

~~J. Z. Brown~~ C. L. Pugh
~~Bliss & Co. Boston~~

ANYTHING MORE, MY LORD ?

BY

LOIS WAISBROOKER.

Author of, "Helen Harlow's Vow," "Perfect Motherhood," "The Occult Forces of Sex," "The Fountain of Life, or The Threefold Power of Sex," and several other works.

PRICE TEN CENTS.

1895.

INDEPENDENT PUBLISHING COMPANY.
TOPEKA, KANSAS.

Labadie Collection.
St. Frank H. Warden. July. 1942
ANYTHING MORE, MY LORD?

BY

LOIS WAISBROOKER.

Author of "Helen Harlow's Vow," "Perfect Motherhood," "The Occult Forces of Sex," "The Fountain of Life, or The Thraeford Power of Sex," and several other works.

1895.

INDEPENDENT PUBLISHING COMPANY,
TOPEKA, KANSAS.

Prologue.

I sat thinking, pondering on the great problem of human needs and human rights, and the reader will say I fell asleep and dreamed. I will not dispute it, but I claim, that whether dream or vision, what I saw and heard has a meaning. Yes, I was thinking deeply when I heard a voice say: "Anything more, my lord?"

I turned to learn from whence the voice proceeded and I saw a man on one side of a broad street and a woman on the other. The man looked well and had every appearance of prosperity. The woman was pale, thin, poorly clothed, was surrounded by a group of children and one in her arms, while behind her was the poor little cottage that she called home. The man stood by a gate that opened into spacious and finely ornamented grounds in the midst of which was a magnificent mansion; his right hand was upon the fastening of the gate as though he feared it might be forced open; in his left hand he held almost the last penny the woman possessed which she had just paid him as rent upon her miserable cottage, but there was a dissatisfied look upon his face. "Too many children," he said, pointing to the group about her.

"Anything more, my lord?" she responded.

He did not reply, but turned, opened and walked through the gate, locking it behind him. Just here I was startled by hearing a real living voice say:

"There is one chapter in that book that has never been sent through the mails, the chapter on contracepts."

"Contracepts" I repeated to myself, as the parties speaking passed on. "Contracepts, that is something to use to

prevent having a large family, is what "my lord" would like so that his sensibilities might not be shocked by seeing hungry children from whose widowed mother he had taken her hard earnings in the form of rent," and again I seemed to see the woman with her group about her—to see the loving look with which she regarded them when told: "Too many children," and again I heard the words:

"Anything more, my lord?"

Something in the scene, the man with his wealth, the woman in her poverty, with her mother love, and the tone in which she asked the question: "Anything more, my lord?" as if she would have said: "Is there anything else that we must yield up for your sake"—all seemed to open up before me a vista, so to speak, of feeling, of soul-sense, in which I saw the importance of that relation through which the world is populated as I had never done before.

The prevailing idea that sex is only of the flesh became hateful to me as I beheld the possibilities of a divine blending of body, soul, and spirit in generating through the physical the life-forces which are to make "all things new," and then and there I resolved to show up, as far as in me lay, the iniquity of a system which would deny the wage slave even a natural sex relation lest he multiply too fast for the convenience of "my lords."

And now, dear reader, if you would get a glimpse of the enormity of the wrongs perpetrated upon the toiler by the natural action of our present property system, please follow carefully the train of thought you will find in the following pages, and when you have grasped the idea perhaps you too will say: "Anything more, my lord?"

ANYTHING MORE, MY LORD?

When one decides to do a thing the next step is to find material suited to the work in hand, and here comes something in the line I wish. The postman brings me a paper devoted to the sexual emancipation of woman. Yes, as our laws now stand woman is a sexual slave. Her person is the property of her husband if married, and if not married, she takes the prerogative into her own hands she is counted accursed. Among the toilers woman is the slave of a slave, is doubly a "bond woman."

But what is this—this flaming advertisement that is new to the columns of said paper? On looking it over, I find it in accord with: "Too many children." I will give it to the reader entire, as I shall have occasion to examine the different statements as I proceed.

EDEOLOGY.

A Treatise on Generative Life, Including Prenatal Influence, Limitation of Offspring, and Hygiene of the Generative System.

A Book for Every Man and Woman.

By Sydney Barrington Elliot, M. D.

"It is the Right of Every Child to Be Born Well."

"Vice has no friend like the prejudice that claims to be virtue."—LORD LYTTON.

"When the judgment is weak,
The prejudice is strong."—KANE OHARA.

[A few of the authorities quoted by the author.]

"Nothing will ever permanently offset pauperism while the present reckless increase of population continues." MRS. FAWCETT.

"Some means ought to be provided to prevent the birth of sickly children."—REV. M. J. SAVAGE.

"Thoughtful minds must acknowledge the great wrong done when children are begotten under adverse conditions. Women must learn the laws of life so as to protect themselves, and not be the means of bringing sin-cursed, diseased children into the world. *The remedy is in preventing conception, not in producing abortion.*"—DR. ALICE B. STOCKHAM, author of Tokology.

