

THE BRUTALITARIAN.

A Journal for the Sane and Strong.

"We have let Brutality die out too much."

Vol. I.]

OCTOBER, 1904.

[No. 1.]

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY—TO OUR READERS	1
SCHOOL DISCIPLINE	2
THE JEWISH METHOD OF SLAUGHTER	3
WORDS OF THE WISE	4

INTRODUCTORY.

TO OUR READERS.

THE *Brutalitarian*, as its name implies, aspires to be the official organ of those who hold, with the late Mr. G. W. Steevens, that "we have let brutality die out too much." It is full time, in this age of decadent humanitarianism, that some trumpet-tongued protest were raised against the prevalent sentimentality, and that there should be an attempt to organize and consolidate the forces—at present scattered and isolated—that make for manliness and patriotism. Our opponents are fond of using the term "brutal" in an opprobrious sense. We take up the word like a gauntlet, and lo! the *Brutalitarian*!

We think that our party has hitherto made two great mistakes in its attitude towards the sickly sentimentalists of the Humanitarian League and other bodies which are seeking to undermine the vigour of the national character. In the first place, we have underrated the ability of these faddists to do mischief; for obscure and contemptible though they are in themselves, these humanitarians, having been allowed to have things largely their own way, have scored some important successes. They have weakened the discipline of the English prison system by the Act of 1898, and by the discontinuance of that most useful form of punishment, the tread-wheel; and owing to the clamour which they have made against the wholesome infliction of the "cat" and birch on scoundrels who break the laws, there is grave danger of those efficacious implements of justice falling into desuetude. By securing the abolition of the Royal Buckhounds, they have deprived our national field-sports of the prestige which they enjoyed through their association with the Crown; and so on, in quite a number of other departments of our national life. All this might have been prevented if we had bestirred ourselves ten years earlier.

Secondly, we have made the fatal error of quibbling over words, and of trying ourselves to pose as the true

"humanitarians" in opposition to our adversaries, a game in which the fanatics of the Humanitarian League, prepared as they are to go any length—even to vegetarianism—have inevitably worsted us. Instead of avowing and glorying in the fact of our anti-humanitarian principles (for such they are), and standing loyally shoulder to shoulder—Imperialist with sportsman, sportsman with vivisectionist—we have allowed our enemies to attack us in detail, and we have even witnessed the shameful sight of one section of our friends betraying and sacrificing the interests of another section. Thus a distinguished nobleman, himself a keen sportsman, has been so forgetful of the fact that we are all "in the same boat" (so to speak) with regard to this common danger, as to accept the position of President in the most active of anti-vivisection societies; while some well-known scientists, on the other hand, have been illogical enough to condemn sport! Is it surprising, under such circumstances, that the humanitarian craze makes headway? What we have now to do, instead of paltering with our consciences and trying to palliate our actions, is to make a bold and united stand against the bigotry which threatens to trammel us all alike—in our foreign policy, in our criminal law and prison system, in our science, in our sports, in our fashions, in our diet—in everything. This will be the first object of the *Brutalitarian*.

Let us speak rather more fully on one or two of the typical subjects with which we shall have to deal.

1. Take the question of flogging, for instance, a practice which is one of the most essential "planks" in our platform; for if we are fools enough to allow the use of the lash to die out, good-bye to all the sterling traits in an Englishman's character! It is through flogging that the Englishman has developed that toughness of fibre and splendid moral stamina which is the wonder of an envious world; and shall all this be cast aside, as if it were nothing, because a few sickly, neurotic humanitarians are averse to the infliction of physical pain? But if we are to preserve and perpetuate this wholesome discipline, it can only be by consistency. If we run away from our principles and admit, for example, that females should not be flogged, how can we hope permanently to retain that most effective of punishments in the case of the male sex? No wonder that Mr. Lloyd Wharton's Flogging Bill, admirable as it was in many ways, was so heavily beaten by the humanitarians, seeing that even he was not courageous enough to propose to flog a woman for

the offences for which he would flog a man. In the same way the Rev. Benjamin Waugh, though sensible enough to see that the truest way of preventing cruelty to children is to flog the "youthful offender," ruined the consistency of his pet Bill by exempting girls from that punishment.

