

Extract from

Unity  
Chicago, Ill.

17 JAN 1938

"One hundred  
of Christmas Day  
Arrests for driving  
—New

Well, how do  
like Repeal now? And how  
last in the face of news like  
this?

New? Why, our newest stunts are as old as the  
hills. Nudism?—at least as old as jungle Africa. The

## UNITY

Monday, January 17, 1938

hington and Moscow march-  
Japan, be like Katisha's left  
orth going miles to see!

seventy-five deaths in automobiles  
ly caused by intoxicated drivers.  
le intoxicated were numerous."  
newspapers (December 26th)

ike Repeal now? And how  
last in the face of news like

trailer?—the Gypsies discovered it centuries ago. Air-  
conditioning?—Pompeii had a fully developed system  
for cooling houses. Continental highways?—what  
about the Appian Way? A re-reading of Wendell  
Phillips's famous lecture, "The Lost Arts," would be  
a wholesome experience as teaching us humility once  
again.

Wiser, braver, than all the people of America are  
the people of the Philippines. Stop, look, listen! The  
Filipinos have abolished Mother's Day.

J. H. H.

## Wanted—A Spiritual Restoration of Art

JAMES H. COUSINS\*

Life is a perpetual re-creation, moving by  
power, through law, to knowledge; and moving by  
the development of finer powers to the realization  
of higher law and the attainment of fuller knowl-  
edge. But life is neither fulfilled nor circumscribed  
nor superseded by power or law or knowledge; to  
these it is original; they to it are derivative.

Seen thus, human life can make only partial,  
hence misleading, contacts with "the total push  
and pull of the universe" (as William James phrased  
it) through thought alone, or feeling alone, or action  
alone. Its fullest contact can only be made by  
action which, like the life of the universe, so far as  
we can realize it, is creative, that is, action which  
unfolds inherent characteristics, and does so within  
a pattern identified by the mind, and in a rhythmical  
order that arises from and invokes feeling.

With this in mind we can, I think, find a clue  
to the failure of religion, philosophy, or science to  
solve the problems of life, and find also a justifica-  
tion for seeking a more effective means of coördi-  
nating individual and group life with the universal  
life.

Religious emotion may, through the power of  
invocation, catch hints from the heart of things.  
But the tendency of the religious impulse to fall  
into doctrinal and liturgical rigidities has lowered  
the vitality of religion by turning originally creative  
thought into sterile dogma, and creative feeling into  
destructive bigotry.

Philosophy has sought to penetrate to the secret  
of the cosmic life by mental concentration. But,  
because of the separation which it has set up be-  
tween the human mind and the supposed remote  
object of its contemplation, it has failed to establish  
a complete intellectual intimacy between man and  
the universe. It has failed also to build its most  
assured principles into the structure of human life  
and organization by following closely the "light of  
reason" and failing to grasp the full significance of  
the imagination and the heart where rise the upper  
and nether springs of human action.

The inadequacy of science as a contact-maker

\*Dr. Cousins, president of a college for Hindu boys and girls  
at Madanapalle, Madras Presidency, India, being an enthusiast for art,  
finds time to create galleries and museums in various parts of the country.  
This paper reveals his idealistic valuation of the arts as means to the  
regeneration of humanity.—EDITOR.

between man and the universe is different from the  
inadequacy of religion and philosophy. All but a  
few handfuls of human beings have nothing to do  
with science as pure knowledge. The nineteenth  
century impacts of science on religion created an  
emotional hubbub in the churches for a while, and  
modified a few intellectual formulae regarding geol-  
ogy and biology, but made little if any difference  
in the deliberate relationships of organized religion  
to daily human life. But the moment science began  
to do things, to put into the hand of man the means  
to larger experience, good and bad, it began its  
climb toward the ascendancy that it has now reached in  
human affairs. Today humanity at large cares  
nothing for scientific truth, but cares everything  
for scientific power. The result has been so great  
an acquisition of mechanical control over the needs  
and experiences of the present moment that vast  
numbers of humanity in every religious area have  
ceased to be interested in unverifiable events in the  
past as an expedient for the attaining of an uncer-  
tain future felicity, and have ignored or dethroned  
religion. Science has done things, and threatens to  
supersede the do-nothing phases of life. It has, to  
a vast and increasing number of people, become  
their religion. But the worship of the externals of  
science is no less idolatrous than the worship of  
persons or books or images which science decried;  
and the religion of science has included in its Pan-  
theon divinities more horrible and cruel than any  
created by the unsophisticated aspiration of human-  
ity in the past. Science has achieved a spurious  
ascendancy by a mere simulation of the creative  
doing which is the condition of life, cosmic and  
human.

