

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. II.

JUNE, 1922.

No. 6.

Sexual Ethics in Present-Day Germany.

PROF. W. H. T. DAU, St. Louis, Mo.

Innumerable times in the history of men and nations the intimate relation of Christian ethics to Christian faith has been shown to be exactly as Scripture describes it. As a person believes, so he thinks, purposes, speaks, and acts. In the wake of the decay of Christian teaching has ever followed decay of Christian living. As a rule, it has been the domain of sexual affairs where the deleterious effects of apostasy from the divine norm for pure doctrine and holy living have appeared first. The classical passage which exhibits the operation of cause and effect in this respect under the permissive dispensation and the retributive justice of the God of holiness, is Rom. 1, 21—32. In the terrible panorama of pagan corruption which the apostle spreads before our eyes in this passage, the prurient subject of the unnatural sexual desires and practises is not passed over, but made quite prominent, even by a writer who otherwise considered it “a shame even to speak of those things which are done in secret,”¹⁾ and who laid down the rule for his congregations that certain matters should “not be once named among them, as becometh saints.”²⁾ There is dire necessity at times to speak of loathsome subjects: to point out, for instance, that the law of compensation, which the righteous Creator has wrought into the order of the universe, and chiefly into the original character of His foremost creature, man, avenges defection from the truth of the divine revelation upon the sexual relationship of the renegades. Accordingly, Paul does not hesitate to write to the Christians in the capital city of the world, who were daily witnessing the things which he mentioned: “Because, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing

1) Eph. 5, 12.

2) Eph. 5, 3.

themselves to be wise, they became fools. . . . *Wherefore* God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts. . . . *For this cause* God gave them up unto vile affections. . . . And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind to do those things which are not convenient."

Present-day Germany is the most recent instance of the operation of the principle to which we have referred. Dr. Paul Wurster, one of the editors of the *Monatsschrift fuer Pastoraltheologie*, has a very informing article on this subject in the issue for December, 1920.³) He recalls the fact that an international congress was to have met in 1914 for investigating the status of sexual affairs. Dr. Wurster holds that this congress would have furnished abundant material for reflection and suggestions for practical work to the student of social ethics and to curates of souls. The project of the congress was swallowed up by the war, and in its place there was pushed into the foreground the terribly serious problem of fighting sexual diseases. Dr. Wurster regrets that this problem was almost entirely changed to the problem of artificial prevention, and subsequent medical cure, of sexual diseases. Important contributions toward the solution of this latter problem had been made even before the war by the Wassermann test for sexual diseases from the blood, and still more by Ehrlich's discovery of salvarsan.⁴) The principles of social ethics were almost entirely superseded by questions of social hygiene and the physical reclamation of so and so many men fit for service which the military authorities demanded. The military censorship prevented to a certain extent an unvarnished discussion of war-measures that had been adopted.⁵) "Now," says Dr. Wurster, "we are confronted with the fact that hundreds of thousands of ex-soldiers have not only become somewhat acquainted and personally connected with the evil of prostitution abroad and in their garrisons at home, but they have been particularly initiated — something that had not happened previously while soldiers were serving their military terms — into all the methods of prevention; still more, with the regular institution of

3) "Neueste sexual-ethische Anschauungen und Theorien und unsere Stellung dazu."

4) Popularly known as "606." See definition in *Standard Dictionary*.

5) Dr. Wurster remarks: "As much as a person was permitted to say I tried to say in my brochure *Die Prostitutionsfrage im Lichte des Kriegs (Prostitution in the Light of the War)* (Karlsruhe, Ev. Schriftenverein, 1915)."

brothels before them, which were given standing in many formations, they have learned to look upon resorting to the sexual vice as something self-evident. Amongst other things, the World War has brought upon us an appalling infection, not only of a physical, but also of a moral nature, and that, as a result of prevailing sexual views and practises. It is to be regretted that officers and physicians were no exceptions to the rule in this respect, but in many instances they were a very bad example to the soldiers." Granted the demoralizing effects of the war, still these effects are not a sufficient explanation for the rapid spread of the evil: the moral stamina must have been wanting in the soldiers when they left their homes to join the army. The war merely developed enormously germs that were latent, more or less, before the war.