So, too, nearly all the champions on our side have flinched at the word "flagellomania," which has been of immense service to the faddists in their crusade against flogging. How much wiser it would be to avow at once that we are flagellants—that it *pleases* us to hear of the increase of flogging! And what could be more pitiful than the plea put forward by the naval lords, for instance, that boys in the Royal Navy are not "flogged" but "birched," in spite of the fact that every public school man in the country knows that the terms are identical? The *Brutalitarian* will at least make it impossible for our friends to repeat these errors, for it will frankly, fully, and consistently uphold flogging (under that name), whether with birch, or cane, or "cat," or any other instrument, as the mainstay of British education.

2. Just as we shall refuse to favour women by supporting the present unjust system of unisexual punishments, so we shall refuse to do them the wrong of blaming them where they are no more to blame than men are—as, for example, in the absurd and illogical outcry against feathered headgear. Never did our friends make a greater blunder than in allowing the term "murderous millinery"—invented and launched at us by the craft of the Humanitarian League—to become a proverbial and accepted expression, for it has done incalculable injury to our cause. With what justice can we men, who defend, and persist in defending, our rights of "sport," blame women for as persistently wearing aigrettes or other plumes in their hats and bonnets, seeing that the pain inflicted by the feather-fashion all the world over is a trifle compared with that which is caused (quite justifiably) by sport? The sentimental and inconsistent attitude taken up by some well-known sportsmen and naturalists on this subject will find no countenance in the *Brutalitarian*.

In like manner we shall maintain that war and sport, flesh-eating and vivisection, are all kindred practices which must stand or fall together, and we shall deprecate that half-hearted sort of defence of any one of these praiseworthy customs which consists in trying to justify it at the expense of another. No encouragement, for example, will be given in these columns to soldiers or vivisectioners who disparage sport, or to sportsmen who look askance on their comrades of the battlefield and the laboratory. Unity, not division, must henceforth be our watchword.

We are confident that the resolute and consistent position which we thus take up will win us the respect of the public, and will lead to a determined rally, under the banner of Brutalitarianism, of the forces of sanity and common-sense. We have not yet arrived at the point of forming our Executive Committee; but the public may be assured that when the names of our patrons and supporters are announced they will be a guarantee of the thoroughness with which our policy will be signalized, and will convey a plain intimation to our humanitarian opponents that in future they will have to deal with a more formidable foe than any they have yet encountered. Meantime we trust that the patriotic Press in general, and especially those papers which represent military, naval, judicial, scientific, and sporting interests—the interests that are directly threatened by the fanatics of the Humanitarian League—will note the appearance of the *Brutalitarian*.

SCHOOL DISCIPLINE.

There is no department of life in which the principles of blatant humanitarianism, now so fashionable, have done more mischief than that of school discipline. Teachers are much better qualified to administer personal chastisement than parents can be, and should therefore be entrusted with more extensive powers of using the rod or the tawse. Parents have not studied mastigology, teachers have. Parents are often deficient in mental training, and led away by passions which they have not learned to control. Teachers understand their business, and are calm, cool, and self-reliant. Parents are usually either too lenient or too severe. A skilful teacher knows when to lay on and when to stop. I claim for every teacher the right of whipping any pupil under the age of twenty-one years who is placed under his or her control, with full power to inflict the punishment, publicly or privately, with any authorized implement and any adjustment of dress which he or she deems suitable, such teacher to have absolute discretion as regards the number and severity of the strokes, so long as no injury of a permanent kind is caused thereby. These are the dictates of common-sense. When adopted, the results have always been beneficial, though I fear that even teachers are now becoming infected with this new-fangled humanitarian folly, and are sometimes too much disposed to spare the rod even where they have no personal reason for sparing it. Many of them require to be reminded that it is not only their privilege, but their duty, to use the birch in all proper cases without fear, favour, or affection, regardless of the age, the sex, or the rank of the offender.

