

*This has been changed.  
I think and there is a cure  
now by inoculation*

1.

#### THE SEX PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTION

*There are cures for it by inoculation*  
Hay-fever is a common and exceedingly annoying disease; ~~but~~  
~~there is almost no cure for it~~ *but* to get relief, I am told, a sufferer must  
go to high altitude where there is no pollen in the air, or where, at least,  
there is a minimum of pollen, for pollen seems to be everywhere when it is  
pollen-time in the plant kingdom; *and pollen in the air is the cause of Hay-fever*

In the reproduction of plant life, pollen plays an all-important  
part. It is the male principle in the scheme of reproduction, the stigma  
being the female principle. When the time for plant propagation comes, it  
seems to be nature's purpose to pollenize all stigmas and in its effort to do  
this it spreads pollen on all the winds in all directions, and so generously  
as not to miss any possible chance for propagation. This is one of the  
early stages in the mating of the sexes, and hay-fever may thus be considered  
a sex problem.

That, of course, is not the phase of the sex problem I am discussing and it is not my purpose to consider hay-fever excepting as an illustration of the seeming intent and determination of nature to reproduce plant life, and as a realization that she employs the sex method of reproduction even in the apparently passive and motionless life of the vegetable kingdom.

Having been pollenized, the thus fertilized stigma ~~produces~~ produces the seed which is the equivalent of the egg in animal life. In the earlier stages of animal life, when protection is difficult and the dangers of destruction great, we find in the enormous quantities of eggs and spawn laid during the propagating season that nature is here equally bent on reproduction with, of course, the sex method, somewhat more defined.

As life becomes more complex and the means of protecting the egg and the fertilizing ~~principle~~ principle increases, we find a decrease in the number of eggs laid and greater watchfulness on the part of the parent in the

hatching process, although the number of eggs and the quantity of fertilizing material are still great due to the principle of fertilization after the laying of the eggs.

As organism becomes more complex and functions more specialized, as in bird life, fertilization takes place before the laying of the eggs and we find greater care and forethought exercised in the protection of the egg and provision made for the care and feeding of the young after birth--in fact at this point we find the existence of family life. We also in this more complex state find fewer eggs; a greater degree of mind and sympathy evidently making mere quantity unnecessary if, indeed, not impossible.

In mammalia the eggs are not "laid" at all; fertilization and hatching both taking place within the body of the parent, and here we find still more mind and greater sympathy and, coincidentally, greater care of the offspring and further decrease in the number of births, until finally in man we find the greatest development of mind and sympathy, the greatest care of the offspring and the smallest number of births.

Even within the human family itself we find that with the further development of mind there is a further subjective decrease in race reproducing potentialities.

It seems then that in the constructive scheme of nature the creation of mind and sympathy is an objective, and that as this objective is approached quality rather than quantity is desired, and that provision for the decrease of quantity with the improvement of quality has already been made in the natural laws that govern these phenomena.

The obvious and most outstanding facts about the sex urge are that it is wholly subjective and in accordance with natural law; that it is perhaps the greatest factor in nature's scheme of reproduction, and that it has but one purpose and that purpose ~~is~~ the re-creation and the perpetuation of the species.

I believe that perhaps the greatest part of the confusion about the sex question arises out of our failure to recognize the sex urge as a purposeful

agent in the intent and scheme of nature to populate the world, together with our seeming general ignorance of the whole question of intent in nature, and of nature's determination and ability to enforce its mandates.

In none but the human animal do we find the exercise of the sex urge combined with objective circumvention of the sex purpose; and this in spite of the fact that the decrease in human births has already been subjectively effected by nature, and in spite of the fact that having more highly developed mind and sympathies man has greater appreciation of, and affection for, children. And also in spite of the farther and more important fact that man has so conquered the forces of nature as to make them serve him in maintaining himself, and can therefore better care for his young than can any other animal.

The situation seems anomalous. It would appear that fewer numbers accompanied by greater sustaining abilities would make for freer and more unrestricted exercise of the productive potentialities; instead of which we find repression and circumvention, both attempts to foil the natural law, and consequently both failures excepting in their momentary and most superficial aspects.

Thus in the human animal we find sex a problem.