"Let us be under no illusions, then. So long as unlimited multiplication goes on, no social organization that has ever been devised, or is likely to be devised, no fiddle-faddling with the distribution of wealth, will deliver society from the tendency to be destroyed by the reproduction within itself, in its intensest form, of that struggle for existence the limitation of which is the object of society"—PROF. HUXLEY.

In his conclusion Dr. Elliot uses this strong, but doubtless true language.

"If one quarter the time, talent, and money which the civilized world now spends on courts, jails, penitentiaries, asylums, poor-houses, hospitals and reform schools were applied to producing only well born children, and to educate and train these, then all the former would soon be little needed. Men would be ready to arbitrate rather than to dispute, to reason rather than to quarrel, rob or murder: and furthermore, they would have the strength of character sufficient to resist baneful habits, and would be of such sound physique that they would not readily succumb to disease."

The above gives some truth mixed with much error, the truth being so given as to sugar-coat the error. That "every child has the right to be born well," no one will question unless destitute of moral sense.

The next two quotations are an apology for advocating contracepts, an indirect way of saying that only the prejudiced and the weak in judgment will oppose, and that in so doing they aid vice.

I would like to ask Mrs. Fawcett how other than reckless increase can be expected when the injustice and reckless extravagance of the ruling classes hold the serving classes to so low a plane of development. I would also like to ask the Rev. Mr. Savage if he does not know that to prevent the birth of sickly children gestating mothers must have good conditions, must be surrounded by healthy, happyfying influences. I know of no other way to compass so desirable an end, unless men are made eunuchs.

Where are the healthy, happyfying conditions of tenement houses, cellars, garrets and the unceasing struggle to raise the rent to keep from being turned into the street. Further, I would like to ask that editor if contracepts tend to the emancipation of woman from sex slavery.

The editor will say that it saves woman from being overburdened with children, and Mr. Savage and Dr. Elliot will most likely say that it is only among the garret, cellar, and tenement classes that contracepts should be used. But why lay all the responsibility of limiting the family upon woman? Why furnish her with preventatives which may not always

prove a success, thus leaving her anxious all the time. Why not authorize certain persons, men who shall be paid for their time from the taxes wrung from the products of the toil of these same classes, to make it a business to watch them and when there is danger of too great an increase, simply use the surgeon's knife upon the men? That would prove effectual.

Oh, it makes me sick! Contracepts and charity are both efforts to cover up the wrongs of our present economic system by trying to fit people to conditions instead of conditions to the people. It is a trimming down, instead of a developing up process, yet one can readily see that every paragraph in that advertisement has been selected with reference to the use of contracepts, and Dr. Elliot's concluding statement, as he applies it, is not true. We want no money, time, nor talent "*applied to the production*" of children, good or bad. What we need to do is to develop *ourselves*, to unfold and round out our own natures, to surround ourselves with all that tends to do this, and this not for the sake of children but because of the love of so doing, and we need to take no thought, to have no fear that our children will not follow the law of like producing like.

I have looked the book through and though finding nothing new, there is much that is very good; in deed only as it is perverted to sustain contracepts, but the chapter giving directions to women during pregnancy makes me think of what a dying woman said to her husband when a little out of her head. "Who is doing this dying, you or I, that you are crying

about it." I would like to ask Dr. Elliot who does this gestating, man or woman? Will men ever learn to mind their own business?

It is man's business, or should be, to furnish for woman the best possible conditions in which to do her work and then leave her to nature and her own soul. I have lived long enough to know that the result of much that the Dr. advises depends upon conditions which neither he nor any other *man* can regulate, and if not harmonizing with the woman's soul-love, the effect would be just the opposite of that wished for. We cannot direct the gestation of a child as we do the erection of a dwelling; there must be spontaneity.

The fatal defect of Dr. Elliot's book is that it recognizes only the physical in sex, thus shutting the door upon the only supply that can satisfy the now unmanageable sex hunger of the race. I feel like saying as I read: "It makes me tired." Yes, it tires me to feel obliged to take issue with the dear, earnest souls who are so anxious to remedy the evils they see; but I must, for they do not touch bottom causes. In the same paper that contains Dr. Elliot's advertisement I find the following from Annie Besant's "Law of Population."

"If this system of preventive checks was generally adopted, [that is, if the poor would raise no more children than are needed to serve the rich] how happy would be the result both to the home and the State. The root of poverty would be dug up, and pauperism would decline and at last vanish. Where now overcrowded hovels stand would then be comfortable houses; where now the large family starves in rags, the small family would then live on sufficient food, and be clad in decent raiment; education would replace ignorance, and self-reliance would supercede charity. Where the work-

house now frowns, the busy school would then smile, and forethought for the then valuable lives would diminish the dangers of factory and work-room. Prostitution would cease to flaunt in our streets, and the sacred home would be early built and joyously dwelt in; wedded love would enter the lists against vice, and, no longer the herald of want, would chase her counterfeit from our land. No longer would transmitted diseases poison our youth, nor premature death destroy our citizens. A full responsibility of life would open before each infant born into our nation, and there would be room, and love, and cherishing enough for each new comer. It remains for England to have all this if she will; but the first step upward towards that happier life will only be taken when parents resolutely determine to limit their family to their means, and stamp with moral disapprobation every married couple who selfishly over-crowd their home to the injury of the community of which they are a part."

