SOCIAL ETHICS: Sociology and the Future of Society

Charlotte Perkins Gilman

PRAEGER

Social Ethics

SOCIAL ETHICS

Sociology and the Future of Society

Charlotte Perkins Gilman

Edited with an Introduction by Michael R. Hill and
Mary Jo Deegan

PRAEGER

Westport, Connecticut
London

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gilman, Charlotte Perkins, 1860–1935.
Social ethics : sociology and the future of society / by Charlotte Perkins Gilman ; edited, with an introduction by Michael R. Hill and Mary Jo Deegan.
p. cm.
Originally published in serial form in Gilman's monthly journal, The forerunner, in 1914. Cf. Introd.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0–275–97886–9 (alk. paper)
1. Social ethics. 2. Sociology—Philosophy. I. Hill, Michael R. II. Deegan, Mary Jo, 1946– III. Title.
HM665.G55 2004
303.3′72—dc21 2003053021

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data is available.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 2003053021
ISBN: 0–275–97886–9

First published in 2004

Praeger Publishers, 88 Post Road West, Westport, CT 06881
An imprint of Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
www.praeger.com

Printed in the United States of America

The paper used in this book complies with the Permanent Paper Standard issued by the National Information Standards Organization (Z39.48–1984).

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

This edition is dedicated to
Patricia Madoo Lengermann and
Jill Niebrugge-Brantley,
Scholars, Feminists, and Co-Organizers
of the Section on the History of Sociology
in the American Sociological Association,
and to the memory of
George Elliott Howard
(1849–1928),
Nebraska sociologist and president of the
American Sociological Society,
in whose personal copies of *The Forerunner*
we found the text of *Social Ethics.*

CONTENTS

Introduction: Charlotte Perkins Gilman's Sociological Perspective on Ethics and Society ix
Michael R. Hill and Mary Jo Deegan

Social Ethics: Sociology and the Future of Society

1. The Nature of Ethics 1
2. Some Bases of Ethical Valuation 11
3. The Influence of Religion Upon Ethics 21
4. As to "The Origin of Evil" 33
5. Sin 45
6. Virtues and Principles 55
7. The Position of Women as Influencing Ethics 67
8. The Training of the Child 77
9. On Certain Interactions 87
10. Instances 99
11. Conduct and Progress 111
12. New Standards and New Hopes 121

Notes 131

Index 145

About the Author and Editors 167

INTRODUCTION: CHARLOTTE PERKINS GILMAN'S SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE ON ETHICS AND SOCIETY

Michael R. Hill and Mary Jo Deegan

> Then, being nothing if not practical, they set their keen and active minds to discover the kind of conduct expected of them. This worked out in a most admirable system of ethics.
>
> —Charlotte Perkins Gilman, *Herland*

Social Ethics: Sociology and the Future of Society provides a complex yet accessible statement of Charlotte Perkins Gilman's mature sociological theory of ethical life. Her perspective is welded intellectually to sociology and evolutionary thought and concretely to the well-being of children throughout the world. We have failed, writes Gilman in *Social Ethics,* to teach even "a simple, child-convincing ethics based on social interactions, *because we have not understood sociology*" (emphasis added). For Gilman, a world in which children are not loved, well fed, properly clothed, thoughtfully educated, and humanely disciplined is a world ethically at odds with logic and itself. From this fundamental premise, all else follows. Thus: war, barbarism, waste, religious bigotry, conspicuous consumption, greed, environmental degradation, preventable diseases, and patriarchal oppression in all its manifestations—all these for Gilman are highly unethical *and must not be allowed to stand* if society is to be a good place for children. If, as readers of *Social Ethics,* we sense that we are being firmly lectured as well as cajoled by Gilman's penetrating wit and obvious intellect—that is because we are. Gilman pulls no punches, she really intends us to change our ways, and to use

sociological insights to improve our future society. *Social Ethics* first appeared in 1914 in serial form in Gilman's extraordinary pedagogical experiment in adult education, a self-published monthly sociological journal, issued from 1909 to 1916, written *entirely* by Gilman and called, aptly enough, *The Forerunner.*

The publication of *Social Ethics,* now for the first time in book form, completes the republication of four of Charlotte Perkins Gilman's major sociological works originally serialized in the final volumes of *The Forerunner* during 1914, 1915, and 1916. Taken as a whole, Gilman's *Social Ethics, Herland, With Her in Ourland,* and *The Dress of Women* provide an integrated and multi-disciplinary approach to the central sociological issues facing not only Gilman's era, but also our increasingly hypermodern era at the dawn of the twenty-first century. Each of these works—whether fiction or non-fiction, fundamental overview or special study, hypothetical thought experiment or searing real world critique—informs, interprets, and reinforces the others.

Of the major works in this sociological quartet, *Herland* is undoubtedly the best known and most widely read, and when first published in book form in 1979, with an introduction by Ann J. Lane, was trumpeted as a "lost feminist classic" (see, for a more carefully edited recent edition, Gilman 1999). *Herland* is a fictional fantasy in which three male explorers discover a secluded and idyllic world inhabited and governed only by women, and this latter feature has understandably delighted successive waves of scholars and students in women's studies and American literature courses. Yet *Herland,* despite its literary attributes, is fundamentally a work of sociology. It is not a utopia, but rather a lucid and persuasive thought experiment of the highest order in which Gilman plays systematically with alternate institutional arrangements and interpersonal relationships emerging from women's values and worldview.

Herland is a step on the way *to* a future utopia where men and women create the ideal society. The ending of *With Her in Ourland* points to the possibility of such a utopia, but Gilman does not write the story of that utopia. When *Herland* is evaluated as a utopia, and this is a large literature (*e.g.,* Kessler 1995; Knight 1997, 1999; Lane 1979), it is the scholar who depicts Herland as a utopia, not Gilman. Gilman wrote *With Her in Ourland* in order to add a necessary step toward the possible imaginary land where men and women are both full human beings and children are central to the social structure. For a thorough analysis of Herland in cultural terms, see Deegan (1997), and, more briefly, as a sociological thought experiment, see M.R. Hill (1996).

Of the three men introduced into Herland, it is Vandyke Jennings, a

sociologist, who—although flawed—is nonetheless the most sympathetically portrayed and is ultimately the most amenable to the unfolding sociological rationale of Gilman's hypothetical Herland. Van narrates the story and, importantly, comprehends what the Herland women have accomplished (Gilman 1999: 102–3):

> Their religion, you see, was maternal; and their ethics, based on the full perception of evolution, showed the principle of growth and the beauty of wise culture. They had no theory of the essential opposition of good and evil; life to them was growth; their pleasure was in growing, and their duty also.
>
> With this background, with their sublimated mother-love, expressed in terms of widest social activity, every phase of their work was modified by its effect on the national growth. The language itself they had deliberately clarified, simplified, made easy and beautiful, for the sake of the children.
>
> This seemed to us a wholly incredible thing: first, that any nation should have the foresight, the strength, and the persistence to plan and fulfill such a task; and second, that women should have had so much initiative. We have assumed, as a matter of course, that women had none; that only the man, with his natural energy and impatience of restriction, would ever invent anything.
>
> Here we found that the pressure of life upon the environment develops in the human mind its inventive reactions, regardless of sex; and further, that a fully awakened motherhood plans and works without limit, for the good of the child.

And as to ethics, *per se,* Van reported (Gilman 1999: 114):

> They developed their central theory of a Loving Power, and assumed that its relation to them was motherly—that it desired their welfare and especially their development. Their relation to it, similarly, was filial, a loving appreciation and a glad fulfillment of its high purposes. Then, being nothing if not practical, they set their keen and active minds to discover the kind of conduct expected of them. This worked out in a most admirable system of ethics. The principle of Love was universally recognized—and used.
>
> Patience, gentleness, courtesy, all that we call "good breeding," was part of their code of conduct. But where they went far beyond us was in the special application of religious feeling to every field of life. They had no ritual, no little set of performances called "divine service," save those religious pageants I have spoken of, and those were as much educational as religious, and as much social as either. But they had a clear established connection between everything they did—and God. Their cleanliness, their health, their exquisite order, the rich peaceful beauty of the whole land,

> the happiness of the children, and above all the constant progress they made—all this was their religion.

Herland, however, is not an ideal society. It is incomplete despite the obvious appeal and virtues of a peaceful, humane, well-ordered existence.

Thus, Gilman marries off Ellador (a young Herland forester) to Van and prepares her to embark on a reconnaissance tour of the outer world—the real world—to discover what can be learned for the eventual benefit of Herland. Ellador, in *With Her in Ourland: Sequel to Herland,* eventually opines to Van (Gilman 1997: 64):

> "It must be nobler to have Two," she would say, her eyes shining. "We are only half a people. Of course we love each other [in Herland], and have advanced our own little country, but it is such a little one—and you have The World!"

As Ellador prepares to leave Herland for her study of Ourland, Van notes: "there was a great to-do all over the country about Ellador's leaving them. She had interviews with some of the leading ethicists—wise women with still eyes, and with the best of the teachers." A thorough re-grounding in ethics was thought necessary for anyone who ventured for the first time from the sheltered realm of Herland into the unknown terrors of the real-world.

In *With Her in Ourland: Sequel to Herland,* the second major work of the sociological quartet to be re-published recently in book form, in 1997, Ellador and Van circumnavigate the globe. The roles in Herland are reversed: Van becomes the guide and Ellador the observer. And, whereas *Herland* was an exercise in sociologically-informed imaginative fiction, *With Her in Ourland* is a fictionalized treatise that centrally engages the concrete and horrendous realities of world war, famine, bigotry, economic exploitation, and sexual oppression—and is necessarily a more foreboding and unsettling work than *Herland.* The Herland/Ourland saga is a comprehensive sociological excursion that runs from the sublime to the horrendous and finally to the possibility of redemption and hope for a better future based on egalitarian cooperation and understanding between women and men.

The Dress of Women, published for the first time in book form in 2002, is a non-fiction guidebook to a range of gender issues presented in Gilman's Herland/Ourland saga, and Gilman published it in *The Forerunner* during 1916 in concert with the serialization of *Ourland.* In *Dress,* Gil-

man spelled out many of the specific intellectual, philosophical, and sociological insights that she wove into the ethical dilemmas and plot devices featured in the Herland/Ourland saga. Concrete examples, Gilman believed, are useful pedagogical tools—and virtually everyone wears clothing; it is a universal example. Central issues for Gilman are the ethical dimensions of clothing in terms of cost, materials, and sexual oppression. *The Dress of Women* is a methodological *tour de force* demonstrating Gilman's ability to integrate and bring wide-ranging social scientific analyses and perspectives to bear on a single, focused topic: clothing, and it begins with a fundamental, wholly sociological premise: "Cloth is a social tissue" (Gilman 2002: 3). *Dress,* however, leaves Gilman's overall ethical system less than fully explicit, a point remedied here by the publication for the first time in book form of Gilman's full-length sociological treatise on *Social Ethics.*

CHARLOTTE PERKINS GILMAN: SOCIOLOGIST

Gilman was a well-known sociologist in her era whose work was integrated into the early pattern of sociological labor by numerous sociologists. She presented review papers at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Society (Gilman 1907a, b), an organization of which she was a dues-paying member, and published full-length articles in the *American Journal of Sociology* (Gilman 1908, 1909). Gilman also worked closely with four male sociologists: Patrick Geddes, George Elliott Howard, Edward Alsworth Ross, and Lester Frank Ward. Her dense and complicated ties are documented in depth by Deegan (1997). These men were not her only professional allies, however. For example, James Q. Dealey (1909) included three of Gilman's books, *Women and Economics* (1898), *Concerning Children* (1900), and *Human Work* (1904), in his bibliography for his introductory textbook, *Sociology: Its Simpler Teachings and Applications.* Dealey discusses marriage, divorce, children, and women in some detail, as well. He has a short section on "social ethics" (pp. 320–1), indicating once again the importance of this topic in sociology during this era.

Several women in the social sciences also counted among Gilman's allies. Gilman's (1935) autobiography was reviewed sympathetically in the *American Journal of Sociology* by Clara Cahill Park (1936), the feisty feminist wife of the patriarchal Robert E. Park, after Gilman's "altruistic" suicide (see Durkheim 1951 and Martineau 1989, on types of suicide generally). Florence Kelley reported that *Women and Economics* was

read by so many Hull-House sociologists, including Jane Addams, that she could barely get time to read it herself (Deegan 1988: 229). Since Gilman also read Addams' work, it is logical to assume that Gilman had specifically read Addams' (1902) *Democracy and Social Ethics* and found the latter book helpful in formulating the text in hand. Gilman's intellectual ties with Addams are further discussed in other sections below.

As a pedagogue, Gilman pursued the popular lecture circuit and the lay press rather than the classroom or the specialist textbook market. She taught sociology through novels, short stories, and punchy essays. Gilman spoke on college and university campuses, giving guest lectures, and she published several non-fiction, full-length treatises, of which *Women and Economics* is the best known. Her special forte, however, was producing serialized works that were offered on the monthly installment plan. These conceptually integrated works included *Herland, With Her in Ourland, The Dress of Women, Social Ethics,* and others. The use of fiction to teach non-fiction sociological ideas to mass audiences has a major precursor in the didactic novels of Harriet Martineau (Hill 1989a, 1991; Hill and Hoecker-Drysdale 2001) and in the later sociological novels of Mari Sandoz (Hill 1987, 1989b), thus placing Gilman in a tradition of female sociological novelists. Working largely outside the academy, Gilman sought to make sociology relevant and intelligible in the lives of everyday women and men.

Gilman wrote and published *The Forerunner* as an educational, sociological enterprise. The influence of works like *The Dress of Women* and *Social Ethics,* presented over the course of a year in twelve monthly installments, was limited primarily to the regular readers of her magazine. Gilman tried to increase readership of *The Forerunner* by offering reduced price subscriptions to the members of "Gilman Circles" (small, face-to-face groups in which the contents of each monthly issue were to be discussed and debated), but sales were poor and the wider audience that Gilman imagined never materialized, thus relegating *Social Ethics* to virtual obscurity. *Herland,* however, and, more recently, *With Her in Ourland,* two novels originally published in *The Forerunner,* have been republished and received renewed notice. Deegan (1997) argues that *Herland* and *With Her in Ourland* should properly be read as two parts of a whole, since each novel radically informs the other. Similarly, *Social Ethics* is best read in conjunction with the two parts of Gilman's Herland/Ourland chronicle, for it systematically invokes and logically grounds the structural arguments that give rise to the women-only society and culture of *Herland* and the sober critiques in *With Her in Ourland* voiced

by Ellador, Gilman's peripatetic protagonist in both novels. In the same way that *Herland* and *With Her in Ourland* compliment each other, Gilman's fiction (represented here by the Herland/Ourland saga) is complimented by her non-fiction (in this case, *Social Ethics*). A similar case can be easily made as well for Gilman's *Dress of Women.* Now that these four works are again readily available for reading, discussion, and critique, we commend them, as a group, to would-be members of twenty-first century Gilman Circles.

Gilman, in working outside the formal academy, provides an alternative model of modern sociological practice, as did Harriet Martineau, Beatrice Webb, Jane Addams, and many other early women sociologists (Deegan 1988, 1991). Gilman engaged the wider world through writing and lecturing. She pushed, pulled, and cajoled her readers and listeners toward new understandings of the social universe and its possibilities for change and improvement.

During sociology's dark era of patriarchal ascendancy (from 1920 to 1965), Gilman's work was rarely considered by sociologists. The highly influential textbook by Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess (1921), *Introduction to the Science of Sociology,* notably excluded Gilman, as well as feminism, women's rights, equality, and children, from all discussion. These topics, so central to Gilman's thought, became invisible in the writings of male sociologists for decades (Deegan 1991).

GILMAN'S RECOGNITION BY SCHOLARS OUTSIDE SOCIOLOGY

Gilman self-identified primarily as a sociologist. Nonetheless, most of the books about Gilman on the shelves of college and university libraries have been penned by scholars in departments of English and modern languages. In addition to editions of some of Gilman's substantive works, her more personal output, including her autobiography (1935), diaries (1994, 1998), and love letters (1995) have been published, as well as a detailed and useful bibliography (Scharnhorst 1985b) and her first husband's diaries (Stetson 1985). The literary studies and biographies are numerous (*e.g.,* M.A. Hill 1980; Scharnhorst 1985a; Mayering 1989; Lane 1990; Karpinski 1992; Kessler 1995; Knight 1997, 1999; Rudd and Gough 1999; Golden and Zangrando 2000). The critique of Gilman's prolific work has produced a large body of literary criticism that too often omits Gilman's central sociological purpose and persona.

Scholars in disciplines cognate to sociology have championed Gilman but with mixed results. Carl Degler (1966) and William O'Neill (1972),

for example, damn Gilman with convoluted praise while, importantly, having kept Gilman's books alive in the 1960s and 1970s. Lois N. Magner (1978: 70) reported Degler's apparent "compulsion to issue warnings about taking her [Gilman's] claims to scientific background too seriously." Analogously, O'Neill (1972: xviii) condescendingly wrote that "Mrs. Gilman was, in her prime, the cleverest phrasemaker among leading feminists." Despite these limitations, however, O'Neill and Degler significantly contributed to Gilman scholarship by incorporating her in their other writings. Thus, O'Neill (1967) analyzed Gilman's role in changing ideas about divorce, the family, and the home, and Degler (1956) re-introduced Gilman's social thought to a new generation of scholars.

Andrew Sinclair (1966: 272), by contrast, boldly and unambiguously claimed that Gilman was the "Marx and Veblen" of the woman's movement. Among other writers in cognate disciplines, Polly Wynn Allen's (1988) treatise on Gilman's architectural and domestic theories holds particular relevance for the social sciences.

GILMAN'S RECOGNITION BY CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGISTS

Recent, specifically sociological writing on Gilman began with Alice S. Rossi (1973: 566–72) who, in *The Feminist Papers,* underscored Gilman's social critiques. Mary Jo Deegan (1981: 16) noted the influence on Gilman by the first president of the American Sociological Society, Lester F. Ward, and documented Gilman's early participation in the Society (now the American Sociological Association). James L. Terry (1983) argued for including Gilman's work in the sociology curriculum. Deegan (1987) included Gilman in a list of the top twenty-five most important women sociologists and noted Gilman's professional and personal friendship with Jane Addams, a leading Chicago sociologist (Deegan 1988: 229). She also located Gilman's mature professional sociological career within the Golden Era of Women in Sociology (from 1890 to 1920) and her eclipse, after 1920, during the subsequent Dark Era of Patriarchal Ascendancy in which many women sociologists in the United States were reduced to near oblivion, at least within disciplinary sociology (Deegan 1991: 15–21).

Since the 1990s, Gilman has received close attention by a larger number of sociologists, changing the canon of the discipline. Susan Gotsch-Thompson (1990) made one of the early calls for more integration of Gilman into classical theory. Bruce Keith (1991) succinctly surveyed

Gilman's sociological contributions. Shulamit Reinharz (1992) enacted this suggestion with an integration of Gilman's theory and methods with the work of both her contemporaries and present day feminist methods. Lynn McDonald's (1993, 1994, 1998) outstanding and extensive work in the history of sociology repeatedly includes Gilman's thought and writings. Charles Lemert (1997: 15–17) turned a sociological eye toward Gilman's early classic, *The Yellow Wall-Paper.* Barbara Finlay (1999) analyzed the feminist foundations of Lester Ward's theories of society and mentioned his strong influence on Gilman. Pat Lengermann and Jill Niebrugge-Brantley (1998: 105–48) devote a full chapter of their text/reader to Gilman's treatment of gender and social structure. Michael R. Hill (1996) sketches the sociological dimensions of *Herland,* and Deegan (1997) details at some length the philosophical and theoretical framework of *With Her in Ourland: Sequel to Herland.* Bert N. Adams and R.A. Sydie (2001: 267–77) discuss Gilman's work in the context of other major sociological theorists. In addition to specifically comparing Gilman's work with that of Lester Ward, Émile Durkheim, and Thorstein Veblen, they discuss the contemporaneous theories of Beatrice Webb and Gilman (pp. 288–89). Deegan and Christopher Podeschi (2001) document that Gilman was an historical founder of "ecofeminist pragmatism" who anticipated many positions found in ecofeminist writing today. Joe R. Feagin (2001) and his colleague Hernán Vera (Feagin and Vera 2001) employ Gilman's ideas in their sweeping historical and contemporary discussions of "liberation sociology." In short, several sociologists are taking Charlotte Perkins Gilman seriously, *as a sociologist.* A few contemporary sociologists, nonetheless, have not welcomed changes in the canon. Jonathan Turner (1998) and Richard Hamilton (2003) are two examples of such resistance to Gilman's incorporation in the sociological enterprise. In discussing this lingering problem, Joan Alway (1995) points to the continuing reluctance of many sociologists to publish feminist theory, either classical or contemporary and Deegan (2003) provides a direct critique of Hamilton.

GILMAN AND SOCIAL REFORM MOVEMENTS

Gilman participated in several important intellectual movements, including cultural feminism, reform Darwinism, feminist pragmatism, Fabian socialism, and Nationalism, that shared an interest in changing the economy and women's social status through social reform movements (Deegan 1997), such as the Dress Reform Movement (Gilman 1935: 234). Some of these movements were national or international in scope

and organization, but their sociological nexus was concentrated in Chicago. Although not manifested in the work of many academic sociologists today, emphasis on institutional change and social reform has a long history and is rooted in the early days of American sociology (see, for example, George Herbert Mead's 1899 important essay on "The Working Hypothesis in Social Reform"). Joe R. Feagin (2001), in his recent presidential address to the American Sociological Association, argues that we have much to gain by celebrating and paying attention to that history. By carefully reading Gilman's corpus, we are offered intriguing pathways for reconnecting with the exciting possibilities for change that once infused and informed sociological practice in the United States. We can also begin to locate Gilman's sociology within the context of other sociological writings.

GILMAN AS A FEMINIST PRAGMATIST

"Feminist pragmatism" is an American theory uniting liberal values and a belief in a rational public with a cooperative, nurturing, and liberating model of the self, the other, and the community. Education and democracy are emphasized by feminist pragmatists as significant mechanisms to organize and improve society. These concepts are defined in terms of human action. Jane Addams and her colleagues at Hull-House developed and refined these concepts between 1889 and 1935. Their ideas on social justice, women, and social change permeate Gilman's notions of "social service, labor, feminism, and ethics." These female sociologists' ideas were allied with and strengthened by the formal concepts developed by pragmatists, such as William James and Charles Horton Cooley, and especially by "Chicago pragmatists," including John Dewey and George Herbert Mead (Deegan 1999, 2001; Feffer 1993).

Gilman repeatedly applies the concepts of "conduct, behavior, habit, intelligence, consciousness, function, mind, organism, impulse, brain, and function." This is a list of ideas emerging from the work of all the male pragmatists, especially William James, Dewey (1899), and Mead (1934, 1999, 2001). Suffice it to say, rather than cite each usage, we simply point here to this vital and sophisticated epistemological commonality.

Feminist pragmatism is a processual model concerned with living society and behaviors emerging from social interaction. But in addition to feminist pragmatism, Gilman was concerned with questions of rules, functions, and religions, topics discussed in depth by the French sociologist Émile Durkheim.

GILMAN AS A DURKHEIMIAN STRUCTURAL FUNCTIONALIST

Émile Durkheim developed a complex theory of social order based on an understanding of rules, functions, the division of labor, social evolution, society as an organic whole, and religion. Gilman discussed these topics in depth. She is particularly close to Durkheim's (1915) understanding of religion as the origin of our ideas concerning the sacred and the profane. He argued, as does Gilman, that the notion of God and religion are a result of group processes, experiences, and meaning. Because we lack language to exalt the group, we transfer this reverence and awe to something beyond the group.

Both feminist pragmatists and structural functionalists use the concepts of "social evolution" and "function." Both refer to a Darwinian understanding of society as changing and developing into more specialized tasks or functions (Darwin 1859, 1872). Again, in the latter concept, both refer to the process of fulfilling a need, a useful social process. Thus, although these two theory groups usually define their words with very different meanings, in the case of these concepts, their meanings are surprisingly very similar. Gilman's adoption of "function" is, therefore unproblematic from a Durkheimian perspective, but, her blend of terminology from these two approaches produces a distinctive and innovative language and theory. At some future point, the possibilities inherent in combining pragmatism and structural functionalism require a lengthy exegesis.

SOCIOLOGY AS SOCIAL ETHICS

Social ethics was a core concern for early sociologists. This is particularly true for Chicago pragmatists who actively supported *The International Journal of Ethics* (a journal that continues today). John Dewey and George Herbert Mead frequently published here, as did the feminist pragmatists Jessie Taft (1915) and Jane Addams (1898). Gilman's work meshed not only with general popular interest in ethical issues at the turn of the century (see, for examples, Lecturers of the Ethical Societies, 1895) but more importantly was also centrally located within ethical analyses conducted by other sociologists.

Harriet Martineau (1838: 109–13) and Auguste Comte (1853, III: 405–8) early tended to the ethical aspects of society. Significantly, Gilman's sociological contemporaries were deeply interested in the relationships between ethics, society, and sociology: Jane Addams (1898, 1902), Émile

Durkheim (1958), Edward Cary Hayes (1918), Charles Richmond Henderson (1903), Harald Höffding (1905), George Elliott Howard (1905), George Herbert Mead (1908), H.H. Powers (1898), Edward Alsworth Ross (1900, 1907), Henry Sidgwick (1899), Albion Woodbury Small (1903), Amos Griswold Warner (1895), and Max Weber (1946). Full analysis of this exciting and important literature lies well beyond the scope of this introduction, but brief mention of the relationship to Addams' work is mandatory.

Jane Addams (1902), in *Democracy and Social Ethics,* devoted an entire text to social ethics and in many ways should be viewed as a companion volume to Gilman's work here. Both books are deeply committed to exploring the relation between women and moral decisions; the role of democracy; changes in the nature of women's work in the home, family, and industry; and the desire to expand women's political participation in the public sphere.

At the same time, Gilman and Addams also differ in their approaches. Gilman's discussions of Christ, for example, are not found in Addams' book. Gilman repeatedly advances support for Jesus as a religious figure who is a good—even "sociological"—guide. She distinguishes her great respect for Jesus from her response to "Christians" who do not, in fact, follow the precepts of their God. Thus, in Gilman's view, Christians set up rules, virtues, conceptions of evil, and so forth, that are not beneficial to human conduct and social action.

Gilman is harsh in her criticism of all "great religions," but particularly critical of Judaism and the Old Testament, and this also separates her work from that of Addams. Gilman argues that the Old Testament reflects a more primitive stage of society and social guidelines. Gilman also rejects any notion of any group as superior or "chosen" in comparison to any other (*e.g.,* Gilman 1997). Gilman argues for a world society, an organic whole, that is the future of growth and ethics. Gilman's continuing albeit intermittent discussions of world religions are also absent in Addams' analysis. Gilman's critiques, nonetheless, are fundamentally progressive.

In *Social Ethics: Sociology and the Future of Society,* we find a comprehensive and sometimes controversial commentary on—and analysis of—social relations in the world as Gilman experienced them in 1914. Sadly, nearly a century later, her world is still very much our world—a world of possibility and potential too often scarred and disfigured by rampant greed, violent industrialization, and unconscionable militarism; it is still not a world safe for children. If organized religion failed to make the grade in Gilman's estimation, organized sociology has failed

at least as miserably during the last three-quarters of the twentieth century. The advocates of bureaucratized scientism in the social sciences have today abandoned the purposeful search for sound, cooperative, and constructive social action. Gilman and many of her early sociological colleagues remain, in several crucial matters, light years ahead of most of us. They claimed for sociology a social imperative: to improve, to educate, and to humanize the world in which we live, to *progress* from the ethics of the individual to the larger and more consequential ethics of structures, institutions, and societies.

There are at least two ways to use this book. On the one hand, *Social Ethics* (read together with *The Dress of Women* and Gilman's other major non-fiction works) provides the sociological foundation so necessary for understanding and interpreting *Herland* and *With Her in Ourland.* To paraphrase Gilman, our literary colleagues have failed to teach even a simple, child-convincing version of the Herland/Ourland saga, *because they have not understood sociology.* On the other—and we believe far more significant—hand, *Social Ethics* outlines a major American sociologist's critical blueprint for the meaningful and progressive mending and re-weaving of our national social fabric. In offering this edition of *Social Ethics* to our students, our colleagues and the wider public, we offer with it our sincere hope that today's readers will drink deeply of Gilman's sense of urgency, will feel her outrage at injustice and oppression, and will understand her impatience for self-indulgent greed. If reading and thinking about Gilman helps to get us moving again, to rekindle in all of us the spirit of pragmatic feminist reform, we will be gratified indeed.

Finally, a note on the editing and preparation of this edition. We append, in several endnotes, identifications of many of Gilman's referents and sources and correct several obvious typographical/typesetting errors appearing in the 1914 serialized version of *Social Ethics.* We also standardize spellings in those few places where the effect is unobtrusive and contributes to readability and consistency. The more peculiar time-bound spellings of Gilman's era, however, and her occasionally curious word choices, we generally allow to stand. All of the dashes, numbering schemes, and strings of asterisks found in our edition are reproduced, to the best of our ability, exactly as they stood in *The Forerunner.* We acknowledge having added the subtitle: *Sociology and the Future of Society,* as we believe it underscores Gilman's intent and will usefully assist those of our colleagues and students who rely increasingly on keyword-guided bibliographic searches to discover Gilman's remarkable socio-

logical work. With the insight that the publication of *Social Ethics* provides, we look forward to future, expanded understandings of Gilman's work on society and ethical living in our hyper-modern world of consequential realities and increasingly complex and dangerous choices.

REFERENCES

Adams, Bert N. and R.A. Sydie. 2001. *Sociological Theory.* Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Pine Forge Press.

Addams, Jane. 1898. "Ethical Survivals in Municipal Corruption." *International Journal of Ethics* 8 (April): 273–91.

———. 1902. *Democracy and Social Ethics.* New York: Macmillan.

———. 1910. *Twenty Years at Hull-House.* New York: Macmillan.

Allen, Polly Wynn. 1988. *Building Domestic Liberty: Charlotte Perkins Gilman's Architectural Feminism.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Alway, Joan. 1995. "The Trouble with Gender: Tales of the Still-Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociological Theory." *Sociological Theory* 13 (3): 209–28.

Comte, Auguste. 1853. *The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte,* freely translated and condensed by Harriet Martineau. London: George Bell & Sons, 1896.

Darwin, Charles. 1859. *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection.* London: John Murray.

———. 1872. *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals.* London: J. Murray.

Dealey, James Quayle. 1909. *Sociology: Its Simpler Teachings and Applications.* New York: Silver, Burdett.

Deegan, Mary Jo. 1981. "Early Women Sociologists and the American Sociological Society: Patterns of Exclusion and Participation." *American Sociologist* 16 (February): 14–24.

———. 1987. "An American Dream: The Historical Connections between Women, Humanism, and Sociology, 1890–1920." *Humanity and Society* 11 (August): 353–65.

———. 1988. *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892–1918.* New Brunswick: Transaction Books.

———, ed. 1991. *Women in Sociology: A Bio-bibliographical Sourcebook.* New York: Greenwood Press.

———. 1997. "Gilman's Sociological Journey from *Herland to Ourland.*" Pp. 1–57 in *With Her in Ourland: Sequel to Herland,* by Charlotte Perkins Gilman, edited by Mary Jo Deegan and Michael R. Hill. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

———. 1999. "Play from the Perspective of George Herbert Mead." Pp. xix–

cxii in *Play, School, and Society,* by George Herbert Mead, edited with an introduction by Mary Jo Deegan. New York: Peter Lang.

———. 2001. "George Herbert Mead's First Book." Pp. xi–xliv in *Essays in Social Psychology,* by George Herbert Mead, edited with an introduction by Mary Jo Deegan. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

———. 2003. "Textbooks, The History of Sociological Stock of Knowledge." *Sociological Theory* 21 (September) 298–305.

Deegan, Mary Jo, and Christopher W. Podeschi. 2001. "The Ecofeminist Pragmatism of Charlotte Perkins Gilman: The Herland Sagas." *Environmental Ethics* 23 (Spring): 19–36.

Degler, Carl N. 1956. "Charlotte Perkins Gilman on the Theory and Practice of Feminism." Pp. 11–29 in *Charlotte Perkins Gilman: The Woman and Her Work,* edited by Sheryl L. Meyering. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1989.

———. 1966. "Introduction." Pp. vi–xxxv in *Women and Economics: A Study of the Economic Relations between Men and Women as a Factor in Social Evolution,* by Charlotte Perkins Gilman, edited by Carl N. Degler. New York: Harper and Row.

Dewey, John. 1899. *The School and Society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Durkheim, Émile. 1915. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life,* translated by Joseph Ward Swain. London: G. Allen & Unwin. (Originally published in French, 1912).

———. 1951. *Suicide: A Study in Sociology,* translated by John A. Spaulding and George Simpson, and edited by George Simpson. Glencoe: Free Press. (Originally published in French, 1897.)

———. 1958. "Professional Ethics: I." Pp. 1–13 in *Professional Ethics and Civic Morals,* Translated by Cornelia Brookfield, with an introduction by Hüseyin Nailkubali. Glencoe: Free Press, 1958. (Originally written in French, 1912).

Feagin, Joe R. 2001. "Social Justice and Sociology: Agendas for the Twenty-First Century." *American Sociological Review* 66 (February):1–20.

Feagin, Joe R. and Hernán Vera. 2001. *Liberation Sociology.* Boulder: Westview.

Feffer, Andrew. 1993. *The Chicago Pragmatists and American Progressivism.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Finlay, Barbara. 1999. "Lester Frank Ward as a Sociologist of Gender." *Gender & Society* 13 (April): 251–65.

Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. 1898. *Women and Economics: A Study of the Economic Relation between Men and Women as a Factor in Social Evolution.* Boston: Small, Maynard. (Reprinted with an introduction by Carl N. Degler. New York: Harper and Row, 1966).

———. 1900. *Concerning Children.* Boston: Small and Maynard.

———. 1904. *Human Work.* New York: McClure and Phillips.

———. 1907a. "Social Consciousness." *American Journal of Sociology* 12 (March): 690–91.

———. 1907b. "Social Darwinism." *American Journal of Sociology* 12 (March): 713–14.

———. 1908. "Suggestion of the Negro Problem." *American Journal of Sociology* 14 (July): 178–85.

———. 1909. "How Home Conditions React Upon the Family." *American Journal of Sociology* 14 (March): 592–605.

———. 1935. *The Living of Charlotte Perkins Gilman: An Autobiography.* With a foreword by Zona Gale. New York: D. Appelton-Century.

———. 1994. *The Diaries of Charlotte Perkins Gilman,* edited by Denise D. Knight. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

———. 1995. *A Journey from Within: The Love Letters of Charlotte Perkins Gilman, 1897–1900,* edited by Mary A. Hill. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press.

———. 1997. *With Her in Ourland: Sequel to Herland,* edited by Mary Jo Deegan and Michael R. Hill. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood. (Originally published in *The Forerunner,* 1916).

———. 1998. *The Abridged Diaries of Charlotte Perkins Gilman,* edited by Denise D. Knight. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

———. 1999. *Herland, The Yellow Wall-paper, and Selected Readings,* edited by Denise D. Knight. New York: Penguin. (Originally published in *The Forerunner,* 1915).

———. 2002. *The Dress of Women: A Critical Introduction to the Symbolism and Sociology of Clothing,* edited with an introduction by Michael R. Hill and Mary Jo Deegan. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press. (Originally published in *The Forerunner,* 1915).

Golden, Catherine, and Joanna S. Zangrando, eds. 2000. *The Mixed Legacy of Charlotte Perkins Gilman.* Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Gotsch-Thompson, Susan. 1990. "The Integration of Gender into the Teaching of Classical Social Theory." *Teaching Sociology* 18 (January): 69–73.

Hamilton, Richard. 2003. "American Sociology Rewrites Its History." *Sociological Theory.* 21 (September): 281–97.

Hayes, Edward Cary. 1918. "Sociology as Ethics." *American Journal of Sociology* 24 (3): 289–302.

Henderson, Charles Richmond. 1903. "Practical Sociology in the Service of Social Ethics." Pp. 27–49 in *Investigations Representing the Departments: Part I: Systematic Theology, Church History, Practical Theology; Part II: Philosophy, Education. The Decennial Publications,* First Series, Vol. 3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hill, Mary A. 1980. *Charlotte Perkins Gilman: The Making of a Radical Feminist, 1860–1896.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hill, Michael R. 1987. "Novels, Thought Experiments, and Humanist Sociology in the Classroom: Mari Sandoz and *Capital City.*" *Teaching Sociology* 15: 38–44.

———. 1989a. "Empiricism and Reason in Harriet Martineau's Sociology."

Pp. xv–lx in *How to Observe Morals and Manners,* by Harriet Martineau. Sesquicentennial edition. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.

———. 1989b. "Mari Sandoz' Sociological Imagination: *Capital City* as an Ideal Type." *Platte Valley Review* 17 (1): 102–22.

———. 1991. "Harriet Martineau." Pp. 289–97 in *Women in Sociology: A Bio-bibliographical Sourcebook,* edited by Mary Jo Deegan. New York: Greenwood Press.

———. 1996. "Herland." Pp. 251–54 in *Masterpieces of Women's Literature,* edited by Frank N. Magill. New York: HarperCollins.

Hill, Michael R. and Susan Hoecker-Drysdale. 2001. "Taking Harriet Martineau Seriously in the Classroom and Beyond." Pp. 3–22 in *Harriet Martineau: Theoretical and Methodological Perspectives,* edited by Michael R. Hill and Susan Hoecker-Drysdale. New York: Routledge.

Höffding, Harald. 1905. "On the Relation between Sociology and Ethics." *American Journal of Sociology* 10 (5): 672–85.

Howard, George Elliott. 1905. "A Call for the Social Puritan." *Lincoln Evening News* (November 20): 16.

Karpinski, Joanne B., ed. 1992. *Critical Essays on Charlotte Perkins Gilman.* New York: G.K. Hall.

Keith, Bruce. 1991. "Charlotte Perkins Gilman." Pp. 148–56 in *Women in Sociology: A Bio-bibliographical Sourcebook,* edited by Mary Jo Deegan. New York: Greenwood Press.

Kessler, Carol Farley. 1995. *Charlotte Perkins Gilman: Her Progress toward Utopia with Selected Writings.* Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Knight, Denise D. 1997. *Charlotte Perkins Gilman: A Study of the Short Fiction.* New York: Twayne.

———. 1999. "Introduction." Pp. ix–xxiv in *Herland, the Yellow Wall-Paper, and Selected Writings,* by Charlotte Perkins Gilman, edited by Denise D. Knight. New York: Penguin.

Lane, Ann J. 1979. "Introduction." Pp. v–xxiv in *Herland,* by Charlotte Perkins Gilman, with an introduction by Ann J. Lane. New York: Pantheon.

———. 1990. *To Herland and Beyond: The Life and Work of Charlotte Perkins Gilman.* New York: Pantheon.

Lecturers of Ethical Societies. 1895. *Ethical Addresses.* Philadelphia: S. Burns Weston.

Lemert, Charles C. 1997. *Social Things: An Introduction to the Sociological Life.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Lengermann, Patricia M., and Jill Niebrugge-Brantley. 1998. *The Women Founders: Sociology and Social Theory, 1830–1930: A Text/Reader.* Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Magner, Lois N. 1978. "Women and the Scientific Idiom: Textual Episodes from Wollstonecraft, Fuller, Gilman, and Firestone." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 4 (Autumn): 61–80.

Martineau, Harriet. 1989. *How To Observe Morals and Manners,* with an intro-

duction by Michael R. Hill. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers). (Originally published by Lea and Blanchard, 1838).

Mayering, Sheryl L., ed. 1989. *Charlotte Perkins Gilman: The Woman and Her Work.* Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press.

McDonald, Lynn. 1993. *The Early Origins of the Social Sciences.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University.

———. 1994. *Women Founders of the Social Sciences.* Ottawa: Carleton University Press.

———, ed. 1998. *Women Theorists on Society and Politics.* Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Mead, George Herbert. 1899. "The Working Hypothesis in Social Reform." *American Journal of Sociology* 5 (November): 367–71.

———. 1908. "The Philosophical Basis for Ethics." *International Journal of Ethics* 18 (April): 311–23.

———. 1934. *Mind, Self and Society,* edited by Charles Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1999. *Play, School, and Society,* edited with an introduction by Mary Jo Deegan. New York: Peter Lang.

———. 2001. *Essays in Social Psychology,* edited with an introduction by Mary Jo Deegan. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

O'Neil, William L. 1967. *Divorce in the Progressive Era.* New York: New Viewpoints.

———. 1972. "Introduction." Pp. vii–xviii in *The Home: Its Work and Influences,* by Charlotte Perkins Gilman. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Park, Clara Cahill. 1936. Review of *The Living of Charlotte Perkins Gilman. American Journal of Sociology* 41 (May): 701–2.

Park, Robert E. and Ernest W. Burgess. 1921. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Powers, H.H. 1898. "Sociology and Ethics." *Progress* 4 (September): 64–65.

Reinharz, Shulamit. 1992. *Feminist Methods in Social Research.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Ross, Edward Alsworth. 1900. "The Genesis of Ethical Elements." *American Journal of Sociology* 5 (May): 761–77.

———. 1907. *Sin and Society.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin.

Rossi, Alice, ed. 1973. *The Feminist Papers.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Rudd, Jill, and Val Gough. 1999. *Charlotte Perkins Gilman: Optimist Reformer.* Iowa City: University of Iowa Press.

Sharnhorst, Gary. 1985a. *Charlotte Perkins Gilman.* Boston: Twayne.

———. 1985b. *Charlotte Perkins Gilman: A Bibliography.* Metuchen: Scarecrow.

Sidgwick, Henry. 1899. "The Relation of Ethics to Sociology." *International Journal of Ethics* 10 (October, Number 1): 1–21.

Sinclair, Andrew. 1966. *The Emancipation of the American Woman.* New York: Harper and Row.

Small, Albion Woodbury. 1903. "The Significance of Sociology for Ethics." Pp. 113–49 in *Investigations Representing the Departments: Political Economy, Political Science, History, Sociology and Anthropology. The Decennial Publications,* First Series, Vol. 4. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stetson, Charles Walter. 1985. *Endure: The Diaries of Charles Walter Stetson,* edited by Mary A. Hill. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Taft, Jessie. 1915. "The Woman Movement and the Larger Social Situation." *International Journal of Ethics* 25 (April): 328–45.

Terry, James L. 1983. "Bringing Women . . . In: A Modest Proposal." *Teaching Sociology* 10 (January): 251–61.

Turner, Jonathan H. 1998. *The Structure of Sociological Theory.* 6th edition. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Warner, Amos Griswold. 1895. "Politics and Crime." *American Journal of Sociology* 1 (November): 290–8.

Weber, Max. 1946. "Science As a Vocation." Pp. 129–56 in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology,* translated and edited with an introduction by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press. (Published originally in German, 1918.)

SOCIAL ETHICS

Sociology and the Future of Society

Chapter 1

THE NATURE OF ETHICS

SOME FORM of ethics has been in use since the widening consciousness of man enabled him to relate consequences to actions, and to generalize upon what he observed.

