THE

JOURNAL OF MENTAL SCIENCE

[*Published by Authority of the Medico-Psychological Association of Great Britain and Ireland.*]

No. 269 [NEW SERIES No. 233.] APRIL, 1919. VOL. LXV.

Part I.—Original Articles.

War Psychology: English and German. By the late Dr. HENRY MAUDSLEY.

[THE following article was sent to the Editors so far back as the autumn of 1916. Exception was taken by the Censor to certain passages, and as it was felt that it was preferable that it should be published in its entirety or not at all, its publication was withheld in the hope that the objections would eventually be withdrawn. This has now been done, and the Editors are glad to be in a position to present the article as it came from the pen of Dr. Maudsley, and without any mutilation.

It is not to be expected that everyone will agree with the views of the writer, but there is little doubt that the paper will be read with interest coming from such a source, written as it was shortly before the termination of his career, and constituting one of the latest utterances of a great thinker, whose writings have always been infused with a truly scientific spirit, and characterised by a dispassionate philosophy expounded with almost judicial fairness, and rare literary genius maintained to practically the close of a life prolonged far beyond the average. The whole article embodies a quasi-prophetic warning, delivered at a time when the nations were in the convulsive throes of a world-wide conflict, from the bitter aftermath of which we are scarcely as yet emancipated: a warning which, if somewhat pessimistic in tone, may be, perhaps, not altogether unheeded, as the outlook is still full of uncertainty, and as there is at least a possibility that our roseate anticipations of a Golden

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Age, a millennium of peace on earth, and universal mutual goodwill among all nations, may fail to reach its long wished for fulfilment.]

To understand truly the psychology of the nations which have plunged headlong into the present unprecedented war, it is incumbent not only to study their elaborate historical records but to take a deeper biological account of the native vigour of each national stock. Mind being fundamentally life in mind, and life being essentially motion, its manifestations presuppose and disclose the vigour of its native vital force. For that reason the psychology which concerns itself only with conscious display must needs be wanting in depth and hold of reality. Is the Teutonic race perchance superior in vital vigour, as it believes, and the Latin races comparatively weak and decadent; its present outburst of military force therefore just the natural consequence of its stronger vitality?

The universal characteristic of life notably is its amazing productiveness and unceasing impulse to prolific increase from the moment when it comes into being in its simplest vital plasm. A continual destruction immensely disproportionate to survival is the consequence: in the order and purpose of Nature death as normal a factor as life, although conscious life is loth to think it as natural and necessary. In this perpetual vital propulsion stronger life survives and grows at the cost of weaker life, building up higher vital complexes in ascending scale by feeding on lower vital complexes. Thence the so-called struggle for existence and survival of the fittest; which is a fundamental fact of the procession of Nature from age to age. Such ethical considerations as right, justice, pity, mercy, have no part or place on that low plane of vital energy which will withal, be it understood, not fail to continue to operate actively even after they come into being and application on a higher plane of human development. This is an important fact which the enthusiastic humanitarian, shrouding reality in a haze of incontinent sentiment, is apt to lose sight of in his optimistic expectation of a complete moral regeneration of humanity after the war is over.

Whence in the system of Nature is life's immanent impulse to increase derived? Without doubt immediately from the

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

perpetual heat of the sun's rays on the vital plasm to which it owed its origin, and by which it is sustained in being: vital force, no self-sufficing and self-determining fictitious entity as commonly supposed, but a natural continuity and complex of unified material forces, its impulsion fundamentally propulsion. Remotely, of course, from the ultimate supreme reality of the universe which, being incomprehensible and ineffable, cannot be expressed in terms of human thought. Certain it is that the one universal dynamic energy unknown and unknowable, however named, comes from above and is distributed downwards in countless channels through every grade of being—through stars and suns, grass and flowers, insects and birds, beasts and men. That is the plain conclusion of physical science beyond which it cannot and forbears to go.

Such stay of thought is unwelcome to human feeling. Hence the postulate of the Divine source ascribed to it by imagination urged by feeling to transcend in its flight the narrow limitations of thought.(1) Construing the illimitable universe in terms of his limited experience and understanding, man is impelled to postulate and personalize a Supreme Being as the ultimate reality and source whence all things proceed, and thereupon to fashion it more or less in the image of his ideal self. That is to say, when he has risen to the conception of unity, and got quit of the effete notions of the various inferior gods which he was compelled to imagine in his slow and irregular ascent of thought to that height. Proceeding from that conception of a one true God, and imbued with the social feeling of the higher vital complex which he has reached in his ascending organization, he naturally finds the Divine in all the phenomena and processes of the visible world, and, above all, specially and supremely incarnate at last in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, who was therefore God and man. Thenceforth he can look hopefully forward to a fatherhood of God and final brotherhood of mankind through worship of that divine Mediator, notwithstanding the disheartening events which, like the present war, occur to perplex and confound him—until, that is, he has divined their regenerative purpose.

Here, it is true, thought is brought into contact with two apparently antagonistic forces. On the one hand is the fundamental self-regarding force of prolific life ever pressing onward to expand beneath all conscious manifestations, and on the

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

other hand is the social or moral ideal of an altruistic suppression of individual vital force to serve the construction of a higher vital complex, and therewith the future development of humanity. The question of paramount importance obviously is, Which shall prevail in the end, the crude vital force or a progressive incarnation of the Divine in human nature? Now it is certain that the vital force cannot abate its essential impulsion and stay its natural self-regarding energy so long as the sun's rays continue to beat upon its vital plasm with unabated energy. But it is nowise incredible, on the contrary quite conceivable, that its force shall, in the human sphere, be minutely divided, regulated, refined, and absorbed into a progressive social and moral development of the race, and that be accomplished in reality which is yet a pious aspiration in the abstract. Therein lie the hope and promise of an indefinite human progress in time to come.