This view is suggested by Dr. Wurster himself. For he speaks of "prevailing sexual views and practises," and raises the pertinent question whether Germany is sufficiently armed by its Christian-ethical standpoint to combat those views in which one of the worst effects of the war must be recognized, and in which a bad theory is seen developing into a foul practise. The domain of sexual ethics, he thinks, has as yet been a rather uncultivated field. So far it has not been treated in any comprehensive manner.⁶⁾

Dr. Wurster now reviews, in a cursory manner, German views on sexual ethics.

1. SEXUAL ETHICS AND ASCETICISM:

Following tradition, he says, writers on our evangelical ethics usually make the mistake of presenting sexual ethics from the viewpoint of *asceticism*. Thus the impression is created as if nature were negatived. However, from the evangelical standpoint the suppression of desire, as such, can never be a guiding thought. At

6) Sexual ethics "appear as a distinct problem in ethics not later than twenty-five years ago. Recent works on this subject are: *Fr. W. Foerster, Sexualethik und Sexualpaedagogik (Sexual Ethics and Sexual Pedagogics)*, broadly treated and oriented chiefly by pedagogical viewpoints, like all writings of Foerster. Counter publications to this are the writings of *Aug. Forel* on the sexual question. The Central Committee for Inner Mission ('Zentralausschuss fuer Innere Mission') caused *Social Ethics* by *Rhodens* to be published in 1918. In the serial publication *Aus Natur- und Geisteswelt (From the Realm of Nature and Spirit)* there appeared in 1919 the small treatise of *Timmerding*. At present we possess neither a scientific treatise of this widely ramified subject that would do justice to the positions taken by modern men, nor a correct popular elaboration of the subject." (Wurster.)

this point we have permitted Catholic ethics to foist its view-point upon us. If we are to apprehend in its purity the immense scope of an effort to make our most animal impulse completely ethical, thoroughly to permeate nature with ethics at the point where we approach closest to the brute, and if we are to recognize the means which God has furnished us to this end, we must take our start from a positively conceived norm. Accordingly, matrimony, hence, a concept that is social-ethical through and through, necessarily is the starting-point. In the matrimonial relationship which God has ordained, sexual morality is accorded its full right. Not until this social-ethical view-point is placed at the head of the discussion does it become manifest that when discussing sexual affairs we are not treating private matters, in which each may do as he likes, as long as he inflicts no harm on the common weal. (A. Forel.)

Dr. Wurster notes an objection that will not suffer itself to be hushed, *viz.*, that the position which Christianity, hence also the evangelical church, takes on the sexual question is a denial of nature (*Unnatur*) and at its very base untruth, because no one makes, nor can make, a serious effort to be governed by this position. He thinks it would not be possible to raise this objection if evangelical Christianity had eliminated from its ethics every vestige of Romanism. In his brochure *Proletariat und Volkskirche* ⁷⁾ (*The Proletariat and the People's Church*), which deserves to be read, Mennicke says on p. 13 ff. that the attitude which the Church assumes toward the sexual problem lacks clearness and is, in the last analysis, not in accord with the principles of Protestantism. Nine-tenths of the men, he claims, have considered this circumstance ample justification for separating from the Church, or at least for not feeling at home in it. Wurster thinks that Mennicke is certainly right if his remarks mean that the evangelical Church, by its view of the sexual relationship in matrimony, does not accord to nature, that is, to the divine order, its right. He regards it as a remnant of medieval thinking that has not yet been overcome to treat sexual intercourse in the state of matrimony as something of which a person really ought to be ashamed, and to regard sexual desire as in itself sinful. In this respect, Wurster holds, Luther has not quite emancipated himself from the influence of Augustine. For, alongside of his magnificent dictum, that sexual desire in matrimonial intercourse is *voluntatis et voluptatis, ut ita dicam, divinae* (a matter of divine will and delight, so to speak), there are found in his writings re-

7) Jena, Diedrichs, 1920.

marks that hark back to scholasticism, such as *frenum et medicina peccati* (a bridle and remedy for sin), and the statement: God connives at this act because of our need, since it cannot be otherwise. On this inclined plane rests the Puritanic standpoint: There must be procreation of children in matrimony; but let it take place, if possible, without sexual desire. This is an internally divided and untenable position. Tolstoy drew this line to the finish when he regarded the entire erotic sphere as something that really ought not to be. (True, he did not take this position until he was an old man.) Hence has arisen the problem how to reduce the society around the hearthstone as much as possible, and to restrict sexual intercourse simply to the rare act of intentional procreation.