He began by making the first broad childish classification of Good and Bad, that flat poster effect in strong black and white which acknowledges no gradation. He knew nothing whatever of any of the other sciences by which we may understand human ethics; he was innocent of physiology, of psychology, of sociology; economic laws had not dawned upon him, and, above all, he failed to appreciate the basic fact without which this science is wholly unintelligible—its social nature.

We assume that those life forms we call "the lower animals" have not the degree of consciousness necessary to form ideas about their own conduct, or to generalize laws of behavior with a connotation of "right" and "wrong." Their conduct has been slowly perfected by nature's large, slow, relentless methods of elimination: "I teach by killing—let the others learn." Under this severe punishment of sinners they have developed a system of conduct which suits their needs. Animals, for the most part, do "right" that which is right for them—because those who did not have died.

We, with our larger minds, studying their conduct from without, can easily grasp the simple ethics of these lower lives. The earliest, most limited creatures have no responsibilities beyond absorbing nourishment and splitting in two. Later the pursuit of nourishment becomes more

complex, as do the reproductive processes; and we may observe a wider range of conduct with its greater possibilities of resultant good and evil.

When the creatures studied live in groups, and profit by mutual service and assistance, we find a scheme of conduct evolved which distances our highest efforts. The unbroken and exalted virtues of the ant, for instance, have long been urged upon our imitation, though the ancient observers knew little enough of the full apotheosis of altruism exhibited in an ant-hill. But in all this we do not conceive of these creatures as entertaining any mental images of their own conduct, or as exhorting the young to behave thus and not otherwise.

All human problems are complicated by the element of consciousness, and that consciousness, in the human stage, is social. We, living in social relation, develop, proportionately with its advance, the power to visualize our own conduct as we do that of other persons; to analyze causal relations, and to generalize our study into rules of behavior.

Hence we find ethics, to some degree, in all human groups.

It is interesting to observe at once, in comparing lower with higher social groups, that the ethics of a primitive tribe is far more akin to that of group creatures below them than is ours, and their methods of enforcing them almost as relentless as nature's.

As we develop socially we require a far more complex scheme of conduct, and, so far, the human race has never developed an ethics which kept pace with social evolution. As individuals we may know how to behave, but in larger forms—in principalities, kingdoms, and, highest of all, in republics, we do not know how to behave.

Ethics is the science of conduct; that is all.

It should be based on a clear understanding of the social structure and functions as hygiene is based on physiology; and as we may learn how to be well from such knowledge, so should we learn how to "be good" from a general knowledge of ethics.

At present there is no such general knowledge. The conduct of humanity is modified by many conflicting forces, but knowledge of the science of ethics plays small part among them. It is held to be an abstract science, suitable for mature students who care for it; it is classed with logic, or with metaphysics; it is by no means popular.

Whereas ethics is the simplest, the most practical of sciences; it should be taught, even in the baby garden,[1] in the same delicate simplicity that characterizes the beginnings in other sciences. It should be a universally required course in all schools, and its larger study should be also mandatory in colleges.

Whatever else a child or youth may learn, how to behave is requisite for everyone, and ethics is merely the science of human behavior.

Sociology, to ethics, is as physiology to hygiene. The one treats of the structure and the unconscious function, the other of the conscious conduct which affects them. From this point of view we might characterize ethics as moral hygiene.[2]

Ethics is to social relation what physics is to material relation. The laws of physics govern the interrelations of matter; the laws of ethics the interrelations of humanity. Since our whole historic process consists in the modification and development of those human interrelations, and since our consciousness has power to govern conduct to an appreciable degree, it is evident how important to normal social development is a general knowledge of this basic science. But as one turns the pages of history the whole record shows how lacking is such knowledge, and how sadly delayed and perverted has been our progress because of that lack.

* * *

To find a broad, natural, easily perceived base for this necessary understanding, we should follow back our ideas of "good and bad," or "right and wrong," to their very earliest possibilities.

Drop down the scale of evolution; leave humanity far behind; leave all the animal creation; retire to the stage of creation before life was, and see if you can predicate right and wrong of what was then going on.

As soon as we are able to perceive "a law"—*i.e.,* "an observed sequence of phenomena"—as soon as it is apparent to us that this crystal is square, this triangular, and this duodecahedral, then, if we find one varying, one pinched, irregular, disproportionate, we say: "this one is wrong," or "this is a bad one."

Where we find any process going on, with observable sequence of cause and effect, we can instantly call its regular fulfillment "right" and any error or failure "wrong."

This does not, of course, involve the slightest degree of blame or praise—those emotions are quite aside from our study. Much less does it involve the idea of "virtue" or of "sin," those arbitrary concepts of our misguided minds. We are studying ethics, a science, not yet touching upon morality, religion, convention, education, tradition, or any of the many modifying factors which have heretofore so blinded us to this science.

So studying, we may follow up the laws of growth through the broad simplicity of the earliest life forms, finding in each, as soon as it had a discernible structure and functions, the right and wrong of its little life.

Presently we come to the condition, common throughout life, which we in our sophisticated minds call "a conflict of duties."[3] The life-processes of two forms clash, their interests differ; the blue-fish eats the menhaden.

Such an event is so incessant, so universal, as visibly to constitute one of nature's chief lines of work. Throughout all the living world death cuts off the individual, and the constituents of the previous form go to make up the later one. Life passes into life, continuously—this is evidently the way it works.

When confronted with an event which is so patently "wrong" for the menhaden, so as patently "right" for the bluefish, we may form our first generalization in ethics:

* * *

1. That is right, for a given organism, which leads to its best development.

* * *

This gives us the sense of relativity in ethics, a perception which we have practically adopted and acted upon in all our ordinary life, assuming that to be right which profited our species, and never dreaming that what we called the lower animals had any "rights" at all.

In recent years, with our widening range of thought, we have come to admit certain abstract "rights" even among birds and beasts, but even so we generally assume that what is "right" for humanity is the real standard of conduct.

Once admitting this relativity, we may study the little circle of personal or racial ethics of each living thing, existing only in our minds, to be sure, but quite capable, none the less, of discussion and proof. We can easily see how each creature ought to behave, and how universally they behave as they ought—each after its kind. And when we mark our own ruthless way, exterminating the fierce beasts that ate us, enslaving the strong ones to serve us, making pets of the little ones that please us, we do not call it wrong to so interfere with their life-schemes, but cheerfully agree:

"That is right for a given organism which leads to its best development."

Then we must decide as to the nature of the human organism, and what does lead to its best development. The first is the base and the second the subject matter of ethics.

Here is where we must face at once the question of whether humanity consists of individuals, or of groups; whether we live and grow individually or socially; whether ethics is to be predicated of individual conduct or of group conduct.

Precisely at this point has the whole human race failed to pass the examination and been sent back to the lower class-room over and over again.

We early developed an individual ethics, a family ethics, even a tribal ethics, sufficient to enable our kind of animal to survive and conquer. We have never developed a social ethics in any way equal to maintain a high and growing society.

The most successful civilizations, measured by mere endurance, are the ancient ones, of which China is the latest great survivor. In these social forms a state of equilibrium has been reached in which enough individuals are enabled to live and reproduce to constitute the bulk of a great state, and in which enough social development is obtained to promote and administer the most necessary functions of a great state; but not enough social development to so rear the individuals and enlarge the social functions as to allow of constant progress.

The most successful civilizations, measured by conquest, are by no means the most ancient, but young valiant ones, with a superabundance of fighting males. Their success is no proof of social progress; quite the contrary.

A peaceful agricultural and manufacturing community might be terrorized and even overcome by a body of armed brigands, but this does not show brigandage to be better than agriculture.

Again, a successful civilization may be measured by its continued fruition in the best products of brain and hand; but if such an one is not able to maintain the mass of its constituents in a state of personal and social health, it only survives by virtue of not being conquered.

In our whole long story, no people yet have ever learned the A, B, C, of social ethics. Their swollen, misbehaved national growths have hung snarling together or turned tooth and claw on one another, all up the ages; and when one, from conquest or fortunate condition, was safe from war, it has straightway proceeded to develop internal diseases of most dangerous character.

As peoples, we have not yet learned how to behave.

The social character of ethics rests upon the social nature of humanity. We exist, function, and develop in organic relation, not as distinct individuals.

Of course, we visibly *are* individuals, and still have a considerable range of individual interests, but so do the constituent cells of our own bodies, when microscopically examined. The crucial test is that those body-cells do not exist save in bodies, and that these individuals do not exist, save in societies. The kind of individual varies also with the kind

of society; a given form of government, a given church, a given system of education tending to produce certain kinds of people.

What first variation in environment started these social modifications it is hard to trace; but once established, a society modifies its individuals far more rapidly and powerfully than they modify it.

Our own brief national history glowingly illuminates this fact.

Here, in a new, large, and propitious environment, were planted individuals from Scandinavia, Italy, France, Spain, Holland and England, in varying numbers. Influenced by their surrounding conditions these scattered social elements coalesced, organized, rebelled against previous social connections and became a nation, and this nation rapidly developed certain special characteristics which we now call American.

So far the course of events, though on a larger scale, and more swiftly accomplished, is not so different from that of earlier social births. But we have one conspicuous feature in our growth which is quite unique, namely our enormous and continuous assimilation of alien individuals.

This transfusion of blood, so to speak, was at first natural and healthy, being the voluntary immigration of healthy stock; of individuals sufficiently wise to see the advantages of the new country, sufficiently strong to break with home ties, and sufficiently successful to afford to come. Such material is an advantage to any nation, and our vigorous young organism thrived and grew apace, making Americans out of all comers by the overpowering force of social contact and transmission.

Later, when these natural forces were interfered with by self-interested parties, employers of labor and steam-ship companies mainly, we have had pumped into our national circulation such an amount of alien blood that our capacity for re-nationalizing them is taxed to the utmost.

Nevertheless, as far as it goes, our experiment does show the predominant force of social influence, even over so long established and persistent a group of racial characteristics as those of the Jews.

* * *

[2.] A given society is the life form, and its ethics must be social.

* * *

Since our human life consists of super-imposed stages, still separately conscious, we may here discriminate, showing three perfectly distinct ranges of ethics:

The ethics of the individual.
The ethics of the family.
The ethics of the state.[4]

These are by no means necessarily in contradiction. They overlap and include one another when viewed from the larger range; but may antagonize and conflict when viewed from below.

Beginning with the simplest, pertaining to the individual, we must detach an individual life completely from all others, and then consider its conduct solely as measured by individual interests. This is difficult to do in human life, because the human individual does not exist separately, not normally, that is. Three arbitrary instances may be taken: that of a man shipwrecked on an otherwise uninhabited island; that of a prisoner in solitary confinement for life; or that of a hermit, self-isolated in cave or cell.

Each concept of right or wrong, good or evil, must here be measured by the personal reaction only. If there is hope of escape from island or prison, that might modify conduct with a view to future social relation, but in the case of the hermit there is not even such a hope; his view is absolutely personal, for all eternity; his conduct is modified absolutely to his own advantage.

In this extreme case we may note at once the cessation of all industry; for work is in itself an essentially social function, pre-supposing other persons whom the work serves.

The hermit has no industry. He is not willing even to provide his own food, which would involve some industry, or if he hunted, fished, and sought for fruit and nuts, would involve such freedom and activity as are incompatible with absolute pre-occupation with self. No, the hermit so adjusts his place of retirement that through a morbid influence over others' minds they bring him food. His activity is reduced to the lowest minimum, and is mainly psychic, consisting of certain mental performances all redounding to his own ultimate advantage. At least he thinks so.

This spectacle of ultra-egoism is rare, and promptly self-destructive. Society does not rear such often, and they do not reproduce their kind.

The life prisoner, or shipwrecked man are not thus egoistic, but while they live alone their vices or virtues must be measured by their effect upon themselves.

To such an individual ethics are limited and clear, as with an amoeba—and he is not required even to split in two. So simple are individual ethics that their fulfillment may be safely left to instinct, the natural desires of a healthy being tend to his own good conduct.

In the family relation, the next step upward, we find instant conflict between the good of the individual and the good of the family. Of course the maintenance of the family is of advantage to the individual—no

second stage could be reached and upheld which would destroy the first, but while family life as a whole multiplies, protects, and promotes individual life, it does so at the incidental expense of much individual comfort and freedom.

The highly evolved processes of motherhood show this so conclusively that we have described them under the phrase "the maternal sacrifice," but the cares and labors of the mother are by no means so sacrificial as the early stages of paternity.

Many a humble father dies even in the act of his one offering; millions more die soon after, having existed but for that; and still more millions perish as mere waste, having accomplished nothing.

But whether in the quick death of the father bee, or the slow strain, the anguish, the long giving of gestation, parturition and lactation, in later motherhood, there is some sacrifice involved. The gain is greater than the loss else would it not have been established, but there is some loss.

This brings us to a conflict in ethics. What is right for the individual must be measured against what is right for the family, and as the family ethics is higher it must triumph.

Among our unreasoning friends in fur and feathers this too is regulated by what we call instinct, and the heights and depths of parental devotion, parental care and labor, parental courage and self-sacrifice, are visibly attained.

With us something of the same effect is shown, especially in that half the world least educated, least developed in human liberty, activity, and reason—the women. Fathers also often show it, even in the instinctive form; and our conscious recognition of it is shown in law, in religion, and in the tremendous weight of tradition and custom.

We are under no delusion in regard to the pre-eminence of family ethics over individual ethics; it would seem almost as if we held that the individual had no rights the family was bound to respect. In our own country particularly this family ethics stands rampant; the mother is supposed to have and to desire no life beyond that of ministering to her children; the father is valued as "a good provider" and "a good family man."

But when it comes to the third stage, social ethics—we hardly know there is such a thing.

In the interests of the individual we toil and strive and wrangle; in the interests of the family we strain and suffer; but the interests of the community do not form any large part in our ethical standards.

Yet the interests of the community are the base, the only base, of real ethics, our ethics, the ethics of humanity.[5]

Individual existence with its instincts and desires we share with the whole creation; family existence with its instincts and desires we share with all the higher creatures; but social existence in our exquisitely specialized, highly organized form, is our great human prerogative. Social relationship is human life.

The development of ever higher forms of social relationship is *the* human process.[6] It is what we are here for. Upon this social organism, its nature, its processes, its purpose, its advantage, we must build our ethics.

* * *

The step upward, from individual to family life, was taken so slowly, under the leadership of such gradually developed instincts, that it has never involved much difficulty. Civilized and uncivilized people generally attain a certain grade of family virtue. Where they fail in it, from marked persistence of lower desires, or from morbid social development, we have a wide common morality from which to condemn such failure.

But the progress of humanity in social relationship has been too swift, too irregular, to develop its commensurate social instincts, and too much interfered with by many jarring influences for us to have thought clearly about it.

This is especially true of the history of the last half-millennium: since the hard-walled cell structure of absolute monarchies and an absolute church gave way to the loosening processes of the new ideals of liberty—freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of action.[7]

Since then we have grown so momentously, with such unprecedented and accelerating swiftness, that it is no wonder the habit-ridden philosophies of the past have failed to grasp the newer state of human life.

Our mechanical progress has greatly outstripped our psychic progress. In the arts and crafts, in manufacture, invention and discovery, in the great new world of the natural sciences, we have swept ahead with dizzying speed. But in our mental attitudes, our habits of thought,[8] and especially in that field which has treated of "moral values," we have definitely striven not to progress—to maintain at any cost our previous standards—and we have been lamentably successful.

The more new, specialized and detailed an art or science or business may be, the more free it is to expand and push forward, as for instance the advance in electricity; but in the more intimate and vital relations of

life, and in that group of ideas and emotions we call "sacred," progress is slow, irregular, and difficult.

Such ethics as we know is old. It is based on the advantage of the individual, as understood in the past; on the advantage of the family, as understood in the past; and, dimly the advantage of the state, as understood in the past.

So our average ethical measurements rest upon the individual's eternal profit; upon the family's immediate personal needs; and upon such service to the state as shall "maintain the law" and fight when so directed.

Of Social Ethics in the full sense we have no more grasp than an unhatched egg.

Chapter 2

SOME BASES OF ETHICAL VALUATION

AMONG OUR earliest ethical percepts was the recognition that not only were certain acts "wrong," but that some were far more wrong than others.

Our judgment in the matter varies, however, from the lowest social group to the highest, and varies among the highest. Not only so, but in a specialized social group such as a great modern nation, we find that ethical values differ as among classes, professions, ages, and sexes, to say nothing of religions.

The whole course of human life is hedged about with ethical restrictions; from the baby who is taught that his essential virtue is keeping quiet, through all the positive and negative conduct required in the different trades, and in the frankly open division between the ethics of the two sexes.

So complex, so confused, so contradictory, is this field of social perception, that in order to form any clear idea of it we must study it from the side, watching the gradual appearance of these distinctions as society developed.

No thorough, all-embracing view is offered, but a brief survey of certain conspicuous well-known ethical concepts, and their course of development.

We are to conceive of early man as coming into a vague, fluctuating state of consciousness, which we naturally call "self-consciousness" because it is the self which registers its sensations. But the main subject

matter of this consciousness, and the agent of its appearance and growth is society. Our human consciousness is essentially social.[1] Self-consciousness is to be sure manifested in proportion to social development, up to this time, but that is because our unrecognized social relations are so ill adjusted as to cause pain, and the pain, of course, is felt by the self.

Also, as we fail to recognize our consciousness as social, we use its widening powers in a forced restriction to our own affairs, a process so morbid as to lead to disease and insanity if carried too far.

In the days of our racial beginnings we may conceive of the growing consciousness of man as slowly recognizing the advantages of obedience, of courage, of loyalty, of hospitality, in others of the tribe, and expressing his approval of them.

Obedience is perhaps the earliest ethical concept, having been established in practice far behind humanity. Suppose we follow that one virtue in its long course from the animal family into the human family, up through history and the changing human mind to its present condition, a mere preliminary outline of study.

The animal mother, in the higher species, has a long period of infancy to guard, and this guardianship, to be effective, requires prompt acquiescence on the part of the young. She has no speech, no means of conveying a general direction or showing its reasons. She can only by voice or action convey an impulse to an immediate act, as when the mother partridge issues her sharp command and the little ones flatten themselves into immobility at once. They are so much less visible, almost invisible indeed, among the dead leaves and twigs which their markings "protectively imitate," that those who keep quite still escape attack. Those who do not so promptly or so perfectly obey are eaten, leaving no descendants. Thus is "the habit of obedience" developed to automatic perfection.

If we were still following nature's method we too might have absolutely obedient children—by the simple expedient of killing all who were not.

The little savage and his savage mother were under this long inheritance of mutual action,—the sharp signal of the mother—the quick response of the child. If the response is not quick, or not forthcoming at all, there is a two-fold distress to the mother; consciously a fear for the child, and subconsciously a sense of balked nerve discharge—the impulse did not "go off" as intended. However accounted for, the child's failure to react properly to her impulse distresses the mother, and she

punishes the child as "naturally" as a mother bear or another cat cuffs her refractory offspring.

Such a deep-seated race habit must needs find easy expression in later groups. So soon as hunting led to teamwork and leadership, and the new power so developed expressed itself in organized war, we find obedience growing rankly as a group virtue.

In the family with a male head the already strongly developed protective obedience became mingled with the military kind, and was exacted, under heavy penalties, by the father. As he became able to form concepts he exalted such filial obedience with accompanying reverence as a requirement of religion, as we so find it in the ancient Hebrew commandments.

As the tribe developed chieftainship, and the chief became a king, we see in the long period of absolute monarchy this virtue at its apogee. There the whole social group must bow to the will of one man.

This universal submission to one resistless power, with filial reverence run mad in praise and prostration to the despot, always assisted, of course, by the priestly cult, presently came to be the main demand of religion. Our religious life is still heavily dominated by this ancient ethical concept, though in politics it is being rapidly outgrown, and weakens fast in the family. On sea-going ships and in military organizations it finds its highest surviving form today, and, of course, in some lingering religions.

What has occurred to alter the position of this virtue in our ethical concepts?

The same natural causes which made obedience the best protection for little partridges, now show us that a child is best safeguarded by developing his own powers of judgment and of will.

Obedience, whatever its object, requires the abrogation of judgment, the surrender of the will. The "obedient" races, those still under absolute despotism, make small progress; the "obedient" professions *par excellence,* soldiers and sailors, also make small progress. The religions which demand absolute obedience have their strongest hold among the weak and ignorant, and find it increasingly difficult to continue that hold on the growing human mind.

We are beginning to see that while obedience is assuredly a necessity at times, it has certain heavy disadvantages in its effect on both commander and obeyer.

The world's endless rebellions, its demands and struggles for liberty in thought, in speech, in action, show, to the sociologist, the healthy

resistance of a growing race-mind to a race-concept which has outlived its usefulness.

The political development leading to democracy, with its appreciation first of "the common will," and later of "the common good," has had its natural effect on the whole range of ethical values. Democratic processes require free general transmission of thought and feeling, that new demands may be spread from the few to the many.

Progress in freedom begins, as it always has, in the superior vision, the deeper insight of the few. From them it must spread to the many and convince them—it cannot coerce them.

Here lies the essential value of a republic as compared to a monarchy.

In a monarchy the subject must submit.

In a democracy the citizen must agree.

In a monarchy there is small encouragement of voluntary organization—it is a danger. In a democracy the whole mass stirs with this impulse—to get together and promote, by collective action, the desired end. The child, in a monarchy, must learn to submit. The child, in a democracy, must learn to persuade and to agree.

The capacity to understand, to see and appreciate a general need, whether shared by one's self or not; the capacity to organize and act collectively—these are the prime needs of a democracy—not obedience. Therefore in a democracy we see the mind grow and the mental growth result in action. The recognition of the power of majorities and the necessity for convincing them, is a very different sort of influence from submission to the power of the king and the necessity of pleasing him.

Democracy tends to discount the ancient virtue of obedience and to demand new ones. This is why we dimly see that our children need new training to fit them for a new world. They may elect to obey, as the patient obeys his doctor, or the enlisted man his officer, or like any temporary servant or employee, but it is no longer the absolute obedience of the past, nor so honored.

In studying a single virtue like this, if it were done in full detail, large historic charts would be needed, emblematic charts, whereon would be traced, in long, branching, upreaching lines, the growth, change, extension and reduction of the quality under discussion, streaming up along the ages; here fed by special conditions and thriving; here starved and dwindling, here arbitrarily preserved by law or religion in spite of changing circumstances.

And from any one quality so studied we must clearly recognize what it is which makes this quality a virtue—or a vice. Our common saying speaks of "making a virtue of necessity." All virtues are made of neces-

sity. Without necessity they would never have arisen; when the necessity ceases they cease to be virtues.

Our failure to recognize this, our arbitrarily attaching ethical values, good and bad, to certain acts, in the face of a moving world of evidence, is a proof of how the telic powers of man,[2] greater than those of any other creature, have so often interfered with and sometimes frustrated the genetic forces which act upon him.

To show this relation of virtue and necessity most clearly, and without rousing undue antagonism, let us take one of the minor virtues, one about which we do not "feel" so intensely—hospitality.

Look at once at its excesses—where you see it most extremely developed, among savages, among the Scotch Highlanders and the Bedouin Arabs.

Where do you find it least? In large, crowded modern cities; its absolute opposite being seen in the mutually opposing coldness of dwellers in apartment houses.

Where do you find it in intermediate degree? In rural districts, especially in scattered settlements, as in our West and South.

With such bald facts as these before us, it is easy to trace the necessity which is the mother of this virtue.

Where life is hardest, exposure greatest, people fewest, there you find hospitality as a tribal virtue—a pre-eminent one. In the desert, the mountains, the jungle, the polar wastes, food and shelter are given the stranger as a matter of course.

In our Southern states, in the old days of lavish hospitality, we find isolated families, having little society except in visits, with labor and supplies in plenty; and in the comparatively unsettled West, the traveler is sometimes dependent on hospitality for his life. Among these conditions, it is a valued virtue.

In the crowded cities, on the other hand, where people press and swarm, where transportation is ample and public entertainment to be had anywhere, this virtue dwindles fast.

We may safely generalize thus:

Hospitality is a virtue in proportion to the scarcity of population, and the distance, difficulty and danger of traveling.

Such an explanation we may readily admit of so moderate and worldly a virtue as hospitality, and yet hesitate before applying the same method to virtues we rate more highly.

Yet a "virtue" is only a quality, a distinguishing method and habit of action. The ability to make the abstraction "courage" came long after that quality was seen and valued. We had the virtue before we knew it

was one. As with any other quality, physical or psychic, development comes only with use, and use rests on necessity.

Let us apply this test to a still more ordinary and un-sacred virtue—thrift or economy.

There is throughout nature what is called "the law of parsimony." Through all the apparent waste and confusion this law slowly works on, reducing the superfluous, eliminating the unnecessary, tending to give each member just the strength and weight essential to it and no more. This is wholly genetic, and hardly to be called a virtue.

With us, the tactics of the ant and the squirrel have grown to such a degree as to produce not only the virtue of thrift, but right through that virtue and on into the vices of the niggard and miser. The great Chinese doctrine of "the golden mean" recognizes that too much virtue may be vice.

A better instance could scarcely be given; and it may be studied far and wide, without offending what we call "our finer feelings."

The fruit-fed native of a tropic land has no occasion for economy. There are plenty of nuts, plenty of fruit, the year round. Having no occasion for thrift, he does not develop it. How could he? If he did, it would not be a virtue.

On the other hand, if men are starving on short rations, as when shipwrecked, or lost in polar wastes, then the extreme of miserliness becomes a virtue, being a necessity.

There is no innate, inherent, good or bad in these qualities. Their goodness, or badness is wholly dependent on other facts and circumstances.

We may here make a third generalization, following two in previous chapter:

3. Good and bad are relative terms, dependent on conditions.

The next general base of ethical values is distinctively human, requiring social consciousness in a considerable degree.

This is found in what we call "morals." Morals rest on customs, on ancient tribal habits. They may or may not have had an original cause in real necessity; in either case their continuing force lies not in necessity but only in long repetition. The "mores" of a tribe are merely its inherited customs.[3]

Here we enter an entirely new field, a psychic field. Some special act has become a custom; such, for instance, as the keeping young women in ignorance of the facts of sexual life.

This is an excellent illustration, because the only tinge of necessity it could ever have had was the necessity of meeting an arbitrary standard set up by the purchaser, or future husband. This demand rested on no necessity of value to the race, but quite the contrary. It is not found among primitive peoples, but appears in proportion to the vices of later societies. As men become more sophisticated and corrupt, it is, of course, to their advantage that their late-chosen brides shall know nothing of the man's previous conduct, and that their wives shall not understand the whole latitude of masculine conduct later. Therefore we have an adventitious virtue, called "innocence," confined strictly to women, and most especially to young girls. This "innocence" does not consist, as in innocence of theft, or murder, in not having committed these crimes; it consists in not knowing that there are such crimes as the man wishes to conceal.

We do not consider that a young girl ceases to be innocent because she knows that people steal or kill, lie, cheat, bribe and tyrannize. Even to understand the full details of a burglary does not corrupt her. But if she is acquainted with the facts of sexual immorality, or even the facts of sexual morality, she has lost that "virginal innocence" which is "her chiefest charm."

To whom? To the one whom it is to her advantage to charm if she wishes to be married.

This is as arbitrary a standard as that among certain North African peoples where a bride is preferred to be fat—and therefore girls are fed on a special diet to increase adipose tissue. Their corpulence is as much a virtue as this "innocence."

In any real sense the ignorance of young women on this subject is not a virtue at all, but a serious evil, because it injures the race by conducing to wrong marriages and continued vice; but having been arbitrarily demanded in the first instance, and having become a very general and ancient habit, it is now a virtue on the second basis, custom.

The working of the forces which modify conduct along this line is most interesting to note. On the first base, necessity, the driving pressure is that of some danger, pain, or advantage—a real one. In this second instance, the pressure lies partly in the remotely conceived and arbitrarily enforced advantage of being married, with danger and pain of not being married (these also largely arbitrary); but also on that power we commonly term "the force of habit." Merely because a thing is usually done, has been done for a long time, therefore our nerve-force is accustomed to discharge along those lines, and to check or divert it causes us mental distress.

A custom, any custom, will long survive even the most arbitrarily invented usefulness, merely by this force of habit, our sense of evil in breaking the rule being purely associative.

The student of comparative sociology[4] may watch the entire course of history, threaded with the secondary virtues; noting their appearance, their quick spread and adoption, their long continuance, and slow, gradual disappearance.

Another conspicuous instance of this sort of arbitrary virtue lies in that peculiar quality called "honor" as confined (a) to the male, and (b) to the "upper classes."

"The honor of a gentleman" ranks among the first, if not, considered by himself, the first of all virtues. "All is lost save honor," cries the proud sufferer. This virtue, as we know it, is of quite modern appearance, though doubtless its social prototypes are to be found far down the line. Its manifestations are varied and peculiar, and bear relation, of course, to the differing conditions in different nations. An extreme feature of this virtue is shown in a gentleman's attitude toward what are called "debts of honor."

The gentleman, we will say, owes money to his tailor, his landlady, his servant—for value received. He has consumed the goods or profited by the services of these persons, and owes them payment according to that other virtue known as "common honesty." On the other hand he has been gambling, and has lost; he has wagered money on some game or bet—and owes that also.

Common honesty is too "common" for him; it is vulgar, it is no virtue at all.

But "honor" rules supreme; "the honor of a gentleman" compels him to pay a gambling debt to another gentleman who has given no value or service—who does not need the money—and to let his tailor, landlady and servant—who have taken care of him—suffer and go to ruin.

In all the galaxy of arbitrary custom-based virtues, there is none shining more brilliantly than this. How is it to be accounted for? By any real necessity of advantage or pain it is not to be accounted for. But in our social psychology it is easily traced. Veblen, in his luminous book, *The Theory of the Leisure Class,* has shown the way.[5]

These gentlemen belong to a class which has no true social relation in service. They have no economic position in the "body politic" except a parasitic one—society supports them. Their advantage, in the sense of being fed, clothed, and generally maintained, bears no relation whatever to their exertions, but is guaranteed them by certain social conditions. But their advantage, in the sense of having an agreeable time—their

pleasures—and their possible gain in still higher gentility, depend wholly on the people they play with. Having no work to do, and not wishing to spend all their time in bed, they must needs play. Being a primitive, unspecialized class, their animal instincts of the battle, and the chase, and the universal love of gaming, as well as grosser indulgences, are strongly in evidence among them. They revolve amongst one another, in a mutual exchange of civilities and entertainments, and the "rules of the game" in these amusements are the governing laws of their lives. To call some one "a good sport," "a true sport," is their highest compliment, sport being their field of life.[6]

It is quite easily to be seen that, since gaming is a principal pastime with this class, and since if gaming debts are not paid the pleasure of the game would disappear, they must insist absolutely upon such payment. Further, since personal compulsion might not be efficacious, and since the law of the land, strangely enough, refuses to recognize the gambling debt as taking precedence of all others, they are compelled to evolve out of their own psychology an ethic of sufficient force to govern conduct. Never was it more successfully done. Having become a custom, its power has steadily increased; and, being a custom of the upper classes, and therefore to be envied and imitated, it has spread to some extent among other classes, into the more genuine fields of life.

Yet to a merely human observer, studying ethics from the standpoint of real value to society, or even to the individual, one would think that clothes, food and service were of more value than the privilege of playing games, and that to accept service without paying for it was more dishonorable than to make a wager and not back it.

This only shows how various is our estimate of ethical values, and how different their bases.

The next dominant element in ethics is the influence of religion, which will be treated at more length in the next chapter. It is difficult, if not impossible, to differentiate the relative weight of these varying elements.

In some cases we may see the primal necessities triumph over all others, as when shipwrecked sailors revert to cannibalism; again we see one of these purely arbitrary elected virtues triumph over the worst necessity, as when the gentleman sacrifices his estates to pay his debts of honor; and again we find the equally arbitrary religious standard triumph over both nature and custom, as in the practice of asceticism.

Ethics as a science is so overlaid and discolored by these and other considerations that real exercise of one's mental muscles is needed to distinguish among them.

This third base is of enormous importance. It is, in a sense, the "high-

est," in that its hypothetical theory of advantage requires a longer range of thought to perceive, and a more permanent mental force to maintain, than the earlier ones.

But precisely because of these conditions it is open to greater eccentricities and excesses.

The first thing to note in studying the effect of religion upon ethics is the development of the abstract concept of "right" and "wrong." "Bad medicine" is a phrase used by some of our native Americans for things evil; medicine by no means indicating drugs, but "practice" or "theory" or "system"—a wrong method of conduct. A generalization is a dangerous thing to play with. For safe handling it needs to be kept in constant touch with the facts. Our first thinkers, having healthy, active young brains to use, brains unencumbered with knowledge, launched forth with the ardor of a child in their perceptions and deductions—and there was no one to stop them.

Very early indeed we find the heavy influence of religion laid upon our dawning perceptions of ethics; very early were the terms "right" and "wrong" weighted with new significance and monopolized by the religious dictators. A complete separation was effected between the right and wrong performance of the ordinary acts of life and the "right" and "wrong" of acts specially commanded or specially forbidden by religion.

When we speak of ethical values today we find that in most people's minds they are confined exclusively to religious requirements and prohibitions. Of all other conduct they speak as "not a question of right and wrong."

The science of ethics covers all conduct. Right and wrong may be indicated in any human act. Such right and wrong varies with the relation of the act to our social advantages, varies in regard to time, place and condition, but, vary as it may, it is always there, and the teacher of ethics should be capable of pointing it out to the student.

Such universal application of ethics soon passed the limited range of savage conduct with its clear and simple code; and ages before we were able to grasp social laws, religion stepped in with its doctrine of despair as to the tangled affairs of "this world," its theory of another one where things were to be set right, and its definite, rigid, largely arbitrary system of conduct, spreading "thou shalt" and "thou shalt not" over a narrow selected field of action, and leaving the whole remainder of life outside.

Chapter 3

THE INFLUENCE OF RELIGION UPON ETHICS

IN ALL the unplumbed depths of human psychology, all its cloudy heights and wide waste places, there is no region more exciting than that in which we may study the effects of religion.[1]

We have to consider a race of beings, the slow accomplishment of ages of evolution, coming into possession of a new power—Consciousness.[2]

This human consciousness is psychic and social. In our individual recognition of it we find ourselves possessed of memory, judgment, and a high degree of volition. We roughly define this consciousness as "the soul."

It is as if, in the limited psychology of our pre-human ancestors, the steering-gear for the most part ran itself automatically, the conduct of those creatures being mostly governed by mere reflexes, or by those inherited habits we call instincts.

But man discovers himself possessed of a big complicated engine-room; power pouring in through a thousand impressions; storage batteries to hold the power; a conning tower, as it were, from which to direct his course; and considerable ability to jump about among the valves and levers, turning the power on here and off there with marvelous effects upon the steering.

The business before him was to learn how to live; how to adjust his individual activities to those of the increasing multitudes of his fellows, and this soul of his, with its growing range of "fellow-feeling," which

is social consciousness, was the field of communication. The main need of a growing humanity was communication, the physical communication in which our bodies and our products of industry may be transferred from place to place, as wanted; and psychic communication, of which speech is our first distinctive medium.

When we learned to preserve and transmit thoughts through literature we extended our power of communication across time as well as space; and in all the later improvements, such as the multiplication of forms by printing, or the increase in speed through telegraphy, we simply developed this governing necessity of men for communication.

Our way upward was to learn to understand one another, to help one another by specialized industry, by the exchange of services and products, to develop as rapidly as might be, a world of peaceful, friendly, mutually serviceable beings, enjoying the wide powers and pleasures of true human growth.

This line of development we call, in a vague way, civilization, because it was visibly accelerated by the improved communication of cities.

Here is the human game, which we are here to learn to play: how to get on together to our best mutual advantage and constant growth; how to develop our new faculties and fulfill the gradually discovered laws of social development.

This is what we had to do.

What have we done?

We soon discovered, and became vastly proud of, this extension of psychic power we call the soul. We could easily see—anyone not a fool could see—that it constituted our real superiority to the other creatures.

This range of consciousness was carried backward by memory and further extended by tradition; carried forward by imagination, that wondrous power we use so little; and spread out around the world as we gradually learned of more and more people and came into human relation with them. Today it begins to waver feebly out among the stars, as we visualize other existence there.

Mightily puffed up were we by this Inner Empire we called the Soul.

It is a lovely comforting thing to solace one's mind for the moment by a fair picture of the normal course of human development, as it might have been.

We may think of the clean matings of the beasts growing smoothly, naturally, into our nobler unions, lasting unions of two, of a thousandfold depth and breadth and tender richness.

We may think of our few primitive industries growing smoothly, naturally, into the thousandfold delicate ramifications of our present forms

of mutual service, each followed in widening delight by those whose special faculties are meant for it.

We may think of our groping loneliness, growing smoothly, naturally, into the thousandfold companionship of social life, with power and joy multiplying at every step.

We may think of societies as rich, as busy, as mutually loving as those of the ant; but with all the added strength and splendor of a universe-ranging intellect, a humanity-holding heart.

We may think of that picture with pleasure, and lay it away with a sigh. That is not what happened.

Consciousness came before knowledge.

Man felt his soul, but did not recognize it.

He became aware of the other people around him, perforce; his relations with them and theirs with him widened and thickened.

Conduct, human behavior, grew steadily in importance.

At first the natural environment was the main factor; how man behaved was not of so much consequence as how the weather behaved, or the wild beasts. But very soon how man behaved was recognized as the one most important fact to human life,—which it is. That is why ethics is the most important study—and should be the commonest.

In the real picture of the progress of humanity on earth we need again our great chart on the wall, our horizontal lines that mark the ages; our long branching upward reaching currents of human growth.

Then, upon those lines of growth, we may mark in different colors, the different forces which have modified them.

In concrete instance, note the change of conduct in regard to mating.

The original sex impulse we will show in clear red, rising from pre-human times and holding its own through the ages. Then we will mark the natural growth of love as blue, slowly appearing, increasing, yet much weakened and discolored by other influences.

The appearance of law, as a modifying influence, we will make brown, checking, discriminating, guiding; here quite extinguishing both the red line and the blue; here blending with them; and here again we see the red running at large, in spite of all the efforts of the brown.

Economic forces appear also,—green, we will say, checking the red line here, swelling it there, driving it under the brown and out from under it as well, always modifying.

But strongest of all comes religion, very early in the ascent, beginning as mere taboo and custom, it is true, but rapidly assuming high importance. So great is that importance, so heavily has the influence of religion modified the initial impulse of sex, that in some cases it has produced

absolute celibacy. In many religions indeed there seems to be an antagonism between sex and holiness; and we find Buddhist and Brahmin vying with Christian in an attitude of rigid denial to this instinct.

Since the sex instinct is one of the strongest in nature, the power of religion to inhibit it is as good a single proof as could be given of the immense weight of that power.

In any line of conduct it is easy to note the modifications of these and of other forces, but in the whole field from the most ancient times, religion is the strongest of our telic forces; stronger than custom, law, economics, than all our emotions and impulses.

Our purpose here is to show something of the pressure of this mighty force upon the knowledge and practice of ethics.

What is a religion?

It is a group of doctrines, of mental attitudes and emotions, of required conduct. It applies to what you believe, to how you feel, to what you do.

In each of these fields it has had an overmastering influence on human life.

Let us consider the matter of belief first.

Every religion rests on certain postulates. In accepting a given religion you must first of all believe something. The merit of the "Believer," the guilt of the "Unbeliever," are predominant in religions. Such a valiant and efficacious faith as the Moslem is spread at the point of the sword. "Confess the faith!" cries the victor. "Believe or die!"

In the predominant forms of the Christian religion as popularly accepted, the same attitude holds. "Whoso believeth in me and confesseth it with his mouth, he shall be saved." An alleged damnation is the alternative instead of a palpable sword, but the requirement is the same—"Believe or die!"

This is the major chord in all our history of religions. The first thing to do with a religion is to believe it. Later one is required to feel it, and lastly to practice it, but believing is the absolute necessity.

In the ruthless violence of ancient times this demand was enforced with sweeping sincerity. Everyone believed—because those who did not had died. For thousands upon thousands of years, in all faiths, this was the attitude of religion—"Death to the unbeliever."

We have seen that our attaching guilt or virtue to a given act may be quite arbitrary, and yet have the most profound effect upon the soul. It is a perfectly easy matter, by careful education, to attach more shame to eating with a knife than to telling a lie; more virtue to clean linen than to chastity.

If a given act is universally condemned and punished, or universally

praised and rewarded, our sense of "right" and "wrong" adjusts itself to the conditions very promptly.

The virtue of belief, the guilt of unbelief, have been so long and so violently inculcated upon the human mind that even a free-thinking scientific student finds it hard to give up a previously accepted theory, and feels a certain sense of wrong in doing so.

Yet what is this thing—Belief? It is something that you do; it is a verb—"to believe." That which you believe becomes a noun—your belief. But all rests on the act of believing.

What is this act? What do you *do*—when you believe anything? You open the mind and take in something, as a bird opens its beak and swallows a cropful.

I tell you that I have seen a man with a beard. You believe it. You know that men have beards.

I tell you that I have seen a woman with a beard. You believe that. You may have seen one yourself, or read of them.

I tell you that I have seen a baby with a beard—a new-born baby—with a beard a yard long. You do not believe that. Why should you? It is contrary to every fact that you know. Your brain rejects it, as not in agreement with its previous knowledge.

But suppose you had no previous knowledge. Suppose you had never seen a baby. Suppose that you were three years old, and your mother told you that—you would believe her.

A young brain, scantily stocked with information, and inevitably depending on its elders for instruction, can believe almost anything.

In the days when religions began to grow we were a baby race. We had no facts save those of immediate personal experience of the narrowest sort. All the instruction then attainable came from our elders—what they said we believed.

You never find a primitive religion basing its myths on the field of practical knowledge open to its hearers. The first stronghold of religion is always to be found in remote antiquity. Unfortunately for those ignorant ancients, these ideas of antiquity were also limited. Our later knowledge has shown these alleged "beginnings" to be of most frankly recent date.

Be the statements what they might, it was essential that they be believed.

I had once the experience of teaching, or of trying to teach, a peculiarly objectionable small boy, who replied to the information given: "I don't believe you, Miss Perkins!" No instruction is possible under such circumstances.

But our open-minded savage ancestors had learned "to believe" before the priest appeared. They had believed their mothers, whose teaching was all for help and protection. To believe meant safety—it was part of obedience.

Also as the early group developed its small social consciousness, as its little stock of mental impressions flowed from mind to mind, any mind refusing to accept was felt as an obstacle, resented and removed.

So when old tales became traditions and loomed grandly into myths, they were believed. When the medicine man grew into the priest, and, exercising his mind along one line, made new percepts, had "ideas," felt the rich experience of mental vision, he supposed that this thought now his, which was not his before, was told him by someone—as he had gained his others.

So came the natural theory of revelation, the "And God said unto me," "the inner voice," which still speaks in the human mind.

Then it was an oracle; it was the literal voice of a very literal god; and above any other message it must be believed.

In our psychology natural law holds sway as in all fields of life. A mental process or habit tends to grow, indefinitely, as does the physical. If a feeling is attached to an act, for good reason originally, perhaps; if, in the lapse of time the act no longer justifies the feeling—we do not therefore lose it on the instant.