Is the abstract ideal then destined to be realized at last? Or is it possibly only an illusion, nothing more than the effect and expression in consciousness of the underlying perpetual vital push of the incorporate sun's rays? Can it justly be assumed to be prophetic of things to come? Mankind have always needed and progressed by means of the illusions and fictions which they created to inspire and spur them in their successive developmental ascents, and have abandoned them one after another when they were no longer serviceable. In all times and places the unfailing vital energy has thus enshrined itself in fitting fictions of thought, as it will no doubt continue to do while it lasts in full vigour. That life will live and grow for ever on earth is without doubt an illusion. End it must when the sun is "turned into darkness." But that is an event so remote that present life need not concern itself with it. How, indeed, can relative life, which is propelled motion, possibly realise absolute motionlessness? Meanwhile, within the immeasurable time of its continuance, it is instinct with the implicit conviction of a progressive ascent to higher vital complexity. The history of its past rise from lower to higher vital complexes justifies the hope and patient expectation of a continuance of the process of organic ascent, and therewith the faith in its progress along a moral line of evolution. Even from the scientific point of view, therefore, the opinion that the crude struggle for material existence will be superseded by a struggle

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for higher moral existence is not unwarranted. Higher vital complexes shall presumably be gradually organized, in whose structure the crude vital force is divided, regulated, refined, and condensed. Not otherwise, in fact, than as in the formation of living protoplasm the simpler physico-chemical forces have been controlled, regulated, and combined in its complex structure, and are constantly thus subtilized and combined in the secret operations and processes of the bodily metabolism. The process of moral ascent will be simply a continuance of the process of organic evolution which has gone on from the beginning of life, and the survival of the fittest be a survival not of the strongest in a merely physical struggle to live, naturally indifferent then to all moral considerations, but of the fittest in a natural evolution making for social advancement and righteousness on earth. International immorality, concerned only with the victory of might and guile, may be expected then to prove as unfitting and disastrous as intranational immorality would be in a particular nation which should adopt that pernicious practice. That the motions of the two apparently antagonistic forces shall thus be harmonized and combined in a higher vital unity, and the self-regarding vital force merge its absorbed energy in refined forces of altruistic evolution; such is the pleasing hope and pious aspiration.

Assuredly the present murderous war has been a rude shock to such idealistic expectation. After nearly two thousand years of Christian profession, the most civilized specimens of the race have found no better use of their gains than to plunge into the biggest, bloodiest, and most destructive war in human history, and to prosecute it with all the most devastating means of destruction which their conquests and control of the forces of Nature have enabled them to devise and employ. All the long and laboriously accumulated acquisitions of human intellect through the ages have been applied with the utmost ingenuity and fiercest resolution to purposes of self-destruction. Such is the result which Nature, operating through its human nature, has brought about as necessary effect in the proper course of its system of evolution. Had any gifted seer a month before the unforeseen eruption of brute vital passions in floods of devastation been bold enough to predict the inevitable catastrophe he would certainly have been denounced as a madman,

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

or scouted as a despicable and anti-human disbeliever in the value of Christianity and the progress of humanity, if any notice had been taken of him at all. Yet it ought to have been foreseen by beings so proud of their present height of intellectual development, and might perhaps have been predicted by a sufficiently cool, penetrating, and prescient student of history. Frederick the Great, as deliberate and resolute an embodiment of treacherous, unscrupulous, and successful brutality as the world is perhaps ever likely to see and enthrone in its admiration (his successful fraud and force having enshrined him as 'The Great'), is the ideal monarch of North Germany, and its present ruler Wilhelm II, its 'All Highest,' and 'Supreme War Lord.' What then has naturally and necessarily happened? That the brute force of vigorous life has asserted and mercilessly executed itself in open and deliberate defiance of the gentle growth of a slowly progressive humanity, and, were it to prove successful, might gloriously enshrine a Wilhelm the Great or Greater—at any rate in Germany. That is the real fact to be faced by an optimistic idealism, a fact the significance of which cannot be got rid of, as the manner is, by putting on an extra strain of sentimental idealism to hide it.

Moreover, in frankly facing the disagreeable fact, it is proper to bear in mind that the fighting nations are alike sincere in their belief that they are fighting for the right and the promotion of a true human development. It is absurd for one nation to assume that the enemy is purely hypocritical, as it might indeed perceive and own were it to try to see itself as the other sees and its own history reveals it, which is truly revealed in the nation, as in the individual, not by its words, but by its deeds. But how can Germany, it is asked, really believe that it acted rightly in its unprovoked attack on nations which wished only to be left at peace, and in treacherously preparing for years—steadily, secretly, and systematically—the means of such a sudden and unexpected attack when the opportune moment arrived? But Germany does not for an instant admit that the attack was unprovoked and unjustifiable. Looking farther back than the immediate precedent circumstances, it found sufficient provocation there, and concluded an immediate attack to be the sensible and righteous defence.(2) A strong, virile and expanding nation perceived itself sur-