"Anything more, my lord?"

What a gush of eloquence to spring from so small a basis! It seems to me however, to be more suited to the business of the auctioneer or the patent medicine vender than to so serious a question as that of controlling, or directing the creative force of the race.

That there are conditions where the prevention of conception seems advisable, I admit. Where there is danger of transmitting disease or deformity it would be well to say: "Love but do not have offspring," and yet, I have so much faith in the power of woman's higher nature, in freedom, to eliminate disease from the coming one, I question if when she awakes to that power, even such precaution will be needed.

I do not say that I would blame a woman for using preventives if she has no other way of escaping unwelcome motherhood, neither would I blame a woman for killing a man if it was the only way in which she could prevent a violation of her person, but these are emergency measures, not panaceas for great

evils. The general use of "checks" might possibly lessen prostitution outside of marriage, but it would tend to increase it on the inside, for with no fear of offspring man would make claims the more insistently. What Mrs. Besant says of wedded love under a "system of preventive checks" sounds strange beside the following just received: (Jan. 3d, —95.)

"I was converted when quite young and have tried to live a Christian life. I was married when a mere child, and compelled to suffer the torments of the damned sexually till I could stand no more. I have been kicked out of bed and out of doors in my night clothes and bare feet, in winter because I refused his demands upon me. I have now a divorce on the ground of extreme cruelty."

Again, I have only to step across the hall to see a woman less than fifty years of age who looks seventy and all from the same cause, sexual abuse. She too, finally left. It needs more than "preventive checks" for limiting the size of the family to straighten out the sex question in a way that will elevate the race above its present plane of poverty and servility.

And here too we find no recognition of the spiritual in sex—no recognition of the basic truth that sex in union generates all things, seen and unseen. A writer in the *Twentieth Century* says:

"Every well read Theosophist knows that SAT-AN, mispronounced SA-TAN, is really synonymous with YHVH the Hebrew unpronounceable name anglicized JEHOVAH, all of which words, in their genuine root meaning are nothing more or less than the procreative principle in nature, the ruling power on this earth, most beneficent in its highest use, most maleficent in its abuse."

And one of the greatest abuses that can be put upon it is the attempt to rule it out of the domain of spirit and intellect.

Mrs. Besant claims that a general limitation of the size of the family would dig up the root of poverty, and concludes her flash of moonshine with the assertion that, England may have all this if she will.

Ah, indeed. I have seen the statement that the annual income of England's aristocracy is \$700,000, 000. I have used this statement in public and have never yet heard it disputed. Not very far from the time that Mrs. Besant wrote of "checks" and digging up "poverty's root" lord Derby said of this same England:

— "Surely, it is better to have 35,000,000 of human beings leading useful and intelligent lives than 40,000,000 struggling for bare existence."

True, but \$700,000,000 divided among 5,000,000 people would give to each \$140, \$700 to a family of five, and mark—England's aristocracy does not produce one dollar of that vast sum. It is the result of the toil of the wage earning classes of whom the earl Pembroke, one of that same aristocracy, wrote:

— "I hold that both the poverty and the over-crowding that are such a blot upon our civilization, are mainly due to the continual and over-rapid increase of the population in the wage-earning class."

Now, permit me to ask, why not limit the income of lord Derby and the earl of Pembroke, and yet further, why did they not limit the family of the queen? The wage-earning class, in the last analysis, are the real supporters of the queen's children, must furnish marriage settlements and stated income. Again, if the earl of Pembroke, lord Derby, and others of England's aristocracy, feel so badly about the blot upon our civilization why not open up their great shooting parks

to cultivation? and the same can be said of vacant land in this country, where dogs wear diamonds and children starve to death.

No, no, that will never do! Not one of their stolen privileges will they yield, but in order to prevent results that disturb their ease they would deprive us of even a natural love relation. How much more, oh ye representative gods, will ye demand of us! Must we lay our very souls at your feet! That is what we do when we yield our sex life to your direction.

"Anything more, my lord?"

There is a natural way to rise out of the physical into the intellectual and spiritually propagative, but you make that natural way impossible to the toiling masses and then demand that we immolate ourselves for *your* sakes, trying all the time to make us believe it is for our own sakes, and as to the "root of poverty" there is more than a glimpse of it in the following lines.

A son is born to the Duchess of York
Sing hey for an heir to the throne!
Light up the village, the palace illumine,
From tower to foundation stone,
Nobles and gentlemen, swing your hats,
Let your children with bonfires sport,
And brown faced peasantry, bend to your toil,
Here's another drone to support.