To speak of sex as a problem, however, I believe, as did the little boy about inverting the divisor and then multiplying in the division of fractions, is only to make it harder. Mathematics is not a problem; mathematics is something we must learn to help us solve problems. Perhaps sex is not a problem at all; perhaps it is just a fact in nature, one of the facts of existence that we must learn about to help us solve the problem of life.

Hunger and thirst are perhaps the greatest of all natural phenomena, for, normally all life is nearly ~~and~~ always hungry and thirsty, yet neither hunger nor thirst in themselves are problems, though how to get food and drink sometimes may be.

Life itself presents a problem only because of the difficulty of "making a living". If it were easy to live, life would present no problem-- and so with sex.

May it not be that it is the hindrances that stand between the sex urge and its free and full and natural expression that really distort into a problem what should be perhaps the happiest event in all human life?

In humans puberty may or may not be the mating time, but be it when it may, is there anyone who will hold that the urge when it does appear is always met and met naturally and normally and without any infraction of the natural laws or interference with the intent of nature? And is there anyone who is interested in "problems" of this sort who will hold that natural law, over any appreciable length of time can be successfully violated?

The married state may or may not be the ideal state in which the sex urge finds <sup>its</sup> best expression (I hold that it is, and that monogamy is the ideal married state), but be that as it may, marriage is universal, conventional, legal, "proper", moral, chaste, and in accordance with all the commandments, usages and habits of civilized mankind, and has everywhere the sanction of civilization in practice and in theory. There is no general objection nor aversion to the married state anywhere. Why then do young folks of marriageable age not all marry and raise families?

I am told that some of the reasons are:

The selfishness of men.

The extravagance of women.

High rents and the high cost of ~~the~~ living.

Not able to give her as good a home as she now has.

Won't marry a man that doesn't earn more than I do.

Can't afford to marry.

Uncertainty of keeping the job,

Earn only enough to support myself.

Have dependents now and can't assume any further obligations.

I know what I have and don't know what I'd get into.

Afraid of the future.

First want to save enough to buy a home.

Have waited too long; it's too late now.

The inconstancy of men.

The inconstancy of women.

The number of unhappy marriages that one sees everywhere.

Have seen and experienced too much already.

Have time to marry when I'm old and need a nurse.

Don't believe in marriage.

Don't need to marry--having too good a time now.

Haven't been asked.

These, of course, do not express all the reasons for single blessedness, but they appeal to me as <sup>among</sup> the essential ones.

The reasons mentioned can in the main be divided into two categories; those hinging on poverty and the fear of poverty, and those that hinge on the fact that marriage is not a 'sine qua non' to sex expression.

Analyzing the second reason first we find the thing that makes marriage a non-essential in sex expression is the unmarried state itself; this state being general and continuous and manifesting the character and proportions of an institution; what wonder that youth--and not youth only--soon finds and deems itself a part of such an institution.

Then too, as Shakespeare tells us, "Custom ever breeds habit in a man, and the thing first shunned and afterwards endured is finally embraced." These factors, coupled with a sense of hopelessness (conscious or unconscious) of ever attaining the married state; (or perhaps <sup>indeed</sup> the aim or hope of reaching that state by indulgence) ~~or perhaps some other institution that~~ <sup>create a</sup> callousness or desperation ~~born of these conditions~~ <sup>that</sup> lead directly to our "problem".

Now as to those reasons for the unmarried state that hinge on poverty, permit me for the purpose of brevity to assume a condition in which there is no poverty and no fear of poverty. Can one avoid the conclusion that in such a condition youth would not remain unwed, and does it not follow as a corollary that marriage would supplant all promiscuity? To me such conclusion seems unavoidable.

~~Life in its development is everywhere governed by an urge from within~~  
~~modified by resistance from without. It is as resistances are conquered that~~  
~~life attains its fullest and truest expression.~~ The sex urge is one of  
~~nature's~~ nature's constructive measures; it would seem that poverty is its  
greatest obstacle; does it then not also seem that the sex problem is really  
a problem of poverty, and does it not follow that the removal of poverty is  
the solution of the sex problem?

There are ~~eight and a half~~ <sup>ten</sup> million women and girls of marriageable  
<sup>(when there is work)</sup> age at work in gainful and legitimate occupations in the United States, ~~and~~  
~~eight~~ million of whom are destined to remain unmarried. And there is a  
vast, but uncounted, number of women and girls of marriageable age, not so  
employed (or otherwise employed) who are likewise destined to go through life  
unwed.