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

rounded by secretly hostile nations in tacit league to bar its needed outlets of expansion and deliberately resolved to obtain them. Having made a modest attempt in Morocco to find a place in the sun—nominally, but really a most formidable post and war station—when the French were taking possession of that country, it was met with the threat of a determined opposition in which the French relied upon the support of England, and presumably of Russia. Yet France was then aggressively extending its colonial dominion, although by deliberate and systematic restriction of its families at home it was not producing sufficient children to keep up its own population. What else could a vigorously vital nation with a superabundant population do but patiently watch and wait until it had perfected the means of breaking down the environing opposition? Vital force in the life plasm would not be vital if it suppressed itself, or allowed itself to be suppressed by its environment. Futile discussion as to whether Germany started the war is no better than puerile pedantry concerning itself with words on the part of shallow-minded diplomatists who, blind to the real forces at work, did not foresee its certain and immediate outbreak—although such foresight was the reason of their being—and persuaded themselves that they could prevent it by words.

The Allies on their side are, no doubt, sincerely convinced, as they hearten themselves by protesting, that they are fighting for right and justice and the cause of true civilization. Yet the Germans, who believe themselves to be good Christians, are passionately convinced that their cause is just, join wholeheartedly in prayer to God for its triumph, and rightly deride the ridiculous notion that the whole nation is a docile people, enslaved by a few domineering Prussians from whose yoke it would wish and welcome deliverance. That is the foolish opinion of persons who did not foresee the impending and inevitable storm, but contemptuously scouted the urgent warnings of those who strove in vain to awaken them to the portentous signs. If such deliverance is to come, sound reason teaches that it must come gradually from a change of mind within the nation. A nation cannot change its constitutional habit of thought and feeling at the bidding of other differently constituted nations. As well ask the lily to blossom like the rose.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Germans are not merely the thoroughly practical people which they have proved themselves to be in industrial, scientific, and military organization, but are essentially a nation of idealists. They have not lost the idealistic spirit which showed itself so eminently in their philosophers—in Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, and many less distinguished thinkers—but have turned and applied it systematically to material and scientific uses. They still conceive theories, and having conceived a theory, philosophic or scientific, make it a creed for the time, thereupon prosecuting it by patient and systematically organized trial either to success and acceptance or to failure and abandonment. In every branch of knowledge, in theology, philosophy, history, and science that is their habit of mind. And the theory which they have now formed is that they embody the highest culture in the world and are justified in spreading it for the advancement of humanity. Arrogant as the assumption seems now in its naked crudity, the theory would not have seemed so outrageous before the war when it was being quietly assumed, peacefully prosecuted, and indeed generally accepted in England and America by writers who industriously provided for their pupils hashes of German philosophy in their Universities, and greedily sucked in the latest German scientific theories by whomsoever and wheresoever propounded in Germany. Like the Jews of old, the Germans claim to be a chosen people and, like them, ordained to fulfil the Divine Will. Monstrous as the claim now appears on its bare face, it ought not justly to shock and revolt Christians who accept the theory that the Jews were a chosen people, and glorify Christianity as the Divine evolution of Judaism.

The wonder and the pity of it is that, while hugging the creed, the Germans, like the Jews of old, should have sincerely convinced themselves that they were divinely ordained to accomplish their mission by unscrupulous treachery, systematic devastation, and ruthless butcheries of men, women, and children, in fact by systematically practising with German thoroughness a rule of infamous "frightfulness," and that they should now with German thoroughness justify their deliberately practised terrorism as the right means to enforce a speedier submission, and ensure German dominion on earth. Yet this theory showed no new spirit in them, was no exceptional ebullition of brutality; it was the natural expression of the

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Prussian brutal nature. Their Emperor, in his memorable address to his troops about to depart to China to suppress the Boxer rising, sternly adjured them to rival the frightfulness of the Huns. And his troops faithfully obeyed his injunctions, ruthlessly shooting harmless women and children who flocked into a street, out of curiosity to see them pass, and thereafter justifying and triumphing in their uncensured butchery—silently condoned indeed by its then allies and present enemies. To their military subordinated minds their Supreme War Lord, their All Highest, was the chosen instrument in the ordained progress of the human race, as he apparently sincerely believes himself to be. Ingrained in the German nature are docile service to the State and its military organisation as the habit of life, and unquestioning obedience to the Head of it; all sense of individual responsibility swallowed up in adoration of the 'All Highest' himself, in sure alliance with the Most High as he has persistently claimed to be, and has apparently infused into them.(3) Withal they conform to the inspired Jewish teachings of the Old Testament, which were practically efficient and fulfilled the Divine Will before the New Testament came into being with a new order of precepts, which are yet only ideal and confessedly impracticable between States in the actual world. The profession of them by those who do not and cannot practise them they naturally count hypocrisy and despise as inefficiency.

But is not that, it will be asked, to throw Christianity clean overboard? No! is the confident answer even of their divines, it is only to restrict it to its proper sphere at the present level of civilization in the Divine procession of events. The morality between State and State cannot possibly for a long time to come be the morality of the Sermon on the Mount. Indeed, it never was nor ever could have been the morality of any State; for no State could have been built and kept up on the foundation of such principles, nor any State continue to exist which practised them. ' In things which belong to the domain of the construction and maintenance of the State it has always been necessary to discriminate between spiritual and worldly matters. The State has grown up by the will and force to make weaker peoples subservient to it, and will continue naturally to do so. And inasmuch as in the progress of human development the manifest impulse of the vital force is

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to the formation of more and more complex social bodies, and to its embodiment in the State as the supreme social complex it necessarily follows that the strongest vital force will embody itself in the strongest State. When the superior State, pre-eminent in vital strength and intellectual culture, has perfected itself and fulfilled its mission, then shall come the time when it can rightly be impregnated with, and apply ethical principles in its dealings with subjugated peoples. Meanwhile, it needs and must use more force than justice, more pitilessness than pity, more rigour than mercy. International morality is the possibility and ideal of the future, when humanity has risen to that height of development. That is the German theory which is now being systematically tried in practice with German thoroughness.