At this point, Dr. Wurster thinks, we must speak a plain language. There is in sexual desire in matrimonial intercourse simply nothing that must be hushed or apologized for: it is the joy of creating, given to men by God, although the maxim applies to it: *Corruptio optimi pessima* (The worst corruption occurs when you corrupt that which is best). The normal condition in this matter is complete naiveness in receiving and giving, as it occurs among children. Dr. Wurster holds that Luther indeed went too far also in the other direction, when in the heat of controversy regarding celibacy he permitted the statement to slip from him which has been snatched up by modern libertinists, *viz.*, that outside of the married state it is impossible to preserve chastity. Here arises the immense ethical and economical problem of our day. If the case is as Luther states, there are nowadays thousands who for economic reasons cannot marry. This is an impossible position, unless naturalism is right after all. How about this? queries Dr. Wurster.

For these strictures upon Luther's position it is difficult to perceive the compelling reason and the critic's exact objective. Unless Dr. Wurster denies any effect of original sin on the married estate of fallen man, he is compelled to say, in a given connection, the same things that Luther said both in praise and in censure of sexual intercourse. In fact, he actually does say them, at least by implication. We cannot conceive it possible that, when Dr. Wurster says that sexual intercourse in itself is not sinful, he means to say that men are without sin in that act. If that were the case, we would have one situation in human life that is proof against devil and flesh. It is futile to argue with a purely metaphysical concept, such as sexual intercourse *per se*, aside from its unavoidable concomitants in the actors. This leads us nowhere. Besides, the appeal

to modern economic conditions must raise the further question of the rightfulness of those conditions. A wrong does not become right for the reason that it is the only act possible under the existing conditions. That economic conditions in the world offend against the laws of nature goes without saying. If persons cannot possibly marry and live in marriage as they should, the cause or causes that prevent them must be removed, and not some substitute of married life provided for them, for there is no substitute. One can with more sympathy view the error of Tolstoy than this undefinable criticism of Luther.

2. THE MORALITY OF DUTY VERSUS MODERN SEXUAL ETHICS.

The Christian standpoint on the relation of the sexes, as expressed in the New Testament, is without doubt very severe, thinks Dr. Wurster: it enjoins unconditional restriction of sexual intercourse to the monogamous relationship and, outside of that, radical abstinence. At this point, says Dr. Wurster, Christian ethics, together with the *morality of duty professed by idealism*, is in diametrical opposition to *modern social and individual ethics of sex*. What constitutes evangelical ethics in this domain is clearly expressed by *Fichte*. In his *System of Ethics* of 1798, as well as in his lectures on *Political Economy (Staatslehre; published 1813)*, we find it stated quite plainly that only on the presupposition of a complete union, designed to endure for life, can a virtuous woman surrender herself to a man; only when this purpose is understood, does the sexual act lose its degrading features. Accordingly, in chastity is "the destruction of honor in its very root, the casting away of all personal self-esteem." The regard for one's own personality as well as for that of one's partner, which is here expressed, is ultimately seen to be something metaphysical, and thus we arrive at an absolute foundation for the morality of sex. This fact is expressed in religious terms thus: in the reverence with which the divine ordinance of sex is regarded lie the roots of the Christian morality of sex.

