

173

835934

Central Bureau Publications
Timely Topics No. XXV.

THE FAMILY

A SOCIAL AND ETHNOLOGIC STUDY

BY

ALBERT MUNTSCH, S. J.



CENTRAL BUREAU OF THE CENTRAL VEREIN

3335 Westminster Place

ST. LOUIS, MO.

1927

IMPRIMI POTEST

M. Germing, S. J.,

Praepositus Provincialis,
Provinciae Missourianae.

die 27a. Junii, 1927.

NIHIL OBSTAT

Joannes Rothensteiner,
Censor Librorum.

Sti. Ludovici, die 28. Junii, 1927.

IMPRIMATUR

† Joannes J. Glennon,

Archieppus Sti. Ludovici.

Sti. Ludovici, die 30. Junii, 1927.

FOREWORD

Much has been said and written of late about the importance of the family as the fundamental social unit and of the disruptive forces that are threatening its integrity. All social thinkers who have at heart the welfare of society deplore the disintegrating factors of an institution that has contributed so largely to social progress. It is not the object of the following pages to repeat the many arguments from history and ethics for maintaining the ideal of the true Christian family. Their purpose is rather to do away with the mischievous notion that the monogamous family ideal, ever maintained by the Church, is a product of slow evolution. The three chapters will also help to show that the Church in guarding the home and the family is safeguarding the foundation of social progress.

The questions and bibliography are primarily intended for teachers and will make the chapters suitable for classes in sociology.

THE FAMILY

A Social and Ethnologic Study

CHAPTER I.

SOCIAL ORIGINS IN THE LIGHT OF RECENT ETHNOLOGY

Like other sciences sociology has been enriched by the extensive explorations among uncivilized and primitive tribes during the last half century. The title of this paper indicates that we are to consider the beginnings of important social institutions and the spread of culture on the basis of data supplied by students of primitive society.

Text books on sociology are often full of errors because statements are based on preconceived opinions and not on the facts of ethnology and archæology. But it is now recognized by scholars that the days of theorizing about primitive culture are passed and that we must seek light on social origins by a patient examination of the culture, language and religion of still surviving primitive tribes. "Sociology", says a writer in the 'Dial' (July 18, 1918) "needs imperatively the discipline of anthropological fact." It will be the aim of this paper to inquire into the social institutions of primitive life in the light of modern ethnology, and not of a-priori speculation.¹⁾

1) To what extent a-priori speculation may vitiate both sociologic and anthropologic study has been abundantly shown in a recent report of research by B. Malinowski, published in "Supplement to Nature", No. 2936 (February 6, 1926). Malinowski's paper is entitled "Primitive Law and Order" and contains the following warning which ought to be heeded by students of social origins. "Since the facts of primitive law described in this article have been recorded in Melanesia, the classical area of 'communism' and 'promiscuity', of 'group-sentiment' and 'clan-solidarity,' of 'spontaneous obedience' and what not, the conclusions which we shall be able to draw—which will dispose of these catch-words and all they stand for—may be of special interest."

Ethnology is the science that treats of the manners, customs, culture and institutions of races, especially the so-called lower races. Its findings are of the utmost importance in a discussion of the structure and development of social institutions. Professor Lowie²⁾ has shown that recent investigations among primitive people have done away with mere speculations and have substituted facts for theories. The most important result of the new methods of ethnologic research is the rejection of the theory of cultural evolution. This theory took over from biology the idea of the gradual growth and perfection of organisms and tried to establish a series of links, a unilinear chain of progress from the lowest type of social culture to its full fruition in modern "civilization." The theory, to use a phrase of Lowie, belongs to the refuse-heap of anthropology.

Opponents of "Evolutionary Culture"

In fact, the new school of American anthropology, represented by Boas, Lowie, Kroeber, Wissler, Sapir, Swanton, Laufer and Goldenweiser rejects evolutionary schemes or patterns of culture and turns to an historic interpretation of early social institutions. Andrew Lang was one of the first scholars to break away from evolutionary shackles³⁾ in the interpretations of culture. Referring to the Australian aborigines, he says that "their speculative philosophy is, in one instance, ingenious, elaborate, and highly peculiar". Yet "evolutionists" often speak of the brute-like behavior of these primitives. Other English scholars who combat the evolutionary theory are W. J. Perry and W. H. R. Rivers.

The attack of this school upon evolutionary hypotheses of the spread of culture forms an interesting and curious chapter in the history of scientific thought. For time was—in the sixties and seventies of the last century—when it was triumphantly asserted that the evolutionary hypothesis, as announced by Darwin and applied by Herbert Spencer, was the only legitimate method for the study of all human

2) Primitive Society, N. Y., 1920.

3) Social Origins, 1903.

phenomena, and that it would prove the master key to solve all problems and questions of art, literature, politics, social life, and religion. But now this opinion, so stoutly maintained a little more than a half a century ago, is gradually being abandoned.

The Rev. Wm. Schmidt, one of the leaders of the new historical school of ethnology, speaks of "the turning away from evolutionism to the historical method in American ethnology." Dr. Berthold Laufer, Curator in the Asiatic Division of the Field Columbian Museum of Chicago, expresses his strong condemnation of "cultural evolution" in the following words: "The theory of cultural evolution, to my mind the most inane, sterile, and pernicious theory ever conceived in the history of science (a cheap toy for the amusement of big children)." (*American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. XX, 1918, p. 90).

The new historical school of ethnology has made most headway in Germany and Austria as is apparent from the following names—most of them of international note. Besides the editors of 'Anthropos', Rev. Wilhelm Schmidt, S. V. D., and Rev. Wilhelm Koppers, S. V. D., we find Fr. Graebner, professor of ethnology at Bonn University, B. Ankermann, director of the Museum of Ethnology at Berlin, W. Foy, director of the Museum of Ethnology at Cologne, O. Menghin, professor of prehistoric archæology at the University of Vienna, Dr. Krickeberg (Berlin), Dr. Krause (Leipzig), Dr. Lebzelter (Vienna), and many others. In England, the evolutionary theory of culture is now rejected by W. H. R. Rivers, the great authority on the Todas of India and on the tribes of Melanesia, by Eliot Smith, by Professor W. J. Perry, author of "The Children of the Sun: A Study in the Early History of Civilization," while the late Andrew Lang leant strongly in the same direction. The well-known Swedish explorer and scholar, E. Nordenskiöld, belongs to the same school. In America the anti-evolutionary school is gaining ground, some of its chief supporters being Dr. Lowie and Dr. Kroeber of the University of California, Dr. Cooper of the Catholic University of America, John R. Swanton of the Bureau of American Ethnology, Clark Wissler of the Ameri-

can Museum of Natural History, and Franz Boas of Columbia University.