Because belief was imperative in parental education; because it became a conscious virtue in all religions, most cruelly enforced; we today still exhibit an enormous capacity for believing, and a clinging conviction that we ought to believe.

But what virtue is there in this purely mental attitude? What has it to do with conduct, with ethics?

When belief is exalted as a virtue, as *the* virtue, sufficient in itself to save life, or, further, to save the soul, we throw all conduct out of perspective. We lose our sense of ethical values. We can no longer correctly judge of relative right and wrong. We have made an arrangement by which one act becomes as it were a password, a ticket of admission, an agreed performance, possible to anyone, by which to attain a desired end.

Anything more subversive to real ethical advance could hardly be imagined.

The real field before us was that of the unfolding complexity of social life; the real work to learn what was right and what was wrong in all the multiplying activities of our growth and change.

Then comes religion, saying: "Believe this—and you are all right." It

was easy—too easy. We have Believed, with might and main, first this, then that, and then something else; each new Belief starting with some mind the intensity of whose percepts was taken as a revelation; each following the same path—the effort to make other people see the same vision—and be saved.

But while thus busily occupied in Believing, some, the rare and courageous, in Denying, and most in laboriously converting, or destroying, the unbelievers, our conduct and our real study of right and wrong, was ignored and neglected.

This general effect of the habit of believing has no concern with the truth or falsehood of the thing believed. When we study the special doctrines of the various religions of the world we find new influences upon ethics, as in the effect of the doctrine of Karma, or of the vicarious atonement, or of plenary absolution.[3]

Of this immense field of influence we will only remark that the ethics of a given people is visibly affected by the doctrines enforced upon their minds; and by no means always for the better.

* * *

The second department of religion, its emotions, and sentiments, has a further influence upon our growth in ethics.

Feelings and ideas do not belong together by changeless law. We have before us a world of facts. As we become conscious of these facts we develop the inner world of ideas. To those ideas we arbitrarily attach a world of feelings.

Take the virtue of modesty, for instance, sex-modesty.[4] Women of some races attach this feeling to their faces, and must go veiled. The Breton peasant woman attaches the feeling to her hair—and must wear a cap. We attach it to our feet and legs—and must bathe in clothing; but we detach it from breast and back, and go half-naked in evening dress. It is all arbitrary.

People "feel" as they do merely from education and association.[5] It is quite possible to change one's "feelings" beyond recognition in a few active years: to be proud of what we were formerly ashamed of and ashamed of what we were formerly proud of.

Neither is there inherent virtue in a feeling any more than in a belief.

Right and wrong applies to conduct, and to feelings only as they lead to conduct.

The religious emotion, *par excellence,* is worship. Worship, as a feeling, is an attitude of mind in which the self is minimized and the object of worship magnified. As practically expressed, it consists, in primitive

form, in physical prostrations and genuflections; in offerings, gifts, oblations, sacrifices; and in the utterance of the most extreme laudation of the object.

Tracing this to its dim beginnings in the patriarchal government, and in the rule of the ancient priest and medicine man, it is easy to see how the natural pride of power developed and demanded of the child, of the people, due honor and respect. As government grew into far-reaching despotism, all this increased. Those ancient kings had an inordinate appetite for praise and salutation, and elaborate cults were developed in all the minutiae of the courts.

The same cult of reverence extended from the priest to the idol, and when we began to form concepts of the gods, as Spirits, not as Images, we transferred our system of worship to that plane of thought.

In our religion, in spite of all the wholesome influence of Jesus, we have the same old primitive worship, with its naïve assumption of pleasing God by a proper form of address. We still vaguely imagine, as shown in many a hymn, that the major exercise of saved souls, for eternity, is "praising God."

Our poor stunted imaginations, so crushed and overlain by Believing that they have no use of their wings, never trust themselves to consider what kind of a God it is which can sit on a throne and be praised for eternity—and enjoy it.

The more we abase ourselves in worship, the more preposterous it becomes that the Exalted Object of worship should derive any satisfaction from our performance.

"But," some protest in pain—in genuine pain, for supreme virtue has been attached to worship for so long that it hurts to feel them dissociated, "consider the effect on the worshipper!"

Well—what is the effect on the worshipper? Do those who worship most, do the best?

There is no relation between this attitude and the development of right conduct.

Worship, as part of religion, decreases as the standard of ethics rises.

Primitive peoples, ancient discouraged peoples, submissive fatalistic peoples, ignorant undeveloped peoples, may throw themselves under the wheels of Juggernaut, or kneel for hours in adoration, march in processions with incense and high-held idols, sing, or hire others to sing, as acts of worship.

But with the long steady lifting of standards of conduct we begin to appreciate more and more the fiery scorn of Jesus for such an attitude: "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and *do not the things which I say!*"[6]

Conduct is the real test.

Connected with this feeling of worship are those other central religious emotions, the feeling of sanctity, of mystery, of authority. Here we come close to the very core of religious psychology.[7]

Remember that all our mental habits arise from pressure of conditions, are developed by education and association,[8] and are so transmitted down the ages in social heredity.

Religious authority is the utmost height of a feeling originating in parental authority, and developed by priest, chief and king.[9] The human mind, so long trained in submission to authority, was lost without it, and out of its own need for this moral support erected a Last Authority, greatest of all, upon which it might absolutely rest. This is so old a habit as to have long since become an instinct, and even when the sturdy young brain insists on rejecting authority, on thinking and deciding for itself, the old brain, or the sick one, sinks gladly back to the earlier attitude of submission.

It is no wonder that Religion has feared Science. The study of natural science shows us a moving universe, in which we live, and of which we may learn as much as we can. The more we learn the better we can live. But in Science is no Authority, no Revelation. We have to study, to experiment, to push on, accumulating knowledge, failing, trying again, slowly rising—a wide road, open to all, leading always upward.

Our conduct in regard to the material world is based on definite knowledge. "But," objects the religious person, "our conduct in regard to the spiritual world must be based on authority; we have no knowledge to offer."

If religion confined its spiritual directions to the spiritual world—of which we have no knowledge—we would not criticize it. Where it interferes with ethics is in dictating plain natural conduct in this world—of which we do have knowledge.

Human conduct is a matter of ascertainable fact; a thing we may study and learn; and the substitution of authority for investigation, with the seal of finality upon it too, the absolute unchangeable law, has had a most paralyzing effect upon our healthy progress in ethical science.

The human brain, which has made such wonderful progress in other departments, where it was free to work its own way, has made very little in the line of ethics. Religious authority, as a substitute for study and experiment, makes a very poor showing in results.[10]

What improvement we have made in conduct is far more perceptible in the fields governed by social relations and not touched by religion—as in "manners," or the standards of "honor," than in the field where the

heaviest penalties, the highest rewards, and the most infallible directions are offered by religion.

With Authority, buttressing it with measureless reinforcements, stands Mystery; and, protecting Mystery, we find Sanctity.

What are these things? How did they arise? What is their effect on ethics?

The world in which we find ourselves consists of the small area of things we know, and the large dark area of the things we do not know. In the sense of mere not-knowing, everything is a mystery to a child—or a rabbit.

The rabbit does not call it a mystery, because he does not care. He knows grass and is not interested in trees—unless prostrate—and hollow. The child is interested. He wants to know. Baby-man wanted to know. He was profoundly interested in the world about him. He investigated, experimented, found out things. If he could not find out the nature of the forces and facts about him he was puzzled.

When that social functionary, the medicine-man,[11] rose to prominence, he held his power by knowing something the others did not. If they found out his secrets then he would have no power, so he sought to protect his patents. Over his charms and tricks he hung the two veils—mystery and sanctity. Mysterious, because unknown, Sacred—therefore you mustn't try to find out.

Of all varied and detachable feelings sanctity is the most so. It is deliberately applied like a plaster in the overt act of "consecration." We erect a stone building, and with stately ceremonies "consecrate it"—and it is sacred. We fence off a piece of ground, make performance thereon—and it is "consecrated ground." We have "sacred music," "sacred relics," "sacred writings"; we speak of "the sanctity of the home"—"the sanctity of human life"; anything may be sacred that we choose to sanctify.[12]

What *is* this thing—sanctity?

It is merely a feeling—a state of mind, which we set up and take down at pleasure. It is as arbitrary and changeable as any game or dance that ever was invented.

Each new religion utterly denies the "sanctity" of the images, symbols, books, buildings and all performances of the previous religions, and then solemnly sets up new "sanctities" of its own—all set aside by the next one.

Yet as humanity advances we see a steady increase of intelligence, and a steady decrease of this "sacred" state of mind. Finding that the element of sanctity in a given object or act is so patently a product of our own, and so glaringly uncertain and removable, we begin to question

what this fluctuating feeling is and what it is good for. In especial, in our study, we wish to know what effect it has upon ethics.

Is human conduct illuminated, strengthened, made surer, easier, higher, by sanctity?

"Do you hold *nothing* sacred?" demands the person who has that feeling about many things.

Why should we? What good does it do—to the thing held, or to the person holding it? Does the arbitrarily attached sanctity of anything help us to distinguish good from evil, or strengthen us to do right and not to do wrong?

Come back to the facts.

Here is a growing race, whose past history shows that it still has much to learn.

We need to know how to live; and in all the processes of living the most important are those which concern our social relation. How to live together, how to conduct ourselves towards one another, how to adjust our desires and impulses, how to restrain and promote our actions, so as to carry out the main purpose of our being.

"Ah!"—A cry of triumph from the religious. "And what *is* the main purpose of our being? What can your miserable ethics tell us of that? Only religion knows!"

Yes?—Which religion, please?

"Mine"! triumphantly answers each and all.

Chapter 4

AS TO "THE ORIGIN OF EVIL"

HERE IS humanity, developing naturally, like any other organism, but modified, artificially, like no other organism.

Here are we, with all our splendid intelligence, our power of communication, our long, recorded history, our wide knowledge, and our tremendous accumulated social energy which we call the human will.

It would seem as if we, above all forms of life, should leap forward, growing in a smooth, swift current with ever better and higher degrees of power and happiness.

Quite the contrary is our record.

Our behavior throughout history is a matter of wonder and shame to the few people who have the intelligence to see it as a whole. We behave, not better than other animals, but worse—far worse.

It is precisely because of and in order to correct our remarkable misbehavior that religion after religion has poured its light upon us—lights of varying color, varying power, and, of whatever quality, always submerged in the continuing misbehavior of the people.

This prominent and painful fact has stirred the philosopher in all ages, its cause being discussed in deepest perplexity as "The Origin of Evil."

The evil referred to is not in the accidents and difficulties of nature, but in our own acts. We have not dogmatized about the evils of the world about us, but have striven to understand them, overcome them, avoid them. We make shelters, fires and clothing against the cold and

wet; destroy obnoxious beasts, dam streams, harness the wind and lightning.

Nature's catastrophes, though terrible, do not begin to puzzle and distress us as do our own peculiar actions.[1]

Humanity, growing conscious, sees vaguely and crookedly how it should behave, also how it does behave, and moralizes as vaguely and crookedly thereon, like a drunken man trying to walk an unnecessary crack.

We have no clear, satisfying, general knowledge as to our use and purpose in life, or of the conduct necessary to best fulfil that use and purpose. Where any of us have such knowledge the others fail to accept it, and even those who know, fail lamentably in their doing. So general, so permanent, is this condition, never more conspicuous than today, that there is some excuse for the ancient theory that "man is as prone to evil as the sparks are to fly upward."

Yet that is not true. On the contrary, man is as prone to good—as inclined to "fly upward" as those same sparks.

He has the irresistible uplifting impulse which raised him from the slime still at work within. Every normal child wants "to be good." Every normal young person looks forward to a life which shall avoid the foolish wickedness so visible in others. And even the worst of us draw the line somewhere—there is always something we will not do.

The trouble with our behavior is not in lack of good impulses. They are so common, and, alas! so futile, that we have cynically paved hell with them.

To call a man "well-meaning" is to use a contemptuous epithet, yet so many of us are well-meaning that we could scarce offer better proof of the inner direction of our souls. As a race we mean well, but we do not do well, and such right conduct as we do achieve is too often difficult and expensive in the highest degree.

Religion, seeing this, has advanced its theories on this grave problem, the Origin of Evil—often pitiful theories, ridiculous theories, false theories—theories which still further complicate and retard our efforts to do right.

Suppose you see someone learning to swim and going under with loud splutterings.

What is the origin of this evil?

It is simple. The devil has not pulled him under, nor his Karma, either.

All that ails the man is this: he has not yet learned to swim.

Suppose, in larger instance, we observe a ballet-master struggling with

a large group of dancers; his efforts frantic; their movements discordant, irregular, confused.

What is the origin of this evil?

They have not learned the dance yet—that is all.

Humanity is engaged in an enormous game. We are set to learn How to Live Together—how to live to the best advantage, with the least waste of effort, to the highest purpose, and we have as yet hardly learned the rudiments of that game.

In all the old religions we find only one that has grasped the idea of our Organic Union. That is in the teachings of Jesus. He had a better grip on the nature of humanity than any other, trying desperately to show his hearers that God was in man, in Himself, for instance, and that "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these ye have done it unto Me."[2]

But this burst of sociological insight was by no means accepted.

Neither the Christian theory of life nor the Christian method of action was adopted save as minor by-products here and there. The dominant doctrine of the Christianity of two thousand years has been Salvation, not Right Understanding, nor Right Behavior. Our ethical sense was so dim, is still so dim, that we have not revolted at the idea of an Omnipotent Deity, whose world had all gone wrong, and who could think of no better way of saving it from His own vengeance than by sacrificing His own Son to Himself.

We have not seen what any school teacher knows—that to climb into promotion by virtue of another scholar's work not only is dishonest, but *does not teach the culprit anything.* We have made of Christianity a sort of eternal selfishness.

We are in this world to learn how to behave—not to be saved by one person's virtues from the consequences of another person's sins.

The Buddhist religion rests on the terrible misconception that life is evil—a thing to escape from; the Moslem religion, with its fleshly paradise, its cruel propaganda, shows no advantages over the others in resultant conduct.

The Hebrew religion, so lauded for its ethics, is based on sheer pride of blood; it is a tribal religion, a thing one is born into, and involves the conception of a God who has "chosen" out of all the peoples of the earth just one as his favorite—a position any mother, any school teacher, would be ashamed of.

None of these religions does justice to God.

None of them explains to humanity its inherent nature and its world-duties, national and international.

Religion confines itself to part of life.

Ethics, once we understand it, covers all.

We must ask of any religion: "Is it true? Is it just?" And Truth and justice are terms of Ethics.

This ancient mysterious problem as to the Origin of Evil should be approached in this manner:

The student should understand, however brief and simple the account, that humanity is a long-growing thing. Even a little child could learn from wall paintings, pictures, museums, above all from the educational—"movies"—that human beings have risen, and that they are better behaved than they used to be.

The teacher should be prepared to show, with dates and maps, histories and illustrations, that a given people at a given time behaved thus and thus—and *why.*

It is no mystery. Judged individually it is confusing, of course; judged socially, it is clear enough.

We do not live alone, acting on lines of conduct of a wholly separate character. We are braided and woven together, a living tissue; and what one does is modified, inevitably, by what the others do.

Ethical problems are not on lines of "What must I do to be saved?" Merely to be saved—if the others are not—is unethical. The problems of ethics deal with collective conduct for collective benefit—"What must we do to help one another forward?"

Where, then, is our "evil"?

The evil conduct is visible enough—painfully, terribly visible. From cannibalism to newspaper lying, from the torture of captives to bomb-dropping aeroplanes, from ancient slavery to modern extortion, we certainly have behaved badly.

Why, then, do we do it? Why is it that the human race has never yet generally understood how to behave?

When we have answered that we shall have found "the origin of evil."

Any human act is resultant primarily from an impulse. This may be merely reflex; it may be unconscious, but there must go out some nerve force to make the muscles work.

If the act is conscious and involves choice, it is resultant secondarily from ideas, from the complex of precepts and concepts which govern the impulse. As, for instance, the ancient impulse of mother-love urges to conduct such as nursing one's own child. But there are ideas quite competent to inhibit this impulse, as when the mother knows her milk is not good, or not sufficient, and engages a wet-nurse, or buys a bottle;

or, further, where she declines to nurse her baby on the ground that it will "spoil her figure" or that she has "been kept in long enough."

In a specific act like this we may trace the good to a safe basis in natural law in mother instinct; and the evil is equally clear, based on external conditions or on false ideas.

The attitude of religion toward our misconduct varies from the free-will assumption that conscience always tells us what is right and what is wrong, and that we are quite free to choose; to the fatalistic assumption that we are predestined, foreordained, to do what we do, and have no choice whatever.

Between these two extremes discussion has raged for centuries.

In the middle ground, as usual, we may find the truth. Conscience is a most variable factor, and not a reliable one. Judgment rests on knowledge, and knowledge is imperfect. The will is as variable as the conscience, and some persons have more will-power than others.

Conduct, in individuals, varies so widely that we are continually puzzled and thrown off the track. But as soon as we begin to study it socially we find it becomes comparatively within our power to change.

We find always these three main lines of pressure always governing our conduct: Inheritance, Environment, Education. Education is in the largest sense part of the environment, but is here used to distinguish the power of deliberately implanted ideas from the power of association. The Thugs of India commit murder because they are taught to do it;[3] the head-hunters of Borneo commit murder because of custom and association as well as education. The "gangsters" of New York commit murder because of association and the general environmental influence rather than from any deliberate cult requiring it.

Now, murder is evil—there is small question as to that among civilized people—but when we seek to check it we should understand its causes. To hang Thugs would in no way prevent their activity so long as there were any left. It would not help the victims in the least; no after-the-event treatment does. The Thugs, being hanged, would only feel that they were martyrs, persecuted for their religion. To stop the murderings by this sect we must cut off from their minds the flow of ideas tending to murder.

One way to do this would be to destroy all images and temples of their goddess Kali; to execute or permanently imprison all priests and teachers of that cult, and penalize whatever known followers remained.

This process in regard to objectionable, i.e., differing faiths, has been repeatedly attempted in past ages with very poor results. Ideas once put

in circulation are not to be obliterated so easily. No Inquisition, no governmental or clerical oppression, no popular abuse, has ever been able to exterminate ideas. They flow from mind to mind—grow, spread, persist, thrive in the face of persecution.

The only way to remove bad ideas is to supplant them with better ones.

In questioning the origin of the evil of murder among Thugs we find it clearly in their religion. Among the Dyak head-hunters it is a matter of custom, association, imitation.[4] The last disappear if we can change the first. But a custom is harder to change than a religion.

Our American murders are more easily understood and should be more easily handled. We have a murder rate which is a shame and a scandal among the nations, and we do not know enough to be ashamed of it.

It is not owing to any error in the Christian religion; that is quite clear and strong on the subject, supplanting the negative Hebrew "Thou shalt not kill"[5] with the positive "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."[6] (Would it not save the face of religion to a considerable extent if we wrote it: "Thou shouldst not——," because you see we keep right on doing it; or "Thou shouldst——," because, though officially admitting that we should—we don't.)

We have no deliberate cult of murder in America. We have no custom of having to show so many dried heads as a proof of our manhood; and our murderers are not invariably popular idols.[7]

But we do allow an environment around millions of our citizens which tends to produce murder. Murder does not suddenly burst forth out of a blameless life. Back of that actual murder were a thousand hates, a thousand ferocious impulses. What made them?

What previous moral injury to mothers and fathers long before left the weak will, the strong passions, the unused reasoning power?

What daily and nightly knowledge of injustice, of anger and insult and cruelty, came to the growing child?

What conditions of his lodging, his feeding, his clothing, his working, tended to increase in his heart the feelings that lead to murder?

In these is to be found "the origin of evil" in regard to our American crimes.

We make murderers in our city slums and our starved and stunted villages, precisely as we make trotting horses by means of "blue grass" and the training stable.

The human animal is a good kind of beast by nature, but extremely susceptible to social influences. Most of our life is social; our social environment counts far more than the merely physical, and also modifies

the physical. A savage may freeze or starve in the open, in a clean and dignified submission to natural law, but a citizen of New York freezes and starves in sight and knowledge of riotous luxury, and this knowledge breeds murder.

The constant noise in which our city's social victims live is either a torment, or makes deaf and callous those who must submit to it. They have in their environment far more to drag them down than to lift them up.

Against this deteriorating influence our best uplifting power is that of the much despised "human nature." People in the mass are always better than their conditions, and the worse their conditions are the better they are in proportion. The wonder is not that we have so many murders, but that we have so few.

In 1906 we had 10,662 homicides, while Italy—we are so apt to lay the blame for our crimes upon our foreign population—had 3,606, and Spain 1,584; England, Ireland and Scotland together only 507.

You may say that the murderers from these countries come to us; but it has been shown that the nationalities of our homicides are as follows: Native white, 42.94 per cent.; foreign born, 16.50 per cent.; negroes, 37.12 per cent.; Chinese and Japanese, 1.28 per cent.; Civilized Indians, 1.21 per cent. (Figures from *The World Almanac,* 1912.)[8]

Now instead of lumping all our misconduct together and trying to account for it all by a process of metaphysics, we should classify our acts, study the antecedent influences, and learn to account for a given line of conduct in a given people in a given locality by a plain study of conditions.[9]

Take another common instance of evil—one of the three great divisions so feared by the early saints: "The World, the Flesh, and the Devil." They considered evil the whole effect of association, and fled from "the world" into the desert—became hermits. They were quite right *in the premises.* If the way they chose to live was right it was assuredly impossible in a community who thought differently.

They assumed that "the devil" was always on hand to "tempt" them, thus describing the action of the brain, the poor lonesome brain, cut off from its natural functioning and falling into a morbid condition. They would have had less "devil" if they had had more "world."

But equally they feared their own poor bodies, their natural desires for food and drink, for rest and comfort, and, worst of all, the mating instinct.

We, who live in comparative decency, should always remember that the frantic reaction of the early Christian ascetics, or of the Hindu or

any ascetics, was against hideous excesses. There was evil, horrible evil, in "the flesh," in the morbid, misused, over-indulged appetites of the ancient world.

So they swung back and called it all "evil," and it was really very difficult work, being a saint, in those days. Fancy setting yourself against those three—the whole influence of society, the action of your own mind, and the pathetic ceaseless demands of the poor ill-treated body, long over-indulged, and suddenly cut off altogether.

That so many were able to do it, and are still able to do it—there are said to be some 50,000 self-torturing ascetics in India today—shows the tremendous power of the human will guided by a dominant idea. The truth or falsehood of an idea does not matter. Once it is accepted, and conduct forced into accordance therewith, a man may suffer a lifetime of agony with great satisfaction. With that proof of our power all we need is to make wise choice of our ideas.

In the question of the dangers of "the flesh," what is "the origin of evil?"

Here we have an initial tendency not only harmless, but beneficial in the highest sense: that impelling power of sex attraction which draws male and female together in all bisexual species. We do not call it "evil" in the animals. Neither do we call it "Love" and make a god of it. In ourselves we do both. We deify and damn the same instinct—according to our views.

There is no denying that in our race there is good ground for calling this thing evil—if one is a superficial observer.

From the slavery of a servile wife-hood to the misery of the prostitute, from the difficulties and diseases of those continually struggling with this impulse to the difficulties and diseases of those continually indulging it, we find evil.

What is the "origin of evil" here?

Why is the human animal afflicted as no other animal is afflicted in this relation?

It requires no revelation to account for our trouble. Any function misused, works wrongly—produces evil.

This function has one admitted general purpose—reproduction. It has, in the minds of many of us, a further function, as the expression of mutual love. We will here grant both uses—not to reduce the area of possible agreement too severely.

Quite beyond either of these has arisen a very general error, maintained by half the world, and religiously taught to the other half, that this function exists mainly for the pleasure and well-being of the male sex.

The first use, that which we have in common with other and healthier creatures, is not an evil; it is a good. No one, except in protest against enforced unwilling maternity, or as a measure of protection against poverty, thinks reproduction an evil. Neither is the second use considered evil, save by those ascetics who would bar both, and by a few earnest extremists who preach—and practice—the theory of continence aside from reproduction, even in marriage.[10]

But when we come to an indulgence which avoids or prevents reproduction and puts slavery in place of love, we find a condition visibly evil. It is here that disease and unhappiness arise; in a brutal excess in marriage, or in the sordid horrors of prostitution.

So far the world has fully agreed that prostitution is an evil; at the same time solemnly asserting that it could not be helped.

We have drawn the line between "legal" and "illicit" relations. We have confused our seeking intelligence with arbitrary distinctions of law, arbitrary regulations of religion, and have failed to follow up the plain and natural laws of the right and wrong.

Study them for the moment in another natural appetite—the desire for food. It is "right" to eat good food. It is "wrong" to overeat, or to eat bad food. Now suppose laws are made against overeating. Or suppose religion insists that none may eat without a sacrament, but with it, being blest, may eat all they please. Neither law nor religion would make the "right" and "wrong" in question. That distinction rests on the laws of the body.

The origin of evil, in that great sad field of happiness, misery and shame, the human sex-relation, is merely the misuse of *function.*

A simple cause, this. It might happen to any function; it has happened to many. We misuse our stomachs; we misuse our eyes; we misuse our teeth. We have outgrown instinct and have not substituted reason. We spend our intelligence in devising means to combat the results of our misdoing instead of using that intelligence to discover the cause.

How are we to account for this gross error in human life: Shall we look for it in Inheritance, Environment, or Education?

We may find it in all. Today the weight of inheritance is heavy upon us. For long ages we have accumulated our present characteristics, and now must face them calmly and see whether we choose to carry on the transmission forever, or to modify it.

But inheritance is no explanation. It only transfers our problem farther back. Sometime a change began, which made our conduct in this field differ from that of other creatures.

Education is a strong force too. There is a cult among men commending and upholding their habits, transmitted by word of mouth and

in literature; a cult which preaches one law for men and one for women. Among the forces of education we find the heaviest weight, as usual, in religion.

Of all the educational forces contributing to the abuse of this function none is more conspicuous than the doctrine of many ancient religions that women are made for the pleasure and service of men.

Christianity has been heavily discolored by the dictum of St. Paul. Not Jesus, but Paul commanded: "Wives submit yourselves to your husbands," and gave that gross sanction of marriage still repeated by those who uphold "early marriages" because it is "healthier" for the young man.[11]

Back of all this, however, lies that degrading old Hebrew legend of the creation of Eve out of Adam's rib, because, forsooth, it was "not good for him to be alone."[12] The nobler and older first version gives no such paltry explanation. "Male and female created He them, and He gave them dominion over the earth, to rule over it."[13]

Later knowledge of the development of life on earth supplants all legends with the facts. We know now that earliest life was asexual, growing on through stages of improvement to the bisexual, and the one later called "female" was the original organism, the male, as a separate organism appearing far later. We know further that in many species he is even yet of the most fractional and temporary service, but one being selected out of ineffectual thousands, and that only in long ages of growth did he rise to equality with the female.

This knowledge, once generally admitted, will displace the Hebrew story. It will be difficult for an intelligent Jew to utter with such heartfelt pride and satisfaction his daily thanks that he was not born a woman.[14]

By preaching the inferiority and subjection of women many religions have been heavily responsible for the evils of our conduct, but even this is not the origin.

Those legends did not appear while women were strong and free—they grew out of her subjection.

We must look to environment, to economic conditions to find the beginning, the simple natural beginning, which led us step by step into this deepest of our racial pitfalls.

Just as an unobserved angle in the road, a fork that seems to lead in the right direction may turn farther and farther from it, and as, in seeking to return, we may find many forks, and not know which was the unnoticed turning that first led us astray, so has man, in his long upward journey, made many a slight misstep, with consequences lasting for thousands of years.

Moreover, in studying our "problem of evil" we must not confound consequences with culpability.

A perfectly innocent babe may commit suicide by falling out of the window, or homicide and arson by playing with matches. It is a great pity—but the child is not to be blamed in proportion to the mischief done.

Baby mankind made as many mistakes as any other growing thing, more, in fact, because of his greater intelligence and the widening area of opportunities. But only the other babies, owl-eyed and solemn, ignorant and weak-minded, could make the mistake we have made, thus far, in blaming and punishing him.

Chapter 5

SIN

IN THE slow, irregular growth of our understanding of ethics one of the heaviest arresting forces is the ancient race-concept of "Sin."

Sin, as such, has not the faintest connection with ethics. It is a wholly arbitrary term, applied to various acts and lines of conduct in accordance with primitive religious views; views held at a period long before even our present meager knowledge of the real laws of right and wrong.

Race ideas grow one from another, in long lines of slow development, modified from age to age by those "mutations," those splendid leaps forward in our race-psychology made by the great founders of new religions.

Even they have always felt the influence of the more ancient thought, and have struggled mightily against it, as in the valiant protest of Jesus—"Ye have heard it said by them of old time"—"But I say unto you—"[1]—and he did, speaking "as one having authority, not as the scribes."[2]

In view of this glorious revolt of new percepts is it not amusing to note how the later compilers, striving to harmonize the New Testament with the old—(that deadly mistaken compromise) carefully wrote in from time to time—"And this he said that it might be fulfilled which was written—."[3]

Fancy that splendid iconoclast, whose teaching was in such rampant opposition to "that which was written," carefully looking up his authorities and arranging his doings accordingly!

Yet in spite of the grand independence of its founder the Christian

religion is heavily modified by the ancient Hebraic views and theories, as they in turn carried on the more ancient Assyrian, and still remoter Chaldean mythology.

In all this long line of psychological heredity, possibly the oldest idea of all is that of Sin.

Sin is disobedience, the obverse of the pre-social virtue of obedience, found, as we have seen, in the animal species long preceding ours.

As the mother-culture gave way to masculine specialization, we find the primitive medicine man giving orders and punishing disobedience; and very early indeed his practical mind developed the basic concept that the wickedest thing of all was not to do what he said.

This attitude was imputed to the early deities as soon as they became strongly visualized. Would that we could represent, as in the cinematograph, the first vague cloudy concept of Personality in the Unknown Forces which impressed that dim and unused mind; and watch it grow, hardening in outline, deepening in color, taking on new attributes, specializing into different gods and goddesses, as the attributes became more varied and irreconcilable, and then, when at last the brain was able to form the greater concept, centralizing again in man's largest thought—one God—*The* Central Power.

If our pictorial representation were correct it would show how difficult it has been to hold that Great Idea, and how a hierarchy of saints, angels, sub-deities with special interests, have been added to ease the strain.

We have frankly divided our deity into three—solemnly asserting that three equals one—and that to doubt this "sacred mystery" is Sin.

"Sin" has accompanied religion all the way up, and is with us yet.

Each religion has its own special sins, carefully arranged, some worse than others, "mortal sins"; some better than others, "venial sins"; and that Formless Terror in the background—"The Unpardonable Sin."

Commands—Disobedience—Punishment—Pardon—Vengeance and Mercy—all these vanish into thin air when we study ethics.

Things are wrong because they are not good for us; because they do not "conduce to the best development of the organism"—Society.

In each religion the Deity is figured as Commanding and Forbidding according to the best ethical precepts of that time, plus a heavy coloring of the ethical percepts of far earlier time, and the special acts thus ordered or prohibited are what we call Sins and Virtues.

In order to compel the desired behavior, this same primitive mind, knowing nothing of the sources of action or how to modify it, could do no better than enlarge its practical systems of reward and punishment, and these, growing as ideas do grow when allowed to dominate the brain,

have cast their prodigious shadows down all eternity—an eternity devised to harbor them.

Since a rigid death penalty failed to check misdoers, since even torture, in hideous excess, proved incapable of affecting the imaginations of other new-made sinners, so as to produce better conduct, our religious authorities, still innocent either of ethics or of practical psychology, merely pursued their erroneous method to the *nth* power.

They elaborated the most frightful concept ever produced by the logical action of a misinformed mind—that of Eternal Punishment. With a sort of psychic Sadism they let themselves go in a riot of unspeakable horror, horror such as no mind could hold close and long without insanity, and then eternalized this horror, inventing an eternal capacity for suffering to match the eternal torment.

And this product of a diseased imagination they attributed to God—!

Let us sweep away these cobwebs.

Right and wrong are relative terms.

Right conduct for human beings is conduct known to be beneficial to humanity; wrong conduct is the reverse.

Right eating is what keeps us well, strong and happy and improving; wrong eating makes us ill, weak, unhappy and stationary or retrogressing.

Is wrong eating, then, a Sin?

We have not been taught so. "Gluttony" was called a sin; and in the Moslem religion it is a sin to drink wine; the Arab is not troubled by gluttony, and the Christian is the most intemperate of all the churches.

We have crudely chalked off streaks and patches of conduct, calling this part virtue, and this part sin—without understanding why, and still less understanding how to most successfully change the conduct.

From the earliest mother-power up through the fierce dominance of newly-enthroned man, and all the dictatorial violence of the solemn priesthoods of old time, we have dealt only with authority.

"Do this—and you shall have a reward."

"Do that—and you shall have a penalty."

"If you do what you are told you are Good."

"If you disobey, you are Bad—that is Sin."

Suppose we had used this plan in the development of other lines of conduct?

Take for instance the study of navigation. Here man undertook the task of riding the sea. Right conduct brought him and his vessel safe to port. Wrong conduct meant drowning—but it did not mean damnation. Drowning was enough.

Very slowly, at great cost of life, men learned the art of navigation. It

is still a dangerous trade, still costs us heavy loss of life and property, but these difficulties are not complicated by adding to the fear of death the fear of eternal punishment.

Take a simpler, safer art—agriculture. If we do right, and the weather suits, we succeed in raising a crop; if we do wrong—or the weather does—we fail. But there is no thought of Sin in our failure.

Take an inter-human process like education. Right conduct on the part of the educator is that which produces the best results in the least time, with the least effort; wrong the reverse. We have made progress in "the virtues" of the educator, and many still "sin"—sin heavily—but they do not call it "sin." Their consciences are not perturbed by their shortcomings.

Or again take that much-vexed field of conduct, the relation of the sexes. Right conduct in this relation is that which produces the best children and the most health and happiness; wrong, the reverse. But we, with that blinding black-and-white poster work of ours, have broadly painted on our harsh distinctions, and called the most vicious overindulgence "right" if under matrimony, and the purest, sweetest, relation "wrong" if outside that shelter.

We made another broad division of right and wrong between the conduct of the sexes, our famous "double standard"; we have allowed tradition, prejudice, custom and habit to dictate to us; even science has been blinded by sex-prejudice; so that in this simple and natural relation there is practically no knowledge of real right and wrong. A vicious and degrading marriage, which any clear-eyed child could see was wrong, we maintain to be Right; and what we do call "Sin" is a sin for one of the two co-sinners and not for the other—a marvel of ethical bewilderment.

The sense of Sin is one of peculiar distress. It is far beyond the feeling aroused by what we call "a mistake," an "error," a "misplay." One may do wrong, glaringly wrong, in a hundred ways, feel any degree of annoyance and shame, but it is not the "conviction of Sin." That feeling grips at the very roots of sensation—no wonder—it is so very, very old. It brings to the sufferer a bitter combination of shame, remorse, and fear; horrible paralyzing fear. This is because of all those ages of primitive authority and primitive punishment; the iron entered our soul many many thousand years ago—and is there yet.

Suppose we take it out—take it out for good and all.

Right and wrong are questions of law; strong, sure, safe, natural law.

The result of right doing is visible and sure to be earned, securely.

The result of wrong doing is as visible and as secure—from it there is no escape.

These results are not "rewards," or "punishments," they are consequences, inevitable consequences. They cannot be escaped.

It is of no use to pray to the water not to drown you, but one may learn to swim! It is of no use to pray to the harvest to benefit you, but one may eat it.

Prayer, in the sense of a deep renewal of psychic vigor, is a process of proven usefulness; but prayer, in the sense of requesting a Personal interference with the Person's own laws, is a process of proven uselessness.

Let us look back at the record of Human Sin. It is very dreadful, is it not?

Now let us look at it under another name—as the record of Human Progress.

We, who were but beasts, have become so largely human that we even now look forward to World-Peace, and have begun to work for it.

We, who strayed from the clean sex-relation of other animals into all manner of uncleanness, are even now looking forward to Chastity for both sexes; to light where there was darkness; to a Conscious Motherhood, a Reverent Fatherhood that will literally regenerate the world.

We have got far enough to form these new ideals and to begin to work toward them. We, who grew from wild freedom into slavery, a slavery which is practically co-existent with history, have just outgrown it; have rushed madly into a brief period of contract labor and are, even now, grasping the idea that to work is the essential condition of human life, of social health, and that to live on the labor of others without return of one's own labor is social parasitism and disease.

We have grown splendidly, have learned much, have done well.

Ah—but think of the awful record of failure, cruelty and crime!

Is it so terrible? What have we a right to expect? What is it likely that such a race of beings, in such and such conditions *would* do?[4]

Does anyone in his senses expect to learn so much as a language—with no mistakes? Or expect a child, never so well brought up, to reach maturity without ever a fault?

We have had to learn—Life.

We are a child-race, and there was no parent-race to bring us up. We have had to experiment all the way, and it was long indeed before we knew enough, before we had sufficient range of vision—to judge of our race mistakes.

Personal conduct, in personal relations, in local conditions, we might have learned fairly well, if we had not always had the handicap of prepotent ancestral ideas; but social conduct—there is where our great wrongdoing lies.

The limited individual ethics was easily learned, the hardly less limited family ethics was not too difficult, though heavily obscured by sex-prejudice and tradition, and arbitrarily modified by religion; but social ethics, the real ethics of humanity—we never knew. Great souls throbbed to it—Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, Confucius, Mencius, Moses, but no religion felt it—until Jesus came. And the religion bearing his name speedily ignored it, and fell back on the old individualism; the worry of the eternally-elongated personal soul about its Reward—or Punishment.

Until we could grasp the idea of the Organic Unity of Society we could have no solid basis of ethics—and that idea, though now set clearly before the world, is still not generally accepted.

Under a merely personal view of ethics we could never understand human conduct. With no special psychology we could never learn how to modify human conduct. With the arbitrary demarcations of religion to still further blind us in a study of the real laws of our nature, and that special and peculiar check which we alone among all living things have suffered under—the persistence of outgrown ideas and customs—the wonder is not that humanity has "sinned" but that it has been so amazingly virtuous.

To the modern student, aware of something of the laws of human progress, the study of history with all its pathos, all its horror, all its shame, becomes as richly sweet as a garden in the spring, with the brave unfolding of lovely qualities against the continuous pressure of ignorance, ancient falsehood and wrong.

The natural love of man and woman has grown strong and beautiful in the face of all the record of outrage and cruelty in marriage and out.

The "love of comrades" has appeared and reappeared, waxed stronger and warmer, in the face of all our ages of warfare, and is now kindling to a mighty blaze; a steady fire that shall warm the world and put an end to bloodshed.

The love of work, our innate human passion, the force that drives the artist to his canvas, the inventor to his machines, the sailor to the sea, has held its own, has made good, is now pushing steadily into recognition, in spite of slavery and traditions of slavery, wages, and the cruelty of wages.

Sin? Can you imagine animals turning into Christians by the slow

process of prehistoric and historic evolution without doing something wrong?

We have no evidence of the possibility of any child, any learner of anything, making unbroken progress without mistakes. One of our worst mistakes was to call our errors "sin."

"The soul that sinneth it shall die," says the sternly convinced Ancient.[5] That was when sin was held to be an entirely private matter. What we are now learning, in our new knowledge of social organic unity, is that our misdeeds cannot be traced to personality but to collective responsibility.

Let us consider one particular "sin," such as unchastity in a woman. Here is one girl, reared in the sweet seclusion of a well-ordered home, trained in all fine sentiment and clean emotion, fed on the noblest literature and art, associating only with people of similar upbringing, and, furthermore, educated not only in strong self-command, but in such noble vigor of physical development as gives her a clean, strong body with normal instincts.

Here is another girl, born of irresponsible, weak-willed degraded parents, feeble in both physical and mental inheritance, growing up in miserable conditions, in crowded rooms where both sexes, of all ages, live together; accustomed to the lowest standards in idea and language; uneducated in any noble sense, cut off from all those fine inheritances and associations which so uphold the other, and so ill-fed, ill-clothed and overworked that she has a feeble body, overridden by its ill-balanced desires.

If these two girls each yield to a temptation of sex, is the "Sin" the same?

It has been shown, in cool, comforting figures, that chastity increases in proportion to the floor-space occupied by the family; just as the height of children increases, similarly, something like a quarter of an inch for each added room, up to the normal size of house—and child. Now if unchastity, in a deadly average of frequency, increases as the room for decent living decreases, and if unchastity is a sin—*whose sin is it!*

Again it has been shown, in Glasgow, when municipal lighting was begun and the authorities lit up not only streets and alleys, but the dark courts, hallways, stairs and "wynds," that this increase of light was followed by a proportionate decrease in the city's crime.[6]

The "city's" crime! The regular average of crime, appearing in humanity when humanity is subjected to certain living conditions.

If these acts are sins, and if they depend upon conditions of housing, lighting, and the like—*whose sins are they?*

Suppose you tell a child that it is a sin to steal.

Then suppose you set before the child a peculiarly tempting delicacy. Then suppose you go away and leave him alone with the temptation. Then suppose you withhold food from the child, so that he is hungry, starving, weakened from privation—and still the dainty is there within reach—and the child eats it.

Is that a sin?—Whose?

It has been shown in carefully noted records in Belgium that a rise in the price of bread is accompanied by a decrease in marriage and an increase in prostitution.[7]

Being hungry does not increase evil desires, but it does decrease resistance.

We must recognize at last, that we stand or fall together. The conduct of a given community is the conduct of that much human nature, under those local conditions, and also under the pressure of the psychic environment, the inherited mental attitudes, the educational influences, the social customs, the common habits of the people.

Into this complex of forces modifying action, the influence of religion has thrust its tremendous force; not to understand and alter the conditions which resulted in the objectionable conduct, but to placard the face of life with its arbitrary "Right" and "Wrong" signs, and to call on the Individual Conscience, the Individual Will, to choose between them.

In our legendary version of The Fall of Man this method did not work, even with the Deity Himself giving express commands of a very simple nature. The Apple Tree was stronger—plus the creeping Intelligence of that Old Serpent.

Furthermore, in our continued account, this method always failed. We have the record of that people who fondly imagined they were better than any other people, and who wrote their own story of themselves. According to that story they never succeeded in avoiding sin, though prophet after prophet arose to threaten, direct and exhort them.

Even in the Christian Theory we find humanity given up as a bad job—they simply *would* sin; they never could learn how to behave, and so they had to be "bought with a price"—not being able to earn their reward by good conduct.

We have flatly accepted Sin as essential to human nature; have accepted the ghastly theory of eternal damnation, and then the ameliorating theory of salvation—not by improved behavior, but by the sacrifice of another to buy us off from punishment.

We do not have to believe this any longer. We may hold a solid knowledge of God, founded, not on questionable records but on the book of

nature itself, a God seen at work, and too honestly respected for us to believe disgraceful stories about him.

We may hold a splendid sense of help and comfort from Jesus, that colossal figure of Human Love, who saw so much of the real law of our collective life, and so pathetically failed to make others see it. The figure of Jesus will stand higher and higher in our later history, when the truth of his position is at last admitted and when we turn our attention from calling him "Lord! Lord!" and begin to do the things which he said.

But we may drop Sin out of minds, for good and all.

Have you done wrong? That is a pity. We all do, more or less.