New ethics, so called, view the matter in an entirely different way. In his *Sexuelle Frage (Sexual Question; published for the first time in 1904)* A. Forel has thoroughly applied this principle: Also in the sphere of sex just those things are moral which correspond to natural desire, and at the same time cause no harm to the common weal, but rather promise proportionately the greatest benefit. This, then, is the *social-eudaemonistic and, at the same*

time, naturalistic view. Intensification of happiness is the central idea in this ethical system. The relative character of this idea is manifest. For ever new experiments are required for discovering what really is happiness, and the means for obtaining it, moreover, can be selected only from the view-point of what is best and most readily accessible.

Dr. Wurster's reference to the New Testament teaching on monogamy is all too brief, and the appeal to Fichte does not remedy this defect. Even in the monogamous relation St. Paul insists on continence, to be practised by the married. This point should have been emphasized very much in view of other sexual aberrations prevalent in Germany and elsewhere that have to be noted later. — Severe? Yes, the New Testament norms of sexual purity are severe to the flesh, but they were not issued to please, but to bridle, subdue, and crucify the flesh. The modern opposition to these rules is not modern at all, but as old as the Old Adam, and Dr. Wurster himself will introduce a witness to show that modern sexual corruption is nothing but the stench rising from some classical graveyards which the God of history had mercifully buried, and which modern ethicists are reopening.

3. EUGENICS.

Dr. Wurster proceeds to point out that the moral view sketched in the foregoing "dominates at present the sexual ethics of non-Christian and antichristian circles. It has been developed in a grossly naturalistic form by the *advocates of eugenics*. Eugenics — the word and the theory for which it stands are English. The father of the theory is Francis Galton, who insisted on the importance of sexual selection, by which, as Chr. v. Ehrenfels in Prague says,⁸⁾ the men fit to live are to achieve greater quota in propagation." Hence it is not the great loss of men in the late war that led to this theory which, in the view of Ehrenfels, tends to plural marriage or "marriage for purposes of procreation" (*Zeugungsehe*), in which one man is to be the "free husband (*Freigatte*) of several women," and that, simultaneously. Other ways of stating the same matter are these: In the interest of racial hygiene those sickly and degenerates are to be debarred from procreation, while others, according to Forel, are to be admitted to bigamy or concubinage. In North America there is a movement to prevent sickly persons and degenerates from propagation by mechanical methods, and the aim is to reduce the inferior population from

8) In *Sexualethik (Sexual Ethics)*, 1907.

10 per cent. to 1 or 1.8 per cent. It is hoped that this state of affairs will have been attained in 1980, provided the system can be applied without a hitch, which is by no means the case. The method which is advocated among us has found an energetic champion in A. Forel, who heaps cruel scorn on those who question the moral character of this method, *viz.*, of employing means for preventing conception, which, as everybody knows, New Malthusianism has propagated a long time ago.

“Hans Blueher in his book, *Die Rolle der Erotik in der maennlichen Gesellschaft (The Part of Erotics in the Society of Men)*,⁹⁾ which will have to be discussed separately later, contends that monogamous relations terminate nearly always in unhappiness, because by this relation a man of some degree of sexual fitness (*ein irgendwie gehaltvoller Mann*) is prevented from giving his entire being to the woman, while he could ‘place the other side into the womb’ of another woman, if he had one besides his wife.” Dr. Wurster imagines that he can discern at least something akin to an ideal motive in talk like this. Lucky discerner! But he proceeds: “When among pure eugenists, you imagine yourself transferred to a stall of breeding studs. Destruction of marriage and an abominable hetaerocracy would be the self-evident results of this system.¹⁰⁾ The favored part assigned to the physically strong male in this system is absolutely nauseating.

“By the way, this system merely draws out to the last inference the oft-repeated thesis of Schopenhauer, who, on the ground of other physiological effects of sexual intercourse on the male and the female, asserted a polygamous disposition in men.” Dr. Wurster certainly is generous when he concludes this chapter by saying: “The truth contained in the thought of the advocates of eugenics is accorded its full right by the demand of the Society for Politics as Related to Population¹¹⁾ (R. Seeberg, President), that prior to his engagement every one should secure a clean bill of health, and the *fiancée* as well as her parents should demand the same.” If that is all the truth in eugenics, nobody need espouse the “science” to learn something that his common sense did not tell him before. But even this truth is not essential to eugenics. The advocates of the theory propose to operate, not by moral suasion, but by legal force;

9) 2 vols., 1917 and 1919.