The question arises, then, whether there is  
available to humanity any means for attaining a  
more complete relationship between his own life and  
the life of the universe than religion, philosophy, or  
science affords. Let us, as a preliminary to an  
answer to the question, note certain features that  
may be taken as common to both phases of life,  
human and universal.

The continuity of the life of nature is assured  
so long as its creative forces preponderate over the  
destructive. Creation is maintained by an arrange-  
ment which confers on its constituent parts an ex-

ed



press our dislike for the national anthem, and to declare that it was among "the most vulgar and profane" of all patriotic ditties. There was nothing new about this statement—condemnation of the "Star-Spangled Banner" has long been deep and widespread in this country. But it brought a response in the form of letters which was amazing. People evidently have strong feeling upon this question, either one way or the other! What chiefly surprised us in this correspondence was the fact that the majority of the letter-writers endorsed our position—the proportion was about four to one! This is an astonishing circumstance, since it is persons angry with dissent who take their pens in hand. There is obviously an abundance of people in this country who have no more use for Francis Scott Key's anthem than we have. Another thing that interested us was the diverse character of the letters, *pro* and *con*. With few exceptions, the letters in approval of our position showed culture, refinement, and intelligence in every line. These were written by men and women who had standards, and were thus able to recognize doggerel when they saw it. On the other hand, the letters in opposition were usually vulgar, insulting, indecent, filled with vile epithets, bad grammar, and the most rudimentary human emotions. It was easy to see what kind of minds find satisfaction in the "Star-Spangled Banner." If there could be any more convincing evidence for our indictment, we would like to know what it may be. Lastly, we were touched by the number of persons who humbly and yet eagerly sent us original compositions—words, and frequently music—as suggested substitutes for our national anthem. These compositions were impeccable in sentiment, breathing the loftiest ideals of peace and brotherhood, and were not unimpressive as literary and musical achievements. Evidently there are many who know that the "Star-Spangled Banner" is all wrong, and would themselves supply something worthy of the nation. Our own idea of patriotic song may be found in William Watson's "Great and Fair Is She Our Land," Rudyard Kipling's "Recessional," and especially Katherine Lee Bates' "America the Beautiful."

#### PACIFIST AND WAR SECRETARY

The late Newton D. Baker was for years one of the most conspicuous and able peace leaders in this country, and he is destined to be remembered with Edwin M. Stanton as one of the greatest war ministers in history. There is a contradiction for you! Yet it is a contradiction which Mr. Baker resolved not only successfully but sincerely in his own mind. He believed, with his great chief, President Wilson, that the war against Germany had become inevitable in 1917, and he went into it to save civilization and to end war forever. When conscription was imposed upon the nation, he accepted the policy and applied it with magnificent efficiency. At the same time he was fair to conscientious objectors, and, in spite of occasional mistakes and regrettable incidents of cruelty and persecution, held the army to a larger measure of justice toward pacifist opinion than was granted in any other belligerent country. All this works into a pattern of the pacifist who believes that, under certain circumstances and to certain ends, it is right to fight. The curious thing is that, unlike so many pacifists of this type, Newton D. Baker never came to feel that any mistake had been made in entering the European War, and never conceded, so far as we know, that America had been frustrated in what it undertook to do. On the contrary, he resented and tried to refute the charge that the country had been led into the war for economic and propaganda reasons, for which the fine talk about peace and democracy was so much camouflage. Not even the Versailles Treaty won his repudiation, nor the League of Nations his pity or contempt. He stood by, in other words, to the very end. Was this an act of loyalty to President Wilson, whose political heir he became? Was it an act dictated by his own personal entanglement in the great affairs of the greatest war in history? Was it a stubborn refusal to accept the judgments of history? Or was it conviction deep-rooted in an experience which had been tried as by fire? One cannot say! But there remains the question of the worth of any pacifist idealism which is ready under given circumstances to compromise with war.