A son was born to the digger of coal,
Sing hey for an heir to the mine!
But light no candles of perfumed wax
And ask no guests to dine.
The father is sick and out of work,
The cupboard is well nigh bare;
The trembling mother is sinking
Beneath her load of care.

ANYTHING MORE,

A son was born to the farmer's home,
 Sing hey for an heir to toil!
 But for rejoicing naught can be spared
 From the grains and fruits of the soil.
 Before the baby can have a cloak
 To keep him snug and warm,
 The mortgage must be satisfied
 To secure the hold on the farm.

A son is born to the millionaire,
 Sing hey for an heir of gold!
 This tiny atom of rosy flesh
 Will inherit wealth untold.
 Hundreds of drooping factory girls
 Will spin their lives away,
 In order to pay for this lordling's wine,
 His feasts and his vain display.

If dressed the same you would not know
 Those tiny babes apart,
 The duchess might clasp the miner's child
 In ignorance to her heart.
 Yet not as equals can they stand
 On Earth's tyrant-burdened soil,
 For one heirs millions, one a throne;
 'The others heir sorrow and toil.

Has not the miner's wife as good a right to be a mother as the wife of the millionaire? Certainly she has, and a moral right to enough of the world's wealth to make her comfortable as a mother, but after having robbed her of this right, it is now proposed that it be made the basis of still further robbery. When woman's place and work, together with the higher uses of sex come to be rightly understood no prospective mother will lack any possible comfort. And there is hope, for we are beginning to reach toward the soul of things and can hardly stop till we get some insight into the nature of our own souls.

The quotation from the *Twentieth Century* tells what Theosophists know of the terms used to signify

God and devil, that they really mean the orderly and disorderly manifestations of the procreative principle in nature, and an eastern physician of note calls sex the all-pervading God-power. Prof. Elliot Coues, a student of Oriental literature, says of sex magnetism: "It is largely concerned in what in the West is called mesmerism' and in the East magic." He also declares mesmeric force to be simply sex-magnetism; again, he calls it psychic force. This is the point to be reached. Psychic pertains to soul; psychic force is soul-force, and if it can be shown that sex-life is connected with soul-life we can readily understand that an unnatural sex relation, no matter how harmless it may seem, is necessarily detrimental to our highest good.

Perhaps it will be well to explain here in what sense the word, soul, is used as there seems to be a misconception of the relative position of soul and spirit in the human economy.

As I understand our threefold nature, soul is the connecting link between body and spirit, between the I Am, the Selfhood and the external world of which our bodies are a part. It is the astral body, the double that has so often been seen, a finer body the exact counterpart of the outer, the tangible body. This astral body, in its weakness or strength, becomes the measure of our personal power. If we are born with a weak soul we grow up subject to others *unless* we can learn how to increase its health and strength. The spirit, the, I Am, cannot be weak or sick in and of itself, but in acting through a weak or distorted soul the body suffers from the efforts made to readjust, harmonize the soul-life, and if such re-adjustment cannot be effected the body dies.

But can we harmonize and strengthen the son? Can we increase the capability of this psychic, this astral body to receive and transmit the power of the, I Am, to the attainment of life's objects, and if so where is the limit of our power? Sex holds a regenerating as well as a generating force, and the former lies in the union of souls, of astral as well as physical bodies in the sex act. The aura thus eliminated becomes a mutually renewing soul-force making us better able to do the will of the God within. When this law comes into action; when the life of sex goes to build up this body of the Spirit—of the I Am, the power to propagate physical bodies will cease naturally, not from loss of virility, but because it has been transmuted into regenerative life.

Now when we must give our time as the slaves of toil and then are asked to forego natural sex relations lest we multiply too fast for the convenience of our masters, we are asked to use up our very souls in the service of the powers that be. I am aware that these are strong statements but I challenge heaven and earth to disprove them, and rest my case upon the experience and confirmation of coming generations.

It is said that the soul cannot die. I question the statement. That the spirit, the selfhood is deathless I feel assured, but the outer body dies and why may not the astral body become disintegrated? and further, has it not been the fate of millions of earth's slaves? Our ancient scriptures speak of the death of the soul but not of the spirit, and saving the soul may mean a very different thing from what has been supposed. [But I must not dwell here for I can only

hint at possibilities, but I hope before I am through to make the idea clear to such thinkers as realize that they have a soul. Of course the Materialist will see no basis for my reasoning. The following, taken from the 41st page of "The "Occult Forces of Sex," is in line with the subject in hand.