The average earnings of women and girls at work are exceedingly low  
as the average ~~new~~ wage of both sexes in the United States, including all  
<sup>in times of prosperity</sup> salaries, is less than \$25 a week. Anyone who believes that these many  
millions of women and girls are at work in mills and factories, in shops &  
offices, and otherwise engaged, because they prefer such occupation to be  
mistresses in their own homes is welcome to his belief.

Every unmarried woman means an unmarried man, and anyone who c  
see in this condition of enforced singleness the basis of the sex probl  
must be seeking causes elsewhere than in the facts.

To say that the sex question insofar as it presents a problem is  
a question of biology or psychology is to beg the question altogether; it is  
the equivalent of saying that the sex question is merely a question of sex;  
both merely state ~~that~~ the fact that there is such a thing as sex and a sex  
urge; neither tends to find or solve, nor is either equipped to solve, the sex  
problem, unless, forsooth, it be by, or tends to, annihilation.

Individual sex pathology may come under the purview of biology or  
psychology, but even the problem of general or social sex pathology, if there  
is such a problem, would be beyond the spheres of biologic or psychologic

-7-

*To say there is no solution*  
inquiry or solution merely discloses proponents' shortcomings.

If it is conceded that the sex problem is merely a poverty, or an economic problem the rest is easy, for poverty is only a lack of purchasing power and the only thing we have to do to remedy it is to increase the purchasing power of the worker.

Purchasing power, of course, depends on wages, and to increase purchasing power it is necessary to increase wages.

Wages are governed by the law of supply and demand, and are high or low in the measure that labor is scarce or plentiful in comparison to jobs, and this is also true of professional services, <sup>salaries</sup> ~~salaries~~ and fees.

To increase the purchasing power of the worker or professional man we have therefore merely to make workers scarce in comparison to jobs ~~and~~ or jobs plentiful in comparison to workers. *As the former can be done in this way, one is to kill off enough workers, doctors and lawyers, so as to leave a dearth of labor and professional men, and the other let us apply ourselves to the latter and all if we can is to let the workers have and merely increase the number of jobs.*

*You see how simple it is. It remains for us now only to increase the ~~the~~ number of jobs in relation to the number of workers and the sex problem is solved.*

To increase the number of jobs we've got to go to the source of jobs. All work is done to satisfy human needs and desires, and ~~all~~ <sup>all</sup> wealth, which is produced in response to these needs and desires, comes out of the earth. The more earth there is in use the more workers there are employed; also the more earth there is in use and the more workers there are employed, the greater is the production of wealth and the more wealth there is to go around. To get more jobs therefore we must get more land <sup>we must</sup> ~~into use~~ <sup>into use</sup> and there is only one way by which this can be equitably done, and that is for the government to collect the full yearly rent of land in lieu of all taxes.

Did you ever hear of anyone paying the full rental value of anything and then not using it? Landowners are business men and will not continue a losing game. If men are compelled to pay the full yearly rent of land they will use their land or let it go to someone who will use it.

In cities that will mean more building activities, in rural communities more farms under cultivation, and in mining districts more mines in operation. Thus we have already increased the number of jobs and we have only begun.

The erecting of a building does not employ merely the hands that put it up; it employs also the men in the mines, the quarries, the forests, the foundries and the mills who furnish and shape the materials that go to make the building, and the men engaged in the transportation of this material and also the men who build the railroads, the steamships, and the trucks, etc. which constitute the machinery of transportation.

Increased activity on farms and in mines, in quarries, forests, foundries, mills and transportation, means also increased activities in factories, shops and offices.

Jobs will now seek the man, instead of men seeking a job. Competition will be between employers for workers, not between workers for employment. The law of supply and demand will do the rest, and the worker will receive the full value of his labor.

Now is this all. More building lots and farms and mines and quarries and forests and foundries and mills and factories in use, means greater production, and greater production means a lower <sup>comparative</sup> cost of living.

Thus, taking the full yearly rent <sup>by the government</sup> of land in lieu of all taxes not only creates more jobs and consequently higher wages, but also furnishes more labor products and therefore <sup>comparative</sup> lowers the cost of living.

Under these conditions poverty and the fear of poverty will be forever banished. Man will have a new interest in himself and in his surroundings; contentment and happiness will supplant hardships and misery, and confidence in the future will take the place of the consuming fears of to-day.