### Jottings

Deaths in 1937, which occurred after we compiled our list as published in the last issue, were the following: FRANK B. KELLOGG and NEWTON D. BAKER, statesmen; MAURICE RAVEL, French composer, and DAN BEDDOES, American tenor; DON MARQUIS, journalist and author, and FRANK SPEARMAN, novelist; and JAKE KILRAIN, immortal for his seventy barefisted rounds with John L. Sullivan.

Premier Chautemps, of France, certainly has the right name for his position. It's a "hot time" in that country, and no mistake.

Nothing could be worse than the extension of the war in the Far East to include Russia and the United States. Yet would the spectacle of the "Stars and Stripes" and the "Hammer and Sickle" waving fold



ternal distinctiveness; maintained also by rhythmical movement which ensures living continuity, and by integration which raises potentiality in the parts to achievement in the whole. Under conditions inherent in its own nature, life runs its course as a river between the defining banks of form. What, from the point of view of the river, might be regarded as limitations, and offensive to its ego-sense, are, from the point of view of the geographer, the means whereby water in general attains the distinctiveness, the beauty, and the power of a river. Such, too, are the conditions to which human life must conform if it is to attain to the fulfilment of its own inherent possibilities, and in doing so attain to its fullest possible measure of community with the life of the universe. It must find for itself a medium of communication between the individual and the group and between both and the cosmos, a medium at once vitally creative, emotionally responsive, mentally aware, materially competent, through which it will reach the unhindered exercise of natural power, from which, as Aristotle saw long ago, comes the experience of perfect pleasure. Such unhindered exercise of natural power does not mean either cosmic or human license. It means the free expression of capacity under accepted inherent conditions, even as the runner accepts the condition that he shall run forwards, not backwards, on his feet, not on his hands, and in the acceptance of the conditions gains the special pleasure that comes of running.

Now when the activity that will give to human life its maximum contact with the universal life is thus described, it will be evident that what is described is really art; that is (to repeat a fundamental condition for the sake of clarity), an activity disclosing the characteristics of a life within yet beyond itself, in a rhythmical order, within a significant design.

From the exercise of art, as thus described, arises not only the joy of creative activity in which the artist specially participates, but a distinctive pleasure derived by the spectator of art through reaction to certain qualities of idea, imagination, thought, figurativeness, feeling, form, design, relationship, succession, tincture, texture, movement and so on, qualities from which humanity has abstracted an inclusive quality which it identifies under the term beauty.

It must, however, here be observed that, while beauty is an accompaniment of creation in art, and in its highest aspects is a sign of the celestial touch, beauty is neither the primary impulse nor the ultimate achievement of art. Indeed, the representation of the pleasure-giving surface qualities of beauty, when it usurps the place of creation in art, leads to a turning away of both art and beauty from life towards death, even as it has done in much of modern art which, in its sensational and sensual phases, has lost the classical sense of cosmic affinity and dignity. By seeking the gratification of the senses, even of the higher senses, instead of the creative joy of the spirit, much of modern occidental art has not only debased beauty by making it a pander to the lower nature of humanity, but has renounced the true service of art as creator, and inspirer to creation, and has turned away from its proper office as regenerator of the race to being the "tempter" to another "fall of man."

The way of escape from this threat of disintegration in art, and its repercussions in social and international disorder, is by the dissemination of joy in creation through art, and the manifestation in art, and, through art, in life, of the inner characteristics of the soul of man and the universe, characteristics which are the essence of beauty. Over-valuation of the externals of the arts is, like over-valuation of the power-producing agencies of science, the worship of images instead of what they symbolize: it is aesthetical idolatry; and idolatry, theological, intellectual, scientific, aesthetical, or otherwise, is the negation of creation, and an invitation to destruction since it sets fixed and unproductive obstacles in the way of the flux of creative life.

The need of the time, then, is the restoration of art to its creatorial office and spiritual quality; and along with a spiritually inspired art, the creation of a spiritually illuminated art-criticism; not an exposition of creative activity in the arts that would seek to intimidate art by this or that inadequate theory or personal whim, but an exposition which will be inclusive of all the factors involved in art-activity; a criticism that will evolve profounder canons than those of the past.

Such theories of art as man has evolved in the past are not of crucial importance, though interesting and thought-provoking to study; they have not heretofore influenced art-creation to any great extent, partly because creation is no more dependent on criticism than the weather is dependent on the science of meteorology; and partly because art-criticism consists mainly of the intellectual speculations of individuals who had no full and absorbing direct knowledge of creative experience in the arts. From the point of view of spectators they theorized on finished products of the creative process, and got no nearer the reality of the process than a student of biology would get to the parallel process and experience of motherhood by only studying a child.

