no' from an English official seriously. The opinions of governments are apt to alter under pressure."³⁴²

Ostensibly all this fuss and fury were let loose upon the world in behalf of Germany's half million Jews. But when one considers the raging and relentless determination and the organized concentration of purpose with which International Jewry labored night and day for the destruction not only of Hitler but of Germany itself, it would seem patent that this was only a pretext. The real object was something else—something far beyond that. Must it not seem virtually certain, especially in view of the fact that the driving minds behind the campaign knew from the beginning that the Jews of Germany were not being treated with any such inhumanity as was being alleged, that their primary objective was the destruction of Germany's threat to their money system, the supreme source of their power, and the removal of the German bastion against their advance to world domination?

Part C, Section 33

The Jews□Part in the War

In any case, war was forced on Hitler,³⁴³ and he went down, and all Germany with him. An account of the infamous tactics pursued by the Allies not only in order to bring Hitler down, but in the process to ensure the slaughter of the largest possible number of Europe's best breeding stock, the flower of her manhood, and to make a shambles of her entire culture and civilization—that is not to be given here. Those who wish can find much of it in such books as *Advance to Barbarism* by the English jurist F.J.P. Veale,³⁴⁴ and Peter Nicoll's *Britain's Blunder*, and George N. Crocker's *Roosevelt's Road to Russia*.³⁴⁵ Here, I can merely list some of the most

infamous of the “crimes discreetly veiled.” I should cringe with even greater shame at the very thought of them were it not that for the most part they were first proposed and pushed, as the war itself was instigated and forced, by Jews. It is largely a tale of Jewish hate and vengefulness.

I think of the terror bombing of civilian districts. This was not begun by Hitler, but in the face of Hitler’s protests and his efforts to prevent it and to stop it. It was begun on the Allied side, after being officially adopted by the British War Cabinet on March 30, 1942, in response to a paper laid before it by Professor Frederick Lindemann, a close friend and a scientific adviser to Winston Churchill, but a Jew. And it was not indiscriminate. It was designed to create mass terror in the enemy population; and working-class districts were deliberately selected for its targets because there the crowded conditions would inevitably make the slaughter greatest. Its ultimate purpose must have been to make the war run on as long as possible, and thus to ensure the greatest possible loss of life and destruction, and eventually the collapse of those moral and spiritual values without which any civilization finally dies.³⁴⁶

I think, too, of the Morgenthau Plan, sponsored by Henry Morgenthau, Secretary of the U.S. Treasury, himself a Jew, but formulated in the brain of his assistant, Harry Dexter White (born Weiss, or Weit),³⁴⁷ another Jew and a Communist spy to boot. This scheme would have reduced Germany to a pastoral State, and in the process have starved millions of German men, women and children to death.³⁴⁸ I think also of Roosevelt and Churchill’s surrender to the Jewish demand for the partition of Europe, by which looting and raping Asiatic hordes for the first time in history were deliberately allowed to penetrate to the very heartland of the White man’s world;³⁴⁹ and finally of the liquidation of the German leaders by the murderous farce of the Nuremberg Trial, in which those who did the accusing, the judging and the executing were guilty of more “crimes against humanity” than those in the dock.³⁵⁰ Few people know that the very dates chosen for the sentencing and execution of the German leaders were Jewish feast days.³⁵¹ Thus the Jewish community the world over, with such relief and thankfulness as they had not known in a thousand years, could cry together, “Ha! at last we have got our revenge!”

Part C, Section 34

The Aftermath

It may be that the Jews’ hand was rather forced by Hitler’s threat to their money system: on this depended their chief hope of ultimate world dominion. But it must be conceded that they came out of the war very well. I have often referred to the two world wars as being essentially White civil wars, and they were that. But the later one in particular was a civil war of a special kind. At bottom it was an assault of World Jewry on Europe—the homeland and fatherland of the entire White race. An isolated Germany was its sole defender, while Britain, France and the United States turned against their own kind to join Soviet Russia and Communists generally as battering-rams for World Jewry. And Jewry won. They were the only nation that gained anything. And their gains were enormous. For the White man’s

world, taken as a whole and vis à vis the Jews, it was a debacle. The power of the White man has gone down steadily ever since, and that of the Jews, steadily up.

For the bankers probably the gain of supreme importance had been the firm settling of their money system on the gentile world as its master. Germany, as we have seen, had been like a choice milk cow that refused to be milked and had broken out of pasture. But now she had been brought back and so fearfully punished and branded as to teach all other wayward cows a lesson. And at Bretton Woods, the pasture fence had been made so tight and so high that henceforth, it was believed, *no* cow could hope to escape the milking machine or the slaughter pen.

From this, it might be said, everything else followed. The astronomical debts to the bankers occasioned by the wars would stand, and from them Jewish international finance would not only derive the power to coerce every government on Earth into compliance with its will, but out of the White men's own pockets extract the money with which to complete the destruction of the White man's world. Churchill and Roosevelt became tools of it. Germany, prostrate and helpless, was divided, one half being absorbed into the body of the Soviet octopus, and the other hogtied and bled and doped by the armies and the Occupation-administration of the only-less-openly Jewish France, Britain and the United States. The withdrawal of the American army enabled the Russians, by their seizure of German scientists and factories and raw materials generally, to set up something like a continuous blood-transfusion from all Eastern Europe to feed the emaciated Russian industry and technology, as it had already long been fed and maintained by "Lend Lease" in the amount of 11 billion dollars, which might well have been dubbed "new lease on life." Exhausted Europe was left without any bulwark athwart the path of the Soviet juggernaut. The mind and soul of the White man, and worse yet of his youngsters, were left exposed naked to the same poisonous Jewish press, radio and TV which have done so much to mislead and corrupt in America. And to take the place of the defunct League of Nations, which also was a Jewish idea (as the Jews themselves frankly claimed), the UN was planned and set up by Communist Jews and their agents,³⁵² as a sounding board for Communist propaganda and an adumbration and approach to world government. And this time the United States was not allowed to escape from it. In fact, its very headquarters were set up in New York, a few blocks from Wall Street, and the United States was saddled with most of the load of maintaining it. And thus was facilitated that nefarious piece of bankers' blackmail by which Palestine with its Jerusalem was finally settled on the Jews, and something like a million Arabs forced into the desert to live or die as they might,³⁵³ and the new State of Israel thus given the richest spot on the entire Earth, and precisely that point where three continents meet, the region which they purpose, by aggression on a grand scale to make the center and the capital of their world empire. And with White men's minds befuddled and blinded, and their mouths everywhere virtually gagged, they were able to launch and to promulgate their vicious lie of "the six million,"³⁵⁴ and to exploit the world's stupid and craven acceptance of it in order to blackmail 11 billion dollars³⁵⁵ out of Germany to promote their new-born State of Israel. Perhaps worst of all, they thus drove a wedge between Germany and the rest of the great White nations, with a view to the ultimate destruction of them all.

The war ended with the dropping of atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. "The bomb" was far too stupendous a power of destruction for the Jews to leave it on the loose. They

immediately got control of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. But their ultimate aim was monopoly. They purposed to panic all the nations into believing that the UN was the only hope left of averting universal destruction, and thus to decoy them into disarmament, the surrender of their national sovereignties, and the acceptance of a monopoly of the bomb by the UN—which, of course, they would continue to control. They are still unremittingly pursuing this line. With a monopoly of the atom bomb in their hands they would indeed be in a position to dictate to a world of gentiles: “Surrender or die”!

But the Jews had yet another trick up their sleeves—a very big one.

Part C, Section 35

The Hoax of □The Cold War□

As the war passions began to cool off, it will be recalled that mutual good will between Russia and the United States began to drag, and in time mutual collaboration yielded to mutual antagonism. This was gradually worked up into what was called the “Cold War.” But at the bottom of this was the hoax. The “Communist” despotism over Russia, which in 1917 had been set up by Jews, financed by Jews, and has ever since perhaps been manned either by Jews or by gentile “fronts” for Jews, from the beginning even until now [1977], has always been under the control and direction of Jewish International Finance, centered in Wall Street, New York. Jewish Finance is as much the master of Moscow as it is of Washington, D.C.—in both cases, of course, secretly. Both serve one head as certainly as a man’s two arms and hands serve one will. The Wall Street Money Power, which has given orders to Moscow, through many channels but principally through the Council on Foreign Relations, the “C.F.R.,”³⁵⁶ one of its own creations, has also given not only orders but also blueprints of policy and senior personnel to our Department of State, by which, more than by any other agency, “Communism” has been advanced all over the Earth! The Korean War was one of its maneuvers—and likewise, the war in Vietnam. Both were *designed* to tear down the White man’s prestige in the eyes of the colored peoples of the world, to betray southeast Asia into the hands of the “Communists,” and thus to pave the way for the White man’s overthrow and ultimate ruin.

I shall have much to say shortly about the Council on Foreign Relations and about the part that it has played in the betrayal of our country and of the entire world of the West, but here I must hold to my present point—which is that from the beginning of the Russian Revolution of 1917 to this day, “Communism” has gone wherever the U.S. Department of State has wanted it to go, and nowhere else.³⁵⁷ This fact—or rather its concealment—that Washington and Moscow were both obeying the orders of one Jewish master, has been one of the greatest diplomatic feats of all time. The saber-rattling between the U.S. and Russia, played up in the press and on radio and TV the world over, has provided the justification and the cover for pushing through one Jewish design after another.

All the present international fuss over Soviet “anti-Semitism,” alleged Soviet persecution of Jews, is nothing but more deception. Evidence has long abounded, and to this day seems to me impressive, that hostility to Jews *simply because they are Jews*, on the part of the Soviet

Government, does not exist. It is impossible to go into the matter in any detail here, but in [Appendix IV](#) at the end of this chapter I shall add, to what I am now about to say, some little-known facts that I believe are essential to an understanding of the situation.

In general, it is never to be forgotten that few people on Earth have ever had such intense dislike for Jews as the Russian Slavs, even the Russian masses. This was true long before the 1917 Revolution, and it had contributed to a growing anti-Government restiveness, as knowledge began to spread through the population of *how* Jewish their "Communist" rulers were, always had been, and were still. Moreover, abroad, many people the world over were beginning to suspect the fact that the Russian despotism was Jewish and pro-Jewish. And on this account, in the stupendous climax that we are now approaching, it became of critical importance for the realization of Jewish aims that this mistrust should be allayed and that world opinion should settle down in the conclusion that Russia's Government was *anti*-Jewish. It is for this reason that World Jewry has gone to such lengths to conceal the part that Russia is really playing.

But to my mind the decisive refutation of the charge that Soviet Russia in recent years has become "anti-Semitic" (or, to be more exact, anti-Jewish) lies in the colossal evidence, only recently revealed,³⁵⁸ that American finance and industry, and the American Government itself (all of which have long operated within the framework of what in the final analysis is a Jewish Money System, and under Jewish direction),³⁵⁹ from 1918 to the present day, without interruption, have contributed heavily to the creation and to the maintenance of Soviet technology, and have alone made its development possible, and perhaps therefore even enabled the survival of Communism itself. "There is no such thing as Soviet technology—only American and Allied technology on Soviet soil."

These words express the verdict reached by Professor Antony Sutton, as stated in his book *National Suicide*, recently published. The research on which it rests required ten years. The bulk of the evidence was taken from long-highly-secret files of our own Government, only recently declassified. Mr. Eric Butler, the highly respected Australian political commentator, refers to Dr. Sutton as "the West's greatest academic [authority] on the subject of Western technological and industrial exports to the Soviet Union," and pronounces this, his latest work, "one of the six most important books published over the past fifty years."³⁶⁰ It gives massive, specific, documented, and absolutely irrefutable evidence that for the past half century, while with one hand and before the eyes of the world we were brandishing our sword at Russia and at Communism, we were with the other hand clandestinely, but on a colossal scale, slipping aid to Moscow so vital that without it the Communist despotism in Russia might well have collapsed altogether; that we did so in jeopardy to our own national welfare; and that we kept on doing so even when the aid we gave was being passed along by Russia to Korea and Vietnam to help in the killing of American men in arms, and to ensure the establishment of Communism throughout the Far East.³⁶¹

Comments the publisher:

"With mountains of documentation Mr. Sutton shows that 90 to 95 percent of Soviet technology since 1918 has come from America and its allies. . . that we've built for, or sold, or traded, or given outright to the Communists everything from copper wiring and motor

vehicles to combat tanks, missile equipment and computers... that we are today giving equipment to build [in Russia] the world's largest heavy truck plant (output: 100,000 ten-ton trucks per year—more than all U.S. manufacturers produce in a year) . . . that 'peaceful trade' is a myth . . . that to the Soviets all goods are strategic. [Because almost everything they get from us by trade they can, and do, use to increase their military potential.] All this to create and maintain an enemy that we annually spend 80 billion dollars to defend [ourselves] against."

The book is full of such blistering facts from cover to cover. Perhaps the gist of it is packed into the dozen pages comprising Appendix B (pp. 252-3). This is Dr. Sutton's testimony before a division of the Platform Committee of the Republican Party at Miami Beach, August 15, 1972. In it one finds, for example, in Ambassador Averell Harriman's report to the State Department in June 1944 his statement that Stalin, after paying tribute to the U.S. for its assistance to the Soviet Government before and during the Second World War, had declared that "about two-thirds of all the large industrial enterprises in the Soviet Union [had] been built with the United States' help or technical assistance." And Dr. Sutton comments:

"Stalin could have said that the other one-third of large industrial enterprises were built by firms from Germany, France, Britain and Italy.

"Stalin could have said also that the tank plants, the aircraft plants, the explosives and ammunition plants originated in the U.S.

"This was June, 1944. The massive technical assistance continues right down to the present day.

"The Soviets have the largest iron and steel plant in the world. It was built by McKee Corporation. It is a copy of the U.S. Steel plant in Gary, Indiana.

"The Soviets have the largest merchant marine in the world—about 6,000 ships. I have the specifications for each ship.

"About two-thirds were built outside the Soviet Union.

"About four-fifths of the engines for these ships were also built outside the Soviet Union.

"There are no ship engines of Soviet design. Those built inside the USSR were built with foreign technical assistance.

"About 100 Soviet ships are used on the Haiphong run to carry Soviet weapons and supplies for Hanoi's annual aggression. I was able to identify 84 of these ships. None of the main engines in these ships was designed and manufactured inside the USSR.

"All the larger and faster ships on the Haiphong run were built outside the USSR.

“All shipbuilding technology in the USSR comes directly or indirectly from the U.S. or its NATO Allies” (pp. 256-7).

And so he goes on—in regard to the Gorki motor vehicle plant, until 1968 the largest in Russia. It produced “many of the trucks American pilots see on the Ho Chi Minh trail”—and military jeeps and rocket launchers besides. “And Gorki was built by the Ford Motor Company and the Austin Company—as peaceful trade.”

And then came “the so-called ‘FIAT deal’—to build a plant at Volga three times bigger than Gorki.” But the Italian name hides the fact that “over half, perhaps well over half of the equipment came from the United States.”

And “so in the middle of a war that has killed 46,000 Americans (so far) and countless Vietnamese with Soviet weapons and supplies, the Johnson Administration doubled Soviet auto output. And supplied false information to Congress and the American public.

“Finally, we get to 1972 under President Nixon.

“The Soviets are receiving now—today, equipment and technology for the largest heavy truck plant in the world: known as the Kama plant. It will produce 100,000 ten-ton trucks per year—that’s more than ALL U.S. manufacturers put together.

“This will also be the largest plant in the world, *period*. It will occupy 36 sq. miles” (pp. 257-8).

Finally, from Dr. Sutton’s summary of conclusions on pages 262 and 263, I select the following:

“We have built ourselves an enemy. We keep that self-declared enemy in business. This information has been blacked out by successive Administrations. . .

“Soviet technical dependence is a powerful instrument for world peace if we want to use it.

“Why should they stop supplying Hanoi? The more they stoke up the war the more they get from the United States.

“We can stop the Soviets and their friends in Hanoi any time we want to.

“Without using a single gun or anything more dangerous than a piece of paper or a telephone call.

“We have always had that option. We have never used it.”

Such support of Russia, on such a scale, would never have been possible if the Jewish power that controls our country had not approved of what Russia was doing, and wanted to further it, wanted the Communist one-world system to spread until it became the master of the Earth. And if, in order to camouflage the enormous extent to which the Moscow

Government is supporting the Jewish drive for mastery, it has seemed advisable that the Soviet Government make it a little uncomfortable for some Jews (especially those of a Zionist persuasion, who are often obnoxious anyway to those dominant and ruthless Jews whose chief reliance is on the power of Money), the top Jewish strategists could easily take this in their stride. All generals are prepared to sacrifice a certain proportion of their own men in order to win a battle or a war. Explain as one may the Soviet anti-Semitism now being made so much of, surely it is silly to think that Russia would ever have received such massive and uninterrupted industrial and military aid from the entire West if there were anything about Russia's policy or performance that was in any way inimical to the achievement of Jewry's principal aims.

On the assumption that I have said enough to dispel the ghost of "Soviet anti-Semitism," let me now return to our examination of the various forms under which an unelected and more or less invisible government in the U.S. is working for the destruction of our country and for the destruction of the whole world of the White man.

Part C, Section 36

Our Invisible Government

The U.S. has *two* central governments. One is the constitutional, legitimate government put in office by the votes of American citizens. The other is the self-appointed, secret, treasonous government of the Jewish International Money Power that aims to destroy every national sovereignty and create a collectivist, world-wide slave state. It operates principally through the "C.F.R.," the Council on Foreign Relations, mentioned a few pages back. This long ago became so powerful as to make what we think of as "our Government," especially the State Department and the Presidents, little better than its tool. In all issues really critical for the advance of Jewish aims for the mastery of the Earth, it is able to exert pressures which, as a rule, no other power in the entire land is able to resist. And yet, as Gary Allen declared in his best-seller *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*.

"Despite the fact that it has staffed almost every key position of every administration since those of FDR—it is doubtful that one American in a thousand so much as recognizes the Council's name, or that one in ten thousand can relate anything at all about its structure or purpose."³⁶²

It was first brought to public attention in 1962 by Dan Smoot with his *The Invisible Government*, and almost simultaneously by Kent and Phoebe Courtney with their *America's Unelected Rulers*.³⁶³ But today there is wide agreement among really reliable investigators as to its origin, purpose, and activities.³⁶⁴

It was founded in May 1919, when Colonel Edward Mandel House, in bitter disappointment over the refusal of the U.S. to become a member of the League of Nations, arranged a dinner meeting in Paris for a group of his most dedicated young intellectuals (such as John Foster Dulles and his brother Allen, Christian A. Herter, and Tasker H. Bliss) and a like group of young Englishmen. They agreed to form an organization "for the study of

international affairs." And out of this grew the Council on Foreign Relations in the U.S. and the Royal Institute of International Affairs in Britain, both having essentially the same purpose and pursuing the same methods.

House had powerful connections with the international bankers in New York, and indeed with the big bankers and politicians of all Europe. In New York, they were chiefly the Warburgs, the Schiffs, Otto Kahn, Henry Morgenthau and Herbert Lehman. The record shows that he was their tool. Congressman McFadden, in his speech before Congress on June 10, 1932, referred to House as "that 'holy monk' of the financial empire," and quoted his reference to Jacob Schiff, head of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. as "my hidden master." And it is surely significant that from the very first Kuhn, Loeb was represented on the Council's board by Otto Kahn and Paul Warburg, especially the latter, who, after he had saddled the U.S. with the Federal Reserve, became one of the supreme powers in the entire country.

The C.F.R. came to be composed of about 1400 of the most powerful and influential men in the U.S.—from the spheres of government, finance, industry, business, the press, radio and television, the tax-exempt foundations, and the colleges and universities. Moreover, totally interlocked with the C.F.R. were not only all the biggest, enormously powerful foundations, but also the C.I.A., the UN, UNESCO, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and all the other internationalist UN agencies.

In 1927, the Rockefellers, who, "since the time of their grandfather," have "worked hand-in-glove with the Rothschilds," together with the big foundations, began to finance the C.F.R. By 1939, it was taking over the U.S. Department of State. "But the crowning moment of achievement [up to that time]," says Mr. Smoot, "Came at San Francisco in 1945, when over 40 members of the United States Delegation to the organizational meeting of the United Nations . . . were members of the Council. . . By 1945, the Council on Foreign Relations, and various foundations and other organizations interlocked with it, had virtually taken over the U.S. State Department.

"The complexion of its membership was indicated by the fact that 'some CFR members were later identified as Soviet espionage agents: for example, Alger Hiss and Laughlin Currie. . . ' Others were subsequently identified as 'conscious, articulate instruments of the Soviet international conspiracy.'" ³⁶⁵ After this peek into its membership, it is perhaps not surprising that evidence is now appearing from various sources, all seemingly reliable, that Henry Kissinger, who was trained by the C.F.R., "has been a Soviet agent and that his involvement with Soviet Intelligence was made known to agencies of our government before his rise to prominence." ³⁶⁶

Mr. S. E. D. Brown, watching developments with the perspective of a distant land, in an editorial in *The South African Observer* for October 1973, said:

"So completely has the C.F.R. dominated the State Department over the past forty years, that every Secretary of State except Cordell Hull, James Byrnes and William Rogers has been a member of the C.F.R. Dr. Henry Kissinger, Mr. Nixon's chief foreign policy adviser and now Secretary of State, came to the job from the staff of the C.F.R., and the under-secretaries, almost to a man, are C.F.R. members.

“But no one can begin to understand the C.F.R. and its workings unless one realizes that, while communist activities have contributed largely to the subversion of European nations and their headlong retreat from their overseas territories, the major pressures for this subversion have been applied by the International Money Power, using the C.F.R. as a base and American governments as instruments.”³⁶⁷

Mr. A.K. Chesterton, after noting the sinister presence of Kuhn, Loeb’s representation on the C.F.R.’s first board, remarks: “It is improbable that the direction has passed out of Kuhn, Loeb hands.” And he observes later: “Perhaps the real status of the Council on Foreign Relations is much higher than that of the White House and the State Department combined.”³⁶⁸

And what is the purpose for which this organization exists? Mr. Smoot stated his overall conclusions as follows:

“I am convinced that the Council on Foreign Relations, together with a great number of other associated tax-exempt organizations, constitutes the invisible government which sets the major policies of the federal government; exercises controlling influence on governmental officials who implement the policies; and, through massive and skillful propaganda, influences Congress and the public to support the policies.

“I am convinced that the objective of this invisible government is to convert America into a socialist state and then make it a unit in a one-world socialist system.”³⁶⁹

An enormously significant proliferation of the C.F.R., or perhaps an arm which it has thrown out to get action more quickly and to make the achievement of its objectives more sure, is the so-called Bilderberger Group, which owes its name to the fact that its first meeting was held at the Bilderberg Hotel in Osterbeck, Holland, in 1954. The group, apparently smaller and more select than the membership of the C.F.R., consists of many of the most powerful men, not only of the U.S. but of the entire Western world—financial tycoons, heads of industries, diplomats, high government officials, editors, university presidents, heads of the tax-exempt foundations, and of the mass media of communication. “Lurking ominously in the shadows . . . are the Rothschilds, Warburgs, Wallenbergs, Rockefellers, and other great international banking dynasties.” Their meetings are held about every six months, in various parts of the world, and are set up and conducted with an extreme rigor of secrecy, which alone is enough to arouse suspicion.

Well on to a score of meetings have been held. Their third in the U.S. took place at Woodstock, Vermont, April 23rd to 25th, 1971. No mention of it appeared in any newspaper or on radio or television anywhere in the country.³⁷⁰ This broke with the precedent of previous meetings in that two Russians and two Red Chinese were included, which would seem to have presaged Nixon’s policy of “detente,” Rockefeller’s trips to Moscow and Peking, the later trips to Russia and China by Kissinger and Nixon, and the vast oil and grain deals in favor of the Communists.

The last meeting of the Bilderbergers, in April 1974, was held at Megeve, France, a village nestled in the French Alps about 20 miles from Switzerland.

“Security surrounding the Megeve meeting was even more strict than in Woodstock three years before. Between 600 and 1,000 uniformed gendarmes were assigned to the task of guarding the participants. They were armed with rifles, machine guns and traveled in armored cars. . . As with the Woodstock Inn in 1971, no employee was allowed near the hotel without a special pass. . . no wire service was permitted to carry news of the meeting. No publicity appeared anywhere in the world except for the local French paper . . . The guests arrived at the Geneva Airport . . . and were whisked over the Swiss-French border, preceded and followed by heavily armed and uniformed Swiss and French police.”³⁷¹

What all this enormous effort to maintain secrecy means—what anyone with any wit in his head knows it must mean—is that what the Bilderbergers are plotting for humanity is a fate so treasonous and so hideous, that if the facts were ever to reach the mass of the people they would rise up against the Bilderbergers in such a spontaneous fury that it is doubtful if one of them would escape alive.

Every indication is that the Bilderbergers purpose to reduce the whole world to a huge cattlepen in which the human cattle will be freely milked by the bankers. They intend to push our technology, our factory and chain-store system, and our system of finance to their full logical limit. They are now near their goal of establishing a one-world government in which they and their tools and their dupes will rule the Earth, and to this end they are now moving to force the so-called free world into compromise with Communism and into coexistence with it. As necessary steps to this end, they are determined also to wipe out all national sovereignties and all personal sense of identity with or loyalty to any one nation. Nations as such are to be abolished. And it has been in order to smooth the ground for the advance of this program that, throughout our entire society, for the past 40 years, we have had the intense, concerted, and undeviating drive to undermine and destroy national and racial consciousness in the White man everywhere, and by consequent miscegenation to debauch his genetic constitution and finish him forever.

Who appoints or selects these men, who covers the expense of getting such a crowd together from all parts of the Earth, we do not know. And they are answerable to no body that represents the interests or the welfare of any people. They by-pass all legitimate governments on Earth. Yet such is their hidden influence that they are able to turn the most powerful governments into agencies for the accomplishment of their primary aim, which is a world “Communist” dictatorship.³⁷² And they are now on the very verge of closing in for their kill. Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes told me, the last time I spent an afternoon with him (late in the Fifties), that the supreme danger to our world came from these interrelated power elites whose levers of coercion and influence were operated from Wall Street, New York. The Communist Party, as such, was almost defunct. Or I should say rather, it was lying low, biding its time. The big international schemers and plotters, having come to realize that “the Party” was not accomplishing its purpose, had shifted their strategy: the most promising way by which to bring the U.S. to its knees, and to drag it into the “Communist” camp, was through the more clandestine operations of the international bankers and their affiliates. They would infiltrate the churches and our educational system; they would fill the minds of the people, and especially of our youth, with poisoned ideas, and thus break down solidarity, authority, and a will to resist aggression; they would destroy religious, moral and national traditions; they would foment racial war and, by supplying the trained revolutionary leaders,

organization, and plenty of money, ensure that the strife steadily advances “Communist” aims.

But the reduction of the U.S., though of course of very great importance, was to be looked upon as only a step, though a very big step, perhaps almost the final step, toward the realization of the Jews’ ultimate objective.

Let me be explicit.

Part C, Section 37

The Line-Up of Forces in the Near East

As I have repeatedly said, but can hardly say too often, the Jews’ supreme drive today is for world dominion. I know that agents of the International Money Power have been in China for at least half a century, quietly making deals and conspiring, and that the Money Power has learned how to accomplish its ends under any and every form of government known to man. And so it was not to my surprise when I read a few days ago—I think, in *U.S. News*—that as a result of the negotiations with Peking by Dr. Henry Kissinger, the Jew representing the Council on Foreign Relations, the Chinese people now have *their* national bank, the Bank “of China.” And this means, as I translate it, that World Jewry is now bridling, and will undertake to mount and to drive China whither it will. As elsewhere, and over and over again, wars will be fomented and deliberately precipitated, to the end that all the participants may be weakened, and so that Jewry will emerge ever-stronger, until it has become their master.

But, for the moment leaving China out as a problem that has not as yet taken definite or tangible form, we must recognize that, under the guise of “Communism,” the Jewish High Command already rules a continuous land empire comprising all northern Asia and all Europe except a few countries in the extreme west, not to mention its deep and very disturbing penetration into almost every other part of the world. Moreover, in rating the extent of Jewish dominion we must not forget Israel. We know that it is a nation of Jews. We know that for over two thousand years the Jews have believed that the outcome of the “battle of Armageddon,” which would make them masters of the Earth, would be fought in Palestine. We know that Palestine, with the annexation of the Suez Canal and adjacent oil-rich Arab lands, would be not only the richest but the most strategic spot on Earth. Any power that has firmly established itself in Palestine is in a position, like a spider at the center of its web, to strike swiftly, north, south, east or west, deep into Africa, Asia, Europe, or over the Arctic into the Americas. We know, too, that in our own time, men like Chaim Weizmann, in continuation of an old tradition, have been announcing Jewish intentions to make Jerusalem the ultimate center of their world, and their capital, and that from the start the Jews have looked upon Israel as a beachhead for expanded aggression, the nucleus of a Jewish empire.³⁷³ And they have already manifested their intentions by their belligerence in the face of the Arabs and their intransigence toward the world. We know, finally, that the Jewish control of the U.S. Government is probably great enough, in the event of a war, to put the United States in on Israel’s side. Those who think this doubtful need to be reminded

that the American people were overwhelmingly opposed to getting into the First World War, and opposed again to the Second World War, and yet in the end means were contrived for getting them into both.

But it may well be that at this point my reader in turn would confidently remind me that Israel and Russia are on opposite sides, that so far the line-up of forces is the Arab world with the backing of Russia, against Israel with the backing of the U.S. But it is of the most critical importance that gentiles should not be deceived as to what is going on here. *Is this actually the line-up? Or do we here have to do with another vast piece of Jewish deception?*

I fully realize that Israel has repeatedly taken an anti-Russia stance. But I am convinced that the purpose behind this, like all the present fuss over “Russian anti-Semitism,” is to make the gentile world *think* that Russia is *not Jewish*. Let me now put the facts, as I have come to see them, before my readers.³⁷⁴

Israel, the U.S., *and Russia* are all, now, controlled and directed, in every issue of decisive importance, by the Jewish hand of the Wall Street International Money Power. They are all in on the secret, the conspiracy against the Arabs, which purposes to carve out a Jewish empire at the Arabs’ expense. All three understand one another. Each knows the part it has to play, and the part to be played by the other two, in the job that is to be done on the Arabs.

The Jews mean to take territory from the Arabs, and then to take more. The might of the U.S. is needed to ensure that, come what may, they will not lose. But the Israelis do not dare, as yet, to make their aggression too flagrant and brazen, lest it turn the moral sense of the world too much against them. Their part is to try to madden the Arabs into making the first attack, to do something that, under the Jewish control of the world’s news media and organs of opinion, will be made to *appear* as if the aggressors were not the Jews but the Arabs.

However, the critically important role has been assigned to Moscow. It must put on a show of being the friend and supporter of the Arabs. But the truth is that Moscow’s part is to be the great betrayer. The Arabs can’t fight, can’t resist or revenge Israel’s aggression, if they have nothing to fight with, if they see from the start that for lack of everything that counts, they would stand no chance of winning. It is here that Russia comes in. Russia’s role is, first of all, to egg the Arabs on, to inflame their hatred of the Jews, their desire to strike back, their hope to recover the homeland so savagely torn from them. Next, it is to provide them with enough money (undoubtedly funneled *through Moscow from Wall Street*), war material and strategists so that resistance to Israel’s aggressions will not seem suicidal. In short, Russia’s part is to see to it, while as always keeping quite out of it herself, that a war gets started, a war that it has been predetermined and agreed that the Israelis are to win—as it surely will, since in fact it is a war of three against one, or indeed, not a war at all but an ambush, into which the Arabs are being decoyed. And then, when the dust has lifted and the masks been stripped from the faces of the principal actors, it will be seen that whether all Israel’s conquests have been added to Russia’s domain or all Russia added to the gains of Israel, the results have been a vast aggrandizement of the Jewish empire, with its capital set up at last in Jerusalem.³⁷⁵

With this, I close my review of the highlights of the Jewish record. By this time, my reader must have come to understand how, gradually and through long years—a quarter of a century—my investigations have revealed that the Jews, working in concert and in secret, and following an all-embracing strategy, have moved steadily and relentless to remove the White man from their path—in fact, utterly to destroy his potentialities as an obstacle or enemy to their designs. They began to effect colossal damage to our world even two centuries ago, and they have been at it ever since.

It must be manifest, I think, that the claims of Mr. Ravage back in 1928 were hardly exaggerated. In fact, even fifteen years before that, Werner Sombart asserted, as already quoted, that the United States had become the distilled essence of Judaism. It is all too plain that the Jew has not only subjugated us as the British, French and Dutch never subjugated Africa and parts of Asia—*so* subjugated us that most of us are afraid to say aloud what we think of him even in what was once our own land, but worse than that, and far worse, he has made us over in his own image. A vast number of us have become as Jewish as he is—thoroughly Jewified in our values, our standards, our aims, our ideas, and our conduct. Our whole country *stinks of Money*, of desire for money and for what money can buy. We even rate the size and worth of a man by the amount of his income. To get money, there are few of us left who would not, in one way or another, sell their integrity and their souls.

We have become so used to our Jewishness that it would almost require the clear eyes of a creature from Mars to perceive *how* Jewish we *are*. The Jew has taken our very land from under us and ruined it. He has taken our civilization and our whole intellectual and spiritual world and perverted it, soiled it, corrupted it, and all but destroyed it. And he means also to destroy us as a people, utterly, beyond recovery, in body as well as in mind and soul. And he has done it in wanton betrayal of our trust, after he had sworn allegiance to the country of his adoption, after we had taken him in and given him harborage and opportunity and protection, as if he were one of our own kind. He has done it in every country of the White man's world, but worst of all in the heartland of our world, in Europe and Britain. He has always done it, wherever he went. He will always go on doing it, unless he is stopped. A friend of mine in New York, years ago, observed—in my judgment, quite justly—that the Jew has us by the throat and will see us dead before he relaxes his hold. Since the Jew has never yet, anywhere, built a great State or civilization, it is safe to assume that he cannot: it isn't in him. But he is the most fearful destroyer in the history of man.

This confronts us with a problem. What are we going to do with this Jew?

In the first place, to be both realistic and frank, I am afraid that before our people can be aroused to do anything to avert their fate, the Jews are going to have their way with us. They do not have far to go now to consummate their aims in a world government and slave state. And some time between now and their hour of triumph, out of a fierce determination to finish us off for all time, they will undertake to destroy our leadership class with the typical vengefulness and cruelty that they worked upon their enemies at the time of the Russian Revolution, especially upon their Christian enemies. Nevertheless, the problem of the Jew will remain the same, whether by some miracle it proves possible to grapple with it now, before the cataclysm strikes us, or later, after the lapse of many years, when perchance we may, by yet another miracle, have recovered the direction of our destiny. From this time on,

for the rest of our existence as a people, it must be of critical and perduring importance in all our shaping of policy, in each of our nations and for our people as a whole, to hold steadily before us what we have to deal with in the Jew.

Part C, Section 38

The Solution of the Jewish Problem

I now set before my readers the conclusions to which twenty-five years of investigation and reflection have forced me. If there is anything about these conclusions that is unsupported by facts, or contrary to the spirit of fair play and justice, I shall be glad to have it pointed out to me how and where.

1. The Jewish people, taken as a whole, are never to be trusted. It has been born in them, and drilled into them too deeply, that first of all and above all else they are Jews, and therefore their first loyalty is to Jewry, to their own kind anywhere and everywhere. That means loyalty to Zionism, to Israel or to any other center to which Jews can rally and which is working for their advancement as a people. There are, of course, exceptions, striking and moving exceptions, and they may be more numerous than I realize, but it is never possible to tell in advance which ones are going to be loyal to the country of their adoption, and which will not. In any case, it does not make sense to base a policy on what, it has to be admitted, is the exception.

2. They will never be assimilated, never, anywhere. They have proved themselves to be very adaptable almost everywhere. But not assimilable. Their identity, and therefore their existence as a people, depends upon their never mixing their genes with those of another race. That individual Jews will do so does not alter the fact that to the Jewish community as a whole this must ever seem betrayal and treason, and that if most Jews followed suit Jewry as a separate people would disappear.

3. Even if they were ready for assimilation, we should reject it, and condemn and punish those of our people who marry Jews even as we should condemn and punish intermarriage of our people with Negroes. Admittedly, the potentialities of the Jews are, on the average, vastly superior to those of Blacks. Nevertheless, both are essentially alien to us. Most gentiles, with their easygoing tolerance, may not recognize this or may wish to ignore it. But Jews recognize it plainly enough. Let any gentile who doubts it spend half an hour looking through *You Gentiles* by Maurice Samuel, from which, in a note at the end of this chapter, I quote a few passages.³⁷⁶ And if we are ever to attain that homogeneity and solidarity upon which our greatest cultural potency certainly depends, and even, ultimately, perhaps our survival, we must burn into our consciousness and forever heed that admonition of Goethe's, "The alien element, we must not tolerate."

4. The Jews hate us, and they have long sought and waited for their chance to destroy us. And, as I have plainly enough indicated in these pages, they mean to do it so thoroughly, by racial mixture with Negroes and any and every sort of people who are genetically alien or

inferior to us, and by inducing a dysgenic differential birthrate among us, that recovery may forever be impossible.

Where does this leave us? Perhaps we can get a clue to the course that wisdom would dictate to us in the advice that Benjamin Franklin is said to have given to the Constitutional Convention in May 1787:

“In whatever country Jews have settled in any great numbers, they have lowered its moral tone, depreciated its commercial integrity, have segregated themselves and have not been assimilated, have sneered at and tried to undermine the Christian religion, have built up a state within a state, and have, when opposed, tried to strangle that country to death financially.