It is withal the logical application in practice of German philosophy, the effect of which, good or bad, remains to be seen. A fair summary of Hegel's philosophic teaching would seem to be much as follows: The great State is built up by war, by conquests, by annexation, by subjugation of weaker peoples. It stands for an idea, a grand beneficent civilizing idea, pregnant and prophetic, and is in duty bound to conquer and annex small States. But, as every State will naturally take it for granted that its own idea is the best, the best can only be distinguished by victory. It is victory which proves that the victor is not only stronger materially, but, standing for a nobler and more vital idea, is the mark of a moral superiority. War is a necessary condition of the evolution of humanity, and generations to come will witness a succession of the triumphs of vital force—for the triumph in fact of the prophetic idea which contains the future over an idea out of date, senile and decadent. Germany, therefore, thus instructed, cares nothing for accusations of infamous barbarity in its conduct of war; they do not touch its conscience; they are not applicable to civilization at its present transitional level. War is war, intrinsically conscienceless, and must be waged relentlessly. Every act which is done to discourage, defeat, and destroy its enemies is a brave and justifiable deed. Victory must be won; nothing else matters. And when it is won, it will be a proof of moral as well as material superiority, being then the fulfilment of the Divine Will.

It is a theory which does not commend itself to the British

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mind. Yet it is what the stronger British race has constantly approved and practised in its subjugation of weaker and so-called inferior races—in India, in Egypt, in New Zealand, in every part of the earth where it has enforced and established its vast dominion. The benefits which it has conferred on the subjugated peoples by raising them a step in its type of civilization (which Ruskin describes as "in many respects one of the most horrible types of society that has ever existed in the world's history") it counts a justification of the servitude which it has imposed upon them. And it is now unsparing in its expenditure of missionary zeal and money to inculcate by the propagation of the Gospel the Christian doctrines and principles which it systematically disregarded and defied in taking possession of their countries for commercial and military purposes. Why then is it so grievously shocked at the proposed application to itself of similar methods by the Germans, who deem themselves similarly justified by their racial and mental superiority, and intend, like it, to bring Christian principles into use when they have established the supremacy of their sounder and more vigorous vitality and higher intellectual culture? British expansion, when all is said, was really the crude effect and expression of rude vital force, the sequent moral justifications having been the embellishing after-thoughts.

It is a characteristic and perhaps an advantage of the British practical mind that it is not idealistic nor severely logical, nor anywise disturbed by inconsistencies of thought. Life has its logic deeper than thought to which thought in the sequence adjusts itself. It believes that it can somehow combine spiritual and worldly matters in the international relations of life, and thinks to do so; its so-called cant and hypocrisy a practical testimony to the immanent ideal, the expression of a pious wish for what it wishes should be. Yet, as such combination is not really possible in practice, and would be as disastrous to a State as it would be for an individual in a particular nation when someone steals his cloak to give him coat also, the attempted compromise is necessarily disadvantageous; it incurs the immediate danger of ineffective practice, as well as provokes the natural accusation of cant and hypocrisy. In a deadly war between two nations the one which uses every means it can to conquer will have an

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

advantage over the enemy which compromises between right and wrong means; the result necessarily a simple matter of pure vital force struggling to maintain and expand itself. A brutal and horrible struggle, it is true, but inevitable: just a repetition of what has been hitherto in the procession of human events. If war be wicked, though it has hitherto been the efficient and divinely ordained factor in the evolution of the human drama through the ages, the impious conclusion would follow that the world has been wickedly governed; which is as absurd a banishment of the spiritual from the government of the Universe as it would be to introduce the spiritual freely into the method of actually conducting a war in an international life-and-death fight. Even Luther, who believed his native brutality to be Christianized—though it never was—stoutly affirmed the necessity of separating the spiritual from the real in war and other worldly matters. And Christian pastors in Germany now openly defend the doctrine which Christians outside Germany are forced implicitly to acknowledge and actually to practise, though loth explicitly to confess, the elimination of the ethical conscience from conduct even in unethical war.

The habit of the English mind is to treat conscience as something sacred in the abstract without considering at all what it actually is in the concrete. To it conscience is a divinely implanted something in every individual mind which ought always to be respected as sacred. That is really to delude itself with words without thinking in the least what they mean. For what is conscience, sincerely considered as a reality, not abstractly as a pious theory? It is really a general name, a fine spiritual abstraction, a fictitious entity, connoting so many and varying particular consciences of all sorts and qualities. The particular conscience always rests at bottom on the particular opinion, which may be narrow, ill-informed, positively irrational, hopelessly prejudiced—the opinion of a crackbrained neurotic, a crank, a faddist, a self-sufficient lop-sided mind, the more intensely conceited the narrower it is, and in that matter, as in other matters, the prouder in its conceit of superior wisdom to despise and oppose the inferior intelligence of the community and to resist its regulations. Yet the opinion is not made sound and infallible by being invested with a sacred halo and called conscience. The