To say this, however, is not to reject as valueless the reactions of the lay spectator to works of art; it is only to give them their real value—as reaction, not creation. Art in its completeness is a collaboration between artist and audience. But when, through circumstances outside the essentials of his art (the spur to notoriety or the stress of economic necessity, for instance) the artist is compelled, in the process of collaboration, to submit to the demands of the spectator, then the basic condition of cosmic or human art, creation from within, is superseded by mere production, in caricatures of art, for the satisfaction of external demands that are irrelevant to true art-creation. The need is for the collaboration of the spectator of art with the artist-creator, even as the need in life is for the collaboration of the individual and the group with the creative life of the universe. For the development of the art-criticism of the future, disciplined and intelligent capacity is needed in order to respond to the inner characteristics of a work of art, to catch its real purport, above all, to participate not only in the specific idea or feeling expressed in the work of art, but to touch the creative joy of the artist.

A necessary help towards a true collaboration



between creator and spectator is the observation, by creative artists, of their own experience of the creative process, and the free expression of their reflection on such experience; for, as Kuo Jo-hsu, the Chinese painter of the twelfth century, truly said: "The secret of art lies in the artist himself." He is, by actual participation and essential identity of experience, in touch with the universal creative process, and has no need for the makeshift of argumentation or speculation.

An epitome of the creative confessions of the artists of Asia who have kept to the Asian tradition would, I am convinced, be of more value to the understanding of art than all the argumentation on the matter since Baumgarten, in the middle of the eighteenth century, under the term aesthetic, deflected the philosophy of art on to the left-hand path, by limiting the process of art to the imitation of nature, and by making the aim of beauty, as generated by the arts, the imparting of pleasure and the stimulating of desires. Western art is suffering today from the inevitable consequences of this inverted and perverted notion.

The artists of China and Japan lived close to the creative life of nature, and tried to relate their work to its movement rather than to its appearance. The first canon of classical Chinese art is "rhythmical vitality." In the long history of the arts of India, personal confession of creative experience by the artists is rare, mainly because of their daily consecrated preoccupation with the expression of cosmic conceptions in which personal consciousness became a matter of no importance.

In the ordinary literature of occidental art, there is little expression of personal inner creative experience, though there is considerable reflection by artists on the phenomena of their art, and much material for consideration by the coming higher art-criticism in the writings of, for example, Leonardo da Vinci, Wagner, Shelley, and Edward Carpenter in the past; and of Pirandello, the Italian dramatist, and George Grey Barnard, the cosmic-minded American sculptor, today.

The complete exposition of the reality of art-creation has probably only reached its true beginning in our time, when research into the mystery of human nature has disclosed forces and capacities and processes formerly unknown, or, where known, concealed; and when the new science of psychology has uncovered the hitherto hidden workings of the mind.

Today, too, the direct expression of creative experience and reflection thereon has reached a stage of awareness of itself and its import not reached before. No book—certainly none in the English language—has uncovered with such frankness and fullness the open-eyed experience of the creative powers working behind the art of the poet as *Song and Its Fountains* by the Irish poet, A.E. An epoch in the understanding of the deeper aspect of music has been opened by the book, *Music Today*, by John Foulds, an eminent English executant and composer. The book by Cyril Scott, an English pianist and composer, *Music: the Secret Influence Throughout the Ages*, indicates the power of music in the subtle modification of human society. Claude Bragdon, the American architect, has given architecture and decoration profound interpretation. The Russian and Belgian painters, Nicholas de Roerich and Jean Delville, have published much personal disclosure of art-experience.

But for bringing about the complete collaboration of the spectator of art with the artist, through which will come the liberation of art from inadequate notions as to its nature and purpose, and the restoration of art to its true work of relating human life to the cosmic life, the ultimate means is the bringing into existence of a race endowed with the capacity to respond to the real force and significance of works of art by being themselves participants in the creative process of art. This, obviously, can only be done when art-creation forms an integral daily part of the education of every individual. It also means a drastic revision of current ideas as to the nature, purpose, and method of education.

