

then clothing is unnatural, cooking is unnatural, and chastity and monogamy are unnatural. If "nature" is to be followed in one point, let it be followed in all. It is surely time that men recognized that all civilization is just a modifying and controlling of "nature." Secondly, to a thinking man or woman there can be no more of "indecent" in giving or acting-on the knowledge necessary for right living in this matter than there is in teaching physiology to students, or in doctors attending women in child-birth and disease, or in nurses attending male patients. It is really a species of mental disease, set up by morbid religion, that makes people recoil from the grave and decent handling of such profoundly important questions. There is no need for the slightest coarseness in the public or printed discussion of these matters; and as far as my experience goes, the coarseness is nearly always on the side of those who raise objections in the name of propriety.

But there is a worse form of folly, which must not here be passed over. In a recent sermon by the Rev. Charles Voysey, of the Theistic Church, London, I find the following:

"I abjure Malthus and all his works, as I would abjure the Devil if there were one. Under the semblance of a wise philosophy, and even wearing the garb of conscientious regard for others, Malthusianism is a rude and impious slap in the face given to our Mother Nature and to Nature's God. I do not say there is no sin in reckless marriages and in unbridled proletarianism; but there is far greater sin and a world of infinitely deeper moral danger and pollution in the hindrances set by society and by the adoption of Malthusianism in the way of marriage and parentage. Celibacy, if sometimes a virtue, is more often a crime which leads to vice. I am sorry to say this is not the place in which these matters can be safely discussed in detail. But this is the proper place and the proper time to declare without faltering that children and the fruit of the womb are an heritage and gift that cometh from the Lord: and that it is a crime against heaven as well as a crime against young men and maidens to frustrate their divine right to fulfil the law of their being. It is not only a crime but a blunder, not a mere choice between evils nearly balanced, but a faithless neglect of duty through lack of trust in the bounty and faithfulness of God, and a wilful adoption of means to outrage Nature and to ruin mankind."

Mr. Voysey is a very confused person, who has rejected part of the popular religion, but talks as much unreason about the rest as anybody else does over the whole. In the above passage he first avows that there is "*sin* in reckless marriages and in unbridled proletarianism"—that is, in poor men having a large number of children. Now, all that Malthus practically did was to warn people against these things. His advice, though well-meant, was bad in so far as he counselled poor men to put off marriage till they had saved a good deal of money, that is, till late in life. Such counsel can only lead to prostitution. But the neo-Malthusians correct his error by teaching young men and maidens how they may marry in their bloom without fear of ruinously large families; whereas Mr. Voysey, after admitting the "*sin*" of procreating children