10) In 1913 the American newspapers had accounts of Haeckel's eugenic breeding-farm near Jena.

11) Gesellschaft fuer Bevoelkerungspolitik.

and they propose to determine human fitness to live and thrive exclusively by pounds of flesh, compactness of tissue, adipose matter, etc. The eugenic paradise is a corral filled with Dempseys and Amazons.

4. ROMANTICISM AS AN ADVOCATE OF THE NEW ETHICS OF SEX.

In a most interesting chapter Dr. Wurster goes on to show that the seeds of sexual error were sown in Germany more than a hundred years ago, and are now flowering and bearing fruit in a frightful manner. In this connection we cross the path of the modern theological idol, Schleiermacher, who seems to be connected with nearly everything that modern scientific minds cherish as a great discovery. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Dr. Wurster says: "The new ethics appears in *idealistic* garb as far back as the Romanticism of an author like Fr. Schlegel, who published his *Lucinda* about 1800. Schleiermacher's confidential letters concerning the same personage — probably not his sole product — appeared in 1801. The basic thought in these literary products is: The claim which every individual has on complete happiness of life is superior to conventionalities. Recently this idea has been taken up again, chiefly by a feminist school. We may see in this woman's revenge, or her answer to the double standard of morals that had been proclaimed by men. If man, for whom a polygamous disposition is alleged, desires to have his full measure of sexual happiness, woman in her own way now desires the same. The champion of this claim is *Ellen Key*, the Swedish esthetician. In her *Essays ueber Liebe und Ehe* (*Essays on Love and Matrimony*; 16th edition, 1916) she develops her new ethics on the basis of the monistic faith concerning life as follows: Inasmuch as human beings are differently qualified, they must not all be hitched to the same matrimonial yoke. Christianity has to a certain extent liberated woman, but stops in its advance after finishing half its course. For Christianity puts upon women the fetter of monogamy, without considering whether the individual woman is fit for the monogamous relation or not. It must be conceded that there are ways for intensifying life, by which the sources of power in human nature can be unlocked, and the possibilities for happiness exhausted, in a different manner than in a conventionally enforced marriage (*Zwangsehe*), which may be satisfactory to many, but does not give enough to all. 'Any person who, because of a new love, feels that fountains which had gone dry are beginning to murmur again, that the sap is rising into branches which had become bare, that the creative powers of life are

being renewed in him, and who thus becomes more capable of high-minded and truthful, gentle and noble action, — any person who wins, not only intoxication, but also strength in his new life, — has the right to such an experience,'¹²⁾ that is, to free love. Accordingly, the state of motherhood is sacred also outside of the married relation, provided only that genuine love has led up to it." Dr. Wurster queries: "How will this esthetic theory of aristocrats look when it descends from the heights of romanticism and enters every-day life? The current talk in these circles is even now to the effect that the state of motherhood *as such*, motherhood *in every instance*, is sacred. To the young people in these circles a man like Forel preaches that they are fully entitled to sexual communion, provided only that they are prepared and able to provide for children that might possibly result, or that they prevent the procreation of children by the application of anticonceptual means, and thus place no burden on the community! Even *Grete Meisel-Hess*, who belongs to the moderate advocates of 'Mutterschutz' (Society for the Protection of Mothers), and in a general way defends the 'sacredness of matrimony,' has declared¹³⁾ that sexual abstinence prior to marriage cannot be regarded as a law, although she admits, indeed, that the right to sexual experience¹⁴⁾ exists only where 'persons meet on a basis of loyalty to one another and assume the consequences.'" (*l. c.*, p. 65.)