Have you done more wrong than others? Well—if you have, that is more pity still.

What, then, should be your attitude and ours toward this evil conduct?

The first thing is, of course, to stop it. If you cannot stop it Society has a right to protect itself from you, as a mere temporary measure of self-defense; but the important thing is for Society to find out what made you do it—and stop that.

Here, for instance, is a man who is drunk, and commits a murder. This is bad conduct, both the murder and getting drunk.

Society punishes him as a murderer.

It may even punish him for getting drunk.

But only a few members of society seek to put an end to drunkenness, and so to many murders and other evils.

Even they, in a downright primitive manner, seek to end drunkenness by removing the Demon Rum. They are only lately beginning to study the two questions: Why do men drink? and Why do men sell liquor?

They say to this man: "You shall not drink." And to this man: "You shall not sell liquor." But they surely must observe that even with the demon rum in evidence *all* men are not drunk.

Why, then, do some men drink while others do not? What classes drink most, and why? What conditions tend to make men drink?

Here is "Sin" if ever there was one; a form of indulgence which injures Society in the loss of millions upon millions of dollars, and in mind, life, health and happiness far beyond that.

But drunkenness is not to be stopped by damnation for drunkards—nor by salvation for drunkards, either.

It is to be stopped by Society as a whole, when it, collectively, shall face the evil, study the causes, and remove them.

No time, no energy, should be wasted in Remorse on the one hand or in condemnation on the other.

Punishment does not stop any evil. Punishment is always after the

event—and the event is repeated, by someone else, owing to the action of the same forces which governed the earlier offender.

When we drop the whole theory of Sin out of our minds for good and all; when we recognize that every act of life is "right" or "wrong," and that the one most important business of an awakened society is to study human conduct and what modifies it, then we shall lose forever the heaviest weight, the darkest cloud, that ever rested on humanity.

Losing this sense of Sin we come out into a clear bright world; a world where things are safe and solid and reliable; a world wherein the past becomes a useful record book whereby we may learn what not to do, for the most part, and also, to some extent, the precious proven truths of what we should do.

This new world blazes with hope.

We have not Sinned.

We are not Dammed.

We do not need to be Saved.

Our business is To Learn and To Grow.

We have The Power of God lifting always within, and the Light of Reason to walk by. There is no dark mystery over our conduct.

Bound together by every law of our nature, and finding our highest pleasure in mutual service, we, the Human Race, need only find out in mutual helpfulness, in long patience, in growing love, first, what is the best way to behave—to our common advantage; and then what is the best way to induce people to behave so.

We have to learn that ultimate forgiveness which *forgives ourselves.*

We must drop that grudge against our ancestors which has been nursed through theory—the theory that "In Adam's fall we sinned all"; and with it that baseless, contemptible meanness which shunted Adam's supposititious guilt upon Eve.[8]

There is no greater horror in the whole period of human consciousness than in our theories of Sin, Punishment, Eternal Damnation, and there is no greater meanness, no more cowardly piece of blackguardism in that same period than the unanimous haste with which our ancestors laid the blame of the whole world's evil upon woman.

All this we may now outgrow.

Chapter 6

VIRTUES AND PRINCIPLES

THE REAL weakness of ethics, as it has been presented to us in the past, is in its explanations. "Why is this right?" asks the child, or, more rebelliously, the older student, and, going further, "Why is this more right than that—what is *most* right?"

Our old answer was mere authority—"Thus saith the Lord," but when the student saw that some most grievous evils, such as gambling, bribery and treason, were not specifically forbidden; and that some of the noblest virtues, such as courage, patriotism, and intellectual honesty were not commanded—then was the student perplexed.

Certain general standards of morality he finds common to many religions, but the explanation of them lies in old race customs more than in the religious sanction. If he is a real student, using his own mind; if he looks at life about him, or in past history, to found judgment on fact, then there appears so tumultuous and perplexing an array of facts that judgment is most difficult.

Out of this welter we have evolved some fairly good rules of conduct, known as "principles." These principles are drawn from a large number of cases, and are supposed to hold conduct up to standard even when the immediate conditions are most confusing.

Today we are changing our ideas about the old principles, and have not developed satisfactory new ones. Those who founded their beliefs on authority and revelation, are horrified at those who dispute authority, deny revelation, and demand reasons for their ethics.

Our study now is to find out, from the open book of human life, past and present, why virtues are virtues, what is their order of importance, and what is the true base for our principles.

Here is a list of some of those qualities we have called virtues, with their opposites, where we recognize them:[1]

1. Love—Hate.
2. Truth—Falsehood.
3. Justice—Injustice.
4. Courage—Cowardice.
5. Hope—Fear.
6. Faith—Doubt.
7. Obedience—Disobedience.
8. Reverence—Irreverence.
9. Mercy—Cruelty.
10. Forgiveness—Revenge.
11. Patience—Impatience.
12. Endurance
13. Contentment—Discontentment.
14. Resignation—Rebellion.
15. Humility—Pride.
16. Loyalty—Disloyalty.
17. Temperance—Intemperance.
18. Prudence—Imprudence.
19. Industry—Laziness.
20. Chastity—Licentiousness.
21. Generosity—Parsimony.
22. Kindness—Unkindness.
23. Cheerfulness—Complaining.
24. Courtesy—Discourtesy.
25. Self-control
26. Hospitality—Inhospitality.
27. Modesty—Immodesty.
28. Honesty—Dishonesty.
29. Gratitude—Ingratitude.
30. Thrift—Wastefulness.
31. Punctuality—Unpunctuality.

32. Perseverance

33. Unselfishness—Selfishness.

34. Patriotism—Treason.

35. Honor—Dishonor.

There is one marked peculiarity in this enumeration. In most cases the virtue is positive and the vice mere lack of virtue; as in "im-prudence," or "dis-honesty"; but in one case the vice is given as positive, and the virtue negative,—"Selfishness," and "Un-selfishness." This would seem, at first, to rather belittle the virtue in question, and, as far as public recognition goes, we have done so. But in general habit and feeling, the one vice of all others most despised is that of selfishness; the one virtue most universally recognized and beloved is unselfishness. The social instinct recognizes this; for "unselfishness" is "love of the neighbor," the base of social progress.

Our measurement of these virtues as to relative importance varies according to the point of view.

If we take the standard of the Hebrew scriptures we should put first Faith, then Reverence and Obedience, then Justice and Mercy.

If we take the Christian standard we have the direct and overwhelming statement that Love, of God and of humanity covers all. Even St. Paul admits that Love is greater than Faith or Hope. One wonders a little at Hope being set so high. At the time it was doubtless due to that very practical and compelling Hope of the early Christians—the Second Coming of the Lord, and the visible establishment of His Kingdom. That Hope was what drove them, lifted them, held them firm. In later centuries this paled and dwindled (save among the "Second Adventists"), becoming, so far as it remained a virtue at all, the hope of heaven. This was always rather a weak sister, not to be mentioned, as a compeller, with the Fear of Hell.

Christianity covers all the Hebrew virtues except Justice—we cannot expect much stress on Justice from a Church which wrested the teachings of Jesus into the doctrine of Vicarious Atonement.

Hebrew, Christian, Buddhist, Moslem, Confucian,—all people of any real civilization, agree on many of the patently useful virtues which fill out the list. Modern business life has added such recent and practical ones as Punctuality, Industry and Thrift. Honor stands high with some classes; Chastity, for both sexes, is but recently under discussion as a real possibility. Loyalty was developed by military life and throve under chieftain and monarch, slowly followed by Patriotism. Courage—a virtue

older than humanity, and one of the best, has not been given high religious sanction, there was too much Reverence for authority to allow virtue to Courage; and there is one—perhaps as great as any, which has never been firmly insisted on, and for which, even yet, we have small respect, namely Truth.

It is not to be expected that while Faith was the first requisite of any religion; that Faith involving the full acceptance of miracles and legends; that the human mind could develop a keen sense of Truth and its value.

Note that the Hebraic commandments, while forbidding perjury and the making of unfulfilled vows, did not even try to prevent so common a thing as lying.

Later peoples have set up certain standards in regard to Truth, but hold them shakily; even a gentleman may lie to or about a woman. Women are not expected to be truthful, tradesmen are expected to be untruthful, and do not disappoint us; neither the legal nor the medical profession is rigorous as to truthfulness; business and politics are alike unveracious; and as to "society"—Truth would flatly prohibit our present polite forms of "social intercourse."

Besides all these there are other virtues as yet but dimly seen, and having no place among the halos, so far.

Of these we may mention two, whose names arouse no thrill, yet without which we could not live at all, far less develop.

The first of these it is hard even to name. We may call it, clumsily enough, "Integrity of function." This means doing the special work one is meant to do in the world, the fulfillment of real social service.

The old fable of "The Lap Dog and the Ass" faintly shows the obverse.[2] An Ass, however affectionate, is unsuited for sitting in one's lap; and a Lap Dog, though possessing every canine virtue, would be a poor beast of burden.

If one's real duty in life is to make music for the people, no amount of effort spent in the grocery business makes up for "malfeasance in office."

Another super-important virtue, though not yet listed, is that most practical of all—Efficiency. To well and thoroughly achieve, to accomplish one's task, to do one's work in the world not only "patiently" or "bravely" or "unselfishly," but *well*—that is a most necessary, most universally necessary virtue.

To recognize these distinctions needs a revision of standards.

The first and all sufficient reason for our failure to establish clear provable ethics is our misapprehension of our own nature.

Ethics is a social science, not a personal one.

While we see, measure and treat life in terms of individualism, we can never understand ethics. Suppose, similarly, military ethics were based upon nothing but the advantage of the individual soldier—his personal hope of reward or his personal fear of punishment. If he was held from desertion only by fear of being shot, and then saw that to remain in the ranks meant the certainty of being shot—why not take a chance of escaping? If courage and devotion to duty meant only a decoration or increase of rank or salary, why show these virtues when they entail certain death?

No, a high standard of military ethics involves a clear ideal of the nature, place and purpose of the army, and is most generally lived up to where the "morale" of the whole army is high, where the soldiers understand such ethics.

When the common sailors of the British Navy respond to the cry: "England expects every man to do his duty," that shows in the common sailor a capacity to understand *his relation to England,* and to fulfill that relation at cost of life itself, even when the country he dies for has never done anything in particular for him.

All this is commonplace; what remains is for us to apply this capacity of ours to similar recognition of the nature of ethics in general. Once we recognize the vital organic character of our relation to one another, and see that the conduct of each is to be measured, not by its reaction on him, *but by its effect upon all*—then we have a workable basis for ethics.

This has been glimpsed in the ancient phrase, "the greatest good to the greatest number," which is a far more reasonable ground of conduct than the interpersonal Golden Rule, but so long as the "greatest number" were mere massed individuals, so long we could not soundly determine what was their "greatest good."

Apply either of these standards to military ethics and see how they fail. The army does not exist *for itself,* or for any number of its individual parts, but for the service of the community. It is "England" which expects the service—not any lesser group.

Apply this again to other service—to all service, to the conduct of each one of us throughout life, and, above even country, put the great concept of Humanity itself, and we have at last a reliable base for ethics.

The human race, society as a whole, is the organic form of which our conduct is the functioning.

In studying its needs we find the same order of duties seen in a simpler organism; the great Three: Self-preservation, Race-preservation, Evolution—To be, To Re-Be, To Be Better.

Society must live, and to that end has evolved its industrial processes;

Society must reproduce itself and to that end intervenes with law and custom to regulate marriage, and to transmit the treasure of previous knowledge and achievement; Society must evolve to higher forms—and here comes in the splendid vanguard of the world, not only the explorers, inventors and discoverers, but those who see and feel and think ahead, and spread to others the new precepts and concepts whereby we grow.

Ethics applies to each of these fields of duty.

Right conduct in the first, is that which best promotes social well-being. In explicit instance consider the ethics of agriculture. Its work is to produce the most and the best food with the least cost, either of labor, money or time. Some farmers "do right" and others "do wrong"—this is the measure.

Or take transportation of goods. Its work is to distribute the most goods at the least cost, in labor, money or time.

Note at once how the personal standard of ethics—or our lack of any, fails to promote these ends. The producers and distributors never see the social duty in their work. "England" does not "expect" anything of them—in these lines, and it is not disappointed.

In the second field, social reproduction, we err again, from the same reason. In the physiological process we see only personality, and in the subtler, wider task of transmitting from age to age the best race achievements we show no conscious selection, but try to hand down the whole past,—failures, follies, errors and all.

Right conduct in this field is such parentage as shall preserve and improve the human stock, such historic and educational work as shall preserve and improve the gains we have already made, and to discard failures. Wrong conduct is the reverse.

In the third we have "sinned" worse than in either of the others, for we have not even known that we had this duty—growth.

To preserve the past we have striven, indiscriminately but with devotion.

To build the future we have never tried.

Yet this should be the governing consideration of all human conduct. We must of course live, socially as well as personally; and in the development of society's nutritive processes, as, more conspicuously, in its methods of offense and defense, we have done well.

Also in preserving and transmitting what we have accomplished we have done fairly well, honoring and rewarding the preservers and transmitters. But those supreme social servants whose duty it is to show the way to better things—for them has always been not only indifference and neglect, but ridicule, contempt, opposition, hatred, death.

In the complex of our interpersonal life, with no knowledge of hu-

manity's real nature to guide us, we have nevertheless evolved from our social subconsciousness our list of Virtues—certain qualities proven valuable; and Principles—certain concepts of right conduct.

In the light of the new interpretation of Humanity as an organic whole, how may we interpret these qualities and concepts? What now stands highest, and why?

In order to judge we have but to compare the human race with other races, thus establishing our essential qualities; and to compare the highest humanity we know with the lowest humanity we know, thus establishing our line of progression.

Certain essentially social qualities are easily determined, and among them none ranks higher than Love. Love is as essential to a Society as it is to an ant-heap. The profound sociological insight of Jesus is sufficiently proven by his unswerving insistence upon inter-human love. Our total failure to understand him in this is due to our collateral failure to understand human nature. We took this "love" he demanded to be a sort of "required study," a quality we were to cultivate to please Him, or to imitate Him—not in the least as a quality essential to us. We found it very difficult to produce an arbitrary hand-made "love" on demand, and did not know how to cultivate it naturally. Those who "standardized" our religion for us soon gave up what they deemed excessive demands, and fell back on the pre-Christian virtues of Faith and Obedience. Therefore, even in our so-called Christian countries we see little enough of the one distinctive virtue of that religion.

With Love, in the highest rank of human virtues, should stand Truth, and Justice, and the lifting qualities of Courage and Hope go with them.

Faith is a very transient quality, useful where there is no knowledge, but wholly useless where there is. We do not need to "have faith" in what we *know.*

Obedience and Reverence are also the companions of Ignorance and Weakness, at times a necessity, and only so far a virtue. Mercy and Forgiveness go with the concept of a very bad-tempered personal God, quite likely to change his mind and let off the offender if properly besought and appealed to. See, for instance, the adroit Moses in the Hebrew story, persuading his Deity not to destroy the erring Israelites, with the prompt result quoted: "And the Lord repented of the evil he had thought to do against His people."[3]

Patience, Endurance, Contentment and Resignation are also very uncertain virtues, sometimes becoming vices, and Humility is with them.

Loyalty was highly useful in monarchies and aristocracies. It is now often a mere excuse for conservatism.

Temperance, Prudence, Industry, Chastity, Generosity, Kindness,

Cheerfulness, Courtesy, Self-control, Hospitality, Modesty, Honesty, Gratitude—these are all useful minor virtues recognized as such by most of us.

Thrift, Punctuality and Perseverance, are wholly conditional; useful when needed.

There remain, of our best, Unselfishness, Patriotism, and Honor, with that most neglected of all virtues—Truth.

Unselfishness, that colorless negative name for the great social virtue of mutual love, we have misunderstood in more ways than one. Because the labor of the world was long performed by women, the loving service of motherhood, that first step toward social growth going with it; and because men despised women, therefore unselfishness was largely left to women. It was considered a feminine virtue, so used, and so ignored.

When, in early industrial development, man-slavery was added to woman slavery, the unselfishness was demanded of them, and obtained, perforce.

To be served, patiently, quietly, faithfully, efficiently, was the lot of the master; to so serve was the lot of the slave; and no master admired slaves' virtues.

Today in our masculine industrialism, selfishness ranges as widely as it ever did in days of constant warfare; and the lines are drawn ever clearer between the small close ranks of the dominant master class, and the vast mass of the people being forced by pressure from above, to unite their selfishness against the united selfishness above them.

Neither feeling is social. The concept of public service does not dominate either the trust or the trade union, yet public service is the only ground from which to regulate industry.

Meanwhile the true social instinct leading to true public service is spreading throughout society; overflowing from our long restricted womanhood, growing among men in industrial comradeship, even manifesting itself among the rich and powerful in a way that shows how unreal is the arbitrary distinction of "class" economics. The division between employing and employed which they insist on does exist, as slavery existed, but it is not a sociological division. It is a temporary and arbitrary division.

Unselfishness, from mother love to international patriotism, is a permanent social factor. Patriotism began most narrowly, most selfishly, a mere tribal feeling at first, then attached to a section of land, now growing swiftly on into a world sentiment—utterly unselfish.

Honor is a new virtue, rather a vague one, slowly emerging here and there as history advances. It is closely associated with a feeling we do not call virtue at all—Pride. "A high sense of honor"—"a delicate sense

of honor"—is for those very refined and very superior always, and unutterably despising all who do not possess it.

Yet it is a very noble virtue, a sort of psychic skeleton key to all the others. By and by we shall have more of it, all of us.

Now for that great neglected angel, Truth.

Society, as a living creature, must have a body and a soul.

Its body is the mechanical world of our manufacture; in the creation of which all our so-called "practical virtues" are so visibly necessary, and have been so largely developed.

Its soul is the social consciousness.

In proportion as we possess that common spirit are we truly human. This common consciousness demands, as its natural medium of existence, the interchange of knowledge, thought and feeling. In the interests of this interchange came speech, with its resultant growth into writing, printing, and all the marvels of electric transmission of the spoken or the written word. When, by wireless, we can some day spread a common joy or hope or purpose over the whole world in a moment we shall have free room for this social soul.

In the interests of all this development it is easy to recognize the value of the mechanic arts by which our thoughts or feelings are preserved and transmitted. It is easy also to see how education comes in, the essential training of young minds that they may successfully receive and transmit the waves of force which pass among us—or, as we put it, that they may be able to "understand," and to "express themselves properly."

No process is more inherently human than this process of mental exchange, none is more essential to our existence, none more necessary to our growth.

By as much as our external and social life depends on production and distribution of material things, so does our internal social life depend on the production and exchange of the spirit, interchange of knowledge, of ideas and of emotions.

If this is admitted—and surely it cannot be denied—we may see why Truth stands so high as a Social Virtue. We may also see why it has never been recognized. Under our wholly personal view of life and all its qualities, we measured virtues, as we did other things, by their reaction upon individuals. Truth is essentially *between* people; it is a virtue of transmission. For the individual, incentive to transmit truly or falsely can be measured only by personal advantage; either the personal advantage of immediate profit or loss, or of some ultimate profit or loss. Unless the transmission itself is recognized as a thing of pre-eminent value to society, Truth as indispensable virtue, has no weight.

As the Sunday-School pupil solemnly recited: "A lie is an abomination

to the Lord, and a very present help in time of trouble."[4] The present help is the governing factor with most of us. Those who have established some sort of value for Truth are the ones who were in least need of help; the aristocrat, the gentleman; while falsehood is conspicuously associated with weak and defenseless people.

What we have not seen is the social sanction for Truth, the vital need of it in all true social relation. Apply it to our educational processes. We can all see at once that if what we learn is not true our learning is wasted. Mistakes we have made, of course, and errors of mere ignorance, but we do have a standard of Truth in our text-books, and approximate it as closely as we can.

Apply it again to ordinary human transmission of information; if the signboard lies, we are astray; if the package is mis-labeled we buy what we do not want; we have to depend for mere existence on the truth of this general transmission.

So far we can readily agree, and, in the matter of personal friendship we know, that if you cannot believe a person you cannot trust him, cannot love him, cannot depend upon him.

In business we have the most curious mixture of absolutely required truth and universally admitted falsehood. Business could not be done at all unless appointments were kept, orders filled as agreed, shipments meeting specification, and charges made as understood. Yet in and through all this solid growth of truth in business runs a web of falsehood as dangerous as leaks in a levee. The law toils vainly after in the endeavor to compel truth in business; the social consciousness recognizing some need of it, but not how much.

We have followed our ideas of personal ethics as far as they would go. Our religious aids to conduct urge continually the personal development of virtues, and deprecate the law's efforts at enforcement. "You cannot legislate morality" they say. Yet if it were not for the law and for the general average of morality it has "legislated" religion would find a much harder task.

But law, like religion, sees its ethics for the most part through the limitations of individualism. It seeks to maintain personal rights against personal rights, keeping the balance as best it may among confessedly warring interests. Only occasionally is some line of conduct condemned as "against public policy." For any large understanding of that public policy we have got to recognize this organic relation to society.

The stimulus of religion will take on new vigor when it recognizes the social soul. The check and guidance of the law will become simple, popular and strong when it recognizes not only the social soul but the social body.[5]

Every standard of measurement will change as we begin to realize *what it is that we are measuring*—a man, or Humanity.

For "a" man there is no ethics, no vice, no virtue, no right nor wrong save in the simple process of self-preservation.

For a family we rise to the scale of ethics involved in race-preservation.

But in Society alone, the Organized Human Race, do we find a true standard by which to measure our human virtues.

Chapter 7

THE POSITION OF WOMEN AS INFLUENCING ETHICS

IF ETHICS is as simple a science as here stated; if we, as social creatures, tend to develop a natural instinct for the ethics necessary to our best growth, as do other social creatures; and if, again, we have an unquestioned supremacy in intelligence and in will power; it seems remarkable indeed that our behavior is so blindly evil.

To understand it we need to bear in mind that our superior intelligence has never been turned upon ethics as a science, and has been, on the contrary, definitely employed in maintaining most unethical ideas and habits.

Moreover, in the steadily increasing complexity of our social life, we have a conflicting pressure of influences, with results spreading far beyond our perception.

The reason that an early social group lives up to what ethical standards it has is not due merely to their simplicity, or the ease of fulfillment; but to the fact that no other influences are at work in the tribal activities to offset and contradict them.

The only broad differences in ethics in savage life is between men's conduct and women's; these are enforced to this day by deep-seated hereditary instincts that what is right for the one must be wrong for the other. This we show plainly by urging different conduct upon little boys and little girls.

The relation of a child of either sex to the family or to the community is precisely the same. There can be no sex ethics at that age. Yet we,

blindly carrying on the traditions of remote savagery, laugh at little boys if they play with dolls, or at little girls if they want to run and climb as boys do.

We say it is "instinctive" and are proud of it. It is "instinctive," and we ought to be ashamed of it. An instinct is nothing but a hereditary habit. Are we to carry on the mental habits of primitive savages forever and ever?

As soon as a more specialized stage of life is reached, each new economic relation develops its own ethics; and these spread like circles from a stone thrown in the water. Let us study some of these effects.

Beginning with that broad division of sex and the arbitrary ethical values based upon it, we find in the earliest stages of human life, the woman naturally evolving industry of various primitive sorts, and the man first specializing along lines of essential maleness.

The inevitability of this is clear when we realize that the female is the race type and the male the sex type. Her feminine attributes, aside from the physiological processes of motherhood, are merely the race attributes, bent to the service of the child. In that service the human mother progresses in human power and skill, while her mate, for a long time, exercised only the combative activities peculiar to his sex, with the predatory efforts common to all Carnivora. His growing human power and skill manifested itself in these lines only, for long ages.

"Man's work" was to hunt and fight. Everything in the line of productive industry was "woman's work." The effect on our early ethical perceptions was deeply marked—and we feel it yet.

One of the most essentially male characteristics is personal pride; the spirit peacefully shown in the strutting peacock, and more aggressively in the triumphant bellow of the conquering bull or stag. To emulate, to conquer, to rear a proud head high above one's fallen rival—this is the line of masculine effort in pursuit of his mate.

So long as food was gained by hunting, this conquering instinct came into play in daily use; he pursued his prey as ardently as if it was his female; and, incidentally, his female as if she was his prey.

When organized warfare raised all this to a power beyond that of other animals; when to his own song of conquest was added the praise of his comrades in arms; there developed in the human male a spirit of unmeasured pride. So strong was this feeling that he made an abstract ideal of it; and cheerfully surrendered every other pleasure in life for—Glory.

Glory had no place with the squaw. She was useful, transcendentally useful, but never glorious. Her pride was in her children, especially in her male children, who might be glorified. Her own activities meanwhile,

the essentially human ones of productive industry, developed in her virtues far more valuable to social progress than most of his; but they were not valued—being women's.

In a primitive people this was not only explicable, but unavoidable. That a highly developed race like ourselves should still be influenced by these ancient feelings requires more explanation.

Observe its continuing effects.

The woman's activities developed patience, industry, ingenuity, the beginnings of specialization, the loving serviceability that makes for comfort. With this was required of her obedience and submission, and a meekness and modesty best fitted to contrast with masculine pride. When Henry the VIII sent his ambassador to woo for him Christina of Sweden, she was not only reported as beautiful and intelligent, but "seldom have I seen a lady more shamefaced," wrote the delighted visitor.[1]

As the next great stage in industrial development consisted in the introduction of masculine slavery; as this period of slave labor covers our entire history, being still the economic system among more millions of people than those which have outgrown it, it is no wonder that our ethical values in industrial relations are a little mixed.

Man, the pursuer, the combatant, the conqueror, had small respect for the servile woman or for the captive of his bow and spear who gave him labor as the price of life.

Because of an age-old servile womanhood, and a system of chattel slavery almost as old, we have an ingrained contempt for some of the most valuable human qualities, and an exorbitant pride in others whose value has long since departed.

In a time when most of our food had to be caught and killed the virtues of the hunter had great economic value. In a time when a primitive masculinity, fed and clothed by slave labor, ran riot in warfare the world over, and filled the air with the noise of the captains and the shouting, military virtues had value, too.

But since the shepherd and the farmer came; since the human brain and hand began to Make instead of to Destroy, the best service of society comes from those who feed and clothe and shelter us, who steadily pour into the world the fruit of our human creativeness; the products of art and industry in which we live.

If only our minds had been clear and unprejudiced! But they never were. They are not yet.

Our living progress is accompanied, for good or ill, by a mighty company of the dead. For one new-found fact we have the memory of a thousand old ones. For one new-seen truth we have the remembered

multitude of a million lies. Our minds are equipped from the past. Our standards of judgment are retroactive.

Further, since we have the power of making abstractions, such as this "Glory," and of attaching to an abstraction such superhuman increment of fervid admiration as to make it outweigh all other considerations; we have slowly emerged from the darkness of the past, always putting our highest ethical values on things outgrown.

In the light of this interpretation it is easy to see how Christian ethics has been so slow in finding expression—or even acceptance.

Here came a religion preaching the virtues of women—the virtues of slaves. Was a world of males, warriors and masters all, to accept such teaching?

They never have, to more than the slightest extent. To the slaves and the women it was easy—they had been practicing those virtues before—they had to.

In the profound sociological insight of Jesus we see Him setting his single splendid force, that power of Perceived Truth, against all authority, to show us what are really the right lines of human conduct.

But the ethical standards of the past were too strong for him. The church that slowly grew upon the faith of his followers has to this day failed in establishing any general recognition of Christian *ethics;* merely enforcing the alleged Christian doctrines under a system of eternal reward and punishment.

We can never recognize ethical values suited to our race and time till we learn to understand instead of believing, and to disabuse our minds of that encrusted mass of historic and prehistoric ideas which make human progress the limping, painful, pitiful thing it is.

Consider now, with a fresh mind.

Here is Humanity today.

It has to perform many acts, in order to live and grow.

Which of these many acts we do perform are right, which wrong, and why?

That we must decide by studying their relative value to social life and progress. For this are we possessed of intellect; *by* this are we possessed of intellect—for intellect only grows with use. When we use as much intelligence in studying ethics as we do in studying mathematics we shall know more about it; but even now, with the brain of any able girl or boy of twelve to sixteen, we ought to be able to see the simple facts.

First, this human race of ours obviously lives in large numbers, held together by the interchange of services.

(*Virtue No. 1.* To serve another.)

Second, the stage of development and rate of progress is to be measured by the quantity and quality of those services.

(*Virtue No. 2.* To widen and improve social service.)

Third, it has been proven, over and over, that certain conditions of individual liberty tend to promote social service;

That Truth is essential to social service;

That Justice is essential to social service;

That Courage is essential to social service;

And so on, and so on—a list we all know and recognize to some degree. But we have not based them on social service, and so do not get their relative value.

Beyond the whole brotherhood of these recognized virtues come the new ones we are only beginning to think about, as intellectual honesty, for instance, and that pre-eminent necessity of an open mind.

The closed mind, the conservative, is as vicious a thing as cumbers human life; not an ultimate evil like those last-stage sins of theft or murder; but a causative evil, an evil condition, a sort of arthritis deformans of the mind. It may not be painful. The sufferer is numb, paralyzed, slowly turned to bone.

This "conservatism," of which most people are still proud, is that quality which most definitely prevents social growth. Those who esteem it imagine that if it were not for them the world would "go too fast," would "fly off at a tangent," and other peculiar dreams. Natural growth has nothing to do with "tangents." You do not hang weights on a tree to keep it from growing too fast. That there may be wrong new ideas as well as right ones is true enough, but both are to be decided by examination—not by shutting one's eyes.

If the previous method or condition is the best, by all means preserve it, but preserve it from choice—on proof of superiority—not merely because it is the oldest.

This general vice of conservatism, which in advanced stages is known as apathy and recognized, even by conservatives, as evil, is a natural result of two things; the external relation of master and slave, which enforces submission, and an inactive mind; and these abstractions of Faith and Obedience, with the theory of completed revelation which turns that Faith and Obedience forever backward. And all these trace back to the dominance of man over woman, and that of conqueror over captive—the twin bases of all slavery.

It is a most interesting thing to see the human mind, growing normally, lift its standards of ethics from age to age; always checked by the fixed limits of religion, of economic condition, and of the sex relation.

Every enduring religion has gradually evolved its scale of ethics; Faith and Obedience usually first, as essential to the maintenance of that religion, of course.

Every new religion, sprouting out of the old, as new things must, has altered that Faith, refused that Obedience—only to set them up again later, for its own preservation.

It is only a few hundred years since the mind of the world was set free, free to think for itself, to study, to find out; and hardly a century since that mind, turning at last upon the living facts instead of dead words, found the only subject matter for true thought.

Ancient ethics rested upon What God Had Said—according to this, that, or the other authority; discussion of authority not the least part of the trouble. Modern ethics is founded upon what God has done—and is still doing.

God, meaning the Law of the Universe—The Way it Works—is something we may study forever; it does us good.

Ethics is the limited, practical, proven knowledge of God's law in our work—in the processes of human living.

Because human living requires the best and fullest service from each of us, therefore any relation which interferes with such service is wrong.

Here we come to the oldest error in our long list; the subjection of women to the service of men.

Any wrong position, wrong relation, of one member or organ to the others, is a source of disease. You have but to tie a string tightly around a finger, to sit on your foot, to have a prolapsed stomach or a floating kidney, to realize this. If the thing is misplaced it works wrong.

A relative position which may be right at one stage of growth may become increasingly wrong as growth continues. Here is where conservatism, always striving to preserve the have-beens, has so mischievously retarded progress and maintained disease.

The ancient theory of "division of labor between the sexes" which left her safe with the children in the cave or tree-hut, or working with the other women, while he went forth to hunt the mammoth with his fellows, or to make long chase alone, was a good working theory—then.

It was "right" in a period prehistorically remote.

That it should still be quoted in time of peace, among green pastures and fertile fields, or in orderly cities, shows as conclusively as anything could that the human mind is indeed "wax to receive, and marble to retain."[2]

The theory that woman's only duty is to her family, which worked very well *when there was no other social group*—becomes increasingly mischievous as society grows more and more complex and efficient, and she, with her limited range of ethical values, lags farther and farther behind.

The squaw, doing her family duty, is doing all the duty there is, so to speak.

The woman of today, doing only her family duty, leaves undone all the duties of city, state and nation—fails utterly to grasp the ethics of her time.

Man, solemnly believing that he must be master in his own house, worked steadily against that individual liberty for her, which is the basic need of all social development, even while he strove for it in his own person.

By maintaining this authority he maintains its coefficient of submission, which keeps the world inert and helpless when most it needs to act.

By the ancient cult of Masculine Superiority he keeps alive both in himself and her an arbitrary honor for certain qualities, certain acts; and a corresponding dishonor for others, all without regard to their social values.

By the grotesque absurdity of double code of ethics for members of the same race, these primitive sex views of ours succeed in maintaining the kind of mind that can believe two opposite things at the same time—a characteristic impressive as an exhibition, but singularly useless to the progress of humanity.

Among all the varied effects upon our life of the emergence of women into full humanity, none is more vitally important than the resultant change in our perception of ethics.

Many see this in regard to the virtue of chastity only; it has a far wider application. Chastity is by no means the sole virtue of women, though it has for long been so regarded. The virtues of women are those common to the human species, with the benevolent devotion of motherhood added. That benevolence, given room to grow as it has grown among the ants for instance, would inevitably develop into universal benevolence.

It has not been given room to grow.

It has been made a minor process, second always to the demands made upon the wife. Notice the exhortation of St. Paul and St. Peter as to the duties of wives. They are bidden to submit to their husbands in all things,

yes, most explicitly: "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord."[3]

This cheerful putting himself into the place of God in regard to the woman he has married is as good an instance as could be given of the false ethical standards due to the subjection of women.

Nowhere else in nature do we find any male creature assuming this attitude of inordinate superiority; we must account for it in the human race by some new condition peculiar to our kind.

As a matter of fact, there is not, and never has been, anything in man's behavior to warrant the assumption that he is more Godlike than she is; nor do his special sins and weaknesses bear out the theory.

But he has assumed it, for thousands upon thousands of years; and that one piece of incredible injustice is enough to unbalance our power of ethical perception.

Her position tends to maintain in her a blind submission, an unthinkable acceptance of authority, quite inimical to any individual thought; and his position only proves again that mastery is as evil in effect as slavery.

Here he has had always this woman to wait upon him, this loving, patient servant. Looking down upon her he has looked down on service. That service, widening out into all our crafts and trades, is still despised. The ages of woman-service and of slave-service makes us still, with those inherited ideas of ours, despise the working class.

To work, to really make something useful, or to carry it about, is to us ignominious. That way no "glory" lies.

It is true, of course, that in mere physical heredity the serf was the descendant of the slave, and the tradesman is the descendant of the serf. In Europe, where serfdom is still close at hand, the attitude towards "tradespeople" is scarcely more respectful than toward "laborers."

With us, where pioneer conditions made labor conspicuously important and hard to get, we have a somewhat different feeling, and, coincidentally, we have more honor for women also.

But this physical descent is by no means so powerful as the psychic heredity, which hands down forever the necessarily limited views of the past.

We have seen that the dependent position of women keeps down the growth of independent thought. No servant class can develop freely. At the same time the man's position of mastery keeps strong in him ancient habits of irresponsible dominance. Neither attitude is favorable to progress in thought, and without progress in thought we can make none in ethics.

A clear judgment and a strong self-sustaining will are necessary to promote right conduct. Neither the god-husband nor the slave-wife is likely to develop either.

It will be apparent that in carrying out ethical perceptions into conduct we need the power of the individual will in self-restraint and self-compulsion. Even if we had no load of false ideas to bewilder and paralyze us, we have always the task of following new truths into new habits; always the need for power to turn what we used to do into what we ought to do now.

The living soul, conscious and alert in its temporary lodgement in this bunch of inheritances, needs to be steadily awake, checking here, pruning there, cultivating this, eliminating that, helping the culture grow.

Our living soul looking out freshly from the eyes of each child born to us, finds itself fairly smothered in ancient tendencies; tendencies which should have been pruned gradually away long since by capable ancestors.

Some are born kleptomaniacs, some dipsomaniacs—we can recognize such sharply marked disabilities as these. But most of us are born as heavily handicapped by any number of tendencies, not so conspicuous, but quite as mischievous.

Where we should have brave keen minds, capable of thinking for ourselves, we have tame, dim, submissive ones, trained in long acceptance of authority.

Where we should have the capacity for judging social relations and the values of social conduct, we have only the capacity for judging personal and family relations, and measure conduct by those limited relations.

Where we should have the ability to handle our own lives, checking wrong habits and training right ones as one checks and trains a horse, we have, as weakness from the woman side, either a brainless submissiveness or an equally brainless wilfulness; and from the man's side, that universal self-indulgence which comes from being too much served.

Being "as the Lord" to one's wife does not develop self-control.

In these several ways does the subject position of women affect our ethics; both in the power to understand and the power to apply. In that main ground of all true ethical perception, the recognition of social life as a whole, we are almost hopelessly blinded by this old race custom which says: "Woman's place is the home," and has kept her, all these ages, out of the normal human relationships.

In the next step of recognition, which sees the mutual interdependence of all our activities, and the essential dignity and value of each, we are blinded again by the primitive division of "man's work" and "woman's

work," and the accumulated honor and dishonor arbitrarily attached to each.

In the growth of those precious qualities, free brave individual thinking and acting upon one's best judgment, we are hampered incredibly by this world-wide condition in which half humanity is made to submit to the other half.

Many people hold that women keep back progress by their tendency to maintain old religions—their timidity—their conservatism. It is not women, but the artificial position of women which does these things.

Men, on the other hand, not only "their own masters," but masters of the women and children, have developed in pride and comparative freedom; striving with one another for more achievements and more glory: yet all their progress continually undermined by the self-indulgent habits which are inevitably bred by having other people as inseparable servants. To be submitted to in all things, even by one person, is not strengthening to the moral nature.

There dawns upon us today the greatest moral awakening the world has ever known. The "hunger and thirst after righteousness" is a natural social instinct.[4] Righteousness is merely the best way for humanity to live. It means a constant increase in power, in prosperity, in health and happiness—and peace of mind.

But ethical values are only to be appreciated by free strong minds, minds capable above all of appreciating our group nature, our organic inter-relation.

Such minds should be common to us all.

That they are not, is mainly due to the conditions we have been surveying; to the paralyzing effect of prematurely crystallized religions, and the perverting effect of this basic error in the relation of the sexes.

The full freedom of woman and her participance in all normal race-activities will on the one hand allow free growth at last to the essentially human qualities; and, on the other hand, give similar freedom to the mind, that we may see and understand at last the laws of human life.

Chapter 8

THE TRAINING OF THE CHILD

WITH EACH of us, individually, our initial confusion in ethics begins in imperfect child-culture.

In place of a dawning perception of natural law we have a forced recognition of authority.

In place of social relation we are confronted only with personality.

In place of the continuing pleasure of learning how to do things we are given the continuing pain of being prevented from doing things.

In each new infancy we repeat the primal lesson of the animal world—inhibition. Our religious, moral and civil laws are so overwhelmingly prohibitive, strong, condemnatory and punitive as to what we should not do; extremely feeble and unconvincing as to what we should do.

This begins in the nursery. It begins with our primitive inchoate motherhood, a motherhood based almost wholly upon instinct, and as such lacking in the qualities of organized humanity.

With the animals below us conduct springs from inherited impulses plus the immediate stimulus of the environment, and is only subject to conscious control when some present danger makes the creature stop what it wants to do, or when one desire overcomes another.

All the pausing and waiting and lying low, the careful control of action, the sudden silence, which makes for safety and efficiency in the adult animal, the mother tries to teach her young.

She also teaches it, by example mainly, the simple arts of its range of life, as anyone may see by watching a cat-mother educate her kittens.

All this kind of tendency comes down to us by "instinct," and thus our human mother seeks to do. But ethics is a social science, not to be accounted for or explained in the family relations; and so long as the human mother lives only in the family, having no social relation or responsibility she has no real experience in ethics.

This lack in women has long been felt by men, though it has been glossed over by their enforced insistence on one distinctive virtue—chastity. The women's predominance in this is the main ground for their being called the more moral sex; they do not predominate in the larger social virtues, such as truth, justice, and tolerance; or in the shallower but necessary ones developed in ordinary business contact. It is true they do not fill our prisons, committing what we call "crimes" as much as men do—but that is mere negation, not social virtue.

Because of their exclusion from those relations on which the science of ethics rests, women are naturally prevented from a first hand acquaintance with or practice of that science; and their educational effect upon the child shows this limitation most unmistakably.

These are the two governing tendencies under which the child's conduct is modified: first, the very ancient one of protecting it from danger; second, the later one of protecting their belongings from the depredations of the child. In both cases the method used is frankly prohibitive.

To save the child from drowning the average mother seeks merely to keep it out of the water. To save it from burning she tries to keep it away from the fire. To protect her furniture, clothing, dishes and such objects, she forbids the child to touch them.

The principal emphasis in each child's life is laid on what he should not do.

"No! No!—who has not seen the eager baby turn a puzzled face to this, fail of course to comprehend it until he is forcibly removed from something he wants, or it is forcibly removed from him; or, failing either, an utterly inconsequent pain is sharply applied.

He was doing something he wanted to do. He was prevented from doing it. He had an extra pain added to his disappointment. And the foundation of his ethical perception is laid. Here it is: a. Right conduct means not doing what you want to. b. It hurts.

It is a simple method, an easy method—at the moment. If consistently and persistently carried out it develops what we call "a well-behaved child." But it develops something else—a deep, wide, universal, underlying conviction that right doing means restriction and pain.

From earliest infancy, up through childhood and youth, we beat it into

them all, both actually and figuratively: To be good is unnatural and unpleasant—and they learn the lesson well.

The general belief of the world is that the practice of human virtue is really quite beyond us; that for human beings to "be good," to live together in peace and justice and freedom and happiness, is more than we can accomplish.

We assume, quite universally, that right conduct requires a struggle, a prolonged effort, a restriction of our "natural" tendencies requiring more power than we possess.

This is the child's first lesson, well learned.

If nothing else called for the humanizing of women it is the need of our children for a higher education in this one matter of ethics, this transcendently important and perfectly natural social law.

Let us parallel our experience once more from below; let us "go to the ant" for ethics.

It is necessary for ants to practice a high degree of altruism. They do, apparently without effort; not a superior few, but all of them.

How do they learn to thus instinctively sacrifice themselves to the common good?

We say, "It is merely an instinct—it has taken them millions of generations—those who did not develop it have died—those who did have survived."

One would think, to hear the slow blundering processes of "nature" thus discussed, that the human brain was a *disability.*

Suppose we left our arts and crafts and sciences to grow that way—by the "survival" of those who chanced to develop such advantages. We should not so have made our glorious leap up from beastdom and savagery in a few scant thousands of years; nor should we be able as at present to foresee happiness infinitely greater even now within reach of our hands—if we would but reach for it.

Our power of consciously perceiving right conduct and voluntarily developing it, is a far swifter and surer process than that long, wasteful, haphazard, negative method of "eliminating the unfit." What the ants have done in millions of generations we ought to do in a century—if we used our brains rightly.

The laws of right living for humanity are the laws of ethics. The power to modify our own conduct to an intellectually perceived standard we have had since tatooing was fashionable, but a knowledge of right fashions of living is still uncommon.