To those who respond with full realization to what has been said above, it will appear no exaggeration to say that there is no hope of any radical improvement in the present state of human affairs until an effective proportion of the people of the earth have become artistic, in the sense of expressing in their daily lives their personal rendering of the creative movement of life, in a creative order, within a creative design, and singly and in groups have made themselves powers in the "art of life," in the recreation of human society on a basis of creative art and its qualities. However the present lamentable condition of things the world over may be held to have been brought about (through economic necessity, national egotism, individual ambition, racial antipathy, or otherwise), it is ultimately due to the fact that the heritage of fear, greed, jealousy, and sense-gratification, that man has brought with him from his animal stage of evolution (and in some senses made more animal than the animals themselves), has not yet been brought under the control of his slowly emerging spiritual nature. Under the influence of that spiritual nature, man has made, through specially endowed members of the race, repeated attempts to touch the creative reality of his life through art. But his ascensive efforts have been periodically frustrated by the downward pull of forces generated by groups who, through the successful exercise of appeal to the lower nature of humanity, assisted by a social organization based on exploitation instead of Brotherhood, have debased the creative power and deflected the interest of humanity, and today have done so over an area and to a depth never before reached in human history. This descensive movement can only be checked and turned back by universalizing creative art in education, and, through education, in organized human life.

It is possible that considerations such as the foregoing may be regarded, by those to whom they are unfamiliar, as remote from the economic and international necessities of the present portentous crisis in human affairs, or may even be regarded as allurements away from what some may consider the urgent need of finding a way out of the conditions that appear to be developing towards a world disaster. It may, however, be pointed out that, in a situation muddled and vitiated by the complexities inherent in all self-centered action, which is the only action that appears to be valid today, no one of the expedients now being put forward for dealing with this or that aspect of the situation can bring about any permanent betterment, since none of them on a close scrutiny is found to touch the fundamentals of free, creative, unified life through which the beneficent potentialities of human nature can be evoked. The world is as it is, because its leaders lack

e2



the spiritual vision of the unity of life and the community of its forms; and because the peoples of the world are denied a mode of life that would liberate their creative impulses into purifying and ennobling expression in the rhythmical order and within the significant design of art.

Forty years ago, Tolstoy, approaching the problems of that time, in *What Is Art?* exclaimed: "The task of art is enormous." It is much more enormous today after a decline in the quality of life and art inherent in the circumstances which he contemplated. But his summary of the matter, in its essentials, is not affected by time, though his remedy, if it could have been applied, would have proved ineffective because of the limitations which his temperament and environment imposed upon it. Tolstoy said:

"Through the influence of real art, aided by science, guided by religion, that peaceful cooperation of man, which is now obtained by external means—by our law-courts, police, charitable institutions, factory inspection, and so forth—should be obtained by man's free and joyous activity. Art should cause violence to be set aside. And it is only art that can accomplish this."

Tolstoy's definition of "real art" was an art that communicated feeling; the religion which, according to him, was to guide art, was the simplest form of Christianity, the ideal of human brotherhood as preached by Jesus Christ. But to restrict art to the communication of feeling (and the feeling regarded by Tolstoy as appropriate to good art was mainly a humanistic sentimentality) is to cut it off from vision and creative *ananda*; to rob a river of its full force by shifting its spring to a point too near its exit. To limit the guid-

ance of art to the doctrine of a single religion is to isolate art, guided by Christianity as Tolstoy conceived it, from the arts inspired by other formulations of the religious instinct of humanity, from the exquisite art of Buddhist Japan, the luminous art of Taoist China, the interpretative art of Hindu India.

The coming spiritual art-criticism, bettering Tolstoy's high claims for art, will, as Shelley did in *Prometheus Unbound*, declare the arts, irrespective of theological distinctions, to be man's true means of fulfilling his real nature as creator, since they put him in contact with the creative life of the universe, and give him the constant opportunity to experience what the English poet laureate, John Masefield, in *Biography*, calls "those glittering moments" in which

All may be imagined from the flash,  
The cloud-hid god-game through the lightning gash,  
Those hours of stricken sparks from which men took  
Light to send out to men in song and book.

That, in the phrase of a creative artist with spiritual vision, is the essential service to which art is now called—the expression of the vision of the "cloud-hid god-game" of the cosmic life and its characteristics, and the translation of that vision into the "art of life." Such vision of reality through art cannot remain an isolated activity: it has in it the power not only to use the intellectual, emotional, and material media of its expression, but to transform them into its own likeness—to vivify and exalt feeling and its expression in religion, illuminate thought and its expression in philosophy, purify the expanding sensory apparatus of the individual and its expression in science, and make human action a version of the divine activity.