“If you do not exclude them, in less than 200 years our descendants will be working in their fields to furnish the substance while they will be in the counting houses rubbing their hands. I warn you, gentlemen, if you do not exclude the Jews for all time, your children will curse you in your graves. Jews, gentlemen, are Asiatics; they will never be otherwise.³⁷⁷

These words have been declared a sheer fabrication, though I have some reason to believe them to be genuine, but for my present purpose it does not greatly matter whether Franklin ever uttered them or not. Let that be as it may, in the light of my knowledge of the Jew and the injury he has inflicted on our people, it is undeniable that an incalculable amount of suffering, humiliation, degeneration, frustration and perversion would have been avoided if the course that these words laid down had been consistently followed from 1787 until this present hour. But at least, beginning now, we can take the words to heart. This, as I see it, would mean:

First. That all Jewish citizenship should be cancelled. Jews should be given protection against physical injury, and a reasonable amount of time should be allowed them to settle their affairs and get out. If the question came up about where they should go, it would doubtless be recalled that many years ago it was urged that some such piece of the Earth as Madagascar should be acquired by international action and by purchase, for Jewish settlement.

Second. Recognizing the suicidal folly of allowing Jews to hold any positions of public trust, responsibility or substantial influence anywhere in our country, they should in the future be admitted to our shores only on temporary visas.

Part C, Section 39

The Problem of Ourselves

The Negro, as I have said, is our most glaring racial problem. But our most deadly racial problem is the Jew in our midst. A large part of his deadliness resides in the fact that it is he who is inciting, organizing, training and financing the Negro as an instrument for accomplishing our destruction. Without the Jew's support and direction, the Negro would be

a comparatively simple problem to solve. But when inflamed and trained for guerilla warfare, and for putting through the reign of terror needed to consummate a revolution, the Negro can be a fearsome instrument for tearing our world to pieces.

The Jew, therefore, I do not hesitate to pronounce our Enemy Number One.

I am ready enough to allow, as will shortly be apparent, that we would be impervious to all the Jew's machinations were it not for our own traitors and for our own weaknesses. And to many of our people, therefore, who would look for a solution less drastic, it would seem that if only we made the needed corrections in ourselves, the problem of the Jew would take care of itself. But I am convinced that there is a flaw in this argument. If a man has succumbed to an infection, do we confine ourselves to efforts to build up his constitution, leaving him all the while to struggle unnecessarily against constant reinfection? Do we not, first of all, undertake to clean up his environment, to remove every possible source of further contamination? As things stand now, the Jew holds such a monopoly of all the important means by which the minds and hearts of our people can be reached, that every move to reach them would be perverted, stymied, sidetracked, or counteracted. I am convinced that all our efforts to regenerate ourselves, to achieve a health in our social body that will provide its own protection against any invasion of deadly organisms, must, like our ultimate fate, depend on getting *all Jews out*.

Part C, Section 40

Our Hour of Deadly Peril

At this moment of writing, I am too deeply concerned about the fearful catastrophe that hangs over my people to bother with what Gobineau, Spengler or James Burnham, the philosophers of history, might say about the situation. It is a matter of life or death that we are confronted with, and if life, then with *what kind* of life we may have ahead of us. I myself feel in my bones that our raft (or whatever it may be called), with all that we have on board, has got to go over Niagara. And what can even survive that, is a question. But whether in the end that fate is staved off or we are left hanging on to a desperate hope of eventual recovery from it, in one case as much as in the other, if we are to get back on our feet again, to recover our health and the strength that would go with it, and thus the direction of our destiny, then there are certain things that our people must be brought around to do.

Let me preface what I am about to say by declaring frankly that I am prepared to accept violence on the part of our people. The Jews' hold on our throat is not going to be relaxed until we break their grip. Hitler felt that he *had to take to the streets*. All normal approach to his people was barred. Today, we are confronted with much the same situation here. A censorship perhaps as tight as that imposed in Soviet Russia virtually closes off our access to press, radio or television as means of reaching the public mind. Politics are completely dominated by Money. In consequence, solutions by regular Constitutional means may now be impossible. If we are not to be destroyed, then we must fight. I am not naturally a man of violence, but there is one thing from the thought of which I shrink more than from violence or its consequences, and that is the thought that our people may not rise to throw off the

death that is being clamped upon them. Those who are strong on theory and moralizing, but weak on action, may object that if any gain is to prove real and lasting, the means employed must be compatible with the end sought. But it happens that this is irrelevant to what I am saying. For the society I seek is one in which the use of force, in extreme circumstances, is accepted as necessary not only for existence, but also in order to make existence meaningful.

Part C, Section 41

The Crucial Importance of Race

To begin with, then, if we are to have any future at all, we must build up in ourselves a lively, burning, and all-dominating sense of *rac*. This seems to be something in which our people have long tended to be weak. But I know that it can be developed. I, myself, grew up almost totally without it, and yet now I have it. I was aware, of course, that I was White, but so much did I accept other men on the basis of their worth as individuals, that it meant almost nothing to me if a man were Yellow, or Jew, or even Black. And while I gradually developed a fairly strong sense of family, I got nothing whatever in Church, high school, college or graduate school that left me with any adequate impression of the magnificence of the White man's achievements in all parts of the world, of the varied rich cultures that he has created, or of the vast and durable civilizations that he has constructed. I had no pride in being a White man. I knew little or nothing to be proud of. I was led to pore over the Bible, over tales of the Old Testament and the teachings of Jesus, as I never learned to pore over the Mahabharata and the cradle tales of the Aryan Hindus, or Firdusi's hero tales of the ancient Persians, or the vast residue of the ancient literature of the Greeks and Romans—Homer, Aeschylus, Herodotus, Thucydides, Aristotle and Plutarch, or Virgil, Horace, Caesar, Tacitus, and Livy. And as for those peoples of northwestern Europe to whom by blood I am most closely connected, it was not until I had reached the age of 45, when I was invited to accompany an old friend on a trip to Sweden and Norway in 1937, that I began to be aware of the great Viking exploits and of Norse and Nordic contributions to Western civilization. But beginning then and for years after that, I dug into, and reveled in, the story of Sigurd, the sagas and Eddas and the Heimskringla, and Beowulf and the Nibelungenlied, and the account of the remarkable sea-going ship the Vikings perfected and in which they penetrated as far as France, and Spain, Africa and Sicily to the south, Constantinople and India to the east, and west not only to England, Scotland, Ireland, and Iceland, but on to Greenland, our New England coast, and even to Minnesota by way of Hudson Bay.³⁷⁸

From all these discoveries, I went on to learn that what was essentially one blood and a supremely great history unites the various branches of our people from India to Iceland, and even to South Africa, Australia and New Zealand—perhaps, I might even claim, from Cro-Magnon and Sumerian man, with whom civilization began, right down to our present-day German, French, British and Scandinavian cousins. Their history and their legends and their folklore and philosophy and religion provide a suitable background and foundation for our whole people as the hero tales and religion of the Old Testament never could, or the New Testament either.

I went on to discover the significance of racial consciousness in the conduct of the individual. This, I think, is deeply related to the family, of which in some sense it is an extension. Both are rooted in common blood, heredity, genes. I doubt that any society can long survive except as the family is kept supremely vital—shaping, sustaining, inspiring, and inviolable. Under normal, unperverted and uncorrupted conditions, in times of strain and danger, men turn first to those to whom they are united by ties of family. And when circumstances have called for a strength greater than the family can provide, they have turned, according to the varying conditions that have prevailed at any given time, to the next larger association—*of their own kind*. At the bottom of everything is a strong sense of race. And one of the essential elements in all vital sense of race is an awareness of solidarity, which in turn depends on homogeneity. All profoundly significant and creative peoples have been guided and spurred and lifted by a profound *belief* in themselves. And “belief in themselves” means a confidence in what they are as a collectivity and in what they can do when they all act together. Commonly—perhaps invariably—they have believed themselves superior to all outsiders, whom, after the manner of the Greeks, they looked down upon as “barbarians,” as in fact, the Chinese look down upon us now. Even where the belief is hardly founded on objective reality, the belief nevertheless has brought out all the best that a people had in them—perhaps it might be said, lifted them *above* themselves, to heights which, without it, even they would have thought to be beyond their reach.

What race can mean to an individual man or woman, and therefore to a whole people whose consciousness is deeply suffused with it, most people today are too stupefied with lies and too bloodless to assess justly. It has to be pointed out to us, as a sort of divine revelation, by a man who has it and who is living among a whole people in whom it is a constant and deeply moving force. Just listen to this:

“Nothing is so convincing as the consciousness of the possession of race. The man who belongs to a distinct, pure race, never loses the sense of it. The guardian angel of his lineage is ever at his side, supporting him where he loses his foothold, warning him like the Socratic Daemon where he is in danger of going astray, compelling obedience, and forcing him to undertakings which, deeming them impossible, he would never have dared to attempt. Weak and erring like all that is human, a man of this stamp recognizes himself, as others recognize him, by the sureness of his character, and by the fact that his actions are marked by a certain simple and peculiar greatness, which finds its explanation in his distinctly typical and super-personal qualities. Race lifts a man above himself: it endows him with extraordinary—I might almost say supernatural—powers, so entirely does it distinguish him from the individual who springs from the chaotic jumble of peoples drawn from all parts of the world: and should this man of pure origin be perchance gifted above his fellows, then the fact of race strengthens and elevates him on every hand, and he becomes a genius towering over the rest of mankind, not because he has been thrown upon the Earth like a flaming meteor by a freak of nature, but because he soars heavenward like some strong and stately tree, nourished by thousands and thousands of roots—no solitary individual, but the living sum of untold souls striving for the same goal.”³⁷⁹

Continuity and solidarity! A sense of being a link in the continuity that stretches from one’s ancestors to one’s offspring, and therefore of indebtedness to one’s past and of obligation to the future. And growing out of this a profound sense of solidarity with all one’s own kind! It

is very necessary that we recognize, and above all feel, that we have roots, that we belong somewhere, to a part of the Earth; and that we are more than a collection of individuals, more than a congeries of atoms, that we belong to something, to a people, to a race, which in a sense is a living body, which has form and character, a record and a destiny, whose life has come down, as a successful type, out of the remotest past, and must struggle, by the very necessities of its being, to maintain itself into the remotest future.

I, William Gayley Simpson, am, to be sure, a human being, and beneath everything else that I may think or do, I would always remember this: there may even be times and levels of experience when this may seem the foremost fact of my consciousness. But certainly the world of time and space, to which history belongs and in which is rooted our life as individuals, with its bodily needs, is a warring world, a world of conflict and struggle. It always has been, and perhaps it will never cease to be. Refine the struggle all you can; push back the area of it as far as possible. You will only come at last to the point where it cannot be pushed back any further and be confronted with the stark realization that the basis of all life is struggle and fighting. Moreover, our worst enemies, striking at our very existence, come at us in groups. And alone we cannot meet them. For better or for worse, whether it be to survive or to go under, even to have any chance of survival, *we must identify ourselves with some group*, most advantageously with one to which we feel that we belong, whose life we somehow recognize as our own, out of whose blood, traditions and accumulated ways of doing and thinking we ourselves have come, and which yet includes, fortifies and transcends all our life as separate individuals, families and groups of one sort or another. And at this point it comes home to me that I am NOT a Negro, or a Jew, or a Chinese!

“Where a man’s treasure is, there will his heart be also.” Aye, verily! And no race, or nation, or society can long survive except as all the members who compose it recognize that, important as the individual may be to himself and ultimately to his group, the group is more important still. The group is his supreme treasure. The individual could not be tolerated, could not have come into existence as such, except as first the life of the *group was made secure*, to give room and to provide a stage for the individual to make something of himself. Freedom can be allowed to the individual only where the society itself is sufficiently secure, and must be curtailed whenever that security is in jeopardy (as in wartime). Always, the welfare of the group must be yielded top priority, and for this the individual, in a crisis, must always be ready even to lay down his life. Robert Ardrey, in his *African Genesis*, tells of two male baboons that threw themselves to “certain death” in order “to protect their kind from a dusk-veiled leopard. The commands [to such self-sacrifice],” he says, “lie mostly on the male. He must preserve the society which is his one most powerful instrument of protection.”³⁸⁰ And everything hinges on the human male’s doing likewise. But what the animal does by instinct the human being must do by conscious love and devotion to his nation or race. Even when the creative individual’s requirements for fulfillment bring him into collision with his group, it should be with his profound conviction that ultimately his own fulfillment will redound to his group’s preservation and advancement.

But our enemies would interrupt me to cry, “Who is this man whom you just quoted but that chauvinist, White-supremacist Houston Stewart Chamberlain? And what is all his talk about consciousness of ‘pure race’ but racist moonshine?”

A hard glint comes into my eyes when I hear these words, and I say in reply: "I know you, you mortal enemy of my people: I know you well. And I know that it is because of your very awareness that you can destroy us only by first destroying our race consciousness that you have so smeared, and damned, and belittled those men who should be our racial prophets and mentors and guides, until today, besotted by your teaching and suggestion, we as a people ignore them, sneer at them and reject them. But so well do the enlightened among us now understand you and what you are up to, that to us all your smearing and damning is only an indication of what we should the more look to and hold to for our salvation. The very men of whom you have been at such pains to make mock, even in our universities—Gobineau, Chamberlain, Spengler, Madison Grant, Lothrop Stoddard, H.F.K. Guenther—yes, and Adolf Hitler and Lincoln Rockwell, too—we will gather up from the scrap heap where you have thrown them and done your best to bury them, and we will wash them clean that they may be seen in a true light for what they were, and will set them up before us as our exemplars, our teachers, our heroes and our inspirers."

The great truth is, as declared in my last chapter, that *breed is everything, race is everything*. What any people does, or is able to do, is determined above all else by what it has in its gene pool. We White men therefore must be intransigent, defiant, adamant and scornful in trampling under foot every bit of teaching and every contemptuous pronouncement designed to expunge "race" from our consciousness. In our ears, all human history chants *racē, racē, racē*—as a Hindu chants his mantras. And we will chant *racē* in unison with it. Damn "racism" all you like, you sharp, sly little men, we will the more think race and live race; and our song of race, chanted with the heartbeat of the universe, and with the example of all great makers of history held aloft before us as a banner, will yet drown out all your curses and silence your sophistry, and at last set us back once more on our own true course. You know as well as we do that we speak the truth, that the truth is with us, and for this very reason you try so desperately to stamp it out of us. But against your cunning and sneaking and deception we will set our honesty, our forthrightness, our courage, our love, and our willingness to die that our people may live. We will yet arouse them, and unite them in a new awareness of the greatness that is in them, of the glory of the record that is behind them, of the beauty of their traditions, the soundness of their values, and the health of their deepest instincts when fully aroused.

Part C, Section 42

□Pure Race□ is Something That Can Be and Must Be Created

And one thing more. You say that "pure race," as a thing to be conscious of, is sheer moonshine, and that Chamberlain, who urged it, thereby revealed himself a charlatan, who served up potions of race hatred.

In reply I would say: Any actual reading of Chamberlain will reveal that he was no hater, nor one who wrote to stir up hatred. He wrote only as all who deeply believe in and love their own kind must write, with a vast concern for their health and their future. It might be said that he did no more for Aryan-Nordic man than Rabbi Lewis Brown, in a far less imposing

way, attempted to do for the Jews in his *Stranger Than Fiction*.³⁸¹ In fact, so great was Chamberlain's admiration for the genuine aristocrat, that he expressed it warmly even when he found remarkable examples of it among some of the old families of Sephardic Jews, straight out of Palestine, who had been inbreeding, like-marrying-like, for many hundreds of years. In fact, they were examples of "pure race" created *within families*, and both illustrated and proved what could be accomplished for a whole nation, or a whole race, by following the same principles of breeding.³⁸²

That all the outstanding races of the Earth have undergone considerable mixing before the dawn of history, I have repeatedly allowed. Indeed, I have not only recognized but stressed that before any people could have sufficient genetic diversity to provide the rich store of varied capacities necessary for achievement of greatness, *some* mixing, a *moderate* degree of *judicious* mixing, was necessary. But all this, the pros and cons of which I went into thoroughly in my Chapters IX, XI, XVI and XVII, is aside from my present point. My point is, first, that despite either more or less mixing in their past, the great creative, history-making peoples of the ancient world were not racial hodgepodes, such as the American people today have become. They all tended to hold the outsider and the alien in abhorrence, and by long inbreeding they had already become relatively pure in their race.

It seems certain that the ancient Greeks, who in their most creative period still held sternly aloof from marrying aliens, must have struck any objective observer by the similarity and distinctiveness of their appearance when contrasted with other peoples. How inbreeding, both in the Greeks and in the Persians, had preserved the original type from which both were sprung is strikingly revealed in "The Dying Persian" whose features and build could easily have been mistaken for those of an Athenian. And Tacitus, in his *Germania*, noted that the Germani (the Germans) of his time (first century A.D.)—

"... have hitherto subsisted without intermarrying with other nations, a pure unmixed, and independent race, unlike any other people, all bearing the marks of a distinct national character. Hence, what is very remarkable in such prodigious numbers, *a family likeness throughout the nation*: the same form and feature, stern blue eyes, ruddy hair, their bodies large and robust . . . proof against cold and hunger."³⁸³ (Emphasis added)

In any case, my desire at the moment is not so much to repeat what I have been saying all through this book—namely, that solidarity and homogeneity, and therefore pure race, are essential for any people that would aspire to greatness, to those moral and spiritual values that alone can lead to *true* human greatness or even to long survival, but rather and above all to stress that where pure race has been lost *it must be created*—and that it *can* be created. Today, the means for achieving it are positively and exactly known. It needs greatly to be brought to the attention of our people that there was no such thing as a pure breed of *horses* (or of cows, or dogs, or any other domesticated animal, for that matter) *until man created it*. Chamberlain points out that the "most physiologically uniform and noblest race of animals in the world, the English thoroughbred," was deliberately produced by the human application of ascertained principles of breeding.³⁸⁴ And Nietzsche, who is so often quoted for his warning against "the mendacious pure race swindle," nevertheless pointed out the observed evil consequences, physical, psychological and social, of indiscriminate racial crossing, and stressed both the practicability and the importance of systematically *purifying*

race. "Purified races," he said "have always become stronger and more beautiful. The Greeks may serve us as a model of purified race and culture! And it is to be hoped that some day a pure European race and culture may arise." ³⁸⁵

We have now reached the point in our discussion where I must gather together what, from the point of view of race, our people must do if they are ever to know a future worthy of their past, or even escape subjugation and enslavement. In a very real sense, this whole book is a statement of the vast change in values, goals, direction, and social and political institutions that our people must undergo, and of the regimen for their whole life that they must adopt and maintain, if they are to recover their ancient spirit and that robustness of mind and body that once caused them to stand out among the children of men and to contribute largely to the enrichment of all human life. Indeed, at this point, it might be worthwhile for my reader to review my foregoing chapters and try to shape in his mind what I have had to say about the sickness and decay that runs all through our society, and about the price that we shall have to pay and the course that we shall have to follow if we are once more to possess our own souls. But in this, my final chapter on race, and to avoid repetition, I will limit myself to what presses upon us so sternly from the point of view of racial realities alone.

1. First of all, as just expressed, we must set it before ourselves to create a *burning consciousness* of race in the souls of all White men of Western Europe and wherever West Europeans have gone—in Canada, the U.S.A., South Africa, Rhodesia, Australia, New Zealand. Since it seems all too evident that race consciousness is something that Aryans, including Nordics, have commonly lacked, or have all too easily lost,³⁸⁶ it is necessary to insist that it is something that has to be created, with all the changes in values and attitude that this must entail.

We must concentrate upon the oncoming generation—especially on that element of it which early displays the greatest promise of superior quality. At its best, this will contain the quintessence of all that has distinguished Nordic man, his soaring vision, his tirelessly exploring mind, his ever dauntless and unflinching courage. This select youth must in every generation be looked upon as our supreme treasure, and be protected therefore against every sort of injury, as the nucleus of our future leadership. They shall sit at the feet of our greatest teachers, and while being provided with every other sort of opportunity that will best nourish their growth, they will also be subjected to tests that will harden their will and prove their self-mastery and their dedication. And not least, through all their most formative years, at the knees of their mothers, and in school from the primary grades through our universities, the minds and souls of our youngsters and youth must be saturated with the folklore, the literatures, and the great historic record of our people, including even the Aryans and the Iranians of ancient India and Persia, and the Egyptians, but concentrating more especially on those closer to us—on Greece and Rome, and the old Germanic peoples as revealed in Tacitus' *Germania* and in Prof. Colin Renfrew's book *Before Civilization*³⁸⁷, which opened up new vistas into the European White man's past greatness; Charles Kingsley's lectures to the students of Cambridge University in 1864, published under the title of *The Roman and the Teuton*;³⁸⁸ Hans F. K. Guenther's *The Racial Elements of European History*;³⁸⁹ and the epics and romances of the Germanic, Scandinavian and British peoples as reviewed in Professor W. P. Ker's "masterpiece of inspired criticism" entitled *Epic and Romance*.³⁹⁰ All

these, and the mass of books that they refer to, show forth what manner of man and woman our distant ancestors were.

2. Such burning consciousness of race, if it burns deeply enough, will ultimately make it impossible for different branches of our people to be induced, tricked, or inflamed into making war on one another. Professor Guenther has a couple of very disturbing pages in his work just referred to (pp. 129-130), in which he points out that it has thus far seemed to be "the fate hanging over the Nordic ruling classes in the peoples with Indo-European languages," that:

"These very ruling classes . . . have ever and again fought against one another to extend the powers of the State founded by them, or to defend the non-Nordic lower classes. As they were lacking in any racial consciousness, the Nordic nobility of the Hellenes was fighting in the Trojan War against the Nordic nobility of the Phrygians and other tribes; the Persians fought against the Medes and the Indians; the Persians against the Hellenes; the Kelts against the Romans; the Germans against the Kelts. Thus it was the very warlike qualities of the Nordics that led to the destruction of the Nordic blood, and all the wars of European peoples have always taken their heaviest toll from the Nordic sections of these people—in Western history, most of all, in the Middle Ages, when the Nordic element alone made war, but in all later wars, too, and not less so in the late Great War. It is only an awakening racial consciousness among Nordic men in all those nations which still have enough Nordic blood which can stop the further and, in the end, utter destruction of this blood. . . ."

Guenther omits to point out what is universally known among scholars: that in the case of the Greek city states, the downfall of Greek civilization is largely to be traced to the fact that they not only fought what we might call their cousins—the Medes and Persians and the early Romans, but actually fought one another in what were essentially little civil wars. Each of these suicidal conflicts decimated the best breeding stock of each of the city-states, with the inevitable consequence of a steady decline in both the quantity and the quality of the leadership class in relation to the mass of the population. The Greek city states died because they no longer had enough men possessed of the acumen and the character necessary to solve their mounting social problems.

In our own case, we have seen what reason there is to believe that, beginning with our War of Secession (our so-called Civil War) and right on through to our war in Vietnam, our wars have been deliberately fomented by our archenemy with a view to our ultimate overthrow. But it must be allowed that, as a race, we White men seem to be extraordinarily susceptible to the machinations of wily men who have studied how to inflame us against imagined enemies. And it looks as if this will continue on into the future until we have been bled and exhausted beyond hope of recovery, unless our people become imbued and united by a burning and inextinguishable race consciousness that absolutely rules out conflict between the different branches of our kind. Perhaps in time, if such consciousness is achieved, we shall feel the necessity of setting up some sort of tribunal of arbitration that will ultimately go a long way toward making war between German and French, or German and British, or British or German and American—*impossible*.

3. But if we do finally achieve an all-inspiring and all-guiding consciousness of our race, of whence we came, of what we are, and of whither we want to go, we cannot content ourselves with mere enthusiasm and attitudes. We must put our entire life on an absolutely sound and solid physical basis. We must educate our whole people to the necessity of, and impose the discipline and regimen of, a complete racial hygiene.³⁹¹ We must begin by gradually eliminating all our stocks afflicted with serious hereditary defects. Social acknowledgment of an individual's right to have children must be closely related to his heredity, and to the character and intelligence that he has manifested in school and in practical living. To those at the lowest end of the scale, a license to marry will be issued only after they have submitted to sterilization. Some children, but only a limited number, will be allowed from those whose offspring may reasonably be expected, at a minimum, to contribute to social stability. But we must build up the tradition that only our families of highest proven capacity may have very large families: from them, ten or even fifteen children per marriage would not be too many.

Indeed, if it comes about that our people must pass through the holocaust of what in effect will be a Jewish-Communist take-over—something that now seems to me all too likely—they will hardly be able to put through a counter-revolution and to break the Communist strangle-hold unless they have resort to eugenic measures even *more* drastic. For when our government is overthrown and the independence of the United States comes to an end, it will be only a matter of time until there will be that reign of terror and that mass liquidation of opponents which all modern social revolutions have used to consolidate their gains. If precedent in other countries may be accepted as a basis for reliable estimate, some 20 million American men will be dragged out to be done to death in one manner or another. The purpose will be to strip our country of all those whose brains, courage, drive and devotion might enable them to tear the Communist vampire off our backs. If accomplished, it would largely liquidate that element of our population capable of leadership, and leave the mass of our people in a state like that of a man who, by the removal of the frontal lobes of his brain, has been reduced to the state of a zombie, little better than putty to be worked to any desired shape in the hands of his master.

In the desperate exigencies of such a situation, it may prove that our entire kind, the whole White race, can have a future only if the surviving mass of the people are able, somehow, to replace, to regain, to recreate, the head, the brain, the leadership of which it was stripped by the purges. The people must once again have great men, searching and creative minds, robust hearts and soaring souls, to lift them and to lead them, or all is lost. But how will it be possible to bring together the elements to produce such genius when they have so largely been screened out of the population by an enemy who has reduced us to the most desperate slavery the world has ever known and wills to keep us in it? I am not overly confident that a people upon whom such an operation has been performed, who in effect have been "lobotomized," can ever recover. But as I have searched all my inner being for something on which I might base a hope for a rebirth of my people after their catastrophe, it has seemed to me that in this period of fearsome crisis the idea of "stirpiculture" initiated by John Humphrey Noyes, and in recent decades elaborated first by Dr. Horace Dutton Taft and now by Dr. Elmer Pendell,³⁹² might present an opportunity and a challenge, and take on an urgency, that so far have been lacking, and thus open up an avenue of salvation for our people.

I must explain the possibilities that I foresee, but first of all warn that to meet such a supreme crisis we must be ready to set aside, for the duration of the emergency, all conventions that may stand in the way. Let us remember, however, that just after the First World War the ruling body of the Church of England considered a motion to relax the monogamous standard until England had made good the loss of a million of her best men in the struggle.

The number of our best women to survive a Communist revolution is likely to be greatly in excess of the number of such men. But it may be expected that some few of our men most gifted will escape the slaughter. And many of the sons of those who have been liquidated will survive to perpetuate the potentialities of their family stock. And, even though more thinly—a few here and a few there—the genes for giftedness will be scattered throughout the mass of the population. The problem before us, then, will be to devise means by which as many as possible of our best women can be artificially impregnated by the sperm of those men of greatest giftedness who may be available, and bear many children. The idea could be worked even by lone married couples, where the husband, out of his love for his country and his kind, would find his opportunity to efface himself, that his wife's children might be sired, again and again, by men of manifestly higher endowment than his own.

How far our people could get with such an undertaking in the face of a deadly secret police is indeed a critical question. But, after all, I just can't imagine that any Jewish world despotism will hold together very long. On the face of it, nothing could be more preposterous than the idea of a handful of people undertaking to put some three billion human beings in chains and to hold them there! And perhaps none of the more gifted peoples has so miserable a record of governing as the Jews. Their picayune states in Palestine, many centuries ago, were so devoid of significance that when the famous Greek historian Herodotus went a-traveling in the Near East to dig up stirring tales of great and glorious achievement to be retold to his own people, it seems that he never heard of the Hebrew, or else that what he heard didn't deserve so much as a word of mention. The Jew simply does not know how to rule wisely and beneficently, with understanding, generosity and humanity. His rule would surely chafe and gall, then incense and finally infuriate to such a degree that no threats or punishments would long hold down the universal seething insurrection that, in the end, would surely sweep him away.

What would then follow remains a question. But while the Jews' empire was falling to pieces, our people might have their opportunity to recover themselves, along with the direction of their destiny. And then at least, if not sooner, "heredity corporations" would offer the quickest means by which our people might recover their leadership stock, upon which our entire future must depend.

But in any case, so long as we retain control over our own society, we must establish it as our undeviating and relentless aim to make and to keep our people homogeneous. The Jews, of course, to their last gasp, will resort to their utmost cunning and marshal all their strength to bring any such effort to naught. For they know full well, as already observed more than once, that it has been only by maintaining an attitude of abhorrence toward all mixing with aliens that they have survived the centuries and have come to be the power in the world that they are today. And they are no less aware that the only means by which they can keep a

creature of our size in leading strings to them is to get us to swallow the poison that they themselves keep so far away from, until we become a race of enfeebled, fawning, mixed-breed curs.

Here let us give *dose heed to their practicae*, but ever be *turry of their preachments*, however much they may be aureoled with authority or with phrased implausibilities. Away with all their poisonous blather in praise of “multi-racialism”! Let us stick together as tightly as burrs, even as they do, and consistently, by preference, choose our own kind, above all to marry, but also to work for us, sell to us and buy from us, to doctor us, to preach to us, to teach our children, to make our laws and on all levels to form our government.

Also, with homogeneity as our goal, we must sternly shut our doors against all immigrants who are not White. Indeed, in my own judgment, we should be wise to reject even those White people who do not stem from the countries of northwestern Europe. This does not necessarily reflect any adverse evaluation of the other White peoples of Europe—principally the Latins ranged along the northern littoral of the Mediterranean, and the Slavs. Primarily, it means only that I recognize the Slavs and the Latins to be different, both genetically and culturally, from the stocks of northwestern Europe, which had the most to do with founding our country and still perhaps form its largest ethnic element. And I believe that the White nations of Europe, too, would be most healthfully and solidly constructed if they formed blocs, each composed predominantly of one ethnic stock, whether Latin, or Slav, or Nordic, as the case might be, and if each worked to achieve, by a sustained policy of segregation, a homogeneity of its own kind.

But after all, these are relatively minor matters to be cleared up gradually once we have met and mastered our primary problems. Literally *everything* waits upon what we do about the Negro and about the Jew.

Ultimately, of course, our aim must be nothing less than a racial rebirth and resurgence. And this whole book is a statement of what such a rebirth and resurgence will require. But the very first step in that direction involves not so much doing anything as ceasing to do and undoing. First, we must shake off our drugged state of mind and soul and tear ourselves away from the foreign idols before which we have overlong prostrated ourselves and to which we have literally sold ourselves into slavery. Only thus and only then shall we get the fog out of our eyes enough to see clearly what we are up against, what have been the fatal mistakes in our past that have reduced us to our present weakness and confusion; and to what end we must gather our forces. Thus only shall we at last *come home to ourselves* and stand forth before the eyes of men for what at bottom we are—our minds and souls bathed in the light of what we have been in the past, and our faces aglow with a newborn faith in what we shall be and do in the future.

But we must be sternly and ever vigilant, lest in our haste and eagerness to reach our goal we try to overleap the inexorable grimness of our present condition. No resurgence is possible unless we meet and master this present. And to do this, our souls will be tested to the ultimate limit of their resourcefulness, their iron, their capacity for suffering, and their devotion. From the start, then, let us face our present squarely. If we cannot completely rid ourselves of the Negro, the United States is finished. And if the White race generally cannot

in the end find a way to cut the consuming cancer of the Jew out of its body, it will be finished too. *These two things we must do—or die.* If we cannot master these problems, we shall not have any future to worry about or to struggle for. The crisis that confronts us is literally terrible. But it cannot be evaded. Doom will be upon us as surely if we make no decision as it will be if we make the wrong decision. The order to us is: “Put the Negro and the Jew from you—or resign yourselves to decay, and, finally, to death.”

Which way then goest thou, Western man? 1977.

Footnotes

1. The genes of this stock may now most often be overlaid and momentarily hidden in people whose appearance is not Aryan-Nordic. But they exist and play a part in everyone who has some measure of Aryan-Nordic ancestry.

2. Oswald Spengler—*The Decline of the West*, 2 vols., Knopf., 1926, 1929. The German word in the title which is translated “decline” is “Untergang,” and really means “going down,” “sinking,” “foundering”—as of a ship.

3. Lothrop Stoddard—*The Rising Tide of Color*, Scribner’s 1930; *The Revolt against Civilization*, Scribner’s, 1922.

4. 4 “Es ist eines der Ratsel unserer Zeit, warum sich der Weisse Mann, Herr der Erde von Pol zu Pol, in der knappen Spanne eines Menschenalters seiner Herrschaft begab, sich mude zuruckzog aus einer weltweiten Machtstellung, dass er heute in panischem Schrecken flieht, wo er noch gestern unantastbar regierte.” *Deutsche Wochen-Zeitung*, 2. Jahr-Nr, 30, July 16, 1960.

5. *Buffalo Evening News*, editorial, November 30, 1972.

6. Arthur Krock—*Memoirs, Sixty Years on the Firing Line*, Funk, 1968, pp. 406, 416.

7. James Burnham—*The Suicide of the West*, Arlington House, 1964.

8. The eminent military critic Captain Liddell Hart, declared that victory in the Second World War was achieved “through practicing the most uncivilized means of war that the world has known since the Mongol devastations.” *The Evolution of Warfare*, Faber, London 1946, p. 75. Quoted in F.J.P. Veale’s fearful but irrefutable book *Advance To Barbarism*, Devin-Adair, 1968, p. 23.

9. So stated by Trygve Lie, Secretary-General of the U.N., in his book *In the Cause of Peace*.

10. See John Stormer—*None Dare Call It Treason*, Liberty Bell Press, Florissant, Mo., 1964, p. 205

11. I shall have much more to say to establish my point here before I finish this chapter.

12. *Congressional Record*, May 31, 1955, p. A3764—as quoted by John Stormer, *None Dare Call It Treason*, op. cit., 1964, pp. 88-9.

13. This thesis was first brought to my attention in such simplicity and clarity by Sir Arthur Keith in his *A New Theory of Human Evolution*, Philosophical Library, 1949. For a brief statement of Sir Arthur’s status and attainments in the world of science, see his name in my directory of scientists, Note 85 in my previous chapter.

It is to be noted that, according to Sir Arthur, “Man did not acquire his dual mentality as a result of practicing two codes of morality, but he practiced a dual code because of the two-fold organization of his nervous system” (page 61). In other words, it is rooted not just in our mores, in attitudes that can be altered by indoctrination, but in our very physical constitution. It is something it is hardly possible to extirpate.

14. For this quotation and for support of the thought of this whole paragraph see the remarkably percipient and incisive article entitled “Dissecting A Racial Mystique” by Mr. Ivor Benson, editor of the highly recommended newsletter *Behind the News*, P.O. Box 3145, Durban, South Africa.

15. C.D. Darlington—*The Evolution of Man and Society*, Allen & Unwin, 1969, p. 608.

16. See S. J. Holmes—*Human Genetics and Its Social Import*, McGraw-Hill, 1936, pp. 312-3, 316, 334-6; Edward M. East—*Man kind at the Crossroads*, Scribner's, 1924, pp. 309-313; Madison Grant—*The Passing of the Great Race*, Scribner's 4th revised edition, 1932, pp. 89-90, 47ff.

17. I single out the United States for special attention, largely because I myself am American-born, have my roots here, know it best, and have a responsibility to it that I owe nowhere else. But I must add that the symptoms to be observed in the U.S. are more or less, and sometimes very largely duplicated, in the other nations of the White man's world. The Common Market, for instance, has so removed barriers to the free movement of the citizens of its member nations, that northern Europe, which on the whole is Nordic Europe, is being invaded by swarms of non-Nordic peoples from the Mediterranean littoral. Warnings are out that predominantly Nordic England is destined to become the racial sewer of Europe. But perhaps my principal reason for now giving the U.S. a close look is its key position. Without question, it is the most powerful White nation on Earth. And it is a common saying that if the U.S. succumbs to the concentrated assault now being leveled against it, the rest of the White man's world is doomed.

18. Again, see Mr. Wilmot Robertson's *The Dispossessed Majority*.

19. James Oneal—*The Workers in American History*, Rand School of Social Science, 4th ed., 1921, pp. 89-90.

20. Charles A. Beard—*An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution*, Macmillan, 1960, pp. 64ff., 242. Cp. p. 164f. See also Henry Cabot Lodge—*A History of the English Colonies*, p. 149.

21. John B. McMaster—*The Acquisition of the Political, Social and Industrial Rights of Man in America*, Imperial Press, Cleveland, Ohio, 1903, pp. 15, 18-21, 70-1, 82. See also Kirk H. Porter—*A History of Suffrage in the U.S.*, University of Chicago Press, 1918, Chapter 11.

22. Woodrow Wilson—*A History of the American People*, Harper, 1902, Vol. III. pp. 120-1.

23. See *Attack*, formerly published by the National Youth Alliance, June 1973, p. 2, for a picture of the Pruitt-Igoe \$36 million public-housing development for low-income Blacks in St. Louis, demolished in 1972. The article is now available in a compendium entitled *The Best of Attack and National Vanguard Tabloid*. The legend under the picture reads:

“Neo-liberal planners spent public funds on this huge, 33-building, high-rise development and ballyhooed it as ‘the city of the future.’ Its 3800 apartments were turned over to Negro families at nominal rents in 1956, and they immediately began converting it into a jungle. Doorways and elevators were used as urinals, halls and stairways as convenient places to dump garbage. Residents stripped copper sheeting from roofs to sell as scrap metal, and vandals smashed windows. Soon the elevators ceased functioning, their wiring shorted by urine, and ceilings began collapsing as a result of leaking roofs. Repair crews could not keep up with the destructiveness of the occupants, and last year the Neo-liberal planners finally admitted defeat and began razing the abandoned, windowless, filth-filled buildings as a public-safety measure.”