Some have known, from age to age; seers, prophets, philosophers.

Many religions have contributed their quota of ethical perception, though heavily handicapped as we have seen.

But this knowledge has failed to be incorporated in our common life.

We have had layers of conduct, detached and often irreconcilable; a high, abstract, "religious" life, accepted as impracticable for most of us; a laborious, difficult, "moral" life, indifferently fulfilled; and a "business life," with its own strange ethics, going on as if Business was as separate from Living as Art is held to be.

And in all of them the governing ethical idea is negative—as the child has learned it.

The law, like the mother, is always telling us what not to do; always punishing us after the event; always cluttering life with prohibitions.

Our conscious positive teaching has confined itself to two fields; what we call "manners," and that peculiar little nosegay of selected subjects taught in schools and colleges and called education. In these we find no great difficulty.

This supposedly headstrong, ungovernable nature of ours has long since learned how to bow and curtsy and doff its hat. The whole artificial curriculum of exterior group behavior is mastered not only without protest but with positive pride, by this "poor human nature" of ours.

Whatever a given group or class decide to be "the proper thing," whether it pinch the feet, hobble the legs, or cause nausea or keen pain—these things the people do with willingness, with joy. The instance before mentioned of tattooing, is as strong as could be given; there we the individual cheerfully submitting to prolonged torture merely because the others admire it, and he values their good opinion.

When we recognize, understand, and admire the requisite virtues of our age as the savage admires a network of raised scars, we shall as cheerfully develop them.

What then should be the training of the child?

How can we make the common necessary human virtues clear, easy, natural, to the child?[1]

This is a question which organized motherhood should have been studying for as many centuries as organized manhood has been studying other important lines of action.

Without here attempting a primer of ethics for nursery use, we may easily outline what should be the general standard of human conduct, as easy to us as altruism to the ant.

A civilized human being should possess, first, Self-control; this both positive and negative,—the power to check and modify with similar power to compel action. This first demand is so primitive, so necessary,

so absolutely essential to happy and efficient life, and withal so easily developed, that it does seem marvelous our little ones are not taught it. Savages have long since shown the capacity to develop self-control to heights of stoicism, and our modern standards of politeness frequently call for, and exhibit, similar power. So do the exigencies of business, conspicuously shown in the instance of comic actors, hiding real grief while they "make merry" for other people's amusement.

As part of self-control, in the positive compelling sense, comes the free voluntary use of the mind. One can hardly predicate ethical conduct of an idiot, or of one who merely transmits or submits to, the ideas of other people.

We read in Eastern tales of the one sent to behead the blameless young Prince, apologizing for his cruelty by saying: "I am but a slave under command." The Prince fully accepts his plea, solemnly replying: "Thou art excusable!"

A slave under command has no ethics; or a soldier under orders, or the man who says: "I have to do it or I shall lose my job." Reporters justify their indecent intrusions on this ground, and other people similarly excuse them, saying, "They have to do it." Workmen justify their conspiring with their employers to fill the market with impure and degraded products, and employers justify their long range anti-social crimes by the same pitiful plea—"A man must live!"

Such submission is, of course, a paralysis of all ethical control. One no longer concerns oneself with the right or wrong of a given act, but merely obeys orders; no thought, no judgment is used, rather avoided, as merely causing pain.

With this primary essential of self-control established, the easy, direct, well-modulated action of a free mind running its own body, there follows without difficulty the appreciation and adoption of the large and simple virtues, such as Social Love, Courage, Truth, Justice and Efficiency. These are given as requiring no argument; no one will contradict their social usefulness.

If our minds were free and exercised in ethical judgments we should have no trouble at all in seeing the simple common sense of these qualities, their general benefit and advantage.

If our minds were free and exercised in voluntarily chosen action we should have no trouble in developing these virtues after perceiving their value.

Admitting this very basic platform of ethics, let us now look at our treatment of babies and young children in regard to its ethical influence.

The most unescapable part of this influence is in that first great ne-

cessity of Self-Control. Here we repeat, age after age, that old, old mistake: We make of the child, or seek to make of the child "a slave under command," and then blindly marvel at his lack of ethics.

Surely the first requisite of ethical conduct is power to see it. Surely the next requisite is power to do it. As surely, the first training towards ethical conduct should develop this Power To See, and Power To Do.

With this in mind, consider the position and training of the child.

Primarily the child faces life in closely personal relation, and in absolute dependence. This is not a social relation, but a purely physical one. The child is in reality a member of society from birth, but is not so regarded. It is regarded only as a member of the family up to the time when the boy "goes out into the world." As for the girl, she never enters social relation, but remains always in the family relation—with its ethics super-added to her maternal instincts. She too is "a slave under command." She too, for all our history, has been denied the ethical power possible only to a free agent. Submission she has learned; patience, endurance, resignation, and, of course, obedience. To the natural caution of the mother she has added the timidity of the helpless dependent, burned in by long ages of exploitation.

As a mother she now governs the life of the child in hourly contact; though the father dictates the larger environment. Having no self-perceived and self-fulfilled ethics, only the accepted virtues enforced by her position, it has naturally not occurred to her to develop in the child powers to herself unknown. Her governing purpose is to "protect" the child; her next to "make it mind." For his safety, and for that of the household gods, the child must be taught to obey.

The history of ancient races shows in long repetition the results of a too-perfect obedience.

All human growth requires some new step, some change, some daring to differ.

We serve one another by means of our differences. We advance, not by doing what we did before, but by doing something different. This is the social genesis of that worship of Liberty, the splendid young virtue, still but half seen, which is so vital an essential of social growth.

Our treatment of the child errs not only in its poverty of ethical understanding, but in the lasting confusion of mind resultant from the misplaced values of household life.

The family is, of course, a personal relation. It is a true and beautiful one, an enduring one, a nobly serviceable one, but it is personal. It is not, as we so glibly repeat, "the unit of the state." Families are not taxed, drafted into service, rewarded or punished. The individual is the unit of

the state; the family is an earlier and narrower form of association above and beyond which rises the social structure so far composed of men only.

The child grows up to see the father going out into social service, which he is falsely told is done merely to provide for the family; and sees his mother spending her energies entirely in family service. Love, duty, affection, effort—all are introduced to him in relation to a few individuals. To obey individuals, to please and serve individuals—these are his required ideals, his enforced activities.

When he demands a reason, a principle, as the normal young brain persistently does, he is given the arbitrary commands of ancient religions, or the practical alternative of punishment. These associations persist throughout life.

The inadequacy of religion to promote social ethics has been universally recognized. Ancient fatalistic theories accepted it, more modern hell-and-devil theories accepted it; we have all faced the fact of a kind of religious teaching which is not expected to produce results in any general measure.

That "God hates a liar" has not yet affected our truthfulness to any appreciable degree; nor has the fact that "father whips a liar" done much better. We have not taught the child to understand why truth is a social virtue, why lying is a primitive weakness, and an antisocial offense.

The conduct of the child is strongly and persistently modified, but not by his own perception, not by his own choice, not by his own fulfilled decisions. It is modified by and to persons with whom he is in visible contact, and governed by two primitive compulsions—to please those persons from affection, gratitude or hope of favor; and to avoid punishment. This list is the strongest influence.

Our major pressure in child training is what we call "discipline," and treats of how, when, why, and in what degree to punish.

Punishment is the main agent in enforcing our limited and erroneous family ethics upon the child, and punishment is the main agent in enforcing the larger but still limited and erroneous social ethics which we do recognize—our pitiful array of negatives—the misdemeanors, vices, and crimes which are "forbidden."

The family has some constructive ethics, narrow as it is; the State, so far, has almost none. This of course is why we behave so much better as members of families than we do as citizens.

But the method of enforcement is what affects the mind of the child; and, so, the conduct of the man. Command, backed by punishment, does not develop either the power to judge or the power to do.

Moreover, in the family, the child soon learns that punishment is fal-

lible—that it is not an unerring consequence, but merely contingent on discovery. Here we have the simple and sweeping explanation of our world-wide sins of citizenship. We have nothing to keep us from them but threat of punishment, and that only follows upon being found out. We have never been taught why these things were wrong, nor trained in the power of self-government.

Then comes the second general result of this primitive child-culture. This is in the relating of acts to personal consequences only—a thing of deadly evil in result.

Even Emerson touches that same error in his strong saying: "If you want anything, pay for it and take it, says God."[2]

Alas! One person cannot pay for it.

The consequences of human wrong doing are not to be restricted to the individual sinner. What our theory of personal salvation and personal damnation does to us from the religious side, our practice of personal praise and personal punishment does to us in infancy, and continues in civic life.

We have a current habit of regarding women as the "conservative" and "reactionary" sex; responsible by their very nature for the maintenance of outworn religions. Those who repeat this never once consider those religions older than ours where practically all the devotees are men. It is not any inner distinction of sex which makes women cling to the Christian religion, but that clinging is distinctly traceable to their position of sub-social development, and their tremendous power upon the child.

The child grows up in an atmosphere of intense personality. Personal supervision, personal accountability, personal praise and blame, personal reward and penalty—these surround him continually.

The mother, herself a subordinate, is subject to the same personal control; and as the arbiter over children and servants, hands down the same method.

Thus we find the child, under the immemorial training received "at his mother's knee"—or across it—growing up to face life with no true knowledge of ethics, that unstudied science; with his sense of right and wrong based on revelation and authority, not on observation, experiment and proof; with his stimulus mainly the fear of punishment, and secondarily the desire to please; with an intense self-consciousness and sense of individual responsibility which makes him miserably ask, "What have I done?" and protest, defiantly or carelessly, "It is not not my fault!" and with those governing convictions that right doing is difficult and unpleasant, and wrong doing only important if found out.

To such training, practically universal, is due our confused dull-eyed

struggle with what we call "the problems of human life." Problems they are, and life is full of them, but in no way more difficult than the problems of agriculture, navigation, or mechanics. Those sciences we have studied, to some degree mastered, and are practicing with hope and energy.

To their difficulties we have not added by trying to perpetuate ancient errors; to their failures we have not added guilt, shame and arbitrary penalty; nor do we intrust the teaching of these necessary sciences to those who have never studied or practiced them.

Yet no science, no art, no craft, is so necessary as that of Human Living—Ethics.

Let us now roughly forecast another kind of treatment for the child. Let us suppose him to open his fresh mind in an environment prepared for him as lovingly as his mother now prepares her doll-like baby clothes; with as much effort and earnestness as his father prepares a home; with as much learning and labor as the State prepares a university.

(Note for those who are deaf by choice, and who like to keep their eyes shut: NO: This does not mean that the child shall "be separated from his mother," shall "have no home," shall "be brought up in an institution.")

Such an environment necessarily assumes long, careful, professional study and practice, the social evolution of method and material, a new standard of child-culture in mother, nurse, and teacher.

Here is merely a suggestion of its effect on our attitude toward ethics:

The child's conduct should be modified by surrounding him with simple observable processes from which he should irresistibly deduce for himself, "This is the right way to do it."

To these carefully prepared conditions should be added, as far as is naturally possible, pleasure in doing it right, with disappointment and loss on failure; these to lie in the necessary results of the act, not in the least in arbitrary praise or blame.

No anger, no criticism, no punishment, is needed; only a cheerful patience, an encouragement to try again; an atmosphere in which the baby mind would take unfailing pleasure in learning to do things right.

Mistakes we should take for granted, and teach that these are to be forgotten as soon as possible; that they are to be expected in some measure, and outgrown, with no loss of energy in shame or regret.

In those most important first years all this would be of extreme simplicity, the value lying not at all in the things done or not done, but in the formation of what we even now call "good habits"—with our own perverse interpretations of what is good.

Our efforts should be to reduce Cause and Effect to words of one syllable, to make right doing understandable and pleasurable in itself; to avoid all sense of personality; never to load on a child-soul our imbecile horrors of guilt and shame; and with all subtlest, lovingest, wisest effort of our highest teachers, to emphasize Principles instead of Incidents.

A little later, when that unsullied soul was able to generalize at all, it should be led through pleasant years of unconscious education, in which a new history, taught by story and picture, should show it the upward steps of Baby Humanity—how it tried, how it failed, how it made this mistake and that, and how, clearly, the failure was due to this or that lack of knowledge and lack of power.

A new literature is needed for our children; not of unrelated traditional tales and folk-lore; still less of the degraded child-catering mercantile sort which clogs the market and the mind today; but a literature prepared by love and genius, to introduce Life to the child.

We should cut off with psychic-antisepsis, the black currents of long-transmitted evil which have crept down the ages, not from father to son, but from child to child.

As the primitive mother would wall out wolves, and the primitive father kill them, so will the parents of tomorrow wall out and stamp out the crowding evils of the past, and bring up their children in an atmosphere as free from tradition as it is free from vermin.

Children so reared would grow up unconscious, unashamed and unafraid; skilled and strong in doing right because it meant both reason and happiness. Before they stood forth, full grown, to do their share in world-lifting, they would long have clearly understood what ails us, and how to help it.

In such minds our misery and sin would rouse only pity, patience, and a tremendous desire to show the way.

Where we see blind confusion, a welter of evil passions and selfish desires, hemmed about by laws and punishments, lit only by that high hope of the ages—Something Better Somewhere Else—they will see only an entanglement of good impulses, morbidly over and underdeveloped, with an almost ridiculous ignorance of the simple laws and processes of Human Living—which is Ethics.

Long before we ourselves are able to understand the whole long-range processes of social relation, we can easily grasp enough of the first principles to rear a generation of new people who will be able to understand them. As it is now our pitiful stupidity in this supreme science is largely due to gross mishandling of the child mind.

Chapter 9

ON CERTAIN INTERACTIONS

SOCIAL LIFE, like other life-forms, has its body and its soul; the soul, that widening spirit of conscious humanity; the body, the mechanical structure in and through which we function.

Further, of a society as of an individual, we may say, "*Mens sana copore sano.*"[1] For a truly sound social mind we must have a sound social body. This truth we were a long time discovering, even of the physical body. Asceticism has always striven to ennoble the soul by degrading the body, and always failed.

That Epicureanism has done no better is because it has misunderstood the uses of the body, and put sensation before function. Very slowly, and only through a growing knowledge of anatomy, physiology, and hygiene, have we come to know the relation between body and soul; to see how indigestion causes bad temper, and irritation of the intestinal tract, melancholy. It is within a few years only that we have begun to appreciate the "fatigue poisons," which so injure body and mind.

If this knowledge of our personal relation of body and soul is so imperfect, so recent, it is no wonder that we are still slower to see the relation between society's body and soul.

Yet the last is as important, as unescapable, as the first. As much as personal health is a necessary concomitant of personal righteousness, so is social health a part of social righteousness.

Into this wide new field of study we must press, examining not only the crasser diseases of society, such as vice, crime, and poverty, but those

subtler, less obvious difficulties,—malposition, dislocation, obstruction, which may be potent causes of enormous evil. To consider again that conspicuous historic instance of chattel slavery: Here is an industrial relation, purely external, in which human labor is performed under the pressure of another's will, and for that other's benefit. Such a relation, acting continually upon both parties, steadily tends to produce certain qualities in the master and in the slave.[2]

Unquestioned mastery develops selfishness, pride, laziness, cruelty, and, in the male, sensuality.

Hopeless slavery develops blind submission, humility, laziness (except under compulsion) and a general feebleness of character. In both the result is to check invention, discovery, progress.

The master is weakened in every nerve by having everything done for him, the slave, by having no room for individual action.

Now suppose you come to teach ethics, personal, domestic, or social, to those living under this condition.

No matter how earnest is the desire to do right, the individual is heavily handicapped by the tendencies of his condition. It is harder for a man who owns female slaves to be continent than it is for a man who must woo—or at least pay, before he is granted indulgence.

It is harder for the female slave to be chaste than if she were free to refuse, to fly, or even to fight. External conditions seriously affect ethics, both in idea and in action.

So, in larger social relation, we find the ethics of a given community varying in accordance with conditions,—climatic, economic, domestic, political, mechanical. Human love and friendliness have been markedly promoted by the steam-engine and its quickening of all transportation.

The motor-car, in its present stage of use, has an amazing power to harden the heart and dull the soul to crime. Murder is committed by means of this machine by people who would never do it with a gun or an ax. The mere speed and power of the thing seems to make monsters of those who ride in it, not invariably of course, but as a tendency.

An absolute monarchy develops certain traits, both in ruler and ruled, as inevitably as does chattel slavery.

Economic pressure, though greatly overestimated by some thinkers, does have a powerful effect upon the soul. And in the sex-relation, polygamy, polyandry, monogamy or promiscuity, all show their effects.

In studying social ethics we must allow for the action and interaction of all our complex conditions, and so, at once, learn patience and tolerance.

But the field is not so hopelessly complicated as it might appear at first glance.

Those governing laws of action which we call "principles" are safe guides in the confusion.

We have but to discriminate between one social function and another, see its use and purpose and thereby its laws of conduct, and so see our way to clear decision.

One thing is needed, of course; that basic assumption, insisted upon from our opening chapter, that Society is the object of all Social Action. If we err in this; if we seek to establish the right and wrong of social conduct on purely personal grounds, we wholly fail. That is the one main error of all our ethics today—it does not recognize the preponderant claims of society.

Let us now consider some one human activity such as that of a doctor.

What is a doctor? He is a member of society specialized for the purpose of curing the sick and of maintaining the health of the well.

What is "right" for a doctor? To so live, so study, so act, as shall establish and maintain the most human health. Surely that is clear.

Now suppose he is offered a salary larger than his income from general practice to be a private physician—to keep one person well. Is that a right or wrong thing to do?

It depends on the thing—is the health of that person of more value to society than the health of the doctor's former circle of patients?

If so, he would be justified in taking the position—and the salary.

But suppose the new patron is merely some social parasite or brigand, some criminal, recognized as such or not—then what is the doctor's duty.

To refuse the job, of course.

But the salary?

The salary has nothing to do with it.

* * *

Or let us consider a lawyer.

What is a lawyer? He is a member of society specialized for the purpose of maintaining "law and order" and promoting justice.

What is "right" for a lawyer? To so live, so study, so act, as to establish and maintain the most social justice—surely that is clear.

Now suppose he is offered a far larger salary than his income from general practice, to promote and protect the special interests of one corporation. Is that a right or a wrong thing to do?

It depends on the nature of the activities of that corporation. Is its

purpose and result to the advantage of society? Are its processes honest, fair, legal, just? Does the lawyer, through serving it, best serve society?

If so, it would be "right" to do it.

If the corporation is but a form of parasitism or brigandage, of rank social injury and wide injustice, it would be "wrong."

But the salary?

The salary has nothing to do with it.

* * *

To take a still commoner profession,—what is a grocer?

He is a member of society, specialized for the purpose of collecting and distributing food for society.

What is "right conduct" for a grocer?

To collect and distribute the most and best food, for the most people, at the least expense.

But suppose he can secure a larger income for himself by handling less food, or food of a poorer quality, or absolutely bad and poisonous stuff, or by charging extortionately, and by deceiving those he feeds? Would this be right?

Visibly not; it would be wrong.

But the income?

The income has nothing to do with it.

* * *

We here face one of the most general misconceptions in social relation; a misconception which acts as a continuing cause for unmeasured evil.

Most of us unquestioningly assume as an axiom in economics, that a business is performed for the payment received; and on that assumption in economics we base our ethics.

The recognized religious teaching as to honesty and good-will to men we admit—as religious teachings; but hold that "business is business," and that religion has no hold on it.

Our personal ethics conflicts sharply with our personal economics; but between social economics and social ethics there is no disagreement.

That is right for a given organism which leads to its best development—and as soon as we recognize society as the organic life in which we exist, all our petty primitive inter-personal problems disappear.

Let no ill-considered protest as to the intense and increasing individuality of human beings confuse this issue. Of course we have individuality—it is a social product. Individuation is in proportion to organization, and is developed by it.

But our so-called individual activities are in reality social activities, and only as such to be rightly fulfilled.

In our present stage of social advancement we are, in economics, highly socialized; but in ethics, still strongly individual. From the highway robber to the manipulator of stocks, the acting force is the same, mere self-interest; and that by no means what might be called "an enlightened self-interest," but pitifully unenlightened.

We delay, clog, weaken, divert, adulterate, and poison the currents of social service, under this mistaken idea of self-interest.

As has been shown in earlier chapters, the human mind has clearly proven its power to modify conduct under the force of false ideas; it is the regular habit of that mind, throughout history.

Today the largest and falsest concept in all our social activities is this universal idea of individualism. In the whole field of warfare between Labor and Capital we see this mistaken position firmly held on both sides. The Capitalist stands, not for Capital, that invaluable promoter of progress, but for each man's right to accumulate "his own money"—for the Private Ownership of Capital.

The Workman stands, not for Labor, that indispensable creator of Capital, as well as of all our social necessities, but for each man's right to the product of "his own labor"—for the Private Ownership of Labor.

Both are Individualists. Both are looking at social life as a fruitful source of profit, *to the individual.* Even the earnest socialist looks at labor as a thing to be minimized, to do as little of as possible, that a man may have time to "develop his faculties."

How they may be developed—except by exerting them, or for what purpose, except social service—it is hard to see.

We cannot establish the ethics of economic action until we understand what that action is, and what it is for.

If the varied activities of human life are merely processes by which individuals are to be fed; if society's accumulated energy, capital, is intended for the gross gratification of a few individuals only; then the Laborer is right to seek the most pay for the least work, and the Capitalist is right in trying to secure, to consume and to control.

See now the difference in our ethics when we commonly understand the nature of social life. From earliest years our children could be taught that simple and prominent fact—the interdependence of human life. It is a clear and interesting story; the group-hunting, which brought down more game; the group-fighting which meant more safety; and how in this common activity the ethics of comradeship developed.

Question to class: If the tribe is hunting a mammoth, and the hunter

who knew where he was saw a fat opossum, which would feed him well enough, should he go off after the opossum, or keep on after the mammoth—which would be right?

Answer: To keep after the mammoth

Q. Why?

A. Because if they all got the mammoth they would all have more to eat—including him.

Q. Why should he care to help feed the others?

A. Because in the long run he will be safer and get more to eat as part of a strong tribe.

A normal child of five could understand the ethics of this stage of action, could see what is right, and why. The older person, seeing that much, sees that a savage who failed to appreciate the position, who forgot the tribal interest for his own immediate advantage, would be not only a traitor but a fool.

Our doctor, lawyer, or grocer, who similarly forgets the social interests for his own immediate advantage, is, similarly, a traitor and a fool.

It is true that he can "get away with it" where the savage could not. It is true that he is honestly ignorant of the social laws which should hold him to true service. But neither natural nor civil law takes account of ignorance. He should know. The facts are before him and the brain is in his head.

Can any man fail to see the more complex but equally clear interrelation of our social activities?

It is the baldest truism to state that the safety and advantage of modern individuals depends on the safety and advantage of the state they belong to; and that state advantage is served by the daily fulfillment of function. Surely it is clear that if no man was honest, if all our food was poisoned, if no work was reliable and every business man a conscienceless scoundrel we should have no *state.*

Our earliest ethics has postulated certain lines of conduct as advantage. "Honesty is the best policy," for instance; but it has never taught this simple, child-convincing ethics based on social interactions, because we have not understood sociology.

We teach, in our religions, certain arbitrary acts as pleasing to God; like that ancient ceremonial called "Divine Service." What imaginable service to God or man lies in our ritual is not explained. We are also taught, vaguely, that "a good man" will not be dishonest, that he must "walk uprightly before the Lord."

But in every church we see good men holding an attitude they truly

believe to be upright, and yet acting as enemies to society in their business life. They do not understand the nature of that life. They innocently assume that "the world" is merely a great open battlefield wherein men are to strive against one another, each seeking to get as much and give as little as possible; each working primarily in the interests of himself and his family. While we have no better understanding of social economics, we can have no better social ethics.

Our conduct, in economics, is pushed strongly one way by this misplaced self interest, and only faintly influenced by the suggestions of religion. "Business is business," says the hard-fisted tradesman; and "I am not in it for my health." He thinks he is reasonable. He thinks he is doing right under economic law. Yet it is precisely under economic law that he is doing wrong. He is as utterly, as unreasonably wrong, as a football player who devoted his energies to getting hold of the ball—to sell it.

We have been so alienated by the ancient theory of sacrifice; so long deeply convinced that right conduct was a religious form; that being good was a performance meant to please God, and that God was only pleased when we were not, that it is somewhat difficult to show the adult mind how directly contrary is the truth.

But a child may be shown, any unprejudiced, uneducated, irreligious child. It takes neither learning, piety, nor unusual intellect to see that right conduct for a social being means fulfillment of social functions.

Question: What is right conduct for a mosquito?

Answer: To get as much food, to mate as promptly, and to lay as many eggs as she can.

Q. Why should she do this?

A. Because that is the way mosquitos live and to keep mosquitos alive is her duty.

Q. What is right conduct for an ant?

A. To get food, to save most of it for the others, and feed them on request; to care for the queen, for the eggs, for the larvae and pupae and young ants; to build the ant-hill and excavate the inner chambers and passage,—and so on, and so on, according to the kind of ant she is.

Q. Why should she do this?

A. Because that is the way ants live—and to keep ants alive is her duty.

Q. What is right conduct for a human being?

A. To obtain food, to mate and reproduce the species, to specialize for the service of society and promote its interests.

Q. Why?

A. Because that is the way human beings live; and not only to live, but to improve—that is our duty.

Q. How is the most food to be obtained with the least effort by human beings?

A. By the study, research and experiment of advanced scientific specialists; by the establishment of government commissions, bureaus, and illustrating stations; by the general education of all the citizens and special training for agriculturalists; by the invention of the best machinery for minimizing labor; by improved means of transportation and distribution, from the planter to the table,—and so on, and so on.

Q. What is the particular right conduct of each person engaged in any part of that great process?

A. To carry on his part to the best fulfillment possible to him.

Q. Why?

A. How foolish to ask! Because if each individual does not do his part right the whole process is injured.

Q. What is to be said of a man who raises poor food, who manufactures bad food, who puts poison in food to sell—that he himself may make more money?

A. He is a traitor, an enemy of society, and a fool.

Q. Why is he a fool.

A. Because society is one living thing; and to poison anybody is also poisoning oneself. It is like a man's injecting poison into his own foot and denying that it hurt him, on the ground that it was a long way off.

Q. But cannot a man injure a great many other people, and yet live comfortably himself—he and his family?

A. Yes—so long as he is a fool. He does not see the evil he has done, and he does not see how it affects him, and his family. He could not be "comfortable" if he were wiser.

Here we have our whole position, pitifully clear.

Because we literally do not understand the nature of our social processes, because we have not used our mental power to follow out, to visualize to ourselves, the evil results of our conduct; because we have no instruction in ethics, real practical social ethics; we go on preying upon one another, and imagining that we are comfortable when we have placed ourselves and our families upon some temporary "island of safety" in the crawling struggling mass. It is not that we are "bad"; we are only foolish. The worst that can be said of us, generally, is that we are lazy and timid; too brow-beaten and discouraged as little children ever to use our own minds with any freedom when grown up.

See now, how easily ethics might be taught in childhood.

First the history of our social progress kept always visible throughout the whole actively educative period. Then each question of conduct, as it came up, related to that familiar field of growth; and, whenever possible, left to be studied out.

Teacher: "You can answer that question yourself, John. Try to think it out."

John: "Why should I think it out, when you can tell me the answer at once."

Teacher: "For two reasons. In the first place I might tell you wrong. If you always accept what people tell you, you remain credulous, gullible, a ready victim. (Illustrations given from savage life, and our earlier history). Secondly, because you need the exercise in thinking. The more questions you work out for yourself, the more you will be able to. As soon as we have mastered the old ones we shall be better able to tackle the new ones."

Children so taught will not sit dumb and unprotesting under the silly miseries of our life today. They will have more understanding of the reasonableness of ethics. When they ask: "Why are there so many poor people while there is so much room for labor in the world?" and are answered: "These people are poor because they are 'the unfit'; they are failures; they cannot succeed in life,"—such children will not be satisfied with such a foolish answer. They will inquire: "Are they born unfit? How do you know they are failures—have they been carefully tested in all kinds of conditions? Are you sure they could not succeed in anything?"

And further. "Is it good for us—who are successful—to have so many failures about? Would it not be possible for us—who are so successful in getting ahead of them—to do something to improve their quality?"

We only need to use our minds; to use them as machines for thinking and for governing action, not merely as receptacles of the ideas of men many centuries dead.

Right conduct must bear relation to something.

The mosquito has no one to consider but herself, her momentary mate, her deposit of eggs.

The ant has many other ants to consider. She forgoes her own function of egg-laying that the specially fed queen may lay more and better ones. Ant ethics is conditioned upon the needs and activities of the group.

Human ethics is conditioned upon the needs and activities of society. And since, as we have seen, any minor misplacement, any one wrong

relation, necessarily affects the health of the whole physical body, so does such misplacement and wrong relation affect the social body.

Further, since economic conditions are universally present, and of vital importance, we find our present economic relation affecting not only our ethics, but our whole social life.

While the condition of chattel slavery existed it produced qualities inevitably modifying social growth. No society, keeping slaves, could ever rise above a certain point.

So while our economic relations persist; while the majority of people never know economic peace, economic freedom; while some of us are too rich and most of us are too poor to "see life steadily and see it whole," there also persist those qualities of mind developed by this relation.

In the disproportionately rich appears the attitude of pride, as of superiors; not that they are superiors—the most casual observation often proves the contrary; but the possession of what others have not seems to them to show them in some way better. They live, as helplessly as a sucking tick, as actively as a hungry flea, or as violently as a robber, on the productive labor of other people; just as the master lived on the labor of his slaves; and, in their very helplessness, find cause for pride.

Pride and selfishness persist not because they are natural human qualities, but because we do not understand what humanity is.

In the disproportionately poor, besides the deterioration, physical and mental, induced by their deprivations, we find other qualities similar to those of slaves. While labor is exacted from them as the price of life (instead of being given, as the fruit of life); while they see all the desirable conditions associated with wealth and generally with idleness; so long will they *despise their own labor*—seek to escape it, and to make others work for them.

Compulsory labor, whether under the lash or the pressure of poverty, is always ignoble *and inferior.* We have, in civilized races, at last found out that slave labor is unprofitable. Some day we shall find out that our wage-slave-labor is unprofitable too.

Both master and slave, both employer and employed, misunderstand and underrate the real source of human power and human pride.

Our wholesale unchastity is developed by the rich holding power over the poor, precisely as it was by masters holding power over slaves.

Our moral qualities are inevitably modified by our economic conditions.

No ethics could be sound which failed to take account of these interactions. It is futile to preach and persuade and threaten, trying to induce

men to live in one way while the whole pressure of their surroundings pushes them another.

Social ethics, once clearly understood, will rearrange the conditions of life, so that it shall be as "natural," as easy, to do right as it now is to do wrong.

Chapter 10

INSTANCES

IN STUDYING the pitiful deficiencies of our primitive ethics in the face of immediate modern problems, it is illuminating to show instances. Properly to rate such instances we need new and definite standards of measurements; and some gradation in order of importance.

"Sin," the old generalization, was "breaking the law of God"; and, from that point of view, one sin was as bad as another. Both church and state, however, have always recognized gradations, and administered penance and punishment accordingly.

Our new recognition of wrong conduct as something which injures the individual, the family, or humanity, is open to the most full and careful gradation. To eat green apples and so bring on a colic is bad, but not so bad as to take prussic acid—self-made indigestion is not so evil as suicide. Neither is plain unqualified "sin," for there might be occasion when green apples were the only attainable food, or when suicide was quite justifiable.[1]

So in family ethics it is bad to be an ill-natured and censorious father, but not so bad as to be no father at all—fault-finding is less wicked than desertion. And in Social Ethics, to offend against the State by mere apathy is bad enough, but to offend by some direct injury to human life, to human happiness, virtue or improvement, is far worse.

The simple old standards of arbitrary "right" and "wrong" were quite easy to follow—or to break.

The standards of Ethics as a science requires study—as does any other science.

There is no longer a question of submission to authority, of blindly following a little string of rules; this is something we can all spend our lives in learning about, and to which each generation can bring new light.

Now, for the purpose of studying a few instances of our advance in, or our ignorance of, Social Ethics, let us arbitrarily make a little scale, brief and limited, having say ten grades of value, five above the line of conduct which neither helps nor hinders, and five below.

At the top we will place those acts which conduce to the highest advancement of the most people; at the bottom those acts which conduce to the lowest degradation of the most people.

We must needs stretch our imaginations to put at the top some enormous race benefit, some human action which should result in endless and increasing improvement to us all. As an instance within reach we might place the invention of the printing press, or, on the psychic plane, the recognition of evolution.

At the bottom should be some instrument of evil, working wide and continuous mischief, as a prison; or some world-arresting lie, such as fatalism, or damnation.

Between these tremendous extremes lies the field of human conduct.

We may live, as most of us do, pretty near the medium line, our behavior kept carefully level with that of the people about us, not benefitting the world much, and not injuring the world much.

This vast majority of us moves slowly onward, pushed by genetic forces, and, as we have seen in earlier chapters, steadily opposes this forward movement, by maintaining the dead weight resistance of indifferences, and the more violently retarding force of false ideas.

Above this majority are the advance guard of the world, that sturdy minority, pushing on, alert and courageous, in ever-narrowing lines, to those few foremost souls whose great discoveries whether material or psychic, lift us along our endless upward path.

Below, in the five lower grades, we must count the real detrimentals; the great numbers of incapable, defective, or positively mischievous persons, who are produced in increasing malignity, by the wrong conduct of those above them; the utterly inert and indifferent who constitute the dragging burden of the world, and those parasites, harmless, or actively evil, who weaken society, or poison it outright. Worse than these come the real criminals, labeled or unlabeled, who are to society what disease germs are to us; and who, if unchecked, would destroy their own source of life by destroying the great social body in which they live.

Along the middle line we may put the man who "behaves himself"; who does not cheat in his business, who does his work well, and who, if he is no more progressive than his forefathers, is at least no less so. Also his wife, behaving herself, bringing up children in her own image, keeping step with her husband in the praiseworthy process of "marking time." These people are generally quite complacent, because, having accepted a field of ethics about the size of a tea-tray, they fulfill its demands, and are satisfied.

A chess player would have as much reason to be satisfied because he did not bite the heads off his pawns, or get the board dirty.

The people who do nothing to promote the progress of the world would still be hairy savages—if it had not been for those who have lifted them along the ages in spite of themselves.

Here the lack of ethics is clear.

They do not recognize social progress as a duty at all. To them society is static—not dynamic.[2] Their pride is like that of a locomotive engine, sitting quite still and boasting that it does not fall off the track. "But for my weight," says the engine complacently, "there's no knowing where the train might go."

These middle-ground people, while not actively evil in any way, are far more of a drag on the world than the recognized or unrecognized criminals because there are so many of them.

When Social Ethics wakes the world, the most important stir will be among these stationary people, who will at last see that there is no life without motion, and that the right motion for humanity is upward and onward.

In our little arbitrary scale we might put Conservatism as number one, going downward; not a violent or incurable evil, but dangerous from its great extent and its almost irresistible contagiousness.

Yet they believe, really, that if it were not for them something dreadful would have happened to the world. They make an absolute virtue of what they proudly call "conservatism" which is only another name for mental inertia.

Second, that common error we call "Selfishness," the anachronism of a primitive ego, still dominant in our advanced social relation.

Third, all Untruth and Dishonesty, in every form.

Fourth, that simple common universal misuse of bodily functions, that pointless self-indulgence, which results in the over development of sex, and in that great trio of ensuing evils—War, Intemperance, and Prostitution.

Fifth, and worst of all, the arrest or perversion of social functions; as

where government is made unjust, education denied, or the press degenerated.

Similarly in the five upward grades we will put, first Open-mindedness, Progressiveness, the spirit which is willing to see farther and to move on.

Second, the Social Spirit, that human instinct we call love, recognizing and serving common social needs.[3]

Third, Truth; Truth in all things—material as well as psychic.

Fourth, Courage, and with it Will—the power to act.

Fifth, highest and most important of all, the Fulfillment and Improvement of Social Function—that tremendous front rank duty which leads on the world.

By these five grades up, and five down, let us measure ourselves, looking at the conduct of the world about us with new eyes.

As we look back along our history, or about us today, we see always some few people who are using their lives to advance humanity. Whether they die in the process or not, they push on, as long as they are able, and their achievements are our achievements—on them we climb forward.

Whether these Lifters and Leaders bring in new mechanical advantages, improvements in the plant or animal world, in chemistry or physics, in manufacture, in astronomy, in medicine; or whether they lift the soul along by better education, freer government, a higher vision in religion; whatever process they improve, they improve the world.

If our business here is social progress and improvement, they are the most virtuous; the most noble, who lead the most people farther onward. Jesus, with his vision of human unity and human love; Lamarck, Wallace and Darwin, with their vision of Life in Motion—the great world-hope of Evolution; Lester Ward, with his vision of the true relation of the sexes,—such as these stand highest for our psychic advancement. The mechanical world helpers we are more familiar with, but do not properly rate their social value. Such men as the Wright brothers, Burbank, Edison and Marconi—in all their splendid numbers, are world benefactors of the highest degree.[4]

In the order of Courage and Power they all stand high—it is essential to their work. In Truth they are also Masters,—truth to function and truth in expression. Whether they have the social spirit or not does not matter—their work serves the world whether the conscience wishes it to or not. They may work from a consecration of their pet science or from personal ambition—it makes no difference to us. We do not ask affection from our eyes and ears—but true service.

In that conscious social spirit we have today a splendid army, wakening to a healthy consciousness of the world's pain, a sympathy with the world's joy, an eager hope for the world's betterment, and a desire to serve. They may not, immediately, accomplish much; they may lack in Truth, in Courage and Power, or have no special Gift of Service, but they *care.* They are beginning to realize the organic social life and to love it, and "love will find out a way."[5]

Below these, in most reassuring numbers, are the swelling ranks of people who are at least willing to move. They no longer hold a belief because they cannot help it; they are willing, when they see that what they had believed was wrong, to leave off believing.

It is these people who ought to cheer the heart of the pessimist; this mighty and growing class who are passing from a static to a dynamic stage of life. As they increase, so grows our hope.

Then we come to the medium line, the motionless ones, doing no harm—and no good. We might as well leave them out altogether—they don't count.

Below comes our first downgrade of evil Conservatism.

It is common enough. The conservatives are far more numerous than those balancing on the fence, the indifferentists.

From the poor peasant in his millions, with narrow darkened mind, clinging stolidly to the beliefs and habits of his ancestors, to the rich aristocrat in his thousands, with "a liberal education," and an enlightened mind, also clinging to the ideas and habits of the past, and infinitely more blameable—the world is full of conservatives.

They constitute the great mass of the enemies of society. They keep it from growing up. They are the hugest obstacle to progress, to all progress. They dwarf and cripple us, trying eternally to keep a moving thing from moving, to hold society back where it used to be.

They are, as a rule, arrogant, and talk complacently of their value in checking the flights and vagaries of unsettled "radicals," a spirit shown, precisely alike, among the fellaheen of Egypt, the coolies of China, the mujicks of Russia, and the worthy "best people" in our own communities.[6]

They simply do not understand that the world is meant to grow.

They think it is meant to stay still—they have always thought so; and the visible growth of all our thousands of years of social progress has no effect whatever on the conservative mind. They are rooted to the ground, immovable as trees. For the world to proceed these have to be simply ignored and left behind, or if they are too thick, they have to be overthrown. Their notion that the world would fly to pieces if they did

not keep it tied up is one of the most laughable manifestations of ignorance.

Growth is not erratic and violent. You do not have to hold a large stone on a child's head because, if not hindered "there's no knowing how he might grow." He would grow upward of course; and in the shape of a human being.

As for those mad enthusiasts of whom the conservatives are so deadly afraid, if they are given free play they run frothing to the front and—froth. They do not and cannot lead the world astray. Given a general education and a free normal rate of advance, and we can manage any number of enthusiasts.

Below the conservatives, poor vegetables, comes the next grade of evil,—those who are actively selfish.

This is a positive evil—conservatism is as negative as a hitching post.

Selfishness is mischievous because it militates against the very structure of society. If a man is all alone somewhere, he may be as selfish as he likes and do no harm; but if he is a member of a community, the more highly advanced is the communal life the more dangerous is his selfishness. Its effect is like that of a bloodthirsty savage in a summer colony. The more peaceful, beautiful and orderly the place, the more amiable, trustful, and defenseless the people, the more harm he could do.

This simple and very general evil of a misplaced disproportionate egoism is so common that we call it "human nature"; whereas it is not human nature at all, but pre-human.

Humanity is essentially social. Social nature is human nature, and it is, inevitably, what we call "altruistic." The social consciousness is "human nature." Those who are persistently selfish in a highly developed society, are by that much sub-human.

The evil results of selfishness are too conspicuous to need much description. In men it has led to all the greediness of our business world. In women, to that hideous inversion of true femininity, the parasitic creature who takes all she can get, and gives nothing. One sees them in every city, wherever men have become rich enough to keep their women in corrupting idleness and luxury,—fat, pink creatures, whose clothes and jewels represent the labor of thousands; and who have not in their minds the faintest sense of obligation to the world. They even refuse, in some cases, the primal service of their sex, committing prenatal infanticide in serene repetition, or conspiring in other methods of sterile indulgence. If we had any clear idea of social ethics these women would be regarded as monstrous unnatural growths, warty excrescences, horribly soft and useless, and condemned and avoided accordingly.

But we have not that clear idea of ethics. We do not regard selfishness as unnatural, idleness as disease, sex-decoration on women an absolute perversion of nature,[7] and sterile sex-indulgence as misuse of the body.

A woman who loves "not wisely but too well," who bears a child as the natural result of her natural affection and passion, we sweepingly condemn (Ella Wheeler Wilcox has recently published an admirable comment on this, in verse);[8] but the woman who has not offended against our ancient standard of "personal ethics" or "family ethics," yet who breaks every law of social ethics, we have neither law nor custom to arraign. Until we recognize Social Ethics we cannot understand why and how she is doing wrong.

When it comes to Lying, to Dishonesty, to all the forms of untruth which distort and ruin our lives, we are even blinder. Truth is so absolutely a social virtue, that we, in our personally limited view, have never rated it highly. Its lack, today, does us incalculable harm, and we do not even see it.

This is not merely a question of "telling a lie." Falsehood has more than verbal form. "All Truth is relative," says the philosopher. Quite so. It is a matter of relation. To be honest in word and deed is quite an elaborate matter. To be true,—true to one's self, to one's work, to one's friends; to be true *in* one's work, to be true from mind to body and from body to dress; to care for truth—to be careful in telling a story not to alter it—all this is difficult and rare. We may some of us have "an ear for music," but very few of us have an ear for truth.

An untruth, in the world today, works evil far and wide. We lie in cloth, in metal, in drugs; our workmanship is unreliable; we lack, apparently, even the desire to be true. With men this shows itself on the larger scale; in politics, in business, in the professions; so common is it in our courts of justice, that in a recent instance the judge reproved a counselor for pointing out that the last witness was committing perjury—that was expected.

Among women, limited in life activities, lying has less reach, but it is no less common. It is not thought wrong, not generally. And their contented distortion or artificial "improvement" of their bodies, shows complete lack of any feeling for truth in expression.