But it is time to turn to the more important question, When and why should boys and girls be flogged? for when this question is once correctly answered, the rest will be easy. More than one answer is admissible, but the first and chief one is: they should be flogged when they deserve it, and because they deserve it. This is simple justice, and to exempt young people of either sex is unjust to those who are not exempted, and it is equally unjust to exempt anyone under the legal age of twenty-one years on account of age, when, if younger, he or she would be flogged for the same offence. Justice is equality—the fitting of the punishment to the offence, regardless of all other considerations, though, of course, by equality, I do not mean equality in the number and severity of the strokes (where the offence is the same), but equality in the physical effect of them. Here I shall, perhaps, be met by the captious objection that girls are physically unfit for personal chastisement. Some girls are so, and so are some boys. Perhaps the girls who are unfit are more numerous than the boys, though of this I am doubtful. The question of fitness or unfitness in both cases may be left to the decision of any prudent and well-informed teacher. I only contend for flogging young persons of both sexes who have been naughty, and are physically fit for flogging. The allegation that no girl is physically fit for that punishment is utterly without foundation, either in reason or experience. Moreover, if a boy or girl deserves to be flogged, the sentence ought not to be remitted without strong grounds. "Flog unless unfitness is clearly proved" should be the general rule. Otherwise how can we pretend that we are dealing out even-handed justice?

It can hardly be regarded as a digression if I pause here to express my surprise at finding so many teachers truckling to the morbid humanitarianism of the day by expressing their "regret" at the necessity of having to chastise their naughty pupils. In most cases I do not



believe in the genuineness of this regret, and certainly it ought not to exist. Every lover of justice should rejoice to see justice fairly and firmly carried out, whether he is himself the administrator or only a spectator. A man or woman of high moral sentiments feels a righteous indignation against all wrong-doers, and the punishment of a wrong doer affords an innocent mode of gratifying this proper and natural feeling. There are further pleasures, too, connected with punishments which ought not to be overlooked. Whipping is, to all intents and purposes, a surgical operation. The spectator feels the same pleasure that the medical student feels when watching a bold and skillful surgical operation, especially if it be one which he has not previously witnessed; and then, as the operation proceeds, the surgeon notes all the symptoms of complete success; this also must give him great satisfaction. It would be far better, as well as more honest, to address the pupils in some such language as, "Master Brown, it will afford me the greatest possible pleasure to give you the soundest flogging that you have ever got, and I hope it will give almost as much satisfaction to these young gentlemen as to myself." Or, "Miss Jones, I shall be delighted to give you the severest and best-deserved whipping that I ever had the happiness to inflict on a young lady of your age, and I hope that my young friends here will derive pleasure, as well as profit, from witnessing it."

The simulated unwillingness of teachers to resort to the birch is closely connected with the privacy now observed in the use of it. It would almost seem as if the modern teacher was ashamed of the implements of his trade. He never uses them without regret, and then he tries, as far as possible, to conceal the fact that he has used them.

But the birch is not merely an instrument of justice. It has a most valuable reformatory, or, at least, deterrent, effect. Here the teacher should have two objects in view—to deter the offender from repeating the offence, and to deter the other pupils from committing it. For both purposes it is desirable to give the offender the full amount of what he or she deserves, especially if the offence is one prevalent at the time and calls for strong repressive measures. There is not the slightest danger in the use of the birch by teachers of experience and skill. Permanent injury is never done in such cases, and the whipping of girls is quite as safe in all respects as the whipping of boys.

Time would fail me to enumerate one-half of the evils that have resulted from the decadence of the birch in the Army, in the Church, in the great schools and universities, and, above all, among the young children of both sexes who are trained by women. But I cannot close without referring to one bright spot in our present system—the Royal Navy. It is true that even there the age for flogging might be advantageously extended to twenty-one years, but it is a real satisfaction to find that youths of eighteen can be flogged with the birch rod at the discretion of the captain, who in that case exerts the delegated authority of the parent. The strokes are often numerous and severe, while the faults for which they are inflicted are not always of a very grave character. And, above all, the floggings are always inflicted in the presence of the other youths whose age does not exceed eighteen years, and the effect of the example is most salutary. Naturally, the humanity-mongers have poured out all the vials of their wrath on the heads of the Navy department, but the latter stand firm, and declare that they would rather die than surrender the birch or cane. It is, indeed, of these kinds of timber that "the wooden walls of England"

are chiefly constructed—block-heads supplying most of the residue—and the British Navy now floats majestically on the ocean with the birch-broom of Van Tromp nailed to the mast. I can only say, in the words of a great Irish patriot, *Esto perpetua!*

TYRANNUS.