Then men and women will marry and they will marry young. The now permanent <sup>eight</sup> ~~six and a half~~ million counted spinsters, (and the now equally permanent though uncounted millions) will be at work as wives at their own



firesides instead of in factories, mills, shops, offices, or as dependents, (or otherwise engaged). The many millions of children and youths below the marriageable age that are now at work everywhere will be at schools and <sup>in</sup> colleges. ~~This not only will prosperify and security of a new order take the place of poverty and misery, but universal education of a high order will take the place of universal ignorance.~~

The work now done by these many millions of women and children will have to be done by men, and thus will be added still more jobs to those already provided, and the greater and more insistent demand for labor thus resulting, coupled with the reduction in the number of workers, will further raise wages, salaries, fees, and all payment for whatever service rendered, to the point where labor and services will absorb all wealth produced.

This brings us to another phase of the sex problem, or rather to what would seem as another phase to those looking to psychology or other extraneous sources for a solution of our problem, namely the phase that is presented by the immensely wealthy who have all the things that money can buy and neither work nor render services of any kind in return; the class generally referred to as the Idle Rich and in which class we find <sup>some</sup> ~~the most~~ glaring examples of sex irregularities; indeed it is to this class that our writers are largely indebted for their eternal <sup>triangular</sup> ~~tragic~~ situations.

Psychology may account for the fact that, having nothing to do but spend money, kill time, and seek enjoyment, the human animal in this class cannot avoid seeking new, continually newer, and perhaps grotesque situations and experiences to amuse <sup>him</sup> ~~it~~, and not having to expend energy to produce wealth or render services to maintain himself, must use that energy <sup>in</sup> ~~gratifying~~ the natural urges within him; <sup>and urge</sup> ~~plus~~ opportunity <sup>will do</sup> ~~to do~~ the rest.

Psychology does not account for the fact that there is an idle rich class; fundamental economics does.

Less than <sup>two</sup> ~~four~~ per cent of the population of New York City own all the land in New York. Less than <sup>five</sup> ~~ten~~ per cent of the population in the United States own all the land <sup>and natural resources</sup> in the United States. According to the latest

<sup>85</sup>  
~~statistics~~ <sup>80%</sup> ~~more than half~~ of all the wealth produced in the United States is absorbed by about <sup>1%</sup> ~~one per cent~~ of the population, ~~leaving the rest~~ <sup>80%</sup> all the wealth being left to the ~~rest of the population~~ who produce it.

Private ownership of land is the insatiable maw that devours the people's substance, fattening an idle class while leaving the mass of mankind to struggle for what <sup>this class</sup> leaves. If the yearly rent of all land were taken by the government in lieu of all taxes, thus forcing land into use and creating a demand for labor that could not <sup>then</sup> be fully satisfied, and thereby securing for the worker the full value of his product, there would be no surplus wealth to go to those who did not produce it. All wealth would go to those who work or render service. There would be no idle rich and there'd be no workers poor.

There also would then be no marriageable person single, nor would unhappiness, as now, accompany the married state. Unhappy marriages are the inevitable outcome of mismatched couples, and under present conditions are the rule rather than the exception. It could not be otherwise, for love, which must be the basis of happy marriage, does not have a chance when girls are glad if only they can get a man, when a perpetual meal-ticket is the 'summa bonum' rather than the desire to be the mother of his children; and when men are looking for cooks, seamstresses, housekeepers and sex companions that will make living handier, safer and more comfortable, rather than for soul-mates. And how often is marriage on the part of the man the result of a financial bargain. There is an established price in the marriage mart, for lawyers, doctors, dentists and such like. I have not heard the latest market quotations, but not long back you could buy a pretty good young doctor for \$10,000--and a fair lawyer for about half that amount.

Is it any wonder that there are so many post-marital awakenings? Is it any wonder that there are so many disappointments? Is it any wonder that there is so much sex irregularity in married life? The divorce courts tell only a part of the story. The same considerations that determine the choice of a mate make for a continuation in the married state whatever the bondships or titles may be: and if, there are the child

ever objects of strongest common interest and ever acting as the link that holds even unwilling mates.

Again, if there were no poverty and no fear of poverty the sex urge would translate itself into love. Girls, sure of being asked, would not give themselves in marriage but where true affection <sup>called</sup> ~~comes~~, and true affection combined with economic freedom is God's estate in the matter of sex.