Our fourth grade down, though in itself as simple as over-eating, is by no means simple in its consequences.

Terrible disease may be caused by a very slight disarrangement of function, in the social as in the physical body.

The initial error was, apparently, unavoidable. The growing intelligence and consciousness of primitive man, with his increased power over natural supplies, led to all forms of excess. He did not know the results

of gluttony—he only knew he liked to eat. The natural pleasure of sex-indulgence, plus opportunity and power, and minus any knowledge of pathology, or hygiene, resulted in our general over-development in this line. Even when we found that in given instances physical disease resulted from certain forms of indulgence, we were still unable to generalize as to the effect on the race. That we are only now beginning to see.

In this general racial effect, even where the patient adjustment of nature has preserved a fair degree of individual health, the result of our oversexed condition shows in many further developments.

Notably our over-masculinized condition keeps up the combative instincts, with its crowning horror of war. The permanent habit of self-indulgence appears in all drug-temperance, as well as in the recognized "social evil" of prostitution.

But just as we have failed to properly honor and reward our greatest social benefactors, so have we failed, so do we still fail to see, to condemn, to punish, our greatest social criminals. The private criminal, poor man, with his hot-headed murder, his petty theft, we are quick to prosecute; but we literally lack power of vision to recognize the murderer of thousands, the thief of millions, the man who bestially degrades society.

Where we do begin dimly to see these larger evils is in the comparatively simple lines of our public, governmental and business abuses. We do begin to feel that to sell a deleterious patent medicine is to be a poisoner; and that to sell canned goods, likewise deleterious, carries the same criminal result. Some of us see it, some of the time.

Also we begin to resent the great public "steals," and other large but clear offenses. Beyond that lie depths of iniquity unsounded.

Remember that these measurements do not involve personal reproach. A man is "wicked" in doing what he believes to be wrong. He may do something a thousand times as wrong—and never know it, may even think it a virtue!

That man who started the idea of Eternal Damnation did as wicked a thing as can be conceived; but he probably thought he was inspired by God.

As the highest good in human conduct is that which most improves our highest social functions, so the lowest evil is that which depraves, perverts, and hinders, these functions.

If we can conceive, for instance, of a man who should deliberately inject into the religion of a people a false idea, one which would from age to age lead people to useless crime; if we can imagine a man so handling the educational institutions of his country as to fill all students

with unreliable science, with defective reasoning, with mind-weakening bad habits; or one who should use government for his own ends, turning normal taxation into universal extortion, and civic restraint into irresponsible cruelty, such a man, or such a woman, is the worst social criminal.

Real human evil is offence against society, and the offense is to be measured by the extent and permanence of the harm inflicted. In the case of hurting one human being we can easily distinguish between the relative evil of a scarless whipping, or a quick-healing clean wound, and some prolonged torture, some hopeless disfigurement or maiming; or, still worse, inoculation with a hideous and incurable disease.

The same relative judgment holds good in offenses against society.

Yet we can see clearly, in the individual case, how an ignorant man might think the man who beat him a terrible sinner, and take no notice of the person who fed him with disease germs—sugared.

Society is thus ignorant.

We do not understand our own social structure and functions enough to appreciate their most dangerous abuses.

Plain dishonesty, small and local, we see; but the evil of a great general habit in business, such as "watering stock" and weighing down a business with a load of dividend leeches, we simply do not mind.

We would not shake hands with a pickpocket, even if at large; but we are quite willing to shake hands with the railroad director who helps pick a million pockets annually.

The misuse of our government by private individuals, the making and administering of law to serve individual ends, with all its accompanying corruption—bribery, perjury, prostitution of the judiciary, and the like, we *know* is wrong, but we do not *feel* it. We have no general honest and hearty contempt for those outragers of society; our ethical sense is too pitifully narrow, too weak and old, to react forcibly against them.

Yet so far even these misdoers and the suffering public do intellectually know that their action is against the laws of ethics. Most dangerous of all are the offenses we utterly fail to recognize.[9]

In this field the worst evil of our time is in a diseased and vicious press.[10]

The daily press is one of our very latest and highest social processes. It has more influence than the church, more power than the government, more educational effect than the schools. It is the sensorium of modern society. Through it we see, hear, feel one another. Our degree of Socialness, that condition of quick general consciousness which is essential to the life of a modern society, is largely maintained by the press.

So far as it functions truly we may then know our condition, our surroundings, our possible dangers and benefits, and take action accordingly.

So far as it functions falsely we are blinded or made to see crookedly; we are deafened and confused in hearing, we are blurred and calloused in feeling; we do not know one another, or our true conditions, and therefore act wrongly or remain inert when action is needed.

The one absolute basic virtue of a healthy press is Truth.

The one general disease of our press today is suppression and perversion of truth. It is subject also to the same traitorous misuse as government, the coercion of public power to private advantage; newspapers being freely used as personal engines of advancement.

If preachers were subject to election to public office, and used their pastoral power to persuade the congregation to vote for them; or if teachers similarly used their powers as teachers to influence their pupils to vote for them, we can see what gross abuse of function that would be.[11] It is precisely the same when that great teacher and preacher, the press, is so prostituted to private ends.

Still other diseases affect this invaluable public service. Whereas its normal use is to convey to the whole public quick and reliable information as to the facts and processes of current life; it has descended to the position of an entertainer, furnishing a vast body of matter which has no more to do with a newspaper than with an arithmetic.

In this gross catering to the mental appetites of the people our daily papers have outdistanced the "dime novel," the "penny-dreadful"; they deliberately load their columns with the rankest "sensation," not only distinct and additional, but staining and degrading the news itself.

In the trail of these abuses comes an insolent tyranny which has no parallel in our democracy. The church respects the conscience of the individual; the law respects the rights of the individual, the newspaper respects nothing.

The evil of all this is to be measured by its effect upon society.

Here, at our highest grade of advancement; in this, our highest social function, that "great moral engine" we so justly honor has become the greatest immoral engine we have.

Our Government is pure beside it.

Our Business is honest beside it.

Our Courts are just beside it.

Paper after paper, the country over, owns without the faintest shame, that it is supported by its advertisers—and obeys the hand that feeds it.

Fancy a Judge owning publicly and unashamed that he was kept in office by his constituents or supporters, and must judge to please them.

Thus riddled with disease our press staggers on, of most necessary service, even in its degraded condition, but doing daily evil to millions; an evil that clouds, weakens, misleads and steadily deteriorates, the human mind.

Chapter 11

CONDUCT AND PROGRESS

WITHOUT ACCURATE and reliable knowledge of physics, both empirical and theoretic, we could make small progress in the mechanical arts which develop our social body.

Without a similarly accurate and reliable knowledge of ethics, we can make small progress in those psychic arts which develop our social soul.

At present the body is faring better than the soul. We elaborate a magnificent mechanism of external life, only to see it collapse and decay because the spirit which should go with it is not there.

Landlords complain that their ignorant tenants use their bathtubs for coal-bins; travelers tell us of a savage chieftain insisting on riding on the box of the stage-coach and making the driver sit inside. The conduct of our so-called "civilized" nations is of a similar absurdity.

To use a college as a medium for playing football is quite as absurd as putting coal in a bathtub.[1] To use a church as a means of social advancement, to use clothing as a glaring means of sex-attraction, to use the law as a prepared shelter for dishonesty, to use the government as a feeding trough,—things like this show as little knowledge of the true purpose and dignity of civilized life as does the bare-legged black king riding on the coachman's box.

The people who do these things are not, as a rule, evilly disposed. They are simply ignorant, grossly, shamefully, pathetically, ignorant. They have never been taught the science of ethics.

We stand in the great game of life like chessmen who have to do their

own playing, but we have no better knowledge of the game than would be shown by those same chessmen fighting duels and pushing one another off the squares, or playing squat-tag and puss-in-the-corner instead of chess.[2]

Until a definite knowledge of the nature and processes of human life is taught to our children from infancy, accompanied by the clear laws of conduct based on those rules of conduct; until such teaching goes on in higher and fuller application in our schools, colleges and churches, we can manifest no better behavior than we do.

We do not know how to behave as social beings should, because we do not know *why.* Our old "whys" depended either on mere authority—which we no longer accept; on tradition and habit—which we are outgrowing; and on immediate reactions of our neighbors—which have changed with time.

This is no casual and temporary accident. It is a consequence of social growth which always occurs.

Many reasons have been advanced to account for the decay of morals and manners in advanced civilizations,—that nation-wide corruption which is seen throughout all history, accompanying the highest progress, and preceding ruin.[3]

Here is a better reason than any of them:

Unconscious conduct, based on inherited instincts and on mere reactions, is, in a state of external progress, necessarily behind the times. As instance: "Mother instinct" has never kept pace with education.[4]

This inadequacy of instinctive or reactive conduct is more marked in proportion to the speed of our progress. As instance: Note the breakdown in behavior of the children of peasant peoples hurled into American civilization.[5]

The only way to keep our behavior abreast of civilization is to have the conscious conduct advance as swiftly as do the external conditions.

This conscious conduct is the one great source of human superiority. The "soul" we boast of is just that; the larger consciousness which can see all around instincts, habits and reactions, and decide what to do on quite other grounds.

On what grounds?

That question underlies this whole science of ethics. *Why* should we do thus and thus?

And here is where civilization, so far, has fallen down.

It is easy to teach a system of ethics based on self-interest, based on authority, based on reward and punishment. Little children, yes, animals, may be taught to govern their conduct thus.

It is not too hard to enlarge this range of ideas to the scope of a family.

Quite primitive races show large capacity for conscious conduct on a high plane, in the interests of a family or tribe.

But the healthy growth of a large and progressive civilization calls for a new code of conduct, a code based on the common interests of immense numbers, extending over great distances, covering long periods of time.

This new code is demanded by changing conditions more rapidly than it is apprehended and practiced by the people. There you have the explanation of the "fall of nations." The outside grows faster than the inside.

It is as if we built an ocean liner and manned it from a Chinese junk or the paddlers of some carven war canoe. Our streets, our harbors, our buildings,—our great Public Body—that is highly socialized; but our Public Spirit,—where is that?

As fast as a society develops two processes should go on, urged by all our conscious powers.

One is the extension of the advantageous development to all the citizens. No civilization can be healthy and strong that is not homogeneous. For some of its people to use steel, some bronze, and some unchipped flints, will not do.

This simple principle has never been realized by any nation in the past. They have always imagined that they could live in strata, in loose sections tied or nailed together; in slippery pyramids where a domineering few held together on top of a more or less quiescent mass below—a mass always liable to sudden disruption or eruption; and, nowadays, in a state of continuous squirming protest and muffled rebellion.

Such a combination does not make a healthy state.

The people must rise together, those external advantages which accompany our normal social development being rapidly distributed to all citizens.

We in America have seen this to some degree in the matter of general and compulsory education. A democracy, we say, must be educated. A democracy must be served much more fully than that, to be a safe and lasting one.

The second great process, absolutely essential to healthy social growth, is the continuous development of the social consciousness and the socializing of our governing ideas. As in the narrow limits of individual ethics we see every act simply and clearly related to self-interest; as in the somewhat larger scope of domestic ethics we see every act simply and clearly related to family interest; so, in a growing state, we should see every act simply and clearly related to the social interest.[6]

Here we fall down.

We do not know what the social interest is.

All the real growth we have made in social ethics is blindly, along lines of special professions; nobly, but with sad limitations, in the establishment and pursuance of certain principles; and such high standards as here and there appear in statesmanship and patriotism. Against these stands forth that hideous bloated individualism transferred to a nation; that maintenance of the lowest and worst instincts, savage and even subhuman, which turns a nation into a raging beast and allows us to do, collectively, what any individual would be hanged for doing.

What can we do, now, to lift our social consciousness up even with our external progress, and make, at last, a sound homogeneous society, which shall both endure and grow?

We need a College or Commission of Social Ethics, selected from the best and wisest, and open to continuous replenishment from the better and wiser as fast as they appear.[7] Such a Commission should base its labors on Biology and Sociology, using History mainly as a painful illustration of our pathetic mis-steps. It should prepare, for the use of schools and churches, certain plain and unquestioned records of fact, leaving open for further knowledge all points not clearly established, the general purpose being to show:

a. What is social life?
b. What is social progress?
c. On what conditions does social progress rest?
d. By what conduct is social progress most advanced, and most impeded?
e. By what definite personal action may we soonest produce the desired conduct?

Such matters as these might be even now set forth so as to command agreement from large bodies of people. It is neither possible nor desirable that any one school of ethicists should formulate and force upon the world a given set of views. The desirable thing is, first to recognize the need of a scientific ethics based on the facts of social progress; and second to show, be it ever so imperfectly, how our personal conscious conduct is related to that progress.

A man may care very little for his individual life, may be willing to drown by himself, and yet not be willing to scuttle the ship and drown all his comrades. Moreover his comrades would not be willing. So long as we believed “the soul that sinneth, it shall die”—why let the man sin and die if he wants to—it is none of our business. But as soon as we see that nobody can keep his sins to himself; that in a social group all

conduct is of importance to all the members; we have a new interest in one another's behavior.

Our condemnation now falls only on childish obvious primitive sins. The force of public opinion—the most tremendous of uplifters, arresters, or depressors is wasted on small irrelevant things.

We need to enlighten that public opinion, and quickly, that it may swing in line with real social forces, and help us live and grow.

Suppose now we prepare ethical charts for use in primary schools, and, more elaborated, all the way up, with appropriate text.

One process is illustrated,—say the feeding of humanity. The savage is shown, lean and famished, stuffing himself when possible; eating lizards, grasshoppers, acorns. The savage woman is shown gathering roots, fruit, seeds, beginning to plant them. Agriculture follows, with pictures of methods, of advance in tools, of irrigation, and our new steps in selection and deliberate improvement.

It is shown what a gain to humanity this is; how before agriculture we never had a sure food supply, or time and strength to do anything but hunt, eat, sleep, and hunt; how the settled home comes with agriculture—depends upon it; how the health and character of a people is affected by its food; how, in individuals or classes, too much food has this result, too little food has that; how the brain and all its activities, even the emotions, depend largely on what, when and how one eats.

Ethics as related to agriculture, is then established. In any given place or time, with historic illustration, the child is shown what conduct did most to advance agriculture, and what did most to hinder or pervert it.

He is shown, with note for future reference in other lines, what great world-lifting service was done by the inventors of new machinery, the discoverers and improvers of new foods; given a set of Heroes to admire who really did something. He is shown, as against these, the common indifference and inertia which everywhere checked advancement, and, in vivid pictures, the peasant plowing with a stick in one country, while the steam plough works in another.

He is shown pictures of the results of famine, of the, starving poor, and, in direct contrast, pictures of the silly elaboration and waste of gorgeous banquets, from Lucullus to the monkey-dinners of today.[8]

He is taught the relation of water to the food supply, the relation of trees to water, the relation of lumber-men to trees, the relation of the state to the lumber-men—and then his own relation to the state.

He is shown the reason and relation of right and wrong in regard to this one function—the feeding of the world. Ships come into it; railroads come into it; brokers and speculators come into it.

Exhibit on the screen to a class of scholars photographs of, first, poor children poking in refuse cans; poor women chaffering with poor peddlers; poor families eating their meager meals—or those poorer ones who have no meals, but eat from hand to mouth; then, at the same date, photographs of San Francisco Bay or of New York Harbor dotted with melons, of carloads of peaches rotting on sidings and dumped, of orchards where pigs eat the apples—or they rot and waste on the ground. Then photographs, where obtainable, of the Commission men, brokers, or whomsoever was responsible for some given instance of such waste.[9]

Show them vivid pictures of the clean sanitary places where good food is prepared for the market; good bread is made; and then of the foul sheds where some of such work is done, the dark basement bakeries, foul and verminous.

Show them methods of adulteration, with the faces and names of the adulterators. Tell them of the embalmed beef sent to our soldiers—and give the senders' photographs. Let them have a new idea of what treason is—someone besides Benedict Arnold to execrate.

Then, if they become too easily personal, the teacher asks: "Whose fault is it?"

"Why *his*—that villain!"

"What do you wish to do about it?"

They cry for punishment.

"How would that improve our food—someone else might do it."

"Make a law against it!"

"Who makes our laws?"

They mention Senators, the Representatives, the Government.

"And who makes them do it?"

Any child could see that where there is no king, the people must demand the laws they want—and the people must see that they are enforced.

Begin again with your illustration. Take a given instance of some long series of small misdeeds; a careless workman here, an extortionate storekeeper there, a speculator changing prices somewhere else—resulting in the end in bad food given to children; and picture their pinched faces, their wasted little bodies.

Ask whose fault it is—show them that it is not one person who is the efficient culprit, but many; and that ultimate responsibility lies not even on them, but on us all.

Nation after nation could be used in illustration of this one theme—the Ethics of Agriculture. Those dead lands, deforested and desoiled because of our sins against the bounteous earth;[10] that terrible Chinese

river with its man-made floods;[11] those and deserts, once gardens from wide irrigation; and, on the other hand, the reclamation work so nobly done in many countries.

There is room for vivid pictures, for interesting stories, for natural science and personal instances, for sympathy, admiration, enthusiasm, and condemnation. And at every step, ethics.

It is right for a given people at a given time to do thus and thus—clearly proven.

It is wrong for any people at any time to do so and so—clearly proven; with redoubled weight under special conditions.

And always show that this right and wrong conduct is traceable not merely to the immediate committers of given acts, but to the whole people.[12]

Our ethical teachers should use all the armory of well chosen words and pictures to establish in the child's mind the *connection* in human conduct, the compound responsibility.

It should be as easy to show as in the old rigmarole of how "the cat began to kill the rat; the rat began to gnaw the rope; the rope began to hang the butcher; the butcher began to kill the ox"—and so on.[13]

We should have surrounding our children in school, in mural paintings or hangings that could be changed from room to room, representation of the rise of mankind, and of those great special inventions and discoveries, which have lifted us by jerks as it were.[14]

The use of fire—with a whole spreading tree of its advantageous results, heavily scored in black with its dangers and evils, would make a great chart in itself. A list, taken from the fire-insurance companies, of the causes of fire; pictures of forest fires with clear strong representations of the harm they do, followed by pictures of the careless campers who left their coals burning, or the more frequent smoker dropping his match or smoldering stub among dead leaves.

The relativity of human conduct—that is what every child should learn through eyes as well as ears. How small a personal offense may result in how large a mischief; how impossible it is to "fix the blame;" how essential, always, the combined moral sense of the whole community.

Out of the belittling atmosphere of personal praise and blame, reward and punishment, authority and irresponsibility, he should come into an enlightening atmosphere of cause and effect.

There is no reason whatever why we should not at once formulate a simple and clear method of teaching the ethics we do know, while our best minds are working on a farther development of the great science.

The teacher should be well equipped with the underlying principles,

ready to show in answer to the everlasting "why" that goodness means advantage in the end, though the greatest goodness may cost both effort and pain for the time being.

Even with the smallest, the baby questioners, who are not put off in their gropings after justice by mere authority, it should be the joy and pride of the true teacher to provide such simple little sequences that even the baby can see "why."

In the young child's growth there are several distinct processes useful in ethics. One is this trained perception of Right and Wrong as associated with facts he can understand. Another is the power of self-control, both active and passive, developed as an exercise, in games, without moral pressure. Then comes the combination of the two—when the young soul is able to restrain an impulse it recognizes as wrong; or to compel an action it recognizes as right—and is met with joyful appreciation.

But the appreciation should be bestowed precisely as in the acquirement of some new physical dexterity, or some mental exercise. "I told the truth that time," is to be praised like—"I did remember." Ethical values should attach to all human conduct.

Punishment or reward has no place in such training,—not the old arbitrary methods that seek to modify conduct along the primitive lines of fear and desire; but the inexorable influence of results should be applied from the beginning,—carefully chosen results, modified to the perceptions of infancy, but always clear reliable consequences of the act.

Sometimes the results are rewards in themselves, but to that we should add from the first the discriminating pressure of approval. On the other hand failure in ethics should not be met with condemnation, any more than failure in arithmetic. If the child does not do well in ethics the fault lies in the method of teaching.

With a careful grounding such as this the older children would take their advanced courses easily. The habit from infancy of using the reasoning power to decide on conduct, and the will to govern it, would make later lessons easy.

There is no mystery in ethics, no ecstatic virtue and no unpardonable sin. It is a matter of plain but hotly interesting study. The instances used would vary from class to class, from child to child, and the teachers of this science should be chosen with more care than any.

From savage rites to social customs of today would be an easy step for the well taught child of ten or twelve, and they would bring back into the home a discriminating judgment, a penetrating power of question and analysis which would go far to lift even the generation behind us.

Similarly from ancient history to modern politics is but a step; from caravan and bazaar to railroad train and department store.

The principles of ethics may be established on almost any group of data picked at random from our great field of conduct, and applied in particular to almost any others.

Of course, in a limited way, we have done this before now; with fairy-tale and fable, verse and tract and story-book, we have tried to teach our children such ethical values as we had. But we had not, until now, the real basis of ethics, the interrelated indissoluble composite life of society. About some points we may differ and argue for years to come, but that great common ground of union is a safe one.

It is not merely the Aristotelian phrase, so wise and so sound as far as it goes: "The greatest good to the greatest number;" it is a deeper recognition that that "number" is organically related, and its "greatest good" involves not only present gain, but progress.[15]

At every stage in his ethical training the child should learn to measure conduct not only by its relativity to the state, to the world, but to that world's improvement.

Using the child himself as an illustration, with his own delight and pride in growing, we could easily show how such and such behavior would be good for him at such an age, but other acts would benefit him "when he was bigger"—would help him grow.

Show them the little peoples, the slow peoples, the backward peoples, compared to the greater ones. Show them a bone needle, a steel needle, a sewing machine; show them a green apple or a bunch of grass in a handkerchief as compared with a real ball; show them always in human affairs, progress—something better to be attained.[16]

Wrong doing is easily exhibited. All the way up the Big Baby, Society, has made as many mistakes as the small ones we should be teaching. Over and over we can point out the mistakes, the big conspicuous patent mistakes they made, and be sorry.

"They didn't know any better," we say. "They did not understand ethics."

All human life should be held in easy survey before the child. Constant reference should be made with the charts and pictures before him to "when we were at that stage," or "when we knew no better than that." And all up and down the line, in strong color and with careful emphasis, we should show what were the real world-lifting acts, the material and psychic steps upward, closely and clearly related to their consequences.

All this needs of course to be kept in careful gradation. Easy and clear

and simple the foundation, but broad and strong to hold the whole great super-structure.

Up from animals, up from savages, up from darkness and cold and terror, up from gluttony and drunkenness and lust and cruelty, up from bigotry and ignorance, up from all the blind prides and petty passions of the past, always tending toward the heights of clear reason, strong will, and loving kindness.

The little brother, the little sister, should learn that they belong to something; learn that It serves them and they must serve It; learn the clear lesson of Its needs and purposes, and the endless joy of fulfilling them.

That is the comfort and beauty of the new Ethics, Social Ethics.

It gives dignity and purpose to all human conduct, settles our long perplexity into a well understood recognition of law, and floods all life with the peace and happiness of a well-loved healthy growing child.

Chapter 12

NEW STANDARDS AND NEW HOPES

WE FACE today a vital need of clear, simple, and generally accepted standards of ethics, workable ethics.[1]

When religious dogma is doubted and religious authority denied, the ethics based on such dogma and authority weaken and fail. Many, seeing this, have striven to keep up old beliefs no longer accepted by themselves, as a means of maintaining good behavior in others. We can see clearly enough the weakening of the old sanctions, but have not seen with any certainty the strengthening of new ones.

Let us discriminate clearly between the two main fields of conduct, the genetic and telic. In the first, that part which is due to instinct and tradition calls for much determined change, while that which is due to the reactive influence of conditions is improving rapidly. In the second—which is our conscious conduct, will-governed, and based on knowledge—we find our strongest hope.

Man's consciousness, his power of determination, his ability to resist hereditary impulse and the pressure of environment, constitutes the great human distinction.

But if this power of determination is based on false premises, it gives rise to our peculiar capacity of behaving worse than any "lower animal."

It is only by establishing right premises to guide our determinations that this essential superiority becomes wholly beneficial. Only by such true judgment may we enlist the human will in those mutually assisting

processes, those lines of conduct which most rapidly develop and improve us.

There is needed, first, the analysis of ancient impulses, checking some, repudiating some, maintaining others; and with a similar discrimination in traditional guides to conduct.

Second, the careful establishment of such conditions as are known to promote right conduct.

Third, the universal study and practice of our new ethics, based on natural law, social in its character, wholly reliable, up-lifting, strengthening, comforting.

Of this last, while it is but beginning to be understood, we have already quite a sufficient grasp to make a clear start in its teaching, and in its practice.

The main change, the one great fundamental departure out of our old field of doubt and confusion—or of submission and stagnation—is the transfer of the headquarters in our thought from the individual to society.

While we persist in interpreting life in terms of the individual, that individual's distress and perplexity increase in proportion to social advance. Only a cast-iron faith in some ancient religion enables him to maintain that essential to human peace of mind—a definitely accepted scheme of life to which all conduct is related.

No matter what the scheme may be, no matter on what proofless dogma it is based, so long as the brain has an accepted plan to rest its thought upon, it finds therein a measure of contentment.

In the process of religious growth (and not even the iron immobility of "revealed religions" has been able wholly to resist the pressure from the growing brain of man) we have repeatedly changed details in our basic scheme.

But we have not got so deep as that mischievous first premise of an ego-centric universe. Our ideas of life, death and immortality, our plans for this world and for all eternity, our sanctions for conduct, our rewards and punishments, praise and blame—all our theories of life, have gone back to that ancient premise of the Individual Soul.

The New Standards all require a change in this—a change to a Homocentric Universe; that attitude of mind which studies the conduct of Humanity, not the conduct of John and Amelia.

This involves, it is true, a deep and searching readjustment of ideas, and the establishment of new feelings, based on the new ideas.

But granting the thorough and more or less difficult change required, the result is a peace of mind such as the modern world has never enjoyed. Not the peace of a stagnant submission, a suicide of one's own thought,

a resetting of one's neck in the yoke of the long past; nor any similar acceptance of some new dogma lacking even the weight of ancient custom; but the peace of a free forward-pushing journey on a broad bright open road—the direction sure at last.

To know, not to merely believe, but to *know* that our race is in process of improvement; to know the steadily increasing speed, the growing interest and delight of that process; to know the measures which most surely help that upward progress and to have the power to take those measures—this gives to human life the peace, the assurance, the growing splendor of a sunrise.

See the limitations of our earlier concept, even at its best. We postulate a Soul. This Soul, from God-Knows-Where, is born—lodged in flesh on this confused and sorrowful planet. All it knows, by the filtered light of very ancient books, is that there is a God—and a Devil, these engaged in endless conflict for the possession of said Soul. (What for? If the Devil gets it, for endless torment. If God gets it, for endless bliss. What kind of bliss? Very indefinite and unsatisfactory.)

Some, pushed by the growing brain, discard the Devil, and postulate God only, working out a mysterious plan, and steering said Soul through tortuous paths onward and upward to—God-Knows-What. But we have hopes, strange hopes of "Eternal Rest," or "Eternal Peace," or "Eternal Growth"; some of the brisker sort even hope for "Eternal Action."

But always this Solitary Soul, wending its way throughout Life, Death, and Immortality, without any clear idea of what it is all about. Some hope "to know" after death. Some hope, and confidently expect, the ceaseless companionship of their beloved ones, after death. But no one has any comfortable convictions in regard to Life; Life here, on this earth, and its purpose.

Here opens the New Ethics, based on Society.

It says: A Force, which we know, because we can see, feel, and use it, has set this world going, and brought it thus far. It is so good a world and we are so attuned to it, that a healthy person derives keen pleasure from just Sun and Air and Water and the Green Earth.

On this world we are visibly the major power. We are a Thing in Motion, a Process of Development. We, alone, as far as we know, have this vast field of Consciousness that can envisage Life—think about it, and so act as to change it.

We live and function in groups, and in those mutual relations find our largest exercise and joy.

We have risen to our present state from smaller, less developed groups, and have now a far larger field of pleasurable expression and impression

than ever before. Visibly our progress is upward and presumably toward still higher efforts and satisfactions.

Then rises the old "Problem of Evil." The New Ethics answers: The good in human life is natural, essential, and increasing. The evil is almost exclusively due to our own imperfect adjustment. We have not understood our social environment, have not known how to adjust ourselves to it and it to ourselves so as to promote progress and lessen pain.

The "Problem of Evil," so far as it treats of outside conditions, resolves itself into a matter of understanding natural forces and adapting ourselves accordingly. This is a long upward course of study and achievement in which we find both satisfaction and success.

The real "Problem of Evil" about which so much discussion arises is purely a matter of Inter-Social relation—of the things we do to one another. This is, of course, the subject matter of ethics, and calls for this wholesale change of base, the question being, not "How shall I behave to the other I's?" but "How shall We behave to Us?"

This is not so difficult. The whole external field of social conduct is so clear that none need be confused by it.

The child should be shown, from infancy, the field of social relation; the superior pleasure, advantage, and obligation of social service, and its simpler processes. That we should so act as to give best service to society in the line of its continued improvement—that is not hard to understand. In the light of this direction we may study forms of government, law, religion, business—all social processes.

The morbid questioning of the Ego as to its Unknown Past and Unknown Future are quite lost sight of in the rich satisfaction of full social expression.

Some neurasthenic megalomaniac baseballist (if any such person could play ball!) might wonder vaguely, "How did I come to be in this Game?" or, "Where shall I go when this Game is over?" with no satisfaction to himself and with great injury to his batting record.

He should get into the Game!—and find in it his immediate reason for being, which is to Play Ball. When the Game is over is high time to plan for what next. As to how he came to be in it—that is ancient history, particularly futile in case he couldn't help it.[2]

In view of this patent futility of inquiry as to the previous whereabouts of the Soul—an inquiry somewhat similar to "Where was the flame before the candle was lit?"—surely we may dismiss it forever from our minds.

We are here, as the song has it, because we're here—at least that is our practical start. The Personal "Whence?" we may therefore lay on the

table, but the Social "Whence?" is so well established as to give the mind a much needed rest.

Society is here, with a very clear record. We have enough left of the rough human material from which Society has grown to trace our origins; and we have not only in recorded history, but in the remaining half-way stages and experimental steps, plenty of proof of our methods.

In the light of this record there is no question whatever of the value of certain kinds of conduct and the danger of others. Here we may rearrange our scale of virtues, establish a temporary order of preference, and go on, until, with further light, we change it. But to every child could easily be taught the place and use of courage, self-control, perseverance, love, truth—or each and every real virtue; and, as easily, the various "anti-social acts" we call vices.

Never again should we say of some rapidly deteriorating character: "He is nobody's enemy but his own." By deteriorating he becomes a traitor, an enemy of Society. He has no right to admit to the Great Body any form of disease.

This cardinal base underlies each step in Social Ethics. We exist, not individually, but socially. By virtue of social progress we are differentiated and developed. As social progress made me what I am, I owe to social progress my life's best service. That is the foundation of Social Ethics. From that base we may then study the nature and relative importance of our various lines of conduct; learn which were most useful at such and such periods of history, which we need most now, and which are called for to advance farther.

There are still many who place Ethics aside from and below Religion. Ethics, they say, appeals only to the Intellect; Religion to the Heart, to the Soul.

In using these words they speak of untenable distinctions. "The Heart" is a misused word, confounding the functions of a circulatory organ with those of the brain. In similar wise we used to call a coward "chicken-livered," or speak of "having no stomach for the fight"; as also of "bowels of compassion," and other physiological metaphors.

Violent emotion does affect various organs. Love—one variety of it—does "register" in heart action, and extreme fear even affects the kidneys. But emotion is roused in our consciousness by way of the brain. No oratory will stimulate an idiot.

What "the Soul" is, or wherein it lodges, is not definitely established, but again, we do not look for it in idiots. It takes some brain to allow standing room for the Soul, apparently.

As vaguely do we use the word "Intellect," as if it was a separate

department of the brain's forces, to be appealed to or not at will. Intellect is brain-activity and brain-power. We use it in choosing our religion, if we do consciously and responsibly adopt it; and we use it in carrying out our religion—if we are in any sense free agents.

What underlies our loose phrasing is this: That Religion, in the past, has chosen to appeal to some few of our more primitive mental processes, as Belief, Faith, Fear, or Hope of Reward. Then, because the use of the higher later mental processes, as of logical reasoning, determination, an exercised will based on determination, were always dangerous to the basic dogmas of religion, these higher processes were set apart as belonging to what was called "intellect"; even contemptuously—"our poor human intellect!" and the earlier faculties considered as superior.

Yet the painful fact that acceptance of dogma and tradition is easier in proportion to extreme youth, to ignorance, or to relative savagery, ought to make even a poor human intellect question their value.

Acting on its absurd premise it remained for Ancient Religion to underrate and condemn the products of that same despised intellect, so that all the real progress of humanity has been consistently belittled, and we are taught to extol some qualities and condemn others merely as they conduce to the acceptance or rejection of dogma.

The New Standards will change all this. Social Ethics shows the relation between material and psychic progress, and establishes the line of human duty to lie, not in defiance of natural law, but in accordance with it.

This does not mean, as some early reactionists assumed, that since the dogma-based requirements of religion called for the restraint of "natural instincts," therefore in rejecting the dogmas we may reject all restraints.

Ethics, far more than religion, establishes the need of a strong dominant personal control of conduct, rigorously refusing expression to impulses proven injurious, and as rigorously compelling actions seen to be advantageous, even though at present undesired.

Where religion has been able to enforce its arbitrary rites, its sensuous ceremonials, its often cruel and senseless denials and compulsions; it has not been able so to develop clear-sighted, self-governing, efficient human beings.

The psychology of a highly organized, long-established religion tends to encourage and maintain minds fitted to accept that religion; and, as every such religion dates back to a much earlier period of mental power, this tends to check social progress.

But if we think, not of any given religion with given creed, but of "Religion" itself, as a state of mind, as that grouping of one set of per-

cepts into a given relation, and the pouring of the stream of energy we call emotion out through that group of precepts—then we see the lasting use and value of religion.

This is what we mean when we say a person has "made a religion" of business, or of housekeeping, or of what you will. We mean that the person has correlated a certain set of values, ideas, habits, into a fixed group, and works powerfully, exclusively, along those lines.

Let us here offer to the world a very simple, very practical, suggestion:—

Suppose we make a Religion of Ethics.

Think of it.

A Religion, world-wide, life-deep, thought-high, hope-far, warm with love and light with knowledge; full of movement, of growing hope, of ever-marching achievement. A Religion which should set before the young Soul a Race Ideal, involving the happiness of every human being, resting on established knowledge, agreeing with all the facts of life, explaining, satisfying, inspiring, stimulating, directing.

* * *

We have been saying to a noble-spirited child: "You are to do this because the Bible says so." And when he asks, "Why?" we tell him that if he does not he will be punished and if he does he will be rewarded; then if he asks "How do you know?" we tell him again, "Because the Bible says so." And if he still asks "How do you know it's true?" we are able to answer only "Because it says so."

Instead of this, Social Ethics will surround the child's first years with such vivid teaching of human interests and human progress as to furnish foundation for further understanding; and then, year after year, show him that he is to do this because of its effect on humanity. If he asks how we know it has such effect—show him.

* * *

We can show, in present example, in selected story, in pictures, moving or still, what are the results of such and such lines of conduct. We can, for the teaching of children, set ourselves to reconstruct most of the influences with which they are surrounded.

There is no need of fighting with nature, of "breaking the will," of any morbid process; we have but to direct and use natural forces, recognizing that social progress is as much a part of evolution as the growing of a tree.

We can show how right conduct is first easy to explain, to justify.

Second, that it means increased happiness. Third, that if it involves present effort or discomfort, still the result is well worth it.

We can show, with a new set of heroes, real ones, who have served humanity in ways any child can see, how such and such qualities are useful, valuable, noble, to be loved and honored.

We can make what used to be called "sin" seem mere foolishness—a thing to be laughed at, pitied, despised.

It is, admittedly, a great change, a change involving one of the most fundamental concepts of our century-filled minds. But, having changed it, all the other concepts change with it, inevitably.

When devout missionaries seek to press their various faiths upon dubious hearers they urge Revelation, Authority, which may or may not be accepted. They urge Reward and Punishment, which may or may not appeal to their listeners. They urge Results—modern missionaries these—and even the results may not be very convincing.

What are the Results of our present standards of ethics.

In the most forward nations of the earth, among which we fondly class our own, what have we to show as proof that our accepted standards are the best?

Some great principles we have, principles that work, that require no justification. But among our highest we find plenty of our lowest; there is small co-ordination. Under this idea we do right, under that idea we do wrong; not only does the conduct of one person offset that of another, but the conduct of the same person, at different times, in different relations, is self-contradictory.

They sway and struggle, pushing now up, now down, now sideways, and the slow growth of our best ideals is continuously interfered with by a recrudescence of earlier ones, as in the holocaust of Christian civilization in Europe in this war begun in 1914.

Is it not worth while to consider a complete rearrangement of Ethical Values, resultant on this change of concept, from an Egoistic to a Social base?

The Christian religion will lose least of any. Its central truth of love and service will stand the test of proof; its theory of the remission of sins can be interpreted by Social Ethics, not as a remission of consequences, but as a repudiation of the very idea of "sin."

But it will lose its pitiful Calvinistic "Scheme of Salvation," as well as its rock-based Church; even as Judaism must surrender that tribal fallacy of the "Chosen People," Buddhism its resentment against natural life, Islam its pride of indispensable Prophet and its sensual masculine paradise. The common sense of Confucianism will survive, blending with

all the best of every other faith, but The Religion of Ethics will rest not on any "faith," but on Truth, known and established.

For emotional content this religion will let loose the strongest yet least recognized passion of the human soul—the Social Passion, the love of Humanity itself. We have this, we feel it, we use it; but we do not consciously recognize and honor it, as yet.

The love of truth, another deep emotion, works freely in it; the spirit of progress has full sway, and all the healthy interests and right desires of humanity, for peace and beauty, health and happiness, find sanction and correlation at last.

And God?

If we could find any trace of God in the tangled masses of falsehood, pride, cruelty and ignorance, disfiguring all the old religions, shall we fail to see the same Great Power in this one?

If we could "worship" Baal and Peor, Pasht and Isis, Krishna and Kali, a jealous and bloodthirsty Jehovah, or a misty Trinity—can we not recognize and honor the Lift and Light of the Universe, the one Acting Force that carries on all the processes about us, in the clear and simple truths of Social Ethics?

Here is the human race, growing.

It is Conscious and Forceful—it can help or hinder its own growth.

It has never yet understood that it was growing, until the great concept of our times, Evolution, began to spread.

It needs to recognize that all its conduct is to be measured by its effect on that common growth, and to re-label that conduct accordingly.

The old standards of ethics bear as little relation to the structure and functions of a living Society as the spots on a patchwork quilt bear to the organs of the sleeper beneath.

The New Standards are based on life, on Sociological Law.

With them comes the New Hope, the most brilliant and most sure that was ever open to us. "We know not that which we shall be," perhaps, but we know, at last, how much we are beyond our sea-born ancestors, and that our descendants shall be even more than that beyond us.

With such a hope, and the knowledge of how to attain it, Life opens clear.

(The End.)

NOTES

CHAPTER 1

1. For discussion of "baby gardens" and the rearing of children generally, see Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *Concerning Children* (Boston: Small, Maynard and Company, 1900).

2. The concept of "moral hygiene" corresponds to the then popular social and moral hygiene movements. See John D'Emilio and Estelle B. Freedman's *Intimate Matters* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988: 203–221) and Clifford Beers' *A Mind that Found Itself: An Autobiography* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1908).

3. Jane Addams often wrote on women's conflict between "family claims" and "social claims," and, according to William I. Thomas, conflicting social values resulted in "social disorganization." For discussion, see Mary Jo Deegan on "Symbolic Interaction and the Study of Women" in *Women and Symbolic Interaction* (Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1987: 3–15).

4. Gilman's conceptualization of "three perfectly distinct ranges of ethics," *i.e.,* the ethics of the individual, the family, and the state, is strikingly similar in order and structure to Talcott Parsons' four-fold analysis in *Social Structure and Personality* (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), *i.e.,* biology, personality, society, and culture. The elemental first component in Parsons' scheme, biology, is clearly implicit in Gilman's concern with the ethics of reproduction.

5. Gilman posits that "the interests of the community are the base, the only base, of real ethics," paralleling Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels' theoretical conceptualization of base and superstructure in *The Communist Manifesto* (London: J.E. Burghard, 1848), but Gilman's central economic tenets in *Women and Eco-*

nomics (Boston: Small, Maynard and Company, 1898) and elsewhere, although certainly Fabian, are decidedly non-Marxist.

6. Gilman here applies a perspective advanced by Jane Addams in *The Newer Ideals of Peace* (New York: Macmillan, 1907).

7. In writing positively about "the new ideals of liberty—freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of action," Gilman not only admires the freedoms guaranteed by the Bill of Rights but also aligns herself with the goals and values of major American pragmatists such as Jane Addams, John Dewey, and George Herbert Mead.

8. Human habits, as distinct from instincts, were noted by Lester F. Ward in *Dynamic Sociology* (New York: D. Appleton, 1883), but "habits" is a more general concept that Gilman may have adopted from John Dewey. See, for example, Dewey's *School and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago: 1899).

CHAPTER 2

1. On the social nature of the "self," see the major posthumously published works by the noted University of Chicago scholar, George Herbert Mead (1863–1931): *Mind, Self & Society: From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist,* edited with an introduction by Charles W. Morris (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934), and *Play, School and Society,* edited with an introduction by Mary Jo Deegan (New York: Peter Lang, 1999). Mead's *Essays in Social Psychology,* edited with an introduction by Mary Jo Deegan (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2001) discusses many concepts compatible with Gilman's work on comparative psychology between animals and humans.

2. Gilman employs "telic," a term generally denoting a final end or purpose, in the specific sociologically applied sense of Lester F. Ward. Ward's sociological emphasis is explicated by Clifford H. Scott in *Lester Frank Ward* (Boston: Twayne, 1976: 88):

> In order to achieve the utilitarian ethic, Ward reasoned, the government had to seek the means of increasing social happiness. A science of society was necessary to determine what produced happiness and how the agencies of happiness could be stimulated and reinforced by purposeful human activity. It was at this point when a science of government became "applied," that, in Ward's phrase, "social telesis" occurred. Accordingly, political theory was largely ethical; and a science of government became a vehicle for the moral progress of society.

3. "Mores" and several related concepts were added to the vocabulary of American sociological discourse via William Graham Sumner's influential book, *Folkways* (Boston: Ginn, 1906).

4. Comparative sociology has since become a well-developed subdiscipline within sociology proper. Writing in 1895, in French, Émile Durkheim defined comparative sociology as fundamental to sociology. See Durkheim's *The Rules of Sociological Method,* translated by Sarah A. Solovay and John H. Mueller (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938).