Sociology Needs Anthropology

It is only when sociology breaks away from the "high-piling hypotheses" and the elaborate "stages of culture" of Spencer and L. H. Morgan that a scientific study of primitive society is possible. This has been well maintained by the writer of the article in the 'Dial', (July 18, 1918) who said:

"Today it is clear that sociological thinking would be made even more fruitful by employing the illuminations which anthropology provides in ever increasing abundance. Some scholar with the adequate background and training, together with the necessary literary skill, needs to do for anthropology precisely what Graham Wallas did for psychology—bring it into the open and put it to work. Sociology needs imperatively the discipline of anthropological fact. For with the war there has come recrudescence of the vicious kind of sociological speculation which the new training of sociologists in the psychology of behavior had to a certain extent destroyed. Most of this popular and flabby generalizing about "races" and "bloods" and "hostile groups"—such as we have par excellence in a writer like Houston Chamberlain—springs from down-right ignorance of the simplest validated truths of anthropology. For example, it is considered the shrewd and scholarly thing to say of Russia that her attempts at a sociological experiment of a totally new kind in the history of the world are "abortive." It is considered the correct reading of the theory of evolution, so respectable a theory that no one dare dispute it. It is assumed that nations must pass through successive stages from the simple to the complex. "How can Russia," these writers ask, "expect to jump from the eighteenth century to the twenty-second? Must she not pass through the mercantile, the industrial, the economic development which the more highly organized and more experienced democracies of the West have had to undergo? Must not the new grow out of the old? Would not any other development be mere caprice in what we know, scientifically, to be an orderly world?" The answer is that anthropology is

largely the history of just this type of caprice. There is nothing in the facts which it discloses to justify any of these questions. Given a fortunate start, the lucky instrument of a popular will which is determined that it shall be so, and there is nothing in the history of mankind to show that the Russian experiment is foredoomed to failure. On the contrary, anthropology would tend to make one optimistic about its chance for success. Examples of this kind might be multiplied. Especially needed is the corrective of scientific anthropological knowledge to those speculating about the natural differences between the various races at war—for here ignorance and unreason is the general rule. The 'Dial' hopes that such a type of book may speedily be written. The opportunity is great, the need imperative."

Too Much Unscientific Procedure

In no domain of sociology has there been such an amount of gratuitous assertion as in that which treats of the earlier forms of social institutions like the family, government, private property, language; that is, those institutions that are generally regarded as forms of cultural enrichment. Mr. Henry W. Henshaw, writing of the American Indians, says that "popular fallacies respecting them have been numerous and widespread."⁴) The same statement may be made about other primitive nations. For hasty travelers, sojourning a few days among a strange tribe, have heaped upon it all kinds of animal and "sub-human" traits. The latter carefully compiled and labeled, are then used to "prove" an "evolution of culture".

There are abundant examples of this unscientific procedure. The tale has often been repeated of the utter barrenness and paucity of resources of primitive speech. But Dr. Edward Sapir, in one of the latest contributions to the science of language, says: "Popular statements as to the extreme poverty of expression to which primitive languages are doomed are simply myths"⁵)

Dr. Malinowski in his afore-mentioned paper on "Prim-

4) Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico, Article "Popular Fallacies."

5) Language, N. Y., 1921.

itive Law and Order" has a section on "Melanesian economics and the theory of primitive communism," which concludes as follows: "Thus, in connection with the first object that attracted our attention—the native canoe—we are met by law, order, definite privileges, and a well-developed system of obligations." In a comment to Malinowski's article in the same journal (l. c. p. 204), we read: "...An observer, not necessarily superficial, may have found by unconscious selection among the multifarious activities of the daily life of a primitive people, very much what he set out to find. An apparently hasty conclusion has inevitably followed. Dr. Malinowski has attacked the problem by a new method and from a new point of view. He has taken certain concrete cases in primitive economics and social organizations and, by a searching analysis of the facts, shows that the conditions are such that no terms such as 'communism' or 'individualism' can be considered." If even men with the scientific acumen of the late W. H. R. Rivers were not altogether free from the tendency of finding things which they expected to "find" what can we expect from the hasty, unscientific, and prejudiced observer or traveler?

To the extent that the study of social origins freed itself from the theory of unilinear evolution, to that degree there was possible a better understanding of primitive social institutions. It is easy enough to construe elaborate series or stages of progress for any cultural acquisition, but quite a different thing to verify such series and stages by historic facts and data. Hence it was only when primitive culture was investigated by sound historic methods that rigid inference was substituted for mere speculation.

Dr. Graebner has shown⁶⁾ how the historic method, applied to the study of primitive life and civilization, can throw light upon the origin of social phenomena. He follows the path marked out by Dr. Bernheim in his famous "Lehrbuch der historischen Methode".⁷⁾ In a remarkably suggestive and well-documented investigation of the culture of Melanesia, the collection of island groups in the Pacific, whose inhabitants are related, he shows how a patient and syste-

6) Methode der Ethnologie. Heidelberg, 1911.

7) Leipzig, 1914.

matic study of the social organization and material and spiritual culture of different tribes, gives insight into their degree of relationship and the paths of their migration from a common center. He calls the type of culture he found among the people of Melanesia, and also to a large extent among the Polynesian group of islands, the "Bogenkultur" or "bow culture", from the practically universal use of a typical form of bow and arrow as weapons of war.

Arguments Refuting the Theory of "Cultural Evolution"

As this paper on social origins is based on the fact that the scientific and unprejudiced study of the history of culture cannot accept the theory of "cultural evolution" our duty will be to give the arguments refuting that theory.

One of the brilliant results of wide ethnologic research during the last half century was the supplying of a basis for the study of cultural relations between nations, and of the diffusion of culture. The trend of anthropology to-day is distinctly opposed to evolutionary schemes, and scholars are now seeking the rationale of human conduct by an intensive study of the history and culture of the various groups of mankind. "For the gathering of such data makes possible comparison, analysis, and interpretation useful in the study of fundamental social problems."⁸)

Now one of the new theories that has satisfied many of the keenest inquirers into the origin of social institutions is the so-called "Kulturkreis-theorie" (Culture-Cycle Theory), according to which human culture radiated in successive waves from definite centers which probably all lie in Asia. These sequences of culture are called culture-cycles or culture-complexes which here and there still remain intact, but more often have been overlaid by subsequent waves and become confused with them. The elements of each stream of culture must be determined and traced back to their point of departure. Each one of these streams of culture once formed a complete whole, each had its own forms of religion, mythology, social organization, primitive art, economic life, tools and weapons. The agreement in the possession of

8) Prof. Fay-Cooper Cole in *Journal of Applied Sociology*, IX (May—June, 1925).

many, unrelated items of material culture is regarded as a fact of special significance for their common origin.

This theory of the diffusion of culture has already been worked out for all parts of the globe. It is obvious that such an establishment of culture cycles is of immense value in a study of the history of cultural development. The inclusion of various cultural elements in compact groups or cycles is not based upon a priori "evolutionary" schemes, but upon careful examination of the data of culture. The only valid objection that may be brought at present against the theory of culture cycles is that an intensive study of all cultural data and contributions has not yet been made. But even though this be true, we have no good reason to reject the theory. As a working hypothesis it has already proved to be a splendid tool for students of social origins, while a number of facts have been fully established. One of these is that certain features of material culture invariably accompany definite acquisitions of a spiritual and social order. But if the coexistence of so many definite cultural acquisitions of both the material and the spiritual kind is only an external fact, and if their coexistence is to be seen in widely separate regions of the globe, it is impossible that such a large number of heterogeneous and unrelated cultural traits should be found together, in the same way, merely by chance. This constant association can only be accounted for by historic contact between the tribes of the respective localities, even though now they be widely separated one from the other. The various cultural traits must once have been organically united for the formation of the cultural life of a people residing in a definite locality, that is, they must have formed a definite and well marked culture cycle. The coalescence of these elements into a compact and organic whole became permanent because no item could be lost or neglected without interfering with an essential need; the coherence was maintained at different points to which the cycle was transferred by the migration of tribes.

Two Practical Rules

At least two practical rules, highly useful in a study of social origins, have been established by the historical

school of culture. First, a culture cycle, which in whatever part of the world it be found, seems to be the oldest, must actually be regarded as such. Second, a culture complex which breaks into or overlays another, did not arise at this place of division and contact.