Natural law governs all things in life. Sex and the sex urge are only tools in the workshop of nature, intended for the rebuilding or re-creation of the species. Whoever mistakes them for something else has only himself to blame for faulty deductions. Whoever disobeys or violates natural law tends only to destroy himself. There is no permanent or safe way out but in ~~obedience~~ <sup>obedience</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> natural law.

If we are looking for solutions that are to be permanent, we cannot remain superficial in our considerations and investigations. We must be fundamental. If curing a headache leads us to the stomach, it is there we must <sup>feel</sup> ~~feel~~. If malaria leads us to the swamps, it is in their elimination that we must seek prevention, and if the solution of the sex problem leads us to economic considerations, then it is in economic adjustments that we must seek a remedy.

Sex and the sex urge are facts, not problems. The conditions under which the sex urge is expressed (or repressed) are the problems confronting us. Eliminate poverty, want, and the fear of want; and you eliminate <sup>and unhappy marriages</sup> ~~batchelorhood and spinsterhood~~. Eliminate these and you eliminate the need, the desire, and the temptation toward sex promiscuity. Eliminate this and you have solved the sex problem.

Oscar H. Geiger

## THE SEX PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTION

by Oscar H. Geiger

Hay-fever is a common and exceedingly annoying disease. There are cures for it by inoculation, but to get relief, I am told, a sufferer must go to high altitudes where there is no pollen in the air, or where, at least, there is a minimum of pollen, for pollen seems to be everywhere when it is pollen-time in the plant kingdom; and pollen in the air is the cause of hay-fever.

In the reproduction of plant life, pollen plays an all-important part. It is the male principle in the scheme of reproduction, the stigma being the female principle. When the time for plant propagation comes, it seems to be nature's purpose to pollenize all stigmas and in its effort to do this it spreads pollen on all the winds in all directions, and so generously as not to miss any possible chance for propagation. This is one of the early stages in the mating of the sexes, and hay-fever may thus be considered a sex problem.

That, of course, is not the phase of the sex problem I am discussing and it is not my purpose to consider hay-fever excepting as an illustration of the seeming intent and determination of nature to reproduce plant life, and as a realization that she employs the sex method of reproduction even in the apparently passive and motionless life of the vegetable kingdom.

Having been pollenized, the thus fertilized stigma produces the seed which is the equivalent of the egg in animal life. In the earlier stages of animal life, when protection is difficult and the dangers of destruction great, we find in the enormous quantities of eggs and spawn laid during the propagating season that nature is here equally bent on reproduction with, of course, the sex method somewhat more defined.

As life becomes more complex and the means of protecting the egg and the fertilizing principle increases, we find a decrease in the number of eggs laid and greater watchfulness on the part of the parent in the hatching process, although the number of eggs and the quantity of fertilizing material are still great due to the principle of fertilization after the laying of the eggs.

As <sup>the</sup> organism becomes more complex and functions more specialized as in bird life, fertilization takes place before the laying of the eggs and we find greater care and forethought exercised in the protection of the egg and provision made for the care and feeding of the young after birth--in fact at this point we find the existence of family life. We also in this more complex state find fewer eggs; a greater degree of mind and sympathy evidently making mere quantity unnecessary if, indeed, not impossible.

In mammalia the eggs are not "laid" at all; fertilization and hatching both taking place within the body of the parent, and here we find still more mind and greater sympathy and, coincidentally, greater care of the offspring and further decrease in the number of births, until finally in man we find the greatest development of mind and sympathy, the greatest care of the offspring and the smallest number of births.

Even within the human family itself we find that with the further development of mind there is a further subjective decrease in race reproducing potentialities.

It seems then that in the constructive scheme of nature the creation of mind and sympathy is an objective, and that as this objective is approached quality rather than quantity is desired, and that provision for the decrease of quantity with the improvement of quality has already been made in the natural laws that govern these phenomena.

The obvious and most outstanding facts about the sex urge are that it is wholly subjective and in accordance with natural law; that it is perhaps the greatest factor in nature's scheme of reproduction, and that it has but one purpose and that purpose the re-creation and the perpetuation of the species.

## The Sex Problem and its Solution

-2-

I believe that perhaps the greatest part of the confusion about the sex question arises out of our failure to recognize the sex urge as a purposeful agent in the intent and scheme of nature to populate the world, together with our seeming general ignorance of the whole question of intent in nature, and of nature's determination and ability to enforce its mandates.