24. See my last chapter, Section c: “Mental Differences,” toward the end, where Dr. McGurk reviews the evidence.

25. I produced overwhelming evidence of this backwardness in my last chapter.

26. Robert Gayre—“The Dilemma of Inter-Racial Relations,” *Mankind Quarterly*, VI, 4 (April-June 1966), p. 188.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 194-200. Some of the more pertinent passages read as follows:

“The ideal is only attained when a particular region is inhabited exclusively by people of one ethnic stock who compete solely against each other in the schools and colleges, with the result that an elite emerges which assumes the leadership of the people. . .” (p. 196).

“The Negro peoples are being made the victims of a political philosophy—disguised as a desire to promote their welfare—which will distort their natural development, rob them of their own self-respect and of satisfaction in their own achievements and ways of life, and do them untold harm” (p. 200).

"It is a curious phenomenon of the present time that these people who so loudly—and sometimes so impudently—claim a monopoly of virtue for desiring to aid the backward stocks of mankind are the very people who are insisting upon exposing the Negroes to an unequal struggle with the Whites. This can only end in tragedy for the Negroes wherever they become the victims of these theorists who are determined, no matter who suffers, to try to establish their quite unproved—indeed untrue—doctrine that with changes in social and physical environment they can equalize all races of men" (p. 189).

28. *Ibid.*, pp. 188-200.

29. See, for instance, *Dallas-Park Cities Digest*, Supplement, Oct. 8, 1962: "The Mississippi Story." Also, *Oxford, A Warning for Americans*, Oct. 1962, published by the Mississippi State Junior Chamber of Commerce, Jackson, Mississippi, and *Shreveport Journal*, final edition, Oct. 1, 1962.

30. See last chapter, Note 187.

31. Quoted by Michael Myers, National Chairman Sohi Committee of 25 sponsoring open investment—in an appeal for support.

32. See the findings of the distinguished geneticist Sir Julian Huxley as stated in his article: "Eugenics in Evolutionary Perspective," *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, VI, 2 (Winter), 1963, p. 165.

33. *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th Ed., "Portugal," Vol. XXII, p. 139.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 144.

35. I am much indebted to Mr. Peterson for the research he did on Portugal's record. An article by Ray Smith based on his research, entitled "The Black Man's Gift to Portugal" was published in *The Best of Attack! and National Vanguard Tabloid*, (p. 8).

36. Carleton Putnam: "This Is the Problem!" in *The Citizen*, Nov. 1961, p. 25.

37. Earnest Sevier Cox—*White America*, Noontide, 1966, p. 10.

38. This would include all persons who by their personal appearance or their records gave any evidence of having Negro blood in them. The country to which they would be sent might be any besides those of Africa with which suitable arrangements could be concluded.

39. *Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, edited by Roy P. Basler, Rutgers University Press, 1953, Vol. III, p. 16. The date was August 21, 1858.

40. Lincoln declared as early as June 26, 1857, in an address at Springfield, Ill., that the amalgamation of the races could be prevented only by their separation, and that "such separation, if ever effected at all, must be effected by colonization." *Lincoln's Collected Works*, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 408-9.

In his *Emancipation Proclamation* of Sept. 1862 he said:

"I have urged the colonization of the Negroes, and I shall continue. My Emancipation Proclamation was linked with this plan [of colonization]. There is no room for two distinct races of white men in America, much less for two distinct races of whites and blacks.

"I can conceive of no greater calamity than the assimilation of the negro into our social and political life as our equal. . .

"Within twenty years we can peacefully colonize the negro. . . under conditions in which he can rise to the full measure of manhood. This he can never do here. We can never attain the ideal union our fathers dreamed, with millions of an alien, inferior race among us, whose assimilation is neither possible nor desirable." *Collected Works*, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 371-5.

41. See Earnest Sevier Cox—*White America*, op. cit., p. 176. This book is the fullest presentation in existence of the grounds for the repatriation of the Negro. See the review of it in *Mankind Quarterly*, VII, 2 (Fall, 1966), p. 118. Cox was a "truly great man and respected anthropologist." His entire life was dedicated as much to the Negroes' welfare as to that of the Whites. He went to extraordinary lengths to obtain the fullest possible knowledge of the

effect on the White race of trying to live in sustained contact with the Black race—through six thousand years of history, and in Africa, Asia, and South America, as well as in his native U.S.A. He reviews the case of one nation and civilization after another which “perished through contact with Colored Races.” He was forced to the same conclusion as that of the great French observer of American life Alexis de Tocqueville, that the White and the Negroes “must either wholly part or wholly mingle,” and in the end found himself forced to take the position that “sixty centuries of race history have proved that the white man has at no time remained white when in prolonged contact with colored races.” See *White America*, p. 10.

42. Ernest Sevier Cox—*Lincoln's Negro Policy*, reprint by Noontide Press, Los Angeles, Calif., 1968, p. 50.

43. Robert Ford, in the review of Cox's *White America*, mentioned in Note 41 *supra*.

44. E.A Cox—*Lincoln's Negro Policy*, op. cit., p. 50.

45. From *History Today*, London, No. 1 (Jan. 1968—as reprinted in *Mark and Quarterly*, Vol. X, No. 3 (Jan.-March 1970), p. 173. “. . . the African Nationalist Pioneer Movement . . . advocated as a matter of racial survival, that all able-bodied, ambitious and race-loving Black people seriously consider colonization in Africa on a mass scale.”

46. For evidence of the massive Jewish support of Negro radical and even revolutionary movements, see Wilmont Robertson—*The Dispossessed Majority*, Howard Allen, Cape Canaveral, Fla., 1972, p. 210, Note. 12. Cp. *The Ugly Truth About the NAACP*, an address by Atty. Gen'l. Eugene Cook of Georgia, before the 55th Annual Convention of the Peace Officers Assn. of Georgia; *Common Sense* (Union, NJ.), No. 352 (Nov. 1, 1960), article entitled “Zionists Control NAACP.” The NAACP has never had a Negro as its national president. Always, or practically always, he has been a Jew. Herbert Lehman, one of its directors, had 10 Communist-front citations; and another was Felix Frankfurter, who packed countless key positions in our society with men and women who, when they were not Jewish, were invariably Communists or Communist supporters. And Communism, as I am about to show, always as been, from its inception, to the present day, essentially a conspiracy aimed at establishing a Jewish dominion of the whole Earth. In Feb. 1957, the Georgia Commission on Education (Atlanta, Ga., issued a report entitled “Ten Directors of the N.A.A.C.P.,” which showed that the citations against these ten directors, indicating “association with Communist fronts,” had ranged from 18 to 72. Zygmund Dobbs, writing

in *Red Intrigue And Race Turmoil* (Introduction by Archibald B. Roosevelt), Alliance, Inc., New York City, 1958, pp. 19-20, states the well-known fact that the group which founded the NAACP "was made up entirely of whites who were socialists or socialist sympathizers." It goes on: "It took almost twenty years for the pro-communist elements to build up their present influence in the national leadership of the NAACP" (pp. 22-3). That they succeeded was revealed by the Communist agitator Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, who "disclosed that the official report of the Fourth National Convention of the Communist Party of the United States, held in 1925, stated that the Party had penetrated the NAACP." (See *Common Sense*, Union, N.J., Oct. 15, 1955, p. 3, col. 3.) And Zygmund Dobbs (op. cit., p. 25) wrote "Today, the Kremlin leadership in Moscow feels so firmly entrenched in the NAACP that the top official organ of the Communist Party in the United States has advised all its followers that: 'We must support the NAACP in this struggle with every ounce of energy at our disposal.' " (He cites *Political Affairs*, official organ of the Communist Party of the U.S., Feb. 1950, p. 26.)

47. "The U.S. Senate internal Security Subcommittee on Nov. 2 [1971] released a study asserting that at least 21.5 million persons had been executed or had died in prison camps in the Soviet Union during the past 51 years.

"The study, 'The Human Cost of Soviet Communism,' was prepared by Robert Conquest of London at the request of Senator Thomas J. Dodd, the vice-chairman of the sub-committee. . . Robert Conquest, an expert on Soviet affairs, said that his estimate of 21.5 million deaths was conservative and that the real figure may be as high as 45 million." *South African Observer*, Jan. 1971, p. 8. The estimate of Mr. D.G. Stewart-Smith, editor of the *East West Digest*, as reported in the *London Daily Telegraph*, 8/29/69, comes to 45 million. Prof. Antony C. Sutton, of the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, made it 35 million. See the dedication in his *National Suicide*, Arlington Press, 1973.

48. Carleton S. Coon—*The Story of Man*, Knopf, 2nd edition, 1967, p 403.

49. F.J.P. Veale—*Advance To Barbarism*, revised edition, Devin-Adair, 1968, pp. 222-3. This has been referred to as "One of the most important books to come out of the Second World War." See also Nesta H. Webster (with Anthony Gittens)—*World Revolution*, Britons, revised edition 1971, 317-8 (with Notes 2 and 3 on p. 323). For further and very authoritative confirmation of all this, see Alexander Solzhenitsyn—*The Gulag Archipelago*, Harper & Row, 1974.

"One of [the chief merits of this book] is that it shatters the myth, so often enunciated by Red apologists, that Russian Communism was a noble concept which went wrong only after Lenin was succeeded by Stalin.

“Employing documented evidence, Alexander Solzhenitsyn makes it quite clear that right from the bloody inauguration of the Bolshevik regime any who would not, or even could not, fit into the mould dictated by the Communist state was ruthlessly eliminated. The brave new world of Communism was raised on a foundation of corpses and it was this that Stalin built, only in even more extreme form. As a social system, Communism held that a man’s life was of no value whatsoever unless he could contribute something to the state. Solzhenitsyn’s portrayal of frame-ups and massacres is brilliant—even grumblers and malingerers were considered anti-social and so exterminated like mad dogs.” R. Huxtable, in a review in *Candour*, Sept. 1974.

50. *U.S. News and World Report*, Dec. 11, 1972.

51. See Prof. John Beaty—*The Iron Curtain over America*, Wilkinson Pub. Co., Dallas, Texas, 1951, Chap. 11: “Russia and the Khazars,” especially page 16. He cites and quotes indisputable authorities.

52. Boswell Publishing Co., London, 1938. Chapter I is entitled “The Jews As A Race.” “Cobbett” was the *nom du plume* of Anthony M. Ludovici, a distinguished English scholar and author with whom I corresponded for many years and came to be a close friend, and whom I twice visited in England.

53. For example: Sir Arthur Keith, one of the greatest of modern anthropologists and one-time President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science—*A New Theory of Human Evolution*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1949, Chap. XXXVII: “The Jews As A Nation and As A Race.” He concludes that “whether we use the term race as the zoologist uses it, or in its original sense, the Jews are to be regarded as a race” (p. 378). It has been only their fanatical sense of race which has preserved them from “the absorption and death of their nation by its disappearance in the common sea of humanity” (p. 376). Prof. E. Ruggles Gates, who at the time of his death in 1962 was looked upon as the world’s foremost geneticist, wrote of the Jews as follows:

“Coon [Carleton S. Coon—*The Races of Europe*, Macmillan, 1939] has traced the racial history of the Jews in some detail. He shows (p. 442) that ‘the Jews form an ethnic group’ and that like all ethnic groups they have their own racial elements distributed in their own proportions . . . They have developed ‘a special racial sub-type and a special pattern of facial and bodily expression easy to identify but difficult to define.’”

On page 444, he declared that they “have their own standard racial character.” His discussion of the question will be found on pp. 432-44 and 638-46. For a review of Dr.

Coon's status in the world of science, see Note 85 of my last chapter. See also Werner Sombart—*The Jews And Modern Capitalism*, Putnam, 1913, p. 291ff. The whole of Chap. XIII, "The Race Problem," is eminently worth reading.

54. See "Cobbett," op. cit., pp. 24-27, where he reviews and weighs the considerations pro and con.

55. Theodor Herzl—*The Jewish State*, American Zionist Emergency Council, New York, 1946, p. 76. Cp. p. 92.

56. Louis D. Brandeis—*The Jewish Problem and How to Solve It*, Zionist Organization, New York, 1919, pp. 12, 14.

57. Quoted in *The International Jew*, Dearborn Publishing Co., 1920, Vol. II, p. 6.

58. For instance, the Jews so successfully resisted the identification of immigrants into the United States by race, insisting that they be set down not as Jews but as Germans, Poles, or what not, that for many years the various national quotas were taken up almost entirely by Jews, and to this day the number of Jews in the United States is known only by the figures the Jews themselves choose to give us.

59. Henry Preserved Smith—*Old Testament History*, Scribner's, 1911, 389-398. Dr. Smith was a widely recognized Biblical authority on the faculty of Amherst.

60. Cobbett, op. cit., pp. 86-9.

61. Proverb of Hell No. 49, *Poetry and Prose of William Blake*, Nonesuch, 1927, p. 194.

62. See Sveinbjorn Johnson—*Pioneers of Freedom*, Boston, 1930, pp. 119, 120, 135.

63. See *The American Hebrew* for Sept. 10, 1920: "The Jew evolved organized capitalism, and its instrumentality the banking system." Werner Sombart, in his *The Jews And Modern Capitalism*, Dutton, 1913, supplies monumental evidence to the same effect.

64. Ezra Pound observed, sagely, "Without understanding economics one cannot understand history." *Impact*, p. 61.

65. See Frederick Soddy—*The Role of Money*, Harcourt, 1935, pp. v, vi. Oxford University professor, Nobel Prizewinner, "father of nuclear fission." No one has done more to illuminate the Money Question than he has. See his name at the end of [Appendix I](#) of this chapter.

66. See Frederick Soddy—*The Role of Money*, Harcourt, 1935, page v.

67. Ezra Pound—*Impact*, Regnery, 1960, pp. 48, 106-7, 191.

68. Jeffrey Mark—*The Modern Idolatry*, Chatto & Windus, 1934, p. 17. (Bombay reprint, p. 9.) For information about this book see the name of its author in [Appendix I](#) at the end of this chapter. It was one of two books especially recommended to me by Mr. A.K. Chesterton when I began my study of our Money System.

69. A word to avoid misunderstanding. I do not for a moment impugn the honesty or integrity of the ordinary banker. It is a paradox that most men who take an active part in what basically is the most dishonest of business enterprises are themselves among the most honest men in any community. Apparently, they enter it with as little suspicion and with as little inquiry into its basic operations as a man accepts employment as a manager or as a clerk in a chain store. They simply carry out the banker's traditional role, doing what is expected of them.

Nevertheless, the severity of my indictment and my condemnation of our Money System must stand. Full knowledge of the facts will admit of no less, and it is endorsed to the hilt by Prof. Frederick Soddy, whose eminence as a scientist and as a scholar is manifest from what I will say in my note about him at the end of [Appendix I](#) to this chapter. Here suffice to say

that he was a Nobel Prize Winner in Chemistry, a Professor in Oxford University, and a Fellow of the Royal Society, England's highest scientific honorary body. In September 1944, shortly before the end of the Second World War, profoundly disturbed by what the International Money Power had done to Britain and to the British people during the two world wars, and by what it could be expected to do to ruin the British future, he published a warning, signed by eight other men of more or less distinction, in which he attempted to arouse the British people, before it was too late, to stave off the disaster that was suspended over them. This brochure, entitled "Present Outlook: A Warning," was addressed primarily to the public of England, but it applied equally well to the U.S.A. It was reprinted over here by Mr. John G. Scott, editor of *Money*, who died in the mid-Fifties. This, if space will permit, I shall quote in full at the very end of [Appendix I](#) to this chapter. I will submit here only the following very significant passages:

"1. The Nation has lost control over its own money and, therefore, over its whole future and destiny. From the first false step of granting a monopoly of note-issue to the Bank of England, soon after its foundation in 1694 [as we did in letting ourselves be saddled with the Federal Reserve Bank in 1913 (W.G.S.)], it has been stealthily, but now completely subjugated to the soulless despotism of Money Power, wielded by institutions still calling themselves 'banks,' but operating for their own power and profit, what is now nothing but a gigantic private minting swindle. . .

"6. The money system is rotten to the core, and until it is replaced by a national, scientific system which is both fool-proof and knave-proof, the corruption will permeate ever more deeply into the roots of our national life. We shall continue with the rest of the world to be governed, as Disraeli said, by persons very different from what is imagined. Crushing taxation and mounting loads of national and municipal debt will hamstring our production, beggar the masses and ruin their hope of social amelioration. It is our hope that before the rot spreads [groups in England for which we have no exact parallel in the U.S.] may make common cause with those who, like ourselves, have been and are trying to educate the public on this absolutely vital matter, so that the existing money system may be entirely abolished and replaced by an honest national, scientific system capable of turning to constructive social betterment this Age of Plenty."

Soddy closes by denouncing our present money power as "the most dangerous conspiracy against the freedom of men the world has ever known."

70. Gertrude Coogan—*Money Creators*, Sound Money Press, Chicago, 1935, p. 329. For an introduction to Miss Coogan and a statement of her credentials, I suggest that my reader look up her name in [Appendix I](#) to this chapter.

71. Werner Sombart—*The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, Dutton, 1913, p. 99.

72. Ezra Pound—*Impact*, p. 94. Prof. Frederick Soddy records that “it was recognized in Athens and Sparta ten centuries before the birth of Christ that one of the most vital prerogatives of the State was the sole right to issue money.”

73. Cp. Gertrude M. Coogan, op. cit., p. 13:

“Fundamentally, only the Government of a nation should create money. It should be created by the imprint of a National Government, and paid into circulation in the first instance as government expenditures. . . . Were the money system of a nation in the hands of conscientious men, they would carefully observe the growth of actual production, and as it increases; they would enlarge the supply of money, and put it into circulation in payment for some governmental operation. When issued to pay for necessary governmental buildings or to pay the legitimate and reasonable costs of carrying out the government’s real purpose—to protect the person and property of private individuals—all governmental costs do not have to be met by taxation. But additional money can only be issued as physical production increases. Otherwise, the purchasing power of all money outstanding would be diluted.”

74. For obvious reasons, this real ruler will choose to apply its pressures upon the apparent government in ways that escape public attention, until such time as it is ready to lift the smoke screen and openly establish itself as the dominant power in the land.

75. Jeffrey Mark—op. cit., Chatto & Windus, London 1934, p. 60.

76. See Emil Ludwig—*Lincoln*, Little Brown, 1930, p. 448.

77. In support and justification of this, Prof. Soddy declared flatly: “As for the public’s confidence, what better calculated to restore it than to *put behind a national system the whole wealth and credit of the nation*. What a change that would be from the reputation for integrity and bottomless affluence which is the private banker’s whole stock-in-trade.” Op. cit., p. 14. (Emphasis in the first sentence added.) It was upon such knowledge and conviction that Lincoln, in the face of all the international bankers’ intense propaganda and humbug to the contrary, had the courage to act. “Lincoln knew that the way to finance the Civil War was to have the United States Government itself issue non-cancellable United States currency but to issue it only in such amounts as corresponded with the nation’s ability to produce the actual physical things needed to conduct the war.” Gertrude Coogan, op. cit., p. 215.

Consonant with this is a remark that Disraeli put in the mouth of Sidonia in his novel *Coningsby*. Sidonia has come to be accepted as representing the head of the House of Rothschild in England in the time of Disraeli. Sidonia has received word that the Government cannot pay the interest on the national debt, and wants to know if he can make it a loan. To which Sidonia replies, in an aside to Coningsby, "Can anything be more absurd than that a nation should apply to an individual to maintain its credit, and with its credit, its existence as an empire and its comfort as a people?" *Coningsby*, Everyman Library edition, p. 205.

78. Quoted by Ezra Pound, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

79. Frederick Soddy—*Wealth, Virtual Wealth and Debt*, Omni Publications, 1961, p. 188. Christopher Hollis, in his *The Breakdown of Money* (Sheed, 1934, p. xviii), declares flatly that

"There is no dispute about the fact that our economy is built by bankers, lending money that they do not possess, never have possessed, and never will possess, on the calculation that they will not be asked for that money in notes or coin; nor can there be any sensible dispute about the importance of the fact." (Emphasis added)

He cites statements of some outstanding English bankers. See also the testimony of Vincent Vickers, one-time Director of the Bank of England, and that of Robert H. Hemphill, Credit Manager of the Federal Reserve of Atlanta, Georgia, as quoted in [Appendix I](#) to this chapter. Christopher Hollis points out also the extraordinary fact that even "in otherwise comprehensive and painstaking historical treatises," the determining influence of Finance on historical developments, even those crucial for our very destiny, is as a rule almost completely ignored. See his pp. xvii, xix and xx.

80. Routledge, London, 1928, Vol. II, pp. 651-2. Cp. Werner Sombart. *op. cit.*, pp. 51, 54ff.

81. See the following, from the testimony of Marriner Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, before the House Banking and Currency Committee, Sept. 30, 1941:

"Congressman Patman: 'Mr. Eccles, how did you get the money to buy those two billions of government securities?'

"Eccles: 'We created it.'

"Patman: 'Out of what?'

“Eccles: ‘Out of the right to issue credit money.’”

See also: Ezra Pound, op. cit., p. 46f.: C. H. Douglas—*The Brief For The Prosecution*, K.R.P. Publications, Liverpool, 1945, p. 43, where he cites the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* for authority; and W. Cleon Skousen—*The Naked Capitalist*, Salt Lake City, 1970, p. 12, where he quotes from pp. 48-9 of *Tragedy and Hope, A History of the World in Our Time*—Dr. Quigley is Professor of History at the Foreign Service School of Georgetown University, and formerly taught at Harvard and Princeton.

82. See Christopher Hollis—*The Break down of Money*, Sheed, 1934, pp. 49-50. Mr. A.N. Field, in his *All These Things* (Omni Pubs., 1963, pp. 218-9), makes the following comment on this development:

“Thirty-three years after Cromwell had let the Jews into Britain, a Dutch Prince arrived from Amsterdam surrounded by a whole swarm of Jews from that Jewish financial centre. Driving his royal father-in-law out of the kingdom, he graciously consented to ascend the throne of Britain. A very natural result following on this event was the inauguration of the National Debt by the establishment six years later of the Bank of England for the purpose of lending money to the Crown. Britain had paid her way as she went until the Jew arrived.” [Emphasis added]

The pawnshop was then opened and the resulting situation in which the nation finds itself to-day could not be better described than in the words put by Shakespeare with prophetic vision in the mouth of the dying John of Guant:

This blessed plot, this earth, this realm, this England,
This land of such dear souls, this dear dear land,
Dear for her reputation through the world,
Is now leas'd out, (I die pronouncing it,) like to a tenement, or pelting farm:
England, bound in with the triumphant sea,
Whose rocky shore beats back the envious siege
Of wat'ry Neptune, is now bound in with shame,
With inky blots, and rotten parchment bonds:
That England, that was wont to conquer others,
Hath made a shameful conquest of itself.

The history of the second Jewish settlement in Britain is one long trail of parchment bonds shackling the nation in debt. Every step in the ascent of the Jew in the nation's affairs has been marked by the increase and multiplication of debt. The culmination was reached when under the Asquith and Lloyd George Ministries, surrounded by the Marconi Scandal Jews, the European War was financed by the fictitious lending of £6,000,000,000 of completely non-existent money. The bare-faced fraud of these proceedings was capped after the war by an audacious contraction of the means of payment, and the consequent wholesale wrecking of British industries and reduction of millions of people to destitution.

“. . . From that time onwards we were simply going to London each year and borrowing more money to pay the interest on what we already owed.”

Since Mr. Field wrote these words (his book was first published in 1931), Britain has been brought to far greater depth of humiliation and disintegration.

With the above account of the return of the Jews to England, compare Werner Sombart, *op. cit.*, pp. 88-9, where, with much else, he says that “towards the end of the 17th century, the [London] Exchange . . . was full of Jews. So numerous did they become that a special corner of the building was designated the “Jews’ walk” “The Alley throngs with Jews,” wrote a contemporary.

“Whence these throngs? The answer is obvious. They came in the train of William III from Amsterdam, and brought with them the machinery of Stock Exchange dealings in vogue there. . .

“The Stock Exchange was like Minerva: it appeared on the scene already armed. The principal participants in the first English loan were Jews: they assisted William III with their advice, one of them . . . was Marlborough’s banker, giving the General an annual grant of £6,000 and receiving in return the advantage of being first in the field with news of the wars. . .”

Etc., etc., always to the Jews’ steady increase in wealth and in control over England’s whole life.

83. See John Hargrave—*Montagu Norman* [Governor of the Bank of England 1920-44.] Greystone Press, New York, 1942, *espec.* pp. 107 and 123. For the history of the “Bank of England,” see Chap. 9 (pp. 55-8.) Cp. Jeffrey Mark, *op. cit.*, p. 59 (last two pages of Chap. VII); Christopher Hollis—*The Breakdown of Money*, Sheed, 1934, p. 64 (this is excellent); Gertrude M. Coogan, *op. cit.*, pp. 176f, 132-3, 139, 141f; A.N. Field, *op. cit.*, pp. 7, 8; John M. Elson—*Lightning over the Treasury Building*, Forum Pub. Co., Boston, 1941, Chap. 11, entitled “The Bank of England.” A reprint of Elson’s book is available from Omni Pubs. Hawthorne, Calif.

84. “The great panics of 1873, 1884, 1903 and 1907 had been serious handicaps in the development of America, but each time the great industry and thrift of the American people caused them to go ahead even though manipulators had repeatedly caused them to lose their properties through intentional well-timed curtailment of the supply of money.” Gertrude M. Coogan, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

85. Martinet Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, on March 13, 1939, issued a memorandum stating that: "The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System opposes any bill which proposes a stable price level." See H.S. Kenan—*The Federal Reserve Bank*, Noontide, 1967, p. 125.

86. See Wickliffe B. Vennard—*The Federal Reserve Corporation*, Meador, p. 8ff.

87. See Eustace Mullins—*Mullins On The Federal Reserve*, Kaspar & Horton, New York, 1952. A second edition, with the title *The Federal Reserve Conspiracy*, was published in 1954 by *Common Sense*, Union, NJ. See also Wickliffe B. Vennard—*The Federal Reserve Corporation*, Meador Publishing Co., n.d. (reprint obtainable from Omni Publications); H.S. Kenan—*The Federal Reserve Bank*, Noontide, 1967, Chap. XI: "In The Beginning"; A.N. Field—*All These Things*, pp. 4-8, 121-2; Gary Allen—"The Bankers" in *American Opinion*, March 1970; Paul M. Warburg—*Essays on Banking Reform in the U.S.*, the Introduction by E.R.A. Seligman, where Mr. Seligman says:

"It may be stated without fear of contradiction that in its fundamental features the Federal Reserve Act is the work of Mr. Warburg more than of any other man in the country."

Prof. Seligman, of the international banking family, was head of the Department of Economics at Columbus University. See also, W. Cleon Skousen—*The Naked Capitalist*, Salt Lake City, 1970, pp. 16-25. Mr. Skousen's book consists, for the most part, of copious excerpts from, and trenchant commentary on, *Tragedy and Hope, A History of the World in Our Time* by Prof. Carroll Quigley, mentioned in Note 81. Of this almost monumental 1300-page book, Mr. Gary Allen says: "It is one of the most important ever written about the international conspiratorial apparatus, and is a must for serious students of modern history. Although Professor Quigley writes from the Establishment point of view . . . he presents considerable information which makes a strong case concerning the existence of an elite international conspiracy." Gary Allen: "The Federal Reserve," in *American Opinion*, April 1970, p. 3, footnote.

88. See A. N. Field, op. cit., p. 123. See also Gary Allen: "The Federal Reserve," *American Opinion*, April 1970, pp. 24-30, where much solid evidence is submitted. Former Congressman Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr., writing of the 1921 panic in his book *The Economic Pind* (p. 95), declared that "under the Federal Reserve Act panics are scientifically created; the present panic is the first scientifically created one, worked out as we figure a mathematical problem." Louis T. McFadden, for many years Chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee and a past-President of the Pennsylvania Bankers Association, declared: "It [the depression] was not accidental. It was a carefully contrived occurrence. . . The international bankers sought to bring about a condition of despair here so that they might emerge as the rulers of us all." Ferdinand Lundberg wrote to the same

effect. Mr. Allen observes that “the House Hearings on Stabilization of the Purchasing Power of the Dollar disclosed evidence in 1928 that the Federal Reserve Board was working closely with the heads of European central banks. The Committee warned that a major crash had been planned in 1927 at a secret luncheon of the Federal Reserve Board and heads of the European Central banks.” (Op. cit., p. 26) He states the conclusion: “Had the Insiders not had a Federal Reserve by which they could control and manipulate inflation, the depression would not have occurred.” (Ibid.)

89. Between 1929 and 1933, “the Nation’s total money supply decreased by about \$8 billion, or one third. . . Such a reduction in the money supply could not help but magnify if not initiate any crash in prices and output—and it did.” See *A Primer on Money*, 1964, p. 83, put out by the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, 88th Congress, U.S. Govt. Printing Office. But while the international bankers were making money ruinously scarce here, they were making it available to Russia, and this at a time when our Government had not yet given the Soviet Government its recognition. See Gary Allen, “The Federal Reserve,” *American Opinion*, April 1970, p. 28.

90. See A.N. Field, op. cit., p. 123. Also, Gertrude M. Coogan. op. cit., p. 60ff. Perhaps the basic history of the United States centers around the struggle between the forces for government control and the forces for bankers’ control of credit—something which, very significantly, our history books rarely touch upon. Mr. Arthur Kitson, a wealthy Englishman for many years in business in a large way in Philadelphia, in his testimony before the Macmillan Committee on Finance and Industry at London, May 15, 1930, gave a vivid account of the depths of baseness to which the big bankers have descended in order to deceive the people and corrupt politics to the end that they might establish the control of credit in their own hands. See Jeffrey Mark, op. cit., Chatto & Windus edition, 1934, pp. 239-240. (Bombay edition, pp. 190-191.)

91. McFadden’s speech of June 10, 1932, as reprinted in full in H.S. Kenan, op. cit. See p. 170. His collected speeches are obtainable from Omni Pubs.

92. Ibid. 142. Mr. A.N. Field adds: “There is a mass of evidence to show that the Bolsheviks since 1917 have received enormous support by international finance, and this alone made the Five Year Plan possible.” Cp. Comte de Saint-Aulaire—*Genève Versus Peace*, Sheed, 1937, pp. 74-90. Saint-Aulaire was Ambassador of France to Great Britain, 1920-24.

Mr. McFadden, in naming outstanding operators in the *International Money Power*, and to show the interconnectedness and tight solidarity existing within the ranks of financial Jewry, said, in a speech in Congress, 6/24/34:

“Mr. Chairman, understanding that Henry Morgenthau is related by marriage to Herbert Lehmann, Jewish Governor of the State of New York; and is related by marriage or otherwise to the Seligmans, of the international Jewish firm of J. and W. Seligman, who were publicly shown before a Senate committee of investigation to have offered a bribe to a foreign government; and to the Warburgs, whose operations through Kuhn, Loeb & Co., the International Acceptance Bank, and the Bank of Manhattan Co., and other foreign and domestic institutions under their control, have drained billions of dollars out of the United States Treasury and the bank deposits belonging to United States citizens; and to the Strauses, proprietors of R.H. Macy & Co., of New York, which is an outlet for goods dumped upon this country at the expense of the United States Government; . . . and that Mr. Morgenthau is likewise related or otherwise connected with the Jewish banking community of New York and London, Amsterdam, and other financial centres, and that he has as his assistant, presiding over public funds, Earl Bailie, a member of the firm of J. and W. Seligman, bribe-givers as aforesaid, it seems to me that Henry Morgenthau’s presence in the United States Treasury, and the request that Congress now give him a \$200,000,000 ‘kitty’ of the people’s money for gambling purposes, is a striking confirmation of the statement made by me on the floor of the House on May 29, 1933. . .” A.N. Field, op. cit., p. 155.

To the above may be added the following from Mr. McFadden’s speech in Congress of May 4, 1933:

“Mr. Chairman, there is a condition in the Treasury of the United States which would cause American citizens, if they knew what it was, to lose all confidence in their Government. That is a condition that Roosevelt will not have investigated. He has brought with him from Wall Street, James Warburg, the son of Paul M. Warburg. Mr. Warburg is head of the Bank of Manhattan Co. Mr. Warburg, alien born and the son of an alien who did not become naturalized here until several years after this Warburg’s birth, is a son of a former partner of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., a grandson of another partner, a nephew of a former partner, and a nephew of a present partner. He holds no office in our Government, but I am told that he is in daily attendance at the Treasury, and that he has private quarters there. In other words, Mr. Chairman, Kuhn, Loeb & Co. now control and occupy the United States Treasury.” A.N. Field, op. cit., p. 129.

Understandably, Mr. McFadden’s scathing exposure of the financial operations of the Jewish community called forth the most venomous resentment. (See A.N. Field, op. cit., 111-2.) He “was preparing to break the full story when he collapsed at a banquet and died. As two assassination attempts had already been made against him, many suspected poisoning.” Gary Allen: “The Federal Reserve,” op. cit., p. 30. This is confirmed by other sources.

94. Op. cit., pp. 22, 24-5. For the socialistic aims of Paul Warburg as he himself stated them in 1917, see B.C. Forbes—*Men Who Are Making America*, p. 404.

95. Op. cit., Chatto & Windus ed., p. 237. (Bombay ed., p. 189.)

96. In regard to what is meant, or should be meant, by the expression “sound money,” attention should be paid to the words of Mr. Reginald McKenna, Chairman of the Midland Bank (one of England’s largest) and one-time Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain. He was “one of the few bankers who have been straightforward enough to admit publicly that ‘the time has gone for the child-like belief that as long as a country is on the gold standard, all is well.’” He declared himself “unable to attach any meaning to the phrase [‘sound money’] except that a ‘sound’ unit of currency would always be of the same value measured in the aggregate of the things on which our money is spent. . . Viewed in this light, could any standard have failed more signally than the gold standard of recent years?” (Speech at Ordinary Meeting of Shareholders, Jan. 29, 1932. See Jeffrey Mark, op. cit., Chap. XXXI.) Cp. Gertrude M. Coogan, op. cit., p. 295f.:

“The phrase ‘sound money’ was appropriated by the money creators and misused to designate the kind of money they create and control for private profit. The money creating powers have been used for international destruction. As now used by the old crowd, it means money that is based 3% on gold and 97% on ‘confidence,’ ‘courage,’ and other purely psychological and irrelevant factors. It means money, the volume of which can be expanded or collapsed at the will of a few individuals who hold huge liquid funds which they can surreptitiously juggle between the various countries. The public has never understood that an export of one gold dollar potentially destroys thirty ‘confidence’ dollars. As thus misused, sound money means mystery money.”

97. Gertrude M. Coogan, op. cit., p. 165ff.

98. R. McNair Wilson—*Promise to Pay*, Routlage, 1934, p. 9. See Appendix 1.

99. See Jeffrey Mark, op. cit., London ed., pp. 66-8 (Bombay ed., pp. 49-51.) Cp. Gertrude M. Coogan, op. cit., Chap. III: “The Origin of the Practices.”

100. Ezra Pound—*Impact*, p. 107.

101. That was the very purpose of the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944. See A.N. Field—*The Bretton Woods Plot*, Nelson, New Zealand, 1957.

102. It has been brought to my attention by Mr. Borge Jensen that in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, under “Russia, New Financial Policies,” will be found the statement that “the State Bank [of Soviet Russia] was established in 1921 [that is, four years after the Revolution] and given authority to issue bank notes as well as to serve as a credit institution. . . the rouble was thus given its pre-war gold equivalent.”

“In other words,” Mr. Jensen comments, “the Jewish system of finance, i.e., the issue of credit based on gold, was adopted by the ‘new’ and ‘proletarian’ country as obediently as by all the other ‘Capitalist’ countries. The link between the two largest Federations in the world is, fittingly enough, the ruling Jewish financial house of the world, Kuhn, Loeb & Co., and when members of the families of Warburg, Kahn, etc., visit the Soviet capital they are received with royal pomp, the Soviet troops . . . presenting arms as they pass.”

See P.R. Masson and Burge Jensen—*Hitler’s Policy Is a Jewish Policy* (correspondence with a Jewish publicist), K.R.P. Publications, Liverpool, about 1941, p. 14.

103. C.H. Douglas—*The Brief for the Prosecution*, K.R.P. Pubs., Liverpool, 1945, p. 51. Cp. pp. 31, 59 “P.E.P.” stands for Political and Economic Planning. It is a scheme to get Britain into the economic straitjacket of state-owned and state-directed bureaucratic monopolies. It was initiated and promoted by Jewish Fabian socialists and Zionists. Douglas believed it collided head-on with the genius of the British peoples. They wanted “self-employment” and “the restoration of the sovereignty of the individual over his own affairs” (pp. 48, 63).

104. Ezra Pound, op. cit., pp. 101, 107, 104.

105. Ibid., p. 104. Cp. Brooks Adams—*The Law of Civilization and Decay*, Knopf, 1943, p. 306. See especially R. McNair Wilson—*Monarchy or Money Power*, Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, 1933.

106. Jeffrey Mark, op. cit., Bombay ed., pp. 167, 169. In Chatto & Windus ed., first 2 or 3 pp. of Chap. XXVI: "The Bid For World Power." Cp. C.H. Douglas—*The Brief for the Prosecution*.

107. Ibid., Bombay ed., pp. 51, 53. Chatto & Windus ed., last couple of pages of Chap. VII: "The Genesis of the Moneylender."

108. At this point Prof. Soddy (and mind you, he is no "anti-Semitic" bigot or hatemonger, but an Oxford University professor and a Nobel Prize winner, and his book is remarkable for its coldly rational and objective analysis) actually cites the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* (published by The Britons Publishing Co., 1925), which purports to be a statement of Jewish aims for world subjugation and of the means by which it is to be accomplished. Though Jews furiously disavow all responsibility for the work, it is significant that what has been going on in the world throughout this century is in striking agreement with what is set forth in this book. This fact was observed by Henry Ford, as reported in the *New York World*, Jan. 17, 1921. It is detailed and brought up to date by the great British journalist Mr. A.K. Chesterton in his brilliant book *The New Unhappy Lords, An Exposure of Power Politics*, 4th revised edition, Britons Pub. Co., 1972.