But after these culture centres, and their limits, traits and types, together with an approximate time period to account for diffusion over a large area have been ascertained, the question of the development of the various elements of culture may be answered. Questions as to the primitive family, the development of the State, of religion, of economic and industrial life, are ready for solution. To answer these important problems of social origin we apply neither the ascending evolutionary theory nor that of deterioration. We have recourse only to facts which are ascertained by purely objective study.

But though this theory of cultural diffusion is accepted by many leading ethnologists it does not answer all the objections of defenders of cultural evolution. Let us, therefore, turn to a critical examination of the latter theory.

Many discussions of the origin of social institutions are vitiated and rendered scientifically worthless by the tendency to find ready explanations for similar customs among widely separated races by a principle that has been extensively used in biology, that is, by evolution.

Dr. Lowie accounts for this tendency. He says:

“When evolutionary principles, having gained general acceptance in biology, had begun to affect all philosophical thinking, it was natural to extend them to the sphere of social phenomena. Among the first to embark on this venture was Lewis H. Morgan, whose ethnographical treatise on the Iroquois had established his reputation as an accurate and sympathetic observer of primitive custom. Under the influence of evolutionary doctrines Morgan outlined a complete scheme for the development of human marriage. It was eminently characteristic of the intellectual atmosphere of the period that Morgan’s first stage should be a condition of perfect promiscuity. . . . Morgan made no pretense at producing empirical proof of pristine promiscuity. . . . He advanced promiscuity as a logical postulate precisely as some

evolutionary philosophers advance the axiom of spontaneous generation; and thereby placed it beyond the range of scientific discussion.”⁹⁾

Again, in his book “Culture and Ethnology,”¹⁰⁾ Dr. Lowie, discussing “The Determinants of Culture” (Chapter IV) says: “What are the determinants of culture? We have found that cultural traits may be transmitted from without and in so far are determined by the culture of an alien people. The extraordinary extent to which such diffusion has taken place proves that the actual development of a given culture does not conform to innate laws necessarily leading to definite results, such hypothetical laws being over-ridden by contact with foreign peoples. But even where a culture is of a relatively indigenous growth, comparison with other cultures suggests that one step does not necessarily lead to another, that an invention like the wheel or the domestication of an animal occurs in one place and does not occur in another. To the extent of such diversity we must abandon the quest for general formulæ of cultural evolution and recognize as the determinant of a phenomenon the unique course of its past history.... And as the engineer calls on the physicist for a knowledge of mechanical laws, so the social builder of the future who would seek to re-fashion the culture of his time and add to its cultural values will seek guidance from ethnology, the science of culture.” (Pages 95-97.)

Dr. Clark Wissler, of the American Museum of Natural History, defends “the historical conception of culture” as opposed to the evolutionary scheme.¹¹⁾ The “historical school” in ethnology and the science of man is gradually gaining wider recognition among students of primitive society. Under the caption “The Historical Conception of Culture” (page 352, l. c.) Dr. Wissler writes: “Sociology and Anthropology have sought to interpret culture as the mere expression of organic evolution, but such interpretations could not be made consistent with the data. Heredity did not appear to perpetuate the different forms of culture

9) “Primitive Society.”

10) New York, Douglas C. McMurtrie, 1917.

11) “The American Indian: An Introduction to the Anthropology of the New World,” N. Y., Douglas C. McMurtrie, 1917.

found in the world, nor could it in any way account for the cultural associations formed by the historical nations. A good illustration of this difficulty is found in language; everyone knows that a language is not inherited, for if such were the case, a person would speak French, Algonquin or Chinese according to his parentage, and not according to his first associates. Neither are shooting with bows or kindling fire with fire drills inherited. Yet such are the elements that constitute culture complexes. It appears, then, that the form and direction the development of culture takes is something of another sort from that followed by organic evolution, because the perpetuating mechanism is not the same. Further, the knowledge we now possess of culture prohibits any fundamental distinctions in this respect between, say, the Eskimo and the English, for in neither case is the particular form of culture perpetuated by direct inheritance. The phenomenon of English culture is made the subject matter of English history, but it is a fair assumption that the causes that operate in it are of the same general type as those that operate in Eskimoan culture. Hence, in dealing with problems of culture, we must take our points of regard from the historian because he deals with the phenomena where the approaches are most complete and direct. We assume, therefore, that the culture complex of the Eskimo grew up in the same manner as that of England and is, in other words, a historical fact. Both are conceived of as perpetuated and evolved by social mechanisms. On the other hand, the straight black hair of the New World native and the more specific cephalic character of the Eskimo are not facts of the same series and are perpetuated by a mechanism we call inheritance.

“It seems strange that these two series of facts should be continually confused to the extent of reading the interpretations arising from one directly into the structure of the other. In so far, then, as anthropology deals with culture, which is, after all, the only distinctly human phenomenon in the objective sense, it conceives of it as historical phenomena and this conception is in so far the soul of its method.”

In fact, modern ethnologic science, as represented by

Lowie, Wissler, Kroeber, and Laufer in America, and Schmidt, Koppers and Graebner in Europe, has done away with the antiquated notions and "high-piling" evolutionary hypotheses of L. H. Morgan and Herbert Spencer. Ethnology is now recognized as the only science that can furnish the data absolutely necessary for the earlier story of human progress. This fact seems to be ignored by many of the text-book makers. They are apparently unaware of the rapid progress that ethnologic research has made during the last forty years. There are ambitious chapters on "Social Evolution" in some of the text-books on sociology, in which the old theories of Spencer and Lubbock are handed down as if they still held good today. Some of these pedagogs seem not to know that the elaborate classifications of forms of human association in Morgan's "Ancient Society" are no longer held by anthropologists, that Spencer's "Principles of Sociology" is a "compilation based on materials collected by assistants," and propounds views which now "are ignored by ethnologists,"¹²⁾ and that the multitudinous data of Frazer's "The Golden Bough" may prove anything, and, as a matter of fact, have received most diverse interpretations at the hands of students of primitive culture and folklore.

Frazer's Fallacies

But the writer who has been chiefly responsible in recent years for the application of "evolutionary principles" to the study of social institutions like the family, the state, private property, etc., is Sir J. G. Frazer. The thirteen volumes of "The Golden Bough" and the three tomes of "Folklore in the Old Testament" have furnished material to those who are anxious for data in "proof" of cultural evolution. But though his data are interesting and have been collected from an immense field they will not serve the purpose of establishing cultural evolution.

For the fallacies of Frazer's methods in reaching his "conclusions" have often been pointed out by critics. By means of his methods almost any "conclusion" can be maintained. Frazer himself admits the weakness of his

12) "Source Book for Social Origins," by W. I. Thomas, Chicago, 1919.

position by the introduction of numerous qualifying phrases: "perhaps," "it may be the case," "it seems possible," etc. In this way, of course, many a hypothesis "may" be proved. but the question is, does the citation of multitudinous "examples" from the folk-lore of nations prove Frazer's contention that all law, all religion, all morality spring from primitive tribal customs and superstitious practices? Many first-rate authorities answer with a decided negative.

On the contrary, in spite of the apparently overwhelming testimony for the support of his thesis, Frazer bases far-reaching inferences upon an extremely weak scaffolding. For when his instances and "analogies" are critically examined, it will be seen that they are far from being proofs for his theories.

In spite of his reckless procedure in compiling his data to support a preconceived opinion, some writers of sociologic texts are well content to copy Frazer. They seem never to have learnt that the far-fetched analogies, the customs and tribal practices and primitive superstitions cited by the author with such remarkable facility to strengthen his case, are now admitted to bear more than one interpretation, and so turn out to be useless to bolster up a preconceived opinion like that of Frazer.