Dr. Wurster is again supergenerous in calling this unblushing license "an idealism that seems to take its rise in the spirit and is bound to end in the flesh." Fact is, it began there; it is altogether carnal, essentially whorish. Dr. Wurster continues: "Grete Meisel-Hess herself admits that the entire movement of the 'new ethics' since 1900 has been very fatal to the world of women, and that general sexual degeneracy and destruction of marriages could be observed in the epoch immediately preceding the war. And at such a time the brutalizing and disintegrating war had to occur! To such a generation of men even the moderate advocates of 'Mutter-

12) "Wer durch eine neue Liebe versiegte Quellen singen, den Saft in kahle Zweige steigen, die schaffenden Kraefte des Lebens sich erneuern fuehlt, wer dadurch faehiger zu Hochsinn und Wahrhaftigkeit, zu Milde und Edelmut wird, wer in seinem neuen Leben nicht nur Berausung, sondern auch Staerke gewinnt, . . . der hat das Recht zu diesem Erlebenis." (*Essays ueber Liebe und Ehe*, p. 41.)

13) In her book, written before the War, *Die Bedeutung der Monogamie* (*The Meaning of Monogamy*), 1917.

14) das Recht auf "Geschlechtserleben."

schutz' are speaking words like those just cited! The idea of 'sexual experience,' in conjunction with the easy prevention of conception, has proved, and is still proving, absolutely devastating. People are toying with sexual commerce, and forget that they are face to face with a sacred ordinance which nobody dare trample upon with impunity. What a painful reflection it is that the sound idea of the protection of illegitimate children and their mothers had to lead to this emancipation of the flesh!

"At this point the individualistic view of sexual conduct is visited upon its advocates with a fearful vengeance. Their failure to recognize the thoroughly social character of the sexual relationship leads, in its ulterior effects, to the most unnatural things, such as artificial prevention of conception, the education at public expense of children that were never welcomed or neglected in consequence of divorce. Bebel's wife even advocates the erection of public institutions for such children. Besides, there arise in this connection very serious problems with which sexual ethics and pastoral care have to wrestle. Not only the baffling problem of modern *Kultur*, especially in the cities, which is presented at this point by the question: How can we create a possibility for healthy marriages in early life? but also the problem of providing protection for women from an excess of maternal duties which undermine their health. In her book *Missbrauchte Frauenkraft (Misused Strength of Women)* Ellen Key raises the charge against the Lutheran Church that it, too, bestows its blessing on woman-murdering wedlock, because it defends in a one-sided manner the standpoint of the wife's duty toward her husband. She calls it an injustice to the wife and the coming generation to make the wife continue conceiving children, even when she is worn out and reluctant. Here serious tasks are proposed to the morality of men, and the pastor in his ministrations to the souls in his charge dare not pass them by. Yea, the question arises whether in certain instances, namely, whenever the husband is not sure that he can practise the necessary abstinence in wedlock anticonceptional means may not be employed, however, by the aid of a physician. Catholic casuistry meets such cases with an inexorable refusal. The question is whether that is right." [*Sic!*]

5. PROVISIONAL MARRIAGE.

"A second demand of the New Ethics is *provisional unions only*. This means, not only that marriage in general must be made easily soluble, but especially that the permanent marriage (*Dauer-*

che) should be preceded by a marriage on trial (*auf Probe*). The well-known utterance of Nietzsche is being cited: 'Give us a time of grace and a minor marriage, in order that we may see whether we are fit for the major marriage; it is a momentous matter to live always as twain.'¹⁵ If this statement were always cited in the serious meaning with which the influential philosopher of our time used to speak of marriage, the consequences would not be as critical as when these words are quoted in connection with the ideas of an Ellen Key. [*Sic!*] This woman demands that every marriage be made just as dissolvable as an engagement. [*Sic!*] She argues that a person who 'ceases to love' has the moral right to dissolve his marriage whenever he so desires. She holds that the introduction of free divorce — which, by the way, is called the conclusion to which Protestantism leads — will not be followed by more misuses than marriage which 'is misused for the indulgence of the coarsest sexual habits, for shameless trafficking, for soul-murders of the most painful sort, and for the grossest curtailments of personal liberty.' Thus there is added to the motive of saving love in marriage this other of protecting the wife in marriage.