"Time was when fruitfulness was counted a glory and efforts to prevent conception unheard of. What is the meaning of this change? A false system of civilization, human depravity, and the like, may be accused as the inciting causes but is there not a something deeper still? Does it not indicate that there is a path out of the propagative sphere failing to find which, mankind are trying to make one, and does not this path lie through the refining, spiritualizing influences coming from the recognition of the spiritual in sex, and is not this the reason that human beings hold sex relations other than for offspring? Why should the human female desire this relation when propagation is impossible? Is Nature so false to herself that she prompts to acts that have no use? Not so: if we teach our children that physical propagation is but the vestibule of sex use—if we can bring them to recognize this spiritual law—they will refine so fast during the first few years of married life, that after the birth of one, two or three children reproduction will cease, but the office of sex will continue by being promoted to mental and spiritual uses. the propagative life going to fructify these, not by passing directly to the brain but from the magnetic exchange coming from the life battery through sex commerce.

The above was written some sixteen years ago, and I now see this law of growth even more clearly than then, while mental science, occultism, and kindred subjects are coming to the front confirming more fully the idea that the quality of life-force we take in from day to day is decided by the brain organs called into action in connection with what we do and are.

In Dr. Elliot's book, Edeology, while pleading for the use of "preventive checks" he says: "Men will

have sexual intercourse" I am glad of it. No, I am not glad of the present ignorant methods, but a living Devil is better than a dead God. Irregular action is better than no action; where there is action there is life, and where there is life there is hope.

As sex is the fountain of all life, and as a necessary sequence, of all power, a full and right action of sex brings a fullness of life, while its wrong action brings discord, suffering to the *individual* and those immediately connected, but the element set free, the indestructible life-viril is not lost to the race, but goes out as a real, human force, vitalizing the atmosphere till it becomes distinctly humanized. Non-action would give out no such life-force. Only vegetable and animal creative viril would pervade the atmosphere, thus tending to drag us backward in the scale of being, consequently, while misdirected sex life is evil (the devil] to the individual, it still tends to give the race a higher grade of life than if not used at all. So, I still say I would rather have a living Devil than a dead God.

Yes, men will have sexual intercourse, and if our thinkers would try to find out what this persistence means there would soon be such progress that they would know how to satisfy the soul starvation that is now often a torture. When that time comes, as come it will, man will never claim—demand by right of marriage or in any other way, a woman's person. If she does not thrill in response to his touch he will as soon think of drinking salt water to quench thirst as to attempt satisfaction. He will know that only in mutuality can love's blessing be his.

The elements of all growth inhere in sex. Yes, *all* growth. That which does not inhere in the germ cannot be unfolded in vegetable, animal or human, and mark—the quality of the germ can be improved only under improved conditions. From the crudest form of life up to the present, every step in the spiral stairway of progress has been through the action and inter-action of sex, thus giving finer, higher results. All partial, imperfect expressions of sex life must of course give partial, imperfect results on the plane of soul as well as in the physical, thus checking this refining, evolving process. Whatever prevents the full magnetic flow of love's eucharist or the full benefit of this current in the restful quiet that should ensue, prevents that full blending of psychic life which tends to evolve positive power on the soul plane, and there is no "check" but is a preventive in this higher sense as well as in the other.

Professor Huxley talks of the tendency to the destruction of society from unlimited multiplication. If our professors of science would note the reproductive law of the human as closely as they do that of the vegetable and merely animal, they would ere this have used the fact that the lower the grade of development the more prolific, to demand better conditions for the masses. Had they studied the law of sex in connection with the action of the brain and soul powers upon the quality of the progeny they would have found the true law of growth to be such respect for sex as will call into action the highest, noblest attributes we possess, thus organizing this best of ourselves

in our children. By so doing we not only produce a higher grade of life in them, a grade with less tendency to prolificness, but we so refine ourselves that we grow out of the prolific plane by the time we have a reasonable sized family.

Such is the law through which nature prevents excessive propagation. gives us fewer and better children, but there are many false ideas on this subject which need noticing here. It has been thought that there could be no conception without sex desire on the mother's part. This is far from being true. It has been thought that those who bore the most children had the most passion, but facts show the reverse to be true.

Men, in their ignorance, and the idea of their right to the wife's person, have not sought to awaken a response to their desire but have claimed the right to satiate their passion, not knowing that an unresponsive woman can give them no compensation; not knowing that they are robbing themselves, wasting their own forces. As I heard a woman say nearly twenty years ago when speaking of her own experience, they (the wives) are given no chance to want.

It has also been supposed that the more moral and spiritual the less sex feeling. There may be, is less frequency of demand for expression but there is more intensity, and more suffering if not satisfied, but an intense woman does not have a large family. This intensity is of the soul and calls for soul love. A woman wants more than passion; she wants to caress and be caressed without having the demands of passion

thrust upon her. If she can do this, if she can caress the object of her love and he returns her caresses and waits till the full tide of her life is aroused, then, if a child results, it will be of a higher order than one born of mere passion; but, under such conditions, the blending is more likely to result in a mutual blessing to the pair than offspring, the more so if the woman has passed the first flush of youth. Only in such mutual blending can sex union give that which will satisfy instead of intensifying man's sex hunger, and at such a time, to have the mind diverted by the idea of contracepts is an outrage to the soul of woman.