## Euthanasia

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Years ago I knew a family consisting of a father, mother, and a young son. The father in his twenties was stricken with paralysis. For eight long years he was an entirely helpless invalid. He existed but did not live. His mind was entirely gone. He was cared for as a helpless babe. The mother supported the family by taking in washing. The father died at the end of eight years. The widow survived as a broken old woman.

From that time to this, I have seen many cases of prolonged suffering which has included not only the invalid but also all the members of the family. In some cases the patient has prayed to die. Life was for him ended. His continued existence meant in some cases the breakdown of the family morale.

I have wondered why we should consider it a crime to permit criminals to suffer and yet approve of unnecessary suffering on the part of human beings. Is it because of the Biblical injunction: "Thou shalt not kill?" If so, why do opponents of Euthanasia argue for the killing of persons who commit crimes, and also for mass killing in the time of war?

Sir Thomas More, whom the Roman Catholic Church recognized as a saint in 1935 and who is described by Father Sir John O'Connell in the *Catholic Times* of January, 1936, as "the greatest Englishman who ever lived," wrote in his *Utopia* as follows:

"If the disease be not only incurable, but also full of continual pain and anguish: then the priests and magistrates exhort the man, seeing he is not able to do any

duty of life, and by over-living his own life is noisome and irksome to others and grievous to himself: that he will determine with himself no longer to cherish that pestilent and painful disease. And seeing that his life is to him but a torment, that he will not be unwilling to die . . . but either despatch himself out of that painful life as out of a prison, or rack of torment, or else suffer himself to be rid of by other.

"And in so doing they tell him that he shall do wisely, seeing by his death . . . he shall end his pain. And because in that act he shall follow the counsel of the priests, that is to say of the interpreters of God's will and pleasure, they show him that he shall do like a Godly and virtuous man. . . . But they cause none such to die against his will, believing this to be an honorable death. . . ."

Here we have the testimony of a Catholic Saint. He well may be considered the Patron Saint of Euthanasia.

All objections to merciful death seem to rest finally on the assumption that it is man's business to live, and yet for ages we have honored men who have preferred death to life.

"Though love repine, and reason chafe,  
There came a voice without reply—  
'Tis man's perdition to be safe,  
When for the truth he ought to die."

Church and school have united in honoring those who have dared to give their lives for others. Certainly the one who willingly dies that his loved ones may be relieved from suffering that comes through his suffering, should not be denied the privilege.

After all, one's life is one's own. No one can deter-



mine for another what his duty is. Why should we by law prevent one doing what we can only call an heroic deed? When a sufferer faces the fact that the prolongation of his life means incalculable suffering for others, when in addition to his own pain he must see himself inflicting pain on others which adds immeasurably to his own torture, how can we insist that this situation be prolonged?

To many the answer is that it is the "will of God." But man is constantly interfering with the will of God. The preservation of the weak through medical care is what men once called interfering with the will of God. If the patient is helpless and food is not given him, he dies. Medicine is, in essence, a food. If it is refused, the patient dies. I know of a case where a helpless invalid was brought back again and again to life by restoratives. But it was hardly to life, it was rather to a helpless existence racked by pain. If the physician had refused to act, then Euthanasia would have been practised. We do not blame the physician in such cases for refusing to act.

I know of a person who was slowly dying and suffering excruciating pain. After a paroxysm of pain she sank into a coma. The doctor said, "I can bring her back as I have before." But he did not. And this with the approval of the entire family. Why thus should we approve of the negative action and deny a positive one that would realize the same end?

That this problem has important medical aspects no one would deny. But it is, as many doctors have said, primarily an ethical and social problem. In England, where this question has for a number of years been a matter of public discussion, there has been organized a Voluntary Euthanasia Legislation society. The movement has been supported by a large number of the leading medical men. It has also been supported by leaders in the scientific and religious world.

Among a large number of leading clergymen are Dr. Inge, the former dean of St. Paul's; the present dean of St. Paul's; the dean of Canterbury; Dr. Rhondda Williams, chairman of the Congregational Union. Among the laymen supporting the measure are names well-known here in America: Julian Huxley, Havelock Ellis, Prof. George Trevelyn, and H. G. Wells.