However, the *Protocols* (the book as a whole) does require some critical examination, and this I have given it elsewhere. But as my case is in no way dependent on the *Protocols*, I will do no more here than suggest that my reader try to get his own impressions of the book, preferably by reading *The Protocols and World Revolution*, Small Maynard, Boston, 1920. This, in addition to the text of the *Protocols*, in Part III contains corroborative evidence taken from testimony of eyewitnesses before the special Overman Committee in the U.S. Senate, which was set up to investigate Bolshevism in 1919. And it is in order, I think, to call attention to the fact that the Jews so feared or hated the book, for whatever reason, that they put Small Maynard & Co. out of business for publishing it, and in the early days of the Revolution in Russia the Jewish Bolsheviks shot anyone found with a copy of the *Protocols* on his person. It is significant, too, that for all this effort to stamp the book out of existence, no official body of Jewry has ever, as far as I am aware, disavowed the aims or repudiated the means set forth in the *Protocols*.

109. Frederick Soddy, op. cit., 1933, pp. 321-3. Cp. the speech of Woodrow Wilson in 1916 in which he apparently broke loose for a moment from the tightening grip on him of Felix Frankfurter and Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis to declare:

"A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit is concentrated. The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men. . . We have come to be one of the worst ruled, one of the most completely controlled and dominated Governments in the civilized world—no longer a Government by free opinion, no longer a Government by conviction and the vote of the majority, but a

Government by the opinion and duress of small groups of dominant men." Quoted by Gertrude M. Coogan, op. cit., p. xvi.

If anyone is skeptical about the Jews' grip on Pres. Wilson, let him read Conrad K. Grieb's *The Balfour Declaration, Warrant for Genocide*, New York, 1972, p. 29ff., and *Genex Versus Peace* (p. 62) by the Comte St. Aulaire, who was the French Ambassador to Britain from 1920-1924. Let him reflect, too, that it was chiefly Kuhn, Loeb money that had put him in office.

110. In January, 1933, when Sir Otto Niemeyer [a Jew, representing the Bank of England] first suggested a central bank for New Zealand linked to the Bank of England, Captain Rushworth, M.P., speaking in a budget debate in the New Zealand Parliament, said:

"If the Government is proposing to set up a central bank that will be beyond the control of this Parliament, I suggest that it is contemplating an act of high treason." Quoted by Jeffrey Mark, op. cit., p. 168.

111. Did not James Warburg, in appearing before a sub-committee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in 1950, declare—perhaps in a tone of threat—"We shall have World Government whether or not we like it. The question is only whether World Government will be achieved by consent or conquest." And did not another "insider," Prof. Quigley, take the same attitude? According to his reviewer Mr. N. Cleon Skousen, "He says, in effect, that it is now too late for the little people to turn back the tide. In a spirit of kindness he is therefore urging them not to fight the noose which is already around their necks. He feels certain that those who do will only choke themselves to death." See W. Cleon Skousen, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

112. Jeffrey Mark, op. cit., p. 3.

113. Professor Soddy, writing in 1935, sized up the situation thus: "The 'money-power' which has been able to overshadow ostensibly responsible government, is not the power of the merely ultra-rich, but is nothing more nor less than a new technique designed to create and destroy money by adding and withdrawing figures in bank ledgers, without the slightest concern for the interests or the community or the real role that money ought to perform therein.

"The more profound students of money and, more recently, a very few historians have realized the enormous significance of this money power or technique, and its key position in shaping the course of world events through the ages. [Any true approach to the problem will be] concerned less with the details of particular schemes of monetary reform that have been

advocated than with the general principles to which, . . . , every monetary system must at last conform, if it is to fulfill its proper role as the distributive mechanism of society. To allow it to become a source of revenue to private issuers is to create, first, a secret and illicit arm of the government and, last, a rival power strong enough ultimately to overthrow all other forms of government," *Role of Money*, Harcourt, 1935, pp. v, vi.

114. Major C.H. Douglas wrote—"The question which the world—and each country—has to decide to-day is whether it has at its command a sufficiency of skill and knowledge to undertake this vital work of monetary control, or whether it must remain at the mercy of a monetary system which, supposed to be automatic and self-adjusting, has in effect again and again thrown the entire productive organisation out of gear and condemned millions of people to unemployment and unnecessary poverty. I am far from suggesting that the technique of control needed to remedy this situation has yet been fully worked out, or that there is general agreement among skilled persons about the basic principles of monetary management. If we attempt control we shall make many mistakes; but we shall learn from them and it is surely better to learn from our mistakes than to drown because we refuse to attempt to master the difficult art of swimming." Quoted in Christopher Hollis—*The Breakdown of Money*, Sheed, 1934, p. xxiii.

115. See "Silvio Gesell"—toward the end of my [Appendix I](#) to this chapter.

116. See the article in *Harper's Magazine* for July 1946 by G.R. Walker for "a helpful analysis of the Gesell theory of money and free economy."

117. Ezra Pound—*Impact*, Regnery, 1960, p. 91.

118. See Christopher Hollis, op. cit., pp. 68, 78.

119. Prof. Soddy declared that under a just and reasonable money system "the nation [would issue] all the money required just as fast as it could be issued without increasing the price-level—and that is just as fast as there were goods and services to exchange for it." See his *Wealth, Virtual Wealth and Debt*, p.16. Ezra Pound wrote, "The state monetary authorities can supply the needs of the people and provide for all work useful to the state, up to a limit imposed by the availabilities of raw materials and the people's brain-power and muscle-power, without having to ask permission of the usurer." *Impact*, p. 68. Cp. pp. 99, 146.

And in different words Gertrude Coogan said the same thing. See her *Money Creators*, p. 318.

120. See Irving Fisher—*Stamp Scrip*, Adelphi, 1933, Chs. IV and V (pp. 17-44.) See also his introductory chapters I-III (pp. 1-16.) As *Stamp Scrip* may prove difficult to find, even in most libraries, I am reprinting as [Appendix III](#) to this chapter the excellent brief account of the Woergl experiment as published in the English periodical *The Week* for 5/17/33. See Christopher Hollis—*The Break down of Money*, Sheed, 1934, pp. 225-7. For a like story, see Olive and Jan Grubiak—*The Guernsey Experiment*, William Maclellan, Glasgow, 1960. Perhaps obtainable from Omni Publications.

121. Benjamin Disraeli—*Coningsby*, Everyman Library ed., pp. 251, 294. It has long been recognized that, in Disraeli's mind, his character Sidonia stood for Lionel de Rothschild and spoke for Disraeli himself. See Everyman ed., pp. xxiv, xxv, and 401 (No. 27).

122. Translated from *Die Ausbeutung Der Christlichen Konfessionen Und Politischen Parteien Durch Die Juden* by Franz Kayser, Munster in Westfl., 1895, p. 36. Quoted in Cobbett, op. cit., pp. 106-7. See also Vicomte Leon de Poncins—*The Secret Powers Behind Revolution*, Boswell, London, 1929, p. 160.

123. Quoted in *The Protocols and World Revolution*, op. cit., p. 121, from an address by A. Shmakoff in defense of T. Vekshin and others, University Printing Office, Moscow, 1907.

124. *Letters and Friendships of Cecil Spring-Rice*, Houghton, 1929, Vol. 2, p. 242

125. Mr. Wilmot Robertson, writing in 1972, has effectively summarized the facts. See his *The Dispossessed Majority*, Howard Allen, 1972, pp. 165-7.

126. *Impact*, p. 256.

127. See Wilmot Robertson, op. cit., pp. 167-8.

128. Ibid., pp. 168-170. See also Frank Britton—*Behind Communism*, pp. 91-6.

129. See Nathaniel Weyl and Stefan Possony—*The Geography of Intellect*, Regnery 1963, pp. 162-4.

130. Mr. Wilmot Robertson, in commenting on Prof. Ernest Van Haag's appraisal of an old psychological test of California school children by Lewis Terman, remarks: "Other population groups produced extremely high scores, but van den Haag did not mention them. The Scots did even better than the Jews on a percentage basis." See *The Dispossessed Majority*, p. 184, Note 124.

131. See Cobbett—*Jews, and the Jews in England*, Boswell, 1938. Cobbett is the *nom de plume* of a distinguished English sociologist.

132. Nietzsche observed: "Die Juden scheinen auch hier bloss Vermittler—sie erfinden nichts." ("Even here the Jews appear as mere middlemen—they create nothing.") *Nietzsche In Seinen Briefen*, Kroner, 1941, p. 466. This is fully supported by what Cobbett has to say about Jewish character and capabilities in his *Jews, and the Jews in England*. Cp. Nesta H. Webster—*Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, Boswell, London, 1946, pp. 395-6, where, in part, she says: "The fact is that the Jew is not usually a man of vast conceptions, nor is he endowed with great originality of mind; his skill consists rather in elaborating or adapting other men's ideas and rendering them more effectual. . . . Thrown on their own resources, what civilization were the Jews able to create? Whilst Egypt, Greece, and Rome left immortal monuments, what monuments has Palestine bequeathed to the World?" In a footnote she adds: "Gustave Le Bon goes so far as to say that 'the Jews have never possessed either arts, sciences, or industries, or anything that constitutes a civilization. . . . At the time of their greatest power under the reign of Solomon it was from abroad that they were obliged to bring the architects, workmen, and artists, of which no rival then existed in Israel.' *Les Premieres Civilizations*, p. 613 (1889)."

133. It is often insinuated that Spain's decline after 1492 was due to Queen Isabella's expulsion of the Jews in that year, but it needs to be investigated whether the decline was not due primarily (as in the case of Portugal) to the fact that just then the Spanish people whose Christianity left them totally without protection against miscegenation, began for the first time to mix freely with their Negro slaves. Naturally, it would have taken several generations

for the miscegenation to show its effects, but by 1585 it had become plain, whatever may have been the basic causes, that Spain was “internally exhausted,” and was entering upon a century of “decadence, ending in intellectual, moral and material degradation.” See the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th edition, Vol. XXV, p. 551.

134. M.J. Wodislawski, *The Jewish World*, Jan. 1, 1909.

135. B. Felz, in *The Jewish Chronicle* (one of Jewry’s leading journals), Dec. 18, 1911, p. 38.

136. *Gothic Ripples*, No. 95, Dec. 12, 1952, p. 2. For a Manifesto to the same effect issued by the World Jewish Fellowship in 1935, see A.N. Field—*All These Things*, Omni, 1963, p. 217. A few weeks later, in its issue for March 8, 1935, the same journal urged “amendment of the British libel laws to make expression of anti-Semite opinion a criminal offense.” That is, they aimed to make it a penal offense *to expose Jewish disloyalty even if it amounted to treason!*

137. *New York Times*, 6/13/38.

138. The full quotation reads: “Connected amongst themselves by the most obstinate faith, the Jews extend their charity to all of their own persuasion, while towards the rest of mankind they nourish a sullen and invertebrate hatred.” Tacitus—*Historical Works*, Everyman Library ed., Vol. II, Book V, Sec. 5, pp. 288-9.

139. *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, edited by Prof. J.B. Bury (recognized as the most authoritative edition), Methuen, 1901, Vol. II, p. 73 including footnote 1. The details of the “horrid cruelties” visited upon gentiles are revolting even to read.

140. For extensive quotations of Voltaire’s views on the Jews, see Houston Stewart Chamberlain—*The Foundations of the 19th Century*, John Lane, 1912, Vol. I, pp. 346-8.

141. Benjamin Disraeli—*Lord George Bentinck*, London, 1852, pp. 7-8.

142. Sir Richard Francis Burton—*The Jew, The Gypsy, And El Islam*, Hutchinson, London, 1898, p. 115.

143. See article entitled “What Is A Jew?” by Rabbi Morris M. Kertzer in *Look* for 6/17/52. Rabbi Kertzer wrote as the official spokesman for the American Jewish Committee. Also, he was at the time Director of Interreligious Activities of the A.J.C., and President of the Jewish Chaplains Association of the Armed Forces of the United States.

144. See *New Edition of the Babylonian Talmud*, edited, corrected and translated by Michael Levi Rodkinson, Boston, Talmud Society, 1918, Vol. I, Preface p. x.

145. *The Talmud*, New Talmud Pub. Co., New York, 1903, Vol. I, Introduction, p. 1.

146. See again article cited in Note 143.

147. The Rodkinson translation was declared by Rabbi Stephen Wise, under oath, to be an authorized English translation. The Soncino translation of 1935 is similarly authoritative. The latter is to be found in the Jewish Room of the New York Public Library, at Fifth Avenue and 42nd Street. Both are in the Library of Congress. Numerous photostatic copies of pertinent pages are to be found in *The Plot against Christianity* by Elizabeth Dilling.

148. Published by Mr. Freedman, who has long been a resident of New York City. Copies may be obtainable from concerns selling “Conservative” or “Right Wing” books.

149. What this amounts to is that their priestly caste, in revising the books of the Old Testament, chose to believe this and taught it to their people. But there is no more validity to it than there is to the erstwhile belief of the Japanese that they are the children of the Sun!

150. For passages in Burton's book where direct quotations from the *Talmud* may be found, see pp. 80-92, 118-120; in Freedman's book, pp. 35f., 52-4. Moscow tried for years to pass off the Katyn Woods Massacre as an atrocity committed by the Nazis. But *Human Events* for July 9, 1952, reported that a special committee of the House of Representatives had just turned in the results of its investigation of the matter as follows:

"The Committee has assembled overwhelming judicial proof of what was known to all competent students, that the Russian NKVD murdered over 10,000 officers of the Polish army, and buried them in Katyn Forest and other mass graves . . . By this one act the Soviet leaders destroyed very nearly all the intellectual classes of Poland . . . This is 'selective genocide' or selective, discriminate and carefully planned murder intended to eliminate solely the leadership of a nation, for slavery, or for whatever purpose was in the minds of the murderers. . ."

Perhaps this, and the peculiar ferocity of the Bolshevik tortures and executions of Christians at the time of the 1917 Russian Revolution, may be looked upon as demonstrations of what the *Talmud* intends for gentiles. See also the Report of the Overman Comm. before the U.S. Senate in 1919; and *The Protocols and World Revolution*, p. 89ff: "The Policy of Terror," and p. 97ff.: "The Destruction of Religion and Christianity," where authoritative testimony is quoted.

151. See Nesta H. Webster—*Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, Boswell, 6th ed., 1946, p. 369, where she says: "The conception of the Jews as the Chosen People who must eventually rule the world forms indeed the basis of Rabbinical Judaism." Let me add that Winston Churchill paid tribute to Mrs. Webster's reliability as a historian in his article on the part of the Jews in the November 1917 Russian Revolution, published in *The Illustrated Sunday Herald*, Feb. 8, 1920.

152. It was this matter of doubtful loyalty that so disturbed Mr. H.A. Gwynnie, editor of the *London Morning Post*, when writing his Preface to, and his endorsement of, *The Cause of the World's Unrest*, Grant Richards, London, 1920.

153. 153 See L. Fry—*Waters Flowing Eastward*, British American Press, Chatou, France, 1934, pp. 91-106, where the story is told in full. Mrs. Fry comments: "It is safe to conclude that Putnam's firm was threatened with bankruptcy if it persisted" (p. 105).

154. Transcribed from the entry in my journal written at the time.

155. I have a photostat copy of this letter. One may be found in L. Fry, op. cit., between pp. 106 and 107.

156. Peter Nicoll, M.A., B.D., was a Scottish clergyman. An American edition of his book is available from the Noontide Press, Box 1248, Torrance, California 90505.

157. Prof. Harry Elmer Barnes was formerly head of the Dept. of History at Smith College, and a President of the American Historical Society. Along with Charles A. Beard and Charles Callan Tansill, he was one of the most outstanding of the so-called "revisionist" historians, who made a heroic struggle to get the truth about the two world wars before the American people. See his *The Struggle against the Historical Blackout*, 6th edition; *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace* (with the collaboration of such men as William Henry Chamberlain, George A. Lundberg, George Morgenstern, Frederick R. Sanborn, and Charles Callan Tansill), Caxton, 1953. In writing me on 6/26/53, Dr. Barnes revised somewhat his initial estimate of *Britain's Blunder*. He expressed his "firm opinion that the truth [about Hitler's occupation of Czechoslovakia] lies about halfway between Nicoll's view and the one generally accepted here"—i.e., in the United States.

158. Cosmopolitan Book Publishers, Chicago, 1933.

159. Adolf Hitler—*Mein Kampf*, Houghton Mifflin, 1943, pp. 231-2.

160. In fact so easily that it is very disquieting evidence of how little our people are on their guard against the Jews, and of how readily they can be made the victims of inveterate Jewish liars practiced in deception. In regard to books that prove the Six Million story a lie, I shall have much to say in due course.

161. As a corrective for this, see not only Nicoll's *Britain's Blunder*, but also *Unfinished Victory* by Arthur Bryant, Oxford Prof. of History, and books by the revisionist historians previously mentioned. But perhaps the best corrective is Hitler's own book *Mein Kampf*, unexpurgated.

162. The spokesman was Mr. Samuel Untermyer, who had presided over the International Jewish Boycott Conference in Amsterdam, Holland, in July 1933. Its avowed purpose was to organize such economic and financial strangulation of Germany as to bring Hitler down. Jewry had already “declared war on Germany” some six months earlier and set up a “fighting fund” of half a billion pounds sterling [perhaps the equivalent of 2 billion dollars.] See the *London Daily Express*, 3/24/33, and the *Sunday Chronicle* (London), 1/2/33. Upon his return to New York, Mr. Untermyer, described as “leader in the boycott against Germany,” made a highly inflammatory speech in which he called upon the entire world to join in a holy crusade to destroy Hitler. The boycott proved so effective that in one year British imports from Germany were cut by 25 percent. See *The New Pioneer*, Editor: Viscount Lynton, June, 1939.

163. The truth about this has begun at last to come out. See *Twas A Famous Victory* by Benjamin Colby, Arlington House, 1974.

164. I have already had occasion to quote him, briefly, in the conclusion of my chapter on Jesus. The year following, these articles he published a book entitled *Five Men of Frankfurt*, which is essentially an account of “the rise of the House of Rothschild.” Dial Press, 1929.

165. *Century Magazine*, Jan. 1928, pp. 347-8; February 1928, p. 476. In the February article he makes his boasts even more specific. Looking upon Christianity as essentially a conquest of gentiles by Jews (which, of course, is exactly what the Russian Revolution of 1917 so is now known indisputably to have been), he actually claims (more or less in accord with Gibbon’s *Decline*, Chapters XV, XXVIII, XLVII and XLIX) that Jewish “conspiracy” was at the bottom of the destruction of Rome and the whole civilization of antiquity. The Christian teaching, which, in the beginning, was simply the doctrine of a small Jewish sect, embodied “a philosophy calculated to appeal to humble people . . . the meek, the despised, the disinherited, the down-trodden.” As such, the Christian movement, in its way, was as subversive of basic aristocratic values as is present-day “Communism.” It was the Jews, Ravage boasts, who “destroyed a great gentile civilization and a great gentile empire with which Jewry was at war.” “The upheaval which brought Christianity into Europe was—or at least may easily be shown to have been—planned and executed by Jews as an act of revenge.” *Century Magazine*, pp. 447, 479, 481. But, however disturbing such boasts may be, the claims that I have already shown are quite sufficient to my purpose, and more immediately relevant.

166. In this connection, I cannot forbear to quote another pronouncement, that of a half-Jew, taken from H. Wickham Steed’s *The Hapsburg Monarchy*, Constable, 1913, pp. 168-170. Mr. Steed, from 1896 until 1913, was foreign correspondent of the *London Times*. He became

its foreign editor in 1913, and its editor in 1919. This book of his the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th Edition, pronounced "the most illuminating work that has been written on Austria-Hungary."

"The present writer [H. Wickham Steed] has in his possession a remarkable letter from the son of an Austrian-Jewish father and non-Jewish mother, born and educated in Western Europe, and, to all intents and purposes, completely assimilated as regards taste, habits, and general views of life. The letter was written in the autumn of 1905 from the Hungarian capital . . . It runs:

" 'Is it indeed true that this race [the Jewish] battens so upon the land it has fastened its tentacles on that, whether the race be comparable with orchid or spider, nothing remains but the dead trunk or the bloodless corpse? Is it true that all the banking, all the distributing trades, nearly all the retail trades and most of the land are in Jewish hands; that the Hungarian noble leaves his land to Jews who own the peasants, body and soul; that by usury they extract from the smaller freeholders what they possess, and that, having exploited the nation which harbours them from the sowing to the reaping, they then minister to their physical weaknesses and their moral by the ultimate exploitation of the tavern and the brothel?

" 'If this, or nearly this, be true, there is no Hungarian question in the true sense. There is a Jewish question, and this terrible race means not only to master one of the grandest warrior nations in the world, but it means, and is consciously striving, to enter the lists against the other great race of the north (the Russians), the only one that has hitherto stood between it and its goal of world-power.

" 'Am I wrong? Tell me. For already England and France are, if not actually dominated by Jews, very nearly so, while the United States, by the hands of those whose grip they are ignorant of, are slowly but surely yielding to that international and insidious hegemony. Remember that I am half a Jew by blood, but that in all that I have power to be I am not. I admire their strength, their constancy, their intelligence, but I hate the Jew because of his nature he is evil, while the Aryan of his nature is good.'"

167. Karl Marx—*Selected Essays*, International Publishers, 1926, p. 88.

168. *Coningsby*, Everyman Library edition, p. 209.

169. Theodor Herzl—*The Jewish State*, American Zionist Emergency Council, 1946, p. 91.

170. See Count Harry Kessler—*Walter Rathenau, His Life and Work*, Harcourt, 1930, p. 117, where Kessler cites the *Neue Freie Presse* (Dec. 24, 1912), which H. Wickham Steed pronounced the chief German-Jewish organ in the Hapsburg Monarchy. (Steed, op. cit., pp. 182, 186.) Kessler adds: “He himself [Rathenau] was one of the three hundred. He was associated at that time with eighty-four large concerns, either as a member of the supervising Board or as a Managing Director.” And he goes on to list these concerns.

This reminds us of the claim of Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England from 1920-1944: “I hold the hegemony of the world.” (Quoted by Prof. Carroll Quigley.) *The Wall Street Journal*, Nov. 11, 1927, called Mr. Norman “the currency dictator of Europe.” See Gary Allen, “The Federal Reserve,” op. cit., p. 26.

These references to Mr. Norman in the present connection do not necessarily mean that I pronounce him a Jew. As yet I have been unable to ascertain what his race is. But it is hardly to be denied that Montagu is exclusively a Jewish name.

171. Quoted in the Introduction to *World Conquest Through World Government*, Britons Publishing Co., 1971, p. 7.

172. Comte de Saint-Aulaire—*Genoa Versus Peace*, Sheed, 1937, pp. 79-81. Mr. A.K. Chesterton, commenting on this in *Candour*, 11/14/58, wrote: “Mr. de Saint-Aulaire did not reveal the identity of this international banker as the banquet was private, but there is every reason to suppose that he was one of the Warburg partners in Kuhn, Loeb & Co.”

173. Baruch was actually adviser to Presidents through five or six administrations, regardless of whether they were Democrat or Republican—the “unofficial President” through them all.

174. Congressman Louis T. McFadden, for many years Chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, also referred to Colonel House as “that busybody, that ‘holy monk’ of the financial empire.” One of my correspondents has challenged my inclusion of House in this list of Jews, and claims that he was “a second generation American of British ancestry.” But Mr. Arnold S. Leese, of whom I formed a high opinion when I met him in England in 1949, and who devoted himself for many years to the accumulation of exact and meticulously accurate information bearing on the Jewish Question (I never knew him to be in error in the smallest particular), wrote me when I inquired about House, that he had traced the family name to “Apfelhaus” (which hardly supports the idea of “British ancestry,” at least on the father’s side!), and pointed out that House’s middle name was “Mandel,” which he had never known in anyone not Jewish.

175. This is quoted by Mr. A.N. Field in his *All These Things*, p. 113, from *The International Jew*, published by the *Dearborn Independent*, Vol. II: *Jewish Activities In The U.S.*, Chapter XXV: "Disraeli of America—Jew of Supreme Power," pp. 56-7. For amplification, see this chapter in its entirety, and also Chapters XXVI and XXVII.

This book of Mr. Field's had the strong endorsement of Mr. A.K. Chesterton, as I know from his personal word to me, and Mr. Chesterton's command of facts (especially distant, elusive and hidden facts, the world over) and his accuracy of diagnosis, together with his integrity and courage, made him, to the best of my knowledge, without a peer. And such a man's endorsement must add considerable weight to Mr. Field's work even when he quotes from *The International Jew*, which Jewry has done its utmost to discredit.

To this, I would add two reflections, which have special bearing on the quotes from *The International Jew* that will appear in my next few pages: (1) This quoted material can only have come from Congressional records that are on file in Washington, but I am not now so placed that I can ascertain exactly where; and (2) the distinguished British historian Hilaire Belloc witnessed to the astonishing accuracy which, as a rule, he had found to mark "anti-Semitic" publications. And Belloc was very definitely not anti-Jewish himself. See Hilaire Belloc—*The Jews*, revised edition, Constable, 1937, p. 153-4.

176. A.N. Field—*All These Things*, op. cit., p. 114.

177. *The International Jew*, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 63, 65.

178. Ibid., p. 65. The italics in all above quotations appear in the original *Dearborn Independent* articles cited.

179. A.N. Field—*All These Things*, op. cit., pp. 114-5. Cp. A.K. Chesterton—*The New Unhappy Lords*, 4th ed., 1972, pp. 34-9.

180. Quoted from *The Patriot*, 11/29/34, by A.N. Field, op. cit., pp. 115-6.

181. A.N. Field—*All These Things*, op. cit., pp. 115-6.

182. A.K. Chesterton—*The New Unhappy Lords*, 4th ed., op. cit., pp. 33-4.

183. C.H. Douglas—*The Brief for the Prosecution*, Liverpool, 1945, p. 83.

184. For a significant sampling see A.N. Field, op. cit., pp. 152-9, 129. This might well be supplemented by the information on a 2' x 3' chart or poster, published about 1960 by *Common Sense* (Union, NJ) to show the extent to which posts of critical importance in our country are held by Jews. It points out that by what amounts to a system of interlocking subversion "they recommend each other for the top level jobs and posts, they hire each other, they promote each other, they raise each other, they assign each other, they protect each other." And in consequence courts, Federal Reserve, radio and television, the Press, immigration, education, American medicine, labor, the State Department, and the United Nations have all passed out from under gentile control into the hands of Jews.

185. This was published shortly afterward in a British White Paper. A copy of it may be found in the Library of the British Museum; I have seen photostat copies of it. It is surely very significant that in the next issue of a British White Paper this reference to the Jews' part in the Revolution had been withdrawn—without explanation. This fact is evidence of the great power of Jewish influence in British counsels.

186. See *The Cause of World Unrest*, with an Introduction by Mr. H.A. Gwynne, editor of *The Morning Post* (London), 1920, pp. 33-4.

187. Nesta H. Webster—*World Revolution*, Constable. I shall shortly have more to say about Mrs. Webster and her work.

188. Cp. Benjamin Disraeli—*Lord George Bentinck*, London, 1852, pp. 497-9, where Disraeli points out that the leaders of the abortive revolutions that took place in Europe around the middle of the last century, were mostly Jews.

189. This book, along with Prof. John Robison's *Proofs of a Conspiracy* (reprinted in 1967 by Western Islands, Belmont, Mass.)—both of them on the secret causes of the French Revolution—"created an immense sensation in their day," both in Europe and in the U.S. Barruel's book went into eight editions. See Nesta H. Webster—*Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, pp. ix, 254.

190. See *The Cause of World Unrest*, pp. 7, 9-10.

191. *The Cause of World Unrest*, p. 10.

192. Also, "anti-Semitism" was at once made a capital offense. See A.S. Leese—*Bolshevism Is Jewish*, 1939, pp. 5-6: "On 9th August, 1918, Lenin signed an order of the Council of People's Commissars instructing 'all Soviet Deputies to take uncompromising measures to tear the anti-Semitic movement out by the roots. Pogromists and pogrom-agitator are to be placed outside the law. . .' In Russia, 'anti-Semitism' is a crime punishable by death."

193. I myself have made a careful study of The Protocols and the issues it involves, including an examination of the Jewish case against the authenticity of The Protocols, and in particular that appraisal of them by a panel of American historians, headed by John S. Curtiss, Prof. of History at Columbia University. But as it is impossible to present the results of my study here, I will refer interested readers to the following:

(a) Nesta H. Webster—*World Revolution*, 6th revised, up-dated and expanded edition, Britons Pub. Co., 1971, pp. 10, 287-300, 332; and *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, London 1946. In the field of secret societies and subversive movements, what they are, have aimed to accomplish and have accomplished in the way of changing the world, I judge that her thorough and dispassionate scholarship have made her the top authority.

(b) A.K. Chesterton—*The Learned Elders and the B.B.C.* This is a reprint of his article of the same title that was first published in *Candour, The British Views Letter*, June 9, 1961. Obtainable from the Candour Pub. Co., Liss Forest, Hants., England. This is the most succinct and incisive judgment of the matter that I know of.

194. R.P. Oliver—*Christianity and the Survival of the West*, Sterling Enterprises, p. 60.

195. Lord Acton (John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Action), Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge—*Lectures on the French Revolution*, Macmillan, 1932, p. 97. The passage reads: "The appalling thing in the French Revolution is not the tumult but the design. Through all the fire and smoke we perceive the evidence of calculating organization. The managers remain studiously concealed and masked; but there is no doubt about their presence from the first. They had been active in the riots of Paris, and they were again active in the provincial rising."

196. An American edition was published by Omni Publications, Hawthorne, Calif. It has an Introduction by General P. A. Del Valle.

197. Concord Press, 1973, P.O. Box 2686, Seal Beach, Calif. 90720.

198. Reprinted from *Candour*, April, 1973, Vol. XXIV, No. 532. Copies may still be available from Candour Publishing Co., Liss Forest, Hants., England.

199. It has been only because of what must be viewed as an almost fantastic series of accidents that this manuscript has not already been published.

200. France in 1306; Saxony in 1349; Hungary in 1360 (and again from the Christian part of Hungary in 1582; Belgium in 1370; Slovakia in 1380; Austria in 1420; Netherlands in 1444; Portugal in 1498; Prussia in 1510; Bavaria in 1551. They were not permitted to enter Sweden until 1782, See Frank L. Britton—*Behind Communism*, Los Angeles, about 1951, p. 6.

201. Quoted in *The International Jew*, Vol. IV, Dearborn Pub. Co., 1922, p. 222.

202. See Sir Richard Francis Burton, op. cit., p. 115ff. See also pp. 72ff. and vii ff.

203. See Lord Acton's *Lectures On The French Revolution*, but above all the four books by Nesta H. Webster, which, she has said, were written according to the following plan: "In *The Chevalier De Boufflers* [Dutton, 1926] the Revolution was seen through the eyes of the best of

the aristocrats, in *The French Revolution* [Dutton, 1919] it was watched from the street on the great days of tumult and from the standpoint of the people." And in the remaining two, *Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette before the Revolution* and *Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette during the Revolution* (Putnam, 1937 and 1938, respectively), "the Revolution [is] seen through the Palace windows by the king and queen of France." All four are remarkable for their scholarship and their insight. But I know of no one who has brought out the basic line-up of forces behind the Revolution, and behind the struggle of Napoleon which followed, better than Mr. R. McNair Wilson in his *The Mind of Napoleon*, Routledge, 1934. (See also his *Monarchy or Money Power*, already mentioned.) The story of Napoleon reveals many striking parallels with that of Hitler, as will come out shortly when I write of the part played by the Jewish International Money Power in the Second World War. Both men have been grossly falsified and made to appear on the pages of history as inhuman monsters only because the Money Power, when it triumphed, as it did in both cases, was ultimately possessed of the power, exercised through control of education and the mass media and pressure on politicians and statesmen, to determine how men's minds should gradually be shaped.

204. See Nesta H. Webster—*Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, pp. 196, 230.

205. See Vicomte Leon de Poncins—*The Secret Powers Behind Revolution*, op. cit., pp. 33, 39, 60. Dr. Revilo P. Oliver has witnessed to the reliability of de Poncin's research. See his *Christianity And The Survival Of The West*, Sterling Enterprises, Sterling, Va., 1973, p. 25.

206. See Nesta H. Webster—*Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, pp. 273-285; *World Revolution*, Britons Pub. Co., 1971, pp. 31, 33-4. Also de Poncins, op. cit., pp. 29-83, 87, 92, 111, 128. To what extent this is true of Freemasonry in Britain is a question. Admiral Sir Barry Domville declared, "up to the hilt." See his *From Admiral to Cabin Boy*, Boswell, 1947, 156-9. Admiral Domville was a man not only of great and manifest integrity and courage, in whom his country had placed the highest trust, but he had exceptional knowledge of what was going on beneath the surface of life. He had commanded British ships in battle, and been Director of Naval Intelligence and President of the Royal Naval College at Greenwich.

207. When Mr. A.K. Chesterton, in his book-debate with Mr. Joseph Leftwich, remarked: "I do not think you will deny that Continental freemasonry is, and has been for nearly two hundred years, notoriously Jew-controlled," Mr. Leftwich, who of course was a Jew, in his reply made no attempt to deny it. *The Tragedy of Anti-Semitism*, London, 1948, p. 209. See also Nesta H. Webster—*World Revolution*, 1971, p. 32.

208. Nesta H. Webster—*Secret Societies*, 1946 ed., p. 280. Also, J. Wickham Steed—*Through Thirty Years*, 1925, Vol. I, p. 302. I have already called attention to the fact that for 17 years Mr. Steed was Foreign Correspondent for the *London Times*, stationed in Berlin, Rome, and (from 1902) in Vienna, where his experience gave him those exceptional insights which enabled him to write his outstanding and authoritative work on Austria-Hungary. Out of his years in Vienna, he set it down that “the Freemasons were mainly, if not entirely, Jewish” (Vol. II, p. 241). This had special reference to the years just before the First World War.

209. Leon de Poncins, op. cit., pp. 33-71.

210. See Count Egon Caesar Corti—*The Rise Of The House Of Rothschild*, Cosmopolitan Book Corp., New York, 1928, pp. 25, 30, 35, 159, 373.

211. “It is a curious fact, and evidence of the consuming power of usury, that if Caesar failed because he did not oppose the power of the usurers, Napoleon failed because he did. Napoleon was the last great champion of the common people against the growing power of finance, as even a superficial study of his Continental System will show. The hostile forces that ringed him round and finally brought him to ruin were financed by usury; and, Wellington among them, were fighting usury’s battle.”

“ ‘It cannot be too strongly insisted that finance and not territorial aggrandizement is the key to Napoleon’s reign. Had the French Emperor consented to abandon his financial system in favour of the system of London—that is, in favour of loans by the money market—he could have had peace at any time.’ ” (R. McNair Wilson, *Napoleon’s Love Story*, London 1933.)

“It should be unnecessary to add that historians, writing in the interest of modern democracies based on usury, have completely falsified this situation. Napoleon, according to them, was a romantic figure who was nevertheless ‘dangerous’ to the peace of Europe. Napoleon was only ‘dangerous’ to the dominance of the usurers, and the most significant thing about him is that he was loved by his people and served by his soldiers with a loyalty and devotion which is probably unequalled in all history. He was with them and was fighting for them, and they knew it.” See Jeffrey Mark, op. cit., London, 1934 edition, pp. 176-7. (Bombay edition, p. 138.)

The same thesis is developed in R. McNair Wilson—*Monarchy or Money Power*, London, 1934. Cp. Ezra Pound—*Impact*, pp. 104, 189, 190, 192.

212. See Brooks Adams—*The Law of Civilization and Decay*, Knopf, 1943, pp. 326ff.

213. Cp. Egon Caesar Corti, op. cit., pp. v, vii, 108, 230, 249, 254, 405.

214. Moses Margoliuth—*The History of the Jews in Great Britain*, London 1851, Vol. II, p. 161.

215. I would call to my readers' attention, for what it may be worth, that the *Protocols*, ostensibly, make precisely this claim for Jewry: "gold ... is all in our hands"; "all the money in the world will be concentrated in our hands"; "In our hands is the greatest power of our day—gold; in two days we can procure from our storehouses any quantity we may please." See the *Protocols*, translated by Victor Marsden (formerly Russian Correspondent to the *London Morning Post*), Protocols III, XV, XXII. The whole work is full of the idea of deluding, betraying, mastering, and enslaving the gentile peoples.

In support of the Jewish boast that they control all the money, see Jeffrey Mark, op. cit., pp. 9-10: "... the creation, the cancellation, the control and the literal ownership of nearly all the money in or out of circulation is in the hands of a private monopoly (the banking system) whose policy is not and cannot be controlled—except in a purely nominal way—by any government in Western civilization today. The bankers, in fact, have a legalized 'corner' in money throughout the world." London ed., p. 17. Cp. pp. 56-7. Bombay ed., pp. 9-10, 42.

216. In its issue for Sept. 10, 1920. *The American Hebrew* is one of the outstanding organs of modern American Jewry.

217. While writing this, I have noted that the question that I have raised here seems to be supported by an observation of Prof. W. G. Pitt-Rivers of Oxford away back in 1921, in his *The World Significance of the Russian Revolution*. He said:

"It is . . . yet possible, without laying oneself open to the charge of anti-Semitism, to point to the obvious fact that Jewry, as a whole, has, consciously or unconsciously, worked for and promoted an international economic, material despotism which, with Puritanism as an ally [and Puritanism was very largely inspired by the Jewish Old Testament], has tended in an ever-increasing degree to crush national and spiritual values out of existence and substitute the ugly and deadening machinery of finance and factory."