In none but the human animal do we find the exercise of the sex urge combined with objective circumvention of the sex purpose; and this in spite of the fact that the decrease in human births has already been subjectively effected by nature, and in spite of the fact that having more highly developed mind and sympathies man has greater appreciation of, and affection for, children. And also in spite of the further and more important fact that man has so conquered the forces of nature as to make them serve him in maintaining himself, and can therefore better care for his young than can any other animal.

The situation seems anomalous. It would appear that fewer numbers accompanied by greater sustaining abilities would make for freer and more unrestricted exercise of the productive potentialities; instead of which we find repression and circumvention, both attempts to foil the natural law, and consequently both failures excepting in their momentary and most superficial aspects.

Thus in the human animal we find a sex problem.

To speak of sex as a problem, however, I believe, as did the little boy about inverting the divisor and then multiplying in the division of fractions, is only to make it harder. Mathematics is not a problem; mathematics is something we must learn to help us solve problems. Perhaps sex is not a problem at all; perhaps it is just a fact in nature, one of the facts of existence that we must learn about to help us solve the problem of life.

Hunger and thirst are perhaps the greatest of all natural phenomena, for, normally all life is nearly always hungry and thirsty, yet neither hunger nor thirst in themselves are problems, though how to get food and drink sometimes may be.

Life itself presents a problem only because of the difficulty of "making a living". If it were easy to live, life would present no problem--and so with sex.

May it not be that it is the hindrances that stand between the sex urge and its free and full and natural expression that really distort into a problem what should be perhaps the happiest event in all human life?

In humans puberty may or may not be the mating time, but be it when it may, is there anyone who will hold that the urge when it does appear is always met and met naturally and normally and without any infraction of the natural laws or interference with the intent of nature? And is there anyone who is interested in "problems" of this sort who will hold that natural law, over any appreciable length of time can be successfully violated?

The married state may or may not be the ideal state in which the sex urge finds its best expression (I hold that it is, and that monogamy is the ideal married state), but be that as it may, marriage is universal, conventional, legal, "proper", moral, chaste, and in accordance with all the commandments, usages and habits of civilized mankind, and has everywhere the sanction of civilization in practice and in theory. There is no general objection nor aversion to the married state anywhere. Why then do young folks of marriageable age not all marry and raise families?

I am told that some of the reasons are: The selfishness of men. The extravagance of women. High rents and the high cost of living. Not able to give her as good a home as she now has. Won't marry a man that doesn't earn more than I do. Can't afford to marry. Uncertainty of keeping the job. Earn only enough to support myself. Have dependents now and can't assume any further obligations. I know what I have and don't know what I'd get into. Afraid of the future. First want to save enough to buy a home. Have waited too long; it's too late now. The inconstancy of men.

The Sex Problem and its Solution

The inconstancy of women. The number of unhappy marriages that one sees everywhere. Have seen and experienced too much already. Have time to marry when I'm old and need a nurse. Don't believe in marriage. Don't need to marry--having too good a time now. Haven't been asked.

These, of course, do not express all the reasons for single blessedness, but they appeal to me as among the essential ones.

The reasons mentioned can in the main be divided into two categories; the fact that marriage is not a 'sine qua non' to sex expression.

Analyzing the second reason first we find the thing that makes marriage a non-essential in sex expression is the unmarried state itself; this state being general and continuous and manifesting the character and proportions of an institution; what wonder that youth--and not youth only--soon finds and deems itself a part of such an institution.

Then too, as Shakespeare tells us, "Custom ever breeds habit in a man, and the thing first shunned and afterwards endured is finally embraced." These factors, coupled with a sense of hopelessness (conscious or unconscious) of ever attaining the married state; (or perhaps indeed the aim or hope of reaching that state by indulgence) create a callousness or desperation that lead directly to our "problem".

Now as to those reasons for the unmarried state that hinge on poverty, permit me for the purpose of brevity to assume a condition in which there is no poverty and no fear of poverty. Can one avoid the conclusion that in such a condition youth would not remain unwed, and does it not follow as a corollary that marriage would supplant all promiscuity? To me such a conclusion seems unavoidable.

The sex urge is one of nature's constructive measures; it would seem that poverty is its greatest obstacle; does it then not also seem that the sex problem is really a problem of poverty, and does it not follow that the removal of poverty is the solution of the sex problem?