While there is no organized movement in America, there are large numbers of men and women who are giving their support to the idea.

This movement is not one which can be damned by referring to it as the work of sentimental social workers. It is interesting to note that, at the organization of the Euthanasia Society, the speeches were made by men of the highest standing in the medical profession in England. The whole question was primarily discussed as one of ethical and social importance.

Dr. C. Killick Millard, organizer of the society, set forth his reasons for his advocacy primarily in moral terms. He said:

"We all know what a heavy load of pain and affliction humanity has to bear. We all desire that everything reasonably practicable should be done to lessen that load.

"Much of the pain and suffering in the world is due to certain diseases, which not only kill their victims, but also kill them by the slow lingering process of exhaustion due to pain and suffering—a process often long drawn out over a period of many weeks or even months."

Lord Listowel, speaking at the same organization meeting, said:

"For Christian and non-Christian alike, the first and

greatest commandment is that which bids us exercise mercy and compassion towards sentient creatures. In the case of a domestic animal expiring in terrible agony our instinctive reaction is to release the poor thing from its pain, and it would be cruelty to do otherwise. Are we to continue to treat animals better than our fellow men? It is surely time for us to extend our mercy to the dying, so as to give them at least a peaceful crossing to the other shore."

But the most interesting testimony was given by Robert Harding of London. His personal testimony is so poignant and searching that I quote it in full:

"You have heard the views of those eminent in medicine, public affairs, and the clerical profession. As a mere private citizen I do not think my testimony is out of place as a complement to that already given.

"I must, for the time being, throw off the restraint with which we customarily speak in public of our own domestic affairs, for what I have to say relates to, or is the outcome of, personal experience.

"It fell to my lot, as, indeed, it may fall to the lot of any of us, to watch by my wife after all hope of saving her life had had to be abandoned.

"Though grievously tormented in body, the mind retained perfect competency and she implored me to find means for terminating her sufferings by painless death.

"Of course, I consulted earnestly with relatives and friends who, like myself, loved her dearly and then, guided by them, I appealed to the doctor. He said 'I am not allowed even to consider that; my duty is to save life if I can, and, if not, to prolong it.' To prolong it, when any extension of the life span could only mean days of agony and nights of anguish!

"And then I vowed that, if ever it should be within my power to speak to others of the lesson I had learned in the sad school of sorrow, at least one voice should be raised for the legalization of Voluntary Euthanasia.

"Assuming that due care is taken, what are the possible objections? Well, it is said 'what husband would like to assent to the termination of his wife's life?' Of course no husband, no decent husband, would like to do so. But when he knows that it is compassion and love that call him to assent, then, though he may weep, he will not hesitate to grant the relief for which his beloved one pleads. Then it is said, 'It is sometimes done already.' That may be true or not. But if it is true, how much better that it should be done under proper regulations, and with proper safeguard against rash or impulsive action!

"This matter is a matter of urgency, but not one in which there should be rashness, haste, or precipitancy. In mercy to those who may now lie in hopeless agony, don't let it rest. Talk to serious and sympathetic friends. *Talk to those who have been tried in the fire through which I have had to pass.* And if some have been so tried I ask them not to let the matter drop just because their own trouble—the grief in their own home—is now passed and over, but to think of those other sufferers, now condemned to the rack of pain after all hope has been abandoned, but who, if this legislation is passed, may close their eyes in peace, grateful for your response to the call of mercy."

The Rev. Canon Harold Anson says:

"Religious people have tended to think that the unfettered course of nature represents the Will of God, and therefore that it was impious to bring rational considerations to bear to control either our entry into, or our exit from, this world. Contraception, whether by abstinence or by mechanical means, was disliked because it was assumed that God could and would control the course of the natural increase of mankind.

"But again, religious people have tended in the past to think that it is always possible that by prolonging life to the last possible gasp some new moral grace or illumination may be secured for the future life. If this indeed be so then it is surely very wrong to allow people ever to go into war or into danger of infection, which might conceivably shorten their life. But if we believe that the prolongation of life is not the supreme aim of living, and that perfection stands not in length of days, then we may believe that we may be judges of the desirable limit to be placed on terrestrial life, and that skilled human judgment may give us a better criterion than the irrational growth of bacteria in the body as to the desirable moment for the final act of death.