But Frazer had held the field so long that he has simply run wild in his mania for constructing theories on huge heaps of unrelated data, gathered from the vast literature of travel and exploration of the last two centuries. Andrew Lang succeeded in laying wide breaches in the system so elaborately constructed, and now, the two scholarly editors of 'Anthropos,' Fr. William Schmidt, S. V. D., and Fr. William Koppers, S. V. D., are gradually dismantling a building reared high, but lacking solid basis. Frazer is one of those anthropologists whom Professor G. W. Mitchell takes to task ('The Dial', Feb. 22, 1919, page 206) and who delight in "finding evolutions and ready explanations at will, and piling hypothesis on hypothesis, as if building high enough on a theory would convert it into fact."

Frazer himself admits that his findings are questionable. He says: "Hypotheses are necessarily but often temporary bridges built to connect isolated facts. If my light

bridges should sooner or later break down, I hope that my book may still have its utility and its interest as a repertory of facts."

Dr. Wilhelm Schmidt comments as follows on this admission: "It is, perhaps, this readiness of Mr. Frazer to give up his own theories, to swallow, like Kronos, his own children, that has contributed to the fact that if his works are universally appreciated as most valuable collections of facts, his theories have found relatively few adherents.

"As I have said, I wonder, and it is a psychological enigma to me, why Mr. Frazer, ready to give up so many theories, that he might be styled an absolute skeptic, is so enthusiastic in defending absolute truth in one determined direction? If Mr. Frazer himself has already so many times changed the direction of his guns, why should it not be possible to turn them also in a direction quite opposed to that in which he intended to direct them formerly?"

But the theory that cultural progress necessarily follows rigid lines and that one stage of social advance imperatively demands a definite antecedent, in other words, that there is a process of unilinear evolution, is now abandoned by all the larger ethnologists.

QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

CHAPTER I.

1. How has sociology been enriched during the last half century?
2. Of what does ethnology treat?
3. What is one of the important results of the study of primitive people?
4. Define culture from the viewpoint of anthropology.
5. What is the main idea of the historical school of the study of culture?
6. What accounts for the reckless application of evolutionary principles to the study of culture?
7. What is a serious objection to Frazer's use of data collected from many nations?
8. Have missionaries made any contributions to the science of ethnology?
9. What is the value of missions from the social and the scientific point of view?
10. Would you call the American Indians "primitive" in the same sense as races like the Pygmies of Africa or the Andaman Islanders?
11. Who has a better chance of coming to a closer understanding of the life of primitive people—the trader and explorer or the missionary? Why?
12. Read the articles on Fr. De Smedt, S. J., on Jesuit Relations, California Missions in the Catholic Encyclopedia, and tell what the missionaries have done to spread knowledge of Indian life.
13. Read some of the late numbers of a Catholic missionary journal and tell what missionaries in foreign lands are doing to record the remains of primitive culture and religion.
14. Collect facts from the books of Charles F. Lummis on the civilizing work of the Franciscan missionaries in Southwestern United States.
15. Give the story of the foundation and destruction of the Reductions of Paraguay.

SUPPLEMENTARY READINGS

CHAPTER I.

- Lowie, Robert. *Primitive Society*. New York, 1920. (One of the best books to help become acquainted with the attitude of the new school of American Anthropology. It offers the decisive refutation of the theory of cultural evolution.)
-*Culture and Ethnology*. New York, 1917. (Contains good explanations of the development and spread of culture.)
- Msgr. Le Roy. *La Religion des Primitifs*, translated by Rev. Newton Thompson. New York, 1920. (A scholarly work by a veteran missionary in the African field. It rejects many of the false impressions on African tribes spread abroad by hasty travelers. The book contains a brief introduction to the study of Comparative Religion.)
- Muntsch, S. J., Albert. *Evolution and Culture*. St. Louis, 1923. (Contains a summary of arguments against evolutionary theories on the development of culture.)
- Sapir, Edward. *Language. An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York, 1921. (Offers proof of the high development of "primitive" languages.)
- Wissler, Clark. *The American Indian*. New York, 1917. (Very valuable for a picture of the life and culture of the American Indian tribes. Incidentally the book offers arguments for the historical concept of culture growth as opposed to the evolutionary schemes.)
-*Man and Culture*. New York, 1923. (One of the best modern treatises on the anthropologic concept of culture, the form and content of culture and the relation of culture to man.)

CHAPTER II.

THE PRIMITIVE FAMILY, THE UNIT OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

Sociologists speak of the family as the fundamental social unit, that is, as the fundamental group without which there could be no orderly and desirable social progress. It is also the typical primary group in which there is face-to-face communication and the closest cooperation in all matters making for the welfare of the individuals of the group. These primary groups, i. e. a number of families banded together, constitute the earliest form of social organization, a community united to secure the welfare of all its components. This is the primitive State. The family precedes the State, it is prior to any definite type of tribal organization or government controlling the behavior of individuals of different families.

The importance of the family in social life is also apparent from the fact that children receive their first training in this fundamental social institution. In the family circle the child first learns its social duties. It is taught to respect the rights of others and is shown the need of yielding at times to the wishes and desires of others. From the parents the child generally receives its first notions of religion, of God and of the worship man owes to a Supreme Being. Finally, the family even precedes the school as an educational agency, at least in the order of time. For the child mind is first developed by contact with the other members of the family. Communication with the members of this primary group develops the faculty of speech and so implants the rudiments of knowledge.

This high rating of the family as "the social world in miniature," in which practically all the relationships that characterize social life in general are found, is accepted by all sociologists. But there is by no means a similar unanimity concerning the status of the primitive family. In fact, the easy theory of "innate and uniform laws of social evolution," which exist only in the minds of some writers,

is here applied much to the detriment of the scientific study of early family life. One of the much quoted writers of this school is L. H. Morgan, author of a work on "Ancient Society." He has developed what one sociologist calls "an extremely interesting and ingenious theory of the evolution of the family." But it is at the same time thoroughly false. Morgan assumes a previous condition of primitive promiscuity upon which he establishes the five stages of development of the family. These are:

1. Consanguine Family, or the intermarriage of brothers and sisters belonging to a single group.
2. Punaluan, or the marriage of each of several sisters in a group with the others' husbands, or of each of several brothers in a group with the others' wives.
3. Syndiasmian, or the marriage (often temporary and unexclusive as to cohabitation) of a single pair.
4. Patriarchal, a mode allowing to one man several wives.
5. Monogamy, the marriage of single pairs with exclusive cohabitation.

Dow, who calls this classification "suggestive" as well as "interesting and ingenious," admits that it "has not generally been accepted among sociologists." Unfortunately, however, such unfounded terms as "evolution of family life" are so current in works of sociology treating on the family, that it is time to do away effectively with the mischievous theory.

Morgan's Erroneous Preconceptions

Dr. Lowie has given us the soundest criticism of Morgan's scheme and asserts that he (Morgan) "made no pretense at producing empirical proof of pristine promiscuity." But he was so carried away by his preconceptions that not having found just what he wanted among the American aborigines to fit in his classificatory scheme, he went to the tribes of Polynesia. But, says Lowie,¹⁾ "had Morgan not been smitten with purblindness by his theoretical prepossessions, he might well have paused before ascribing to the Polynesians the part they play in his scheme. For the

1) Primitive Society, p. 57.

aboriginal civilization of Polynesia, instead of suggesting by its crudeness an extreme antiquity for any and all of its constituents, must rank among the very noblest of cultures devoid of the metallurgical art. When Morgan assigned to this settled, politically organized and marvelously æsthetic race the lowest status among surviving divisions of mankind he attained the high-water level of absurdity, which accounts of Oceanian exploration, accessible even in his day, would have sufficed to expose."