"It is appalling how little appreciation there is in these modern circles for the profounder moral character of marriage. The reason is because the entire problem is conceived and determined from the esthetical-romantic view-point, not to say from the view-point of the novelist. How often does the flower of married happiness bloom in those very marriages which are visited with grievous afflictions to the health of the married twain, so that there can be little or no thought of the indulgence of sensual delights! Nor do our modern ethicists take into account the fact that even disappointments and self-denials are to be, and can be, educating forces of the highest value in our lives. Even Ellen Key admits that the new 'idealism' makes greater demands upon life, while its patience has become smaller! The feeling of responsibility prior to marriage and in marriage would be considerably lowered if we were to go as far as advocates of the feminist movement who are otherwise seriously disposed have gone, *viz.*, if divorce were made possible 'because of differences in the general view which the parties married take of the world (*Weltanschauung*), differences in their temperament and tastes. Is not this clamoring for happiness entirely supererogatory, especially in instances where there exists a common social-ethical

15) "Gebt uns eine Frist und kleine Ehe, dass wir zusehen, ob wir zur grossen Ehe taugen; es ist ein grosses Ding, immer zu zweien zu sein."

duty of the first order because of the children with which the marriage has been blessed? Even Ellen Key, who is not married, admits that on account of the children 'the utmost endeavor must be put forth to preserve the living together of the married.' (*l. c.*, p. 369.) And yet, people are toying with the idea of separation; yea, a provisional law has been suggested which would require of those wishing to marry no more than that they appear before the marriage-clerk and have their names recorded. The same law proposes to make divorce just as simple. Since each party to the marriage contract under this law retains his or her property in marriage, either party may take such property with him, or her, in the event of a divorce, and also the additional property acquired during marriage. The future law would have to be worded still more simply, thus: 'Those who love each other are man and wife.' May the day never come, not even in centuries, when such a crime is enacted! In this whole affair of idealism, so called, we are witnessing the same moral bankruptcy as in the sexual naturalism of men."

6. PAGANISM IN A MODERN EDITION.

"However, our picture will not be complete, unless we briefly sketch the pagan ideas which have been taken over from antiquity by *Hans Bluher* and his people. Bluher's book we have cited before. Sad to say, it is very much read in students' circles — perhaps it is just as popular in other circles, but with those I am not acquainted. Bluher preaches the return to Graccism (*Griechentum*). He argues that nature intended two kinds of women: besides the Penelope type there was to be also a Circe and Kalypso type; in other words, besides the housewife there was to be the hetaera — the latter differing essentially from the wench whose social level was far below hers. The common wench, Bluher holds, serves sexual purposes without any erotic sentiments, and should share the protection given to animals,¹⁶⁾ hence, should be protected against cruelty and exploitation, but in other respects should not be treated as a moral being.¹⁷⁾ We must at last get out of the misery of modern life, in which our civil marriage does not permit us to get out of woman what we might, and the hetaera has been

16) "sei unter den Tierschutz zu stellen."

17) Bluher says that trying to save this class of woman is "one of the foolhardy enterprises of moralism" ("eine der narrenhaften Unternehmungen des Moralismus"). (*l. c.*, II, p. 50.)

forced into exile.¹⁸⁾ Furthermore, Blueher holds that there are likewise two types of men: one was meant for woman, the other for men. There are, in Blueher's view, no pathological aspects in this second type, but two varieties of it must be distinguished: the *typus inversus*¹⁹⁾ proper, which is found either in a pure form as pederasty and love of men in the sexual sense, or in a composite form; and the secondary type, which is characterized by weakened procreative fellowship, and serves to explain the social instinct of men for men and, in particular, the Alliance of Men (*Maennerbund*). It is perfectly nauseating to observe how inverse — surely we might much more aptly call it perverse — sexuality is injected into every form of living in fellowship by Blueher's theory. He is constantly on the scent for the sexual element, just like Freud in his one-sidedly developed psychoanalysis, who also scented sexual motives everywhere. It is hardly possible that sexual ethics can sink to a lower level than in Blueher's book. We are told, moreover, that he applies in his own way to the sexual relationship the statement: Love is God, and that he announces that he is about to proclaim, also in his own meaning, the contrary statement likewise: God is Love. Thus we are facing in Blueher not only the most pronounced moral decadence, but the consummately frivolous contradiction to the Christian ethics of sex. Perhaps it is good that this contradiction is now expressed with such clearness."