Also, I would suggest to my reader that he turn to Professor Carlton J.H. Hayes—*A Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe* (Macmillan, 1937), pp. 6, 8, 36, 46-7, and 454, and see whether, after reflection upon what he has to say, the reader is not inclined to grant the validity of my suspicion that the hand of the Jew has, from the start, had a great deal to do

with the exceedingly nasty state of every part of the world to which our modern technology and industrialism have penetrated.

In any case, it is surely not irrelevant that Werner Sombart, writing in 1913, declared that “Jewish influence made the United States just what they are—that is, American. For what we call Americanism is nothing else, if we may say so, than the Jewish spirit distilled.” And again: “. . . modern capitalism is nothing more nor less than an expression of the Jewish spirit.” *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, op. cit., pp. 43-4, 38.

Equally pertinent is the judgment of Ezra Pound: “The nineteenth century: the century of usury. Mazzini wrote, ‘. . . the history of the last half century, and the name of this half-century is Materialism.’” *Impact*, p. 50.

To the above, I must allow myself to add the following passage from Prof. Arthur Bryant’s *Unfinished Victory*, Macmillan, 1940, p. 187:

“To Hitler, Jewish Marxism completed the process of social corrosion that Jewish joint-stock capitalism had begun.

“Yet the ultimate objective of that sinister Movement was not, it appeared, the triumph of the Proletariat, but the domination of those who by exploitation had created the Proletariat—the Jews. . . The ultimate aims of Marxism and international Capitalism were in Hitler’s eyes the same: the concentration of all power in the hands of a few, and the elimination of every independent agency that could resist the process—religion, country, private property.”

218. At this point, let me call attention to a very pertinent and well-founded observation of Mr. Christopher Hollis in the opening pages of his *The Break down of Money* (Sheed, 1934, pp. xvii-xx).

“History, as she is taught, is marred by a much more serious fault than that of occasional bias. That serious fault is the complete neglect of monetary causes. Take the stories of any of the great catastrophes of history as told by a student of money and as told by an ordinary text-book. The two stories are almost without correspondence. The text-book, speaking of the English Civil War or the Revolution of 1688, the American War of Independence or the French Revolution, explains it entirely by political causes. . .

“Now it is not the theory of a particular school but the agreed admission of economists of every school that this view is a most serious distortion of the truth.

“Count Corti, in the foreword to his *Reign Of The House Of Rothschild*, tells how it used to be said that Metternich or Bismarck did this, how Cavour or Louis Napoleon had such and such a policy. The text-book recorded that a war was fought; it said nothing of how the war was paid for. When he came to read the Rothschild private papers he found there the

record of the intimate relations between every statesman in Europe and that great house—that great house whose name was not even mentioned in the text-books.”

Mr. Hollis speaks of Count Corti’s “restrained and authoritative words, and the admirably documented work which follows,” and quotes a passage from Corti which reads:

“Strangely enough the influence of the Rothschilds is barely mentioned, or at the least casually referred to, in otherwise comprehensive and painstaking historical treatises. . . In the course of my researches, I found that references to the name of Rothschild in official documents and in books of memoirs were as common as they are rare in contemporary text-books.”

See Ezra Pound to the same effect: *Impact*, pp. 185, 16, 187-90. Also, Gertrude Coogan, op. cit., Chap. X: “The Historical Facts, Our Untaught History,” pp. 173-184; and Jeffrey Mark, op. cit., London edition, p. 237ff. (Bombay edition, p. 189ff.) 219 In the same way, as I shall shortly relate, in the case of the Second World War, the Jewish financial powers of the world, assembled in Amsterdam in August 1933, declared war on Hitler six years before actual fighting began, and launched an enormous crusade to enlist the entire world to destroy him.

219. In the same way, as I shall shortly relate, in the case of the Second World War, the Jewish financial powers of the world, assembled in Amsterdam in August 1933, declared war on Hitler six years before actual fighting began, and launched an enormous crusade to enlist the entire world to destroy him.

220. Belmont’s original name was August Schoenberg. He was a German-born Jew who spoke English as thickly as Henry Kissinger does today.

221. For some of these facts about Belmont, Slidell and Benjamin, I am indebted to the research department of *The Councilor*, Shreveport, La. See its issue for Oct. 5-25, 1973 (Vol. 10, No. 15).

222. Gertrude M. Coogan, op. cit., p. 210ff. See also Bismarck’s remarks to Conrad Siem in 1876 as reported in *La Vieille France*, No. 216, March 1921. A passage from this is quoted by Francis Neilson in his *The Makers Of War*, C.C. Nelson, Appleton, Wisc., 1950, p. 53f. Mr. Neilson, at one time a member of the British Parliament, was a revisionist historian of distinction. Further and longer excerpts from the article published in *La Vieille France* are to be found in Gertrude Coogan’s *Money Creators*, pp. 214-6, and in *Uncovering the Forces for War*

by Conrad K. Grieb, Examiner Books, New York City, 1947, pp. 91-3. From these I quote the following:

Bismarck declared: "It is not to be doubted, I know of absolute certainty, that the division of the United States into two federations of equal power had been decided upon well in advance of the Civil War by the top financial power of Europe (la Haute Finance). These bankers were afraid that the United States, if they were to remain entirely one and were to develop into one Nation only, would achieve economic and financial independence, and this latter would completely upset the capitalist domination of Europe over the world.

"Of course, within the 'inner circle' of Finance, the voice of Rothschild dominated. They foresaw the chance of prodigious booty if they could substitute two weak democracies, burdened with debt, imploring the aid of the Jewish financiers, in place of the vigorous Republic, confident and proud, sufficient unto herself. Consequently they put their emissaries in the field to exploit the question of slavery, to open up an abyss between the two sections of the Union. . .

"The rupture between the North and the South became inevitable; the masters of European finance employed all the forces to bring it about and to turn it to their own account."

Bismarck then went on to tell of Lincoln's part in the unfolding drama.

223. See, for instance, "the infamous Hazard Circular . . . written by an agent of London bankers, and very judiciously distributed among the professional money lenders of America," including U.S. Senators and Congressmen. That infamous circular favored the abolition of slavery in America, but only to pave the way for a more subtle form of slavery. It said, in part:

"Slavery is likely to be abolished by the war power and chattel slavery destroyed. This I and my European friends are in favor of, for slavery is but the owning of labor and carries with it the care of the laborers, while the European plan, led by England, is that capital (money lenders) shall control labor by *controlling unges*." (Banishing purchasing power at will and making the laborers victims of unemployment.) [Parenthesis added by Miss Coogan.]

"This can be done by controlling the money. The great debt (national) that capitalists (money lenders) will see to it is made out of the war, must be used as a means to control the volume of money . . . It will not do to allow the greenback, as it is called, to circulate . . . for we cannot control them." See Gertrude M. Coogan, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

The final sentence of the quotation is supplied by Ezra Pound. See his *Impact*, p. 104.

224. Lincoln wrote: "As a result of the war, corporations have been enthroned and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to

prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until wealth is aggregated in the hands of a few and the republic is destroyed. I feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in the midst of the war." Coogan, op. cit., p. 1. See also, Francis Neilson, op. cit., p. 53f.

225. Quoted by John R. Elson in his *Lightning over the Treasury Building*, Meador, Boston, 1941, p. 78.

226. See Gertrude M. Coogan, op. cit., p. 322, 215.

227. Bismark realized this was what had happened, and said so—to Conrad Siem—in 1876. See the conclusion of the conversation recorded in *La Vieille France*, March, 1921, as quoted in Coogan, op. cit., p. 216, and in Conrad K. Grieb, op. cit., pp. 91-3.

228. See Isola Forrester—*This One Mad Act*, Boston, 1937. The author was the granddaughter of John Wilkes Booth, Lincoln's assassin. She states that "the same secret cipher that was later found in the office of Judah Benjamin was found in Booth's trunk after the assassination." This was manifest evidence of clandestine communication between them. Booth was of Spanish descent and was one-quarter Jewish. The book is of absorbing interest, and completely convincing that he was the tool of a conspiracy. And the fact that he made a secret trip to London and Paris at least suggests that foreign parties of some sort desired Lincoln's removal. The book is eminently worth reading in its entirety, but valuable impressions can be gleaned by reading only pages 51, 54, 117f., 186, 194-7, 203, 206, 214, 248-293, 344, 356, 359f., 451. On the whole it is fully substantiated by Otto Eisenschiml's *Why Was Lincoln Murdered?* Little Brown, 1937. Cp. Francis Neilson, op. cit., pp. 53-4.

229. Ezra Pound, op. cit., p. 102.

230. Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, British Ambassador to the U.S. during the years just before the outbreak of the First World War, made such observations as the following: One by one the Jews were getting control of the big newspapers. They had acquired the New York Times. The Jewish banks were supreme. They had captured our Treasury Department. They forced upon Woodrow Wilson "the appointment of the German, Warburg, on the Federal Reserve Board, which he dominates." This Paul Warburg, nearly related to Kuhn, Loeb and Schiff, and a brother of Max Warburg, a dominant figure in German finance, "practically controls

the financial policy of the [Woodrow Wilson] administration." See *Letters And Friendships Of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice*, Houghton, 1929, Vol. II, pp. 242-3, 245.

231. The facts seem to be, (1) that repeated scientific investigations, sent out from Britain, the U.S.A., Germany, France, and elsewhere, from the beginning of this century and even earlier, kept reporting that "an extensive oil-field exists in the Jordan and Dead Sea Valley" (Arnold S. Leese—*Deceitry in the Holy Land*, London, 1938, p. 8); (2) that Palestine is within easy striking distance of Arab lands "that contain between 50 and 55 per cent of the estimated crude oil reserves of the world" (Alfred Lilienthal—*What Price Israel*, Devin-Adair, 1953, pp. 149-150); (3) that as early as 1925 an official British Report entitled *Production of Minerals from the Waters of the Dead Sea*, stated that "the value of the chemical deposits of the Dead Sea may be estimated . . . at more than that of all the gold stored at Fort Knox." (Douglas Reed—*From Smoke to Smother*, Jonathan Cape, 1948, p. 297.) In terms of the prices current in the late Forties, this wealth was estimated at 5 trillion dollars. (See the full page article published in the *New York Herald Tribune* for Jan. 14, 1947.) A somewhat more conservative but still "staggering figure" was given by the *London Daily Telegraph* for Jan. 26, 1934. (A.S. Leese, op. cit., p. 11.)

Douglas Reed, I must remind my readers, was for years the European correspondent of the *London Times*, and gained considerable fame as the author of *Insanity Fair* and *Disgrace Abounding*, and then of *From Smoke to Smother* (mentioned above), and finally of *Somewhere South Of Suez*.

In the last of these books (p. 317), he comments:

"This wealth in the Dead Sea may explain the enormous output of energy which has been devoted to acquiring Palestine, and might serve as the basis on which world power would be built there. If that is the explanation, Count Bernadotte [with his proposals] cut right across the design. Therefore, with perfect logic, he was killed. . ."

Apparently the Jews' plan, before the First World War resulted in the Balfour Declaration and the promise of Palestine "as a National Home," was to work very clandestinely to get a concession for the exploitation of its enormous treasure while at the same time maintaining strict silence about it and doing their utmost to suppress all knowledge of it. Even in 1921, such was their control over the British Government that they were able, illegally, to secure the cancellation of all existing rival concessions, and, without the knowledge of Parliament, to secure the grant of a monopoly concession for themselves. (Douglas Reed—*From Smoke To Smother*, p. 297.)

But evidently this was not enough. More and more, "since 1916, Zionists have proceeded on the theory that their plan for creating an independent Jewish state in Palestine [emphasis added] was the only certain method by which Zionists could acquire complete control and outright ownership of the proven Five Trillion Dollar (\$5,000,000,000,000) chemical and mineral wealth of the Dead Sea. A Jewish state possessing this fabulous wealth would by

virtue of its financial power soon become a nation with greater international importance than any nation in the world." (*Herald Tribune* article cited above.)

Only after the Zionists felt sure of the outcome, and that nothing henceforth could break their hold on the country, did they begin to loosen up a bit in regard to the intensity with which they had concentrated on getting it. In May, 1929, in a speech before the Zionist Federation Conference at Sydney, Australia, the Jew, M. Ettinger said: "Capitalists of all countries have been turning heaven and earth in order to get this concession. In time to come, particulars over the Dead Sea Concession may become public, and they will probably read like a most exciting detective story, with intrigues, political and financial, covering all countries . . . Had we lost this Concession, our whole future might have been endangered." (A.S. Leese, op. cit., p. 11. Cp. Douglas Reed—*From Smoke To Smother*, p. 297. Also Borge Jensen—*The 'Palestine' Plot*, Lawers by Aberfeldy, Scotland, 1948, p. 5, where excerpts from the *Herald Tribune* article of 1/14/47 are quoted.)

And as for "strategic importance," Douglas Reed pronounced Palestine "geographically the centre of the world, roughly speaking." While Nahum Goldman, a president of the World Jewish Congress, quite gave the game away when he bluntly declared:

"The Jews might have had Uganda, Madagascar and other places for the establishment of a Jewish Fatherland, but they want absolutely nothing except Palestine: not because the Dead Sea water by evaporation can produce Five Trillion Dollars worth of metaloids and powdered metal; not because the sub-soil of Palestine contains twenty times more petroleum than all the combined reserves of the two Americas; but because Palestine is the crossroads of Europe, Asia and Africa, because Palestine constitutes the veritable centre of world political power, the strategic centre for world control."

No wonder that Major Tulloch, of the Palestine Potash Co., Ltd., in a speech before the Royal Society of Arts, in July 1934, declared that Palestine was "the most valuable spot in the whole world."

232. See, for instance, Harry Elmer Barnes—*Genesis of the World War*, Knopf, 1929, p. 679, where he says that the gradual unearthing of the original documents bearing on the First World War, its causes, events and results, had forced every "competent and honest authority on the problem of war guilt" to reverse what for long years was the prevailing judgment as to who started the war. See also Sidney B. Fay—*The Origins of the World War*, Macmillan, 1929, Vol. I, p. 2ff. Arthur Bryant, Prof. of History at Oxford, records that "in 1935 a joint Commission of German and French historians unanimously agreed that no deliberate desire for a European war could be attributed to any particular Government or people in 1914." *Ameriam Historical Review*, 1938. Cp. Francis Neilson, op. cit., p. 21: "No historian of any repute today believes that Germany was solely responsible for the war."

233. Sidney B. Fay—*The Origins of the World War*, Vol. II, p. 53.

234. Leon de Poncins—*Secret Powers Behind Revolution*, Boswell, 1929, pp. 78-80, where he quotes a long passage from General Ludendorff's *Kriegsnotizen Und Volkermordern*, Munchen, 1928, p. 170, to the effect that a high-placed Mason, having learned in 1911 of the plot to assassinate the Archduke and precipitate a world war, had gone to the head of the Order in Germany in an effort to release forces to frustrate it. But he found himself up against a stone wall.

235. The *American Jewish News* for Sept. 19, 1919, contained a personal memoir of one Litman Rosenthal, an "intimate friend" of Max Nordau, a powerful German Jewish financier. The gist of the matter is that Nordau, in his report to a meeting of Jews in Paris in regard to the Sixth Zionist Congress of 1903, which he had just attended, had "prophesied" the Balfour Declaration of 1917, which promised Palestine to the Jews for a national home. Nordau brought his speech to a climax thus:

"Let me tell you the following words as if I were showing you the rungs of a ladder leading upward and upward: Herzl [the father of modern Zionism], the Zionist Congress [the First—in 1897], the English Uganda proposition [the British Government, just before this, had offered the Jews a national home in East Africa, and the Sixth Zionist Congress had just rejected it], the future world war, the peace conference where, with the help of England, a free and Jewish Palestine will be created."

That was in 1903. Douglas Reed, long a highly distinguished special correspondent to various large London newspapers and the author of a number of best-selling books on the fast-shaping situation in Europe prior to the Second World War, in his *Somewhere South Of Suez*, pronounced the passage quoted "foreknowledge of the highest order" (p. 311). The obvious question is whether it could have been mere prescience, or whether the prophecy must not have depended upon firsthand knowledge both of some secret plan and of a hidden power to bring the plan to fulfillment.

236. And now for the backward glance over the same period. In 1928, in the course of addressing a New York meeting of Zionists, the British Lord Melchett, President of the English Zionist Federation and a public figure of great power, spoke in much the same vein as had Max Nordau in 1903. According to *The Jewish Chronicle* for November 9, 1928 (p. 19) he said:

"Let me take you back to 1913. If I had stood here in 1913 and said to you, 'Come to a conference to discuss the reconstruction of a national home in Palestine, you would have looked at me as an idle dreamer; even if I had told you in 1913 that the Austrian Archduke would be killed and that out of all that followed come the chance, the opportunity, the occasion for establishing a national home for Jews in Palestine. Has it ever occurred to you how remarkable it is that out of the welter of world blood there has arisen this opportunity?"

Do you really believe that this is an accident? Do you really in your hearts believe that we have been led back to Israel by nothing but a fluke? Do you believe there is no greater inner meaning in the opportunity we have been given? After two thousand years of wandering in the wilderness we have a chance and an opportunity bestowed upon us, and many sit back and say it is of no interest to us. I wonder if they have thought of that train of circumstances.”

Before being made Lord Melchett, he was Sir Alfred Mond. He was the First Commissioner for Public Works in the Lloyd George Ministry, and as head of the Mond Chemical Works (afterwards converted into Imperial Chemical Industries), the most powerful chemical industry in England, he dominated the chemical resources of the British Empire. In short, he was in a position of very great public responsibility and power.

Douglas Reed comments (op. cit., p. 312f.):

“If the words meant, as they appear to mean, that the God in whom Political Zionists believe ordained the murder of an archduke and a welter of blood in order to bring about the National Home, they could with slight alteration be used of the second welter of world blood which brought about the Zionist State. The speaker, had he lived, might in 1948, have asked, with as much or as little truth as in 1928, whether this was nothing but a fluke.”

237. See Robert L. Owen—*The Russian Imperial Conspiracy, 1892-1914*, A.&G. Boni, 1927. At the end of May, 1914, Colonel Edward Mandel House, roving diplomat for President Wilson, wrote him from Berlin: “Whenever England consents, France and Russia will close in on Germany and Austria.” *Intimate Papers Of Colonel House*, Houghton Mifflin, 1926, Vol. I, p. 249.

238. Vol. II, Sept. 15, 1912, pp. 787-8. Published at 8 Avenue Portalis, Paris. Quoted by Sidney B. Fay, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 110- 111, footnote 103. Quoted also by de Poncins, op. cit., p. 72.

239. See Leon de Poncins—*Secret Powers Behind Revolution*, op. cit., p. 75, where he cites p. 46 of the Pharos shorthand report of the assassins’ trial. The eminent scholar Prof. Revilo P. Oliver, of the University of Illinois, has witnessed to de Poncin’s reliability. See the latter’s *Christianity and the Survival of the West*, Sterling Enterprises, Sterling, Va., 1973, p. 25.

240. Sidney B. Fay, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 3.

241. Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 55-6.

242. De Poncins, op. cit., pp. 77-80, quoting the Pharos shorthand record of the testimony in the trial of the assassins: "In Freemasonry it is permitted to kill. Ciganovic [one of the conspirators] told me that the Freemasons had condemned to death the Archduke Franz Ferdinand more than a year before." De Poncins also quotes Count Czernin as having said in his book *Im Welt-Kriege [In The World War]*: "The Archduke knew quite well that the risk of an attempt on his life was imminent. A year before the war, he informed me that the Freemasons had resolved his death."

In this connection, it is to be recalled that "at the Masonic congress of Wilhelmsbad . . . it was decided to remove the headquarters of illumined Freemasonry to Frankfurt, which incidentally was the stronghold of Jewish finance, controlled at this date by such leading members of the race as Rothschild, Oppenheimer, Wertheimer, Schuster, Speyer, Stern and others. At this head lodge of Frankfurt, the gigantic plan of world revolution was carried forward, and it was there that, at a large masonic congress in 1786, two French Freemasons afterwards declared the deaths of Louis XVI [King of France at the time of the Revolution] and Gustavus III of Sweden were definitely decreed." See Nesta H. Webster—*World Revolution*, 1921, pp. 19-20 (1971 edition, pp. 32-3).

243. Sidney B. Fay, op. cit., Vol II, p. 99.

244. As reported in *The Jewish World*, January 5, 1922, Henry Ford recalled the impression made upon his mind by the talk of "two very prominent Jews" who were on the "Peace Ship" with him when it was crossing the Atlantic in 1915. "We had not been to sea 200 miles before these Jews began telling me about the power of the Jewish race, how they controlled the world through their control of gold, and that the Jew and no one but the Jew could stop the war.

"I was reluctant to believe this, and said so. So they went into details to tell me the means by which the Jews controlled the war—how they had the money, how they had cornered all the basic materials needed to fight the war, and all that, and they talked so long and so well that they convinced me. They said, and they believed, that the Jews had started the war, that they would continue it so long as they wished, and until the Jew stopped the war it would not be stopped."

Mr. A.N. Field, after quoting the above in his *All These Things* (p. 118), went on to record Lt. Colonel Repington's recollections of a conversation with Count Albert Mensdorff in Austria in 1921. He said:

“Mensdorff thought that Israel had won the war. They had made it, thrived on it, and profited by it. It was their revenge on Christianity.”

245. See Conrad K. Grieb—*The Balfour Declaration, Warrant for Genocide*, New York, 1972, p. 29ff.; also Anthony Sutton—*Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, Arlington House, 1974, p. 176.

246. Nothing was said then about setting up a Jewish political state.

247. Two books by principals in the affair are Samuel Landman’s *Great Britain, The Jews and Palestine*, published in 1936 under the auspices of the Zionist Association, and James A. Malcolm’s *Origins Of The Balfour Declaration: Dr. Weizmann’s Contribution*, 1944, reproduced from a copy in the British Museum. Samuel Landman was Secretary of the joint Zionist Council of the United Kingdom (1912) and editor of *The Zionist* from 1913 to 1914. James A. Malcolm was active in initiating the deal. As was Sir Mark Sykes, an ardent gentile convert to Zionism, who was destined to “play a decisive part in the ultimate success of the Zionist movement.” See *Two Studies in Virtue* by Christopher Sykes (the son of Sir Mark), Collins, London, 1953, pp. 107-235, but especially pp. 173-188. The fullest account, packed with incontrovertible evidence, is that of J.M.N. Jeffries—*Palestine: The Reality* (Longmans, 1939). It is a large, tightly packed book, and now very hard to find. The most recent account, with extracts from official Jewish documents, is that of Leon de Poncins—*State Secrets*, Britons, London, 1975, pp. 9-17. See also Conrad K. Grieb’s *The Balfour Declaration* cited in Note 245. It contains valuable new material.

248. Harry Elmer Barnes—*The Struggle against the Historical Blackout*, 6th ed., pub. by its author in the early Sixties.

249. *War Memories*, Vol. II, 509.

250. In a speech of Nov. 3, 1919.

251. A.N. Field, *All These Things*, p. 96, where Theodor Fritsch is quoted: “Since the beginning of William II’s reign, the Jews have been the real rulers of the German Empire.”

It is to be recalled that only a few years before the Revolution erupted, Count Walter Rathenau, one of Germany's most powerful financiers, remarked that "three hundred men [of whom he was one], all acquainted with each other, control the economic destiny of the Continent." And Cecil Spring-Rice, while British Ambassador to Germany shortly before the War, wrote a letter to our Henry Adams in which he said: "Rothschild's agent is admitted into the Foreign Office before ambassadors. . . The press is almost entirely in the hands of Jews." And Prof. Antony Sutton, of whom I shall soon have much to say, records that "the Kaiser himself was not aware of the revolutionary movement until after Lenin had passed into Russia." *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, p. 40.

252. See Cecil Spring-Rice, op. cit., Vol. II, 200f., 242, 245, 421f. Also A.N. Field—*All These Things*, pp. 4-6, 111, 155.

253. Mr. F.W. Wile, correspondent for the *London Daily Mail*, in *Men around the Kaiser* (Heinemann, 1914), stated that Dr. von Bethmann-Hollweg came of "an old-time Frankfort merchant and banking family," whose founder had been expelled from Holland because of his religion. What his religion was is not stated, but it could hardly have been anything but Jewish. Also, for whatever it may be worth, Irvin Potter, in a pamphlet entitled "The Cause of Anti-Jewism in the U.S." (P.O. Box 162, Astor Station, Boston, Mass.) quotes a passage from Count Spirodovich's *The Secret Government* which refers to "Miss Bethmann of Frankfort, a daughter of a partner of the Rothschilds, an ancestor of the German Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg-Rothschild, the 'hero' of the 'scrap of paper' incident." See A.N. Field, op. cit., p. 84 (and 88).

But the most explicit identification of Bethmann-Hollweg as a Jew comes from Mr. Boris Brasol, already introduced to my readers as an international jurist of distinction who was sent to the U.S. early in 1917 in an attempt to negotiate an Anglo-American loan on behalf of the Czar's Government. He was therefore in a position to know the facts, and in his *The World at the Cross Roads*, Boston, 1919, he wrote:

"Bethmann-Hollweg, one of those notorious Jews whose birthplace was Frankfort-on-Main—the strongest anti-Russian, Semitic center in the world. . ."

See the edition reprinted by Omni Pubs., 1970, pp. 8-9.

254. Walter Rathenau was president of the great German electrical combine, the A.E.G., and "associated. . . with 84 large concerns, either as a member of the supervising board or as a managing director." The A.E.G. was closely associated with the Deutsche Bank, dominant among Germany's "big four" banks. Its manager, Felix Deutsch, was married to the sister of Otto Kahn, a partner in the firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. of Wall Street. After the war, Mr. Rathenau became the German Foreign Minister. It is to be remembered that Paul Warburg,

also a partner in Kuhn, Loeb was a brother of Max Warburg, head of the powerful Hamburg banking house of that name, and closely associated with the House of Rothschild. Albert Ballin was another one of the very powerful Jews who “were in immediate personal contact with the Kaiser.” In fact, he was said to be “the closest adviser of the German Emperor.” “Directly after the outbreak of the war . . . Rathenau and Ballin took over the organization of the economic side of the war [much as Baruch did for the Allied side]—ostensibly in the interest of the nation, but in reality . . . [to secure all sorts of advantages for the Jews].” For the above quotations, unless otherwise indicated, see A.N. Field—*All These Things*, pp. 84-96, 211. The whole situation supports the judgment with which Mr. Field concludes his examination of a particular incident—namely, that it “reveals Jewish activity of a highly ambiguous and possibly decisive character at the inmost core of the European crisis, with the lives of millions of human beings [chiefly gentile human beings—WGS] swaying in the balance” (p. 94). Cp. Antony C. Sutton, 1974, pp. 40-41.

But it was a Jew known as Parvus (real name, Israel Lazarevitch Helphand) who was responsible above all others. For the story of this, see Nesta H. Webster—*The Surrender of an Empire*, 1933, pp. 73-80; *World Revolution*, 1971, pp. 276-7.

255. Stalin, at a session of the Third International in Moscow in May 1936, stated what has always been basic Communist strategy in relation to the capitalist states. He said: “The revival of revolutionary action on any scale sufficiently vast will not be possible unless we succeed in utilizing the existing disagreements between the capitalistic countries, so as to precipitate them against each other into armed conflict. The doctrine of Marx-Engels-Lenin teaches us that all war truly generalized should terminate automatically by revolution. The essential work of our party comrades in foreign countries consists, then, in facilitating the provocation of such a conflict. See *The Rulers of Russia* by Prof. Denis Fahey, C.S. Sp., D.D., D.Ph., B.A., a Prof. of Philosophy and Church History, Dublin, 1962, pp. 15-16.

256. The race of Lenin and Trotsky may not be of great importance, since a pliant and gifted gentile tool or “front” may often serve a Jewish revolutionary purpose better than a Jew. But Trotsky is universally conceded to have been a Jew, and though Lenin was at first declared to be “a Russian,” and later his race was said to be “in doubt,” C.D. Darlington (*The Evolution of Man and Society*, 1969, pp. 556-7) states that he was one-quarter Jewish, by his grandfather on his mother’s side. In any case, it is definitely known that he married a Jewess and that Yiddish was the language spoken in his family circle; and Chaim Weizmann, President of Israel from 1948-1952 was quoted in the *London Jewish Chronicle* of Dec. 16, 1932, as saying that Lenin had taken part in Jewish student meetings in Switzerland thirty-five years before.” For all this (in addition to Prof. Darlington), see A.N. Field: *All These Things*, p. 275; Dr. Denis Fahey—*The Rulers of Russia*, 1951 ed., p. 30. Prof. Darlington, of Oxford, is certainly one of the most outstanding of our living geneticists.

257. Quoted by Denis Fahey, op. cit., pp. 6-7.

258. *Genoa Versus Peace*, op. cit., p. 74. See the whole chapter (No. III): "The Real Forces at Work."

259. Nesta H. Webster—*The Surrender of an Empire*, 1933, pp. 78-9.

260. Congressman McFadden witnessed to this fact when, in addressing the House on June 10, 1932, he referred to Kuhn, Loeb & Co. as "German international bankers." The Jewish Money Power manifestly does not pay allegiance to any country—unless it be to Israel. Cecil Spring-Rice, when Britain's Ambassador to the United States in the years just before the First World War broke out, made the same observation. Confidential discussions with the Jewish banking houses in Wall Street were straightway communicated to their fellow Jews in Frankfurt, Germany. See *Letters and Friendships of Cecil Spring-Rice*, II, 243.

261. Nesta H. Webster—*The Surrender Of An Empire*, pp. 76-7.

262. For all these quotations from Prof. Sutton, see his *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, Arlington House, 1974, pp. 43-4, 17-18, 55ff. He bases his rejection of the Sisson Documents on an article by George F. Kennan. "The Sisson Documents," *Journal of Modern History*, 27-28 (1955-56): 130-154. See Dr. Sutton's book, p. 43, Note 9. I shall be introducing Dr. Sutton to my readers very shortly.

263. See the *New York Journal-American* for Feb. 3, 1949. Also, W. Cleon Skousen *The Naked Capitalist*, published by its author, 2197 Berkley St., Salt Lake City, 1970, p. 40-1. He largely takes his facts from the monumental two-volume work *Tragedy and Hope, A History of the World in Our Time*, Macmillan, 1966, by Prof. Carroll Quigley, of Harvard and Princeton, and now with the Foreign Service School of Georgetown University.

264. See H.S. Kenan—*The Federal Reserve Bank*, Noontide Press, 1967, Chap. III, where McFadden's speech is given in full. See especially pp. 142, 146.

265. Boris Brasol—*The World at the Crossroads*, Small Maynard, 1919 (1970 reprint, Noontide, pp. 70-3.) See here also the perspicacious report of Count Lamsdorf, Russian Foreign Minister to the Czar, January 1906, in regard to the abortive revolutionary upheaval in Russia in 1905.

266. Both were published by Arlington House, the former in 1973, the latter in 1974.

267. For Dr. Sutton's statements about all this, see his *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, pp. 15-19, but especially Chap. 11: "The Alliance of Bankers and Revolution" (pp. 169-179). The whole book must be read.

268. At this point, in fairness to Dr. Sutton, I must bring it to my readers' attention that, though he absolutely clinches the case that International Finance was what got Communism fastened on Russia in 1917 and has kept it going ever since, he does not subscribe to the idea of Jewish dominance in Finance, or at least, he is not convinced that in and behind Jewish operations in the financial field there has been a conspiracy to make Jews the masters of the world. But as my reply to this has run to some length, I am putting it in [Appendix V](#) at the end of this chapter.

269. See Nesta H. Webster—*World Revolution*, 1971 edition, p. 278; Antony C. Sutton—*Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, op. cit., pp. 39-40.

270. See Denis Fahey—*The Rulers of Russia*, Dublin, 1951; A.N. Field—*All These Things*: see "Trotsky" in the Index.

271. For the significance of this, see A.K. Chesterton—*The New Unhappy Lords*, 4th revised edition, 1972, p. 13. A passport was issued to Trotsky at the insistence of President Wilson, who was "under the powerful influence of—and indeed was financially indebted to—this group of internationalists"—which had just been stated to have included such financiers as Carnegie, Paul Warburg, Otto Kahn, Bernard Baruch, Herbert Hoover, and indeed the very nucleus out of which "the modern internationalist movement" has grown. See Antony C. Sutton—*Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, pp. 175-6. See also, for the vise in which President Wilson was held by the Jewish powers, Conrad K. Grieb—*The Balfour Declaration*, New York, 1972.

272. Nesta H. Webster—*The Surrender of an Empire*, 1933, pp. 73-4.

273. *The Cause of World Unrest*, pp. 23, 131f.

274. *The Last Days Of The Romanoffs*, Thornton Butterworth, London, 1920, pp. 147, 27-8, 81, 118, 119, 127, 139-148.

275. See A.N. Field—*All These Things*, Appendix B (pp. 274-6).

276. See especially pp. 6-32. Pages 32-45 are very significant also.

277. U.S. Senate Document 62, 1919.

278. "It is in the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party that the governmental power resides." Robert Wilton, French edition of *The Last Days of the Romanovs*, pp. 136-8.

279. A.N. Field—*All These Things*, Appendix B, pp. 276-7.

280. Douglas Reed—*Insanity Fair*, Jonathan Cape, 1938. Later books of his were no less important—notably *From Smoke to Smother*, Jonathan Cape, 1948, and *Somewhere South of Suez*, Devon Adair, 1951. The latter book bears the sub-title: "A Further Survey of the Grand Design of the Twentieth Century." And he who has the book before him might do well to read p. 328.

281. See Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, President of the World Jewish Congress, in *American Bulletin*, 5/15/35; Jewish journal *Le Droit de vivre*, Paris, 5/12/35; *Jewish Chronicle*, London, 4/4/19; *The American Hebrew*, 9/10/29.

282. *Genex Versus Peace*, Sheed, 1937, pp. 78-84.

283. If this conception of Russia as an antagonist to the United States seems inconsistent with what I have said about the Jewish Money Power's control of both, let me point out that this Power, though it may be as "invisible" in Russia as it is unrecognized by most people in the United States, may nevertheless be quite capable of using its very control to sacrifice all gentiles against one another, in order to accomplish the weakening and ultimately the destruction of the United States, and thus to advance the always dominant interests of World Jewry.

284. H. Wickham Steed—*Through Thirty Years*, Doubleday, 1925, Part II, pp. 301-2.

285. If Churchill was not bought, he must have been cowed. My readers will recall his very strongly worded alert against International Jewry that he uttered before Parliament on Feb. 5, 1919 and published in the London *Illustrated Sunday Herald* on Feb. 8, 1920. Between then and the time he was chosen to become the chief instrument in Britain for the achievement of Jewish aims, he obviously underwent an enormous about-face. I figure that one day he found himself confronted by one of the great moguls of Jewish International Finance and told bluntly that if ever again he declared himself in such terms about Jews he would be finished; but that if he proved himself their man they would make him one of the greatest figures in the modern world, and his name one of the most illustrious in history. On the other hand, if he stood against them, they would turn him into a nobody. To this he succumbed. From then on he was their tool. In line with all this is the known fact that Churchill came to the U.S. in the early Thirties and was the guest of Baruch in New York. At that time he was out of office, and had been for some while. Also, his home estate in England was up for sale, which suggests that financially he was in a very straitened and embarrassing position. But when he returned to England, his estate had been taken off the market and he joined in the Jews' world-wide crusade for the destruction of Germany. See "The Buying of Mr. Churchill", *Attack*, July 1977, page 10.

And as for Roosevelt: I have just finished reading George Crocker's *Roosevelt's Road to Russia* (Regnery, 1959). It is a brilliant and blistering exposure of FDR's secret war aims and the working of his mind, and ought to be not only read but thoroughly absorbed by every American of intelligence who loves his country. But I think that Mr. Crocker makes too much of a mystery of FDR's psychology. Again and again, as I read the book, it came over me that all one need do in order to dissipate the mystery is to put behind "FDR" the word "Jew." It must always be borne in mind that World Jewry officially declared war on Germany in 1933 (six years before overt war broke out) and called on the entire world to unite in its "holy crusade" to "destroy medieval Hitler land." It goes without saying that the Jews could

never have accomplished such a purpose in their own persons. They could accomplish it only as they succeeded in getting the nations of the world to do their fighting for them, and in particular to get so many of the big nations into the fight that they would surely bring Germany down.

To this end, they had to mobilize every possible agency and institution to serve their cause, but, above all, to choose in each country the man, the leader, who would direct his share of the whole performance, the man who, however great his appearance of independence, would in fact be their pliable, obedient tool. They picked their leaders well. To manage things in Britain and wherever British influence reached, it was Churchill. In the U.S., it was Roosevelt. And for both, though in the beginning top priority was assigned to the destruction of Nazi Germany, the overriding assignment, especially to FDR, was his support of everything that would strengthen and advance the cause of Marxist Communism, no matter what the cost to his own country, or how greatly to its weakening. Both men undoubtedly had abilities akin to genius, but these certainly served in the long run for the overthrow of Western civilization and thus the removal of this obstacle to the advance of World Jewry toward world dominion.