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

consciences of the "passive resisters" in England obliged them to resist the Education Act and count their resistance righteousness; the consciences of the suffragettes and their allies to violate the law by arson, destruction of pictures, churches and property, and by the other criminal deeds which feminine imagination conceived, and acute feminine ingenuity put into practice; and the consciences of not a few "conscientious objectors" now to refuse military service in defence of their country fighting for its existence, while comfortably claiming and obtaining the benefits of military protection by the sacrifices and sufferings of their fellow citizens' lives. The result is that everybody except the convicted criminal and the certified lunatic is entitled to his sacred conscience, of what quality soever that be, and however mean a creature he be. His formed or more often tamely received opinion he then frantically hugs, without ever giving the least thought to how he got it and what it is worth. His abstract conscience is brought into instant use to oppose the collective conscience, and consecrate his prejudiced opinion.

Obviously such opinions carried into practice by a minority of the population are not consistent with the true weal of the State and would, were they generally adopted, be its ruin. Service to the State and obedience to its laws by its citizens are the plain duty of the individuals constituting it and consenting to live in and by it, the necessary condition indeed of its strength and stability: the so-called conscientious refusal of such civil duty from whatever personal motives a proportionate weakening of its strength and hurt to its stability. The British mind, inveterately addicted to compromise, and content to deal with phrases and conventions rather than realities, shrinks from thoroughly sincere and logical thought, and when trouble comes from the breakdown of the conventional practice and decisive action is needed, thinks to surmount the danger by the appointment of a committee to consider it and report. For that reason, when real vital forces are in opposition, it is at a disadvantage in its conflict with the German mind whose systematic military organization, ingrained obedience to the State, and concentrated application of its forces under single and revered leadership, enables it to use them directly, forcibly, and effectively. By a loose organization of all sorts of committees and commissioners

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and compromises promptly required action is consequently delayed and ineffectively applied; which is perhaps a practice hardly less foolish than it would be to think to win a battle by an army commanded by several loosely co-ordinated and often wrangling committees.

It is not surprising if the German military authorities—looking on the demoralised state of citizenship in England before the war, on the various resisters to law, and the licence freely granted to them to parade the streets and assault ministers, police, and others, on the interminable talk and vote-catching legislation of party politicians,(4) on the virtual emasculation of one estate of the realm by a subservient House of Commons whose members voted money to themselves for their private use out of the public revenues of which they were elected to be trustees, on the unchecked so-called peaceful but actually forcible picketing of factories by Trade Unions put above the law by law, on the lack in fact of honest leadership and effective government—thought they saw a nation sunk in selfish individuality and the sure signs of a moral decadence, and were tempted to seize the favourable opportunity of vigorous action. Obsessed with their notion of the value of their brute vital force, they overlooked the possibility of the uprise of such a latent force in England, and, disdainful of all ethical considerations in war, they underrated and despised the possible value of moral force in the procession of the human drama. Their psychology was the crude psychology of the essentially brutal Prussian nature. They had gladly embraced the doctrine of the evolution of man from the animal, and the survival of the strong in the life-struggle, but they blindly or wilfully ignored the fact that man, whatever his historical descent, is not now a mere animal, but essentially something higher, in fact a social and moral animal, who has developed and expects to continue to develop along that line of evolution otherwise than through German dominion.

That ethical aspiration has been an important and abiding factor in human development through the ages is an incontestible truth. Human ascent from its lowest stage of being to its present height witnesses positively to its operation, irregular and uncertain it may be, but on the whole undeniable and decided. However near akin to the gorilla in his historical evolution and physical structure he be, man is not a gorilla,

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nor, although of the same species as the Hun, is the Hun's spirit now congenial, at any rate outside Prussia. He is not, in fact, an evolution only but an epigenesis. Even the Germans, despite their adoration and brutal use of force, feel in some degree the reality of the ethical spirit in human nature, and partially recognize it in practice. Notwithstanding their gospel of terrorism deliberately devised and systematically practised, they do not openly advocate and justify the habitual killing of the wounded and the merciless shooting of prisoners; they allow some intrusion of the ethical factor, however illogically; and they deny angrily as lies or excuse their calculated brutalities and bestial defilements of occupied houses in conquered territory, perpetrated systematically in defiance of Hague Conventions which they had agreed to observe. Brutal and brutish as they may be in practice, they resent as an insult being called beasts. The recognition that they belong to the human species and wish to be thought human is an implicit acknowledgment by them of something higher in human nature than brute animality. But so sure are they of their vital superiority and pre-eminent intellectual culture that they reconcile their inconsistency by the moral conviction that their embodiment of the highest human development is the express purpose of the Divine Will, and the justification of the supremacy which they would achieve in the world. Their Emperor loudly and exultantly proclaims the doctrine, and they in their adoration of their All Highest, and rigidly disciplined obedience to his military control as Supreme War Lord, docilely accept it and its consequences. It does not appear that a single voice from Christian pulpit or professorial chair or literary cabinet was ever raised to protest against his ruthless adjurations to his troops to imitate the Huns in the conduct of war, and the carefully framed instructions of their military manuals mercilessly to terrorize the civil population of the devastated country. On the contrary, when the war was declared and Belgium treacherously overrun with savage brutality, systematic butcheries, and unspeakable atrocities, professors, priests and pastors, theologians, and distinguished persons in literature and science hastened with one consent to assure their All Highest in a servile and laudatory address of their approval and loyalty. That any ruler of a civilized nation in the twentieth century should have seriously given the advice

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and openly sanctioned the method of barbarous warfare which he exultantly proclaimed few persons beforehand would have believed possible, but perhaps not a single person could have conceived it possible that it would be enthusiastically received and endorsed by such distinguished representatives of German culture. Patriotic passion instantly swept away all quiet reflection. When a nation is hurt it feels as a whole, and responds in sympathetic and synergic unity of vital action.