7. UTILITARIAN STANDPOINTS.

"However, also regarding the utilitarian standpoints discussed before, the following must be said: If they maintain their ground, we shall witness another degradation of woman. If that happens, many a man will lose what has helped him to get out of a moral swamp — his hold on a pure wife. It is gratifying that even a man like Gruber speaks out emphatically against advertisements and recommendations of anticonceptual devices, because, he says, they are apt to smother the sense of shame and hold out the prospect of sinning with impunity. It is quite true what Marianne Weber has occasionally said regarding the entire sexual politics of modern times, understood in their wider meaning: 'Not in this way can we elevate a human being, that we take down the barriers which moral consciousness raises against wantonness, until any immature

18) Frensen in his novels popularized these ideas, teaching that men and women must "sich ausleben," that is, seek sexual commerce to the limit.

19) On this *typus inversus* read Rom. 1, 27.

person can vault over them. Concessions made to instincts (and in that sense to what is 'natural') have never yet raised the moral standard.²⁰ No other way leads to sexual purity and self-control, and to all the blessings accruing therefrom, than resolute discipline of the will; and this must be an affair that engages the *entire* man. During the war the question was frequently raised whether the Church was really right in treating sexual affairs as the matter of chief importance, as she did in her practical ministry. Some, *e. g.*, O. Baumgarten, discussed the question in a statement that attracted wide attention, and denied that sexual affairs were matters of primary importance. The truth of the matter is that we must distinguish between degrees [of the moral conflict along sexual lines]: the lowest stage is that naive attitude which approaches close to nature and the animal in these matters. With many persons this may, indeed, endure for a long time. The next stage is that of inward protest and battling. In this stage the crisis must occur. The third and final stage is either sinning against one's own better knowledge and intention even to the degree of becoming steeped in vice and losing the sense of shame, or victory. Agreeably to these stages, as we meet with them, we must formulate our judgments and arrange our pastoral treatment of each case."

During the concluding sections of Dr. Wurster's review we have purposely — except by the chapter-headings and the footnotes — striven not to interrupt his argument with critical remarks though the temptation was great at times. Our object was to let the presentation of the appalling immorality by this evidently well-informed scholar sink fully into the consciousness of the readers of this paper. It is a panorama of corruption so appalling as a whole and so repulsive in its details that we shall not add another word. Only the method which our authority employs for administering the needed criticism and rebuke deserves to be noted. He still discovers a grain of truth in the most virulent error, and not infrequently weakens his censure by the credit he bestows at the same time. By this method it would not be difficult to point out much that is true in what the devil has said. It is the "scientific" method that creates this excessive scrupulousness in dealing with an opponent. The "scientific" farmer — if there are such — would, we suppose, not remove a noxious weed without squaring his botanical conscience

20) "Zugestaendnisse an das Triebhafte (und insofern 'Naturliche') haben noch nie die Sittlichkeit gehoben."

to the fact that the weed is, *per se*, a plant, with roots, stem, leaves, etc., all of which are good *per se*, and that exhibits the wonderful phenomena of plant-life, which, again, is good *per se*. Altogether it is a pity that in removing the weed for its noxiousness you must destroy so much of scientific interest. There is too much deference shown by our authority to science and its famous representatives. Men like Schleiermacher and Nietzsche deserve to be denounced in scathing terms for their utterances on sex relationship. This rotten Germany deserves to be told by a John the Baptist or a Paul what the divine verdict on its shameless theories and practises is. It would seem to be the theologians' business to do that.

One thing, however, remains to be said in conclusion. What Dr. Wurster has stated with such candor and thoroughness is not a distinctly German evil. It is duplicated in every part of the modern civilized world. For the practises which he has described we have advocates on our American lecture platforms and in our American literature and the press. The moral fiber of our age is that of "this adulterous and sinful generation, of which the Son of Man shall be ashamed when He cometh in the glory of His Father with the holy angels." 21)