Anthropologists agree in saying that some of the most primitive of extant tribes are the Andaman Islanders. Yet these primitives are remarkable for the purity of their family life. Mr. E. H. Man, one of the best authorities on these people, says: "We have been told that the system of communal marriage prevails among them, and that marriage is nothing more than providing oneself with a slave. But the marriage contract is so far from being a temporary makeshift, which can be disregarded at the will of either one of the two parties, that not even difference of temperament or any other cause can sunder the union. While polygamy, polyandry and divorce are unknown, marital fidelity unto death is not the exception, but the rule. Domestic quarrels, which are of rather rare occurrence, are easily settled with or without intervention of friends."²⁾

The Negritos of the Malay Peninsula are equally primitive; yet authentic reports prove their high morality. W. W. Skeat writes with authority of these tribes which he studied so closely. In his "Pagan Races of the Malay Peninsula" he says: "All indications point to the fact that once married, the parties remain true to one another, and cases of infidelity are extremely rare."

Errors Concerning Primitive Family Still Wide-Spread

It was necessary to give these details because even today erroneous teachings concerning the primitive family are found in sociologic writings. In a chapter on "The Social Composition," Professor Giddings³⁾ writes:

2) On the Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands, London, 1883.

3) The Principles of Sociology, New York, 1904.

“Among savages generally, desertion, divorce and remarriage are extremely frequent.”

This is a specimen of the unsound generalization that characterizes a good deal of writing in our sociologic texts. Wild statements of this kind have become traditional in certain schools, while contrary facts are carefully left unnoticed or unexplained. As regards the three social plagues referred to by Professor Giddings we should remember that there is only one nation in the world today which holds a higher (or lower) record than the United States. This is Japan. So we may wonder whether the Professor considers them as evils or as desirable manifestations of social life.

It is Mr. Giddings' opinion on “the family life of the primitive man” that we wish to examine. He gives it (l. c., page 264) in the following words: “There is at least a reasonable presumption that the family of the primitive man was an intermediate development between the family of the highest animals and that of the lowest living man. If so, it was a simple pairing family, easily dissolved, and perhaps rarely lasting for life” (page 264). Again we have “perhaps” and “a reasonable presumption.” The reader will have noticed that “reasonable presumption,” “we may readily imagine,” etc., are favorite phrases of Giddings whenever he gets into the field of ethnology.

In support of his “reasonable presumption,” Giddings refers in a footnote to Westermarck, “History of Human Marriage,” pages 14, 15 and 50.

But that was unfortunate for Giddings. A careful reading of the pages referred to, shows that not only is there no “reasonable presumption” for Giddings' opinion, but that Westermarck has given no stronger proofs anywhere in his book for the relatively high moral state of the primitive family.

The sentence in Giddings leading up to the “reasonable presumption” reads as follows:

“Living in environments more favorable than those of the lowest hordes of today, primitive men were probably often massed in relatively large bands, and their sexual relations may therefore have been even more irregular than

those of any existing horde" (page 264). (Please notice the "probably" and the "may have been.")

Now compare this statement with Westermarck (l. c., pages 14 and 15): "With the exception of a few cases in which tribes are asserted to live together promiscuously,—almost all of which assertions I shall prove further on to be groundless,—travelers unanimously agree that in the human race the relations of the sexes are, as a rule, of more or less durable character. The family, consisting of father, mother and offspring, is a universal institution, whether founded on a monogamous, polygamous, or polyandrous marriage."

We "presume" the students in many courses of sociology piously accept such "reasonable presumptions" as above, on the word of the professor, and never think of verifying the "authorities" in the footnotes. We would suggest that they do so hereafter.

All that the Professor can say in answer to the charge of misinterpreting his "sources" is that he refers to the edition of 1891 (in his Bibliography, page 432), whereas the present writer quotes from the third edition (1901); but W. I. Thomas informs us that there are "no important changes from the first edition." In fact, in the latest (fifth) edition of his work (1922),⁴ Westermarck reiterates his earlier opinion more emphatically, and in the light of recent research in the following heading of Chapter III, Vol. I: "No known savage people living in promiscuity; the hypothesis of a general stage of promiscuity entirely groundless; sexual relations most nearly relating to promiscuity not found among the very lowest races, but among more advanced people."

In conclusion, we quote Westermarck's final sentence from this "Criticism of the Hypothesis of Promiscuity" (Edition of 1901, page 133):

"There is not a shred of genuine evidence for the notion that promiscuity ever formed a general stage in the social history of mankind. The hypothesis of promiscuity, instead of belonging, as Professor Giraud-Teulon thinks, to the class of hypotheses which are scientifically permissible, has no real foundation, and is essentially unscientific."

4) New York, 1922.

Promiscuity Unknown Among Truly Primitive People

If we examine family life among the primitive tribes of South Africa—that is, among tribes untouched by civilization—we again find a picture totally different from that painted by the adherents of the evolutionary school of culture. And in the case of the African Pygmies we have a witness of unimpeachable authority. It is Bishop Le Roy who wrote a book on “The Religion of the Primitives,” but did not write it until he had spent thirty-two years with his black flock. He went to Africa in 1877, beginning work there on the East coast, and published his book in 1909. He possesses a thorough knowledge of the language of the Bantu, and was enrolled as a member of one of their totemistic societies.

Bishop Le Roy⁵⁾ says at the beginning of his first chapter on “The Primitive and the Family,” that “among primitive tribes of Africa, as well as those of other countries, the family is the central pillar with which religion and the whole social life is linked; if the family is solidly established, the tribe is prosperous. But if it breaks up, the tribe becomes weakened; and if, as happens on the Coast and in European districts, it is dissolved entirely, the tribe disappears.”

Taking up the wild statement of a French sociologist, Gustave Le Bon, who says that at the beginning of human society we find everywhere “la promiscuité générale” Bishop Le Roy says: “It is possible that this herd-like condition may have existed among some human groups (quelques groupements humains) especially wretched. But before changing such an hypothesis into an incontestable truth, it would be wise to establish it by definite facts. The one certain fact is this, that nowhere in Africa today can we find traces of this promiscuity except in the vast steppes of the eastern and southern zones—among herds of

5) “La Religion des Primitifs” par Mgr. Le Roy, Paris, 1900. An English translation of this scholarly work has been prepared by Rev. Newton Thompson, under the title “The Religion of the Primitives.” The publishers’ notice correctly says of it that it is a “missionary work that reads like a fascinating adventure story. A new and attractive exploration into the depths of the human soul. One long proof that men are incurably religious.”

antelopes. As to man, the closer we come towards the people of a general primitive nature (*d'aspect général primitif*), as are the Negritos and the San, the more evidence we find of family life, of the family precisely as the fundamental, necessary and unshaken basis of society."

It is gratifying to place this clear testimony, so directly opposed to the "stage of sexual communism as it is pictured by Morgan's school," beside the equally vigorous conclusion of Dr. Lowie: "Sexual communism as a condition taking the place of the individual family exists nowhere at the present time; and the arguments for its former existence must be rejected as unsatisfactory. This conclusion will find confirmation in the phenomena of primitive family life" (l. c. page 62).