The thing duly considered is not, of course, so strange as it looks on its face; it was a natural and necessary event. The three wars which Bismarck secretly devised, carefully prepared, and successfully carried through against Schleswig-Holstein, Austria, and France—in defence of German interests, as he alleged, which to him were avowedly German rights—had raised the German pride of military power and inflated the conceit of national superiority to an extravagant height, which their immensely increased and rapidly advancing material, economic, and commercial progress was not calculated to lessen; a progress so great that it was gaining, and might perhaps have continued to gain, peaceably all or more than all which they can hope to obtain by the present war. Not a single person in Germany could now perhaps be found (as the writings of their Christian pastors prove) to disapprove those wars, and their unscrupulous methods of provocation. They are approved as necessities of *inter*national life to which *intra*national rules of morality must be subjugated. What reason then to wonder at the patriotic outburst of exultation and adulation when their Supreme War Lord in his capacity of ruler of the State by divine right declared and entered on the greatest war in the world's history, in order to obtain and secure the domination of Germany in Europe and on earth?

What wonder again that their Emperor should have acted as he did? Think with adequate insight on his character as displayed in his speeches and conduct from the time when he succeeded to the throne, and with amazing self-sufficiency instantly took on himself the whole burden and responsibility of the government of the State as the Lord's anointed, dismissing the Great Chancellor whose genius had made it what it was. Apparently he was sincerely convinced that his grandfather, by sole virtue of being a Hohenzollern, had done the work which he had been guided and ruled to do under

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Bismarck's powerful tutelage, and he, by virtue of his being a divinely instituted Hohenzollern, was perfectly competent to continue and perfect. His secret if unavowed ambition was possibly to imitate Frederick the Great, and to be as great or even a greater figure in German history by operating on a grander scale, and with the vastly augmented resources of wealth and modern military science. The greatest war in human history would be the splendid theatre of his exploit, and his glorification for ever in human admiration.

Is that perchance a misreading of his character? Let the motive have been what it may, explicit or implicit, the judgment is certainly not a misreading of his character. Think on his many eloquent and boastful orations, his sermons, his telegrams, his fierce injunctions to his recruits, his restless journeys and constant poses in the limelight, his self-confident instructions to painters, sculptors, actors, even tailors, and his indiscreet speeches which provoked the submissive Reichstag at last to a humble remonstrance and forced him to a sort of apology through his Chancellor, whom, however, he soon after dismissed. Europe looked with a mixed admiration and amusement on so picturesque a figure in its drab procession and did not take him very seriously. Yet all these exhibitions were the exponents of character which could not fail to show itself in future conduct, and just insight might have foreseen. On March 23rd, 1890, Edmond de Goncourt wrote in the *Journal des Goncourt* (vol. viii, p. 142): "Ce jeune souverain allemand, ce névrose mystique, ce passionné des dramas religioso-guerriers de Wagner, cet endosseur en rêve de la blanche armure de Parsival, avec ses nuits sans sommeil, son activité maladive, la fièvre de son cerveau, m'apparait comme un souverain bien inquiétant dans l'avenir." The history of his earlier life was the revelation of his character, and what could his later life be but its natural continuation and expression? A mystical megalomaniac was possessed with the belief that he, the All Highest in Germany by divine right, was in alliance with, and the ordained instrument of the Most High in Heaven. So he shrunk not from plunging his country into war, and his subjects, content to be autocratically governed and docilely habituated to a strict military organisation, which treated the least imagined offence to military arrogance by a civilian as a crime justifying instant killing of the culprit by

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the hurt vanity of the officer, joined patriotically in the struggle.

The sequence of events was natural and inevitable. But it certainly was a painful surprise to Englishmen who supposed that the Emperor possessed some element of the quality which Englishmen imply in "a gentleman" should have sanctioned, extolled and rewarded the barbarities systematically practised. Military reasons, however, entirely obliterated such superficial feeling, if it ever existed, and furthermore justified every guile, lie, and atrocity which might serve to promote military success. An organized system of falsifications, forgeries, perversions and suppressions of truth, effected with all the thoroughness and completeness of the German national character, was deemed right for military reasons and a necessary and justifiable method of conducting military operations. The sole aim being to win in the fight, no consideration of truth or right must stand in the way of success; the matter was purely a triumph of might, and the use to be made of it in the end justified the means used to obtain it. Herein the German certainly does not conform to the English standard. Englishmen have an inveterate national prejudice in favour of fair play and strict observance of the rules of the game. It is doubtful whether there is a single well-authenticated instance of an English officer insulting or brutally treating a German prisoner, officer or private, whereas it is undeniable that there have been several such instances of assault and brutal treatment of so-called "English swine" by Prussian officers. Goethe, whose calm and lucid insight into Prussian character will hardly be contested even by Germans, said: "The Prussian is cruel by birth; civilization will make him ferocious." And that is just what has happened, even where it might have been least expected in the apparently cultivated Kaiser; a cultivation which events have shown to have been quite superficial veneer not native in character. Although his mother was English, the element of gentler breeding was instantly swept away by the uprush of native Hohenzollern brutality when the crisis came.