286. See Francis Neilson—*The Makers Of War*, C.C. Nelson, 1950, Chap. XX: "The Pledge to Poland"; Peter Nicoll—*Britain's Blunder*, Part I, espec. Chap. 4: "The pledge to Poland." This last was published by its Author, but my reader may recall that it was nevertheless pronounced by Prof. Harry Elmer Barnes "a cogent, brief account of the essential facts about World War II." See also Charles Callan Tansill—*Back Door to War, The Roosevelt Foreign Policy, 1933-1941*, Regnery, 1952, pp. vii-viii, 18-19, 37, 44, 200, 509-514, 541-547, 555-6. Dr. Tansill was Prof. of American Diplomatic History in Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. Prof. Henry Commager pronounced this work "the most valuable contribution to the history of the pre-war years in our literature." Dr. Tansill himself says of it that he "was given access to the confidential material that revealed in great detail the President's policy of proclaiming pacifism while working for war." On page 555, he quotes a document which is in line with the *Forrestal Diaries*, p. 121-2, (also quoted) to the effect that, in the summer of 1939, England and France were assured of "all aid" from the United States if they would support Poland in her refusal to negotiate with Hitler's reasonable proposals for a settlement in regard to the Polish Corridor—upon which, it seemed, peace had come to hinge. Forrestal recorded a statement of Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain "that America and the world Jews had forced England into the war." We must always remember that under and behind all the maneuverings on the Allied side there was the undeviating aim of the Jewish Money Power to work Hitler into a position where, in order to maintain himself, he would have to strike—and thus bring down almost the whole world upon him to his destruction.

See also Charles A. Beard—*President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War*, Yale University Press, 1948; Frederic R. Sanborn—*Design for War*, Devin-Adair, 1951; Admiral H. E. Kimmel—*Admiral Kimmel's Story*, Regnery, 1955; Captain Russell Grenfell, R.N.—*Unconditional Hatred*, Devin-Adair, 1953.

287. See George E. Morgenstern—*Pearl Harbor, The Story of the Secret War*, Devin-Adair, 1947; Rear Admiral Robert A. Theobald (Retired)—*The Final Secret Of Pearl Harbor, The Washington Contribution to the Japanese Attack*, Devin-Adair, 1954; George N. Crocker—*Roosevelt's Road to Russia*, Regnery, 1959.

288. Substantiation of this will be given when I come to my section entitled "The Jews' Part in the War."

289. See the leading editorial in *The South African Observer* for Sept. 1974 (pp. 3-4) by its thoroughly informed editor Mr. S.E.D. Brown.

290. See R. Harris Smith—*OSS, The Secret History of America's First Central Intelligence Agency*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1972, p. 367.

291. See Frank A. Capell—*Treason Is the Reason (847 Reasons for Investigating the State Department)*, published by *The Herald of Freedom*, Zarephath, N.J., 1965.

292. See Rene A. Wormser—*Foundations: Their Power and Influence*, Devin-Adair, 1958, pp. 45-48. For the documentation in this note and in the two preceding notes, I am pleased to acknowledge my indebtedness to Mr. Frank A. Capell.

293. Antony C. Sutton—*National Suicide*, 1973, p. 39.

294. Antony C. Sutton—*Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, 1974, p. 176, Note 14.

295. *Ibid.*, p. 172.

296. Prof. Harry Elmer Barnes.

297. Senator Robert L. Owens—*The Russian Imperial Conspiracy, 1892-1916*, A.&G. Boni, 1927, p. 2. Cp. p. 202f.

298. "In 1922, Nahum Sokolov, at the Carlsbad Zionist Congress, said: 'The League of Nations is a Jewish idea. We created it after a fight of twenty-five years. Jerusalem will one day become the capital of world peace.'" See Douglas Reed—*Somewhere South of Suez*, p. 327.

299. *Genoa Versus Peace*, Sheed & Ward, 1937, p. 77.

300. Quoted by Mr. D. S. Fraser Harris, Chairman, League of Empire Loyalists, in *Cardour*, No. 265, Nov. 21, 1958, p. 167. This is remarkable in itself as coming from Lloyd George, who had "close Jewish associations during the greater part of his career," "had been . . . solicitor to the Zionist Association in England," etc. See A.N. Field, *All These Things*, pp. 34, 39-40.

301. Lloyd George's private secretary and constant companion was the Jew Philip Sassoon, whose mother was Aline de Rothschild of Paris. "And the House of Sassoon, with all its affiliations and ramifications, is considered from a financial standpoint as holding the same position in Asia as that held by the House of Rothschild in Europe." (A.N. Field—*All These Things*, p. 105.) Clemenceau's secretary was the Jew Mandel-Rothschild. Woodrow Wilson was surrounded by Jewish "advisers" such as Bernard Baruch, Jacob Schiff, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., and Justice Brandeis. "Paul Warburg, partner in the firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., part financier of the Russian Revolution and agent-in-chief for the founding of the U.S. Federal Reserve System, accompanied President Wilson to the Versailles Conference, where he acted as financial adviser to the American delegation, while the German delegation employed as financial adviser a partner in the Hamburg lending house run by Paul Warburg's brother, Max." A. K. Chesterton—*The New Unhappy Lords*, 1972, pp. 14-15. Cp. Boris Brasol, op. cit., p. 207f.

Moreover, the interpreter and the only man present when the Big Four were in secret council, was the Jew Monteux.

302. Far more significant than Lippmann's part in the drafting of Wilson's Fourteen Points is the following:

“Jacques Bainville has said that to write an exact history of the third Republic it would be necessary to know the official minutes of the masonic general assemblies. This necessity applies to the history of the League. The works of MM. Ballery-Radot, Leon de Poncinsan du Messnil-Thoret, better known abroad than in France, have thrown a brilliant light over the obscure relationship between these two institutions which are well constituted to understand one another. M. Leon de Poncins has recently published a full review of the Congress of Freemasons of the allied and neutral countries, held in Paris on June 28th, 29th and 30th, 1917. This document established that two years before the Treaty of Versailles freemasonry was beginning to place its foundations in position, was adopting a scheme for the League of Nations in thirteen articles and communicated it to all governments of allied and neutral countries. *Every essential point in this project is reproduced in the Covenant.*” (Emphasis added. WGS)

See Comte de Saint-Aulaire, *Genex Versus Peace*, p. 62. That European Freemasonry has long been dominated by the Jews, I have already submitted some evidence.

303. Comte de Saint-Aulaire, *ibid.*, pp. 89-90.

304. Boris Brasol—*The World at the Cross Roads*, p. 206.

305. See *The Inside Story of the Peace Conferenæ*, Harper, 1920, pp. 496-7ff.

306. Quoted in Francis Neilson—*The Makers of War*, C.C. Nelson, 1950, pp. 151-3.

307. *Perpetual War for Perpetual Peace*, edited by Prof. Harry Elmer Barnes (with the collaboration of seven distinguished “revisionist” historians), Caxton Printers, 1953, p. 81, at the beginning of the chapter entitled “The United States and the Road to War in Europe,” Section entitled “The Peace Treaties of 1919 Insure the Outbreak of Another World War,” by Charles Callan Transill. See also the last pages of this Chapter, Sec. 10: “German Reaction to the Treaty of Versailles” (pp. 96-7). Also, *Unfinished Victory* by Arthur Bryant (Oxford Prof. of History), Chap. 2: “The Pound of Flesh”; and Peter Nicoll—*Britain’s Blunder*, 1948, Chap. 1: “The Seeds Are Sown,” espec. pp. 3-4.

308. *Britain’s Blunder*, pp. 3-4.

309. "Incredible as it seems, a document introduced at the Nuremberg War Crimes Trials showed that Max Warburg was later involved in the financing of Adolf Hitler. (See Stephen Birmingham, *Our Crowd*, pp. 428-430.)" Was this done in order to make another big war possible? Of course, the financing stopped as soon as it became evident where Hitler was taking Germany.

310. See Jeffrey Mark, *op. cit.*, p. 30: "Germany, driven to desperation by the humiliating impositions of Shylock-driven statesmen at the Treaty of Versailles; having witnessed the total obliteration of her middle-class savings in the effort to wipe out an impossible internal debt by the spectacular depreciation of the mark; having writhed in the financial coils of the Dawes and Young plans—essentially schemes of external taxation by the foreign creditor powers; and having contracted further debts to America and Great Britain to the tune of several billion dollars in an effort to pay them, has at last turned under the emotional but intensely sincere leadership of Hitler."

311. Macmillan, 1940. Though by no means pro-German, the book is very revealing of Germany's position—and not least, of her attitude toward the Jews, and of what caused it.

312. Such as that of Houghton, Mifflin, 1943, or that of Hurst & Blackett, London, 1939. Prof. Arthur Bryant refers to *Mein Kampf* as Hitler's "great work . . . the Koran of the Nazi Revolution . . . one of the most germinating works of the age." And again: "Like other prophets who have founded religions, he has given his testament to mankind, and in *Mein Kampf*. . . laid bare his soul for the world to view." *Unfinished Victory*, pp. 243, 230.

313. *Op. cit.*, p. 44. In strong confirmation of this, see Francis Neilson, *The Makers of War*, p. 184

314. Francis Neilson, in his *The Makers of War*, *op. cit.*, pp. 102, has the following to say about Hitler at the time he came to power (1933) and about some tributes that Winston Churchill had previously paid to him. I quote:

"In Germany, Hitler began his series of reforms with speed and certainty of touch. While Roosevelt and his Brain Trust were trying futile experiments, the totalitarians were working wonders in Germany. . . In three short years, this Austrian upstart, who had been the butt of comic cartoonists for years, changed the whole outlook of the German people. Their

triumph was so startling that Winston Churchill wrote, in *Great Contemporaries*: 'Whatever else may be thought about these exploits, they are certainly among the most remarkable in the whole history of the world.' The tribute was written in a work published in 1937.

"Churchill's extraordinary tribute, . . . , is the most unusual one ever paid to the head of a foreign state.

"In a passage exposing the follies of the French and British Governments, during the years before Hitler took his place at the head of the Reich, Churchill says:

" 'While all those formidable transformations were occurring in Europe, Corporal Hitler was fighting his long, wearing battle for the German heart. The story of that struggle cannot be read without admiration for the courage, the perseverance, and the vital force which enabled him to challenge, defy, conciliate, or overcome, all the authorities or resistances which barred his path. He, and the ever-increasing legions who worked with him, certainly showed at this time, in their patriotic ardor and love of country, that there was nothing they would not do or dare, no sacrifice of life, limb or liberty that they would not make themselves or inflict upon their opponents.'

"In conclusion, Mr. Neilson quotes the following from Churchill's *Step By Step*: "If our country were defeated, I hope we should find a champion as indomitable to restore our courage and lead us back to our place among the nations."

Parts of the above excerpts from Mr. Neilson are to be found in the Duke of Bedford's *Straight Speaking*, Strickland Press, Glasgow, 1944, p. 14.

And as for Lloyd George: ". . . a change in Germany's monetary system caused her to turn from abysmal depression to a glorious economic boom which, even in its initial stage, caused England's World War I leader, Lloyd George, to call Hitler, after a visit to see with his own eyes, 'the greatest statesman living,' and the German people 'the happiest on Earth.'" Hugo R. Fack in *The Great Betrayal*, Free-Economy Pub. Co., San Antonio, Texas, p. 25.

315. Citizens of the "freedom loving democracies" often smile—or sneer—at the Germans' apparent love of discipline and willingness to submit themselves in implicit obedience to a leader. I suggest that anyone so disposed take a look at a map of Europe and note Germany's geographical position. She lacks the protection of natural barriers, and "has always had foes east and west and had to fight on two frontiers in the world wars." Long and bitter experience has made the German people realize that if they are to survive, they must act as a unit. It was a life and death necessity. See Francis Neilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 134-5, where this is somewhat enlarged upon.

But the most compelling presentation of Germany's situation that I know of comes from the pen of Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, who before being Britain's ambassador to Germany was her ambassador to the Czar's government, as later, just before the outbreak of the First World War, he was ambassador to the U.S. Obviously he was one of the most capable and

responsible men whom Britain had in her Civil Service. His judgment, therefore, deserves to be carefully weighed. And since an American understanding of Germany is of prime importance for the achievement of White solidarity, and this in turn for White survival, I must take the space to present to my readers what Sir Cecil had to say. The first two quotations are taken from letters that he wrote to our Henry Adams, the last from a letter to Theodore Roosevelt.

“Germany is in a peculiarly exposed position from the military point of view, which the years succeeding Jena have brought home to the national consciousness. She may have to fight war with two fronts, and if she does not win she may be absolutely extinguished. How to face the danger? By a great army which has had to be increased time and again, and also to be fed and armed. For this she has to find men and money. . . It is also true that Germany does not provide enough food to feed its population and that in case of war with certain countries [in particular Sir Cecil’s own Britain], Germany in default of a sufficient navy may run a risk of starvation. [In the British blockade incident to the First World War, millions of Germans actually starved to death. WGS] The Germans seem no less unable to conceive of not accepting the Government as the Government because they object to its policy than a Hindoo would be of not worshipping the Ganges because it had overflowed his crops. Perhaps the reason again is the immense and tremendous pressure from without, which makes a German regard his Government as a sailor does his captain when the ship is in a cyclone.

“If you were here, you would be a good deal interested in politics. I hope it won’t bore you to hear a little about them because the questions here are so very different from what they are with us. On the one hand, the monarch with the history of blood and iron and the army of (in theory) absolute slaves. On the other, all the people who are liberal, who read, think, work, make money or books. Now, which would you go with? There is on either side, in France and Russia, a deadly enemy waiting his chance. This time, the war will be a war of extermination, which it is hardly likely that the beaten party will survive as a nation. Everything depends on the army and its leaders. . .”

The above quotations are to be found in Cecil Spring-Rice—*Letters and Friendships of Sir Cecil Spring Rice*, Houghton Mifflin, 1929, Vol. I, pp. 223, 237, 239.

316. Arthur Bryant, op. cit., pp. 199-200.

317. Ibid., p. 253.

318. Francis Neilson, op. cit., p. 108. “Lloyd George, after a personal visit, said of Hitler: ‘There is no doubt that Hitler, so far as Germany is concerned, is the resurrection and the

life.' 'He is the savior of Germany, a great and wonderful leader.' 'He is the George Washington of Germany' " See C.C. Veith—*Citadels Of Chaos*, Meador, 1949, p. 285.

319. Cesare Santoro—*Hitler Germany, As Seen by a Foreigner*, Internationaler Verlag, Berlin, 1938, p. 290. Cp. pp. 292-4. For significant recognition of the value and authority of this book, see Francis Neilson, op. cit., pp. 81-2.

320. Duell, Sloane & Pearce, 1940, Chap. XVI (p. 187ff.): "In A Eugenics Court."

321. For all these quotations, see Ezra Pound, op. cit., pp. 65, 186. Cp. Gertrude M. Coogan, op. cit., p. 137, where she quotes *The Breakdown of Money* by Christopher Hollis. See also Ezra Pound, op. cit., pp. 174, 189, where he quotes eight lines from a letter by Thomas Jefferson to Crawford which he pronounced "eight of the most significant lines ever written."

322. The Duke of Bedford—*The Neglected Issue*, Glasgow, 1946, p. 29.

323. After Germany adopted a new monetary policy the *London Times* said

"Germany ceased to experience any financial difficulty. In this country [Britain] the people suffer the burden of heavy and increasing taxation, but in Germany nothing is ever heard of the necessity of increasing taxation, compulsory savings, or the issue of enormous war loans. Quite the contrary. Recently an important tax was abolished. Public savings bank deposits touch new monthly records again and again. Money is so plentiful that the interest rate on the Reich loans could recently be reduced from 4 1/2 percent to 4 percent."

Quoted by C.C. Veith in his *Citadels Of Chaos*, Meador, 1949, p. 283—taken from a chapter entitled "The Peace We Lost" in Robert J. Scrutton's book, *A People's Runnymede*, London, 1942.

324. Hitler said in 1937: "We were not foolish enough to to make a currency coverage of gold of which we had none, but for every mark that was issued we required an equivalent of a mark's worth of work done or goods produced." C.C. Veith, p. 282.

He said further: "we laugh at the time when our national economists held the view that the value of a currency is regulated by the gold and securities lying in the vaults of a State Bank;

and more especially we laugh at the theory that its value was guaranteed thereby. We have instead come to learn that the value of the currency lies in the productive capacity of a nation." Veith, op. cit., p. 284, where he also quotes the gist of "Hilter's Official Program," published by Unwin, London, in 1938. Money, in Hitler Germany, was based, not on gold, but on the capacity of the German people to create real wealth.

325. Quoted by C.C. Veith, op. cit., p. 266-7. Also, in *Freedom and Plenty*, San Antonio, Texas, 1947. *Freedom and Plenty*, edited by Hugo R. Fack, was the official mouthpiece in the U.S. for the Silvio Gesell movement toward a "natural economic order."

326. The evidence for this is too voluminous to cite here, but as indicative of it I suggest Francis Neilson's *The Makers of War*, especially Chap. XX: "The Pledge to Poland." Also, see the pages listed in the Index under "Poland," "Danzig" and "Checho-slovakia." Also, Peter Nicoll—*Britain's Blunder*, Part I, especially Chap. 4: "The Pledge to Poland."

327. Quoted in C.C. Veith, op. cit., p. 263.

328. Ibid., p. 263.

329. Francis Neilson, op. cit., pp. 109, 203.

330. Ibid., pp. 213-4.

331. Ibid., p. 85.

332. Ibid., p. 110

333. C.C. Veith, op. cit., pp. 287, 288.

334. Francis Neilson, op. cit., p. 112.

335. Ibid., p. 86.

336. Ibid., p. 83-4. Neilson supports this with a quotation from the League of Nations Armaments Year Book for 1936, showing that at that time, even though Germany was even then "completely encircled," the "total German war strength" amounted to little more than one-quarter that of the Little Entente and France (in all cases measured apparently in terms of "men under arms"), not to mention that of the British Empire.

337. Mr. Arnold S. Leese, one of the most exact and thorough investigators of the Jewish Question, in his *The Jewish War of Survival* (published by its Author, Guilford, England, 1947, pp. 81-2), quotes several paragraphs from the *London Sunday Chronicle* article of January 2, 1933, as follows:

"The Jew is facing one of the biggest crises in his troubled history. In Poland, Rumania, Germany, Austria, his back is to the wall. But now he is going to hit back hard. . . Now a united front composed of all sections of Jewish parties is to be formed.

"The great International Jewish financiers are to contribute approximately 500,000,000 pounds sterling. This sum will be used to fight the persecuting States. The battle will be fought on the world's stock exchanges. Since the majority of the anti-Semitic States are burdened with heavy international debts, they will find their very existence threatened.

"A boycott throughout Europe of their export products by way of the retailer may undermine the present uncertain economic stability of several of the anti-Semitic countries." [At this point, I must call my readers' attention to the fact, reported in *The New Pioneer* for June 1939, that in one year the Jewish boycott had cut British trade with Germany by 25 percent, and that the boycott had put Germany's neck, economically, in a hangman's noose.]

(Mr. Leese continues) "Here is an admission of Jewish power and the will to ruin States hostile to them with utter disregard of the trade requirements of the countries of which they pretend to be nationals. . .

"Within a month, the Goga Government of Rumania, which sought to restrict Jewish commercial control, fell, owing to an economic and financial crisis.

"On 3rd June 1938, the influential *American Hebrew* printed an article [in which a non-Jewish newspaperman ventured 'a daring glimpse into the future']:

“The forces of reaction are being mobilized. A combination of England, France and Russia will sooner or later bar the triumphant march of this success-crazed Fuehrer. Either by accident or design, a Jew has come to the position of foremost importance in each of these nations.”

[He mentioned Blum in France and Hore-Belisha in England. He might well have added Baruch and others in the U.S. Hore-Belisha, a Jew of North African extraction, was head of the British War Office; Leon Blum, later, became Premier of France.]

These declarations of war against Hitler were eventually acknowledged by the highest Jewish authorities. In 1940, Rabbi M. Perlzweig, head of the British Section of the World Jewish Congress, told a Canadian audience: “The World Jewish Congress has been at war with Germany for seven years.” (*Toronto Evening Telegram*, Feb. 26, 1940.) And Moishe Shertok, at the British Zionist Conference in January 1943, said: “The Yishuv was at war with Hitler long before Great Britain and America.” (*Jewish Chronicle*, Jan. 22, 1943. See Arnold Leese, op. cit., p. 84.)

338. Note that this was all the Jews then claimed to be in Germany.

339. The quotations are from Mr. Untermeyer’s speech as reported in the *New York Times* for August 8, 1933.

340. This quotation and the one preceding it may be found in Francis Neilson’s *The Makers of War*, p. 92. Page 93 contains the following, which surely may be taken as conclusive. Apparently, Jewish charges of persecution and harsh treatment were flooding our press even before Untermeyer made his speech and had begun to create a serious situation. In consequence, Cordell Hull, our Secretary of State, communicated with the American Embassy and asked for a report. On March 27, 1933, he issued a statement:

“A reply has now been received indicating that whereas there was for a short time considerable physical mistreatment of Jews, this phase may be considered virtually terminated. . . Hitler in his capacity as a leader of the Nazi party, issued an order calling upon his followers to maintain law and order, to avoid molesting foreigners, disrupting trade, and to avoid the crisis of possible embarrassing international incidents.”

With this, one may compare the judgment of Peter Nicoll in his *Britain’s Blunder*, which, I may remind my readers, received Prof. Harry Elmer Barnes’ almost unqualified endorsement:

“The fact is that under the Nazis, a Jew simply as a Jew, suffered no outrage; although here and there he was made to feel an inferior, it was only the Jew who incurred the suspicion of being disloyal, revolutionary or criminal who brought on himself any real penalty” (page 27).

On page 28, he says: “By this time [apparently 1939], the worst period of trial was over and the concentration camps held ever fewer prisoners. They had been released in hundreds. The Jews had been deprived of the privilege of German citizenship in order to safeguard against the previous grip they had in so many regions of German life, and while they were encouraged to emigrate they were not forced to.” Pages 23-28 should be read in their entirety.

341. See Douglas Reed—*Somewhere South of Suez*, 1951, p. 327. See also B. Jensen—*The ‘Palestine’ Plot*, W.L. Richardson, Lawers by Aberfeldy, Scotland, 1948, p. 15.

342. B. Jensen—*The ‘Palestine’ Plot*, p. 83.

343. I could quote numerous authorities, even outstanding Jewish spokesmen, who recognized that Hitler did not want war. For example: Bernard Baruch, Charles Lindbergh, Henry Morgenthau, Emil Ludwig [real name, Cohen], Lord Rothschild, Vladimir Jabotinsky, and David Brown, Chairman of the United Jewish Campaign. A collection of such statements, with the original source cited, is to be found in *The ‘Palestine’ Plot* by B. Jensen, op. cit., pp. 11-12.

344. Devin-Adair, 1968. First published in 1953 by C.C. Nelson. Mr. Veale was also author of *Crimes Discreetly Veiled*, Cooper Book Co., London 1958.

345. Henry Regnery, 1959.

346. See F.J.P. Veale—*Advance To Barbarism*, Devin-Adair, 1968, pp. 18-19, 23-24, 112, 176, 181-5. It is important to get this latest 1968 edition, to which the above page numbers refer. I believe that the evidence submitted is absolutely unanswerable. My reader will find my summary of what it all means in [Appendix VI](#) at the end of this chapter. The latter part of this reviews the evidence that Frederick Lindemann was a Jew.

347. The best account of White's background and doings that I know of, is given by Mr. A.N. Field in his *The Bretton Woods Plot*, Nelson, New Zealand, 1957, pp. 3-20. A reading of the booklet's 64 pages would be well worthwhile. It has been reprinted by Omni Pubs., Hawthorne, Calif.

348. See William Henry Chamberlain—*America's Second Crusade*, Regnery, 1950, p. 306. Cp. F.J.P. Veale's *Advance to Barbarism*, pp. 50-1, 224 footnote. Also, George N. Crocker—*Roosevelt's Road to Russia*, Regnery, 1959, pp. 20-21, 28-29, 221, 240-248.

349. This was all agreed upon in the meetings of Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin. See, for instance, *Human Events*, Sept. 19, 1951, p. 2.

350. In regard to this, see *Epitaph On Nuremberg*, Falcon Press, London, 1946, by "the influential man of letters, Montgomery Belgion"; and especially his later and fuller *Victors' Justice*, Regnery, and the note about it in *Human Events* for April 27, 1949 (p. 3) by Frank Hanighen. Also, the still later and quite unanswerable *Advance To Barbarism*, Devin-Adair edition, revised, 1968. See the Index: "Nuremberg, The War Trials at." Pertinent also is the following statement by Mr. Arnold Leese in his *Gothic Ripples*, January 30, 1950:

"The Jew, M. Perlzweig, an official of the World Jewish Congress, is reported in the *Jewish Chronicle* (16th Dec. 1949) to have recently stated in an address at Glasgow—"It was the World Jewish Congress which had secured the holding of the Nuremberg trials at which it provided expert advice and much valuable evidence."

351. 351 See Douglas Reed—*From Smoke to Smother*, Jonathan Cape, 1949, Chap. 13, p. 130ff., in particular pp. 132-3, where Mr. Reed comments as follows:

"What seems to me to have been a most significant event at Nuremberg, where the world's press was gathered, passed without mention in the mass-circulation newspapers. The dates of sentence and execution were Jewish festivals. . .

"Judgment at Nuremberg was pronounced on Sept. 30th and October 1st (between the Jewish New Year and Day of Atonement). The executions were carried out just after midnight in the morning of October 16th, Hoshana Raba. For Jewry everywhere there was an unmistakable significance in these dates. To Gentiledom everywhere they meant no more than any others. Hoshana Rabba, October 16th, is the day when the Jewish God, after an interval during which he considers his verdict on every single human being, and may still pardon sinners, delivers his final judgment."

352. The key figure in the creation of the UN was Russian-born Leo Pasvolsky. He wrote the first draft of its charter, and attended its revision from the first day at Dumbarton Oaks to the last at San Francisco. He knew more about it than anybody else, and every member of the official U.S. delegation deferred to his interpretation of its contents. Yet he was born in Russia and was brought into the State Department ostensibly as an economist. He had published a book on Communist economics. It is significant that the head of the UN's Security Council, UN's most important post, always has been, and by UN Charter always must be, a Communist. See *Common Sense*, Oct. 15, 1952. See also the special issue of *The Freeman*, March 1955. The following Communist comments about the UN speak for themselves. "The United Nations is the culmination and supreme realization of the global Communist conspiracy." John Parvulesco, Co-Editor of the *Roumanian Courier*—in *World Survey*, April 1957. "The Communist Party regards the UN as the most important platform for Soviet propaganda in the world." Dr. Marek Korowicz, member of the Communist Polish delegation to the UN. And this from *Commentary*, official organ of the American Jewish Committee: "The International government of the United Nations, stripped of its legal trimming, . . . , is really the International Government of the United States and the Soviet Union acting in unison." *Commentary*, November 1958, p. 376.

353. See Alfred M. Lilienthal—*What Price Israel*, Regnery, 1953, pp. 57, 60ff.; *The Other Side of the Coin*, Devin-Adair, 1965. And it was the Jews, who committed and have perpetuated this hideous crime against another people, an innocent people—who had the effrontery to initiate and put through the law against "genocide."

354. Since what I want to say to expose this as a lie cannot be contained in a footnote, let me refer my reader to my very important [Appendix VII](#) at the end of this chapter.

355. This figure needs to be updated. It was stated in the London *Jewish Chronicle*, Nov. 7, 1975, that by the end of 1974 West Germany had paid out over 19 billion dollars in reparations for Nazi wrongs; that within another few years another 13.5 billion will be paid out to alleged victims of Nazi persecution and their heirs; and that in the end it is expected that West Germany will have paid a total of 33 billion dollars as compensation.

356. Commonly abbreviated the "C.F.R." See A.K. Chesterton—*The New Unhappy Lords*, 1972, pp. 179ff. Also, Dan Smoot—*The Invisible Government*, 1962, and the *Dan Smoot Report*, No. 29, Vol. 10, July 20, 1964, P.O. Box 9538, Dallas, Texas; Kent and Phoebe Courtney—*America's Unselected Rulers*, 1962, Conservative Society of America, New Orleans, 1962; W.

Cleon Skousen—*The Naked Capitalist*, 1970, Salt Lake City, see Index: “Council on Foreign Relations.”

Mr. Smoot was formerly a teacher at Harvard and later a member of the FBI. In the opening pages of his book he says:

“Bitter with disappointment [over the refusal of the U.S. to become a member of the League of Nations] Colonel [Edward Mandel] House called together in Paris a group of his most dedicated young intellectuals—among them John Foster Dulles and his brother Allen, Christian A. Herter, and Tasker H. Bliss—and arranged a dinner meeting with a group of like-minded Englishmen at the Majestic Hotel, Paris, on May 19, 1919. The group formally agreed to form an organization ‘for the study of international affairs.’ [This was paralleled by the formation of the Royal Institute of International Affairs in England.]

“The American group came home from Paris and formed The Council on Foreign Affairs, which was incorporated in 1921” (p. 3).

In 1927, the Rockefeller family and various big tax-exempt foundations began to finance the C.F.R.

“In 1939, the Council began taking over the U.S. State Department” (p. 4).

“The crowning moment of achievement [up to that time] came at San Francisco in 1945, when over 40 members of the United States Delegation to the organizational meeting of the United Nations . . . were members of the Council . . . By 1945, the Council on Foreign Relations, and various foundations and other organizations interlocked with it, had virtually taken over the U.S. State Department.

“Some CFR members were later identified as Soviet espionage agents: for example, Alger Hiss and Laughlin Currie. Others were “subsequently identified as conscious, articulate instruments of the Soviet international conspiracy” (pp. 5-6).

Mr. Smoot calls attention to the fact that “according to [Colonel] House’s own papers and the historical studies of Wilson’s ardent admirers (see, for example, *Intimate Papers Of Colonel House*, edited by Charles Seymour, Houghton Mifflin, 1926, and, *The Crisis of the Old Order* by Arthur Schlesinger, Houghton Mifflin, 1957), House created Wilson’s foreign and domestic policies, selected most of Wilson’s cabinet and other appointees, and ran Wilson’s State Department.”

Mr. A.K. Chesterton calls attention to the fact that “Paul Warburg and Otto Kahn, of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., were members of the Council’s first board,” and remarks: “It is improbable that the direction has passed out of Kuhn, Loeb hands.” (Op. cit., p. 110.) Further on (p. 181) he says: “Perhaps the real status of the Council on Foreign Relations is much higher than that of the White House and the State Department combined.”

Mr. Smoot continues (p. 2): “House had powerful connections with international bankers in New York. He was influential, for example, with great financial institutions represented by

such people as Paul and Felix Warburg, Otto H. Kahn, Henry Morgenthau, Jacob and Mortimer Schiff, Herbert Lehman. House had equally powerful connections with bankers and politicians of Europe." But whereas Mr. Smoot speaks of House's influence with them, the record shows that House was himself their tool. Representative Louis T. McFadden, in his speech before Congress on June 10, 1932, mentions Col. House as referring to Mr. Jacob Schiff, head of Kuhn, Loeb, as "his hidden master in Wall Street," and again as "that 'holy monk' of the financial empire," as "a financial Judas." See H.S. Kenan—*The Federal Reserve Bank*, Noontide, 1967, p. 148. His speech is there quoted in full. Cp. Boris Brasol, op. cit., pp. 200-2, 261.

Mr. Smoot states his overall conclusions, on page iii and iv of his Foreword:

"I am convinced that the Council on Foreign Relations, together with a great number of other associated tax-exempt organizations, constitutes the invisible government which sets the major policies of the federal government; exercises controlling influence on governmental officials who implement the policies; and, through massive and skillful propaganda, influences Congress and the public to support the policies.

"I am convinced that the objective of this invisible government is to convert America into a socialist state and then make it a unit in a one-world socialist system."

Cp. Gary Allen—"C.F.R., Conspiracy To Rule The World," *American Opinion*, 1969; *Open Letter to A U.S. Senator*, begun by Upton Close, "a journalist of the highest order," and continued by Mary M. Davison, an able and dedicated patriot. Address: Council on American Relations, West Palm Beach, Florida.

Mr. S.E.D. Brown, in an editorial in *The South African Observer* for October 1973, made the following significant observation:

"So completely has the C.F.R. dominated the State Department over the past forty years, that every Secretary of State except Cordell Hull, James Byrnes and William Rogers has been a member of the C.F.R. Dr. Henry Kissinger, Mr. Nixon's chief foreign policy adviser and now Secretary of State, came to the job from the staff of the C.F.R., and the under-secretaries, almost to a man, are C.F.R. members.

"But no one can begin to understand the C.F.R. and its workings unless one realises that while communist activities have contributed largely to the subversion of European nations and their headlong retreat from their overseas territories, the major pressures for this subversion have been applied by the International Money Power, using the C.F.R. as a base and American governments as instruments."

He continues: "Totally interlocked with the C.F.R. are all the major [tax-exempt] foundations and so-called 'Think Tanks,' the C.I.A., the UN, UNESCO, the World Bank, the IMF and all the other internationalist UN agencies." And at some length he details the International Money Power's activities in furtherance of C.F.R. policies.

But a fuller and the most up-to-date report on the C.F.R. is contained in Gary Allen's *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, Concord Press, Rossmoor, Calif., 1973, p. 80ff. He calls attention to the fact that "although the formal membership in the C.F.R. is composed of close to 1500 of the most elite names in the worlds of government, labor, business, finance, communications, the foundations, and the academy—and despite the fact that it has staffed almost every key position of every administration since those of FDR—it is doubtful that one American in a thousand so much as recognizes the Council's name, or that one in ten thousand can relate anything at all about its structure or purpose."

357. See Bryton Barron—*The State Department: Blunders or Treason?* Crestwood Press, Springfield, Va., 1965, p. v (and indeed the whole book). Mr. Barron, a Rhodes Scholar, served in the State Department under seven successive Secretaries of State, and for six years was Chief of its Treaty Section. He resigned to free himself to tell what he knew of State Department activities. For a review of his record and what he had to say in his book, see the article he contributed to *American Opinion*, January 1964, entitled "Otto Otepka and the State Department."

358. To be sure, this is fully in line with the revelations made by Major George Racey Jordan in his book *From Major Jordan's Diaries* back in the Forties. It was based on his "experience as a Lend Lease expeditor and liaison officer with the Russians during the war, when [he] served for two crucial years, from May 1942 to June 1944, both at Newark Airport and at the big air base at Great Falls, Montana." But hideous though these revelations were, they only lifted a little corner of the rug of tight official secrecy under which a huge agglomeration of duplicity and perfidy had been shoved.

359. The knockdown feud of the Twenties between Henry Ford and the Jewish Money Power not only ended in Ford's humiliating defeat, but led to the absorption of his entire dynasty and to the perversion of the Ford Foundation of the Republic into a powerful agency for furthering the very Jewish aims that Ford had hated and fought. This probably settled once and for all that to throw down the gauntlet to Jewry was to court destruction, and completely confirmed the pronouncement of Werner Sombart a decade earlier, that the U.S. was so completely under the Jewish thumb that "Americanism [was] nothing else, . . . , than the Jewish spirit distilled."

360. See *Spearhead*, June 1974, p. 12, for a recent speech that Mr. Butler gave at Caxton Hall, London. Mr. Butler says that Dr. Sutton's book "provides 'chapter and verse' proving that the Soviet Russian Empire has from the beginning, up to the present, been sustained by massive technological and economic blood transfusions from the West, mainly the U.S.A."

361. Dr. Sutton quotes *Barron's Weekly* as saying (1/4/71) that the U.S. has been "the arsenal for communism in the Soviet Union." It is significant that though Dr. Sutton summarized his testimony before the Platform Committee of the Republican Party at its 1972 Miami Beach Convention, and though copies of this testimony were hand-delivered to the two major American wire services covering the Convention, both refused to carry it. Manifestly, every effort has been made to give Dr. Sutton's work the 'silence treatment.' See Antony Sutton, op. cit., pp. 252-3; Eric Butler:—"The Plotters Behind the World Crisis," *Spearhead*, 50 Pawsons Rd., Croydon, England, June 1974, p. 12.

362. *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, Concord Press, Rossmoor, Calif., 1973, p. 80.

363. *The Invisible Government*, P.O. Box 9538, Dallas, Texas. See also the *Dan Smoot Report* for July 20, 1964. *America's Unelected Rulers*, Conservative Society of America, New Orleans, Louisiana.

364. See A.K. Chesterton—*The New Unhappy Lords*, Britons Pub. Co., 1972, p. 179ff.; W. Cleon Skousen—*The Naked Capitalist*, 1970, Salt Lake City (see its Index: "Council on Foreign Relations"); Gary Allen: "Conspiracy to Rule the World," *American Opinion*, 1969, and his *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, 1973, p. 80ff.; Mary M. Davison: "Open Letter to a U.S. Senator," Council on American Relations, West Palm Beach, Florida.; and S.E.D. Brown, the valiant and dedicated editor of *The South African Observer*—for example, in his editorials in its issues for January, 1972 (p. 2) and October, 1973.

365. Dan Smoot, op. cit., 1962, pp. 5-6.

366. Frank Capell: "Kissinger—A Former K.G.B. Agent?", *Review of the News*, March 15, 1974. See also his "Detente Emerging as an Alliance Between U.S. and U.S.S.R." *Herald of Freedom*, Zarephath, NJ. Mr. Cappell has earned the reputation of being a careful and very able investigator.

367. *The South African Observer*, October, 1973.

368. A.K. Chesterton, op. cit., 110, 181.

369. Dan Smoot, op. cit., pp. iii and iv.

370. See Liberty Lobby's *Loudoun* No. 100, June, 1971, the first paragraph of which states: "This story was first broken by Rep. John Rarick . . . in the May 5 [1971] *Congressional Record*, with information supplied to him by Liberty Lobby on May 3. Other than this mention, and the article in the May 15 *Washington Observer*, this tremendous story has been totally suppressed in all of the national news media." Liberty Lobby, 300 Independence Avenue, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003. Mr. Rarick named many of the notables present, such as Henry Kissinger; Edmond de Rothschild of Germany; former Under Secretary of State George Ball; David Rockefeller and John D. Rockefeller IV; Lt. General John W. Vogt, U.S. Army, Director of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; etc.