Treatment of Women in Primitive Society

We may conclude this chapter with some statements on the treatment of woman in primitive society. The position of woman in any tribe is a fair index of its cultural status. Evolutionists seem to take pride in pointing to the "degraded condition" of woman in all primitive societies. They depict her as an abject slave of her physically stronger consort, loaded down with intolerable burdens, driven and maltreated like an animal. The man is alleged to have taken things easy, to have had "a good time" in sport and revelry. Hence there can be no question of the equal position of man and woman in the primitive family (*Urfamilie*). So say Lubbock, and some socialist writers like Bebel.

But scholarly research gives us just the reverse of this imaginative picture. What we have already said about prevalence of monogamy shows that the picture drawn by the evolutionary delirium is false. Those students who had opportunity to study particular tribes more intimately admit this charge against the evolutionists.

Seligmann writes in his book on the Veddahs that "in every respect women seem to be treated equally with men; they eat the same food, and when we gave the men presents of eatables, they apparently offered the women and children their share." Hewitt knew of several cases

among the Kulin and Chepara, tribes of Southeast Australia, of men carrying their wives, who were too old or infirm, over long distances. Man says of the Andaman Islanders that they treat their wives in such a considerate manner, as to be models for certain classes among European nations.

Seldom has popular fallacy run riot so wildly as in this point—the condition of woman in primitive society. Mr. J. N. B. Hewitt says that this is the case concerning woman among the American Indians. He writes:

“One of the most erroneous beliefs relating to the status and condition of the American Indian woman is that she was, both before and after marriage, the abject slave and drudge of the men of her tribe in general. This view, due largely to inaccurate observation and misconception, was correct, perhaps, at times, as to a small percentage of the tribes and peoples whose social organization was of the most elementary kind, politically and ceremonially, and especially of such tribes as were non-agricultural.”

Mr. Hewitt then quotes several authorities on the treatment of Indian women by the stronger sex, and continues:

“From what has been said it is evident that the authority possessed by the Indian husband over his wife or wives was far from being as absolute as represented by careless observers, and there is certainly no ground for saying that the Indians generally kept their women in a condition of absolute subjection. The available data show that while the married woman, because of her status as such, became a member of her husband’s household and owed him certain important duties and obligations, she enjoyed a large measure of independence and was treated with great consideration and deference, and had a marked influence over her husband. Of course, various tribes had different conditions to face, and possessed different institutions, and so it happens that in some tribes the wife was the equal of her husband, and in others she was his superior in many things, as among the Iroquois and tribes similarly organized.”⁶⁾

6) Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 30, Part 2, Art. Woman.

A Difference Between Primitives and More Advanced Tribes

On the basis of these facts we see that it is unscientific to speak of the evolution of the family from a brute condition in which lust ruled supreme. If the picture here presented has also its darker features we are not surprised. The utopia, where perfect peace and harmony prevail and where the strong never oppresses the weak, is found only in the regions of romance. It is at least definitely established that the lurid portrayal of "primitive savage life" as a stage abounding in every abomination is false. In fact, later periods show the dominance of ugly excesses like cannibalism and human sacrifice, whereas during the childhood of the race man worshipped the deity by offering the fruits of the earth, by prayer and by rites which were free from the grossness of later periods. As regards human sacrifice among highly cultured races it is only necessary to recall the highly developed civilization of the Aztecs of Ancient Mexico and their inhuman practices at the shrine of the god of war. Such abominations did not vitiate the culture of the real primitives like the Pygmies of Africa and of the Andaman Islands, the Veddahs of Ceylon and the Australian aborigines.

Again, the Bassonge of the interior of Africa occasionally practiced ferocious cannibalism. Yet, according to the testimony of a close observer, "these cannibal Bassonge were, according to the types we met with, one of those rare nations of the African interior which can be classed with the most æsthetic and skilled, most discreet and intelligent of all those generally known to us as the so-called natural races. . . . Before the Arabic and European invasion they did not dwell in 'hamlets', but in towns with twenty or thirty thousand inhabitants, in towns whose highways were shaded by avenues of splendid palms planted at regular intervals and laid out with the symmetry of colonnades."⁷⁾

7) "The Voice of Africa", by Leo Frobenius, 1913, p. 14.

QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

CHAPTER II.

1. What is the importance of the family in social organization?
2. Why is it a "Primary Group"?
3. What is the relation of the family to the State?
4. What is the verdict of modern research on L. H. Morgan's theory of the "evolution of the family"?
5. What do we know of family life among some very primitive people?
6. What is the verdict of Bishop Le Roy on family life among the African Pygmies?
7. What was the position of woman in primitive society? Is it true that she was everywhere considered a "slave"?
8. Did abominations like human sacrifice exist among really primitive people?
9. Is the monogamous family the best type of this fundamental social institution? Why?
10. What has Christianity done for woman and for the preservation of the monogamous family?

CHAPTER III.

FORCES DISRUPTIVE OF THE MODERN FAMILY

In his interesting book "Social Origins," Andrew Lang says: "The family is the most ancient and the most sacred of human institutions, the least likely to be overthrown by revolutionary attacks." Much water has flowed under the bridge since the above statement was written in 1893. For almost every book of sociology refers to "the disruptive factors of the modern family," to its changing status or to its actual disintegration. Hence some of the "revolutionary attacks" directed against it have become effective. These disruptive factors affecting home and family are many and have been variously classified under the doctrine of neo-Malthusianism, lax marriage and divorce laws, woman's growing economic freedom, the break-up of home-life, the rise of individualism, the upward extension of education, the seeking of amusement outside the home, etc.

Besides these disintegrating factors influencing the modern family, others may be mentioned. For the present we may accept those cited as accounting for a large number of shattered families and broken homes.

Conditions in Europe, as regards disintegration of home and family life, are about the same as those in our country. Long before the great War, French writers spoke of "les maux dont meurt la Famille,"—"evils bringing on the death of the family." M. Etienne Lamy, of the French Academy, has written a Preface to a book entitled "The Plot Against The Family,"¹⁾ in which he says: "In our time, rich in imaginary plots, you denounce as the most threatening the plot against the family, the source on which depends the continuity of the species, the first school of the living being, the group with which society begins. The family is the most essential of human institutions. Nothing is in jeopardy as long as it remains intact; everything is in danger as soon as it decays. . . .As the same race, which no longer

1) *Le Complot contre la famille* per Georges Noblemaire, Paris 1908.

renews itself in France, is multiplying in Canada, its sterility is not organic but voluntary. This race has been fruitful in France as long as morals and laws united to fortify those social groups which protected the individual."

Neo-Malthusianism

The learned academician refers to that plague which has caused all Frenchmen who truly love their country to be fearful of its future. If there be no increase in population, who will in future years keep alive the culture and traditions of the nation? A race that does not obey the moral law as regards its duty to provide future citizens, is a race that will be swept away by a stronger people.

French sociologists have tried to combat what they aptly call the "mal des foyers", the evil attacking homes. For to oppose or restrict the coming of children into the world by unlawful means is a blow both at the sanctity and the stability of the home. The doctrines of neo-Malthusianism which advocate the policy of voluntary birth restriction by means which Christian morality declares unlawful, are not a factor for strengthening and uplifting, but for weakening and debasing the family. Nor is it true that neo-Malthusianism (birth control) will help to save families from falling into poverty. Indeed some of our closest students of social conditions agree that the Malthusian doctrine ought to be rejected from both the moral and the economic standpoint. For the use of the vicious and immoral means taught by the Malthusians cannot be condoned. While from the latter point of view, it must be borne in mind that the statement of Malthus: "Population tends to increase in a geometric progression whilst the means of subsistence can only increase in an arithmetic progression" is not true. It is false to say that production has not kept pace with population; what was true in the days of Malthus, does not necessarily hold for the economic life of today. We have developed intensive farming, we have new and improved machinery; what were formerly waste-products, have now an economic utility; new countries and new sources of food supply have been acquired and a more rapid distribution of commodities has been effected.