The truly English element must at best have been slight, for his maternal grandfather was a German, and withal a Coburg. Moreover, going further back in heredity and considering the strong stream of Hanoverian German ancestry in the English Royal family, it must have been a very thin

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

stream of pure English heredity which percolated downwards to affect his nature. No wonder then that it was quickly swept away by the torrent of native brutality. No wonder again that he has never shown the least sympathy with the qualities of his father's gentler character or, so far as appears, ever said a good word of him in all his manifold orations. He has gloried in praise of the coarser quality of his revered grandfather to whom he ascribed the successes which a very ordinary mind owed entirely to Bismarck's firm control and intelligent guidance. It is not in the least strange then that, brutal by Prussian birth, civilization has made the Prussian ferocious, as Goethe's prescience predicted.

So much for a cursory glance into individual psychology. But it would be unjust to Germans to suppose that they all share the brutal Prussian nature, although, having now given themselves up wholly to Prussian rule and militarianism, they condone and even rejoice in the barbarities practised. That the German people as a body believe that they are fighting for the salvation of their country and are heartily imbued with patriotic feeling cannot be reasonably doubted. They believe what their rulers tell them and suffer now the consequences of docilely putting the destinies of their country into the hands of a virtual autocracy. They do not learn the real merits of the matter because they depend for what they learn on their rulers, who strictly control all the sources of information, tell them only what they wish them to believe, and scrupulously hide from them what they do not wish them to know. Democracy is nowise lovely and has its disagreeable defects and dangers, but autocracy is perhaps a greater danger to the nation and assuredly to the world.(5) In view of present events it would seem therefore to be righteously resisted in the interests of civilization and humanity, to be a fight of moral right against immoral might.

The Allies on their side, and the English in particular, might do well not to delude themselves with the notion that they are really fighting from purely righteous motives, even though their cause be the cause of true human progress. They are fighting fundamentally from motives of self-interest which will continue to operate in the future when the war is over and to produce its inevitable consequences. France is fighting with admirable bravery and unsurpassed devotion in defence of its national

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

existence against a ruthless attack which its past national policy and traditional glorification of Napoleon and his great victories for the glory of France have certainly done something to provoke. Russia has been moved by its Slav sympathy with Serbia, and its desire to uphold its Balkan interests, which were gravely menaced by Austrian aggression. Great Britain was instinctively urged by the necessity of preventing the destruction of Belgian independence and the subjugation of France, which would have been a great and abiding peril to her shores and to Britannia's proud rule of the waves. Each nation in fact is struggling to maintain its life and future weal against an ambitious, vigorous, and expanding nation resolved at all cost to obtain more room in the world, and the supremacy in Europe which it is sure its superiority in might and culture rightly deserves: fundamental vital forces operating from different motives the real factors at work, and the inevitable result the triumph of the strongest, since Providence is confessedly on the side of the big battalions.

The forces of the Allies are united for the time in strenuous effort and somewhat extravagantly effusive professions of sympathy and anticipations of eternal friendship which are not in the least likely to be eternal; for the attraction which now holds them together in union against a powerful enemy may quickly dissolve when their respective interests no longer coincide. Nations do not any more than individuals change their character in a miraculous manner, and knowledge of their past history is the only safe basis for prediction concerning their future. Reviewing the histories of France, Russia, and Great Britain, which are nowise stories of peaceful unaggression, and judging national character as exhibited therein, it might not be well for Europe and humanity that Germany should be so completely vanquished as to supply no effective check on their actions. The English are notably liable to waves of unthinking sentiment, and their present sentimental effusions and enthusiastic anticipations of lasting friendships with France and Russia, as expressed in newspapers and speeches which may please the populace but the judicious cannot but look on with grave doubt or amused contempt, exhibit a signally short memory and foolish forgetfulness of former and comparatively recent conflicts of interests verging nearly on war. What good reason is there to suppose that France, if it comes

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

triumphant and exultant out of the present war, will have the same peaceful and chastened spirit which, knowing its weakness in face of Germany's strength, it undoubtedly showed before the war? Is it expected then to repudiate its adoration of Napoleon and its glorification of his splendid victories which Germany has good cause to remember, if not avenge? Before it was vanquished and heavily penalized in the Franco-German War it did not exhibit under Napoleon III any such quiet and moderate spirit; on the contrary, it showed a quite different spirit of unrest and aggression which caused many persons to sympathize with Germany and approve her success before they learnt the story of her atrocities. The truth is that the whole history of France is a decisive refutation of the expectation of a miraculous transformation of national character. And if Russia under its present amiable sovereign may perhaps be trusted to avoid an aggressive war, though not probably its persistent habit of silent aggression—if he is not seduced or overruled by his military and interested counsellors, as in the Japanese war—a new Czar of a different disposition disposing autocratically of its forces and resources (especially if in possession of Constantinople) might endanger British interests and be thought to necessitate their defence by war. Conflict between England and Russia in the not distant future (not to speak of France) seems to cool reason a more natural and probable event than the lasting friendship which sentimental enthusiasts fatuously expect to last for ever. More fatuous withal the humanitarian optimism which expects the result of the present sanguinary war to be a complete moral regeneration of humanity, when people shall not learn war any more, when there shall be a peaceful federation of nations, when they shall institute an International Court of Justice (without troubling to devise an International Executive), when righteousness shall reign everywhere on earth. Would that stagnant state of international felicity which fancy fondly pictures—should it ever come—be a boon or a bane to the human race? The doubt need not gravely disquiet mankind: the illusion or fiction of a Paradise Regained in lieu of a Paradise Lost will be a useful incentive to endurance and effort in the pilgrimage of labour and sorrow which reason teaches that human life is, a lesson which the lust of life joying to live prevents man for ever really minding.