There are ten million women and girls of marriageable age at work (when there is work) in gainful and legitimate occupations in the United States, eight million of whom are destined to remain unmarried. And there is a vast, but uncounted, number of women and girls of marriageable age not so employed (or otherwise employed) who are likewise destined to go through life unwed.

The average earnings of women and girls at work are exceedingly low as the average wage of both sexes in the United States, including all high salaries, in times of "prosperity" is less than \$25 a week. Anyone who believes that these many millions of women and girls are at work in mills and factories, in shops and offices, and otherwise engaged, because they prefer such occupation to being mistresses in their own homes is welcome to his belief.

Every unmarried woman means an unmarried man, and anyone who cannot see in this condition of enforced singleness the basis of the sex problem must be seeking causes elsewhere than in the facts.

To say that the sex question insofar as it presents a problem is a question of biology or psychology is to beg the question altogether; it is the equivalent of saying that the sex question is merely a question of sex; both merely state the fact that there is such a thing as sex and a sex urge; neither tends to find or solve, nor is either equipped to solve, the sex problem, unless, forsooth, it be by, or tends to, annihilation.

Individual sex pathology may come under the purview of biology or psychology, but even the problem of general or social sex pathology, if there is such a problem, would be beyond the spheres of biologic or psychologic inquiry or solution. To say there is no solution merely discloses proponents' shortcomings.

## The Sex Problem and its Solution

If it is conceded that the sex problem is merely a poverty, or an economic problem, the rest is easy, for poverty is only a lack of purchasing power and the only thing we have to do to remedy it is to increase the purchasing power of the worker.

Purchasing power, of course, depends on wages, and to increase purchasing power it is necessary to increase wages.

Wages are governed by the law of supply and demand, and are high or low in the measure that labor is scarce or plentiful in comparison to jobs, and this is also true of professional services, salaries and fees.

To increase the purchasing power of the worker or professional man we have therefore merely to make workers scarce in comparison to jobs, or jobs plentiful in comparison to workers. As the former can be done only by killing off enough workers, doctors and lawyers, etc., so as to leave a dearth of labor and professional men, let us apply ourselves to the latter and see if we can increase the number of jobs.

To increase the number of jobs we've got to go to the source of jobs. All work is done to satisfy human needs and desires, and all wealth, which is produced in response to these needs and desires, comes out of the earth. The more earth there is in use the more workers there are employed; also the more earth there is in use and the more workers there are employed, the greater is the production of wealth and the more wealth there is to go around. To get more jobs therefore we must get more land into use — we must make it impossible to hold valuable land out of use — and there is only one way by which this can be equitably done, and that is for the government to collect the full yearly rent of land in lieu of all taxes.

Did you ever hear of anyone paying the full rental value of anything and then not using it? Landowners are business men and will not continue a losing game. If men are compelled to pay the full yearly rent of land they will use their land or let it go to someone who will use it.

In cities that will mean more building activities, in rural communities more farms under cultivation, and in mining districts more mines in operation. Thus we have already increased the number of jobs and we have only begun.

The erecting of a building does not employ merely the hands that put it up; it employs also the men in the mines, the quarries, the forests, the foundries and the mills who furnish and shape the materials that go to make the building, and the men engaged in the transportation of this material and also the men who build the railroads, the steamships, and the trucks, etc. which constitute the machinery of transportation.

Increased activity on farms and in mines, in quarries, forests, foundries, mills and transportation, means also increased activities in factories, shops and offices.

Jobs will now seek the man, instead of men seeking a job. Competition will be between employers for workers, not between workers for employment. The law of supply and demand will do the rest, and the worker will receive the full value of his labor.

Nor is this all. More building lots and farms and mines and quarries and forests and foundries and mills and factories in use, means greater production, and greater production means a lower comparative cost of living.

Under these conditions poverty and the fear of poverty will be forever banished. Man will have a new interest in himself and in his surroundings; contentment and happiness will supplant hardships and misery, and confidence in the future will take the place of the consuming fears of to-day.