Moreover, if we compare the abstract tendency of the human race to increase beyond the means of subsistence with the increase of the means of subsistence, the greater increase will be found on the side of the means of subsistence. For it is impossible to show that natural productive forces have already reached their maximum. While the increase of population is checked by accidents, death, disease and natural calamities, there has been a steady development of means of food supply.

At most the "law of diminishing returns" may be called in proof of gradually decreasing means of subsistence. But experts tell us that new inventions in machinery will help meet the problem while its full solution may be left to the wisdom of far distant generations.

We have ample means to combat the evils of the present economic and industrial order. The causes of these evils are not overpopulation and inadequate production. But there is too great a difference in the distribution of wealth, while faulty methods regulate that distribution. There is also too much sordid greed and selfishness in all classes of society. Hence, there must be a spiritual awakening. The realization that man has other and higher interests than those of an economic nature, and that Christian charity and justice must become two corner stones of the new social order, will pave the way to the spiritual awakening that can lead to social peace.

Instead of fierce competition in the production and sale of commodities let there be economic coöperation. Economic or democratic coöperation, which has been successfully tested in various industries, means sharing of control and management and the distribution of rewards in accordance with the value of the several contributions of the coöperators. "This can be done," says Mr. Glenn Plumb, "in producers' or consumers' cooperatives, as effectively as in any basic or other industry organized and conducted in the corporate form."

An industry, based upon economic coöperation, will fully satisfy its sole function of supplying economic wants. For, says Mr. Plumb: "It has truly been said that a single fact that cannot be reconciled with a particular theory is

sufficient to overthrow that theory. A single fact, the fact of 'overproduction', defeats and disproves all the theories of economic pessimists from Malthus to our own time." We have already referred to imperfect methods of the distribution of wealth. This causes the "over-production" to which Mr. Plumb refers as an economic evil, in as much as "the recent period of industrial depression was due to the inability of the people to buy all that by their labor they could produce."

Moreover, if wise measures be passed, for instance, laws in favor of applying labor and capital to agricultural rather than to manufacturing interests, if monopolies in raw materials and in the necessaries of life be restrained, if the making of commodities that minister rather to luxury than to wants be curtailed, if large landed estates now kept only for private pleasure be abolished, there will be little need of Malthusian doctrine, preaching and practice.

An Eminent English Medical Authority

Finally, it will be in place to cite the words of an eminent English medical authority on the evils of a doctrine which is being strenuously propagated. "Both the supporters and the opponents of Malthus are often mistaken in considering his greatest achievements to be a policy of birth control. Malthus did a greater and a more evil thing. He forged a law of nature, namely, that there is always a limited and insufficient supply of the necessities of life in the world. From this false law he argued that, as population increases too rapidly, the newcomers cannot hope to find a sufficiency of good things; that the poverty of the masses is not due to conditions created by man, but to a natural law; and that consequently this law cannot be altered by any change in political institutions. This new doctrine was eagerly adopted by the rich, who were thus enabled to argue that Nature intended that the masses should find no room at her feast; and that therefore our system of industrial capitalism was in harmony with the Will of God. Most comforting dogma! Most excellent anodyne for conscience against acceptance of those rights of man that, being ignored, found terrible expression in the French Revolution!

Without discussion, without investigation, and without proof, our professors, politicians, leader-writers, and even our well-meaning socialists, have accepted as true the bare falsehood that there is always an insufficient supply of the necessities of life; and to-day this heresy permeates all our practical politics. In giving this forged law of nature to the rich, Malthus robbed the poor of hope. Such was his crime against humanity.”²⁾

Dr. Sutherland quotes in turn the opinion of a noted English woman physician, the late Sr. Elizabeth Blackwell. She says: “A doctrine more diabolical in its theory and more destructive in its practical consequences has never been invented. This is the doctrine of neo-Malthusianism.”

Divorce.

The evil influence of voluntary family restriction cannot be measured by statistics as can that of another factor destructive of family life—divorce.

“There are more divorces granted in this country than in all the rest of the world put together.” The writer who makes this statement makes another in the same paragraph to the effect that “the conditions are not all bad, for often a divorce is a good thing in that it may be a relief of a worse condition.” And anon we read: “The fact that we have such a thing as divorce is not the alarming feature; it is rather in the great increase of divorce in the United States.”

This attitude towards the divorce problem is characteristic of many sociologists. They realize that it is unwise to plead for greater facility in sundering the marriage bond and yet they look upon divorce as an agency of greater social peace and progress. That in instances there result increased peace and happiness for the individual or individuals concerned, no one will deny. But we are considering the wider and more far-reaching effects of increasing instability of marriage; we are looking upon divorce as a vital social problem.

One reason of the lax attitude of sociologists towards

2) Birth Control. H. G. Sutherland, M. D., London.

divorce and of the many attempts to encourage it still more is found in their abhorrence of "theologic argument." They think that in the present question this argument is out of date. A writer frankly admits: "We are quite aware of the consistent opposition of certain religious groups and many sincere individuals to the granting of divorce under any circumstances. But we are not talking in terms of abstract right and wrong or of theology. We are concerned with objectively observable changes in human personality as the result of changes in social arrangements such as divorce."³)

In other words, ethical principles of right and wrong are to be set aside for the more urgent claim of changes in human personality.

To this lax and unsound attitude towards divorce we oppose the only true and consistent ethical doctrine, according to which unity and indissolubility are the two chief properties of marriage. By virtue of the latter characteristic the marriage contract is of such a nature, that, once entered upon, it continues in force until the death of one of the contracting parties. The Pastoral Letter of the Archbishops and Bishops of the country states an opinion on the divorce evil which is shared by thousands of thinking men in every community:

"We consider the growth of the divorce evil an evidence of moral decay and a present danger to the best elements in our American life. In its causes and their revelation by process of law, in its results for those who are immediately concerned and its suggestion to the minds of the entire community, divorce is our national scandal. It not only disrupts the home of the separated parties, but it also leads others who are not yet married, to look upon the bond as a trivial circumstance. Thus, through the ease and frequency with which it is granted, divorce increases with an evil momentum until it passes the limits of decency and reduces the sexual relation to the level of animal instinct.

"This degradation of marriage, once considered the holiest of human relations, naturally tends to the injury of other things whose efficacy ought to be secured, not by coercion, but by the freely given respect of a free people. Public

³ Queen and Mann, "Social Pathology," p. 67.

authority, individual rights and even the institutions on which liberty depends, must inevitably weaken. Hence the importance of measures and movements which aim at checking the spread of divorce. It is to be hoped that they will succeed; but an effectual remedy cannot be found or applied, unless we aim at purity in all matters of sex, restore the dignity of marriage and emphasize its obligations.”⁴)

A Catholic sociologist has given the following as one of the best arguments against divorce from the standpoint of pure reason: Allow divorce (with the privilege of re-marriage) in one case and the flood-gates are opened. There is no way for unaided human reason to distinguish between the enormity of one crime and that of another as grounds for legal declaration of nullity. It may be argued in reply that all human laws draw such distinctions; that there are sentences of capital punishment and sentences of a nominal fine. But in the matter of divorce all these vanish. The motives on the part of those seeking relief from matrimonial ties are too subjective to allow of such distinctions, obvious enough in other matters.