371. See Liberty Lobby *Loudoun*, No. 129, May 1974.

372. See A.K. Chesterton, op. cit., pp. 186, 197-210. Also, "Something Rotten in The State of Holland," an article by S.E.D. Brown in *The South African Observer* for March 1971, pp. 7-8.

373. This is anything but fantasy. Consider the significance of the following statements by eminent Jewish leaders, published in *The South African Observer*, May 1974:

From General Dayan, commander-in-chief of Israel's armed forces:

"Our fathers had reached the frontiers which were recognized in the Partition Plan. Our generation reached the frontiers of 1949. Now the Six-Day generation have managed to reach Suez, Jordan and the Golan Heights. This is not the end. After the present cease-fire lines, there will be new ones. They will extend beyond Jordan—perhaps to Lebanon and perhaps to Central Syria as well." Quoted in the *London Times*, June 25, 1969.

From General Yitzhak Rabin:

"The Americans have given us weapons so that we should use them when necessary. . . in an extreme case it is permitted to the civilized world to take control, by force, of the oil sources." Quoted in *Ha'aretz*, July 20, 1973.

From General Ariel Sharon:

"Israel is now a military superpower . . . For the Americans, there is nothing more important than a strong Israel. All the forces of European countries are weaker than we are. Israel can conquer in one week the area from Khartoum to Baghdad and Algeria." Quoted in *Yediot Aharanot*, 7.26.73.

From Ben Gurion's Diary, May 21, 1947:

"The Achilles heel of the Arab coalition is the Lebanon. Muslim supremacy in this country is artificial and can easily be overthrown. A Christian State ought to be set up there. . . We would sign a treaty of alliance with this state. Thus when we have broken the strength of the Arab Legion and bombed Amman, we could wipe out Trans-Jordan; after that Syria would fall. And if Egypt still dared to make wars on us, we would bomb Port Said, Alexandria and Cairo. We should thus end the war and would have put 'paid' to Egypt, Assyria and Chaldea on behalf of our ancestors."

And all this is only in line with utterances that have been coming from World Jewry, every now and then, for the past century and more. Consider the following:

On Feb. 9th, 1883, ninety years ago (as I write this), an editorial appeared in *The Jewish World* which throws light on much that has since come to pass. I quote some passages from it:

"The Dispersion of the Jews has rendered them a cosmopolitan people. They are the only cosmopolitan people, and in this capacity must act, and are acting as a solvent of national and racial differences. The great Ideal of Judaism is not that Jews shall be allowed to flock together one day in some hole-and-corner fashion. . . ; but that the whole world shall be imbued with Jewish teachings, and that in a Universal Brotherhood of nations—a greater Judaism in fact—all the separate races and religions will disappear. . . By their activity in literature and science, by their commanding position in every public walk of life, they are gradually molding non-Jewish thought and non-Jewish systems in Jewish moulds; and all that we hear now-a-days of Jewish influence, and all that we have heard of Jewish influence in the past, only represent the accomplished stages in the practical working out of the Jewish Mission."

Does not this sound very like what Mr. Marcus Eli Ravage said about taking us in hand and making us over according to a Jewish image?

And then there are the more recent declarations of aims, dated around 1948, in which violence as a means for Jewish aggrandizement seems to be plainly implied and more openly accepted. Mr. Douglas Reed (in his *Somewhere South Of Suez*, 1951, pp. 327-9) cites a number of them. They followed upon the threat of Vladimir Jabotinsky in 1923 about the Jews' blowing the British Empire to smithereens. In May 1948, Mr. A. Abrahams, Political Adviser to the World Revisionist Executive, wrote: "We must regard ourselves as the mighty nation that we are, and not as a third-rate State conditioned by the small territory we at present hold. All the resources of the world are at our disposal. . . There is no known weapon in the world without Jews who know its construction, who have taken part in its development and construction. . . Provided we think and act as a nation at war, planning for total victory, and drawing together all our resources, we shall triumph and shall be restored in full strength and

power, marking the first stage of our liberation and clearing the way for the second and final stage—the return of all Israel to the whole of the Land of Israel.”

Later the same year Ben Hecht, a prominent American Zionist, said: “Within the next twenty-five or fifty years Israel will get the territory they need and go on to become one of the five leading nations of the world.”

Was he modest, or at least something less than frank, in avowing Jewish aims? For is it not known that the Jews intend to become the nation, the one nation, of the world? And at this point, does one not call to mind that sinister prediction of Heine in the 1840’s? “I do not know; but I think that eventually the great sea serpent [Britain] will have its head crushed and the skin of the Northern Bear [Russia] will be pulled over its ears. There may be only one flock and one shepherd—one free shepherd with an iron staff, and a shorn-alike, bleating-alike human herd!” (See Robert H. Williams—*Know Your Enemy*, published by its Author, Santa Ana, Calif., p. 10.)

374. I began to see, and to set down, what here follows, in the late Sixties.

375. I will not pretend that I can make this view square with every one of the latest day-to-day developments. But if I am correct, it must be expected that many such “developments” will in fact be a deliberately contrived and necessary part of the hoax. To get an accurate view of the real movement of events one must base one’s judgment on the over-all trend through a period of some months, or even years. One must be prepared to find that every effort has been made by feint and counter-feint, and by all the means for deception afforded by full control of the important means for reaching the public mind, to make the world think that the real move is in one direction when in fact it is in the very opposite. The aim is to leave the world in the greatest confusion and division as to what is the real move. But when the dust has lifted and the fog cleared, it will be seen clearly that in the end every move has furthered the Jewish design of aggrandizement in the Near East and toward ultimate world dominion. So certain am I of this that, up to the time of this writing, I must let the view here presented stand.

For an appraisal very like my own, of events and of the primary drive behind the existence of Israel and all its movements, see “South Africa, Israel and the Middle East,” an editorial by Mr. S.E.D. Brown in *The South African Observer* issue for Nov. 1973, pp. 1-3. Also, for the part of Mr. Henry Kissinger in furthering all this, see Candour for Sept. 1974, pp. 83-4; and *The South African Observer* for Dec., 1973, pp. 7-9, where maps are submitted to show Israel’s expansion from its beginning in 1948 to late 1973; and also the issue for April 1974, pp. 7-9.

376. Significant passages taken from *You Gentiles* by Maurice Samuel, Harcourt, 1924:

"If I have long pondered this question of Jew and gentile it is because I suspected from the first dawning of Jewish self-consciousness that Jew and gentile are two worlds, that between you gentiles and us Jews there lies an unbridgeable gulf" (p. 9).

"In the main, we are forever distinct. Ours is one life, yours is another" (p. 21).

"We will not accept your rules because we do not understand them" (p. 33).

"We could never build a world like yours" (p. 35). "These are two ways of life, each utterly alien to each other. Each has its place in the world—but they cannot flourish in the same soil, they cannot remain in contact without antagonism. Though to life itself each way is a perfect utterance, to each other they are enemies" (p. 36).

"We are everywhere, to a large extent, aliens" (p. 60).

"There does not seem to be a single country with a history which has not been anti-Semitic at one time or another" (p. 95).

"In our life, the Jewish life, loyalty is unknown" (p. 103). With this contrast "the incomparable and altogether peculiar Germanic loyalty." See H.S. Chamberlain, *op. cit.*, Vol. I (p. 544).

"We are unquestionably an alien spirit in your colleges" (p. 104).

"Because your chief institution is the social structure itself, it is in this that we are most manifestly destroyers" (p. 147). "In everything we are destroyers—even in the instruments of destruction to which we turn for relief" (p. 152). "We Jews, we, the destroyers, will remain destroyers forever. Nothing that you do will meet our needs and demands. We will forever destroy because we need a world of our own, a God-world which it is not in your nature to build" (p. 155). "Our geniuses, in the midst of your world, are an alien and destructive element" (p. 184).

In explanation of the "unbridgeable gulf" Samuel found between Jew and gentile he said: "This difference in behavior and reaction springs from something more earnest and significant than a difference of beliefs: it springs from a difference in our *biological* equipment." (Emphasis added.)

377. The full text of this may be seen in the *New York Times* for March 9, 1937, under the caption: "Nazis Say Franklin Urged Ban on Jews." The case for the validity of this speech is more than I can take the space to present here.

378. The literature on the subject is growing rapidly. From it, I make a small selection. Gwen Jones—*A History of the Vikings*, Oxford, 1968; *Norse Atlantic Saga*, Oxford, 1964; *Eirik the Red*

and Other Icelandic Sagas, Oxford, nd. David Wilson—*The Vikings And Their Origins: Scandinavia in the First Millennium*, McGraw, 1970. Frederick J. Pohl—*Viking Settlements of North America*, Crown Pubs., New York, 1972. Magnus Magnusson and Herman Palsson—*The Vinland Saga and the Norse Discovery of America*, Penguin Books, n.d. Count Eric Oxenstierna—*The Norsemen*, about 1975. Hjalmar R. Holand—*Norse Discoveries and Explorations in America, 982-1362*, Dover. Frederick J. Pohl—*The Viking Settlements of North America*, Clarkson N. Potter, New York, 1972.

379. Houston Stewart Chamberlain—*The Foundations of the 19th Century*, John Lane, 1913, Vol. I, p. 269. I confess that I found much in Part II of this work (pp. 251-578) enlightening and even inspiring. For appreciation of it from two eminent scientists, see H.F.K. Guenther—*The Racial Elements of European History*, London, 1927, p. 256.

380. Robert Ardrey—*African Genesis*, A Delta Book, 1961, pp. 80-1, 134-5.

381. Macmillan, 1926. However, the book greatly impressed me when I first read it.

382. Houston Stewart Chamberlain—*The Foundations of the 19th Century*, John Lane, 1913, Vol. I, p. 273.

383. Tacitus—*Germania*, Everyman Library edition, pp. 313-4.

384. Houston Stewart Chamberlain, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 260, 263.

385. Friedrich Nietzsche—*The Dawn Of Day*, Auth. English Ed., Vol. IX, Aphorism 272, pp. 253-4.

386. For observation of this, and comment on it, see H.F.K. Guenther—*The Racial Elements of European History*, Methuen, London, 1927, p. 130.

387. Published by Knopf, 1974. Its sub-title reads: "The Radiocarbon Revolution and Prehistoric Europe." The publisher adds: "How archaeological history has been pushed backward in time by the recent drastic revision of radiocarbon dates—which now trace the megalithic cultures of Europe to beginnings earlier than and independent of Egypt and Mycenae." The gist of the book's conclusions was first published in an article by Dr. Renfrew in *Scientific American* for October 1971.

388. Published by Macmillan. Roger Pearson has undertaken to give the substance of the book in a severely abridged but still inspiring version which bears the title *The Teuton and the Roman*. Perhaps obtainable through Noontide Press.

389. Methuen, London, 1927.

390. London, 1897. Reprinted by Dover Publications, New York, 1957.

391. For a conception of how comprehensive this should be, see *Racial Hygiene* by Prof. Thurman B. Rice, Assoc. Prof. of Bacteriology and Public Health, Indiana University School of Medicine, Macmillan, 1929.

392. My reader can refresh his memory of what I have already said about "heredity corporations," by turning to the latter part of my second chapter on eugenics, entitled "The Doctrine of the Thoroughbred."

Appendix 1

FOR RESEARCH INTO THE DECEPTION IN OUR MONEY SYSTEM

HILAIRE BELLOC—*Economics for Helen*, London, 1938, chapter entitled "Usury"; *The Jews*, 2nd edition, Constable, 1937; *Monarchy, A Study of Louis XIV*, Cassel, 1938, Preface, pp. vii and viii, and chapter entitled "Monarchy," pp. 3-17. Belloc, besides being a distinguished man of letters, was one of the outstanding historians of the English-speaking world in this century. Far from being any anti-Semite, he had a Jewish secretary, and in writing his *The Jews* seemed to be concerned as much for the welfare of the Jews as for that of gentiles.

A.K. CHESTERTON—*The New Unhappy Lords, An Exposure of Power Politics*, 4th revised and expanded edition, 1972, Britons Pub. Co. American edition, with an Introduction by General P. A. del Valle, Pub. by Omni Pubs., Hawthorne, Calif. "A.K.," as he was long known by all those who came to be counted among his friends, was in my judgment the most brilliant, illuminating, and reliable journalist of our day. Inevitably, much of his best work went into his paper *Candour, The British Views-Letter*, of which he was the founder and editor. His book very effectively brings into high relief the part played by the Money Power in shaping and determining the direction of the modern world. When I consulted him for books that would furnish me with reliable information about the Money Power, he recommended especially the next two books in this present list, and sent me his own copies of them.

A.N. FIELD—*All These Things*, Nelson, New Zealand, 1936. Reprinted by Omni Publications, 1963. His mastery of money problems was evidenced by his being called to witness before the special commission that was appointed to look into the question whether New Zealand should accept a central bank, such as our Federal Reserve. His *All These Things* is a mine of well-documented information. His *The Truth about the Slump* carried Mr. Chesterton's unqualified endorsement, and was also recommended by Prof. Soddy.

JEFFREY MARK—*The Modern Idolatry, An Analysis of Usury and the Pathology of Debt*, Chatto & Windus, 1934. This book is largely based on Prof. Frederick Soddy's *Wealth, Virtual Wealth And Debt* (for Soddy, see toward the end of this list), but it is very much easier reading. I found its 200 pages a marvelously clear and illuminating analysis of our Money System, the best introduction for the beginner that I know of. A reprint (with different pagination) was brought out in Bombay. But so far as I am aware, both editions have long been out-of-print, and copies of the book must be hard to find. However, a copy is (or long was) available in the Reference Room of the main Public Library in New York City. I hope that a new edition may soon be brought out by Omni. Recommended not only by Mr. Chesterton but also by Prof. Soddy.

GERTRUDE M. COOGAN—*Money Creators*, Sound Money Press, Chicago, 1935. A reprint is now available from Omni. This book, also, I found exceedingly informative and thought-provoking, and it was unequivocally and unreservedly endorsed by Senator Robert L. Owen, who wrote the Foreword to it. Sen. Owen was a man of very large banking experience. He established the first national bank chartered in Oklahoma, was its President for 10 years and one of its Directors for 45 years in succession. Also, he was a member of the U.S. Senate for 18 years, and for 12 years the Chairman of its Committee on Banking and Currency. He

drafted the original Federal Reserve Bill, but, as he tells in his Foreword to Miss Coogan's book, his efforts to make this an act to "promote a stable price level" were circumvented and frustrated by the development of "secret hostilities . . . the origin of which at the time (he) did not fully understand." Of this last, I shall have much to say in due course. In his view, the Bill as passed was a national disaster. It threatened the welfare of every man, woman, and child in the United States as it had not been threatened even during the World War. Thoroughly aroused, he felt the necessity of trying to gain the attention of the American public. It was at this point that the manuscript of Miss Coogan's book came into his hands. Some indication of the warmth of the endorsement he gave it may be gathered from the following excerpts from his Foreword to it:

"The facts that Miss Coogan was awarded a Master's Degree in Economics and Finance by Northwestern University, was for eight years a Security Analyst for the Northern Trust Co. of Chicago, that from the beginning she had a deep desire to understand the fancied enigma of money, have given her a great insight into money science. . .

"I found this young American woman had a masterful knowledge of the so-called money enigma.

". . . This book is worthy of careful study by American citizens who wish to understand the principles that govern the value and the volume of money in the United States and other countries. It contains scientific truths—not quackery,

". . . This writer is informed. The information is sound. It has been digested. It is written in an attractive way with an engaging style, and it conveys to the American people truths of the very first magnitude."

ROBERT McNAIR WILSON—*Promise To Pay, An Inquiry into the Principles and Practice of the Latter-Day Magic Called Sometimes High Finance*, Routledge, 1934. A small book for the beginner. In his Preface, the author says: "In the following pages an attempt has been made to describe the money system so that its principles maybe grasped easily by anyone above the age of sixteen years." Recommended by Prof. Soddy. Two other very excellent and highly readable books by Mr. Wilson are his *Monarchy or Money Power*, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1933, and *The Mind of Napoleon*, Routledge, 1934.

EZRA POUND—*Impact*, Regnery, 1960. *Who's Who in America*, 1969-70, described Pound as "a principal founder and moving spirit of modern poetry in English," and Wilmot Robertson said that he "probably exercised more influence on modern literature than any other poet." This collection of Pound's prose is packed full of arresting and incisive and provocative observations on all sorts of subjects, none more so than those on the Money Power. His fervid denunciations, together with his lucid and persistent statements of the simple and essential principles of a really honest money system (combined, to be sure, with other features of his life no less repugnant to the would-be masters of the world) led to his being given the American equivalent of a sentence to Siberia. But to the end, he was never silenced.

JOHN R. ELSOM—*Lightning over the Treasury Building*, Meador, Boston. Reprint available from Omni. Not as well documented as I should like, probably because it was written primarily for the common man (who usually has an aversion for notes!), but it is simple, clear, goes to the heart of things, and is an eye-opener. Recommended by Mr. A.K. Chesterton.

CHRISTOPHER HOLLIS—*The Breakdown of Money, An Historical Explanation*, Sheed & Ward, 1934 (Endorsed by Prof. Soddy); *The Two Nations, A Financial Study of English History*, Routledge, 1935 (recommended by Mr. Chesterton). These books deal primarily with the British situation, but basically the problems remain the same however much the scene changes. Though I have yet to finish reading these two books, I include them here because they are of good repute, and I have liked what I found in them.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, WOODROW WILSON, HENRY FORD, and THOMAS A. EDISON. Quotations from the published utterances of these men in regard to finance and financiers will appear in my text and need not be quoted here.

SIR ARTHUR KITSON—*The Bankers Conspiracy, Which Started the World Crisis*, Elliot Stock, London, 1933; and *A Fraudulent Standard*, first published in 1917, reprinted by Omni in 1972. Mr. Kitson, after having won fame as an inventor and holder of some 500 patents, abandoned a lucrative business career to devote the last 40 years of his life to lecturing, writing and crusading on money reform. In his very first book, *A Scientific Solution of the Money Question*, Boston, 1894, he “called attention to the fraudulent character of the so-called ‘Gold Standard’ of Value, and to the impossibility of any commodity functioning in its commodity capacity, as either a just measure or an honest expression of exchange-values.” He declared the gold standard to be “legalized fraud, a delusion and a snare.” (See *A Fraudulent Standard*, Omni, pp. v, viii.) Prof. Soddy recommends five of Mr. Kitson’s books, whom he calls “the doyen of British Monetary Reformers.”

LOUIS T. McFADDEN—*Collected Speeches* (before Congress). After becoming President of the Pennsylvania Bankers’ Association, he was for 12 years Chairman of the Finance and Currency Committee of our House of Representatives. His scathing exposure of the treasonous operations of the Money Power under the eyes of the nation is believed by many to have led to his assassination.

EUSTACE MULLINS—His *The Federal Reserve Conspiracy* (Kaspar & Horton, New York, 1952) and H.S. Kenan’s *The Federal Reserve Bank* (Noontide, 1969) are both excellent for their revelation of the unholy secrecy and treachery in which our Federal Reserve Bank was conceived and eventually brought into the world. Mr. Kenan’s book has valuable lengthy excerpts from McFadden’s speeches about the operations of the international bankers.

VINCENT VICKERS—*Economic Tribulation*, John Lane, 1941. Reprinted in 1960 by Omni. Vickers was for many years a very high-placed figure in the British banking system, and from 1910 to 1919 was even a Director of the Bank of England. But in the Foreword to his *Economic Tribulation*, a “world-famous book on money-reform,” he tells of “that day in 1926 when . . . I felt it my duty to explain to the Governor of the Bank of England, Mr. Montagu Norman, that ‘henceforth I was going to fight him and the Bank of England policy until I

died.” And this he did, spending the next 15 years pressing upon the Western world the “necessity for a reform of the money system.” Just before his death, he declared his conviction that “the existing system is actively harmful to the State, creates poverty and unemployment, and is the root cause of war.”

With this may be compared the statement of Robert H. Hemphill, former credit manager of the Federal Reserve Bank, Atlanta, Georgia, that the banking problem “is the most important subject intelligent persons can investigate and reflect upon. It is so important that our present civilization may collapse unless it is widely understood and the defects remedied very soon.” See his Foreword to Prof. Irving Fisher’s book *100% Money*.

GARY ALLEN—Two articles, “The Bankers” and “The Federal Reserve,” originally published in *American Opinion*, reprinted as one booklet by Western Islands, Belmont, Mass., 1970. As I recall, Mr. Chesterton, in something he wrote not long before his death, showed his respect for Gary Allen’s qualities as an investigator. Also, most recently, there is his best-seller *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, Concord Press, Seal Beach, Calif. It contains a very arresting and well-documented body of significant facts.

Among the most constructive works on the Money Question are those of the three authors with whom I will conclude this list.

C.H. DOUGLAS, known all over the world as the founder of Social Credit. Perhaps his most influential books have been *Social Credit*, now available as an Omni reprint, and *The Brief For The Prosecution*, K.R.P. Pubs., Liverpool, 1945.

SILVIO GESELL—*The Natural Economic Order*, Free Economy Pub. Co., Huntington Park, Calif. In this, he proposed a new monetary system. H.G. Wells said of him: “Gesell’s name will be a leading name in history once it has been disentangled.” Prof. Soddy declared him “a voice in the wilderness—a Genius.” Prof. Irving Fisher’s *Stamp Scrip* gives a clear treatment of the Gesellist economy.

FREDERICK SODDY—*Wealth, Virtual Wealth and Debt*, Dutton, 1933. A reprint may be available from Omni. Prof. Soddy was a Professor of Chemistry at Oxford University, “father of nuclear fission,” a Nobel Prize laureate, and a Fellow of the Royal Society, England’s highest scientific honorary body. Stuart Chase, in reviewing his book, said that it might prove to be “one of the most important books ever written.” Having come to feel that he must reach an understanding of our money system, Soddy spent two years studying what its proponents had to say for it, only at last to find himself facing the fact that he “could make nothing of it.” And “then one day,” he went on to say, “the truth dawned on me. What I was studying was not a system but a confidence trick.” Basically, the whole thing was a swindle, dependent for its successful operation on keeping people deceived.

Thus was brought home to him the necessity of making his approach to the problem independently of all orthodox authorities. Out of the ensuing research came his book, and by the time he had reached page 14 he stated bluntly that our money system “has become easily the most powerful tyranny and the most universal conspiracy against the economic freedom of individuals and the autonomy of nations that the world has ever known.” By the

time he finished his book he had made his case, and was stating it in terms even more extreme and severe. He also declared, let me add, that "the solution [to which his searching investigation of the Money Question led him], as was to be expected, . . . proved to be most ordinary incontrovertible common sense, requiring nothing more than that to prove it" (p. 22).

I have found two other books by Prof. Soddy very valuable. *Money Versus Man* he himself describes as "a succinct account of [his] *Wealth, Virtual Wealth And Debt*." Also, it is much easier to understand, and in it Soddy seems more deeply involved, personally, than in his larger work. The other book, *The Role of Money* (Harcourt, 1935), on pp. 213-4, contains a valuable list of recommended books on the Money Question.

Appendix 2

FOR INTRODUCTION TO THE JEWISH QUESTION

Most of those named in the list below need no supporting word from me. Their own status as historians or scientists, their records of brilliant achievement or of high and faithful service to their country, command respect and confidence. But as there is a disposition abroad to dismiss any writing that can be called "anti-Semitic" with contempt, as if it were necessarily ill-informed, biased and unjust, I wish to preface my list with the following quotation from *The Jews* (pp. 153-4) by Hilaire Belloc, who was most emphatically not an enemy of the Jews, who, in any case, was one of the outstanding historians and men of letters of our own time. He said:

"It is the greatest mistake in the world to regard the Anti-Semite in the vast numerical strength he has now attained all over our civilization as wholly unpractical and therefore negligible. . . The strength of Anti-Semitism was and is based not only on intensity of feeling, but also on industry, an industry very accurate in its methods. The Anti-Semite pamphlets, newspapers and books, which the great daily press is so careful to boycott, form by now a mass of information upon the whole Jewish problem which is already [1922] overwhelming and still mounting up: and all of it hostile to the Jew. You will not find in it, of course, any material for the Defendant's Brief, but as a dossier for the prosecution it is astonishing in extent and accuracy and correlation."

Allen, Gary—*None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, Western Islands, 1973.

Beaty, John—*The Iron Curtain over America*, Wilkinson, Dallas, Texas, 1951.

Belloc, Hilaire—*The Jews*, Constable, 1922. Better, revised edition, 1937.

Britton, Frank—*Behind Communism*, Los Angeles, n.d.

Burton, Sir Richard Francis—*The Jew, the Gypsy and El Islam*, Hutchinson, 1898, the part on the Jews.

Chesterton, A.K.—*The New Unhappy Lords*, 4th revised edition, 1972, Britons. American Edition obtainable from Omni Pubs., Hawthorne, Calif. *The Learned Elders and the B.B.C.*, Britons. *The Tragedy of Anti-Semitism* (with Joseph Leftwich), Robert Anscombe, London, 1948.

Corti, Egon Caesar—*The Rise of the House of Rothschild*, Cosmopolitan, 1928.

Dilling, Elizabeth—*The Plot against Christianity*, Section II: Exhibits. This consists largely of photostat copies of pages from the Talmud.

Domville, Admiral Sir Barry, K.B.E., C.B., C.M.G.—*From Admiral to Cabin Boy*, Britons, 1947.

Douglas, C.H.—*The Brief for the Prosecution*, K.R.P., Liverpool, 1945.

Emden, Paul H.—*The Money Powers of Europe in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, London, n.d.

Fahey, The Reverend Dennis—*The Rulers of Russia*, Dublin, 1951.

Field, A.N.—See under his name in [Appendix 1](#).

Freedman, Benjamin—*Facts are Facts*, 1955, Sterling Enterprises, Sterling, Va.

Grieb, Conrad K.—*Uncovering the Forces for War*, Examiner Books, New York, 1947. *The Balfour Declaration, Warrant for Genocide*, Examiner Books, New York, 1972.

Gwynne, H.A. (Editor)—*The Cause of World Unrest*, Putnam, 1920.

The International Jew, 4 vols., reprinted from Henry Ford's *Dearborn Independent*, 1920-1922.

Jordon, Major George Racey—*From Major Jordan's Diaries*, Harcourt, 1952.

Knupfer, George—*The Struggle for World Power*, Plain-Speaker Pub. Co., London, 1958.

Leese, Arnold S.—*The Jewish War of Survival*. Perhaps obtainable from the Britons Pub. Co. *Bolshevism Is Jewish*. Perhaps obtainable from Britons. *Gentile Folly. The Rothschilds*.

Poncins, Count Leon de—*The Secret Powers Behind Revolution*, Boswell, 1929. *Judaism and the Vatican*, Britons, 1967.

The Protocols and the Learned Elders Of Zion, Britons, 1971, Anonymous.

The Protocols and World Revolution, Small Maynard, 1920.

Ramsay, Capt. A.H.M.—*The Nameless War*, Britons, 1952. Capt. Ramsay was a member of the British Parliament and a personal friend of Neville Chamberlain.

Reed, Douglas—*Disgrace Abounding*, chapters 23 and 24 on the Jews in Europe, Jonathan Cape, 1929. From *Smoke to Smother*, Jonathan Cape, 1948. Good, despite his curious notions about Hitler. *Somewhere South of Suez*, Devin-Adair, 1951.

Stormer, John A.—*None Dare Call It Treason*, Liberty Bell Press, Florissant, Missouri, 1964.

Sutton, Antony—*National Suicide*, Arlington House, 1973. Pronounced by Eric Butler, the much-respected Australian political commentator, “one of the six most important books published over the past fifty years.”

Theobald, Rear Admiral Robert (U.S.N.)—*The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor*, Devin-Adair, 1954.

Webster, Nesta H.—*The French Revolution*, Dutton, New York, 1919. *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, Boswell, 1946. World Revolution, expanded and up-dated edition, Britons, 1971.

Williams, Major Robert H.—*Know Your Enemy*, Excellent brief introduction. Obtainable from White Legion Books, Box 9391, Arlington, Va., 22209.

Wittmer, Felix—*Yalta Betrayal*, Caxton Printers, 1954.

Appendix 3

FROM THE ENGLISH PAPER *THE WEEK*, MAY 17, 1933

“Unprecedented and widely significant is a case—just coming before the Austrian courts—arising out of the alarm of the Austrian National Bank¹ over the financial revolution which has brought prosperity to the little Austrian town of Woergl, and which the Bank fears is going to compete with its own monopoly powers. Woergl had been moving rapidly to bankruptcy since the beginning of the crisis. Its factories closed down one after another and unemployment rose daily. Nobody did any business and scarcely anybody paid any taxes. Then Unterguggenberger, Burgomaster of Woergl, proposed the following plan [based on the proposal of Silvio Gesell], which was adopted. The town authorities issued money to the value of thirty thousand Austrian schilling notes [in denominations of convenient size], which were called tickets for services rendered. The special feature of these notes was the fact that they decreased in value by one per cent every month. Anyone holding one of these notes at the end of the month had to buy from the local authorities a stamp of sufficient value to bring the note up to face value. This he affixed to the back of the note, and the proceeds of the stamp went to the poor relief fund. The result was that the notes circulated with unheard of rapidity. They were first used for the payment of wages for the building of streets, drainage and other public works by men who would otherwise have been unemployed. On the first day when the new notes were used eighteen hundred schillings worth were paid out. The recipients immediately hurried with them to the shops, and the shopkeepers and merchants to use them for the payment of their tax to the municipality. The municipality immediately used them to pay the bills. Within twenty-four hours of being issued the greater part of this money had already been passed on its way again. During the first month, the money had made the complete circuit no less than twenty times. There was

no possibility of anyone avoiding the one per cent stamp tax on any note he happened to hold at the end of the month, since without a stamp to bring it up to face value, the note lost its entire value. Within the first four months after the issue of the new money, the town had accomplished public works to the value of one hundred thousand schillings. A large proportion of tax arrears had already been paid off and there were even cases of people paying taxes in advance. Receipts of back taxes were eight times greater than in the past before the introduction of new money. Unemployment is now reduced enormously, the shopkeepers are prosperous. The fame of the Woergl miracle spread. Irving Fisher, American economist, sent a commission of enquiry to Woergl, and the system has been introduced into a score of American townships. The Austrian National Bank however was highly disturbed by the whole proceeding. Now Unterguggenberger is being brought before the courts to explain himself and his plan."

¹ At this point a footnote reads: "The so-called Austrian National Bank is at present [in 1933] completely under foreign control, the finances of the country being in the hands of a Commissioner of the League of Nations."

Appendix 4

ALLEGED SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

Much has been made of a "Soviet anti-Semitism" that is alleged to have been initiated by Stalin. Those who hold to this view call attention to the Czech purge of 1953, the year of Stalin's death, in which nine of the eleven men executed were Jews. In reply to this, and further, as a background for what I want to say about the years that have followed, I can hardly do better than to quote some comments from competent observers of that period. The first are taken from *Gothic Ripples*, Nos. 96, 97, and 98 of the year 1953, by Mr. Arnold S. Leese, whom I have found an exceedingly exact and reliable investigator. (*Gothic Ripples* has been defunct since Mr. Leese's death, but I have a complete file of it.) In No. 96 he wrote:

"Recently in Czechoslovakia there has been a drastic purge of officials anxious to be their own bosses, like Tito in Yugoslavia. Now, you can't purge Bolshevists without purging Jews; in Stalin's great purges in Russia (1935-8) the victims were nearly all Jews, but there were always plenty of Jews left to carry on Bolshevism. To the alarm of world Jewry, it could not be hidden from the public that in this new Czechoslovakian purge, the officials arrested were nearly all Jews. Actually, we know for certain that twelve out of the fourteen were Jews. . ."

And then he lists the posts that these Jews held. One is struck at once by the fact that they were anything but Jewish nonentities. On the contrary, they included Rudolph Slansky, Vice-Premier of Czechoslovakia and Secretary-General of the Communist Party; and also the Deputy Secretary-General, numerous deputy Ministers (of Finance, National Defense, Foreign Trade and Foreign Affairs), a local secretary of the Communist Party, and a member of the editorial staff of *Rude Pravo*, the official organ of the Communist Party.

"In these facts," resumes Mr. Leese, "not in the fact of their sentences, you have the proof that Bolshevism is Jewish in Czechoslovakia. But the most significant fact of all is that the Minister of Justice who ordered the execution of the condemned eleven men (of whom nine were Jews) was Stefan Reis, recognized by the *Jewish Chronicle* [one of the leading Jewish periodicals of England] of 5th May, 1950, as a Jew himself!"

How can anyone conceive that so many Jews could have attained posts of such eminence and influence in a Communist country and in the Communist Party if there had been any mounting feeling against Jews on the part of the Government?

In the next issue of *Gothic Ripples* (No. 97), Mr. Leese comments on the readiness with which gentiles the world over had swallowed the Jewish brainwash of Soviet anti-Semitism. "Let us just remind everyone that Stalin married a Jewess, whilst his daughter married in 1951 a Jew; that in the recent Czechoslovakian purge the Minister of Justice was the Jew, S. Reis; that two Jews, E. Pollak and Jaroslav Simon, have just been decorated in Soviet Russia for agricultural services; . . . while at the Jewish Board of Deputies meeting on the same date [1.18.53], a far-sighted Jew, A. Wolffe, who knew this lie of anti-Semitism in Russia would come back on the Jews like a boomerang, said to his fellow tribesmen, 'You know, as I know, that there is no anti-semitism in Eastern Europe.' The whole idea is puerile. Even in Rumania, the Jewess Anna Pauker has been replaced by another Jew, A. Bughici."

And *Gothic Ripples* No. 98 records that the *Jewish Chronicle*, 2.13.53, had reported that Vol. 15 of the *Soviet Encyclopedia* published that month, had declared that "the Jewish problem does not exist in the Soviet Union, where today Jews find the doors open to all professions." It adds, after pointing to the Jewishness of the Government in Hungary, "you can only purge a Jewish Government by purging Jews from it."

A succinct note in *Time* magazine, March 2, 1953, confirmed this. In regard to the expected purge of Jews in Communist Hungary, it sifted down the reports to mean "that a Russian purge tribunal has gone to Hungary to root out 'suspected Zionists' from the strongly Jewish (90% in the top echelons) government of Communist Premier Matyas Rakosi, who is himself a Jew."

Free Britain for March 15, 1953 (No. 135) brought out another side of the matter:

"For thirty-five years the Russian people have been exploited and pillaged by the Soviet Government.

"Never has it been allowed to occur to the Russian masses that they have a Jewish Government, although this is known to be the case." [With this compare Americans' unawareness of the Jewishness of our Government for the past 50 years!]

"If once the Russian people were to awake to the fact they had been ruled for all these years by the one people whom they detest most of all, the Soviet Government would be faced with a domestic upheaval that might end the regime.

“The Russians have always detested the Jews, and the main reason for all the secrecy behind the Iron Curtain, for the secret police, for the censorship of the Press and for the concentration camps is to prevent the Russians learning that their country is ruled by Jews.

“That is why two years ago *Free Britain* pointed out that ‘the soft underbelly of the Soviet Monster is the Jewish Question.’ “Now in spite of all precautions the Russian people are beginning to learn the truth, and it has become an urgent matter for their Jewish masters to throw dust in their eyes. They have found it necessary to sacrifice some of their own people, as of old, and to give the widest publicity, in an effort to make their actions appear anti-Jewish.

“By its actions the Soviet Government has shown beyond any shadow of doubt the one thing it fears above everything else is that its Jewishness should become known to the Russian people.”

But there are those who claim that no matter what may have been the official Soviet attitude toward Jews 15 or 20 years ago, mounting evidence for the past decade has conclusively proved this to be hostile. In reply to this, I would submit such indications as the following:

(1) On Sept. 30, 1960, the *B'nai B'rith Messenger*, official organ of one of the most powerful Jewish institutions in the world, published this “exclusive United Nations WUP report”:

“A.I. Mikoyan has officially denied that any form of anti-Semitism exists today in the Soviet Union, a Soviet Embassy revealed this week. . .

“Take, for example, the list of members of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. How many Jews are on it? There are most likely relatively more of them than representatives of other nationalities.

“My brother is an aircraft designer and he works with Gurevitch, a Jew by nationality. Their plan is called ‘MIG,’ that is, Mikoyan and Gurevich. I don’t consider this an instance of anti-Semitism.

“There are many Jews among the artists. . . . Talented Jews have wide opportunities for the development of their gifts. There are many Jews among the film directors, artists, screen players, composers, musicians, writers, and also in offices, in ministries, in the Army. They hold high posts. We have, for example, General of the Army Kreiser, a very respected man, a Jew by nationality. I know him personally.

“Engineer Dymshitz is likewise a Jew. He is minister in charge of all capital construction in the Soviet Union.”

(2) Mr. A.K. Chesterton, who has made it part of his business to be informed about all matters vitally pertaining to Jews, in a personal letter to me dated June 11, 1973, wrote:

“The Soviet Union has always been anti-Zionist, and nonetheless so because it procured tens of thousands of Polish Jews for export to Palestine in 1946. . .

“Heaven knows that I am no champion of the Soviet regime, but it does have my sympathy in recognizing that dual loyalty in the eyes of Zionist Jews is a deceptive phrase to cover up single-minded loyalty to Israel. *As far as I am aware*, Russian Jews have no specific complaint against the regime except its discouragement of emigration.” [Emphasis added.]

Please note that this brings us up to a few months ago.

(3) *The South African Observer* (Box 2401, Pretoria, South Africa), in its issue for February 1973, had a significant note about the activities of Walter B. Kissinger, a brother of Henry Kissinger. Walter is a millionaire American industrialist, who is also the head of a West German firm, the Rohe Company, “which is negotiating a contract involving over \$125 million with the Soviet Union to build and equip five hundred gasoline stations in and around Moscow.” This hardly supports the idea that Jews have any deep grievance against the Soviet Government.