5. Thorstein Veblen (1857–1929) wrote the influential *Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study in the Evolution of Institutions* (New York: Macmillan, 1899). For discussions of Veblen, see Colin Campbell on "Conspicuous Confusion? A Critique of Veblen's Theory of Conspicuous Consumption," in volume 13 of *Sociological Theory* (March 1995: 37–47), Nils Gilman on "Thorstein Veblen's Neglected Feminism," in volume 33 of *Journal of Economic Issues* (September 1999: 689–712), Alvin Johnson on "Veblen, Thorstein Bunde (1857–1929)," in volume 15 of *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* edited by E.R.A. Seligman and Alvin Johnson (New York: Macmillan, 1934: 234–35), Margaret Lewis and David Sebberson on "The Rhetoricality of Economic Theory: Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Thorstein Veblen," in volume 31 of *Journal of Economic Issues* (June 1997: 417–24), Tony Maynard on "A Shameless Lothario: Thorstein Veblen as Sexual Predator and Sexual Liberator," in volume 34 of *Journal of Economic Issues* (March 2000: 194–201), and David Riesman's *Thorstein Veblen: A Critical Interpretation* (New York: Charles Scribners, 1953). On a related note, and for a recent analysis of "flawed play" and the "core codes" of American life, see Mary Jo Deegan's *American Ritual Dramas* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1989) and *The American Ritual Tapestry* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1998).

6. See George Herbert Mead's ideas in *Play, School and Society* (New York: Peter Lang, 1999) on the importance of play and games in the development of the self.

CHAPTER 3

1. Gilman was deeply interested in the social aspects of religion. See especially: Charlotte Perkins Gilman, *His Religion and Hers: A Study of the Faith of Our Fathers and the Work of Our Mothers* (New York: Century, 1923).

2. George Herbert Mead's explication between 1894 and 1910 of "consciousness"—in his *Essays in Social Psychology* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2001)—gave a new technical meaning to this term in the social sciences.

3. Karma, in Buddhism, consists of a person's acts and their ethical consequences, a kind of natural moral law, determining via rebirth one's species, longevity, wealth, social status, and other characteristics. Vicarious atonement, in early Christian theology, is accomplished in and through the death of Jesus. In Roman Catholic theology, a plenary indulgence remits the whole of any temporal punishment owing to one's sins, and may be applied for on behalf of oneself as well as those whose souls are already in purgatory.

4. On the limitations of "sex-modesty," see William I. Thomas on "The Psychology of Modesty and Clothing," in volume 5 of *American Journal of Sociology* (September, 1899: 246–62) and "The Psychology of Woman's Dress" in volume 67 of *American Magazine,* Vol. 67 (November, 1908: 66–72).

5. The likely influence of Lester F. Ward, for whom "association" was a sig-

nificant concept, is here evident between the lines. See Ward's *Dynamic Sociology* (New York: D. Appleton, 1883).

6. Luke 6:46: "And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" See volume 8 of *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 127).

7. On the psychological aspects of religion, see William James' influential treatise, *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1902).

8. The conjunction of education and "association" was central to the work of Lester F. Ward.

9. Writing in 1912, in French, Émile Durkheim made essentially the same argument. See *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life,* translated by Joseph Ward Swain (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1915).

10. In reference to Gilman's interest in human conduct and the human brain in the context of contemporary thinking on these subjects during Gilman's era, see George H. Mead's *Essays in Social Psychology* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2001).

11. Both W.I. Thomas and George H. Mead used "medicine men" as examples of expertise in simply structured societies. See Thomas on "The Relation of the Medicine-Man to the Origin of the Professional Occupations" in volume 4, first series, of *Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1903: 241–56), and Mead in his *Play, School, and Society,* edited by Mary Jo Deegan (New York: Lang, 1999) and *Essays in Social Psychology,* edited by Mary Jo Deegan (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2001).

12. Note the similarity to Émile Durkheim's 1912 discussion of the sacred and the profane in his *Elementary Forms of the Religious Life,* translated by Joseph Ward Swain (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1915).

CHAPTER 4

1. Gilman here neatly anticipates the two basic "frames" (the natural and the social) posited by Erving Goffman in *Frame Analysis* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974).

2. Matthew 25:40: "And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done *it* unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done *it* unto me." See volume 7 of *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 565).

3. The Thugs, from the mid-1300s onward, comprised well-organized groups of assassins who preyed on travelers in India, murdering them for their possessions and justifying the lethal nature of their methods on religious grounds.

4. The Dyak (or Dayak) are indigenous groups in southern and western Borneo. Intertribal warfare, distinguished by headhunting, was once frequent.

5. Exodus 20:13: "Thou shalt not kill." See volume 1 of *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 986).

6. Matthew 19:19: "Honor thy father and *thy* mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." See volume 7 of *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 485). Compare, however with Leviticus 19:18: "Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: I *am* the Lord." See volume 2 of *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 97).

7. Gilman wrote prior to the glamorization of Chicago's notorious Al Capone and well in advance of violent urban gangs that now require commission of a murder to prove oneself for membership.

8. For additional detail, see *The World Almanac and Encyclopedia 1912* (New York: The Press Publishing Company, 1911: 338). It appears that Gilman misquoted the facts regarding the number of homicides in 1906, mistaking it for the year 1896. According to the same *World Almanac:* "The average number of murders in the United States annually during the twenty years, from 1885 to 1904, was 6,597. In 1896 the murders reached high-water mark, 10,662, and in 1895 there were 10,500." In 1999, by comparison, the number of "murders and nonnegligent manslaughters" reported in the U.S.A. was 15,530. The latter data are from *The World Almanac and Book of Facts 2001* (Mahway, NJ: World Almanac Books, 2001: 888).

9. Edith Abbott (1876–1957) did just this in her detailed study for the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement (Wickersham Commision) on *Crime and the Foreign Born* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1931). Abbott documented that foreigners were no more likely than native-born persons to commit crimes in the United States.

10. Here, we have amended Gilman's wording, "the theory of continuence," to read: "the theory of continence," which we discern to be her intent.

11. Colossians 3:18: "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord." See volume 11 in *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 224).

12. Genesis 2:18: "And the Lord God said, *It is* not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a help meet for him." See volume 1 in *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 497).

13. Genesis 1:27–28: "So God created man in his *own* image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." See volume 1 of *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 484–486).

14. Gilman stood in sharp opposition to the patriarchal biases of Judaism, and made a virtually identical reference to the Orthodox "prayer of thanks" in the last paragraph of Chapter 3 in her *Women and Economics* (Boston: Small, Maynard and Company, 1898: 56). Apropos, Louis Jacobs, in *The Jewish Religion: A Companion* (London: Oxford University Press, 1995: 594–5), remarks as follows on the Orthodox, Reform, and Liberal views concerning women:

A variety of attitudes towards women is found in the Talmudic and Midrashic literature. Too much should not be read into the wording of the benediction, recited each day, in which a man thanks God for not having made him a woman (*Menahot* 43[b]), whereas a woman simply thanks God for having made her "according to His will," since it is clear from the context that the thanks are for the greater opportunities a man has for carrying out the precepts, women being exempt, as above, from carrying out those precepts dependent on time. In his *A Rabbinic Anthology* (London, 1938: 507), Claude Montefiore states the Reform and Liberal opposition to this benediction in a particularly strong but one-sided manner:

No amount of modern Jewish apologetics, endlessly poured forth, can alter the fact, that the Rabbinic attitude towards women was very different from out own. No amount of apologetics can get over the implications of the daily blessing, which orthodox Judaism has still lacked the courage to remove from its official prayer book, "Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, who hast not made me a woman." At the same time it must be readily admitted that the Rabbis seemed to have loved their wives, that they all, apparently, had only one wife each, and that the position of the wife was one of much influence and importance.

CHAPTER 5

1. Matthew 5:27–28: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, "Thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." See volume 7 of *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 297).

2. Matthew 7:29: "For he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes." See volume 7 of *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 336).

3. Matthew 21:4: "All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying. . . . " See volume 7 of *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 501).

4. Gilman's classic 1915 thought experiment on the development of society devoid of male influence is found in *Herland,* edited by Denise D. Knight (New York: Penguin, 1999), and her consideration of the real world, in which men and women must live together, is explored in *With Her in Ourland: Sequel to Herland,* edited by Mary Jo Deegan and Michael R. Hill (Westport: Greenwood/Praeger, 1997).

5. Ezekiel 18:4: "Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die." See volume 6 of *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 158).

6. By the 1890s, Glasgow had more municipal services than any other city of similar size, having completed an ambitious program, begun in the 1860s, that included slum clearance, gas supplies, public lighting, tramways, museums, libraries, galleries, and parks.

7. In one of the foundational early studies of "moral statistics," Adolphe Quetelet (1796–1874) observed in *A Treatise on Man and the Development of His*

Faculties (Edinburgh: William and Robert Chambers, 1842: 20) that "In 1826, the price of bread rose again in Belgium, and we also see that the mortality became greater, and the number of marriages and births which the preceding year presented, underwent a sensible diminution."

8. Gilman quotes from Noah Webster's *New England Primer: Improved and Adapted to the Use of Schools* (Hudson, NY: A. Stoddard, 1801: [22]) the first line from a formulaic rhyming device designed to teach youngsters their ABCs:

> In *Adam's* fall; We sinned all.
> Thy life to mend; This *Book* attend.
> The *Cat* doth play; And after slay.
> A *Dog* will bite; A thief at night.
> [Etc. . . .]

CHAPTER 6

1. Gilman's subsequent list omits opposites for the virtues of Endurance (number 12), Self-control (number 25), and Perseverance (number 32). These omissions may have been a printer error or a proofreading oversight on Gilman's part. Obvious opposites would be Defeat (for Endurance), Helplessness (for Self-control), and Despair (for Perseverance), all areas that were personally difficult for Gilman.

2. From *Aesop's Fables.* For a handsome new edition, see: "The Ass and the Lap-dog" in *Aesop's Fables,* retold in verse by James Michie (London: Jonathan Cape, 1989: 130).

3. Exodus 32:14: "And the Lord repented of the evil he had thought to do unto his people." See volume 1 of *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 1066).

4. Typically attributed to an earnest but misguided young scholar, this twist on Proverbs 12:22—"Lying lips *are* abomination to the Lord: but they that deal truly *are* his delight"—appears without attribution as one of several humorous, possibly apocryphal, definitions of a "lie" in Evan Esar's *Comic Dictionary* (New York: Harvest House, 1943: 163).

5. Gilman's concept of "social soul," perhaps unwittingly, echoes W.E.B. DuBois' potent imagery of triumphant humanity in *The Souls of Black Folk* (Chicago: A.C. McClurg, 1903).

CHAPTER 7

1. Gilman presumably intended Christina of Denmark.

2. This phrase derives from Lord Byron (1788–1824): "His heart was one of those which most enamour us, Wax to receive, and marble to retain," from "Beppo," stanza 34. The complete text is found in *Byron,* edited by Jerome J. McGann (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986: 324).

3. Colossians 3:18: "Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as it

is fit in the Lord." See volume 11 of *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 224).

4. Matthew 5:6: "Blessed *are* they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled." See volume 7 of *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 283).

CHAPTER 8

1. John Dewey posits this major tenet in *The School and Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1899).

2. The phrase Gilman attributes to Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803–1882) is offered in Emerson's commentary on "Compensation," in *Essays of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Garden City, NY: Famous Classics Library, 1941: 37–8), merely as an *example* of a proverb:

> Still more striking is the expression of this fact in the proverbs of all nations, which are always the literature of reason, or the statements of an absolute truth without qualification. Proverbs, like the sacred books of each nation, are the sanctuary of the intuitions. That which the droning world, chained to appearances, will not allow the realist to say in his own words, it will suffer him to say in proverbs without contradiction. . . .
>
> All things are double, one against another.—Tit for tat; an eye for an eye; a tooth for a tooth; blood for blood; measure for measure; love for love.—Give, and it shall be given you.—He that watereth shall be watered himself.—What will you have? Quoth God; pay for it and take it.—[and so on]. . . .
>
> It is thus written, because it is thus in life. Our action is overmastered and characterized above our will by the law of nature. We aim at a petty end quite aside from the public good, but our act arranges itself by irresistible magnetism in a line with the poles of the world.

CHAPTER 9

1. "A sound mind in a sound body" (Latin).

2. Like Harriet Martineau before her in *Society in America* (London: Saunders and Otley, 1837), Gilman opposed slavery and understood clearly the mutually destructive consequences of slave systems for all parties involved, men and women alike.

CHAPTER 10

1. Indeed, Gilman took her own life when confronted with increasing complications from cancer. She wrote on August 15, 1935, three days before her death, to her friend and fellow sociologist, Edward A. Ross, who later quoted her words in his *Seventy Years of It: An Autobiography* (New York: Appleton-Century, 1936: 244):

My Very Dear Old Friend:

I was so pleased to get your letter. Cheerfulness! Why not? I've had the best-behaved cancer you ever saw—no pain at all. But in June I had shingles, which is a devilish disease, and now "complications" have set in, nephritis and dropsy, and a fairly laughable weakness; so I'm going to go peacefully to sleep with my beloved chloroform. I'm getting "fed up" with sheer weakness. . . . I'm glad you are so rich in the Ross Clan—you being the Ross! I always did admire and like the Scotch. . . .

Well—Good-by
Charlotte Perkins Gilman

2. The distinction between static and dynamic action lies, for Gilman, in the work of Lester Ward (1841–1913), who wrote in volume 1 of *Dynamic Sociology* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1883: 56–57):

> Passive, or negative, progress contemplates the forces of society as operating in their natural freedom, subject only to the laws of evolution in general. Here society is regarded as passive in the sense of being simply acted upon by the forces that surround it and operate within it. It is conceived as negative from the absence of any force extraneous to these regular natural forces operating in the direction of their limitation or modification. Such, it is believed, has been the nature of most of the progress thus far attained by society. . . . Active, or positive, progress takes place through the application to the natural forces acting in and upon society of a force external and distinct from them. To the regular course of the social phenomena as determined by the laws of evolution, we must conceive added a new force limiting and directing these into special channels and for special ends. Its chief quality as distinguished from other forces is *purpose.*

3. The "spirit" metaphor was in the sociological air during Gilman's era. See, for examples, Charles Richmond Henderson, *The Social Spirit in America* (Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1901) and Jane Addams, *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets* (New York: Macmillan, 1909).

4. Specifically: Jesus of Nazareth (ca. 4 B.C.–29/30), Jean Baptiste Lamarck (1744–1829), Alfred Russell Wallace (1823–1913), Charles Darwin (1809–1882), Lester Ward (1841–1913), Wilbur Wright (1867–1912), Orville Wright (1871–1948), Luther Burbank (1849–1926), Thomas Alva Edison (1849–1931) and Guglielmo Marconi (1874–1937).

5. "Love will find out a way," an anonymous song, is used in another setting when Gilman chronicles Terry Nicholson's plot to escape from captivity in Herland: "We'll break a glass from the bathroom and use that." 'Love will find out a way,' he hummed. "When we're all out of the window. . . . " See *Herland, The Yellow Wall-Paper, and Selected Writings,* by Charlotte Perkins Gilman, edited by Denise D. Knight (New York: Penguin, 1999: 36–7). The escape attempt was foiled, of course, by the women of Herland.

6. Fellaheen and mujicks (or moujiks, or muzhiks) were peasants in their respective countries; coolies were low-paid laborers in China and other Asian countries.

7. The analysis of "sex-decoration" is explored more fully by Charlotte Perkins

Gilman in her *The Dress of Women: A Critical Introduction to the Symbolism and Sociology of Clothing,* edited with an introduction by Michael R. Hill and Mary Jo Deegan (Westport: Greenwood Press, 2002).

8. Ella Wheeler Wilcox (1850–1919) was a prolific poet. The relevant phrase is derived ultimately from Shakespeare's *Othello* (Act V, Scene II, lines 343–4): "Then must you speak of one that loved not wisely but too well."

9. Gilman's astute understanding of "the offenses we utterly fail to recognize" presages Niklas Luhmann's analysis of unperceived ecological dangers in his *Ecological Communication* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).

10. Gilman, herself a victim of yellow journalism, was understandably critical of irresponsible publishers. See, for example, Mary A. Hill's account of the sensational newspaper coverage of Gilman's divorce in *Charlotte Perkins Gilman: The Making of a Radical Feminist, 1860–1896* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1980: 196–9). For the sensational newspaper treatment visited on Chicago sociologist William I. Thomas, see Mary Jo Deegan's *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892–1918* (New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1988: 178–86).

11. Here, Gilman anticipates Max Weber's admonition that "politics is out of place in the lecture-room." See, Max Weber, "Science as a Vocation," *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology,* translated, edited, and with an introduction by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946: 129–56). The text of Weber's well-known essay, "Wissenschaft als Beruf," made its first appearance as a 1918 speech delivered to the university in Munich.

CHAPTER 11

1. Gilman's assertion that "To use a college as a medium for playing football is quite as absurd as putting coal in a bathtub" reflects the serious and widespread public discussion of corruption in collegiate athletics at the start of the twentieth century. See especially the revealing series by Edward S. Jordan: "Buying Football Victories, I: The Universities of Chicago, Illinois and Northwestern," in volume 36 of *Collier's* (November 11, 1905: 19–20, 23), "Buying Football Victories, II: The University of Wisconsin," in volume 36 of *Collier's* (November 18, 1905: 22–23), "Buying Football Victories, III: The University of Michigan," in volume 36 of *Collier's* (November 25, 1905: 21–23), and "Buying Football Victories, IV: The University of Minnesota," in volume 36 of *Collier's* (December 2, 1905: 19–20).

2. In the children's game of Stoop Tag or Squat Tag, according to Jessie H. Bancroft in *Games for the Playground, Home, School and Gymnasium* (New York: Macmillan, 1909: 190):

> One player is It and chases the others, trying to tag one of them. A player may escape being tagged by suddenly stooping or 'squatting'; but each player may stoop but three times. After the third time of stooping, the player may resort only to running to escape being tagged. Any player tagged becomes It.

In the children's game of Puss-in-a-Corner, again according to Bancroft (p. 163):

> All of the players but one are disposed in the corners or at convenient goals that will answer the same purpose. The odd player goes from one to another, saying, 'Pussy wants a corner!' The player to whom this is addressed replies, 'Go to my next-door neighbor.' Any two of the other players meanwhile watch their opportunity to beckon to one another for exchanging places. They try to make this exchange of signals and to dash across from place to place when the attention of Puss is attracted in some other direction, as Pussy must try to secure a corner by rushing to any place that is vacant when the players thus exchange. The sport of the game consists very largely in tantalizing Puss by making many exchanges, or, on the other hand, in Puss suddenly dashing for some vacant place without giving previous evidence of knowing of it. Whenever Puss secures a corner, the odd player left out becomes Puss. Puss, when not succeeding in getting a corner as soon as desirable, may call 'All change!' when all of the players must exchange places, and in the general flurry Puss should secure a place.

3. "Morals and manners" was an early term used to describe what is today more likely to be called "social behavior"—see, for an early example, Harriet Martineau's 1838 methodological treatise, *How To Observe Morals and Manners,* with an introduction by Michael R. Hill (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1989).

4. A proposition fully in accord with—and clearly predating—William Fielding Ogburn's well-known "cultural lag" thesis as expounded in his *Social Change, With Respect to Culture and Original Nature* (New York: Viking, 1922).

5. William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki later conceptualized such breakdowns as examples of "social disorganization" in *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Boston: R.G. Badger, 1918–20).

6. Gilman's position here reflects the ethical stances adopted by John Dewey and James H. Tufts in their *Ethics* (New York: H. Holt, 1908).

7. Gilman's abiding faith in such a proposal is significant, given her earlier chiding of the Country Life Commission for failing to take an inclusive and appreciative perspective on women's lives and work. See Deborah Fink, *Agrarian Women: Wives and Mothers in Rural Nebraska, 1880–1940* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1992: 26–27).

8. Lucius Licinus Lucullus (c. 117–56 B.C.) was a successful Roman general whose luxurious banquets eventually became synonymous with gastronomic extravagance. With "monkey-dinners," Gilman refers to formal banquets whereat the male guests dress in tuxedos or "monkey suits." See Harold Wentworth and Stuart Flexner, *Dictionary of American Slang,* second supplemented edition (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1960: 344).

9. Gilman, as were many others in this era, was fascinated by the pedagogical possibilities of photography. In *With Her in Ourland,* for example, Ellador announces, "I'm writing a book—in fact, I'm writing two books. One is notes, quotations, facts, and pictures—pictures—pictures. This photography is a wonderful art!" To emphasize the point, Van remarks that Ellador, "had become quite

a devotee of said art." And, when preparing to return to Herland from Ourland, Ellador selected to take with her, as the sole physical example of Ourland technology, "a moving picture outfit with well-selected films."

10. "Those dead lands, deforested and desoiled because of our sins against the bounteous earth" reflects Gilman's astute ecological sensibility. Deforestation and soil erosion remain today as serious, complex, and enduring social problems—see, for example, Piers Blaikie and Harold Brookfield, *Land Degradation and Society* (London: Methuen, 1987).

11. The monster floods of the Hwang Ho (or "yellow river") river, have certainly as much to do with the Monsoon rains that periodically and predictably swell its waters, and while the flooding is sometimes destructive of riverside towns and villages, the resulting massive deposits of rich alluvial soils on the North China plain have played a decidedly felicitous role in the long history of Chinese agriculture.

12. For an earlier explication of this thesis, one with which Gilman was likely familiar, see Amos G. Warner, "Politics and Crime," in volume 1 of *American Journal of Sociology* (November, 1895: 290–8).

13. From "The Old Woman and Her Pig," in *English Fairy Tales,* by Joseph Jacobs (London: D. Nutt, 1890). For a handsome new edition, see *English Fairy Tales and More English Fairy Tales,* by Joseph Jacobs, edited by Donald Haase (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2002: 30–32).

14. Gilman's views on art joined the voices of John Ruskin and William Morris (of the English arts and crafts movement), and Ellen Gates Starr (who championed the arts and crafts movement at Hull House in Chicago). The use of murals by the Chicago School Art Movement to inspire and instruct public school students from 1900 to 1946 was documented recently in a major exhibit, "To Inspire and Instruct: Art from the Collection of the Chicago Public Schools," at the Art Institute of Chicago, May 23-August 11, 2002. See Heather Becker, *Art for the People: The Rediscovery and Preservation of Progressive- and WPA-era Murals in the Chicago Public Schools, 1904–1943* (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 2002). The kind of developmental sequences to which Gilman presumably refers are exemplified in John W. Alexander's (1856–1915) six striking murals illustrating "The Evolution of the Book" in the Library of Congress. For details, see Herbert Small, *Handbook of the New Library of Congress* (Boston: Curtis and Cameron, 1897: 33–35). For color plates, see Howard Grey Douglas, *The Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.; Its Principal Architectural and Decorative Features* (Washington, DC: Howard Douglas, 1901). The role of art in the early settlement house movement in the United States, in which Gilman was no small player, was integral from the start. See *On Art, Labor, and Religion,* by Ellen Gates Starr, edited with an introduction by Mary Jo Deegan and Ana Maria Wahl (New Brunswick, NJ, 2003), Mary Jo Deegan and Ana-Maria Wahl on "Arts and Crafts in Chicago and Britain: The Sociology of Ellen Gates Starr at Hull-House" in *Mirrors and Windows: Essays in the History of Sociology,* edited by Janusz Mucha, Włodzimierz Wincławski, and Dirk Kaesler (Toruń: Nicholas Copernicus

University Press, 2001: 159–72), and Cheryl R. Ganz on "Enella Benedict" in *Women Building Chicago 1790–1990: A Biographical Dictionary,* edited by Rima Lunin Schultz and Adele Hast (Bloomingtion, IN: Indiana University Press, 2001: 75–7). Gilman was herself a trained designer and her first book, *Art Gems for the Home and Fireside* (Providence, RI: J.A. & J.R. Ried, 1888), shows her early interest in the democratic potential of the fine arts. For discussion of this previously forgotten work by Gilman, see the enlightening article by Denise D. Knight on "Charlotte Perkins Gilman's Lost Book: A Biographical Gap" in volume 14 of *ANQ* (Winter, 2001: 26–31).

15. This phrase, "the greatest good for the greatest number," is strongly associated with the philosophical movement called "utilitarianism." A.W. Hastings, in writing on the origins of the movement, notes that: "The idea of the greatest good for the greatest number is no doubt to be found in Greek philosophy, in the Stoic conception of the 'citizenship of the world'. . . . The exact formula used by [Jeremy] Bentham, 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number,' is found in a translation (1767) of [the Italian criminologist Cesare Bonesana] Beccaria's *Dei Delitti e delle Pene.*" from A.W. Hastings, "Utilitarianism," in volume 12 of *Encylopaedia of Religion and Ethics* edited by James Hastings (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928: 559). Lester F. Ward in *Applied Sociology: A Treatise on the Conscious Improvement of Society by Society* (Boston: Ginn & Company, 1906: 31) provides essentially the same genealogy:

> The way to a new philosophy from the moral side was opened by Francis Hutcheson, who said, "That action is best which procures the greatest happiness for the greatest numbers." The same sentiment is embodied in the saying of Beccaria,—"*la massima felicità divisa nel maggior numero.*" Jeremy Bentham crystallized the maxim into the form, "The greatest happiness of the greatest number." He is usually credited with the maxim, but he expressly attributes it to Priestley and Beccaria.

16. Gilman clearly advocated hands-on illustrations of invention and industrial progress. In contrast, however, the Hull-House Labor Museum provided living demonstrations of traditional craft techniques expressly to acquaint immigrant youngsters with the extraordinary artistic skills and technical expertise possessed by their elders, such that "old fashioned" crafts might be celebrated and admired rather than belittled in the name of industrial or scientific "progress." See, for discussion, Marion Foster Washburne's essay, "A Labor Museum" in volume 6 of *The Craftsman* (September 1904: 570–80).

CHAPTER 12

1. In framing this chapter as "New Standards and New Hopes," Gilman applies the constructive, forward-looking perspective adopted by Jane Addams in such works as *The Newer Ideals of Peace* (New York: Macmillan, 1907) and *A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil* (New York: Macmillan, 1912).

2. Gilman apparently enjoyed watching the game of baseball, and became vexed if women wore hats to games such that their generous chapeaus obstructed

anyone's view of the playing field, writing in *The Dress of Women,* edited by Michael R. Hill and Mary Jo Deegan (Westport: Greenwood/Praeger, 2002: 69–70):

> In the theatre we can hear something, even if we cannot see. In the church or concert-hall, we can hear, even if we cannot see. But what shall we say of a woman, a kind, sympathetic, well-bred woman, who will go to a *baseball game* and wear a big hat? They do it. I have seen three vacant seats behind a big-hatted woman at a ball game; good seats too, in a crowded stand. Now what, if anything, was going on in that woman's head? Did she not *know* that the one essential in a ball game is To See?

INDEX

Abbott, Edith, 135
Action: social, xx–xxi; society is the object of all, 89
Adam and Eve (parable), 42, 52, 54, 137
Adams, Bert N., xvii
Addams, Jane, xiv–xvi, xviii–xx, 131, 132, 139, 143. Works: *Democracy and Social Ethics,* xiv, xx; *A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil,* 143; *The Newer Ideals of Peace,* 132, 143; *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets,* 139
Adultery, 91, 116, 136
Adventists, 57
Aesops' Fables, 137
Affection, 83, 102
Agriculture, 5; art of, 48; Chinese, 142; ethics of, 60, 116; pedagogical examples of, 115–16; problems of, 85; special training for, 94
Alexander, John W., 142
Aliens, assimilation of, 6
Allen, Polly Wynn, xvi
Altruism, 2, 79–80, 104. *See also* Selfishness
Alway, Joan, xvii
America: children of peasant immigrants to, 113; education in, 113; murders in, 38; special characteristics of, 6
American Journal of Sociology, xiii
American Sociological Association. *See* American Sociological Society
American Sociological Society, xiii, xvi, xviii
Animals, lower, 1, 4, 77, 120, 121; and evil, 40; humans compared to, 33, 49–50, 68, 112. *See also specific animals*
Ants, 2, 16, 23, 61, 73, 79, 80, 93, 95
Apathy, 71, 99
Appetites: for food, 41; mental, 108; for praise and salutation, 28; for sex, 40
Apples, 52, 99, 116, 119
Aristotle, 50, 119
Arnold, Benedict, 121
Arson, 43
Arts and crafts, 9, 79, 142

Ascetics, 19, 39–41, 87
Assimilation, 6
Assistance, mutual, 2
Association, 27, 29, 37–39, 51, 83, 133–34
Astronomy, 102
Attitudes, 24, 26–29, 37, 46, 52, 92; toward ethics, 85; toward evil, 53; of inordinate superiority, 74; of mind, 122; of pride, 96; toward tradespeople, 74; unfavorable to progress in thought, 74; toward women, 136
Authority, 28–30, 45, 47–48, 55, 58, 73–75, 77, 84, 100, 102, 112, 121, 128. *See also* Revelation
Automobiles, 88

Baal, 129
Baby gardens, 2, 131. *See also* Nursery
Ballet-master, 34–35
Barbarism, ix
Baseball, 124, 143–44
Bathtubs, used for coal-bins, 111
Beauty, 129; in Herland, xi; of the new ethics, 120
Beccaria, Cesare Bonesana, 143
Becker, Heather, 142
Bedouins, 15
Behavior, xviii, 1–3, 23, 33–35, 46, 67, 74, 112, 119, 121
Belgium, 52, 137
Belief, 24–27, 103, 121, 126; founded on authority and revelation, 55; in a rational public, xviii. *See also* Unbelievers
Benedict, Enella, 143
Bentham, Jeremy, 143
Bible, 127; various quotations from, 134–38. *See also* Christianity; Judaism; New Testament; Old Testament
Bigotry, ix, xii, 120
Biology, 114, 131
Bisexuality, 42
Bluefish, 4
Body: human, 5, 22, 39–41, 51, 63, 81, 87, 95, 105, 116, 136; social, 64, 87, 95, 100, 111, 113, 125
Bombs, aerial, 36
Borneo, 37, 134
Brahmins, 24
Brain, human, xviii, 5, 20, 25, 29, 39, 46, 69–70, 79, 83, 92, 115, 122–23, 125–26, 134
Breeding, good, xi
Bribery, 17, 55, 107
Brittany (France), 27
Buddhism, 24, 35, 57, 128, 133
Burbank, Luther, 102, 139
Burgess, Ernest W., xv
Burglary, 17
Business, 9, 57–58, 64, 78, 80–81, 90, 92–93, 101, 104–8, 124
Businessmen, 92
Byron, George Gordon, 137

Calvinism, 128
Campbell, Colin, 133
Cannibalism, 19, 36
Capitalism, 91. *See also* Business; Economics
Catastrophes, natural, 34
Cause and effect, 3, 86, 117; antecedent influences, 39. *See also* Conditions; Consequences; Environment; Influences
Celibacy, 24
Charts, didactic, 14, 115, 119. *See also* Maps
Chastity, 24, 49, 51, 56–57, 61, 73, 78
Cheerfulness, 56, 62, 74, 80, 85, 139
Chemistry, 102
Chess, 101, 111–12
Chicago (Illinois), xviii, 135, 142
Chicago pragmatists, xviii–xix

Chicago School Art Movement, 142
Chieftainship, 13, 57, 111
Child. *See* Children
Child-culture, 77, 84–85
Children, ix–xiii, xv, xx; blame of, in proportion to mischief done by, 43; breakdown of behavior in immigrant, 112; chastity and, 51; demands on, 28; desire to be good in normal, 34; developing powers of judgment and of will, 13; expectations of based on sex of, 67–68; games and, 118; growth of, 103–4; illegitimacy and, 105; in monarchies versus democracies, 14; knowledge by, of injustices, 38; learning how to behave, 3, 52; men and, 76; mistakes by, 49, 51; mothers and, 68, 72; movies, murals, museums and, 36, 115–17; mysteries and, 39; need new training for a new world, 14; obedient, 12; relationship of parents to, 8; right conduct produces the best, 48; training of, 77–95, 112, 118–20, 124, 127–28; vicious and degrading marriages, perceived by, 48. *See also* Education; Mothers and motherhood; Pedagogy; Teaching
China, 5; coolies of, 103; doctrine of "golden mean" in, 16; floods in, 116–18, 142; murder rate in, 39; junks in, 113
Choice, 36–37, 40, 71, 83, 85
Christianity, xx, 24, 35, 38, 39, 42, 45, 47, 50, 52, 57, 61, 70, 84, 128, 133. *See also* Bible; Calvinism; Churches; Jesus of Nazareth; New Testament; Old Testament
Christina of Denmark, 137
Christina of Sweden, 69
Churches, 6, 9, 47, 92, 99, 108, 114, 144; Calvinist, 128; Christian, 57, 70; misuse of for personal social advancement, 110. *See also* Christianity; Religion
Cinematograph, 46. *See also* Motion pictures
Cities, 15, 22, 72
Citizenship, 14, 83–84, 113, 143
Civilization, 5, 22, 57; American, 112; decay of morals and manners in advanced, 112; European, 128; new code of conduct required for healthy growth of, 113; requirement for homogeneity in, 113. *See also* Savages
Class, economic, 62
Classification, 1
Clothing, xiii, 27, 33, 38, 78, 111, 133, 140
Code of conduct, xi, 20, 113; double, 73
College of Social Ethics. *See* Commission of Social Ethics
Colleges, xiv; ethics should be taught in, 2, 112; football and, 111, 140; manners taught in, 80. *See also* Universities
Combat, tendencies toward, 68–69, 106. *See also* Militarism; War
Commands, 13, 46, 83, 114; of mother partridge, 12; religious, 20, 46, 52, 58, 83; of St. Paul to wives, 42; self, 51; slaves under, 81–82
Commission of Social Ethics, 114, 141
Communication, 22, 33; ecological, 140
Companionship, 23, 123
Complaining, 56, 111
Comrades: ethics of comradeship, 91, 114; industrial comradeship, 62; love of, 50; praise of, 68
Comte, Auguste, xix
Concepts, xviii–xx, 13, 28, 60; arbi-

trary, 3; ethical, 11; of obedience, 12; of personality, 46; of right and wrong, 7, 20, 45, 61. *See also* Ideas; *specific concepts*
Conditions, 6, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 25, 29, 37–39, 42, 49–53, 55, 71, 74, 76, 85, 88, 95–96, 108, 112–14, 117, 121–22, 124. *See also* Cause and effect; Environment; Influences
Conduct, human, 20, 28–31, 50, 54, 60, 100, 134; general standard of, 80; highest good in, 106; right lines of, 70; social progress and, 111–20; variations in, 3
Confucius and Confucianism, 50, 57, 128
Confusion, 16, 77, 82, 86, 89, 122
Consciousness, xviii, 1–3, 11–12, 16, 63–64, 99–2, 108; as a new power, 21–23, 26, 133; larger, 112–14, 121, 123, 125; theories of sin and, 54; self, 84
Consequences, 35, 42, 49, 84, 105, 118, 128; direct relation to actions, 1, 119; Karma and, 133; of slave systems, 138. *See also* Cause and effect
Conservatism, 61, 71–72, 76, 84, 101, 103–4
Consumption, conspicuous, ix, 133. *See also* Veblen, Thorstein
Contentment, 56, 61, 122
Cooley, Charles Horton, xviii
Coolies, 103, 139
Courage, 8, 12, 15, 55–59, 61, 71, 81, 102, 103, 125
Courtesy, 56, 62; in Herland, xi
Courts, 28, 51, 105, 108. *See also* Laws; Prisons
Crimes, 17, 49, 78, 87, 140; American, 38–39, 135; automobiles and, 88; false ideas and, 106; lighting and decrease in, 51; of employers, 81; punishment and, 83. *See also* Criminals; *specific crimes*
Criminals, 89, 100–101, 106–7. *See also* Crimes
Criticism, literary, xv
Cruelty, 38, 49, 50, 56, 81, 88, 107, 120, 129
Culpability, 43
Cultural feminism, xvii
"Cultural lag," hypothesis of, 141
Customs, 8, 16–19, 23, 24, 37–38, 48, 55, 75, 118, 123

Damnation, 24, 47, 52–54, 84, 100, 106
Dancing and dancers, 34–35
Dangers, 5, 14–15, 17, 40, 77–78, 108, 117, 125; ecological, 140; unrecognized, 107
Darwin, Charles, xix, 102, 139
Darwinism, xvii, xix
Data, picked at random, 119
Dead, continuing company of, 69–70. *See also* Tradition
Deafness, 39, 85, 108
Dealey, James Q., xiii
Death, of individuals, 4
Death penalty, 24, 47–48, 59
Debts of honor, 18–19
Deegan, Mary Jo, x, xiii, xiv, xvi, xvii, 131, 133, 142
Defectives, 100
Defense, 60, 104; self, 53
Deforestation, 116; 142
Degler, Carl, xv–xvi
Democracy, xviii, xx, 14, 108, 113, 143
Depravity, 106
Deprivation, relative, and murder, 39
Desires, 7, 9, 31, 39, 52; healthy interests and right, 129; ill-balanced, 51; selfish, 86. *See also* Impulses
Devil, The, 34, 39, 83, 123

Dewey, John, xviii, xix, 132, 138, 141
Dictators, religious, 20
Disability, 75, 79
Discovery, 9, 84, 88. *See also* Invention
Dishonesty, 35, 56, 92, 101, 105, 107, 111. *See also* Falsehood; Lies and lying
Dishonor, 19, 57, 73, 76
Disobedience, 46, 56
Despair, 137; doctrine of, 20
Doctors, 14, 89, 92
Dogma, 33, 121–25, 126
Double standard, 48, 73
Doubt, 46, 56, 121, 122
Dress Reform Movement, xvii
Drugs, 20, 105, 106
Drunkenness, 34, 53, 120
Durkheim, Émile, xiii, xvii, xviii, xix, xx, 132, 134
Duties, conflict of, 4, 131
Dyaks (Borneo), 37–38, 134

Ecofeminist pragmatism, xvii
Ecological dangers, 140
Economics, 24, 42, 62, 68–69, 71, 88, 90–93, 96; personal, 90; social, 90
Edison, Thomas Alva, 102, 139
Education, x, xiv, xviii, 3, 27, 29, 48, 80, 134; better, 102; careful, 24; compulsory, 113; denial of, 102; environment and, 37, 41; general, 94, 104; influence of, 52; liberal, 103; mother instinct and, 112; via motion pictures, 36; new literature for use in, 86; parental, 26; to preserve accomplishments, 60; religion and, 42; system of, 6; truth in, 64; unconscious, 86; women and, 78–79
Efficiency, 58, 62, 73, 77, 81, 116, 126
Effort, 2, 27, 34–35, 48, 68, 79, 83, 86, 93, 124
Ego, 7, 101, 104, 122, 124, 128. *See also* Homocentrism
Egypt, 103
Ellador (fictional character), xii, xv, 141–42. *See also* Herland; Ourland
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 84, 138; violent, 125. *See also* Feelings; *specific emotions*
Endurance, 5, 56, 61, 82, 137
Enemies, 92, 94, 103, 125
Engels, Friedrich, 131
England, 6, 39, 59, 60
Entertainment, 15, 19
Environment, ix; in America, 6; conduct and, 37–38, 41; in Herland, xi; of larger social relations, 88; natural, 23; pressure of, 121; psychic, 52; social, 38, 8, 124; stimulus of, 77; urban, 39; variations in, 6
Epicureanism, 87
Equilibrium, 5
Error, 3, 38, 40–41, 47, 48, 51, 60, 64, 72, 76, 84–85, 89, 101, 105
Esar, Evan, 137
Ethicists, 114; in Herland, xii
Ethics: defined, 2; family, 5, 8, 50, 83, 99, 105; for the future, 111–29; grounds for, 112; individual, 5, 7–8, 50, 90, 113; legal; 89; medical, 89; military, 59; nature of, 1–10; persons not evil if untutored in, 111; ranges of, 6–7; religion and, 21–32; requires scientific study, 100; scientific, 114; sin and, 45–54; social character of, 1–10; supreme science of, 86; teaching of, 77–86, 118; tribal, 5; women and, 67–76. *See also* Laws
Europe, 74, 128

Evolution, ix, xi, xix, 2–3, 21, 51, 59, 85, 100, 102, 127, 129, 139
Experiment, 6, 29–30, 49; by advanced scientific specialists, 93; pedagogical, x, 84; society and, 125; thought, x, 136
Explanation, 15, 41–42, 55, 84, 113. *See also* Cause and effect
Exploitation, economic, xii; of women, 82
Exploration: by those who see and feel and think ahead, 60; in Herland, x; of men and women living together in Ourland, 136; of the relation between women and moral decisions, xx
Extortion, 36, 90, 107, 116

Fabian socialism, xvii, 132
Fables and fairy stories, 58, 119, 137, 142. *See also* Folklore
Facts, 15, 20, 30–31, 92; lack of, 25, 27; of life, 127; living, 72; newspapers and, 108; perplexing array of, 55; recorded by Ellador in *With Her in Ourland,* 141; scientific ethics based on, 114; of sexual life, 16–17; simple, 70; supplanting legends with, 42; understandable, 118
Failure, 3, 9, 48–49, 60, 85–86, 95, 118. *See also* Error; Sin; Success
Faith, 24, 37, 56–8, 61, 70–72, 122, 126, 128
Falsehood, 27, 40, 56; ancient, 50; associated with weak and defenseless people, 64; nonverbal forms of, 105. *See also* Dishonesty; Lies and lying; Perjury
Family, xvi, xx, 82–83, 131; boys and girls in, 82; chastity related to floor-space occupied by, 51; claims of, 131; compared to animal, 12; ethics of, 5–6, 50, 65, 83, 99, 105; is not the unit of the state, 82; patriarchal, 13; relations in, 7–10, 78, 82; women's duty to, 73
Famine, xii, 115
Fatalism, 28, 37, 83, 100
Fathers and fatherhood, 8, 13, 38, 49, 82–86, 99, 135, 136. *See also* Mothers and motherhood; Parentage
"Fatigue poisons," 87; and Epicureanism, 87
Feagin, Joe R., xvii, xviii
Feelings: ancient, 69; attached to acts, 26; calloused, 108; changes in, 27; consciousness and, 63; democratic processes and, 14; finer, 16; ideas and, 27; inherent virtue in, 27; lack of for truth in expression, 105; mere, 30; of modesty, 27; murder and, 38; new, 122; pioneer conditions and, 74; pride and, 62, 68; religious, 11, 27–29; sanctity and, 30–31; selfishness and, 57; sense of sin and, 48; tribal, 62; worship and, 27–28. *See also* Emotion; *specific feelings*
Fellaheen, 103, 139
Fellow-feeling, 21
Femininity, inversion of true, 104
Feminist pragmatism, xvii, xviii–xix. *See also* Ecofeminist pragmatism; Pragmatism
Feminist reform pragmatism, xxi
Fiction, relation to non-fiction, x, xii, xiv, xv, xxi
Fink, Deborah, 141
Finlay, Barbara, xvii
Fire, use of, 33, 78, 117
Flesh, dangers of, 39–40. *See also* Drunkenness; Temptation
Floods, man-made, 116–17, 142
Folklore, 86. *See also* Fables and fairy stories
Football, 93, 111, 140

Forgiveness, 54, 56, 61
France, 6; Breton women in, 27
Freedom, 7–9, 49, 79, 132; comparative, 76; economic, 96; Lester Ward on natural, 139; progress in, 14; of children's thinking, 94; of women, 76. *See also* Slaves and slavery
Function, xviii; misuses of which produce evil, 40
Functionalism, xix. *See also* Structural functionalism