Then men and women will marry and they will young. The now permanent eight million counted spinsters, (and the now equally permanent though uncounted millions) will be at work as wives at their own firesides instead of in factories, mills, shops, offices, or as dependents (or otherwise engaged). The many millions of children and youths below the marriageable age that are now at

### The Sex Problem and its Solution

The work now done by these many millions of women and children will have to be done by men, and thus will be added still more jobs to those already provided, and the greater and more insistent demand for labor thus resulting, coupled with the reduction in the number of workers, will further raise wages, salaries, fees, and all payment for whatever service rendered, to the point where labor and services will absorb all wealth produced.

This brings us to another phase of the sex problem, or rather to what would seem as another phase to those looking to psychology or other extraneous sources for a solution of our problem, namely the phase that is presented by the immensely wealthy who have all the things that money can buy and neither work nor render services of any kind in return; the class generally referred to as the Idle Rich and in which class we find some glaring examples of sex irregularities; indeed it is to this class that our writers are largely indebted for their eternal triangular situations.

Psychology may account for the fact that, having nothing to do but spend money, kill time, and seek enjoyment, the human animal in this class cannot avoid seeking new, continually newer, and perhaps grotesque situations and experiences to amuse him, and not having to expend energy to produce wealth or render services to maintain himself, must use that energy in gratifying the natural urges within him; and urge plus opportunity will do the rest.

Psychology does not account for the fact that there is an idle rich class; fundamental economics does.

Less than two per cent of the population of New York City own all the land in New York. Less than five per cent of the population in the United States own all the land and natural resources in the United States. According to the latest statistics 85% of all the wealth produced in the United States is absorbed by about 5% of the population, 15% of the wealth being left to the 80% who produce it.

Private ownership of land is the insatiable maw that devours the people's substance, fattening an idle class while leaving the mass of mankind to struggle for what this class leaves. If the yearly rent of all land were taken by the government in lieu of all taxes, thus forcing land into use and creating a demand for labor that could not then be fully satisfied, and thereby securing for the worker the full value of his product, there would be no surplus wealth to go to those who did not produce it. All wealth would go to those who work or render service. There would be no idle rich and there'd be no workers poor.

There also would then be no marriageable person single, nor would unhappiness, as now, accompany the married state. Unhappy marriages are the inevitable outcome of mismatched couples, and under present conditions are the rule rather than the exception. It could not be otherwise; for love, which must be the basis of happy marriage, does not have a chance when girls are glad if only they can get a man, when a perpetual meal-ticket is the "summum bonum" rather than the desire to be the mother of his children; and when men are looking for cooks, seamstresses, housekeepers and sex companions that will make living handier, safer and more comfortable, rather than for soul-mates. And how often is marriage on the part of the man the result of a financial bargain. There is an established price in the marriage mart, for lawyers, doctors, dentists and such like. I have not heard the latest market quotations, but not long back you could buy a pretty good young doctor for \$10,000 -- and a fair lawyer for about half that amount.

Is it any wonder that there are so many post-marital awakenings? Is it any wonder that there are so many disappointments? Is it any wonder that there is so much sex irregularity in married life? The divorce courts tell only a part of the story. The same considerations that determine the choice of a mate, make for a continuation in the married state whatever the hardships or indignities may be; and then, of course, there are the children -- ever objects of strongest common interest and ever acting as the link that holds even unwilling mates.

over



### The Sex Problem and its Solution

Again, if there were no poverty and no fear of poverty the sex-urge would translate itself into love. Girls, sure of being asked, would not give themselves in marriage but where true affection called; and true affection combined with economic freedom is God's estate in the matter of sex.

Natural law governs all things in life. Sex and the sex-urge are only tools in the workshop of nature, intended for the rebuilding or recreation of the species. Whoever mistakes them for something else has only himself to blame for faulty deductions. Whoever disobeys or violates natural law tends only to destroy himself. There is no permanent or safe way out but in obedience of natural law.

If we are looking for solutions that are to be permanent, we cannot remain superficial in our considerations and investigations. We must be fundamental. If curing a headache leads us to the stomach, it is there we must follow; if malaria leads us to the swamps, it is in their elimination that we must seek prevention, and if the solution of the sex problem leads us to economic considerations, then it is in economic adjustments that we must seek a remedy.

Sex and the sex urge are facts, not problems. The conditions under which the sex urge is expressed (or repressed) are the problems confronting us. Eliminate poverty, want, and the fear of want, and you eliminate bachelorhood, spinsterhood and unhappy marriages. Eliminate these and you eliminate the need, the desire, and the temptation toward sex promiscuity. Eliminate this and you have solved the sex problem.