Now, I would ask, what conditions have the toiling millions for carrying out such an ideal, of availing themselves of nature's contracepts through this law of growth? In the first place they are not educated to see the wisdom of such a course. Then, the man must give the forces of his whole being to his task-master, must make his employer's interest his own or he does not give satisfaction, he goes home exhausted, hungry for more than food, and his avenues of supply are sex, then sleep. No preparation, but a hasty draught from what should be to him the fountain of life; depletion because not met with life's tidal wave from his poor, tired companion, sleep, and then another day's toil. No wonder he grows old, haggard, repulsive, seeks tobacco, whiskey, etc., to try to allay the gnawing soul hunger which only natural, mutual love in its fullness of expression through body, soul and spirit can satisfy. And the wife is held to the plane of fear, dread lest she must again carry another unwelcome life beneath her heart.

Fear hath torment, and that which she fears is very likely to come upon her unless she knows of some unnatural way of prevention or resorts to the methods of abortion of which she can avail herself, and with such danger to health and life that her children are very likely to be left motherless while another, generally a younger woman, takes her place. As Dr. Elliot says, men will have intercourse, and the poor man's only available resource is marriage; marriage that is not such in any true sense of the word, but simply a convenience. Yes;

"Thoughtful minds must acknowledge the great wrong done when children are begotten under adverse conditions."

True, and I am not surprised that Dr. Stockham should prefer prevention to abortion, for the former seems the least of the two evils, but I am sorry that a mind like hers should stop at emergency measures instead of rising to the plane of causes and seeking to remove the necessity for either. Yes, it will take time, and a great deal of growth to reach so desirable an end, but the more need that we commence working to that end by demanding such changes in our economic system as will secure to the toiler the conditions for growth, and the first step toward it is to make the toilers themselves see the extent of the robbery that is being practiced upon them.

This is the more difficult because sex has been so degraded, so abused that it needs a great deal of illustration before people can realize its wondrous power under right conditions, and intelligent use.


We, in our selfhood, are a part of the infinite life, and as such, we inherit infinite possibilities. As an earnest of such possibilities, we find that if we *obey* a law of nature we thus *command* it. If we understand mechanical law, have the conditions, and *obey* the law involved, we *command* the result in the construction of the machine desired. But we must understand before we can obey. If we *obey* the law involved in any mathematical or geometrical problem or as connected with any principle of philosophy, we in turn *command* a solution. Nothing can prevent it, but here as elsewhere, we must understand ere we can obey. Following out this known law, we are justified in saying that there is no conceivable result that we may not command if we can once grasp the law that governs, and secure the conditions for its application.

Keeping these axioms in mind, for they are axioms, let us go back to the question of the possibilities of sex in its yet unrecognized, or but slightly recognized uses.

For what have the great cities been built? For the products of the sex act. For what are all our schools and colleges founded? For the results of sex in union. Sex is the fountain of all life, of all states and grades of life. Is not this statement true? Can there be one thing found that manifests the slightest degree of life that is not the product of sex, that has not sprung from that wonderful fountain? It follows then, as before said, as a logical sequence, that it is the source through which all power which is or can be made manifest, at least in this state of existence. If

then, all we have and are is rooted in sex, it follows of necessity that all we can ever hope to be must be rooted in sex.

This sentence needs repeating for it contains a volume of meaning.

 If then, all we have and are is rooted in sex, it follows of necessity that all we can ever hope to be must be rooted in sex.

We may cultivate our brains, we may unfold our mental powers, we may send out our aspirations beyond what has been true of any previous age, but the ability to do this entered this life through the doorway of sex; and our increased powers, the talents we are cultivating can become organic, can become the basis of a higher development in the next generation—only—through the law of sex.

True, all these possibilities inhere in the human spirit, but we possess only negatively that which was negative, unrecognized in the act which started us on our journey through this life. That is, such unrecognized factors cannot be brought out in our lives except through mental and physical suffering.

We have now come to a very important point in the argument. The prevailing idea of sex is that it is of the flesh only, a fleshly lust which may be indulged under certain conditions, but to be pure in the highest sense of the word, we should repudiate, overcome sex? Just think once of an austere celibate who has crucified nature, being considered purer than a mother with her babe! What possible insult is there that has not been heaped upon woman? There is one text

of scripture to which the Christian world would do well to take heed in connection with sex.

"He that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; he that soweth to the spirit, shall of the spirit reap life everlasting."

I fully believe it. I see the truth thereof in the law of sex, and all who believe that sex is only of the flesh, sow to the flesh in the propagative act, and but for the mother love inherent in woman there would be small hope for the race. That love touches, as it were, the hem of the garment of spirit, and thus gathers somewhat, yet not enough to be the body's preservative, and so we die; of the flesh we reap corruption. The truth of that part of the text is everywhere apparent, and why will not its correlative become true also, when we have fulfilled the conditions and given spirit time to do its work?