The State and Divorce

It is rather inconsistent to say, as some sociologists do, that the State has full rights over the standards of family welfare and yet maintain that the State should tolerate divorce as a means conducive to family welfare. For divorce too often lowers and strikes a serious blow at “those educational and moral standards” of the home, which the State should maintain. For in thousands of divorce cases children are involved, and who will deny that the separation of parents is injurious to the rearing and education of the offspring?

Neither science nor reason can remedy the evils born of the ceaseless grinding of the divorce mills; the former speaks with the faltering accent of human authority; the latter does not provide the severe sanctions sometimes needed to beat down the lure of sense. An appeal to the shifting standards of social convention to combat the worst

⁴) Pastoral Letter of the Archbishops and Bishops of the U. S., 1920.

effects of increasing divorce is doomed to failure. Only a loyal acceptance of the true Christian doctrine concerning marriage, as both a contract and a sacrament, will save society from the woful social effects of disregarding the sanctity of the marriage bond and of marriage vows.

Reason and experience teach us that the only salvation lies in the acceptance of the sound ethical doctrine defended by the Church. Many Christian denominations are recognizing the need of more stringent legislation to stem the divorce evil. Again, thinking men are challenging the reasons generally given for legitimizing divorce and are pointing out the risk society runs by failing to check the disorder. M. Fonsegrive, a French sociologist, says: "To reduce marriage to a matter of sense attraction and to assert the right of free union (union libre) is to destroy the family, to authorize the worst moral disorders....As in our researches we have not been guided by any dogma nor preconceived opinion, but have followed only the facts of experience and of reason, it seems to us very proper to conclude that the doctrines of the Church at which we have arrived, are based upon a solid and rational foundation."

Nor is it right to speak harshly of "ecclesiastical control" of marriage, or of "new ethical standards" which are developing. For the Church merely holds that civil society cannot legitimately usurp control over matrimony, which is a sacrament instituted by Christ. Nor can any "new ethical code" justify an act which is wrong.

Professor Lichtenberger rightly says that "the forces tending to counteract divorce are among the most efficient elements of social control." In opposing the "divorce evil" the Church is therefore exercising a most beneficent form of social endeavor for the nation, and is not trying to hold individuals to an "outworn code of ethics."

We realize, of course, that there are certain social forces working themselves out in the development of society, and that these were bound to have a disintegrating effect upon the family. Such causes are changing standards of living, pressure of new economic forces upon the home, the lessened economic functions of the latter, new avenues of self-support opened to women, the entrance of

women into the professions and their consequent economic emancipation, the growth of industrialism, the popularization of law, the spread of social discontent and the general restlessness so characteristic of our age, and finally, the inconsistency, as Professor Fairchild says, "between the economic and marriage family mores." While the former have been forced to adjust themselves to the rapid changes in industry, family conventions have remained more or less intact.

These changes were inevitable and there is no need to deplore them. But unfortunately they were accompanied by a "spirit of independence," and the consequent decay of respect for authority. Here we touch upon one of the "radical causes" why the rate of divorce is more rapid in the United States than in any other country except Japan.

Professor Peters⁵⁾ thinks that the pronounced tendencies toward the disruption of the family "began with the individualism and freedom of thought of the Protestant Reformation." Perhaps so. But the fact is that ever since that momentous crisis in history there has been a drifting away of family life from its former moorings and from those high ideals that once clung about the Christian hearth and home.

"Let Us Unite to Abolish Divorce"

The divorce question gives concern to students of society in other countries. Concluding an earnest appeal of his countrymen to hold fast to the ancient Christian law regarding divorce, Rev. John J. O'Gorman, D. C. L., of Canada, says: "The law against divorce was repromulgated by Christ, not as a new law, but as a primeval law given in the infancy of the race. The command 'What therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder,' is at once a law given by the Divine Founder of Christianity, and a law given by the Divine Creator of nature. It is a law which applies to Christians, Jews, and pagans, to lawyers and newspaper editors, to voters and legislators. It is a natural law observed by some of the most barbarous tribes in the

5) Foundation of Educational Sociology, p. 169.

history of mankind. Are we Canadians to have our moral sense so blunted, our moral vision so blurred, our moral decision so weakened, that we must have divorce, when the savages of the Andaman Islands, the aborigines of Ceylon, the Papuans of New Guinea, and other races just as barbarous, never tolerated it? In the name of God, let us unite to abolish divorce."

And these are timely reflections for our own people.

QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

CHAPTER III.

1. What is meant by "disintegrating forces" affecting the the family?
2. Is France today suffering from the evil of Neo-Malthusian principles concerning the family?
3. What is the theory of T. R. Malthus, and what is Neo-Malthusianism?
4. State your objections against this doctrine (See Birth Control by H. G. Sutherland, M. D.)
5. What measures may be adopted to safeguard the welfare of an increasing population?
6. What are some of the main causes of frequency of divorce in the United States?
7. State the Catholic attitude towards marriage and divorce.
8. To what extent is decay of religious faith and disrespect for law and legitimate authority a cause of divorce?
9. Write a paper on the ideal Christian family.
10. What are some of the remedies to bring back the Christian family to the high ideals that once governed it?
11. What is meant by the decay of home life?
12. What changes in the family have followed changes in economic conditions?
13. In what respect was family life changed when industry came to be carried on outside the home?
14. What is meant by the "Industrial Revolution"?
15. Has the employment of women had a marked influence on home life? on the rate of divorce?
16. Does the monogamous family exist among so-called "primitive races"?

SUPPLEMENTARY READINGS

CHAPTERS II AND III.

- Burke, S. J., Rev. E. J. Political Economy. New York, 1923. (A brief explanation of all important economic questions, which has found favor with many Catholic teachers).
- Coppens, S. J., Rev. Charles. A Brief Text-Book of Moral Philosophy. Revised and enlarged by Rev. Henry S. Spalding, S. J., New York, 1924. (Contains the ethical basis of social questions which have been much discussed during the last three decades).
- Crawford, Virginia M. Ideals of Charity. London, 1908. (A well-written treatise by an experienced English social worker and student of social questions).
- Dardano, L. Elements of Social Science and Political Economy. Dublin, 1909. (Contains good chapters on the Family and on the State).
- Devas, C. S. The Key to the World's Progress. New York, 1919. (Gives an historical account of the contributions of the Catholic Church to civilization).
-Political Economy. New York, 1918. (One of the well-known Stonyhurst Series).
- Fletcher, Margaret. The Christian Family. Oxford: Catholic Social Guild. (Will be useful in the class-room on account of its "Essay and Discussion Points").
- Gerrard, Rev. Thomas J. Marriage and Parenthood: The Catholic Ideal. New York, 1911. (Contains chapters on "Sanctity of Marriage" and the "Catholic Family").
-The Church and Eugenics, B. Herder, 1921. (Discusses the rise and spread of the eugenic movement).
- Koch-Preuss. A Handbook of Moral Theology. Vol. V. Man's Duties to His Fellowmen. (St. Louis, 1914).
- Parkinson, Msgr. Henry. A Primer of Social Science. Third Edition, London, 1920.
- Ross, C. S. P., Rev. J. E. Christian Ethics. New York, 1919.
- Spalding, S. J., Rev. Henry. Introduction to Social Service. New York, 1923.
- Sutherland, M. D., H. G. Birth Control. London, 1622.
- Towne, Ezra Thayer. Social Problems. New York, 1919.
- Vaughan, S. J., Rev. Bernard. The Menace of the Empty Cradle, London, 1917.