THE JEWISH METHOD OF SLAUGHTER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "BRUTALITARIAN."

SIR,

I thank you for your kind invitation to contribute something to the first issue of your new paper, as there is one subject in which I am much interested, and which, I am sure, sufficiently represents the "old brutality" which you advocate to claim your hearty sympathy. I mean the good old-fashioned method of slaughtering cattle still employed by my nation. I have watched for years the attack made on it by the hypersensitive people calling themselves humanitarians, and no words can express my admiration for the stolid indifference with which our Board of Sheeheta has treated them throughout. There have, however, lately been signs of weakness in my people, and your paper will come most opportunely to stiffen their necks (to use a Biblical expression) a little again.

I have even heard that, in deference to the absurd humanity-mongers, some indiarubber flooring is to be put down in one slaughter-house in London for the animals to fall on when "cast." This is distinctly a weak concession, but in reality it matters very little, as there is no fear that it will be done in other places; and, besides, it does not make much difference when you are violently hurled to the ground whether you fall on a mat of india rubber or a stone floor, and the stand-up fight beforehand and the wrenching of the head with the crowbar still remain to testify to our real principles.

For myself the question is decided once for all when I read those sublimely contemptuous words, "Doth God care for oxen?" (1 Cor. ix. 9). Certainly not, say I. Then why should we, who are made in His image, do so either?

As one of our leading men so slyly and withal so truly said, when giving evidence before the recent committee: "We cannot fathom the feelings of oxen." Why, indeed, should we? It seems quite clear to me that what was good enough for our ancestors in the grand old days of Moses is quite good enough for us in these degenerate times.

There is just one other point as to which I should like to correct a misapprehension. It is often urged by some of our weaker brethren as an indication of our humanity (such nonsense!) that the knife used for the final severance of the neck is kept exceedingly sharp, and that not even the slightest little notch is allowed in it. This is quite true, but it can show only ignorance or wilful misrepresentation to say that this is done for reasons of humanity. It is done simply because it is written in our Ordinances, and the meat would be considered "unfit" if the point should be neglected. The object of it is, of course, to insure that the blood shall leave the body as rapidly as possible, which would not be the case if the knife was notched and blunt, and the cut was not a clean one. The question of humanity does not really come in at all. We have to carry out our law, and that is quite enough for us to do.

I think I have said enough to show that our case is worthy of your support.

Yours ever,

SHUCHET.

WORDS OF THE WISE.

We conclude this Introductory Number with a few quotations, which will give some idea, not only of the principles to be advocated by us, but also of the eminent personalities on whose authority we rely :

"At the bottom of all distinguished races the beast of prey is not to be mistaken, the magnificent blond beast, roaming wantonly in search of prey and victory."
—NIETZSCHE.

"All men who are Patriots and Sportsmen must feel that there is about War, once commenced, something of a Magnificent Game."—RIGHT HON. ALFRED LYTTELTON, M.P.

[This profound remark, uttered by Mr. Lyttelton in 1889 with reference to the Boer War, foreshadowed the great qualities since developed by him as Colonial Secretary.—Ed. *Brutalitarian*.]

"Might was Right when Caesar bled upon the stones of Rome :

Might was Right when Joshua led his hordes o'er Jordan's foam :

And Might was Right when German troops poured down through Paris gay :

It's the gospel of the ancient world, and the logic of to-day.

"The Strong must ever rule the Weak is grim primordial law ;

On earth's broad racial threshing-floor the Meek are beaten straw ;

Then ride to power o'er foemen's necks, let nothing bar your way :

If you are fit, you'll rule and reign, is the logic of to-day."

[Dr. Redbeard is the Laureate of Brutitarianism, and his great work, "The Survival of the Fittest : or, the Philosophy of Power," deserves to be the text-book of our cause.—Ed. *Brutalitarian*.]

"This (the new humanitarianism) is throttling patriotism and common-sense and virility of individual character. . . . Our forefathers burned, and marooned, and beheaded, and shot, and fought cocks ; but they were quite ready to bear like sufferings when their turn came. So they bred hardihood. Brutes as you may call them, on these unhumanitarian principles they built the British Empire."—G. W. STEEVENS.