As it now is, sex is generally regarded as simply of the flesh and only physical gratification is sought. The result is, much of the growth of one generation is lost to the next because thus held to the plane of that from which the parents started instead of from that of the added development. I hope, dear reader, you begin to understand that there is a good and sufficient reason for opposing "preventive checks," or contracepts. In entering into that relation with the deliberate intent of preventing what might be a natural result, the highest and best of ourselves cannot be called into action, even if mutual, so I again say that those who, through the action of a false economic system, control the world's wealth, are not only demand

ing the full physical powers of the wage-slaves, but their very soul life.

"Anything more, my lord?"

Mrs. Besant speaking from "my lord's stand point, says the first step will be taken toward that happier time of which she prophecies:

When parents resolutely determine to limit their family to their means, and to stamp with moral disapprobation every married couple who selfishly over-crowd their home to the injury of the community of which they are a part.

No protest against the accumulations of the rich at the expense of the poor, no recognition of the fact that were justice done them the people would not be poor, no recognition of the fact that a chance for the higher, broader development of the whole nature and there would be no need for "preventive checks" for Nature herself would give fewer and better children, while the recognition of spirit acting in and through sex would eventually purify from all uncleanness and overcome all disease, for it is "spirit that giveth life."

No, this grand law of growth is ignored. The toiler is given no hope only as he adapts himself to the convenience of those who live upon the results of his toil. He and his must perforce shrink themselves into yet narrower compass to make way for their expand-power—no, no, there must not be too many of you, oh ye who are robbed of your inheritance, lest you overcome them by sheer force of numbers—only as many as they can conveniently use, and manage, all beyond that are "too many children."

"Stamp with moral disapprobation" those who have more children than a robbed and blinded commu-

nity think they ought to have! Oh, that I had the language to tell you how that sentence makes me feel! Oh, that I could paint the horribleness of it as I can feel and see it! Could I do this so that a sufficient number could understand, no more would be said of contracepts, but there would be such an uprising of the people against whatever stands in the way of the best conditions for motherhood that those who control the wealth of the world would think the judgment day had indeed come.

Are we a set of cowards that we do not speak out against such terrible wrongs, or are we so accustomed to look at things from "my lord's standpoint that they are not seen to be wrongs?

"I don't see where the wrong of it comes in" says one, "I am sure that many women would be glad to have less family."

Very true, but if the family is limited by unnatural methods till there are only as many toilers as the "my lords" desire, *you, as a class, will never rise above a condition of serfdom.* Now and then an individual may climb out, but that will not make void the stern decree of evolution: *grow, or die.* That is the position the working people of the United States now occupy, and the life of this Republic depends upon the course they take. Will they be able to grasp the situation, to secure justice for themselves and children, or must this hope of the nations go out in darkness? If so, it will be thick darkness.

True, as things now are many women are overburdened with children, but the question to be settled

is, shall the "my lords" always receive the products of toil, or will the producers demand and obtain what is rightly theirs? Give labor its own and secure the conditions for growth and the life will expand, the selfhood be built up till there will be no need for preventive checks for burdensome prolificness, for Nature, true to her higher law of development, will diminish in numbers as she adds in quality. Nature's contracepts aid spiritual growth by transmuting creative power into renewing life, soul life.

But the question is asked: "If there is a truth in what you say, why has not this been done before?"

It has in a measure. How many have realized the love-life to be health, strength, power, but they have never thought why. We must sow the seed in prepared soil and watch that it is not choked with weeds if we expect a harvest. Thought, belief, faith is the seed from which the harvest of human deeds, human soul growth must come. We never try to do ~~or~~ get a thing till we believe we have the power to do or to obtain. The idea that sex has other use than pleasure or children is new: it is not time yet for the harvest. Minds are not even prepared in which to sow the seed of thought for any other result. It may be well to give here some extracts from

THE OCCULT FORCES OF SEX.

Thought in the human, acts both upon the voluntary and the involuntary functions, and we as living bodies take on and throw off continually. We must do this or cease to live. But suppose that which we take on each day is of a poorer quality than that which we throw off, how long would it be before we should become so coarse, so gross we should hardly know ourselves?

Some people grow repulsively coarse from year to year, and it is from the action of invisible essences. *Our thoughts* help to refine or deteriorate the body through the involuntary attracting power which draws from the elements about us *just that which corresponds with the thought itself.* The sexized secretions of the human body are its concentrated oils, so to speak; they take a large quantity of the crude material from both body and brain that, when thus separated, must be replaced, *and the idea we have of the sex act decides the character of that which takes its place.* Such estimate, if low, coarse, gross, draws that which is like unto itself just as truly as anything else brings forth after its kind. The process is repeated: more sexized matter is separated from the general circulation, and its place must again be supplied, and thus year after year does sex life drag the man down, and all because he thinks it merely of the flesh—counts it animal and low at that. Can we wonder that we find disgusting, detestable old men in society, or that women sometimes grow repulsive, acrid, haggish?