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Note.

The writer of a letter in the *Spectator* of August 12th, who is serving in the war, is much saddened by the levity shown by our troops in their attacks on the enemy's trenches. "Is there not something lacking," he asks? "Is our levity altogether sound and wholesome? The spirit that jests with death, that calls through the din of the attack—'Sixpence the front row'—is it the spirit of true strength? Doesn't it lack something somewhere?" He would doubtless similarly regret the dribbling of a football in front of the attack and the reported praise of the King by the troops as "a real sport."

He and those who feel with him "have seen the hand of God in the business," and wish for the inspiration in which alone "can we find the strength of the faith that will enable us to tread in the victorious steps of those great forbears who through faith subdued kingdoms." It is a cheering thought and might no doubt be a useful inspiration, but the writer in his pious zeal neglects two considerations: he does not reflect that the Kaiser feels exactly in the same way and confidently claims the help of the "hand of God," which after rival claims can be certainly known only by the event. Secondly, the jesting spirit which he deprecates is evidence of strong and exultant vitality which will be necessary to win in the end, for the pious inspiration of faith would not avail if there were not the rude vital force for it to vivify. The reckless "jest with death," which must sooner or later come, shows a nobler spirit than the craven fear of it as "the last enemy."

([1]) Le cœur a des raisons que la raison ne connait pas.—PASCAL.—([2]) Le véritable auteur d'une guerre n'est pas celui qui la déclare, mais celui qui la rend nécessaire. —MONTESQUIEU.—([3]) The Vienna *Arbeiter Zeitung* calls attention to a sermon delivered at Hamburg by an evangelical pastor named Ebert. It contains passages like the following: "When it is a question of the Judgment of God, God's word knows nothing of mercy . . . God has put the sword of Justice into our hand . . . God has placed in our hands all means to defeat the enemy . . . God has given us the most brilliant leader of our days." Captain Valentiner, son of the Dean of Sonnenburgh Cathedral and the reported officer in command of the German submarine which sank the "Lusitania," has been decorated with a number of orders since the deed, including the first-class order of the Iron Cross and the Hohenzollern House Order with swords, a special distinction in the personal gift of the Emperor.—([4]) Some of them belonging to what Burke describes as "the profane herd of those vulgar and mechanical politicians who, so far from being qualified to be directors of the great movement of Empire, are not fit to turn a wheel in it." —([5]) The following quotation is from an article by Lord Cromer in *The Spectator* (August 19th, 1916): "Mr. Fortescue and other historians have drawn attention to the fact that the European chaos produced by the French Revolution was in some measure due to the abundance of half-witted or incapable Sovereigns who, during

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the eighteenth century, governed their respective countries. The Emperor Paul of Russia was a madman. King Christian VII of Denmark was subject to intermittent attacks of dementia, as also was George III of England. Queen Marie of Portugal and Gustavus IV of Sweden were both lunatics. Charles IV of Spain and his brother, Ferdinand of Naples, were half-witted. Louis XVI of France, Victor Amadeus of Sardinia, Francis of Austria, and Frederick William of Prussia, though not of unsound mind, were all wholly unfit to occupy with advantage to their countries the exalted positions which they held."

The Factors of Criminal Actions. By SIR H. BRYAN DONKIN, M.D., F.R.C.P.

AN article under the title of "The Ætiology of Crime" by Dr. Goring, in the April number of the Journal for 1918, consists to a great extent of criticisms of one by me, entitled "Notes on Mental Defect in Criminals," which appeared in the January number for 1917, and contained special comments on Dr. Goring's well-known work "The English Convict: a Statistical Study." As it then seemed to me necessary to consider Dr. Goring's views when writing on this subject, it seems equally necessary now to make some comment on his criticisms. The main reason for the following remarks is the interest and importance of the subject-matter on which he and I differ; but since some of his strictures depend greatly on misrepresentations of what I have written, or on imputations of arguments and opinions that I have not uttered, I am forced to occupy more space in this paper than I could have wished in quoting from Dr. Goring's charges and re-stating my own position.

Dr. Goring starts with the charge that I criticise "adversely an important modern idea—the idea that criminological science, that all social science, must be built on facts, and facts alone." This statement, as it stands, uninterpreted, is baseless, if not meaningless, and, at any rate, unjustifiable. If it means, as its wording unquestionably implies, that I have denied that scientific study must be based on facts only, the statement is false. If, however, Dr. Goring means that I criticise adversely his attempt to found a "criminological science" on the basis of the biometrical statistics he has worked upon, why does he not openly say what he means? It is clear throughout my paper that I do not regard the biometrical method as co-extensive with the scientific method of inquiry, and still less as the sole or chief instrument of the scientific study of things either biological or social. Whether he or I be right in our estimate of the applicability of this instrument does not matter one jot in connection with the charge Dr. Goring makes against me—a charge which, as it stands at the outset of his article, worded as it is, and totally unsupported, is acutely calculated to prejudice the

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.65.269.65 Published online by Cambridge University Press