"The application of the Golden Rule, that we should do to others as we would they should do to us, obviously depends upon what we wish them to do to us. The soldier who kills a Zulu in fair fight is fulfilling the Golden Rule to the letter. He is doing to the Zulu what he fully expects and wishes the Zulu to do to him—if he can."—CECIL CHESTERTON.

[Mr. Cecil Chesterton is the younger brother of "G. K. C.," and his talent, in our opinion, is of an even higher order. As the above quotation shows, he has an extraordinary power of throwing a new light on old sayings.—Ed. *Brutalitarian*.]

"Many persons would hold that a suitable punishment for an impenitent thief would be to crucify him ; but torture can never be used without injury to the society which has recourse to it."—SIR ROBERT ANDERSON.

[Such was the high note struck in the first of Sir Robert Anderson's series of articles on crime in the *Nineteenth Century*, but it appears since to have somewhat lowered his tone for prudential reasons. We regret it.—Ed. *Brutalitarian*.]

"May we not now and again put aside the rather scoldish and canting idea that punishment is only reformative? Have not the majority of all healthy-

minded, healthy-bodied individuals a strain of vengeance in their nature, and is there not to such people a downright pleasure and satisfaction in dealing with savage vengeance upon violent and cruel blackguards? I would urge the rehabilitating of a cruel and degrading penalty, just because its cruelty appeals to what is wholesomely and justifiably cruel in our nature, and also because it degrades still further an already degraded scoundrel."—REV. RAYMOND BLATHWAYT.

[Bravo, Rev. Mr. Blathwayt! We wish a few more clergymen had your consistency and courage. We shall ask you to join our army as hon. chaplain.—Ed. *Brutalitarian*.]

"It is very properly the desire and intention of the Prison Commissioners to increase the number of Tread-Wheels, as supplying a form of real, and therefore deterrent, hard labour."—REV. J. W. HORSLEY.

[So wrote Canon Horsley in 1887, but, alas! since then, the Prison Commissioners have given way to humanitarian outcry, and have abolished the admirable institution of the tread-wheel. All honour to the worthy Canon, nevertheless, for doing what he could to retain it. He is the authority on prison problems.—Ed. *Brutalitarian*.]

"Think what the members of this society (the Humanitarian League) will have to answer for if they are able to induce any weak men and silly women to disobey God's commands to whip the naughty children under their control, and thereby save their souls from going to hell!"—LIEUTENANT-COLONEL P. F. ROBERTSON.

[Colonel Robertson, of Bray—the "Sage of Bray" he has been called—has frequently raised a lusty voice in favour of the Rod. We hope the gallant officer will often be heard in our columns.—Ed. *Brutalitarian*.]

"As the lower animals have no duties, since they are destitute of freewill, so they have no rights, for right and duty are correlative terms. The brutes are made for man, who has the same right over them which he has over plants and stones."—*Catholic Dictionary*, by W. E. ADDIS and T. ARNOLD.

"The morality which satisfied St. Augustine may surely be considered good enough for the English Churchman of to-day. . . . It should be remembered that animals are our slaves, not our equals, and for this reason it is well to keep up such practices as hunting and fishing, driving and riding, merely to demonstrate in a practical way man's dominion over the brutes. . . . It is found that an advocacy of the rights of brutes is associated with the lowest phases of morality."—PHILIP AUSTEN.

"Now, my boy or girl, whichever you are, drop this nonsense about dogs. They are demanding valuable time that should be spent in teaching such as you. A dog cannot love you ; you cannot love a dog. Chloroform your dog, and take to reading your New Testament."—*The Dog Question, discussed in the Interest of Humanity*.

"Would that all sparrows had one head, and that I might be allowed to silence for ever the infernal chattering of that commonplace pest! Is this creature of any use? Yes, he may be eaten. Moreover, he is one of the best birds for trap-shooting, and he is useful for feeding ferrets and captive merlins."—P. H. EMERSON.

"My views as regards Anti-Vivisection are these : That all the animals in God's creation should suffer the excruciating tortures of hell for millions of years, provided that by doing this they saved humanity from a pain in its little finger for five minutes."—*From a Private Letter*.