Gambling. *See* Gaming
Games, 19, 118, 124, 133, 140–41, 143–44; arbitrary nature of, 30; human life as a game, 22, 35, 111–12
Gaming, 18–19. *See also* Debts of honor; Honor
Ganz, Cheryl R., 143
Geddes, Patrick, xiii
Generalizations, 1–2, 4, 15, 16, 86; as dangerous, 20; inability to make, 106; sin and, 99;
Generosity, 56, 61
Genetic field of conduct, 122. *See also* Telesis
Gifts, 27; of service, 103
Gilman, Charlotte Perkins, bibliography of, xv; on Christ, xx; criticism of religion, xx; Herland/Ourland saga, xii–xv, xxi; ix–xxii; major sociological works, x; mature sociological theory of ethical life, ix; serialization, x, xii, xiv, xxi; suicide, 138–39; taking Gilman seriously as a sociologist, xvii; teaching experiences, 25. Works: *Art Gems for the Home and Fireside,* 143; *Concerning Children,* xiii, 131; *Dress of Women, The,* x, xii–xv, xxi, 139–40, 143–44; *Forerunner, The,* x, xii, xiv, xxi; *Herland,* ix, x–xv, xvii, xxi; *Human Work,* xiii; *Social Ethics,* ix–x, xiii, xiv–xv, xx–xxii; *With Her in Ourland,* x, xii, xiv–xv, xvii, xxi; *Women and Economics,* xiii–xiv, 135; *Yellow Wall-paper, The,* xvii, 139
Gilman Circles, xiv, xv
Gilman, Nils, 133
Glasgow (Scotland), 51, 136
Glory, 68, 70, 74, 76
Gluttony, 47, 105–6, 120
God, xi, xix, xx, 26, 28, 35, 46, 47, 52–53, 54, 57, 61, 74, 83, 84, 92–93, 99, 106, 123, 129, 135, 136, 138; defined as Law of the Universe, 72
Goffman, Erving, 134
Golden Rule, 59
Good and Bad: arbitrary values of, 15; classification of, 1; ideas of, 3; relativity of terms, 16
Gotsch-Thompson, Susan, xvi
Government, 6, 116; abuses in, 106–7, 111; children to study forms of, 124; commissions, 94; freer, 102; patriarchal, 27–28; Lester Ward on, 132; power of compared to newspapers, 108; self-government, 84; unjust, 102
Gratitude, 56, 62, 83
Grocers, 58, 90, 92
Groups: animals in, 2; chiefs and, 13; decisions made by, 80; early, 26, 67; ethics in human, 2, 91; ethics of ants and, 95; face-to-face, xiv; habits and, 13; human life defined by, 123; hunting, social, 114–15; lower and higher social, 2, 11; processes, xix; superiority of one over another, xx; theory, xix; versus individuals, 4; women and complexity of, 72–73

Habits, xviii, 26; ancient, 17, 74, 103; bad, 107; common, 52; custom as force of,18; "double standard" as, 48; effects of on beliefs, 27; force of, 17; good, 85; inherited, 21, 67; Lester Frank Ward on, 132; new, 75, 118; of action, 15; of dishonesty in business, 107; of obedience, 12; of punishment, 13; of thought, 9; regarding women as conservative, 84; regular, 91; self-indulgent, 76, 106; source of, 29; tribal, 16; unethical, 67; within a constellation of related practices, 127; wrong, 75
Hamilton, Richard, xvii
Happiness, 33, 48, 79, 86, 127, 129; injury to, 99; of children, in Herland, xii; social, 132, 143
Harm, 40, 100, 103–5, 107, 117. *See also* Injuries; Mischief
Hastings, A. W., 143
Hate, 56; and murder, 38; God hates a liar, 83
Hayes, Edward Cary, xx
Headhunting, 37–38; 134
Health, 6, 41, 48, 89, 129; doctors and, 89; in Herland, xi; personal, 5, 87, 96, 106, 123; social, 5, 49, 87, 96, 113, 115
Heart, as a misused term, 125
Hebrews. *See* Judaism
Henderson, Charles Richmond, xx, 139. Works: *The Social Spirit in America,* 139
Henry VIII, 69, 137
Herland (fictional place), x–xvi, xvii, xxi. *See also* Novels, sociological; Ourland
Hermits, 7, 39
Hill, Mary A., 140
Hill, Michael R., x, xvii
Hindus, 39
History, 12, 102, 124; of ancient races, 82; as painful illustration, 114; comparative sociology and, 18; corruption throughout, 112; Jesus of Nazareth and, 53; of the last half-millennium, 9; new, 86; recorded, 33, 125; of religion, 24; slavery and, 49, 69; of social progress, 94; of sociology, xvii–xviii; study of; 50; of USA, 6; women in, 82
Höffding, Harald, xx
Homicide. *See* Murder
Homocentrism, contrasted to egocentrism, 122. *See also* Ego
Homogeneity, 113–14
Honesty, 56–57, 62, 90; common, 18; intellectual, 55, 71; is the best policy, 92. *See also* Dishonesty; Plagiarism
Honor, 18–19, 28, 29, 57, 62–63, 76, 108, 135
Horses, 38, 75
Hospitality, 12, 15, 56, 62
Howard, George Elliott, xiii, xx
Hull-House (Chicago), xiv, xviii, 142; Labor Museum at, 143. *See also* Jane Addams; Settlement house movement
Humanity: agriculture and, 115; in Christian theory, 52; communication needed by, 22; concept of, 59; conduct beneficial to, 47; conduct of, 2, 50; conscious, 87; crime in, 51; defined in terms of groups or individuals, 4–5; direction of, 101–2, 126; engaged in an enormous game, 35; ethics of, 9, 50, 79, 127; failure to understand, 96; heroes who serve humanity, 128; highest and lowest, 61; homocentric study of, 122; injury to, 99; interrelations of, 3; is a long-growing thing, 36; is essentially social, 104; Jesus' understanding

of, 35; love of, 57, 129; measurement and, 65; new interpretation of, 61; progress of, 9, 23, 30, 33–34, 73; qualities of organized, 77; righteousness and, 76; social nature of, 5; standard of conduct for, 4; of today, 70; W. E. B. DuBois' image of, 137; women in, 73, 76
Humility, 56, 61, 88
Hunger, 52, 96; after righteousness, 76, 138
Hunting, 7, 13, 68, 91, 115; as man's work, 68; virtues of hunters, 69
Hwang Ho ("Yellow River"), 116–17; 142
Hygiene, 2–3, 87, 106, 131

Ideas, 25, 27, 36–38, 45, 63, 128; changing, 55; enlarging the range of, 112; false, 75, 91, 100; flow of, leading to murder, 37; of good and bad, 3; governing, 113; implanted, 37; inherited, 74; inner world of, 27; of life and death, 122; new, 71; 122; of one's own conduct, 1; of other people, 81; of personal ethics, 64; of the past, 25, 50, 70, 103; readjustment of, 122; receptacles of, 95; sacred, 9–10; unethical, 67; wise choice of, 40. *See also* Concepts
Ignorance, 16–17, 50, 61, 64, 86, 92, 100, 104, 120, 126, 129. *See also* Knowledge
Images, 2, 28, 30, 37, 101, 135, 137
Imagination, 22, 28, 47, 100
Imitation, 2, 38
Immigration, 6
Immortality, 122–23
Impatience, xxi, 56; in Herland, xi
Imprudence, 56, 57
Impulses, xviii, 12, 24, 31; ancient, 122; ferocious, 38; for collective action, 14; good, 34, 86; human acts result primarily from, 36; inherited, 77, 121; refusing expression to, 118, 126; sexual, 23, 40; uplifting, 34. *See also* Desires
India, 37, 40, 134
Indigestion, 87; self-made, 99
Individualism, 59, 64, 91; bloated, 114
Individuals, xxi, 2; adjustment of activities of, 21; care for life of, 114; conduct of, 37; confusion of, 77; conscience and will of, 52, 75, 108; death and, 4; as elements of humanity, 4; ethics and, 5–10, 19, 50, 113; exist socially not as, 125; health of, 106; ideals of service and, 83; interpreting life in terms of, 122; liberty of, 71, 73; modern, 92; responsibilities of, 94; and sin, 84; slavery and actions by, 88; souls of, 122; as standard of measurement, 63; thoughts of, 74, 76; units of the state, 81–2; wrong conduct by and injuries to, 99, 107. *See also* Individuation; Personality
Individuation, 90. *See also* Individuals
Industry, 7, 22, 56–57, 59, 61–62, 68–69, 88, 143
Inertia, 101, 115
Infanticide, prenatal, 104
Influences, conflicting pressure of, 67. *See also* Cause and effect; Conditions; Environment
Inheritance, 12, 37, 41, 51, 75
Inhibition, 77–78
Injuries, social, due to: apathy versus direct action, 99; average behavior, 100; corporations, 89; drunkenness, 53; failure of individuals to do their part, 94; "fatigue poi-

sons," 87; wrong conduct, 99. *See also* Harm; Mischief
Innocence, 17
Instincts, 8, 21, 112, 132; animal, 19; combative, 106; conduct, inadequate, and, 112; conquering, 68; ethics and, 7; family life and, 9; hereditary, 67, 112, 121; individual existence and, 9; love, 102; lowest and worst, 114; mating, 39–40; mother, 37, 77–78, 82, 112; natural, 67, 126; normal, 51; outgrowing, 41; pride in, 68; religious denial of sexual, 24; sex, 24; social, 9, 57, 62, 76; of women, 79
Institutions, social, x, xviii, xxi; educational, 106
Intellect, 23, 70–71, 93, 125–26. *See also* Intelligence
Intelligence, xviii, 30, 33, 67; confused with arbitrary distinctions, 41; of primitive man, 105; use and abuse of, 41
Intemperance, 56, 101. *See also* Drunkenness
Interdependence, 75, 91
Interests: clashes of, 4, 64; common, 113; community, 8–9, 131; family, 8, 92, 113; healthy, 129; human, 127; individual, 5, 7, 8, 92; of corporations, 89; social, 92, 96
International Journal of Ethics, xix
Invention and inventors, 9, 50, 60, 88, 93–94, 100, 115, 117, 143
Investigation, 29–30
Ireland, 39
Irrigation, 115, 117
Isis, 129
Islam, 128. *See also* Moslem religion
Italy, 6, 39

Jacobs, Louis, 135
James, William, xviii, 134
Japanese, 39
Jehovah, 129
Jesus of Nazareth, xx, 28, 35, 42–45, 50–53, 57, 102, 133, 139; sociological insights of, 61, 70
Johnson, Alvin, 133
Jordan, Edward S., 140
Judaism, xx, 6, 13, 35, 38, 42, 57, 61, 128, 134–36; Orthodox "prayer of thanks," 135–36.
Judgment, 11, 21, 74; abrogation of, 13; difficult, 55; discriminating, 118; ethical, 81; lack of, 81; powers of, 13; rests on knowledge, 37, 55; relative, 107; retroactive standards of, 70; true, 121; women, position of, and, 75–76

Kali, 37, 129. *See also* Thugs
Karma, 27, 34, 133
Keith, Bruce, xvi–xvii
Kelley, Florence, xiii
Kindness, 56, 61, 120
Knight, Denise D., 136, 143
Knowledge, 2–3, 20, 23, 25, 33, 114, 129; accumulating, 29; of anatomy, physiology and hygiene, 87, 106; of community's nature, 59–60; definite, 29; of the development of life, 42; empirical, 111; of ethics, 84, 111; faith and, 61; general, 34; of God, 52; of God's law, 72; ideas and of emotions, interchange of, and 63; imperfect, 37; of injustice, 38, 39; lack of, 86; of laws of right and wrong, 45, 48; of the nature and processes of human life, 112; of our personal relation of body and soul, 87; of physics, 111; practical, 25; of right fashions of living, 79; in relation to authority, 29; in relation to judgment, 37; Religion of Ethics and, 127; of social or-

ganic unity, 51; of the true purpose and dignity of civilized life, 111; telic conduct based on, 121; theoretical, 111; thought and feeling, interchange of, and, 63; transfer of, 60. *See also* Ignorance
Krishna, 129

Labor: abundance of in American South, 15; attitudes toward, 74; by contract, 49; cost of, 60; division of, xix; employers of, 6; Hull-House Museum of, 143; industrial, performed under the pressure of another's will, 88; maternal, 8; minimization of, 91, 94; one's own, 49; of others, 49; parental, 8; paternal, 85; and poverty, 95–6; relationship to capital, 91, 96; sexual division of, 62, 72, 75–76; slave, 69, 96; under pioneer conditions, 74
Lamarck, Jean Baptiste, 102, 139
Lane, Ann J., x
Language, xi, xix, 49, 51
"Lap Dog and the Ass," fable of the, 58, 137
Laws, 8, 10, 14, 23; arbitrary distinctions of, 41; changeless, 27, 29; to compel truth in business, 64; of conduct taught to children, 112, 116; economic, 1, 93; of ethics, 80, 86; of evolution, 137; against gluttony, 41; of God, 72, 99; to govern action, 89; of growth, 3; of human nature, 50, 54; ignorance of, 92; lawyers and, 89–90; for men versus women, 41; misuse of, 107, 111; natural, 41, 48, 77, 122, 126, 138; of parsimony, 16; personal, 49, 64, 105; punitive aspects of, 77, 80, 86; recognition of, by children, 120; regulation of marriage by, 60; of right and wrong, 45, 48; rights of individuals and, 108; of right living, 79; of social development, 22, 76; social, 20, 53, 79; as social process, 124; sociological, 129; of sport, 19
Lawyers, 89, 92
Laziness, 56, 88, 94
Lemert, Charles, xvii
Lengermann, Patricia Madoo, xvii
Lewis, Margaret, 133
Liberty, 8; ideals of, 9, 132; individual, 71, 73; struggles for, 13; worship of, 82
Licentiousness, 56; as unchastity, 51, 96
Lies and lying, 36, 58, 83, 100, 105, 137; and women, 105. *See also* Dishonesty; Falsehood; Perjury
Life, 15, 33, 63, 80, 114, 129; as Sociological Law, 129; associations throughout, 83; civic, 84; civilized, 111; communal, 104; complexity of social, 26, 67, 75, 91, 119; continuity of, 4; earliest forms, 3; earliest stages of human, 68; economics, effect on, 95; ethics in savage, 67; ethics to rearrange the conditions of, 96; external, 111; facts of, 127; family, 8, 9; game of, 111–12; general consciousness essential to modern, 108; gross error in, 41; in Herland as growth, 11; individual, 7, 9, 114; intimate and vital relations of, 9; knowledge of the development of, 42; laws of, 76; military, 57; misconception of as evil, 35; misplaced values of household, 82; modern business, 57, 80, 92; most is social, 38; motion in, 101–2; nature of social, 91; one's real duty in, 58; natural law and, 26; the one most important fact

to, 23; open book of, 56; ordinary acts of, 20; organic social, 103; our use and purpose in, 34; principal emphasis in each child's, 78; problems of, 85; right and wrong in, 54; service throughout, 59; sexual, 16; silly miseries of , 95; slave labor as the price of, 69, 96; society as a form of, 6, 87, 90; static to a dynamic stage of, 103; success in, 95; teaching children about, 119; in terms of individualism, 59, 63, 91, 122–23; varied activities of, 91; work is the essential condition of, 49
Lighting, municipal, 51, 136
Liquor, 53
Logic, 2, 47, 126
Love, xi, 38, 40–41, 50, 53, 56–57, 61, 81, 83, 88, 102–5, 125, 128–29, 135
Loyalty, 12, 56, 57, 61
Lucullus, Lucius Licinus, 115, 141
Luhmann, Niklas, 140

Machinery, 50, 88, 93, 95, 115, 119
Magner, Lois N., xiv
Majorities, power of, 14, 100
Mammoths, 72, 91–92
Manners. *See* Morals and manners
Manufacturing, 5, 9; of bad food, 94; leaders in, 102; and mechanical world, 63
Maps, 36. *See also* Charts
Marconi, Guglielmo, 102, 139
Marriage, xiii, 17, 41–42, 48, 50, 52, 60, 137
Martineau, Harriet, xiii, xiv, xv, xix, 138, 141
Marx, Karl, xvi, 131
Masculinity, 17, 46, 62, 68–69, 73, 106, 128. *See also* Femininity; Men; Patriarchy
Master-slave relationship. *See* Slaves and slavery
Material relations, 3, 29, 63, 100, 102, 119, 126
Maynard, Tony, 133
McDonald, Lynn, xvii
Mead, George Herbert, xviii, xix, xx, 132–34
Mean, golden, 16
Measurement: of agricultural practice, 60; of civilizations, 5; of conduct, 75, 119, 129; ethical, 10, 100–101; evil measured by seriousness of injury, 107–8; of incentives for lying, 63; of individual life, 7–8; of interpersonal conduct, 59; of life in terms of individualism, 59; new standards of, 99; of ourselves, 102; personal reproach and, 106; proposed scale of, 100–101; of rate of human progress, 71; relativity of, 65; of religion, 83; of virtues, 57, 63, 65
Mechanics, 9, 63, 85, 87, 102; mechanical arts, 111
Medicine, 20, 58, 102, 106
Medicine men, 26, 28, 30, 46, 134
Memory, 21, 22, 69
Men: appear later in evolution than do females, 42; attitude of superiority in, 74; characteristics of, 5, 68; characteristics of in families with a male head, 13; combative nature of, 68–69, 106; essential maleness of, 68; honor between gentleman, 18–19; hunting as work of, 68; male pragmatists, xviii; male sociologists, xv; mastery and sensuality in, 88; pride and, 68; tuxedos worn by, 141; well-meaning, 34; women in service of, 40; women, virtues of, and, 70. *See also* Adam and Eve;

Fathers and fatherhood; Masculinity; Mothers and motherhood; Women
Mercy, 46, 56–57, 61
Method: of action, Christian, 35; arbitrary, 118; of conduct, 20; didactic illustrations of, 115–16; of elimination, nature's, 1, 12; of enforcement, 2, 83; negative, 79; of offense and defense, by society, 60; prohibitive, 78; religious, 47, 52; retention of, criteria for, 71; of sterile indulgence, 104; social evolution of, 85, 124; of teaching ethics, 117–18; virtues and, 14–15
Militarism and military life, xx, 13, 57, 69; combative nature of men, 68–69, 106; ethics of, 59. *See also* Combat; War
Mind, xviii, 1, 4, 22, 26–27, 58, 71, 94; active, ix, 14, 40; adult, 93; attitude of, 122; average, 20; best, 117; change of, 61; child's, 83, 85, 117; clear and unprejudiced, 69; clogged, 86; closed, 71; confusion of, 82; conservative, 103; darkened, 103; enlightened, 103; equipped from the past, 70; free, 72, 76, 81; human, 12, 13, 25, 29, 91, 109; ideas, flow of, and, 38; inactive, 71; inventive reactions of, xi; loss of, 53; maintenance of, 126; misguided, 3; misinformed, 47; murder and, 37; obligation, sense of, and, 104; open, 25, 71, 102; opposites and, 73; other's, 7; peace of, 76, 122; practical, 46; primitive, 46; qualities of, 96; race-mind, 14; social, 87; sophisticated, 4; in a sound body, 87, 138; state of, 30, 126–27; student using his own, 55; submissive, 75; training of young, 63; voluntary use of, 81; weakened by bad habits, 107
Mischief, 43, 100, 117. *See also* Harm; Injuries
Missionaries, 128
Mistakes, 43, 45, 48–49, 51, 64, 82, 85, 91, 119
Modesty, 27, 56, 62, 69, 133
Monarchy, 9, 13, 14, 57, 61, 88
Monogamy, 88
Moral hygiene, 3, 131
Moral statistics, 136–37
Morals and manners, 16, 29, 80, 112; Harriet Martineau's definition of, 141
Mores, 16, 132
Morris, William, 142
Moses, 50, 61
Moslem religion, 24, 35, 47, 57. *See also* Islam
Mosquitoes, 93, 95
Mother-love, xi, 36. *See also* Love
Mothers and motherhood, xi, 8, 49, 62, 68, 73; children, raising of, and, 77–86; unwilling, 41. *See also* Fathers and fatherhood; Parentage
Motion pictures, 36, 46, 127, 141–42. *See also* Pedagogy; Photography; Teaching
Mujicks, 103, 139
Murals, 117, 142. *See also* Pictures, pedagogical uses of
Murder, 17, 37–39, 43, 53, 71, 88, 106, 134–35; rates of, by country, 39, 135
Mutations, 45
Mystery, 28–30, 46, 118
Myths, 25, 26, 46; Assyrian, 46; Chaldean, 46

National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, 135

Nationalism, xvii
Native Americans, 20; 39
Nature, human, 39, 52, 61, 80, 104
Navigation, 47, 85
Necessity, making a virtue of, 14
New Testament, 45. *See also* Bible; Christianity; Judaism; Old Testament
New York, 37, 39, 116
Newspapers, 36, 107–8, 140
Nicholson, Terry (fictional character), 139. *See also* Herland; Ourland
Niebrugge-Brantley, Jill, xvii
Noise, in cities, 39
Northwestern University, 140
Nourishment, pursuit of, 1–2
Novelists, sociological, xiv–xv
Novels, dime, 108
Nursing, 36–37, 85
Nursery, 77, 80. *See also* Baby garden

Obedience, 12–14, 26, 46, 56–57, 61, 69–72, 82
Observation, 19; casual, 96; contrasted with revelation and authority, 84; directive to observe continuing effects of ancient feelings, 69; by Ellador in *With Her in Ourland,* xii; generalization, and 1; of lower and higher groups, 2; of pursuit of nourishment, 1–2; of sequences of phenomena, 3; of simple processes, by children, 85; superficial, 40; of unobserved phenomena, 42
Offenses, 83, 106–7, 117, 140
Ogburn, William Fielding, 141
Old Testament, xx, 45. *See also* Bible; Christianity; Judaism; New Testament
"Old Woman and Her Pig," fable of the, 116, 142
O'Neill, William, xv–xvi
Opossums, 92
Oppression: clerical, 38; patriarchal, ix; sexual, xii–xiii
Organicism, xix, xx, 5, 35, 46, 50–51, 59, 61, 64, 76, 90, 103, 119
Organisms, xviii, 4, 6, 9, 33, 42, 46, 90
Ourland (fictional place), x–xvi, xvii, xxi. *See also* Herland; Novelists, sociological

Pageants, religious, xi
Pain, 12, 17–18, 71, 80–81, 124; of being prevented from doing things, 77–78; consciousness of the world's, 103; of foot binding, 80; greatest goodness may cost both effort and, 118. *See also* Pleasure
Parasites, 18, 49, 89, 100, 104
Parentage, 8, 26, 29, 51, 60, 86. *See also* Fathers and fatherhood; Mothers and motherhood; Reproduction
Park, Clara Cahill, xiii
Park, Robert E., xiii, xv
Parsimony, 56; law of, 16
Parsons, Talcott, 131
Partridges, 12, 13
Pasht, 129
Passion, 38, 50, 86, 105, 120; social, 129
Patience, 54, 56, 61, 69, 82, 85–86, 88; in Herland, xi
Patriarchy, ix, xiii, xv–xvi, 28, 135. *See also* Masculinity; Men
Patriotism, 55, 57, 62, 114; international, 62
Peace, 22, 72, 79, 120, 123, 129, 132; economic, 96; in Herland, xi–xii; terror and, 5, 104; submis-

sion and, as suicide, 122–23; world, 49;
Peacocks, 68
Peasants, 27, 103, 112, 115, 139, 141
Pedagogy, x, xiii, xiv, 119, 141. *See also* Teaching
Penalty, death, 47. *See also* Punishment
Peor, 129
Perjury, 58, 105, 107. *See also* Falsehoods; Lies and lying
Perseverance, 57, 62, 125, 137
Personality, 46, 51, 60, 77, 84, 86, 131. *See also* Individualism; Individuals
Perversion, 3, 76, 85, 101, 106, 108, 115; sex-decoration as absolute perversion of nature, 105
Philosophers: ethical perceptions of, 79–80; topical interest in misbehavior, 33; views on relativity of truth, 105
Philosophy, Greek, 143
Photography, 116, 141. *See also* Motion pictures; Pictures
Physics, 3, 102, 111
Physiology, 1, 2, 3, 87
Pictures, pedagogical uses of, 36, 86, 115–17, 119, 127, 141. *See also* Motion pictures
Plagiarism, 35. *See also* Lies and lying
Plato, 50
Play, 19, 22, 43, 68, 101, 111–12, 124, 133, 140–41
Pleasure: of conquest and glory, 68; of doing right, 85; of gentleman gamblers, 18–19; of growing, xi, 22; highest feelings of found in mutual service, 54; of learning, 77; of males, 40, 42; of sex-indulgence, 106; of social service, 124; from Sun and Air and Water and the Green Earth, 123. *See also* Pain
Plenary indulgence, 27, 133
Podeschi, Christopher, xvii
Poison, 87, 90–92, 94, 100, 106
Polyandry, 88
Polygamy, 88
Population, 15, 39
Poverty, 41, 87, 96, 103
Powers, H.H., xx
Powers, human, 12, 13, 15, 22, 82, 113; of teachers, 108
Pragmatism, xvii–xix; xxi, 132. *See also* Ecofeminist pragmatism
Prayer, 49, 135
Pride, 28, 35, 42, 56, 62, 68–69, 76, 80, 88, 96, 103, 119–20, 129
Priests, 13, 26, 28–29, 37, 47
Principles: defined as governing laws of action, 89; defined as reasons, 83; defined as rules of conduct, 55; of ethics, 119; of growth and love, in Herland, xi; highest and lowest, 128; of love, 86; professions and pursuit of, 114; underlying, 117; versus incidents, 86; versus virtues, 55–65. *See also* Virtues
Printing, 22, 63, 100
Prisons, 7, 78, 100
Prisoners, 7
Profane, xix, 134. *See also* Sacred
Professions, 11, 13, 105, 114. *See also specific professions*
Progress, 88; capitalism and, 91; conduct and, 111–20; constant, 5; delayed or retarded, 3, 72, 101, 103; in ethical science, 29; in freedom, 14; history of social, 94; human, 70, 127; of humanity, 9, 23, 73; laws of human, 50; Lester Frank Ward on, 132, 139; living, 69; material, 126; mechanical, 9; of mothers, 68; obedience and,

13; psychic, 9, 126; rate of, 71; record of human, 49; in sacred ideas, 9; social, 5, 57, 69, 70, 102, 125–27; spirit of, 129; in thought, 74; unbroken, 51; upward, 123–24; women and, 76
Prohibitions, 20, 46, 58, 77, 80
Promiscuity, 88
Prostitution, 40, 41, 52, 101, 106–8
Protection, 8, 12–13, 26, 30, 41, 78, 82, 88; right of society to, 53
Prudence, 56, 61
Psychology, 1, 19, 21, 45, 50; comparative, 132; natural law and, 26; practical, 47; religious, 29, 126–27; social, 18
Public opinion, 115
Public service, 62, 108. *See also* Service
Punctuality, 56, 57, 62
Punishment, 46, 52–53, 83–86, 99; eternal, 47–48, 54; personal fear of, 59; practical alternative of, 83; primitive, 48; of sinners, 1; systems of reward and, 46, 50, 70, 112, 117–18, 122, 128; temporal, 132
Pyramids, social, 113

Quetelet, Adolphe, 136–37

Rabbits, 30
Railroads, 107, 115, 119; locomotive engines, 101
Reason, 8, 38, 41, 54, 83, 86, 107, 118, 120, 126. *See also* Thinking
Rebellion, 13, 56, 113
Recognition, xv–xvi, 8, 11, 14, 21, 50, 57, 75, 77, 99–100, 119–20
Reflexes, 21, 36
Reform Darwinism, xvii
Reinharz, Shulamit, xvii
Relations, legal and illicit, 41
Religion, xi–xii, xviii, xix–xx, 8; influences on ethics of, 21–31; obedience, and 13; psychology of, 126–27; relation to ethics as a science, 3, 19–20; world, xx. *See also* Churches; God; *specific prophets, deities, and religions*
Religion of Ethics, 127–28
Reporters, 81
Reproduction, 40–41, 131; social, 60
Resignation, 56, 61, 82
Responsibility: collective, 51, 116; compound, 117; documentation of, 116; individual, sense of, 84
Revelation, 26–27, 29, 40, 55, 71, 84, 128. *See also* Authority
Reverence, xix, 13, 28, 56–58, 61
Riesman, David, 133
Righteousness, 76, 87, 138
Rights, xv, 4; Bill of Rights,132; of the individual, 8, 64, 108
Robbery, 90, 96
Roman Catholic theology, 133
Ross, Edward A., xx, 138–39
Ruskin, John, 142
Russia, 103, 139

Sacred, xix, 10, 30–31, 46, 138. *See also* Profane
Sacrifices, 28; ancient, 93; instinctive, to the common good, 79; maternal, 8; of others, 52; parental, 8; to pay debts of honor, 19; self, 8
Sadism, psychic, 47
Sailors, 13, 50, 59; shipwrecked, 7, 16, 19
Saint Paul, 42, 57, 73
Saint Peter, 73
Salvation, 35, 52–53, 84, 128
San Francisco Bay, 116
Sanctity, 28–31
Sandoz, Mari, xiv

Savages, 12, 20, 26, 39, 67–68, 95, 101, 104, 110, 114–15, 118–20, 126. *See also* Civilization;
Scale, of ethics, 65, 72, 100–101, 106, 125; evolutionary, 3. *See also* Measurement
Scharnhorst, Gary, xv
Science: free-thinking scientific students, 25; natural, 9, 29, 117; need for a scientific ethics, 114; research and experiment by scientific specialists, 94; social: ethics as, 1–10, 58, 67, 78; Gilman and, xvi; scientism in, xxi; sociology as, 132; 78; women in, xiii. *See also* Sociology
Scientism, xxi
Scotch Highlanders, 15, 139
Scott, Clifford H., 132
Sebberson, David, 133
Self, 11–12, 27, 133
Self-consciousness, 11–12, 84
Self-control, 56, 62, 75, 80–82, 118, 125, 137
Self-indulgence, 19, 41, 48, 53, 75, 103, 104–6
Self-interest, 6, 90–91, 112–13
Selfishness, 35, 57, 62, 86, 88, 96, 101, 104–5. *See also* Altruism
Senators, 116
Sensations, 11, 48, 87
Sense, 4, 12, 18, 25–26, 35, 40, 48–49, 84, 117, 128
Serfs and serfdom, 74. *See also* Slaves and slavery
Service: to children, 68; Christianity and, 128; divine, 92; doctrine that women are made to service men, 42, 72, 74; exchange of, 22, 70; foundation of social ethics is best, 125; gift of, 103; human living requires best and fullest, 72; to humanity generally, 58, 69; improving, 71; loving, 62; measurement of quantity and quality of, 71; military, 59; municipal, 136; mutual, 2, 22–23, 54; of newspapers, 109; primal, 104; public, 62, 108; social, 58, 71, 83, 91, 93, 124; temporary, 42; true, 92, 102; truth, justice and courage essential to, 71; to the state, 10; value of received, 18–19; women and family, 83; world-lifting, 115
Settlement house movement, 142. *See also* Hull-House; Jane Addams
Sex: antagonism between holiness and, 24; attraction, 40, 111; chastity and, 49, 57, 78; conduct, 48; decoration, 105, 139; division of, 68, 72–73; ethics, 67; ignorance of, 16; impulse, original, 23–24, 31; indulgence in, 104–6; instinct, 24; male, 40, 68; modesty, 27, 133; and morality, 17, 51; over development of, 101, 106; prejudice, 48, 50; relation, 41, 48, 71, 76, 88, 102; temptations of, 51; type, 68; variations in ethics by, 11; women as conservative, 84
Ships, 6, 13, 114, 115. *See also* Sailors
Sidgwick, Henry, xx
Sin, 45–54; arbitrariness of, 45; mortal, 46; no connection with ethics, 45; venial, 46. *See also specific sins*
Sinclair, Andrew, xvi
Slaves and slavery, 36, 40–41, 49–50, 62, 69–71, 74–5, 81–82, 88, 95–96, 138
Slums, 38
Small, Albion Woodbury, xx
Social disorganization, 131, 141
Social environment, and sin, 51
Social ethics, and sociology, xix–xxi
Social perception, 11

Society: awakened, 54; best service of, 69, 124; as Big Baby making mistakes, 119; children as members of, 82; clear record of, 125; composite life of, 119; consciousness and, 12; diseases of, 87; enemies of, 93, 94, 100, 103, 106, 125; ethics conditioned on the needs and activities of, 95; ethics needed to maintain growing, 5; evil as offence against, 107; evolutionary understanding of, xix; failure of ethics in regard to, 90; future, x; grocers as members of, 90; Harriet Martineau and Auguste Comte on ethical aspects of, xix; as headquarters of thought, 122; homogeneous, 114; ideal, x, xii; ignorant, 107; individuals vary by type of, 5–6; lawyers as members of, 89–90; Lester Ward's theories of, xvii; as a life form, 6, 63, 129; living, xviii; love essential to, 61, 132; must evolve, 60; must live, 59; must reproduce, 60; New Ethics based on, 123; newspapers and, 108; nutritive processes of, 60; as object of all social action, 89–90; as organic whole, xix, xx, 64, 90; organic unity of, 50, 53; as an organism, 46, 94; organization and improvement of, xviii; physicians as members of, 89; as place for children, ix; primitive stages of, xx; public service spreading in, 62; relationship of to ethics and sociology, xix–xx; right to protect itself, 53; selfishness and structure of, 104; setting one's self against, 40; slavery and, 95; sound social mind in sound, 87; support of leisure class by, 18; Talcott Parsons, theory of, 131; ultra-egoism and, 7; women-only, xiv
Sociologists, 13; as novelists, xiv–xv. *See also* Vandyke Jennings (fictional character); *names of specific sociologists*
Sociology: ix–x, xiii–xviii, 1; alternative models of practice in, xv; Commission of Social Ethics based upon, 114; comparative, 18, 132; Dark Era of Patriarchal Ascendency in, xv; employment relations as concept in, 62; Golden Era of Women in, xvi; insight of, 35; relationship to ethics, 3; required to understand ethics, ix, 92; social ethics and, xix–xxi; sociological insight of Jesus of Nazareth, 61, 70; Sociological Law, 129. *See also* Novelists, sociological
Soldiers, 13, 59, 81, 116
Spain, 6, 39
Spirit, as metaphor, 63, 87, 102–3, 111, 113, 129, 139
Spiritual world, 29
Stages: of advanced conservatism, 71; asexual, 42; of automobile use, 88; child's understanding of, 92, 119; of creation, 3; of development measured, 71; economic, 68; ethics as third stage, 8; experimental and half-way, 125; human, 2; industrial, 69; interdependence of, 7–8; of paternity, 8; primitive, xx; relativity of, 72; of social advancement, 90; from static to dynamic, 103, 139; super-imposed, 6; of ultimate evil, 71
Starr, Ellen Gates, 142
State, 6, 10, 82–83, 85, 92, 99, 115, 119, 131
Stetson, Walter, xv
Stocks, manipulation of, 90, 107

Strata, social, 113
Struggle, 13, 40, 45, 79, 84–85, 128
Structural functionalism, xix
Subversiveness, 26
Success, 5, 95, 124. *See also* Failure
Suicide, xiii, 43, 99, 122, 139
Sumner, William Graham, 132
Superstructure, 120, 131
Sydie, R.A., xvii
Symbols, 30, 131
System, 20; of conduct, 20; economic, 69; Gilman's overall ethical, xiii; of slavery, 69, 138; of education, 6; of ethics, 112; of ethics in Herland, xi; of reward and punishment, 46, 70; of worship, 28

Taft, Jessie, xix
Tag (children's game), 112, 140–41
Teachers: child-culture and, 85; of the cult of Kali, 37; dialogues with, 94–95, 116; ethical, 117–18; of ethics, 20; in Herland, xii; inappropriate influence by, 108; school, 35–36
Teaching, 25, 26; about mistakes, 119; of children, 119, 127; of conduct, 112; of ethics, 117, 122, 127; faulty method of, 118; of Jesus, 35, 57, 70; of manners, 80; religious, 83, 90; of sciences, 85. *See also* Pedagogy
Technology. *See* Invention; Machinery
Telesis, 15, 24, 121, 132
Temperance, 56, 61, 106. *See also* Drunkenness; Intemperance
Temptation, 51–52
Terror, 5, 46, 120
Testament: New, 45; Old, 20, 45
Textbooks, truth in, 64
Theft, 17, 71, 106
Theory, ix, xi, xvi–xix, 20; of advantage, 20; Christian, 35, 52; of continence, 41, 135; difficulty of giving up an accepted, 25; of "division of labor between the sexes," 72; of eternal damnation, 52, 54, 84; of evil, 34; fatalistic, 83; Hebrew, 46; of the leisure class, 18, 133; of life, 122; of Marx and Engels, 131; modern hell-and-devil, 83; otherworldly, 20; of physics, 111; of the remission of sins, 128; of revelation, 26, 71; of sacrifice, 93; of salvation, 52, 84; of sin, 54; of "social telesis," 131; of woman's duty, 72
Thinking, xxi, 25, 29, 75–76, 95. *See also* Reason
Thomas, William I., 131, 133, 134, 140, 141
Thought experiments, x, 136
Thrift, 16, 56, 57, 62
Thugs (in India), 37–38, 134
Torture, 36, 47, 80, 107; self, 40
Tradesmen, 58, 74, 93
Tradition: acceptance of, 126; of arts and crafts at Hull-House, 143; atmosphere for children free of, 86; change and, 121; continuing company of the dead, 69–70; as extension of memory, 22; of female sociological novelists, xiv; outgrowing of, 112; relation to ethics, 3; of remote savagery, 68; sexist practice and, 48, 50; of slavery and wages, 50; transformation of tales into, 26; weight of, 8
Transportation, 15, 60, 88, 94. *See also specific forms of transport*
Treason, 55, 57, 116
Tribe, primitive, 2, 12, 13, 113; hunting by, 91–92; mores of, 16
Trinity, 46, 129. *See also* Christianity

Trust, 28, 64, 104
Truth, 27, 40, 58, 81, 103, 118, 125; in all things, 102; basis of the Religion of Ethics, 127; is essential to social service, 71; as an ethical term, 36; love of, 129; most neglected virtue, 62–64; newspapers and, 108; perceived, 70; proven, 54; task of following new, 75; in textbooks, 64; as a virtue, 56, 61, 83, 105. *See also* Falsehood; Lies and lying
Turner, Jonathan, xvii
Tuxedos, 141; in reference to "monkey dinners," 115

Unbelievers, 24, 27
Unconsciousness, 3, 36, 86, 112
Universities, xiv, 85; Football in, 93, 111, 140. *See also* Colleges
Unselfish, 57–58, 62
Utilitarianism, 132, 143

Values: moral, 9; women's, x
Vandyke Jennings (fictional character), x–xii. *See also* Herland; Ourland
Veblen, Thorstein, xiv, xvii, 18, 133. Works: *Theory of the Leisure Class,* 18, 133
Vera, Hernán, xvii
Vermin, 86, 116
Vicarious atonement, doctrine of, 27, 57, 133
Vices, 7, 16–17, 61, 83, 125
Virtues, 3, 7, 12, 14–19, 24–28, 46–8, 55–65, 70–72, 78–83, 118, 125; master list of, 56–57; measurement of, 65; minor, 61–62. *See also* Principles; *specific virtues and their opposites*
Visiting, social, in Southern states, 15
Violence. *See* Emotion; Murder; Slaves and slavery; War
Volition, 21

Wahl, Ana Maria, 142
Wallace, Alfred Russell, 102, 139
War, ix, xii, 5, 13, 50, 62, 68, 69, 101, 106; World War I, 128. *See also* Combat; Militarism and military life
Ward, Lester Frank, xiii, xvi, xvii, 102, 132, 133–34, 139, 143. Works: *Applied Sociology,* 143; *Dynamic Sociology,* 132
Warner, Amos Griswold, xx, 142
Washburne, Marion Foster, 143
Wastefulness, ix, 8, 16, 35, 56, 64, 79, 115–16
Webb, Beatrice, xv, xvii
Weber, Max, xx, 140
Webster, Noah, 137
Wickedness, 34, 46, 99, 106
Wickersham Commission, 135
Wilcox, Ella Wheeler, 105, 140
Wireless communication, potential of, 63
Women, 8, 68; attributes of, 68; children, education of, and, 79; as conservative, 84; as slaves, 88; as sociological novelists, xiv; dependent position of, 72, 74–76; double standard and, 41–42; facts of sexual life, ignorance of, and 16–17; false ethical standards due to the subjection of, 74; hats worn by, 143–44; Herland, women in, xii–xv, xxi; ix–xxii; influence on ethics of, 67–76; inversion of true femininity in, 104–5; Judaism and, 135–36; living with men in Ourland, 136; modesty in, 27; priority of, 42; service of, 62, 72; sex attraction and, 40; sociology and,

xvi–xviii, xx; subjection of, 42, 72, 74; truthfulness of, 58, 105; values and virtues of, x–xii, 70, 73; 62; "Woman's place is in the home," 75. *See also* Adam and Eve; Fathers and fatherhood; Femininity; Masculinity; Men; Mothers and motherhood
Workmen, 81, 91, 116
World Almanac, The, 39, 135
World-Peace, 49
Worship, 27–29, 129; of liberty, 82
Wright, Orville, 102, 139
Wright, Wilbur, 102, 139

Znaniecki, Florian, 141

ABOUT THE AUTHOR AND EDITORS

CHARLOTTE PERKINS GILMAN (1860–1935) was an eminent feminist sociologist and novelist, perhaps best known professionally for *Women and Economics* (1898) and as a fiction writer for her semi-autobiographical novella, "The Yellow Wallpaper" (1892).

MICHAEL R. HILL is an interdisciplinary social scientist. He is the author of *Archival Strategies and Techniques* (1993) and the editor of Harriet Martineau's *How to Observe Morals and Manners* (1989). With Mary Jo Deegan, he is co-editor of *Women and Symbolic Interaction* (1987), Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *With Her in Ourland* (Greenwood 1997), and Gilman's *The Dress of Women* (Greenwood/Praeger 2001). *Harriet Martineau: Theoretical and Methodological Perspectives* (2001), co-edited by Hill and Susan Hoecker-Drysdale, received the American Sociological Association Section on the History of Sociology Distinguished Scholarly Book Award for 2002. Hill received the Harriet Martineau Sociological Society Award for 2002, bestowed annually for significant contributions to the study of early women sociologists. In 2003, Hill won the Distinguished Scholarly Career Award bestowed by the American Sociological Association's Section on the History of Sociology.

MARY JO DEEGAN is Professor of Sociology at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Among her earlier publications are *Jane Addams and the Men of Chicago School, 1892–1918* (1988); *American Ritual Dramas*

(Greenwood, 1989); *Women in Sociology: A Bio-Bibliographical Sourcebook* (Greenwood, 1991); *The American Ritual Tapestry* (Greenwood, 1998); and *Race, Hull-House, and the University of Chicago* (Praeger, 2002). In 2002, Deegan won the first Distinguished Scholarly Career Award bestowed by the American Sociological Association's Section on the History of Sociology. In 2003, Deegan received the American Sociological Association Distinguished Scholarly Book Award for her monograph on *Race, Hull-House, and the University of Chicago.*