(4) But to my mind what completely silences the idea that the Russian Government has done anything that has seriously alienated Jewish affections and support, is the well-established fact that, although the United States and all the other major nations of the West has been under steadily increasing Jewish control for the past fifty years, every one of them, and the U.S. most of all, has consistently done whatever was necessary to prevent Russian collapse. What organized Jewry can do, and leaps to do, when it really feels itself confronted by an enemy, was made fearfully plain by the vengeance it heaped upon Hitler and Germany. Beside this, any resentment Jews may feel toward Russia looks pretty pallid. And if at first one be disturbed by noticing, for instance, that the *New York Times* “every day seems to run a scheduled attack on the Russian Government,” one needs to remember that the Jews stand out in history as the great masters of deception. With their undisputed control of the mass media they are in a position to fabricate whatever reports they will, as a smokescreen to cover up their real designs: they can make us think they are about to move in one direction, when in fact they intend to move in the opposite. Above all, there is the fact, behind which Dr. Antony Sutton has put such mountains of indisputable evidence (as already detailed in my text), that *since* Stalin as much as before him, it has been the Jew-controlled U.S.A. that is chiefly responsible for having built up the Russian regime, prevented its collapse, and maintained it in power. Most recently, “when the last Soviet famine threatened as the result of yet another failure of collectivized agriculture, Dr. Kissinger [himself a Jew born abroad], whose power base is the international financial groups whose interests he has faithfully served, rushed to Moscow . . . to offer the necessary credits to enable American wheat to be shipped to the Soviet Union. 700 million dollars were provided.”¹ Russia got the wheat by American taxpayers’ having to go short of wheat for themselves. They got it without actually paying a cent for it. They got it “on the cuff,” by a mere promise to pay for it, a promise on which they may be counted to renege, as they reneged on their obligation to pay off their debt to the U.S. of 11 billion dollars for Lend Lease.

All this shows actual *favoritism* toward Communist Soviet Russia, and is inconceivable on the part of a Jew-controlled U.S. Government, except as the Soviet Union not only had the approval of American Jewry but enjoyed its active support.

This favoritism, as revealed in the apparent attitude of the U.S. Government to a recent Russian military move, was commented on in the *London Financial Times* of April 22, 1974:

“No one without access to the inner councils of the Kremlin can say, of course, that Russia would not have mounted this considerable new military effort if the U.S. had not been willing to act as its extremely indulgent international banker. But what cannot be denied is that, by granting the Soviet greatly extended access to American money and resources, President Nixon’s detente has made it very much easier than it would otherwise have been for Russia to cope with the additional stresses its intensified military effort must be imposing on the country’s external payments and domestic economic situation.”

And as a final observation bearing on the alleged anti-Semitism of the Russian Government, I must add a note about the so-called Dartmouth Conferences. Eight of these have been held since the first in 1960, half in the U.S., half in Russia. They have all been held in secret under extreme security precautions. Money to cover the expenses incurred has almost always been supplied by the large American tax-exempt foundations, notably the Ford Foundation. The delegates are exclusively from the U.S. and Russia. They are persons of very great power and influence in the worlds of finance, politics, science, education, and all the means for shaping the public mind. They manifestly work, like the Bilderberger Group, in close liaison with the Council on Foreign Relations, all of which further the same ends. They are obviously an instrument for bringing together in particular the U.S. and Russia, to combine their forces for the destruction of national sovereignties and to create a homogenized world most advantageous to money-making and favorable to the dominion of the Earth by bankers.

But the point of particular importance here is that a large number of the names of the Russian delegates to the Dartmouth Conferences have been Jewish. This, it would seem, makes it undeniable that “racial Jews still have great power and influence in the Soviet totalitarian dictatorship.” See *Youth Action News*, August 1974, at the bottom of page 7. (Box 312, Alexandria, Virginia 22313.)

I readily allow that there may be indications that do not fit in with the view that I have presented here. And perhaps I could not answer every such contrary indication. But I must heed my very painful awareness both of the fearful importance of our not being taken in, and of the Jews’ need of deception for the accomplishment of their ends, and of their genius for it. Our very existence as a nation, and as a people, may depend on our discerning clearly, beneath all appearances to the contrary, what is really going on. But let it be my final word that the danger, as I see it, is not so much from what apparently emanates from Russia, as from the Jewish International Money Power that works partly behind and through it, and always for the destruction of the White man everywhere—in the United States, in Russia, in Britain, in Europe, throughout Africa, in Australia, and in New Zealand. And nowhere has it ever been truer that if we don’t hang together, all of us White men, we shall certainly hang separately. And the hangman will be the Jew.

¹ Eric Butler—“The Plotters Behind the World Crisis,” *Spearhead*, June 1974, p. 13.

Appendix 5

IN REPLY TO DR. ANTONY SUTTON'S REJECTION OF THE IDEA OF A JEWISH CONSPIRACY

Dr. Sutton gives the grounds for his rejection in Appendix 2 (pp. 185-189) of his *Wall Street and The Bolshevik Revolution*, but, though I hold all the rest of Dr. Sutton's work that I have seen in very high respect, I have to confess myself unimpressed by this.

On page 185, he denies the truth of Winston Churchill's statement in his front-page article in the *London Illustrated Sunday Herald* of Feb. 8, 1920, "that with the exception of Lenin, 'the majority' of the leading figures in the revolution were Jewish." He makes this rejection in the face of all the evidence for Jewishness that I have ever seen, and he does it, moreover, without bothering to submit a shred of evidence to support his rejection! And it simply is not permissible to dismiss (without any attempt at an answer) such evidence as I have submitted in this book, or am about to submit, that the crew of trained conspirators under Lenin and Trotsky were overwhelmingly Jewish—from 80 to 95 percent Jewish! Even Lenin, as I have shown, was one-quarter Jewish, Jewish by his paternal grandfather. And there is other very authoritative evidence that he was Jewish.

Again, Dr. Sutton tries to make out that Jacob Schiff not only did not support the Bolshevik Revolution, but would have welcomed its overthrow—"because the Bolshevik government does not represent the Russian people." Such an attitude, on the part of Jacob Schiff, is, again, belied by all the evidence that I have seen—much of which I have quoted in foregoing pages. In fact, it flies in the face of one of the State Department documents that Dr. Sutton, with characteristic honesty, himself quotes—on pages 186-7. To be sure he pronounces it only "superficially damning," but on what ground, he gives no clear indication. The "central" document of this collection is entitled "Bolshevism and Judaism," and is dated Nov. 13, 1918. It is in the form of a report, stating that the Revolution was engineered "in February 1916," and that "it was found that the following persons and firms were engaged in this destructive work." Of the names given, that of Jacob Schiff comes first, and after him Kuhn, Loeb & Co; and as the responsible heads of Kuhn, Loeb's management, again first of all, Jacob Schiff; and then Felix Warburg, Otto Kahn, Mortimer Schiff and J. J. Seligman. And every last one of them was a Jew.

Dr. Sutton then continues as follows: "The report goes on to assert that there can be no doubt that the Russian Revolution was started and engineered by this group and that in April 1917 [quoting the document] 'Jacob Schiff in fact made a public announcement and it was due to his financial influence that the Russian revolution was successfully accomplished, and in the spring of 1917 Jacob Schiff started to finance Trotsky, a Jew, for the purpose of accomplishing a social revolution in Russia.'"

The document then gives further information about Max Warburg's financing Trotsky (from Germany), about various German banks and the Nya Banken of Stockholm, which confirms what I have said in previous pages of this chapter; and then it goes on to point out that the connections between these institutions and their financing of the Bolshevik Revolution

reveal how [quoting the document] “the link between the Jewish multi-millionaires and Jewish proletarians was forged.”

Dr. Sutton follows this by quoting cables, etc., which passed between certain Russian bankers and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., to show that Schiff did not back the Bolsheviks (pp. 194-7). But, once again, these so obviously fly in the face of all the other evidence about him that I am forced to wonder whether they may not, like the Sisson Documents, be forgeries, fabricated (before the documents that Dr. Sutton has recently had access to, were declassified) as a red herring drawn across the trail by powerful persons in the State Department, which we have already seen to be Jew-controlled: or else, whether, at the time of the Revolution, these communications were not sent *in order to provide a cover* for what, in fact, Jacob and his confreres *were actually doing*. Without some such explanation, I am simply mystified.

But I still have to reckon with Dr. Sutton’s rejection of the idea of a Jewish conspiracy. In the face of all the evidence, as I have assembled it through some twenty-five years and which to me is so impressive, how could he have come to this rejection?

To begin with, it is certainly true that two men, equally honest, can react differently to the same evidence. Also, if there be a conspiracy initiated and maintained by astute, trained and experienced men, it must go without saying that they will make every effort to hide their tracks, and must in the large be very successful at doing so. So that evidence of the conspiracy is something that we must expect to come upon only now and then, here and there, where it has somehow escaped all the conspirators’ precautions. And thus, taken as a whole, it will not be what Dr. Sutton calls “hard” evidence—that is, as it were, confessions signed, but rather an assembly of indications. Nevertheless, these indications may all point in one direction, and may, moreover, offer a better explanation, a more comprehensive and plausible accounting, than any other yet proposed, for what, plainly and undeniably, has been going on relentlessly for the past two centuries to smash the Western world of the White man, to control it, to poison it, to demoralize it, and at last utterly to disintegrate it. The first heavy blow fell on France, then Russia was the next to go, and after her Germany, followed by all eastern Europe and the dissolution of the British Empire (within twenty years!); and now the United States is being dissolved as a sovereign state.

Finally, and above all, I think that the most likely explanation of Dr. Sutton’s rejection of the idea of a Jewish conspiracy, whereas I am so convinced of it, is simply that he never has faced the whole body of available evidence. He has not had it set before him, or had occasion to search for it. After all, he is a specialist. And within his chosen field we must recognize that he has done work of exceptional quality and very great importance. But no man can read everything, least of all a specialist. Dr. Sutton’s reaction, therefore, is different from mine primarily because his judgment has been based on only a small part of the relevant evidence. That is, I have to assume that he has not explored all that the history of the past two centuries has to say about Jewish aims and activities, as revealed not only in full-fledged histories but also in biographies, memoirs, state papers, Jewish periodicals, studies of the Jewish character, and also in the writings of avowed anti-Semites, which (as we have seen) even so pro-Jewish and scholarly a writer as Hilaire Belloc found very voluminous, exact, accurate, and generally impressive.

And then, too, we have to reckon with the likelihood that to a man like Dr. Sutton the whole idea of a conspiracy, and especially a Jewish conspiracy, would run as counter to his own personal nature and ingrained prejudices as it did to mine. I remember well that it took me *years* to get to the place where I could take a fair look at the idea.

In short, I think that Dr. Sutton's rejection of a Jewish conspiracy may be quite adequately explained by the simple fact that he has never had the opportunity, or the occasion, to face the whole body of evidence.

Appendix 6

THE ABANDONMENT OF THE CODE OF CIVILIZED WARFARE

For centuries Europeans (including the British) had lived under the code of "civilized warfare," by which non-combatants were excluded from the scope of hostilities. The Lindemann Plan proposed that this code be abandoned. It urged that military targets were too difficult to hit, and that with effort concentrated on the production of airplanes specially designed for the purpose, "50 percent of all the houses in the cities and towns of Germany with over 50,000 inhabitants would be destroyed." The Lindemann Plan was adopted, and terror bombing given top priority. The culmination came in 1945, after the war was virtually over, in the attack of several thousand planes on the beautiful and unarmed city of Dresden, overcrowded with hordes of frantic refugees fleeing before the advance of the Russian army. It is estimated that in one night anywhere from 135,000 to 250,000 people, mostly women and children, died. "It was the greatest single massacre in all European history."

This decision of the British War Cabinet and the bombing that followed "was kept a closely guarded secret from the British public for nearly twenty years." But eventually, even while being publicly denied, it was officially admitted by Mr. J. M. Spaight, Principal Assistant Secretary of the Air Ministry, and by Air Marshall Sir Arthur Harris, who had been the chief in command. In 1961, the facts, both about the decision and about the bombing, were laid before the world by Sir Charles Snow, a high-placed physicist, in his Godkin Lecture at Harvard in 1960, and published in 1961 with the title of *Science and Government* by the Harvard University Press in the U.S. and by the Oxford University Press in England. And no denials were forthcoming from any quarter whatever, though when it came to the matter of Dresden, Sir Arthur did apparently feel the need to shift some of the responsibility onto the shoulders of others, and replied: "I will only say that the attack on Dresden was at the time considered a military necessity by much more important people than myself." Who the "much more important people" were he refrained from disclosing.

It is important to add that *Mr. Spaight of the Air Ministry, declared that Hitler had been genuinely anxious to reach an agreement with Britain "confining the action of aircraft to the battle zones," that Hitler undertook the bombing of the British civilian population reluctantly and not until more than three months after the Royal Air Force had commenced the bombing of the German civilian population. And he expressed the opinion that, after it had started, Hitler would at any time have been willing to stop the slaughter. "Hitler assuredly did not want the mutual bombing to go on."*

Who were the men responsible for this ghastly crime against humanity? Sir Arthur Spaight refrained from naming them, but it is high time the question be pressed. Preeminently they must have been Churchill and Lindemann—above all, it would seem, Lindemann, since it was in his mind that the Plan had its origin, and since Snow reveals that he had a great hold on Churchill, was his very close and inseparable friend; and also that he “was making all the major scientific decisions on the English side of the war,” and had “power greater than that exercised by any scientist in history.”

This, of course, makes it important to know whether or not Lindemann was a Jew. The English people at once assumed that he was. So much so, apparently, that Lord Birkenhead hastily threw together a biography of Lindemann to prove that he was not. But Snow admits that he may have been Jewish, and casually slips in quite an array of facts that make it difficult to draw any other conclusion. He was positively “not even English by birth,” was a “Central European,” came from Berlin but spoke German only as well as he did English (perhaps much as Kissinger does now), and though he was rich and like many another of the Rothschild species got himself elevated to the rank of a Peer of the Realm, displayed an attitude toward money quite alien to that of the real English aristocracy. It is to be noted, too, that he deserted Germany for England in 1933, the very year that Hitler came to power, and the year also that world Jewry declared war on Hitler and launched both a world-wide economic boycott and a world-wide holy crusade to bring him down. Before leaving, he rounded up some half-dozen of the best Jewish scientists in Germany and took them with him to England, where, in a revitalized Clarendon Laboratory, their genius could work most effectively for the destruction of the most dangerous enemy that Jewry had known in a thousand years. Certainly, I have never known of anyone with the name Lindemann who was not Jewish. And quiet reflection on the meaning of the information supplied by Sir Charles Snow has left me feeling pretty certain that Lindemann was not only a Jew, but an exceptionally vengeful and ferocious one. (See Snow—*Science and Government*, pp. 10-14, 21-2, 64; and *Appendix to Science and Government*, 1962, pp. 15, 33.)

Appendix 7

THE LIE OF THE SIX MILLION

The full body of facts, of course, cannot be submitted here, but I must bluntly declare my conviction that the accumulating body of the most comprehensive, up-to-date and objective evidence now makes it positively unanswerable that the charge against the Nazis of concentration camp horrors, gas chambers, six million Jews exterminated, and all the rest of it, was from the start nothing more than preposterous, shameless, and contemptible defamation and blackmail against the great German people. Let anyone inclined to sneer at this conclusion first face the evidence in the books listed below, especially the one by the Englishman Richard Harwood, and, above all, that of Prof. Arthur Butz of our own Northwestern University, before he ever again allows this vicious charge to pass his lips.

1. App, A.J., Ph.D.—*The Six Million Swindle*, Boniface Press, 1973, 8207 Flower Ave., Takoma Park, Maryland 20012. Dr. App, now retired, was a professor in Catholic University, Washington, D.C. Contains impressive, validated evidence, but it is not so objective as the

testimony of Christophersen (see below), or so well organized and massive as the overwhelming case presented by Richard Harwood (also see below).

2. Christophersen, Thies—*Auschwitz, Truth Or Lie? An eye-witness account*. 13 pictures. Published in Germany in 1973. Translated and now available from Liberty Bell Publications, Reedy, WV 25270. The author, not as an internee but as a scientist, was sent to Auschwitz to do research in the production of synthetic rubber for making tires. Auschwitz was the largest and most important of the industrial concentration camps. In these, the Government put prisoners to work producing all kinds of material for the war effort. The author spent the whole of 1944 in Auschwitz. He had the free run of the camp, and visited all the separate camps of which the Auschwitz complex was composed, including Birkenau. His wife was allowed to visit him, and he remarked: "This fact, that we were able to have our relatives visit us at any time, should prove that the camp administrators had nothing to hide. Had Auschwitz been the death factory it is reputed to have been, such visits would certainly not have been permitted." And he declared conclusively: "During the whole of my time at Auschwitz, I never observed the slightest evidence of mass gassings."

3. Rassinier, Paul—*The Drama of the European Jew*, 1964, translated from the French, available from Liberty Bell Pubs., Reedy, WV, 25270. This is the only one of four of Rassinier's most important works analyzing alleged Nazi atrocities that has been put into English. It is well reviewed by Harwood in his *Did Six Million Really Die?* (see below), pp. 26-8. He says: "Without doubt, the most important contribution to a truthful study of the extermination question has been the work of the French historian, Professor Paul Rassinier. The pre-eminent value of this work lies first in the fact that Rassinier actually experienced life in the German concentration camps, and also that, as a Socialist and anti-Nazi, nobody could be less inclined to defend Hitler and National Socialism. Yet, for the sake of justice and historical truth, Rassinier spent the remainder of his post-war years [from 1948 to 1966] pursuing research which utterly refuted the Myth of the Six Million and the legend of Nazi diabolism." "Himself an inmate of Buchenwald, Rassinier proved that no such things [as gas chambers] ever existed there." Moreover, "he investigated all the stories of extermination literature and attempted to trace their authors . . . and found that none of these authors [whom he specified by name] could produce an authentic eye-witness of a gas chamber at Auschwitz, nor had they themselves actually seen one." Harwood adds: "Certainly the most important fact to emerge from Rassinier's studies, and of which there is now no doubt at all, is the utter imposture of 'gas chambers.' Serious investigations carried out in the sites themselves have revealed with irrefutable proof that, contrary to the declarations of the surviving 'witnesses' examined above, no gas chambers whatever existed in the German camps, at Buchenwald, Bergen-Belsen, Ravensbrueck, Dachau and Dora or Mauthausen in Austria." This conclusion is supported by the testimony of Stephen F. Pinter, a lawyer for the U.S. War Department who served for six years after the war in the occupation forces in Germany and Austria. In the Catholic magazine *Our Sunday Visitor*, June 14, 1959, he testified as follows:

"I was in Dachau for 17 months after the war . . . and can state that there was no gas chamber at Dachau. . . Nor was there a gas chamber in any of the other concentration camps in Germany." [And, this verdict "has now been recognized and admitted officially by the Institute of Contemporary History at Munich."] Pinter went on to say: "We were told that

there was a gas chamber at Auschwitz, but since that was in the Russian zone of occupation, we were not permitted to investigate since the Russians would not allow it. . . I interviewed thousands of Jews, former inmates of concentration camps in Germany and Austria, and consider myself as well qualified as any man on this subject.”

As far as the charge of gas chambers at Auschwitz may be concerned, we have the testimony of Christophersen given above, that this was absolutely false.

And finally, Harwood goes on to say: “Prof. Rassinier is emphatic in stating that the German Government never had any policy [for the solution of the Jewish problem] other than the emigration of Jews overseas.” (Harwood, op. cit., 26-7.)

4. Harwood, Richard E.—*Did Six Million Really Die?* Historical Review Press, 1975, Richmond, Surrey, England. 12 illustrations. Available from Examiner Books, P.O. Box 783, New York City, 10022 and from Liberty Bell Pubs., Reedy, WV 25270. It was written before Professor Arthur Butz’ book was published. Of all the available books that examine the Six Million charge, this is the most compendious, up-to-date and easily read. And it is by an Englishman, a specialist devoted to the investigation of political and diplomatic aspects of the Second World War, and associated with London University. And his book completely demolishes, item by item, the claim that the Nazi Government put six million Jews to death.

(a) To begin with, the six million figure, on the basis of statistics supplied by the *World Almanac*, the *New York Times*, and the Jews own published computations, it is absolutely impossible to maintain. By careful compilation and analysis of the most reliable statistics, and checking them one against another, Harwood comes to the conclusion that “the number of Jews in Nazi-occupied Europe after emigration [which totaled some 3.5 million] was scarcely more than 3 million, by no means all of whom were interned.” Even the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee “officially” estimated that over 1.5 million Jews lived in Nazi-occupied territory right through the war. This means that “the number of possible wartime Jewish deaths could not have exceeded a limit of one and a half million” (pp. 5-6). It is surely significant that by 1961, at the Eichmann trial, “the Jerusalem Court studiously avoided mentioning the figure of Six Million, and the charge drawn up by [the prosecution] simply said ‘some’ millions” (p. 9).

That six million is a gross exaggeration is further established if, instead of concentrating on the figures for the Jewish population in Europe before and after the war, we compare the figures for the Jewish world population before and after. I quote Harwood: “The *World Almanac* of 1938 gives the number of Jews in the world as 16,588,259. But after the war, the *New York Times*, February 22nd, 1948, placed the number of Jews in the world at a minimum of 15,600,000 and a maximum of 18,700,000. Quite obviously these figures make it impossible for the number of Jewish war-time casualties to be measured in anything but thousands. [Emphasis added.] 15 1/2 million in 1938 minus the alleged six million leaves nine million. The *New York Times* figures would mean, therefore, that the world’s Jews produced seven million births, almost doubling their numbers, in the space of ten years. This is patently ridiculous” (pp. 6-7).

(b) The concentration camps were not set up for exterminating anybody. Since they were first used by the British in the Boer War they had been accepted as the only means by which a nation could protect itself against subversive activities of masses of enemy aliens in wartime. World Jewry had declared war on Hitler as early as 1933 at their Economic Boycott Conference in Holland; and Chaim Weizmann, the principal Zionist leader, had reinforced this in September 1939 by pledging to "fight on the side of the democracies," and by offering to make immediate arrangements for throwing Jewish manpower and other resources into the struggle. (*Jewish Chronicle*, 9/8/39.) Yet Germany did not begin putting Jews into concentration camps until after the United States and Canada had thus confined their Japanese aliens, which they did even though the Japanese had made no such declaration of disloyalty as that made by the Jews against Germany. The *Report of the International Committee of the Red Cross on Its Activities during the Second World War*, Geneva, 1948, as always faithful to its well-known tradition of strict political neutrality, clarified "the legitimate circumstances under which Jews were detained in concentration camps, i.e., as enemy aliens." They "were arrested for political or racial motives because their presence was considered a danger to the State or the occupation forces." (*Report*, Vol. III, p. 73.) The *Report* affirms that the German camps were well disciplined and well administered. Until the utter collapse of the last few months of the war, the inmates, though kept at work in support of the war effort, were well fed and clothed, and provided with medical care, and with hospital care if needed. Moreover, all internees, unlike those in Soviet camps, could receive gifts from outside. The Red Cross testified that "from the autumn of 1943 until May 1945, 1,112,000 parcels with a total weight of 4,500 tons were sent off to the concentration camps." (Vol. III, p. 80.) These contained food, clothing, and pharmaceutical supplies. "Parcels were sent to Dachau, Buchenwald, Sangerhausen, Sachenhausen, [many others], Mauthausen, Theresienstadt, Auschwitz, Bergen-Belsen," etc. Jews were specifically mentioned as recipients. "The Committee was in a position to transfer and distribute in the form of relief supplies over twenty million Swiss francs collected by Jewish welfare organizations throughout the world, in particular by the American Joint Distribution Committee of New York." (Vol. I, p. 644).

(c) The Nazis never had any policy of Jewish extermination. Harwood says: "It should be emphasized straightaway that there is not a single document in existence which proves that the Germans intended, or carried out, the deliberate murder of Jews." Though thousands of documents were captured, from all levels of the Nazi hierarchy, there is not one that makes any mention of extermination. This, in fact, "has been admitted by the World Centre of Contemporary Jewish Documentation at Tel-Aviv." (Harwood, pp. 8-9.) All the evidence proves that from the beginning of Hitler's rule, in 1933, and maintained to the end, the Nazi policy was based on the conviction that Germany belonged to the Germans, and that the Jews, who as a whole had proved themselves adamantly alien, corrupting in their spiritual and cultural influence, and doubtful in their loyalty to the German State, should be denied German citizenship, deprived of their influential positions within the nation, and as soon and as largely as possible removed from German soil. To the end Jewish emigration remained the Nazis' "final solution" of the Jewish problem. Moreover, "by 1939, the consistent efforts of the German Government to secure the departure of the Jews from the Reich had resulted in the emigration of 400,000 Jews from a total population of about 600,000 [that is all there were in Germany proper], and an additional 480,000 emigrants from Austria and Czechoslovakia, which constituted almost their entire Jewish populations. Had

Hitler cherished any intention of exterminating the Jews, it is inconceivable that he would have allowed more than 800,000 to leave Reich territory with the bulk of their wealth, much less considered plans [as he manifestly did] for their mass emigration to Palestine or Madagascar." "Even as late as May 1944 [at the beginning of the last twelve months of the war], the Germans were prepared to allow the emigration of one million European Jews from Europe." This, of course, would have included Jews from countries occupied by Germany—notably, Polish Jews. And again, this was something totally incompatible with the charge that the Nazi aim was Jewish extermination (pp. 4-5).

(d) How then did it ever come about that such charges were almost universally accepted as valid?

Doubtless, it was largely due to the impact made on world opinion by the so-called Nuremburg "Trial." Care was taken to make the unthinking public assume that its proceedings were in accord with honored Western jurisprudence, but, the grim reality was perhaps first revealed by Mr. F.J.P. Veale in his *Advance To Barbarism*. (Published 1948; revised edition 1968. Cp. de Poncins—*State Secrets, Britons*, 1975, Chap. 4.) The Nuremburg "Trial" trampled all legal precedents under foot from start to finish. Its spirit was murderous. The testimony desired against the defendants was often extorted by promises of favor, or by threats, or by actual physical torture (Harwood, pp. 10-11). The crimes of the Allies, often worse than those charged against the Nazis, were barred from mention. As a "trial" it was a criminal farce. The defendants were doomed before it began. It has justly been dubbed "victors' vengeance." It set a fearful precedent for the treatment to be meted out to the leaders of the vanquished in future wars (Ibid., p. 9, Sec. 5).

It is a matter of record that the idea of setting up a court of justice for punishing Nazi war criminals was first proposed by Dr. Nahum Goldmann, President of the World Jewish Congress, at its Pan-American Conference in Baltimore in 1941—that is, before the war had run even half its course. The idea was then studied and perfected before being imposed on the American Government and the associated Powers. (See Goldmann—*Memories*, pp. 216-7; de Poncins—*State Secrets, Britons*, 1975, p. 50ff.) It was thus the Jews' hysterical hatred that hovered over every session of the Court and ensured that their intended victims did not escape.

But the uncovering of such facts, of course, was kept from the knowledge of the gentile public by the Jewish control of all the important means by which the minds of our people, from age 60 down to age 5, are reached and shaped.

And this sea of ignorance served well to float publishing ventures of many kinds and in large quantity. Book after book, most of them Jewish authors, laden with horror upon horror, alleged to have been witnessed and blending fragments of truth with the most grotesque fantasies and lies, were launched upon the world. They have been well run down and proved, by such men as Rassinier and Harwood, to be foul and contemptible frauds. Conspicuous among these is the so-called "Diary" of Anne Frank, which, in 1959, seven years after its initial publication, was proved by a decision of the New York State Supreme Court to have been a hoax (op. cit., p. 18). But about all this there has been little or nothing from our newspapers, radio and TV—but silence. And in consequence, it is probably safe to say that

not one of our people out of a thousand has any doubt but that Hitler and the Nazis were hideous monsters, sub-human beasts, and the German people, too, who so largely followed and supported them, little better.

(e) But whatever could have induced the Jews to stoop to methods that to us seem so contemptible? Well, obviously, the stakes were enormous.

In sizing up the Jewish conduct here, we must never for a moment allow ourselves to forget that their dominant, relentless, and absolutely undeviating aim is to make themselves the undisputed masters of all humanity. Also, we know, from our examination of the *Talmud*, that in their dealings with gentiles they are prepared to be completely unrestrained by any moral scruples whatever. Freedom to deceive and lie to gentiles is expressly allowed them.

And so, if, with clear conscience, they could let loose upon the world the holocausts of the two world wars in order to advance themselves toward world dominion, as there is reason to believe they did, it would obviously be for them a small matter to keep the ball of destruction rolling by putting forth the tall tale of the Six Million. I doubt if there was a Jew in all the world who did not instantly realize it was a lie: Jews understand one another. But our Simple Simon White folk swallowed it hook, sinker and line, without once so much as catching a glimpse of the grinning Jew on the other end of the fishing rod. It seems that for our people a report or statement has but to come out in a newspaper or on radio or television, and it is at once accepted as gospel truth. But to one another the Jews whisper, "What easy marks they are!" And how enormously to their advantage their hoax has proved itself to be! Let us therefore examine closely what their gains from it have added up to.

(1) Having saturated the consciousness of the world with the belief that the Nazis did actually butcher some six million Jews, they were able to extort about 43 billion dollars out of the German people, mostly for their bandit State of Israel. At bottom, it was a raw case of blackmail.

(2) By thus conditioning the consciousness of mankind to accept their charge that the Nazis had been guilty of a "crime against humanity" beside which even that of Genghis Khan with his pyramids of the skulls of his beheaded enemies, seems to pale into insignificance, they made Germany the pariah, the outcast leper, among the nations of the Earth, and thus drove a wedge between our peoples. It is certain, as came out plainly enough at the Yalta and Teheran Conferences and in statements by outstanding Jewish spokesmen, that the Jews have long been fully aware that if they are ever to achieve their dominion of the Earth, the nations of the White man, and above all Germany, have got to be destroyed. Their strategy therefore has been *divide et impera*—to conquer by dividing, by setting one part of the whole against another. And by fouling the honor and good name of the German people they have engendered in the rest of our people condemnation, repugnance and antagonism, and consequent mistrust, against precisely that one of our nations which was perhaps best qualified to lead us in the coming struggle. Might not the Jews have thus ensured that we White men of the world will be unable to achieve that united front upon which in the near future our very survival may depend?

(3) Further, since the atrocities were alleged to have been committed at a time when the Government of Germany was nationalist, nationalism everywhere has been stigmatized and discredited. Though a nationalist totalitarian government under which all the energies and resources of a people can be coordinated and directed with a view to their survival, may, as an emergency measure, be their only hope of surviving an hour of direst peril, our people have become so prejudiced against it that they will fail to resort to what alone can save them.

(4) The lurid tales of Jewish sufferings called forth a flood of maudlin sympathy in pudding-headed gentiles—especially in Christian gentiles. In consequence probably most American citizens would now endorse those four-fifths of our Senators who are reliably reported as being committed in advance to giving the State of Israel almost anything it asks for, and would approve our continuing to make Israel an annual outright gift of billions of dollars and our placing at its disposal our most advanced military equipment even before it reaches our own forces in Europe—all to enable Israel not only to keep the lands it wrested from the Arabs by one of the foulest acts of aggression known to history, but to extend them by yet further aggression.

(5) The Jews have attributed the alleged Nazi murder of the six million to what they call the Germans' "racism." And by "racism" they mean a recognition of race as a reality, which they declare unfounded, and an emphasis on its importance, which they pronounce a menace to the peace and well-being of mankind. At the present time, perhaps there is no word in the English language so charged with repugnance and condemnation as is "racist," and anyone who makes or proposes to make any discrimination between one man and another on the basis of race is liable to be treated as if he were a felon. It at once becomes apparent, if one looks closely beneath the surface of the situation, that this attitude toward race is the result of an organized, coordinated and heavily financed drive, simultaneously concentrated on White men wherever they exist, to expunge all racial motivations from their consciousness. And at the bottom of it all is the Jew.

And yet, as already laid bare in earlier pages of this book, the Jews themselves have been more fanatically race-conscious and more fiercely determined to keep themselves a people apart from all others, than any other people known to history. It is universally recognized, not only by all students of the Jewish record, in all lands, but by the Jews' own foremost leaders and spokesmen, that it has been only by their insistence on their race, by their refusal to mix their genes with those of gentiles, that they have been able to survive through thirty centuries. And it just won't go down, for all their present furor over the charge in the U.N. that Zionism is racism, for them, at this date, to try to make out that "Zionism is only a religion." Zionism may indeed have its roots in the religious faith that has inspired nearly all Jews since the day when their tribal god Yahweh is believed to have made his famous contract with the Hebrew followers of Moses, but in its ultimate aim it is political, and the realization of the aim is made to depend on the fulfillment of conditions that are racial and nationalist in the extreme. As we have already seen, their religion, which is the driving force behind Zionism, teaches them that they alone are human beings, or, as Samuel Untermyer put it in 1933, a little more modestly, that they "are the aristocrats of the world." In either case, the Earth was made for them to rule, and gentiles to be their servants and slaves, their milk cows. One can quote any number of Zionists of the highest status and authority, to the effect that Jews are aliens, and are forever determined to remain aliens, amidst the people of

any gentile nation that may take them in. No matter their oaths of allegiance to the country of their adoption, their first loyalty is to Israel. Jews who profess to share the patriotism of their gentile hosts "are simply living lies." Any Jew who fails to give his first loyalty to the State of Israel "is a traitor to the Jewish people." It should be observed, too, that Norman Podhoretz, editor of the very influential Jewish paper *Commentary*, recently remarked: "It has become clearer and clearer that something has happened to the Jews of America: they have all been converted to Zionism." That is, they are now giving their first allegiance to Israel. This inevitably means that if we Americans accept a Jew as our Secretary of State, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, editor of the very powerful *New York Times*, or owner and controller of an even more powerful TV network, we should expect him to put the advancement of the State of Israel above his concern for the well-being of the United States of America. It was long experience of just such perfidy on the part of the Jews that largely determined the German Nazis to cancel all Jewish citizenships and to adopt a policy aimed at removing all Jews from German soil.

Fierce for racial consciousness in himself, fierce against it in us! What can be the explanation? Is it not at once obvious—if one but stop to think?

Race consciousness, and discrimination on the basis of race, are absolutely essential to any race's survival, and to any nation's survival—essential for the homogeneity, the solidarity, and the formidable strength without which no people can long survive. That is why the Jews are so fiercely for it for themselves, because they mean not only to survive but to become master; and fiercely against it for us, because we are their intended victim, and they wish to emasculate us and to paralyze us to the point where we cannot thwart their determination to put us in chains. Unless we recover our race consciousness, and maintain it, and heighten it, and live by it, we shall die.

Verily, an enormously profitable hoax was this lie of the six million. Mr. Harwood declared it "the most profitable atrocity allegation of all time." And Dr. Max Nussbaum, former chief rabbi of the Jewish community in Berlin, proclaimed triumphantly, in April 1, 1953, that "the position the Jewish people occupy today in the world . . . is ten times stronger than what it was twenty years ago"—when Hitler came to power, and when the Jews first declared war on him and launched their "world-wide crusade" to bring him down. Perhaps now, after the lapse of another twenty-odd years, it would have to be admitted that the Jews are the strongest power in the world and for us the most dangerous. For the point of their whole engine of demolition is now leveled against the base of our citadel. Ludovici revealed the eye of prophetic genius when, as long ago as 1949, he said to me: "Nothing but a miracle can now save our civilization from complete destruction."

Since the above was set up in type another book on "the six million" has come to my attention. As yet I have not had time to get a copy of it from England (no one in the U.S. dared to publish it), but from the extremely high praise it has called forth from very discriminating and honest reviewers, I judge that it will establish itself as the absolutely unanswerable exposure of the Jews' charge as an infamous and shameless lie, and leave them without a leg to stand on. The only question then will be whether, in the face of their tight control of the mass media, the truth can be made known to the world.

5. Butz, Arthur—*The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, Historical Review Press, 23 Ellerker Gardens, Richmond, Surrey, England, but obtainable much more quickly from Liberty Bell Publications, Reedy, WV 25270. Mr. S.E.D. Brown, editor of the *South African Observer*, in reviewing the book (Sept., 1976), declared that Prof. Butz “demolishes the greatest propaganda legend of our times—the legend that the Germans attempted to ‘exterminate’ the Jews during World War Two. Combining the historian’s mastery of documents with the technical knowledge of a scientist, Prof. Butz’ book is the product of a massive research effort lasting three years. . . In all essentials, his book . . . is the last word on the subject. . . in the breadth of its scope and the depth its research it will remain the most complete statement of its kind yet written.”

The book is also reviewed, brilliantly and at greater length, in Mr. Wilmot Robertson’s *Instauration* for October, 1976 (page 9). I limit myself to quoting a few lines.

“If there ever was a time in human history when falsehood was about ready to put truth permanently out of business, it was the last three decades—from the cocoon stages of the Six Million Myth in early World War II through the avalanche of death camp propaganda in the late 40’s to the present era of total acceptance. How can a lie be nailed down when the whole world believes in it, when 99.99 per cent of the world’s magazines, newspapers, textbooks, educators, scholars and historians pay total obeisance to it? . . .

“It is a strange sort of truth that must be upheld in lawsuits, jail terms, threatening headlines and social ostracism . . .

“All the more reason that *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, a model of scholarship, research and erudition, deserves the fair and open hearing that the liberal-minority coalition is determined it shall not have. One of the greatest works of counterpropaganda ever written, it dearly demonstrates that the West’s will for truth, though moribund, is not dead. It takes courage to wrestle with a taboo that no respectable historian and no respectable publisher would dare to touch. It takes immense courage for the author to write such a book under his own name. As a professor at Northwestern University, Dr. Butz has opened himself and his career to attack from some of the world’s most rabid and most vengeful organizations.”