Indeed, we cannot. The prevailing idea of sex would drag a race of angels down from their high estate were they accepted and lived from. But the thought is born that sex can be a refiner, a purifying instead of a consuming fire, and in time that thought will bear rich and abundant fruit. We will now look at another side of the picture.

On the other hand, let us take an old man whose vigorous constitution has carried him to four score years, and who has never had a low thought of sex, one who has used that function without abusing it, and you will find that his skin is pure and sweet, his eye clear and his form attractive; his presence will be a benediction, while we instinctively bless him in return. His thought of sex has made it a purifier, a refiner, while the low thought of the other has made him so repulsive that the earth fairly spurns his decaying carcass.

Suppose this sweet, pure old man has a companion like unto himself, and that, as their sex commerce grows purer, sweeter, there comes a time when there ceases to be waste, the relation only quickening, revivifying each the other even till they commence anew the cycle of life, their bodies grow-

ing young again till all the freshness of life's morning is added to the rich old age we have pictured. What more could be asked of heaven itself? If the blossom is a prophecy of fruit; if the thought is a pledge of future realization, somewhere along the track of the ages will come this immortal fruitage of human desire, and each step leading thereto rests upon sex as its basis.

So far, injustice to the toiler's has been spoken of only in reference to its effect upon this life, but what of another? If we go there as intelligent beings we have a right to expect that the laws of mind are the same there as here. I once heard the remark made of a student: "He can't live long and what good can an education do him?" "It is all he can take with him," was the reply. I often think of that reply as I look at the masses and wonder what they can take with them.

That saying of Jesus: "Blessed are the poor in spirit," may have been true as the meaning of the words was then understood, but as understood to-day they are entirely false. Gerald Massey, the English poet whose sweet songs are sung the world over, says of that text:

"'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' Do you call the teachings of that saying divine? I think it would be false and fraudulent if uttered by a voice from the Infinite with all heaven for its mouth-piece. The poor in spirit (soul) are the accursed, the outcasts the pariahs of the earth; those who sink into the squalor, and crawl in the filthy dens of poverty to become the natural victims of all its parasites of prey. The poor in spirit are prematurely old men, weary, worn out women, and wizened children, all bleaching into a ghastly white in the chilling shadow of daily want.

The poor in spirit are those who crouch and offer their backs to the whip, who remain bowed just as they were bent and allow their hands to be fettered and held fast in the attitude of prayer, when they ought to be up and striking—they who are content to crawl like caterpillars, and be trodden like caterpillars underfoot.

Poverty of spirit is the very devil; the source of half the evil extant; most of the evils of human nature may be traced to poverty of spirit. It dwarfs the mental stature of men, makes them creep and crawl for a little gain, or go down on all fours in the dirt, like beasts in human form, from lack of spirit to stand erect! The poor in spirit dare not think for themselves or utter what they think! They only wonder what other people will think.

"In this world of struggle, this scene of the survival of the fittest, the poor in spirit stand no chance, and find no place; there is no victory for those who fight no battle. And as to heaven—do you really think it is a harbor for the sea-sneaks of earth? The poor and needy, the hungry and suffering, are not the blessed, and no assumption of divine authority on the part of the sayer will ever make them so.

So terrible an arraignment is seldom seen, and its strength lies in the truthfulness of the picture—in its perfect conformity to nature and common sense. It is simply nonsense to think for a moment that the degraded specimens of poverty and oppression of whom we see so many—men and women who are so poor in spirit they hardly seem to have one—it is absurd to think that such are ready for the beatitudes of heaven by simply passing through the gate of death under the hands of a priest. As well say that the ignorant beggar who knows not a letter, and has never seen the inside of a well furnished room is a fit inmate of the parlor because he can walk into, or is forced through the open door into the kitchen. Why, even the servants pity, or fear and shrink from him.

No, no, ye poverty stricken toilers! let not false promises of the future deceive you longer, but know that you are being robbed, not only of the good things of this life, but of all that can make that life desirable.

You may cry out against this, may say it is unjust, but that will not change nature's universal law,

and if you will stop and think about it you will see that it is a perfectly natural result. What would you think of a farmer who expected a good crop of wheat at harvest after having been robbed of the seed at the time of seeding?

Nature reiterates her decree, grow or die, and if you are to "poor in spirit" to grow, to rise out of your enslaved condition, then it is best that you die out—best that you use "checks" to propagation, except so far as it may be necessary to raise what servants "my lord" wants to wait upon, and produce wealth for him. Anything more, my lord?

The import of this sex question is too mighty—is of too much importance to the race to be exhausted in one little pamphlet. Those who feel interested enough to read further will find food for thought by sending for my other books on this subject.

"The Fountain of Life, or The Threefold Power of Sex," and "The Occult Forces of Sex," 50 cents each, and "A Sex Revolution," 25 cents. The three to one address for \$1. Send to

LOIS WAISBROOKER,

Topeka, Kansas.